





THE LIBRARIES
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY



GENERAL LIBRARY

C. J. Inslöv
quondam
e libris

C. J. Inslöv

ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ;
OR THE
ANTIQUITIES
OF
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

AND
OTHER WORKS,

OF THE

REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

Formerly Fellow of University College, Oxford; and afterwards Rector of
Headbourn Worthy, and Havant, Hampshire;

WITH A

SET OF MAPS OF ECCLESIASTICAL GEOGRAPHY.

TO WHICH ARE NOW ADDED,

SEVERAL SERMONS,

AND OTHER MATTER, NEVER BEFORE PUBLISHED.

The whole Revised and Edited, together with

A Biographical Account of the Author,

BY HIS GREAT GRANDSON,

THE REV. RICHARD BINGHAM, B.C.L.

Prebendary of Chichester, Vicar of Hale Magna,
Incumbent of Gosport Chapel, and formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.—VOL. IV.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR WILLIAM STRAKER,

443, WEST STRAND.

MDCCCXXXIV.

931

551

4

A
SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH,

In reference to the Administration of

BAPTISM BY LAYMEN.

PART II.

WITH

Some Considerations on Dr. Brett's and Mr. L——'s Answers to the
First Part.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

Rector of Headbourn Worthy, and Havant, Hants, and sometime Fellow of University-
College, in Oxford.

PART II.

B

359858

937

B31

4

THE
AUTHOR'S DEDICATION.

TO THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND
FATHER IN GOD,
JONATHAN,
LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

And Prelate of the most Noble Order of the Garter.

MY LORD,

I CANNOT but take this opportunity to make my public acknowledgments for the late favour your lordship has been pleased to bestow upon me, as an encouragement to proceed in my laborious work of reducing the Antiquities of the Church into one body or view. It is no small satisfaction to me that I have hitherto proceeded with your Lordship's approbation, not excepting my last dissertation upon the judgment and practice of the Church, in reference to the Baptism of Laymen, with which some, who can bear no contradiction, have been pleased, without reason, to be offended; to whom, I hope, I have given abundant satisfaction in the present discourse. I did not, I confess, write

the former part of this Scholastical History by your Lordship's particular direction or command, though some have done me so great an honour as to say so; and I shall ever be proud of doing any thing that is good by the direction and command of my superiors; your Lordship did not so much as know what subject I was upon, till it was finished; nor did I perfectly know your Lordship's sentiments upon the point, till you were pleased to honour me with a letter of thanks for my book, and tell me that you exceedingly approved of it; and particularly that part of it, which treats of the deficiency of heretical and schismatical baptisms, and of the obligation those, who are so baptised, lie under to return to the unity of the Church, in order to have the defects of their baptism supplied by imposition of hands in confirmation; which was the usual way of supplying such defects, according to the general rule and practice of the ancient Church. Your lordship was pleased also to acquaint me, with what I did not understand before, that all the bishops of both provinces were unanimously of the same opinion, which I had defended, and thought there were other ways of supplying a faulty baptism, than by rebaptisation, if given in due form by a layman. And though your lordship did not consent to subscribe the resolution, which was then intended to be drawn up, yet it was not because you dissented from them in the main of the determination, but because you thought it more proper to have added the words, *in cases of necessity*, which are cases less liable to exception, whose deficiency, whatever it be, may most certainly be rectified by confirmation. And so far both the rules and practice of the Church of England, for these last two hundred years, are clear; for we have neither order nor example to encourage rebaptisation in any such case, no, not after the rubric had confined the ministration of baptism wholly to the hands of a lawful minister.

For still no rule was made, that such, as were not baptised by a lawful minister, should be rebaptised; but they were required to receive the bishop's confirmation, and then were admitted to the eucharist, and the privilege of Christian burial, neither of which are allowed to unbaptised persons. Notwithstanding all this, I am charged by some as a false and self interested writer; as one that is writing against the true Church of England; as an encourager of dissenters; because I would not suffer certain persons to represent the Church just as they pleased, and fix upon her such principles and practices as are peculiar to the dissenters only; because I would not join with them in advancing Cartwright's notions about rebaptisation, against the Church of England, and revile and undervalue all the eminent bishops and doctors of the Church that have written heretofore in her defence, and learnedly defended her constitution; because I would not withdraw the writers of the primitive Church, and represent them as favourable to this novel hypothesis, when without the greatest injustice to them, and the world, and myself, I could not do it; because I would not allow all the heretics and schismatics of the primitive Church, to be as true priests of God, and invested with as ample commission, power, and authority to baptise, when they were actually degraded, and removed from all sacerdotal offices by the discipline of the Church, as those catholic priests, who never were under any such censure. And yet upon this last point, upon which the whole controversy turns, and the whole discipline of the Church depends, the adversaries are strangely divided. One of them thinks, heretical and schismatical priests are safe under the protection of indelible character; that is, they can never be wholly divested of their sacerdotal commission, let the Church use what authority she can or will to take it from them; their indelible character will still preserve their sacerdo-

tal authority entire to them, and no power on earth can extend so far as to deprive them of the internal power of priests, whatever restraint she may lay upon the external exercise of their function. The other champion of the cause will not venture to go thus far, so to destroy all ecclesiastical discipline at a blow, and cut the very sinews of episcopal power in pieces. Which he is sensible must be the consequence, if they, who grant the sacerdotal authority to priests, have not power, acting by the canons, to withdraw the same commission again, in case of heresy, or schism, or any the like occasion. For then there is an end of all authority and power in the Church; and the ecclesiastical censures, when inflicted upon a delinquent bishop, or priest, to deprive them of sacerdotal authority and power, is but a bugbear. Here therefore he deserts his fellow disputant, and owns there is a real and effectual power in the Church to withdraw the sacerdotal commission from heretical and schismatical bishops and priests, and deprive them of their authority, and reduce them to the state of laymen: in which case, he confesses, their baptisms are as much unauthorised and uncommissioned as those of any other laymen. But then he pretends, that no Church, except the Cyprianic Churches, ever exercised this power against heretics and schismatics: though their commissions were delible, and the Church had power to delete them, yet no Church, besides the Cyprianic, ever actually deleted them. So that, according to him, heretics and schismatics were still acknowledged by the Church to be lawful priests, in actual and full commission, and the Church was so kind to them, even during their heresy and schism, as to leave them in full possession of their sacerdotal authority, and never withdraw her commission from them. Which is such a representation of the primitive Church, and so grand a reflection on her discipline, as I believe no one ever made before him. But it was necessary to salve

this gentleman's hypothesis, who otherwise must have been forced to own, that the primitive Church did generally receive the baptism of heretics and schismatics, when given in due form, at the same time that she accounted them to be no priests, but actually deprived of their commission, and reduced to the state of laymen. For he is very sensible, and any one with half an eye may see it, that if the ancient Church did actually by her discipline deprive heretics and schismatics of their commission, and thereby divest them of all sacerdotal authority and power; then they were no longer priests in that state, but reduced, by vacating their commission, to the degree and condition of laymen: and if the Church, notwithstanding this, received the baptisms of such heretics and schismatics without re-baptising, then she must receive the baptism of such persons as had then no sacerdotal commission, being such as she herself had deprived of commission, and reduced to the state of laymen. The consequence is here so plain, that our author, on supposition the premises stand good, cannot pretend to deny it. All the dispute now therefore is reduced to this one point, whether the ancient heretics and schismatics, whose baptisms the primitive Church received and completed by confirmation, without a second baptism, were true authorised priests in actual commission, during their heresy or schism; or only nominal priests, whose commission was vacated by the same lawful episcopal power and authority, which first committed it to them? Our author does not dispute the power of the Church to vacate the commission of heretical or schismatical priests, but boldly affirms that no Churches, except the Cyprianic, ever actually exercised this discipline upon them, but left them still in full commission, and lawful possession of the power and authority of the priesthood. Which I have proved to be a grand mistake, and a grand reflection upon the disci-

pline of the whole Catholic Church, and such an abetting of heretics and schismatics, as sets them upon the same level with Catholic priests, which the Catholic Church never intended. For she always vacated the commission of heretical and schismatical priests, and by her just power and discipline took away all sacerdotal authority from them, leaving them in a state of unauthorised and uncommissioned laymen. This I have proved from such undeniable evidence from the ancient rules and canons of general and particular Councils, and the practice and proceedings of the whole Catholic Church, that the contrary assertion must be the effect either of very great ignorance, or very great prejudice, and a resolution to serve an hypothesis, in any one that will venture to maintain it. The result then of the whole inquiry is this, that the Catholic Church was so far from abetting or encouraging the priesthood of heretics and schismatics, that she vacated and destroyed their commission, and reduced them, by her discipline, to a state of laymen; but yet she did not wholly cancel and disannul the unauthorised baptisms of those uncommissioned laymen, or priests who had lost their commission; she did not order all men to be re-baptised, who were baptised by them; but only supplied what was irregular, unauthorised, and deficient, by her own just authority and power in a subsequent confirmation. And it is well known, that the practice of the Church of England, for these 200 years has been the very same; and few, besides professed dissenters from her, have offered to oppose it. Yet they, who now oppose her practice, and maintain the principle of dissenters, will needs outface the world, and bear all men down, that they are the only true defenders of the Church, who really desert her cause, and reflect upon her practice; and that they, who defend her practice, and shew it to be agreeable to the practice of the whole Catholic Church, are men of ill designs; that they who will not allow the priesthood of

heretics and schismatics to be as good as that of true Catholics, are enemies to Christ and the Christian priesthood; and that they, who write in defence of the Church's discipline, both ancient and modern, are subverters of her constitution. I have lately received a letter from an unknown hand, which I shall beg leave to insert in this place.

SIR,—You will perhaps wonder to receive this from one that never saw you, and perhaps never may. But it is out of kindness to you, to let you know what (opinion) the true Church-of-England-men have of you about us. Your *Origines*, &c. gained you a great reputation, and notwithstanding some mistakes incident to all mankind, you were looked upon as a member of the Church both willing and able to serve her. The news of your *Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism* being published, caused great joy to several about me, hoping so able a pen as your's would have set that matter in a clear light, and have ended a dispute, which has caused so much trouble to the Church, triumph to its adversaries, and a staggering in several well-meaning men; but to our great surprise, it proved only a daubing, prevaricating piece, to recommend yourself to the moderate party, falsely so called, and their patrons, unfortunately crept into some of the highest places in the Church. The world has long waited for your justification in answer to Mr. Lawrence, which, if you refuse to do, all mankind will impute it to your guilt, and that you own yourself a false and self-interested writer; which I do assure you is the opinion of

Your servant,

TRUE DARBYSHIRE.

London, Sept. 22.

All I shall say in answer to this, is only, “Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall

say all manner of evil against you, falsely for my sake: rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven!" What reward I am to expect on earth for my service, I know not. What your lordship bestowed upon me, was for my former labours, and not for this. For you were pleased to give me the offer of it before ever my last book appeared in print, and before you yourself were acquainted with the purport of it. And I hope this gentleman, whoever he is, or his friends, will not be angry at your lordship for giving a little encouragement to the author of the *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, "which gained him," he says, "a great reputation, and made him to be looked upon as a member of the Church, both willing and able to serve her." That may be sufficient to justify your lordship in bestowing your favour upon a person of such a character. But I have now spoiled all by writing a "daubing, prevaricating piece, to recommend myself to the moderate party, falsely so called, and their patrons, unfortunately crept into some of the highest places in the Church." Some persons take a great latitude in distinguishing men and parties, and fixing names to them as they please; for which, perhaps, they may be accountable another day. I suppose now, every one, that declares against rebaptisation, is by this gentleman reckoned among his moderate-party-men: and then I see not how your lordship, or the archbishop of York, or the bishop of Bath and Wells, will escape the imputation of being patrons of the moderate party, and that, in this gentleman's opinion, "unfortunately crept into some of the highest places in the Church," because you have, with many others, declared yourselves freely against rebaptisation, as contrary to the sense and practice of the Catholic Church and the Church of England. But perhaps he had his eye more upon some others, when he spake of "moderate-party-men and their patrons:" and if so, I can

assure him, the author of the *Origines* had no occasion to write a “daubing, prevaricating piece” to recommend himself to them: having gained himself by his former labours, a good esteem with them, as well as others; as writing what was of general use, and to general satisfaction. But my crime is, that I wrote against one, whom he calls Mr. Lawrence, for I myself must not, without a rebuke, presume to call him so; one, who, in the opinion of this gentleman, and his friends, is highly to be regarded: and unless I justify myself against him, all mankind will impute it to my guilt, and that I own myself a false and self-interested writer. But, perhaps, he may be a little out in his computation. For if I had never answered his book, all men would not have judged so hardly: there are many, who think it needs no answer; and others, who would have imputed not answering to other causes; to indisposition, or want of time, and avocation by other studies and labours; or a willingness not to insist too long upon such a debate, when I had a far greater work still upon my hand. But to prevent all further demands, the world has now my justification, whereby it will appear, who is the most faithful representer of the sense and practice of the Catholic Church; which, I have, in this *Second Part of the Scholastical History*, delivered with such plain, full, and authentic evidence, as cannot fail of giving satisfaction to all such as will read without prejudice, and with a design to inform themselves of the true discipline and practice of the Ancient Church, in reference to the baptisms administered by declared heretics and schismatics, whom she accounted no more than laymen. If any men for doing this will call me again “a false and self-interested writer,” they may use their pleasure: such reproaches will only teach me, that there are some men in the world, who are not to be obliged by any useful services, unless a man will give up his un-

derstanding to them, and write a history against the Church, in favour of their particular conceptions and opinions. Which I have never yet done, and by the grace of God, never intend to do, though speaking truth expose me to a thousand worse reproaches. I cannot yet see any reason to espouse the principle of dissenters, about rebaptisation, against the Church; I have more honour for the priesthood, than to put it into the hands of declared heretics and schismatics, against the discipline and practice of the first six general Councils of the Church; which some, who call themselves the only true Churchmen, are forced to do, because their hypothesis obliges them to do it, lest they should be forced to confess the baptism of such heretics and schismatics to be no more than the baptism of laymen. Which if they once own, they know they must give up the argument drawn from the practice of the Catholic Church, which received the baptisms of heretics and schismatics, without rebaptising, whilst she accounted the administrators to be no more than laymen. These things are so plainly demonstrated in the following discourse, that though I despair of convincing some men, yet I doubt not it will open the eyes of many, and give them rational satisfaction, as to what concerns the discipline of the Primitive Catholic Church, whose example in this point of discipline is now followed by the Church of England: both which conjoined together, I have endeavoured to vindicate from the misrepresentations of those, who, under colour of defending, manifestly oppose them both. I know, indeed, it is confidently pretended by the adverse party, that they are writing in defence of the Church, against the dissenters: but wise and considering men take this to be a very odd way of defending the Church, to espouse the professed principle of dissenters about rebaptising, and maintain it against the the Church's practice, and yet, after all, call this, "defending the Church against the dissenters." They say

indeed, they are persuading the dissenters to come into the Church, and be rebaptised, because lay-baptism is invalid: but this is only proving to them what they do not deny. For they assert the same thing, that lay-baptism is invalid, whilst the Church denies this by her constant practice. Therefore instead of writing dissertations about the invalidity of lay-baptism, which they do not deny, they should convince dissenters, that their ministers are only laymen; and then they would readily hearken to the doctrine of rebaptisation, because this doctrine is according to their own principles; but as the matter stands at present, writing for the invalidity of lay-baptism, in the way that they do, is only writing against the Church, without any effect at all upon dissenters; who are convinced of nothing more thereby, than what they professed to believe before, that lay-baptism is invalid, which they always asserted and maintained against the Church, from the beginning of the Reformation. They pretend further, to be maintaining the cause of the primitive Church, and the Christian priesthood, against heretics and schismatics, and other usurpers, when yet it is plain, they manifestly lodge the power of the priesthood in the hands of heretics and schismatics, which the ancient Church took from them; and they thereby misrepresent the discipline of the Church, as favouring the priesthood of heretics, which she utterly denied. So they give a secret wound to the Christian priesthood, and cast a blemish on the ancient discipline, even whilst they would appear to their admirers to be the only zealous and true defenders of them. If these things be undeniably proved in the following discourse, then I hope it will a little abate the confidence of these gentlemen, and work them either into satisfaction or silence, when they find themselves so palpably mistaken about the priesthood of heretics, and the discipline of the ancient Church in rela-

tion to such a pretended priesthood. As I know no better way to end the present dispute about lay-baptism, so I hope it will not be unacceptable to your lordship or the world, to see the proceedings of the ancient Councils against heretics and schismatics, brought into one view, in order to illustrate this part of ancient history, and set it in a just light, pursuant to my general design of collecting and illustrating the Antiquities of the Christian Church; in which I have hitherto proceeded with your lordship's countenance and approbation, and hope to finish it under your encouragement and protection, who am,

My LORD,

Your most obliged,

most dutiful, and

obedient servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

CONTENTS.

The state of the present Controversy.

SECT. 1. No further dispute with Dr. Brett, about the modern Greek Church.—**2.** Nor about the Churches of the Reformation.—**3.** How far we are agreed about the Church of England.—**4.** How far we are agreed about the primitive Writers.—**5.** Whether St. Basil's Canon and the Council of Trullo determine the invalidity of Lay-baptism in the practice of the Church.—**6.** An account of the Luciferian Heresy. And whether St. Jerom be a witness of the Church's annulling the Baptism of Laymen in ordinary cases.—**7.** The testimony of St. Chrysostom no evidence against the baptism of Laymen in extraordinary cases.

CHAP. I.

That heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, and excommunicated clerks, when once they are convicted and legally censured, are no longer authorised to minister baptism, or officiate as true priests and ministers of God and the Church; but that thenceforth all their acts are unauthorised, and done only by usurpation. This proved from the history of the first six General Councils, and their proceedings against heretics, and schismatics, and other delinquents.

SECT. 1. How Meletius was deposed and divested of all ministerial authority by the Council of Nice.—**2.** How Arius was deposed and anathematised by the same Council.—**3.** How the Macedonians, Apollinarians, and other heretics, were degraded and anathematised in the second Council of Constantinople.—**4.** How the third General Council of Ephesus degraded Nestorius and his followers.—**5.** How the Council of Chalcedon deposed Eutyches and Dioscorus, and their adherents.—**6.** Of the condemnation of Anthimus and Severus in the Council of Constantinople, under Mennas, Anno 536.—**7.** How the defenders of the Tria Capitula were degraded in the fifth General Council of Constantinople.—**8.** How the sixth General Council of Constantinople deposed and anathematised the Monothelites.—**9.** How the Council of Trullo censured delinquent Bishops and Clerks.

CHAP. II.

The same assertion proved from patriarchal, national, and Provincial Councils; and from the Writings of Private Fathers, with several Arguments drawn from their Testimony. The first Argument, That some Heretics, whose Baptism was received, never had originally any real and

true Ordination to the ministerial Office and Function : Consequently they could be no other than Unauthorised Persons. This particularly proved upon the Novatian Heretics.

SECT. 1. A short reference to such patriarchal, national, and provincial Councils, as agree with the forementioned General Councils.—2. The first argument founded upon the Novatians wanting a true ordination.—3. That Novatian was never a true bishop. This proved, first, because he had only a simoniacal and forced ordination.—4. Proved further, because he intruded himself into a full see.

CHAP. III.

The second Argument, that heretics are not authorised ministers of God, because when they fall into open and professed heresy, they cease to be true Christian priests, and become wolves and antichrists, instead of true Shepherds and governors of the flock of Christ.

SECT. 1. That a lawful ordination does not secure a man in the possession of a perpetual authorised priesthood, unless he observe the rules of the priesthood.—2. This proved from Cyprian, who declares heretics to forfeit both the name and authority of priests.—3. And from the Council of Aquileia under St. Ambrose.—4. And from the Council of Colonia Agrippina.—5. From an Italic Council under St. Ambrose, Anno 381.—6. From the Roman Council under Damasus, Anno 369.—7. From the testimony of Domnus, bishop of Antioch, and John Cassian.—8. From the Decrees of Pope Innocent.—9. And Pope Simplicius.—10. And Pope Vigilius.

CHAP. IV.

The third Argument, that heretics and degraded clerks were not authorised priests, in the account of the Ancient Church, because, by her discipline they were reduced to the state and communion of laymen.

SECT. 1. No persons, who were obliged to do public penance, allowed to be of the clergy.—2. All degraded persons reduced, at least, to lay-communion.—3. This proved from Cyprian, and his cotemporaries, Cornelius, and the Council of Carthage.—4. And from the Apostolical Canons.—5. And the Council of Eliberis.—6. And the Council of Sardica.—7. And the Council of Adge.—8. The Council of Orleans.—9. The first Council of Toledo.—10. The Council of Hippo, and St. Austin.—11. The Decrees of Pope Innocent.—12. And Siricius, and St. Jerom.—13. And St. Basil.—14. And the Council of Trullo.

CHAP. V.

The Fourth Argument, that heretics and schismatics and degraded clerks were not accounted authorised priests, be-

cause they were sometimes thrust down one degree below Laymen, by being anathematised and cast out of the Communion of the Church.

SECT. 1. That no Man is reckoned a complete Layman but he that is in full Communion with the Church.—2. Heretics and Schismatics and degraded Clerks sometimes denied the Privilege of Lay-communion.—3. This proved from the testimony of Cyprian.—4. And the Apostolical Canons.—5. And the Council of Colen.—6. And the Council of Sardicæ.—7. And the Council of Eliberis.—8. And the Council of Rome under Felix III. Anno 487.

CHAP. VI.

The Objection taken from the notion of an Indelible Character imprinted in the Ordination of a Priest, examined, and shewed to be of no force against the former Allegations. With an Account of the first original and meaning of that term in the Writings of the Church.

SECT. 1. What meant by an Indelible Character imprinted in Baptism.—2. That the Indelible Character of Ordination is of the same Nature.—3. The name of *Indelible Character* not to be found in any ancient Council.—4. In what sense St. Austin owns and allows it in heretical Priests.—5. What the Papists mean by their Indelible Character.—6. How far an Indelible Character is allowed by Protestant Writers.—7. What submission is due to the Judgment of the Catholic Church, in such Points of Discipline as rebaptising and reordaining.

CHAP. VII.

A Resolution of some Difficulties concerning the Communion of Heretics, and their Baptisms, and Ordinations.

SECT. 1. Whether it be lawful to hold Communion with heretical Priests before they be degraded.—2. Whether it be lawful to communicate with Heretics, when a whole Church is heretical.—3. Whether, in any case, it be lawful to desire the Baptism of Heretics.—4. Whether the ordinations of Heretics and Schismatics may be accepted by the Church without reordination.

APPENDIX,

OR,

REMARKS ON THE AUTHOR OF THE SECOND PART OF LAY-BAPTISM INVALID.

CHAP. I.

A short Way to end the Controversy with this Author about unauthorised Baptism, by shewing his great Ignorance of the ancient Discipline of the Church, whilst he sup-

poses the ancient Heretics to be true authorised Priests, in actual Commission, when the Church had reduced them to the state of Laymen.

CHAP. II.

Remarks on our Author's Preface.

SECT. 1. That unauthorised Baptisms, and invalid Baptisms are not of the same import in the sense of the ancient Church.—**2.** This Author's reasons for the Validity of heretical Baptism, very different from those of the Primitive Church.—**3.** His notions about the invalidity of heretical Baptism unbaptises the whole Church of England.—**4.** His Exceptions against the new Form of Confirmation, which was proposed to the Convocation, considered.—**5.** He confesses his Mistake in producing Lucifer as a Witness against Lay-Baptism.—**6.** How he confounds valid Baptism, and saving Baptism together, against the Sense of the Ancient Church.—**7.** That heretical Baptism is properly anti-episcopal, by our Author's own Concessions.—**8.** That our Author's Charge upon his Adversaries, of dissolving the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood, equally reflects upon the Principles and Practice of the whole Catholic Church in all Ages.

CHAP. III.

Remarks on the first and second Chapters of our Author's Book.

SECT. 1. That allowing the Baptisms of Usurpers, Heretics, or Schismatics, to be valid only so far as not to need rebaptising, is not abetting or encouraging their Usurpations.—**2.** That some discretionary Power was supposed to be in the Hands of Bishops, in commissioning Persons to baptise.—**3.** Whether Deacons were accounted Priests, and the ordinary and standing Ministers of Baptism.—**4.** That many uncommissioned Baptisms were anciently confirmed by Bishops without rebaptising.—**5.** The necessary Distinction of the Ancients between an authoritative Baptism and a merely valid Baptism, confounded by our Author.

CHAP. IV.

Remarks on our Author's Account of the Greek Church and the Churches of the Reformation.

SECT. 1. That the ancient Greek Church had several Laws before the Eighth Century, determining the Validity of uncommissioned Lay-Baptism.—**2.** The Authority of the Canons of Nicephorus vindicated from our Author's Exceptions.—**3.** His disingenuous Way of answering the Modern Greek Writers.—**4.** That the Reason of the Greek's Practice was not their Opinion of the absolute Necessity of Baptism for dying Infants.—**5.** Of the Moscovite or Russian Churches.—**6.** No further Dispute about the Lutheran Churches.—**7.** Nor about Zuinglius and the Helvetic Churches.—**8.** That the Calvinists do in some Cases allow of the Validity of Lay-Baptism. The Conclusion, reducing the whole Controversy to this single Point, whether the ancient Heretics and Schismatics were true authorised Priests in Actual Commission, or only unauthorised and uncommissioned Laymen, usurping the Priests' Office at the Time of baptising.

THE STATE OF THE PRESENT

CONTROVERSY.



SECT. I.—No further Dispute with Dr. Brett about the modern Greek Church.

WHEN I set myself to write the First Part of this Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, I did it with the same prospect and view as I have done all other parts of the Antiquities of the Church, only to set matters in as fair a light as I could, and inform the judgment of every unprejudiced reader; not without hopes of bringing an unhappy controversy to a fair end, by convincing some learned persons, who are warmly engaged in the dispute, that they were under some great mistakes, in reference to several points, both of ancient and modern history. And in some measure I have gained this end, though not so perfectly as I hope to do in this Second Part, in which I have taken care to give these gentlemen all imaginable satisfaction from the most authentic rules and undeniable practice of the primitive Church, if the sense of the first six general Councils, and the concurrent testimony of all other Councils and Fathers, be of any force in such a case. Our controversy is now brought within a shorter compass: for I have no further dispute with my learned friend Dr. Brett, about the modern Greeks and Moscovites. All I have said of them is allowed, only the doctor complains he had not books to examine upon this occasion, nor would the excellent library of Canterbury furnish him with necessary assistance. I hope his Grace of Canterbury, or the Reve-

rend dean and chapter, will take his admonition to furnish their library with a Suicerus, and a Leunclavius, a Hottinger, and an Arcudius, &c. that the doctor may not be at a loss, when he is obliged to consult them upon any other such occasion.

SECT. 2.—Nor about the Churches of the Reformation.

I have no further dispute with the doctor neither, about the Churches of the Reformation. We are agreed, that the Lutheran Churches are all of the same opinion with the Greeks, and allow lay-persons to baptise in cases of necessity. Zuinglius did the same, and his followers did not much depart from his opinion. The Palatine Churches forbid the rebaptisation of those, who are baptised by laymen in a grand dissipation of the Church, if Alting, an eminent professor among them, knew their sense in such an exigency. The French and Dutch Churches are of the contrary opinion, and order all persons to be rebaptised that are baptised by laymen in any case whatsoever. Calvin was of the same opinion with Alting, that lay-baptism might be admitted without rebaptisation in a grand dissipation of the Church. And what the doctor quotes from him, only respects order in a quiet and peaceable state of the Church. The doctor will have it also, that the Scotch Church followed the French at the Reformation: and though he does not prove it from any piece of their discipline, or from Knox, or any private writer; for I think Knox's Book of Discipline, in Bishop Spotswood, has nothing about it: yet I will not contend with him about this particular, having as little proof against his assertion as he has for it, and it would be only to fight in the dark, to say any thing further without authority upon it.

SECT. 3.—How far we are agreed about the Church of England.

Thus far then our dispute seems to be at an end. But there are two points about which the doctor is not satisfied; the sense of the Church of England, and the primitive Church. To what I said about the Church of England, he gives a very short answer, that I have said nothing but what

was said some time before, in a small pamphlet, called "The Judgment of the Church of England in the Cause of Lay-Baptism," which was fully answered by Mr Lawrence, to which he therefore refers his reader; and only observes further, that I gave the opinion of private men only, and not the judgment of the Church from any of her rubrics, articles, or canons. So that though I had alleged a thousand authorities more than the little pamphlet, called, "The Judgment," had done, or should now allege a thousand more, the same insinuation, that I had added nothing new, would answer all in a word. For it signifies nothing to this gentleman to produce the unanimous consent of private writers, in every age since the Reformation, declaring their judgment of the sense of the Church of England in this matter. The constant practice of the Church, which is obvious to every one that has but half an eye, is of no more weight with him: for unless he sees express rubrics, articles, or canons, forbidding to rebaptise, he will not believe it to have been the sense or judgment of the Church of England. So that it is in vain to add any more Whitgifts, or Abbots, or Whitakers, or Casaubons, father or son, or the judgment of the universities, or the judgment of the prince in a conference of bishops: all these were but private men, and cannot tell us what was the judgment of the Church in their times. Nay, according to the new hypothesis, some of them were not baptised Christians, but only in the state of catechumens: for Casaubon, I suppose, was baptised by a French minister, and therefore, according to this hypothesis, ought to have been rebaptised when he first joined himself to the Church of England. And it has already been observed by others, that the royal martyr was baptised by a Scotch presbyter only, and therefore, by the same hypothesis, ought to have had a new baptism to make him a complete Christian. But it is vain to urge any absurdities that attend this new hypothesis: for be the consequences what they will, or be the authorities and testimonies never so full and ample for the Church's practice, yet unless articles, rubrics, or canons be produced, that plainly say, such persons ought not to be rebaptised, the gentlemen, that maintain the new hypothesis, resolve never to depart from it. The constant practice of

the Church is not thought sufficient to interpret her rubrics ; nor the concurring judgment of the sons of the Church allowed to be any indication of the sense of their mother. And therefore if I should here add, that most of, if not all, the bishops of the present Church, have either publicly or privately given their opinion and judgment in favour of the Church's general practice, this would be reckoned to have no weight, because it is not improved into a rubric or canon of the Church. But a rubric or an article, however misunderstood or wrong applied, is of sufficient force to bear down all other authority, whether from general consent or general practice. So that I think it in vain to dispute with Dr. Brett, or any other of his way, any longer upon this head, who refuse to be determined by any other evidence but such as they think cannot possibly be brought against them : I only take what is allowed, that the general consent of private writers, and the general practice of the Church interpreting her own rules, is clearly against them : and then leave the rest to be determined by the judgment of every ingenuous reader.

SECT. 4.—How far we are agreed about the Primitive Writers.

But I have something more to say to my friend, Dr. Brett, about the sense and practice of the primitive Church. For here I intend to give him satisfaction in his own way, and answer all his demands, and offer him such proof and conviction as will once more try his ingenuity, whether he will take it kindly to be informed in a matter of historical truth, by the evidence of the plainest demonstration. I will trouble him now with no private writers, but such as are backed by the authority of general Councils. In the former discourse I alleged only private writers, and those, though they spake never so plain, were all answered in a word, that they delivered only their own private sense, and not the sense of the Church. When the testimony of Tertullian was urged, it was easily turned off, by saying, he only spake his own opinion. When I added to this the decree of the Council of Eliberis ; that is answered by saying, it was not a general, but only a provincial Council. When it was further urged, that

Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, received the baptisms given by Athanasius ; that is rejected as a fable and a mere hearsay story, because it had no better authority than Sozomen or Ruffin. When I urged the plainest words imaginable from St. Jerom, I am told, that these proceeded only from a slip of St. Jerom's pen, whilst he transcribed Tertullian, and is directly contrary to every other part of his dialogue against the Luciferians. St. Austin has no better quarter, for he is rejected as one, that only speaks his private opinion, and that built upon a wrong foundation, viz. The absolute necessity of baptism to salvation ; which is said neither to be agreeable to the doctrine of the Catholic Church nor the Church of England. And yet St. Austin in truth had no other opinion of the necessity of baptism in adult persons, whatever he might think of Children, but what Cyprian and St. Ambrose, and all the whole Catholic Church had of it before him, and makes the same allowances, in the case of necessity, as the Church of England does at this day, as I shall undeniably prove in the next book of my *Origines*,¹ however the doctor is so confident to the contrary. But something was necessary to be said to lessen the character and authority of St. Austin. The same answer is given to Gelasius and Isidore of Sevil, that the permission they spake of, as granted in the Western Church, to laymen to baptise in case of necessity, was all founded upon the same mistaken opinion of St. Austin about the absolute necessity of baptism, which prevailed by St. Austin's great authority in the Western Church. This is the unhappy method, which this learned person takes to obviate the force of my former dissertation ; sometimes lessening the character of historians as over credulous ; charging others as writing in a dream, and letting their pen run too fast ; and others of great and venerable name as guilty of heterodoxy, in running against the general sense of the Catholic Church : and all of them, put together, whether they spake true or false, are no sufficient evidence of the practice of the Church, in his opinion, because they spake no more but their own private sense of the matter. And this is a solution ready at hand for a thousand authors,

¹ *Origin*, Eccles. book. x. chap. ii. s. 20. &c.

had they been alleged to the same purpose. So that unless we can produce some general Councils determining the validity of lay-baptism in the cases under debate, or at least some authors of indisputable credit, that say general Councils have so determined, the doctor will still find his evasion, and desire to be excused from yielding his assent to it. Now some persons would be apt to complain of this as hard usage, for men to require the evidence of general Councils to determine a matter of fact on one side, when the other side will not produce a patriarchal, or a national, or so much as a provincial Council on the other hand. They would be ready to say, this was to bind heavy burthens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on other men's shoulders, whilst they themselves will not touch them with one of their fingers. But I will make no such complaint, but gratify my friend in his demands, and try whether I cannot convince him, that this matter has been abundantly determined by all the six general Councils, when I have first examined, how he pretends to prove his opinion to be agreeable to the general sense and practice of the Church.

SECT. 5.—Whether St. Basil and the Council of Trullo determine the invalidity of lay-Baptism, in the Practice of the Church.

His main strength is from the testimony of St. Basil, whose opinion, he says, p. 59, is not to be esteemed a private opinion, for the epistle, wherein it is contained, is a canonical epistle, and received by the Greek Church as a canon, and as such is put into the Canonical Code of that Church, and was so as early as the sixth century at least; about which time Johannes Scholasticus, patriarch of Constantinople, made his collection of all the canons then received in that Church, among which are the canonical epistles of St. Basil. So that when we cite an epistle of St. Basil, we do not produce the authority of a single Father, but of the whole Greek Church. This is his argument, which will do the Doctor's cause much more harm than good, for if he stands to it his cause is utterly lost. I examine not how early St. Basil's Canons were made a part of the Greek Code, whether in the time of Johannes Scholasticus, who lived two hundred years

after St. Basil, or afterward: the first general Council, that confirmed them, I believe was the Council of Trullo, Anno 692. And if they had no complete authority till that time, they are no very good authority or testimony of the Church's general practice for the three hundred years foregoing. But what is it that St. Basil's Canons are made to testify of the Church's practice? Is it not first, that heretics and schismatics were only reputed laymen? Which is true, not because St. Basil said it, or because his Canons were received by the Church two or three hundred years after they were made, but because the Church has decreed the same thing in all her general Councils, as I have abundantly proved in the following discourse, not to serve the Doctor's hypothesis, but to do him more true and useful service, in setting him right in his notions about lay-baptism, so far as concerns the Church's practice. For, secondly, the Church never came in to St. Cyprian's or St. Basil's notion in the other part of it, that the baptisms of heretics and schismatics, who were only laymen, or not so good as laymen, were therefore to be repeated, because they were laymen; but expressly determined the contrary, that their baptisms, if given in due form, were to be received by imposition of hands without rebaptising, notwithstanding that they were given by those, whom the Church herself accounted no more than laymen. How then is it possible for St. Basil's Canons to testify that to be the practice of the whole Church, when the Church, in her general Councils, does for herself so evidently testify the contrary? I do not accuse my friend of insincerity, but I cannot wholly acquit him of want of a due sagacity and judgment, in making St. Basil a witness of the Church's practice in a case, wherein the Church always went against him. For though she agreed with him in the first proposition, that heretics and schismatics were no better than laymen; yet she differed from him in the other assertion, that therefore the baptisms of those laymen, though given in due form, were to be repeated: the one affirmed it, the other denied it: and therefore, unless an affirmation and a negation be the same thing, we cannot possibly say, with any colour of reason or truth, that St.

Basil's Canons witness or affirm that to be the general practice of the Church, which all the Canons of the Church positively deny. But the ground of the Doctor's mistake was this; he did not consider, that St. Basil's Canons went one way in this particular, and the Canons of the Church another, but hastily concludes, that because St. Basil's Canons were received into the Code of the Greek Church, and that two or three hundred years after they were made, therefore the Church Universal must needs always practice according to those Canons: whereas this is a very wrong conclusion; for even when these Canons were received into the Code, the Church did not practice according to them, but according to her own general rules, which were directly contrary. Nothing can be plainer than this from the Council of Trullo, which in her second Canon receives the Canons of St. Basil among those of Athanasius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and many others: and yet she has a Canon of her own, expressly contradicting this Canon of St. Basil, which so much weight is laid upon. For her 95th canon orders some heretics to be received by a new baptism, and others only by imposition of hands or consignation. The Euno- mians, the Montanists, the Sabellians, the Manichees, the Valentinians, the Marcionites, the Paulianists, and such others were to be rebaptised, for a reason that every body knows, because they observed not the due form of baptism: but the Arians, the Macedonians, the Novatians, the Quartadecimans, the Apollinarians, the Nestorians, and Eutychians, are to be received only by anathematising their errors and consignation. This canon is plainly contrary to that of St. Basil. Now, then, if a man were to judge of the Church's practice at this time, by one of these two canons, whether of them would it be more proper to take for his guide, the canon of St. Basil, or the canon of this general Council? I can hardly think any man so weak, as to declare upon a fair hearing, that this Council intended the obsolete canon of St. Basil should take place of their own canon just then made, and stifle it in its very birth, only because they gave St. Basil's canons a decent reception in the lump, as they did many others, which were then no rules of practice. Sure it must be concluded, this Council spake the sense of

the Church at that time in her own canon; and if other Councils did the same before her, up to St. Basil's time, and all against St. Basil's rule, it must be monstrous to conclude what was the practice of the Church from St. Basil's single canon, rather than from so many canons of general Councils to the contrary. But the doctor will ask what general Council has said, that the baptisms of laymen are to be received in any case without rebaptising? I answer, as many as have said that the baptisms of heretics and schismatics are to be received, when given in due form, without rebaptising. For they had no other notion of heretics and schismatics, when once degraded or excommunicated, but only either as laymen or worse than laymen, by being cast out of the Church. This was no private opinion of St. Cyprian, or St. Basil, as the other opinion about rebaptising such heretics was, but it is the voice of the Church in all her general Councils: it is confirmed by the decrees and sanctions of almost every patriarchial, national, provincial Council: it runs through the writings of every Catholic Father, who all combine in this one point against heretics and schismatics, that they are no longer true authorised priests of God, but only laymen, or a degree below laymen, as I shall abundantly shew the doctor in the sequel of this discourse. The plain consequence of which is, that the Church in ordering the baptisms of such heretics and schismatics to be received, must needs receive the baptisms of unauthorised laymen, because she received the baptisms of those, whom she either made laymen, or accounted them so to be, as is irrefragably proved in the following discourse. The controversy now is brought into a short compass, it turns all upon this one point at present, whether heretics and schismatics be true authorised priests of God, that can never be divested of their authority, by virtue of an indelible character? Or, whether, by their apostacy, and the Church's censure, they are not rather divested of all ministerial authority, and reduced to the state of laymen, or one degree below laymen, that continue in the Church? When I have determined this point by the best authority in the Church, by the acts and canons of the first six general Councils, and by such arguments as are proper

to be urged in this case, my learned friend and I shall have no longer occasion to dispute about this or that private author, which will signify little to be urged on either side against the whole stream and current of the Catholic Church. If I do not satisfy him by this plain history, let him give me better proofs for the contrary part, and I will promise him, in point of history, to become his convert.

But before I have done with St. Basil, I will make the doctor two or three more observations out of him, which are obvious enough, though he did not think fit to observe them. As, 1. That St. Basil, or at least St. Cyprian and Firmilian, whose opinion he relates, were not possessed with the modern notion of the indelible character of a priest: they thought, that when a bishop or a presbyter turned heretics or schismatics, they were no longer priests, but laymen; not like laymen, or parallel to them, though that were enough, but perfectly and entirely laymen, and no priests: which is the foundation of their argument for re-baptising those that were baptised by them. Their words are very express, “λαϊκοὶ γινόμενοι,” that heretics and schismatics, by breaking off from the Church, “become laymen,” and therefore have not the authority of priests any longer. Now, if we suppose, with the doctor, that St. Basil’s canons were entirely confirmed by the Church Universal, then it is evident the modern notion of an indelible character was no doctrine of the Catholic Church, no more than it was of St. Basil; but that a bishop or a priest may forfeit his episcopal or sacerdotal authority and power, and be reduced, by the discipline of the Church for his crimes, whether heresy, schism, or other crimes, to the state and condition of laymen; which I have proved to be true, not because St. Basil said it, or because his canons were received by the Church, but because it was the constant and avowed doctrine and discipline of the Church Universal.

2. Whence it follows, secondly, that such priests, having lost their authority, could have no more power than laymen to baptise, as St. Basil rightly observes, and that consonantly enough to the sense and received opinion of the Catholic Church, of which I shall give a full account in the following discourse.

3. And yet I observe, thirdly, that as to the particular case of schismatics, whom St. Basil reckons laymen as well as heretics, though in his own private opinion he was for rebaptising them as well as heretics, yet he is not stiff to that opinion, but thinks the custom of the Church in every country ought to be complied with, whether it were to baptise, or not baptise them again. And he particularly applies this to the case of the Novatians, and such other schismatics as did not err in faith, and were not wholly broken off from the Church in fundamentals. Therefore since many Churches in Asia received the baptism of such by way of dispensation, he is not against the receiving of it. So that, in his opinion, if the Church thinks fit to receive lay-baptism, it is in her power to admit of it. And so he determines not only in his first canon, but in the forty-seventh also, in the case of the Enekratitæ.

4. And therefore I observe in the last place, that, according to these rules of St. Basil, the decrees of general Councils and the common consent and practice of the Church in these matters were to be complied with. So that the Council of Nice having received the baptism of the Novatians, though they were both in St. Basil's opinion, and in reality, but laymen; and the Council of Constantinople, not long after St. Basil's death, having determining the same about the Novatians and several others; in all such Churches as submitted to the authority of those Councils, no further dispute was to be made about this matter, but either the directions of the Councils, or the custom of every Church was to be regarded by all private men, and no disturbance to be made upon this point of discipline. All which things considered, it cannot be concluded from St. Basil's Canons, or their reception in the Church, that laymen's baptism was generally annulled; but we must necessarily conclude the contrary, that since heretics and schismatics, both in the opinion of St. Basil and the Church, were generally voted to be laymen; and yet the baptisms of these laymen were generally received by public orders of the Church; that therefore the general practice of the Church was, to receive the baptisms of laymen, if given in due form, without rebaptising. So unhappy is my

learned friend in his conclusions from the ancient Fathers, to urge that for his cause, which directly proves the contrary.

SECT. 6.—An Account of the Luciferian Heresy. And whether St. Jerom be a Witness of the Church's annulling the Baptism of Laymen in ordinary Cases.

Let us see whether he be any happier in his other great pillar and support of his cause, which is St. Jerom. The doctor does not pretend that St. Jerom was wholly on his side, but only in one point. He owns St. Jerom allowed laymen to baptise in case of necessity: but then he says he contradicted himself, and spake not the sense of the Church neither, but only the private opinion of Tertullian against the Church; though St. Jerom speaks in terms plain enough, "*Quod frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam licere laicis.*—We know that it is frequently allowed to laymen to baptise, when necessity requires it." This sure was not the allowance of Tertullian, or St. Jerom, but the allowance of the Church, which authorised laymen to do it frequently in such extraordinary cases. Or if they did it frequently without her authority, it is not to be imagined but that the Church should have made some decree against it, especially when St. Austin and the Council of Eliberis and several others, had declared for it. Here was reason enough to expect some general Council should have interposed her authority, as she did in another case against the Cyprianists, and have forbidden laymen to baptise in any case whatsoever, if it had been against the sense and discipline of the Church to allow it. But the doctor does not pretend to give us any general Council to this purpose. But still he will have it, that the Church always rebaptised those, that were baptised by laymen in ordinary cases, and that St. Jerom herein is a witness of the Church's practice. Now, to convince the doctor of his mistake, I will only ask him two plain questions. First, whether the Church ever made any general decree for rebaptising such as were baptised in due form by heretics and schismatics; or, whether St. Jerom ever speaks of any such decree? I know my learned friend will not assert this, because I have proved the contrary before to his

satisfaction. I ask then, secondly, whether the Church, by any general Council, ever declared, that heretics and schismatics, whilst they remained heretics and schismatics, were true authorised priests of God, or whether St. Jerom ever alleges any such decree? If he says there are such declarations and decrees of general Councils, it will be easy to produce them, as I have done abundance to the contrary in the following discourse. But if he can produce none that say this, but all unanimously, on the contrary, declare, that heretics and schismatics, are no longer true priests of God, but laymen, or of a lower order than laymen, in the Church; then it inevitably follows, that the Church, in ordering the baptism of heretics and schismatics to be received, ordered the baptism of those to be received, who were no more than laymen, in her opinion. If he says, St. Jerom is a witness, that the Church esteemed heretics and schismatics to be true priests of God, it will be easy to produce his testimony: but then, all that will be gained by it, will be only this, that St. Jerom contradicts the general Councils, and delivers a private mistaken opinion of his own, which, in that case, can be no sufficient testimony or evidence of the Church's sense, against the clearer and stronger evidence of her general Councils.

This, without any more ado, will be allowed to be a sufficient answer to any thing the doctor has produced or can produce out of St. Jerom's Dialogue against the Luciferians. And so I might here put an end to the dispute about it. But because that Dialogue is a very intricate discourse, in the former part of it, and the doctor has chosen that part of it, to be the foundation of his assertion, I will, for the satisfaction of the learned reader, make a little further inquiry into the design of that dialogue; and state, as fully and exactly as I can, the case between St. Jerom and the Luciferians. The first rise of the Luciferian schism is well known to have proceeded from the inflexible stiffness and rigour of Lucifer, bishop of Caralis, in Sardinia, who, having been a confessor for the faith against the Arians, in the time of Constantius, thought it unreasonable, when the persecution was over, that those three hundred bishops, who had

so far complied with the Arians, in the Council of Ariminum, as to consent to the dropping of the word, consubstantial, out of the Creed, should be allowed to continue in their places any longer, as having, in his opinion, betrayed the faith and the cause of the Catholic Church. Hereupon, as soon as the Council of Alexandria, under Athanasius, Anno 362, had determined to receive these bishops again in their station, because they found no just reason to depose them; Lucifer offended at this, in his over-righteous and over-wise zeal, made a separation from the Church, and would no longer communicate either with those lapsed bishops, or those that received them; declaring that the whole Catholic Church was become an apostatising harlot, and the Synagogue of Antichrist for receiving them. This occasioned several questions to be debated by St. Jerom; some of which he answers categorically and directly, and also upon Catholic principles; others only hypothetically, in pursuance of his adversaries, suppositions or assertions; and in these last he does not always speak his own sense, or the sense of the Church, but only shews his adversary what must follow upon the advancement of such a false principle or assertion, to drive him to an absurdity. If men will not carefully distinguish these things, it is impossible to understand this Dialogue of St. Jerom, or make the sense of one part of it consistent with another.

Now the questions proposed were such as these :

1. Whether the Arians and other heretics were heathens? This the Luciferians affirmed, but St. Jerom denied.

2. Whether upon this supposition of their being Heathens, they could give such a Christian-baptism as needed not to be repeated? This the Luciferians affirmed, but St. Jerom positively denied upon that supposition: for no Heathen, none but a baptised person, could give Christian baptism. And yet, when the question was otherwise proposed,

3. Whether an Arian heretic, considered absolutely as a baptised person, and not upon the Luciferian supposition

of being a mere Heathen, could give such a baptism as needed not to be repeated by the Church? Then St. Jerom not only affirmed, but maintained it from Scripture and Councils, that heretical baptism, when given in due form, was not to be repeated. By which we may see, that St. Jerom affirmed and denied the same thing, upon different suppositions, without any contradiction.

4. The next question was, whether any beside a priest could baptise? The Luciferian asserted, any man, an Arian, that is, in his opinion, an Heathen, one that was no priest, nor Christian, might baptise. But St. Jerom denied all this, and asserted, that it was necessary a man should in some sense be a Christian priest, to qualify him to baptise. But he distinguishes a double notion of the priesthood, and cases ordinary from extraordinary. There is the *Sacerdotium Laici*, as he calls it, *The Priesthood of a Layman*, that is, his baptism, as well as the priesthood of a clerk, which qualified the one to administer baptism in extraordinary cases, as the other did in ordinary. And without a priesthood of one sort or other, there could be no ministration of baptism. Therefore if the Arians were Heathen, as the Luciferian asserted, their laics were to be rebaptised as Gentiles; since an Heathen could not be a priest either in the strict or the large notion of a priest, nor consequently baptise either in ordinary or extraordinary cases. Here again St. Jerom disputes hypothetically upon the principles and assertions of the Luciferians.

5. Another question was, whether any man could administer baptism, who could not give remission of sins, and the Spirit with it. The Luciferian affirms it, but St. Jerom denies it. And here, I confess, I am at loss to understand St. Jerom's reasoning, and make him speak agreeably to the doctrine of the Catholic Church: and if my learned friend will help me out, he will do both me and St. Jerom a piece of service. For I am sure St. Austin always argues against the Cyprianists and the Donatists upon a contrary notion, that a true baptism might be given without remission of sins or the Spirit accompanying it.

For heretics had not power to give either remission of sins or the Spirit. This was the deficiency of their baptism; and for this reason all the Councils ordered heretics to receive imposition of hands upon their return to the Church, that they might receive remission of sins and the Spirit, which they could not receive before in heretical baptism; as I have abundantly proved before in the First Part of my Scholastical History, which the doctor does not pretend to call in question. How, therefore, to reconcile St. Jerom's notion to the rule of the Church, in this particular, is beyond my skill at present, and I will thank any one that will do it for me.

6. Another question, which indeed is the principal and leading question in this whole dialogue, though it was only about a matter of fact, was, whether the bishops of the Council of Ariminum were really Arians or not? The Luciferian affirmed it, but Jerom utterly denies it, and proves clearly from the history and acts of the Council then extant, and to which he appeals, that they were all catholic bishops, and only subscribed a Catholic Creed in a Catholic sense: but Ursatius and Valens, two deceitful and crafty Arian bishops, had prevailed upon them, with fair words, to leave the word, consubstantial, out of the Creed, for the sake of peace, pretending that then all would be well, and there would be no more disputes about religion. Which they had no sooner done, but these deceitful Arians immediately gave out and boasted, that they had destroyed the Nicene faith. Which as soon as the bishops of Ariminum came to understand, they with tears detested and abhorred the fraud, declaring, by all that is sacred, they never intended to make an Arian creed, as these miscreants gave out against them. Then "*ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est*;" which does not mean, as it is vulgarly misunderstood, that these three hundred bishops were Arians, or that the world was turned Arian with them, but that these bishops were really grieved, that they should, by such a trick, be brought under the suspicion of Arianism, who never intended any such thing. Thus St. Jerom does justice to these

Catholic bishops, in freeing them from the imputation of Arianism, which Lucifer, after Ursatius and Valens, had cast upon them. He owns they were to blame for leaving out the word, consubstantial, which the Nicene Council had made the barrier of the faith; but that they had established an Arian Creed he utterly denies: and therefore he vindicates the Church against Lucifer, in allowing them to continue in their station. "For why," says he,¹ "should they have condemned those, who were not Arians? Why should they divide the Church, whilst it continued in the unity of the faith? Why should they by their obstinacy make those become Arians, who were really orthodox believers?" "The Council of Alexandria," he adds, "upon this account only condemned the authors of the heresy, who were not to be excused; but received the rest upon their repentance: not as if they could have been bishops, if they had been heretics; but because it was so manifest, that those, who were received, never had been heretics."

In these last words St. Jerom seems to me to determine two other questions, which were,

7. Whether, upon supposition that those bishops had been really professed Arians, they ought to have been esteemed true bishops whilst they were heretics? And,

8. Whether, in strictness of discipline, the Church would or could have received them to the station of bishops again, upon the renunciation of their heresy, without breaking in upon her own ordinary standing rule, which was to deprive all such as fell into heresy, of the office of bishops and the clerical priesthood? St. Jerom seems to me, plainly to determine these two questions in the negative, in those words, "*Non quod Episcopi esse possint,*

¹ Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. cap. vii. Cur damnassent eos qui Ariani non erant? Cur Ecclesiam scinderent, in concordia fidei permanentem? Cum (lege cur) denique credentes benè, obstinatione sua facerent Arianos?—In Alexandrinâ synodo constitutum est, ut exceptis auctoribus hæreseos, quos error excusare non poterat, pœnitentes Ecclesiæ sociarentur: Non quod episcopi possint esse, qui hæretici fuerant; sed quod constaret eos, qui reciperentur, hæreticos non fuisse.

qui hæretici fuerant, they could not ordinarily be allowed to be bishops who had been heretics." For this I shall shew to be exactly agreeable to the common and ordinary rules of the Church, which were, neither to allow of heretics as true bishops or priests, whilst they were heretics; nor yet, in strictness of discipline, to admit them as bishops or priests upon their return to the Catholic Church, but only to allow them to communicate in the quality of laymen.

9. But then there was another main question, upon which St. Jerom and the Luciferian are absolutely divided, which was, whether the Church, for weighty and prudential reasons, could not dispense with the strictness and rigour of her own ordinary rule of discipline? That is, whether the Church, if she thought fit, could not give authority to an heretical bishop, to act as a bishop again, upon his return from his heresy to the Church. This was stiffly denied by Lucifer, and it was the thing he grounded his schism upon. But St. Jerom, with a great deal of reason and eloquence, maintains this dispensing power of the Church, and her prudence in receding sometimes from the rigour of discipline, upon just and proper occasions. He argues this, chap. ii. from the practice of the Luciferians themselves, who admitted Arian laymen without rebaptising them, upon a prudential reason, because no one would be converted, if he knew he must be rebaptised; and so they should have been the cause of their ruin, if they had absolutely rejected them. Hence St. Jerom argues, that if such a concession was made in receiving a layman, to save a single soul, there was much more reason to do it in receiving of a bishop, who, by his return, might unite not only a city, but a whole province to the Church; but if he was refused, he might draw many others with him into destruction. He argues further, chap. vii. from the example of the Nicene Council, which allowed eight Arian bishops to continue in their places, when they might have rejected them without any danger to the Church: and it were much, if the Church should not be obliged to do that to save the whole world, which the Council of Nice did voluntarily, when she had no such fear or concern upon her. So that,

according to St. Jerom, the Church had power to receive lapsing bishops to their station again, if prudential reasons required it, though this was receding a little from the ordinary discipline in the exactness and rigour of it. And this was the grand debate betwixt Lucifer and the Church. Lucifer would make no allowance or abatement for extraordinary occasions, but was for standing stiff to the rule prefixed for ordinary cases, whatever was the consequence.

10. And this drew him into another great error ;—that the whole Church was polluted and profaned by receiving those bishops, whom he thought Arians, into their office and station again. This made the whole world become the Devil's possession, and turned the Church into an harlot's house, and the synagogue of Satan, and there were no true Christians left but in the isle of Sardinia, where Lucifer governed them. This strange uncharitable opinion St. Jerom excellently refutes and exposes in the first and eighth chapters of his Dialogue.

11. Hilary, the Roman deacon, went one step further, and added to all this, that the Church was not only polluted, but that all, that were baptised by heretics, were of necessity to be rebaptised again in order to make them Christians: which was more than his master Lucifer had asserted. Against this St. Jerom disputes in the two last chapters of his dialogue, from the authority of Scripture, and the Council of Nice, and the practice of the Church, and the authority of Lucifer himself, who received those that were baptised by the Arians, though he would not consent to receive the clergy to their ancient stations. Which shews, that when St. Jerom disputes against the baptism of the Arians in the former part of the Dialogue, he speaks not absolutely his own or the Church's sense, but only discourses hypothetically upon the principles, suppositions, and assertions of his adversaries, to shew them the absurdities and unreasonable consequences of their opinions; if, as they said, the Arians were heathens, then they ought to rebaptise those, that were baptised by them; for no heathen could give Christian baptism.

It is by this key, by carefully distinguishing what St. Jerom speaks absolutely, as his own plain opinion, from what he discourses only hypothetically upon the opinions of his adversaries, that any one must pretend to understand the easy part of his discourse ; and for that which is extremely difficult in it, as I pretend not to be master of it, so I had rather be a disciple than a teacher to others, in what I profess not to understand ; as I do not that part of his discourse, where he seems to say there can be no true baptism without remission of sins and the gift of the Spirit, which I cannot reconcile with the sense of the Catholic Church, nor with the validity of heretical baptism, which St. Jerom himself pleads for against Hilary, the deacon. Nor can I reconcile some other intricate discourse of his with the Luciferian, to the common known rules and practice of the Church, which yet my learned friend takes to be plain indications, not only of his own opinion, but also of the Church with him, that lay-baptism, in ordinary cases, is wholly null and void. Nay, he is so confident as to say, p. 63, “ If it is not demonstrable from that Dialogue, that St. Jerom maintained the baptism of laymen, in ordinary cases at least, howsoever it might possibly be allowed in extraordinary cases, not only to be unlawful, but also wholly invalid, and consequently to be repeated, he will yield the cause.”

Now one would expect presently to see as plain words for this, as I had given for the lawfulness of laymen’s baptising in cases of necessity ; but in vain ; for all the doctor pretends to allege, is not the assertion in plain terms, but some little appearance of it from two or three passages of St. Jerom, where it is not certain, whether he speaks absolutely either his own sense, or the Church’s sense, but only hypothetically upon the suppositions of his adversaries. The thing, which the doctor labours to demonstrate out of St. Jerom, is, that the Arian bishops were true bishops, and not laymen : for otherwise he knows not how to justify the Church’s receiving such as were baptised by them without rebaptising. Now, I cannot but observe, in the first place, that he is the most unfortunate man in the world at demon-

stration: for he brings two demonstrations which contradict and destroy one another. Not long ago we heard him demonstrating, out of St. Basil, and that in the name of the whole Church, that all heretics and schismatics are only laymen; and here we have him demonstrating out of St. Jerom, and that in the name of the Church too, that the Arian heretics are true bishops and priests, and not laymen. Now how will these things consist together? what distinction in the schools can free them from a contradiction? and whether must the reader hearken to the doctor demonstrating out of St. Basil or St. Jerom? For my part, I have already said, that I think his demonstration out of St. Basil comes nearer the Church's sense of heretics and schismatics, that they were not esteemed bishops and priests, but only laymen; not because the doctor has solidly proved it, but because I have, in this discourse, more substantially done it for him. And this is a sufficient prejudice against his pretended demonstration out of St. Jerom, in the opinion of any wise and sober man, and might be a justifiable reason for dismissing it without any further examination. But, because my friend shall not complain of my incivility, that I would not give both his demonstrations a fair hearing, and because it will be of some use to the learned reader to set all things right about St. Jerom, I will examine it a little more closely, and here follow the doctor, *κατὰ ποδά*.

He says, p. 64, "If St. Jerom's main topic, on which he builds all his arguments, was not then the known sense and practice of the Catholic Church, his controversy with the Luciferian was about his own private opinion." And so it might be for any thing the doctor has said to the contrary. For I have shewed before, that in one point St. Jerom plainly maintained a private opinion against the sense of the Church, when he said, there could be no true baptism without remission of sins and the grace of the Spirit conferred therein, which tends to disannul all heretical baptisms whatsoever. And if St. Jerom maintained a private opinion in this point, why might he not do so in any other, and particularly in the point of the invalidity of lay-baptism, if that had been really his opinion, as I think it really was not?

But he says, "this was not only his opinion, but the main point which he defended, viz. the invalidity of lay-baptism,

and that such as had been so invalidly baptised, ought to receive the true baptism of the Church: and hence," he says, "it follows that this doctrine was at that time the known sense and practice of the Catholic Church." Whether this was the sense and practice of the Catholic Church, we shall see more hereafter: at present I only observe, that the invalidity of lay-baptism was not the main point defended by St. Jerom, if it was defended at all. For any one, that reads the account I have given before of the questions debated by St. Jerom, will easily perceive, that the main point of all, and the very leading question to all the rest was, whether the bishops of the Council of Ariminum were really Arian heretics or not? And next to that was, whether there was any dispensing power in the Catholic Church to receive such bishops as lapsed into the Arian heresy, into any clerical station in the Church again? These were the principal and leading questions in the whole debate, and the rest only followed upon them: as whether the Arians and all other heretics were mere heathens? Whether upon that supposition, the baptism of heretics was valid, and not rather to be repeated? Whether any but a Christian priest could administer Christian baptism, &c.? Therefore the doctor is mistaken in saying, the invalidity of lay-baptism was the main point in dispute, which was no dispute at all, but only hypothetical. And he would have done well, instead of blaming me for not carefully reading and considering St. Jerom's Dialogue, or not exactly stating the dispute with the Luciferians, to have demonstrated to his reader, that he had been more careful and exactly judicious in reading it himself, by giving his reader a full and accurate account of the whole matter, which would have been of more use than his two other pretended demonstrations.

But there is one thing, though not very material to the cause, I must blame the doctor for by the way, which is, that he sometimes misrepresents me, as here he makes me say, "the Arian priests only were mere heathens;" whereas the word, "only," is thrust in from his own invention: for I had no intention to say, the dispute was about the priests only, or about the Arian heretics exclusive of all others. Again he says, pag. 66, "I make it the main point

in controversy, whether the Arians were mere heathens, when indeed it was no more than a thing heedlessly asserted by the Luciferian, and what he yielded up immediately, and therefore the merits of the cause did not depend upon it." To which I must answer, that my words are here changed again, "a main point," for "one point," only to make them a point of dispute to no purpose; which kind of writing I desire my friend to forbear for the future.

But how does it appear that the merits of the cause, on the side of the Luciferian, no ways depended upon that point? Why, the doctor says, he maintains his cause after he had entirely given that up. Which shews how negligent my friend was in considering the whole scope of St. Jerom's Dialogue, at the same time that he accuses me of want of care in reading it. For, first, this very point comes again in play, and is argued upon, *pro* and *con*, by the two disputants, in the fifth chapter of the Dialogue. The Luciferian pleads, "that an Arian layman might be pardoned,¹ because in the simplicity of his heart he took the Arian Church to be the Church of God, and so came thither to be baptised, believing in his own faith." To which the Orthodox replies, "you surprise me with strange news, in asserting, that a man may be made a Christian by one, who himself was no Christian." Does not this still go upon the Luciferian supposition, that the Arians were no Christians, but Heathens? But suppose again, this point had been entirely given up by Helladius; the doctor might have known that this Helladius, the Luciferian disputant, not only gives up this point, but all other points in dispute, by degrees one after another, before he comes to the end of the Dialogue, as owning himself convicted and converted by his opponent. And will the doctor hence conclude, that these were none of them points of dispute between the Catholics and Luciferians, because this single Luciferian happened to give them all up entirely upon his conviction? I believe if Dr. Brett should happen to give me

¹ Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. cap. v. *Lucif.* Laico ideò ignoscendam est, quia Ecclesiam Dei putans, simpliciter accessit, et juxta fidem suam credens baptizatus est. *Orthodox.* Novam rem asseris, ut Christianus quisquam factus sit ab eo, qui non est Christianus.

up all the points in debate between us in this book, as he has done one or two already, his friends would hardly allow there were no points of dispute remaining, because of his concessions or conversion. And yet this is the way the doctor takes to make his reader believe I was plainly mistaken in stating the controversy between St. Jerom and the Luciferians.

But let us leave skirmishing, and come to that point, which the doctor calls the merits of the cause, and upon this join issue with him. He says, p. 66, "That the public avowed doctrine and practice of the Luciferian sect, was to receive the Arians upon the renouncing their heresy by penance, and not by baptism, and receiving them all as laymen, none as clergymen: in which doctrine and practice they differed from the orthodox, who received the Arian laymen as laymen, and their clergy as clergy, according to the orders they had received during their heresy: so that an Arian bishop, if he came over to the Church, was still reputed a bishop; a priest, a priest; and a deacon, a deacon. Whereas if an Arian bishop, priest, or deacon, came over to the Luciferians, he was reputed to be but a mere layman."

The doctor calls this the right state of the matter, but he quotes no author for it, and he did well, for he had none for some parts of it, which are only his own imagination and invention, for want of an exact understanding the discipline of the ancient Church. What he says of the Luciferians is true; they admitted no Arian bishops, priests, or deacons, but only in the quality of laymen: but then it is not true, that the Church always, on the other hand, admitted Arian bishops, priests, and deacons, to the same station they had before, and much less all other heretics and schismatics whatsoever. For she very frequently denied them this privilege, and by the strictness of her ordinary rules was obliged to do it; and therefore she very often reduced them entirely, by exact discipline, to mere lay-communication, and reputed them no other than laymen, neither before, while they continued in heresy, nor after their return to the Church, as the doctor will find it fully made out in the following discourse, and I doubt not to his content and satisfaction. This therefore could not be the dis-

pute the Church had with the Luciferians. But the question was, whether the Church was so tied to this rule of discipline in the exact rigour and strictness of it, as that she could not, for any prudential reason, or upon any extraordinary occasion dispense therewith, so as to allow an Arian bishop or other heretic to become a bishop of the Catholic Church without polluting her own communion? Lucifer said, "the Church had no such dispensing power to be exercised on any occasion." And therefore he broke communion with the Church, for receiving those three hundred bishops of the Council of Ariminum, whom he thought worthy of degradation, as Arian heretics. But the Church maintained her own liberty and power to dispense with this rule upon just and proper occasions: and, therefore, as in some cases she refused to receive Arians and other heretics among her clergy, so when in prudence and charity she found it requisite, she dispensed with her ordinary rule, and took them in at discretion. This aggrieved Lucifer, and that was the occasion of his schism: he was for rejecting all heretics; the Church was for rejecting or receiving them at discretion: he denied the Church's power absolutely in this matter; the Church maintained her own power and liberty to act in the affair, as prudential reasons and the exigencies of the Church should require and direct her. Therefore she did not receive Arian bishops, or any other heretical bishops, promiscuously in the state they were in, as the doctor represents, but only as the exigency of affairs required: she sometimes dispensed with her rule, but more commonly reduced them to lay-communion; as the doctor might have learned from the canons of the Church, and even from St. Jerom himself in this Dialogue, if he had not, as usual, been too hasty in making his conclusions. For, as I have observed before, St. Jerom says, in the seventh chapter of this Dialogue, that in strictness of discipline none were allowed to be bishops in the Church, who had once been heretics. Therefore the admitting them was not a thing of course, or necessity, or universal practice, but only done by way of dispensation with the ordinary rule, as a matter of grace and favour, or expediency, as prudence directed upon proper occasions; of which the Church al-

ways made herself judge, and reserved to herself the liberty of acting this way or that way, as she thought most expedient ; which Lucifer, in his stiffness and moroseness, would not allow. This was the true state of this matter, whatever the doctor has suggested to the contrary.

Now then let us see how St. Jerom argues with the Luciferian, in behalf of this liberty and power of the Church, and what advantage the doctor would fain make of his argumentation. " Tell me," says St. Jerom, " why you receive a layman coming over from the Arians, and do not receive a bishop ?" The Luciferian answers, " I receive a layman, because he confesses that he has erred, and the Lord desireth the repentance, and not the death of a sinner." " And I," says the Orthodox Christian, " receive a bishop, because he confesses that he has erred, and the Lord desireth the repentance, and not the death of a sinner." The Luciferian answers. " If he confesses that he has erred, why does he continue a bishop ? Let him depose himself from the priesthood, and I will grant pardon to the penitent." " I will answer you in your own words," says St. Jerom, " if a layman confesses that he has erred, why does he continue a laic ? Let him depose himself from the priesthood of a layman, that is, his baptism, and I will grant pardon to the penitent. For it is written, ' He hath made us a kingdom and priests unto his Father.' And again, ' An holy nation, a royal priesthood, a chosen people.' All that is lawful for a Christian, is common as well to a bishop as a layman. He that does penance condemns his former acts. If it be not lawful for a penitent bishop to remain what he was, it is not lawful for a penitent layman to remain in that state for which he does penance. We do not act inconsistently with ourselves : either we receive the bishop with his people, whom he has made Christians : or if we receive not the bishop, we know that we ought also to reject the people."

Upon this the doctor asks this question : " Do not those therefore, according to St. Jerom's principle, and the sense and practice of the Catholic Church in his time, act inconsistently with themselves, who are for receiving the dissenting laymen as lay-christians, and their teachers also

in the station of laymen ; but will not receive those, who they suppose make them Christians by baptism, as clergymen? The Catholic Church, as he observes, did not receive any upon repentance without baptism, except they came over from a sect, whose clergy were also received as clergymen."

If the doctor had truly understood the discipline of the primitive Church, he never would have asked such a question as this. And he might have spared his reflection, if for no other reason, yet for the sake of his mother, the Church of England, whose known and avowed practice, and not merely that of any private men, it manifestly reflects upon. But it is not a greater reflection on the Church of England, than it is on the practice of the whole Catholic primitive Church, which in receiving those, who were baptised by heretics and schismatics, very often received those as laymen, whose teachers and baptisers she would not receive as clergymen, but only in the station of laymen, as I intend to give the doctor full proof from another sort of authorities than what he here insists upon. So that whatever pretended inconsistency there is in the thing, the charge lights as heavy upon the whole primitive Church, as it does upon any others. And yet, after all, if I have any understanding of this difficult passage of St. Jerom, for I will not pretend here to be exact master of it, there is no ground to make such a reflection from his argumentation. For St. Jerom seems here to me not to speak absolutely and dogmatically either his own sense always, or the sense of the Church, but to be arguing hypothetically, and as we now say, *ad hominem*, with his adversaries, upon their own principles and practice. It is plain enough he does so in some expressions, as where he says, " If a layman confesses that he has erred, why does he continue a laic? Let him depose himself from the priesthood of a layman, that is, his baptism, and I will grant pardon to the penitent." This was not according to the principles or practice of the Church: for she never deposed laymen from their baptism, if once truly baptised by heretics; nor does St. Jerom plead for it, but only shews his adversaries what they ought to do according to their own principles, who asserted, that

all heretics were mere heathens, and therefore, according to their principles, laymen ought to be deposed from their priesthood, that is, their baptism, as well as clergymen from their priesthood; because if heretics were mere heathens, they could have no pretence to Christian baptism. And therefore there was as much reason to allow the Church her liberty to receive clergymen to their priesthood, if she thought fit to do it, as the Luciferians took in receiving laymen to their priesthood, which was their baptism, even when their principles led them to depose them. Therefore he charges the Luciferians as acting inconsistently with themselves, and against their own principles, whilst the Church acted consistently to her own principles, which were to use her liberty in receiving clergymen to their orders, if she thought it requisite in her own wisdom and discretion. Not that the Church was bound to do this in all cases, or else reject the people with the priests; as the doctor pleads: neither of which he will ever be able to prove to have been the practice of the Church, either from St. Jerom or any other author. For, as I said before, it appears evidently in fact, that she often received laymen, without obliging them to receive a new baptism, at the same time that she rejected the priests, that had given them baptism, from their pretended priesthood. So that it seems pretty plain to me, that St. Jerom is here only arguing hypothetically with his adversaries; and if the doctor would have used this key, he might more happily have unlocked the dark sense and meaning of his author, and spared his unnecessary reflections.

But the doctor goes on again with St. Jerom, p. 69, "Wherefore I beseech you, says he, that you either allow him a right to offer sacrifice, whose baptisms you approve, or reject his baptism, whom you esteem to be no priest." Again, says he, "I do not at present either blame the Arians or defend them: I keep to my point. A bishop is received by us for the same reason for which a layman is received." Here the doctor, by a little art, drops two words at the end of the sentence, which should have been put in, to make the reader understand the drift of his author. It should have been, "*received by you,*" meaning the Luciferians. For St. Jerom's words are, "*recipitur à vobis;*" whereas,

as the doctor has cited them, any one would believe that St. Jerom had said, that a bishop was received by the Church for the same reason for which a layman was received by her; when, indeed, St. Jerom says quite otherwise, "*A bishop is received by us (Catholics) upon the same foot as a layman is received by you (Luciferians.)*"—*Eâdem ratione à nobis episcopum recipi, quâ laicus à vobis recipitur.*" Which makes a wide difference in the matter, as I shall shew the doctor by and by.

But he goes on still with St. Jerom: "Therefore according to the custom of boys disputing together, says he, what you shall say, I will say; what you shall affirm, I will affirm; what you shall deny, I will deny. An Arian baptises, therefore he is a bishop: he does not baptise: do you deny him to be a lay-christian, and I do not receive him for a priest. I will follow you whithersoever you go: we will both stick in the mire, or both get out of it." Here the words, "*Tu refuta laicum, et ego non recipio sacerdotem,*" should be rendered otherwise, "*Do you refuse to receive the layman, and then I will not receive the priest.*"

A little after the Luciferian argues thus: "A layman, though baptised out of the faith of the Church," so the doctor reads it, "*Extra Ecclesiæ Fidem baptizatus,*" which, in my books of the Colen edition, 1616, is, "*Extra Ecclesiam Fide baptizatus, baptised in the faith, though out of the Church,*" "is received as a penitent. But a bishop shall not do penance because he is a priest: or if he should do penance, he ceases to be a bishop. Therefore we rightly receive a layman to penance, and reject a bishop if he will continue in his priesthood." St. Jerom replies, "Prove to me, that a layman, coming over from the Arians, has baptism, and I will not refuse to admit him to penance. But, if he is no Christian, if he had not a priest, who could make him a Christian, how shall a man do penance, who does not yet believe?" The Luciferian answers, "Do you think it just, that an Arian should be a bishop?" "You prove him to be a bishop," says St. Jerom, "because you receive him, whom he has baptised. In this you are to be blamed, that you separate from us, and yet agree with us both in the faith, and in the reception

of the Arians.—We receive a bishop from the Arians for the same reason, for which you receive one baptised by them. We agree in faith, we agree in receiving heretics, let us agree in communion.” The Luciferian replies, “Behold I lift up my hands: I yield, you have conquered me.”

These are the doctor’s long citations out of St. Jerom, instead of which, one, short, plain proposition, asserting the necessity of rebaptising all that were baptised by laymen, in ordinary cases, as I had produced one for the lawfulness of laymen’s baptising in extraordinary cases, had been much more to his purpose. But he pretends not to find any such, or so much as point it out to his reader; but only makes these two general observations upon the whole. 1st. “That I was to blame for saying, St. Jerom was silent in this matter.” 2dly. “That St. Jerom has plainly enough shewn what was the sense of the Catholic Church in this point. And whatsoever might be his opinion of lay-baptism in cases of necessity, it is certain he was of opinion, and the Church with him, that lay-baptism, in ordinary cases, was wholly null and void, and that persons so pretendedly baptised were not to be received into the Church as penitent Christians, but as Gentiles by baptism. For it is evident from him, that if they were not baptised, with episcopal baptism, they received no baptism at all.”

As to his first observation, I think, with submission, I was so far from being to blame for saying St. Jerom was silent upon the matter, that I should rather have been to blame if I had said otherwise, unless I could have proved it more directly, plainly, and closely than the doctor has done. It is an easy matter to make a flourish with dark reasonings and ambiguous words, as many men have done with the intricate part of this Dialogue of St. Jerom; and it is not a very easy matter to make an ordinary reader understand him, though I tell him he speaks not his own sense many times, but only hypothetically, to his adversaries. Yet I hope the doctor understands what I mean. Some of the most plausible words the doctor has urged are these, “*reprobes ejus baptismam, quem non existimas sacerdotem,—reject his baptism, whom you esteem to be no priest.*” But it seems very probable to me, that St. Jerom here is

not delivering dogmatically his own opinion, much less the sense and practice of the Church, but only shewing the adversaries what they ought to do upon their own principles. As any one that reads the whole passage will easily perceive. The Luciferian had laboured in a long discourse to prove, that the Arian bishops ought not to be admitted as bishops in the Church, because they were the disciples of Antichrist, the enemies of Christ, blind guides, salt without savour, idolaters, sacrilegious, and abundance more. And he also concluded,¹ “ that the Church, by admitting them, had, as it were, by a little leaven, corrupted her whole mass, whilst to day she received the eucharist at the hands of him, whom the day before she rejected as an idolater.” To this St. Jerom replies, “ admit that what you say be true, let an Arian bishop be the enemy of Christ, let him be insipid salt, a lamp without fire, an eye without sight: all that you can gain by this is, that he, who has no salt himself, cannot season others, that a blind man cannot illuminate others, nor he make others shine, whose own light is extinct and his lamp gone out. But why then do you complain of the insipid seasoner, while you eat of the meat, which he has seasoned? Your Church shines by the light of his fire, and do you still complain that his lamp is gone out? He gives eyes to you, and is he himself blind? Wherefore I beseech you, either allow him the liberty of offering at the altar, whose baptism you approve; or else refuse his baptism, whom you do not esteem to be a priest. For it cannot be, that he, who is holy in the ministration of baptism, can be a sinner at the altar.”

¹ Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. cap. ii. Ex quibus ostenditur, dicit Luciferianus, vos per modicum fermentum totam Ecclesiæ massam corrupis, et de ejus manu hodiè eucharistiam accipere, quem heri quasi idololatram respuebatis. *Resp. Orthodoxus.* Sit quippe, ut vis, Arianorum episcopus hostis Christi, sit infatuatum sal, sit lucerna sine igniculo, sit oculus sine pupillâ: nempe eò pervenies, ut salire non possit, qui sal ipse non habeat, non illuminet cæcus, non accendat extinctus. Tu autem, cùm conditum ab eo cibum devores, cur insulsum arguis conditorem? De igniculo ejus ecclesia tua luceat et lucernam ejus criminariis extinctam? Oculos tibi præbet, et cæcus est? Quamobrem oro te, ut aut sacrificandi ei licentiam tribuas, cujus baptismum probas; aut reprobas ejus baptismum, quem non existimas sacerdotem. Neque enim fieri potest, ut qui in baptismo sanctus est, sit apud altare peccator.

Who sees not now, that the plain drift and design of St. Jerom was to argue with and confute the Luciferians, upon their own principles; by shewing them, that if an Arian bishop was qualified to minister true baptism, which they themselves supposed, for they received his baptism without repeating it, then he was as well qualified to be a priest, which he explains by offering sacrifice at the altar: if he was qualified to baptise, he was qualified to offer sacrifice at the altar. And therefore, upon their principles, they were obliged either to refuse the baptism of an Arian bishop, which yet they accepted, or else to allow him liberty of sacrificing at the altar, which they utterly refused. Whatever St. Jerom's notions might be in themselves, here is nothing in all this that clearly discovers them to us: for his discourse is all hypothetical, and only *argumentum ad hominem*, upon the principles and avowed practices of his adversaries. He does not say, that none but a priest, that could offer sacrifice at the altar, which is the notion of a priest here spoken of, could baptise: for then neither deacons in ordinary cases, nor laymen in extraordinary cases of necessity, could have done it; for neither of these is allowed to offer sacrifice at the altar; and yet St. Jerom allows them both to minister baptism authoratively in those respective cases: but his intention was only to shew his adversaries, that if they allowed an Arian bishop to baptise, they ought also to allow him to offer sacrifice at the altar, since a bishop or priest cannot be debarred of one of these offices and allowed the other: either he has a right to both, or a right to neither; he cannot be holy and a priest at the font in baptism, and at the same unholy and no priest at the altar. This was rational discourse to a Luciferian, upon his own hypothesis, when the question was concerning an Arian bishop, whether he had not as much right to sacrifice as to baptise? He that allowed the one to a bishop, ought in reason to allow the other, or else by parity of reason, equally to deny him both. But here is nothing positively asserted, but all upon supposition. He does not here either absolutely vindicate or condemn the Arian baptism; he does not say, an Arian bishop has a right to sacrifice at the altar, but only upon supposition that he had

a right to baptise, then he could not be denied to have a right to sacrifice also. So that here is nothing absolutely and positively determined by St. Jerom, concerning the absolute necessity of a priest, in all cases, to minister baptism, unless we distinguish the priesthood, as St. Jerom does elsewhere, into the *sacerdotium clerici, et sacerdotium laici, the priesthood of a clergyman, and the priesthood of a layman*, which is the Christian's baptism: in which latter and large notion it is necessary every man should be a priest, that is, a baptised Christian, that ministers Christian baptism: for though the Luciferian was forced to maintain it upon his absurd principles, yet St. Jerom and all the Ancients utterly deny, that a man that was a mere heathen could give Christian baptism: but I do not think, that St. Jerom here, in this place, intended to determine who was the minister of baptism, but only to infer from the principle and concession of the Luciferians, that if an Arian bishop had power to baptise, then he had power to offer sacrifice at the altar also: and so the Church was vindicated in receiving Arian bishops again into office, even upon the principle of the Luciferians. He does not here determine, whether the Arians were true bishops and priests or not; though he does elsewhere in the negative: nor whether the Church, in strictness of discipline, was obliged to receive them to the episcopal honour again; which in other places he also plainly denies; but he only vindicates the Church's prudential liberty in receiving them, from the practice of the Luciferians, who, by the same reason that they allowed them to baptise, ought to allow them to sacrifice at the altar also.

I have been the longer in explaining this short passage of St. Jerom, because the right explication of it will help as a key to open the labyrinth of all the rest of his dark and intricate reasonings, which Dr. Brett has chosen to be the groundwork of his demonstration. This shews his meaning, when he says, "I do not at present either blame the Arians or defend them: I keep to my point: a bishop is received by us upon the same reason as a layman is received by you. What you shall affirm, I will affirm; what you shall deny, I will deny. An Arian baptises, therefore he

is a bishop: he does not baptise; do you refuse to receive the layman, and I will not receive the bishop." Is not this the point he still keeps to, to follow the Luciferians and argue with them upon their own principles? Here is nothing of St. Jerom's positive sense, or the Church's in all this, but only to catch the adversaries in all their windings and turnings, upon their own hypothesis. Otherwise St. Jerom would speak contradictions, that an Arian was a bishop, and not a bishop; that he could baptise, and not baptise; that the Church did both receive him and not receive him.

So again, when he says, " Prove to me, that a layman coming over from the Arians has baptism, and I will not refuse to admit him to penance. But if he is not a Christian, if he had not a priest to make him a Christian, how shall a man do penance, who does not yet believe?" St. Jerom does not here deny absolutely, that an Arian's baptism might be received, for the Church actually received them, but only upon the hypothesis of the Luciferians, who said all Arians, as well their lay-priests as clergy-priests, were mere heathens, and consequently there were no priests of any kind among them that could give Christian baptism: for a man must be a Christian priest of some sort or other, and not a mere heathen, before he is qualified to give Christian baptism. So that his saying, " A man is no Christian, if he had not a priest to make him a Christian," makes nothing for the absolute invalidity of lay-baptism in general, which St. Jerom himself plainly allows to laymen, or lay-priests, as he calls them, in case of necessity, but only upon the hypothesis of the Luciferians, who made all Arians no priests, but mere heathens.

In the last place, when the Luciferian demands, " Do you think it just that an Arian should be a bishop?" St. Jerom replies, " You prove him to be a bishop, because you receive him, whom he has baptised." This answer is still made to the Luciferian upon his own practice. St. Jerom does not assert, that every man that baptises is a bishop; for then a presbyter and a deacon would be a bishop, and a layman would be a bishop, because he baptises in cases of necessity: but he only says, if the Luciferians allowed an Arian bishop to baptise, their own very practice proved he

might be allowed to exercise any other episcopal acts, and they had no reason to quarrel with the Church, as they did, for admitting Arian bishops to officiate in the Church again, when in prudence she thought it requisite so to do, since they themselves allowed them to exercise one episcopal act, viz. baptism, and that was sufficient to justify the Church in receiving them again to officiate at the altar; since no just reason could be assigned, why a bishop should be allowed to baptise, and not also be admitted, if the Church thought fit, to offer sacrifice at the altar.

I believe any reasonable man will now see the whole tendency of St. Jerom's discourse in all these passages, that it was not to determine the point of the invalidity of lay-baptism, but to justify the Church in her prudence and condescension toward the Arian bishops, upon the principles of the Luciferians, as I have explained it. And therefore I cannot yet think myself to blame for saying St. Jerom was silent in this matter, however Dr. Brett is of a different opinion.

But admit St. Jerom had as clearly delivered his opinion against the validity of lay-baptism in ordinary cases, as the doctor imagines: yet it does not so certainly follow from hence, as to amount to a demonstration, that the whole Church must needs be of the same opinion: for might not St. Jerom mistake the sense and practice of the Church as well as another man? Or mistake her in this point as well as in some others? Might he not mistake the sense of the Church then, as well as either Dr. Brett or I do now mistake the sense and practice of the Church of England, who deliver contrary opinions about her, and therefore one of us must needs be mistaken? If St. Jerom had never so plainly delivered this as the sense of the Church, yet if there be greater evidence from the Church herself, and such evidence as cannot be contradicted, that it was otherwise; then the testimony of the Church herself, and not St. Jerom, is to be believed in this case. And that thus it was, I will prove to the doctor by another sort of demonstration than that which he pretends to. For I will shew it plainly from the history of the first six general Councils and many others, which in full consent with one another are the best evidence

of the Church's sense and practice, that she received the baptism of those whom she accounted laymen. For all heretics and schismatics, when once convicted and degraded, were no other than laymen in her opinion. Which if I shew the doctor plainly to be true, then I hope he will submit to the force of the argument, which carries in it the evidence of a demonstration, since it is as good proof as the nature of the subject is capable of: and we shall need no longer dispute or cavil about St. Jerom or any other private author, when the question is once so fully decided by the supreme authority of the Church. This therefore is what I will try with the doctor, and the gentlemen of his opinion, in the following discourse.

SECT. 7.—The Testimony of Chrysostom no Evidence against the Baptism of Laymen in extraordinary Cases.

And here for the same reason I might have omitted what the doctor says of St. Chrysostom, p. 53, who is the only remaining author the doctor pretends to urge for his cause. I had said before, that Dr. Forbes had utterly mistaken the meaning of St. Chrysostom. For when Chrysostom confines the office of baptism to the hands of a priest, he only means in ordinary cases; otherwise deacons, who are no priests, would be absolutely excluded from it in all cases whatsoever, as well as laymen: and yet Chrysostom allows deacons to baptise in cases of necessity; which makes it evident, that his discourse only relates to the ministration of baptism in ordinary cases. To which the doctor replies, that St. Chrysostom here by a priest means only a bishop. Which, in my opinion, instead of mending the matter, makes it so much worse. For then, according to Dr. Forbes's interpretation, no valid baptism could be administered but by the hands of a bishop. Yes, Dr. Brett says, by the bishop's authority presbyters and deacons may do it. But I conceive there is some difference between the bishop's hands and his authority, and so Dr. Forbes thought, who makes this passage conclude as much against deacons as laymen, and that with reason enough, upon his supposition, that none but a priest, with his own hands actually, can have authority to baptise in any case whatsoever. For the hands of a deacon

were not the hands of a priest, either in the opinion of Chrysostom or Dr. Forbes, whether we understand by a priest either the bishop alone, or a bishop and presbyter together. So that this passage, in the sense which Dr. Forbes puts upon it, holds as much against deacons as laymen. And Dr. Brett, instead of vindicating Dr. Forbes, runs to another thing, and tells us, deacons may have authority from the bishop to baptise, which Dr. Forbes utterly denies. So these gentlemen clash together, and yet neither of them hit the truth, because they would not rightly understand Chrysostom of ministering baptism in ordinary cases only, which I shewed was all that possibly could be his meaning.

But Dr. Brett says, "Chrysostom's opinion is plainly so far on their side, as to shew the invalidity of all antiepiscopal baptisms, all baptisms by such as are uncommissioned, unauthorised by a bishop." To which I answer, though all such baptisms should be allowed to be invalid, yet this is more than the doctor can prove out of this place of Chrysostom, unless mere silence be a proof; for Chrysostom says nothing here expressly of commissioned or uncommissioned, authorised or unauthorised, episcopal or antiepiscopal baptism; but only that baptism cannot be given by any but the hands of a priest, which I interpret of the ordinary ministration by a bishop or a presbyter; but Dr. Forbes extends it to all cases, not only ordinary but extraordinary, and thereby excludes deacons from the power of baptising, as well as laymen. Dr. Brett confines the office of baptism to the hands of a bishop, but says he may commission a presbyter or a deacon, yet not a layman; which is only telling a man's own sense without his author, for Chrysostom's words make no such distinctions here, and the doctor should have proved his sense of this place, as I did, from others in the same author, if he had intended to satisfy a judicious reader.

But the doctor goes a little further, and says, "Chrysostom does not give his own private opinion, but the known judgment and practice of the Church." Yet the reader must take this upon his word too, for he offers no manner of proof of it, but only by saying, the Church had confined this charge to the episcopal office, and that, he thinks, invalidated all such baptisms as had not the bishop's commission. Now

this is the thing to be tried between the doctor and me, whether all unauthorised and uncommissioned baptism, that was administered by persons that were no actual priests, but laymen, was declared wholly invalid, null, and void, and as such ordered to be repeated by the Church. The doctor affirms it upon the testimony of St. Cyprian, St. Basil, St. Jerom, and St. Chrysostom, which I have now examined: and I deny it upon the strongest evidence of all the general and particular councils of the Church, whose decrees and orders must be owned to be the most convincing proof of the Church's sense and practice. From which I shall shew, that the Church received the baptism of some heretics and schismatics, who never had any true orders from any episcopal ordination; and the baptism of others, whom she herself degraded, and took their orders from them, leaving them altogether in an unauthorised state, and divested of all sacerdotal power; not having so much as the name, much less the dignity and authority of priests, but entirely reduced to the state and quality of laymen. If I can prove these things to my friend in a way of the plainest demonstration to his satisfaction, I hope I shall have no further dispute with him, whatever I may have with others, upon this subject, because I know him to be an ingenuous man, and he has promised to yield the cause upon fair and rational conviction. And here I will do him that justice to say, he has managed the dispute with as much strength and learning as the cause would bear, and with as much good manners and Christian temper as any disputant in the present age; for which he is truly to be commended, and will not fail thereby to advance his reputation with those, who cannot otherwise fall in with his mistaken notions, which happen to run so cross to the general sense and practice of the Catholic Church.

A
SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY
OF THE
PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH,
IN REFERENCE TO THE
ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM BY LAY PERSONS.

PART II.

CHAP. I.

That Heretics, and Schismatics, and degraded Clerks, and excommunicated Clerks, when once they are convicted, and legally censured, are no longer authorised to minister Baptism, or officiate as true Priests and Ministers of God and the Church; but that thenceforth all their acts are unauthorised, and done only by Usurpation.—This proved from the History of the first Six General Councils, and their Proceedings against Heretics, and Schismatics, and other Delinquents.

SECT. 1.—How Meletius was deposed and divested of all ministerial Authority, by the Council of Nice.

THE first general Council was the famous Council of Nice, which all men reverence, and which alone were sufficient to put an end to this whole dispute. This Council was called by Constantine in the year 325, to allay the flames that had sometime before been raised by Meletius and Arius in the Church. Meletius was bishop of Lyco-

polis, in Egypt, who had, for a long time, headed a schism of his own making, against the bishops of Alexandria, his lawful metropolitans. The occasion of his schism was this. Meletius, in the time of the Dioclesian persecution, had denied the faith and offered sacrifice to idols; for which, and some other reasons, he was, according to the laws of the Church, deposed by Peter, bishop of Alexandria,¹ who presently after suffered martyrdom. Meletius, instead of submitting to this legal censure, raised a schism upon it, first against Peter, and then against Achillas, and Alexander, his successors; ordaining bishops and priests throughout Egypt and Thebais, to strengthen his faction; and this he continued to do, till the time of the Council of Nice. The Council, therefore, to correct this presumption, and confirm the sentence, which before had been passed upon him, made this peremptory decree against him, which is in their Synodical Epistle, sent to the churches of Alexandria, Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, and recorded by Socrates and Theodoret,² “ That Meletius should have no manner of power, or authority, either of ordaining or making elections; that he should be confined to his own city, and neither appear in the country, nor in any other city upon such an occasion, but only retain the bare name and title of his dignity. And for such bishops and presbyters as had been ordained by him, they should not be admitted to officiate as ministers in the Catholic Church, till they were *Μυσικωτέρα χειροτονία βεβαιοθέντες*, *confirmed*, or *authorised by a more sacred imposition of hands*, together with the approbation and allowance of the bishop of Alexandria.” Which Valesius, and du Pin, and other learned men, take to imply a new ordination: however, it certainly implies a new authority and confirmation from the Church, and supposes that all their pretended ministerial offices before were done without competent and just authority, and only by mere usurpation: and if they continued to act as they had done before, all their ministerial acts would be

¹ Socrat. Hist. lib. i. c. 6. Καθηρέθη, &c. Athanas. Apol. ii. p. 777.

² Socrat. lib. i. c. 9. Theodor. lib. i. c. 9. Μηδμίαν ἰεσάσαν μήτε χειροθετεῖν μήτε προχειρίζεσθαι.

unauthorised, especially after such a formal and judicial degradation by the greatest power of the Church in a general Council. This, I think, is as clear as the sun at noon-day, that either the Council of Nice had no authority from God, by the power of the keys, to deprive Meletius of his authority, for his contumacy and just deserts; or else that Meletius had no authority, after this, to act as a bishop of the Church; nor any of his accomplices, who only derived from him, any authority to perform any ministerial offices, till they had first received a more competent authority from the Catholic Church. And yet the Council made no decree that the baptisms of all these should be annulled, and that such as came over from them should be rebaptised again; as she did in the case of the Paulianists, in her 19th canon: because though the Meletians and Paulianists were equally divested of the Church's true authority to minister baptism or any other sacred office, yet the one baptised in the form of the Church, and the other did not, which was the reason of this distinction. And it plainly shews the sense of the Nicene fathers, that they did not think a baptism, that was given in due form, was necessarily to be repeated, because given by a person, who had no competent authority to give it: for then they would have ordered the Meletians to have been rebaptised, as well as the Paulianists: which yet neither they nor any other Council have done; nor is there to be found any instance of such a Meletian's rebaptisation, that I know of, in all ancient history.

After this decree, Meletius, as soon as he came back to Lycopolis, went on in his own way, in contempt of the Council, ordaining bishops to propagate his schism, as he had done before. For, as Baronius observes out of Athanasius,¹ he made Arsenius, bishop of Hypsele, in Thebais, and Sozomen adds,² that a little before his death he ordained one John to be his successor at Lycopolis. Now, will any one say, that Meletius had authority to ordain these men, when the Council had taken all power and authority from him? If not, then Meletius was no true priest or minister

¹ Athanas. Apol. ii. Baron. an. 326. n. 7.

² Sozomen. lib. ii. c. 21.

of God and his Church, but all his acts were unauthorised, and done only by usurpation.

SECT. 2.—How Arius was deposed and anathematised by the same Council.

The same Council shewed her authority a little further in the condemnation of Arius, and those bishops that joined with him in his heresy: for they not only deposed them, but anathematised them also. Arius himself had been once or twice deposed before by Alexander, his bishop, and declared excommunicate or anathematised in a full synod of Egyptian bishops. Socrates says,¹ Alexander called a synod of many bishops, where Arius, and those that embraced his opinions were deposed: and Alexander wrote a synodical or encyclical epistle, to give notice to all other Churches. This epistle is recorded by Socrates, wherein it is said, that they were cast out of the Church, and anathematised, and declared to be aliens both from the Church and the Catholic faith. And Alexander says, he therefore intimated the fact to other Churches, that they might do as became Christians, that is, shew their aversion to all such as spake against Christ, or held ill opinions of him, as men that were enemies to God, and destroyers of men's souls; and that they might not bid them, God speed, and so become partakers in their sins, as St. John words it. Epiphanius takes notice of the same, and says,² Alexander expelled Arius from the Church, and published his excommunication throughout the whole city. And the curious diligence of Cotelerius has helped us to the very form of his deposition, under the name of *Καζάρσεις Αρείς*, *The Deposition of Arius*, which the inquisitive reader may find at large in Cotelerius's Notes upon the Constitutions.³ Now, what Alexander and the Egyptian synods had done before, the Great Council of Nice confirmed and ratified, declaring Arius, and two bishops, Secundus and Theonas, to be deposed for joining with him;⁴ and they also anathematised, or laid the greater excommunication

¹ Socrat. lib. i. c. 6.

² Epiphanius. Hæres. 69. n. 3. Ἐξεῖοι αὐτὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἧ, ἐκκηρυκτὸν ποιῶ ἐν τῇ πόλει.

³ Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. viii c. 28.

⁴ Con. Nic. Epist. Synod. ap. Socrat. lib. i. c. 9.

upon him, and all others that should maintain the same errors; adding these words at the end of their creed,¹ “those that say, there was a time when the son of God was not, or that he had no being before he was created, or that he was made out of nothing, or of any other substance, or created, or changeable, the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematises them.”

Now by the tenour of these direful censures, Arius and all his adherents were not only deposed from their clerical office and orders, but also expelled from lay-communion, and all the privileges of Christians, save only that their baptism intitled them to be admitted again into the Church upon a true repentance. But in the mean time, they were neither authorised priests, nor complete lay-christians, whilst they were under such bonds of excommunication. For no man is a complete layman, who is not in full communion with the Church. Upon this account catechumens, who are unbaptised, and heretics and schismatics, and excommunicate persons, are but imperfect Christians: the first of these communicate with the Church in the faith, but not in the sacraments; the other three either excommunicate themselves, or are excommunicated by the power of the keys and church-censures. Till therefore they are admitted again and loosed by the same power of the keys, they are not in full communion with the Church, and consequently but imperfect Christians. Now it would be absurd to say, that those, who are not so much as proper and perfect lay-christians, are proper and perfect priests; that they, who have no right to receive themselves the sacraments, have authority to give the sacraments to others. Therefore heretics and schismatics, and priests under anathema, can have no authority to minister the sacraments whilst they are in that state; or, if they do, it is all done without authority and by usurpation. And this was the case of Arius, and all his adherents, whilst they were under the anathema of the Council of Nice. The baptisms, which they gave in that state, were given without authority, and were not so much as the baptisms of perfect lay-christians. And yet

¹ Ap. Socrat. lib. i. c. 6.

the Church did not rebaptise such persons as were baptised in due form by them, but only supplied what was deficient in their baptism, at their return to the Church, by imposition of hands and confirmation, as I have fully proved in the First Part of this History, which no one has pretended to call in question. This then, I think, is demonstration, that if the Council of Nice took away all clerical authority from the Meletians and Arians; and left the one in a state of laymen, and the other not so much as laymen; and yet received the baptisms that were given by both these without rebaptising; she must receive the baptism of those, who, in her opinion, had no authority to give baptism, because she herself had taken that authority from them. This one thing were enough to silence all disputes, if men will hearken to reason, or the authority of the Church in so great a Council. But let us see whether the Council of Nice was singular in this treatment of the Arians and Meletians, or whether the Church did not always follow her example in her behaviour toward heretics in succeeding ages.

SECT. 3.—How the Macedonians, Apollinarians, and other Heretics, were degraded and anathematised in the Second General Council of Constantinople.

The next general Council was that at Constantinople, Anno 381, called by Theodosius the Great, where one hundred and fifty oriental bishops met to condemn and exterminate two growing heresies; that of the Apollinarians, who denied the humanity of our Saviour, in denying the existence of his human soul; and the other of the Macedonians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Apollinaris and his disciple Timotheus, had some time before been condemned and degraded, in two famous Councils of the East and West, the one at Rome of ninety-three bishops, under Pope Damasus, Anno 373, or 378; and the other at Antioch of one hundred and forty-six bishops, Anno 378, or 380. The Council at Rome both deposed and anathematised them,¹

¹ *Con. Rom. Profess. Fidei Con. tom. ii. p. 900. Anathematizamus Macedonianos, qui de Arii stirpe venientes, non perfidiam mutaverunt, sed nomen. Anathematizamus eos, qui pro hominis animâ rationali et intelligibili, dicunt Dei verbum in humanâ carne versatum, &c.*

as the acts of the Council and Pope Damasus's Synodical Epistle shew.¹ "We anathematise those," says the Council, "who say, that the word of God was instead of the rational and intelligent soul in the human flesh of Christ." "And," says Damasus, "we have deposed Timotheus, the prophane scholar of Apollinarius, together with his impious doctrine." And so Theodoret understood the censure of the Council to be both deposition and excommunication.² This sentence was first confirmed in the Council of Antioch, and then in the general Council of Constantinople, in whose Synodical Epistle, recorded by Theodoret, it is said,³ "That they had published a writing against the new sects, the Eunomians, the Arians, the Macedonians, and the Apollinarians, laying them all under the sentence of anathema." And one of the canons of that Council also confirms all that Damasus and the Council of Antioch had before decreed against the Macedonians, in these words,⁴ "We approve the tome of the Western bishops, and those of Antioch, professing that there is but one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." As therefore the Western bishops, and those of Antioch had anathematized the Macedonians, so here the Council of Constantinople gave their approbation of the sentence. And in another canon⁵ they depose Maximus the cynic, who had intruded himself into the place of Gregory Nazianzen, at Constantinople, by the help of seven bishops that ordained him, declaring, "That Maximus, neither ever was a bishop, nor should be a bishop, nor any of those true clerks, that were ordained by him, in any degree whatsoever; all that had been done either to him, or by him, being actually void and null." There were two reasons for de-

¹ Damas. Ep. Synod. ap. Theod. lib. v. c. 10. Τιμόθεον τὸν βίβηλον τὸν μαθητὴν τῷ Ἀπολλινάριε τῷ αἰρετικῷ καθείλομεν. &c. ² Theod. lib. v. c. 9. Καθελὼν ἀπεκέρυξε, &c.

³ Theod. lib. v. c. 9.

⁴ Con. Constant. can. v. Περὶ τῷ τόμῳ τῶν δυτικῶν, ἃ τῶν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, ἀπεδείξαμεθα τῶς μίαν ὁμολογῶντας τῷ Πατρὶ εἰ Ἰησοῦς ἔστι Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματος Θεότῳτα.

⁵ Con. Constant. can. iv. Περὶ Μαξίμου τῷ κυνικῷ, ἃ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν ἀταξίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινῶπολει γενομένης, ὥστε μήτε Μάξιμον ἐπίσκοπον ἢ γενέσθαι ἢ εἶναι, μήτε τῶς παρ' αὐτῷ χειροτονηθέντας ἐν οἴφῳ ποτε βαθμῶ κλήρω, πάντων ἃ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν ἃ τῶν παρ' αὐτῷ γενομένων ἀκυρωθέντων.

posing this man; one was, that he had intruded himself into a full see, which, as I shall shew hereafter, always by the ancient canons made an ordination void. Another reason was, that he was an Apollinarian heretic, which is the reason that Theodoret¹ assigns, why the Council deposed him. Now then the question will be, whether any of these men, Maximus or his clergy, or the rest of the Macedonian and Apollinarian heretics, had any authority to minister baptism, after they were legally deposed by this general Council? To say they had authority still, notwithstanding their deposition, is only to affront the authority of the Council, and make a jest of all ecclesiastical censures. But if they had no authority to minister baptism, whether or no might the baptisms given by them, without authority, be received by the Church, supplying only what was deficient, without rebaptisation? We need not go far for the resolution of this question, for this very Council has fully determined it in her seventh canon, if we allow that to belong to this council: for there the Macedonians and Apollinarians are expressly named among other heretics, whose baptism might be received by the sacred unction without rebaptising. Or if any one questions the authority of that canon, as Bishop Beverege does, yet the thing is evident from other proofs: for the Council of Trullo has the same canon;² and it does not appear that either the Macedonians or Apollinarians rejected the true form of baptism, but always baptised in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And it is observable, that this very Council, which annulled the ordination of Maximus, and all that were ordained by him, does not annul the baptisms given by them, or order them to be repeated: which shews that a difference was made between these things in the discipline and practice of the Church.

SECT. 4.—How the third General Council of Ephesus degraded Nestorius, and his followers.

The third General Council was held at Ephesus, under

¹ Theod. lib. v. c. 8.

² Con. Trull. c. 95.

Theodosius, Junior, Anno 431, by two hundred bishops, and upwards, Cyril of Alexandria presiding over them. This Council is famous for the deposition of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, and John, bishop of Antioch, and many others with them. And the forms of their depositions, both in the acts and canons of that Council, run in such a strain, as shew that they had a just sense of their own authority to degrade men for heresy or any other great crimes, and that men so legally degraded had thenceforth no authority to perform any ministerial acts, unless the same power, which laid them under bonds, thought fit to grant them a legal relaxation. The sentence of deposition against Nestorius runs expressly in this form: “Our Lord Jesus Christ,¹ whom he hath blasphemed, doth, by this holy synod, declare Nestorius deprived of episcopal dignity, and all communion and society of the priesthood.” Can any thing be more authentic or formal than this proceeding in the name of Christ? And were it reasonable to think the Council esteemed Nestorius a priest after such a judicial sentence as this? But they not only deposed Nestorius, but all his abettors and defenders, particularly Charisius, who made an Exposition upon the Creed, to wire-draw it to the sense of Nestorius. Against which they made that famous decree concerning new forms of faith: “that no one should offer, write, or compose any other creed for the use of new converts, besides that which was made in the Nicene Council: and if any transgressed this order, being bishops,² they declare them degraded from their episcopal order, and other clerks from their clerical order, and laymen to be anathematised. In like manner, if any bishops,³ clerks, or laymen, were found to believe or teach, concerning the incarnation of the Son of God, according to the exposition of Charisius, or the wicked and perverse doctrines of Nesto-

¹ Con. Ephes. Act. i. Con. tom. iii. p. 531. Ὁ βλασφημηθεὶς παρ' αὐτῶν Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὤρισε διὰ τῆς παρόσης ἀγιοτάτης συνόδου, ἀλλοτρίων εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν Νεστόριον τῷ ἐπισκοπικῷ ἀξιώματι, ἢ παντὸς συλλόγου ἱερατικῶ.

² Con. Ephes. Act. vi. p. 690. Τέτρες, εἰ μὲν εἴεν ἐπίσκοποι, ἢ κληρικοὶ, ἀλλοτρίως εἶναι τὰς ἐπισκόπους ἐπισκοπῆς, ἢ τὰς κληρικὰς τῷ κλήρῳ.

³ Con. Ephes. Act. vi. p. 690. Τὸν μὲν ἐπίσκοπον ἀλλοτριῶσαι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, ἢ εἰνακαθρημένον, τὸν δὲ κληρικὸν ὁμοίως ἐκπίπτειν τῷ κλήρῳ.

rius, they should be liable to the same censure of this holy and œcumenical synod, viz. that a bishop should be removed from his episcopal office, and be deposed; and a clerk fall from his clerical degree; and a layman be anathematised, according to the tenor aforesaid." Now that by deposing of heretics they meant depriving them of all power and authority of the priesthood, they themselves tell us, who are best able to interpret their own meaning. For in their Synodical Epistle to Pope Celestin,¹ where they give him an account of their proceedings against John, bishop of Antioch, and his schismatical synod, they tell him, they had taken from them all power of the priesthood, so that they could now do no one any harm by their sentence of excommunication. For it was but necessary and reasonable they should be deprived of the power of doing hurt. And in another place they declare this John and his adherents to be cast out of the Church,² and to "have no power or faculty, as from any authority of the priesthood, either to hurt or benefit any one thereby, until they should condemn themselves, and confess their fault. Which if they did not do in a short time, they might be sure the utmost severity of the canons would be exercised upon them, that is, they should be irreversibly degraded without hopes of restitution. Nothing can be plainer than these words, to take away all authority of the priesthood from such clerks, as were legally deposed by the just power of the keys in the Church. It took away the whole *δύναμις, ἐξουσία, ἀθθεντία ιερατική*, the whole *power, authority, and spiritual efficacy of the priesthood* from them. They might do the acts of a priest, bind or absolve, but those would be of no spiritual efficacy, because done without authority; their bindings would hurt no man, nor their absolutions benefit him, because the authentional power of the priesthood was wanting in them. They did not then dream of such a notion of the indelible character of the priesthood, as some have advanced

¹ Con. Ephes. tom. iii. p. 666. Περιελόντες αὐτῶν πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν ιερατικὴν. ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι βλάπτειν, &c. ² Ibid. Act. v. p. 654. Μηδεμίαν ἔχοντες ἄδειαν, ὡς ἐξ ἀθθεντίας ιερατικῆς, εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι τινὰς βλάπτειν ἰκαύτης ἢ ὠφελεῖν. &c.

since, as if a man could act with the absolute authority of a priest, when God and Christ and the best authority in the Church had taken his authority from him. The very opponents of this Council had no such opinion, but only pleaded they were unjustly deposed; and therefore, to be quits with Cyril and his Council, John of Antioch, and his faction, took upon them to depose Cyril and the Council, as Apollinarians; and they did it much in the same form of words as the other had used towards them: for so *Liberatus*, in giving an account of this Council, represents it. John and his faction of thirty bishops, sent them a sentence of deposition in these words,¹ “ know ye, thou Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, and thou Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, that ye are deposed, and deprived of your episcopacy, and all ecclesiastical ministry whatsoever.” And the same may be seen in the first session of the Council of Ephesus, where the acts of the schismatical synod are related.² To this Cyril, and the Council of Ephesus, replied upon the aforesaid Catholic principles, that the sentence of deposition pronounced against them was of no authority or force, because the thirty bishops, who decreed it, were divested of legal power; they had no authority as priests to sit judges upon others; they had lost the power of the keys, and their excommunications or absolutions were equally insignificant, because they were not men rightly qualified to perform such actions:³ “ for of those thirty bishops

¹ *Liberat. Breviar. cap. vi.* Scitote quod depositi estis, et alieni ab episcopatu, Cyrille Alexandrine episcopo, et tu Memnon hujus civitatis, et omni ecclesiastico ministerio alieni. ² *Con. Ephes. Act. i. Con. tom. iii. p. 590.* Under this title, *Acta Conciliabuli, in quo Johannes Antiochenus et Orientales quidam episcopi Cyrillum ac Memnonem deposuerunt, et excommunicarunt omnes, qui ad synodum convenerant.*

Ibid. p. 598. Tu Cyrille Alexandrine, et tu Memnon hujus civitatis episcopo, scitote vos depositos, et ab episcopatu alienos, et ab omni ministerio ecclesiastico amotos, &c. ³ *Con. Ephes. Ep. Synod. ad Cælestin. Act. i. Con. tom. iii. p. 663.* Johannes Antiochenus, collecto collegio hominum circiter triginta numero, qui nomen habebant episcoporum, ex quibus alii erant extorres, otiosi, ecclesiisque carentes, alii ante multos annos ob graves culpas à suis metropolitanis depositi; cum ipsis etiam Pelagiani et Cælestiani, ac non nulli de iis qui ex Thessaliâ ejecti fuerunt, rem ausus est impiam.

some of them were mere wanderers, without any Churches; others had been legally deposed many years ago by their metropolitans, for great and scandalous offences; and some of them were Pelagian and Cœlestian heretics, and others had been ejected out of Thessaly as criminals, who now pretended, with John of Antioch, to depose or excommunicate an universal synod, which was an impious pretence to an authority, which they had not the least claim to, who had only the name of bishops, without the power, which they had forfeited by being justly deposed." Does not all this suppose, in the judgment of this Council, that heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, lose their authority ministerial by a legal deposition; so that thenceforward they have no authority to bind or loose, to excommunicate or absolve, or perform authoritatively any other acts of the ministerial function? If it does not, I despair of ever understanding men's meaning by their words. But if it does, then it is undeniably evident, that priests may be divested of their ministerial authority, in the opinion of this general Council.

It were easy to transcribe almost half a volume upon the same subject, out of the several acts and records of this Council: but that my friend may not complain again, that I send him to books, which he cannot easily come by, I will here subjoin two or three canons of this Council, which are in every one's hands; and they are as full to the purpose, as what has been already alleged out of the Acts of the Synod.

The preface to these canons is their Encyclical Epistle to all Churches, wherein they speak of those thirty schismatical bishops, who made a separate synod under John of Antioch; of whom they give the same account and character as we have heard before.¹ "That they had no power or faculty, as from any authority of the priesthood, either to hurt or benefit any one thereby; because some of them were deposed, but especially because they embraced the opinions

¹ Con. Ephes. Epist. Encycl. Μηδεμίαν ἔχοντες ἄδειαν, ὡς ἐξ ἀυθεντίας ἱερατικῆς, εἰς τὸ δόνασθαι τινας ἐκ ταύτης βλάπτειν ἢ ὠφελεῖν, διὰ τὸ ἕ τινας ἐν αὐτοῖς εἶναι καθηρημένους. &c. Οὕτως δόγματι κοινῷ ἢ ἀγία σύνοδος πάσης μὲν ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας ἀλλοτριῶς ἐποίησεν, πᾶσαν δὲ αὐτῶν ἐνέργειαν ἱερατικὴν περιεῖλεν, εἰ ἢς ἠδύνατο βλάπτειν ἢ ὠφελεῖν τινας.

of Nestorius and Cælestius: and therefore the holy synod, by a common decree, excluded them from all ecclesiastical communion, and took from them all the power or energy of the priesthood, which enabled them to do good or hurt to others." Their meaning is, that they deprived them of all authority as priests, to excommunicate or absolve, or perform any other ministerial acts, that might have a spiritual effect on others. And if this did not render them unauthorised persons, it is hard to say what would. Their first canon is levelled against all such metropolitans as forsook the œcumenical synod, and joined with the schismatical conventicle, or embraced the heresy of Cælestius: "such an one should have no power to do any thing against his provincial bishops,¹ being cast out of all ecclesiastical communion by the synod, and rendered incapable of performing any ecclesiastical office: nay, he should be subjected to the bishops of his own province, and the neighbouring metropolitans, in every thing, being degraded from the order of episcopacy." In the next canon they determine the same against all bishops that joined in the schismatical synod,² "that they, according to the decree of the holy synod, were altogether divested of the priesthood and fallen from their order." These are not the words of men that supposed, that heretics or schismatics, or deposed priests, could act still with the authority of priests, after they were degraded and fallen from their order.

In the third canon they decree, that all such clerks as were interdicted the priestly office by Nestorius, for their orthodoxy, should be restored to their station again: and thenceforward no clerk should be subject to an apostatising bishop upon any account, or in any respect whatsoever. This certainly supposes that degraded heretics had no longer authority, as bishops or priests, to censure or exact obedience from their subjects. And yet the power of the keys was one of the most authentic and appropriate ingredients of the episcopacy and priesthood: but they having

¹ Con. Ephes. Can. i. Οὗτος κατὰ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων διαπράττεισθαι τι ἑδαμῶς δύναται, πάσης ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη ἀπὸ τῆς συνόδου ἐκβεβλημένος, ἢ ἀνεύρηγτος ὑπάρχων ἐν τῷ βαθμῷ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐκβληθέναι. ² Can. ii. ibid. Τέτοιον πάντη κατὰ τὸ εἶδος τῆ ἀγία συνόδου ἀλλοτριῆς εἶναι τῆς ἡρωσόνης ἐν τῷ βαθμῷ ἐκπίπτουρας.

lost both the key of knowledge and the key of government, submission and obedience to them, as priests and ministers of God, in this degraded state, was no longer due unto them.

In the fourth canon they decree, that if any clerks apostatise, and, either publicly or privately, hold the opinions of Nestorius or Cælestius, they are *deposed* by the holy synod—
 “ Τῆς εἶναι καθερημένους.”

And in the fifth canon, if any clerks are condemned by this holy synod, or their own bishops for their crimes; and Nestorius or any of his accomplices attempt to restore them to communion, or to their order; this shall not profit them: they are to remain deposed notwithstanding. Whence it is plain, that Nestorius being legally deposed, had no authority to absolve or restore any to communion, by virtue of any indelible character of a bishop remaining in him. And, though he had absolved them a thousand times, his authority would have signified nothing, till the Church by her authentic and authoritative acts had reinstated them.

In the sixth canon all, who shall pretend to evacuate or set aside any of the acts of the Council of Ephesus, if they be bishops or clerks, they *do totally fall from their order*, τῶ οἰκίαι παντελῶς ἀποπίπτειν βαθεῖμῶ, and if laymen, they are excommunicate. And can men have the authority of priests or bishops, when they are totally fallen from their order? No certainly, no more than laymen have a right or authority to demand the communion, whilst they are excommunicate by the Council.

The last canon decrees, that if any one use the impious creed of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, proposed by Charisius in the Council, or any other creed beside that of Nice, *if they were bishops, they were deprived of their episcopal order, and if clerks, deprived of their clerical order*, ἀλλοτρίως εἶναι τὰς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, καὶ τὰς κληρικὸς τῶ κλήρος, and if laymen, they were anathematised, or under the sentence of the greater excommunication.

These seven are all the canons which the Council of Ephesus made, and we see they are all upon this one point, to take away the ministerial authority of bishops and priests from them, in case of heresy or any such crime, for which

they incurred the censures of the synod: and a man may as well say, that black is white, as say, that the Council of Ephesus thought these men had still the authority of ministers of Christ, when they, by the authority of God and Christ, had taken their authority from them. And yet the baptisms given by such men in this unauthorised state, were not repeated; the persons they baptised, while they were divested of their ministerial power, were not rebaptised when they came over to the Church, but only received with imposition of hands and confirmation, as I have shewed, particularly of the Nestorians, in the First Part of this Scholastical History, to which I refer the reader.

SECT. 5.—How the Council of Chalcedon deposed Eutyches and Dioscorus and their Adherents.

Come we now to the fourth general Council, the great Council of Chalcedon, where above six hundred bishops met, under Marcian, the emperor, Anno 451, to condemn the heresies of Eutyches and Dioscorus, who denied the consubstantiality of Christ's human nature with that of ours, as Arius had denied the consubstantiality of his divine nature with that of the Father. Eutyches had been once condemned before in the Council of Constantinople, under Flavian, Anno 448, the Acts of which Council are inserted into the first action or session of the Council of Chalcedon. There we find the first sentence of deprivation passed upon him in these terms, by Flavian and fifty-six bishops and archimandrites:¹ “ We decree him, by the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom he hath blasphemed, to be deprived of his priestly order, and our communion, and the superintendency of his monastery; and all those, who converse with him, to be obnoxious to the same excommunication.” And there they call him only, “ A quondam presbyter,—’ο πάλαι πρεσβύτερος,” as supposing him to be no longer a presbyter after he was thus deposed from his order. This decree indeed was pretendedly cancelled by the second Council of Ephesus, com-

¹ Con. Constant. Act. vii. in Act. i. Con. Chalced. Con. tom. iv. p. 230. Ὀρίσαμεν--αὐτὸν ἀλλότριον εἶναι παντὸς ἱερατικῆς τάγματος, καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοινωνίας, καὶ τῆ προεστάναι μοναστηρίας, &c.

monly called, The latrocinial synod, or, The synod of robbers, because it turned the temple of God into a den of thieves, by condemning Flavian, and absolving Eutyches,¹ at the instigation of Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria. But the attempt of this synod was quickly reversed by the authority of the great Council of Chalcedon, which condemned both Dioscorus and Eutyches in a very remarkable manner. Dioscorus is often deposed in these forms: “ Διόσκορον ὁ Θεὸς κἀσεῖλεν, *God hath deposed Dioscorus* ;”² “ Christ hath deposed the murderer :” “ the holy synod hath divested him of episcopal dignity and deprived him of all the honour and ministry of the priesthood.”³

And it is further remarkable, that in the sentence of deposition pronounced against him, they declare him deprived of all sacerdotal grace and office without hopes of restitution,⁴ because he contumaciously contemned the citations and admonitions of the synod. Liberatus takes notice of the same things in his account of this Council. He says,⁵ “ the whole council cried out, God hath deposed Dioscorus, God hath deposed the murderer! And that they gave it in command to the clergy of Alexandria, then present at Chalcedon, that they should not henceforward esteem him a bishop, but look upon him as one entirely degraded from his order. And because some thought that Dioscorus might recover his bishopric again, they published an Edict, declaring Dioscorus to be irrecoverably deprived of his honour.” Can any thing be more solemn, full, or authentic than this deposition? Which is said to be done by God and Christ; which

¹ Vid. Act. Con. Ephes. Secund. in Actione primâ Concil. Chalced. p. 256.

² Con. Chalced. Act. ii. p. 371. Ibid. Act. i. p. 831. Edit. Crab. p. 310. Ed. Labbe.

³ Act. iii. p. 817. Edit. Crab. p. 427. Edit. Labbe. Aliens eum ab omni sacerdotali ministerio et dignitate. See the several subscriptions of particular bishops in that session, p. 439. Ego Cyrus alienum eum judico à pontificatûs collegio et omni sacerdotali ministerio. Another says, Dignus est alienus esse à sacerdotali ordine, et ab omni ministerio et communione, &c.

⁴ Con. Chalced. Act. iii. in Edicto cont. Dioscor. p. 459. and 461.

⁵ Liberat. Breviar. c. xiii. Acclamavit omne Concilium, Dioscorum Deus deposuit! Homicidam deus deposuit! Clericis vero Alexandrinis mandavit Concilium, jam eum non putare episcopum esse sed omnino cognoscerent eum de gradu suo esse dejectum. Sed et aliquibus putantibus Dioscorum recuperare posse episcopatum, propositum est edictum, et omnibus manifestatum est, Dioscorum irrecoverabiliter honore fuisse abjectum.

deprives him not only of episcopacy, but of all ecclesiastical ministry and sacred function; which orders his own clergy to look upon him as no bishop, but as an abject or castaway, irrecoverably degraded, without hopes of restitution; that he was expelled the college of bishops, and the order of priests, and had now not so much as the name or appellation of a bishop left him. Can any man think they took him for an authorised minister of Christ, after they themselves, by the power of Christ, had so solemnly unauthorised him, without hopes of restitution? Whatever there may be in the indelible character of a bishop or priest, it is certain this Council did not think it authorised him to act as a lawful bishop, after so full and ample a deposition. Though we should suppose it preserved him in a capacity to minister as a priest, without a new ordination, if ever the Council should think fit to restore him to his ministerial authority again; yet he could not be said to minister with authority, whilst he remained in that deposed state, and all the power of Heaven and earth had taken his authority from him. And yet we no where read, that the baptisms given by Dioscorus or his adherents, were at any time repeated; or that any Eutychians were rebaptised upon their return to the Catholic Church.

The condemnation of Eutyches himself was parallel to this of Dioscorus. I shall but trouble the reader with one instance of it, out of the edict of the Emperor Marcian, where he confirms the acts and sentence of the Council against him. In Crab's Edition it is inserted into the third session of the Council, p. 866. But in Labbe's edition it is found at the end of all the acts, among other records relating to this Council; and it is in these words:¹ "By this law we decree, that they who are deceived by the errors of Eutyches, shall have no bishop, nor presbyter, nor have, nor

¹ Edict. Marciani, ad Calcem Con. Chalced. part. iii. cap. xii. Con. tom. iv. p. 868. Hac lege decernimus, eos, qui Eutychetis decipiuntur errore— nullum episcopum, nullum habere presbyterum, nullos habere, vel creare, vel appellare clericos; ipsumque Eutychem nomine presbyteri, quo et indignus et spoliatus est, in totum carere. Si qui tamen contra definita nostra, episcopos, presbyteros, ceterosque clericos ausi fuerint creare, iam factos, quam facientes, vel præsumentes sibi clericorum gradum, bonorum amissione percussos, exilio perpetuo præcipimus contineri.

create, nor name any men clerks; and that Eutyches himself shall be totally deprived of the name of presbyter, of which he is unworthy and divested. But if any shall presume, against this our order, to create bishops or presbyters or other clerks; both they, that create such clerks, and they, that are so created, or assume to themselves the degree of clerks, shall have their goods confiscated and be confined to perpetual banishment. Now then, if according to the sentence of the Council, and this ratification of it, Eutyches and his adherents were so deprived of all ministerial offices, that they were not so much as to have the very name of bishops or presbyters allowed them, nor might create any under those titles; what authority could the Eutychians have after this to minister baptism, or perform any other acts of the ministerial function? They might do the things indeed, but they had no authority to do them: they were as much usurpers of the office as the mereest layman. All the difference was, that the one never had authority, and the other once had authority, but forfeited and lost it, and, by their heresy and obstinacy, reduced themselves to a state and condition one degree below laymen, by suffering themselves to be legally anathematised and cast out of the communion of the Church. And yet after all, the canons assure us, that they, who were baptised in due form by these unauthorised usurpers, were not rebaptised, but only had their deficiencies supplied and completed by imposition of hands and a proper form of confirmation.

I could give other instances to the purpose, out of the remaining acts of this Council, but I chuse rather to say something of its canons; among which there are no less than eight, which specify certain crimes for which a clerk is deposed or fallen from his order. The second canon is against ordination for money, in which case both the ordainer and ordained, and also any other, who is instrumental or a mediator in the crime, if he be a clerk, is deprived of his order, “*Τῆ οἰκέις ἐκπίπτειτω βαθμῆ.*” So if a clerk forsakes his own Church without leave, by the tenth canon he incurs the same censure, “*Ἐκπίπτειν τῆ ἰδῆς βαθμῆ.*” If a bishop procure his see by a pragmatic sanction, to be erected into a metropolis, to the prejudice of his lawful

metropolitan, by the twelfth canon he makes himself liable to the like degradation.

By the eighteenth canon, clergymen, who are found guilty of treason or conspiracy against the civil government, are wholly to be degraded from their order, “Ἐκπιπέτωσαν πάντα τῶ οικείῳ βαθμῷ.”

By the twenty-second canon, clergymen who commit robbery upon the goods of a deceased bishop, are liable also to be deposed.

And they, who under pretence of marriage, take women by force, or give assistance to any that do so, are by the twenty-seventh canon subjected to the same censure.

The twenty-ninth canon says, it is sacrilege to degrade a bishop to the order of presbyter: but if a just cause removes him from the episcopal function, then he ought not to retain the place of a presbyter.

Now, upon all these canons I desire to know, whether, if a clerk be formally and judicially deposed from his order, as these canons suppose, he has then any longer authority to exercise the ministerial offices of his function? To say, he has authority still, seems to fly in the face of all these canons, and cut the sinews of all ecclesiastical discipline, and leave the Church without a just power of censure. But supposing him to have no authority after such a deposition, what if, in spite and contradiction to these canons, he will go and join with heretics, or set up a *παρασυναγωγή*, a *conventicle*, of his own, erect an altar against an altar, and there baptise, and perform all other acts of the ministerial function, as many degraded bishops and presbyters did: the question is, whether all persons baptised by such a degraded, unauthorised bishop or priest, were rebaptised by the Catholic Church? If they were, my learned opponents might easily have produced some order of one of these general Councils to have proved it: if they were not rebaptised, as it is evident they were not, then it is reasonable to conclude, as I here do, that the bare want of authority in the administrator of baptism, did not wholly annul or make void the baptism that was given in due form by an unauthorised person; but had its want of authority, with its other deficiencies, supplied by the authority of the Church

in a subsequent imposition of hands and confirmation; as is clearly evinced from the history of these four first general Councils, compared with what has been said before of the method of receiving such, as were baptised by heretics and schismatics into the communion of the Catholic Church. This argument, I think, carries with it the conviction and strength of a demonstration. The baptism of heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, and excommunicated clerks, is the baptism of unauthorised persons, according to the sense of the four first general Councils.

But the baptism of heretics, schismatics, degraded clerks, and excommunicated clerks, if ministered in due form, was always received by the Church without rebaptising.

Therefore the baptism of unauthorised persons, if ministered in due form, was always received by the Church without rebaptising.

SECT. 6.—Of the Condemnation of Anthimus and Severus in the Council of Constantinople, under Mennas, Anno 536.

But I go on with the present history. There are two synods of Constantinople, which lay some claim to the title and appellation of the fifth general Council, both of them in the time of Justinian, the former under Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, Anno 536, and the other under Pope Vigilius, Anno 553. In Crab's Edition of the Councils, that under Mennas has the name of the fifth general Council; but in Labbe the title is given to the latter. I shall join them together, and out of both we shall be sure to have a general Council. That under Mennas was called against Anthimus, bishop of Trebisond; Severus, bishop of Antioch; Peter, bishop of Apanca; and Zoaras, a monk; with other heretics, who went by the name of *Acephali*, and were a branch of the Eutychian heresy, but they were called *Acephali*, that is, *without head*, because the first authors of the sect at Alexandria, separated from their bishop and held conventicles, and gave baptisms in private houses, which are therefore frequently called, *Παρασυναγωγαι*, and *Παραβαπτίσματα*, in the acts of this Council. Anthimus was first condemned by Pope Agapetus, whose

Epistle was read in Council, declaring him¹ “to be neither worthy the name of a Catholic, nor the name of a priest.” And this sentence was ratified and confirmed over and over again by the Council, who more solemnly pronounced him² “to be cast out of the priesthood, and divested for the future of all sacred appellation, dignity, energy, or power, whatsoever.” And in another place,³ excommunication is added to the sentence of deposition: so that nothing could be wanting to deprive him of all manner of sacerdotal authority and power. The like sentence of deposition was pronounced against Severus, by four several synods, whose synodical epistles are related and approved in this Council, viz. the synod of Jerusalem, the synod of Tyre, the synod of Syria Secunda, and a former synod of Constantinople, whose sentence runs in these words,⁴ “We subject this Severus to a perpetual anathema, and deprive him of all honour, name, dignity, operation, or power belonging to a priest or a Christian, and exclude him from the holy communion, according to the canons.” After this deposition Justinian published an imperial edict against them, which is still extant among his Novels,⁵ wherein he confirms all that had been done by the Church in the deposition of Anthimus, Severus, Peter, and Zoaras, and their accomplices, forbidding them to hold conventicles, or to baptise, or give the eucharist, or preach, or do any other office of the sacerdotal function. Now, it is well known, that notwithstanding both the deprivation of so many synods, and the imperial edicts against them, these men set up conventicles, and administered baptism therein. For complaint was made

¹ Agapet. Epist. ad Petrum in Act. i. Concil. sub Menna. p. 47. Οὐδὲ καθολικῶ ἑδὲ ἱερέως ὀνόματος ἄξιον εἶναι ψηφίζομεν.

² Ibid. Act. iv. p. 61. Ἱεροσύνης ἕξω καθεστᾶναι συγχωροῦμεν, πάσης τε ἐτέρας αὐτὸν ἱερατικῆς προσηγορίας ἅμα ἐξ ἀξίας ἐξ ἐνεργείας ἀλλότριον εἶναι τῷ λοιπῷ.

³ Ibid. p. 87.

⁴ Con. CP. in Act. I. Concilii sub Menna. p. 36. Edit. Crab. Hunc justè perpetuo anathemati subjicimus, omni honore, nomine, dignitate, operatione (in Greek ἐνέργεια) tam Christiano quàm hieratico conveniente, vel convenire valente, privantes, et nudum divinæ communionis statuantes. In Labbe it is, Actio. v.

⁵ Justin. Novel. xlii. cap. 3. Sancimus quemlibet talium silentium ducere, et non convocare aliquos ad se, neque accedentes recipere, aut parabaptizare audere, aut sacram communionem sordidare, et ipsam aliquibus tradere, &c.

of this against Zoaras, the monk, in the Council under Menas,¹ and he and his accomplices were again censured upon it by the general sentence of the synod. But those censures did not extend to the rebaptisation of all such as had been baptised by these unauthorised persons. The heretics were indeed divested of ministerial power, but those, whom they baptised, were received as the laws directed the Eutychians should be, by imposition of hands, without rebaptising, upon their repentance.

SECT. 7. —How the Defenders of the *Tria Capitula* were degraded in the fifth General Council of Constantinople.

The other Council of Constantinople under Justinian, Anno 553, which, in the new editions of the Councils, now bears the title of the fifth general Council, consisted of one hundred and sixty five bishops, who were called together to condemn the *Tria Capitula*, i. e. three noted books, which the Nestorians made great use of to defend their heresy, which were, the Writings of Theodorus, of Mopsuestia; the Epistle of Maris to Ibas, the Persian; and, the Reflections of Theodoret upon Cyril of Alexandria. Here also the errors of Origen were condemned. But all these were dead men and gone to another world to answer for themselves. All therefore, that the censures or anathemas of the Council could signify to them, was little, save only as they were of use to reclaim the living, and deter them from embracing or encouraging the errors of the dead. And, to do this effectually, they made a solemn decree,² “ that if any one endeavoured, either by teaching or writing, to propagate tenets contrary to what had been piously determined in the Council; if he were a bishop or a clerk, he

¹ Con. Constant. sub Menna, Act. i. p. 70. Edit. Crab. Quanquam piissimus imperator noster mandaverit non reconventiculare, neque rebaptizare, Zoaras tamen tale præceptum despexit, et parabaptizavit in die Paschæ non paucos.

² Constant. Con. v. General. Collat. viii. Con. tom. v. p. 579. Si quis conatus fuerit contraria his quæ à nobis piè terminata sunt, tradere, aut docere, aut scribere; siquidem episcopus est, aut in clero, Γυμνωθήσεται τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἢ τῆς κλήρου; si autem monachus aut laicus fuerit, anathematizabitur.

should be deprived of his episcopal or clerical order; or if he were a monk or layman, he should be anathematised." Now here it is very obvious for any one to observe, that as being anathematised deprives a monk or layman of all the power and privilege of Church communion, that belongs to a layman; so the deposing of a bishop or clerk from his episcopal or clerical office, deprives them of all the authority and privilege that belongs to clerical communion: and the pretence of an indelible character does no more secure any authority to them in the one case, than it does in the other. For as the indelible character of baptism does not give a layman authority and right to challenge communion, whilst he stands legally excommunicated by the Church; but only a right to be restored to communion again, when he truly repents, without a new baptism: so the indelible character of ordination does not give a bishop or priest any authority to challenge to himself the powers of clerical communion, that is, authority to perform the offices of a bishop or priest, so long as they are legally degraded by the Church; but only power or capacity to officiate again without a new ordination, if ever the Church shall think fit to give them authority so to do, by a relaxation of her censures, and permission to return to their ancient state again; which upon great necessities the Church sometimes did, but this not very often. Now if this be the truth of the case: then all the defenders of the *Tria Capitula*, and the errors of Origen, were truly divested of clerical authority by this Council: and yet their *Παραβαπτισματα*, their *unauthorised baptisms*, were not repeated: for we never read of any Nestorian or Eutychian, who, having been baptised in due form, was rebaptised in the Church.

SECT. 8.—How the sixth General Council of Constantinople deposed and anathematised the Monothelites.

The sixth general Council was held at Constantinople, under Constantius Pogonatus, Anno 680. Here met two hundred and eighty-nine bishops to condemn the heresy of the Monothelites, which were another branch of the Eutychians, so called, because they asserted but one will in our Saviour, thereby undermining and destroying the perfec-

tion of his human nature. This heresy had for some time prevailed, both at Rome and Constantinople: for Pope Honorius was a defender of it, who is therefore, together with Sergius, Cyrus Paulus, and several others, frequently anathematised after death in the Acts of this Council. But that which we are to inquire into is, what censures here passed upon the living. And among these we have the deposition of Macarius, bishop of Antioch, and Stephen, a monk, one of his presbyters.

In the eighth session, Macarius, whom they call the new Dioscorus, and the new Apollinarius, is ordered,¹ first to be divested of his pall and deprived of his bishopric. Then, in the ninth session, the sentence is formally pronounced against him and Stephen, his disciple, in these words:² “ We declare you deprived of all sacerdotal dignity and ministry.” And upon this Stephen was immediately driven out of the Council.

In the twelfth session, after having heard all that Macarius had to say, he is again declared justly and canonically deprived of his archiepiscopal habit, and all power of teaching from the doctor’s chair,³ that he might not spread his heresy any further. And whereas he had presumed to say, “ If he was cut in pieces, limb from limb, and cast into the sea, he would not own two wills or two *operations*, *ἐνεργείας*, in Christ;” the Council therefore declares him synodically deposed and anathematised also, and wholly without right to sit *ἐν ἱερατικῷ θρόνῳ*, *in the sacerdotal chair*, for the future.

In the fifteenth session, one Polychronius, a monk, pretended to work a miracle, by raising the dead, in confirmation of the Monothelite doctrine: which he having attempted in vain, the Council condemned him as an impostor, and a blasphemer, and a manifest heretic, declaring

¹ Con. vi. Gen. Act. viii. p. 321. Edit. Crab. Edit. Labbe, p. 760. Con. tom. vi.

² Ibid Act. ix. p. 326. Edit. Crab. et Edit. Labbe. 778. Ὅριζομεν ἡμᾶς πάσης ἱερατικῆς ἀξίας ἐξ λειτουργίας ἀλλοτρίας ὑπάρχειν.

³ Ibid. Act. xii. p. 937. Labbe. Δικαίως ἐξ κανονικῶς ἀπὸ τῆ ἀρχιερατικῆ σχήματος γυμνωθέντα, ἑδαμῶς ὁ θεῖος κανὼν παραδέχεται τῆ λοιπῆ εἰς διδασκαλικὸν καθίσαι θρόνον. &c.

him to be deprived of all the order¹ and ministry of a priest. And so having deposed him, the holy synod cried out, “Anathema to Polychronius and his accomplices. Anathema to Macarius, Stephanns, and Polychronius. *The Trinity hath deposed these three*;—*Ἡ Τριάς τῆς τρεῖς καθέλιεν.*”

At the end of the sixteenth session they are all again anathematised with Honorius, and the rest of the heretics, that were dead before. And in the close of the eighteenth session, having read the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, the Council concludes, “that whoever presumed to compose any other faith, or propose, or teach, or hand down any other Creed to new converts, turning either from gentilism, Judaism, or any heresy; or offered to introduce any new terms, contrary to what the present Council had agreed upon; if they were bishops or clerks,² they should be deprived of their episcopal or clerical order: and if laymen, be anathematised, or cast out of the Church.”

In consequence of these decrees, all such bishops as herded with Macarius and the Monothelites, are declared to be out of the college of bishops, by Pope Agatho and his Roman Council, whose Synodical Epistle to this Council is related in the fourth session.³ And Constantine Pogonatus, the Emperor, in his Sacra, or Edict, where he confirms the acts of the Council, uses a like expression, where he says,⁴ “the Council had banished all such heretical priests from the sacerdotal fold:” that is, from the confraternity and society of the sacred order. In like manner, as Leo, the second bishop of Rome, writing to this same Emperor, concerning the proceedings of the present synod against Macarius and his accomplices, says,⁵ “that Macarius being found to be a wolf in sheep’s clothing, and a thief and a robber, instead of a shepherd, was by the true shepherds of Christ’s flock, meaning the sixth general

¹ Con. vi. Gen. Act. xv. p. 999. Labbe. Πάσης ἱερατικῆς τάξεως ἡ λειτουργίας γυμνωθῆναι.

² Ibid. Act. xviii. p. 1027. Ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, ἢ τῶν κληρικῶν τῆ κλήρε.

³ Con. Rom. in iv. Act. Con. vi. Gen. p. 689.

⁴ Constantin. Edict. ad Calcem. Con. vi. Gen. p. 1085. Τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐξωστράκισαν ἀύλης, &c.

⁵ Leo. Epist. ad Constant. ibid. p. 1117.

Council, abdicated as a waster and destroyer: for they deposed him from his prelatical dignity, and his disciple, Stephen, with Polychronius, the new Simon Magus, from the honour of their priesthood.”

How could a degradation be expressed in more ample and significant terms than these? They are deposed, not only from the honour and chair, but from the ministry, the order, and the offices of the priesthood; from preaching and all other operations belonging to the sacred function. And they are deposed not only by man, but God: for the Holy Trinity deposed them. And being so, they were no longer owned by the rest of the bishops, as fellow-bishops, or fellow-ministers, or spiritual brethren, but looked upon as wolves, and thieves, and robbers, who could not be admitted in the college of bishops, till some wonderful change was wrought in them. And is it possible to think, that men of this character, under all the disadvantages of heresy, excommunication, and deposition from their order by the Trinity itself, should still be looked upon as true ministers of God; as still invested with a sufficient authority to perform any ministerial acts, by virtue of an original ordination implanting a power in them, that no power on earth could wholly take from them? If the power of the Church was not sufficient to deprive them of this pretended authority, yet sure the power of the Holy Trinity, the fountain of all spiritual authority and power, must be owned all-sufficient to take away the authority, which it at first gave them. And then we have as full proof, that these Eutyechian heretics were divested of their whole ministerial authority, as can possibly be given. Yet there is no order or decree, in this or any other Council, for re-baptising such as were in due form baptised by these unauthorised heretics, but the contrary; for all the Eutyechians are appointed to be received only by imposition of hands and confirmation.

SECT. 9.—How the Council of Trullo censured delinquent Bishops and Clerks.

To what has been said of the six general Councils I

shall add the sense of the Council of Trullo, which is, as it were, but an appendix to the two last of them. For, because no canons of discipline were made in those two synods, this Council was called on purpose, Anno 692, or, as Petavius computes, Anno 707, under Justinian the Second, to supply the defects of the two former Councils, whence it had the name of *Quinisextum, the fifth and sixth Council together*. There are above thirty canons in this Council, which order bishops and clerks to be degraded, for several crimes there specially noted: but I shall only mention two or three that are a little more remarkable. In the twenty-first canon some criminals are subjected to a total and perpetual deposition,¹ and thrust down to the place and state of laymen, there to exercise themselves in repentance for ever, without hopes of restitution. In the twenty-second canon, if bishop or any other clerk, is simoniacally ordained for money,² they that are ordained; and they that ordained them, are both ordered equally to be deposed. And in the next canon, every clerk is subject to the same penalty that takes money for administering the communion, as guilty of a simoniacal error and wickedness.³ In the twenty-sixth canon, a priest that marries unlawfully, though it be by ignorance, is allowed to retain the honour of his chair, but he must forbear all sacred offices: he must neither give the blessing publicly nor privately, nor distribute the body of Christ to others, nor do any other ministerial act.⁴ And a reason is given for all this, because such an one wants a cure for his own wounds, and the blessing of sanctification himself, and he cannot impart that to others, which he himself wants, but he must weep out his sins before the Lord by a perpetual repentance.

Now upon these canons, I would ask these plain questions: whether priests, totally degraded, and thrust down to the place of laymen, could be supposed, by this Council, to

¹ Con. Trull. can. 21. Παντελεῖ ἐξ οὐνεκεῖ καθαιρέσει ὑποβαλλόμενοι, ἐν τῷ τῶν λαϊκῶν ἀποθέμενοι τόπῳ, &c.

² Ibid. can. 22. Τὰς ἐπὶ χρήμασι χειροτονημένους καθαιρέϊσθαι προστάσσομεν, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ χειροτονήσαντας.

³ Ibid. can. 23. Καθαιρέϊσθω ὡς τῆς Σίμωνος ζήλοτος πλάνης ἐκ κακουργίας.

⁴ Con. Trul. can. 26. Μήτε δημοσίᾳ μήτε ἰδίᾳ εὐλογεῖτω, μήτε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καταμενεῖτω ἱετέροις, μήτε τι ἄλλο λειτεργεῖτω, &c.

act, after this, as authorised ministers of Christ? Whether bishops or priests, deposed for simony, were still invested with the true rights and power of the ministerial function? Whether that, which makes an ordination void as soon as it is given, as simony does, doth not likewise deprive a man of sacerdotal authority, when he is afterward found guilty of it, and legally deposed for it by the Church? And, whether a man, who is lawfully forbidden, by the best authority in the Church, to do any ministerial act whatsoever, can be said to perform those acts by the Church's authority, in opposition to her lawful commands? He that can reconcile these things by the help of two words, called, *indelible character*, may enjoy his opinion, for me, without contradiction. I shall not think it worth while to dispute eternally with any one, who has such an infallible way of solving difficulties by hard names, or reconciling contradictions by some dark and unintelligible school-distinction. I hope I have plainly made it appear to all unprejudiced men, that there is no foundation for asserting, that heretics, and schismatics, and degraded priests, and priests cast out of the Church with anathema, are authorised ministers of the Church of Christ, from the history of the first six general Councils. The consequence of which is, that the baptisms given by such unauthorised persons could not be valid by virtue of any true ministerial authority residing in such persons, who were really and truly divested of it; but they must be received by the Church upon some other principle, since it is certain she never allowed the ministerial authority of heretics, and yet received their proselytes by imposition of hands without rebaptising.

CHAP. II.

The same Assertion proved from Patriarchal, National, and Provincial Councils, and from the Writings of private Fathers, with several Arguments drawn from their Testimony. Argument I.—That some Heretics, whose Baptism was received, never had originally any real and true Ordination to the ministerial Office, and Function: consequently they could be no other than unauthorised Persons. This particularly proved upon the Novatian Heretics.

SECT. I.—A short Reference to such Patriarchal, National, and Provincial Councils, as agree with the forementioned General Councils.

AFTER the history of the six general Councils, it will be needless to trouble every ordinary reader with a particular account of every patriarchal, national, and provincial synod upon this subject. And yet there is scarce one of these in all the tomes of the Councils, where the same thing is not as plainly asserted. The learned and inquisitive reader, that will be at the same pains as I have been, may satisfy himself by having recourse to them; for whose ease I will here give him a short index or reference to such Councils and Canons, as will give him satisfaction upon this subject. There are some provincial Councils, which are taken into the Code of the Church Universal, and so are of the nature of general Councils by their confirmation. Such are the Council of Ancyra, can. 1, 2, 10, 14. The Council of Neocæsarea, can. 1, and 8. The Council of Antioch, can. 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13. Others are large patriarchal Councils, next to general ones. Such are the Council of Sardica, can. 1, 2, 4, 20. And the African Code, can. 11, 15, 25, 27, 28, 31, 71, 81. In citing which Canons I follow the edition of Ehinger Witebergæ, 1614. To these may be added those which are called the Apostolical Canons, because they were generally received in the Greek Church, can. 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 20, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50.

51, 52, 53, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 83. In all which canons the sentence of deposition is pronounced against all such clerks, as were found guilty of the several crimes particularly specified in them. Other Councils were only national or provincial; such as the Council of Eliberis, can. 51, 76. The first Council of Arles, can. 13, 22. The second Council of Arles, can. 14, 15. The first Council of Carthage, can. 2, 14. The Council of Aquileia, where Palladius the Arian was deposed by St. Ambrose. The Council of Colonia Agrippinia, where Euphatas, bishop of Colon, was deposed for Arianism. The fourth Council of Carthage, can. 48, 49, 50, 56, 57, 60, 68, 69. The Council of Turin, can. 2. The fifth Council of Carthage, can. 3, 11, 12, 13. The first Council of Toledo, can. 2, 4, 5. The Council of Milevis, can. 18, 19, 22, 25. The Council of Ries, Rhegiense, can. 1. The Council of Adge, can. 1. 9. 49, 50, 60. The first Council of Orange, can. 21. The Council of Rome, under Hilary, can. 8. The Council of Tarraco, can. 2, 10, The Council of Epone, can. 22. The Council of Lerida, can. 5, 12, 16. The Council of Valentia in Spain, can. 3. The Council of Girone, Gerunda, can. 11. The second Council of Toledo, can. 3. The second Council of Orleans, can. 4, 8, 9, 13. The third Council of Orleans, can. 2, 6, 7, 8, 15, 19, 26. The fourth Council of Orleans, can. 10, 17. The fifth Council of Orleans, can. 4, 10, 11. The fourth Council of Toledo, can. 30, 44. The first Council of Bracara, can. 32, 37. The eighth Council of Toledo, can. 3, 4, 7, 8.

In these Canons there are almost an hundred particular crimes specified, for which bishops and clerks might be deposed from their office and function. What then, if such clerks should pretend to officiate after they were degraded, shall it be said, that such persons were still authorised ministers of Christ, when the Church, in the name of Christ, had unauthorised them, and, as some of them express it, unordained them? When the Church had cancelled their ministerial authority, had they still authority, in spite of the Church's power, to act as lawful ministers of God? Or were all these canons made to no other purpose, but to shew how insignificant the Church's power and discipline was;

and how much superior the indelible character of a priest was, which could maintain his authority, let the Church do what she would to deprive him of it? Whatever some men's notions may be of the priesthood, I question not, the generality of sober readers will have more honourable sentiments, than to think that a wicked or impious and heretical priest cannot possibly do any thing to forfeit his authority, if he has but once had a regular ordination: or that the Church cannot justly deprive him of this authority, if he does such things as make him liable to a total and perpetual deprivation. This were such an affront to all these Councils, and their authority, that I cannot think it needful to say any thing further to any wise man to convince him of the unreasonableness and absurdity of such an assertion. Therefore, instead of being more particular in the history of these several Councils, I will sum up the force of them and other private writers in some proper arguments, to shew, that all the baptisms, which the Church anciently received, were not given by true authorised ministers; which, without any further inquiry, must infallibly put an end to the question about Lay-baptism.

SECT. 2.—The first Argument founded upon the Novatians wanting a true Ordination.

The first argument I shall draw from the ancient Councils and Fathers, to this purpose, is founded upon the Novatians wanting a real and lawful ordination. That the Church received their baptisms, is a matter clear beyond all dispute, and I know my learned antagonists will not pretend to question it: but, that these Novatians had a lawful and true ordination, is not so clear, but rather, from ancient history and rules, it is clear to the contrary. For Novatian himself, who was the father of the Novatians, was never ordained a true and lawful bishop, but only was a bishop in pretence: therefore all such ministers as derived the original of their orders and authority from him, were only pretended ministers like their founder. I know the gentlemen, with whom I now dispute, will not offer to deny this, supposing Novatian was no true bishop: but they will say, that Novatian was a true bishop, because he had three bishops to ordain him. And

indeed if the hands of three bishops was all that was necessary to the true ordination of a bishop, then it could not be denied that Novatian was a true bishop. But these gentlemen cannot be ignorant, that to a true ordination something else is required besides the hands of three bishops: there are some personal qualifications requisite in the party ordained, and many canonical prescriptions to be observed in making a true bishop, else his ordination is null and void, *ab origine*. For what, if three bishops should combine to ordain a child of three years old, as the Popes have done some at seven, would such an imposition of hands pass for a true ordination? What if three bishops should be wrought upon by simony to ordain a man, who had no manner of episcopal qualifications? What if three bishops should first be made drunk with wine, and then forced, against all rules, and against their own wills, to lay hands on a vile wretch, who had not the least pretence to an ordination; would this be thought to give him the true power and authority of a bishop, or be looked upon as such in any part of the Catholic Church? What if three bishops should illegally concur to ordain a man an anti-bishop into a full see, where another was legally ordained already, and in just and quiet possession of the Church; would this intruder be esteemed a true bishop in any part of the world but Utopia, because of such a pretended ordination? And yet this was, in a great measure, the case of Novatian. He had nothing beside his age to qualify him to be ordained a bishop, of all the particulars that have been mentioned.

SECT. 3.—That Novatian was never a true Bishop, proved first, because he had only a simoniacal and forced Ordination.

For first, his ordination was not only against his own oath, but simoniacal, and forced into the bargain. Some indeed have said, that he was ordained only by Novatus a priest: but that is a mistake, for it is owned he had three bishops to ordain him. But then their manner of proceeding was such as no rules could justify: the ordination which they gave him was null from the very first: because these three bishops, being fetched from the furthest corner of Italy, had nothing to do to ordain Novatian a bishop at Rome.

without a regular and synodical election. They were made to believe, before they came there, that they should have a synod of bishops to join with them: but when Novatian had got them into his possession, he set some of his party to make them drunk, and shut them up prisoners, and then at four o'clock in the afternoon he compelled them by force to give him the bishopric by an imaginary and delusive and vain ordination,¹ as Cornelius, the true bishop, words it in his Epistle to Fabian, bishop of Antioch, where he gives him an account of the whole proceeding; rightly concluding, that, by this wicked craft and treachery, he usurped a bishopric, which did by no right belong to him. And therefore this episcopacy was only taken to himself by robbery; it was not given him from Heaven.² Not long after, one of those three bishops, as Cornelius adds, returned to the Church, confessing and bewailing his crime. Whom Cornelius, at the intercession of all the people, received into communion, but only as a layman, “*ἐκοινωνήσαμεν ὡς λαϊκῶν*,” and the other two he deposed, and ordained two successors in their room, and sent them to their respective places. This is also taken notice of by Cyprian,³ who seems to say this penitent bishop's name was Trophimus, who brought back with him a great multitude of people from the schism to the Church: which made his admission so much the easier, because he made some sort of satisfaction for his crime thereby: yet he was admitted only to communicate in the order of a layman, and not allowed any longer to retain the place of a priest. Nothing now can be plainer, than that, by this account, Novatian's pretended

¹ Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. p. 243. Συγκλεισθέντας ὑπὸ τινῶν ὁμοίων αὐτῶν τεταγμένων ἀνθρώπων, ὥρα δεκάτῃ μεθύοντας ἔκραιπαλῶντας μετὰ βίας ἠνάγκασεν εἰκονικῇ ἔμματαίᾳ χειροπιθεσίᾳ ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτῷ δῶναι, ἢν ἐνέδρα ἔμ πανουργία μὴ ἐπιβάλλεσαν αὐτῷ ἐκδικεῖ. ² Ibid. Παρασπᾶσαι τε ἔμ ὑφαρπάξεν τὴν μὴ δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ ἀνωθεν ἐπισκοπὸν ἐπιχειρεῖ.

³ Cyp. Ep. lii. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 105. Tractatu cum collegis plurimis habito, susceptus est Trophimus; pro quo satisfaciebat fratrum reditus, et restituta multorum salus: sic tamen admissus est Trophimus, ut laicum communicet, non secundum quod ad te malignorum literæ pertulerunt, quasi locum sacerdotis usurpet. Cyprian, in the same Epist. p. 104. reflects upon Novatian for using force to get himself ordained: *Vim fecit, ut episcopus fieret.*

ordination did not make him a true bishop, nor give him episcopal authority to ordain others. For if one of his ordainers was, for his crime, degraded and made a layman; and the other two not allowed so much as the privilege of communicating laymen, but were wholly excommunicated and cast out of the Church, we cannot suppose, that Novatian, who was the cause of all this, could have the least pretence to a true ordination, nor consequently any authority, as from Heaven or the Church, to act as a bishop, and give others ordination. For not only Cornelius and Cyprian, who might be supposed to be parties against Novatian, but all the ancient Canons, declare such sort of simoniacal, irregular, and forced ordinations, to be void and null from the beginning. Which are things, I presume, so well known,¹ that I need not insist upon them.

SECT. 4.—This proved further, because he intruded himself into a full Sec.

But there was another reason, which utterly annulled the ordination of Novatian, and made him no true bishop; and that was, that, against all the laws of the Catholic Church, and rules of Catholic unity, he intruded himself into a full sec, where another was regularly and divinely chosen before him. This is the argument so much insisted on by Cyprian in particular, to prove him no true bishop. Thus in the forecited Epistle to Antonian, speaking of the difference between the ordinations of Cornelius and Novatian, he freely, after this manner, gives his judgment of them both: “Cornelius,” says he,² “was made bishop by the approbation and judgment of God and Christ; by the testi-

¹ Vid. Can. Apost. c. xxix. et Concil. Chalced. can. ii. ² Cypr. Ep. lii. al. iv. ad Anton. p. 104. Factus est Cornelius episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio, de clericorum perè omnium testimonio, &c. cum nemo ante se factus esset, cum Fabiani locus, id est, cum locus Petri, et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret. Quo occupato de Dei voluntate, atque omnium nostrum consensione firmato; quisquis jam episcopus fieri voluerit, foris fiat necesse est; nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem, qui ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem; quisquis ille fuerit, multum de se licèt jaectans, et sibi plurimum vindicans, profanus est, alienus est, foris est. Et cum post primum secundus esse non possit, quisquis post unum, qui solus esse debet, factus est, non jam secundus ille, sed nullus est.

mony of almost all the clergy, and the suffrage of all the people that were present, and the college of ancient and good bishops; when no one had been ordained before him, when the place of Fabian, that is, when the place of Peter, and the episcopal chair was empty. Which being once filled according to the will of God, and confirmed by all our consent and approbation; whoever after that is minded to be made bishop, is a foreigner and an alien; he has not the ordination of the Church, who holds not the unity of the Church; whoever he be, or whatever he boasts or assumes to himself, he is a profaner, an alien, a foreigner. There cannot be a second bishop after the first: therefore, whoever is made a bishop after the first, which ought to be singly done, he is not a second bishop, but none at all." It is impossible to express in plainer words, that Novatian was not a true bishop, though he had three bishops to give him a theatrical and delusory ordination. Cyprian a little after, in the same Epistle, joins both these arguments together, to prove him to be no bishop, because he was simoniacally ordained, and because¹ " he was an adulterous and extraneous bishop, made after another had been ordained in the Church by sixteen fellow-bishops:" and, therefore, he charges him with " setting up an human Church, instead of a divine, and sending new apostles into every city, to maintain the foundations of his new institution:" in short, all these were false bishops, because they were super-ordained, by one who himself had no power, over other bishops that had before been regularly ordained in every city and province, and who, both for their age and faith, and fortitude in sufferings and persecution, were without exception. Cyprian often repeats and inculcates this argument in his other Epistles,² " that there could not be another bishop

¹ Cypr. Ep. lii. al. lv. ad Anton. p. 112. Nisi episcopus tibi videtur, qui episcopo in ecclesiâ à sedecim coepiscopis facto, adulter atque extraneus episcopus fieri à desertoribus per ambitum nititur;—Et humanam conetur ecclesiam facere, et per plurimas civitates novos apostolos suos mittat.—Cùmque jampridem per omnes provincias et per urbes singulas ordinati sim episcopi in ætate antiqui, in fide integri, in pressurâ probati, in persecutione proscripti, ille super eos creare alios pseudoepiscopos audeat.

² Cypr. Ep. xli. al. xliv. ad Cornel. p. 86. Episcopo semel facto, et col-

after the first was legally made; that he was an adulterous bishop and a contrary head,¹ not in the Church, but out of it, since he was ordained against the rule of the divine institution and Catholic unity, only by the prevalency of a faction." With much more to the same purpose,² which, after such plain testimonies, I need not cite at length to satisfy a judicious reader. But, that this may not seem to be the private opinion only of Cyprian or Cornelius, as persons who wrote out of prejudice to Novatian, I will shew it to be agreeable to the general and standing rule of the Catholic Church, that a man is no bishop, who is superordained over another bishop, into a full see, which the other is legally and divinely possessed of. This was the ground upon which the Council of Aquileia³ pronounced Valens the Arian to be no bishop, because he was superordained at Petavio, while Marcus, the true bishop, was living. Upon this ground the ordination of Majorinus, the first father of the Donatists, was reckoned null, because he was superordained a pretended bishop at Carthage, when the see was legally filled before by Cæcilian. For this made the schism, and "set up altar against altar, and therefore the ordination of Majorinus was unlawful," as Optatus words it.⁴ This was one reason why the Council of Nice disannulled the ordinations of those bishops, whom Meletius had schismatically superordained in Egypt, when the sees were filled with Catholic bishops before: this he did to strengthen his party, but the Council decreed all these should be reordained before they were admitted to serve in the Catholic Church, as we have heard before in the history of that Council.

The next general Council of Constantinople, upon the same ground, declared Maximus, the cynic, to be no bishop,

legarum ac plebis testimonio et iudicio comprobato, alium constitui nullo modo posse.

¹ Cypr. Ep. xlii. al. xlv. ad Cornel. p. 86. Contra sacramentum semel traditum divinæ dispositionis et catholicæ unitatis, adulterum et contrarium caput extra ecclesiam fecit.

² Vid. Cypr. Ep. xlv. al. xlvi. ad Maxim. et Nicostrat. p. 89. Ep. lxvii. al. lxviii. ad Lucium. p. 177.

³ Con. Aquilei. Epist. Synod. ad Gratian. et Theodos. Con. tom. ii. p. 995. Qui episcopus esse nec cœpit. Nam primo Petavione superpositus fuerat sancto viro Marco admirabilis memoriæ sacerdos. al. sacerdoti.

⁴ Optat. lib. i. p. 42. Sic exitum est foras, et altare contra altare erectum est, et ordinatio illicitè celebrata est.

though he had seven bishops to ordain him, because his ordination was only a superordination into a full see, of which Gregory Nazianzen was legally possessed before; and they not only annulled his ordination, but all those that were ordained by him, as I have shewed in the last chapter, from the fifth canon of that Council. For the same reason all the bishops in the world, who defended the Council of Chalcedon, declared unanimously in their answers to Leo, the Emperor, upon the case of Timotheus Ælurus, the pretended bishop of Alexandria, who had gotten himself first superordained into the see of Proterius, and shortly after, by his faction murdered him; they declared, I say,¹ “this Timotheus not only to be no bishop, but to be deprived of the name of a Christian,” as Liberatus informs us from the Synodical Epistles, that were then, from several parts of the world, sent to the Emperor upon it. Some of these are yet remaining at the end of the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, one or two of which it will not be amiss here to transcribe. In the Synodical Epistle of the bishops of Phœnicia Secunda to the Emperor, they thus express themselves concerning this Timotheus,² “that he was a wicked tyrant, and by no means ever made a bishop, but was only an adulterous invader of the Church; one who, by the blood of the true bishop, was minded to settle himself in the Church, which Christ redeemed with his own blood: one that was no shepherd of Christ’s flock, but an insupportable wolf; not a father, but a parricide or murderer of his father, (meaning the true bishop) not a bridegroom, but an usurper of the marriage-chamber. Such an one, they declare, they could not call a bishop.” In another of these Synodical Epistles³ from the bishops of Helenopontus, which the

¹ Liberat. Breviar. c. xv. Rescribunt, Timotheum non solum inter episcopos non haberi, sed etiam Christianam appellationem privari.

² Epist. Synod. Phœnicia Secunda ad Leon. Imp. ad Calcem Con. Chalced. par. iii. cap. 38. con. tom. iv. p. 922. De impia vero tyrannide Timothei Ægyptii, qua usus est, sacerdos equidem factus non est, sed potius ecclesie adulter apparuit. Quid dicam, qui eam quam Salvator proprio sanguine liberavit, ille pontificali sanguine voluit adipisci: et factus est non pastor ovium Christi, sed importabilis lupus; non pater, sed parricida; non sponsus, sed thalami violator.—Nequaquam nos vocamus sacerdotem.

³ Ibid. cap. 53. Neque is, qui ab eis ordinatus est, sacerdotium poterit

printed copies read corruptly, Hellespontus, a great many reasons are given why the ordination of this Timotheus never made him a true bishop; because he was, in the first place, actually deposed from the office of presbyter, by his own bishop, Proterius, and an Egyptian Synod; then again he had but two bishops to ordain him, which was not a canonical number; and further these two were under the same sentence of deposition with himself; and lastly this wicked ordination was made while Proterius the true bishop was living, and actually performing the duties of the episcopal function. Such intruders as these therefore were only wolves or adulterers, and not true shepherds or bishops, in the language of the ancient Councils. Some Councils¹ peremptorily forbid all such superordinations, or superposition of one bishop over another, except it be in the place of one, who is legally deposed for some capital crime. And other Councils declare³ all such superordained usurpers to be wolves, and not bishops, no, nor to deserve the name of bishops, as the great Council of Sardica speaks in this behalf, concerning Gregory, who was intruded into Alexandria, in the room of Athanasius; and Basil, of Ancyra, in the room of Marcellus; and Quintianus of Gaza, in the place of Aselepius. So that it is as evident, as words or authorities can make it, that according to the rules and discipline of the ancient Church, not only in the Cyprianic age, but in the following ages also, the ordination of a man into a full see, legally possessed and occupied by another, was a null ordination from the beginning; and such an one

obtinere, vel si regulariter provenisset, quando etiam is qui dicitur ordinatus, damnatus erat à sanctissimæ memoriæ episcopo suo Proterio, et Concilio sanctorum episcoporum Ægyptiacæ diœceseos, quique à duobus solummodò similiter secum condemnatis, et neque numerum ordinantium complementibus regularem, nefandam ordinationem dicitur suscepisse, vivo pontifice, et eâ quæ sunt sacerdotii celebrante.

¹ Con. Aurel. v. can. 12. Nulli viventi episcopo alius superponatur aut superordinetur episcopus, nisi forsitan in ejus locum, quem capitalis culpa dejecerit. ² Con. Sardic. Ep. Synodica, ap. Hilar. in Fragmetis p. 128. Illos autem qui se eorum ecclesiis immerserunt luporum more, id est, Gregorium in Alexandria, Basilium in Ancyra, et Quintianum in Gaza, nequenomen habere episcopi, neque communionis omninò eorum habere participatum. Vid. Theod. Hist. lib. 2 c. viii et Athanas. Apol. 2.

was not a bishop, but an unauthorised intruder, a wolf, an adulterer, an alien and foreigner, and no priest in the eye of the Catholic Church. Whence it follows, that Novatian, being one of this sort, had no pretence to the name or authority of a bishop; and consequently all such as were ordained by him, either bishops or priests, to strengthen his faction, were in no better condition: for they could have no more authority than they derived from him, which was really none at all, if there be any weight in the account that has now been given of his ordination. And yet the baptisms of these Novatians were by order of several general Councils received, as given in due form, in the name of the Trinity, though by persons who upon many accounts, had no ministerial authority to give them. I hope now my learned friend Dr. Brett will own this is home to the point, that the Church received the baptisms of such heretics as administered it in due form, though they never had a real, but only a pretended ordination. If he asks, why then the Council of Nice did not order the Novatian bishops and priests to be reordained? I answer, some learned men think she did make such an order in her eighth canon, which appoints them “*to be received among the Catholic clergy by imposition of hands.*—*χειροθετημένους αὐτῶν μένειν ὅπως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ.*” But I am not sure that imposition of hands, in that place, means the imposition of hands used in ordination. If the doctor thinks it does, he has his answer. But one thing I am sure of, that without a reconciliatory imposition of hands to unite them to the Church, the Novatians had no authority to act as lawful ministers of the Church; and whether the Church gave them a new ordination or not, she certainly gave them the authority of a new commission, which they had not, nor could have before, whilst they were involved in such a schism, as could afford them no real, but only pretended ordinations. But forasmuch as the outward form of ordination was given them in pretence, though without any competent authority in the ordainers, the Church perhaps might have her reasons to omit the outward ceremony, and supply what was deficient in their ordination, by adding her own authentic commission and authority upon their reconcilment to the Church. But

whether it was one way or other, we are assured in fact, they were never truly and authentically ordained in their schism, because they had no real, but only a pretended ordination, given them by persons, who, by the rules of the Church, had no authority to give it.

CHAP. III.

Argument II.—That Heretics are not authorised Ministers of God, because when they fall into open and professed Heresy, they cease to be true Christian Priests, and become Wolves and Antichrists, instead of true Shepherds and Governors of the Flock of Christ.

SECT. I.—That a lawful Ordination does not secure a Man in the Possession of a perpetual authorised Priesthood, unless he observe the Rules of the Priesthood.

HAVING thus far shewed, that some heretics were not true authoritative ministers of God, because they never had a just and proper call or ordination to the priesthood: I will now, to gratify my learned adversaries' hypothesis, suppose with them, not granting it, that all the ancient heretics had a true and lawful ordination: yet I assert, that it does not hence follow, that they were true authorised priests of God. For the priests of God are bound to walk by certain rules, which are necessary to preserve their authority, and unless they observe those rules, they forfeit their authority; and it is not merely the privilege of a lawful ordination that can secure them in the perpetual possession of an authorised priesthood, if they do such things as unqualify them for the ministry of the Gospel. There are, it may be, near an hundred several crimes, specified in those ancient canons, to which I have referred the reader in the beginning of the last chapter, for which a priest, who had received a lawful ordination might be finally degraded and deposed, and thereby forfeit all the right and title he could pretend to have, to act with authority in any part of the ministerial function. And

among these crimes, heresy was always reckoned the chief, because it struck at the very foundation of religion; that is to say, the faith which was once delivered to the saints. Therefore a priest once plainly convicted of open and professed heresy, was no longer deemed a true and lawful priest, or allowed to act with the authority of a minister in the Church. The very people were bound in conscience to fly from such for their own security: for they were wolves, and not shepherds; antichrists, and not true ministers of Christ.

SECT. 2.—This proved from Cyprian, who declares Heretics to forfeit both the Name and Authority of Priests.

A man cannot look into the writings of St. Cyprian, but he will see this almost in every page of him: for he always opposes the priests of God and heretics, as diametrically contrary to one another; styling the latter adulterers, impious, sacrilegious usurpers, who set up a priesthood only of human invention, contrary to the divine and evangelical institution; and assumed to themselves such powers, as did by no right belong to them. Thus, in one of his Epistles to his people at Carthage,¹ he complains of the five schismatics, who joined with Felicissimus, that they left the priests of the Lord, and set up a new sacrilegious institution against the discipline of the Gospel. A little after he says,² “ There was but one Church, and one chair, founded by Christ himself in the person of Peter. And another altar could not be erected, nor a new priesthood invented, beside the one altar and the one priesthood that was already settled. Whosoever gathers elsewhere, he scatters abroad. Whatever priesthood is set up by human fury, to the violation of the

¹ Cypr. Ep. xl. al. xliii. ad Pleb. p. 82. Relictis Domini sacerdotibus contra evangelicam disciplinam nova traditio sacrilegæ institutionis exsurgit.

² Ibid. p. 83. Una ecclesia et cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui, aut sacerdotium novum fieri, præter unum altare et unum sacerdotium, non potest. Quisquis alibi collegerit, spargit. Adulterum est, impium est, sacrilegum est, quodcumque humano furore instituitur, ut dispositio divina violetur. Procul ab hujusmodi hominum contagione discedite, &c.

divine institution, is adulterous, impious, sacrilegious. Therefore depart from the contagion of these men, and avoid their preaching as a cancer and a plague." Could he that said thus much of schismatics, think heretics to be priests of God, who are so much worse than schismatics, by how much they strike more directly at the foundation? Though they were regularly ordained at first, yet, according to Cyprian, their heresy or schism destroys their title, and their succession becomes only an human institution, which cannot make priests without God's appointing. Therefore he calls all such as are ordained by heretics,¹ "false bishops, and false priests; adversaries of the Lord and antichrists; rebels and enemies, for receding from charity and the unity of the Church; and worse than heathens and publicans, for setting up false altars, and illegal priesthods, and sacrilegious sacrifices, and adulterated names." In short, he denies all such to be priests; "they are the enemies of priests; they only usurp other men's offices, which by no right belong to them."³ Therefore the Council of Carthage under Cyprian,⁴ determined that all such pretended priests lost what they received before, by virtue of a legal ordination; and all such as were ordained by them, upon their return to the Church, were only to be received as laymen.⁵ I know my opponents will not pretend to deny this to have been the opinion of Cyprian and the whole Council of Carthage. Nay, they will readily join Firmilian and St. Basil to them. For they know St. Basil says, Cyprian and Firmilian pleaded for the rebaptisation of such as were baptised by heretics and schismatics, upon this principle, that heretics were not priests, and

¹ Cypr. Ep. lv. al. 59. ad Cornel. p. 132. Fortunatum pseudoepiscopum — Felicem in hæresi pseudoepiscopum constitutum. ² Cypr. Ep.

76. al. 69. ad Magnum. p. 180. Apparet adversarios Domini, et antichristos omnes esse, quos constat à caritate atque ab unitate Ecclesiæ recessisse.— Si qui Ecclesiam contemnunt, ethnici et publicani habentur; multo magis utique rebelles et hostes, falsa altaria, et illicita sacerdotia, et sacrificia sacrilega, et nomina adulterata fingentes, inter ethnicos et publicanos necesse est computentur, &c. ³ Ibid. p. 184. Hostes sacerdotum, aliena et illicita, et nullo sibi jure concessa, usurpare conantur.

⁴ Con. Carthag. ap. Cypr. num. 70. Schismaticus quod habuit amisit.

⁵ Ibid. n. 4. p. 231. Eos, qui ordinati videbantur, inter laicos recipi.

therefore had no authority to baptise, or ordain, or absolve, or perform any other office of the sacerdotal function. They could not then think, there was any such virtue in the indelible character of a priest, as to preserve his sacerdotal authority entire in him, after he was turned heretic or schismatic, or was legally degraded by the Church. Thus far therefore we seem to be agreed. But then they will say, if Cyprian's principle was true, why should not his consequences be received also; that those who are baptised by heretics, and those who are baptised by laymen, (both which are priests of the same authority, that is, none at all) should be rebaptised? I answer, because wiser judges than either they, or I, or even Cyprian himself, that is, the general Councils and Fathers of the Catholic Church, have determined otherwise. And therefore our question at present, is not, whether heretics were to be rebaptised? (for that is determined already beyond contradiction,) but only, whether heretics acted with the true authority of priests, when they baptised others, in the opinion of Cyprian and the Catholic Church? That they did not act as true authorised priests, in the opinion of Cyprian, is already cleared, and granted by my opponents also. So that all I have now to do, is to shew the same of the Fathers and Councils of the Church in after ages.

SECT. 3.—From the Council of Aquileia under St. Ambrose, Anno 381.

And here we have the testimony of St. Ambrose and a whole Council of Italian bishops, who met at Aquileia to depose Palladius and Secundianus, two Arian bishops, Anno 381, the same year that the Macedonians, and Apollinarians, and Maximus the cynic, were deposed in the General Council of Constantinople. Now this Council, in their Synodical Epistle to the Emperors Valentinian and Gratian, acquainting them with their proceedings against those Arian bishops, tell them they had abdicated them from the priesthood:¹ for it was not fit that they should lay any claim to

¹ Con. Aquilei. Ep. Synod. Con. tom. ii. 989. Ne ulterius populos deciperent, sacerdotio putamus abdicandos. Neque enim dignum est, ut sacerdotium ejus sibi vindicent, quem negaverunt.

be priests under Him, whose Divinity they had denied. In the Acts of the Synod every bishop pronounces his particular sentence against them. St. Ambrose and Valerian in these words;¹ "I judge Palladius an alien from the college or society of priests." Justus in these words;² "I think Palladius can no longer be called a priest, nor be reckoned among bishops." Felix of Jadera;³ "I judge him by no means to be either a priest or a Christian." These bishops had not such an opinion of the indelible character of a priest, whatever there may be in it, as to think that an Arian heretic had any longer the authority of a priest of Christ, whose Divinity he denied: but they thought he might be abdicated from the priesthood, and therefore they deprived him of it, that he might no longer, under the name of a priest, deceive the people.

SECT. 4.—From the Council of Colonia Agrippina, Anno 346.

About the year 346, another Council was held at Colonia Agrippina, by the famous Servatius Tungrensis, and several other bishops, against Euphratas, bishop of Colen, whom they likewise deposed for maintaining the Arian heresy. The form of his deposition runs much in the same terms, as in the Council of Aquileia. Maximinus Treverensis who presided in the Council, declares it⁴ "manifest that he cannot be a bishop." Others say, "he is legally deposed from his episcopacy by the rules of the Gospel." Servatius speaks more expressly, "that he cannot be a Christian bishop, who with a sacrilegious mouth denies Christ to be God." Valentinus, bishop of Arles, said, "he could be no bishop, who, for denying Christ to be God, had not so

¹ Sentent. Ambros. Con. Aquilei. Ep. Synod. Con. tom. ii. A consortio sacerdotum censeo esse alienum. ² Sentent. Justi. ibid. Censeo ulterius sacerdotem dici non posse, nec inter episcopos deputari.

³ Felix. ibid. Nec Christianum hunc, nec sacerdotem ullo modo censemus.

⁴ Con. Agrippin. p. 317. ap. Crab. tom. i. Episcopum eum, manifestum est, esse non posse. Valentinus episcopus dixit, 'Quia Euphrata Christum Deum negat, consentio eum episcopum esse non posse, qui nec laicam debet communionem accipere.'—Severinus dixit 'Consentio eundem, juxta evangelica præcepta jure ab episcopatu esse dejectum.'—Servatius dixit, 'Censeo eum Christianis episcopum esse non posse, &c.'

much as right to lay-communion." The same is said in the Acts of Servatius, which are added by Crab at the end of the Acts of this Synod;¹ "that it was his opinion, that if this Euphratas was allowed to do penance, it should not be as a bishop, but rather as a layman." To which all the rest of the bishops consenting, immediately thereupon Euphratas, in their style, is said to be "unordained," or to have his ordination cancelled, which appears to be done by degrading him to the order of laymen.

SECT. 5.—FROM AN ITALIC COUNCIL, UNDER ST. AMBROSE, ANNO 381.

Such another sentence was passed upon the Apollinarian heretics, in an Italic Council under St. Ambrose, Anno 381. Whether this was the forementioned Council of Aquileia, or Milan, or some other, is not certain. For all that Labbe could find of it, is only two Synodical Epistles to Theodosius the Emperor; in the first of which there is this decree mentioned, as made against the Apollinarians in that Council;² "that if any priest was convict of that new heresy, he should lose both the office and name of a priest, as having lost that which makes priests, that is, the magistrery of Catholic doctrine." What can be plainer than the evidence given in these Councils against heretics having any pretence to sacerdotal authority after their deposition? They may be less than laymen; for they may be anathematised and cast out of the Church: but more than laymen they cannot be, although they repent and be restored to the communion of the Church; so long as they are divested both of the name and office of priests, which was the usual punishment of heretics, according to the sentence and decrees of these ancient Councils.

¹ Acta Servatii, ap. Crab. *ibid.* p. 318. Cujus et pœnitentia si qua est expectanda, potiùs hanc sentio inter laicos, quàm inter episcopos egendam. Nulla mora, singulis pontificibus orationes similes ad eandem normam dictantibus, Euphrata deordinatur. ² Con. Italic. Ep. i. ad Theod. Con. tom. ii. p. 1006. Ut convictus in dogmate novo----- illicò, quod doctrinæ magistrerio non teneret, et officium deponeret, et vocabulum sacerdotis.

SECT. 6.—From the Roman Council of ninety Bishops under Damasus, Anno 369.

Such another Council was held under Damasus, at Rome, Anno 369, where ninety bishops met to condemn Auxentius, and other Arian bishops. In their Synodical Epistle to the bishops of Illyricum, which is both in Theodoret and Sozomen, and the tomes of the Councils,¹ they threaten to deprive them both of their communion and the very name of bishops. Which certainly implies, that they thought they had power to take away the authority of priests from them, since they would not leave them so much as the very name remaining.

SECT. 7.—From the Testimony of Domnus, Bishop of Antioch, and John Cassian.

And as they thus treated heretics, so did they also Catholic priests, who committed crimes worthy of deposition, if they continued obstinate in them. Thus Liberatus observes concerning the proceedings, of Domnus, bishop of Antioch, with the presbyters and deacons of Edessa, who came to accuse Ibas their bishop before him. Ibas had excommunicated them for pretending to make information against him. From this unjust excommunication Domnus, the patriarch¹ ordered them to be absolved; but yet upon this condition,² “that if they stirred a foot out of Antioch before the festival of Ascension, which was then at hand, they should be deposed from their orders.” It seems this patriarch had no other notion of the orders of a priest or deacon, but that if they did things unworthy of their order, they might have their orders taken from them; and it was not the pretence of an indelible character could secure the authority or name of priests to them, against the authority of their patriarch,

¹ Con. Rom. Ep. Synod. Con. tom. ii. p. 889. Pro certo credimus, eos propter suum conatum brevi fore à nostrâ communione segregatos, et nomine episcoporum privatos. Vid. Theodor. lib. ii. c. 22. et Sozom. lib. vi. c. 27.

² Liberat. Breviar. cap. x. Qui cùm ascendissent Antiochiam, Ibas eos excommunicavit. Sed, superveniente festivitate Quadragesimæ Ascensionis, jussi sunt à Domino excommunicatione absolvi, sub eâ conditione, ut Antiochiam non exirent, alioquin à suo deponerentur ordine.

who presumed he had a legal power to depose them from their orders. And that this was the standing rule of the Church of Antioch, is further evident from what Cassian says upon occasion of Nestorius's turning heretic. Nestorius was born, and bred, and baptised, and ordained at Antioch; and it was the profession of his faith, according to the Antiochian Creed, which made him both a Christian and a priest: but when he once had lost this faith, Cassian says,¹ "he then lost all that he gained by his faith: for the sacrament or mystery of his priesthood, and his salvation too, depended both equally upon the truth of his creed." So that he forfeited his priesthood, as much as he did his salvation, when he turned heretic, and apostatised from the faith in which he had been baptised.

SECT. S.—And Pope Innocent.

In the Church of Rome they never received any one as a priest who was brought to do public penance: and for this reason, those that were ordained by heretics were reckoned no priests among them, to the time of Pope Innocent, who says,² "where penance was necessary, as it was in receiving such as were ordained by heretics, there the honour of ordination could have no place." But, on the contrary, they maintained, that he that had lost his honour, could not give the honour of the priesthood; nor could one ordained by heretics receive any thing, because the giver had nothing in him to give. Therefore it was the custom of the Roman Church, to receive those that came over from heretics only to lay-communion by imposition of hands, but not to allow them the least honour of the clergy.³ For though this was

¹ Cassian. de Incarnat. lib. vi. p. 1274. Perdens symboli fidem, totum quod fueras perdidisti: sacramenta enim sacerdotii, ac salutis tuæ, symboli veritate constabant.

² Innoc. Ep. xxii. ad Episc. Macedon. c. 3. Ubi pœnitentiæ remedium necessarium est, illic ordinationis honorem locum non posse habere.—Sed è contrario asseritur, eum qui honorem amisit, honorem dare non posse; nec illum aliquid accepisse, quia nihil in dante erat, quod ille posset accipere.

³ Ibid. c. iv. Nostræ lex ecclesiæ est, venientibus ab hæreticis, qui tamen illic baptizati sunt, per manûs impositionem laicam tantùm tribuere communionem, nec ex his aliquem in clericatûs honorem vel exiguum subrogare.

dispensed with in some extraordinary cases of necessity, in some other Churches, yet he says it never prevailed at Rome. Whence it is evident, they thought that neither they that lapsed into heresy, nor they that were ordained by heretics, had any title to the honour of the priesthood.

SECT. 9.—And Pope Simplicius.

Simplicius, bishop of Rome, had the same opinion of delinquent clerks, that they might lose the authority of the priesthood. For writing to John, bishop of Ravenna, who had ordained some clerks against their will, he tells him,¹ “that for this he deserved to lose his privilege, for abusing the power that was committed to him. And if he persisted contumacious in this practice, the power of ordination should be wholly taken from him.” In another Epistle to Florentius, Equitius, and Severus,² three Italian bishops, he has occasion to censure one Gaudentius, bishop of Aunium, for ordaining against the canons, for which crime he declares him “deprived of all power of ordaining for the future, and those that were ordained illegally by him, to be deposed.” Could it then be said, that these bishops had still authority to ordain, when all power and authority of ordaining was wholly taken from them? Or, that those priests who were illegally ordained by them, were true authorised priests, that were deposed as soon as they were ordained, and never allowed to exercise any part of the ministerial function? We see no difference here made between those that once had a true ordination, and those that had not: for when they were once totally deposed, they were all equally deprived of the power and authority of the priesthood.

¹ Simplic. Ep. ii. ad Joh. Raven. Privilegium meretur amittere, qui permissâ sibi abutitur potestate.—Denunciamus autem, quod si posthâc quicquam tale præsumpseris, et aliquem seu episcopum seu presbyterum seu diaconum invitum facere fortè credideris, ordinationis tibi Ravennatis Ecclesiæ vel Æmiliensis noveris auferendas.

² Id. Ep. iii. ad Florent. ap. Crab. tom. i. p. 957. Relatio nos instruxit, Gaudentium Auniniensis Ecclesiæ sacerdotem, contra statuta canonum ac nostra præcepta, ordinationes illicitas perpetrâsse, quarum illi totam penitens auferri præcipimus potestatem.—Et hi, qui illicitè ab eodem sunt proveci, ab ecclesiasticis ministeriis sint remoti.

SECT. 10.—And Pope Vigilius.

Pope Vigilius is as peremptory as his predecessors, that a synod of bishops has power to take away all ministerial office and power from a delinquent bishop or clerk: and by virtue hereof he himself, with a synod of bishops, deprived Theodore, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, declaring him,¹ “divested and despoiled, as well of sacerdotal honour and Catholic communion, as of all episcopal office and power; and that henceforth he had nothing to do but to weep out his sins by repentance.” They, that made canons in this style against heretics and other criminal clerks, could not possibly think they were authorised priests, after such legal and formal depositions, which took from them both the office and the name, and the power and authority of the priesthood. But it will still be said, over and over again, by those against whom I dispute, that these were not mere laymen; by which if they mean men that never had any sort of ordination at all, either real or pretended, I grant they were not, nor could be mere laymen: for it were an absurd contradiction to say, that they had received an ordination, and yet never had one. But the thing I assert is this, that a man who had a true ordination, if for heresy or any other crime he was legally deposed, he had no longer the divine power of an authorised priest; because the same divine authority which gave him his authority by ordination, by deordination takes it away from him; and save that it cannot be said he never had an ordination, in all other respects he was a layman, and all his pretended ministerial offices were of no more authority or effect, than those of a layman, because he was wholly divested of all clerical authority; and either reduced to a state and communion of laymen, if penitent; or else, if he remained contumacious and impenitent, he was set one degree below laymen, that is totally excommunicated and cast out of the Church. Of which points

¹ Fragment. *Depositionis Theodori per Vigil.* ap. Crab. tom. ii. p. 8. *Theodorum tam sacerdotali honore et communione catholicâ, quàm vel omni officio episcopali seu potestate spoliatum esse decernimus, &c.*

of discipline, toward heretics and delinquent clerks in the ancient Church, I have given some hints already, and shall now more fully demonstrate the truth of them in the two following chapters.

CHAP. IV.

Argument III. That Heretics, and degraded Clerks, were not authorised Priests in the Account of the ancient Church, because, by her Discipline, they were reduced to the same or a lower Communion of Laymen.

SECT. I.—Persons, who were obliged to do public Penance, allowed to be of the Clergy.

As a further proof of the position at first laid down, that heretics and degraded clerks could not act with the authority of priests, but only as laics, in the ministration of baptism, or any other sacred office, I here observe, that by the censures of the Church they were reduced to the state, and name, and communion of laymen. And this upon supposition only that they were penitent and submitted to the Church's discipline; for otherwise they were anathematised with the greater excommunication, and not allowed the benefit even of lay-communion in the Church. Lay-communion then was a privilege allowed to heretics and degraded clerks upon their repentance; but more than this was not ordinarily granted them: If any man, for any scandalous crimes, was obliged to do public penance, this cut him off from clerical communion ever after, by the strict discipline which continued for several ages in the Church. Upon this account, as I have observed and proved in another place¹ from many testimonies of Siricius, Innocentius, Gennadius, the second Council of Arles, the Council of Agde, the first Council of Toledo, the fourth Council of Carthage, the Council of Gerunda, Optatus, and St. Austin, if any had done public penance in the Church, for any scandalous crime, that very thing did for ever, according to the rules and dis-

¹ Origin. Eccles. Book iv. cap. iii. sect. 6.

ipline of those times, render that person incapable of holy orders; or, if he was ordained by mistake, as soon as the thing came to be known, he was deposed by a rule of the fourth Council of Carthage, can. 68. for not declaring that he had been a penitent, at the time of his ordination. So in like manner, any clerk, who had received a just and canonical ordination, if after that he lapsed into any crimes that required him to do public penance, as heresy, idolatry, murder, adultery, and many the like, was thereby utterly excluded from all clerical communion, and reduced as entirely to lay-communion, as any one that had at first been irregularly ordained.

SECT. 2.—All degraded Persons reduced, at least, to Lay-Communion.

Nor was it only public penitents among the clergy that were thus treated, but likewise all others that were totally degraded for any crimes whatsoever. Though they were excused doing public penance, because they thought a single punishment of degradation was sufficient for such crimes; yet they were still debarred all clerical communion, and only treated as laymen for ever after in the Church. This is so evident to all that are acquainted with ancient history, that I would not spend time to prove it, were not the gentlemen I am dealing with, so rigid as to exact superabundant proofs from Fathers and Councils for every thing I have asserted against them. Let us see then, for their satisfaction, what evidence there is, that hereties and degraded clerks, whether subjected to public penance or not, were all reduced to the state of lay-communion.

SECT. 3.—This proved from Cyprian and his Cotemporaries, Cornelius, and the Council of Carthage.

I begin with the testimony of Cyprian, and his cotemporaries, Cornelius, bishop of Rome, and the Fathers assembled under Cyprian in the Council of Carthage. We have had something of Cyprian's judgment about this matter before, upon the case of Trophimus,¹ one of the three

¹ See before, chap. ii. sect. 3.

bishops that ordained Novatian, who, upon his acknowledgment of his error, was admitted into the Church again, yet not allowed to take upon him the office of a priest, but only to communicate in the quality of a layman.¹ And so Cornelius, speaking of the same person, says.² he received him into communion only as a layman: which does not mean, that he was only like a layman, but that he was now a layman, and not a priest, as Cyprian more distinctly expresses it. In another Epistle, Cyprian, with a whole synod of African bishops, considers the case of Basilides and Martial, two Spanish bishops, who had lapsed into idolatry in time of persecution: "These men, at first," he says,³ "deposed themselves voluntarily for their crimes, and desired only to be admitted to penance, and thought it favour enough to be admitted to communion as laymen. But afterward they repented of their repentance, and would have been admitted again as bishops; which would by no means be allowed them: for such men did but in vain attempt to be bishops,⁴ since it was a clear case, that they ought not to preside over the Church of Christ, or offer sacrifice to God: especially when it had been so decreed, not only by the African synods, but by Cornelius at Rome, and all the bishops of the whole world, that such men might be admitted to penance indeed, but never more lay any claim to the order of the clergy, or the honour of the priesthood." Here, I think, if ever, there was universal consent of all the bishops in the world upon the point in debate: they all decreed to a man, that a bishop or priest, that was justly deposed for idolatry, was

¹ Cypr. Ep. lii. al. lv. ad Anton. p. 105. Sic tamen admissus est Trophimus, ut laicus communicet, non—quasi locum sacerdotis usurpet.

² Cornel. Ep. ad Fabian. ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43. Ἐκοινωνήσαμεν ὡς λαϊκῶν.

³ Cypr. Ep. lxxviii. al. xlvii. ad Fratr. Hispan. p. 173. Basilides episcopatum pro conscientiae suae vulnere sponte deponens, ad agendam pœnitentiam conversus, Deum deprecatus, et satis gratulans, si sibi vel laico communicare contingeret.

⁴ Cypr. ibid. p. 174. Frustrâ tales episcopatum sibi usurpare conantur, cum manifestum sit ejusmodi homines nec Ecclesiae Christi posse præesse, nec Deo sacrificia offerre debere. Maximè cum jam pridem nobiscum et cum omnibus omninò episcopis in toto mundo constitutis, etiam Cornelius collega noster—decreverit, ejusmodi homines ad pœnitentiam quidem agendum posse admitti; ab ordinatione autem cleri atque sacerdotali honore prohiberi.

no longer an authorised bishop or priest, nor to be reckoned of the order of the clergy, but to be treated only as a layman. I challenge the world to give a plainer proof of universal consent in this case: and if the opposers of the validity of lay-baptism, and defenders of rebaptisation, will produce as authentic a testimony of universal consent for their thesis, I will promise, in point of history, to subscribe to their opinion.

But I go on with Cyprian, who, in another Epistle to Pope Stephen, says,¹ “ It was agreed upon by common authority and consent, that if any presbyters or deacons, who were first ordained in the Catholic Church, did afterward turn traitors and rebels against the Church, or any others that were promoted among heretics, by the profane ordination of false bishops and antichrists, against the rule of Christ, did take upon them to offer false and sacrilegious sacrifice, out of the Church, in opposition to the one altar of God; that neither of these, upon their return to the Church, should be received upon any other condition but this, that they should be laymen, and communicate only as such, and account it enough to be admitted to the Church’s peace, who had been the enemies of peace, but not be allowed to retain the armour of their ordination and honour, with which they had fought against her.” It is impossible to say in plainer words, that heretics and degraded clerks are not priests, but only laymen; or that such as are ordained by heretics, who are only false bishops and antichrists, are only laymen, and to be treated as laymen, upon their return to the Church. I shall but mention one place more in Cyprian, which relates the case of one Fortunianus, an African bishop of Assuræ, who had lapsed either

¹ Cypr. Ep. lxxii. ad Stephan. p. 197. Addimus planè auctoritate communi, ut si qui presbyteri aut diaconi, qui vel in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ prius ordinati fuerint, et postmodum perfidi ac rebelles contra Ecclesiam steterint; vel apud hæreticos à pseudoepiscopis et antichristis contra Christi dispositionem profanâ ordinatione promoti sint, et contra altare unum atque divinum, sacrificia foris falsa ac sacrilega offerre conati sint; eos quoque hæc conditione suscipi cum revertuntur, ut communicent laici, et satis habeant quod admittuntur ad pacem, qui hostes paces extiterint; nec debere eos reverentes ea apud nos ordinationis et honoris arma retinere, quibus contra nos rebellaverint.

into idolatry or the Novatian schism, for which he was deposed, but afterward would have acted as a bishop again. Whom Cyprian therefore violently opposed, writing to the Church of Assuræ, and telling them,¹ “ how much he was offended, that Fortunatianus, this quondam bishop, should, after his fall and ruin, attempt to be restored to his office, and act as a bishop again; and, when he ought only to give himself up to prayers and tears, day and night, to implore God’s mercy, and make satisfaction for his offence, he still presumed to lay claim to the priesthood, which he had betrayed; as if it was lawful for a man to minister at the altar of God, who before had stood at the altar of the Devil.” This evidently goes upon the same principle, that a bishop, once deposed for idolatry or heresy, was never after to be reputed a bishop, or to meddle with any part of the episcopal office, but to do penance for his crimes, in order to be received to communion as a layman. And upon this principle it was asserted in the Council under Cyprian,² that as heretics and schismatics were to be rebaptised, so all that were ordained by them, were only to be received as laymen. And indeed, upon this very principle, if St. Basil says true,³ both Cyprian and Firmilian required heretics and schismatics to be rebaptised, because their baptism was no other than the baptism of laymen. So that they must needs suppose, that heretics and schismatics were only laymen, else the foundation of their argument had been faulty. And, though they drew a wrong conclusion from that principle, which the Church, in after ages, by her general Councils, corrected; yet she never denied their principle, but acted still in conformity to it, reducing heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, to lay-com-

¹ Cypr. Ep. lxiv. al. lxxv. ad Plebem Assuritan. p. 162. Graviter motus sum, quod cognoverim Fortunatianum quondam apud vos episcopum, post gravem lapsum ruinæ suæ, pro integro nunc agere velle, et episcopatum sibi vindicare cœpisse.—Et cùm debeat satisfacere, et ad Dominum exorandum, diebus ac noctibus, lachrymis et orationibus et precibus incumbere, audet sibi adhuc sacerdotium quod prodidit vindicare; quasi post aras diaboli accedere ad altare Dei fas sit.

² Con. Carthag. ad Cyprian. n. 4. p. 231. Novatus à Thamugade dixit ‘ Omnes schismaticos et hæreticos, qui ad Ecclesiam conversi sunt, baptizari; sed et eos qui ordinati videntur, inter laicos recipi.’

³ Basil. Can. i.

munion, except were some intervening necessity and extraordinary occasion required her to relax her discipline, as in the case of the Novatians and Donatists, and some few others, in order to make up the Church's peace, and put an end to an inveterate schism. Of which I shall make full proof in pursuing the subsequent practice of the Universal Church, by which it will evidently appear, that the ordinary way of treating heretics and schismatics and degraded clerks, was, according to the Cyprianic age, to reduce them still to lay-communion.

SECT. 4.—And from the Apostolical Canons.

This appears first from those canons which go under the name of the Apostolical Canons, if we allow those to be of later date than Cyprian. For in two of those rules there is this direction. In the fifteenth canon it is ordered, that if any clerk run from his own diocese to another, and refuse to return again at the command of his own bishop, he shall be degraded from his ministry, and only be allowed “*to communicate as a layman,—ὡς λαϊκός κοινωνεῖτω.*” And in the sixty-second canon it is said, if any clerk through human fear of a Jew, or Greek, or heretic, denies himself to be a clerk, he shall be deposed, and upon his repentance, “*be admitted to communicate only as a layman,—ὡς λαϊκός δεχθήτω.*” By which any one may judge, that being deposed from the ministry, and being made a layman, are words of the same importance, according to the sense of those ancient Canons. See also Can. ix. al. xii.

SECT. 5.—And the Council of Eliberis.

We have the same rule in the ancient Council of Eliberis, which orders,¹ “that if a deacon suffered himself to be ordained, when he was conscious to himself of having com-

¹ Con. Eliber. can. 76. Si quis Diaconus se permiserit ordinari, et postea fuerit in crimine detectus mortis, quod aliquando commiserit; si spontè fuerit confessus, placuit eum, actâ legitimâ pœnitentiâ, post triennium accipere communionem. Quod si alius detexerit, post quinquennium actâ pœnitentiâ, accipere communionem laicam debere.

mitted a mortal sin ; if he confessed it voluntarily himself, he should be admitted to communion after three years penance: but if another detected him, he should do penance for five years, and then only be admitted to lay-communion."

SECT. 6.—And the Council of Sardica.

Such another canon we have in the great Council of Sardica, where the case of two faulty bishops, Musæus and Eutychian, was examined, and a decree to this purpose made upon it;¹ " that neither of them should thenceforth assume to themselves the name of bishops, nor be esteemed as such: but if they desired lay-communion, it should not be denied them."

SECT. 7.—And the Council of Agde.

A like decree was made in the Council of Agde, for the French Churches, where it is ordered,² " that if a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, committed a capital crime, or falsified a deed, or gave a false witness, he should be deposed from the honour of his office, and be thrust into a monastery, and there, as long as he lived, have only the privilege of lay-communion.

SECT. 8.—And the Council of Orleans.

The third Council of Orleans has two canons to the same purpose. The first concerns the clergy, from bishops down to subdeacons, who are forbidden to cohabit with their wives, under pain of being deposed from their office, according to the decrees of former canons, and³ " being

¹ Con. Sardic. can. 20. Ἐπι δὲ λαϊκὴν κοινωνίαν ἀπαιτοῦεν, μὴ χρῆναι αὐτὸς ἀπαρνεῖσθαι.

² Con Agathen. can. 1. Si Episcopus, presbyter, aut diaconus capitale crimen commiserit, aut chartam falsaverit, aut testimonium falsum dixerit, ab officii honore depositus, in monasterium retrudatur, et ibi quamdiu vixerit, laicam tantummodo communionem accipiat.

³ Con. Aurelian. iii. can. 2. Quod si fecerit, laicâ communionem contentus, juxta priorum cononum statuta ab officio deponatur.

reduced to lay-communion."¹ The other forbids all the same orders of the clergy to exercise usury, under the same penalty, threatening, that if any one presume to transgress their decrees,² "he shall be degraded from his order and only be admitted to communion;" that is, to lay-communion: for no other communion can here be meant, since he was excluded from clerical communion by his degradation.

SECT. 9.—The first Council of Toledo.

The first Council of Toledo has such another canon about subdeacons,³ "that if any of them marry a third wife, he shall be excommunicated for two years, and then being reconciled by penance, be admitted to communicate only as a layman." And in the next canon, a presbyter, or a deacon, neglecting the daily sacrifice, is no longer to be reputed a clerk,⁴ if, after he is reprimanded by the bishop for his fault, he refuses to ask pardon and make satisfaction.

SECT. 10.—The Council of Hippo, and St. Austin.

The Council of Hippo in Africa made the same order about the Donatists,⁵ "that they should only be received in the number of laymen." And though this rule was afterward dispensed with, for the sake of peace and to put an end to the inveterate schism of the Donatists; yet St. Austin plainly tells us, that in strictness of discipline this would not have been allowed with any other view but only that of peace. For he thus answers the objection of the Donatists, who pertly demanded of him, "how it came to pass, that, if it was necessary in order to salvation

¹ Con. Aurelian. iii. can. 2. Quod si fecerit, laicâ communione contentus, juxta priorum canonum statuta ab officio deponatur. ² Ibid. can. xxvi. Quod si quis adversus hæc statuta venire præsumpserit, communione concessâ, ab ordine degradetur.

³ Con. Tolet. l. can. iv. Qui tertiam acceperit, abstentus biennio, postea inter laicos reconciliatus per pœnitentiam communicet. ⁴ Ibid. can. v. Presbyter aut diaconus—clericus non habeatur, si castigatus, per satisfactionem veniam ab episcopo noluit promereri.

⁵ Con. Hippon. can. xli. Ut Donatistæ in numero laicorum recipiantur.

for a Donatist to repent of his being out of the Church and against the Church, notwithstanding this the Donatist clergy and bishops were suffered to continue in their station after their repentance?" To this he replies,¹ "that this would not have been allowed, because, in truth, it ought not to have been allowed; but only that the consideration of peace makes some compensation and atonement for it. Therefore the Donatists ought rather to turn this objection against themselves and grieve the more humbly and heartily, that they lie in such a death of schism, as that nothing can revive them but making such a wound in the discipline of their Catholic mother. For this was the ordinary rule of the Church, that no one, after he had done penance for any crime, should either be promoted to the office of a clerk, or return to his office, or continue in his office: which was done, not to make men despair of pardon, but to keep up discipline in its just rigour and strictness. Otherwise we should dispute against the power of the keys committed to the Church, of which it is said, 'Whatsoever ye loose upon earth, shall be loosed in heaven.' But lest men should proudly repent of their crimes in hopes of an ecclesiastical promotion, this severity was wisely agreed upon, that after a man had done penance for any damnable crime, he should not be made a clerk, that by despairing

¹ Aug. Ep. l. ad Bonifac. p. 87. Si ergò, inquit, oportet ut nos extra Ecclesiam et adversus Ecclesiam fuisse pœniteat, ut salvi esse possimus, quomodò post istam pœnitentiam apud vos clerici vel etiam episcopi permanemus? Hoc non fieret, quoniam reverà, quod fatendum est, fieri non deberet, nisi pacis ipsius compensatione sanaretur. Sed sibi hoc dicant, et multo maximè humiliter doleant, qui in tantâ morte præcisionis jacent, ut isto quodam vulnere matris catholicæ reviviscant.—Ut enim constitueretur in Ecclesiâ, ne quisquam post alicujus criminis pœnitentiam clericatum accipiat, vel ad clericatum redeat, vel in clericatu maneat, non desperatione indulgentiæ sed rigore factum est disciplinæ: alioquin contra claves datas Ecclesiæ disputabitur, de quibus dictum est, 'Quæ solveritis in terrâ, soluta erunt et in cælo.' Sed ne forsitan etiam de cæteris eriminibus, spe honoris ecclesiastici animus intumescens superbè ageret pœnitentiam, severissimè placuit, ut post actam de crimine damnabili pœnitentiam, nemo sit clericus, ut desperatione temporalis altitudinis medicina major et verior esset humilitatis.—Verùm in hujusmodi causis, ubi per graves dissensionum scissuras non hujus aut illius hominis est periculum, sed populorum strages jacent, detrahendum est aliquid severitati, ut majoribus malis sanandis charitas sincera subveniat.

of temporal promotion, the medicine of humility might work a more sincere and effectual cure in him. But in such cases as these, when by reason of great dissensions and schisms, it was not one or two single persons that were in danger, but whole multitudes that lay prostrate and slain, then something was to be abated of the strict severity of discipline, that charity might come in to assist in the cure of greater evils."

I have transcribed this whole passage of St. Austin, to shew, both what was the ordinary strictness of the Church's discipline in this case, and what those reasons were that sometime oblige her to alter her measures upon extraordinary occasions. By which it appears, that notwithstanding such dispensations upon great exigencies, her ordinary and standing method was to reduce heretics, and schismatics, and other delinquent clerks to the state and communion of laymen.

SECT. 11.—The Decrees of Pope Innocent.

For the practice of the Church of Rome, we have the testimony of Pope Innocent, who was cotemporary with St. Austin. For we have heard him declare before, in the last chapter, sect. 8, that it was the constant custom of the Roman Church, to receive those that came over from heretics only to lay-communion by imposition of hands, but not to allow them the least honour of clerical promotion.

SECT. 12.—And Siricius.

Pope Siricius mentions the same discipline, as exercised upon all such clerks as had, against canon, either married a widow, or a second wife:¹ "they were to be deprived of all ecclesiastical dignity, and only admitted to lay-communion." And St. Jerom says the same of heretical bishops, in his Dialogue against the Luciferians, cap. vii.

¹ Siric. Ep. i. ad Himerium Tarracon. c. ii. Quisquis sanè clericus aut viduam, aut certè secundam conjugem duxerit, omni ecclesiasticæ dignitatis privilegio mox nudetur, laicâ sibi tantùm communionem concessâ.

SECT. 13.—And St. Basil.

Among the Canons of St. Basil, there is one to the same purpose,¹ “that such clerks as committed mortal sin should be degraded, or deposed from their order, but be still allowed to communicate as laymen: because except in some special cases, a clerk was not to be punished doubly for the same fault,” that is, both by deposition and excommunication.

SECT. 14.—And the Council of Trullo.

All this is confirmed by a canon of the Council of Trullo, which says,² when delinquent clerks are degraded by a complete and perpetual deposition, they are then “thrust down to the place of laymen.” So that we have as good proof of the discipline of the Church, upon this head, as need be required.

Now then, upon the whole matter, let any impartial man judge of the sense and practice of the ancient Church, in reference to the admission of such baptisms, as were given in due form by unauthorised laymen. If the Church had no other opinion of heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, but as of unauthorised laymen; and yet admitted the baptisms of all such so far, as not to repeat them again by rebaptisation: does it not plainly follow, that she admitted the baptisms of those who, in her opinion, were only unauthorised laymen? If any one says, they were reduced to lay-communication, but yet were authorised priests, and not laymen, he must first answer Cyprian, and all the other bishops of the world, who say, in the plainest terms, that they are not priests, but laymen; not like laymen, but really so. And then he must shew likewise, how a man can be said to have the authority of a priest, when God and Christ and the best authority in the Church have taken away his authority from him. And when this is done, there

¹ Basil. can. xxii. Οἱ τὴν πρὸς θάνατον ἁμαρτιῶν ἁμαρτανοντες κληρικοὶ, τῆ βραθυμῆ μὲν κατάγονται, τῆς κοινωνίας δὲ τῶν λαϊκῶν ἐκ ἐξέφρονται. Οὐ γὰρ ἐκδικήσεις δις ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. ² Con. Trull. can. 21. Ἐν τῶν τῶν λαϊκῶν ἀπωθήμενοι τόπων.

will remain another difficulty behind, how a man can be said to be an authorised priest, who is not a complete and perfect laymen: as no heretic, or schismatic, or degraded clerk, after they are anathematised for their obstinacy, can be said to be: for they are then not only reduced to the communion of laymen, but sunk one degree below laymen, by being excommunicate or cast out of the Church. For no man is a complete laymen, but he that is in full communion with the Church; which heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks are not, after excommunication is once added to their deprivation, as it sometimes was when they persisted obstinate and contumacious against the discipline of the Church, of which I shall give a more distinct and full account in the following chapter.

CHAP. V.

Argument IV. That Heretics, and Schismatics, and degraded Clerks, were not accounted authorised Priests, because they were sometimes thrust down one degree below Laymen, by being anathematised and cast out of the Communion of the Church.

SECT. I.—That no Man is reckoned a complete Layman but he that is in full Communion with the Church.

ALL that has been said in the last chapter of heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks being reduced to the communion of laymen, goes upon supposition of their being penitent, and that they quietly submitted to the Church's discipline, when they were corrected for their faults: for, in that case, the Church, in her punishments, showed them some favour, when they did not add obstinacy and rebellion to their other crimes. She thought it enough to punish ordinary crimes in penitent clerks by the single punishment of degradation from their orders, and reduction of them to lay-communion, and did not proceed to the utmost severity

of excommunication with them; unless for some higher crimes of a more malignant nature, or unless they proved refractory and contumacious against her censures. There are some ancient Canons which give particular direction about this matter, that a delinquent clerk should not be punished twice for the same fault, in ordinary cases, that is, he should not both be degraded, and cast out of lay-communion also.¹ But then, this was upon supposition, that he submitted quietly to the Church's censure, and that his crimes also were not of such a nature as to require a more severe judgment and condemnation. For otherwise both these punishments might be inflicted on him: he might not only be deprived of clerical communion, but of lay-communion also; and at the same time that he was cast out of orders, be cast out of the Church, and be cut off entirely from all communion whatsoever. And this was sinking him one degree below a layman: for no man was accounted a complete layman, but he that was in full communion with the Church, and had a right to participate with the faithful in all holy offices, and particularly the holy eucharist, or oblation, which was τὸ τέλειον, *the consummation of all*, and that which made a man a perfect and complete Christian. For without this a man was only an imperfect Christian, and in an incomplete state, and scarce to be reckoned of as a perfect and proper member of the Church. Upon this account all catechumens were reckoned but imperfect members of the Church, though they had in a large sense the name of Christians, because, while they remained unbaptised, they had no right to the full communion of the faithful. In like manner all excommunicate persons were at most but incomplete Christians, by being cut off from the communion of the Church: they were but a sort of dead members, till they revived again by repentance, and were restored by virtue of the right which baptism gives them to be admitted to communion again upon confession and satisfaction. And in this state, all such heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks were supposed to be, who underwent a double punishment, and had excom-

¹ Can. Apost. c. xxv. al. xviii. Basil. Epist. Canon. c. xxxii.

munication added to their deposition. They were, by this means, shut out of the Church, and denied the privilege even of lay-communion. So that they were not so much as complete and perfect laymen, but one degree lower than laymen, having lost their present right to full communion, and retaining little more besides their baptism to entitle them to the name of Christians. It is not easy to conceive then, how they should be esteemed true authorised priests by the Church, whom she herself excluded from the privilege of true complete Christian laymen.

SECT. 2.—Heretics, and Schismatics, and degraded Clerks, sometimes denied also the Privilege of Lay-communion.

But now that the Church did many times exercise this double censure, and inflict both the punishment of deposition and excommunication upon them, will be no hard matter to be made appear. For, not to mention, now, how often heretics are laid under anathema by the six general Councils, of which I have given a full account in the first chapter of this Book; nor how unanimously all the Ancients declare all heretics and schismatics to be out of the true and perfect communion of the Holy Catholic Church; nor how often heretics are said to be no Christians, no Church, nor members of the Church, meaning thereby Christians in the adequate sense, and persons in full communion with the Church; I say, not to insist upon any thing of this, at present, it will be sufficient to show, that heretics and schismatics, and degraded clerks, were sometimes, after their deposition, also formally excommunicated by the Church, and denied even the communion of laymen.

SECT. 3.—This proved from the Testimony of Cyprian.

This is evident from what Cyprian says of Evaristus, one of the three bishops that pretended to ordain Novatian,¹ “that for his crime he was so far degraded, as of a bishop not to be suffered to continue in the state and quality of a

¹ Cypr. Ep. 49. al. 52. ad Cornel. p. 96. Didicimus Evaristum de episcopo jam nec laicum remansisse, cathedræ et plebis extorrem, et de Ecclesiâ Christi exsulem.

layman: he was not only deprived of his people and his see, but wholly banished the Church, because he continued obstinate in his schism, and did not, as Trophimus had done, submit himself by confession and penance, that he might be received to communion as a layman." This was the difference the Church then made between these two criminal bishops, who were concerned in the ordination of Novatian: they were both deposed from their order, and reckoned no bishops; but the one was received into church-communion, upon his repentance, as a layman; whilst the other was wholly cast out of the Church for his impenitency, and not allowed to enjoy either the honourable title or communion of a layman. He was now less than a layman, who a little before was a bishop in the Catholic Church.

SECT. 4.—And the Apostolical Canons.

Among the Apostolical Canons, there are some which forbid a clerk to be punished doubly for the same crime in all ordinary cases, as has been observed before; yet there are two cases specified, in which excommunication is to be added to deposition. The first is the case of simony, which was a crime of that high nature, that if any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, was found guilty of it, "both he that was ordained, and he that ordained him, were not only to be degraded, but to be cut off entirely from all church-communion whatsoever,"¹ as Simon Magus was by Peter. The other case was much of the same nature,² "If any bishop made use of the secular power, (by which learned men understand the heathen magistrate,) to obtain a Church, and thereby gets possession of it, he shall be both deposed and excommunicated also." There was no favour for such men, they must be ejected, not only from clerical communion and dignity, but from the common privilege and communion of laymen.

SECT. 5.—The Council of Colen.

This was the censure that was passed upon Euphratas,

¹ Canon. Apost. c. xxix. Καθαιρέσθω ἕ ἀὐτὸς, ἕ ὁ χειροτονήσας, ἕ ἐκκοπήσθω παντάπασι καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας. ² Ibid. can. xxx. Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος κοσμικοῖς ἀρχαῖσι χρησάμενος, εἰ αὐτῶν ἐγκρατῆς ἐκκλησίας γένηται, καθαιρέσθω ἕ ἀφοριζέσθω.

the Arian bishop of Colen, who, because he would not recant his heresy, was deposed in the Council of Colen, Anno 349. There every bishop gives his particular vote against him, and one of them thus expresses his condemnation: ¹ “ I agree to the determination of the synod, that Euphratas neither can be a bishop, nor ought to receive the communion of laymen.”

SECT. 6.—The Council of Sardica.

The Council of Sardica has two very remarkable canons upon this subject, pronounced by the mouth of the famous Hosius, bishop of Corduba, who presided in this synod. The first is made against such bishops as, through covetousness or ambition, without any legal or synodical call, removed themselves from one see to another, from a less city to a greater: to correct which exorbitancy with a just severity, it is there decreed, ² “ that such bishops ought not to have so much as the communion of laymen.” And again, in a second canon, ³ “ If any such bishop plead that he was called by the vote of the people, that being found to be only a pretence, such an one should not be admitted to lay-communion, not even at the hour of death.” These Fathers surely could not take those for authorised bishops, whom they laid under such a terrible anathema, that they did not think them worthy of the Church’s peace *in extremis*, but denied them the common *viaticum* of laymen, at their last hour.

SECT. 7.—The Council of Eliberis.

The Council of Eliberis has such another canon concerning deacons, that suffered themselves to be ordained, when they knew themselves guilty of some mortal sin, that if it had been detected before-hand, would have hindered their

¹ Con. Agrippin. in Sententia Valentini. ap. Crab. tom. i. p. 317. *Consentio Euphratam episcopum esse non posse, qui nec laicam debet communionem accipere.*

² Con. Sardic. can. i. *Μηδὲ λαϊκῶν ἔχειν τὸς τοιαύτας χρῆναι κοινωνίαν.*

³ Ibid. can. ii. *Τοιοῦτον μηδὲ ἐν τῷ τέλει λαϊκῆς γὰρ ἀξιῶσθαι κοινωνίας.*

ordination:¹ “ If such an one confesses his fault voluntarily, then after three years’ penance he might be admitted to communion; but, if he was detected by another, then he should do five years’ penance, and after that only be received to lay-communion at the last.” And in another canon they decree,² “ that if either bishop, presbyter, or deacon was found guilty of fornication, committed after his ordination, such an one for the scandal and heinousness of his crime, should not be admitted to communion, no, not at his last hour.” There are a great many other canons in this Council, which deny communion to the very last, to all such criminals in general, as are there specified in them: and though the clergy be not particularly named, yet doubtless they were included in the number, when such crimes as lapsing into idolatry are ordered to be punished with perpetual excommunication, without readmission at their last hour.³ For we cannot suppose these canons were more favourable to the clergy than to others, since we have found this Council inflicting the same penalty upon them upon other occasions.

SECT. 8.—The Council of Rome, under Felix III. Anno 487.

I will conclude these collections with the testimony of a Roman Council, held under Felix III. Anno 487. Here the case of several bishops, presbyters, and deacons, came to be considered, who had submitted themselves to be rebaptised by the Arians, in Africa, during the time of the Vandalic persecution: and the determination that was made upon it was this;⁴ that for so doing “ they should be subjected to a per-

¹ Con. Eliber. can. lxxvi. Si quis diaconum se permiserit ordinari, et postea fuerit in crimine detectus mortis, quod aliquando commiserit; si sponte fuerit confessus, placuit eum, actâ legitimâ pœnitentiâ, post triennium accipere communionem. Quod si alius detexerit, post quinquennium actâ pœnitentiâ, accipere communionem laicam debere.

² Ibid. can. xviii. Episcopi, presbyteri, diaconi, si in ministerio positi, detecti fuerint quod sint mæchati, placuit, ut propter scandalum et propter nefandum crimen, nec in fine communionem accipere debere.

³ Ibid. can. ii. Flamines, qui post fidem lavaeri et regenerationis sacrificaverint—placuit eos nec in fine accipere communionem. Vid. Can. i. iii. &c.

⁴ Con. Rom. iii. sub Felice II. al. III, Can. ii. Con. tom. iv. p. 1076. Usque ad exitûs sui diem, in pœnitentiâ, (si respiscunt,) jacere conveniet: nec

petual penance all their lives, and not be allowed to be present, either at the prayers of the faithful, or the prayers of the catechumens, but only be restored to lay-communion at the hour of death."

Now then, if such bishops, presbyters, and deacons, were denied the communion of laymen, and only allowed it at the point of death, and sometimes not that neither; it is plain, they could not be true authorised priests, because they were sunk one degree below laymen in the Church: unless any one will say, that a man may be an authorised priest of the Church, who is not so much as an authorised layman of it. Yet the Church never made any order for rebaptising such as were baptised by these men, but received them as she did others, only by imposition of hands and confirmation. Which is a certain argument to prove, that she did not repeat the baptism of laymen, since she received not only the baptism of those whom she herself made laymen, but of those also whom she thrust one degree below laymen, by subjecting them to excommunications and anathemas and denying them the benefit and privilege of lay-communion in the Church.

orationi non modò fidelium, sed ne catechumenorum omnimodis interesse, quibus communicatio laica tantùm in morte reddenda est.

CHAP. VI.

The Objection taken from the Notion of an Indelible Character imprinted in the Ordination of a Priest examined, and shewed to be of no force against the former Allegations. With an Account of the first Original and Meaning of that Term in the Writings of the Church.

SECT. 1.—What meant by an *Indelible Character* imprinted in Baptism.

THERE IS but one objection against all that has been said in the foregoing discourse, which has occasionally been answered already: but because, to some, it seems to carry more weight than it really does, because of the ambiguity of the terms, I will here give it a distinct consideration. The objection is this; that there is *an indelible character* imprinted on a man when he is ordained a priest, which no heresy, or schism, or degradation, or excommunication can obliterate: therefore, though they may suspend him from the exercise, yet they cannot take away from him the power and authority of the priesthood. The antecedent of this argument is, in some measure, true, if rightly explained and understood: but the inference or consequence drawn from it, is altogether false: and, unless it be false, the Catholic Church has been always under a great mistake, to pretend to take away the power and authority of priests from them. Nay, the power of God and Christ himself could not do it, if this notion holds true; for the Church always pretended to act by the authority of God and Christ, that is, by the power of the keys committed to her, in taking away the ministerial authority from such priests as deserved her censures. So that if the Church could not do it, God and Christ could not do it; or else the Church was to blame, to assume a power which did not belong to her. But the truth of the matter is, that the *indelible character* of a priest's ordination, implied no such thing in the opinion of the Ancients, as this objection supposes. For they never imagined, that a priest, by virtue of any such character, could preserve his ministerial

authority, in spite of all the censures of the Church inflicted on him; that he was a priest when they made and called him no priest, and reduced him to the order and quality of a layman; that he was a priest when they excommunicated and anathematised him, and cast him, not only out of clerical communion, but all church-communion, and sometimes would not allow him so much as the communion of a layman, at the point of death. There must be a strange virtue in indelible character indeed, if it could preserve sacerdotal authority in a priest, after so many attempts of the Church to deprive him of it. It is therefore worth inquiring, whether there be not some mistake in this matter? and whether the wrong notion some have entertained of the nature of an indelible character do not lead them into errors about it? Now, the best way to come by the true notion and import of this term, is to examine, first, what it was taken to signify in baptism. For an indelible character was always supposed to be imprinted as much in baptism as in ordination; though I do not remember that any ancient Council expressly used that term about either, but only said something that may be reckoned equivalent to it: and that is this, as it relates to baptism; that a man, who is once truly baptised, can never do any thing that will so far erase or cancel his baptism, as that he shall need, upon any occasion, to be rebaptised with a second baptism. Thus far the Ancients believed an indelible character in baptism. Though a man turn his back on Christianity, and totally apostatise and fall away from the profession of it; though he turn heretic or schismatic; though he excommunicate himself, or be excommunicated by the Church; though he embrace Paganism or Judaism, or any other opposite religion; though he curse and blaspheme Christ in a synagogue or in a temple, as many of the old apostates did; though he become a Julian, or an Ecebolius, and, ‘trample under foot the Son of God, and count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and do despite to the Spirit of Grace;’ yet, after all, if this man turn again to Christianity he was not to be received by a second baptism: his repentance and the Church’s absolution was sufficient in that case to reinstate him in his ancient profession, and he was not to be rebaptised to be made

again a Christian. The Church had but one baptism for the remission of sins, and the virtue of that was so far indelible, that it would always qualify the man that had received it, to be admitted to communion again after the greatest apostacy, only by a true repentance and reconciliatory imposition of hands, without rebaptising. This was what the Ancients understood by what we now call the indelible character of baptism. But they were far from thinking that a man, who was such an apostate had any right or authority, whilst he was an apostate, to challenge any of the common privileges of a Christian: they did not think, whilst he was a Pagan or a Jew, that he was properly a member of the Christian Church still, because of his baptism; or that he had any right to be called Christian, or to be admitted to the prayers of the Church, and much less to the communion with other faithful laymen: and yet, after all, there was so much of a Christian in him, by virtue of his baptism, that he needed not to be baptised again as a mere Jew or Pagan. His baptism was such as nothing could obliterate; it would remain with him when he was an apostate, and either go to Hell with him to his condemnation, or bring him back to Heaven and the Church by the way of repentance, not rebaptisation. Now, if any one should ask, whether such an apostate, while he continued an apostate, was a Christian? the answer must be in the negative, or, at least, with the qualification of a common school-distinction of, *simpliciter et secundum quid*. For, *simply and absolutely* speaking, it would be incongruous and against propriety of speech to call an apostate, Jew, or Heathen, or Turk, a Christian: for words and names, when they have no limitation to any more particular meaning, are to be taken, *in sensu famosiori, according to the common sense*, in which they are usually understood. Now by a Christian, properly speaking, we usually mean a man in perfect and full communion with the Christian Church. Therefore an apostate from Christianity is never absolutely and simply called a Christian, but an apostate, whether it be Jew, or Pagan, or Mahometan, or under any other denomination. But yet there is something of a Christian in this apostate, that is, his baptism; in respect of which he is not so perfectly a

no-christian, as one that never was baptised: and if in this respect only, in such a qualified sense, any one will give him the title of an apostate Christian, which is, as the Schools speak, only a Christian *secundum quid*, in respect of the baptism which he once received in the Christian Church, and which will for ever continue with him; I cannot think it worth while to contend about words or names, when men are otherwise agreed about the import and signification of them. Let him be a Christian in this sense, yet he has no right or authority, till he repents and is reconciled, to join in communion with true Christian laymen, notwithstanding the indelible character of his baptism. And they who would fain make something more of this character, either understand not what it means, or what has been the true discipline of the Christian Church in reference to the reiteration of baptism.

SECT. 2.—That the *Indelible Character* of Ordination is of the same Nature.

Having seen the whole mystery that is contained under this hard word, *indelible Character*, in baptism: let us now examine, whether it be not much after the same manner in *the indelible character* of ordination. A priest, when he is ordained, receives such a consecration to a ministerial office by imposition of hands, as needs not upon any occasion to be a second time repeated, to establish him in the execution of such an office. There is the indelible character of it, the very same as in baptism; a man needs no more to be reordained, than to be rebaptised. But what, if a priest should turn idolater or apostate, and offer sacrifice at the heathen altars, instead of the altar of God? Would he preserve the authority of a true Christian priest, or the name and office of a priest, whilst he was actually engaged in such diabolical prevarication? Would the virtue of indelible character have been thought to extend so far as this, by the ancient Councils of the Church? They who say so, and would persuade the world to believe so, must first reconcile contradictions, and shew how a man can have the authority of a priest, when his own apostacy, and God and the Church, by their censures, have taken

his authority from him. Let them produce as good proofs for that, from ancient Councils, as I have produced to the contrary, and then, perhaps, the notion of an indelible character may seem to have more weight in it than I have represented. But, till that be done, I believe the world will hardly be persuaded, that an apostate priest retains the right and authority of a true Christian priest, any more than an apostate layman retains the right and authority of a true Christian layman. A priest, indeed, may be admitted, if the Church thinks fit, to clerical communion again, without a new ordination, as a layman may be admitted to lay communion, without a new baptism: but that is all that an indelible character can signify in either. It does not give authority to an apostate priest, to act as a priest of God, whilst he continues an apostate, and is deprived by God and the Church of all authority of the priesthood. If the Church in some great exigency, receives such an one to his office again, which she never did but upon some very extraordinary occasion, in that case there was no need of a new ordination, but only to relax her censures, and give him that authority again, which his crimes and her censures had taken from him. And this was parallel to the case of baptism: there was no need to baptise a man a second time, in order to admit an apostate to the communion of laymen; in like manner, there was no need to ordain a man a second time, in order to admit him to clerical communion. The way of admission was the same in both; it was done by repentance and absolution, without rebaptising the one, or reordaining the other. So that the notion of an indelible character could signify no more in the one case, than it did in the other. Therefore, as an apostate layman had not the right and authority of a lay-christian, whilst he continued an impenitent apostate, notwithstanding any force of the indelible character of his baptism; but might be admitted to the privilege of lay-communion again without rebaptising, when the Church thought fit to loose him from his bonds, and reconcile him by the power of the keys committed to her: so, in like manner, an apostate priest had not the right and authority of a Christian priest, whilst he continued an

apostate notwithstanding any force of the indelible character of his ordination; but only was in a capacity to officiate again without reordaining, if the Church should find it necessary to employ such an one again, by restoring him to the authority which by her censures she had taken from him. And unless this be allowed, we make plain nonsense of all the ancient Councils, and charge them moreover with tyranny and usurpation, in pretending God's authority to take away the name, and office, and authority of the priesthood from delinquent clerks, when no such power or authority was committed to them. And there is an end too of all the discipline of the Church, as to what concerns the censure of her delinquent clergy: she may curb and correct her laity, and deprive them of all right and title to the communion of Christian layman; but all her censures are but a *brutum fulmen* against the clergy. For, if after she has degraded a priest, and said, he neither is, nor shall be a priest; shall neither have the name, nor office, nor dignity, nor the authority of a priest, but only act and communicate as a private layman: if after she has also excommunicated a contumacious priest, and by casting him out of the Church reduced him to a state one degree below a layman;—notwithstanding all this, that priest can pretend, that by virtue of his indelible character, he is as true an authorised priest, after all the thunderings of the Church against him, as he was before: what then becomes of all the power and discipline of the Church, and all her authority to censure and silence offending and apostate priests? A censure, it seems, may affect the conscience of a priest, but not his authority: that will remain entire to him by virtue of his indelible character, let the Church use what authority she will to deprive or degrade him. I wish the defenders of this unlimited power would not undermine the authority of the Church, whilst they are so seemingly zealous to defend the authority of the priesthood. I desire them to read over all the Canons of the ancient Councils, as I have done upon this occasion, and then see whether they can find any one single Canon, that places any such virtue in an indelible character as is here pretended.

SECT. 3.—The Name of *Indelible Character* not to be found in any ancient Council.

Indeed the name of *indelible character* never so much as occurs once expressly in any act or canon of an ancient Council. And they who have been most inquisitive after its synodical establishment, are at a loss to find it any where else but in the Council of Florence or the Council of Trent : which is an argument that the ancient Councils knew nothing of it. But if they did not own the name, they might, however, own the thing in other terms. Yes, in a qualified sense, as I have explained it. They owned, that a man who was once truly baptised, whether in the Church or out of the Church, whether by a true authorised catholic priest, or by an heretical apostate, could never want a second baptism to reconcile him to the Church after any transgression. And they likewise owned, that a man, who was once truly ordained a priest, could never want a second ordination to qualify him to officiate as a minister in the Church, if the Church thought fit to receive him into office again, and give him her authority and commission to act, after any great apostacy or censure. But they never said, that when they had bound an apostate under all the bonds of anathema and excommunication, and divested him of all clerical power and authority, that still he had the authority of a priest, when they had taken it from him. Such a notion of indelible character, I will venture to affirm, is not to be met with in any ancient Council.

SECT. 4.—In what Sense St. Austin owns and allows it in Heretical Priests.

The Fathers indeed very often call baptism by the name of *Σφραγις* and *Σημεῖον*, which we may translate indifferently *a seal*, or *a sign*, or *a mark*, or *a character*. And in St. Austin the term *Character Dominicus*, and *Character Regius*, the *Lord's character*, and the *royal character*, is frequently used when he speaks of baptism. But then, by this they mean baptism itself only, and not any distinct character, or quality, or spiritual sign upon the soul, and

that distinct from sanctifying grace too, as the modern Schoolmen love to word it: for it was only another name for baptism, which was the mark or character by which complete Christians, who devoted themselves to Christ, were distinguished from Jews and Pagans, who had no such character upon them. And therefore, so far as baptism was indelible, so far this character was indelible, but no further. St. Austin used the same term about ordination, and he makes the indelibility, both of baptism and ordination, as I conceive, to consist in this, that a man once truly baptised or ordained, though he turn apostate, never needs a second baptism or a second ordination. "It is manifest," says he,¹ "that baptism remains inseparably in the baptised person; because whatever depth of iniquity, whatever horrible gulph of sin he falls into, though it be into the ruin of apostacy, he never wants baptism; and therefore whenever he returns by repentance, his baptism is not repeated, because he is judged not to want it." This he often repeats in his books against the Donatists;² and observes further,³ that Cyprian himself, and all that followed him, were of the same opinion: which appears from several of Cyprian's Epistles,⁴ and the Council of Carthage held under him; for though they rebaptised such as were baptised by heretics and schismatics, yet they never rebaptised any that had been baptised in the Church, though they lapsed, or apostatised, or fell from the Church into any heresy or schism; because they supposed, with St. Austin that no crime could so far obliterate or extinguish baptism, as to make an apostate need a second baptism. And as an apostate layman could not need a second baptism to make him a complete lay-christian, but only repentance and ab-

¹ Aug. de Bapt. lib. v. c. 15. In baptizato baptismata inseparabiliter permanere manifestum est, quia in quodlibet profundum malorum, et in quamlibet horribilem voraginem peccatorum irruat baptizatus usque ad apostaticam ruinam, non caret baptismo; et ideò per pœnitentiam redeunti non redditur, quia eo non potuisse carere judicatur.

² Aug. de Bapt. lib. i. cap. 1. It. lib. vi. c. 15. Cont. Crescon. lib. ii. c. 16. Cont. Liter. lib. ii. c. vii. et. xlviii.

³ Aug. de Bapt. lib. iii. c. 11.

⁴ Cypr. Ep. lxxi. ad Quintum, p. 191. Ep. lxxiv. ad Pompeium, p. 216. Con. Carthag. ap. Cypr. n. 8. and 22.

solution, to reinstate him in full communion with the Church; so an apostate clergyman, though he was reduced to lay-communion, or fallen below it, could not need a new ordination, but only the Church's commission and authority to release him of his bonds, and invest him with clerical power again; which she did by absolution, or the power of the keys, and not a new ordination. Thus far therefore St. Austin¹, and all the Ancients, allow both baptism and ordination to be given inseparably to those to whom they are given: they are indelible so far as that neither of them need to be repeated upon apostates: but that apostates, whilst they remain apostates, are still true authorised priests, is a doctrine not to be met with in any ancient Council of the Church, nor private writer.

SECT. 5.—What the Papists mean by their *Indelible Character*.

But it may be said that modern writers take *indelible character* in another sense, and extend it so far as to preserve the authority of a priest in him, even after the Church has degraded or excommunicated him by her lawful censures. But who are these modern writers? Either those of the Popish or Protestant communion. For the Popish writers, I own, they make quite another thing of the indelible character, from what the Ancients did, though they can scarce tell an intelligent reader what they mean by it. Some call it a spiritual relation, others a spiritual quality imprinted on the soul, as an effect of baptism, distinct both from the external sacrament, and the internal sanctifying grace of it: which is a sort of abstruse language the Ancients were not acquainted with. But whatever the nature of it be, they are thus far agreed with the Ancients, that the indelibility of it consists in this, that a baptism once truly given, needs not upon any occasion to be repeated. As to the character of a priest given him in his ordination, they seem still to recede further from the doctrine of the Ancients. For it does not suffice them to say, it is such an indelible character as may

¹ Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. c. 13. See this cited at large in the First Part of the Scholast. Hist. sect. 22.

qualify a degraded priest to officiate again without a new ordination, if the Church think fit to recall him to his station ; but they will have it to be a perpetual spiritual power or authority impressed upon the soul of a priest, which no removal from his office can take from him : for so Bellarmin¹, the great oracle of the Romish Church, in express terms, delivers it as the Catholic opinion. Which is as contrary to the common sentiments of the ancient Church, as the doctrine of the Council of Trent is contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the first six general Councils, which take away all power and authority from degraded clerks, till the Church thinks fit to restore them to their authority again by a relaxation of her censures. There is a plain opposition and contrariety in the style and language of the ancient Church to this modern new doctrine. “ We deprive a wicked priest of the power and authority of his priesthood,” say the ancient Councils. “ No,” says Bellarmin, “ that ye cannot do ; ye may remove him from his office, but ye cannot take away his spiritual power ; that remains imprinted on his soul by an indelible character.” “ We make him no priest,” say the ancient Councils : “ We leave him not so much as the name of a priest ; we reduce him from the order of priests to the order of laymen.” “ Hold there,” says Bellarmin, “ none but modern heretics do this ; it is not in the power of the Church to make a man, who is one day a priest, the next day become a layman.” Is not this to make heretics of all the ancient Church, and to talk in a style that they were utter strangers to ? Unless any one will soften Bellarmin’s words and say, he means no more by his perpetual spiritual power and character of a priest, than that the Church may recall him to his office again, if she pleases, without giving him a new ordination.

¹ Bellarm. de Sacramento Ordinis. lib. i. cap. x. tom. ii. p. 970. *Convenit inter catholicos, duplicem esse effectum hujus sacramenti, primo potestatem spiritualem perpetuam, in cujus signum imprimitur character, &c.*

SECT. 6.—How far an *Indelible Character* is allowed by Protestant Writers.

But, in the gross sense of the words, it is not more contrary to the doctrine and practice of the ancient Church, than it is to the general stream and current of Protestant writers. Bellarmin himself owns this: for he says,¹ “all the heretics of these times,” (by whom he means all the Protestants, from the days of Wickliffe to his own time,) “deny this character,” (as he describes it.) “For they will have the ecclesiastical ministry to be only a simple office, which may be given and taken away again; so that a man may be to-morrow a layman, who to-day is a minister and a pastor.” This was then the general sense of the Protestants about this new Roman character, if Bellarmin does not misrepresent them. And that he did not much wrong them, appears from the opposition which they presently made to the Council of Trent, as soon as she had framed her Canon about this indelible character, with an anathema, as if it had been the greatest point of faith, against those that did not believe it. Calvin wrote his *Antidote*, and Kemnitius his *Examen of the Council of Trent*, and they both reject and refute it as a modern fiction. Calvin says,² “It was a fable first invented in the schools of the ignorant monks, and that the Ancients were altogether strangers to it: and that it had more of the nature of a magical enchantment, than of the sound doctrine of the Gospel in it. And therefore it might be rejected with the same facility that it was invented.” Chamier confirms his notion of the novelty of it at large, not only from the Fathers, but from the Schoolmen themselves,³

¹ Bellarm. de Sacramento Ordinis. lib. i. cap. x. tom. ii. Hæretici hujus temporis characterem præcipuè negant. Volunt enim ministerium ecclesiasticum esse simplex officium, quod possit dari et auferri; proinde cras fieri laicos, qui sunt hodiè ministri vel pastores.

² Calvin. Antidot. Con. Trident. Sess. vii. can. 9. Quod de characterè indelibili fabulantur, ex eâdem prodiit officinâ: Nam veteribus hoc totum ignotum fuit: et magis consentaneum est incantationibus magicis quàm sanæ Evangelii doctrinæ. Eâdem ergo facilitate repudiabitur, quâ excogitatum fuit.

³ Chamier. Panstrat. tom. iv. de Sacramentis lib. ii. cap. xii. n. 4.

from Durandus, and Scotus, and Gabriel Biel, and De Rubione, and Cajetan, who all confess, that there are no footsteps of it to be found, either in Scripture or antiquity, but that it is wholly owing to the authority of the Church, and that not very ancient neither. For it is observable, that Peter Lombard knew nothing of it: he never mentions any other character but *the character* of Christ in baptism,¹ by which he means only the external form of baptising, ‘In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,’ which form or character is owned to be ancient enough, but is far from being that internal quality which is pretended to be imprinted on the soul. He that would see more of the Protestant allegations and oppositions against this novelty, may consult Kemnitius,² and Rivet,³ and Vorstius,⁴ and Gerhard,⁵ and Alting,⁶ and Perkins,⁷ and Amesius,⁸ and such others as have written particular dissertations against it. I shall only trouble the reader with one of them, the famous Turretin, who was a man of great judgment and learning in this last age. His account of the matter, as it is summed up by his contractor Riissenius,⁹ is this: “That the three sacraments, of baptism, confirmation, and orders, according to the Popish doctrine, imprint a spiritual and indelible character in the soul; which is given as the reason why they cannot be reiterated or repeated. But we reject this device as a

¹ Lombard. lib. iv. distinct. vi. p. 303. Ex his apertè colligitur, quod qui etiam ab hærelis baptizati sunt, servato characterè Christi, rebaptizandi non sunt, &c. ² Kemnit. Exam. Concil. Trid. part. ii. ad canon. ix. sess. 7. p. 25.

³ Rivet. Cathol. Orthodox. tract. iil. quæst. 6.

⁴ Vorstius. Antibellarmin. p. 361.

⁵ Gerhard. Loci Commun. tom. iv. de Sacramentis. n. 95. p. 184.

⁶ Alting. Theolog. Elenctica, loc. xiv. p. 594.

⁷ Perkins. Demonstratio Problematis, p. 130.

⁸ Ames. Bellarmin. Enervat. tom. iii. cap. v. p. 47.

⁹ Riissenius, Compend. Theologiæ Turretin. loc. xvii. p. 242. Pontificii docent characterem esse signum spirituale et indelebile impressum, sive in animæ substantiâ, sive in ejus potentiis, vi et efficacîâ trium sacramentorum, baptismi, confirmationis, et ordinis; et hanc volunt esse causam, propter quam hæc tria sacramenta non sunt iteranda, quod nempe imprimant characterem indelebilem.—Nos tale commentum rejicimus, et dicimus, fideles duplex habere sigillum; internum unum, nimirum Spiritum Sanctum, quo ob-signantur in diem redemptionis; alterum externum, nimirum baptismum, quo distinguimur à Turcis, Judæis, et aliis infidelibus; sed nullum alium characterem agnoscimus.

fiction, and we say, the faithful indeed, have a double seal or character; the one internal, which is the oblation of the Holy Spirit, whereby they are sealed to the day of redemption; the other external, which is baptism, by which we are distinguished from Turks, Jews, and other infidels; but beside these we acknowledge no other character." Nothing now, I think, can be plainer than this, that the indelible character, so much contended for by the Romanists, is a mere fiction, and contrary both to the sense of the Protestants, and the doctrine of the primitive Church; which both allow an indelible character, as that signifies the outward form of baptism or form of ordination, that needs not be repeated; but utterly deny any other character imprinting a spiritual power on the soul of a priest, whereby he is authorised to perform sacerdotal offices perpetually, notwithstanding any deposition or excommunication. The Protestants are so far from allowing this, that some of them think an ordination may, without sacrilege, be repeated; so Calvin, Kemmitius, Alting, Baldwin. And, it is observable, that at Geneva, they repeat the ceremony of ordination upon the removal of a minister from one Church to another, as I have had occasion to shew formerly in a discourse of another nature.¹ And they, who do not think this either necessary or convenient, or that even an apostate or heretical priest should be restored to his office by a new ordination, do not yet maintain that a man is an authorised priest, after he is totally degraded from his office by the authority of the Church; but that the Church has power to take away all sacerdotal authority from such a delinquent priest, if she sees it necessary, and reduce him to the state of a layman; and that this was actually the discipline and practice of the primitive Church in many cases; as I have represented it, I hope, to the satisfaction of all ingenuous readers, and the conviction of some of my erring brethren, who perhaps would more edify the Church, if they would bear a part with me in carefully studying and explaining the ancient discipline of the Church, instead of entangling themselves

¹ See French Church's Apology for the Church of England, in the Conclusion.

and others with the perplexed and intricate, and sometimes dangerous, notions of the Schoolmen. Chamier, I am sure, makes no scruple to affirm, that, by the discipline of the ancient Church, a criminal priest might be degraded from his order, and be made a layman. For explaining the ancient notion of reducing clerks to lay-communion, which Bellarmin and some others ignorantly understand of communion only in one kind, according to the modern phrase, he says,¹ “ it was so denominated neither from the place, nor from the species, nor from the time, but from the person that received it, because he that before was a clerk and in the nomenclature of clerks, was now a layman and in the order of laymen.” Upon the whole matter then, we now see clearly, that according to the ancient Church, and in the opinion of Protestants, a criminal clerk might be degraded from his order, and be made a layman, notwithstanding the Popish pretence of an indelible character imprinting a spiritual power on his soul; which the ancient Church knew nothing of, and the Protestant schools reject and refute as a novel invention. The consequence of all which is, that a clerk, so degraded, is no longer an authorised priest, or public minister of the Catholic Church, but a private man in the order of laymen: and all heretics and schismatics, that are formally degraded by the Church, are in this predicament, that is, in the order and quality of laymen; only with this difference, that if the Church, in any great exigency, thought fit to recall them to their former station, she did not think it necessary to give them a new ordination; but only a new commission or authority, which they wanted before. And yet she never rebaptised such as were in due form baptised by these men, in their unauthorised state. From whence it plainly follows, that she received the baptism of unauthorised laymen, because she received the baptism of those whom she herself made laymen, by taking all clerical authority from them. Which was the

¹ Chamier. Panstrat. tom. iv. de Eucharist. lib. ix. cap. iii. n. 33. p. 487. Appellatam fuisse laicam communionem, non à loco, non à speciebus, non à tempore, sed à personâ: nimirum quòd qui antè fuerit clericus, sive in clericorum nomenclaturâ, nunc sit laicus, et in ordine laicorum.

thing I designed to shew. And how solidly and fairly, without any artifice or sophistry, but the plain dint of historical truth, I have proved this beyond exception, I now leave to the judgment of every impartial reader; only repeating the argument once more in form for memory's sake.

The baptism of deposed heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, and excommunicated clerks, is the baptism of unauthorised persons, either made laymen, or set one degree below laymen, according to the general sense of the Catholic Church.

But the baptism of such deposed heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clerks, and excommunicated clerks, if ministered in due form, was always received by the Catholic Church without rebaptising.

Therefore the baptism of unauthorised persons, laymen, or one degree below laymen, if ministered in due form, was always received by the Catholic Church without rebaptising.

The first proposition in this argument has been fully made out in this discourse; and the second proposition, in the former part of this history, even to the satisfaction and content of the adversaries themselves, who have nothing to object against it. And if both the premises stand good, it will be impossible to shake the conclusion.

SECT. 7.—What Submission is due to the Judgment of the Catholic Church, in such Points of Discipline as Rebaptising and Reordaining.

All I shall add further in this chapter, is only a reasonable and useful reflection on what has hitherto been said, in relation to the opinion and judgment of the Catholic Church, upon this subject, viz. that a great deference is due to her wisdom and authority in all such controverted points of discipline, as those of rebaptisation and reordination of heretics and schismatics and other unauthorised laymen, both because they are matters of discipline, and because they seem not to be so fully and expressly determined in Scripture. The Council of Nice ordered the Meletians to be reordained, but the Novatians and Donatists were received without it: and yet the ordinations of the Meletians were as

good as the Donatists, and something more canonical than the Novatians: but it became every private man to comply with these different determinations, and not break or disturb the peace and communion of the Church upon either account, but to submit to her authority and wisdom in both, as presuming she had good reasons and authority in both cases to order matters as she judged most conducing to the common interest of the public. So if she had determined, that all persons baptised by heretics, or schismatics, or other unauthorised laymen, should have been rebaptised, I think every wise and good man ought to have complied with this rule of discipline, rather than break communion upon it: but since she has at all times determined the contrary, I judge it no small crime, at this time of day, for any private man to oppose his own sentiments to the common sense and practice of the universal Church, which can have no other effect but to raise a flame, and disturb her peace, and fill men's heads with endless scruples about their baptism. If it were not for the apprehension of such mischiefs, I would never have given myself the trouble to have made such a laborious search into the ancient discipline and practice of the Church upon this head: and I think it now high time to put an end to such a dispute, after all things have been so fully discussed and set in so fair a light, that have any relation to it. And therefore I intend to take my leave of this subject, if the adverse party will suffer me to go on quietly with a more necessary work, in which I have already made some progress, and I hope not without general benefit and satisfaction to the Church, as soon as I have resolved a few difficulties, concerning the ordinations, baptisms, and communion of heretics, which may perhaps fall in the way of an intelligent reader.

CHAP. VII.

A Resolution of some Difficulties concerning the Communion of Heretics and their Baptisms and Ordinations.

SECT. I.—Whether it be lawful to hold Communion with Heretical Priests before they be degraded.

The first difficulty may arise concerning holding communion with heretical priests. For if, according to the doctrine of the Ancients, they be not true authorised priests, but only laymen, or a degree below laymen; then it seems unlawful to hold communion with them in any ministerial acts whatsoever. And yet in two cases there seems almost a necessity to do it. 1. When they are not yet fully discovered or censured by the Church. 2. When a whole Church is turned heretical, and there are no other but such priests to hold communion with. The first of these cases has no great difficulty in it: for the Ancients allow, that till heretics be fully manifested, convicted, and censured by the Church, men may innocently communicate with them. The case often happens to be, as it was in the strugglings of the Arian heresy; heretics pretend to be Catholics, and shelter themselves under Catholic terms, and profess their faith in the same creeds and form of words as Catholics do, at the same time that they put an equivocal and heretical sense upon them. This was the subtle artifice of the politic Arians, called Eusebians, from their ringleader Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, all the time of Constantine, and of some of them in the time of Constantius. They durst not oppose the council of Nice formally and directly, and therefore they used her creed, and spake and taught as other Catholics did, in the form of sound words, and contented themselves to put their own private heretical sense upon them. Nay, many of them, when they had got the word, consubstantial, thrown out of the creed in the time of Constantius, under pretence of peace, durst not yet, in plain terms, pro-

pose the Arian blasphemies to the people, but spake in Scripture terms, and words seemingly expressing the Catholic faith, which the people understood only in the true genuine Catholic sense, whilst they had their own fallacious and insidious meaning to put upon them. Now though these men were heretics before God, yet they were not so in the eye of the people, who honestly took them to mean as they spake, without any fraudulent sense or equivocation. And so long the people were thought excusable in holding communion with them, because they did not communicate with them in their errors, but intentionally only in the Catholic faith. But when the heretics were once plainly detected and convicted, then it was no longer lawful for the people to join with them, but to fly from them as wolves in sheep's clothing, and avoid them as ministers of Antichrist, and angels of Satan, who, by a diabolical subtilty and malice, only transformed themselves into angels of light. This is the resolution which St. Hilary gives of this difficulty, with a particular respect to the case of Auxentius, the Arian bishop of Milan, and Ursatius, and Valens, who pretended to speak orthodoxly, and professed their faith in such terms, as seemed to carry in them nothing but the ancient Catholic doctrine; but they had an insidious meaning, which the innocent people could not always discover: "They ascribed to Christ," says Hilary,¹ "the name of God, because this was also given to men. They confessed him to be truly the Son of God, but only as every one else is made truly the son of God, by the sacrament of baptism. They allowed him to be before time and ages, because this

¹ Hilar. cont. Auxentium, p. 102. Tribuunt Christo Dei nomen, quia hoc et hominibus sit tributum. Fatentur Dei verè Filium, quia sacramento baptismi verè Dei filius unusquisque perficitur. Antetempora et sæcula confitentur, quod de angelis et diabolo est non negatum. Ita Domino Christo sola illa tribuuntur, quæ sunt vel Angelorum propria vel nostra. Cæterum quod Deo Christo legitimum et verum est, Christus Deus verus, id est, eadem esse Filii quæ Patris divinitas, denegatur. Et hujus quidem usque adhuc impietatis occasio per fraudem perficitur. Ut jam sub anticristi sacerdotibus Christi populus non occidat, dum hoc putant illi fidei esse, quod vocis est. Audiunt Deum Christum, putant esse quod dicitur. Audiunt Filium Dei, putant in Dei nativitate inesse Filii veritatem. Audiunt antetempora, putant id ipsum antetempora esse quod semper est. Sanctiores sunt aures plebis quam corda sacerdotum.

may be said of angels and the Devil. So in reality they ascribed nothing more to Christ the Lord, than what was proper to men or angels. His peculiar property they denied; that he was Christ the true God, that is, of the same Divinity with the Father. But all this impiety was for a long time coloured over, and carried on by fraud and artifice. And so it happened that the people of Christ were not mortally hurt under the priests of Antichrist, whilst they thought their faith and meaning had been agreeable to their words. They heard Christ called God, and they supposed him to be truly so. They heard him called the Son of God, and they thought the verity of a son was implied in the nativity of God. They heard him said to be before all time, and they thought that being before all time was the same thing as being eternal. So the people's ears were much more pious than the hearts of the priests." Thus far therefore they communicated with the heretics, supposing them to be orthodox and sincere according to their outward expressions. But when once it was made appear to them, that they were heretics indeed, then Hilary tells them,¹ "they ought no longer to communicate with them as ministers of Christ, but to avoid them as antichrists, as angels of Satan, as enemies of Christ, as devils, though by the Emperor's favour, they were in possession of the churches. They should not be so much in love with walls and buildings, as to think the true Church of God was confined to them, and for their sakes have peace with the Arians. For Antichrist himself was to sit within the walls of the Church. So that moun-

² Hilari. cont. Auxentium, in fine. Unum moneo cavere antichristum. Malè enim vos parietum amor cepit, malè Ecclesiam Dei in tectis ædificiisque venerimini, malè sub his pacis nomen ingeritis. Anne ambiguum est antichristum in his esse sessurum? Montes mihi, et sylvæ, et lacus, et carceres, et voragines sunt tutiores: in his enim prophetæ, aut manentes, aut demersi Dei Spiritu prophetabant. Absistite itaque ab Auxentio, Satanæ angelo, hoste Christi, vastatore perditio, fidei negatore, quam sic est regi professus, ut falleret: sic fefellit, ut blasphemaret. Congreget nunc ille quas volet in me synodos et hæreticum me, ut sæpe jam fecit, publico titulo proscribat, et quam volet iram potentium molliatur: mihi certè ille nunquam aliud quàm diabolus erit, quia Arianus est. Neque pax aliquorum unquam optabitur, nisi eorum qui secundùm patrum nostrorum apud Nicæam tractatum, anathematizatis Arianis Christum Deum verum prædicabunt.

tains, and woods, and lakes, and prisons, where the prophets of God were cast, were safer places than the buildings of the Church in such a condition. Therefore depart," says he, "from Auxentius, that angel of Satan, that enemy of Christ, that wicked destroyer, that denier of the faith, which he made profession of before the Emperor, in such a manner as to deceive him, and so deceived him as to blaspheme Christ. Let him gather as many synods as he pleases against me; let him proscribe me as an heretic by public titles, as he has often done already; let him stir up the anger of great men as much as he will against me; yet he shall never be any better, in my opinion, than a devil, because he is an Arian. Nor will I ever desire to be at peace with any but those, who, according to the rule of the Nicene Fathers, anathematise the Arians, and preach Christ to be the true God." By this one instance, to which I could add many more, it is easy to judge, how far it was deemed innocent to hold communion with undetected heretics, and where the bounds of that communion end, viz. when heretics openly declare themselves, and are convicted of their errors against the Catholic faith, then they were no longer to be communicated with as priests of God, but to be avoided as the priests of Antichrist, as angels of Satan, as destroyers of the faith, with whom no peace could safely be maintained, though they were in possession of the Churches.

SECT 2.—Whether it be lawful to communicate with Heretics, when a whole Church is heretical.

But what if the whole Church should turn heretics, would it be lawful in that case to communicate with them? I answer, if by the whole Church, be understood the whole Catholic Church, the supposition is not to be allowed. For the whole Catholic Church never was totally involved in any damnable heresy. In the greatest prevalency of the Arian faction the whole Church was far from being overspread with that error, as a learned person¹ has undeniably demonstrated against those that suppose it. And it is but a vulgar

¹ Bull. Defens. Fid. Nicææ. in Epilogo.

error, to say, that the Council of Ariminum was a council of Arian bishops, or that the whole world upon that turned Arian. For though St. Jerom's testimony be commonly alleged for that, yet I have had occasion heretofore¹ to show the contrary from St. Jerom himself, who vindicates the bishops of Ariminum, as Catholic bishops, but only insidiously imposed upon by Ursatius and Valens, the same that St. Hilary complains of, who pretended to be true Catholics, and offered a Catholic creed to the Council, which they subscribed in a Catholic sense, though the subtle Arians put their own fraudulent and equivocal sense upon it. Which, as soon as the Catholic bishops understood, they declared their abhorrence of the fraud, and utterly detested their communion. Which is a more pregnant evidence still, that the face of the whole Catholic Church was never totally overspread with Arianism. Nor can it be showed, that in the darkest times of Popery the whole Catholic Church was sunk into the dregs of Popish errors: for, to say nothing of the Eastern Churches, which never came under the Romish yoke and tyranny, I have made it appear, in the First Part of this Scholastical History, that there were sufficient numbers among the Albigenses, which never subscribed or fell in with the Romish idolatry and corruptions. And I do not find any of my opposers inclined to call this in question. So that the supposition of the whole Catholic Church having, at any time, fallen into damnable heresy, is a supposition in fact without any foundation. But if by the whole Church, be meant only the aggregate body of some particular Church, as that of Rome, then there is no absurdity in supposing, that such a whole Church may fall into damnable heresy. And if the question then be, whether it was lawful to join in communion with such an heretical Church? it will easily be resolved by the foresaid answer of St. Hilary: if men are not well apprised of any heresies maintained in such a Church, so far her communion may be innocent to them, as the communion of those Arian bishops was to the Catholics that Hilary mentions: but if they are known heresies, the communion of heretical priests is to be

¹ Origin. Eccles. book vi. cap. iii. sec. 10.

avoided, and Catholic communion to be preserved with the rest of the Church in a spiritual union with them, when a man has no opportunity corporally to join with them. But if men, through invincible ignorance, join in an heretical communion which they, through want of judgment, suppose still to be orthodox and innocent, as perhaps it was the case of many in the dark times of Popery, and may be so still in many countries, where nothing but Popery is professed; what allowances God will make for such honest ignorance, is best known to himself, and it belongs not to us positively to determine. The Church always made a distinction betwixt heresiarchs and their followers; between the guides and the people; and between such as were born and bred in the Church, and afterwards apostatised into heresy, and those that received their errors from the tradition and seduction of their parents. Insomuch that St. Austin goes so far in his great charity, as to say,¹ “that they who defend a false and perverse opinion, without any pertinacious animosity, especially if by any audacious presumption of their own they did not first invent it, but received it from the seduction of their erring parents, and are careful in their inquiries after truth, being ready to embrace it when they find it, such men are not to be reckoned among heretics.” He means, I suppose, they have not the formality of heresy in them, pride and obstinacy, as commonly the first seducers have; and therefore they may, perhaps, find favour with God, who, knows the sincerity of their hearts, and we may judge charitably of them, at the same time that we do not think it lawful to join in communion with them.

SECT. 3.—Whether, in any Case, it be lawful to desire the Baptism of Heretics.

The next difficulty may arise concerning the desiring of

¹ Aug. Ep. 162. ad Episc. Donat. p. 277. Qui sententiam suam quamvis falsam atque perversam nullâ pertinaci animositate defendunt, præsertim quam non audaciâ præsumptionis suæ pepererunt, sed à seductis atque in errorem lapsis parentibus acceperunt, quærent autem cautâ sollicitudine veritatem, corrigi paratî cum invenerint, nequaquam sunt inter hæreticos deputandi.

baptism from the hands of an heretical priest, where a Catholic cannot be found to do it. Shall a man, in that case, rather die without baptism, than receive it from the hands of such a priest? The question has no difficulty at all in ordinary cases: for the ancient rule was very plain, that where a Catholic priest might be had, no man might have recourse to a known heretic under pain of excommunication.¹ If it be said, that Constantine was baptised by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, who was an Arian; I answer, that Eusebius professed himself a Catholic all the time that Constantine lived, and he durst do no otherwise, for fear of banishment. So that Constantine did not desire baptism of him but only upon presumption of his being a Catholic; and if Eusebius prevaricated and was a secret heretic, that was nothing to Constantine, who judged him to be a Catholic, and, in the simplicity of his soul, desired baptism of him as a Catholic, and not as an Arian. For otherwise it is not to be imagined, that a person so zealous against Arianism as Constantine, would ever have submitted to have been baptised by an Arian, so much against the rule of the Church, in an ordinary case, when many other Catholic bishops might as easily have been procured to do it. But the difficulty of the question is in cases of extremity, when a man is born or lives in a country, where there are none but heretics, and must either die without baptism, or receive it from them: what is to be done in such an exigency? St. Austin resolves this case plainly, without any hesitation,² “ that if a man is compelled by extreme neces-

¹ Con. Herdens. can. xiii. Catholicus, qui filios suos in hæresi baptizandos obtulerit, oblatio illius in Ecclesiâ nullatenus recipiatur. Vide. Hieron. cont. Lucifer. cap. v.

² Aug de Bapt. lib. i. c. ii. Si quem fortè coegerit extrema necessitas, ubi catholicum per quem accipiat non invenerit, et in animo pace catholicâ custoditâ, per aliquem extra catholicam unitatem acceperit, quod erat in ipsâ catholicâ unitate accepturus, si statim etiam de hâc vitâ migraverit, non eum nisi catholicum deputamus. Si autem fuerit à corporali morte liberatus, cùm se catholicæ congregationi etiam corporali præsentia reddiderit, unde nunquam corde discesserat, non solùm non improbamus quod fecit, sed etiam securissimè verissimèque laudamus: quia præsentem Deum credidit cordi suo, ubi unitatem servabat, et sine sancti baptismi sacramento, quod ubicunque

sity, where he cannot have a Catholic to give him baptism, to take it at the hands of one who is not in Catholic unity; in that case he should be reckoned as a Catholic, though he died immediately, because he was in heart and mind a Catholic, and would have been baptised in Catholic unity, if there had been any opportunity to have done it. If such an one lives, and corporally joins himself to the Catholic congregation, from whence in heart he never departed, we not only not disallow what he has done, but securely and truly commend him for it: because he believed God to be present in his heart, where he preserved unity and would not depart out of this life without the sacrament of baptism, which he knows to be God's, and not men's, wheresoever he finds it. But if any one, when he might receive it in the Catholic Church, by some perverseness of mind, chuses rather to be baptised in schism, though he afterward design to return to the Church, because he is certain the sacrament will profit him in the Church, but not elsewhere, though he may receive it elsewhere: this is a perverse and wicked man, and so much the more perniciously so, by how much the more knowing he is." St. Austin gives the same resolution in case a man receives baptism from a schismatic in extreme necessity at the point of death:¹ "This baptism is advantageous to him because he receives it with a heart and mind never separated from the Catholic unity of the Church: whether he lives or dies, he is spiritually in the Church, and therefore his baptism is of advantage to him." So that cases of necessity make many things innocent and allowable, which in ordinary cases are strictly prohibited by the laws of God and man. The resolution of this case may

invenit, non hominum sed Dei esse cognovit, noluit ex hâc vita migrare. Si quis autem, cùm possit in ipsâ catholicâ accipere, per aliquam mentis perversitatem eligit in schismate baptizari, etiamsi postea venire ad catholicam cogitat, quia certus est ibi prodesse sacramentum, quod alibi accipi quidem potest, prodesse autem non potest: procul dubio perversus et iniquus est, et tanto perniciosiùs quanto scientiùs.

¹ Aug de Bapt. lib. vi. c. 5. Potest salubriter accipere à separato, si ipse non separatus accipiat: sicut plerisque accidit, ut catholico animo et corde ab unitate pacis non alienato, aliquâ necessitate mortis urgentis in aliquem hæreticum irruerent, et ab eo Christi baptismum sine illius perversitate perciperent, &c. Vid. lib. vii. c. 52.

perhaps be of some use to all such, who are baptised in countries where the Church is overrun with heresy or schism; and to those who are baptised in infancy, by the force of their parents carrying them to heretics or schismatics for baptism, when they might have had it in the Church: though the parents cannot plead necessity in that case, yet the children perhaps may be allowed to do it; and the Church may accept their plea, when they detest their parents' iniquity, and return unfeignedly to the unity of the Catholic Church.

SECT. 4.—Whether the Ordinations of Heretics and Schismatics may be accepted by the Church without Reordaining.

The last and greatest difficulties seem to be about the ordinations of heretics and schismatics, and such degraded bishops as are divested of their authority to ordain. For if they are not true authorised ministers in that state, but at the best, only in lay-communion; as they have no authority to baptise, so neither can they have any just authority, in such a state, to ordain. But then the question is, What if they do ordain in such a state? Of what force are their ordinations? How did the Church receive pretended clerks so ordained? Did she wholly disannul their ordinations, and give them a new ordination, or only supply what was deficient in them, by adding her own authority and confirmation? To this, I answer, the Church used her liberty in this matter to receive or reject such ordinations, as she thought expedient, and judged most necessary in the present exigency of affairs. She received the ordinations of the Novatians and the Donatists without reordaining, at the same time that she rejected the ordinations of the Meletians, and would admit none of their clergy to officiate in the Church without a new ordination. And yet Meletius, the father of the Meletians, was once a regular archbishop in the Church, if that had been sufficient to have given a perpetual authority to his ordinations: but Novatian, the father of the Novatians, and Majorinus, the first founder of the Donatists, were never truly ordained bishops in the Church, and consequently never had true and lawful authority to ordain others. There must therefore needs be

some other reason, why the Church was more favourable in the case of the Novatians and Donatists, than she was in that of the Meletians: for it could not be because the ordinations of the Novatians and Donatists were originally more authentic than the other, since it appears from the observation I have made upon the history of both, that they were rather less authentic, as descending from those, who were never ordained themselves true bishops in the Church. But the truth of the matter seems to be this; the Church never esteemed any of these three sects to be lawful ministers, either bishops, priests, or deacons, but only in the condition of laymen, according to the rules and discipline of the Church then prevailing; but because they retained the outward form of ordination, as they did the outward form of baptism, though they had no authority to give the one more than the other, the Church used her liberty, either to reject the ordinations wholly, or to confirm them by her own authority, as she judged expedient for the reclaiming those sects, or promoting her own welfare and peace, as the exigency of the case required. Therefore she rejected the ordinations of the Meletians, and would admit none of them to officiate in the Church, till they had received a new ordination; because the Meletians had joined interest with the Arians, and deserved a more severe censure. And they were but an upstart sect, not inveterately rooted, nor far spread, and therefore might more easily be obliged to submit to the Church's discipline. But the Novatians and Donatists never sided with the Arians, but generally joined with the Church in opposing them, and therefore the Church was a little more inclined to shew favour to them. Besides they were become firm and inveterate sects, which had spread themselves in many parts of the world, and gained great strength, so that there was little hopes of reducing them by strictness and exactness of discipline: therefore the Church in this exigency, to regain them more universally, thought it more conducing to the public interest of religion to abate something of the rigour of her own discipline upon this occasion, which otherwise would not have been allowed but only for the sake of peace. For in strictness of discipline, no one ordained or

baptised by heretics was ever to be admitted to clerical dignity in the Church, either by virtue of his former ordination, or by a new one: but, for prudential reasons, the Church sometimes dispensed with these rules, and admitted some by a new ordination and some without it, but both the one and the other by a new commission and authority which they had not, nor could have in heresy or schism: for out of the Church there was no just authority either to baptise or to ordain, as has been abundantly proved before; but the authentic performance of these things belonged only to the ministers of the Church. If it be asked, how the Church could admit such to officiate without a new ordination? I answer, upon the same ground that she admitted them without a new baptism: for the outward form of ordination had been given them before, though by persons who had no authority to give it: and, though no just authority could be conveyed by such unauthorised ordainers, yet the Church did not think fit, in such exigencies, always to repeat the outward form of ordination, but only supplied what was deficient in it, by her own just authority and commission granted to them; which was thought sufficient to complete an unauthorised and incomplete ordination, as the unction of chrism or imposition of hands in confirmation, was thought sufficient to complete an unauthorised and incomplete baptism. But why then did not the Church observe this method in receiving all heretics to clerical dignity, without a new ordination? Why did she not admit the Meletians and others without reordaining, as well as the Novatians and Donatists? I answer, because this was matter of prudence and discretion; and the Church used her authority and just liberty, in dispensing her commission to others out of the Church, in such a manner, as she in wisdom judged most convenient for the reduction of heretics, and preservation of her own peace; which are the great ends to be aimed at in all parts of ecclesiastical discipline: and it is but fair to let the Church judge for herself, what is fittest to be done in all such cases. And if men would consent in modesty to be guided by this rule, we shall need dispute no longer about rebap-

tising those who are baptised by unauthorised baptism, whether administered by heretics or other laymen; since this has been so fully determined by the universal consent and practice of the Catholic Church, in her first six general Councils, and all others that have said any thing upon the subject, except those of the Cyprianic age, which are no balance against the counterpoise-judgment of the Church in all ages.

END OF PART II.

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

Some Remarks on the Author of the Second Part of
Lay-Baptism Invalid .



CHAP. 1.

A short Way to end the Controversy with this Author about Unauthorised Baptism, by shewing his great Ignorance of the ancient Discipline of the Church, whilst he supposes the ancient Heretics to be true Authorised Priests in actual Commission, when the Church had reduced them to the State of Laymen.

WHEN I had finished the foregoing discourse, there came to my hands an anonymous treatise called, The Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid; wherein the author pretends to shew, that the ancient Catholic Church never had any ecclesiastical law, tradition, or custom for the validity of baptisms performed by persons who never were commissioned by bishops to baptise; all proved from Mr. Bingham's Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, and from other evidences not produced by that historian. I must no longer call this author by the name of Mr. Lawrence, for he is very angry at my incivility, as he pleases to term it, for doing so before; when yet I thought no harm in doing that, which his greatest friends do every day, and speak of him in all public places of concourse, with a design to honour him under that appellation and distinction. But the gentleman is out of humour with me upon other reasons, and therefore takes any occasion to express his anger and resentments against me, for being really so uncivil as to pretend to un-

derstand ecclesiastical history, and the discipline of the Church better than himself, and for being a little too free in correcting his mistakes, and exposing the dangerous consequences and absurdities of some of his opinions. But however it be, I will neither trouble myself nor the reader any further about his name, but stick to the merits of his cause, and shew him that he has made a gross mistake about the sense and practice of the ancient Catholic Church, after all his pretences to Councils and Fathers, and the general assistance of all his friends, as when he said, a major proposition was a minor or an assumption: and therefore if he will be but as ingenuous in retracting one plain error as another, our controversy will be at an end, and he will trouble the world no more with such tedious accounts of ancient history, to so little purpose. I will not say of him, as he says of his learned adversaries in his preface, page 2, "That if they make false arguments to defend error, he shall not esteem such their methods to be only mistakes but something worse, considering the greatness of their knowledge." I have more charity for him than this comes to, though he has so little for others; and believe, that when he turned a minor proposition into a major, and thereby made Lucifer a witness to an assertion, which he never dreamt of, that it was only an undesigned mistake. But yet there are two things which I cannot but a little wonder at: 1. That so learned and acute a man as Dr. Hicks, should carefully read over his papers, and never observe such an heap of blunders, till an adversary came more kindly to discover them. And, 2. That this gentleman should be so severe and uncharitable in his censures of other mens' intentions, who needs so much candour and charity to put a favourable construction upon his own. For any man's knowledge is great enough to transcribe the words of an English writer; and if he transcribes them wrong in favour of his own opinion, would not an untoward critic, of an ill-disposed temper, be apt to suspect the worst, and uncharitably construe it to be something more than a mistake, when outwardly it bears such a face of an ill design to impose upon his readers? Now if this gentleman would not be pleased to have base suggestions insinuated against

himself, he ought to have so much candour and charity, as not causelessly to insinuate the like against others, and represent them as abettors of heretics and schismatics, and of those who would dissolve and take away the necessity of the Christian priesthood, and of Christ's authority here on earth, and of all revealed religion too: which are his kind suggestions in the end of his preface, page 21, concerning the principles of those, who only labour to defend the principles and practices of the Catholic Church against his own heterodoxies and novelties in opinion. Some of those learned men he thus characterises have been as zealous opposers of heretics and schismatics, and written as learnedly and judiciously in defence of the Christian priesthood, and Christ's authority on earth, and revealed religion, as either he or any of his assistants can pretend to do: but something, true or false, was to be insinuated against their integrity, to frighten young students in divinity from reading and considering their works, as if he and his friends were the only men that could teach them sound divinity, after 1700 years experience. And yet I will give the world a plain demonstration, that he has said much more for the honour and encouragement of heretics and schismatics, and more dishonourable things against the true power of the Christian priesthood, and the authority of the Church, which he pretends to be defending, than any of those that have appeared in defence of the Church's power and authority against him.

To come close to the point, the thing I mean is this: this author asserts, over and over again, both in his preface and his book, that according to the discipline of the ancient Church, heretics and schismatics, even when they were cut off and cast out of the Church, were still allowed to be true authorised and commissioned priests, invested with full power, authority, and right to baptise; and that upon this principle only the Church allowed of the validity of their baptism, because they were then priests in commission, and not in the state of laymen.

Now I affirm and maintain on the contrary, that both these assertions are as false, as for a man to say, that black

is white, or, that a major proposition is a minor. And if this author will please to peruse the foregoing discourse with any tolerable ingenuity and candour, he will receive abundant satisfaction as to both the particulars I maintain against him. The questions are matters of fact, upon which the whole controversy turns and depends: viz. whether heretics and schismatics, under the censures of the Church, were reputed to be actually priests in commission, with full power, authority, and right to baptise; or were not rather deprived of their commission, and authority, and reduced back again to the state of laymen? And then, upon what foot the Church received the baptisms of such men? For that she received them upon some foot or other, in fact, there is no dispute; but the question is, whether she received them as the baptisms of true authorised priests, not deprived of their commission; or as the baptisms of usurping priests, deprived of their commission, and reduced to the state of laymen? The determining these questions of fact aright will determine the whole dispute I have with this author concerning the sense and practice of the ancient Church. For if heretical priests have no better title to the true authority of the Christian priesthood than laymen; if they lose the commission which they once had, by the censures of the Church, and are reduced to the state of laymen; then, I hope, this author or any one will own, that the Church, in receiving the baptisms administered by such persons in such a state, received the baptisms of those whom she esteemed not true authorised priests, or priests in actual commission, but only laymen. To quibble now about their once having received a commission, which other laymen never had, will here be to no purpose: for if they may forfeit and lose their commission, then it is the same thing whether they had or had not a commission; since their acts, after they have forfeited their commission, and are legally deprived of it, are as much unauthorised and uncommissioned, as those who never had any commission at all, that is, the mereest laymen.

Now then this is the thing which I will fairly try with this author, and all his learned assistants, to put a short end to this whole debate, whether heretical and schismatical priests,

whom the ancient Church formerly censured and degraded, were during that censure and state of degradation, reputed to have the authority of true priests of God, and remain undeprievd of their commission, notwithstanding the Church's censure? This author affirms it, I absolutely deny it, and will prove my position to him universally, and in such a manner as he shall not be able to contradict it.

For, first of all, he owns and confesses, without scruple, page 53, that all the Cyprianists were entirely of this opinion, that heretics and schismatics were but as laymen; that they had no power, authority, or right to baptise. Thus far we are exactly agreed. The proofs he has alleged out of Cyprian are full and convincing enough, and almost the very same that I have produced in the foregoing discourse. So that we can never dispute further about the opinion of the Cyprianic Churches, as to this particular, whether heretics and schismatics, after they are formally censured, be commissioned priests, or only uncommissioned laymen. When the Church, by her lawful power, withdraws their commission, then they are no longer authorised priests, but only in the state and condition of laymen, because the Church has withdrawn her authority and commission from them.

But then this author pretends, that the other Churches in the Cyprianic age were of a different opinion, and had a different discipline; and that the Catholic Church also, in after ages, had other sentiments of heretical and schismatical priests, and esteemed them to be actually true authorised and commissioned priests, even when they were under their errors and the Church's censures. Now these are our author's grand mistakes, which all the learning and assistance of his party will never clear him of: and I require him either to make good his assertions, which I am confident he can never do, or else confess his errors, and put an end to this whole debate, so far as concerns the history of the Church, and then he may dispute, for me, with whom he pleases. I do not charge him, as he does his learned adversaries, with any wicked designed mistakes, but reckon he was led into them by the information and authority of others, who themselves seem not to have duly considered the exact discipline of the ancient Catholic Church. For I have made

it appear as plain in the foregoing discourse, as the nature of any subject is capable of, as plain as that a major proposition is not a minor, that all the Churches in the world, in Cyprian's time were of Cyprian's opinion, as to this particular, that heretical and schismatical priests were not truly and properly priests (however they might equivocally bear the name) whilst they were formally under the Church's censure; but were only treated in the quality and condition of laymen, or less than laymen, if they were excommunicated and cast out of the Church. And I have made it further appear, that the Catholic Church in after ages, never departed from this opinion; if we may judge of her sense by the decrees of general or particular Councils, and the declarations of private Fathers, all concurring in the same opinion. I have shewed Dr. Brett, and this author with him, that Cornelius, bishop of Rome, writing to Cyprian, declares it to be the sense, the unanimous uncontested sense of all the bishops in the world, that criminal bishops, such as idolaters and heretics, once formally declared and censured, were no longer to be reputed priests, but laymen. And if the Catholic Church agreed with them in after ages, here is as full consent as can be required in any case against these gentlemen's assertions. I will repeat nothing that I have said before, but only add the ample testimony of St. Ambrose, who, in his Books of Repentance, against the Novatians, plainly speaks the sense of the whole Church upon this matter of sacerdotal authority and power; denying the Novatians and all other heresies to have any right or authority to perform any sacerdotal acts, such as binding and loosing, or retaining and forgiving sins. "For this power," says he,¹ "is permitted to the priests alone. Therefore the Church rightly claims it, because she has true priests: but heresy cannot claim it, because it has no priests of God. And whilst heresy

¹ Ambros. de Pœnitent. lib. i. c. ii. Jus enim hoc solis permissum sacerdotibus est. Rectè igitur Ecclesia vindicat, quæ veros sacerdotes habet; hæresis vindicare non potest, quæ sacerdotes Dei non habet. Non vindicando autem ipsa de se pronunciat, quod cum sacerdotes non habeat, jus sibi vindicare non debeat sacerdotale.

cannot claim it, it pronounces sentence against itself, that whilst it has no priests it cannot lay claim to sacerdotal power." Can any words be plainer than these, to prove, that heretics are no true priests, or priests of God? Or, that there are no true priests but only in the Church, however the Novatians or other heretics might pretend to that name? Could any one more fully or emphatically express himself against the Novatian heretics, if he had a mind to say, they were no priests, because they were heretics, and consequently could lay claim to no part of the sacerdotal authority and power? I shall despair of understanding any man, if this be not the plain sense of St. Ambrose.

Now then, I would ask our author, how came it to pass, that the baptisms given by these Novatians, who are thus positively declared to be no priests, nor to have any sacerdotal authority or power, came afterward to be received both by the great Council of Nice, and the whole Catholic Church after it, as valid, so far as not to need the outward form to be repeated by rebaptisation? It could not be because they were priests: for they were no priests, nor invested with any sacerdotal authority as priests of God, as St. Ambrose peremptorily determines. If therefore their baptism was received as valid, it is plain, it must be upon some other reason than their having sacerdotal authority, for they had none: and that shews also, that the authority of the administrator is not so absolutely essential to the outward form of baptism, as our author makes it, in the opinion of the ancient Church; since they received the baptisms of those whom they reckoned to be no priests, nor invested with any sacerdotal powers, as is evident in this case to a demonstration.

Our author must now have recourse to his usual evasion, by which he can answer a book in two words, and say, that St. Ambrose here speaks only his own private sense of the Novatians and other heretics, and not the public sense of the Church. But I have already precluded him from this little subterfuge, by shewing at large, that this was not the private sense of St. Ambrose, but the voice of the whole Church; the sense of the Cyprianists, which he himself owns, and the sense of Cornelius and all the bishops of the

world in the time of Cyprian, who had no dispute with Cyprian upon this point; the sense of the Ante-Nicene and the Post-Nicene Fathers together; the sense of the six general Councils, and all the provincial Councils that have said any thing against heretics: they all agree with St. Ambrose in this, that heretics are no true priests or priests of God, nor invested with any sacerdotal right, authority, or power: but that if they had originally any commission given them by the Church, investing them with sacerdotal authority, they lose that authority, when the Church withdraws her commission by her censures. And then it is all one whether they ever had sacerdotal authority or not: it is certain they had none by the discipline of the ancient Church, when once she had recalled her commission, and taken their authority from them; which she thought she had power and authority to do: and then in that case heretics had no more sacerdotal authority than the merest unauthorised layman. All this I have made as plain to our author, as that a major proposition is not a minor; and therefore I hope he will be as ingenuous as he was before, and own himself to have made an undesigned slip, in representing the discipline of the ancient Church quite otherwise than it appears to be, and what a man must shut his eyes upon, and wink hard, not to be convinced of.

I would not have our author now quibble with me again, about those who never received any sacerdotal commission from bishops, and say the case of the ancient heretics and these men is not parallel. For if men lose the commission they once had, they have no more authority by virtue of that commission, than they who never had any commission at all and therefore, in this respect, their case is parallel; the one has no more sacerdotal authority than the other: the only difference is, that the one never had a commission or authority, the other once had it, but afterward forfeited and lost it; and then they were in the same condition with those that never had it; they were equally no priests, equally destitute of sacerdotal power. This our author owns to have been the sense of the Cyprianists; and I have shewed him, what he did not apprehend before, that it was also the general sense of the whole Catholic Church in all ages.

Besides, I have observed and proved, in the second chapter of the foregoing discourse, that the Novatian heretics, of whom we are now discoursing, never had any real and true episcopal ordination among them; their first founder Novatian was only a nominal and false bishop, a no-bishop, by all the rules and discipline of the Catholic Church; whereby his pretended ordination was disannulled from its first original: whence he himself being no bishop, could give no episcopal or sacerdotal authority to others, against the rules of the Catholic Church.

This I have there proved from very plain evidences; to which I shall only add now the testimony of Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona, who wrote against the Novatians, Anno 370, several Epistles, wherein he maintains,¹ “that Novatian was never truly ordained a bishop, but was only a nominal bishop, a false bishop, a no-bishop, because he had no proper ordainers, no lawful consecration; his consecration was against all ordinary rules; he was not ordained by the bishops of the province; but by the letters and instigation of some pretended confessors; and that when the see was full, and another bishop legally ordained before him.” So Novatian had only the name and title of a false bishop, not the right and power of a true one. He also asserts,² that the Novatians had no true priests among them, rightly consecrated. Therefore, though they might give pretended ordinations, and call themselves bishops, presbyters, and deacons, yet they were but nominally so, being destitute of that original power in their first founder, which he ought to have had, to have handed down a succession of priests among them. For ought then that appears to the contrary, these Novatians were in the same condition with those who never received any true sacerdotal commission at all, and

¹ Pacian. Ep. ii. ad Sempronian. Bibl. Patr. tom. iii. p. 56. Cognosco Novatianum sine consecratione legitimâ episcopum factum, ideòque nec factum. Ep. iii. p. 59. Novatianus tuus, ne falso quidem adhuc episcopatu sacerdos, &c. It. p. 60. Ille ex auctoritate epistolarum, sedente jam Romæ episcopo, adversum fas sacerdotii singularis, alterius episcopi sibi nomen assumit. Ep. ii. p. 55. Quem, consecrante nullo, linteata sedes accepit. Ep. iii. p. 57. He denies that he was “Jure ordinario consecratus ab episcopis, &c.” ² Id. Ep. iii. p. 58. Vestræ plebi unde spiritum, quam non consignat unctus sacerdos?

therefore must be ranked in the same class with uncommissioned laymen. All the difference is, they pretended to a formal ordination, and a divine commission, and the authority of priests, which mere laymen do not use to do in the Church; but the Church made no account of these pretences, but treated them as laymen in a double respect, both because they first wanted a true ordination and commission originally; and, secondly, because, though they had once a true commission and authority, yet they had forfeited their title to all sacerdotal authority and power, by becoming heretics, and falling under the Church's censure.

I know, indeed, this author pretends, page 198, that the Council of Nice acknowledged the Novatians "to be true priests and not laymen, persons destitute of commission; but still bishops, priests, and deacons, with an indeleted, unrepealed commission to baptise:" and says, page 202, "that they and other heretics and schismatics had the Church's lawful authority and commission to baptise." Which would be very strange indeed, that the Church should first by her discipline vacate the commission of heretics, and take away their authority from them; and say particularly of the Novatians, that they were no true priests of God, nor had sacerdotal authority, nor yet any true ordination or commission from the beginning; and yet, after all, say likewise, as this author represents it, that these very heretics were still true bishops, priests, and deacons, with the Church's lawful authority and unrepealed commission to baptise, and consequently perform all other spiritual offices of the ministerial function. This would be monstrous indeed, that the Church should so contradict herself upon the very same article of discipline in relation to the very same persons. But the truth of the matter is, our author understood not the Church's discipline in this point, and therefore he makes a woful misrepresentation of it. The Council of Nice nor any other Council ever allowed the Novatians to be true bishops, presbyters, or deacons, during their heresy or schism; but looked upon them as false priests, destitute of sacerdotal power, and the Church's lawful authority and commission to baptise: but if they were willing to return to the unity of the Church, then they might enjoy those

honourable stations by the Church's authority and commission, which they had only in pretence, without any legal authority or commission laid claim to before. This was not to say, that heretics and schismatics were true priests of God, invested with the Church's authority and commission, whilst they remained in heresy or schism, degraded and divested of all sacerdotal authority by the Church's censures: for this were a manifest contradiction in itself, and utterly inconsistent with the proceedings and discipline of all the ancient Councils. But the meaning is, that they, who before were only nominal priests, should now by the Church's favour have the authority of real priests, and act by her commission in the same station that they had usurped before, in contradiction to all the laws and rules of the Catholic Church, which with one voice declare heretics and schismatics to be no true priests of God, whilst they continue in that state, whatever this author pretends to the contrary.

We need not now dispute what names they were to be called by, whether priests or laymen: if they had lost the Church's commission and authority, they were as much unqualified, for that time, as to any acts, intents, or purposes of the sacerdotal power, as the merest layman, who never had any authority or commission from the Church. Our author owns it was so by the discipline of the Cyprianic Churches, and I have proved that it was so by the discipline of all Churches. And, till our author disproves this, the charge will lie upon him, that he has grossly mistaken and misrepresented the practice and discipline of the ancient Church, by putting the authority and commission of true priests of God into the hands of heretics and schismatics, which the ancient Councils unanimously agree to take from them.

I may now appeal to his own conscience and the world, to decide, which of us looks most like an abettor of heretics and schismatics, or pleads most for the power of the Church, and the authority of the priesthood; he, who against the sense of all the ancient Church, puts the power of the priesthood, and the commission and authority of the Church

into the hands of heretics and schismatics, and makes them true priests of God; or I, who, in compliance with the rules and discipline of the ancient Church, shew how all these things may be denied them, and all these powers and privileges taken from them? His assertions tend to the detriment and dishonour of the Church's power, and the debasement of her authority, by saying, and that against truth and fact too, that all the ancient Churches, except the Cyprianic, allowed heretics and schismatics to be true priests of God, to be true bishops, priests, and deacons, even whilst they were declared heretics, and under the Church's censures." Which is such a reproach to the ancient discipline, and such a stretch upon the truth of ancient history, that one would think a man had never looked into a volume of the ancient Councils, that could be guilty of so grand a mistake, and make such a dishonourable and partial representation of the Church's discipline, when there is scarce a Council in all the tomes, but what might have taught him otherwise. Therefore, as well for the honour of the ancient Church, as to shew this gentleman and his friends their error, I have shewed at large, from incontestable evidences, from the history of general and provincial Councils, authorities that cannot be turned off by the little artifice of saying, they are only private authors that speak their own private sense, that the ancient discipline was not so favourable to the priesthood of heretics as this author supposes. And now let the world judge, who has said most for the honour of sacerdotal powers, or who is the greatest favourer of heretical pretensions.

But this author and Dr. Brett were both of them very sensible, that unless heretics were allowed to have sacerdotal authority and powers, their cause was infallibly lost. For then it will undeniably follow, that men who were no authorised priests, but laymen, might administer the outward form of baptism, so far valid as not to need repeating. For it cannot be denied that the baptisms given by these ancient heretics, who were no authorised priests by the discipline of the ancient Church, but unauthorised laymen, were notwithstanding, received by the Church without rebaptisation. The consequence of which is very plain, that then the

ancient Church, all except the Cyprianists, did receive the baptisms of those whom she esteemed to be no priests: and it matters not what names they were called by, whether unauthorised priests, or unauthorised laymen; for it is not names we are disputing about, but the authority and powers of the men, who took upon them to administer the outward form of baptism. If they had not the Church's authority and power, they were not the Church's priests, and if they were not the Church's priests, they were no priests of God: if the Church discarded them from all ministerial authority and power, from all sacerdotal office and function, as she certainly did, then they might call themselves priests, and pretend to the rights, and authority, and commission of priests still, but the Church made no other account of them, but as of nominal or false priests, or of uncommissioned priests, divested of all authority and commission, and reduced to the state of laymen.

If these things stand good, as I am confident they will with all impartial and unprejudiced men, by the strength of the evidences in the foregoing discourse, then there is an end of the dispute between me and this gentleman, about the sense and practice of the ancient Church, relating to the administration of the outward form of baptism, by unauthorised and uncommissioned persons. For if heretics, who lose their commission which they once had, be as much unauthorised thenceforward, as any laymen who never had a commission, their case, as to actual sacerdotal authority and power, is then the same: and if their baptisms were received by the ancient Church only by imposition of hands or confirmation; that is, by completing what was deficient for want of authority, not repeating what was actually done, though without authority; then it must be owned, that the baptisms given by persons who had no actual authority or commission, call them what you please, uncommissioned priests or uncommissioned laymen, were received by the ancient Catholic Church without rebaptisation. Which is the thing I have undertaken to show, against Dr. Brett and this author; and I hope I have done it with as good proofs as the nature of an historical subject is capable of, to the evidence of a demonstration. And if either of them can bring better

proofs for their assertions than I have done for mine, they shall not fail to have my assent upon rational conviction. Only I desire now they would observe their own rules, and stick to the conditions they impose upon me, that is, give us the sense of the Church from her public acts, from her general and provincial Councils, as I now have done, and not from any dark and ambiguous expressions of private writers.

I also desire they would not dispute any more about words, nor charge me with contradictions where there are none. To avoid which beforehand, I think fit to obviate two exceptions, which I know they will be inclined to make, as if I had contradicted myself upon this subject.

The first is, that in the Former Part of my Scholastical History I have said, that the usurped baptism of laymen was not decreed to be valid by the determination of any general Council; and now I pretend to prove, that the baptism of heretics and schismatics is but the baptism of laymen, by the determination of all the general Councils; which carries the face and appearance of a contradiction. But this will easily be cleared among wise and ingenuous men, by distinguishing the several acceptations of the word laymen; which may be taken either first, for Catholic laymen, who never had any pretence to sacerdotal authority or commission in the Church: or, secondly, for heretical laymen, who pretended to have a sacerdotal commission, when they really had none; such as I have showed the Novatians to be in the ancient Church: or, thirdly, for such laymen as once had a true sacerdotal commission, but were afterward deprived of their commission by the same power of the Church which first gave it, and so were reduced to the state and condition of laymen again. Such laymen were all the ancient heretics and schismatics that had received a legal ordination in the Church, but afterward were deprived of their authority and commission for their crimes, their obstinacy and rebellion, by the Church's censures. Such laymen, our author confesses, all heretics and schismatics were made by the discipline of the Cyprianic Churches; and such laymen I say, they were made by the discipline of the Church Universal in all ages. Now, when I said before, that the usurped baptism of laymen was not decreed to be valid by the determination of

any general Council, I spake of laymen in the first sense, in the vulgar and common acceptation, as denoting laymen in the Church, who lay no claim to sacerdotal powers peculiar to the clergy of the Church. And I do not yet remember any general Council that has directly determined any thing for or against the validity of baptism administered by such laymen. But in the second sense, I think the Council of Nice has determined the validity of laymen's baptism, because she received the baptism of the Novatian heretics, who pretended to have a true sacerdotal commission, when they really had none. And in the third sense I have showed that several general Councils admitted of the baptism of laymen, because they admitted of the baptism of heretics, whom they themselves deprived of all sacerdotal authority and commission, and reduced to the quality of laymen. So that there is no contradiction in all this, when matters are rightly adjusted and distinguished.

The other exception I would obviate against beforehand, is in relation to what I have said about heretical priests, in determining whether they be priests or laymen. In the First Part of the Scholastical History I asserted, that heretical priests were, in some sense, allowed to be priests, and their ordination to be valid, even after degradation. The meaning of which I explained to be this, that if they were once truly ordained, the Church did not intend by her censures so far to cancel or annul their ordination, as to make it necessary when she recalled them to their office again, to give them a new ordination. And thus far I still allow the character of a priest, degraded for heresy by the censures of the Church, to be indelible, that is, that the Church, upon his repentance, needs not give him a new ordination. But I did not intend hereby to say, that heretical priests could not be legally deprived of the authority and power and commission of priests; or, that the Church never so deprived them; or, that when they were actually so deprived of all authority and commission, they had still the authority of God and the Church, and were in actual commission as lawful priests to baptise, or perform any other sacerdotal acts, notwithstanding their deprivation. And therefore when I assert in this book, that heretics were deprived of all authority and

commission actually by the Church, and during their heresy denied all sacerdotal powers, as much as any other laymen; I take this to be no contradiction to what I said before, but fairly consistent with it, in the understanding of any intelligent and unprejudiced reader. And therefore I desire our author not to multiply disputes about hard terms, with a design to involve and cloud my discourse under pretence of contradictions, but to consider fairly what I have now offered from the ancient discipline of the Church, to prove that heretics may be deprived of all sacerdotal authority, commission, and power; and that they were actually so deprived by the rules of all the ancient Councils, which yet allowed the validity of their baptisms so far, as not to repeat them by rebaptisation. If this author can show, either, first, that the baptisms of heretics were rejected universally, by the unanimous vote of all the ancient Councils; or, secondly, that those heretics, whose baptisms were received, were true priests of God, in actual commission and authority when they baptised, and not reduced to the condition of laymen by the censures of the Church; then I will own he has the truth of ancient history on his side: but if he can fairly make out neither of these things, then my assertions will stand good; First, that the ancient Church did receive the baptism of such heretics as received it in due form. Secondly, that those heretics were not reputed to be true priests of God, but destitute of sacerdotal authority and commission when they administered such baptisms: and that, therefore, thirdly, the baptisms of persons destitute of sacerdotal authority and commission, when they administered them, were received by the Catholic Church without rebaptisation. These are the things I assert and maintain, and this author may now try his skill in ecclesiastical history to prove them to be otherwise.

Our author owns, that this was the principle and discipline of all the Cyprianic Churches, that heretics and schismatics were deprived of their authority and commission, and thenceforward not to be reputed priests, but laymen: they had no regard to the modern notion of the pretended indelible character of priests, but thought, that if priests did things unworthy of their character, their sacerdotal authority and

commission might then legally, by the power of the Church, be taken from them: and thence they concluded, that the baptisms of heretics and schismatics were null and void, because they were given by persons, who had lost their sacerdotal authority and commission. Now, I say, the Catholic Church entirely agreed with the Cyprianists in their principle and discipline, that heretics were actually deprived of all sacerdotal authority and commission by the authentic power of the Church and her legal censures. But she differed from them in the inference or conclusion which they deduced from it: for whereas the Cyprianists said, the baptism of heretics is null and void, because heretics are deprived of that sacerdotal authority and commission which perhaps they once might have had from the Church, and were now not priests but laymen; the Catholic Church concluded otherwise, that though heretics were truly deprived of sacerdotal authority and commission by the censures and authority of the Church, yet the baptisms given by them in that state were not wholly null and void, if given in due form, nor so far invalid as to need the outward form to be repeated by rebaptisation. The difference was not in their principle, it is plain then, nor in their discipline about heretical priests, but in the different conclusions they drew from it: the one said the baptisms of heretical priests were null, the other said, they were not null; whilst they both agreed in this, that heretics were not true priests of God, but deprived of all sacerdotal authority and commission by the discipline and authority of the Church.

It is plain now to any ordinary capacity, that if matters stood thus in the Catholic Church, she must needs receive the baptisms of persons destitute of sacerdotal authority and commission; for they could not have a divine commission, when God and his Church agreed to take it from them: and if they had no commission, they were not true priests, however they might sometimes equivocally bear the name and title; which are not the things we are disputing about, but the qualifications and authority of the persons. For let them be called priests or laymen, they were certainly men destitute of a commission, when all sacerdotal authority was taken from them; and if the Church

received the baptisms of such men, it is evident she received the baptisms of unauthorised and uncommissioned persons; who were destitute of a commission, not because they were originally without it as other laymen, though some heretics might be so, but because they were deprived of it by the just powers and discipline of the Church. This I have fully proved against Dr. Brett, and I reckon it a sufficient answer to any thing this author has pretended to offer further concerning the sense and practice of the ancient Church, who makes no new discoveries, but only represents things with a little more artifice, and that not always the most laudable, as will appear in the sequel of this discourse.

CHAP. II.

Containing Remarks on our Author's Preface.

SECT. I.—That Unauthorised Baptisms, and Invalid Baptisms are not of the same Import in the Sense of the Ancient Church.

HAVING shewed our author's grand mistake, in supposing all the ancient heretics to be true priests in actual commission, against all the discipline of the ancient Church, I now proceed to make such remarks on the remaining part of his preface and book, as shall seem necessary to set matters in a just light to every candid and unprejudiced reader. In page 3 of his preface, he is offended that I charge him with a great error in confounding the terms of unauthorised baptism and invalid baptism together: and for any thing he has said to clear himself, I still charge him with the same error, in going against the sense of the ancient Church, who distinguished between unauthorised baptisms and invalid baptisms, and reckoned many baptisms to be unauthorised, which she did not esteem invalid: particularly the baptisms of heretics, who had no actual commission, as true authorised priests, when she had taken away their commission from them; those baptisms she esteemed unauthorised, but

not invalid, so as to need repeating by rebaptisation. And our author must first shew, that heretics were true authorised priests by the discipline of the ancient Church, and in actual commission at the time they pretended to baptise, before he will clear himself of the error I charge upon him. For it is not sufficient to say, they once had a true commission, unless he also shew, that they had never lost their commission, by being deprived of it by the censures of the Church. For if they had lost their commission at the time they pretended to baptise, they were as much unauthorised as those who never had any commission at all. And yet the Church received the unauthorised baptisms of these unauthorised men, and did not pronounce them wholly null and void, but received the persons so baptised by them, without rebaptisation. Which shews, that unauthorised baptism and invalid baptism were not terms of the same import in the sense of the ancient Church, however our author is pleased to make them so, which is the thing I charge upon him.

SECT. 2.—This Author's Reasons for the Validity of Heretical Baptism, very different from those of the Primitive Church.

In the next place, page 6, he complains “that the rest of the Churches in the world would not concur with Cyprian, nor agree with him, to make frustrate and void, during their heresy and schism, the commissions once received by their heretical and schismatical subjects.” This grand charge against the Universal Church I have already shewed to be a grand mistake: for all the Churches in the world did thus far concur with Cyprian, as to make frustrate and void the commissions of heretics and schismatics, during their heresy and schism: only they did not conclude with him, that therefore the baptisms of heretics are absolutely invalid, and to be repeated again, as being given by persons out of commission; which was a wrong inference of Cyprian's, in which the Catholic Church never would concur with him. But our author is very confident, that the reason why the Churches differing from Cyprian, did not make void the baptisms given by heretics, was only because those Churches had no laws to take away the sacerdotal commission of heretics from them. Which is not only said without proof,

but against the glaring evidence of so many laws of general and provincial Councils, which I have now produced, to shew, that the Church abounded with such laws, which were actually put in execution upon heretics, upon every proper occasion, vacating their commissions, and taking away all sacerdotal authority from them. And I am amazed to think, how any man could converse with ancient Councils, and not observe this, which almost occurs in every page of them.

SECT. 3.—This Author's Notion about the Invalidity of Heretical Baptism, unbaptises the whole Church of England.

But for all this our author will still have it, that the validity of heretical baptism depended upon heretics having a true commission, not vacated or taken away during their heresy or schism. For these are his words, page 7, "Those Churches held such baptisms to be valid in themselves, as to their ministration, and so do I too, because there was no want of commission." Now, if I rightly understand him, this is as much as to say, that if heretics have not a commission, their baptism is invalid. I cannot see but that by our principles it must be so. And therefore unless he can shew, that the ancient heretics and schismatics had a lawful and unvacated commission, during their heresy or schism, he must needs conclude their baptism was invalid. And then I will venture to say again, that such notions concerning the invalidity of heretical and schismatical baptism, do unchurch and unbaptise the whole Church of England, however angry our author is for bringing so heavy a charge against him. He says, I should have named his black notions in his own words. And I did so in my remarks upon him, page 153,¹ &c. But if he was pleased to overlook it, that was his fault, and not mine.

Now the charge was this: that he had then declared himself freely for the Cyprionic notion of the invalidity of heretical and schismatical baptism; and withal declared, that the baptisms of the Church of Rome were the baptisms of a Church that was overrun with abundance of damnable doctrines and practices, and had but little of solid or substantial religion to be found in her communion. Upon which I told

¹ See Appendix to the First Part, p. 127, in the present edition.

him plainly, that if the baptisms of heretics and schismatics were invalid, and the Church of Rome were an heretical and schismatical Church; and the Church of England had her baptisms originally from that Church, and no other; that then the consequence must be, that all the baptisms of the Church of England were invalid, and that there was no true baptism administered by her priests, any more than by any others. Now to free himself from this charge, he thinks fit to say, "he believes the baptism of heretics to be valid in such Churches, as did not by their discipline vacate or take away the commission of heretics from them." But then I tell him his supposition is utterly false; there were anciently no such Churches, as left heretics and schismatics in possession of their authority and commission; and I have proved my assertion by as undeniable evidences as can be given: and therefore, till he disproves them, and proves his own supposition by stronger evidences, the charge I bring against him, must rest upon him; and, whether he will repent of and retract his unchurching principles or not, I see yet no reason to take off the just reproach which is laid upon him. I can be as civil to his person as he desires, but if he advances such false assertions and positions, as reproach the Universal Church and the Church of England together, he must excuse me, if I think myself in common justice bound to shew him his mistakes, and with some reflection on his principles do justice to our common mother.

SECT. 4.—The Exceptions of our Author against the new Form of Confirmation, which was proposed to the Convocation, considered.

His next exceptions are, pages 8 and 9, against the proposal I humbly offered to our superiors, legally assembled in convocation, concerning a peculiar form of confirmation for such as were baptised by heretics and schismatics. He hopes our superiors will distinguish between such heretics as received an episcopal commission, and those that never had one. I think neither he nor I need direct our superiors what is fit and proper to be done in this case. But I will make bold to tell him again, that if heretics lose their commission which they once had; if their commission be vacated by the censures of the Church, and taken from them by

the same authority that gave it ; then their sacerdotal authority and powers are not so vastly different from those who never had a commission, as he imagines. For he himself owns, that a commission once received, and afterwards vacated, was reduced to an equality with a no-commission never received at all, by the discipline of the Cyprianic Churches. And I have made it appear, that this was the case of the ancient heretics, by the discipline of all Churches. So that whatever forms of confirmation were made for persons baptised by those heretics, must needs be for persons baptised by such men as had no actual commission, but antiquated, vacated, and taken from them. And where, then, is the mighty difference between such a vacated commission, and no commission at all ? But our author cannot yet believe, that the ancient heretics had their commissions so vacated and taken from them by any other beside the Cyprianic Churches. He had best, therefore, inquire a little further into this matter, and give himself and the world a little more rational satisfaction, before he is too dogmatical and peremptory in directing his superiors, and fixing distinctions to be rules to their proceedings.

But he has a pleasant exception behind, against the form of confirmation which I subjoined as an exemplar. He says, " it was only the product of the ninth century, and wants the noble character of what is Catholic, that is, antiquity, universality, and consent." I am a little at a loss here to know what this gentleman would have, especially when he adds, " that I might with as much reason have given an instance of image-worship and invocation of saints from the second Council of Nice." But why so much anger against an innocent form of prayer ? Or why, to make it answer the end for which I proposed it, must it needs have antiquity, universality, and consent ? Have we now any apostolical liturgies ? Or any particular forms of prayer, except the Lord's Prayer and some few others in Scripture, which may pretend to this noble character and a general reception over all the Church in all ages ? A man may as reasonably object against some of our Common-Prayers, that they are taken out of the Mass-Book, as this author does against this form, because it is only fetched from the ninth century, when every

one knows, prayers of the same sense and kind, though not of the same length and words, may be found among the first orders that were made by general Councils for the reception of those that were baptised by heretics, into the communion of the Church. But if our author is not more sparing in such objections as these, I shall be obliged to be a little more sparing in my answers.

SECT. 5.—Our Author confesses his Mistake in producing Lucifer as a Witness against Lay-Baptism.

In page 11, we have something more candid and ingenuous from him. He confesses he made an undesigned slip when he mistook a minor proposition for a major, and therefore brought Lucifer upon the stage as a witness for the invalidity of lay-baptism, and St. Jerom as asserting the same by the authority of the Nicene Council, he civilly thanks me for helping him to correct these mistakes; and I hope I shall have his thanks again for setting him right once more about the priesthood and commission of heretics and schismatics, when I show him that it was vacated and taken from them, during their heresy and schism, by the universal consent and votes of the whole Catholic Church. After which I shall have no longer occasion to dispute with him about unauthorised or uncommissioned baptism, from the history of the Church; since all the world will own, that a vacated commission and a no-commission are pretty near a parallel; and if the Church received the baptisms of those as valid, whose commission she had vacated, she might as well receive the baptisms of those who never had any commission at all, because they were both actually and equally without commission when they pretended to baptise; the one, as never having had any commission; the other, as having lost their commission by the Church's censures.

SECT. 6.—How our Author confounds Valid Baptism and Saving Baptism together.

But our author alters his style in the same page, and, instead of thanks, charges me with captiousness and cavilling, only because I desired to know, in what writing of

the Stephanians he found this maintained, that they who had received baptism from heretics or schismatics, were in a state of salvation? He says, "any one who has looked into Cyprian's works, must know, that Stephen, bishop of Rome, did hold that such baptised persons were in a state of salvation, for they esteemed them to have been validly baptised: and sure they, who held men to have been validly baptised, esteemed them to have been in a state of salvation, otherwise what signified the validity of their baptism? To which I answer, without captiousness or cavilling, that it signified thus much, that they were not to be re-baptised when they came over to the Catholic Church; but it did not signify, that they were in a state of salvation while they continued in heresy or schism; for these things are very different from one another. St. Austin, and all the Catholic Church, defended the validity of heretical baptism against the Donatists, but they did not tell them or any other heretics, that therefore they were in a state of salvation while they were heretics, because they had a valid baptism; for then it had been in vain to exhort them to come over to the Catholic Church in order to be saved. So that unless Pope Stephen had some very peculiar notion of the salvability of heretics, different from the rest of the Church, he could not be of the opinion our author fathers upon him, for there is no consequence in our author's proof. Stephen believed the baptism of heretics to be valid, *ergo*, he believed heretics to be in a state of salvation. For men may have valid baptism, and yet be in a state of damnation, as heretics out of the Church, and such wicked men as Simon Magus in the Church: which is so plain, that I will not stand longer to dispute it with our author, but leave it to the reader to judge who is the most cavilling person; I who distinguish valid baptism from saving baptism, with all the Ancients; or he, who, to make good his charge against Pope Stephen, thus admirably confounds different things together.

SECT. 7.—That heretical Baptism is properly anti-episcopal by our Author's own Concessions.

I here pass over two or three things, as not worth dispu-

ting any longer about them : as whether Athanasius was represented by our author to be of Cyprian's opinion ; and what number of bishops there were in the Council of Arles 33 or 200 ; and pass on to a more material question, whether the baptism of heretical bishops was not esteemed the baptism of false bishops, or no-bishops, and all their ministrations reckoned anti-episcopal ? Our author says, page 15, " I must needs know that the Novatians, and other heretics and schismatics began their heresies and schisms in episcopacy." But I am so far from knowing this, that I hope to make our author know the contrary : for I have made it more than probable in the foregoing discourse, chap. ii. that Novatian himself, the first founder of the Novatians, was never truly ordained a bishop, but his ordination was declared null and void by the Catholic Church, *ab origine* : because, though he had three bishops to give him a pretended ordination, yet it was done in such a manner, against so many standing rules of the Catholic Church, that the Church declared it a void ordination from the very first, and he was never admitted into the college of bishops, but esteemed a false bishop, a counterfeit bishop, a no-bishop, from the beginning. By our author's own rules, then, he could be no true bishop, because the Catholic Church declared him to be a false one. Our author says further, " that those first heretical and schismatical bishops so ordained, had not their orders nulled and voided by those Churches that allowed their baptisms." But I have evidently proved the contrary to a demonstration, that those heretical and schismatical bishops had their commissions repealed and vacated, not only by the Cypriatic Churches, which annulled their baptisms, but by the Roman Churches, and the whole Catholic Church, and the bishops of the whole world, who allowed their baptisms to be valid, so far as not to need repeating. They took away their commissions and authority from them, and declared them to be false bishops, counterfeit bishops, and no-bishops ; and though they called themselves bishops, yet they were really no-bishops in the eye of the Church ; because she had taken away their commissions, and reduced them by her own authority to the state of laymen.

Our author owns, the Church had such a power to vacate their commissions, and that the Cypriatic Churches did actually exercise this power upon them: in which case he allows, that heretical bishops were unbishoped, by being deprived of their commissions by the discipline of those Churches, and reduced plainly to a state of laymen. Now I have proved to him further, that this same power was claimed and actually exercised by all the Churches in the world against heretical bishops; that they did deprive them of their commissions, divest them of their authority, take away all episcopal and sacerdotal power from them, and then declare them henceforward to be no bishops nor priests, but in the state of laymen. So that upon this supposition, that their commissions were vacated and taken from them, it follows upon our author's own principles and concessions, that these heretical bishops were no longer true authorised and commissioned bishops or priests of God, but uncommissioned laymen; being deprived, by the authority of the Catholic Church, of that commission which they once were possessed of.

And now let our author or any other man judge, whether the baptisms of these heretics and schismatics were not, upon this supposition, the baptisms of no-priests and anti-episcopal baptisms, and the baptisms of unauthorised and uncommissioned laymen. I do not say laymen that never had a commission, that our author may not quibble, but men that were actually deprived of their commission by the bishops of the Church, and set themselves up against bishops, after they were reduced to the state of laymen. If such baptisms were not anti-episcopal, I know not what anti-episcopal means; or what are uncommissioned baptisms, if the baptisms of these men were not uncommissioned, when their commission was taken from them. Our author now will not pretend to take sanctuary, as some of his friends do, in that bold assertion against the authority of the Church, that a priest is a true priest, still in authority, let the Church do what she will to take his commission from him, and bring him back to the state of a layman. For our author owns, the Church both has and ought to have such a power; and that the Cypriatic Churches did

actually exercise this power upon heretics by their discipline, vacating the commissions of heretical bishops and priests, and leaving them destitute of all sacerdotal authority in the condition of laymen: so that the only question remaining between this author and me is, whether the rest of the Churches of the world did actually exercise the same power against heretical bishops and priests? For if they did, they plainly made them laymen: and then if any of those laymen set up against their bishops, or the college of bishops, pretending to baptise without regaining a commission from them, their baptisms, in that case must needs be anti-episcopal baptisms, the baptisms of false priests or no-priests, as having no commission but a vacated and repealed one, and the baptisms of unauthorised and uncommissioned laymen. I would speak as plainly as I can upon this head, because the whole of our dispute depends upon this single point: and, if our author will fairly try it out, we will lay aside all other debates and stick to this, and let truth prevail on that side which appears to have the clearest evidences and strongest reasons. It is a question of fact and history, that may easily be decided by the public records of the Church, the acts of her general and provincial Councils in all ages, which contain her proceedings against heretics; whereby it may easily be discovered whether she vacated the commission of heretics and took their sacerdotal authority from them or not. If she did not vacate their commission, then I will yield the cause to this author: but if I have made it appear, that she did vacate their commission and deprive them of all sacerdotal authority, then I expect he will as civilly give up the cause to me, that the ancient heretics were not true bishops and priests in lawful commission, but anti-episcopal usurpers, acting without and against the commission of the true bishops of the Church; and that their baptisms consequently were not the baptisms of true commissioned priests, but the baptisms of anti-episcopal, uncommissioned, unauthorised laymen, made such by the Church's censures. And I desire no more to be allowed me, to prove, that the ancient Catholic Church received as valid, without rebaptising, such baptisms as were given in due form, by men who at

the time of baptising had lost their commission, and were not then true priests of God in actual commission, but at that instant unauthorised and uncommissioned laymen.

SECT. 8.—That our Author's Charge upon his Adversaries, of dissolving the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood, equally reflects upon the Principles and Practice of the whole Catholic Church in all ages.

I shall but make one observation more upon our author's long preface, and that is the sting in the close of it. "To conclude my long preface," says he, "I leave this with our reverend historian, as he is a clergyman, and do affirm, that it is a proposition very easy to be proved against any man whatsoever, that if baptism performed by persons, who were never really and truly commissioned by bishops to baptise, and who act herein rebelliously against, and in opposition to the divine right of episcopacy, be good and valid baptism; then authoritative preaching, administering the other sacrament, the power of excommunicating, of binding and loosing, of retaining and absolving men's sins, and all the spiritual functions of the clergy, are also good and valid, when attempted by unauthorised, never commissioned lay-persons. The consequence of which is the utter dissolution and taking away the necessity of the Christian priesthood, therefore of Christ's authority here on earth, and so of all revealed religion too: which is a dreadful consideration; and much more so, if any who ought to be the guardians of these sacred things, should endeavour by their writings and preaching, to establish the dangerous premises, from whence such profane consequences do naturally flow."

Our author had done much better to have proved this solidly, than to have barely said it, and threatened what he could do: for no one will believe him, but only those who take every thing upon his word, merely because he says it. Let the consideration be as dreadful as it will, I not only say, but have proved to our author, that it neither affects me, nor the bishops of the present Church, who are most of them involved in the same accusation, any more than it does the whole Catholic Church, which allowed the validity of heretical baptism, at the same time that she deprived

heretics of their sacerdotal commission, and esteemed them really and truly no more priests during their heresy, though they once had a commission, than the most unauthorised layman, who never had any commission at all. And therefore, with a little variation of necessary terms, I shall draw up his accusation against the primitive Church, as near as may be, in his own words. If baptism performed by persons, who are really and truly deprived of their commission to baptise by the bishops of the Catholic Church, and who act after such deprivation rebelliously against, and in opposition to, the divine right of episcopacy, be good and valid baptism, as the ancient Church asserted, then authoritative preaching, administering the other sacrament, the power of excommunicating, of binding and loosing, of retaining and absolving men's sins, and all the spiritual functions of the clergy, are also good and valid, when attempted by unauthorised priests, whom the Church makes laymen by depriving them of their commission: the consequence of which is, the utter dissolution, and taking away of the necessity of the Christian priesthood, therefore of Christ's authority here on earth, and so of all revealed religion too. Now if this rant of an argument would only be reckoned an insignificant slander in any one that should level it against the known practice of the primitive Church in allowing the baptism of heretics to be valid, when they were deprived of their commission by the same power that first gave it; I leave every one to judge what name the same accusation deserves, when brought against others, who are only relating and defending the practice of the ancient and present Church against the pretensions of modern innovators. Our author will not pretend there is any great difference, between a vacated commission once received, and a no-commission never received at all; for as to actual authority it is equally wanting in both: but he will still say, the primitive Church never vacated the commission of those heretics whose baptism she received as valid; which, when he has said it over a thousand times, will be no nearer truth, but a grand mistake of his own, or some others, who abused his credulity in informing him so; and the more he repeats it, the more he will only abuse himself and the world in echoing forth their wrong information.

I could say a great deal more to shew the weakness and absurdity of this his insinuation, but what I have already said is sufficient, with all wise and good men, to vindicate the guardians of sacred things from so vile an aspersion, which reflects so much dishonour on his lawful superiors, and so much reproach on the ancient Catholic Church; with whom I take it to be an honour to be reproached by this author, only for advancing the same principles as the Catholic Church did, which he falsely charges with the consequence of dissolving all revealed religion, and the necessity of the Christian priesthood: as if there were no necessity of lawful priests, because there may be some usurpers; some heretics that have lost their commission, and some that never had a commission; whose baptisms can confer no graces of the Spirit, for which there is a necessity of lawful priests, but may give the outer form in such a manner, as the Church thinks fit not to repeat by rebaptisation. Let him declaim as long and as loud against this as he pleases, and call it a dissolving of the necessity of the Christian priesthood: it is only what I expected at his hands, who insults the Fathers of his Church with contempt and scorn, and under the professions of respect to priests, treats all those rudely who are not his followers and admirers. All I shall say further at present, upon this head, to this accuser of the brethren, is only, ‘The Lord rebuke thee!’

CHAP. III.

Remarks on our Author's First and Second Chapters.

SECT. 1.—That the allowing the Baptisms of Usurpers to be valid, is not abetting or encouraging their Usurpations.

HAVING thus far copiously considered our author's preface, I shall be more sparing upon his book, because the main controversy about uncommissioned baptism is already determined. Our author's first chapter is spent in a sharp invective against the usurpers of sacerdotal powers, and the abettors and encouragers of those usurpations. In which I know no one that has engaged in the present controversy, to be really concerned, though he would gladly insinuate and fasten the charge upon them. He begins his book by telling his readers, "that the occasion of it is a most novel and unchristian usurpation, attempted at the Reformation, and since that time to this day, by men who never received any divine commission; and who yet, in opposition to, and rebellion against their spiritual sovereigns, refusing to receive any such commission from them, endeavour to advance themselves into the high-priest's and priest's office, and to minister in such holy things as God has appropriated to that sacred commission, which he gives to men for that purpose. And this they do, not upon the pretence of necessity, arising, as some suppose, from the want of such as are commissioned, but in an obstinate perverse resistance against Christ's spiritual vicegerents, undervaluing and trampling upon that authority wherewith he has invested them."

Now, whatever there may be in this accusation, it affects most his own friends, I mean those who hold the same opinions with our author about rebaptising, that is, the followers of Cartwright in England, and the Calvinists beyond sea: for we of the Church of England are not concerned in any such pretended usurpation. "Yes," our author says, "we adhere to, and encourage them in their usurpations; we concur with and abet them, because we affirm there is

some validity in such pretended ministrations." But if this were to be called abetting or encouraging men's usurpations, I could much more plausibly prove our author guilty of abetting and encouraging heretics and schismatics; for he maintains that the baptism of the ancient heretics and schismatics was not only good and valid, but ministered with as good authority and divine commission, as that of the Catholic priests: which assertion puts those usurpers upon an equal foot and level with the true priests of God, and the authorised baptisers of the Church, when yet I have evidently proved, that the ancient heretics were all of them destitute of commission, and anti-episcopal usurpers. Again, if there be any force in his accusation, then, First, it holds equally against all the Church of England, and her whole college of bishops ever since the Reformation, who have constantly admitted such as were baptised by these usurpers, without giving them a new baptism. So that if allowing the bare validity of their baptism be an abetting and encouraging of usurpers, the whole Church of England has been involved in this crime from the beginning of the Reformation. Secondly, his accusation holds equally against the primitive Church, for allowing the validity of the baptisms of the Novatians, who were not only deprived of their commission as heretics, but originally destitute of episcopal commission, having, as I have proved, never received a true episcopal ordination. Thirdly, it involves the whole primitive Church in the same crime of abetting or encouraging usurpers, because she allowed the validity of the baptisms of those heretics, whom she deprived of their commission by her own authority, and esteemed them no priests after that, but mere usurpers. For these men, only changing the terms, "having never received a divine commission," into, "being deprived of their divine commission," were as liable to the character which our author gives of unchristian usurpers, as those against whom he levels it, "For they were deprived of their divine commission, and yet in opposition to, and rebellion against their spiritual sovereigns, they endeavoured to advance themselves into the high-priest's and priest's office, and to minister in such holy things as God had appropriated to that

sacred commission, which he gives to men for that purpose; and this they did, not upon the pretence of necessity, arising from the want of such as are commissioned, but in an obstinate perverse resistance against Christ's spiritual vicegerents, undervaluing and trampling upon that authority wherewith he has invested them." These heretics, after they were deprived of all divine commission by Christ's spiritual vicegerents, without receiving any other commission from them, in opposition to, and rebellion against them, took upon them the sacerdotal office of baptising, without authority, and against authority; and yet the primitive Church received the baptisms of these usurpers as valid, so far as not to repeat the outward form by rebaptisation. Now then, according to our author's way of arguing, the primitive Church was guilty of abetting and encouraging heretical and schismatical usurpers, because she so far allowed the validity of their baptisms. But if this be a slander upon the primitive Church, then it is equally so upon all those, who maintain the validity of usurper's baptism, no further than the primitive Church did; who put no sacerdotal authority into the hands of heretics and schismatics, as our author does, but take it away from them; who ascribe no spiritual effects to heretical or unauthorised baptisms, but call upon men to reconcile themselves to the Church, in order to be made partakers of grace and salvation. This is not to abet or encourage heretics, or schismatics, or usurpers, but to lay the due weight and load of their crimes upon them; to condemn their usurpations, to deny their authority, and exhort them to forsake a bad and unauthorised way, and return to the true authorised and effectual way of the Church. Which shews how much our author overshot himself in his zeal, when he went about to form such a groundless and false accusation against his innocent brethren, that reflects dishonour upon the Church of England, and the whole Catholic Church, and even upon himself too, who stands up for the sacerdotal authority of those heretics, whom the ancient Church declared to be no priests, but usurpers. And this is the only observation and remark I have occasion to make upon his first chapter.

He begins his second chapter with saying, "that I grant

the thing disputed as a divine, but deny it as an historian, because I say, a power or commission to authorise men to baptise was necessary to preserve the Church according to the order of Christ in future ages." This author has a notable talent of finding out contradictions where there are none. For wherein do I make my divinity and history contradict one another? If it was the order of Christ, that there should be a standing ministry in his Church, authorised to baptise, then it was necessary, there should be some persons still in commission to authorise such a ministry to baptise: this I call observing the order or rule which Christ has appointed in his Church, to preserve it with such an authorised standing ministry in it. But now if some men, who are not authorised, take upon them to baptise without commission, and the Church thinks fit not to repeat the outward form of baptism given by such usurpers, does that make it unnecessary, either that there should be a standing authorised ministry, or that there should be those who have commission to authorise others, because a valid baptism may be given, so far as concerns the outward form, sometimes by an usurper? I believe the primitive Church understood the order of Christ as well as any of us: but yet she did not think that, because she admitted the baptisms of heretics and schismatics, who were destitute of a commission, that therefore there was no necessity of a standing authorised ministry, or of persons in commission to authorise others to baptise according to the order of Christ, because there were some that baptised without the authority of the Church, and so against his order; but she thought these two things might consist together; the outward form of baptism administered sometimes by unauthorised persons, did not destroy the general necessity of a standing authorised ministry in the Church. So that whatever contradiction our author fancies in my accounts, as an historian and a divine, will unavoidably fall as much upon the Catholic Church, and an equal charge be brought against her judgment on the one hand, and her practice on the other. And in such society I shall not be concerned to fall under our author's censure.

SECT. 2.—That some discretionary Power was supposed to be in the Hands of Bishops in Commissioning Persons to baptise.

His next discourse against the author, under the name of St. Ambrose, page 6, I pass over, because as I laid no stress upon him before, so I intend to multiply no disputes about him. But our author says, page 10, “that I found the principle of bishops’ power to authorise laymen to baptise upon the pretended relation of that author.” Which is a wrong information, that may perhaps satisfy such of his readers, as intend to read his book, and not mine: but it will satisfy no others: for I found nothing upon the fact as related by that author, but only say, the Ancients went upon the same principles, which I prove another way. My words are these: “Though no other writer among the Ancients has so plainly expressed his mind upon this point, as this author under the name of St. Ambrose; yet it is plain, all of them, who maintained the power of bishops to authorise deacons and laymen to baptise, or, at their discretion, to restrain them from it, must needs go upon the same principle, viz. that such a power was lodged in the hands of the bishops of the Church, as the Apostles’ successors, to authorise what men should baptise, and in what cases, according as they should think necessary in their wisdom and discretion, for the greater or lesser exigencies of the Church: and I there give this reason for it, because without this principle it will be impossible to account for the practice of the ancient bishops, who sometimes restrained deacons from baptising as well as laymen, and sometimes granted authority to them both.” Scholast. Hist. p. 4. Now our author had done much better, if he had accounted for those practices of the Ancients some other way, since he did not like the account which I gave, rather than criticise upon mine so causelessly and to so little purpose.

SECT. 3.—Whether Deacons were accounted Priests and the Ordinary and Standing Ministers of Baptism.

But this is not the only false criticism our author is guilty of in the same place. For he asks immediately, page 3, “why are deacons here ranked with laymen among those, who are not standing ministers to baptise? Did not Mr. Bingham

reckon them before as standing ministers?" I answer, No; I only said, they had a commission from the Apostles to baptise; but whether that was for ordinary or extraordinary cases I determined not. Philip's baptising the eunuch, was in an extraordinary case, when no one else could do it: and a commission for such a case does not make a man a standing ordinary minister of baptism; otherwise laymen, who had a commission for extraordinary cases, would have been standing ministers. But he says, page 17, "I was of another opinion when I wrote my Origines, for there I call deacons, priests, and shew from Optatus and Dr. Hicks, that bishops, presbyters, and deacons had all their share in the Christian priesthood." He cites abundance of my words, but he forgets one thing, that I was then delivering the opinion of the Ancients on both sides the question, and that I said the opinion of Optatus was not the general and received opinion, but that which prevailed most was, that they were not priests but Levites. Here I shall be constrained to transcribe a paragraph in my Origines, which our author was pleased to overlook. The very title of it is, "That deacons were not generally called priests, but ministers and Levites;" and the words are as follows, "That I may not seem to impose upon my readers, I must observe, that the name of priest was not generally given to the deacons, by those that esteemed them a sacred order; but they are commonly distinguished from priests, by the names of ministers and Levites. Thus St. Jerom distinguishes them from the priests of the second order, that is, from the presbyters, by the title of Levites. The author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament, under the name of St. Austin, and Hilarius Sardus, under the name of St. Ambrose, are more positive and express in denying them the name of priests; "*Non sunt sacerdotes.*" And Salvian, though he acknowledges their ministration and function to be about holy things, yet he gives them but the same title of Levites, and that in contradistinction to the priests. And so frequently in the Councils the names, *Sacerdos* and *Levita*, are used as the peculiar distinguishing titles of presbyters and deacons. The fourth Council of Carthage speaks more

expressly, that deacons are not ordained to the priesthood, but only to the ministering office or inferior service, &c. Whence some learned men, Habertus and Bishop Fell, conclude, against Optatus and St. Austin, that deacons were in no sense allowed to be priests; whilst others, Rigaltius and Dr. Hicks with Optatus, distinguish the several degrees of the priesthood, and reckon, that though deacons were not absolutely called priests, because that was the appropriate title of bishops and presbyters, whose ministers and attendants they were; yet deacons sometimes performed such offices, as did entitle them to a lower degree of the priesthood. Having thus fairly stated and represented the matter on both sides, I must leave the judicious reader to determine for himself, which opinion has the strongest reasons." So far my Origines, book ii. chap. xx. sect. 2. By which the reader may now judge, how far I contradict myself when I say, the Ancients did not generally allow deacons to be priests, nor the ordinary ministers of baptism. For it is plain they were divided about these matters, and the greatest part held the negative side of the questions; and so many of them as did not believe deacons to be priests, nor the ordinary ministers of baptism, and yet allowed them, in some cases, to baptise, could not, surely, think the hand of a priest so indispensably necessary in all cases, as that it could be no baptism, if given by any other person, unless they spake egregious contradictions. But I believe our author takes the words, priest and sacerdotal power, in a larger sense than those Ancients did, who distinguished priests from deacons, as our Church does also when she distinguishes the three orders, of bishops, priests, and deacons: for he makes every man a priest and invested with sacerdotal powers, who has the bishop's commission to baptise, either in ordinary or extraordinary cases whatsoever. For he says in his preface, page 17, "If there can be any such thing as the giving of a real authority to laymen to baptise, then when authorised they will cease, in that respect, to be laymen, having, if they can have, a sacerdotal power to baptise in want of the clergy; which will make such their baptisms to be sacerdotal, authorised baptisms, and so not properly lay-baptisms."

Now so long as we are thus divided about terms, we are but disputing and wrangling in the dark about priest and priesthood to no purpose. The Ancients commonly mean by a priest, a presbyter, who in his ordination receives a sacerdotal power not belonging to a deacon; and the ordinary ministration of baptism is by most of them made part of this power. But our author, by a priest, understands any one who has a commission to baptise in any case whatsoever, as well a deacon and a layman, supposing him to have received such a commission, as a presbyter, whom the Church has used to call a priest in opposition to a deacon. And whilst the Ancients mean one thing by a priest, and our author another, it is better to dismiss this dispute, and come to something that is more certain; to take priest in our author's notion, and then inquire, whether none but a person in commission can administer the outward form of baptism so far valid as not to need to be repeated?

SECT. 4.—That many uncommissioned Baptisms were anciently confirmed by Bishops without rebaptising

It is a maxim with our author, page 10, “No power, no baptism; no commission in the administrator, no baptism in the receiver.” Upon which he challenges me and all the world, page 11, to produce any instances of such baptisms pretended to be confirmed by bishops, where the commission, which he calls essential, was wanting. Again he repeats his challenge, page 12, “What presbyters among the Ancients did ever offer to baptise, as absolute and independent of bishops. Mr. Bingham has not produced any ancient instance of such modern rebels: no, the schismatics of old adhered to, and depended upon some bishop or other.” Now I have answered this challenge, as Providence would have it, before it was made: for I have shewed that the irregularity of the ancient heretics and schismatics consisted in the want of commission: for their commission was taken from them; and then it is all one as if they never had any commission at all: as he that loses his eyes, is as much blind, and without eyes, as he that never had any eyes at all. I have proved this so substantially in the

foregoing discourse, that it effectually silences all his little quibbles that follow in the next pages about circumstantial and essential irregularities: for the want of a commission is, according to him, an essential irregularity in a priest or presbyter. But why then do I call such a one a presbyter, when he is out of commission? Why, only to give him some name to know him by: for I agree he is no true presbyter, when he is out of commission. And therefore it is no such hard matter to come by my meaning, as he pretends it to be; page 14. I mean one, who once had the commission of a presbyter, but afterwards was deprived of it for his heresy and schism, by the authority and discipline of the Church, whose act of ministration is sinful in this very act, because now he acts without commission. This is the presbyter I am inquiring about, what validity there was in baptisms administered by him, after he had lost his commission, and set up to act against the authority of his bishop or the Church that had taken his commission from him? He was now no real presbyter, but only in name, because he had lost his commission. How then came his baptisms to be reputed valid for all that, when he was unauthorised and uncommissioned? That is my inquiry. And now let our author mistake my meaning again if he can. He must now say, either there never was an heretical or schismatical presbyter so deprived of commission in the ancient Church; or, that his baptisms given after such deprivation, were never received as valid. Either of which will be to purpose, if he can really make them good, against so many evidences, and so authentically attested, as I have given to the contrary. But nothing short of this will signify any thing in the present case, where we are inquiring about the validity of baptisms given by uncommissioned persons.

SECT. 5.—The necessary Distinction of the Ancients between an Authoritative and a merely Valid Baptism confounded by our Author.

Our Author's hypothesis will not suffer him to distinguish between an authorised baptism, and a mere valid baptism, because he thinks all baptism null and void that is given without authority. But the Ancients distinguished betwixt these two sorts of baptism, and reckoned the one

to be founded on the lawful authority of the administrator, but the other not so. Therefore our author only trifles and imposes upon himself and his readers, page 16, when he charges me with inconsistencies and contradictions, because when I speak of authoritative baptism, I say the Ancients founded it upon a commission; and when I speak of mere valid baptism, I say they did not found it upon sacerdotal powers; because they reckoned the baptism of an heretical or schismatical priest, who was deprived of his commission, to be valid notwithstanding: which things, in the opinion of the Ancients, were fairly consistent together. But then he says, page 20, "that if I would have done any thing here to the purpose, I should have produced authorities, who allowed of the validity of baptism in the name of the Trinity, administered by heretical, schismatical and other irregular priests; I should have given an history of such Ancients nulling and making void the commission of those priests during their heresy, schism, or other irregularity; but as yet I have given no such instance and he is confident I never will. For it is notorious, that those ancient Churches, which allowed of the validity of those baptisms, did also acknowledge the holy orders of the baptisers, and esteemed their episcopal ordination to be good and valid." Now the reader will best judge of this, when he has considered the evidences I have produced in the foregoing discourse, to prove heretics, and schismatics, and degraded priests to be deprived of their commission; to be no true priests of God in that state of deprivation, but unauthorised and uncommissioned priests, or laymen. The two authorities our author produces, page 21, out of the Council of Nice and the African Codex, are nothing to his purpose: for they do not say, that heretics and schismatics were allowed to be true authorised and commissioned priests, during their heresy or schism; but that they should be admitted to officiate in the clerical state, upon their return to the Church; and then they had the Church's commission, which they had been deprived of during their heresy or schism. And this was only a particular favour allowed to the Novatians and Donatists, by way of indulgence and dispensation with the common rule, which was to keep heretics and

schismatics for ever deprived of clerical promotions and sacerdotal powers. But our author being ignorant of the strictness of discipline in the ancient Church, did not distinguish between her common and ordinary rule, and the particular indulgences and dispensations that were granted in some cases, when the necessities of the Church required her to relax a little of her usual severity and discipline. Which she did in the case of the Novatians and Donatists, to encourage them to return to the unity of the Church; not allowing them to have been true priests, while they were out of the Church, but favouring them with a lawful commission, when they returned into her bosom; which favour was denied generally to other heretics, who still stood deprived of their commission for their former rebellions and oppositions to her, even after they were reconciled, and admitted to lay-communion: of which I have given numerous instances in the foregoing discourse.

It will therefore stand good against our author, that those ancient heretics and schismatics were deprived of their commission, during their heresy and schism: and then, according to his own principles and confession, they were no priests in that state, when their commission was taken away by that very authority, that is, the episcopal power which first gave it. I will put the whole issue of the debate upon this single point: for he and I are now well agreed, that the merits of the cause are now contained in it. So that if it appears, that the sacerdotal power and commission of those ancient heretics and schismatics was actually taken from them by the same episcopal power which first gave it; then our author professes he will own, that they were no longer authorised priests by virtue of any indelible or indeleted character remaining in them. For our author, in this, is more ingenuous and favourable to the Protestant cause than some others: he owns that the character of a priest may be so far deleted, or blotted out for his crimes, that all actual power, authority, commission, and rights of a priest, may be taken from him by the same competent power which first invested him with them. And if it be undeniably proved, that this was actually the case of the

ancient heretics and schismatics, as I am confident it is proved by the best of evidences in the foregoing discourse, as clear as the sun at noon-day; then the ground of the dispute is entirely at an end, and our author will confess, that baptism was anciently given by such unauthorised and irregular priests as had actually no commission.

And therefore, for this reason, I will waive at present making any further reflections upon our author's account of ancient history; not because he has said any thing of moment to take off the force of the arguments and authorities I urged to prove my several assertions; but, because the method he and I are now agreed upon, is a more likely and compendious way to terminate this dispute, by bringing matters to a single point, and examining the truth of that by the most public acts and authentic records of the Church. Here we shall have no such great occasion to wrangle about private authors speaking their own private sense: which is our author's way of answering all that I have said in two words, though he himself obliges the world with no other authors. For the Councils will be allowed on all hands to be the public voice of the Church; and, therefore, to make speedy despatch of this dispute and bring it to a short issue, I have chosen to prove my thesis from the proceedings of the general and provincial Councils against heretics and schismatics, which are proofs that are liable to no exceptions of this kind, so long as they are the genuine acts of the Councils they pretend to be, and are understood by us in the genuine sense and meaning of them. Let these then be the dernier resort and final inquiry, as to what concerns ancient history upon this point, between me and this author. And let him remember, that the only question now is, whether the ancient heretics and schismatics had not their commission vacated by the same episcopal power and authority which at first gave it? If the reader desires to see an answer to what this author urges from St. Jerom, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, which are the only authorities that seem to carry any colour of an argument in them, he may find it in the entrance of the foregoing discourse, where I state the controversy with Dr. Brett, and shew how he mistakes the sense of each of them;

and particularly, that Basil's opinion of heretics being divested of their commission and made laymen is agreeable to the sense of the whole Catholic Church, and therefore utterly destructive of our author's contrary notion and assertion.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Greek Church, and the Churches of the Reformation.

SECT. 1.—That the ancient Greek Church had several Laws before the Eighth Century, determining the Validity of Uncommissioned Lay-Baptism.

I HAVE now but one thing more to consider with our author, which is the reflections he makes upon the account, which I gave of the modern Greek Church, and the Churches of the Reformation. I began my account of the modern Greek Church, with the Canons of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, who lived in the beginning of the ninth century: and I thought it was very proper to give an account of the modern practice of the Greek Church from modern writers. But our author takes occasion hence to observe, page 212, “that for the first eight hundred years, that Church had no rule, ecclesiastical law, or custom, whereby to determine the pretended validity of any lay-baptisms whatsoever.” I hope by this time our author is a little better informed and satisfied, when he has considered how many ancient general Councils, during that term of eight hundred years, by their ecclesiastical laws and rules, determined the validity of heretical baptism; and how many of the same Councils, with many others, determined likewise, that those very heretics were deprived of all sacerdotal power, authority, and commission, and consequently in the state of unauthorised laymen; as I had sufficiently intimated in the First Part of my Scholastical History, and

have now more substantially proved in this. Therefore his harangue about the great extent of the Greek Church, and how significant a part it was of the Catholic Church, is only against himself; though he designed it as a specious pretext to impose upon his readers. And for the authorities of St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, which are so often produced for the invalidity of lay-baptism, I have shewed before, in stating the controversy with Dr. Brett, that they make nothing to his purpose.

SECT. 2.—The Authority of the Canons of Nicephorus vindicated from our Author's Exceptions.

He next runs out against Nicephorus, as a zealous promoter of the superstition of image-worship, and says, page 214, “that his authority is of no more value in this case of lay-baptism, than it is in the other, of the use of images in divine worship.” I did not desire it to be of any greater value: I produced it only to determine a question of fact, not of right, whether lay-baptism, in any case, was then allowed in the Greek Church? The question was not, whether it was lawful or unlawful in itself, but whether it was then the practice of the Greek Church? And his testimony is sufficient to decide this to be their practice, though their practice might chance to be against a divine law, which is another question. So if the question had been about image-worship, as to fact only, whether it was then set up in the Greek Church, the testimony of Nicephorus, or the second Council of Nice, had been good in this case to have proved the fact, though not sufficient to have justified the lawfulness of the practice. But our author cunningly confounds these questions of fact and right together, and labours artificially to work his reader into an ill opinion of Nicephorus, only to ruin his credit as an historian.

But if this will not succeed, he would have his reader believe these Canons were only the private dictates of Nicephorus, not made in any authentic Council at all, page 215, especially not in the Council of 270 bishops, Anno 814. I am not much concerned what Council they were made in; though I think it as likely to be in the Council of 270

bishops as any other. But that is not the question. Were they not canons of the Greek patriarch; and were the canons of the patriarch of no force in the Greek Church? If not, how came Harmenopulus to make use of them as canon-law, in a Collection of Rules to direct men in their practice? This one reason is of more weight with me than all our author's little criticisms to the contrary; who, if Nicephorus and his Canons had been for his turn, could have said as many pretty things in their favour, as now he does to their prejudice, only to bias his reader against them. He could have said, that patriarchs did not use to make canons but in synod; or if otherwise, yet their power was so ample and extensive, that their canons were of force through all the Churches under their jurisdiction. But now, these Canons are not the declared authentic sense of the Greek Church; and that for another reason, page 220: because some Greek writers wrote boldly against the lawfulness of lay-baptism in any case whatsoever; which it is reasonable to believe they would have been more tender of opposing, if it had been the general sense and practice of the Greek Church. As if our author, or I, or our readers, knew none at this day, who write boldly against the approved lawful sense and practice of the Church of England, without any tenderness for the standing rules and orders of the Church. It is low waters with a man, and his invention is almost exhausted, when he is forced to make use of such pretty arguments as these.

But he returns upon us again with St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and the whole Greek Church, for 800 years, page 221. In answer to which, I have shewed him before, that St. Basil's Canons, which he says were part of the canon-law of the Greek Church, pronounce heretics to be no more than laymen: and the Greek Church, for 800 years did the same; and yet received the baptisms of those laymen without rebaptisation. Which is another sort of demonstration of the sense and practice of the Greek Church, than any our author pretends to give us.

At last he comes to the poor shift to tell his readers, page 221, "that Nicephorus was wrought upon by the emissaries of the Church of Rome, to introduce this novelty

into the Greek Church, and that gave just occasion to others of the Greek Church, who were jealous for the truths of Christianity, to give that Church timely warning of dangerous Romish novelties creeping in among them; of which number Georgius Hamartolus, Glycas, and Theodorus Scutariota, appear to have been, in vigorously opposing the pretended lawfulness of lay-baptism, which was first started only in the Latin Church." This pretence of being wrought upon by Romish emissaries, serves our author at all turns, when he has nothing else to say to lessen the credit, or elude the testimony of any writer; and we shall have more of it by and by, against the modern Greeks. Here I observe only, how he gives characters of men, just as they seem to favour or not favour his own opinions. The authority of Nicephorus was not worth a straw, because he was a zealous defender of image-worship; but Hamartolus and Glycas, though they were as zealous defenders of image-worship as Nicephorus, are honest men, jealous for the truths of Christianity, only because they vigorously opposed the pretended lawfulness of lay-baptism. When men can be thus partial in giving characters of men, I think it matters not much, what they say for or against them: and therefore the Canons of Nicephorus will stand good still, as rules for the Greek Church, notwithstanding all these little pleas of our author against them.

SECT. 3.—Our Author's disingenuous Way of answering the Modern Greek Writers.

In the year 1166 I observed there was a Council at Constantinople, which denied the validity of baptism given by pretended or false priests, who counterfeited orders, pretending to be priests when they were not so. Our author upon this says, "I can produce no Councils for 1200 years, that would have have determined otherwise than this Council did in this matter;" when yet I have shewed him, that most of the ancient Councils said, heretics were no priests, but false priests, pretending to be priests when they were not so; and yet they did not order such persons as were baptised by them, to be rebaptised, as this Council did; I said further concerning the decree of this Council, that it

had not said any thing particularly about the invalidity of laymen's baptism in extraordinary cases of absolute necessity; and therefore it might consist with the Canons of Nicephorus, which only respected such cases. To this our author replies, "that the power of baptising was committed only to those who were vested with a priestly power, and laics have no such power or authority given them." page 230. But now our author forgets what he had so often asserted before, "that upon supposition a layman could have the bishop's authority and commission to baptise in an extraordinary case of necessity, he would, in that act, and for that time so far be a priest, and invested with sacerdotal power, and not be in that act a mere uncommissioned layman." And why might not this Greek Council be of our author's mind, and think laymen, that were commissioned to baptise in a particular case, to be priests in that act, and not mere laymen? And if so, there is no contradiction between the Canons of Nicephorus and this Council: for they both allow the baptisms of men invested with sacerdotal powers.

But however it was, I shewed that the Greeks practised according to the rules given in the Canons of Nicephorus to this day; and this I proved from undoubted evidences of historians and others, who give an account of their practice. To smother which glaring evidence, our author first betakes himself to his usual art of lessening the authority of the witnesses, by saying, page 236, "they were no more than particular men, and their authority of no importance." As if a number of credible historians agreeing together, were not sufficient authority to show us what was the practice of any Church, when the question was only about a matter of fact, and not right; and no contrary evidence is so much as pretended to confront or contradict them. "But it is very notorious," our author says, secondly, "that in these latter ages the Greeks are, by the craft and subtilty of the Romish emissaries, divided into two parties." Why did he not then produce the testimony of some of that party, who were against "the Popish doctrine," as he calls it, of allowing laymen to baptise in case of necessity? Or, why did he not prove particularly of the authors I produced, that they were influenced

or bribed by the Jesuits to deliver false history in favour of the Romish pretensions? Were they divided into two parties upon this point, and yet all wrote unanimously on one side only? Or, how does he prove that those that wrote were all in the Romish interest? He entertains his readers, by way of blind, with a long story about the Jesuits' usage of Cyrillus Lucaris; which is nothing to the purpose; for this author is not concerned in the dispute, one way or other. He should have shewed that the testimony of Jeremy, the patriarch, was gained only by the art of some Romish emissaries. Instead of this he tells us, "the patriarch was displeased with the Lutherans, for believing invocation of saints to be vain and frivolous, and for despising that adoration which was paid to their images and relics." page 238. And what then? Is it likely, that he who was displeased at the Lutherans, would have represented the practice of the Greek Church, as agreeing with the Lutherans, if it was really otherwise? Nothing can be more improbable than this: and therefore I cannot but imagine our author was in a sort of maze and confusion when he wrote it, since nothing could have been said more directly against his purpose. But he adds, "Mr. Bingham might with as good a grace have produced that patriarch's testimony for these Popish corruptions, invocation of Saints, and adoration of images and relics, as for the other." And where had been the harm of that, I pray, if any one had made a question, whether invocation of saints, and the worship of images had been the practice of the Greek Church? Could we have had a better evidence for matter of fact in such a case, than the testimony of one of their own patriarchs? Does not our author himself quote a Greek Council, and some others before that, for the invalidity of lay-baptism? And why might he not with as good a grace have produced the same authors for the worship of saints and images. No doubt he might, if the question had been only, whether saints and images had then been worshipped in the Greek Church? Their testimony in this case, to determine a matter of fact, had been as good and certain as any other. Why then does he quarrel with me for doing that which any one may do, and which he himself has done, without any

offence or imputation? I know not, in truth how he should determine matters of fact, unless from such authors as have particularly wrote about them.

After he has lashed the patriarch, he turns off all the other instances I gave, by saying, page 238, "that they are of so modern a date, that we have reason to believe, they are no better than the mere effects of some Greeks being too much infected with the superstitions of the Church of Rome." If these modern Greeks had been of his side, then they had not been too modern for his purpose. But if they were only some Greeks, infected with the Romish superstitions, why did he not produce others not infected with them, to tell us what was the practice of the non-infected Greek Church in the point of lay-baptism? As it happens, our author is very unlucky in his observations on the character of these modern Greeks. For the chief of those writers, which I quoted, were so far from being Latinised Greeks, that they were professed opposers of the Romish usurpations. Gabriel Severus, archbishop of Philadelphia, is often railed at by Leo Allatius for writing in defence of the Greeks against the Latins, and particularly against the Pope's supremacy, which is the grand usurpation and corruption of the Romish Church. It was a little unfortunate therefore in our author, so carelessly and without considering, to rank that archbishop among those Greeks that were favourers of the Romish Church, when he was so great a stickler against it. He is no happier in applying his character to Metrophanes Critopulus; for this writer was out of the reach of Romish emissaries and Jesuists: he was a student in Oxford, sent into England by Cyrillus Lucaris, and by him recommended to the protection and patronage of Archbishop Abbot, who will not be suspected to have instilled into him any of the Romish corruptions. How then could our author, with any modesty say, the rest of the instances I had given were out of Latinised Greeks, when it is so plain they were most directly contrary? And why would he not vouchsafe his readers one modern Greek writer, Latinised or unlatinised that gave a different account from what I did of the present practice of the Greek Church? That had been the fair

way of answering, by confronting and disproving my authorities by better and more credible allegations. But he knew this was not to be attempted, and yet resolving to outface the sun at noonday, he betakes himself to another method, to invalidate the evidence by falling foul upon the character and reputation of the persons; which yet proves as unfortunate, as it was disingenuous; for the persons he assaults were men of a quite different party and character, to what he represents and labours to fasten on them; being no Latinised Greeks, but stiff opposers of the Romish Church in all the ancient points controverted between them.

Commend me now rather to the honest ingenuity of Dr. Brett, who, being sensible there was no withstanding so many undeniable evidences and unquestionable allegations, chose rather to confess he had nothing to oppose or say against them, for want of books to make a just inquiry. But this author would not so give up the cause; he pretends there was a party among the Greeks, the true unlatinised Greeks, that would depose and vouch for him: but when he comes to produce his authorities and tell the evidence, there is not one appears in his behalf; even the unlatinised Greeks, as well as the rest, are all against him. And therefore with what success this bold undertaker has adventured to advance one step further than Dr. Brett, and walk where he thought it not safe to tread, I now leave to the judgment of every sensible and ingenuous reader.

SECT. 4.—That the Reason of the Greeks Practice was not their Opinion of the Absolute Necessity of Baptism for dying Infants.

I have but one remark more to make upon our author in relation to the modern Greek Church. He says, page 239, “that the reason of this practice of some of the Greeks is the uncharitable and cruel opinion, which some of the Romanists hold of infants dying without baptism, and which those Greeks have learned from them.” Now our author knows very well, that this opinion about infants was the doctrine of St. Austin and other Latin Fathers, long before the Roman Popish writers were in being: for he himself charges St. Austin with it, and reckons it the reason also why he allowed laymen to baptise in case of necessity.

Why then might not the Greeks have it from St. Austin, as well as from the friars and Jesuits of the Romish Church? But the absolute necessity of baptism for dying infants was not the reason of allowing laymen to baptise; for laymen were allowed to baptise adult persons, as well as infants, in cases of necessity: and yet St. Austin had not that opinion of the absolute necessity of baptism for adult persons, that he is commonly supposed to have of it for infants; because he particularly excepts two sorts of adult persons, as the rest of the Catholic writers commonly do, from the severity of the sentence, viz. First, such catechumens as died martyrs, baptised in their own blood: and, Secondly, such of them as made profession of a true faith and a sincere repentance, and died without baptism; not in any contempt or neglect of it, but by some extreme necessity, which debarred them from it, when they most earnestly desired it. They, who represent St. Austin's opinion otherwise, I will make bold to say, are ignorant of his doctrine, which ought not to be spoken of without this necessary distinction between infants and adult persons. Now then to found the opinion St. Austin had of the lawfulness of laymen's baptising adult persons in cases of necessity, upon the doctrine of the absolute necessity of baptism for infants, is doing wrong to St. Austin, because it is certain, this reason will not extend to adult persons, unless St. Austin had entertained the same notion of them, as he did of others. And that he did not, I shall have occasion to shew very plainly in the next volume of my *Origines*,¹ which is now preparing for the press. If, then, St. Austin did not found the lawfulness of laymen's baptising in cases of necessity upon the opinion of the absolute necessity of baptism for infants, but upon some more general reason, that equally extends to adult persons also; it is more than probable the Greeks did so too, as I shall be inclined to think, till I see better reasons than our author has offered to the contrary.

But I will presume to ask our author two questions further. First, how he is assured, that this uncharitable and cruel opinion about infants dying without baptism, was em

¹ The fourth volume in this edition, the fifth in the original.

braced by the Greeks at all? And, Secondly, why he ascribes it only to some of them, and not to the rest? If he says, they must needs be of this opinion, because they allowed laymen to baptise in cases of necessity; I answer, that that is no reason at all: for many men allow laymen to baptise in such cases, who yet were never tinctured with that cruel opinion. As the Lutherans, who hold, that infants dying unbaptised, may be saved as well as adult persons: and some of the Romanists, by his own confession; for he makes this cruel opinion not to be the doctrine of all the Romanists, but only of some of them. If then some of the Romanists and all the Lutherans could allow laymen to baptise in cases of necessity, without making any such cruel doctrine about infants dying unbaptised to be the reason and foundation of it, why might not the Greeks do so too? Since it does not necessarily follow, that the reason of allowing laymen to baptise is any such cruel opinion of infants dying without baptism. But admit some to be of this opinion; how does it appear, that it is only the opinion of some of the Greeks, and not of all? Our author produces the testimony of neither side, to make good his assertion. And if he says, it must needs be so, because it was only some of the Greeks that allowed laymen to baptise in cases of necessity, but not all of them, I have already shewed that to be false: for the unlatinised Greeks allowed this liberty to laymen as well as the latinised: and therefore, if the reason of this allowance was only the cruel and uncharitable opinion of infants dying unbaptised, it must either be ascribed to them all or none. But whether they held this opinion or not, which I dispute not with our author, it is plain this was not the necessary reason of allowing laymen to baptise, since that might be done without holding any such cruel and uncharitable opinion. So little strength or solidity is there in any part of our author's account of the Greek Churches, either in point of history, or in point of reason, after thirty pages spent upon it.

SECT. 5.—Of the Moscovite or Russian Churches.

Next for the Moscovite Churches, I gave an instance of their rule from one of the Canons of John, their metropoli-

tan, which orders, that children, in case of necessity, should be baptised without a priest. Now, instead of confronting this, by producing some contrary canons, he only says, page 241, “ this was one single man’s authority ; no synod or council mentioned wherein this canon was made.” And that it was not the general opinion of those Churches, he concludes from the contrary practice of the people. But, till he produces some contrary canon, of equal weight and force with this of their metropolitan and patriarch, his saying so will not pass for a sufficient answer. He supposes this metropolitan made an innovation in the Church, and the people, tenacious of their ancient custom, would not submit to his novel canon, or his injunction. But this is all precarious, and a mere supposition without proof: therefore it lies upon him to shew, that the Moscovites, who had their religion from the modern Greeks, had originally contrary rules of discipline settled in their Churches, and then it will look a little more probable that this John, whom they called their prophet, was an innovator ; though still it will be something harsh and uncouth to join such disagreeable epithets together, and give one and the same man the titles both of prophet and innovator. I should rather think the Churches at first very readily complied with the directions of their prophet, but afterwards his rules came to be neglected by the degeneracy and corruptions of the people. Our author thinks otherwise: but till he produces some authentic canon to confront this, I cannot come into his opinion.

SECT. 6.—No further Dispute about the Lutheran Churches.

Next for the Lutheran Churches, he owns the account I gave of them to be true: but he says, page 247, “ they have no Catholic principle whereon to found their practice, and that their reasons are very weak, insignificant, and false.” Which is not now the question, for we are only considering matters historically, and so long as he owns what I delivered before to be true in fact, we will enter into no further dispute about them.

SECT. 7.—Nor about Zuinglius and the Helvetic Churches.

For the same reason we need not stand about the opinion of Zuinglius or the Helvetic Churches: he for acknowledges the account to be true; only he cries out, Popery! Popery! Because no prohibition was laid upon men in cases of necessity, nor any order made for rebaptising those who were irregularly baptised by others. But if this be Popery, it was the Popery of the primitive Church, which, neither by general or provincial Council, laid any prohibition upon men in cases of necessity, nor made any order for rebaptising those that were irregularly baptised by others: but, on the contrary, made many orders both in general and provincial Councils against rebaptising those that were baptised by heretics and schismatics, though those heretics and schismatics were determined to be no authorised priests but uncommissioned laymen.

SECT. 8.—That the Calvinists do, in some Cases, own the Validity of Lay-Baptism.

In stating the opinion of Calvin, our author finds several faults with my account. First, he says, I wrong translate Calvin's words, "*Adeòque ab ipso ferè Ecclesiæ exordio, usu receptum fuit, ut in periculo mortis laici baptizarent, si minister in tempore non adesset:*" this only implies a received custom, not a general prevailing custom, he says, that laymen should baptise in danger of death, and that not always, but only almost from the beginning of the Church. But what difference there is between a received custom, and generally prevailing custom, I think we had best leave to the critics to determine. If Calvin had expressed his mind never so clearly, it would have weighed little with our author: for he thinks Calvin was deceived, in allowing the custom to be so early received as he fancied, that is, from near the beginning of the Church.

But, secondly, he is very confident I am mistaken in saying, that Calvin does not peremptorily pronounce such

baptisms absolutely null and void, but the contrary: the proof I gave of this was from the words of Calvin, cited by Archbishop Whitgift, to the same purpose, against Cartwright: viz. “ It is sufficient for us to know the hand and seal of the Lord in his sacraments, by whomsoever they be delivered.” In answer to this, our author says, page 251, “ that if the word, whomsoever, as Archbishop Whitgift has it, must be taken in its full extent and meaning, then Calvin will be made to esteem as good and valid, all the pretended baptisms of laymen and women, Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Pagans, which is plainly a novelty of corrupt Popery. And Calvin will be made to speak inconsistently with himself, and to contradict his own principle, which was, that lay-baptism was not lawful in any case whatsoever.” Our author here again confounds unauthorised and invalid baptism together, and hence concludes, that because Calvin thought all lay-baptism to be unlawful, therefore he must needs think it absolutely invalid and of necessity to be repeated. Whereas he was not of that opinion, but thought, if it had the hand and seal of the Lord, that is, the outward form of baptism duly administered, it was not necessary to repeat it, especially in a confused and disorderly state of the Church, where many things were to be tolerated, which were not proper to be endured in a well-regulated and exactly disciplined Church. He did not think the lawfulness of the administrator to be absolutely an essential part of baptism, but only a necessary circumstance, which ought to be observed in all well-disciplined Churches; which yet might be dispensed with in a dissipated state of the Church; and in such cases, though administered by laymen, he thought there was no necessity of repeating it by rebaptisation. Our author has already been shewed this by another hand¹ out of Calvin’s Epistles,² part of which, I shall here again transcribe. “ *Adulterinum baptismum censemus, qui administratus est à privato homine; ac in Ecclesiâ rectè compositâ tolerabilis non esset hæc temeritas.*

¹ Letter to the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid; by a Country Clergyman. Lond. 1713. p. 33. ² Calvin. Epist. p. 209. Edit. Amst. 1667.

Sed quia id apud vos inter principia contigit, ante restitutum Ecclesiæ ordinem, et rebus adhuc confusis; non tantum errori danda est venia, sed ferendus est qualiscunque baptismus, modò ne in exemplum trahatur, quod semel perperam gestum est. Nam in Ecclesiæ dissipatione multa Deus condonat, quæ nullo modo admittere fas esset in Ecclesiam benè ordinatam. Olim cum vitata esset religio, haud dubiè multis vitiis et corruptelis implicita circumcisio fuit; quam tamen iteratam fuisse non legimus, quum populus revocaretur ad purum cultum. Ergo anxie disquirere necesse non est, ac ne expedit quidem, in omnes circumstantias, quæ innumeros scrupulos gignerent. Proinde quod ignovit Deus sub Papatu, nos quoque sepe liamus: Nunc ubi de vero baptismi usu admonita fuerit Ecclesia, quod pugnaret cum Christi institutione, pro nihilo dicendum esset, ac de integro baptizandus, qui pollutus fuerit profanâ aspersione.” “ We judge that baptism to be adulterated or vitiated, which is administered by a private man; and this temerity in a well ordered Church ought not to be tolerated. But because this happened among you in the beginning of the Reformation, before the order of the Church was well restored, and while things were in confusion, this error is not only to be pardoned, but any baptism to be admitted, provided the irregularity of what was once done be not drawn into precedent or example for the future. For in the dissipation of the Church, God pardons many things that are not to be admitted of in a well-ordered Church. Heretofore, when religion was corrupted no doubt many faults and corruptions had crept into circumcision; yet we do not read, that it was repeated, when the people were called back to the purity of religion. It is therefore neither necessary nor expedient to be too anxious in our inquiries into all circumstances, which may raise innumerable scruples. And therefore what God pardoned under the Papacy, let us also bury. Only now that the Church is instructed in the true use of baptism, what is repugnant to Christ’s institution, is to be accounted as nothing; and he is to be baptised again, who has been polluted by a profane washing.”

Here it is plain Calvin does not make the public minister so absolutely necessary and essential to baptism, as that all baptisms ministered by private men in all cases, and especially in a grand dissipation of the Church, are of necessity to be repeated. For he advises against the repetition of such baptisms, as, in the infancy of the Reformation were given by Popish laymen. But in a well settled Church his opinion was, that by the rules and discipline of such a Church, such baptisms should be ordered to be repeated.

And this, I shewed also, was the opinion of Dr. Alting, an eminent leader and professor of the Palatine Churches, that baptisms given by laymen in some exigencies, as that of a dissipation of the Church, were not of necessity to be repeated. But our author replies, page 255, " what signifies the saying of one man, when, according to Mr. Bingham, the Churches of the Palatinate commonly follow the contrary doctrine? And the doctor talks inconsistently with himself too, whilst he acknowledges the same baptism to be illegitimate and unlawful." Our author uses here a great deal of his usual artifice and sleight-of-hand in this answer: for he has an excellent talent at misrepresentation. First, he would persuade his readers, that I say, the Palatine Churches commonly follow the contrary doctrine to that which was delivered by Alting; when yet I say nothing of the Palatine Churches, but what makes them plainly agree together. But, secondly, Alting was but one man, and a doctor of no moment in this affair. Yet our author did not think fit to oblige his reader with a doctor of as little moment to confront him, or his opinion, about the validity of lay-baptism in time of persecution, or dissipation of the Church. In which opinion he was not so singular as our author imagines: for as we see, he followed Calvin in the resolution of this point, and in manner transcribed his arguments taken from circumcision, and baptisms administered by laymen, under the Papacy, which they both call baptisms in a dissipation of the Church. And this makes it probable to me, that this was then the current doctrine both of the Genevans and Palatine Churches. But he says, thirdly, that Alting contradicts himself, in affirming such baptisms to be valid and not necessary to be re-

peated, whilst yet he acknowledges them to be unlawful and illegitimate, and therefore false and invalid. But, by our author's leave, this contradiction is none of Alting's, but only fathered on him by our author's own inference, whose principles lead him to conclude all unauthorised and unlawful baptisms to be invalid; which is not asserted either by Alting or Calvin, as we have seen in the several testimonies alleged from them: so that thus far, if these men spake the sense of the Genevans and Palatines, they are both contrary to our author.

But after all, the determination of the question about the baptism of unauthorised laymen, depends not upon the sense or practice of the Reformed Churches, but upon the sense and practice of the primitive Church, to which this author and I appeal: and when the reader fairly considers the evidences produced on both sides, for and against the authority and commission of heretics and schismatics baptising whilst they were in their heresy and schism, he will be best able to judge for himself, where the truth lies; whether the ancient heretics and schismatics, whose baptisms were received, were true priests, in actual commission never vacated by the Church, as this author asserts; or whether, as I have maintained in the foregoing discourse, they were really and truly deprived of their commission by the authority and discipline of the Church, and left in the state of unauthorised and uncommissioned laymen. The deciding this question decides the whole dispute, and therefore this is the only material thing to be examined between me and this author. I have already produced the evidences for my assertion, and leave him and the world to judge of the force of them, having no further concern in the present dispute, but to clear the truth of ancient history, and shew what was the discipline and practice of the primitive Church, which I suppose, in this question, will have its weight with all sober and unprejudiced readers.

END OF APPENDIX TO PART II.

A
DISSERTATION

UPON THE

EIGHTH CANON OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE:

PROVING

That Novatian, the Heretic, was never allowed to be a true
Bishop in any part of the Catholic Church :

WITH

Some Remarks on Mr. L———'s way of handling the
Controversy about

L A Y - B A P T I S M .



BY THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

Rector of Headbourn Worthy, and Havant, Hants, and sometime Fellow of University-
College, in Oxford.

A

DISSERTATION

UPON THE

EIGHTH CANON

OF THE

COUNCIL OF NICE.

SOME readers might now perhaps expect, that having finished another volume of the Antiquities of the Church, I should pursue again the controversy of lay-baptism with Mr. L——, volume after volume, as often as he thinks fit to demand it. But when a controversy begins to spend itself in mere wrangling, and equivocations, and tedious repetitions, and personal rude reflections, and feigned charges of contradictions, only to swell out a book without much edification to the reader; I think it high time to put an end to such a debate: and therefore I shall give a short and final answer to his last book, by making two or three observations upon the most material parts of it. 1. Upon his notion of indelible character, and his artifice in pretending that I agree with him in owning it, and contradict myself upon it, and allow all that he contends for. 2. Upon his notion of laymen, and lay-communion; and of a man's having a right to give the communion, who has no right to receive it. Which I shall shew to be nothing but a splendid equivocation, to dazzle the eyes of his readers. 3. Upon his loose notions of the power and effects of Church-laws and authority in annulling uncanonical ordinations.

and particularly the ordination of Novatian, the heretic. 4. Upon his sense of the Nicene Canon, which he pretends allowed the Novatians to be true bishops and priests, during their continuance in heresy and schism. As to his flowers of rhetoric, indecent reflections, and ungentle insinuations, which he every where intersperses, to lessen the character of his adversary and his writings; as these have no relation to the merits of the cause, nor any ways affect the present dispute; so I think it below me to take notice of them: and if his admirers are pleased with his way of writing, they may enjoy the pleasure of it, for me, without contradiction.

1. The first thing I take notice of, is his notion of the indelible character of a priest, which he supposes to have such a virtue in it, as to preserve the power and authority of a priest, even after the Church has deposed, degraded, and excommunicated him, and done all she can to take away his sacerdotal power by withdrawing her commission from him. Now such a notion of indelible character, I have every where denied and utterly rejected: and therefore all his quotations out of my writings, as if I had owned an indelible character in his sense, are a mere equivocation and manifest imposition upon the credulity of his readers. The indelible character which I have owned, is the external ceremony of imposition of hands, which may remain upon a man, when the Church has withdrawn her commission, and taken away all sacerdotal power and authority from him. And the meaning of this is no more than that, when the Church thinks fit to recal such a man to his office, and restore him to the power and authority of a priest again, she does it not by a new imposition of hands ordinarily, but only by a new commission. This may be illustrated by the example of the Roman Emperors treating their soldiers, from whose practice the name of indelible character was first taken. When the Emperors took any soldiers into their service, they were used to set a mark or character upon their bodies, to signify to whose service they belonged. Now if any soldier turned rebel against his prince, the Emperor immediately withdrew his commission, and took away his office, power, and authority from him; but still his initial character, which he had at his

first entrance, remained with him, even after the man was turned rebel, and divested of all authority by his prince: and if the Emperor had occasion to recal such an one again into his service, he needed not to do it by a new character, which still remained upon the rebel, but only by granting him a new commission, and thereby restoring him to the office, power, and authority of a soldier again. In this case it would be absurd to say, that a soldier who turns rebel has his prince's authority and power, when the prince has withdrawn his commission from him, because he still retains the imperial mark or character upon him; which then signifies no more, but that only the man is turned renegado against his prince, till such time as the prince is pleased to restore him to his office and power again: and then the same character will serve to be the mark of a lawful soldier, which, in the time he stood divested of authority and without commission, was only the indication of a rebel. After the same manner it is with Christians: the soldiers of Jesus Christ, when they are first entered into his service, are signed and marked with the washing of baptism, which is the character of the Lord, that distinguishes them from Jews and Gentiles. If after this they turn rebels or apostates, they are no longer entitled to the spiritual rites and privileges of Christian communion; yet still they retain their external character, their first washing of baptism, which after the greatest apostacy, when they return to their obedience, is never a second time repeated. And so likewise, when they are entered into a higher degree of Christ's service, his ministry or sacerdotal office, they are signed or marked with another external character, which is, imposition of hands; together with which they receive a commission, power, and authority to act as his ministers in the sacerdotal function. If after the reception of these, they turn rebels against Christ, and become heretics, schismatics, apostates, or vile and flagitious men; the Church, who first gave them their commission, power, and authority in the name of Christ, has power also in the name Christ, to withdraw their commission, power, and authority from them: but still the external character of imposition of hands remains upon them, even after they are turned out of office, and divested of all sacerdotal authority by the

Church in the name of the prince: so that if the Church shall think it proper to recal them again into her service, she needs not to do it by a new external character of imposition of hands, but only by a new commission; thereby investing them again with the power, authority, and rites of ministers, which for their rebellion she had taken from them. Whereby it plainly appears, that the external character of a priest, which is called indelible, and the commission, power, and authority of a priest, are very different things: the one may be taken away, whilst the other remains; the one is an external ceremony, which may continue with a rebel after he is turned out of commission; the other is a spiritual authority and power, which can last no longer than a man is allowed to continue in his office by virtue of his commission: which commission, when it is once withdrawn by Christ, or by the Church legally in his name, the man has no longer the power and authority of a priest, because he is deprived by his prince of the commission, which entitled him to it. I believe, there is no ordinary reader, but what can plainly distinguish these two things from one another: and yet our author is pleased to confound them together, that he might thence infer, that if the external character of a priest remained with him after he was degraded, the spiritual power, commission, and authority of a priest remained with him likewise: and that I was guilty of a contradiction, in allowing the one to remain, and not the other. Whereas the greatest part of the testimonies I had cited, which our author is pleased to slide over, do shew as plainly as words can express, that the Church did actually withdraw her commission, power, and authority from degraded and excommunicated priests, at the same time that she left this, which I call the external character of imposition of hands, still remaining with them, so as not to repeat it when she thought fit to receive them into office again by the grant of a new commission: as the Emperors were wont to receive their rebel-soldiers into office again, not by impressing upon them a new character, but by granting them a new commission. Our author himself makes no question, but that in the time of Cyprian, the Church did totally withdraw her commission, authority, and power from degraded priests, and

thereby reduce them to the state and condition of laymen : but yet she recalled some of these to their station again ; not by giving them a new imposition of hands, but only a new commission. As appears in the case of Maximus, the Roman presbyter, who had been the chief instrument in procuring the pretended ordination of Novatian, and was one of the principal men in the schism : whilst some others, both bishops and presbyters, were reduced to the unalterable state of laymen, there to continue without hopes of restitution ; this one man had this peculiar favour shewed him, in consideration that he had been a confessor for the name of Christ, that he was restored to his clerical office again, upon his submission and return to the Church. Yet we do not find that he was admitted again by any new imposition of hands, but only by a new commission, or precept, empowering him to act with authority in his former station. As Cornelius, bishop of Rome, who was the man from whom he received his commission, gives Cyprian¹ an account of the whole transaction. By which any one may judge, the commission was a different thing from the imposition of hands, since the one was necessary to be renewed, to restore a degraded priest to his office again, but the other needed no repeating. The Church in after ages generally observed the same rule ; she withdrew her commission from delinquent priests, and reduced them, as the Church in the time of Cyprian and Cornelius had done before, to the state of laymen : and then they were as much laymen, as those in the time of Cyprian, because they were deprived of their commission in the same words and form as those in the time of Cyprian. But yet the Church sometimes restored to these their priestly office again, as Cornelius did to Maximus, not by any new imposition of hands, but by granting them a new commission, and investing them with a new authority and power, which they were deprived of by the Church's censures. So that when our author has laboured ever so much, to prove that a degraded priest has still the Church's commission, authority,

¹ Cornel. Ep. xlv. al. xlix. ad Cypr. p. 93. Maximum presbyterum locum suum agnoscere jussimus, &c.

and power to act as a priest, because he once received an imposition of hands, which is an external character, that he needs not receive again; his labour is all to no purpose: for it is the commission and authority we are inquiring after, whether a man can be said to retain his commission and authority; when the Church has declared, in the plainest terms, that she has taken all commission and authority from him? Let him retain, if you please, his external character of imposition of hands upon him; let him be one that needs not a new imposition of hands to restore him to the priestly office again: yet he needs a new commission, if he was deprived of it, and must have a new authority, before he can act as an authorised priest again. His indelible character will not preserve his authority, when the Church by her just authority has taken his commission from him; no more than a rebel-soldier can be said to war by the authority of his prince, when his prince has once taken his military commission from him, although he retain still his prince's signature or character that was given him at his first admission. But this gentleman always takes the character of a priest for his commission, authority, and power: and then it is no wonder he should think, a priest cannot lose his authority and commission, but he must lose his character also. But if the character of a priest be a different thing from his commission, as a sign differs from the thing signified, and may be without it, though it many times bears its name, then a priest may lose his commission and authority, whilst he retains his character: and a man, who has once received imposition of hands, may always be said to have received the sign or character of the priestly office and power, and to retain the sign, even when the commission and power is taken from him. If men will not distinguish these things, let them enjoy their own confusions: but let them not think hereby to preserve the commission and power of degraded priests, by the amusement of an indelible character, when the Church has once, by her lawful authority, taken their commission from them; nor go on to charge their adversaries with contradictions, which are only of their own inventing.

2. Another thing disputed between this gentleman and

me, is concerning the notion of laymen, and lay-communion; and about a man's having a right to administer the communion, who has no right to receive it. This author, page 31, of his preface is very much disturbed, that I invented a threefold acceptation of the word laymen. 1. Catholic laymen in the Church. 2. Heretical laymen, who pretended to have a sacerdotal commission, when they really had none. And, 3. such laymen, as once had a true sacerdotal commission, but were afterward deprived of their commission by the same power of the Church, which first gave it, and so were reduced to the state and condition of laymen again. The first sort of laymen he allows; but the two others are fancies, he says, of my inventing. It is a great happiness in an author, when he can say what he pleases, and be believed also upon his bare word. He himself owns, the Cyprianic Churches made such laymen as I contend for, under the third head, that is, such laymen as once had a sacerdotal commission, but were afterwards deprived of their commission, and so reduced to the state of laymen again. And yet, what he himself owns, is now only a notion of my inventing. What would not a man give for such a license as this, to be able to make that which is nonsense in an adversary's mouth, be in his own mouth only an argument of learning and understanding? But he says, he has proved, that these were not laymen in the opinion of those Churches, who held their baptisms to have been valid. When yet he has not so much as transcribed, much less answered, that cloud of witnesses I produced upon this head; for the same reason, I presume, that some historians tell us, Bellarmin's works are scarce to be met with in Italy, for fear men who will not read Protestant books, should see the strength of the Protestant arguments in Bellarmin himself, and the weakness of his answers. The second sort of laymen he turns off, by saying, the Novatians I instanced in were allowed to be clergymen by the Council of Nice; concerning which, we shall see more by and by. But what if this were so? Can he be ignorant, that there were forty heresies before the Novatians, which perhaps all pretended to have their clergy and priests, which yet were no commissioned priests, although some of their baptisms were received by those Churches who disputed

against the Cyprianists upon this question? If these men were not laymen, or at least no priests, I desire to know what more convenient name to give them, that we may agree upon terms, and end disputing about names and words to no purpose.

Our author's notion of a priest's being reduced to lay-communion, is another fancy of his own inventing, and no ways answerable to the design of the discipline of the primitive Church. For according to him, page 110, "reducing a priest to lay-communion, is no more than to oblige him, whilst he is suspended from the execution of his priestly power, to receive the sacrament not among the rest of the clergy in the most sacred place, within the rails at the altar, as was the custom, but among the laity, in a more inferior, or less honourable part of the Church." Whereas it signifies a great deal more in the ancient style and language of the Church. For it always denotes the divesting a priest of his sacerdotal authority and commission, and reducing him to the state and condition of a layman; whereof the receiving the communion without the rails, was but a variable token or appendix. Our author is forced to own, it signified thus in the writings of the Cyprianists. When they speak of reducing a bishop or priest to lay-communion, in them it denotes the making a priest become a layman, or reducing him to the state and condition of a layman: why then does it not signify the same in the writings of Cornelius, when, writing to Fabian, bishop of Antioch, concerning the deposition of Trophimus, one of the three bishops that pretended to ordain Novatian, and giving an account in what capacity he was received into the Church again, he says,¹ "Ἐκοινωνήσαμεν ὡς λαϊκῶ, *Wereceived him to the communion only as a layman?*" When Cyprian says of this same Trophimus,² "*Sic tamen admissus est Trophimus, ut laicus communicet, non quasi locum sacerdotis usurpet;—that Trophimus was admitted into the Church again, but only to communicate as a layman, not to take upon him the place or office of a priest.*" Here our author will allow, that to communicate as a layman, signifies the divesting Trophi-

¹ Ap. Euseb. lib. vi. cap. xlili.

² Cypr. Ep. lii. ad Anton. p. 105.

mus of his episcopal commission, and reducing him to the state and order of laymen. But when Cornelius says the very same thing of the same person; and all the Canons of the Church say the same of other bishops and priests, whom they degraded, and obliged to communicate only as laymen: then communicating as laymen does not signify their being deprived of their episcopal or sacerdotal commission, or their being reduced to the quality and order of laymen, but only their being obliged to communicate among laymen without the rails of the altar, whilst they were suspended from the execution of their priestly power. But I have said so much to expose this vain notion of lay-communion, from the ancient Canons and writers of the Church, in the fourth chapter of the Second Part of my Scholastical History, of which our author thought it the most prudent way to take no notice, that I need only refer an inquisitive and ingenuous reader to that chapter for the fullest satisfaction, that whenever the Church speaks of reducing a priest to lay-communion, it means something more than bare placing him among laymen to communicate without the rails of the altar; it means degrading him from his order, and depriving him of sacerdotal authority and commission, and reducing him to the state and condition of laymen.

But why then, says our author, do I contradict myself, and own that they have still the character of priests, in some sort, upon them? If, by the character of priests, he means the commission, power, and authority of priests, (which seems ever to be his meaning,) then I deny, and have always denied, that there remains any such character after a priest is degraded, and reduced properly to lay-communion: but if by character he will content himself to mean no more than I do, viz. the external ceremony of imposition of hands, which may sometimes be separated from commission, authority, and power; as it is in heretical ordinations, where a formal imposition of hands is given without any divine authority and commission, which heretics have no power to give; and as it is in all degraded priests, when the Church has withdrawn her commission from them: then, I say, it is no absurdity or contradiction to say, the commission and authority of a priest may be taken away, whilst the external

character of imposition of hands remains upon him ; so far, as that when the Church thinks fit to give him a new commission and authority, she does not think it necessary to give him a new imposition of hands ; which is all I mean by a new character. And thus much the Cyprianists allowed, when they had deprived heretical or schismatical priests of their authority and commission, and reduced them to the state of laymen : they did not for all that, when they restored them to their sacerdotal authority, do it by a new character, that is, a new imposition of hands, but invested and re-instated them by a new commission. As appears by the commission given to Maximus at his restoration, which Cyprian approved of, though he had been a ring-leader in the Novatian schism, and the principal author of all the confusion. “ *Jussimus Maximum presbyterum locum suum agnoscere,*” was the form of his admission ; which implies a new commission indeed, but no new imposition of hands, to restore him to the authority of his ministration. So that the Cyprianists, as well as others, made a distinction between the character and the commission, and when they withdrew the commission, left the character, in the sense that I take the character, still remaining : for they did not restore a degraded and ex-commissioned priest by a new imposition of hands, but only by a new commission. Our author will not distinguish these things, as I do, with the ancient Church, both Cyprianists and others ; and that is the ground of all this unnecessary squabble, and his frequent repeated charges of contradictions, with which he should have charged the practice of the ancient Church, and not my representation.

Our author has one very pleasant notion more about communion and sacraments, page 41, which I dare say every reader will readily own to be only a splendid equivocation. I had occasion in discoursing of such priests as are not only degraded, but east out of lay-communion by the Church, to say of these priests, that they, who have no right to receive the sacraments themselves, have no authority to give the sacraments to others : where nothing can be plainer, than that I am speaking of such priests, as are actually turned out of office and church-communion by the Church’s

authority and censures. In answer to this, he forms his reply concerning such priests as are wicked men in themselves, but yet are in actual communion with the Church, and are allowed by her to administer the sacraments, because the Church has passed no censure upon them. And then he quotes the twenty-sixth article of the Church of England, as a proof, that we may use the ministry of wicked men in receiving the sacraments, although such men have no right, in his opinion, to receive the sacraments themselves. Now what is all this, but a splendid equivocation? I am speaking about such wicked men, as the Church has actually censured, and deprived of all right to receive the sacraments, as well as administer them, by excommunicating them after she has degraded them: and he proves, that we may use the ministry of such wicked men, as the Church has neither excommunicated nor degraded, but allowed both to continue in communion, and minister in their office also. Such men, indeed, may be unworthy before God either to administer the sacraments or receive them; but so long as the Church, for want of taking cognizance of them, allows them, *in foro externo*, both to continue in communion and their ministry; so long they have an external and presumptive right, *in facie Ecclesiæ*, and before men, both to minister the sacraments and receive them. But when the Church by her authority has once deprived them both of their ministry and communion, then they have no right either before God or men to minister the sacraments or receive them. And it is of these only I am speaking, concerning which sort of wicked men the twenty-sixth article of the Church of England has not a syllable, and therefore is applied by our author to no purpose, but only by a mere equivocation to amuse an unwary reader. And of this sort are most of the answers our author has made to the arguments which I offered to prove, that degraded and excommunicated priests have not any right to administer the sacraments, when once they are formally censured and divested of their authority by the discipline of the Church.

3. Another observation I think it proper to make, is upon our author's loose notions of the power and effect of Church-laws in annulling uncanonical ordinations, and particularly

the ordination of Novatian, the heretic. I had occasion to say, the ordination of Novatian, though given him by three bishops, was originally void, because it was given him against such laws of the Church, as declared that the ordination of persons in such circumstances, should be void. These laws I instanced in were the laws against simoniacal and forced ordinations; the laws against ordaining without a regular and synodical election; and the laws against usurpation and intrusion into a full see. To all which our author answers in general, page 47, that these were only circumstantial irregularities, not essential. Which is not the thing in question; but, whether the Church had not made such laws, and declared, that such irregularities, as were manifest transgressions of those laws, should not make an ordination void, except the Church herself for just reasons, thought fit to grant a dispensation? It matters not whether they are called essential irregularities, or circumstantial, so long as they are such irregularities, as the Church in her discipline, declares shall make an ordination void: for then the ordination with such irregularities must be void, unless the Church in some special case, or great exigency, (of which she is the proper judge.) thinks fit to dispense with her own rules, and accept an ordination, though given contrary to such prescriptions. For I conceive, the difference between an essential and circumstantial irregularity against Church-canon is not always, that the one makes an ordination void, and the other not; but rather, that the Church has power to dispense with the one, and not with the other: but if the Church does not dispense with the irregularity committed against her own laws, when they declare that an ordination given in such circumstances shall be void, then the ordination must be void, whether we call the irregularity essential or circumstantial, because it has not the Church's dispensation. Therefore if our author would have answered any thing to the purpose, he should have proved, either that there were no such laws then in being, declaring an ordination given with such irregularities as Novatian's was, should be void; or else, that the Church had dispensed with her own laws in this particular case, in favour of Novatian. For this was matter of Church-discipline, and the Church

has power to make laws about ordinations, and declare what shall stand good, and what not; and she has also power to dispense with her own laws upon just and proper occasions: but every heretic and schismatic, who is in rebellion against the Church, as Novatian was, has not therefore a privilege, whether the Church will or no, to challenge a dispensation.

Suppose Novatian was ordained by three bishops, as our author and I are agreed he was: is there no more required by the laws of the Church toward making a true bishop, but only to have the hands of three bishops, vested with the power of ordaining, to be laid upon him? What, if three bishops should ordain a man who was never truly baptised; would that make him a true bishop? Our author indeed thinks so, because three bishops invested with the power of ordaining, laid hands upon him: but the Council of Nice thought otherwise, and therefore decreed, “ that the Paulianists, who were so ordained bishops, priests, and deacons, should be both rebaptised and reordained, as is undeniable from the nineteenth canon of that Council. So that something more was then thought necessary, beside the hands of three bishops, to make a man a true bishop of the Church. Some personal qualifications were required, as that he should be a Christian truly baptised, to make him a subject capable of a true ordination; else by the rule of that Council, such a formal ordination was void. There were many other rules of the Church, declaring ordinations given in irregular ways to be void, which more nearly affected the case of Novatian. I could easily instance in twenty things of this kind, but I shall keep to the particulars I before instanced in against Novatian. One was, that Novatian was ordained by a mere stranger without a regular and synodical election, which sort of ordinations the Church by her rules declared void. Our author therefore ought to have shewed, either that there was no such rule in the Church; or that Novatian was not so ordained; or else, that the Church upon some weighty reasons thought fit to dispense with his irregularity, and make a particular exception to her rule in his favour. Instead of this, he only tells us, “ this did not null the ordination of Novatian;

for if it did, then the acts of all bishops, priests, and deacons, done irregularly out of the places of their own jurisdiction, will be null and void: and so if a priest baptises out of his own parish, intruding into another man's district, without his leave and consent, or without any necessity at all, the baptism he administers must be null and void, if a bishop's act of ordination be null and void, for his having performed it irregularly out of his own diocese and jurisdiction." I cannot but pity readers that must be imposed upon with such argumentation as this. The fallacy of it lies in this, that things of a different force, are made to be of the same importance. The Church in one case has made a rule, that ordinations given in such an irregular circumstance, as I mentioned, shall be void, and she actually declared the ordination of Novatian void upon this account. In other cases she has declared, that things done in irregular circumstances, though they be criminal, as done against her rule, yet shall not be void, but only the man shall be liable to a canonical punishment for his transgression. Now can a man rightly conclude, that because an irregular act is void in one case, where the Church in her discipline and wisdom has declared it shall be void, that therefore all other irregular acts shall be void in other cases, where the Church has expressly declared they shall not be void? As it is in the case of a priest's administering baptism out of his own parish; the thing is an irregular act, but yet the Church has declared it shall stand good for all that: but in the other case, of bishops ordaining a bishop out of their own province, and that in a schismatical way, where one was ordained regularly before, the Church has declared, that such an irregular ordination shall be void. Therefore these are not parallel cases, because the Church herself has made an express difference between them. I dispute not whether the irregularity of such an ordination be essential or circumstantial: it is sufficient to my purpose, that the Church declares it to be such an irregularity as shall make an ordination void. Nor is it material to say, that the Church sometimes admitted of such ordinations, and did not actually void them: for that only argues, that the Church has power to dispense with

her own rules, and shew favour where she thinks it proper. But then it must be shewed, that the Church did dispense with her rule in this particular case of Novatian, and actually shewed him this favour, by owning him as a bishop of the Catholic Church, notwithstanding his irregular ordination, which is the thing I affirm she never did during his whole life, but always rejected him as no bishop, notwithstanding he had three bishops to lay hands upon him, and give him a pretended ordination.

The second thing I urged against the ordination of Novatian was, that it was a simoniacal and forced ordination, which sort of ordinations the rules of the Church always directed to be declared void. Our author says nothing to the charge of simoniacal ordination, as knowing full well, what the decrees of the Church have ever been in this case. But he makes a long harangue about personal iniquities in ordainers, such as drunkenness, and being drawn to give orders by compulsion, which he thinks does not make void an ordination. "For then, where shall we find valid orders on the face of the earth, since ordainers are but men, and some of them may have been grievous sinners in one age of the Church or other, and thereby may have broken the line of succession irreparably, so as never to be made whole again. Nay, if personal immoralities in those who are bishops do null their episcopal character, and render the ordinations performed by them null and void, then it will unavoidably follow, that we have no valid orders in the Church of England; since orders were originally conveyed to our clergy by the wicked immoral bishops of the Church of Rome." And here again, he trumps up the twenty-sixth article of the Church of England, altogether as pertinently as he did before; for he is only fighting with his own shadow: all he says, is utterly beside the question, and therefore to no manner of purpose, but only to amuse his zealous and unwary readers. For I am not speaking of such personal immoralities, or wicked men, as the Church has taken no cognizance of or censured: they, whom the Church allows to be in office, must be presumed to be the Church's ministers, (though they be wicked men in themselves, and before God, and unworthy of their office,) till such times as

the Church has deprived them of their office, or declared them incapable by her discipline and censures. But my question is concerning such personal immoralities, as the Church has declared shall make an ordination void; such as simoniacal practices to gain an ordination, and the like: and concerning such wicked men as the Church has found guilty of such practices and immoralities, and actually censured and deprived them, and declared their ordination void for attempting to obtain an ordination by such irregular practices; as she actually did in the case of Novatian and his ordainers, the one of which she deprived of their office, and declared the ordination of the other to be void, because obtained by such irregular practices. What is this to wicked men, of whom the Church has taken no cognizance; or to such personal immoralities, upon which she has passed no censure? A priest simoniacally ordained may pass for a true priest in the face of the Church, and before men, till such time as the Church has discovered his crime, and censured him for it by a legal proof made against him: but if as soon as he is ordained, the Church is acquainted with his crime, and by her legal authority declares his ordination void immediately upon it; then, either that man is no true priest, or else the Church has no authority to declare such an ordination void. Now this was the case of Novatian: the Church had a law, that ordinations obtained by such irregular practices as Novatian was guilty of, viz. simony, force, and fraud, should be declared void: and this law was actually put in execution against Novatian; no favour or dispensation was allowed in his case; he was condemned by the governors of the Church throughout the world; and not so much as one bishop, except perhaps one or two of his ordainers, who were now themselves degraded, ever owned him for a bishop, or in token of it wrote letters communicatory to him, or received letters communicatory from him. It was not only the Cyprianic Churches that voided the ordination of Novatian, but the Churches of the whole world; the Cornelians and Stephanians at Rome; the Churches of the East and West; the Churches that admitted his baptisms without rebaptising, as well as those that rebaptised his proselytes; they all agreed that he was

no bishop, though they did not agree to reject the baptisms, that were given by him and his party, as utterly null and void. Which shews how fairly our author represents the matter, when he says no Churches voided the ordination of Novatian, or other heretics, who did not also make null and void all the acts of their ministration. When it is as plain as the sun at noon-day, that the Roman Church under Cornelius and Stephen, and all the rest that sided with them in the dispute about rebaptising heretics, did never rebaptise the Novatians, though they agreed with the Cyprianic Churches that Novatian was no bishop, and concurred with them in cancelling and voiding his ordination. Either therefore Novatian was no bishop, as having his ordination declared void for such crimes as the Church thought worthy of such a censure; or else, the Church exceeded her power in declaring his ordination void by such a rule, as she had neither power to make, nor put in execution.

Yet our author will have it, that such a rule would void all the ordinations on the face of the earth, and even those of the Church of England. This is hard, indeed, that the Church cannot make a rule that shall void the ordination of one immoral man, but that must needs void the ordinations of all the world beside. But this is a supposition that destroys itself by its own absurdity. For we must always suppose a Church in being, and governors in it, to put church-laws in execution, before they can operate upon delinquents to void their ordinations. If laws against delinquents did execute themselves without any further examination or process, then there might be some colour to assert, that laws made to void the ordination of immoral men, might some time or other, in a very corrupt state of the Church, have endangered the ordinations of the whole. But human laws do not use to execute themselves: therefore, before they can operate effectually upon delinquents, we must suppose some governors of the Church to put them actually in execution: and if they do not, there may be laws to void the ordinations of immoral men, which yet will not effectually take place, because they are not put in execution against them. Now there may be many reasons assigned, why such laws are not always put in execution

against delinquents. Sometimes a very heinous crime, such as a simoniacal ordination, is transacted in private; and then the Church cannot execute the law against simony upon such offenders, because the fact is a secret, and no legal proof can be made against it. In some cases again, the Church herself thinks fit to dispense with her own laws, in times of great exigency, or to prevent or cure a dangerous schism, and does not proceed against criminals to the utmost height and rigour of her laws, but allows those ordinations to stand good, which in strictness she might void and cancel. Sometimes again, there is a great want or neglect of discipline in a very corrupt state of the Church; as it was in the prevalency of the Papacy; and then many great offenders may escape the lash of the laws, because there is not a sufficient spirit of Government to put the laws in execution against them. In all these cases, the laws that appoint irregular ordinations to be voided, do not take effect; either because the Church is ignorant of the fact; or because, for just and weighty reasons, she thinks fit to dispense with her own laws; or because there is a general neglect or corruption in those that are at the helm, and entrusted with the execution of them. This shews, that the laws, by which the irregular ordination of Novatian, for his personal immu-ralities, was made void, can never destroy the ordinations of the whole Church; because that would suppose the whole Church first to put such laws in execution upon every individual member of her own clerical body, and the very judges to agree universally to condemn themselves; which is a supposition that sufficiently exposes itself at the first view, and destroys itself by its own absurdity. There is, therefore, no danger either to the ordinations of the Catholic Church, or the Church of England, as our author would insinuate, from the second reason I gave, why the Church voided the ordination of Novatian, for the irregular methods he used to obtain it.

My third reason against his ordination was, that he intruded himself into a full see, where Cornelius was regularly and divinely placed before him. Which sort of ordinations were so much against the laws and rules of Catholic unity, that the Church had agreed by ancient laws to pronounce

such ordinations void; and accordingly this law was put in execution against Novatian, and his ordination was declared void by the bishops of the whole world, unanimously and with one consent, because of his usurpation. This I proved from the undeniable testimony of Cyprian and Cornelius, and many plain laws and canons of the Church. To which our author answers something pleasantly, "that the designation of him to that full see, was indeed a nullity, with respect to his being bishop of Rome; but the ordination of him to be a bishop was not therefore a nullity." As if a man, who by his ordination was particularly designed to be bishop of Rome, might be allowed to be a bishop in any other place of the world, save that to which he was particularly designed! And this, against the express will and declaration of the Church too, which always refuted his ordination, as vain, imaginary, and delusive! If he were owned to be a true bishop, why did none of the bishops throughout the world hold correspondence with him as a bishop at large, though not bishop of Rome? Why did Cornelius say, his episcopacy was not given him from Heaven, but only taken to himself by fraud and robbery? If his ordination were divine, why did Cyprian say universally, that he was no bishop? And does not our author himself labour to prove in other places, that by the strict discipline of the Cyprianic Churches, the ordinations and priesthood of all schismatical and heretical dividers and intruders were made void and null? How then comes Cyprian all of a sudden now to mean only, by the nullity of this episcopacy of Novatian, that it was a nullity purely in his designation to that full see of Rome, but no nullity in the ordination of him to be a bishop? I hope our author will not go so far in vindication of Novatian, as to say, he was no schismatical intruder. If then it be allowed, that he was a schismatical intruder, by the rule of the Cyprianic Churches, our author himself tells us, his ordination was made null and void: and yet here we are told at a pinch, that the nullity was not in his ordination to be a bishop, but in his designation to that full see, with respect to his being bishop of Rome. Ingenious men never want distinctions to help out at a dead lift, but they are sometimes, like other men, unhappily involved in contradictions thereby; which should make them sparing in the charge of pretended contradic-

tions upon others. Our author is certainly in the right, when he says, Cyprian's rule voided the ordinations of schismatical intruders. And is it not according to this rule then, that Cyprian says, Novatian was no bishop? That he set up a human Church, instead of a divine? That his new apostles, which he sent to most cities to maintain the foundations of his new institution, were only false bishops? These are not the words of men, who thought that he had his episcopacy by divine right, and only his designation by human presumption. No; they went upon another principle, that a man who breaks the unity of the Church is not to be allowed any ecclesiastical ordination. "*Nec habeat ecclesiasticum ordinationem qui ecclesie non tenet unitatem,*" are the words of Cyprian, alleged by me before upon this occasion; which, methinks, they who talk so much of the principles of the Cyprianic age, should at least have taken notice of. Now he, that gets himself fraudulently and simoniacally ordained into a full see, against the consent of the whole Catholic Church, does certainly break the unity of the Church; and that, not only the unity of that particular Church, into which he is so ordained, but the unity of the Church Universal, which is linked and united to that particular Church by the mutual union of the whole college of bishops one with another, and the common ties of the Catholic communion. So that, he that breaks the unity of a particular Church breaks the unity of the whole; and every part of the Church Universal thinks herself concerned to oppose such an adversary, and assist that particular Church on which the assault is first made, by denying the enemy the privilege of Catholic communion. Now then, if Novatian broke the unity of the Roman Church by his irregular intrusion, which is not contested; he thereby broke the unity of the whole: and then, by Cyprian's rule, that he that breaks the unity of the Church cannot have an ecclesiastical ordination, it follows that Novatian had no ecclesiastical ordination either in the Roman Church, or in any part of the Catholic Church, by the laws of Catholic communion. Nor indeed can it be shewed, that ever Novatian was owned for a bishop ordained by divine right, all his life-time, by any beside his own accomplices, in any part of the Catholic

Church: but plain condemnations of him, as no bishop, occur every where in all the writers that have spoken of him.

But our author says, “ designation to a particular place is only a circumstance of ordination, the essence of which may be without the circumstance of being possessed of a diocese.” Let this be so: for I will not dispute with him about what is circumstantial or essential to an ordination. My question is only, whether the Church had then any law to declare the ordination of a schismatical intruder to be void, when he used unlawful means to get himself ordained into a full see with this irregular circumstance of intrusion? And whether the Church did not actually put this law in execution against Novatian, and declare his ordination void upon this account? It is not at all material to say in this case, that the Church has sometimes allowed of persons being ordained to the episcopal function, without being possessed immediately of any particular district; or that she sometimes allowed of two bishops in one city, the one by way of co-adjutor to the other in case of infirmity or old age, or to put an end to an inveterate schism: of which I have given some instances in my *Origines*, as exceptions to the common rules in both these cases; out of which our author tries to justify the ordination of Novatian, putting him in the condition of those who are ordained as co-adjutors and co-partners to another bishop in his diocese, or are ordained at large, *ἀπολελυμένως*, without being bound to any particular district. But, alas! this little evasion will not serve the turn. For every one certainly must needs see, though I should not inform them, that the case is very different between a man doing a thing with the Church’s allowance and consent, by way of dispensation with a common rule; and his doing it altogether against her will, by breaking in knowingly and ambitiously, upon her common rules, with the utmost contempt of her laws and discipline. The Church, as I said before, may dispense with her own rules as she pleases. And therefore, if a man for just and weighty reasons (of which the Church is judge) is ordained a co-partner or a co-adjutor to another bishop by the Church’s allowance and consent, there is no harm in it; nor will the Church ever proceed judicially against such a man, to pronounce his ordination

void ; because, though it was done against the letter of the common rule, yet there was nothing of contempt in it, nor proper breach of the law, as being done by just allowance and dispensation. But Novatian's case was quite otherwise : he was neither ordained co-partner nor co-adjutor to Cornelius in the see of Rome : he had neither the consent of the legal bishop, who required not his help ; nor the consent of the Church, who granted him no dispensation : but against a known and standing rule, which forbade any man to be ordained by way of intrusion into another bishop's see, under pain of having his ordination voided, he not only ambitiously and simoniacally got himself so ordained, but persisted in his obstinacy and contempt of the laws of the Church ; for which, not only the bishop of Rome, with his suffragan bishops, put the law against simoniacal intruders in execution against him, declaring his ordination a void ordination ; but Cyprian, and all the bishops of the whole Catholic Church, joined with them, and confirmed the sentence, never acknowledging Novatian for any thing more than a pretended bishop ; one, whose ordination was only human, not divine ; whose right to episcopacy was a mere usurpation against the laws of the Church and the laws of Heaven.

It is in vain for our author now to go about to whiten this blackamoor, set forth in such dark and dismal colours by all the Ancients, by offering to compare him with those co-partners and co-adjutors, which the ancient Church sometimes allowed : since there is such a vast difference between the Church's allowance, and non-allowance ; between her dispensing with a law, and condemning a criminal by a law ; that they cannot bear any similitude, or be fairly drawn into a parallel. And, if what I have now discoursed stand good against Novatian, our author will find no relief for him in the Council of Nice, which is the last effort he makes toward proving his ordination to be of divine right, whilst he owns the designation to the diocese of Rome, to be a mere nullity. For if the ordination of Novatian was judicially declared void by the whole Catholic Church in the age in which he lived, I do not see how the Council of Nice could make it good, fifty years after his death, unless it were

by bearing some direct testimony to the divine right of it, and so disproving all that ever before was said against him.

4. Let us therefore examine, what it is the Council of Nice has said in his favour. The Council says nothing of Novatian himself, but has something concerning his followers, which my opponents take to be a justification of the divine right of Novatian's ordination. They pretend the Council allowed the Novatians to have derived a true ordination from their founder, as a true bishop; and that the Council allowed the Novatian clergy to be true bishops, priests, and deacons, invested with a divine commission and authority, during their continuance in their heresy or schism; because she gives them the name of clergymen, bishops, priests, and deacons; and allows them the privilege of abiding or continuing in the same order they were in before. But if this would prove the Novatians to be true bishops, priests, &c. then it would equally prove the Samosatensians or Paulianists, to be true bishops, priests, and deacons: for the same Council speaks of them under the same title of clergymen, who yet were not so much as true baptised laymen: for, by an order of this very Council, they were not only to be reordained, but also rebaptised, because their baptism was so faulty as to need repeating. Which is a certain argument, they were not allowed to be properly true Christian priests, though they are distinguished by the name of clergymen, since they were not in strictness so much as laymen. I know Mr. L—— and Dr. Brett could easily get over this difficulty, by imagining that men might be made true priests by ordination, who never were made true Christian laymen by baptism: but the Council of Nice thought otherwise, and I believe they are the first gentlemen that ever entertained the contrary opinion, that a man might be ordained a true priest before he was made a Christian by baptism. Heretics indeed, who were never baptised, may have the name of priests, to distinguish them from those called laymen in the same sect, but neither are the one true priests, nor the other true lay-christians, before they are baptised, whatever titles or denominations are given them. The Council of Nice gives the Paulianists the name of clergymen; but it does not follow, that therefore

she believed them to be truly and authentically commissioned priests of God, because they went by this name in contradiction to those among them who went by the name of laymen. The canon relating to them, runs in these words:¹ “Concerning the Paulianists which return to the Catholic Church, it hath been decreed, that they shall be universally rebaptised. But if any of those in this error were in time past of the clergy, if they be found blameless and irreprehensible, then they shall be rebaptised and ordained by the bishop of the Catholic Church: but if upon examination they be found unqualified, then it is convenient that they should be deposed.” Here we see the Council gives the Paulianists the name of clergymen as well as the Novatians, and says, if they were not qualified, they should be degraded from their order. And yet, I suppose, it will be agreed on all hands, unless perhaps Mr. L——— or Dr. Brett think fit to gainsay it, that these Paulianists, notwithstanding their being distinguished by the name of clergymen, were not true authorised priests invested with proper powers to minister in holy things, because they were yet unbaptised, and both to be rebaptised and reordained, before they could be admitted as authentical clergy of the Church. They had indeed a formal ordination among them to the office of bishops, priests, and deacons, which they might derive from their founder Paulus Samosatensis, who was once a true bishop of the Catholic Church: but now this succession of bishops and priests among them, was but imaginary and nominal; partly because their first leaders were degraded for their heresy, and divested of all sacerdotal power and authority; and partly because they gave ordinations to incapable subjects, that is, to persons never truly baptised, who were to be both rebaptised and reordained, before they could be allowed to officiate as true ministers in the Catholic Church. So that the giving here-

¹ Con. Nic. can. xix. Περὶ τῶν Παυλιανισάντων, εἴτα προσφυγόντων τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὅρος ἐκτίθεται ἀναβαπτίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξάπαντος· εἰ δὲ τινες τῶ παρελευθότι χρόνῳ ἐν τῶ κλήρῳ ἐξητάσθησαν, εἰ μὲν ἄμεμπτοι ἔσονται, ἀνεπίληπτοι φανέειν, ἀναβαπτισθέντες χειροτονείσθωσαν ὑπὸ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπῳ. εἰ δὲ ἀνόκρισις ἀνεπιτηδέις αὐτοὺς εὑρίσκει, καθαιρεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς προσήκει.

tics the name of clergymen, only for distinction's sake, when applied to such sects as still kept up a formal distinction between clergy and laity among them, is no argument that the Church esteemed such nominal clergy to be truly authorised bishops or priests; for here the Council of Nice affords us a plain demonstration to the contrary. And it were easy to make out the same observation concerning several other sects, whose pretended ministers went by the name of clergy, and were called sometimes bishops, presbyters, and deacons, when yet in strictness and propriety they were not so much as true Christian laymen, having never received a true Christian baptism. Particularly the Cataphrygians and Montanists, are said to have had bishops among them. Sozomen says,¹ the Montanists in Phrygia had their bishops, as well as the Novatians. And St. Jerom says,² they had not only bishops but an order called Cenones, above these, and an higher degree of patriarchs over them. And yet when we come to examine more strictly what these bishops were, we find, they were not so much as Christian laymen; for they were never truly baptised: but where such as had need to be admitted into the Christian Church by the door of baptism. And therefore, though they were commonly called bishops and clergy; yet they were, in strictness, only nominal and supposed clergy, as the Council of Laodicea, which speaks more accurately of them, properly styles them, ordering even their bishops to be rebaptised. For, says the canon,³ "If any return from the heresy of those called Phygians, though they be of their reputed clergy, though they be of those called chief, (that is, I conceive, patriarchs among them,) they shall be first catechised with all diligence, and then be baptised

¹ Sozom. lib. vii. cap. xix.

² Hieron. Ep. liv. ad Marcellam. Apud nos Apostolorum locum episcopi tenent; apud eos episcopus tertius est. Habent enim primos de Pepuzâ Phrygiæ Patriarchas: secundos, quos appellant Cenones: Atque ita in tertium, id est, penè ultimum locum, episcopi devolvuntur.

³ Con. Laodic. can. viii. Περὶ τῶν, τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν λεγομένων Φρυγῶν ἐπιτρέφοντας, εἰ καὶ ἐν κλήρῳ νομιζομένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς τυγχάνουεν, εἰ καὶ μέγιστοι λέγοντο· τὴν τοιαύτην μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας καταχεῖσθαι τε καὶ βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπων τε καὶ πρεσβυτέρων

by the bishops and presbyters of the Church." Nothing can be plainer, than that though these Cataphrygians were sometimes called bishops, yet in truth they were only nominal bishops, and placed in the rank of simple catechumens, a degree below laymen, by the bishops of the Catholic Church, who were obliged to rebaptise them, before they admitted them to the common privileges of lay-communion. The Photinian bishops, who derived their pretended ordination from Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, were in the same case: though they are sometimes in common speech termed bishops, yet they were only supposed bishops: for they, like the Paulianists, were to be rebaptised upon their return to the Church, as appears from the sixth canon¹ of the second Council of Arles made concerning them. The Manichees also had their apostles, and bishops, and presbyters, and deacons, as St. Austin² informs us. Fortunatus, against whom St. Austin wrote one of his books, was a presbyter among them, and St. Austin more than once³ gives him that title. Yet these bishops and presbyters were in reality no Christians. For among many other monstrous errors, for which St. Austin⁴ calls them only Pseudo-Christians, they had wholly rejected Christian baptism,⁵ as the same author assures us, and therefore are always reckoned among those sectaries, which were to be baptised upon their return to the Catholic Church. Since, therefore, in all these instances, and forty more that might be added, it is very plain, that when such heretics are called bishops, or presbyters, or clergymen, it cannot be meant that they were persons truly invested with sacerdotal power and authority; because, we see, these names were sometimes given, in compliance with

¹ Con. Arelat. ii. can. xvi. Photinianos sive Paulianistas secundùm Patrum statuta baptizari oportet.

² Aug. de Hæres. cap. xlvi. Electis suis habent duodecim, quos appellant magistros, et tertium decimum principem ipsorum. Episcopos autem lxxii. qui ordiuntur à magistris, et presbyteros qui ordiuntur ab episcopis. Habent etiam episcopi diaconos.

³ Aug. contra Fortunatum Manichæorum Presbyterum. tom. vi. Item retractat. lib. i. cap. xvi. Eodem tempore presbyterii mei, contra Fortunatum quendam Manichæorum presbyterum disputavi.

⁴ Cont. Faustum. lib. i. c. 3.

⁵ De Hæres. cap. xlvi. Baptismum in aquâ nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis afferre: nec quenquam eorum, quos decipiunt baptizandum putant.

the characters of distinction that men assumed to themselves, even to unbaptised persons, and such as had no right in strictness to be called Christians: I think it reasonable to conclude, that when the Council of Nice calls some of the Novatians clergymen, it does not mean, that they were so of right, but only gives them the name by which they were vulgarly distinguished from such others of their sect, as went by the name of laymen.

But how then shall we account for that other expression of the Council, which orders these Novatians “*μένειν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ*, to remain or continue in the clergy?” This our author thinks, implies that they were in the clergy of right before; otherwise, to decree that they should continue in the clergy, would have been ridiculous, since no man can be said to continue in that, which he never was in before. Now I expounded this, by being received or allowed to continue authoritatively among the Catholic clergy, in the same orders which they had pretendedly before. Upon which our author enters into a learned disquisition, whether it was out of ignorance or knavishness, that I expounded the word, *μένειν*, by *being received*? To which I answer, that if our author’s knowledge or charity had been as great as he pretends, he would have known, or at least charitably imagined, that I had some other author beside my own brain for expounding the word, *μένειν*, *received*. For indeed, I expounded it just with the same ignorance or knavishness, as some of the Ancients had done before me. Particularly Innocent, bishop of Rome, who was cotemporary with St. Austin, having occasion to consider this very Canon, expounds it in the same manner as I did. First, he gives a verbal translation¹ of the Canon, which I also did, and there both

¹ Innoc. Epist. xxii. ad Episcopos Macedon. cap. v. Prius ille Canon, à Patribus institutus, ponendus est—De his, inquit, qui nominant seipsos catharos, id est, mundos, et aliquando veniunt ad Catholicam Ecclesiam, placuit sanctæ et magnæ synodo, ut acceptâ manûs impositione, sic maneant in clero. Possimus verò dicere de solis his (al. hoc) Novatianis esse præceptum, nec ad aliarum hæresium clericos pertinere. Nam si utique de omnibus ita defini- rent, addidissent, à Novatianis, aliisque hæreticis revertentes debere in suum ordinem recipi. Ruffin. lib. i. cap. vi. renders it, In ordine suo suscipi debere.

he and I agree to translate μένειν, let them *remain* in the clergy. Afterward, he proceeds to expound the sense of the word, and then it is, let them be received; if the Latin word, *recipi*, which I hope our author, as much as he is given to contradiction, will grant me, do but signify *to be received*, in English. The words of the Canon, according to Innocent's translation, are these: "Concerning those, who call themselves *Cathari*, that is, *Puritans*, and sometimes come over to the Catholic Church, it hath pleased the great and holy synod, that when they have received imposition of hands, they shall so remain in the clergy." Then he gives his exposition of the Canon in the following words: "But we may say, that this order was made for the Novatians only, and did not appertain to the clergy of other heresies. For if they had defined so concerning all others, they would have added, that they who return from the Novatians and other hereties, shall be received into their own order." Where we may observe, 1. That to remain in the clergy, and to be received into their own order, is the same thing. 2. That they were to have imposition of hands, and so be received into the clergy of the Catholic Church. 3. That all other hereties had their *clerici*, or *clergy*, as well as the Novatians. And yet, 4. That this was a peculiar privilege granted to the Novatian clergy, and not to the clergy of other hereties. It remains, therefore, to be inquired, what that privilege is, which was allowed to the Novatian clergy, and denied to the clergy of other hereties. Our author thinks it was, that the Council allowed the Novatian clergy to be true authorised clergy, whilst they continued in heresy or schism, before they came over to the Catholic Church. Whereas the Council says nothing of this; but for as much as there had been an ancient and general rule in the Church, that no heretical clergy should be allowed to bear the same office in the Church, which they had borne before among hereties, this rule should be dispersed with in favour of the Novatians, and they by an act of grace should be allowed to continue in the same order or office that they acted in before among hereties. This is not to justify the Novatian ordinations, much less those of all other hereties, who could lay a much fairer pretence to episcopal ordination than

the Novatians could; but only to grant the Novatians a peculiar privilege of being admitted to serve in the clerical office of the Church, which, by the general discipline of those days, other heretics were denied. The reason of admitting the Novatians was not that the Novatians had better ordinations than some others that were refused; but because the Council was minded to shew a particular favour to the Novatian clergy, which other heretical clergy should not lay claim to. That is, to continue in the clerical office by a particular dispensation, while others by the general rule of the Church were utterly discarded. And yet, even this privilege was not allowed the Novatians in all places, after the Council of Nice. For at Rome they never admitted any heretical clergy to any clerical dignity whatsoever in the Church. Which we learn from this same Epistle¹ of Pope Innocent, which says, it was the law of the Roman Church to give lay-communion only, to such as were baptised by heretics, when they came over to the Church, but not to admit any one of them to the least honour of a clerical office in the Church. So that, whatsoever ordination the Novatians pretended to, they were not allowed to remain or continue in the clergy or the Roman Church. Nor were they admitted in other Churches, as being true authorised priests before in their heresy of schism, but were allowed the favour of a new commission, to continue them in that station, which without any right or authority they had only usurped before. And this was a privilege, which the Council did not grant to all heretical clergy; but only to the Novatians and Paulianists, upon respective injunctions; obliging the one to have a new commission, if not a new formal ordination; and the other, to have not only a new ordination, but also a new baptism; because, though the Paulianists could pretend a better title to an episcopal ordination than the Novatians could, yet they were never truly baptised, and therefore were not only to be reordained, but

¹ Innoc. Ep. xxii. cap. iv. *Nostræ lex Ecclesiæ est, venientibus ab hæreticis, qui tamen illic baptizati sunt, per manûs impositionem laicam tantùm tribuere communionem, nec ex his aliquem, in clericatûs honorem vel exiguum subrogare.*

to be rebaptised, before they could be allowed to continue or remain in the clergy of the Catholic Church.

But our author thinks it were ridiculous in the Council to decree, that they should continue in the clergy, if they were not in the clergy before. I own, in strictness, it is not the most proper way of speaking, to prevent a critical wrangler from raising disputes upon it; but yet it is a very common and usual way of speaking, almost upon all occasions: as when we say, men are to be rebaptised or reordained; this in strictness, would signify, that they had been once baptised, or once ordained truly before: otherwise, to a nice critic, it would be ridiculous to say, a man should be rebaptised, who was never baptised before; or reordained, who was never ordained before: and yet this is that ridiculous improper way of speaking the Church has commonly used about these matters. So, in like manner, when the Council of Nice says, "the Novatian clergy shall remain in the clergy of the Church," our author may call it ridiculous, if he pleases; but wiser men will still understand it to mean, that they were to be made true clergymen by the authority of the Church, who were only clergymen in pretence before; as he is said to be rebaptised, who was never truly baptised, but only in pretence before. But none can better expound the sense of the Nicene Council than the Council itself, which in a parallel case, concerning the Paulianist clergy, uses a way of speaking, that, according to our author's criticisms, will be as ridiculous. For in the nineteenth canon it says, the Paulianist Clergy, if they were found unworthy, should be degraded. But now a sharp critic would ask, how could it be said, without nonsense, that they were clergymen, who were never truly baptised or ordained; or, how could they be said to be degraded from their clerical order or degree, who were never truly in any order or degree of the clergy? As it is plain enough these Paulianists never were in the opinion of that Council; and yet it makes no scruple to say, these clergymen should be degraded. What can be the meaning of this, in the judgment of any candid reader, but only, that the Council, in a vulgar and large sense, call them by the common name of clergymen, because they had some pretence to the clerical order by a formal, but fictitious ordi-

nation? And says, they should be degraded or deposed from their order, which yet they never truly had, because they made some pretence to an order, which the Church would not allow them to have received authentically before? The Arabic translation of this Canon, both according to the version of Turrianus and Abraham Echellensis, makes this matter something plainer. I will set it down in their own words. The seventeenth Canon, according to the version of Turrianus, Con. tom. ii. page 296, runs thus: "*Si quis ex hæresi Pauli Samosatensis convertatur ad fidem Ecclesiæ, debet iterum baptizari: et in quocunque gradu ecclesiastico antea fuerit, si convertatur dignè, et cum humilitate, et ejus vita antea acta reprehendi non possit, sed laudari potius; restituendus est in gradum suum, et imponendæ ei manus, ut imponi solent ei cui nunquam antea impositæ fuerunt, cum benedictione diaconali, id est, quæ fit super ministros Ecclesiæ. Sed si aliquis eum accusaverit, et non fuerit dignus gradu propter malam fidem et prava opera, non est ordinandus.*" The other translation of Echellensis has it thus, Can. xviii. page 322, "*Iterum baptizandus est, quicunque revertitur ad fidem Ecclesiæ apostolicæ ex heresi Pauli Samosateni. Quicunque verò eorum in aliquo extiterit gradu, placueritque ejus reversio, &c. volueritque restitui in gradum suum, restituat illum episcopus, et imponat ei manum, ac benedicat ut benedici solet qui nunquam diaconalem habuit benedictionem. At si reprehensibilis extiterit, et gradu illo indignus habeatur ————— nec sic restituatur, nec ad ipsum admittatur diaconatum.*" Here we see the Paulianists are said to be in an ecclesiastical or clerical degree, and are to be restored to their clerical order, if they were worthy of it: but yet they are to be restored to it first by a new baptism, and then a new ordination. And if they were unworthy, they were not to be restored to it, even by a new ordination. What means restoring them to their order in this place, but only allowing them to be reordained? Or what means degrading them, but only not allowing them to take orders in the Church? And that by a known figure called *Catachresis*. It certainly does not mean, that they were in any true order or degree of the clergy before; but only that they should enjoy no privilege of clergymen,

either from their former pretended ordination, or from any real or authentic ordination by the Church, which is forbidden to be given them, because they were unworthy of it. We see what work a severe critic might make with this common expression, and call it ridiculous nonsense, to say, a man may be degraded, who never had any clerical degree, from which he might be degraded; since, according to our author's nice way of exposition, no man can be said to continue in that, or be restored to that, or degraded from that, which he never was in before. And yet thus the Council of Nice expressed itself in these two parallel cases, which a candid reader may easily understand; but a critic will torture them to a very untoward sense, if he comes to handle them with any design to serve a purpose.

I know not what impression this account may have upon our author; but I believe it will satisfy all indifferent judges, that the Council of Nice, in calling the Novatians by the common name of clergy, or appointing them to remain in the clergy, did not intend to reverse the judgment of the whole Catholic Church before, which had declared Novatian to be no true bishop, and his followers no true priests; but only gave them the names, by which they were commonly distinguished in their own sect, and allowed them the privilege of being made Catholic priests by the Church's authority and commission: which was a privilege not commonly granted in those times, when the strictness of discipline wholly excluded heretics from ever attempting to be admitted into the dignity of any clerical order, even after their return to the Catholic Church.

If it were otherwise, how could St. Ambrose have said, after the Council of Nice, "that the Novatians were no true priests, nor could lay any claim to sacerdotal power?" If the Council of Nice had declared Novatian to be a true bishop, and the rest that were ordained by succession from him in their heresy, to be true bishops and priests; how should it enter into the head of St. Ambrose to contradict the Council in so plain a case and be peremptory in his sentence against them, when the Council had declared so much in favour of their priesthood? Or, why should Pacianus, in his disputes with the Novatians, after the Council

also, charge them as being no priests, and Novatian himself as no bishop, if the Council had declared in favour of their priesthood? Is it reasonable to suppose, either that these men were ignorant of what the Council had determined, or that they would set up their own opinion in opposition to the Council's determination? How easy had it been for the Novatians to have replied upon them, that their priesthood was allowed by the Council of Nice; which was then the greatest authority in the Catholic Church.

If the opinion of modern authors signifies any thing in this cause, I might add the judgment of Dr. Maurice,¹ and Du Pin,² who have declared their sentiments about Novatian, that he never was a true bishop. For they rightly observe, that the first bishop who ever broached an heresy in the Church, was Paulus Samosatensis, bishop of Antioch, Anno 257. There were forty-four Christian heresies before this, but never a bishop among them. Novatian was the founder of one of these sects; but Dr. Maurice denies that ever he was a bishop, or any thing more than a Roman Priest; and says, the first heretic bishop that we find is Paulus Samosatensis, who succeeded Demetrian, in the bishopric of Antioch, in the year 262, and who fell into heresy in the year 267, which was at least twenty-six years after Novatian had set up his heresy in the Church. Now how can this observation stand good, if Novatian had been an heretic bishop so many years before? There had at least been one heretic bishop before Paulus Samosatensis, which yet these learned men positively deny.

And what shall we say of all those other forty-three heresies, that had never a bishop among them. What sort of succession of priests had they to administer baptism to their converts? Shall we say, they had true priests, who had no bishops? Or, shall we say, their false priests never baptised any persons but such as were rebaptised when they came over to the Catholic Church? This cannot be. For the very dispute that was on foot in Cyprian's time, between him and Pope Stephen, about rebaptisation, shews, that many

¹ Maurice's Vindic. of the Prim. Church, p. 285.
Eccles. Hist. Vol. II.

² Du Pin.

of those, who were baptised by these heretics, were received into the Catholic Church, by imposition of hands only, without rebaptising. For that was the very thing contended for by Stephen, and the rest of the Church, against the Cyprianists, that such as had been baptised in the name of the Trinity by those heretics, who retained baptism in its due form, needed not to be rebaptised upon their return to the Catholic Church. Now then, if there were no bishops among those forty-three heresies, I would ask, whether there was any succession of true priests among them? If there were no priests among them; by whom were those persons baptised, who were afterward received into the bosom of the Catholic Church without any new baptism? Not by a true priest certainly, since it appears they had none, but only in the name and pretence, which will not give a false priest true authority and power. So that, for ought I can see, not only the Novatian heresy, but all the other forty-three heresies, that arose in the same compass of time, were destitute of episcopacy and sacerdotal power. And yet the Church made no scruple to receive those, that were baptised in due form in those heresies, without rebaptisation.

But do we not commonly say, that all the ancient heresies retained the orders of bishops, priests, and deacons; and that the first who disputed about this distinction of orders, was Arius, in the middle of the fourth century? This is commonly said indeed; but unless it be duly qualified, and taken with a little distinction, it will be far from being true. These ancient heresies were not begun by bishops, nor had they any real or true bishops among them. Some of them had presbyters, and others only laymen for their founders: but they all aped the discipline of the Church, and created to themselves nominal and fictitious bishops, presbyters, and deacons; that they might seem to have the face of a Church, by keeping up the several orders of the clergy among them. Thus, as I have shewed before, the Montanists had not only their bishops, presbyters, and deacons; but their cenons, and patriarchs, or chiefs, above these. And the Manichees had their bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and their masters, and apostles, above the rest. And so probably all the other forty-three heresies might imitate the

Church in observing these distinctions of orders among their pretended clergy. And so this matter never came to be disputed. But still among all these called bishops, there was not one true bishop, that could legally derive his authority and power from any other founder than such as were founders of the several heresies, which were either presbyters or laymen. Therefore, though there were those who had the name of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, among them, yet we see they were only nominal, fictitious, and titular, they were created by an incompetent power, and so were faulty in their first original. So that it was not these three real orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons; but only the face and name of these orders, that they kept up among them. And yet there is nothing more certain, than that many persons, who were baptised by these heretics who had no real priests among them, were, upon their return to the Church, received without rebaptisation. Some of the heretics indeed had wholly rejected water-baptism; and others had changed or corrupted the form of it; and all such were rebaptised: but the rest, who retained both the matter and form, were admitted without repeating their baptism, though there were no real, but only feigned and nominal priests among them, to administer it. Which is a further demonstration, that the Novatians were not the only heretics that wanted a true episcopal ordination; nor the only persons whose baptism was admitted, though administered by men who had no real title to the authority and rights of the Christian priesthood.

But our author says frequently, that if the Novatians were not truly ordained bishops and priests, then the Council of Nice admitted them to be priests, who had no more than a lay-ordination. To which I must reply, as I did before, that they had now the Church's authoritative commission, which they wanted before; and that, upon our author's own principles, is sufficient to distinguish a priest from a layman. For, he says, "If a layman have the bishop's commission to baptise in case of necessity, he is so far made a priest by his commission. Since therefore the Council of Nice gave the Novatians at least a new commission and authority, which they had not before, she can-

not be said to admit them to be priests, who had only a lay-ordination. For the commission which she gave them was a true episcopal commission, which our author owns to be the substantial part of an ordination, and which bishops sometimes give without the external ceremony of imposition of hands; as in the case of commissioning laymen to baptise in one particular case, which, according to our author, so far makes them priests, without the solemnity of laying hands upon them. And I believe there want not instances of men's being appointed to preach publicly in the Church, which I think is one part of the sacred function, which private men without authority may not take to themselves, without any other designation than the bishop's commission, by patent or word of mouth, both in the ancient Church and the Church of England. Since, therefore, the Novatians had an authentic commission from the Council, they cannot be said to be made priests merely by a lay-ordination, though it were demonstrated that the imposition of hands, commanded by the canon, does not relate to a new ordination. And yet I know not who can demonstrate that it was not a new ordination. For some ancient versions of the Canon call it so. In the the tomes of the Councils there are two ancient versions, one of which calls it simply imposition of hands; but the other expressly styles it ordination, saying,¹ "If any are minded to come over from the Novatians to the Catholic Church, it pleases the holy synod that they shall be ordained, and so remain among the clergy." And Gratian cites a like version in his Decree,² from whence he concludes, that the Council appointed the Novatians to be ordained upon their return to the Church. And this, he says, was only by way of dispensation: for by the ancient and general rule of the Church, no heretics were to be promoted to any clerical order whatsoever, but

¹ Con. Nic. can. viii, Con. tom. ii. p. 47. Si qui voluerint venire ad Ecclesiam Catholicam ex Novatianis, placuit sancto Concilio, ut ordinentur, et sic maneant in clero.

² Gratian. Caus. i. Quæst. vii. cap. viii. Similiter ex dispensatione etiam in Niceno Concilio, Can. viii. de Novatianis statutum est, ut ad Ecclesiam redeuntes ordinentur. Si qui voluerint venire ad Ecclesiam Catholicam et Apostolicam ex Novatianis, placuit sancto Concilio ut ordinentur, et sic maneant in clero.

were to remain of the quality of private men or laymen in the Church all their days. But the Council dispensed with this general rule, and made a particular exception to it in favour of the Novatians, to encourage their more speedy and general return to the Catholic Church, that they should have the privilege of being ordained, and so of remaining among the Catholic clergy, which by the strictness of former discipline was denied to all heretics, except any after the same manner could plead the Church's favour and dispensation. Ruffin likewise in his ancient translation of this Canon,¹ interprets their remaining among the clergy after imposition of hands, so as to mean, their being received in their order only by a new ordination. Where we may observe also, that according to Ruffin, a man may be called a clerk, though he has no just title, but only a pretence to real orders; and with good sense be said, from that pretence, to be received in his order, or remain in his order, which in Ruffin's opinion is the same thing, even when he wants a new ordination to make him a real and true authorised clerk. Though our author, because I say this, is pleased to send me to the school-boys for correction, who himself, if he had consulted ecclesiastical writings more than the dictionaries and school-boys he refers me to, had better understood the language of the Church. Or, if he had but consulted Morinus,² he would have directed him to Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, and the sixth Council of Carthage, and some other ancient writers, who understood the Nicene Canon as appointing the Novatian clergy to be received by a new ordination. And Morinus himself is clearly of this opinion: and I shall freely own, that though I once thought otherwise, yet now from the force of so many ancient testimonies concurring in this sense, I think it more probable, that it means a new ordination. I am not so stiff to any opinion advanced in my Origines, but that I can easily depart from it upon better conviction. Though if our author could de-

¹ Ruffin. lib. i. c. 6. Et Catharos, qui apud nos Novatiani sunt, si fortè pœnitentes ad Ecclesiam convertantur, confessos ecclesiastica dogmata, clericos in ordine quidem suo suscipi debere, sed ordinatione datâ.

² Morin. de Ordinât. Exerc. v. cap. xii. n. 10. &c.

monstrate certainly, that it does mean a new ordination, that would not justify the ordination of Novatian, condemned so many years before by the Catholic Church, whose sentence was never reversed by any competent authority in his favour. The Church might admit the Novatians in after ages by a new commission, which is the essential part of an ordination, though she did not repeat the external ceremony of imposition of hands, as what had been formerly given them before, but without competent authority to invest them with a spiritual and divine commission, which was not ordinarily to be had but from the allowed governors of the Church.

So that upon the whole matter, there is nothing appears to justify the ordination of Novatian, or to prove him to be a real bishop. The Church universal in his own time agreed in declaring his ordination void: this was done as well by that part of the Church, which received the baptisms administered by his emissaries, as that part which utterly rejected them: the Council of Nice did nothing to reverse this sentence pronounced against him, but only dispensed with the rigour of an ancient ecclesiastical law in favour of his successors; that whereas the law forbad any heretics to be admitted to clerical promotion in the Church, the severity of this sentence should not affect such of the Novatian clergy as would return to the Church: they should now have the Church's real commission, who had only a pretended commission before. Or, if we suppose, with so many of the Ancients as have interpreted this Canon, that the imposition of hands, with which they were to be received, was such an imposition of hands as was given in ordination, then the matter is still more clear, that the Council of Nice was no favourer of the pretended ordination of Novatian, and yet admitted the baptisms given by his successors, who could lay no claim to any just authority or commission from the Church. The reader may add to this those forty heresies which were before Novatian, none of which had any real episcopal ordination, but only in name and pretence, among them: and yet all Churches, except those of the Cyprianic way, received their baptisms, if given in due form, without rebaptisation. Let our author, who with such an air of vanity and self-conceit, despises all his adversaries, and pre-

tends so magisterially to correct all their errors in ecclesiastical history, try how many real bishops he can find among those forty heresies, for nominal ones there were enough, to give authoritative baptism to their proselytes; and then perhaps we may admire his skill in ecclesiastical antiquity, when he has done a work that none could do before him; and he may be allowed with a better grace to say, the Church never received the baptisms of any but such as were true bishops, of those commissioned by them. Till he has done this, and better asserted the cause of Novatian, it will still stand good against him, that the Church received the baptisms of many who never had any real episcopal ordination; which is the thing I undertook to shew against him.

As to my own concessions formerly made in favour of the episcopacy of the Novatians, or the Meletians, or Arians after their formal deposition by the Church, I readily consent to the correction of them in my *Origines*, upon better consideration and inquiry into the exact discipline of the ancient Church. I never thought my *Origines* without mistakes, and hope to find time, when I have finished them, carefully to review them; and then I shall not be ashamed with St. Austin, to write my retractations, or with Bellarmin my *Recognitions*, though the faults our author finds in them, are not the things that need correction.

I have only two things more to note, of lesser moment in this dispute; one with relation to my honoured patron and diocesan, the Lord Bishop of Winchester, and the other in relation to the reverend and learned Dr. Hicks. Our author, page 6, of his preface, charges me for asserting without proof; nay, contrary to experience, that all the bishops of both provinces were unanimously of this opinion, that there were other ways of supplying a faulty baptism, than by re-baptisation, if given in due form by a layman. He says, I tell my Lord of Winchester this without proof, and contrary to experience: whereas, in truth, it was my Lord of Winchester that told me this, and I am only repeating his words, and telling the world what he was pleased to communicate to me by letter, and order me to publish; which is my proof for what I so delivered. Our author did not

think it decent to tell my Lord of Winchester he said a false thing, and therefore he persuades his reader to believe it was a groundless story of my inventing. But he says, it is contrary to experience, witness the case of Exeter. What the case of Exeter is, I have no certain knowledge: but if he means, that my Lord of Exeter is of a contrary judgment to the rest of the bishops of England; when he is pleased to declare himself so, I, for my part, shall have nothing to say against it. In the mean time, our author must excuse me for saying what I had just authority to say in reference to what I asserted.

The other thing he charges me with, page 4, is indecency and uncharitableness to the learned Dr. Hicks, for saying, I could not but wonder so learned and acute a man should carefully read over his papers, and never observe such a heap of blunders. For this, he thinks, I am obliged to ask the doctor's pardon openly for the affront, because the doctor never read over the papers in manuscript, where the blunders were committed. The doctor himself had signified the same thing to me privately by letter, and left it to me to give him what satisfaction I thought proper. And I immediately gave him the satisfaction to acquaint him, I neither said, nor meant, that he had read the papers in manuscript, but I did reasonably suppose he had read them after they were printed, which he did not deny; and that was a year before I made any remarks upon them, which I thought was time enough for our author, if he had been informed, to have rectified them. In answer to which I was told, that the doctor had only read them cursorily, as learned men are used to do books upon subjects they are well acquainted with. So that the sum of my crime, which our author aggravates as such a great indecency and uncharitableness, is, that I said the doctor had read them carefully; when it appears to have been a little otherwise; which our author who understands the art of making a mole-hill into a mountain, is pleased to call a great transgression. And having said this I now very friendly take my leave of our author and this subject, declaring once more, as I have frequently done before, that in all that I said upon this matter, I intend not to justify the usurpations

of any men whatsoever, who assume to themselves the power of baptising without a lawful commission and authority; but only to assert, what I take to have been the discipline and practice of the Catholic Church, and the Church of England, who have power to determine in their own discipline upon what terms and after what manner they will receive heretics and schismatics, baptised in due form, into their communion.

END OF THE DISSERTATION.

ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ;
OR THE
ANTIQUITIES
OF
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

VOL. V. of the Author's Original Edition.



CONTENTS.

BOOK XIII.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO DIVINE WORSHIP IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Some necessary Remarks upon the Ancient Names of Divine Service, which Modern Corruptions have rendered ambiguous.

SECT. 1. The Partition of this Work.—2. Of the *Missa Catechumenorum*, or *Ante-Communion-Service*, to which all Orders of Men were admitted.—3. Of the *Missa Fidelium*, or *Communion-service*, peculiar to Communicants only.—4. The true Original and Meaning of the ancient Name *Missa*, the *Mass*, which in its primitive Use denotes every part of Divine-Service; but no where an expiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead.—5. In what Sense Divine Service anciently called Sacrifice, *Sacrificium*.—6. And *Sacramenta*.—7. And *Cursus Ecclesiasticus*.—8. The names *Αστυρογία*, *Ἱερερογία*, *Ἰσρά*, and *Μυσταγωγία*, most usual in the Greek Church.—9. Liturgies sometimes taken for set Forms of Prayer.—10. Of Litanies. This at first a general Name of Prayers. How and when it came to be appropriated to certain particular Forms of Worship, called Rogations.—11. Of the distinction between greater and lesser Litanies.—12. Of their Processions.

CHAP. II.

That the Devotions of the Ancient Church were paid to every Person of the Blessed Trinity.

SECT. 1. Proofs of the Worship of Christ, as the Son of God, or second Person of the Blessed Trinity in the first Century.—2. Proofs of the same in the second Century, from the Testimony of Pliny, Ignatius, Polycarp, and the Acts of Polycarp, the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Lucian, Irenæus, Theophilus Antiochenus, Clemens of Alexandria, Athenogenes, the Acts of Andronicus, Tertullian.—3. Proofs of the Worship of Christ in the third Century, out of Caius Romanus, the Council of Antioch, Dionysius of Alexandria, Origen, Novatian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, the Acts of the Martyrs in Eusebius, the Acts of Felix, Thelica, Emeritus, Glycerius, Olympius, and many others. The force of this Argument to prove the Divinity of Christ upon this Christian Principle.—that divine Honour was to be given to none but God only.—4. The Proofs of the Worship of the Holy Ghost, from the Testimony of Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Lucian, Theophilus, Clemens of Alexandria, Athenogenes, Origen, the Author of the *Récognitions* under the name of Clemens Romanus. The Ancients charged with Tritheism, by Praxeas and the Sabellians upon the Account of their worshipping the Holy Trinity. The Worship of the Holy Ghost proved further from the Testimony of Cyprian, Firmilian, and Gregory Thaumaturgus.—5. In what Sense all Prayers are ordered to be directed to the Father.

CHAP. III.

That in the Ancient Church, Religious Worship was given to no Creature, Saint, or Angel, Cross, Image, or Relic, but to God alone.

SECT. 1. This Position proved, first, from their general Declarations against giving religious Worship to any Creature.—2. Secondly, from their denying the Worship of Saints and Angels in particular, and condemning it as Idolatry.—3. Thirdly, from their charging the Practice of it upon Heretics and Heathens only.

CHAP. IV.

That anciently Divine Service was always performed in the Vulgar Tongue, understood by the People.

SECT. 1. This proved, first, from plain Testimonies of the Ancients asserting it.—2. Secondly, from the People's joining in Psalmody and Prayer, and making their proper Responses in the Liturgy.—3. Thirdly, from the frequent Exhortations of the Fathers to the People, to hear, and read, and pray with Understanding.—4. Fourthly, from the References made by the Fathers in their Sermons to the Prayers and Lessons in the Service of the Church.—5. Fifthly, from the Scriptures being translated into all Languages from the first Foundation of Churches.—6. Sixthly, from the Use of the Order of Interpreters in the Church.—7. Seventhly, from the Custom of having Bibles laid in Churches, for the People to read in private.—8. Eighthly, from the general Allowance granted to all Men to have, and read the Scriptures in their Mother-tongue. Which Privilege was never infringed by any but the Heathen Persecutors.—9. From the Liberty granted to Children and Catechumens to join in the Public Prayers, and read the Scriptures.—10. From the Form and Tenor of the Ordination of Readers in the Church.

CHAP. V.

Of the Original and Use of Liturgies in stated and set forms of Prayer in the Primitive Church.

SECT. 1. Every Bishop at Liberty in the first Ages to order the Form of Divine-Service in his own Church.—2. In after Ages the Churches of a whole Province by Consent conformed to the Liturgy of the Metropolitan Church.—3. Why none of the ancient Liturgies are now remaining perfect and entire as they were in their first Original.—4. What Forms were used in the Apostles' Days. Where of the ancient Forms used by the Jews in their Temple-Worship and Synagogue-Service. How our Saviour and his Apostles complied with the Use of them. What new Forms were introduced by the Apostles into the Christian Service.—5. What Evidence there is of the Use of set Forms in the second Century, from the Testimony of Pliny, Ignatius, Lucian, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, and the Acts of St. Perpetua and Felicitas.—6. Evidence of set Forms in the third Century, From the Testimony of Hippolytus, Origen, Cyprian, Firmilian, Gregory Thaumaturgus, the Council of Antioch, Caius Romanus, Nepos, Dionysius of Alexandria, Athenogenes, and Cornelius, Bishop of Rome.—7. Evidences of set Forms in the fourth Century, from the Testimony of Arnobius, Lactantius, Eusebius, the Forms of Licinius, and Constantine, Athanasius, Juvencus, Pachomius, Flavian, Bishop of Antioch, Cyril of

Jerusalem, Hilary of Poitiers, the Council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Optatus, Basil, Ephrem Syrus, the Practice of Arius and Eunomius, St. Ambrose, St. Jerom and St. Austin, the Council of Carthage and Milevis.

CHAP. VI.

An Extract of the several Parts of the ancient Liturgy out of the genuine Writings of St. Chrysostom, following the Order of his Works.

SECT. 1. Parts of the Liturgy in the first Tome.—2. Parts of the Liturgy in the second Tome of St. Chrysostom's Works.—3. Part of the ancient Liturgy in the third Tome.—4. Parts of the ancient Liturgy in the fourth Tome of St. Chrysostom's Works.—5. In the fifth Tome.—6. In the sixth Tome.—7. In the seventh Tome of his Homilies on St. Matthew.—8. In the eighth Tome on St. John and the Acts of the Apostles.—9. In the ninth Tome on Romans, on the first and second to the Corinthians.—10. In the tenth Tome.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Use of the Lord's Prayer in the Liturgy of the ancient Church.

SECT. 1. The Lord's Prayer esteemed by all the Ancients a Form given by Christ to be used by all His Disciples.—2. Accordingly it was used by the primitive Church in all her public Offices: particularly in the Administration of Baptism.—3. And in the Celebration of the Eucharist.—4. And in their Morning and Evening Prayers.—5. And in their private Devotions.—6. Whence it had the Name of *Oratio Quotidiana, the Christian's Daily Prayer*.—7. And was used by all Heretics and Schismatics as well as Catholics.—8. That it was esteemed a divine and spiritual Form of Prayer.—9. And the Use of it esteemed a peculiar Privilege, allowed only to Communicants and perfect Christians.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Use of Habits, and Gesture, and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Ancient Church.

SECT. 1. No certain Evidences for the Use of distinct Habits in the Apostolical or the two following Ages.—2. What Evidence there is for them in the fourth Century.—3. Four Postures of Devotion spoken of by the Ancients. First, Standing, which was particularly enjoined on the Lord's-Day, and all the Time between Easter and Pentecost.—4. Secondly, Kneeling at all other Times, especially on the Stationary Days, and other times of Devotion.—5. Thirdly, Bowing down the head, or Inclination of the Body.—6. Fourthly, Prostration.—7. Sitting not an allowed posture of Devotion.—8. Some superstitious Practices in Devotion noted by Tertullian, as bathing the Body, and putting off their Cloaks when they went to Prayer.—9. That the Ancients always prayed uncovered.—10. And lifted up their Hands toward Heaven, sometimes in the Form of a Cross.—11. But yet were great Enemies to all theatrical Gestures.—12. What Ceremonies they used at their Entrance into the Church.—13. That the Bishop saluted the People with the Form, "*Pax vobis*," at his Entrance into the Church.—14. And the People gave Alms to the Poor, who stood before the Gates of the Church for this Purpose.—15. That they worshipped toward the East, with the Reasons for this Practice.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Times of their religious Assemblies, and the several Parts of Divine Service performed in them.

SECT. 1. No certain Rule for meeting in public, except upon the Lord's Day, in Times of Persecution for the first two Ages.—2. The Original of the Stationary-Days, or Church Assemblies on Wednesdays and Fridays, and what Divine-Service was performed on those Days.—3. Saturday or the Sabbath anciently observed with great Solemnity, as a Day of public Devotion.—4. How they observed the Vigils of the Sabbath and Lord's Day, and other incidental Festivals of Martyrs.—5. Of the Festivals of Martyrs, their Original, and what Divine-Service was performed on those Days.—6. Solemn Assemblies for preaching and other Acts of Divine Worship held every Day during the whole forty Days of Lent, and the fifty Days between Easter and Pentecost.—7. Public Prayer Morning and Evening every Day in the third Century.—8. The Original of the Canonical Hours of Prayer. No Notice of them for Public Prayer, but only for Private, in the three first Ages.—9. What Service was allotted to these Canonical Hours by the Church in the fourth Century.—10. Of the *Matulina* or *Prima*, called the *New Morning-Service*.—11. Of the *Tertia*, or *Third Hour of Prayer*.—12. Of the sixth Hour, or Noon-Day-Service.—13. Of the ninth Hour, or three in the Afternoon.

CHAP. X.

The Order of their Daily Morning-Service.

SECT. 1. The Order of Morning-Service, as described in the Constitutions. This began with the *Ixiii. Psalm*.—2. What Notice there is of this Morning Psalm in other Writers.—3. Next to the Psalm followed the Prayers for the Catechumens, Energumens, Competents, and Penitents.—4. Then the Prayers for the faithful, the Peace of the World, and the whole State of Christ's Church.—5. What Notice we have of these Prayers in other Writers.—6. After the general Prayer for the whole State of the Church, followed a short Bidding-Prayer for Preservation in the ensuing Day.—7. Then the Bishop's Commendation or Thanksgiving.—8. And his Imposition of Hands or Benediction, with the Deacon's Dismissal of the Assembly.—9. Whether the Morning-Hymn was part of the Public-Service every Day.—10. Whether the Psalms and Lessons were read at the daily Morning-Service.—11. The Original of the *Ante-lucan* or *Night-Assemblies* in Time of Persecution.—12. These continued when the Persecutions were over.—13. The Order of Divine-Service, which was performed in them, as described by St. Basil.—14. The Account of them out of Cassian.—15. This Morning-Service much frequented by the Laity as well as the Clergy.

CHAP. XI.

The Order of their Daily Evening Service.

SECT. 1. The Evening-Service in most things conformed to that of the Morning.—2. But they differed, first, in that a proper Psalm (the *cxli.*) was appointed for the Evening-Service. This Psalm called the Evening Psalm by the Author of the Constitutions.—3. This Psalm mentioned by Chrysostom and other Writers under the same Denomination.—4. Secondly, they had Proper Prayers for the Evening Service.—5. The Evening-Hymn.—6. Whether there were any Hymns, or Psalms, or Lessons read in the Evening-Service, beside the *cxli. Psalm*.—7. The Lord's Prayer used in many Churches, as the Conclusion of the daily Morning and Evening-Service.

THE
ANTIQUITIES
OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK XIII.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO DIVINE
WORSHIP IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

*Some necessary Remarks upon the Ancient Names of
Divine Service, which Modern Corruptions have rendered
ambiguous.*

SECT. 1.—The Partition of this Work.

WE have hitherto seen the method of introducing men into the Church, through the various steps of their catechumenhip, and baptism, and confirmation : we are now to view their practice in the worship of God after their admission, and to examine into the manner of their holding religious assemblies, and performing there the several public offices of divine service. Some things of this kind are general considerations, that run through all offices, and relate to every part of divine worship, such as the object of their worship, and the circumstances of language, and forms, and habits, and gesture, and time ; and therefore of these general things I shall discourse first in this Book. After this I shall consider the several parts of their most solemn worship on the Lord's day ; such as their psalmody, and reading of the Scriptures, and preaching and prayer, and receiving the communion, which were their solemn acts of worship on every festival.

And because some of these were such as the catechumens and all others were allowed to be present at, for their benefit and edification; whilst other parts of divine service were more restrained to persons baptised, who were complete and perfect Christians, (who were therefore called communicants, because they had a more peculiar right to all the privileges of Christian communion,) I shall upon this account speak of their worship under these two heads, according to their own distinction; the *Missa Catechumenorum*, and the *Missa Fidelium*, the service of the catechumens, and the service of the communicants; or, as we may otherwise term them, the ante-communion service, and the communion service.

SECT. 2.—Of the *Missa Catechumenorum*, or First Part of Divine Service, to which all Orders of Men were admitted.

The *Missa Catechumenorum* comprehended all that part of the service, which preceded the common prayers of the communicants at the altar; that is, the psalmody, the reading of the Scriptures, the sermon, and the particular prayers, that were made over the catechumens and other orders of penitents, energumens, &c. before they were dismissed. For, by the ancient rules and discipline of the Church, the method of divine service was so ordered that all persons, except some very scandalous sinners, had liberty to be present at some parts of it. The psalms, and lessons, and sermons were for the instruction, not only of believers, but also of catechumens and heathens, Jews and infidels, unbelievers and heretics: and therefore by some canons all these had liberty to stay in the Church, till this part of the service, called *Missa Catechumenorum*, was ended. The fourth Council of Carthage has a rule to this purpose,¹ “that the bishop shall not prohibit any one to enter the Church, and hear the Word of God, whether he be Gentile, Jew, or heretic, till the service of the catechumens was ended.” A like canon was made by the first Council of Orange,²

¹ Con. Carthag. iv. can. lxxxiv. Ut episcopus nullum prohibeat ingredi ecclesiam, et audire Verbum Dei, sive gentilem, sive gentilem, sive hæreticum, sive Judæum, usque ad missam catechumenorum.

² Con. Arausican. I. can. xviii. Evangelia placuit deinceps catechumenis legi apud omnes provinciarum nostrarum Ecclesias.

“ that the catechumens should have the liberty to stay and hear the Gospels read in all their Churches.” The Council of Valentia,¹ in Spain, extends the privilege to heretics and heathens, as well as catechumens, and therefore orders, that the Gospel should be read before the oblation was brought fourth, in the usual order of the lessons, so that not only the communicants, but the catechumens and penitents, and Gentiles, and heretics, who were of the contrary part, might have liberty to hear the saving precepts of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the sermons of the bishops. For they had learned by experience, that by the bishops preaching many had been brought over to the faith. And by this we may interpret an obscure canon of the Council of Lerida, which orders,² “ that incestuous persons, so long as they continued in their sin, should not be permitted to stay any longer in the Church, save only during the service of the catechumens, that is, to hear the psalmody, the lesson and the sermon.” St. Chrysostom abundantly confirms this observation: for in many of his homilies he speaks not only of catechumens,³ but of heretics and heathens being present as part of his auditory. Particularly, in his Homily upon the forty-fourth psalm,⁴ he wishes all the Jews and Heathens had been then present to have heard him expound that prophetic psalm of Christ. In another Homily upon the forty-eight psalm he brings in an heathen using this form of complaint against Christians,⁵ “ I went into a Christian Church, and there I heard Paul say to their women, that they should not adorn themselves with gold or pearl; but I saw every thing contrary in

¹ Con. Valentin. can. I. Ut sacrosancta Evangelia ante munus illationem, in missâ catechumenorum in ordine lectionum post legantur, quatenus salutaria præcepta Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel sermones sacerdotis, non solum fideles sed etiam catechumeni ac pœnitentes, et omnes qui è diverso sunt, audire licitum habeant. Sic enim pontificum prædicatione auditâ, nonnullos attractos ad fidem evidenter scimus. ² Con. Ilerdense. can. iv.

De his qui incestus pollutione se commaculant, placuit, ut quousque in ipso detestando et illicito carnis contubernio perseverant, usque ad missam tantum catechumenorum in ecclesiâ admittantur. ³ Chrys. Hom. 41. de Pelagiâ. tom. i. p. 560. Hom. 71. de Phocâ. tom. i. p. 878. Hom. 8. tom. v. p. 124. Hom. I. in Mat. p. 5. Hom. 27. in Mat. p. 271. Hom. de Prophet Obscuritate. tom. iii. p. 926. Hom. ii. p. 946. Hom. 40. in I. Cor. p. 688.

⁴ Hom. in Psal. xlv. tom. iii. p. 206. ⁵ Chrys. Hom. in. Psal. xlvi. al. xlix. p. 806.

their practice." "And," says Chrysostom, "will not the Heathen, when he comes into the Church, and sees the women thus adorned in the galleries above, and hears Paul thus speaking below, be ready to say, our religion is mere pagantry and fable? It is not so, indeed; but the Heathen is scandalized and offended at this contrariety in our practice." This plainly implies, that the Heathens had free liberty to come into the Christian Churches, and hear the Scriptures read, and the sermon preached. And it is very remarkable, what Sozomen observes of St. Chrysostom,¹ "that by this means he brought over many of those, who heard him in the Church, to acknowledge the divinity of Christ." Which some understand of the scholars of Libanius, but Valesius, I think, more truly interprets it of heathens and heretics in general, who flocked to St. Chrysostom's church to hear him. There is but one thing that can be said against all this, and that is, that the Council of Laodicea has a contrary canon, which absolutely forbids the permitting of heretics to enter into the house of God.² But this is only a local ordinance; and the thing being a matter of pure discipline, there might be prudential reasons for denying heretics in some places the privilege that was allowed them in others. Or else the canon may be understood of not permitting them to come into the Church for prayers or communion, which was a thing forbidden by all canons whatsoever, till after their recantation. Some indeed think, that in Tertullian's time the catechumens were excluded before sermon, because he objects it to the heretics,³ "that there were such confusions in their assemblies, that no one could tell who was a catechumen, and who was a communicant, because they all met, and heard, and prayed together. And heathens, if they came in among them, were not excluded from the very mysteries of their religion." But in this, as Schelstrate⁴ has observed against Albaspinæus and Christianus Lupus, Ter-

¹ Sozom. lib. viii. cap. ii.

² Con. Laodic. can. vi. Περὶ τῶ μὴ συγ-

χωρεῖν τοῖς ἁρετικοῖς εἰσεῖναι εἰς τὸν οἶκον τῶ Θεοῦ.

³ Tertul. de Præscript. advers. Hæreticos. cap. xli. In primis quis catechumenus, quis fidelis, incertum est: pariter adeunt, pariter audiunt, pariter orant: etiam ethnici si supervenerint, sanctum canibus, et porcis margaritas, licet non veras, jactabunt.

⁴ Schelstrat. de Concilio Antiocheno. p. 200

tullian does not object to the heretics, that they admitted catechumens to hear their sermons, but that they made no distinction in their assemblies, as the Church did; but without any observation of decency or order, suffered their catechumens to mingle themselves with communicants, whom the Catholics always confined to a separate place in the Church, while heretics admitted them confusedly, not only to hear sermons but to be present at their prayers and the oblation of the eucharist also. So that this passage of Tertullian rather confirms the thing asserted, that the *Missa Catechumenorum*, or *service of the catechumens*, lasted to the end of the sermon. After which it was usual for the deacon to call to the heathens, and heretics, if there were any present, to be gone: “Μή τις τῶν ἀκροουμένων· μή τις τῶν ἀπίστων.—*Let none that are only hearers, none of the unbelievers, be present,*” as the author of the Constitutions¹ words it. Then followed the prayers for the catechumens of the order called prostrators; and after their dismissal, prayers for the energumens; and after them, the prayers for the candidates of baptism, and last of all the prayers for the penitents. All which was included in the general name of *Missa Catechumenorum*, the *service of the catechumens*, or *ante-ommunion service*.

SECT. 3.—Of the *Missa Fidelium*, or *Communion-Service*, peculiar to Communicants only.

After this was ended, it was usual for the deacon to make another solemn proclamation to all orders of non-communicants to withdraw: “οἱ ἀκοινωνήτοι περιπατήσατε,—*ye that cannot communicate, walk off and be gone.*” “Let no catechumen be present, no hearer, no infidel, no heterodox or heretical person,” as the author of the Constitutions words it.² And as St. Chrysostom acquaints us,³ he was used to add further, “Ἐπιγινώσκετε ἀλλήλους,—*ye that are communicants discern and know one another*: see that there be no catechumen, none of those that cannot eat of the sacrifice, no spy,

¹ Constit. lib. viii. cap. 5.

² Constit. lib. viii. cap. 12.

³ Chrys. Hom. 1. cont. Judæos. tom. i. p. 440. et Hom. 37. de Filio Prodig. tom. vi. p. 375.

no one that cannot see the heavenly blood shed for the remission of sins, no one unworthy of the living sacrifice, no unbaptised person, no one that may not touch the tremendous mysteries with his polluted lips." And here began the *Missa Fidelium*, or *communion-service*, so called, because none might be present at it but communicants only, as appears from these solemn forms of dismissing all others before it began. This contains all those prayers, which were said at the altar, and were properly called *Εὐχαὶ Πιστῶν*, *prayers of the faithful* or *communicants*, in opposition to the prayers of the catechumens, which went before: these were the prayers for the whole state of the Church, and peace of the world, which preceded the oblation and consecration of the eucharist; and then the consecration prayers, and prayers again for all orders of men in the Church, with proper forms of communicating, and doxologies, hymns, and thanksgivings after reception, of which we discourse particularly in the last of these books, under the general title of *Missa Fidelium*, or *communion service*. This part of the service being wholly spent in prayers, and that by the communicants only, is therefore peculiarly distinguished by the name of *Εὐχαὶ πιστῶν*, *the prayers of the faithful*, by the Council of Laodicea,¹ which speaks of them as coming after the prayers of the catechumens and their dismissal. In other canons they are called the common prayers of the people, and absolutely the prayers, without taking notice of any other prayers in the Church. Whence in the Council of Nice,² speaking of penitents, the phrase "communicating in prayers with the people without the oblation," denotes joining in this part of the service of the Church, distinguished by the name of prayers, or communion-service, which belonged not to the catechumens, but the body of the people, in which the penitents of the highest class, called costanders, were allowed to join, though they might neither make their oblations, nor partake of the eucharist with the faithful. And in the same

¹ Con. Laodic. can. xix.

² Con. Nicen. can. xi. Δύο δὲ ἐτη χωρὶς προσφορᾶς κοινωνήσασσι τῷ λαῷ τῶν προσευχῶν.

sense the Council of Ancyra speaks of penitents,¹ who as they were to be three years substrators among the catechumens, and bow down under the bishops hands for benediction ; so were they for two years to communicate in prayers only without the oblation. And so communicating in prayers with the people is taken in the Council of Antioch, when they say, all such as come to Church, and hear the Holy Scriptures read, but will not communicate in prayers with the people,² or withdraw themselves disorderly from partaking of the eucharist, shall be cast out of the Church. Where, as reading of the Scriptures is put for the whole service of the catechumens, which was the first service ; so communicating in prayers and the eucharist denotes the second part of the service, peculiar to communicants, or persons baptised, from which, as catechumens were debarred, so others might not withdraw themselves, under pain of ecclesiastical censure. This was the true order of the first and second service in the ancient Church, and the true distinction between the *Missa Catechumenorum*, and *Missa Fidelium*, of which I intend to give a full account in the two next books.

SECT. 4.—The true Original and Meaning of the ancient Name, *Missa*, the *Mass*, which in its primitive Use denotes every Part of Divine Service: but no where an Expiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead.

At present we may observe how shamefully they have abused the ancient name *Missa*, under the appellation of *Mass*, who apply it only to denote the office of consecrating bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and offering that as an expiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead. For anciently the name *Missa* signified no such thing, but was a general name for every part of divine service. It signified, as we have seen already, the service of the catechumens, as well as the service of the altar ;

¹ Con. Ancyr. can. xxiii. Ὑπο τὸν κανόνα πιπέτωσαν τρία ἔτη ὑποπτώσεως ἢ δύο ἔτη εὐχῆς χωρὶς προσφορᾶς.

² Con. Antioch. can. ii. Πάντας τὰς εἰσιόντας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἢ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ κοινωνούντας δὲ εὐχῆς ἅμα τῷ λαῷ, ἢ ἀποστρεφόμενος τὴν μετάληψιν τῆς εὐχαριστίας κατὰ τινα ἀταξίαν, τέτρες ἀποβλήτως γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

and is often used for the psalmody, for the lessons, and for the prayers at evening, when there was no communion, as well as for the prayers used in time of celebration of the eucharist. Thus Cassian often mentions the *Missa Nocturna*,¹ by which he means *the morning prayers and psalmody before day*, when it is certain they had no communion. The Council of Agde speaks of evening mass,² as well as morning, which meant no more but morning and evening prayer without any communion. For they had no communion either morning or evening at their daily prayers, but only on festivals at a distinct hour from both those. So the Emperor Leo, in his Tactics,³ speaks of the *Μίσαι Ἐσπεριναί*, a word plainly borrowed from the Latin *Missa*, for the Greeks had originally no such name to signify only evening prayer. And Bishop Usher, in his religion of the Ancient Irish,⁴ gives us another such instance out of Adamnanus, who uses the name *Vespertinalis Missa*, for what is commonly called *evening prayer*. And the late learned Mabillon has observed out of the Rules of Cæsarius Arelatensis and Aurelian,⁵ that the word *Missa* is sometimes used for the lessons also. For it is one of Aurelian's rules, that they should take six *Missas*, that is, *lessons* out of the prophet Isaiah, "*Facite sex Missas de Esai Prophetâ.*" And Mabillon very judiciously remarks further,⁶ that the word *Missa* has at least three significations. It sometimes signifies the lessons, sometimes the collects or prayers, and sometimes the dismissal of the people. And indeed the third sense is the original notation of the word; for *Missa* is the same as *Missio*. And it was the form used in the Latin Church, "*Ite, Missa est,*" which answers to the Greek "*ἀπολύεσθε*" and "*προέλθετε,*" the solemn words used at the dismissal of the catechumens first, and then of the whole assembly afterwards, at the end of their respective services. Whence the services themselves at last took

¹ Cassian Institut. lib. ii. cap. 13. lib. iii. cap. 5, et 6.

² Con.

Agathen. can. xxx. In conclusione matutinarum vel vespertinarum missarum, post hymnos capitella de psalmis dici, &c.

³ Leo Tactic. cap. xi. num.

18. cited by Bishop Usher.

⁴ Usher Relig. of the Ancient

Irish. chap. iv. p. 26. ex Adamnani Vita Columban. lib. iii. cap. 31.

⁵ Mabil. de Cursu Gallicano. lib. ii. p. 107.

⁶ Ibid. p. 393.

their names from these solemn dismissions, the one being called, *Missa Catechumenorum*, and the other *Missa Fidelium*, neither of which ever signify more than the divine service, at which the one or the other attended.

In vain therefore do many learned men labour to deduce its original from foreign languages, to make it signify something agreeable to the modern notion of the Roman Mass, when it is so plainly of Latin extraction. Baronius,¹ after Reuclin and Genebrard, would have it come from the Hebrew word *Missah*, an oblation, but Durantus² has a good reason against that; because if it had been of Hebrew extraction, the Greeks would have retained it in their language, as they do the words *Hosanna*, *Sabbaoth*, *Allelujah*, and *Amen*: whereas there is no Greek writer uses it till the time of Leo Sapiens, who first borrows it from the Latin in his Tactics. Albaspinæus has still a wilder conjecture; he says, the word *Mess*, among the northern nations, signifies a festival, and therefore he imagines, the name *Missa*, and *Mass* might come from that: which is only to invert the origination, and make the daughter to become the mother; since it is evident, the name *Mess* comes from *Missa*, and not *Missa* from that. Cardinal Bona³ takes a great deal of pains to confute these and all other false opinions, and establishes the true one with undeniable evidence from Alcimus Avitus, and all the ancient ritualists, Isidore, Rabanus Maurus, Florus Magister, Remigius Altissiodorensis, Alcuinus, Gregory's Sacramentarium, Hugo Victorinus, and Bernoldus, who all agree in this, that *Missa* comes from the *dismission* of the people, and not from any other original. So that I think it needless to trouble my reader with any of these authorities, since the matter is now cleared beyond all contradiction by Mabillon and Bona, too such eminent writers of the Roman communion.

¹ Baron. an. 34. n. 59.

² Durant. de Ritibus. lib. ii. cap. i. n.

i. So also Bellarmin and Bona both refute it.

³ Bona Rer. liturg.

lib. i. cap. i. n. 6. where he censures Genebrard, as "nimis addictus rebus Hebraicis."

SECT. 5.—In what Sense Divine Service anciently called *Sacrificium*.

Another general name of the ancient service, which in later ages has met with some abuse, is *Sacrificium*, *sacrifice*; a name borrowed from the Jewish carnal sacrifices, and applied to the spiritual sacrifices of Christians, viz. their prayers and praises, and preaching, and devoting themselves entirely, body and soul, to the service of Christ, by the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's-supper. Hence every part of divine worship had the name of sacrifice, and not only the service of the altar. For they commonly call their evening hymns and prayers, by the name of evening sacrifice. Thus St. Jerom bids Læta accustom her daughter not only to the morning hymns, and daily hours of prayer, the 3d, the 6th, and the 9th, but also when night comes, and the lamps are lighted, then in like manner to render to God her evening sacrifice.¹ And so St. Hilary, upon those words of the Psalmist, "Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice," says, "The sacrifice of Christians is their prayers recommended to God by stretching forth their hands to relieve the poor. For we," says he,² "upon whom the ends of the world are come, do not sacrifice to God with blood or burnt-offerings: but the evening sacrifice which is pleasing to God, is that which Christ teaches in his Gospel, 'I was an hungry, and ye fed me; thirsty, and ye gave me drink, &c.' This is the evening sacrifice, that is, the sacrifice of the last times. In this we are to lift up our hands: for by such prayers the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven is prepared for those, that are blessed of God, from the foundation of the world." In the same sense Eusebius calls the prayers of Christians, "the rational sacrifices, that are offered without blood to God."³

¹ Hieron. Ep. vii. ad Lætam. Accensâ lucernâ reddere sacrificium vespertinum.

² Hilar. in Psal. 140. p. 330. Non enim sanguine et holocaustis nos, in quos consumnatio sæculorum devenit, sacrificamus Deo: sed quod sacrificium vespertinum placitum sit, audiamus dominum—Hoc sacrificium vespertinum, id est, temporum novissimorum est. In hoc manus elevandæ sunt: quia istiusmodi orationibus jam ab initio mundi benedictis Dei, regni cœlestis præparata possessio est.

³ Euseb. aud. Constan. Orat. p. 659. Τὰς ἀναίμους ἐλογικὰς θυσίας τὰς δι' εὐχῶν.

Vid. de Vit. Constant. lib. iv. cap. 45. Θυσίας ἀναίμους, &c.

And Clemens Alexandrinus says,¹ “The sacrifices of Christians are their prayers and praises, and reading of the Scriptures, and psalms and hymns before meals, and at their meals, and at bedtime, and in the night.” And there are hundreds of passages in the Ancients, both of public and private prayers, to the same purpose, besides what is said of the sacrifice of the eucharist, or communion-service, of which we shall have reason to say something more upon another occasion. Here it is sufficient to have hinted the grounds, upon which the Ancients gave the general name of sacrifice to all parts of divine service.

SECT. 6.—And *Sacramenta*.

Another name, though neither so ancient, nor so common as the former, is that of *Sacramenta*, which in some authors signifies not what we now call sacraments, but *the order or manner of performing divine offices*, and that as well the prayers and service in general, as the particular offices of administering baptism and the Lord's-supper. For the word *Sacramentum*, answering to the Greek *Μυστήριον*, is a word of a large extent, denoting not only the proper sacraments, but *all sacred ceremonies and usages* of the Church, that have any thing of symbolical or spiritual significancy in them, representing something more to the understanding than appears to the outward senses: and in a more restrained, though not the strictest sense, it denotes the manner or method of performing divine offices in the Church, whether relating to the sacraments, properly so called, or any other parts of divine service, as the prayers, hymns, lessons, in morning or evening service. In this sense, it is observed by learned men,² that the Book of Divine Offices composed by Gregory the Great for the use of the Roman Church, bears the title of *Liber Sacramentorum*, *the book of sacraments*, that is, a book or method for performing

¹ Clem. Alex. Strom. vii p. 860. Ed. Oxon. *Θυσίαι τῷ Θεῷ, εὐχαί τε καὶ αἶνοι, καὶ αἱ πρὸς τῆς ἐσιτάσεως ἐντεύξεις τῶν γραφῶν*, &c. Vid. Cassian. Instit. lib. iii. c. 3. Con. Aurelian. iii. can. 28. Martin. Bracarenensis Capitul. c. 66.

² Menard. Not. in Sacramentum Gregor. p. i. et Stillingfleet Orig. Britan. p. 225.

divine offices in the Church. And Gelasius did the same thing before him, under the title of *Codex Sacramentarius*, lately published by Thomasius, at Rome, 1680. And Gennadius says,¹ Musæus, a presbyter of Marseilles, composed “*Volumen Sacramentorium, a large book of sacraments,*” that is, divine offices, to direct what lessons, and psalms, and hymns were to be used in the communion-service, according to the seasons of the year, and what prayers and thanksgiving were to make up the service of the Church. And it is the opinion of two very learned men, Menardus and Bishop Stillingfleet,² that both St. Austin and St. Ambrose give the name of *Sacramenta* to the books of Liturgic Offices used in their time. And they observe, that the old Missal, published by Illyricus, bears the name of *Ordo Sacramentorum*, which can mean nothing but the manner of performing divine offices in the administration of the eucharist and other parts of public worship.

SECT. 7.—And *Cursus Ecclesiasticus*.

These offices are by other writers styled *Cursus Ecclesiasticus, the order or course of divine offices*. For under this title, Gregory Turonensis is said to have composed a book, *De Cursibus Ecclesiasticis*, for the use of the Gallican Church, which is now lost: but he himself³ mentions it in his history.³ And Bishop Usher⁴ cites an ancient manuscript out of the Cotton library, which says, “that Germanus and Lupus brought *Ordinem Cursus Gallorum, the Gallican Liturgy*, into Britain with them.” And this was the Liturgy of the British Churches for some ages, till by degrees the *Cursus Romanus* was brought in upon them. Bede says,⁵ “in the time of Pope Agatho, Joannes

¹ Gennad. de Scriptor. cap. 79. Composuit sacramentorum egregium et non parvum volumen, per membra quidem pro opportunitate officiorum et temporum, pro lectionum textu, psalmodumque serie et decantatione discretum, &c. Id. cap. 78. de Voconio. Composuit sacramentorum volumen.

² Menard. *ibid.* Stillingfl. *ubi supra*.

³ Greg. Turon. Hist. lib. x.

cap. ult. de Cursibus Ecclesiasticis unum librum condidi.

⁴ Usher de Primrod. Eccles. p. 185.

⁵ Bede. Hist. lib. iv. c.

18. Quatenus in monasterio suo cursum canendi annum, sicut ad sanctum Petrum Romæ agebatur, edoceret.

Abbas, the Roman præcentor, was sent over to settle the Roman Cursus, or psalmody, for the whole year, according to the usage and way of St. Peter's Church at Rome. And the Council of Calchuth sometime after Bede¹ speaks of the liturgy under the same title, ordering all Churches at the canonical hours, reverently to perform their Cursus. And Mabillon² cites the Lives of Walaricus and Senericus, where there is frequent mention of the *Cursus Gallicanus*.

SECT. 8.—The Names *Λειτουργία*, *Ἱεραργία*, *Ἱερά*, and *Μυσταγωγία*, most usual in the Greek Church.

Among the Greek writers we seldom meet with any of these names, but they usually style all holy offices, and all parts of divine service by the general name of *Λειτουργία*, and *Ἱεραργία*, *liturgy*, and *sacred service*. Though liturgy, in its extended sense, denotes any public office or ministration, as the Apostle uses it, Phil. ii. 30. and 2 Cor. ix. 12. for the ministration of charity; and ecclesiastical writers do the same, often applying it both to civil and sacred functions, as to the office of a magistrate or a bishop, as Casaubon shews at large;³ yet in a more limited sense it is put to signify those sacred offices, which make up the several parts of divine worship, as prayers, reading, preaching, and administration of the sacraments. But it is never used as the Romanists would appropriate it, for the business of sacrificing only. The Council of Ephesus speaks both of evening and morning liturgies,⁴ which doubtless mean evening and morning prayers only. And so Casaubon observes, that Justinian takes it for the office of reading the Scripture, as well as administering the eucharist, when he says of a certain monastery,⁵ “that the divine Liturgy was performed in it, as it was used to be in the Churches, both by reading the Holy Scrip-

¹ Con. Calchuthens. can. vii. Con. tom. vi. p. 1865. Ut omnes ecclesie publicæ canonicis horis cursum suum cum reverentiâ habeant.

² Mabil. de Cursu Gallican. p. 420.

³ Casaub. Exercit. in Baron.

xvi. n. xli. p. 471.

⁴ Con. Ephes. Epist. Synod. ad Imperat. ap.

Casaubon. τὰς ἑσπερινὰς ἢ τὰς ἑωθινὰς λειτουργίας.

⁵ Justin. Novel.

vii. Ἱερά γέγονε λειτουργία—τῶν τε θείων ἀναγνωσκομένων γραφῶν, τῆς τε ἱερᾶς ἐκ ἀρρήτων μεταδιδομένης κοινωνίας.

tures, and receiving the holy communion." And Antiochus applies the name of *Liturgy*,¹ not only to morning prayer, but also to the service of their midnight assemblies. Neither of which was in his time the ordinary hours of the communion service. So that Erasmus and others are governed more by prejudice than reason, who would have that passage of Acts, xiii. 2. *Λειτουργῶν αὐτῶν* to be rendered, *Sacrificantibus illis*, as if there were no divine service without sacrifice in their notion of it; when yet the vulgar translation renders it *ministering*, and the old Syriac and Arabic, as Beza observes, have it *praying*; which is agreeable to the notion of *liturgy* for divine service. Yet when the epithet of *mystica* was added to *liturgia*, then it commonly signified the communion service. As when Theodoret says, "That the salutation of St. Paul, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. 'The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.' is the beginning of the mystical Liturgy,"² he means the communion office, where this form of salutation was always used. And so in the Clementina Epitome,³ "the sacred Liturgy," denotes the service of the altar, which came after the *ἐυχὴν τῶν ἱερῶν ὕμνων*, *prayers used in psalmody*, or the service of the catechumens. And it is Bona's observation,⁴ out of Vincentius Riccardus,⁵ "That except the words sacred, or mystical, be added to the name Liturgy, it is never to be taken for the sacrifice of the altar, but for some other part of divine service." Though, I think, this is more than can be fairly proved. As on the other hand, when the epithet of mystical is added, it does not always, but only for the most part, as I said before, mean the eucharistical service. For the service of baptism was ever esteemed a mystical service, as well as that of the eucharist, and the name *Μυσταγωγία*, *communion in the sacred mysteries*, is upon that account frequently given by St. Chrysostom,⁶ Theodoret,⁷ and others to baptism, as well as

¹ Antioch. Hom. 19. Bibl. Patr. G. L. tom. i. p. 1056. Ἐξέγειρον ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὰς νυκτερινὰς ἃ ἑωθινὰς λειτουργίας.

² Theod. Ep. 146. p. 1032.

³ Ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς μυστικῆς λειτουργίας προσίμουν.

⁴ Clementina Epitome de Gestis Petri. ap. Coteler. tom. i. p. 796. Τῆ πατριάρχῃ τὴν νύκτα ἐκτελέσαντος λειτουργίαν.

⁵ Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. cap. 3. n. 3.

⁶ Riccard. Comment in Proclum de Tradit. Missæ.

⁷ Chrys. Hom. xxi. tom. i. p. 273.

⁸ Theod. in cap. i. Canticorum.

Canticorum.

the Lord's-supper; as may be seen at large in Suicerus's Collections upon that subject.¹ It is certain the author under the name of Dionysius, the Areopagite, uses the title of *Mystagogia*, as well when he is describing the ceremonies and service of baptism, as the eucharist: and Cyril's *Mystagogical Catechisms*, are equally an exposition of the rites observed in administering baptism and confirmation, as of those of the other sacrament; these being the two great mystical services of the Christian Church. The names ἱερὰ, ἱεραργία, and Θυσία, are all words of the same importance: they most commonly signify the communion-service, or the sacrifice of prayers at the altar. But sometimes they denote the offices of baptism, preaching, reading the Scripture, and psalmody: these being the spiritual sacrifices of Christians. It is certain the Apostle calls preaching the Gospel by the name of ἱεραργία, Rom. xv. 16, and the conversion of the Gentiles thereby, "the offering them up or sacrificing them to God." Upon which words Chrysostom observes,² "that the Apostle does not call this service barely λατρεία, but λειτουργία and ἱεραργία, sacrifice, or sacred service. For this is my priesthood to preach and publish the Gospel: this the sacrifice that I offer to God." And St. Basil³ gives the same names of ἱεραργία, and Θυσία, to the duty of praise and thanksgiving. "I will offer unto thee the sacrifice of praise." And we have seen before sect. 5, how the evening prayer is commonly styled *Sacrificium Vespertinum*, evening sacrifice, by the Latin writers.

SECT. 9.—Liturgy sometimes taken for set Forms of Prayer.

It is further to be observed, that as the Latins by the names *Missa*, *Cursus*, *Ordo*, and *Officium*, mean not only the divine worship itself, but also the books containing the method and prescriptions for the regular performance of it, which we usually call set forms of prayer, so the Greeks some-

¹ Suicer. Thesaur. voce Μυσταγωγία.

² Chrys. Hom. xxix.

in Rom. p. 302. Οὐχ ἀπλῶς λατρείαν λέγων, ἀλλὰ λειτουργίαν, ἢ ἱεραργίαν. αὕτη γὰρ μοι ἱερωσύνη, τὸ κηρύττειν ἢ καταγγέλλειν. ταύτην προσφέρω τῇ θυσίαν.

³ Basll. in Psal. 115. p. 275. Ἱεραργήσω σοι τὴν τῆς αἰνέσεως θυσίαν.

times understand the same thing by the name of Liturgy, and that not only when they speak of the forms of administering the sacraments, but of any other parts of divine service. It is plain the author of the Constitutions¹ takes the word in this sense, when he applies it to the forms of prayer then made for the catechumens. And Casaubon observes,² that all those forms of worship which go under the names of Peter, James, Andrew, Chrysostom, and Basil, bear the name of Liturgies, which the Latins call *Ordo*, and *Officium*, and the modern Greeks, Ἀκολῶθία. These were sometimes also among the ancient Greek writers termed Εὐχῶν διατάξεις, *the order of the prayers*; which is the name that Nazianzen gives the Liturgy of St. Basil,³ composed by him by the direction of his bishop, whilst he was presbyter of Cæsarea, and those forms and orders of divine worship collected by the author of the Constitutions, bear the same title of Διατάξεις. In Chrysostom they are styled Νόμοι, *the rules*, or *appointments* of the Church; and the prayers particularly are distinguished into two sorts of forms, both by him⁴ and the Council of Laodicea, the one called Εὐχαὶ κατηχησμένων, *the prayers of the catechumens*, and the other, Εὐχαὶ πιστῶν, *the prayers of the faithful*, or *believers*. But I shall say no more of Liturgies here, considered as set forms or prescriptions of worship, because they will come to be discoursed of more fully hereafter in their proper place.

SECT. 10.—Of Litanies. This at first a general Name for Prayers. How and when it came to be appropriated to certain particular Forms of Worship, called Rogations.

There is one general name more, which the first writers use to denote all sorts of public prayers, but the middle ages have appropriated it to a particular form of worship, that is, *Litanies*, in Greek called Λιτανείαι, and Λίται, in Latin *Supplicationes* and *Rogationes*. These words in their original signification are but another name for prayers in general, of

¹ Constit. lib. viii. cap. vi. Ἡ Θεία λειτουργία, ἐν ᾗ προσφώνησις ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχησμένων. ² Casaubon. Exerc. ib. in Baron. n. xli. p. 472.

³ Naz. Oral. xx. in Laud. Basil. p. 340,

⁴ Chrys. Hom. ii. in 2.

Cor. p. 740.

⁷ Con. Laodic. can. xix.

whatever kind, that either were made publicly in the Church, or by any private person. Eusebius, speaking of Constantine's custom of making his solemn addresses to God in his tent, before he went out to battle, says,¹ "he endeavoured to render God propitious to him by supplications and *Litanies*, that he might obtain his favour, assistance, and direction in his enterprizes." And again he says,² "a little before his death he spent some time in the house of prayer, making supplications and *litanies* to God. In which places *litany* seems to be a general name, and not to intend any particular sort of prayers: so Chrysostom also uses the word *litany*, when he says³ to his people, "To morrow I shall go forth with you to make our *litany*," that is, the public service. And again speaking of the solemn form of words, *Pax vobis, peace be with you*, he says,⁴ "the bishop used it in all offices, when he first entered the church, when he made the prayers and litanies, and when he preached." And Arcadius, in one of his laws made against hereties, about the same time,⁵ takes *Litany* in the same sense for prayers in general, when he forbids hereties "to hold profane assemblies in the city, either by night or by day, to make their *litany*." Where it is plain, his intent was, not to prohibit hereties from making any particular sort of prayers, but all prayers in general within the city, and to cut off all opportunities of meeting either by night or by day for that purpose: and so Gothofred understands him: for this law was made with a direct view to the Arian assemblies for psalmody in their night stations, which had occasioned some tumults and murder in the city, as Socrates and Sozomen inform us.⁶ So that the morning hymns and psalmody and prayers then came all under the general name of *Litany*, and the Arians were

¹ Euseb. Vit. Const. lib. i. cap. xiv. Τὸν Θεὸν ἱκετηρίας, λιτανείαις ἐμει-
νος, &c. ² Id. lib. iv. cap. lxi. Ἐδκτηρίῳ ἐνδιατρίψασόικῳ, ἱκετη-
ρίας εὐχὰς τε ἔβ λιτανείας ἀνέπεμπε τῷ Θεῷ.

³ Chrys. Hom. antequam
iret in Exilium, tom. iv. p. 965. Ἀῦριον εἰς λιτανεῖον ἐξελεύσομαι μετ' ἡμῶν.

⁴ Hom. iii. in Colos. p. 1338. Ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις εἰρήνην, ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς, ἐν
ταῖς λιταῖς, &c.

⁵ Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. De Hereticis. leg.
30. Interdicatur his omnibus, ad litaniam faciendam intra civitatem noctu
vel interdiu profanis coire conventibus.

⁶ Socrat. lib. vi. cap. viii.
Sozomen. lib. viii. cap. viii.

forbidden in this sense to make any litanies within the city by this law of Arcadius. What Hamond Lestrangle¹ alleges out of St. Austin, Cyprian, and Tertullian, proves nothing but that there were always prayers made in the church to implore God's mercy and favours; which no one ever denied: neither is the name litany used by any of them. It is more to the purpose what St. Basil² says to the Church of Neocæsarea, where Gregory Thaumaturgus was bishop; that though in Gregory's time they had no litanies, yet afterward before St. Basil's time they had admitted the use of them. By which argument he defends the nocturnal prayers and psalmody and vigils against those, who objected, that they were not used in St. Gregory's time. For neither were litanies used in his time, and yet now they were in use, and no one objected novelty against them. This shews, that St. Basil takes *litanies* for a peculiar sort of prayers, lately set up in the Church. For it cannot be doubted, but that they had prayers before, though not of this particular kind.

Some think, that litanies in this new limited sense were first introduced by Mamercus, bishop of Vienna, in France, about the year 450. But St. Basil's testimony proves them to be earlier in the East: and it is a mistake in those, who assert Mamercus to be the first author of them in the West; for Sidonius Apollinaris, who lived in the time of Mamercus, and wrote some Epistles to him, says expressly, that he was not the first inventor of them, but only of the rogation-fast-days before Ascension, to which he applied the use of these litanies, which were in being long before, though not observed with such solemnity, nor fixed to any stated times, but only used, as exigencies required, to deprecate any impending judgment. This he declares at large in an Epistle to Mamercus himself,³ styling him "the author of the rogation-days," and shewing both the reasons of their institution, and the manner of observing them, with ardent supplications and fastings, in imitation of the Ninevites, to avert the

¹ Lestrangle's Alliance of Divine Offices. cap. iv. p. 100.

² Basil.

ep. lxxiii. ad Neocæs. Ἄλλ' ἐδὲ αἱ λιτανεῖαι ἐπὶ Γρηγορίῳ, ἃς ἡμεῖς νῦν ἐπιτηδεύετε. ³ Sidon. lib. vii. Ep. i. ad Mamercum. Solo tamen invec-tarum, te auctore, rogationum palpamur auxilio, quibus inchoandis, instituendisque populus Arvernus cepit initiari. &c.

threatening judgments of fire, or earthquakes, or inundations, or hostile invasions. But that we may not think Mamercus was the first author of litanies, because he applied their use particularly to the rogation-days, he speaks more expressly in another Epistle,¹ where he says, “that Mamercus indeed first brought in the observation of the rogation solemnities, which spread by his example: but supplications or Litanies were in use before, when men had occasion to pray against excessive rains or droughts; though they were observed but in a cold and disorderly manner, without fasting or full assemblies: but those, which he instituted, were observed with fasting, and praying, and singing, and weeping.” What Sidonius says here, proves that Mamercus was the author of the rogation-fast in France; but litanies were in use before: and if Savaro judge right² of one of St. Austin’s homilies, the rogation-fast must have been observed long before in the African Churches. For among his Homilies *De Tempore* there is one upon the vigil of the Ascension, where he speaks of a fast³ observed for three days before Ascension-day, advising all men to keep those days with fasting, prayer, and psalmody. However from the time of Mamercus we are sure these rogation-days and litanies were celebrated with great solemnity in the Church, being frequently mentioned by Alcimus Avitus,⁴ Cæsarius Arelatensis,⁵ Eucherius Lugdunensis junior,⁶ and Gregory of Tours,⁷ to name no later writers. The first Council of Orleans, anno 511, established them⁸ by a decree, ordering the

¹ Sidon. lib. v. ep. xiv. Rogationum nobis solennitatem primus Mamercus pater et pontifex, reverentissimo exemplo, utilissimo experimento, invenit, instituit, invenit. Erant quidem prius, (quod salvâ fidei pace sit dictum,) vage, tepentes, infrequentesque, utque sic dixerim, oscitabundæ supplicationes, quæ sæpe interpellantium prandiorum obicibus hebetabantur, maxime aut imbres aut serenitatem deprecaturæ:—In his autem, quos supra fatus summus sacerdos nobis et protulit pariter et contulit, jejunatur, oratur, psallitur, fletur.

² Savaro Not. in Sidon. lib. v. ep. xiv. p. 354.

³ Aug. Hom. clxxiii. de Temp. t. x. p. 338. Sine dubio peccatorum suorum vulnera diligit, qui in istis tribus diebus, jejunando, orando, et psallendo medicamenta sibi spiritualia non requirit.

⁴ Avitus Hom. de Rogationibus.

⁵ Cæsar. Hom. 37.

⁶ Eucher. Hom. de Litanis.

⁷ Greg. Turon. lib. ii. cap. xxxiv.

⁸ Con. Aurelian. i. can. xxix.

Rogationes, id est, litanias, ante Ascensionem Domini placuit celebrari, ita ut premissum triduanum jejunium in Dominicæ Ascensionis solennitate solvatur, &c.

three days before Ascension to be kept a fast with abstinence after the manner of Lent, and with rogations or litanies, and that on these days servants should rest from their labours. In the Spanish Churches they deferred these rogations to the week after Pentecost: for they kept to the old rule of the ancient Church, not to have any fast during the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide; therefore as Walafridus Strabo observes of them,¹ “they would not observe the rogation-fast in the time that the bridegroom was with them.” But by an order of the Council of Girone² these litanies and this fast were put off to the week after Whitsuntide. And they ordered a second litany to be used on the first day of November. The fifth Council of Toledo³ appointed another such litany and fast to be celebrated yearly for three days, commencing on the thirteenth day of December. The sixth Council of Toledo⁴ confirmed this decree about two years after, anno 638, and made it a general rule for all the Churches of Spain and Galicia, and Gallia Narbonensis, which was at this time under the government of the Gothic King Chintillan, and in the seventeenth Council of Toledo,⁵ anno 694, under King Egicanes, a more general decree was made, “that such litanies should be used in every month throughout the year.” And so by degrees

¹ Strabo. de Offic. Eccles. cap. xxviii. Hispani autem, propter hoc quod scriptum, “non possunt filii sponsi lugere, quamdiu cum illis est sponsus,” infra Quinquagesimam paschæ recusantes jejunare, litanias suas post Pentecosten posuerunt.

² Con. Gerunden. can. ii. Ut litanie post Pentecosten a quintâ feriâ usque in sabbatum celebrentur. So it is in the title of the canon: and in the body of it, Ut per hoc triduum abstinencia celebretur. Ibid. can. iii. Item secunda litania facienda est Kalendis Novembris.

³ Con. Tolet. v. can. i. Ut à die Iduum Decembrium litania triduo ubique annuâ successione peragatur, &c.

⁴ Con. Tolet. vi. can. 2. Universalis autoritate censemus Concilii, ut hi dies litanarium, quæ in Synodo præmissâ sunt instituti, annuo recursu omni observatione habeantur celebrari.

⁵ Con. Tolet. xvii. can. vi. Quando præcorum patrum institutio, per totum annum, per singulorum mensium cursum, litaniarum vota decreverit persolvendum—decernimus, ut deinceps per totum annum, in cunctis duodecim mensibus, per universas Hispaniæ et Galliarum provincias pro statu Ecclesiæ Dei, pro incolunitate principis nostri, atque salvatione populi, et indulgentiâ totius peccati, et à cunctorum fidelium cordibus expulsionem diaboli, exomologeses votis gliscentibus celebrentur.

these solemn supplications came to be used weekly, on Wednesdays and Fridays, the ancient stationary days, in all Churches.

SECT. II.—Of the Distinction between greater and lesser Litanies.

In the mean time Gregory the Great instituted some such rogations at Rome, and one particularly on the twenty-fifth day of April, which goes by the name of *Litania Septiformis*, because he ordered the Church to go in procession in *seven* distinct classes; first the clergy, then the laymen, next the monks, after them the virgins, then the married women, next the widows, and last of all the poor and the children. This is mentioned both by Gregory himself,¹ and Walafridus Strabo,² who give it the name of *Litania Major*: whence some have been led into a mistake, to think the Roman litanies were distinguished by the name of *the greater litanies* from those of Mamercus, which they call the less. So Hamond Lestrage, and others,³ in their accounts of these things. But the French writers do not allow of this distinction. Cellotius⁴ says, “the Rogation or Litany of Mamercus, was always dignified with the title of *Litania Major* by their old writers, as well as that of Gregory, and that Gregory’s Litany was of little use among them. It is certain, the Council of Mentz⁵ and the Capitulars of Charles the Great,⁶ which repeat the words of that Council, applied the Name of *Litania Major* to their own rogations before Ascension. And Cellotius says, Gualterus Aurelianensis and Strabo both give it the same title. But still he does not tell us what they mean by the *Litania Minor*, *the lesser litany*, in contradistinction to the greater. If the reader will take my conjecture, it is no more but the known form, *Kyrie eleison*, as the Latins read, from the Greek, *Κύριε ἐλέησον*, *Lord have mercy upon us!* or, *Lord, have mercy upon them!* If they were praying for others.

¹ Greg. lib. xi. ep. ii.

² Strabo de Offic. Eccles. cap. xxviii.

³ Lestrage Alliance, cap. iv. p. 100.

⁴ Cellot. Not. in Capitula

Gualteri Aurelianensis, Con. tom. viii. p. 649.

⁵ Con. Moguntin.

an. 813. cap. xxxiii.

⁶ Carol. Capitular. lib. v. c. 85.

As this was the constant response made by the people to each petition of their larger supplications for the catechumens and others, as we shall see hereafter ; so it was used sometimes by itself, in all their offices, as a shorter form of supplication: and then it had the nature of a litany by itself, and was not a part of a larger prayer. This is evident from the order made in the Council of Vaison for introducing the use of it into the French Churches.¹ “Whereas,” say they, “it is a very useful and agreeable custom in the Roman Church, and all the provinces of Italy and the East, to use the frequent repetition of the *Kyrie eleison, Lord, have mercy upon us*, with great affection and contrition: we therefore decree, that the same holy custom be introduced into all our Churches, both at morning and evening prayer, and in the communion-service.” The Greeks usually said, *Lord, have mercy upon us!* without adding the other part, *Christ, have mercy upon us!* But the Latins used both clauses, and repeated them alternately, as we now do, first the minister, and then the people; whereas, by the Greeks the supplication was made by the common voice of all together. This difference is noted by Gregory the Great;² but it does not detract from our observation, but rather confirms it, that this was a short form of supplication used one way or other in all Churches, and that as a part of all their daily offices; whence it borrowed the name of the lesser litany, in opposition to the greater litanies, which were distinct, complete, and solemn services, adapted to particular times, or extraordinary occasions. I must note further, that the greater litanies are sometimes termed *Exomologeses, confessions*;³ because fasting, and weeping, and mourning, and confession of sins, were usually joined with supplication to avert God’s wrath, and reconcile Him to a sinful people.

¹ Con. Vasens. ii. can. iii. Quia tam in sede apostolicâ, quàm etiam per totas Orientis atque Italiæ provincias, dulcis et nimium salubris consuetudo intronmissa est, ut *Kyrie eleison* frequentius cum grandî affectu ac compunctione dicatur: placuit etiam nobis, ut in omnibus Ecclesiis nostris ista consuetudo sancta, et ad matutinam, et ad missas, et ad vesperam, Deo propitiante, intronmittatur.

² Greg. lib. vii. ep. lxiv. ad Joan Syracusan.

³ Vid. Con. Moguntin. can. xxxii.

SECT. 12.—Of their Processions.

Sometimes, to these solemn supplications, they added processions, which at first had nothing of harm or superstition in them: for they were only of the same nature with their processions at a funeral, when they carried a corps with the solemnity of psalmody to its interment. They sometimes made their processions, and sometimes their litanies, as occasion required, in the open field: but here was no pomp of relics, nor exposing of the eucharist to adoration, in such solemnities; they only carried the cross, as they did also in some of their night-processions for psalmody, as the badge of their profession, before them. Of this indeed there are some instances as early as Chrysostom: for it is noted in his *Life by Palladius*,¹ that his enemies trampled under-foot the sign of the cross, which the people carried on their shoulders as they made their litanies in the field. And in those vigils, which he set up at Constantinople, in opposition to the Arians; the historians say,² they had silver crosses given them by the empress for this purpose. And the *Laws of Justinian* expressly provided,³ “that as these litanies should not be celebrated without the bishop or the clergy; so the crosses to be used in these solemnities, should not be repositied in any places but the Churches, nor be carried by any but such as were appointed.” And because in these solemn processions some were inclined to appear in pomp unsuitable to the occasion, with gay clothing, and on horse-back; therefore both these things were particularly forbidden. *Sidonius*⁴ notes it as a great absurdity for men to appear,

¹ Palladius Vit. Chrysost. cap. xv. p. 27. in appendice. tom. ii. Crucis signum venerabile, quod illi ferentes in humeris, litanias in campo agebant, pedibus suis conculeantes.

² Socrat. lib. vi. cap. viii. Sozom. lib. viii. c. viii.

³ Justin. Novel. cxxiii. cap. xxxii. Omnibus laicis interdiciamus litanias facere sine sanctis episcopis, et qui sub eis sunt reverendissimis clericis,—sed et ipsas honorandas cruces, (cum quibus et in litanis ingrediuntur,) non alibi nisi in venerabilibus locis reponi, &c.

⁴ Sidon. lib. v. ep. vii. ad Thaumastum, p. 327. Libenter incedunt armati ad epulas, albati ad exequias, pelliti ad ecclesias, pullati ad nuptias, castorinati ad litanias.

“ *Castorinati ad Litanias, dressed up in their rich beaver cloths at a litany*, because sack-cloth and ashes were more becoming such solemnities, which were intended for fasting, and mourning, and supplication, and humiliation, and confession of sins, after the example of the Ninevites, in their solemn addresses to God.” And for this reason the Canons¹ forbade any one to appear “ on horse-back or in rich apparel at the rogation-solemnities, but rather *discalceati*, in sack-cloth and ashes, unless he had the excuse of infirmity to hinder him.” For these rogations were intended to implore God’s mercy in the most humble manner, and with the most ardent affections of soul to beseech him to avert all sicknesses, and plagues, and tribulations; to repel the evils of pestilence, war, hail, and drought; to compose the temper of the air, so that it may be for the health of men’s bodies, and fertility of the earth; that he would keep all the elements in due order and harmony, and grant men peaceable times; as Eucherius relates the chief heads of them in his sermon upon this subject.² Whereas yet we may observe, no prayers or intercessions were made to saints or angels, as in the modern litanies of the Romish Church, but to God only, as shall be shewn at large in the following chapters.

CHAP. II.

That the Devotions of the Ancient Church were paid to every Person of the Blessed Trinity.

SECT. 1.—Proofs of the Worship of Christ, as the Son of God, or the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity in the first Century.

HAVING thus distinguished the ambiguity of the names of the ancient worship, and settled the true meaning of them, our next inquiry must be into the object of the Christian

¹ Con. Mogunt. can. xxxiii. Sicut sancti patres nostri instituerunt, non equitando, nec preciosis vestibus induti, sed discalceati, cinere et cilicio induti, nisi infirmitas impederit. Vide Burchard. lib. xiii. cap. vii.

² Eucher. Hom. de Litanis.

worship, to see what persons they were, to whom they paid their devotion. That which makes this inquiry necessary, which otherwise might have been omitted, is the prevalency of two contrary errors, too much reigning in these latter ages: one of which asserts, that the Father alone was the sole object of true divine worship, and not the Son, or Holy Ghost; and the other, that saints and angels had also a share in it. To shew the falseness of both which pretences, I shall a little detain the reader with the proofs and evidences of the contrary assertions. And first to shew, that Christ, as the Son of God and the Second Person of the ever Blessed Trinity, was the object of divine worship in all ages, we will begin with the original of Christian worship, and carry the inquiry through the three first Centuries. For the first age, the Scripture is sufficient evidence of the Christians' practice. For not to insist on the precept of honouring the Son, as they honoured the Father; or the form of baptism, in which they are commanded to join the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in one act of worship; or the injunction to believe in the Son, as they believed in the Father; with many other acts of internal worship, peculiar to God alone: I only argue from their example and practice. St. Stephen, the protomartyr, when he was sealing his confession with his blood, breathed out his last in a prayer to Christ, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" And "Lord, lay not this Sin to their charge." Acts, vii. 59. St. Paul professes he never baptised any but only in the name of Christ. 1 Cor. i. 13. And his common forms of blessing were with invocation of the name of Christ. "Grace be to you and peace from God the Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ." And, "The Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all:" As the solemn forms run almost in all his Epistles, both in the beginning and the conclusion of them. Nay, so common was this practice, that among other titles of the believers, at their first rise and appearance in the world, they were distinguished by the character of those that called on the name of Christ. Acts, ix. 14. 21. 1 Cor. i. 2. 2 Tim. ii. 22. Some critics, I know, would have the phrase, "ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ," to be taken passively only for those who

were named by the name of Christ, that is, Christians. But this criticism is of no weight; for they were called invocers, or worshippers of Christ, before the name, Christian, was known in the world: for this name was not used till some time after St. Paul's conversion, when, as St. Luke says expressly, Acts, xi. 26. "the disciples were first called Christians in Antioch." But they were worshippers of him before, and therefore were distinguished by the character of the men that called upon his name. Many other such like evidences are obvious to any one that reads the New Testament: I only add that of the Revelations, v. 8. where the Church in heaven and earth together is represented as offering both prayers and hymns to Christ: "When he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb, that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature, which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

SECT. 2.—Proofs of the same in the Second Century.

We have here seen the model of the worship of Christ, as begun and settled in the practice of the Church in the first age. And we shall find it continued in the same manner in those that followed immediately after. For Pliny, who lived in the beginning of the second Century, and as a judge under

Trajan, took the confessions of some revolting Christians, says,¹ “ They declared to him, they were used to meet on a certain day before it was light, and among other parts of their worship sing an hymn to Christ, as to their God.” Which is a plain indication of their worship of Christ on the Lord’s day. Not long after this lived Polycarp,² who joins God the Father and the Son together in his prayers for grace and benediction upon men. “ The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ himself, the eternal High-Priest, the Son of God, build you up in faith and truth, and in all meekness, to live without anger, in patience, in long suffering and forbearance, and give you a lot and part among the saints, and to us with you, and to all them that are under heaven, who shall believe in Jesus Christ our Lord, and in his Father, who raised Him from the dead.” And so he begins his Epistle, “ Mercy and peace from God Almighty, and from the Lord Jesus Christ be multiplied unto you.” And when he came to his martyrdom, he made a prayer to God at the stake, before he was burnt, concluding it with this doxology to the whole Trinity:³ “ I praise Thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee for all things, together with the eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son, with whom unto Thee, and the Holy Spirit, be glory both now and for ever, world without end. Amen.” When Polycarp was dead, the Church of Smyrna wrote a circular Epistle to other Churches, to give an account of his sufferings, wherein they relate this

¹ Plin. lib. x. ep. xcvii. Affirmabant, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire: carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem.

² Polycarp, Ep. ad Philip. n. xii. Deus autem et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et ipse sempiternus Pontifex, Dei Filius, Christus Jesus, ædificet vos in fide et veritate, et in omni mansuetudine, &c. et det vobis sortem et partem inter sanctos suos, et nobis vobiscum, et omnibus qui sunt sub cælo, qui credituri sunt in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum et in ipsius Patrem.

³ Martyrium Polycarpi, ap. Coteler. Patr. Apostol. tom. ii. p. 199. Περὶ πάντων αἰνῶ σε, εὐλογῶ σε, δοξάζω σε, σὺν τῷ αἰωνίῳ καὶ ἑπερανίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ἀγαπητῷ σὺ Παιδί, μεθ’ ἧ σοὶ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἢ δόξα καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς τὰς μέλλοντας αἰώνας. ἀμήν. Euseb. lib. iv. c. 15. ex Epist. Ecclesiæ Smyrnenensis, reads this with a little variation of the particles, “ Διὰ αἰτῶ ὡνὶς ἀρχιερέως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ σὺ Παιδίος· δι’ ἧ σοὶ σὺν ἀντῶ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἢ δόξα. &c. But this makes no alteration in the sense: for still it concludes with a doxology to the three divine persons: by whom and with whom unto Thee and the Holy Spirit be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

remarkable occurrence, “that as soon as he was dead, the Jews suggested to the Heathen Judge, that he should not suffer the Christians to take Polycarp’s body and bury it, lest they should leave their crucified Master, and begin to worship this other.”⁴ “Not considering,” says the Epistle, “that we can never either forsake the worship of Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all those, who are saved in the whole world, the just for the unjust; or worship any other. For we worship Him as being the Son of God; but the martyrs we only love, as they deserve, for their great affection to their King and Master, and as being disciples and followers of their Lord, whose partners and fellow-disciples we desire to be.” This is an unanswerable testimony, to prove both the divine worship of Christ, as the true Son of God, and that no martyr or other saint was worshipped in those days. Not long after this lived Justin Martyr, who in his Second Apology, to wipe off the charge of atheism, brought against them by the heathens, who objected to them, “that they had cast off the worship of God;” answers,⁵ “That they worshipped and adored still the God of righteousness, and his Son, that came from Him, and taught both them and the host of good angels, who followed Him, and were made like unto Him, as also the Holy Spirit of Prophecy: to these they paid a rational and true honour, as they always frankly owned to all such as were disposed to learn.” Bellarmin³ very fraudulently urges this place, to prove the worship of angels: as if Justin had said, that they worshipped the Father, the Son, the Angels, and the Holy Spirit; whereas he says nothing of the worship of angels, but that the angels were taught by the Son, and that the Son together with the Father and Holy Spirit, were the ob-

¹ Smyrn. Eccles. Epist. ap. Euseb. lib. iv. c. xv. et ap. Coteler. p. 200. Μη, φησίν, ἀφέντες τὸν ἐσαυρωμένον, τῶτον ἄρξωνται σέβεσθαι.—ἀγνοῶντες, ὅτι ἔτε τὸν Χριστὸν ποτὲ καταλιπεῖν ὀνησόμεθα, τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶ παντὸς κόσμου τῶν σωζομένων σωτηρίας παθόντα, ἁμῶν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτωλῶν, ἔτε ἕτερόν τινα σέβεσθαι. τῶτον γάρ, υἱὸν ὄντα τῷ Θεῷ, προσκυνῶμεν τὰς δὲ μάρτυρας, ὡς μαθητὰς ἢ μιμητὰς τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως. &c.

² Justin. Apol. ii. p. 56. Ἄλλ’ ἐκείνόν τε, ἢ τὸν παρ’ αὐτῷ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα, ἢ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, ἢ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπομένων ἢ ἐξομοιζόμενων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν, πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα ἢ προσκυνῶμεν. &c.

³ Bellarm. de Beatitud. Sanctor. lib. i. cap. 13. tom. i. p. 1957.

ject of Christian worship. Which he repeats again in his foresaid Apology,¹ saying, in answer to the same objection, that they could demonstrate, that as they worshipped God, the Creator of all things, so with equal reason they worshipped Jesus Christ in the second place, and the Holy Spirit of prophecy in the third, knowing Jesus Christ to be the Son of the true God. For, whereas the Heathens objected further, that it was madness in them, next to the immutable and true God, maker of all things, to give the second place to a crucified man, he tells them, they understood not the mystery of this practice. Which shews, that as they worshipped Christ, so they worshipped him as the true Son of God, and not as a creature: for he tells the Emperors a little after,² they held it unlawful to worship any but God alone. Therefore in their practice they also shewed their belief of his true Divinity: since they worshipped Him only upon this foundation and supposition, that He was truly God and not a mere man; and to have done it upon any other supposition, had been gross idolatry, by their own confession. Which I wish were duly considered by those, who now write against the Divinity of Christ, and absurdly pretend, that all the Fathers of the three first ages were of their opinion. For this is only to make them guilty of the grossest idolatry, and involve them in a monstrous contradiction; whilst they pretended to worship none but God alone, and yet gave divine honour, to One, whom, if our modern representers say true, they did not believe to be truly God by nature, but only a creature.

But to go on with the inquiry, as to what concerns the object of their worship in practice;—Athenagoras answers the charge of atheism, after the same manner as Justin Martyr had done before him:³ “ We are no atheists, who

¹ Justin. Apol. ii. p. 60. Τὸν Δημητρίον—ἔστι Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, υἱὸν αὐτῶ τῶ ὄντως Θεῷ μαθόντες, ἃ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χόρᾳ ἔχοντες, Πνεῦμά τε προφήτικον ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει, ὅτι μετὰ λόγῳ τιμῶμεν, ἀποδείξομεν. It. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 302. He styles him. Θεὸν ἰσχυρὸν ἔτι προσκυνητὸν, *the Mighty God that was to be adored.*

² Ibid. p. 64. Θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνῶμεν. &c.

³ Athenag. Legat. pro Christianis. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. tom. i. p. 76. Οὐκ ἔσμεν ἄθεοι, ἀγοντες τὸν Ποιητὴν τῶδε τῶ παντος, ἔτι τὸν παρ' αὐτῶ Λογον.

worship the Creator of all things, and his Word, that proceedeth from him." Minucius Felix, to another objection, that they worshipped a crucified man, answers,¹ "that they were mistaken in the charge; for He, whom they worshipped, was God, and not a mere mortal man: miserable is he, whose hope is only in man; for his help is at an end, when the life of man is extinct." About this time, lived Lucian the Heathen, who in one of his dialogues takes notice of the Christian worship. For bringing in a Christian instructing a catechumen,² he makes the catechumen ask this question, "By whom shall I swear?" And he, that personates the Christian, answers, "By the God that reigns on high, the Great, Immortal, Heavenly God, and the Son of the Father, and the Spirit proceeding from the Father, One in Three, and Three in One. Take These for your Jupiter, imagine This to be your God." Which evidently shews, that Lucian had learned this from the Christian institutions, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were the object of their divine worship. And he elsewhere objects to them the worship of their crucified impostor,³ as he blasphemously terms our Blessed Lord. Not long after Irenæus, speaking of the miracles, which the Church wrought in his time, particularly in casting out devils, says,⁴ "She did this, not by invocation of angels, nor by enchantments, nor by any other wicked piece of curiosity, but by directing her prayers, clean, and pure, and openly to the God over all; and by invoking the name of Jesus Christ, she works miracles for the benefit of men,

¹ Minuc. Dial. p. 88. Quod religioni nostræ hominem noxium et crucem ejus adscribitis, longè de viciniâ veritatis erratis, qui putatis Deum credi aut meruisse noxium, aut potuisse terrenum. Næ ille miserabilis, cujus in homine mortali spes omnis innititur, tonum enim ejus auxilium cum extincto homine finitur!

² Lucian. Philopatris, prope finem.

³ Ὑψιμέδοντα Θεὸν, Μεγαν, Ἄμβροτον, Οὐρανίωνα, Υἱὸν Πατρὸς, Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, Ἐν ἑκ Τριῶν, δὲ ἕξ Ἐνὸς Τρία. Ταῦτα νόμιζε Ζήνα, Τὸν δὲ ἡγᾶ Θεόν.

⁴ Lucian. in Proteo. p. 764. Τὸν ἀνεσκολοπισμενον ἐκεῖνον σοφιστὴν προσκυνεῖν.

⁵ Iren. lib. ii. cap. 57.

Nec invocationibus angelicis facit, nec incantationibus, nec aliquâ pravâ curiositate, sed mundè et purè et manifestè orationes dirigens ad Dominum, qui omnia fecit, et nomen Domini nostri Jesu Christi invocans, virtutes secundum utilitates hominum, sed non ad seductionem perficit.

and not for their seduction.” And that this was so, appears further from some of the forms of prayer used then in the Church for the energumens in the public service, one of which is recorded by the author of the Constitutions directed personally to Christ,¹ under the title of the Only Begotten God, who binds the strong one, that is the devil: which prayer I need not repeat here, because the reader may find it at length hereafter in the service of the catechumens.²

About the same time with Irenæus, lived Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, who though he does not expressly mention the worship of Christ, yet he acknowledges him to be God of God,³ and says, “ the world was made by Him: for when the Father said, ‘ Let us make man in our own image,’ He spake this to no other,⁴ but to his own Word, and his own Wisdom;” that is, the Son and Holy Spirit. Whom he expressly styles by the name of Trinity in the godhead,⁵ and says elsewhere,⁶ that “ God is to be worshipped, and nothing else besides Him, who is the true God, the ordainer of kings; who may be honoured, but not worshipped, because they are only men, and not God.” From all which it is easy to infer, that Theophilus thought Christ the object of divine worship, as the living and true God, and that it would be idolatry to give divine worship to Christ, upon any other supposition, than that He is true God as well as man.

In the same age Clemens Alexandrinus is an illustrious witness of this practice. For in his Exhortation to the Gentiles,⁷ he styles Him the living God, that was then worshipped and adored: “ Believe,” says he, “ O man, in Him, who is both Man and God: believe, O man, in Him who suffered death, and yet is adored as the living God.” In the end of his Pædagogus, he himself addresses his prayers to the Son, jointly with the Father, in these words:

¹ Constit. lib. viii. cap. 6

² Book xiv. cap. v. sec. 7.

³ Theoph. ad Autolye. lib. ii. p. 130. Θεός ὢν ὁ Λόγος, ἔκ Θεῶ πεφυκώς.

⁴ Ibid. lib. ii. p. 114. Οὐκ ἄλλω δὲ τινι εἶρηκε, ποιήσωμεν, ἀλλ’ ἢ τῷ ἑαυτῷ Λόγῳ, ἔκ τῷ ἑαυτῷ Σοφίᾳ.

⁵ Ibid. lib. ii. p. 106. Τύποι Τριάδος

τῶ Θεῶ, ἔκ τῶ Λόγῳ αὐτῷ ἔκ τῆς Σοφίας αὐτῷ.

⁶ Ibid. lib. i. p. 30.

Θεῶ δὲ τῷ ὄντως Θεῶ ἔκ ἀληθεῖ προσκυνῶ, &c.

⁷ Clem. Protreptic

tic, p. 84. Edit. Oxon. Πίστευσον ἀνθρώπε ἀνθρώπῳ ἔκ Θεῶ. πίστευσον ἀνθρώπε τῷ παθόντι ἔκ προσκυνομένου θεῶ ζῶντι.

“ Be merciful to thy children, O Master, O Father, Thou Ruler of Israel, O Son, and Father, who are both One, our Lord!”¹ And in the conclusion of the book, he has this doxology to the whole Trinity:² “ Let us give thanks to the only Father and Son, to the Son and the Father, to the Son, our Teacher and Master, with the Holy Spirit; One in all respects; in whom are all things; by whom all things are one; by whom is eternal existence; whose members we are; whose is the glory and the ages; who is the Perfect Good, the Perfect Beauty, Allwise, and All-just: to whom be glory, both now and for ever! Amen.”

Cotemporary with Clemens was Athenogenes, the martyr, who suffered about the year 196. St Basil says,³ he composed a sacred hymn, setting forth the glory of the Holy Ghost. From whence we may collect, that it did the same for Christ as the Son of God. The learned doctor Cave,⁴ by a little mistake of what St. Basil says, supposes Athenogenes to have been the author of those two ancient hymns called the Morning and Evening Hymns, which the reader will find related at length hereafter,⁵ under the titles of the Great Doxology, “ Glory be to God on high, &c.” and *Hymnus Lucernalis*. But it is plain from St. Basil, that the hymn of Athenogenes was distinct from these. For he makes no mention of the Morning Hymn, and says expressly of the Evening Hymn, that he knew not who was the author of it. However it was an hymn of ancient use in the Church, addressed immediately to Christ, and containing this doxology to the whole Trinity, Ὑμνοῦμεν πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεῶν, *we laud the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit of God!* which St. Basil urges, as we do here, as a distinct testimony from that of Athenogenes, and as a further instance of the Church’s ancient practice in giving divine

¹ Clem. Pædagog. lib. iii. chap. xii. p. 311. “Ἰλασθὶ τοῖς σοῖς Παιδαγωγῆ, Πατέρ, Ἡνίοχε Ἰσραὴλ, Υἱὲ καὶ Πατέρ.” Ἐν ἄμφω, Κύριε. ² Ibid. p. eadem. Τῷ μόνῳ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, Ὑψὶ καὶ Πατρὶ, Παιδαγωγῷ, καὶ Διδασκάλῳ Ὑψὶ, σὺν καὶ τῷ Ἅγιῳ Πνεύματι, πάντα τῷ Ἐνὶ, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα, &c. ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν. Vid. Strom. lib. vii. cap. vii. p. 551. Σέβειν ἰγκελευόμεθα τὸν λόγον, &c. ³ Basil. de Spir. Sancto. cap. 29. tom. ii. p. 359. ⁴ Cave Hist. Liter. vol. i. p. 60.

⁵ See Chap. x. sect. 9. chap. xi. sect. 5.

honour and worship, not only to the Father, but to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

About the same time suffered Andronicus, the martyr, in the Acts of whose passion it is objected to him by the Heathen Judge,¹ “that Christ, whom he invocated and worshipped, was a man that had suffered under the government of Pontius Pilate, and that the Acts of his passion were then extant.” Their worship of Christ was so well known to the Heathens, that at every turn, we see, it was objected to them. And their answer was always the same,—that they worshipped Him indeed, but not as a mere man, but God, the Son of God by nature, and of the same substance with the Father. Which is the answer that Tertullian, who is the last writer of the second age, makes to this objection. For whereas it was objected,² “that they were worshippers of a man, whom all the world knew to be a man, and the Jews had condemned as a man:” to this he answers,³ not by denying that they worshipped Him, but by explaining the reasons and foundation of their worship, “because they knew Him to be the true natural Son of God, by a spiritual generation, and therefore called God and the Son of God, because He was of one and the same essence or substance. For God was a Spirit: and the Son was Spirit of Spirit and God of God, as Light is of Light. In that manner He was begotten of God, so as to be God and the Son of God, and They were both One.” In another place dissuading Christian women from marrying with unbelievers, among other arguments, he uses this,⁴ “that in such a family there could be no mention of God, no invocation of Christ, no

¹ Acta Andronici ap. Baron. an. 190. n. 26. Non scis, quem invocas Christum, hominem quendam factum, sub custodia Pontij Pilati punitum; cujus extant acta passionis.

² Tertul. Apol. cap. xxi. Sed et vulgus jam scit Christum, ut aliquem hominem, qualem Judæi judicaverunt, quo facilius quis nos hominis cultores existimaverit.

³ Ibid. Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, et prolatione generatum, et ideirco Filium Dei et Deum dictum ex unitate substantiæ: nam et Deus Spiritus.—Item, De Spiritu Spiritus, et de Deo Deus, ut Lumen de Lumine accensum,—ita quod de Deo profectum est, Deus est et Dei Filius, et Unus ambo.

⁴ Tertul. ad Uxor. lib. ii. cap. vi. Quæ Dei mentio? Quæ Christi invocatio? Ubi fomenta fidei de scripturarum interlectione?

cherishing of faith by their joint reading of the Scripture." At the same time he tells us,¹ " a Christian could pray to no other but the eternal, the living and true God : he could not ask such things, as they were wont to ask in prayer, of any other but Him, from whom he knew he could obtain them, and who alone was able to give them." Now this had been absurd and ridiculous arguing to the Heathens, had not Christians believed Christ to be the eternal, living and true God. Their arguments might easily have been retorted, and charged with contradiction ; and they would have stood self-condemned by their own practice, if whilst they were arguing against the heathen idols upon this foot, that nothing was to be worshipped but the eternal, living, and true God, they themselves had worshipped one, who fell short of that character. Therefore we must conclude, that as it is plain from the foregoing testimonies, that Christians did give divine worship to Christ in this age, so they did it only upon this supposition, that He was the Eternal, Living, and True God, as the Eternal Son of the Eternal Father ; and that however They differed, as far as it was necessary for a father and son to be distinct, yet They were but One Creator, and One God.

SECT. 3.—Proofs of the Worship of Christ in the Third Century.

We are now come to the third century, where we have first an illustrious testimony for the worship of Christ, as God, in the Fragments of Caius, a Roman presbyter, preserved by Eusebius, out of his book called the Labyrinth, written against Artemon, one of the first that appeared against the Divinity of our Saviour. Here, among many other things, showing the novelty of that heresy, he observes,² " there were anciently many psalms and hymns composed by the brethren, and transcribed by the faithful,

¹ Tertul. Apol. cap. xxx. Nos pro salute Imperatoris Deum invocamus æternum, Deum verum, Deum vivum, &c. Hæc ab alio orare non possum, quam à quò me scio consecuturum, quoniam et ipse est qui solus præstat.

² Euseb. lib. v. cap. 28. Ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι δὲ ψῆλαι ἀδελφῶν ἀπαρχῆς ὑπὸ πειτῶν γραφεῖσται, τὸν Λόγον τῷ Θεῷ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμνεῖσι ζυλολογῶντες.

setting forth the praises of Christ as the Word of God, and ascribing Divinity to him." And that such sort of hymns were used in the service of the Church, we learn from another passage in the same Eusebius, taken out of the Council of Antioch, against Paulus Samosatensis, the heretical bishop of Antioch, about the middle of this century. For there he is charged as giving orders¹ to forbid the use of such psalms or hymns as were used to be sung in the Church to the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, under pretence that they were only the novel compositions of late and modern authors. Whilst, in the mean time he suborned women on the great day of the Lord's passion or the resurrection, for *Pascha* will signify both, to sing hymns composed to his own honour; where, among other things, he, that would not allow Christ any other but an earthly original, was not ashamed to hear himself blasphemously extolled as an angel come down from heaven; which, as those holy fathers observe, was enough to make an hearer tremble. And for this insolent attempt against the Divinity and worship of Christ, that heretical bishop was anathematised and deposed.

A little before this time, Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, composed psalms and hymns for the use of the Church, which are commended by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria,² as an useful work for the edification of the brethren. And probably they might be some of those hymns, which Paulus Samosatensis discarded as novel inventions of modern authors, though hymns of the like nature had been in use from the first foundation of the Church. Dionysius, of Alexandria, was one of those, who opposed the practice of Paulus Samosatensis by his letters, though he was not present in the Council; and he is commended by St. Basil³ as one that always used this form of doxology: "To God the Father, and the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, be

¹ Con. Antioch. Epist. Synod. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 30. Ψαλμοὶς δε τῶς εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν παύσας, ὡς δὴ νεωτέρως ἐκ νεωτέρων ἀνδρῶν συγγράμματα, &c.

² Dionys. de Promission. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 24. Ἀγαπῶ Νέπωτα—τῆς τε ψαλμωδίας, ἧ μεχρι νῦν πολλοὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν εὐθυμῶνται.

³ Basil. de Spir. Sancto. cap. 90.

glory and dominion now and for ever, world without end. Amen." But we have more pregnant testimonies from the works of Origen in the beginning of this century. In his Fifth Book against Celsus, he tells us, that they could not lawfully worship angels, but they might and did worship the Son of God. "All prayers," says he,¹ "and supplications, and intercessions, and thanksgivings, are to be sent up to God the Lord of all, by the High Priest, who is above all angels, being the living Word and God. And we can also pray to the Word Himself, and make intercessions to Him, and give thanks, and make supplications to Him, if we rightly understand how prayer is to be taken in propriety of speech, or with some restriction." He means, that prayers offered to the Son of God, considered as a son, redound to the Father, as the fountain of the Deity; as Bishop Bull judiciously explains, and vindicates this passage from the unjust exceptions, which Huetius makes against it.² As he does also another passage in the Eighth Book, where Origen more largely asserts the worship of Christ against the common objection renewed by Celsus, that the Christians worshipped one, that had but lately appeared in the world. Celsus had thus formed the objection with all the art and force he was able: "If the Christians," says he,³ "worshipped no other but One God, their arguments might be of some weight and force against others: but now they give immense honour and worship to this new upstart, who so lately made his appearance in the world, and yet think they commit no offence against God, though they give divine worship to his servant." To this Origen replies, not by dissembling, or denying, or diminishing the worship of

¹ Origen. cont. Cels. lib. v. p. 233. *Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ λέγουσι, ἢ προσευχὴν, ἢ ἐντὺ εὐχῆν, ἢ εὐχαριστίαν, ἀναπεμπτίον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ. διὰ τῶ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων Ἀρχιερέως, ἐμψύχε λόγος ἢ Θεῶ. Δεισόμεθα δὲ ἢ αὐτῶ τῶ Λόγῳ, ἢ ἐντενζόμεθα αὐτῷ, ἢ προσευζόμεθα δὲ ἐὰν ἐνωόμεθα κατακείν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κυριολεξίας ἢ καταχρήσεως. ἀγγέλως γὰρ καλέσαι—ἐκ ἔυλογον.*

² Bull. Defens. Fid. Nicen. sect. 2. cap. ix. n. xv. p. 199.

³ Orig. cont. Cels. lib. viii. p. 385. *Celsi verba. Εἰ μὲν δὴ μὴ ἐνα ἄλλον ἐσθεράπεινον ἄτοι πλὴν ἓνα θεόν, ἦν ἄν τις αὐτοῖς ἴσως πρὸς τῶς ἄλλῶς ἀτενῆς λόγος νοεῖ ἐν τὸν ἐναγχος φανέντα τῶτον ἕπιπροθρησκείας. &c. Vid. Orig. *Ἐπὶ Εὐχῆς.* n. 49. and 50. And Br. Fell's Note upon it.*

Christ, but by asserting it upon such grounds and principles as shew that Father and Son can be but One God: and that to worship two persons under such relation and economy of real Father and Son, cannot be to worship two Gods. “If Celsus,” says he, “had understood the meaning of this, ‘I and the Father are One;’ or what the Son of God says in his prayer, ‘As I and Thou are One,’ he would never have imagined, that we worship any but the God, who is over all. For he saith, ‘The Father is in me, and I in the Father.’ But that no one may think, that in saying this, we run over to those, who deny the Father and Son to be two Hypostases or persons, meaning the Sabellians, let him consider that which is said, ‘All they, that believed, were of one heart and one soul,’ that he may understand this, ‘I and the Father are One.’ We therefore worship One God, as I have shewed, the Father and the Son; and our reasoning stands still in full force against others; neither do we give divine honour to an upstart being, as if he had no existence before. For we believe Him, when he says, ‘Before Abraham was, I am;’ and again ‘I am the Truth.’ Neither is any of us of so mean and servile understanding, as to imagine, that the substance of truth had not a being before the appearance of Christ in the flesh. Therefore we worship the Father of Truth, and the Son, who is the Truth, two things in personal subsistence, but one in agreement, and consent, and identity of will. *Ὅντα δύο τῇ ἀποστάσει πράγματα, ἔν δὲ τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ, καὶ τῇ συμφωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τῆ βεβλήματος.*— So that whoever sees the Son, who is the brightness of the glory of God, and the express image of his person, sees God in him, as being the true image of God. Now Celsus imagines, that because together with God we worship his Son, it follows upon our own principles, that we may not only worship God, but his ministers and servants. And indeed if he meant the true servants of God, after his only begotten Son, such as Michael and Gabriel, and the rest of the angels and archangels, and stood up for the worship of these; perhaps taking worship, and the acts of the worshippers in a sound and qualified sense, (he means the common respect of love and honour, which is due to good angels,) we might say something

proper upon this head: but now when he understands by the servants of God, only the devils, whom the Gentiles worship, he does not oblige us by any just consequence to worship such as these, whom the Scripture assures us to be only servants of the wicked one, the prince of this world, and the author of apostasy from God. We refuse to worship all such, as knowing them to be no servants of God; for had they been servants, we should not have called them devils; but we worship One God, and his only Son, and Word, and Image, with supplications and prayers to the utmost of our power, offering our prayers to God over all by his only begotten Son; to whom we first present them, beseeching Him, who is the propitiation for our sins, as our High Priest, to offer our prayers, and sacrifices, and intercessions to God the Lord of all things. Therefore our faith relies only upon God, by his Son, who confirms it in us. And therefore Celsus has no reason or colour for his charge of sedition, or departing from God upon the account of his Son: for we worship the Father, whilst we admire and adore the Son, who is his Word, and Wisdom, and Truth, and Righteousness, and whatever else we are taught to believe of the Son of God, begotten of such a Father."

I have recited this passage at length, not only because it is such a full proof of the matter of fact, that the Christians did give divine honour and worship to the Son; but also because it shews us upon what principle and foundation they did it; viz. as being the true Son of God, and One God with the Father. For though Huetius has excepted against some words in this passage, as derogatory to the Son; and the modern Arians have abused it to patronise their heresy; and the Romanists would fain draw it into a proof for the worship of angels; yet I dare be bold to say, there is not a tittle in it, when rightly understood, to countenance any of their suggestions: but as it is a solid proof of the matter of fact, so it is an illustrious evidence of Origen's belief, and clear explication of the unity of the Godhead. For excepting that sort of unity, which Origen and all Catholic writers reject as inconsistent with a real Trinity, that is, the unity of Hypostases, or persons, which none but Sabellians and

their followers maintain ; he asserts all other kinds of unity, in opposition to Arians, who denied the unity of essence, or nature, and made the Son to be of a different substance from the Father, as a created being ; in opposition to the Marcionites, and such other heretics, as maintained contrary principles, one good, and another evil, in the Godhead ; in opposition to the Tritheites, who brought in the proper doctrine of three Gods, by denying the subordination and relation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and asserting three co-ordinate and independent principles, and baptising “in the name of three such *ἀναρχοι, ἀνάριθτοι, and ἀγέννητοι*—(as the Apostolical Canons¹ call them)—*three unoriginated and unbegotten* principles, wholly *independent* of one another ;” in opposition to Hieracas and the Triformians, who absurdly divided the Trinity into three parts of one whole ; and finally in opposition to all that swarm of heretics, who distinguished with the Cerdonians between the God of justice, and the God of goodness, styling the one the God of the law and the prophets, and the other the Father of Christ and God of the Gospel. Origen, I say, in opposition to all these asserts every sort of unity, except the Jewish and Sabellian notion of unity, which confines the divine nature to one person. For in saying, 1. that the Son is the express and true image of God the Father, he asserts the identity of nature, against Arius ; and so could not believe him to be a creature of a different substance or nature, but as a true Son, of the same essence with his Father, and equal to Him in all infinite and divine perfections. 2. In saying, that He was a Son, deriving his original from the Father, and not another independent being, he maintains the unity of principle, and reserves to the Father the privilege of being the fountain of the Deity ; and consequently opposes the heresy of the Tritheites, who maintain three co-ordinate and independent principles, and destroy the monarchy, and make three Creators instead of one, by destroying the due subordination and relation of the Son to the Father. 3. In saying, that the Father and Son are one in agreement, and consent, and identity of will, he asserts the unity of operation, creation, and government ; which des-

¹ Canon. Apost. c. xlix.

troys the heresy of those, who maintained contrary principles in the Godhead. 4. In saying, that the Son was equal to the Father in all infinite perfections, he rejects the absurdity of those, who dreamed of three parts in the divine nature. 5. In asserting Christ to be the Son of the Creator, and God of the Old Testament, he maintains the unity of Providence, and refutes the heresy of those, who maintained, that the Creator and God of the Old Testament was a different God from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. So that he maintains all sorts of unity, except personal unity, which cannot consist with a real Trinity in the Godhead. And upon this foot he answers the objection of Celsus, who charged the Christians with polytheism for giving divine honour to Jesus Christ.

Having made this short and useful digression upon the celebrated passage of Origen, to vindicate it from the abuses of the modern Arians, I now return to the history of fact, to shew that divine worship was given to Christ as the Son of God. And of this there is further evidence in Origen: for this is not the only place in which he is put to vindicate the worship of Christ from the charge of Polytheism, which is frequently repeated by Celsus. In the third book Celsus objects,¹ “ that they worshipped one, who was apprehended and put to death; in which respect they were no better than the Getæ, who worshipped Zamolxis, and the Cilicians Mopsus, and the Arcanians Amphiloehus, and the Thebans Amphiarus, and the Lebadpans Trophonius.” In replying to which Origen says, “ they offered their prayers to Christ, as Mediator between God and man, who conferred the blessings of the Father upon men, and presented their prayers as High Priest to the God over all.” Not long after Celsus repeats the charge again,² “ that they, who ridiculed the heathens for worshipping Jupiter, whose sepulchre the Cretians could shew, did themselves worship one, that was laid in the grave.” In the seventh book he renews the impeachment three times, bidding the Christians,³ “ not be so ridiculous,

¹ Origen. cont. Cels. lib. iii. p. 131.

² Ibid. lib. iii. p. 136.

³ Celsus, lib. vii. p. 358.

as to revile the heathen gods as idols, whilst they worshipped a God of their own more wretched than any idol, and not so much as an idol, for that he was truly dead. If they had a mind to innovate in worshipping a dead man they might with more reason," he thinks,¹ "have chosen Hercules, or Æsculapius, or Orpheus, or Anaxarchus, or Epictetus, or Sibylla, rather than have made a God of one, who lived an infamous life, and died a miserable death. Yea, they might have chosen among their own prophets, Jonas under the gourd, or Daniel in the lions' den, as more worthy of this honour." "He whom they worshipped," he cries again,² "is no dæmon, but a dead man." Thus from the charges of Celsus, and Origen's replies, we may collect what worship was given to Christ as the Son of God, and also as Mediator between God and men.

It is further observable, that Origen in his first book,³ speaking of the wise men, who came to worship Christ by the leading of a star, says, "they offered gifts to Him suited to his different qualities, who was compounded, as one might say, of God and mortal man: they therefore presented Him with gold, as a king; with myrrh, as a mortal man that should die; and with frankincense, as a God." And Origen himself in his other works frequently speaks of his own prayers offered to Christ. In one of his Homilies he addresses Him in these words;⁴ "O Lord Jesus, grant that I may be found worthy to have some monument of me in thy tabernacle. I could wish to offer gold or silver, or precious stones, with the princes of the people: but because these things are above me, let me at least be thought worthy to have goat's hair in the tabernacle of God, only that I may not in all things be found empty and unfruitful." In another Homily,⁵ "We must pray to the Lord Jesus and the Holy Spirit, that He would take away that mist and darkness,

¹ Celsus, lib. vii. p. 368.

² Ib. lib. vii. p. 376.

³ Ib. Lib. i. p. 46.

⁴ Orig. Hom. xiii. in Exod. xxv. tom. i. p. 102. Domine Jesu, præsta mihi, ut aliquid monumenti habere merear in Tabernaculo tuo, &c.

⁵ Hom. i. in Levit. p. 106. Ipse nobis Dominus, ipse Sanctus Spiritus deprecandus est, ut omnem nebulam, omnemque caliginem, quæ peccatorum sordibus concreta, visum nostri cordis obscurat, auferre dignetur, &c.

which is contracted by the filth of our sins, and dims the sight of our souls." And again,¹ "I must pray to the Lord Jesus, that when I seek, he would grant me to find, and open to me when I knock." And in another Homily,² "let us pray from our hearts to the Word of God, who is the Only-begotten of the Father, that reveals Him to whom He will, that He would vouchsafe to reveal these things unto us." And he has many the like prayers in his other discourses:³ but especially that passage in his Comment on the Epistle to the Romans is most remarkable, where he proves Christ to be God, from his being called upon in prayer: "the Apostle," he says,⁴ "in those words, 1 Cor. i. 2. 'With all that call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,' declares Him to be God, whose name was called upon. And if to call upon the name of the Lord, and to adore God, be one and the self same thing; then as Christ is called upon, so is He to be adored: and as we offer to God, the Father, first of all prayers, so must we also to the Lord Jesus Christ; and as we offer supplications to the Father, so do we also to the Son; and as we offer thanksgivings to God, so do we offer thanksgivings to our Saviour. For the Holy Scripture teaches us, that the same honour is to be given to both, that is, to God the Father and the Son, when it says, 'that they may honour the Son, as they honour the Father.'"

Not long after Origen lived Novatian at Rome, and Cyprian at Carthage, who both speak of the prayers of the Church, as offered up to Christ together with the Father. Novatian⁵ makes it an argument of his Divinity, that He is

¹ Orig. Hom. v. in Levit. p. 126. *Dominum meum Jesum invocare ne oportet, ut quærentem me faciat invenire, et pulsanti aperiat, &c.*

² *Ib.* Hom. xxvi. in Numer. p. 271. *Nos autem oremus ex corde Verbum Dei, qui est Unigenitus ejus, et qui revelat Patrem quibus vult, ut et vobis hæc revelare dignetur.*

³ *Ib.* Hom. iii. in Ezek. p. 627.

Præsta mihi, Christe, ut disrumpam cervicalia in animarum consuta luxuriam. It. tom. xxxii in Joan. p. 404. Utinam nobis adsit columna illa lucidæ nubis Jesu, &c.

⁴ Orig. Com. in Rom. x. lib. viii. p. 587.

⁵ *Novat. de Trin. cap. xiv. Si homo tantummodò Christus; quomodò adest ubique invocatus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit, sed Dei, ut adesse omni loco possit? Si homo tantummodò Christus; cur homo in orationibus Mediator invocatur, cum invocatio hominis ad præstendam salutem inefficax judicetur? Si homo tantummodò Christus: cur spes in illum ponitur, cum spes in homine maledicta referatur?*

present in all places to them that call upon Him; which belongs not to the nature of man, but God. And he argues further from the Church's praying to Him as mediator; which kind of prayers would be of no use, if He were a mere man: and from our obligations to fix our hope on him, which would be a curse rather than a blessing, if He were not God, as well as man. "For cursed is the hope that is placed only in Man." St. Cyprian in like manner speaks of his being worshipped in many places. In his Book of the Advantage of Patience, he styles Him,¹ "the Lord God of Hosts, the God of the Christians:" and particularly tells us, "that God the Father has commanded his Son to be worshipped; and in regard to that command, the Apostle Paul says, 'That God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name 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 in the Revelations, when St. John would have worshipped the angel, the angel opposed it, and said, "I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren: worship the Lord Jesus." So Cyprian reads it, "*Jesum Dominum adora.*" And he uses this as an argument to persuade men to patience, that the Lord Jesus, who is worshipped in heaven, bears with many indignities on earth, and does not avenge Himself till his second coming in glory. Again, in one of his Epistles he speaks "of their offering prayers to Him as Mediator first,² and then by Him to God the Father; and that upon this double foundation, that He was their advocate and intercessor, and also their Lord and their God." In another place,³ writing to Lucius, bishop of Rome, who had been a confessor for Christ, he tells him, "they would not cease in their sacrifices and prayers, to give thanks for him to God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ,

¹ Cypr. De Bono Patientæ. p. 220.

² Cypr. Ep. viii. al. xi.

p. 25. Primo ipsum Dominum rogare, tum deinde per ipsum Deo Patri satisfacere debemus. Habemus advocatum et deprecatores pro peccatis nostris Jesum Christum Dominum et Deum nostrum.

³ Cypr. Ep. lviii. al. lxi. p. 145. Hic quoque in sacrificiis atque in orationibus nostris non cessantes Deo Patri et Christo Filio ejus gratias agere, et orare pariter ac petere, ut qui perfectus est atque perficiens, custodiat et perficiat in vobis confessionis vestræ gloriosam coronam.

his Son, and also make supplications and prayers for him, that He, who was the author of all perfection, would keep and consummate in him the glorious crown of his confession." Not long after Cyprian, Arnobius wrote in vindication of the Christian worship, and here again he brings in the Heathens forming their usual charge against the worship of Christ. "Our Gods," say they,¹ "are not displeased with you for worshipping the Almighty God, but that ye make a God of one that was born a man, and put to death by the punishment of the cross, an infamous punishment, only inflicted on vile men, and because ye believe Him to be yet alive, and make daily supplications unto Him." To this he answers, first upon their own principles, that admitting it were so, that Christ were only a man, yet He might with more reason deserve to be worshipped for his good deeds to mankind, than either their Bacchus, or Ceres, or Æsculapius, or Minerva, or Triptolemus, or Hercules, because there was no comparison between their actions and his for the benefit of the world. But, secondly, he answers more closely upon true Christian principles,² "that the reason of their worshipping Christ was indeed their certain knowledge that He was the true God, whom they could not but worship and honour as the head of their body. And though an angry heathen would rave at his being called God, yet they must answer plainly, that He was God, and God too of the interior powers of the soul;" that is, "the searcher of the hearts and reins," which is the peculiar property of God. The same objection is once more proposed,³ and answered by Lactantius. "They are wont," says he, "to object to us

¹ Arnob. cont. Gentes, lib. i. p. 30. Sed non, inquitis, idcirco Dii vobis infesti sunt, quod Omnipotentem colatis Deum: sed quod hominem natum, et, quod personis infame est vilibus, crucis supplicio interemptum, et Deum fuisse contenditis, et superesse adhuc creditis, et quotidianis supplicationibus adoratis.

² Arnob. ibid. p. 36. Cùm verò Deus sit re verà, et sine ullius rei dubitationis ambiguo, inficiaturos arbitramini nos esse, quàm maximè illum à nobis coli, et præsidem nostri corporis nuncupari? Ergonè, inquiet aliquis furens—Deus ille est Christus? Deus, respondebimus: et interiorum potentiarum Deus.

³ Lact. lib. iv. cap. 16. Venio nunc ad ipsam passionem, quæ velut opprobrium nobis objectari solet, quod et hominem, et ab hominibus insigni supplicio affectum et excruciatum colamus.

his passion, by way of reproach, that we worship a man, and one that was put to a notorious death by men." In replying to which, after having largely set forth the reasons of his incarnation and sufferings, he at last answers that part of the objection, which concerns their worshipping Him, and pleads, that they worshipped Him as one God with the Father. "For," says he,¹ "when we speak of God the Father and God the Son, we do not speak of diverse natures, or separate the one from the other; for neither can He be a Father without a Son, nor the Son be divided from the Father: for as much as He cannot be called a Father without a Son, nor the Son be begotten without a Father. Seeing therefore a father makes a son, and a son makes a father, they have both one mind, and one spirit, and one substance; but the Father as the fountain and original; and the Son as the stream flowing from the fountain." A little after he explains their unity by this similitude:² "When any one hath a son, who is dearly beloved, as long as he is in his father's house and under his hand, although he allow him the name and power of lord, yet it is called but one house, and one lord. So this world is one house of God; and both the Son and the Father, who unanimously dwell therein, are but One God: because the one is as two, and the two as one;" meaning Two Persons, and One God. Nothing can be plainer than these two things, from the words of Lactantius; first, that Christians gave divine worship to Christ: secondly, that they gave him this worship, as One God with the Father: and there was no other way to avoid the charge of polytheism, which they objected to the Heathens, and the

¹ Lact. lib. iv. cap. xxix. De mortalitate jam diximus, nunc de unitate doceamus. Cum dicimus Deum Patrem, et Deum Filium, non diversum dicimus, nec utrumque secernimus: quia nec pater esse sine filio potest; nec Filius à Patre secerni: siquidem nec pater nuncupari sine filio, nec filius potest sine patre generari. Cùm igitur et pater filium faciat, et filius patrem: una utriusque mens, unus spiritus, una substantia; sed Ille quasi exuberans fons est, Hic tanquam defluens ex eo rivus.

² Ibid. Propriore exemplo uti libet: cùm quis habet filium, quem unicè diligit, qui tamen sit in domo, et in manu patris, licet ei nomen domini potestatemque concedat, civili tamen jure et domus una et unus dominus nominatur. Sic hic mundus una Dei domus est: et Filius ac Pater, qui unanimes incolunt mundum, Deus unus est; quia et unus tanquam duo, et duo tanquam unus.

Heathens were so desirous to recharge and throw back upon them.

There is one thing more may be observed as very remarkable in this age, which was an age of great persecution; that is, that the martyrs, who suffered in it, commonly directed their last prayers, as St. Stephen did, personally to Christ, in whose cause they laid down their lives, and into whose hands they resigned their spirit, commending their souls to Him, as unto a faithful Creator and Redeemer. Thus Eusebius observes of a whole city in Phrygia, in the time of the Diocletian persecution, that being all met together in the Church, men, women, and children, magistrates, and people, for the city was entirely Christian, they were surprised by their enemies, and barbarously burnt all together in the Church, as they were at their devotions, “calling upon Christ,¹ the God over all, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιβρωμένους.” So in a former persecution in France under Antoninus, Blandina, one of the martyrs, when she was put into a net, to be tossed by a wild bull, is said not to have been sensible of any pain, “whilst she made her prayers to Christ, διὰ τὴν ὁμιλίαν πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν.”² And Eusebius himself, who gives us these particular relations, makes a more general observation concerning the worship of Christ, that the highest powers on earth confessed and adored him,³ “not as a common king, made by men, but as the true Son of the Supreme God, as the true and very God; who had preserved his Church against all the opposition of so many fierce persecutions; there being nothing that was able to withstand the will of that Word,⁴ who was the universal King and Prince of all things and very God himself.” We see in the opinion of Eusebius, the ground of their worship was no other than his being the living and true God, and the great King of all the earth. Which is the title that is given him in the Acts of St. Felix, an African bishop, who

¹ Euseb. lib. viii. cap. xi. p. 164. ex Epist. Eccles. Lugdun. et Vien. p. 375. Ὅχι οἶα κοιτῶν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων βασιλέα γενόμενον ὁμολογεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' οἶα τῆ καθόλου Θεῷ παῖδα γήσιον, ἐς αὐτοθεὸν προσκυνεῖσθαι. &c.

² Euseb. lib. v. cap. i.

³ Euseb. lib. x. cap. iv.

⁴ Euseb. ibid. p. 376. Τί γὰρ ἐξ ἔμελλε τῆ Παμβασιλείως ἐξ Πανηγεμόνος ἐξ αὐτῷ Θεῷ Λόγῳ ἐνστήσεισθαι τῷ νευματι.

suffered in the Diocletian persecution:¹ “ O Lord God of heaven and earth, Jesus Christ, I bow my neck to Thee as a sacrifice, who livest to all eternity: to whom belong honour and power for ever and ever. Amen.” And in the Acts of Thelicia,² “ I give thanks to the God of all kingdoms. Lord Jesus Christ, we serve Thee. Thou art our hope: Thou art the hope of Christians: Most Holy God, Most High God, God Almighty, we give thanks to Thee for thy great name.” So again in the Acts of Emeritus:³ “ I beseech Thee, O Christ: I give thanks to Thee: deliver me, O Christ. In thy name I suffer, I suffer for a moment, I suffer willingly: let me not be confounded, O Christ.” The curious reader may find many other prayers in the like terms in The Passions of Glycerius,⁴ Olympius,⁵ Ampelius,⁶ Euplius,⁷ Dativus,⁸ Saturninus,⁹ senior and junior, recorded in Baronius, which I need not here transcribe. I only add two further instances out of Eusebius and St. Ambrose. Eusebius,¹⁰ speaking of the passion of Porphyrius, a Palestine martyr, and one of the scholars of Pamphilus, says, when he was surrounded with flames, he called upon Jesus the Son of God to be his helper, and with those words he gave up the ghost. And St. Ambrose tells us,¹¹ Vitalis, the martyr, made this his last prayer: “ O Lord Jesus Christ, my Saviour and my God, command that my spirit may be received; for I desire to obtain the crown, which thy holy angel hath shewed me!”

¹ Acta. Felic. ap. Baron. an. 302. n. 124. Domine Deus cœli et terræ, Jesu Christe, tibi cervicem meam ad victimam flecto, qui permanes in æternum: cui est claritas et magnificentia in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

² Acta Theliciæ. ap. Baron. an. 303. n. 41. Grâtiâs ago Deo regnorum. Domine Jesu Christe, tibi servimus. Tu es spes nostra: tu es spes Christianorum: Deus Sanctissime, Deus Altissime, Deus Omnipotens, tibi laudes pro nomine tuo agimus.

³ Acta Emeriti, ap. Baron. an. 303. n. 50. Rogo Christe: tibi laudes: libera me Christe. In nomine tuo patior, breviter patior, libenter patrior, Christe non confundar.

⁴ Acta Glycerij. ap. Baron. an. 301. n. 28. ⁵ Acta Olympii ap. Baron. an. 259. n. 30. ⁶ Acta Ampelii ap. Baron. an. 303. n. 52.

⁷ Acta Euplii ibid. n. 148. ⁸ Acta Dativi, ibid. n. 44. 45. ⁹ Acta Saturnia. ibid. n. 48. et 54. ¹⁰ Euseb. de Martyr. Palæst. c. xi. p. 339. Τὸν ὕδον τῆ Θεῆ Ἰησοῦν βοηθὸν ἐπιβοούμενος.

¹¹ Ambr. Exhort. ad Virgines. tom. i. p. 105. Domine Jesu Christe, Salvator meus, et Deus meus, jube suscipi spiritum meum: quia jam desidero ut accipiam coronam, quam angelus tuus sanctus mihi ostendit.

It were easy to add many other testimonies of the like nature, but these are abundantly sufficient to shew, what was the practice of the Church, in reference to the worship of Christ, during the three first ages, before Arianism appeared in the world, or any of those difficult questions were raised, which afterwards perplexed men with unintelligible subtilities, occasioned by the restless endeavours and sophistry of the Arian party. The Christians of the three first ages, we see, in their disputes with the Heathens, always with a great deal of honest plainness and simplicity freely owned, that they worshipped Christ as their Creator and their God; not as a creature, but as the true and living God; equal to the Father in all divine perfections, as a genuine Son; who, as a Son, could not be another God, but only one God with the Father. For they declared, that so long as He was owned to be a true Son, He could neither be a creature, nor another God, which would imply another co-ordinate and independent being, which was inconsistent with his being the Son of God. They declared at the same time, that it was unlawful and idolatry to give divine worship to any creature, or any being, how excellent soever, that was not the living and true God; as we shall see more fully in the next chapter: and that is such a sensible and intelligible argument of their believing the Son to be the living and true God, as any one of the meanest capacity may understand: and it is such an argument of his Divinity, as all the art and sophistry in the world cannot evade, without charging those holy men with the grossest idolatry, and self-condemnation, and a flat contradiction of their principles in their practice, if they gave divine honour to One, whom they did not believe to be by nature the living and true God. And for this reason I have insisted a little the longer upon this plain way of proving their belief of the Divinity of our blessed Lord, from their constant and universal practice in giving divine worship to Him as their God. And as to those distinctions between absolute, relative, and mediatorial worship; or those of *Latria*, *Dulia*, and *Hyperdulia*, hard words invented to solve the idolatry of later ages, whatever shelter modern idolaters may think to find in them; the Ancients had no occasion to lay the stress of their cause

upon any such subtillies and distinctions. For they knew no distinction between *Latria*, *Dulia*, and *Hyperdulia*, when they spake of religious worship, but plainly said all religious worship was solely due to God: and though they distinguished between absolute, relative, and mediatorial worship, yet they gave all these to the Son; worshipping Him with mediatorial worship, as the only proper Mediator in both natures between God and man; beseeching Him by his own merits, as their great High Priest, to present their prayers to the Father; and with relative worship, as the Son of God, whose honour redounds to the Father; and with absolute worship as their Creator and Author of their being; declaring it to be idolatry to give any such honour to any mere creature. So that, either they believed Christ to be the living and true God, or else it is impossible to understand men by their words or practice.

SECT. 4.—Proofs of the Worship of the Holy Ghost.

We are now to see whether they gave the same divine honour to the Holy Ghost. And for this the reader only needs to look back into the former proofs; for many of the preceeding allegations join the Son and Holy Ghost together. Polycarp's doxology is to the whole Trinity;¹ "to Thee the Father, with Him the Son, and the Holy Spirit, be glory now and for ever. Amen." Justin Martyr² declares also to the heathen, that the object of their worship was the whole Trinity. "We worship and adore the God of Righteousness, and his Son, and the Holy Spirit of prophecy." And again he proves, that Christians were no Atheists, as the heathens objected,³ "Because they worshipped the Creator of all things, and his Son Jesus Christ in the second place, and the Holy Spirit of prophecy in the third place." Only observing the natural order of the persons, not distinguishing them into one God and two creatures; for then it had been unlawful to worship Them upon their principles, which denied divine worship to any thing that by nature was not God. We have heard Lucian before,⁴ representing the

¹ Polycarp. Martyr. ap. Coteler. tom. ii. p. 199.
p. 56.

³ Ibid. p. 60.

⁴ Lucian Philopatris.

² Justin. Apol. i.

Christian worship, “as the worship of the Great God of Heaven, and the Son of the Father, and the Spirit proceeding from the Father, Three of One, and One of Three.” Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, expressly mentions the Trinity¹ under the title of “the Father, his Word, and his Wisdom;” and says further,² “that it was his Word and his Wisdom, to whom He said in the beginning, “let us make man.” So that if the Holy Ghost was the Creator of man, there can be no dispute but that He was worshipped as his Creator together with the Father and Son. We have heard Clemens Alexandrinus concluding his Pædagogues³ with this doxology, “To the Father, and the Son,” with the Holy Spirit be glory now and for ever! Amen.” We have heard St. Basil testifying of Athenogenes, the martyr,⁴ that he composed an hymn to the glory of the Holy Ghost; and that the Church, time out of mind, used that known doxology in her evening hymn at setting up lights, “we laud the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God.” Which hymn was so ancient, that St. Basil professes, he knew not who was the author of it. He testifies further in the same place, that Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, was always wont to use this form of doxology; “to God the Father, and the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Ghost, be glory and dominion now and for ever! Amen.” We have heard Origen saying,⁵ “that we are to pray to the Lord, to the Holy Spirit; that He would vouchsafe to take away that mist and darkness, which is contracted in our hearts by the defilement of sin, and dims the sight of our minds.” They, that said such things as these, did certainly own and practice the religious adoration and worship of the Holy Ghost. And all this we have seen proved in the former allegations. To which we may here add that plain testimony of Origen upon the first chapter to the Romans, where he compares the practice of the Heathens and Christians.⁶ “It is the pro-

¹ Theoph. ad Autolye. lib. ii. p. 106.

² Ibid. p. 114.

³ Clem. Pædagog. lib. iii.

⁴ Basil. de Spir. Sancto. cap. 29.

⁵ Orig. Hom. i. in Levit. p. 106.

⁶ Orig. in Rom. i. lib. i. p. 468.

Eorum est contumeliis afficere corpora sua, qui deserviunt simulacris; et eorum colere creaturam, qui dereliquerunt Creatorem. Nos autem qui nullam creaturam, sed Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum colimus et adoramus,

perty of those only to dishonour their bodies," says he, " who serve idols; and of them only to worship the creature, who have forsaken the Creator. As for us, who worship and adore no creature, but the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, as we do not err in our worship, so neither let us offend in our actions and conversation: but looking to what the Apostle says, ' Know ye not, that your bodies are the members of Christ?' And again, ' That your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost?' Let us keep our bodies in all holiness and purity, as members of Christ, and as temples of the Holy Spirit." St. Basil, who wrote in defence of the worship of the Holy Ghost, cites another passage of Origen out of his Commentaries,¹ upon St. John, wherein he speaks of the worship of the whole Trinity in the celebration of baptism, saying, " baptism by virtue of the invocations there made, is the fountain and spring of spiritual graces to every one that dedicates himself to the divine Majesty of the adorable Trinity." In which words Origen by invocations seems to refer to two things: first the consecration of water to a mystical use, which was always performed by prayer, as I have shewed at large in another place,² and secondly the form of baptism, which was always administered in the name of the Holy Trinity: in like manner as bread and wine in the eucharist was consecrated by invocation of the three divine persons. Which is expressly said by St. Cyril,³ " that before invocation of the adorable Trinity it is common bread and wine, but after invocation it is made the body and blood Christ." Where he uses the same expression about the consecration of the eucharist, as Origen does about baptism, saying, that it was done by invocation of the adorable Trinity. And this is what Justin Martyr means, when he says,⁴

sicut non erramus in cultu, ita nec in actibus quidem et conversatione peccemus, &c.

¹ Orig. tom. vi. in Joan. ap. Basil. de Spir. Sanct. cap. xxix. Τῶ ἐμπαρέχοντι ἑαυτὸν τῇ Θεότητι τῆς προσκυνητῆς Τριάδος, διὰ τῆς ἐνδύμεως τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, χαρισμάτων ἀρχὴν ἔχει ἐκ πηγῆν. ² Book. xi. chap. x.

³ Cyril. Catech. Myst. i. n. iv. Πρὸ τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλήσεως τῆς προσκυνητῆς Τριάδος ἄρτος ἦν ἐξ οἴνου λιτός. &c. It. Catech. iii. n. iii. Μετὰ τὴν ἐκκλήσιν τῶ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτός. ⁴ Justin. Apol. ii. p.

97. Λίβον ἐξ ὄξωσιν τῶ Πατρὶ τῶν ὄλων διὰ τῆς ὀνόματος τῆς Υἱῆς καὶ τῆς Πνεύματος τῆς Ἁγίας ἀναπέμπει.

“ that the minister in consecrating the eucharist, sent up praise and glory to the Father of all by the name of his Son and Holy Spirit.” Optatus, speaking of the sacrilege of the Donatists, says,¹ “ they had broken down the altars, where God Almighty was wont to be invocated, and the Holy Ghost prayed to, that he might come down and sanctify the oblation.” Theophilus, of Alexandria, says in like manner,² “ that the bread and wine in the eucharist was consecrated by the invocation and descent of the Holy Ghost.” And we are told, that in the old Gallican Liturgy, the oblation prayer was conceived in this form:³ “ Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which we offer unto Thee, in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension.” And probably, Origen might have respect to some such invocation of the Holy Trinity in the consecration of the waters of baptism. However, the form of administering baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was ever esteemed an act of adoration of the Trinity, both as a profession of faith in Three Divine Persons, and as a dedication of the party to the service of the Holy Trinity, and as a solemn invocation of their benediction. The ancient author of the Recognitions, who lived before Origen, says expressly,⁴ “ that baptism was anciently given by invocation of the name of the blessed Trinity.” By which we can understand nothing but joining the Holy Ghost as God with the Father and the Son; in the same act of adoration, expressed either in the prayers or form of baptism. And hence the Ancients were used to prove the Holy Ghost to be God,⁵ because He was joined in the same divine worship with the Father and the Son in the administration of baptism. And that baptism was generally esteemed null and

¹ Optat. lib. vi. p. 93. Quid tam sacrilegum, quàm altaria Dei frangere, quo Deus Omnipotens invocatus sit, quo postulatus descendit Spiritus Sanctus?

² Theophil. Ep. Paschal. i. Bibl. Patr. tom. iii. p. 87. Panem Dominicum—per invocationem et adventum Sancti Spiritus consecrari.

³ Microlog. de Observat. Eccles. cap. xi. Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas, hanc oblationem, quam tibi offerimus in memoriam passionis, resurrectionis, ascensionis.

⁴ Clemen. Recognit. lib. iii. cap. lxxvii. Baptizabitur unusquisque vestrum in aquis perennibus, nomine Trinae Beatitudinis invocato super se.

⁵ Vid. Idacium, lib. iii. contra Varimundum, Bibl. Patr. tom. iv. p. 300. Basil. de Spir. Sanct. cap. xxix.

void, which was given to any person without mentioning the Holy Ghost, as well as Father and Son, as I have fully shewed in another place."¹

It is further observable, that in Tertullian's time, the worship of the Holy Ghost was so common in the Church, that Praxeas and other Unitarians, were ready to charge the Catholics with Tritheism, or the worship of three Gods, upon this account. They boasted,² that they were the only persons, who truly worshipped one God, and preserved the divine monarchy entire; whilst all other Christians, by worshipping three persons, introduced the worship of three Gods: "as if," says Tertullian, "the Unity absurdly collected, might not make an heresy; and a Trinity rationally conceived might not consist with Unity." He there explains how³ "these three are one God by unity of original, by unity of substance, condition, and power." And he adds,⁴ "that as the Father was God, so the Son was God, and the Holy Ghost God." And says in another place,⁵ "that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was a Trinity in one Godhead or divine nature." So that it is plain, the difference then between the Praxeian heretics and the Catholics was, that the Praxeans worshipped but one Person as God; but the Catholics worshipped three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, under the title and appellation of One God. And Erasmus was wonderfully mistaken, when he asserted, that the name, God, was never given to the Holy Ghost before the time of St. Hilary, in the middle of the fourth century: when it is so evident he had both the name and worship of God given him in the time of Tertullian, and in effect by all Christians in former ages, whilst they joined

¹ Book. xi. chap. iii. sect. 2.

² Tertul. cont. Prax. cap. iii.

Duos et Tres jam jactitant à nobis prædicari, se verò Unius Dei cultores præsumunt: quasi non et Unitas irrationaliter collecta, hæresin faciat: et Trinitas rationaliter expensa veritatem constituat.

³ Ibid. cap. ii. Tres sunt unius substantiæ, et unus status, et unus potestatis: quia unus Deus, ex quo (tres) in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti deputantur.

⁴ Ibid. cap. xiii. Et Pater Deus, et Filius Deus, et Spiritus Sanctus Deus, et Deus unusquisque.

⁵ Tertul. de Pudicitia, cap. xxi. Trinitas unius divinitatis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus.

him in all acts of divine worship and glorification with the Father, and Son, as one God.

Cyprian expressly styles him God, when, disputing against the validity of heretical baptism, he uses this argument:¹ "If a man can be baptised by heretics, he may obtain remission of sins: if he may obtain remission of sins, he may be sanctified, and be made the temple of God. I ask, of what God? If it be said the Creator; he cannot be his temple, who believes not in Him. If Christ; neither can he be his temple, who believes not Christ to be God. If the Holy Ghost; seeing the Three are One, how can the Holy Spirit be reconciled to him, who is an enemy to the Father or the Son?" As the Holy Ghost is here plainly styled God, so every true Christian is said to be the temple of the Holy Ghost, as God: and temples being for the worship of God, it may be concluded, that, according to Cyprian, the Holy Ghost was then worshipped in all his living temples as God.

At the same time with Cyprian lived those two shining lights of the Asiatic Church, Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, and Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, from his power in working miracles, surnamed *Thaumaturgus*. Of both these St. Basil testifies,² that in their prayers and books, they were always wont to use this doxology, "to God the Father, and his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Ghost, be glory and dominion for ever and ever!"

And this is the doxology that most commonly occurs in the Author of the Constitutions, which though I do not with a late author take for an inspired writing, nor for the genuine work of Clemens Romanus, yet I believe it to be a very good collection of the Rituals and Liturgy of the ancient Church, for the three first ages, and not infected with those pernicious principles of Arianism, which some would fain father upon him, who pervert his words, as they do the other

¹ Cypr. Ep. lxxiii. ad Jubaian. p. 203. Si baptizari quis apud hereticos potuit, utique et remissam peccatorum consequi potuit. Si peccatorum remissam consecutus est, et sanctificatus est, et templum Dei factus est. Quæro, Cujus Dei? Si Creatoris: non potuit qui in eum non credidit. Si Christi: nec hujus fieri potest templum, qui negat Deum Christum. Si Spiritus Sancti: cum tres unum sint, quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus esse potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est?

² Basil de Spir. Sanc. cap. xxix.

Anti-Nicene writers, from their proper meaning to an heretical sense. This author, I say, commonly uses that doxology, which is so much commended by St. Basil, as expressing the true worship of the Holy Trinity. Of which I shall give a few instances out of his eighth book, which is a collection of the Forms of Prayer used in the ancient service. In the twelfth chapter of that book the oblation prayer is thus concluded: "We beseech Thee to gather us into the kingdom of thy Christ, the God of the whole nature of things, both visible and invisible, and our King: for to Thee belongs all glory, and worship, and thanksgiving, and honour, and adoration, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now and for ever, throughout all ages world without end!" In the thirteenth chapter, the prayer after consecration ends in the same manner: "By thy Christ, to whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost, be glory, honour, and praise, doxology, and thanksgiving, for ever and ever!" In the same chapter all the people sing this hymn to Christ: "There is One Holy, One Lord Jesus Christ, Blessed for ever, to the glory of God the Father! Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good-will towards men! Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed be God the Lord, who came in the name of the Lord, and was manifested unto us! Hosanna in the highest!" In the fourteenth chapter, after the communion, the deacon says, "Παραδώμεθα,—*Let us commend ourselves to God, the only unbegotten God, and to his Christ.*" Now the παραδέσεις, or *commendations*, were one sort of prayers, as I shall shew hereafter.¹ Then the bishop makes a thanksgiving in the fifteenth chapter, which he concludes in these words: "By Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost be glory, honour, and adoration, now and for ever. Amen." And in his invocation in the same chapter, he says, "To Thee and thy Son Jesus, thy Christ, our Lord, and God, and King, and to the Holy Ghost, be glory, praise, majesty, worship, and adoration, now and for ever, world without end. Amen." There are many other such doxologies in other prayers throughout this book, which I need not here repeat.² For if these be

¹ Book xv. chap. iii. sect. 29.
18, 20, 21, 22, 29, 37, 38, 39, 41.

² Vid. Constit. lib. viii. cap. 16.

not plain instances of the worship of the Holy Ghost, together with the Father and the Son, it is hard to say, what words can express it.

SECT. 5.—In what Sense all Prayers are ordered to be directed to the Father.

Now then, by all this we may interpret the meaning of that African Canon, which orders all prayers at the altar to be directed to the Father.¹ For that was not intended to exclude the worship of the Son and Holy Ghost together with the Father; for the hymns and doxologies before mentioned, which were used at the altar, plainly shew the contrary: but it was designed, that when the sacrifice of Christ was commemorated, He should be considered as the great Mediator, by whose sacrifice we apply to the Father, and have access by his merits and intercession to the throne of grace and mercy. And therefore all prayers at the altar are ordered to be directed to the Father in his name; which very application was a worship of the Son as Mediator, and an honour peculiar to Him, and incommunicable to any creature. In other prayers direct applications were made to the Son, as we have seen before in that of the Constitutions for the dispossessing of devils:³ and in these prayers at the altar, the glorification was in common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Whence Fulgentius, who was an African bishop, and therefore may be presumed to understand the meaning of the African Canons, tells us,³ “ that all worship and adoration of honour and sacrifice was equally given to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that is, to the Holy Tri-

¹ Con. Carthag. iii. can. 23.

lib. viii. cap. 8.

² Constit.

³ Fulgent. ad Monimum. lib. ii. cap. v. Omne cujuslibet honorificentiae et sacrificii salutaris obsequium, et Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto, hoc est, Sanctae Trinitati ab Ecclesia Catholica pariter exhiberi—Neque enim praedictum Filio vel Sancto Spiritui comparatur, dum ad Patris Personam precatio ab offerente dirigitur. Cujus consummatio dum Filii et Spiritus Sancti complectitur nomen, ostendit nullam esse in Trinitate discrimen. Quia dum ad solius Patris personam sermo dirigitur, bene credentis fide tota Trinitas honoratur: et cum ad Patrem litantis destinatur intentio, sacrificii munus omni Trinitati iue eodemque offertur litantis officio.

nity, by the Catholic Church; and that it was no prejudice to the Son or the Holy Ghost, that the minister at the altar directed the prayers to the person of the Father. For in the end of them, the names of the Son and Holy Spirit were always expressed; and that shewed, that there was no difference in the Holy Trinity: because when the words were only directed to the Person of the Father, yet the whole Trinity was honoured by the faith of the true believer; and whilst the intention of the sacrificer was more peculiarly fixed upon the Father, the sacrifice itself was by one and the same act offered to the whole Trinity." From all which it is evident to a demonstration, that the three Persons of the Holy Trinity were always the object of divine adoration from the first foundation of the Christian Church, and that the giving of divine honour to the Son and Holy Ghost, as God, was not the invention or addition of any later ages.

CHAP. III.

That in the ancient Church religious Worship was given to no Creature, Saint, or Angel, but to God alone.

SECT. 1.—This Position proved, first, from their general Declarations against giving religious Worship to any Creature.

It has been observed in the foregoing chapter, that the worship of Christ in the primitive Church was esteemed a good argument of his Divinity, because it was then an undoubted principle, that no creature, how excellent soever, was to be worshipped with religious worship, but only the living and true God. And an Arian or a Socinian can never answer or evade this argument from antiquity, so long as both those assertions stand good, that Christ was worshipped with religious worship, and that nothing is to be worshipped with religious worship, but only the living and true God. The force of this argument has been much weakened and indeed wholly enervated and destroyed by the writers of the Romish Church, in whose mouths the argument signifies nothing to an Arian or Socinian, because their own practice,

in giving religious worship to saints and angels, is a sufficient answer to it. For upon supposition, that saints and angels may be worshipped, the worship of Christ can be no argument of his Divinity, no more than it is of the divinity of saints and angels, because they are worshipped in the Romish Church. But, upon the principles of the primitive Church, the argument is unanswerable: for at the same time that they asserted the worship of Christ, they asserted likewise, that religious worship was not to be given to any creature, but to God alone. And in this view, the argument for Christ's Divinity was very rational and solid. As therefore we have seen the truth of the first position, that Christ was religiously worshipped in the primitive Church, made good from their undeniable assertions and practice: so now we will a little examine the truth of the second, that nothing is to be religiously worshipped but only the living and true God. Which position is designed to be handled here, only as an illustration and confirmation of the argument for the Divinity of Christ, drawn from the practice of the primitive Church in giving religious adoration to Him. And the truth of this proposition I shall confirm briefly these three ways. 1. By shewing in general, that the Ancients declare universally against giving religious worship or adoration to any creature, or being, which by nature is not God. 2. That in particular they rejected the worship of saints and angels as idolatry and unlawful. 3. That there is no mention made of it but in the practice either of heretics, or heathens, whose idolatry is aggravated upon the account of this practice.

In the first place it is observable, that the Ancients in general declare against giving religious worship to any creature, or being, which by nature is not God. It would fill a whole volume to cite all that is said by the Ancients upon this head, therefore I shall content myself to select a few plain passages out of an infinite number that might be alleged to this purpose. Justin Martyr often tells the Emperors in his Apology,¹ "that Christians could worship none but God alone: and that Christ had taught them so in

¹ Just. Apol. i. p. 63. Τὸν Θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. &c. It. p. 64. "Θεὸν Θεὸν μόνον προσκυνῆμεν. &c.

saying, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve, with all thy heart and with all thy strength, the Lord God that made thee.' And again in saying, 'render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.' Therefore, we worship God alone, but in all other things we cheerfully serve you." In like manner Theophilus, bishop of Antioch: "I will honour the king," says he, "not by worshipping him, but praying for him. But I will worship God, the living and true God, knowing, that by Him the king is ordained. You will say then, why do you not worship the king? Because he is not made to be worshipped, but to be honoured with lawful honour. For he is not a God, but a man. And as he will not suffer any other to assume the title of king but himself; so neither is it lawful¹ to worship any other but God alone." In another place, he says,² "God's laws forbid not only the worship of idols, but all other creatures, the sun, moon, and stars, heaven, earth and sea; and command the worship of the true God alone, who is the Creator of all things." After the same manner, Tertullian speaking of the Christians' prayers for the Emperors, and the peace of the world,³ says, "They asked these things of the living and true God, and they could ask them of no other but Him, of whom they were sure to obtain them, because He alone was able to give them." And he repeats the same in several other places of his writings.⁴ This was the answer, which the martyrs commonly gave to the persecuting judges, when they solicited them to worship other Gods. When Fructuosus, a Spanish bishop, and martyr, who suffered at Tarragone, about the year 262, was commanded to sacrifice, he replied,⁵ "I only worship one God, the Maker of heaven

¹ Theoph. ad Autolye. lib. i. p. 30. Οὐδέε ἄλλω ἐξόν ἐστι προσκυνεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνῳ Θεῷ.

² Id. lib. ii. p. 173. Μόνῳ τῷ ὄντως Θεῷ ἐξ ποιητῆ τῶν ὅλων χρη λατρεύειν.

³ Tertul. Apol. cap. xxx. Nos pro salute imperatorum Deum invocamus æternum, Deum verum, Deum vivum. —Hæc ab alio orare non possum, quàm à quo me scio consecuturum, quoniam et ipse est qui solus præstat, &c.

⁴ Tertul. Scorpiac. cap. iv. Præscribitur mihi, ne quem alium adorem, aut quoquomodo venerer, præter unicum illum, qui ita mandat. Vid. Apol. cap. xvii. et ad Scapulam. cap. ii.

⁵ Acta Fructuosi. ap. Baron. an. 262. n. lx. Ego Unum Deum colo, qui fecit cælum et terram, et omnia quæ in eis sunt.

earth, and of all things that are therein." And so Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, answered Æmylian, the prefect, as he himself tells us in an Epistle, recorded by Eusebius,¹ "I have publicly testified," says he, "that I worship none but the true God alone, neither can I ever depart from this practice, or cease to be a Christian." And when Æmylian urged him further to worship the gods of the Empire together with his own God, his answer was still the same, "We worship Him and no other." There are many the like expressions in Iræneus,² Clemens Alexandrinus,³ Origen,⁴ Cyprian,⁵ Lactantius,⁶ the author of the Recognitions, under the name of Clemens Romanus,⁷ Athenagoras, Tatian, and others: which, because the learned reader may have recourse to himself, or read them collected together in one view in that excellent book of Mr. Daille,⁸ against the idolatry of the Church of Rome, I shall here omit them, and proceed.

SECT. 2.—Secondly, from their denying the Worship of Saints and Angels in particular, and condemning it as Idolatry.

To the second observation; which is, that the Ancients not only in general reject the worship of any creature, but reject the worship of saints and angels in particular, as idolatry and unlawful. And of this we cannot have a plainer proof, than was given in the answer of the Church of Smyrna, to the suggestion of the Jews, when, at the martyrdom of Polycarp, the Jews desired the Heathen Judge, that he would not permit the Christians to carry off the body of Polycarp, lest they should leave their crucified master, and begin to worship this man in his stead: "this suggestion," says the answer, "proceeded purely from ignorance, that we could neither forsake Christ, nor worship any other.⁹ For we worship Him as being the Son of God: but the martyrs as the disciples and followers of the Lord, we love with a due

¹ Dionys. Epist. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. 11. *Τὸν Θεὸν ὄντα μόνον, ἃ ἕδεν ἕτερον σέβω.*

² Iren. lib. v. cap. xxii.

³ Clem.

Strom. vi. p. 825.

⁴ Orig. cont. Cels. lib. ii. p. 10. lib. viii. p.

395. et passim.

⁵ Cypr. Ep. lxxvi. al. lxxviii. It ad Demetrian. p. 187.

⁶ Lactant. lib. ii. cap. i. lib. iii. c. vi. lib. iv. c. xiv.

⁷ Recognit. lib.

v. n. xvi.

⁸ Daille de Objecto Cultus Religiosi. lib. i. cap. ii. iii. iv.

⁹ Martyr. Polycarp. ap. Euseb. lib. iv. cap. xv. p. 134.

affection, for their great love of their own King and Master ; with whom we desire to be partners and fellow-disciples." A like answer was given at the martyrdom of Fructuosus, in Spain. For when the judge asked Eulogius's deacon, whether he would not worship Fructuosus? As thinking, that he, who refused to worship the heathen idols, might yet perhaps be inclined to worship a Christian martyr; to this Eulogius plainly replied,¹ "I do not worship Fructuosus, but I worship Him whom Fructuosus worships." We are beholden to Baronius himself for this testimony: and we cannot desire a clearer evidence, that in those early times the Christians did not worship the martyrs, but only the God of the martyrs, to whom the martyrs offered their own bodies in sacrifice, whilst they died for his name, and sealed their confession with their blood. Before this, Origen, in his answers to Celsus, positively denies that ever the Jews or Christians gave any religious worship to angels. He says, they are ministering spirits, that bring the gifts of God to us, but there is no command in Scripture to worship or adore them.² For all prayers, supplications, intercessions, and giving of thanks, are to be sent up to God by the great High-Priest, the living Word of God, who is superior to all angels. He says again,³ allowing what Celsus says to be true, that the angels were God's heralds and heavenly messengers: yet still the heralds and messengers were not to be worshipped, but He, whose heralds and messengers they were. He repeats this frequently in his eighth book in several places,⁴ which for brevity's sake I here omit, only reciting one passage more, because it so handsomely meets with that common pretence of the Romanists, that we are to worship angels, because they are the friends of God. "We must endeavour," says he,⁵ "to please God alone, who is above all things and labour to have him propitious unto us, procuring his good will, with piety

¹ Acta Fructuosi. ap. Baron. an. 262. n. 62. Ego Fructuosum non colo, sed Ipsum colo, quem et Fructuosus. Vid. Aug. Serm. 101. de Diversis. p. 571.

² Orig. cont. Cels. lib. v. p. 233. Οὐχ ὡς εἰ προστάσσειθάι ἡμῖν τὸς διακονῶντας—σίβειν δὲ προσκυνεῖν ἀντι τῶ Θεῷ, &c.

³ Orig. ibid. p. 239.

⁴ Orig. lib. viii. p. 400. 416.

⁵ Orig. lib. viii. p. 420.

and all kind of virtue. And if Celsus will yet have us to procure the good will of any others, after Him that is God over all: let him consider, that as when the body is moved, the shadow follows its motion; so in like manner, when we have God, who is over all, favourable unto us, it follows, that we shall have all his friends, both angels, and souls, and spirits favourable unto us also. For they have a fellow feeling with them, that are thought worthy to find favour from God. Neither are they only favourable to such as are thus worthy, but they labour with them also, that are willing to worship God over all, and are friendly to them, and sympathise with them, and pray with them. So that we may be bold to say, that when men, who with resolution propose unto themselves the best things, do pray unto God, many thousands of the sacred powers pray together with them *unspoken to*,—*ἀκλήτοι*,—without any invocation." A like answer is given to the same pretence by the author under the name of St. Ambrose. "Men are wont," says he,¹ "when they are ashamed of their neglecting of God, to use this miserable excuse; that by these they might go to God, as by officers we go to the king." To which he answers, "Is any man so mad, or so unmindful of his salvation, as to give the king's honour to an officer; when if any shall be found but to treat of such a matter, they will be justly condemned as guilty of high treason? And yet these men think themselves not guilty, who give the honour of God's name to a creature, and forsaking the Lord, adore their fellow-servants; as though there were any thing more that could be reserved to God. For therefore men go to the king by tribunes or officers, because the

¹ Ambros. in Rom. i. Solent tamen pudorem passi neglecti Dei, miserânti excusatione, dicentes, per istos posse ire ad Deum, sicut per comites pervenitur ad regem. Age, nunquid tam demens est aliquis, aut salutis suæ immemor, ut honorificentiam regis vindicet comiti; cum de hâc re si qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut rei damnentur majestatis? Et isti se non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei deferunt creaturæ, et relicto Domino conservos adorant; quasi sit aliquid plus quod servetur Deo. Nam et idcò ad regem per tribunos aut comites itur, quia homo utique est rex, et nesciat quibus debeat republicam credere. Ad Deum (ante quem nihil latet, omnium enim merita novit,) promerendum suffragatore non opus est, sed mente devota.

king is but a man, and knows not with whom he may entrust the affairs of the commonwealth. But to obtain the favour of God, from whom nothing is hid, for he knows the merits of all men, we have no need of an advocate or spokesman, but only a devout mind. For wheresoever such an one shall speak unto him, he will answer him." We have heard before out of Irenæus,¹ that the Church in his time, though she wrought many miracles for the benefit of men, yet did nothing by invocation of angels, but only by prayer to God and the Lord Jesus Christ. And that thus it continued to be in the time of Athanasius, appears plainly from his way of disputing with the Arians, when he proves the unity of the Father and Son from the Apostle's joining them together in prayer, 1. Thess. iii. 11. "God himself and our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you." "No man," says he,² "would pray to receive any thing from the Father and the angels, or from any other of the creatures: neither would any man say, God and the angel gave me this." And whereas the Arian might have said, that Jacob joined God and the angel together in prayer, Gen. xlviii. 16. Athanasius obviates this exception, by saying, "he did not join one of the created angels, who are angels by nature, with God who was their creator; neither did he, omitting God that fed him, desire a blessing from an angel upon his children: but in saying, 'The angel which redeemed me from all evil,' he showed that it was not any of the created angels, but the Word of God, whom he joined with the Father and prayed unto Him." There had been no force in this argument, had the Church used invocation of angels in her prayers in the time of Athanasius; the Arian might easily have replied, that his argument was refuted by experience in the Church's daily practice. But that neither men nor angels were the object of religious adoration in his time, appears further from another discourse of his against the Arians,³ where he argues thus: "Peter the Apostle, did forbid Cornelius, when he would have worship-

¹ Iren. lib. ii. c. 57. Nec invocationibus angelicis facit, nec incantationibus, &c.

² Athan. Orat. iv. cont. Arian. tom. i. p. 464.

³ Athan. Orat. iii. cont. Arian, p. 394.

ped him, saying, ‘ I myself am also a man.’ Acts, x. 26. And the Angel likewise did forbid John, when he would have worshipped him in the Revelations, saying, ‘ See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them who keep the sayings of this book: worship God.’ Rev. xxii. 9. Wherefore it belongs to God only to be worshipped. And this the angels very well know; that though they excel others in glory, yet they are all but creatures, and not in the number of those that are to be worshipped, but of those that worship the Lord.” We cannot have clearer evidences than these, either of the Church’s doctrine or practice: both which are equally attested by St. Austin in his Book of True Religion: where he makes it a distinguishing character and property of true religion to worship no sort of creature, particularly neither angels, nor saints, after death, but the Sovereign Majesty of God alone. “ Let not our religion,” says he,¹ “ consist in the worship of dead men: because if they lived piously, they are not esteemed such as would desire that kind of honour; but would have Him to be worshipped by us, by whose illumination they rejoice to have us partners with them in their merit. They are therefore to be honoured for imitation, not to be worshipped for religion.” A little after he says, “ That which the highest angel worships, the same is to be worshipped by the meanest man. And this we are to believe, that the very greatest of angels, and most excellent ministers of God, would have us worship One God with them. And therefore we honour angels with love, not with religious service: neither do we build temples to them; for they desire not to be so honoured by us; because they know, that we ourselves, when we are good, are the temples

¹ Aug. de Vera Relig. cap. 55. tom. i. p. 317. Non sit nobis religio cultus hominum mortuorum: quia si piè vixerunt, non sic habentur, ut tales quarant honores: sed illum à nobis coli volunt, quo illuminante lætantur meriti sui nec esse consortes. Honorandi sunt ergo propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem.—Quod colit summus angelus, id colendum est etiam ab homine ultimo.—Hec etiam ipsos optimos angelos, ex excellentissima Dei ministeria velle credamus, ut unum cum ipsis colamus Deum. Quare honoramus eos charitate, non servitute. Nec eis templa construimus: nolunt enim se sic honorari a nobis. &c.

of the Most High God. And therefore it is well recorded, that the angel forbid the man to worship him, and bid him worship God, under whom he was his fellow-servant, Rev. xxii. 9."

It is true indeed the Manichees about this time began to charge the Catholics with worshipping their martyrs: Faustus objected to them, that they had only exchanged the heathen idols for martyrs, whom they worshipped with the same devotions, offering sacrifice of wine and meats to the ghosts and shades of dead men. Had this been a true charge, though it could not have effected the argument, as drawn from the practice of the Church in former ages, yet it would have proved the corruption of saint-worship to have crept a little earlier into the Church, than will now be allowed. But the truth of the matter is, it was a mere calumny of Faustus's own inventing: and St. Austin rejects it with the utmost scorn and indignation. Therefore he says,¹ in answer to it, "That the Christian people did celebrate the memories of the martyrs with religious solemnity, both to excite themselves to their imitation, and to be partners in their merits, and to have the benefit of their prayers, yet so, as that we never offer any sacrifice to a martyr, but to the God of martyrs, although we erect altars in the memories of the martyrs, meaning Churches called by their names. For what priest, standing at the altar in the places,

¹ Aug. cont. Faust. lib. xxi. cap. 20. Tom. vi. p. 156. Populus Christianus memorias martyrum religiosâ solennitate concelebrat, et ad excitandam imitationem, et ut meritis eorum consocietur, atque orationibus adjuvetur: Ita tamen ut nulli martyrum, sed ipsi Deo martyrum sacrificemus, quamvis in memoriis (al in memorias) martyrum constituamus altaria. Quis enim antistitem in locis sanctorum corporum assistens altari, aliquando dixit, ' Offerimus tibi, Petre, vel Paule, vel Cypriane?' Sed quod offertur, offertur Deo, &c. Colimus ergo martyres eo cultu dilectionis et societatis, quo et in hâc vitâ coluntur sancti homines Dei, quorum cor ad talem pro evangelicâ veritate passionem paratum esse sentimus.—At verò illo cultu, quæ Græcè *Latria* dicitur, Latine uno verbo dici non potest, cùm sit quædam propriè Divinitati debita servitus, nec colimus, nec colendum docemus nisi unum Deum. Cùm autem ad hunc cultum pertineat oblatio sacrificij, unde idololatria dicitur eorum, qui hoc etiam idolis exhibent: Nullo modo tale aliquid offerimus, aut offerendum præcipimus, vel cuiquam martyri, vel cuiquam sanctæ animæ, vel cuiquam angelo; et quisquis in hunc errorem delabitur, corripitur per sanam doctrinam, sive ut corrigatur, sive ut condemnetur, sive ut caveatur.

where the holy bodies lie, ever said, ‘ We offer unto thee, Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian?’ But whatever is offered, is offered unto God, that crowned the martyrs, at the memories of those whom he crowned, that by the very admonition of the places our affection may rise higher, to quicken our love both toward them, whom we may imitate, and toward Him, who enables us to imitate them. Therefore we worship the martyrs with that worship of love and society, wherewith we worship holy men of God in this life, whose heart we perceive to be prepared to suffer in like manner for the Gospel truth. But with that worship, which the Greeks call *Latria*, and the Latins cannot express by one word, being a service proper to God, we neither worship, nor teach any one to worship any other but God alone. And whereas the offering of sacrifice appertains to this kind of worship, whence it is called idolatry in those that give it to idols: we neither offer, nor teach any to offer such worship, either to any martyr, or any holy soul, or any angel; but whoever falls into this error, is rebuked by sound doctrine, either to correct him, or condemn him, or to make him be avoided by others.”

It is plain from this answer of St. Austin’s, that the charge of giving religious worship to saints and angels was false, and a mere calumny upon the Church in those days; and that the only persons then guilty of it, were such as were disowned and discarded by the Church. Which brings me to the third and last consideration proposed to confirm this position, that the ancient Church did not give religious worship either to saints or angels, because she condemned the practice both in heathens and heretics, and aggravated their idolatry upon this account.

SECT. 3.—Thirdly, From their charging the Practice of it upon Heretics and Heathens only.

St. Austin in another place makes a severe remark upon all such as sought to angels by prayer for their assistance: he says, they were distracted with strange curiosities and illusions. Take it in his own words, as he delivers it in a pious reflection upon his own happiness in escaping the snare at his own conversion, and a thankful acknowledg-

ment of God's mercy in delivering him from such a delusion. "Whom," says he,¹ "should I have found, that might reconcile me unto Thee? Should I have gone unto the angels? With what prayer? With what sacraments? Many endeavouring to return unto Thee, and not being able to do it by themselves, as I hear, have tried these things; and have fallen into the desire of curious visions, and were accounted worthy of illusions." St. Chrysostom has a more severe reflection on this sort of men: for he not only says,² "that no creature is to be worshipped by man, neither of things above, nor things below, whether man or demons, or angels, or archangels, or any other supernal powers, but only God the Lord of all: and that the Apostle in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Colossians discourses against such as taught, that man was to come to God by angels, and not by Christ; for that was too great for him."³ But he adds, in pursuance of the same matter,⁴ "that it was the devil, which introduced this having recourse to angels, whilst he envied the honour of man. These be the enchantments of devils. Though it be an angel, though an archangel, though they be cherubims; endure it not. For neither will these powers themselves receive it, but reject it, when they see their Lord dishonoured. 'I have honoured thee,' saith God, 'and bid thee call upon Me.' And dost thou then dishonour Him?" Where we see plainly, that invocation of God and invocation of angels are opposed to one another; and as the one is made the character of true religion, so the other is said to be the doctrine of devils.

The persons here reflected on by Chrysostom, were probably the same as had been known in the Church, and condemned from the Apostles' days as heretics, under the name of *Angelici*, or *Angel-worshippers*. For so St. Austin⁵ de-

¹ Aug. Confess. lib. x. cap. 42. Quem invenirem, qui me reconciliaret tibi? An eundem mihi fuit ad angelos? Quâ prece? Quibus sacramentis? Multi conantes ad te redire, neque per seipsos valentes, sicut audio, tentaverunt hæc: et inciderunt in desiderium curiosarum visionum, et digni habiti sunt illusionibus.

² Chrys. Hom. v. in Colos. p. 1348.

³ Hom. vii. in Col. p. 1360.

⁴ Hom. ix. in Col. p. 1381.

Ὁ διάβολος τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐπεισήγαγε, βασκαίνων ἡμῖν τῆς τιμῆς τῶν δαιμόνων τοιαῦται αἰ ἐπφῶται, &c.

⁵ Aug. de Hæres. cap.

39. Angelici, in angelorum cultu inclinati.

scribes them, calling them *Angelici*, from their inclination to worship angels. And so Isidore after him.¹ Irenæus² seems to insinuate, that hereticks were wont to invoke angels, when he opposes the Church's practice to them, telling them, that many miracles were wrought in the Church, not by invocation of angels, but by prayer to God and the Lord Jesus Christ. And Tertullian³ says expressly of the followers of Simon Magus, "that they worshipped angels in the exercise of their magical art, which idolatry was condemned by St. Peter in their first founder." Now there being such foot-steps of angel-worship in the practice of so many heresies; and it being a thing that some were fond of, because it had a show of humility in it; the Council of Laodicea, to prevent the growing malady, made a severe canon under the denunciation of anathema to restrain it. "Christians," say they,⁴ "ought not to forsake the Church of God, and go aside, and hold conventicles, to invoke or call upon the names of angels. Which things are forbidden. If any one therefore be found to exercise himself in this private idolatry, let him be accursed: because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and gone over to idolatry." The first publishers of this Canon in the Latin editions, changed the word "*Angelos*" into "*Angulos*," *corners* instead of *angels*: but the Greek admits of no such corruptions, and therefore the fraud is easily discovered; and nothing but the shame of seeing their practice so plainly condemned in this Canon, could have induced any men to have attempted such a childish corruption. Theodoret, in his Comment upon the Epistle to the Colossians, has occasion twice to mention this Canon. Where he says,⁵ "That because some in the Apostles days commanded men to worship angels, therefore the Apostle enjoined the contrary,

¹ Isidor.⁶ Origin. lib. viii. cap. v. Angelici vocati, quia angelos colunt.

² Iren. lib. ii. cap. 57.

³ Tertul. de Præscrip. cap. xxxiii.

Simonianæ autem magiæ disciplina angelis serviens, utique et ipsa inter idololatrias deputabatur, et à Petro Apostolo in ipso Simone damnabatur.

⁴ Con. Laodic. can. 35. Οὐδέϊ Χριστιανῶς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ ἀπέλθει, ἢ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν, ἢ συνάξεις ποιεῖν. &c.

⁵ Theod. in Col. iii.

that they should adorn their words and deeds with the commemoration of the Lord Christ, and send up thanksgiving to God and the Father by Him, and not by the angels. And that the synod of Laodicea following this rule, and desiring to heal that old disease, made a law, that men should not pray to angels, nor forsake our Lord Jesus Christ." And again,¹ "this vice continued in Phrygia and Pisidia for a long time, for which cause also the synod assembled in Laodicea, the chief city in Phrygia, made a law to prohibit praying to angels. But yet even to this day among them and their neighbours there are oratories of St. Michael to be seen." Cardinal Perron uses a great deal of art and sophistry to pervert the sense of the Apostle and this Canon together, which the reader may find sufficiently exposed and refuted by the learned Daille,² with the false glosses of Petavius and others, with which I shall not trouble this discourse. I only observe further, that as the Church condemned heretics as guilty of idolatry for worshipping of angels, so did she likewise for worshipping of their leaders and martyrs. Apollonius, who wrote against the Montanists, objects it to them, that they worshipped one Alexander, a martyr among them.³ And St. Austin reckons it among the errors of Simon Magus,⁴ that he left his own image, and the image of his harlot, Selene, to his disciples, to be worshipped by them. They objected the same to the Heathen, that they worshipped such Gods as were only men, and dead men: as may be seen in all the apologies made by Minucius Felix,⁵ Tertullian,⁶ Clemens Alexandrinus,⁷ Arnobius,⁸ Cyprian,⁹ and the rest that wrote against them: which had been a very weak argument, and easily retorted, had Christians worshipped their martyrs, whom they could not deny to be mortal men. The Heathens further pretended, that their demons, or Gods, whom they

¹ Theod. in Col. ii. lib. iii. cap. 31.

² Daille. de Objecto cult. Relig.

xviii.

³ Apollon. ap. Euseb. lib. v. cap.

⁴ Aug. de Hæres. cap. i: Imaginesque et suam et ejusdem meretricis discipulis suis præbebat adorandas.

⁵ Minuc. Dial.

p. 88.

⁶ Tertul. Apol. cap. x. xii. xxix.

⁷ Clem.

Protreptic, p. 26.

⁸ Arnob. lib. i. p. xxxii.

⁹ Cyprian de

Idol. Vanit. p. xi.

worshipped, were good angels, and worshipped only as the ministers of the Supreme God, and attendants of the court of Heaven. Notwithstanding which pretence, they charge them with idolatry, as giving the worship of God to the creature. He that would see this argument managed to just advantage, may consult the learned discourses of Mr. Daille¹ and Bishop Stillingfleet,² where he will find the pretences of the Heathen, and the answers of the Christians collected and set in their proper light. I shall only detain my reader with one citation out of St. Austin, as a specimen of all the rest, where he introduces the Heathen making this apology for themselves; “ We do not worship wicked devils,” say they,³ “ it is the angels you speak of, that we worship, the powers of the Great God, the ministers of the Great God.” To which St. Austin answers, “ I wish you would worship them, for they would quickly teach you, that they are not to be worshipped. Hear the instruction of an angel. He taught a certain disciple of Christ, and shewed him many miracles in the Revelations of St. John. Who having seen a certain miracle in a vision, was astonished, and cast himself down at the feet of the angel. But the angel, who sought nothing but the glory of his Lord, said, ‘ arise, what dost thou? Worship God: for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren.’ How is it then, my brethren? Let no one say, I fear lest the angel should be angry at me, if I do not worship him for my God. He is then only angry at thee, when thou art inclined to worship him. For he is good and loves God: and as

¹ Daillæ. de Cultu Relig. lib. iii. cap. xxv.

² Stilling.

Defence of the Discourse of Idol. part i. cap. i.

³ Aug. in

Psalm 96. tom. viii. p. 445 Respondent: Non colimus mala dæmonia: angelos quos dicitis, ipsos et nos colimus, virtutes Dei Magni, et ministeria Dei Magni. Utinam ipsos colere velletis, faciliè ab ipsis discretis non illos colere. Audite angelum doctorem. Docebat quendam discipulum Christi et ostendebat illi multa miracula in Apocalypsi Joannis. Ille autem quodam sibi demonstrato miraculo visionis expavit, et misit se ad pedes angeli. Et ille angelus, qui non querebat nisi gloriam Domini sui, ‘ Surge, quid facis,’ inquit, ‘ illum adora: nam et ego conservus tuus sum, et fratrum tuorum.’ Quid ergo fratres mei? Nemo dicat, Timeo ne irascatur mihi angelus, si non illum colo pro Deo meo. Tunc tibi irascitur, quando ipsum colere volueris. Bonus est enim, et Deum amat. Quomodo enim dæmones irascuntur, si non colantur: sic angeli indignantur, si pro Deo colantur.

the devils are angry, if they be not worshipped: so the angels are highly displeased, if they be worshipped instead of God." At last he concludes with this admonition to the pagans: ¹ "let the pagans learn to adore God. They have a mind to adore angels: let them imitate angels, and adore Him whom the angels adore." And with these words I shall conclude this whole discourse of religious worship, knowing no better admonition that can be given to the angel-worshippers of the present age, than to advise them to imitate the angelical practice of the primitive Church, who had God and only God for the object of their adoration.

CHAP. IV.

That anciently Divine-Service was always performed in the Vulgar Tongue, understood by the People.

SECT. 1.—This proved, First, from plain Testimonies of the Ancients asserting it.

HAVING thus considered the nature and object of Christian worship, I come now to speak of the circumstances and manner of performing divine-service. And here it will be proper to examine in what language the Ancients performed their worship; and to inquire into the use and original of what we commonly call Liturgies, or set forms of prayer; and to take notice of the habits and modes, and gestures, and different rites and ceremonies observed, without any breach of faith or Christian unity, in different Churches; together with the solemn times of prayer and religious assemblies, whether weekly or daily, generally observed and set apart for the exercise of public devotion.

As to the first of these, there is nothing more certain in history, than that the service of the ancient Church was

¹ Aug. in Psalm, 96. Discant Pagani adorare Deum angelos volunt adorare: angelos imitentur, et Illi adorent qui ab angelis adoratur.

always performed in the vulgar or common language of every country, that is, such as was either commonly spoken, or at least commonly understood. And so it continued for above a thousand years in the Church. And it is even monstrous to think, that in so inquisitive an age as the present is, there should be any men of learning to defend, or whole nations so tamely to submit to the imposition and tyranny of the contrary practice; so absurd and unreasonable in itself; so prejudicial to devotion; so contrary to the use of speech, whose end is edification; so reproachful to human nature, as if men were asses indeed, as Thomas Aquinas once made the comparison; so derogatory to the Christian's birth-right; so flatly contradictory to the Apostle's reasoning; and so diametrically opposite to the universal practice of the Church for so many ages. But I shall not think myself obliged to dispute against it upon all these topics, nor to say all that might be said in an historical way against it. He that pleases may see that done already in an excellent book of Bishop Usher's, published by Mr. Wharton.¹ I shall content myself to suggest a few things agreeable to the design of treating matters succinctly, which will be sufficient to satisfy any candid reader as to the sense and practice of the primitive Church.

And first I observe, that the Ancients declare unanimously, that divine service was performed in the vulgar tongue of every nation. "The Grecians," says Origen,² "use the Greek language in their prayers, and the Romans the Roman, and so every one, in his own dialect, prays to God, and gives thanks as he is able: and the God of all languages hears them that pray in all dialects, understanding their different languages, as well as if they all spake with one tongue." This he says in answer to an objection of Celsus, who charged them with using of barbarous and unintelligible names and words in their prayers. Justin Martyr says,³ "The Scriptures were first read in their as-

¹ Usseii Historia Dogmatica de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis, cum Auctario H. Wharton. Lond. 1690. 4^o.

² Orig. cont. Cels. lib.

viii. p. 402. Ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες Ἑλληνικοῖς χρῶνται, οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι Ῥωμαῖοις. &c.

³ Justin. Apol. ii. p. 96.

semblies to the people, and then the president made a discourse to them, exhorting them to observe and follow the good instructions they had heard out of the Prophets and Apostles." Which had been an absurd admonition, had not the lessons been read in a language, which they understood. St. Jerom tells us,¹ "that at the funeral of the famous Lady Paula, the psalms were sung in Syriac, Greek, and Latin, because there were men of each language present at the solemnity." And for the same reason Cæsarius, bishop of Arles, is said,² "to have appointed the people to sing the psalms and hymns, some in Greek, and some in Latin:" no doubt that the divine service might be understood by men of different languages then present in the assembly. Aurelius Cassiodore, writing upon those words of the Psalmist, "She shall be brought unto the king in raiment of divers colours," says,³ "this variety signified that diversity of tongues, wherewith every nation sang to God in the Church, according to the difference of their own country-language." And it being then the way of the Church, that all offices should be performed with the understanding and edification of the people, Justinian provided for this in one of his laws,⁴ obliging "all bishops and presbyters to repeat the prayers used in the communion and baptismal-service, not in secret, but with an audible voice, so as the minds of the hearers might be raised to greater devotion, and stirred up to glorify the Lord God. For so the holy Apostle directs in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, saying, "If thou blessest only with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of

¹ Hieron. Epitaph. Paulæ. Græco, Latino, Syroque sermone Psalmi in ordine personabant.

² Cyprian. Vit. Cesar. Arelat. apud Surium. Aug. xxvii. p. 947. Compulit laicos et populares homines psalmos et hymnos promere, altâque et modulatâ voce, instar clericorum, alios Græcè, alios Latinè, prosas et antiphonas decantare, &c. Vid. Pagi. Critic. in Baron. anno 397. n. 11.

³ Cassiodor. in Psal. 44. al. 45. Hic varietatem, aut linguas multiplices significat; quia omnis gens secundum suam patriam in ecclesiâ psallit auctori; aut virtutum pulcherrimam diversitatem.

⁴ Justin. Novel. 137. cca vi. Jubemus omnes episcopos et presbyteros, non in secreto, sed cum eâ voce, quæ à fidelissimo populo exaudiatur, divinam oblationem, et precationem quæ fit in sancto baptismate, facere; ut inde audientium animi in majorem devotionem, et Dei laudationem et benedictionem efferantur, &c.

the unlearned, say the holy amen to God at thy giving of thanks? For he knoweth not what thou sayest. For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified." It is plain by this, that Justinian thought all prayers, which the people either could not hear, or could not understand, were equally blamed by the Apostle, as not contributing to edification; and therefore as he made a law against private muttering of prayers, which ought to be public; so he would no doubt have been as severe against praying in an unknown tongue, had there then been any occasion, as there was not, for the like prohibition in the Liturgy of the Church. Which may be collected from another of his laws, which was made upon occasion of a dispute, which in his time arose among the Jews. Some of them, who were superstitiously inclined, were for having the law read only in Hebrew, though not understood by the people: others were for having it read in Greek, or any language, which the people understood. The matter at last was brought before Justinian, and he determined in favour of the latter, that it should be read in Greek, or any other language,¹ which the place, where they lived, had made more useful and known to the people. Hitherto therefore we are assured, this corruption had made no attempt to gain admittance in the service of the Christian Church, since it was corrected by the civil magistrate, as soon as it was observed to be creeping into the Jewish synagogue.

SECT. 2.—Secondly, From the People's joining in Psalmody and Prayer, and making their Responses.

Secondly, as a further evidence of this matter, we may observe, that all the people anciently were allowed to join in psalmody, and prayers, and make their proper responses. The learned and unlearned, nay, even women, young virgins, and children, in those times bare a part in the public service of the Church. St. Chrysostom² and the Author of the Constitutions³ speak of children praying with the rest of the

¹ Justin. Novel. 146. *Constit. lib. viii. cap. 6.*

² Chrys. Hom. 71. in Mat. p. 624.

³ Con-

congregation for the catechumens and the faithful also. And St. Jerom¹ speaks of young virgins singing the psalter at morning and evening, at the third, and sixth, and ninth hours, and at midnight in their course ; and says, they were obliged to learn the psalms and some portion of Scripture every day. St. Basil² and many others, as we shall see hereafter, when we speak of psalmody, say, all the people sung the psalms alternately ; and Basil particularly takes notice³ of children performing this office in common with the rest of the people. And we shall meet with the people's prayers and responses almost in every part of the Liturgy, such as the " Κύριε ἐλέησον, *Lord have mercy,*" subjoined to every petition of the deacon's prayers ; and in those mutual prayers of minister and people, " the Lord be with you, and with thy spirit : lift up your hearts, we lift them up unto the Lord ;" with abundance more that need not here be mentioned. All which suppose the service to be in the vulgar and known language ; else it were absurd to think, that the people should know how, and when, to make their responses ; or that children and young virgins should learn the psalms and Scripture by heart, and join in psalmody and other parts of the service of the Church.

SECT. 3.—Thirdly, From the frequent Exhortations of the Fathers to the People to hear, and read, and pray, with Understanding.

Thirdly, there is nothing more common among the Ancients in their discourses to the people, than to admonish and exhort them both to hear, and read, and pray with understanding, attention, and fervency of spirit. Which had been very incongruous admonitions, obliging them to impracticable rules, had the lessons and prayers been in an unknown tongue. St. Basil thus exhorts his people,⁴ " Thou hast the Psalms, thou hast the Prophets, the precepts of the

¹ Hieron. Epitaph. Paulæ. Manè, horâ tertîâ, sextâ, nonâ, vespere, noctis medio, per ordinem Psalterium cantabant. Nec licebat cuiquam sororum ignerare psalmos, et non de scripturis sanctis quotidîe aliquid discere.

² Basil. Ep. 63. ad Neocæsariensis. ³ Basil. Proœm. in Psalmos. Venant. Fortunat. lib. ii. Poem. in Laud. Cleri Parisiaci. Pontificis monitis clerus, plebs, psallit et infans.

⁴ Basil. Hom. in Psal. 28. Serm. i. tom. i. p. 154.

Gospel, the preachings of the Apostles; let thy tongue sing, and thy mind search the meaning of what is spoken; that thou mayest sing with the spirit, and sing with understanding also." In another Homily he tells them,¹ "that the Divine Oracles were God's gifts to the Church, to be read in every assembly, as the food which the Spirit afforded us for the nourishment of our souls." And in another place,² putting the question, "How a man prays with the spirit, whilst his understanding is unfruitful?" He answers, "that this was spoken of those that prayed in a tongue unknown to the hearers. For the Apostle says, 'If I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit indeed prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful.' For when the words of the prayer are not known to them that are present, the understanding of him that prayeth is unfruitful, because his prayer is of no use or advantage: but when they, that are present, understand the prayer, which is of advantage to the hearers; then he, that prays, reaps the fruit of it, namely, the edification of those, who receive benefit by it. And we are to conceive in like manner of all utterance of the words of God. For it is written, 'If any be useful for edification in the faith.'" By all this it is evident, the Scriptures and Psalms and prayers were read in a known tongue: for otherwise it were in vain to exhort men to give diligence and attention to understand what they heard, if every thing was spoken in a language, which they did not, or could not understand.

SECT. 4.—Fourthly, From the References made by the Fathers to the Prayers and Lessons in the Service of the Church.

Fourthly, the Fathers in their sermons frequently refer to the prayers of the Church, and to the lessons read before, as things the people were perfectly well acquainted with. They often argue from matters contained in the prayers, as Chrysostom does commonly from all parts of the Liturgy: and their sermons for the most part were upon such portions of Scripture, as had just been read before, as I shall show, when I come to the office of preaching. Now this

¹ Basil. Hom. in Psalm. 59. p. 253.

² Regul. Brev. Qu. 278.

supposes that both the prayers and lessons of Scripture were in a known tongue; else it were absurd for the preachers to appeal to their auditors as well acquainted with them, or draw arguments from thence, as motives grounded upon their own experience, if yet indeed they had no knowledge of them.

SECT. 5.—Fifthly, From the Scriptures being translated into all Languages from the first Foundation of Churches.

Fifthly, this is evident from that pious care, which the Church took to have the Bible translated into all languages: and as soon as any nation was converted, that spake an uncommon tongue, immediately to procure a new version of the Scriptures into their language. Eusebius¹ says, “they were translated into all languages both of Greeks and Barbarians throughout the world, and studied by all nations as the oracles of God.” Chrysostom assures us,² “that the Syrians, the Egyptians, the Indians, the Persians, the Ethiopians, and a multitude of other nations translated them into their own tongues, whereby barbarians learned to be philosophers, and women and children with the greatest ease imbibed the doctrine of the Gospel.” Theodoret says the same,³ “that every nation under heaven had the Scripture in their own tongue: the Hebrew books were not only translated into Greek, but into the Roman, Egyptian, Persian, Indian, Armenian, Scythian, and Sauromatic languages, and in a word into all tongues used by all nations in his time.” The like is attested by St. Jerom⁴ and St. Austin⁵ and many others. Ulphilas is said by all the historians⁶ to have translated the whole Bible into the Gothic tongue. St. Jerom translated it into the Dalmatic, as he himself⁷ seems to intimate, when he calls it his own tongue; as Scaliger and most others understand him; though Bishop

¹ Euseb. de Præpar. Evang. lib. xii. cap. i. Præsertim de Laud. Constant. cap. xvii. p. 662. ² Chrys. Hom. i. in Joan. al. 2. Edit. Savil. tom. ii. p. 561.

³ Theod. de Curand. Græcor. Affect. Serm. 5. tom. iv. p. 555. ⁴ Hieron. Præfat. in quart. Evangel. ⁵ Aug. Ep. 48. ad Vincent.

⁶ Socrat. lib. iv. cap. 33. Sozom. lib. vi. cap. 37. ⁷ Hieron. Ep. 134. ad Sophronium.

Usher¹ thinks he meant the Latin rather by his own tongue. St. Chrysostom² sometimes mentions the Syriac translation; and he is said by the author of his Life³ to have procured, during his exile at Cucusus in Armenia, a translation of the Psalms and New Testament for the use of the Armenian Churches. Not to mention that of Methodius or Cyril into the Sclavonian tongue, or any others of later ages. Of which the curious reader may find exact accounts in Bp. Usher,⁴ Bp. Walton,⁵ Dr. Milles,⁶ and Hottinger,⁷ and others upon this peculiar subject of the Scripture-versions.

SECT. 6.—Sixthly, From the Use of the Order of Interpreters in the Church.

As to the ancient practice, it may be evidenced further and confirmed from the use of the interpreters in the Church, whose office, as has been shewn in another place⁸ out of Epiphanius⁹ and other writers, was to render one language into another, as there was occasion, both in reading the Scriptures and in the homilies that were made to the people. For it happened sometimes that there were men of different languages in the same Church: as in the Churches of Syria and Palestine some understood Syriac only, and others Greek; and in the African Churches some spake Latin and others Punic: in which cases, whatever was said in one language, was immediately rendered into the other by the interpreter for the benefit of the people. In confirmation of which custom, to what has been said before I shall here add the observation of Theodoret¹⁰ upon the practice of Chrysostom, who by the help of such an interpreter often preached to the Arian Goths in Constantinople, whom by that means he reduced to the Catholic Faith.

¹ Usser. de Sacris. Vernac. p. 221.

² Chrys. Hom. iii. in 2 Cor. p. 754.

⁸ Georg. Alexandrin.

Vit. Chrys. n. 59. tom. viii. Edit. Savil.
p. 210.

⁹ Usser de Script. Vernac.

⁵ Walton. Prolegom. cap. v.

⁶ Milles Prolegom.

in Nov. Test.

⁷ Hottinger. de Translat. Biblior. Heidleberg.

1660.

⁴ Book iii. chap. xiii. sect. 4.

⁹ Epiphani. Ex-

pos. Fid. n. 21.

¹⁰ Theod lib. v. cap. 10.

SECT. 7.—Seventhly, From the Custom of having Bibles laid in Churches for the People to read in private.

Another custom observed in the ancient Church, was to have Bibles in the vulgar tongue laid in a convenient part of the church, for the people at their leisure to employ themselves, as they were piously inclined, in reading of the Scriptures before or after the times of divine-service. Of which custom those verses of Paulinus,¹ which he wrote upon the wall of the *secretarium* of the church of Nola, are an infallible proof, which were in these words ;

“ Si quem sancta tenet meditandi in lege voluntas ;
Hic poterit residens sacris intendere libris.”

“ *If any one is piously disposed to meditate in God’s Law, here he may sit, and employ himself in reading the holy books.*”

Thus Constantine himself, as is observed by Eusebius,² was wont to employ himself in the church, partly by joining in the public prayers with the people, and partly by taking the books of the Divine Oracles into his hands, and exercising his mind in the contemplation of them. And probably for this reason he ordered Eusebius to prepare fifty copies of the Bible for the use of the Church of Constantinople³ as his letter to Eusebius witnesses ; for it is observed, and spoken to his praise, by Eusebius in another place,⁴ that by his means innumerable multitudes both of men and women exchanged the food of their bodies for that of their souls, that rational food which was so agreeable to rational minds, and which they obtained by reading the Holy Scriptures. This must necessarily relate either to their reading the Scriptures by the help and benefit of his copies in the church ; or else will argue that they were encouraged by him to read them at home in their private houses ; which had been denied them

¹ Paulin. ep. xii. ad. Severum.

iv. cap. 17.

² Ap. Euseb. Ibid. lib. iv. cap. 36. et ap. Theod. lib. i. cap. xvi. et Socrat. lib. i. cap. 6.

³ Euseb. Orat. de Laudibus Constant. cap. xvii. p. 661.

⁴ Euseb. Vit. Constant. lib.

Orat. de Laudibus Constant. cap. xvii. p. 661.

under pain of banishment or death before, in the preceding reigns of the persecuting princes.

SECT. 8.—Eighthly, From the general Allowance granted to all Men to have and read the Scriptures in their Mother Tongue. Which Privilege was never infringed by any but the Heathen Persecutors.

And this leads us to another plain evidence of the primitive practice: which was the privilege and encouragement all Christians had to read the Scriptures at home, for the exercise of themselves and families in private devotion, and better preparation for the public. None ever denied them this privilege, but those persecuting tyrants, who intended to destroy the name and faith of Christians, together with their Bibles, out of the world: for which reason they made the strictest search after them, and used all imaginable art and force to make them deliver them up to be burnt: which they who did, were branded by the the infamous name of *Traditores*, *traitors* and *betrayers* of their religion. A certain argument, that then private Christians had the use of the Scriptures; else they could not have been impeached for delivering them up to the enemy. It cannot be pleaded here, that the Scriptures were then only in the hands of the bishops, and readers, and others of the clergy: for Baronius himself has published the acts of several Martyrs, where not only private men, but women confess to the inquisitors that they had the Holy Scriptures in their houses with them. I will give a single instance out of the Acts of Agape and Irene,¹ and their companions. Where the grand inquisitor asks this question of Irene, “Who advised you to keep those parchments and Scriptures to this time?” To which Irene answered, “God Almighty, who has commanded us to love Him unto the death; for which cause we durst not betray Him; but had rather be burnt alive, or suffer any other things that may befall us, than treacherously deliver up those

¹ Acta Agapes et Sociarum ap. Baron. an. 304. n. 44. Quisnam tibi autor fuit, ut membranas istas atque Scripturas in hodiernum usque diem custodires? Irene inquit, Deus Omnipotens, qui jussit nos ad mortem usque ipsum diligere, quâ de causâ non ausi sumus eum prodere, sed maluimus aut viventes comburi, aut quæcunque alia nobis acciderint, perpeti, quàm talia Scripta prodere.

writings." It is plain from this, that private Christians, both men and women, then enjoyed the Scriptures as their birth-right, and none pretended to ravish them from them but only the persecuting heathens. The Fathers of the Church were so far from doing this, that on the contrary they used all manner of arguments to induce men to read and study them; exhorting them not only to hear them with attention in the Church, but to read them privately at home with their wives and families; commending those that studied them, and reproving those that neglected them; making large encomiums upon the use and excellency of them, and requiring men to peruse them privately as the best preparation for the public service and instruction; answering all objections and pretences that men could make to the contrary; as that they were ignorant and unlearned, and that the Scriptures were difficult and hard to be understood; that they were only for the use of monks and religious, and not for secular men, and men of business; assuring them, that the Scriptures were for the use of all men, and that it was the neglect of them that was the cause of all ignorance, heresies, errors, and irreligion. These were the general topics, upon which the Fathers then pressed the common people to read the Scriptures, which are diametrically opposite to the arguments used in later ages to dissuade and deter men from the use of them. A man cannot look into the Fathers, but he will see such arguments every where running through their writings. So that it is needless here to insist upon them: the reader, that pleases, may see them collected together from first to last by Bp. Usher, and Mr. Wharton. I shall only relate one passage of Chrysostom out of his famous Sermons upon Lazarus, where he at once proposes the several arguments, and answers the several objections I have now mentioned. "For this reason," says he,¹ "we often acquaint you many days beforehand with the subject of our discourse, that taking the Bible into your hands in the mean time, and running over the whole passage, you may have your minds better prepared to hear what is to be spoken. And this is the thing I have always advised, and shall still continue to exhort you to,

¹ Chrys. Hom. iii. in Lazar. tom. v. p. 59.

that you should not only hear what is said in this place, but spend your time at home continually in reading the Holy Scriptures. And here let no one use those frigid and vain excuses, I am a man engaged in the business of the law, I am taken up with civil affairs, I am a tradesman, I have a wife and children to breed up, I have the care of a family, I am a secular man: it belongs not to me to read the Scriptures, but to those that have bid adieu to the world, and are retired into the mountains, and have nothing else to do but to exercise themselves in such a way of living. What sayest thou, O man? Is it not thy business to read the Scriptures, because thou art distracted with a multitude of other cares? Yes, certainly, it belongs to thee more than them. For they have not so much need of the help of the Holy Scriptures, as you have, who are tossed in the waves of the multiplicity of business." Then enumerating what sins and temptations secular men are exposed to, he infers, "that they have perpetual need of divine remedies, as well to cure the wounds they have already received, as to ward off those they are in danger of receiving: to quench the darts of the devil, whilst they are at a distance, and drive them away by continual reading of the Holy Scriptures. For it is impossible that a man should attain salvation without perpetual exercise in reading spiritual things." But some again will say, what if we cannot understand the things that are contained therein? "Why," says he,¹ "even in that case, though you do not understand every thing that is contained therein, yet by reading you shall obtain much sanctification. For it is impossible that you should be equally ignorant of all things in those books. For the grace of the Spirit so ordered it, that they should originally be composed and written by publicans, and fishers, and tent-makers, and shepherds, and private and illiterate men, that none of the most ignorant and unlearned might have this excuse of difficulty to fly to; that the things there spoken, might be easy to be looked into by all men; that the handy-craftsman, the servant, the widow, the most illiterate and unlearned among men might reap benefit and advantage by hearing them read." "The Apostles and

¹ Chrys. Hom. iii. b. Lazar. tom. v. p. 62.

Prophets," he says, "wrote not like the philosophers of the Gentiles, in obscure terms, but made things plain to the understandings of all men, as being the common teachers of the world, that every man by himself might learn by reading alone the things that were spoken. To whom are not all things in the Gospel manifest and plain? Who is there, that hearing those sayings, 'Blessed are the meek, blessed are the merciful, blessed are the pure in heart,' and the like, would desire a teacher, to understand the meaning of them? Moreover, the signs, and miracles, and histories, are they not all intelligible and plain to any ordinary reader? This therefore is only a pretence, and excuse, and cloak for idleness. Thou dost not understand the things contained in the Scripture. How shouldst thou understand them, when thou wilt not so much as look into them? Take the book into thy hands, read the whole history, and remember those things that are intelligible and easy; and those things, that are more obscure and dark, read over and over again: and if thou canst not by frequent reading dive into the meaning of what is said, go to a wiser person, betake thyself to a teacher, and confer with him about any such passage; shew thy diligence and desire to be informed. And when God sees thy willingness and readiness of mind, He will not despise thy vigilance and care. But though man inform thee not in the things about which thou makest inquiry, He himself will certainly reveal it unto thee. Remember the eunuch of the Ethiopian queen, who, though he was a barbarian, and immersed in a multitude of cares and business, and understood not what he read, yet read for all that, sitting in his chariot. And if he shewed so great diligence by the way, consider how he behaved himself at home. If he would not omit reading in the time of a journey, much less would he omit it, when he sat quietly in his own house. If when he understood nothing of it, he still continued to read; much more would he do it, when he came to understand it. Wherefore, because he read when he had no guide, he quickly found a guide. God knew the willingness of his mind, and accepted his diligence, and presently sent him a teacher. But Philip, you will say, does not now stand by us. No: but the Spirit, that moved Philip,

is still by us. Let us not neglect our own salvation, beloved. These things were written for our salvation, upon whom the ends of the world are come. The reading of the Scriptures is our great guard against sin. Our ignorance of them is a dangerous precipice, and a deep gulph: it is an absolute betraying of our salvation, to know nothing of the Divine Law. It is this that has brought forth so many heresies; this that has brought so much corruption into our lives; this, that has turned all things into confusion."

One would think St. Chrysostom had foreseen all the little pleas and sophistry of the Romish Church, and was here disputing and inveighing against them. So apposite is every word to refute their trifling pretences; that ignorance is the mother of devotion; that the Scriptures are obscure; that there is need of an infallible guide on earth, besides the Spirit, to understand them; that the promiseous use of them is the cause of all errors and heresies; that laymen, and secular men are not fit to be entrusted with them: each of which positions is as plainly combated by St. Chrysostom, as if he had been directly disputing against the insufferable tyranny and frivolous pleas of the present Church of Rome: and his whole discourse, with some hundreds of the like passages that might be alleged out of him and other writers, does irrefragably shew, that it was as much the care and concern of the primitive Church to have the service of God and the Scriptures to be understood by all, as now it is the concern of the Roman Church to have them concealed from their knowledge, and locked up in a language, which the unlearned do not understand.

SECT. 9.—Ninthly, From the Liberty granted to Children and Catechumens to join in the Public Prayers, and read the Scriptures.

For it is very observable further, that in the primitive Church not only men and women, but children, were encouraged and trained up from their infancy to the reading of the Holy Scriptures: and the catechumens were not only admitted to some of the prayers of the Church peculiarly appropriated to their condition, but also obliged to learn the Scriptures as part of their discipline and instruction. Of their obligation to learn the Scriptures we have

treated before,¹ in speaking of the method of training them up for baptism: and of their admission to certain prayers of the Church, we shall see more hereafter² in that part of the worship, called, the service of the catechumens. All then, that is further here to be shewed, is, that children were trained up to the use of the Holy Scriptures. And of this we have undoubted evidence from many eminent instances of their practice. Eusebius³ remarks of the great care of Leonides, the martyr, and father of Origen, in the education of his son, that he made him learn the Scriptures, before he set him to the study of the liberal arts and polite learning. And Socrates⁴ makes the like observation upon the education of Eusebius, surnamed Emisenus, who was born of noble parentage at Edessa, a city of Osroene in Mesopotamia, that he was first taught the Holy Scriptures from his infancy, and then human learning: and Sozomen⁵ in relating the same story, says, this was done *κατὰ πατριον ἔθος, according to the custom of his country;* which shews that it was no singular instance, but a general practice to bring children up from their infancy to the use of the Holy Scriptures. Gregory Nyssen notes it in the Life of his sister, Maerina,⁶ that the first part of her instruction in her infancy was to be taught the easy portions of Scripture, that were most suitable to her age: and he says also,⁷ she did the same for her younger brother Peter, taking him from his mother's breasts, and instructing him in the Scriptures, that he might have no time to spend upon vain studies. It is noted by Sozomen⁸ and Palladius, of Marcus, the hermit, that he was so expert in the Scriptures, when he was but a youth, that he could repeat all the Old and New Testament without book. And it is observable, that as there were many catechetical schools in those times for explaining the Scriptures to the catechumens, so there were also schools appointed in many Churches to instruct the youth in the knowledge of the Scriptures. When Gregory, the Apostle

¹ Book x. chap. i. sect. 6.

² Book xiv. chap. v.

³ Euseb. lib. vi. cap. ii.

⁴ Socrat. lib. ii. cap. ix.

⁵ Sozom. lib. iii. cap. vi.

⁶ Nyssen. Vit. Maerin. tom. ii. p. 179.

⁷ Ibid. p. 185.

⁸ Sozom. lib. vi. cap. xxix. Pallad. Hist.

Lausiaca. cap. xxi.

of the Armenians, first converted that nation, it is said in his life,¹ that he set up schools in every city, and masters over them, by the king's command, to teach the Armenian children to read the Bible. And Theodoret relates a remarkable story of Protogenes, the scribe,² "that when Valens, the Arian Emperor, banished him to Antinoe, in Thebais, in the utmost parts of Egypt, he finding the greatest part of the city to be heathens, set up a charity school among them, and taught them the Holy Scriptures; dictating to them in writing short-hand David's Psalms, and making them learn such doctrines of the apostolical writings, as were proper for them to understand; by which means he brought many both of the children and parents over to the Christian faith." And it has been observed before,³ that by the canons of some councils such sort of charity schools were appointed to be set up in cathedrals and other churches, where no doubt, according to the custom of those days, children were taught to read the Scriptures.⁴ These rules were renewed in several Councils under Charles the Great and the following princes. Particularly in the second Council of Chalons,⁵ anno 813, it was appointed, "that according to the order of Charles the Emperor, bishops should set up schools to teach both grammar and the knowledge of the Scriptures." And in the Council of Toul or Savonieres in Lorraine,⁶ the decree was renewed, "that schools of the Holy Scripture and human learning should be erected; for as much, as by the care of the religious Emperors in former days, by this means both ecclesiastical knowledge and human learning had made a considerable progress in the world." And Mr. Wharton⁷ will furnish the inquisitive reader with many other rules and canons made about the same time to promote and encourage the learning of the Scriptures.

¹ Acta Gregorii ap. Simeon. Metaphrast. Sept. xxx. cited by Bishop Usher.

² Theod. lib. iv. cap. xvi.

³ See Book viii.

chap. vii. sect. 12.

⁴ Con. vi. General. Can. iv. et v.

⁵ Con. Cabillon. ii. can. iii. Oportet etiam, ut sicut Dominus Imperator Carolus præcepit, episcopi scholas constituent, in quibus et literaria solertia disciplinae, et Sanctæ Scripturæ documenta discantur.

⁶ Con. Tul-

lense, al. Ad Saponarias. can. x. Statuimus ut scholæ Sanctarum Scripturarum, et humanæ quoque literaturæ, &c. constituentur.

⁷ Wharton.

Auctarium ad Usserii Hist. Dogmat. cap. iv. p. 346.

SECT. 10.—Lastly, From the Form and Tenour of the Ordination of Readers in the Church.

I only observe one thing more, that the very form and tenour of the ordination of readers anciently did manifestly imply, that the service of the ancient Church was always performed in a known tongue. For they were sometimes ordained with prayer to God for his Holy Spirit, to qualify them to read his word to the instruction and edification of the people. The form of their ordination in the Book of the Constitutions, prays,¹ “that God would give the reader wisdom, as He did to Esdras, to read his laws to the people.” Now it is well known how Esdras read the law to them, by causing them to understand the reading. Neh. viii. 7, 8. “they read in the book, in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.” And if all readers read, as Esdras did, they certainly either read, or interpreted the reading, in a known tongue. For he rendered that, which was written in the Hebrew tongue, into the Chaldee or Syriac, which was after the captivity the common language of the people. Cyprian twice or thrice speaks of the ordination and office of readers, and he plainly intimates, that the people understood what they read out of the Gospel to them. In one place, speaking of Celerinus, the confessor, whom he had ordained a reader, he says,² “it was very fitting he should read the Gospel, who had so courageously and faithfully observed it; and that the same tongue, which had confessed the Lord, should be daily heard to repeat what the Lord hath spoken: since there was nothing wherein a confessor could more advantage his brethren, than to have them hear the Gospel read by the mouth of such a confessor and reader, whose faith was so brave an example.” In another epistle,³ speaking of Aurelius, the

¹ Constit. lib. viii. cap. xxii.

² Cypr. ep. xxxiv. al. xxxix.

p. 77. *Legal præcepta et evangelium Domini, quæ fortiter ac fideliter sequitur; vox Dominum confessa, in his quotidie, quæ Dominus locutus est, audiatur.*—Nihil est in quo magis confessor fratribus prosit, quàm ut dum evangelica lecto de ore ejus auditur, lectoris fidem quisquis audierit, imitetur.

³ Id. ep. xxxviii. al. xxxiii. p. 75. *Nihil magis congruit voci, quæ Dominum gloriosâ prædicatione confessa est, quam cele-*

confessor, whom he also ordained a reader, he says, “there was nothing more agreeable, than that that voice, which had so gloriously confessed the Lord, should sound forth in reading the lessons of the Lord: and after those lofty words, whereby he proclaimed the martyrdom of Christ, he should read the Gospel of Christ which makes martyrs.” The Gospel was then so read, that the hearers might reap advantage by it, whilst they understood the doctrines and precepts that were read to them out of it. And such was the advantage, which some hearers in those days reaped from the benefit of having the Scriptures read in their own tongue, that it is very remarkable what is related of one or two of them, that being men of good memories, they got the Scriptures by heart, without any knowledge of letters, only by hearing them constantly read in the Church or elsewhere. St. Austin¹ remarks this of St. Antony, the famous Egyptian monk, that without being able to read himself, he made such a proficiency in the the knowledge of the Scriptures, as both by hearing them read to be able to repeat them, and by his own prudent meditation to understand them. And Gregory the Great² gives a like instance in one Servulus, a poor man at Rome, who though he knew not a letter in the book, yet purchasing a Bible, and entertaining religious men, he prevailed with them to read it continually to him, by which means he perfectly learned the Holy Scriptures. It is a yet more astonishing instance, which Eusebius³ gives in one of the martyrs of Palestine, a blind man, called John, who had so happy a memory, that he could repeat any part of the Bible as readily as others could read it. And he sometimes supplied the office of a reader in the Church; and he did

brandis divinis lectionibus personare: post verba sublimia quæ Christi martyrium prolocuta sunt, evangelium Christi legere, unde martyres fiunt.

¹ Aug. de Doctrinâ Christianâ in Prologo. tom. iii. p. 3. Sine ullâ scientiâ literarum Scripturas divinas, et memoriter audiendo tenuisse, et prudenter cogitando intellexisse prædicatur.

² Greg. Hom. xv. in Evangelia. tom. iii. p. 40. Nequaquam literas noverat, sed Scripturæ sacræ sibi met codices emerat; et religiosos quosque in hospitalitatem suscipiens, hos coram se legere sine intermissione faciebat. Factumque est, ut quantum ad mensuram propriam attinet, plenè sacram Scripturam disceret; cùm sicut dixi, literas funditùs ignoaret.

³ Euseb. de Martyr. Palæstin. cap. xiii. p. 311.

this to so great perfection, that Eusebius says, “ when he first heard him, he was perfectly amazed, and thought he had heard one reading out of a book, till he came a little more curiously to examine him and found that he did it only by the eyes of his understanding, having the Scriptures written not in books or tables of stone, but in the fleshly tables of his heart.” These and such like examples, of which there are many¹ in ancient story, are enough to raise in a man another sort of astonishment than that which Eusebius speaks of: I mean it would amaze a man to think, that there should be a Church in the world pretending to the height of purity and devotion, which yet runs counter to this indisputable practice of the ancient Church, whose public readers never once pretended to read any part of Scripture in an unknown tongue: that being as much against the design of their ordination, as it is against the design of the Scripture itself: for the one was written, and the other ordained to read what was written, for men’s learning and instruction. Yea, the very form of ordaining readers, as it stands still in the Roman Pontifical, shews as much: for it is much ancients than the corruption that is now crept into their service, and only stands there as a monument of their reproach, who oblige their readers to act directly contrary to the design of their office, and the very instructions that are given them in their ordination. For there the bishop still, in conferring the order of readers, uses this form:² “ Study to pronounce the Word of God, that is, the sacred lessons, distinctly and plainly to the understanding and edification of the faithful, without any error or falshood; that ye may teach your hearers both by word and example.” This was a very proper form of exhortation to be given to readers at their ordination, while the ancient custom continued of reading in a known tongue: but now it is no better than mockery, to tell men they are obliged by the vow of their ordination to read the Scriptures to the understanding, and

¹ Vide Palladium Vit. Chrysost. cap. xvii. Socrat. lib. vii. cap. xxii.

² Pontifical. Roman. Cap. de Ordinatio. Lectorum. Studete verba Dei, videlicet lectiones sacras, distinctè et apertè ad intelligentiam et edificationem fidelium absque omni mendacio falsitatis proferre.—Quatenus auditores vestros verbo pariter et exemplo docere possitis.

instruction, and edification of the people; and at the same time tie up their mouths, that they shall not read a word that may be understood, but it must all be in an unknown tongue. This monstrous contradiction in their own practice one would think, might bring men to see their error, and, what some in their communion¹ have been so long pleading for, oblige them to return to the useful and edifying practice of the primitive Church.

CHAP. V.

Of the Original and Use of Liturgies, in stated and set Forms of Prayer in the Primitive Church.

SECT. 1.—Every Bishop at Liberty in the First Ages, to order the Form of Divine Service in his own Church.

THE next inquiry is concerning the ancient manner of performing divine service: whether they did it by stated liturgies, which we usually call set forms of prayer, or by unlimited liberty of prophesying and extempore conceptions? The question about set forms of worship has more disturbed the present Church than any other: and yet after all there can be no public prayer, but it will be a set form, at least to the congregation. For though we suppose the minister to pray extempore, and vary the method, the form and the phrase every time he prays; yet to make it common prayer to a congregation, it will be a form to them, though a new form every time, in spite of all contradiction. And I have often wondered, that discerning men should not observe this, before they charged all forms of prayer as void of the Spirit, or a stinting of the Spirit: since if they were so, extemporary forms would be as much stinting the Spirit of the congregation as any other: and perhaps in some measure more so; since in stated forms, which every one knows beforehand, men may be supposed to make them their own

¹ Vid. Fredric. Furius Coriolanus de libris sacris in vernaculam linguam convertendis.

heartly prayers by preceding meditation ; whereas in extemporary forms every man must wait till he hears what is said, and then join in that form, or else not pray at all, but only privately by himself, not in any public or common prayer jointly with the rest of the congregation. For which reason I shall not here inquire simply, whether the public worship of the Ancients was by a form or no : since it is impossible there should be any public worship of a congregation, as a congregation, joining in common prayer to God, without having a common form dictated to them some way or other for all to join in ? But the question shall only be, whether they used stated forms of worship, or new extemporary forms in every Church assembly ? And here we must distinguish, 1. Between divine forms, and forms of human institution. 2. Between ordinary and extraordinary occasions. Between the times of extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and the times when those miraculous gifts abated. Now there is no doubt to be made, but that the forms of divine institution were always used in the Church without any variation. As the form of baptism, the Lord's prayer, the singing of David's Psalms, the forms of benediction, such as, " the Lord be with you, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c." The constant use of the form of baptism has been demonstrated already.¹ The use of the Lord's prayer and the rest shall be shewed hereafter.² As to forms of human institution, they were added by the bishops and governors of the Church according to their wisdom and discretion. And this with relation to the ordinary service. For still they were at liberty to compose new forms for extraordinary emergencies and occasions. And whilst the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit continued, there is little doubt to be made, but that prayers and hymns, immediately dictated by the Spirit, made up a part of the ordinary service ; still retaining such forms as were antecedently of divine appointment. When the extraordinary Spirit of prophecy ceased, then the rulers of the Church supplied this want by proper forms of their own composition, according to Christian prudence and discretion.

¹ Book. ii. chap. iii.

² Book xiii. chap. vii.

And this seems to have been the true original of liturgies, or stated forms of divine-service. But why then have we none of these Liturgies remaining entire and perfect to this day? I answer, there may be several reasons assigned for this. One is, that the bishops at first made every one their own liturgy for the private use, as we may call it, of their own particular Churches. And therefore the use of them not extending further than the precincts of their own dioceses, there was little knowledge of them beyond the bounds of those churches, and not much care to preserve them but only for the uses of such churches, for which they were particularly designed. That every bishop had at first this power and privilege to compose and order the form of divine-service for his own church, I have shewn in another placed,¹ where I had occasion to discourse of the independency of bishops, and their absolute power in their own church: where, among other things, I observed, that as they had the privilege to word their own creeds, so they had the privilege to frame their own liturgy; which privilege they retained for several ages. As may be confirmed by this further and most certain observation; that when any new episcopal church was taken and erected out of another, the new erected church was not obliged to follow the model and prescriptions of the old church, but might frame to herself a form of divine service agreeable to her own circumstances and condition. Of which Sozomen² gives a clear evidence in the instance of Maiuma, a city raised from a village in Palestine, and once belonging to the diocese of Gaza: for as soon as it was erected into a distinct episcopal see, it was no longer obliged to observe precisely the rules and forms of the church of Gaza, but had, as he particularly remarks, a calendar for the festivals of its own martyrs, and commemorations of their own bishops and presbyters that had lived among them. Which is the same thing, as to say, they had a liturgy and service of their own, independent of the church out of which they were taken.

¹ Book. ii. chap. vi. sect. 2.

² Sozomen. lib. v. cap. iii.

SECT. 2.—In after Ages the Churches of a whole Province by Consent conformed to the Liturgy of the Metropolitan.

In after ages bishops agreed by consent to conform their liturgy to the model of the metropolitan Church of the province to which they belonged. And then it was enacted into a law by several councils, that the same order and uniformity should be observed in all Churches. The rudiments of this discipline were first laid in the French Churches. For in the Council of Agde a canon was made about the year 506,¹ “that one and the same order should be equally observed in all Churches of the province in all parts of divine service.” And in the Council of Epone it is more expressly said,² that in celebrating divine offices, the provincial bishop should observe the same order as was observed by the metropolitan.” And before these, the Council of Vannes, in Bretany in the province of Tours, made a like order for that whole province,³ “that one and the same custom in celebrating divine service, and the same order of psalmody should be kept in all Churches; that as they held one faith and confession of the Holy Trinity, so they should keep to one rule of divine offices; lest, if they varied in their observations, that variation should be interpreted as a disagreement in some point or other.” And the same rule was made and concerted in the Spanish Churches. For in the Council of Girone, Anno 517, a like decree was made for the whole province of Tarragone or Catalonia,⁴ “that the same order of mass, and custom in psalmody, and other

¹ Con. Agathens. can. xxx. Quia convenit ordinem Ecclesiæ ab omnibus æqualiter observari, studendum est ubique (sicut fit) et post antiphonas, collectiones per ordinem ab episcopis vel presbyteris dici, &c.

² Con. Epauuens. can. xxvii. Ad celebrandum divina officia, ordinem, quem metropolitani tenent, provinciales observare debebunt.

³ Con. Veneticum. can. xv. Rectum quoque duximus, ut vel intra provinciam nostram sacrorum ordo, et psallendi una sit consuetudo; ut sicut unam cum Trinitatis confessione fidem tenemus, unam et officiorum regulam teneamus: ne, variatâ observatione, in aliquo observatio nostra discrepare videatur.

⁴ Con. Gerundense. can. i. Ut institutio missarum, sicut in metropolitana ecclesiâ agitur, ita in Dei nomine in omni Tarraconensi provinciâ tam ipsius missæ ordo, quàm psallendo vel ministranda, consuetudo servetur.

ministrations, should be observed in all Churches of the province, as was observed in the metropolitane Church." The fourth Council of Toledo enlarged the order for uniformity in all the Churches of Spain and Galicia,¹ obliging all priests to perform divine offices in the same manner, that there might be no diversity among them, and that such difference might neither offend the weak, nor look like a schism in the Church to ignorant and carnal men." Therefore they appointed, " that one order should be observed in praying and singing, and the same method be kept in the morning and evening service, because they were all of the same faith, and the same kingdom." And the first Council of Braga has four or five canons to the same purpose,² appointing " the same order of psalmody, and lessons, and salutations, and the same forms of celebrating baptism and the eucharist to be observed in all Churches." So that though every bishop at first had liberty to frame a liturgy for the use of his own Church; yet in process of time they agreed by consent to take the liturgy of the metropolitane Church as a standard for the whole province: and when the Roman Empire began to be cantonised and divided into different kingdoms, then came in the use of national liturgies, whose use was commensurate to the bounds and limits of their respective nations and kingdoms.

SECT. 3.—Why none of the Ancient Liturgies are now remaining perfect and entire, as they were in their first Original.

If it be inquired, why then none of the ancient liturgies are now remaining, as they were at first composed for the use of particular Churches? I answer, several reasons

¹ Con. Tolet. iv. can. 2. Placuit omnes sacerdotes, qui catholicæ fidei unitatem complectimur, ut nihil ultra diversum aut dissonum in ecclesiasticis sacramentis agamus, ne quælibet nostra diversitas apud ignotos seu carnales schismatis errorem videatur ostendere, et multis extet in scandalum varietas ecclesiarum. Unus ergo orandi atque psallendi ordo à nobis per omnem Hispaniam atque Galliciam conservetur; unus modus in missarum solemnitatibus; unus in vespertinis officiis, nec diversa sit ultra in nobis ecclesiastica consuetudo, quia in unâ fide continemur et regno.

² Con. Bracar. i. can. 19. Placuit ut unus atque idem psallendi ordo in matutinis vel vespertinis officiis teneatur. &c. Vid. can. 20, 21, 22, 23, ibid.

may be assigned for this. 1. The very liberty, which every bishop had to frame the liturgy of his own Church, was one reason why none of these are now remaining perfect and entire, as they were at first composed for the use of such a particular Church. For the design of them being only for the use of such a particular Church, there was no great reason to be very solicitous, either to communicate and diffuse the knowledge of them to other Churches, or to preserve them entire to posterity, who were not precisely tied up to the use of them, but might frame others at their own discretion. 2. It is not improbable, but that as a late learned French writer has observed,¹ the ancient liturgies were for some ages only certain forms of worship committed to memory, and known by practice, rather than committed to writing, which is the only certain way of preserving such sort of monuments to late posterity. This seems very probable, because in the persecutions under Diocletian and his associates, though a strict inquiry was made after the books of Scripture, and other things belonging to the Church, which were often delivered up by the *Traditores* to be burnt, yet we never read of any ritual books, or books of divine-service, delivered up among them. Which is an argument, that their forms of worship and administration of the sacraments, were not then generally committed to writing, or at least not compiled in books, distinct from the Psalms or other books of Scripture: otherwise, it is very probable, that as the Scriptures, with other utensils and treasures of the Church, were often found by the heathens, or betrayed by apostatising Christians, and delivered up to be burnt; so we should have heard something of their books of divine worship undergoing the same fate: since they were so curious in inquiring after the cups, and lamps, and torches, and vestments and other utensils and vessels of the Church, as in some of their Calendars and Breviats we find they were, would hardly have omitted their books of worship, as being more proper objects of their spite and malice, had they found any such in the Christian Churches. Mr. Daille² argues well upon this

¹ Renaudotius. *Collectio Liturgiar. Oriental. Dissertat. i. p. 9. tom. i. Par. 1716.*

² Daille de Cultu Relig. lib. i. cap. 25.

foot against the use of images in the ancient Church, because no such thing was ever found or betrayed to the Heathen in the times of their most furious inquisition after any thing that related to the Christian Church or religion: and I think the argument will hold as well against having their Liturgies compiled into books and volumes, since it is scarcely possible that such things in difficult times should have wholly escaped the notice and fury of their enemies. We are not hence to conclude, as some weak men might perhaps be inclined to do, that therefore they had no liturgies or set forms of divine worship in these persecuting ages of the Church; because there are undeniable evidences to the contrary, as we shall see by and by: but we are only to conclude, that they did not so generally compile them in books as in after-ages, but used them by memory, and made them familiar to the people by known and constant practice, as many now use forms of prayer at this day without committing them to writing. And this is another reason, why none of those ancient Liturgies are come to our hands perfect and entire, but only in scattered fragments, as the Fathers had occasion to mention them incidentally in their writings. Nor need we wonder at this, since even those Liturgies, which were most certainly compiled in books, in the following ages, are now in a great measure lost also by the injuries of time, as the old Gallican, Spanish, African, and Roman Liturgies, of which there is nothing but fragments and dismembered parcels now remaining. Which is a third reason, why none of those ancient Liturgies are extant at this day. The fourth and last reason, is the interpolations and additions made to the ancient Liturgies in future ages. For though those ancient Liturgies, which go under the name of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, might originally have something of their composition in them, yet so many additions and alterations have been made in them by the Greek Church in following ages, that it is not easy to discern, after they have passed through so many hands, and so much new modelling, what was the genuine composition of the first authors. And therefore I have made little use of them in this work, but rather chosen to collect the fragments of the ancient Liturgy from the scattered remains in the genuine writings of

the Fathers; joining with them such forms as we find in the ancient book, called the Apostolical Constitutions: which though it be not so ancient, as the title pretends, nor of so venerable authority as Mr. Whiston contends for, who would have it to be truly apostolical, yet it is owned to be a good collection of the Liturgy and rituals of the Church in the third and fourth centuries, and less corrupted than any other Liturgy that bears the name of an ancient writer: the true reason of which was, because it never being of that esteem as to be used as a standing Liturgy in any Church the book came down to us with less alterations than other Liturgies, which were new modelled, according to the different taste and sentiments of the ages they passed through, as all things of this kind are commonly revised and altered by several hands, when they are in constant use and practice. For proof of which we need go no further than the example of our own Liturgy, which has received many reviews, alterations and additions from the time it was first compiled in the days of King Edward. Upon this score those Liturgies, which bear the names of ancient authors, are not to be depended on, as the genuie, unmixed Liturgies of those authors, having undergone so many alterations, interpolations and additions by passing through various hands in succeeding ages. For as much therefore as we have now no ancient Liturgies perfect and entire, as they were first composed, we must take our accounts and estimate of them from other fountains: and by the Providence of God there is so much of them remaining in the genuine writings of the ancient Fathers, as both to shew us in general that the Church made use of stated forms of worship, and also what was the particular order and method of her worship in the most considerable parts of her sacred service and devotions. We will therefore first give some account of the use of Liturgies and sacred rites in general, and then proceed to explain in order the several parts of the ancient service in the same natural method as we find it was performed, at several times, either in the daily or weekly assemblies for that purpose.

SECT. 4.—What Forms used in the Apostles' Days. Where of the Ancient Forms used in the Jewish Worship, and of the New Forms introduced into the Christian Service.

As to the use of Liturgies in general, I shall begin with the apostolical times, and carry the history through the four first ages. The apostolical practice may be considered in a double respect; first, in their compliance with the stated forms settled among the Jews, and secondly, in the new forms introduced into the Christian service. As to the former, there seems to be nothing more uncontested among learned men, than that the Jews had set forms of worship in all parts of divine service, and that the Apostles freely used these in all instances, in which they thought it necessary or becoming to join with them. Their ordinary service was of two sorts, the service of the temple, and the service of the synagogue. These differed in many respects, but both agreed in this, that the public prayers in both were offered up in a certain constant form of words. For their private prayers, which every man made particularly by himself, which were like those silent prayers we shall hereafter¹ meet with in the Christian Church, a late learned writer tells us,² they had no public forms to pray by, nor any public ministers to officiate to them herein; but all prayed in private conceptions: but their public prayers were directed by public forms both in the service of the temple and the synagogue. The Temple-service is very accurately described by Dr. Lightfoot, as it stood in the time of our Saviour: the sum of his description is this.³ First, before the offering of the sacrifice, the president called upon them to go to prayers, which they began with this form: "Thou has loved us, O Lord our God, with an everlasting love, with great and abundant compassion hast Thou had mercy on us, O our Father, our King, for our fathers' sakes, who trusted in Thee, and Thou taughtest them statutes of life. So be gracious to us also, O our Father, O most

¹ See Book xv. chap. i. History. part. i. chap. vi. p. 382. Service. chap. ix. sect. 4. p. 108.

² Prideaux Connection of Scripture

³ Lightfoot, Temple-

merciful Father, O Thou compassionate One, pity us. And put into our hearts to know, understand, obey, learn, teach, observe, do, and perform, all the words of the doctrine of thy law in love, and enlighten our eyes by thy law, and cause our hearts to cleave to thy commandments, and unite our hearts to love and to fear thy name, &c." After this prayer they rehearsed the Ten Commandments, and after the Ten Commandments they said over their phylacteries, in Hebrew called *Tephillin*, which contained four portions of the law written in four parchments. The first out of Exodus, xiii. from ver. 3. to 10. The second out of Exod. xiii. from ver. 11 to 16. The third out of Deut. vi. from ver. 4 to 9. The fourth out of Deut. xi. from ver. 13 to 21. After this prayer and rehearsal of the Decalogue and of their phylacteries, at the time of offering incense, they had three or four prayers more; the first of which was in this form, referring to their phylacteries: "Truth and stability, and firm and sure, and upright and faithful, and beloved, and lovely, and delightful, and fair, and terrible, and glorious, and ordered and acceptable, and good and beautiful is this word for us for ever and ever. The truth of the Everlasting God our King, the Rock of Jacob, the Shield of our salvation, for ever and ever. He is sure, and his name sure, and his throne settled, and his kingdom and truth established for evermore," &c.

The second prayer was in this form: "Be pleased, O Lord our God, with thy people Israel, and with their prayer, and restore the service to the oracle of thy house, and accept the burnt-offering of Israel, and their prayer in love and complacency; and let the service of thy people Israel be continually well-pleasing unto Thee." And they concluded thus: "We praise Thee, who art the Lord our God, and the God of our Fathers, the God of all flesh, our Creator and the God of all creatures: glory and praise be to thy great and holy name, because Thou hast preserved and kept us; so preserve and keep us, and bring back our captivity to the courts of thy holiness," &c.

A third prayer ran thus: "Appoint peace, goodness, and blessing, grace, mercy, and compassion for us, and for all Israel thy people. Bless us, O our Father, even all of us as one man, with the light of thy countenance: for in

the light of thy countenance Thou, O Lord our God, hast given us the law of life, and loving mercy and righteousness, and blessing and compassion, and life and peace: let it please Thee to bless thy people Israel at all times. Let us and all thy people the house of Israel be remembered and written before Thee in the book of life, with blessing and peace, &c."

A fourth prayer was used on the Sabbath as a blessing, by the course that went out of their service, upon those that came in to do the service of the following week, in these words: "He that caused his name to dwell in this house, caused love and brotherhood, and peace, and friendship, to dwell among you."

After these things the priests lifted up their hands and blessed the people in that form of words, which is in Numb. vi. 24. "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee, the Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." To which the people answered, "Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, from everlasting to everlasting."

After this blessing, the meat-offering, and the drink-offering was offered, and then began the singing of psalms and the music. The constant and ordinary psalms, which they sung, were these:

On the first day of the week, the xxivth psalm, "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof, &c."

On the second day, psalm xlviii. "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of God, &c."

On the third day, the lxxxiiid psalm, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, and judgeth among Gods, &c."

On the fourth day, the xcivth psalm, "O Lord God, to whom vengeance belongeth, &c."

On the fifth day, psalm lxxxi. "Sing aloud unto God our strength, make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob, &c."

On the sixth day, psalm xciii. "The Lord reigneth, He is clothed with majesty, &c."

On the Sabbath day they sang psalm xcii. which bears the title of "A psalm or song for the Sabbath day," both in the Hebrew Bibles, and the translation of the Septuagint.

These were the known, and constant, and fixed psalms for the several days of the week throughout the year.¹ But upon some certain days they had additional psalms and hymns. For on the Sabbath, as there was an additional sacrifice appointed, Numb. xxviii. 9. so at the time of this additional sacrifice, the Levites sang the Song of Moses, Deut. xxxii. "Hear, O heavens, and I will speak," which they divided into six Sabbaths for the morning service: and at the evening service they sang that other Song of Moses, Exod. xv. "I will sing unto the Lord for He triumphed gloriously: the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea, &c." By which custom of singing the songs of Moses upon the Sabbath, Dr. Lightfoot observes,² that that passage in Rev. xv. 3. may be illustrated, where the saints are said to "sing the song of Moses, the servant of God:" because they were now come to their everlasting Sabbath, having gotten the victory over the beast and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, and having the harps of God in their hands. Which allusion to the Sabbath-service in the time of St. John, is a good argument for the antiquity of the practice.

Besides this, there was an additional sacrifice appointed on the first day of the year, called the Feast of Trumpets, Numb. xxix. 1. and at this time they sang the eighty-first psalm, "Sing aloud unto God our strength, &c." And at the evening-service of this day, the twenty-ninth psalm, "The voice of the Lord shaketh the wilderness, &c."

Also at the Passover, besides many other forms, they were used to sing the hymn, called, the Egyptian Hallel, because it was sung in remembrance of their delivery out of Egypt: which consisted of the cxiii, cxiv, cxv, cxvi, cxvii, and cxviii psalms. And this, as some observe,³ was sung also at the beginning of every month, and on the Feast of Dedication, and the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles. And the latter part of it is generally sup-

¹ Lightfoot Temple-Service, chap. vii. p. 59.

² Ibid. p. 61.

³ Otho. Lexicon. Rabbia. p. 236.

posed to be the hymn which our Saviour sung with his disciples at the conclusion of his last supper.

This is the sum of the Jewish Temple-service, as it stood in our Saviour's time, with which, notwithstanding its stated forms, both He and his disciples complied, whenever they had occasion upon any such solemnities to frequent the Temple.

The service of the synagogue was something different from that of the Temple. For here were no sacrifices, but only these three things: 1. Prayers. 2. Reading of the Scriptures. 3. Preaching and expounding upon them. Their public prayers, like those of the Temple, were all by stated forms. Among these the most ancient and solemn were those, which are called *Shemoneh Eshreh*, that is, *the eighteen prayers*, which are said to have been appointed by Ezra and the great synagogue from the time of the Captivity. These have been lately translated and published by Dr. Prideaux in his *Connexion of Scripture-History*,¹ which, because it is a work that deserves to be in every one's hands, I shall not here transcribe, but refer the reader thither for the knowledge of them. Only, whereas he observes rightly, that another prayer, called the nineteenth, was added a little before the destruction of Jerusalem, against the Christians, who are therein meant under the names of apostates and heretics; I shall confirm his observation from a passage in Epiphanius,² who tells us, that the Jews in their synagogues were used to pray against the Christians in this form: “*Κατάρασαι ὁ Θεὸς τὰς Ναζαράϊας, O God, curse the Nazarenes.*” And the same thing is intimated by Justin Martyr,³ who says, “immediately after our Saviour's resurrection the Jews sent forth their chosen emissaries to all the synagogues in the world to tell them, that there was a certain, impious, lawless sect risen up under one Jesus, a Galilean impostor, whom they had crucified, but his disciples came by night, and

¹ Part i. book vi. p. 375.
fine.

² Epiphani. Hærer. 29. Nazaræor. in

³ Justin. Dial. cum. Tryph. p. 335. Also Hieron. ad Esa. v. 18. Ter per singulos dies in omnibus synagogis sub nomine Nazaræorum anathematizant Judæi nomen Christianum.

stole him away out of the grave, and deceived men by saying, he was risen from the dead, and ascended into heaven:" and he adds, "that after their city was demolished they repented not, but even dared "*καταρῶσαι αὐτῶς*, to curse him, and all that believed on Him." Which plainly refers to this additional prayer inserted into their Liturgy against the Christians. But excepting this prayer, which was of later date, all the other seem to have been in use in the time of our Saviour and his Apostles. And as we are sure they frequented the synagogues, so there is no doubt to be made, but that they joined in these usual forms of prayer, which were one part of the synagogue-service.

The other parts of this service, were the reading of the Law and the Prophets, and expounding of them to the people. Which was also done by a certain rule and order. For the Five Books of Moses were divided into as many sections or lessons, as there are weeks in the year, one of which was read every Sabbath, and half of the same every Monday and Thursday, which were their days of assembly for the synagogue-service. At these our Saviour was usually present, and sometimes assisted and officiated in reading, according to custom, as a member of the synagogue, as is expressly said of him, Luke iv. 16. and at other times taught in their synagogues, Mark i. 39. Luke iv. 15, 44. which is also noted of St. Paul, Acts xiii. 15. and xvi. 13. and xvii. 2. and xviii. 4. that it was his manner on the Sabbath-days to go into the synagogues, where prayer was wont to be made, and there, after the reading of the Law and the Prophets, to preach to the people, and dispute or reason with them. So that notwithstanding the public service of the synagogue was all performed by order and form, yet this was no reason to the Apostles to refrain from it, as a thing simply sinful or unlawful; but they complied with it for some time, probably to gain upon the Jews the better, and make them lay aside their prejudices against the Christian doctrine.

But besides their compliance with the stated forms of the Jewish Liturgy and worship, they had some forms of their own in constant use among themselves. Among which we

may safely venture to reckon, 1. The Lord's-prayer, as a form appointed by Christ to be used by all his disciples ; of which the primitive Christians never made any dispute, as we shall see more fully hereafter. 2. The form of baptism constantly used without any variation, as has been shewed in a former book.¹ 3. The forms of professing their faith in baptism, or the forms of sound words settled in every Church. 4. The forms of renouncing Satan, and covenanting with Christ in baptism. 5. The forms of Scripture-hymns and psalms, and glorifications of God. To which the Ancients seem to add, 6, the forms of benediction, such as, " The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c." And lastly, the repetition of the history of Christ's institution of the last Supper, as a necessary part of consecration, which together with the use of the Lord's-prayer in the celebration of the eucharist is generally thought to descend from apostolical practice. These things are sufficient to shew, that even the Apostles themselves, notwithstanding the extraordinary gift of inspired prayer, whether in matter, or method, or words, or languages, sometimes confined themselves to forms, without any reflection on their gifts, or stinting of the Spirit, or want of edification to their hearers. If these things be rightly considered, some of them at least will evince, that the use of well chosen and well appointed forms, are no ways disagreeable to apostolical practice, since the Apostles themselves both complied with the forms in use in the Jewish temple and synagogue and used some others of Christian institution. I now proceed to carry this inquiry through the three or four following ages of the Church.

And here first we may add what Josephus says of the Essenes,² that they were used to rise before the sun was up and offer unto God " *πατρῖς τινας εὐχὰς, certain prayers according to the custom of their forefathers, or such as they had received from them :*" and what Philo says³ of the Therapeutæ of Alexandria, the Ascetics, whether Jews or

¹ Book xi. chap. iii.

² Joseph. de Bello Jud. lib. ii. cap. 12.

³ Philo de Vitâ Contem-

plativâ, tom. ii. p. 1211.

Christians, that lived there in his time, that the president among them, after he had made a sermon, first began to sing an hymn to the praise of God, either such as he had composed himself, or one taken out of the ancient Prophets, in the close of which they all, both men and women, joined in concert with him. Again in their vigils¹ they divided themselves into two choirs the one of men, the other of women, each of which had their precentor, and so they sang hymns to the glory of God, composed in divers sorts of metre, sometimes one side singing and sometimes the other, in imitation of the children of Israel, under the conduct of Moses and Miriam, their precentors, at the Red-sea. This was so much a resemblance of the ancient Christian way of psalmody, that Eusebius,² who transcribes a great many things out of this curious Tract of Philo, was clearly of opinion, that it was a description of the worship of such Jews as had embraced the Christian religion: in which opinion he is followed not only by St. Jerom,³ but by many learned writers of this last age also. I shall not need to determine this question, whether they were Jews or Christians: it is sufficient to our present purpose, that their way of worshipping God by certain forms of praise, and those of human composition, was the same, or so much alike, that it was not easy to distinguish the one from the other.

SECT. 5.—What Evidence there is of the Use of set Forms in the second Century.

In the beginning of the second century lived Pliny, a Roman proconsul in Bythynia, who giving Trajan the Emperor an account of the Christian way of worship, which he had from the mouth of some apostates, says, “ They were used to meet on a certain day before it was light, and sing an hymn alternately to Christ as God, binding themselves by an oath or sacrament not to any wicked thing, but that they would not steal, nor rob, nor commit adultery,

¹ Philo de Vitâ contemplativâ, tom. ii. p. 1215.
ii. cap. 17.

² Euseb. lib.

³ Hieron. de Scriptor. cap. xxi.

nor break their faith, nor withhold the pledge.”¹ The word “*Carmen dicere*,” which Pliny uses, will signify a solemn form of prayer, as well as praises, as Vossius² and Brissonius³ have observed out of the Roman writers: and then it will denote, that their whole divine-service was by a stated form. However in the most restrained sense it implies, that they used certain forms in some part of their service in their alternate hymnody, which could not otherwise be performed but by composition and prescription. And that makes it probable, that the rest of their service was then of the same nature and order.

In the beginning of the same century Ignatius is said by the ancient historians to have brought in the way of alternate singing into the Church of Antioch;⁴ that is, hymns sung alternately to the praise of the Holy Trinity. For they speak not of the alternate singing of David’s Psalms, as introduced by Ignatius, but of hymns composed by him to set forth the Divinity of Christ: which appears to have been a very ancient practice, not only from what has been already observed out of the account given by Pliny, but from what is said by that ancient author in Eusebius,⁵ who wrote against the heresy of Artemon in the latter end of the second century; where, among other arguments which he brings for the Church’s constant belief of our Saviour’s Divinity, he urges this for one, that from the beginning there were psalms and hymns composed by the brethren, and written by the faithful, setting forth the praises of Christ as the Word of God, and declaring the Divinity of his person. Among these hymns we may reckon those of Ignatius, composed for the service of the Church of Antioch, which probably might continue in use till Paulus Samosatenensis removed them out of the Church, and introduced others in their room, as the Fathers of the Council of Antioch, mentioned in Eusebius,⁶ object against him.

It is not improbable likewise, but that Ignatius, as he

¹ Plin. lib. x. ep. 97.

² Voss. Comment. in Loc. p. 97.

³ Brisson. de. Formulis p. 97.

⁴ Socrat. lib. vi. cap. 8.

Hist. Tripartita. lib. x. cap. 9.

⁵ Euseb. lib. v. cap. 28. See

this cited before. Chap. ii. sect. 3.

⁶ Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 24.

made hymns, so might compose a whole form of prayers for the use of his own Church, as was customary for bishops to do in those days. To which custom he seems to refer in his Epistle to the Magnesians, when he bids them do nothing without the bishops and the presbyters; nor attempt any thing seemingly agreeable to their private fancies: but, when they met together,¹ to have one prayer and one supplication. Which not only forbids them to break out and divide into schisms and separate assemblies, but also to conform to the order of prayers agreed upon by the bishop and presbytery of the Church.

Not long after Ignatius, we meet with collateral evidence of Lucian the Heathen, who had some knowledge of the Christian service. For in one of his Dialogues, describing his coming into a religious assembly, he says, he there heard that prayer which began with the Father, and ended with the hymn of many names.² It is more than probable, that by the prayer beginning with the Father, he means the Lord's-prayer, which was of known and general use in the eucharistical service, but it is not so clear what he means by the hymn of many names, that came after it. Bp. Wettenhall³ takes it for the lesser or common doxology "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost:" Dr. Smith⁴ and others for the great doxology, "Glory be to God on high;" which I think more probable: though it is not necessary in our present inquiry, to determine what hymn it was: it being sufficient to our purpose, that he speaks of some prayers and hymns then of such common and vulgar use in the Christian worship, as that they were known to the very Heathens.

Justin Martyr's authority is commonly alleged on both sides, both for and against Liturgies. The defenders of prescribed forms urge his mentioning, "*κοινὰς εὐχὰς, com-*

¹ Ignat. Ep. ad Magnesian. n. 7. Μηδὲ περιάσσητε εὐλογόν τι φαίνεσθαι ἰδίᾳ ὑμῶν· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μία προσευχή, μία ἕησις. ² Lucian. Philopatris. p. 1123. Τὴν εὐχὴν ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἀρξάμενος, ἔς τὴν πολυώνυμον ὡδήν εἰς τέλος ἐπιθεῖς.

³ Wettenhall. Gift of Singing. chap. ii. p. 273.

⁴ Smith. Account of the Greek Church. p. 226. Comber. Orig. of Liturgies. chap. ii. p. 30. takes it for the Trisagion.

mon prayers:"¹ the opposers with great vehemence argue for extempore prayer, because, he says, the bishop offered prayers and thanksgivings, "ὄση δύναμις, *with all his might and power.*"² Now to speak freely, I think there is no demonstration in either of these expressions: for they are both ambiguous. Common prayer does not always imply, that the minister prayed by a prescribed form: for inspired prayer was doubtless common prayer, when offered in a public congregation; and though it was then a form prescribed to the people, yet it was not so to the minister: but conceived by immediate inspiration. Therefore we cannot argue barely from the mentioning of common prayer, that the minister prayed by a prescribed form, unless it be added, as usually it is in Chrysostom, that the congregation prayed "μᾶ φωνῇ, *with one voice,*" joining vocally in the whole prayer, or alternately by way of responses, with the minister. For that implies, that the people understood beforehand the words of their common prayers, before they were uttered by the minister. On the other hand there is no solidity in the argument brought against Liturgies, from Justin's saying, that the bishop prayed and gave thanks, "ὄση δύναμις, *with all his ability or power.*" For this may not at all relate to the invention of words, but to the ardency and intenseness of devotion, which may be in the use of prescribed forms, as well as those of immediate conception. And so it is plain the very same phrase is used by Nazianzen, when he exhorts the Christians to sing "ὄσα δύναμις, *with all their might,*" that triumphal hymn upon the death of Julian,³ which the children of Israel sang when the Egyptians were drowned in the Red-sea. Which was not an extempore hymn, but a form composed by Moses, and appointed to be sung alternately by the congregation of Israel, Exod. xv. So that after all the pains, that have been taken by some late writers to draw an argument against Liturgies out of this passage of Justin, there is no reason for such a conclusion: and yet this is the only passage that is brought against them. But it is more material to consider, that Justin lived among

¹ Justin. Apol. ii. p. 97.

Justin, *ibid.* p. 98.

³ Naz.

Orat. iii. quæ est l. *Invectiv. cont. Julian.* tom. i. p. 54.

the Jews, who certainly used set forms of prayer, one of which he condemns, as I have shewed before, as an execration inserted against the Christians, but says nothing against the other, which yet doubtless he would have done, had he believed the use of Liturgies to have been only a piece of Jewish superstition, unbecoming the spirit of a Christian. But he too well understood the practice of our Saviour and his Apostles, in complying with the forms of the Jewish service, to put any such mark or brand of infamy upon them. And therefore this is of more weight with me, to persuade that Justin believed the known forms both of the Jewish and Christian service to be lawful, than any ambiguous expressions are to persuade the contrary.

Not long after Justin lived Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in France. And he takes notice of a certain form used in the Christian worship, so well known to the Valentinian heretics, that they made use of it as an argument to prove their own fabulous doctrine of the *Æones*: “for,” said they,¹ “you yourselves of the Church in your thanksgivings say, ‘for ages of ages,’ or ‘Æones of Æones;’ thereby intimating the *Æones*, which we contend for.” This plainly refers to some form of thanksgiving then of known use in the Church. Dr. Comber and some others take it for the *Gloria Patri*, because it ends as that in Irenæus did, with the words, “world without end. Amen.” But I rather conceive with Dr. Grabe,² that it was the conclusion of the great thanksgiving in the eucharist; where the glorification of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, ends with the words “εἰς τὸς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, world without end;” to which the people always answered, Amen! As appears from the form remaining in the Constitutions,³ of which more in its proper place. About the same time lived Clemens of Alexandria, who, speaking of the Church, says, it was the congregation of those, who prostrated themselves in prayers, having as it were, “φωνὴν τὴν κοινὴν, one common voice.”⁴ Which implies, that their prayers were such as that they could join

¹ Iren. lib. i. c. i. Ἄλλα δὲ ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας λέγοντας, εἰς τὸς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἐκείνους τὸς αἰῶνας σημαίνειν.

Irenæi.

² Constit. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 12.

³ Grabe not. in Loc.

⁴ Clem.

Strom. vii. cap. vi. p. 848. Edit. Oxon.

vocally in them, either by repeating the whole, or at least by alternate responses. He also mentions a form of prayer used over the penitents by the Valentinians' imposition of hands, in the close of which were these words,¹ "that they may obtain angelical absolution." Not to mention that common form of doxology, which he uses at the end of his Pædagogus; "To whom be glory both now and for ever, world without end. Amen."

Next after him Tertullian often tells us, that they used the Lord's prayer as a form enjoined by divine command, of which I shall say more in a following chapter.² He also says,³ "that the form of baptism was appointed and prescribed by Christ to be always in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And not only so, but to this the Church added several other ceremonies and observations, which were not enjoined expressly in so many words by Christ. As the form of renouncing the devil and his pomp and his angels;⁴ the trine immersion; the interrogatories and responses, which were made in a certain form, to the articles of the Creed; the giving of milk and honey to the newly baptised; the obligation to abstain from bathing for a whole week after. All which observations were only of ecclesiastical institution and prescription. So again, their receiving the eucharist in their morning assemblies before day,⁵ which Christ instituted after supper; their annual oblations and commemorations for the dead; their avoiding fasting and refusing to pray kneeling on the Lord's-day, and the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost; their signing themselves with the sign of the cross upon all occasions; and their appointing of occasional fasts,⁶ together with the fast of lent and stationary days. None of which were of express divine command, but were instituted by the Church, with many other observations of the like nature, for the edification of her children, as her rules of discipline, and psalmody, and singing a particular psalm at the eucharist, which is mentioned by our author.⁷

¹ Clem. Epitome. p. 974. *ἐν τῇ χειροθεσίᾳ λέγεσθαι ἐπὶ τέλει, εἰς λύτρωσιν ἀγγελικῆν.* ² Chap. vii. ³ Tertul. de Bapt. cap. xiii. Lex

tinguendi imposita est, et forma præscripta. Ite, &c.

⁴ Tertul. de

Coron. Mil. cap. iii. et xiii. It de Bapt. cap. vi.

⁵ Tertul. de Coron.

Mil. cap. iii.

⁶ Tertul. de Jejun. cap. xiii.

⁷ Tertul. ibid.

Again he intimates,¹ that in all their assemblies they had not only sermons and prayers, but also the Scriptures read, and psalms sung to the glory of God. Which must be allowed to be forms of praise and glorification. Nor would it be material to suggest, that Tertullian, when he wrote this, was a Montanist; for both the Church and heretics commonly agreed in singing of David's psalms, and even vied in hymns of their own composition and prescription. Tertullian indeed does not expressly say, that their prayers, like their psalms, were offered in a certain form of words; but he says what may incline a man reasonably to believe it. For as a proof of the Christians' loyalty, he says,² "they met together, and as if they were drawn up in battle, did jointly set upon God with their prayers, which violence was acceptable to him. They prayed for the Emperors, for their officers and powers, for the state of the world, for the peace of their government, and for the continuance of their empire." And again he says, "they prayed constantly for all the Emperors, that they might have a long life and quiet reign; that their family might be safe, their armies valiant, their senate faithful, their people virtuous, and that the whole world might be in peace." Now these, as we shall see hereafter, were known parts of the Church's Liturgy; and if they had not been of constant use, they had been but poor arguments of the Christians' loyalty, for which Tertullian here produces them. In another place he expressly mentions the same doxology as Irenæus does before him; for speaking against Christians frequenting the Roman theatres, he asks them,³ "With what face they could go from the Church of God into the

¹ Tertul. de Anima. cap. ix. Jam verò prout Scripturæ leguntur, aut Psalmi canuntur, aut adlocutiones proferuntur, aut petitiones delegantur: ita inde materiæ visionibus subministrantur.

² Id. Apol. cap. xxxix. Coimus in cœtum et congregationem, ut ad Deum, quasi manu factâ, precationibus ambiamus orantes. Hæc vis Deo grata est. Oramus etiam pro Imperatoribus, pro ministris eorum et potestatibus, pro statu sæculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis. It. cap. xxx. Precantes sumus semper pro omnibus Imperatoribus, &c.

³ Tertul. de Spectac. cap. xxv. Quale est enim de ecclesiâ Dei in diaboli ecclesiam tendere?—Ex ore illo, quo Amen in sanctum protuleris, gladiatori testimonium reddere? Εἰς αἰῶνας alii omnino dicere nisi Deo Christo? Or as other copies have it, Nisi Deo et Christo.

Church of the devil? And with that mouth, wherewith they had said amen, at the consecration or reception of the eucharist, give testimony to a gladiator? Or say, ‘ world without end,’ to any besides God and Christ, or to any besides Christ their God?” I do not take this, with some learned men, to mean that common form of doxology, “ glory be to the Father, &c.” at the end of the psalms, but the conclusion of the consecration-prayer in the communion-service, which, as I noted before, always ended with those words, “ *εις αἰῶνας, world without end,*” to which the people subjoined their amen. And then it is an evident proof that the African Churches had a certain form of prayer for consecrating the eucharist, the known words of which Tertullian could allege to the people, as an argument to dissuade them from frequenting the heathen theatres. He also intimates, that they sang psalms and hymns alternately in private;¹ for, to dissuade Christian women from marrying heathen husbands, he uses this argument, what will such an husband sing to his wife, or the wife to her husband? But if they married Christian husbands, then they would sing psalms and hymns between themselves, and mutually provoke one another, and strive who should make the sweetest melody to their God.² And there is no doubt to be made, but that this private psalmody was an imitation of the public psalmody of the Church. So when he says, that at their feasts of charity, after the communion was ended, in the close of all, when they had washed their hands, and brought in lights,³ “ every one was excited either to sing something out of Scripture, or some hymn of his own composing:” this as plainly argues, that they made use of forms in this part of their private devotions. For the psalms of Scripture are undoubtedly forms: and hymns of private composition are no less so, unless we will suppose every one that sings has words suggested to him by immediate inspiration; which still will be a form to the congregation that hears it, though

¹ Tertul. ad Uxor. lib. ii. cap. vi. Quid maritus suus illi, vel marito quid illa cantabit? ² Ibid. cap. ix. Sonant inter duos psalmi et hymni, et mutuo provocant, quis melius Deo suo canet.

cap. xxxix. Ut quisque de Scripturis sanctis, vel de proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium Deo canere. ³ Tertul. Apol.

not to the person, who is so extraordinarily inspired by the Holy Ghost.

But there is one expression in Tertullian, which the opposers of Liturgies lay great stress upon, because he says, the Christians prayed for the Emperor,¹ “*sine monitore, quia de pectore, without any monitor, because they prayed from their heart.*” Which they expound, praying extempore. But if this be interpreted rigidly, it will prove much more than the objectors design. For if they prayed simply without any monitor, then it will exclude even the minister’s dictating to them his own conceptions; because these will be an admonition or direction to the people: and so all public prayer must cease, and all devotion be resolved into the private prayers of the people. Which is such an absurdity, as neither Tertullian ever thought of, nor the objectors themselves will allow. Whatever therefore be meant by this phrase, “praying from the heart without a monitor;” it cannot mean, that the people’s prayers were simply their own conceptions. Among the many interpretations which are put upon these words by learned men, which may be seen in Dr. Faulkner,² or Dr. Comber, I take these two to be the most natural, either first, that they prayed *memoriter*, saying their prayers by heart, and needing no prompter, as the Heathens did; which is the sense that Rigaltius,³ and Bishop Fell⁴ put upon it; in which sense it is an argument for Liturgies, and not against them, or secondly, that they prayed sincerely from the heart, and freely out of the loyalty of their own heart without compulsion, as Hamond Lesstrange, and Dr. Comber⁵ interpret it. Which seems to be the truest sense: for the Heathens were neither sincere, nor hearty, nor zealous in their prayers for the Emperor; but the Christians offered their prayers with all those due qualifications, as became the character of truly pious votaries, and loyal subjects. The sense of this dark passage being thus cleared, it remains no argument against Liturgies, un-

¹ Tertul. Apol. cap. xxx. chap. iv. sect. 2. Comber. Orig. of Liturgies, chap. ii. p. 47.

² Faulkner. Libertas Eccles. book i.

³ Rigalt. in Tertul. cap. xxx.

⁴ Fell. Not. in Cypr. de Orat. p. 152.

⁵ Lesstrange. Smectymniomastix. p. 5. Comber of Liturgies. p. 49.

less a man will say, there can be no such thing as sincerity and heartiness in a form of prayer. Which would be to condemn the whole Catholic Church in the time of Tertullian, from whose testimonies it is evident, that forms were generally used in most parts of divine service.

I have nothing further to add in this century, but only one or two small observations out of the Acts of St. Perpetua, and Felicitas, two African martyrs, who suffered in the latter end of this age. There it is remarked of Perpetua,¹ that seeming in a vision to receive the eucharist into her hands and eat it, all that stood round her said, amen! alluding to the custom of saying, amen! at the reception of it from the hands of the minister in the church. There is a like allusion to the use of the Trisagion, Holy! Holy! Holy!² which the angels used in Heaven. And a further intimation of the solemn custom of giving the peace, and the kiss of peace in the communion. For it is said,³ that Perpetua and her brother Saturus saluted one another with a kiss before they suffered, that they might consummate their martyrdom by the solemn rites of giving the peace.

SECT. 6.—What Evidence there is for the Use of set Forms in the third Century.

In the beginning of the third century, about the year 220, lived Hippolytus the martyr, and bishop of Adana or Portus Romanus in Arabia. Among other learned works, he wrote a book called, *Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις περὶ Χαρασμάτων*, *The Apostolical Tradition concerning Ecclesiastical Offices*. Which, according to the general opinion of the most learned critics, Dr. Bernard, Dr. Gale, and others,⁴ is no other than the eighth book of those called, the Apostolical Constitutions, which they think were compiled and published at Rome by this author. And if so, there can be no question what his opinion was about the use of forms in divine ser-

¹ Passio Perpetuæ. ad calcem Lactant. de Mort. Perfec. p. 10. Ego accipi junctis manibus, et manducavi: et universi circumstantes dixerunt, Amen!

² Ibid. p. 23. Introivimus et audivimus vocem unitam,

Hagios! Hagios! Hagios! sine cessatione.

³ Ibid. p. 35.

Ante Jam osculati invicem, ut martyrium per solennia pacis consummarent.

⁴ Vid. Cave. Hist. Literar. vol. ii. p. 45.

vice: for that book is nothing else but a collection of such forms, as either were in use, or made in imitation of those that were then in use in the Church. I will not allege any of them here, because I do it in every part of this work, and it would be very needless and superfluous here to repeat them.

Besides this, Hippolytus wrote a book of Odes or Hymns upon several parts of Scripture, some of which most probably were of use in the public service. For in another treatise of the Consummation of the World and Antichrist,¹ he commends the use of doxologies, and psalms, and spiritual odes; and makes it one of the signs of the reign of Antichrist, that liturgy shall be extinguished, psalmody shall cease, and reading of the Scriptures shall not be heard. It is true indeed, some learned men, Bishop Usher,² Combesis, and Du Pin, reject this as a spurious tract, composed by some modern Greeks: but, as learned critics, Labbe³ and Bp Bull,⁴ have undertaken to defend it, and answer all the arguments that are produced against it, I will not enter into this debate, but only say, that as there is nothing in this passage now alleged dissonant to the sense of Hippolytus's other works, we may be allowed to cite it in this cause, till some clearer evidence can be produced against it. Hippolytus wrote also a book, called, Canon Paschalis, which Scaliger⁵ and Gothofred⁶ take to be a Calendar, shewing what lessons were to be read on several festivals; as the first of St. Matthew, called Γένεσις, *the Generation* of Christ, on the vigil of Christ's nativity; and the Πάθος, or the history of his *sufferings*, out of the Gospel of St. Matthew, on the day of his crucifixion: and it is certain from many passages in St. Chrysostom, and St. Austin, and others, that such Calendars were used in the Church, as shall be shewn in another place,⁷ when I come to speak of the an-

¹ Hippol. de Consummat. Mundi. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. tom. ii. p. 357, et 362.

² Usser. Biblioth. Theol. ap. Cave. Hist. Liter. tom. i. p. 70. Combesis. Auctarium. Bibl. Patr. p. 51. Du Pin. Biblioth. vol. i. p. 104.

³ Labbè de Scriptor. Eccl. p. 471. ⁴ Bull. Defens. Fid. Nic. sect. 3; chap. viii. p. 369.

⁵ Scaligar. de Emendat. Temp. lib. vii. p. 725.

⁶ Gothofred. Not. in Cod. Theodos. lib. xv. tit. v. de Spectaculis. leg. v. p. 356.

⁷ Book xiv. chap. iii. sect. 3.

cient method of reading the Holy Scriptures by a certain rule and order in divine service. But because Ægidius Bucherius, who has since republished this Paschal Cycle, and Dr. Cave¹ give another interpretation of it, I will lay no greater stress upon it than it will bear, contenting myself in so critical a point to have suggested the sense of learned men, and leave the matter to the further disquisition of the curious reader; having otherwise given sufficient evidence, that the Church in the time of Hippolytus used stated forms of prayer and praises in her public service.

Not long after Hippolytus lived Origen, who was one of his scholars, and took some of his opinions from him. Now this writer in his Homilies upon Jeremy² expressly mentions one of the prayers of constant use in the Church: "We frequently say in our prayers," says he, "Grant us, O Almighty God, grant us a part with thy Prophets; grant us a part with the Apostles of thy Christ; grant that we may be found at the feet of thy only Begotten Son." Which is a testimony so clear, that the Centuriators³ made no scruple to conclude hence, that forms of prayer were undoubtedly used in the Church in the time of Origen. He elsewhere says,⁴ the Christians used the ordered or prescribed prayers, as became them continually night and day, whereby they were preserved against the power of magic and the devil. For Celsus in his spiteful way had advanced an egregious calumny against the Christians, pretending that he had seen in the hands of some of their presbyters certain barbarous books, containing the names of the devils and their impostors; hereby insinuating, that the prayers, which the Christian presbyters had in their books, were only magical enchantments: which calumny Origen not only rejects with scorn, appealing to the experience of the world, which knew it to be a fiction; but also tells his adversary further,

¹ Vid. Cave Hist. Literar. vol. ii. p. 47-

² Orig. Hom. xi. in Jerem. p. 606. *Frequenter in oratione dicimus, 'Da Omnipotens, da nobis partem cum prophetis; da cum apostolis Christi tui; tribue ut inveniamur ad vestigia Unigeniti tui.'*

³ Centur.

Magdeburg. Cent. iii. cap. 6. p. 94.

⁴ Orig. cont.

Cels. lib. vi. p. 302. *Ταῖς προσαχθείσαις εὐχαῖς συνεχίστερον ἢ δεόντως νεκ-
τὸς ἐν ἡμέρας χρώμενοι. &c.*

that the prayers, which they used by order and appointment, were such as rendered them invincible and proof against all the force of magic and power of the devils. Now, considering that the objection of Celsus lay against the service-books of the Christian presbyters, it is reasonable to conclude, that Origen's answer relates to the same: for Origen does not deny, that they had any such books, but only says their prayers, which they were ordered to use, were of a different nature from what the adversary had represented them.

To this we may add what Origen says in his Comments upon Job,¹ that by ancient custom of the Church the Book of Job was always read in Lent, and particularly in the passion-week, as most properly adapted to that occasion. The reader may find this passage at length hereafter,² and therefore it is sufficient to hint in this place, that the Scriptures in his time were methodised and brought under rule, being read by some certain order and prescription.

Not long after Origen, St. Cyprian testifies not only, that the Lord's prayer was used as a form, and as a spiritual form, most acceptable to God, as we shall see hereafter; but also mentions several other forms of common and noted use in divine service. As in the administration of baptism, every one was to renounce the devil and the world in a certain form of words,³ then vulgarly known in the Church, which Cyprian more than once has occasion to mention. They were likewise to make profession of the several articles of the Christian faith in a certain form of words, which every Church had for that purpose, and for this particular use collected into a creed. Cyprian⁴ often specifies both the interrogatories, and the answers that were made upon this occasion: and he assures us, they were so precise to a

¹ Origen. in Job. lib. i. p. 366.
sect. 3.

² Book xiv. chap. iii.
³ Cypr. de Lapsis, p. 125. Stare illic potuit Dei servus, et loqui et renunciare Christo, qui jam diabolo renunciârat et sæculo? It. Ep. vii. al. xiii. ad Rogat. p. 37. Sæculo renunciaveramus, cum baptizati sumus.

⁴ Cypr. ep. 70. ad Episcopos Numidas. p. 190. Sed et ipsa interrogatio quæ fit in baptismo, testis est veritatis. Nam cum dicimus, Credis in vitam æternam, et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam Ecclesiam? Intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesia dari, &c.

form,¹ that the Novatians themselves used the very same words in their questions and responses, as the Catholics did: they observed the same rule as the Church did; they baptised with the same creed; they asked the party, “Whether he believed in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Whether he believed in the remission of sins, and eternal life by the holy Church?” Which were the first and last words in the Creed. So they kept close to the same form of words, though they differed about the sense of them in some particulars relating to remission of sins, and the Church. Which is so clear an argument for the observation of a form in baptism, that I see not what can reasonably be replied to it.

Then again, for the prayers in the administration of the eucharist, nothing can be more evident, than that the people bare a part in them. I will not insist on those expressions of his, that they had public and common prayer,² because they are capable of an evasion: but what he says of the people’s answering to the priest is not to be evaded. For persuading the people to use diligence and attention in their prayers, he puts them in mind of an usual form of speech, which the whole Church used to raise their souls to a spiritual and heavenly temper. “The priest,” says he,³ “before prayer prepares the hearts of the brethren, by promising a preface, and saying, ‘Lift up your hearts:’ that whilst the people answer, ‘We lift them up unto the Lord,’ they may be admonished at that time to think of nothing but the Lord only.” What Cyprian says here of this preface coming before the prayer, is not so to be understood, as if it came before all the prayers of the Church, but imme-

¹ Id. Ep. 69. al. 76. Ad Magnum. p. 183. Eandem Novatianum legem tenere, quam Catholica Ecclesia teneat; eodem symbolo, quo et nos baptizare; eundem nôsse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum:—Dicunt, ‘credis remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per sanctam Ecclesiam?’

² Cypr. de Orat. Dom. p. 141. Publica nobis et communis oratio est. It. Ep. viii. al. 11. ad Cler. p. 26. Oratione communi et concordi prece pro omnibus jussit orare.

³ Cypr. de Orat. Dom. p. 152. Ideò et sacerdos ante orationem, præfatione præmissâ, parat fratrum mentes, dicendo. “Sursum corda:” ut dum respondet plebs, ‘Habemus ad dominum,’ admonetur nihil aliud se quàm Dominum cogitare debere.

diately before the prayer of consecration in the communion-service: for, as we shall see hereafter, there came before this both the prayers for the catechumens and penitents, and the prayers for the faithful, or the whole state of Christ's Church; but when the solemn prayer of the oblation was to be made, then it was, that the priest called upon the people in this form, "Lift up your hearts;" and they answered, "We lift them unto the Lord." The priest went on again, and said, "Let us give thanks to our Lord God;" and the people answered, "It is just and right so to do." Then followed the eucharistical or consecration-prayer, and the Lord's-prayer; and after that the salutation, "*Pax vobis, peace be with you;*" to which the people answered, "and with thy Spirit." After which they gave one another mutually the kiss of peace, and then proceeded to receive the holy sacrament. This was the form and order of the communion-service in St. Austin's time in the African Church; and it is very probable it might be much the same in the time of Cyprian: but Cyprian had no occasion to mention any other part of the prayers, but only that which related to his particular subject; which one is sufficient to prove, that stated forms of prayer were then allowed in the public service of the Church of Carthage, and probably in the rest of the African Churches.

At the same time with Cyprian lived Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who, having occasion to speak of a certain woman, an impostor, who pretended to the spirit of prophecy, he says,¹ "she took upon her to consecrate the eucharist with the venerable invocation, and ceremony of predication then commonly used in the Church:" he means

¹ Firmil. Ep. 75. ad Cypr. p. 223. Hoc frequenter ausa est, ut invocatione non contemptibili sanctificare se panem, et eucharistiam facere simularet, et sacrificium Domino non sine sacramento solitæ prædicationis offerret; baptizaret quoque multos, usitata et legitima verba interrogationis usurpans, ut nil discrepare ab ecclesiasticâ regulâ videretur.—Nunquid et hoc Stephanus, et qui illi consentiunt, comprobant? Maximè cui nec symbolum Trinitatis nec interrogatio legitima et ecclesiastica deficit? Potest credi aut remissio peccatorum data, aut lavacri salutaris regeneratio ritè perfecta, ubi omnia quamvis ad imaginem veritatis, tamen per dæmonem gesta sunt, &c.

the commemoration of God's great blessings bestowed upon man, and the repetition of the history of the first institution of the Lord's-supper, which by the Ancients is called Ἀνάμνησις, and *Solita Prædicatio*, a thing seldom or never omitted in the consecration of the eucharist. He adds also, "that the same impostor baptised many, using the common and appointed interrogatories, that she might not seem to vary in any thing from the rule of the Church." She made them answer to every article of the Creed, "the Creed," as he calls it, "of the Holy Trinity;" she put the usual questions to them prescribed by the Church, that is, "whether they renounced the devil, his angels, his pomp, and his service?" And, "Whether they made a covenant with Christ?" And she did every thing "*ad imaginem veritatis, according to the exact method and form, that was observed in the Church.*" Now, though all this was done by the devil, speaking in an impostor; yet being done according to the exact rules of the Church, it argues that the Church at that time had a stated rule and order for administering both the sacraments, and that the forms were so well known, that this woman could imitate them so exactly, as in nothing to vary from the usual solemnities either of prayers, or other ceremonies then observed in the Church. And if we consider, that the administration of the two sacraments was then the most considerable part of the Church's service, this is as clear an evidence as we can desire, to prove that prescribed forms were now in use in the Asiatic Churches.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, bishop of Neocæsarea, in Pontus, was cotemporary with Firmilian, and he was a man famous for working miracles by the Spirit, whence he had the name of Thaumaturgus, *the Wonder-Worker*. There is no doubt but that he prayed also by the Spirit, yet he prayed by a form; which shews, that praying by a form, and praying by the Spirit, are not inconsistent. As he was the founder of his Church, finding but seventeen Christians when he came thither, and leaving but seventeen Heathens when he was taken from it, so he left them a Liturgy or form of divine service, which they were so tenacious of, that as St. Basil¹

¹ Basil. de Spir. Sancto. cap. xxix. p. 360. Οὐ πράζιν τινά, ἐ λόγον, ἐ τύπον τινά μυσηκόν, παρ' ὃν ἑκείνοις κατέλιπε τῆ ἐκκλησία προσέθηκαν.

testifies of them, they would not suffer one ceremony, or one word, or one mystical form to be added to those, which he had left among them. He settled the way of singing psalms, not alternately, but by the common voice of the people all joining together: and the clergy of Neocæsarea were such admirers of this rule, that, when St. Basil had introduced the alternate way in his own Church, they were offended at it, and objected against him, that it was not so in the days of Gregory the Great. Upon which St. Basil was forced to write an apologetical Epistle to them in vindication of his practice, wherein he shews, that the way of alternate song, was now conformable to the practice of all the Eastern Churches, except that of Neocæsarea; and that however tenacious that Church had formerly been of the ways and forms of Gregory, yet in one particular they had now made an alteration; for in the days of Gregory,¹ they had none of that peculiar form of prayers, called litanies, which now in St. Basil's time they had admitted into their service, and were very zealous in the use of it, notwithstanding that it was neither of St. Gregory's composition, nor used at all in his days. As this shews that the use of litanies was brought into the church of Neocæsarea some years after the time of St. Gregory; so it as evidently proves, that their other forms were instituted by him, and derived their original from his composition, who was the first founder of the Church.

Not long after this, we find a complaint made by the Council of Antioch, Anno 270, against Paulus Samosatensis, the heretical bishop of that place, that he had forbidden the use of such psalms, or hymns,² as were used to be sung in the Church to the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, under pretence that they were only the novel compositions of late and modern authors. I have already produced this passage more at length³ to prove the worship of our Saviour: and here it serves to prove, that they worshipped Him by certain

¹ Basi. Ep. 63. ad Neocæsar.
 ὡς ἡμεῖς νῦν ἐπιτηδευοίμεν.
 cap. xxx.

² Ἀλλ' ἄλλ' αἱ λίτανεῖαι ἐπὶ Γρηγορίῳ,
 Con. Antioch. ap. Euseb. lib. vii.

³ Chap. ii. sect. 3.

forms of praise, which the bishop cast out of the Church, upon a pretence of novelty: which was but a mere pretence; for such forms of praise had been in use in the Church “ἀπαρχῆς, from the beginning,” as the ancient writer against the heresy of Artemon in Eusebius words it.¹ And about the same time Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, composed hymns of the like nature for the service of the Church, for which he is commended by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria,² who also himself used a certain form of doxology to the whole Trinity, as is reported by St. Basil,³ who also tells us in the same place, that Athenogenes, the martyr, composed hymns to the glory of the Holy Ghost; and adds, that the hymn called “*Hymnus Lucernalis*,” the hymn to be sung at lighting of candles in the evening service, containing a glorification of the Holy Trinity, was of ancient use in the Church, so ancient that he knew not who was the author of it. But I have already alleged these more at large⁴ in vindicating the worship of our Saviour, and therefore content myself barely to hint them as accustomed forms of praise in this place.

I shall only note one thing more in this century, out of the Epistle of Cornelius, bishop of Rome, to Fabian, bishop of Antioch, recorded by Eusebius: which is, that it was customary in those days for the minister to use a form of words at the delivery of the bread and wine in the eucharist, saying “the body of Christ, or the blood of Christ,” to which the people always answered, “amen!” For Cornelius,⁵ speaking of the wickedness of Novatian, says, “when he delivered the eucharist to the people, he obliged them instead of saying amen, at the naming of it, to swear by the body and blood of Christ, that they would not desert his party, nor return to Cornelius.” Which custom of saying amen, in answer to the minister, when he named the body or blood of Christ, is both an ancient and universal practice. For Tertullian,⁶ as has been shewn already, mentions it long before; and we find it frequently in the writers of the next

¹ Euseb. lib. v. cap. xxviii. cap. xxiv.

Chap. ii. sect. 2. xliii. p. 245.

² Dionys. Epist. ap. Euseb. lib. vii.

³ Basil. de Spir. Sancto. cap. xxix.

⁴ See

⁵ Cornel. Ep. ad Fabian. ap. Euseb. lib. vi. cap.

⁶ Tertul. de Spectat. cap. xxv.

age, St. Ambrose, St. Cyril, St. Austin, St. Jerom, and the author of the Constitutions; of which I shall have occasion to speak more in another place.

SECT. 7.—Evidence of the Use of set Forms in the fourth Century.

In the beginning of the fourth century, Arnobius, apologising for the Christian devotions, tells the Heathens, they might know that they worshipped the supreme God, and called upon Him for what they desired, by the sound of their voice,¹ which they used in prayer. He says, they all prostrated themselves before him, adoring him with joint supplications.² And he gives us the general heads of their prayers, which are very agreeable to the ancient forms of the Church, viz.³ “That God would grant peace and pardon, to all men, to the magistrates, to the armies, and to the Emperors; to their friends and to their enemies; to those that were alive, and those that were set at liberty from the bonds of the body.” Which petitions are so conformable to the method and order of the ancient Liturgies, that one might have imagined them to be offered by a form, though Arnobius had said nothing of their joint prayers, or vocal consent in their devotions.

Lactantius and Eusebius wrote after the great persecution, under Diocletian and his associates, was over: and they both take notice of forms of prayer appointed by the first Christian Emperors for their soldiers to use, in imitation of those of the Church. Lactantius says expressly, that when Licinius was about to join battle with Maximinus, Maximinus made a vow to Jupiter, that, if he got the victory, he would utterly extinguish and blot out the very name of Christians. Upon which, the night after, an angel of God came and stood by Licinius, as he lay at rest, bidding him rise quickly, and

¹ Arnob. lib. i. p. 24. Summum invocare nos Deum, et ab eo quod postulamus orare, vel auribus potuit scire, vel ipsius vocis sono, quâ utimur in precibus, noscitur.

² Ibid. p. 25. Huic omnes ex more prosternimur, hunc collatis precibus adoramus.

³ Id. lib. iv. p. 151. Cur nostra meruerint immaniter conventicula dirui? In quibus summus oratur Deus, pax cunctis et venia postulatur, magistratibus, exercitibus, regibus, familiaribus, inimicis, adhuc vitam degentibus, et resolutis corporum vincione.

pray to the most high God with all his army, promising him the victory, if he did so. As soon as he heard this, he thought with himself, that he arose and stood with the angel, who gave him this warning, and who then taught him after what manner and in what words they should pray. Therefore awaking out of sleep, he ordered a notary to be brought to him, to whom he dictated the prayer in these very words,¹ as he had heard them: "O Thou most High God, we beseech Thee. O Holy God, we beseech Thee. We commend all the justice of our cause to Thee: we commend our safety unto Thee: we commend our empire unto Thee. By Thee we live, by Thee we are victorious and happy. O most High and Holy God, hear our prayers. We stretch forth our arms unto Thee. Hear us, O most High and Holy God." These words were written in many books, and sent by the generals and tribunes, that they might teach them to their soldiers. When the day of battle came, the soldiers laid aside their shields, and put off their helmets, and lifting up their hands to heaven, said the prayer after the Emperor, their generals repeating it before them. And this they did so loudly, that the adverse army, about to be sacrificed, heard the echo of their prayer. Which when they had repeated three times, they were inspired with courage, and resuming their arms, though they were but a few, they without any loss gained a complete victory over their enemies; "whom the most High God," says our author, "delivered up to be slaughtered, as if they had come not to engage in battle, but as men devoted to death and destined to destruction."

It is not many years since this little golden tract of Læ-

¹ Lact. de Mort. Persecut. cap. xlv. Discusso somno notarium jussit aciri, et sicut audierat, hæc verba dictavit. Summe Deus, te rogamus. Sancte Deus, te rogamus. Omnem justitiam tibi commendamus, salutem nostram tibi commendamus, imperium nostrum tibi commendamus. Per te vivimus, per te victores et felices existimus. Summe sancte Deus, preces nostras exaudi. Brachia nostra ad te tendimus. Exaudi sancte, summe Deus. Scribuntur hæc in libellis pluribus, et per præpositos tribunosque mittuntur, ut suos quisque milites doceat.——Erat jam utraque acies in conspectu. Liciniani scuta deponunt, galeas resolvunt, ad cælum manus tendunt, præeuntibus præpositis, et post imperatorem precem dicunt. Audit acies peritura precantium murmur. Illi oratione ter dictâ, virtute jam pleni, &c.

tantius, came to light, and therefore probably this testimony may not very often have fallen under the observation of every ordinary reader. But as there is no dispute to be made of the truth of the relation upon the authority of Lactantius, so it is an illustrious evidence both of the opinion of Lactantius, and the general sense of Christians, that they did not think forms of prayer unlawful, because they were written in a book, nor the repetition of them any offence, for this prayer was thrice repeated. If it should be said, that this prayer was dictated immediately by an angel, the same and more may be said of the Lord's prayer, that it was dictated by Christ himself, and the Psalms were written as forms of prayer and praise by an inspired penman; and yet there are those, who, for no other reason, but because they are forms, despise the use of them, when inserted into any Liturgy of the Church.

Parallel to this testimony of Lactantius is that other relation of Eusebius, concerning Constantine, that he ordered all his soldiers, as many of them as were heathens, to go forth into the field on the Lord's day, and there with hands and hearts lift up to heaven, to offer up to God,¹ “*μεμελετημένην εὐχὴν*, a certain prayer which they *had learned and premeditated before.*” The prayer was to be said in the Latin tongue, which was the vulgar language, and in this express form of words:² “ We acknowledge Thee to be the only God; we profess Thee to be our King; we call upon Thee as our helper. It is from Thee we have our victories; by Thee we are superior to our enemies. We give Thee thanks for the by-past favours and benefits we have already received; and we hope in Thee for those that are to come. We are all humble supplicants unto Thee, beseeching Thee to preserve Constantine our king, with all his pious children, and grant him long to reign over us with safety and victory.” This was the prayer, which he enjoined the Heathens in his army to use every Lord's day.

As for those that were Christians, he commanded them to follow his own example, and attend the prayers of the

¹ Euseb. de Vita Constant. lib. iv. cap. xix. cap. xx.

² Euseb. Ibid.

Church on the Lord's-day, setting them a pattern in his own practice. He ordered his own palace after the manner of a Church, first taking the Bible into his hands, and reading and meditating therein, and then repeating the prescribed prayers with all his royal family,¹ which shews that forms of prayer were then generally used in the Church, since Constantine used the prescribed prayers in his own family, and thereby made it to resemble the Church.

Eusebius highly extols and applauds Constantine for all this: which argues that Eusebius himself was no enemy to prescribed forms. And, indeed, we are beholden to his history both for the knowledge of this of Constantine, and many other forms, which had been lost, had it not been for his care and diligence in preserving them; of which any reader may be sensible, that considers how many things have already been alleged out of his treasury, especially the account which he gives of the Essenes, and their way of worship out of Philo Judæus: for as it is evident, that they worshipped God by certain forms, so it is as evident that Eusebius took them for Christians, and their worship for the way of worship settled by the first Christians at Alexandria.² It may not be improper also to observe, that Eusebius, in one of his letters recorded by Socrates, expressly says,³ that in the Church of Cæsarea, where he was bishop, they always had a creed in a certain form of words, which he there repeats, whereby their catechumens were to be instructed, and their answers in baptism to be made in the words of it: and that thus it was that he himself had been there both catechised and baptised. And if his Church allowed a form in baptism, there is reason to believe from what has been said, that she was not averse to it in other parts of divine service. Moreover from the time of the Council of Nice, we are well assured, that the Creed composed in that Council was used in most of the Eastern Churches as a precise form, by which all catechumens were to make their responses in baptism, as I have proved elsewhere upon another occasion,⁴ though

¹ Euseb. Ibid. cap. xvii. *Εἰτ' ἐν χάρις ἐνθέσμενος σὺν τοῖς τὸν βασιλείου οἶκον πληροῦσιν ἀπεδίδα.*

² Vid. Euseb. Hist. lib. ii. c. xvii.

³ Socrat. lib. i. cap. viii.

⁴ Book. x. chap. iv. sect. 17.

it was not presently admitted as a form to be repeated, as now it is, in the ordinary service of the Church: but its being allowed as a form in baptism is an argument, that the Church had then no exception against forms, since she enjoined them in the administration of her sacraments, which are the most considerable part of divine service.

Athanasius, as well as Eusebius, was a member of the Council of Nice, and there are plain footsteps of a Liturgy in his writings. In one place he declares, that when he said,¹ “ Let us pray for the safety of the most religious Emperor Constantius, all the people immediately with one voice answered, Christ help Constantius.” Which is exactly agreeable to the ancient way of praying for kings and others in the prayer for the whole state of Christ’s Church, where the people were used to answer to every petition, “ *Κύριε ἐλέησον, or ὠῶσον, Lord have mercy upon them, or Lord save and help them,*” as will be shewn in its proper place.

Again, speaking of the communion service,² he says, the people offered up their prayers with one voice, and without any manner of disagreement; and that in that great multitude there was but one voice, when they unanimously answered, Amen! It is evident also that in his time psalmody was in great request at Alexandria: for Sozomen takes notice,³ that it was by the advantage of this practice, that Athanasius, when he was beset in the Church by his enemies, escaped their hands, whilst he got out secretly in the company of those that were singing psalms. St. Austin also speaks of it, and tells us,⁴ that Athanasius made some regulation in the way of singing, and brought in the custom of plain song, ordering the readers of the psalms to pronounce their words with so little inflexion or variation of the tone, that it looked more like reading than singing. It is further observable out

¹ Athanas. Apol. ad Constant. p. 679. Μόνον γὰρ ἔλεγον, ἐδέξομεθα περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας, &c. ἔ πας ὁ λαὸς ἐνθὺς μιᾷ φωνῇ ἐβόα, Χριστέ βοήθει Κωνσταντίῳ.

² Athan. Ibid. p. 683. Μίαν ἔ τὴν αὐτὴν μετὰ συμφωνίας τῶν λαῶν γενέσθαι τὴν φωνήν. &c.

³ Sozom. lib. iii. cap. vi. Συμφώνε δὲ τῆς ψαλμῳδίας γενομένης. &c. Vid. Socrat. lib. ii. cap. xi. Προσαξας διακόνῳ κηρύξαι ἐρχίν. &c. Theod. lib. ii. cap. xiii.

⁴ Aug. Confess. lib. x. cap. xxxiii. Tam modico flexu vocis faciebat sonare lectorem psalmi, ut pronuncianti similior esset quam canenti.

of Ruffinus¹ and the other historians, who relate the story of Athanasius baptising the catechumens whilst he was but a youth, that the questions and answers and all other ceremonies of baptism were then performed by such a certain rule and order in the Church, that Athanasius was able to imitate them exactly, and omit nothing that was used to be done, but observed every rite to a tittle, as Alexander, the bishop, found upon inquiry, when he came more strictly to examine them. And this shews that not only in the time of Athanasius, but in the days of Alexander, his predecessor, such sort of forms were of constant use in the Church. Athanasius himself also not only mentions their psalmody, but tells us, that it was so ordered, the people might bear a part in it. For though the antiphonal way of singing verse for verse, by way of alternate song, was not yet brought into the Church in repeating David's psalms, yet it was usual sometimes for the people to join in the close of a verse, and repeat it together with the reader. And this was called *ὑπηχεῖν* et *ὑπακείν*, *to come into the concert at the close.*" Whence Athanasius,² speaking of that great assault made upon his Church, mentioned before by Socrates and Sozomen, says, he commanded the deacon to read a psalm, to which the people did "*ὑπακείν*" that is not barely *hearken*, as the unskilful translator renders it, but *repeat in the close* these words, "for his mercy endureth for ever," of which way of singing I shall say more hereafter in its proper place.³ Here I shall only note further, that Athanasius, describing the great barbarities and indignities which the Arians shewed to the matrons and virgins in the very Church, mentions one virgin⁴ whom they despitefully used, having her psalter in her hand. Which no doubt she had to join in singing David's psalms, according to the custom of the Church. And the book *De Interpretatione Psalmorum*, is nothing else but a direction how

¹ Ruffin. lib. i. cap. xiv. Diligenter inquirens, quid interrogati fuerint, quidve responderint, videt secundum religionis nostræ ritum cuncta constare, &c.

² Athan. Apol. ad Constant. p. 717. Προέτρεπον τὸν μὲν διάκονον ἀναγινώσκειν ψαλμὸν, τὰς δὲ λαὸς ὑπακείν, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτῶ. &c.

³ Book xiv. chap. i. sect. 12.

⁴ Athan.

Epist. ad Orthodoxos p. 947.

to use the psalms as forms of prayers and praises upon all particular occasions, where, among other things, he observes,¹ that the lxii or lxiii psalm, “O God, my God, early will I seek thee,” was always a psalm to be used at morning prayer. And the author of the Book, *De Virginitate*, among his works,² says the same; which is also mentioned by St. Chrysostom and some others about this time, of whom we shall have occasion to speak more particularly in considering the order and method of morning service.³

Athanasius lived forty-six years bishop of Alexandria, and continued in being till the year 371. During which interval we have the concurrent testimony of Juvencus and Pachomius, and all the Egyptian monasteries; of Flavian, bishop of Antioch, Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, Optatus, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephrem Syrus, St. Basil, and Apollinaris, the supposed author of the books under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, together with the Council of Laodicea. And not long after, St. Ambrose, St. Jerom, St. Austin, and St. Chrysostom, with several African Councils, all within the compass of this fourth age in which Athanasius lived.

Juvencus flourished under Constantine in Spain, and being a poet, turned the history of the Gospel into verse, and St. Jerom adds, that he wrote a book⁴ in the same way, giving an account of the order of the sacraments of the Church. Now if we consider, what has been observed before,⁵ that in ecclesiastical style, *Ordo Sacramentorum*, commonly denotes *A Book of Divine Offices*, it is most probable that this work of Juvencus was no other but the offices or forms of divine service turned into verse.

Pachomius about the year 340, brought the Egyptian monks into communities, and settled them under rules; one of which was to meet twice a day, and sing a certain number of psalms, with prayers intermixed, as may be seen in

¹ Athan. de Interpr. Psalmor. ad Marcellin. tom. i. p. 975.

² Athan. de Virgin. p. 1057.

³ Book xiii. chap. x. sect. 2.

⁴ Hieron. de Scriptor. Eccl. cap. lxxxiv. Nonnulla eodem metro ad sacramentorum ordinem pertinentia composuit.

⁵ Book. xiii.

chap. i. sect. 6.

the accounts which Cassian,¹ Palladius,² and St. Jerom³ give of them. Now it must be owned, that whatever their prayers were, their psalmody was matter of form, whether sung singly or alternately; and though they did not repeat the usual doxology, "Glory be to the Father," as was usual in the Western Church at the end of every psalm, yet they did it at other times at the end of their *Antiphonas*, as Cassian,⁴ an eye-witness of their service, informs us.

About the year 350, lived Flavian, first a presbyter, and then bishop of Antioch. Whilst he was presbyter, it happened that Leontius, the Arian bishop, made an alteration in the common Doxology, "Glory be to the Father, &c." to make it favour his heresy. Upon this, Flavian and Diodorus withdrew from his communion, and assembled with the people at the monuments of the martyrs; where, dividing the people into two parts, they taught them to sing the Psalms of David alternately;⁵ which custom beginning first at Antioch, was from thence propagated all the world over. After this manner Theodoret relates the story; where it is easy to observe, first, that the form of glorification was an ancient thing, and only Leontius made an innovation in it: 2dly, that the singing of David's Psalms was ancient too, which are forms both of prayers and praises; and Flavian was not the author of that service, but only of the alternate way of singing them. And whereas it is said by Socrates, that Ignatius had introduced the antiphonal way of singing before, that is not to be understood of David's Psalms, but of other hymns composed to the glory of the Holy Trinity; which, as we have seen before, were always in use in the Christian Church. And Theodoret adds, 3dly, that this way of singing was so taking to the people of Antioch, that they all deserted Leontius, and he was forced to beg of Flavian, that he would bring back this *Δειτηρησιαν*, this *Liturgy* or service into the Churches.

About the same time lived Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, who in his Catechetical Discourses to the newly baptised, takes notice of many forms that had been of ancient use in

¹ Cassian. Instit. lib. ii. cap. 6.
cap. 38.

² Pallad. Hist. Lausiac.
³ Hieron. Ep. xxii. ad Eustoeh. c. 15.

⁴ Cassian. lib. ii. cap. 8.

⁵ Theod. lib. ii. cap. 24.

the Church. In his first catechism he tells them the meaning of the ceremonies used in baptism:¹ “Ye were first brought in,” says he, “into the ante-room of the baptistery, and placed towards the West in a standing posture, and then commanded to renounce Satan, by stretching out your hands against him as if he had been present.” A little after he explains the meaning of their doing this towards the West. “The West,” says he, “is the place of darkness, and Satan is darkness, and his strength is in darkness. For this reason ye symbolically look toward the West, when ye renounce that prince of darkness and horror. For what did every one of you then say standing? ‘I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy works, and all thy pomp, and all thy worship and service.’” After this, he tells them,² “they turned from the West to the East, which is the region of light and place of paradise, and then were commanded to say, ‘I believe in the Father and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and in one baptism of repentance.’” In his second discourse, he reminds them of their unction in the baptistery,³ and their repeated confession of the Holy Trinity, and their trine immersion. In his third discourse,⁴ he treats of the second unction with the holy chrism, which was then used in confirmation, immediately after they were come out of the waters of baptism. In his fifth discourse, he treats of the ceremonies used in the communion-service, where first he speaks⁵ “of the deacon’s bringing water to the bishop and presbyters to wash their hands, in token of men’s obligation to purify themselves from sin. Then the deacon cries out, ‘Embrace and salute one another with an holy kiss.’⁶ After this, the priest cries out,⁷ ‘Lift up your hearts,’ and ye answer, ‘we lift them up unto the Lord.’ He says again, ‘let us give thanks to the Lord;’ and ye answer ‘it is meet and just so to do.’ After this, we make mention of heaven, and earth, and sea, the sun, moon and stars and the whole creation, rational and irrational, visible and invisible, angels and archangels, dignities, dominions,

¹ Cyril. Catch. Myst. i. n. 2. q. 278.

² Cyril. *ibid.* n. 6. p. 283.

³ Cyril. Catech. ii. n. 3. and 4.

⁴ Catech. iii. n. 2. and 3.

Catech. v. n. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.* n. 2.

⁷ *Ibid.* n. 3.

principalities and powers, thrones and cherubims, and with them we sing the seraphical hymn, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth." After which we beseech the merciful God, that He would send forth his spirit upon the elements, and make the bread the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ. Then after this spiritual and unbloody sacrifice and service is performed, we beseech God for the common peace of the Church, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings and their armies and allies, for the sick and afflicted; and, in a word, for all that want assistance, saying, " We beseech Thee for them, and offer this sacrifice unto Thee." Then we make mention of those that are fallen asleep, first patriarchs, prophets, Apostles, and martyrs, that God, through their prayers and intercessions may receive our prayers; and after we pray for our holy fathers and bishops, and all that are departed this life before us, then we say that prayer, which our Saviour gave to his disciples, calling God by the name of Father, and saying, " Our Father which art in heaven." After which, the priest says, " Holy things for those that are holy." And the people answer, " There is One Holy, One Lord Jesus Christ." Then one is appointed to sing those words of the xxxiii. psalm, " O taste and see that the Lord is gracious," as an excitement to receive the communion; and every one communicates, saying Amen! twice, when first he receives the body of Christ into his hand, and afterward the cup of his blood. Finally, when all have communicated, he tells them, they are to wait for prayer again, and give God thanks for making them partakers of so great mysteries."

Now one must be blind that cannot see the plain footsteps and forms of a stated Liturgy in all this. And therefore I shall make no other descant upon them, but only this, that undoubtedly before St. Cyril wrote those Lectures, there was a prescribed Liturgy, and offices in form, for the administration both of baptism and the eucharist in the Church of Jerusalem, and those handed down from their fore-fathers, though it be not possible to trace every thing precisely to its first original.

Cotemporary with Cyril was Hilary, bishop of Poitiers,

of whom St. Jerom¹ says, that he wrote a book of hymns and mysteries, which most probably were the forms of the holy offices then used in the Church. It is certain, his hymns, together with those of St. Ambrose, were afterwards in great request in the Church; and when some excepted against them, as only of human composition, the fourth Council of Toledo ordered them² “to be retained in the Church’s service, together with the hymns, ‘Glory be to the Father,’ and ‘Glory be to God on high;’ threatening excommunication to any, who in the Churches of Spain and Gallieia should reject them.” Hilary himself plainly intimates, that both the prayers and hymns were such, as all the people with an audible voice might join in them. “Let every profane hearer,” says he,³ “be terrified with the words of our confession: ‘Let us fight against the devil and his weapons with the sound of our prayers, and let the victory of our war be proclaimed with the voice of exultation.’ Let him, that stands without the Church, hear the voice of the people praying, let him perceive the glorious sound of our hymns, and hear the responses of our devout confession in the offices of the divine sacraments.” He that can make out all this from the people’s silent consent in heart only to the minister’s prayer, without any vocal joining in forms of prayer and praises, may make any thing out of any thing, and it were not worth while to produce any manner of evidence for such a man’s conviction. I only note further out of Hilary, that these prayers and hymns were both for morning and evening service.⁴ The

¹ Hieron. de Scriptor. cap. 100. Liber hymnorum et mysteriorum.

² Con. Tolet. iv. can. 12. Quia à nonnullis hymni humano studio in laudem Dei, atque Apostolorum et martyrum triumphos compositi esse noscuntur, sicut hi quos beatissimi Docteres Hilarius atque Ambrosius ediderunt, quos tamen quidam specialiter reprobant pro eo quod de Scripturis sanctorum canonum, vel Apostolica traditione non existunt, &c.

³ Hilar. in Psal. 65. p. 232. Terrendus est confessionis nostræ sermone omnis prophanus auditor: et adversus diabolum, armaq; ejus orationum nostrarum sennitu certandum est, et belli nostri victoria exultationis voce monstranda est. Audiatur orantis populi consistens quis extra ecclesiam vocem; spectet celebres hymnorum sonitus; et inter divinorum quoque sacramentorum officia responsonem devote confessionis accipiat.

⁴ Id. in Psal. 64. p. 231. Progressus Ecclesiæ in matutinum (leg. matutinarum) et vespertinorum hymnorum delectatione maximum misericordiæ

Church had her outgoings, both morning and evening, to praise God: she began the day with prayers, and ended the day with hymns to God.

Chronologers are not exactly agreed about the time of the Council of Laodicea. Labbé and others place it before the Council of Nice, about the year 319. Bp. Beveridge about the year 365. But on all hands it is agreed to be within this century. Now here are several canons, which plainly shew the use of prescribed forms in the service of the Church. The seventh canon orders, that such as returned from the heresies of the Novatians, the Photinians, and the Quartadecimans should first learn the Creeds of the Church, and be anointed with the holy chrism, before they were admitted to the communion of the holy mysteries. Which implies, that the Creeds were then in a certain form, since they were obliged to learn them. The fifteenth canon orders, “ That none should sing in the Church except the canonical singers, who went up into the *Ambo*, or *reading desk*, and sang *from a book*,—*ἀπὸ διφθέρας*. The seventeenth canon forbids the continuing of psalms one after another, and orders a lesson to be read after every psalm. The eighteenth orders the same Liturgy of prayers to be used at the Nones, that is, three o'clock in the afternoon, and at evening service. The nineteenth orders the method of divine service, that after the bishop's sermon should follow the prayers for the catechumens; and after they were gone, the prayers for the penitents; and when they had been under the bishop's hand, and were retired, then the three prayers for the faithful or communicants; the first whereof were to be in silence, the second and third by way of bidding prayer and audible invocation. Then the presbyters were to give the kiss of peace to the bishop, and laymen to one another; after which the holy oblation was to be made, those only of the clergy communicating within the rails of the altar. This canon plainly describes the order and method of the ancient service, as it was performed in that age; and though the several forms of prayer here mentioned are not set down,

Dei signum est. Dies in orationibus Dei inchoatur, dies hymnis Dei clauditur.

yet we are sure, they were in use at that time, and therefore a brief reference, such as was suitable to the compass of a short canon, is made to them, as shall be shewn more at large in another place.¹ The twenty-second canon orders, that the subdeacon shall not wear the *Orarium*, which was a scarf or tippet belonging to the deacons, by which they were used to give the signal or directions to the people in the performance of the several parts of divine-service. The forty-sixth canon orders those, that are to be baptised, to learn the Creed, and on the Thursday before Easter to rehearse it to the bishop or presbyters. The forty-seventh canon appoints those, that were baptised in sickness, afterwards to learn the Creed also; which implies, that the Creed was then in a certain form of words. The fifty-ninth canon orders, that no psalms composed by private men, should be sung in the Church; which argues that hymns composed by private men were only to be discarded, but others were allowed, that were authentic. And this is full proof, that forms of divine service were in use at the time of this Council.

About the year 368, Epiphanius was made bishop of Salamis, or Constantia, in Cyprus. And that he approved forms of prayer appears from the frequent testimony he gives to the book called, the Apostolical Constitutions, the eighth book of which is nothing but a collection of such forms. Cotelerius² has compared the several places in the Constitutions with those, that Epiphanius alleges out of them, and shewed them to be the same in substance: particularly he observes, that Epiphanius in one place gives the Constitutions this character,³ that they contain all canonical order, and nothing contrary to the faith, or confession, or the administration and rules of the Church, which no man could say, that did not approve of the several forms of worship contained therein. And therefore when Epiphanius says,⁴ in another place, that the Church observed her morning hymns and prayers, and her evening psalms and prayers, it

¹ Book xv. chap. i.
Constitut. Apostol.

² Coteler. Testimonia Veterum Præfixa

³ Epiph. Hær. 70. Audianor. n. 10. Πᾶσα ἐν αὐτῇ κανονικῇ τάξει ἐμφέρεται, ἡ ἕδεν παρακεχαραγμένον τῆς πίστεως, ἡδὲ τῆς ὁμολογίας, ἡδὲ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς διοικήσεως ἡ κανόνος.

⁴ Epiph. Expos. Fid. n. xxiii, tom. i. p. 1106.

is reasonable to suppose, that all these were according to prescribed forms, as it is certain at least the psalms and hymns were. But there is one place in Epiphanius's Epistle to John, bishop of Jerusalem, which evidently proves, that the communion-service was then performed by a prescribed office and form. For Epiphanius having been accused to John, as if he had reflected on him in his prayers, saying thus, "Lord grant that John may believe aright:" to clear himself of this accusation he denies, that ever he prayed so for him in public, though he did so privately in his heart, and for the truth of this, he appeals to the words of the communion-offices then in public use: "When we offer up prayers in the communion-office," says he,¹ "we use these words for all bishops, and for you also: 'Keep him, who preacheth the truth:' or certainly thus, 'Lord, grant our requests, and keep him, that he may preach the word of truth,' as the occasion of the words requires, and as the order of the office for prayer directs." To understand which aright, we are to consider, that anciently in the communion-service there were two prayers, where bishops were prayed for, one in the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church before the oblation, and the other in the prayer immediately after the oblation, when all states of men were again solemnly commemorated and recommended to God; as we shall see hereafter. Now in reference to these two prayers, Epiphanius says, they prayed either thus or thus, as the occasion of the words required, and the order of the office directed. Which is a manifest reference to the two prayers, in which these words were contained, and as plain an argument for prescribed forms, as can be required. And indeed the word *Consequentia*, which in Greek no doubt was ἀκολουθία, shews as much: for that always signified a stated or prescribed order of prayers. Of which the reader may find examples enough in Suicerus Thesaurus, or Meursius's Glossary, which need not here be inserted.

¹ Epiphanius, Epist. ad Joan. Hierosol. tom. ii. p. 313. Quando autem compleremus orationem secundum ritum mysteriorum et pro omnibus, et pro te quoque dicimus, 'Custodi illum qui prædicat veritatem:' vel certe ita, 'Tu præsta, Domine, et custodi, ut ille verbum prædicet veritatis,' sicut occasio sermonis se tulerit, et habuerit Oratio consequentiam.

Optatus, bishop of Milevis, was cotemporary with Epiphanius; and he has a great many plain references to the forms then used in the public service. He tells the Donatists, "that by confining the Church to their own party, they had frustrated the intent of the Holy Spirit, which had presignified, that the name of God should be praised with psalms and hymns over all the earth, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof; and that in effect they had defrauded God of his praise.¹ For if they only were the true church that was to praise him, the rest of the world, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, must be silent: they had shut the mouth of Christian nations, and imposed silence upon all people, however desirous to praise God at the proper seasons." Which manifestly implies, that psalmody was then a part of the people's devotions all the world over, and that the Donatists were injurious to God, whose principles tended to defraud him of it. Again he speaks of the prayer for the whole Church in the time of the oblation, as a form so firmly established by law, that the Donatists themselves would not venture to make any alteration in it. "Who doubts," says he,² "but that you continue to use that settled form of words in the celebration of the sacrament, and never omit to say, that you offer for that one Church which is diffused over all the world?" He says the same of the use of the Lord's prayer in the communion service, that the Donatists continued to use it as well as the Catholics: for he observes,³ "that though they gave imposition of hands and absolution to sinners in such an haughty and supercilious manner, as if they themselves had had no sin; yet not long after, when they turned to the altar, they could not

¹ Optat. lib. ii. p. 47. *Fraudatis aures Dei: si vos soli laudatis, totus tacebit orbis, qui est ab ortu solis usque ad occasum. Clausistis ora omnium Christianarum gentium: indixistis silentium populis universis, Deum per momenta laudare cupientibus, &c.*

² Ibid. p. 53. *Quis dubitet vos illud legitimum in sacramentorum mysterio præterire non posse? Offerre vos dicitis pro unâ ecclesiâ, quæ sit in toto terrarum orbe diffusa.*

³ Ibid. p. 57. *Inter vicina momenta, dum manus imponitis et delicta donatis, mox ad altare conversi, Dominicam Orationem prætermittere non potestis, &c. It. lib. iii. p. 72. Oratio Dominica apud nos et apud vos una est.*

omit the Lord's-prayer wherein they said 'Forgive us our trespasses and sins.' The Lord's-prayer," he says, "was of one and the same use with them both." He says also, "the common form of salutation, established by law, was likewise retained by the Donatists: for they could not omit saying, 'peace be with you;'¹ they retained the name, when they had lost the substance." He says further, "that the Catholics and Donatists used the same interrogatories in baptism: they asked the catechumen,² whether he renounced the devil? And whether he believed in God? And he answered, I renounce, I believe. Only the Donatists did one thing amiss, in repeating these things over again, and rebaptising those whom the Catholics had baptised before." He seems also to hint something of the ancient form of exercising catechumens before baptism, when he tells the Donatists,³ that by rebaptising Catholics, who were already baptised, and in whom God dwelt, they said in effect to God, "Go out thou cursed one." For this was the phrase then used in exorcism, which was a prayer, as St. Cyril⁴ calls it, for expelling Satan out of the catechumen: and these words of Optatus seem plainly to be taken out of the prayers of exorcism, then commonly used in the Church. There is one thing more very observable in Optatus, he says a rumour was once spread in Afric, that the Emperor's officers were to come and make strange alterations in the Church, by placing images upon the altar in time of divine-service. Which flying report put the people into great consternation and confusion. But they were presently quieted again, when they saw those officers come, and no such altera-

¹ Optat. lib. iii. p. 73. Non potuistis omittere quod legitimum est: Utique dixistis, 'pax vobiscum.'—Quid salutas, de quo non habes? Quid nominas quod exterminasti? Salutas de pace, qui non amas.

² Id. lib. v. p. 86. Quocunque interrogante, qui credidit. Deo credidit: Et post illius unum 'Credo,' tu exigis alterum 'Credo.' It. p. 89. Interrogemas gentilem, an renunciat diabolo et credat Deo. Et dicat, 'Renuncio; et credo.'

³ Id. lib. iv. p. 79. Vos rebaptizando exorcizatis hominem fidelem, et dicitis Deo habitanti, 'maledicte, exi foras.'

⁴ Cyril Catech. xvi. n. ix. p. 234. 'Ο δαίμων λόγοις εὐχῆς ἐκρατῆθη.

tions made by them, but the ancient purity and solemn custom and usual rites were still observed, and nothing was either changed, or added, or diminished in the divine sacrifice.¹ Which shews, that the public service was then in a certain form, and not left to every man's liberty to make alterations in it, or lengthen or shorten it, by adding or diminishing at his pleasure.

About the year 370 St. Basil was made bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, but before he was a bishop he lived a presbyter in the same Church under Eusebius, his predecessor in the see. During which time, as Nazianzen assures us,² among other services done for that Church, he composed forms of prayer and orders of decency for the communion-service, which, by the consent and authority of his bishop, Eusebius, were used in the Church. We are not bound to assert, that any of the Liturgies, which now go under his name, are exactly the same with that. It is certain they have received many additions and alterations, and in many things differ from one another: and some things are alleged by ancient writers out of St. Basil's genuine Liturgy, which a learned man³ assures us are not to be found at present in any of these. As that prayer, which is cited by Petrus Diaconus, who lived about the year 520, in whose time St. Basil's Liturgy was used almost all the East over. For he says,⁴ among other things, they then prayed thus, according to St. Basil's Liturgy: "Grant us, Lord, thy defence and protection; we beseech Thee, make the evil to become good, and keep those that are good in their goodness. For all things are possible unto Thee, and no one can contradict Thee: when Thou pleasest, Thou canst save and there is no one that can resist thy will." Some

¹ Optat. lib. iii. p. 75. *Visa est puritas, et ritu solito solennis consuetudo perspecta est. Cum viderent divinis sacrificiis nec mutatum quicquam, nec additum, nec ablatum.*

² Naz. Orat. 20. in Laud. Basil. p. 340. *Εὐχῶν διατάξεις ἐν εὐκοσμίας τῆ βήματος, &c.*

³ Cave. Hist. Liter. vol. i. p. 194.

⁴ Petr. Diacon. de Incarnat. inter Fulgentii Opera. cap. viii. p. 633. *Basilius Cæsariensis in oratione sacri altaris, quam penè universus frequentat Oriens, inter cetera, 'Dona,' inquit, 'Domine, virtutem ac tutamentum; malos, quæsumus, bonos facito; bonos in bonitate conserva: omnia enim potes, et non est qui contradicat tibi; cum enim volueris, salvas, et nullus resistit voluntati tuæ.'*

fancy these words are to be found in the present copies, but whether that be so or not, we may be pretty well assured they were in the original Liturgy of St. Basil, whence the author cites them. And that is an argument, that St. Basil composed a Liturgy, which was then of general use in the East, and known to the Africans also. Proclus, bishop of Constantinople, was within half an age of St. Basil's time, and he gives this account of his composing a Liturgy : St. Basil seeing men's sloth and degeneracy made them weary of a long Liturgy, thought there was nothing unnecessary or tedious in that of St. James, which was used before ; yet to prevent the weariness of priests and people, he delivered a shorter form.¹ And it is also cited under St. Basil's name by Leontius,² and the Council of Trullo.³ So that though many things be inserted into the present copies of St. Basil's Liturgy, and others wanting in them ; yet these are no arguments against the original composition, of which there is such clear evidence in the ancient writers.

But St. Basil not only composed a form for the communion-service, but often speaks of other forms as generally used upon other occasions. In his 63d Epistle he gives a large account of the people's joining in alternate psalmody and prayers, and of their repeating the psalm of confession, that is the fifty-first psalm, at morning prayer. And he there also speaks of the Liturgy of Gregory Thaumaturgus with approbation, and of the litanies, which the Church of Neocæsarea had admitted since the time of Gregory. In his 241st Epistle he mentions several particulars of the usual prayer for the whole state of the Church, telling his friend, whom he writes to, that he must needs remember them in the deacon's bidding prayer, for all that were gone to travel ; for the soldiers ; for all that profess the name of Christ, &c. Which, as I shall shew hereafter,⁴ were the usual forms of supplication in the prayers for all states of men in the Church. In his 68th Epistle he mentions other forms, which were as evidently parts of the ancient Liturgies, " We

¹ Proclus de Tradit. Divin. Liturg. cited by Comber of Liturgies. p. 168.

² Leont. cont. Nestor. lib. iii. Bibl. Patr. tom. iv. part. ii. p. 1006.

³ Conc. Trull. can. 32.

⁴ Book xv. chap. i. sect. 3.

pray that the rest of our days may continue in peace; we desire that our death may also be in peace. We have heard him before¹ speak of the Hymns of Athenogenes, and the evening hymn to the Holy Trinity. And we shall hear him hereafter speaking² of particular psalms appointed for particular hours of canonical prayer. All which are such manifest indications of the use of stated forms, that nothing but prejudice can incline a man to except against them.

Gregory Nazianzen was St. Basil's dear friend, and of him it were enough to say, that he commends his friend for making forms of prayer for the use of the Church, as we have heard already. But he also says his own father consecrated the eucharist with the solemn words, that were wont to be used upon that occasion.³ And speaking of Julian, the apostate, he says,⁴ "he admired the Church for her forms of worship, which were anciently delivered and still preserved among them:" and therefore he intended that his Heathen priests should imitate the Christians, and "have a form of prayers in parts,"⁵ that is, prayers so composed as that the people might make their responses. Which is also taken notice of by Sozomen, who says, that Julian, admiring the order of Christian worship, appointed, that the Heathen temples should be adorned after the same manner,⁶ "with prescribed prayers upon set days and hours." Nazianzen also mentions the usual form of renouncing the devil in baptism, and the solemn covenant or compact made with Christ, which he says they did,⁷ "ἐν τοῖς σχήμασι ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασι, both by words and gestures," that is, renouncing the devil with their faces to the West, and then turning about to the East, by which they signified their turning to Christ, the sun of righteousness. Both which words and gestures were evidently matter of form and ecclesiastical prescription. As was also the form of professing their

¹ Book xiii. chap. ii.² Basil. Regul. Majores. Quæst. 37.³ Naz. Orat. xix. p. 305. *Εἶτα ἐπειπὼν τὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ῥήματα ἔτως ὡς συνηθῆς, &c.*⁴ Naz. Orat. iii. p. 101. *Τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἐν εἰς τὸδε τετηρημένοις τύποις τῆς ἐκκλησίας.*⁵ Naz. Ibid. p. 102. *Εὐχῶν τύπον ἐν μέρει.*⁶ Sozom. lib. v. cap. xvi. *Ὁρῶν τε ῥητῶν ἐν ἡμερῶν τεταγμέναις εὐχαῖς. &c.*⁷ Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. p. 671.

faith, the triple immersion, and many other such rights and observances, which we meet with in Nazianzen and all other ecclesiastical writers almost, that have any occasion to speak of the ancient manner of administering baptism.

There is one author more, which was famous about this time, before the death of Athanasius, which was Ephrem, deacon of Edessa, commonly called the prophet of the Syrians. Theodoret says,¹ that he composed a great many hymns, in opposition to those that had been formerly made by Harmonius, the son of Bardesanes, the heretic, and that they were used upon the festivals of the martyrs. Sozomen² mentions his divine hymns also, as well as those that were made upon the martyrs. And these no doubt were some of those famous writings of his, which St. Jerom³ says were used to be rehearsed in the Church after the reading of the Scriptures.

Here it will not be improper also to observe, that the practice of heretics in endeavouring to corrupt and alter the ancient forms of the Church, is often a manifest evidence and testimony of the antiquity of them. Thus Theodoret takes notice,⁴ that in the beginning of this century, Arius, transgressing the ancient laws of giving glory to God, which had been handed down by those, who lived and served in the ministry of the word from the beginning, introduced a new form, teaching those, whom he deceived, to say, "Glory be to the Father, by the Son, in the Holy Ghost." And that, though he did not presume to alter the form of baptising "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," yet he forbade to use the glorification according to the rule of baptism. Does not this prove, that the form of this doxology was long before Arius, since he presumed to introduce a new one? So again, when the same Theodoret tells us,⁵ that Eunomius subverted the ancient law of baptism, delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and

¹ Theod. lib. iv. cap. 39.

² Sozom. lib. iii. cap. 16.

³ Hieron. de Scriptor. cap. 115. Ad tantam venit claritatem, ut post lectionem Scripturarum publicè in quibusdam ecclesiis ejus scripta recitentur.

⁴ Theod. Hæret. Fabul. lib. iv. cap. 1.

⁵ Theod. Ibid. cap. iii.

brought in a contrary law, that men should not be baptised with a triple immersion, nor by invocation of the Trinity, but only by a single immersion in the name of Christ : does not this innovation as plainly prove, that the rite of trine immersion was the ancient form and custom of the Church? As Tertullian,¹ and all that speak of it before Eunomius, have constantly asserted. So that, whether we consider the testimonies of the Catholics, or the practices and innovations made by heretics, they both concur to prove, that within this period of time, viz. during the life of Athanasius, the Church made use of forms in every considerable part of divine service, baptism, psalmody, and the most solemn worship at the Lord's table. And so she did also in her funeral rites, where nothing is more common than to hear of psalmody in their solemn processions to any interment, as may be seen in the writings of Gregory Nazianzen,² and the Constitutions,³ to mention no other at present, that come not within the prefixed term of the life of Athanasius.

It was not above three years after the death of Athanasius, that St. Ambrose was made bishop of Milan, Anno 374. He was a zealous defender of the Catholic faith against the Arians, in opposition to whom he composed several hymns in Latin to the glory of the Holy Trinity, for the people to sing in the Church. Of which he himself gives this account in his tract against Auxentius : " They accuse me," says he,⁴ " for deceiving and alluring the people with the poetry of my hymns. And I do not altogether deny the charge. For what can be more powerful and alluring than the confession of the Trinity, which is daily sung by the mouth of all the people? They all zealously strive to make profession of the faith; they all know how to celebrate the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in verse." These hymns are mentioned al-

¹ Tertul. cont. Prax. cap. 26. It de Coron. Mil. cap. iii. Vid. Can. Apostol. xlix.

² Naz. Orat. iv. in Julian. p. 118.

³ Vid. Constit. Apost. lib. vi. cap. 30.

⁴ Ambr. Orat. cont. Auxent. ad calcem Epist. xxxii. Hymnorum quoque meorum carminibus deceptum populum ferunt. Planè ne hoc abnuo. Grade carmen istud est, quo nihil potentius. Quid enim potentius quàm confessio Trinitatis, quæ quotidie totius populi ore celebratur? Certatim omnes student fidem fateri; Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum nôrunt versibus prædicare.

so by Prosper in his *Chronicon*,¹ as the first that were sung in the Church in Latin measures. St. Austin frequently speaks of them, and says,² they were sung, as then the psalms were, in the alternate way, verse for verse by the people, to alleviate the tediousness of their sorrow; and from this example the custom of alternate hymnody and psalmody spread almost all over the Western Churches. One of these is particularly cited by him,³ as an evening hymn, and others are among his works: and these we are sure in the following ages continued in use: for the⁴ hymns of St. Ambrose and St. Hilary are mentioned by the fourth Council of Toledo, Anno 633, as parts of the daily service in the Spanish Churches. St. Ambrose himself also speaks of the use of that ancient hymn called the Trisagion, telling us,⁵ “that in most of the Eastern and Western Churches, when the sacrifice was offered to God, the priest and people with one voice said, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, all the earth is full of thy glory!” He mentions also the common form of salutation, “The peace of God be with you.”⁶ He says the music spoken of in the parable of the prodigal son, Luke xv. means the whole Church’s singing together the psalms

¹ Prosper. *Chronic. an.* 386. ap. Papi Critic. in Baron. *an.* 387. n. 7. Hymni Ambrosii compositi, qui nunquam ante in Ecclesiis Latinis modulis canebantur.

² Aug. *Confess. lib. ix. cap. vii.* Tunc hymni et psalmi ut canerentur secundum morem orientalium partium, ne populus mæroris tædio contabesceret, institutum est; et ex illo in hodiernum retentum, multis jam ac penè omnibus gregibus tuis et per cætera orbis imitantibus.

³ *Ibid. cap. xii.* Recordatus sum veridicos versus Ambrosii,

Deus Creator omnium
 Polique rector; vestiens
 Diem decoro lumine;
 Noctem soporis gratiâ:
 Artus solutos ut quies
 Reddat laboris usui,
 Mentisque fessas allevet
 Luctusque solvat anxios.

Vid. *Retraction. lib. i. cap. xxi.*

⁴ *Con. Tolet. iv. can. xii.*

⁵ Ambros. *de Spir. Sancto.* cited by Comber of *Liturgies. p. 183.*

⁶ *Id. de Dignit. Sacerd. cap. v.* Pronunciat episcopus hujusmodi ad populum dicens, ‘Pax vobis, &c.’

alternately,¹ men, women, and children, with different voices, but all conspiring, as the strings of an instrument, in one harmonious concord. And this was the symphony, which the Apostle had reference to, when he said, "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." His Books, *De Sacramentis*, if we allow them to be his, are so full of forms and ceremonies relating to the administration of baptism, confirmation, and the eucharist, that a man cannot look into them, but he must conclude, he wrote his accounts of these things from the known and settled forms of the Church. For which reason I think it needless to recite any of them; but they that please may see them related in Dr. Comber.² If any one should except against these Books, as none of St. Ambrose's genuine off-spring, it is sufficient to have evidenced the use of forms from his undoubted writings. St. Jerom testifies concerning the use of the psalms, as forms of prayer and praises, that they were used both publicly and privately upon all occasions. In the Egyptian monasteries, he says,³ the singing of the Psalms was a principal part of their devotions at every solemn meeting. He directs Rusticus⁴ to learn the psalter by heart, and to repeat the psalm in his turn, as the monks were obliged to do one by one in their assemblies. He says of himself,⁵ that he thus learned the psalms by heart, when he was young, and sung them when he was old every day. He directs Læta, a noble lady, so to accustom her daughter to the singing of psalms and hymns at all the canonical hours of prayer,⁶ and teach her this by her own example. And after the same manner⁷ he writes to Demetrias, a virgin, to observe

¹ Ambr. lib. vii. in Luc. xv. tom. v. p. 125. Hæc est symphonia, quando concinit in ecclesiâ diversarum ætatum atque virtutum, velut variarum chordarum, indiscreta concordia. Psalmus respondetur: Amen! dicitur. Hæc est symphonia. quam scivit et Paulus; ideo ait, 'Psallam spiritu, psallam et mente.'

² Comber Origin. of Liturg. p. 182.

³ Hieron. Ep. xxii. ad Eustoch. cap. xv. Post horam nonam in comune concurrerit, psalmi resonant, scripturæ recitantur ex more. &c. Vid. Ep. xxvii. cap. x.

⁴ Ep. iv. ad Rustic. Monach. Discatur psalterium ad verbum.—Dicas psalmum in ordine tuo.

⁵ Invectiv. ii. cont. Ruffin. cap. vii. Psalmos jugiter canto, &c.

⁶ Epist. vii. ad Lætam. Assuescat exemplo ad orationes et psalmos nocte consurgere. manè hymnos canere, tertiâ, sextâ, nonâ, &c.

⁷ Ep. viii. ad Demetr. Considerans propter psalmoreum et orationis ordi-

the order of psalmody and prayers at every such stated hour. There may be some dispute about the observation of canonical hours seven times a day in the public service of the Church, but there is none about the use of psalmody in general: for St. Jerom, writing to Sabinianus,¹ a deacon, who had been guilty of some indecent behaviour toward a consecrated virgin, reminds him of the immodest signs he had made to her even whilst he stood in the choir of the singers. And a little before,² he speaks of the whole Church sounding forth hymns to Christ their Lord in her nocturnal vigils, a great part of which, we shall see hereafter, was always spent in psalmody. This was always a part of their funeral service: for speaking of the great concourse of bishops and people at the funeral of the lady Paula, he says,³ “some of the bishops led up the choir of singers, and the people sounded forth the psalms in order, some in Greek, some in Latin, some in Syriac, according to the different language of every nation.” He says the same in his Epitaph of Fabiola,⁴ “that the people made the gilded roof of the temple shake and echo again with their psalms and hallelujahs.” It is also observable that in St. Jerom’s time and long before, the Church had a peculiar order among her clergy called singers, which he himself mentions,⁵ and of which I have given a more particular account in a former Book.⁶ He also frequently speaks⁷ of the clergy as ministering in a peculiar habit of white garment, in imitation of the angels, of which more will be said hereafter. At present I only observe, that this could not be done without some rule or order prescribing the cere-

nem, quod tibi horâ tertiâ, sextâ, nonâ, ad vesperum, mediâ nocte et manè semper est exercendum. ¹ Ep. xviii. cont. Sabinian. Stabas

deinceps in choro psallentium, et impudicis nutibus loquebaris.

² Ibid. Tota ecclesia nocturnis vigiliis Christum Dominum personabat, &c.

³ Hieron. Ep. xxvii. Epitaph. Paulæ. Alii choros psallentium ducerent in mediâ ecclesiâ.—Græco, Latino, Syroque sermone psalmi in ordine personabant. ⁴ Id. Ep. xxx. Epitaph. Fabiolæ. Sonabant psalmi,

et aurata tecta templorum reboans in sublime quatiebat alleluja.

⁵ Com. in Ephes. v. 19. Audiant hæc adolescentuli: audiant hi, quibus psallendi in ecclesiâ officium est, &c. ⁶ Book iii. chap. vii.

⁷ Hieron. Ep. iii. ad Heliodor. Ep. ad Præsidium. Com. in Ezek. 44. lib. i. cont. Pelag.

monies of decency in divine worship. He does not say much of the other parts of the Liturgy, yet he frequently mentions the form of renunciation used in baptism, and the use of the creed,¹ as does also Pelagius, in his Comments upon the Epistles of St. Paul, under the name of St. Jerom,² and Hilary, the Roman deacon, under the name of St. Ambrose,³ whose authorities are good in this case because they were co-temporaries with these writers. He mentions also the use of the Lord's-prayer in the communion office, as given by Christ to his Apostles, from whom the Church⁴ learned to use it every day in the sacrifice of his body. He speaks likewise of the Trisagion, or cherubical hymn, Holy, Holy, Holy,⁵ Lord God of Sabaoth ! which they sung as a confession of the Holy Trinity. And he mentions a part of one of the Church's prayers,⁶ which was, " Lord grant us thy peace, for Thou hast given us all things." And again,⁷ " Thus saith the Church, ' in rest and in tribulation I have been mindful of Thee ? ' " Commenting on that psalm, which the Ancients called their morning psalm, " my God, my God, early will I seek Thee." And on another psalm,⁸ " The Church says, ' from the remembrance of our former sins, our hearts are hot within us.' " Speaking also of wicked priests, he says,⁹ " they act impiously against Christ, whilst they think that a good life is not as necessary to the eucharist, as the solemn prayer or words of the priest." Where he seems plainly to reflect on those, who trusted to the bare form of prayer without moral

¹ Id. Com. in Amos. vi. 14. et in Mat. v. 26. et Dial. cont. Lucifer.

² Pelag. Com. in i. Tim. vi. 12.

³ Ambro. in i. Tim. vi. 12.

⁴ Hieron. cont. Pelag. lib. iii. cap. 5. Sicut docuit Apostolos suos, ut quotidie in corporis illius sacrificio credentes audeant loqui, ' Pater noster qui es in cœlis,' &c.

⁵ Id. de xlii. Mansionibus

in initio. In confessionem Sanctæ Trinitatis erumpimus, dicentes, ' sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus, Deus sabaoth !'

⁶ Hieron. Ep. iv. ad Rusticum. Utinam audiat vox Ecclesiæ implorantis, ' Domine pacem tuam da nobis : omnia enim dedisti nobis.'

⁷ Id. Com. in Psal. lxii. Dicit hæc Ecclesiæ : ' Et in requie et in tribulatione non fui tui oblitus.'

⁸ In Psal. xxxviii. Concaluit cor meum intra me. Dicit Ecclesia, ' A recordatione delictorum priorum.'

⁹ In Zephan. iii. Impiè agunt in legem Christi, putantes *Εὐχαριστίαν* imprecantis facere verba, non vitam ; et necessariam esse tantum solennem orationem, et non sacerdotum merita.

qualifications. He also mentions the solemn rite of giving each other the kiss of peace in the eucharist,¹ and the people's known custom of answering amen, at the reception of it. All which are plain indications of the use of certain forms in divine worship; though St. Jerom only mentions them incidentally, and had no occasion to enlarge much upon them.

St. Austin and St. Chrysostom, as they are more voluminous writers, so they are more copious and exact upon this subject. I have given the reader a specimen of what may be collected of the Eastern Liturgy out of the writings of St. Chrysostom in the following chapter. And some learned men are of opinion, that if any one will be as curious in examining St. Austin's works, he may find the whole African Liturgy in his writings. I will not pretend to be so exact in this collection, but only make some short references to what he says upon some parts of it. He divides the whole Liturgy or service of the Church into five parts,² viz. psalmody, reading of the Scriptures, preaching, prayers of the bishop, and the bidding prayers of the deacon. All which, except preaching, were done by certain forms and prescriptions.

And, first, for psalmody, he says, "it was the exercise of the people at all times, when no other part of the service was performing." "For there was no time," he says, "unseasonable for the people to sing holy psalms and hymns in the Church, except when either the Scriptures were read, or the sermon was preached, or prayers were made by the bishop, or the common prayers were dictated by the voice of the deacon." We have heard him before speak with approbation of the ways of singing psalms and hymns, introduced by Athanasius and St. Ambrose.³ Which argues not only, that he allowed the singing of psalms and hymns, that is. forms of prayer and praises, in general; but also, that he liked the several ways of singing then in

¹ Hieron. Ep. lxi. ad Theophil. cap. i. Quisquamne inter sacras epulas Jude osculum porrigit?—Qua conscientia ad Eucharistiam Christi accedam, et respondebo Amen! eum de charitate dubitem porrigentis?

² Aug. Epist. exix. ad Januar. cap. xviii.

³ Aug. Confes.

lib. ix. cap. 7. et 12. lib. x. cap. 33.

use, the plain song, and the symphoniacal concert at the conclusion of every verse, used by Athanasius, and the new alternate way introduced by St. Ambrose. Though he intimates that the plain way generally was more agreeable to the slow genius of the African people,¹ whose singing he vindicates from the scurrilous objections, which the Donatists made against their practice. And he wrote a book particularly against one Hilarius, a secular tribune, who pretended to quarrel with the custom of the Church of Carthage, for singing hymns out of the book of psalms at the altar,² either before the oblation of the eucharist was made, or whilst it was distributed to the people. This book of St. Austin's is now lost, but he mentions it in his *Retractations*. He also speaks of the evening hymns:³ and of the singing of the "Halleluia!"⁴ in some churches every day, and in others only the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost. And Possidius tells us in his *Life*,⁵ "that in the great irruption of the Vandals into Afric a little before his death, nothing grieved him more than to see the hymns and praises of God destroyed out of the Churches, and the solemnities of God's worship, with the sacrifice and sacraments, to fail in the places, where they were used to be celebrated." And he adds,⁶ "that in his last sickness he ordered some of the penitential psalms of David to be written for him in large sheets, and hanged up against the wall, which he read and used as forms, proper for penitential devotion." All which

¹ Ep. exix. ad Paulin. cap. xviii. Donatistæ nos reprehendunt quod sobriè psallimus in Ecclesiâ divîna cantica Prophetarum, &c.

² Aug. *Retractat.* lib. ii. cap. xi. Hilarius quidam vir tribunitius laicus—morem qui tunc esse apud Carthaginem cæperat, ut hymni ad altare dicerentur de Psalmorum libro, sive ante oblationem, sive cùm distribueretur populo quod esset oblatum, maledicâ reprehensione ubicunque poterat læcerabat, &c.

³ Aug. de Civ. Dei. lib. xxii. cap. viii.

⁴ Ep. exix. ad Paulin. cap. xviii. Ut autem halleluia! per illos solos dies quinquaginta cantetur, non usquequaque observatur. Nam in aliis diebus variè cantatur alibi atque alibi; ipsis autem diebus ubique.

⁵ Possid. Vit. Aug. cap. xxix. Cernebat etiam hymnos Dei et laudes de ecclesiis deperisse: solennia quoque quæ Deo debentur, de propriis locis defecisse, &c.

⁶ Ibid. cap. xxx. Jusserat sibi psalmos Davidicos, qui sunt paucissimi de penitentiâ scribi, ipsosque quaterniones jacens in lecto contra parietem positos diebus suæ infirmitatis intuebatur et legebat, et jugitur ac ubertim flebat.

shews, that St. Austin thought the Psalms of David were not unlawful to be used as forms of prayers and praises in the service of God.

Secondly, for the reading of the Scriptures, he acquaints us in many places, that this was done by a certain rule and calendar, appointing proper lessons for particular occasions and seasons. There were some festival days, he says,¹ on which they were bound to read certain appropriated lessons out of the Gospel, which were so fixed to those anniversary solemnities, that no other lessons might be read in their room. Thus he says in Easter week they constantly read² four days one after another the history of Christ's resurrection out of the four Gospels, on the first day St. Matthew, on the second St. Mark, on the third St. Luke, and on the fourth St. John. So likewise on the day of Christ's passion, he says, they read the history of his sufferings³ out of St. Matthew only, because it was all but one day; and when he would have had all the four Gospels read at that time also, the people were disturbed at it, because they had not been accustomed to it. In the time between Easter and Pentecost, he says,⁴ they always read the Acts of the Apostles. St. Chrysostom will give us the reason of this hereafter: and we shall see, that this was an universal custom obtaining throughout the whole Church, when we come to consider this rule more fully exemplified⁵ in the Church's general practice.

Thirdly, for the prayers made by the bishop in the communion-office, St. Austin gives us such a description of them, as shews they must needs be made by a certain order and form. For he thus describes one part of them, while he instructs the newly-baptised in the method and meaning

¹ Aug. Expos. in i. Joan. in Prefat. tom. ix. p. 235. *Interposita est solemnitas sanctorum dierum, quibus certas ex Evangelio lectiones oportet in ecclesiâ recitari, quæ ita sunt annuæ, ut aliæ esse non possint.*

² Serm. 139. de Temp. It. 140, 141, 144, 148.

³ Serm. 144. de Temp. p. 320. *Passio quia uno die legitur, non solet legi nisi secundùm Matthæum, &c.*

⁴ Tract. vi. in Joan. Evang. tom. ix. p. 24. *Actus Apostolorum, &c. Anniversariâ solennitate post passionem Domini nostis illum librum recitari. Vid. Aug. Hom. 227. Nov. Edit. Benedictin. quæ est 83. de Diversis.*

⁵ Book xiv. chap. iii. sect. 3.

of them: "ye understand," says he,¹ "the sacrament in the order of its administration. First after prayer, (meaning the prayer for the whole state of the Church, which went before,) ye are taught to lift up your hearts. Therefore when it is said, 'Lift up your hearts;' ye answer, 'We lift them up unto the Lord.' The bishop or presbyter, who officiates, goes on and says, 'Let us give thanks unto our Lord God:' and ye give in your attestation, and say, 'It is meet and right so to do.' Then after the consecration of the sacrifice we say the Lord's prayer. And after that, the priest says, 'Peace be with you,' and Christians salute one another with an holy kiss." Here we have not only the method of the communion-service, but the several forms of it in order one after another. And these forms are frequently mentioned by St. Austin in other places. The Lord's-prayer, he says,² was always used by the whole Church almost, as the close of the consecration-service, and at other times as the daily prayer³ of the faithful, peculiarly belonging to them and not to the catechumens, as we shall shew more fully hereafter.⁴ The form, "*Sursum corda, lift up your hearts, &c.*" he says,⁵ was used by all Christians throughout the world, who daily answered with one voice, "We lift up our hearts unto the Lord," as he speaks in his Book of True Religion, and other places. And to this he says the priests added that other form, "Let us give thanks to our Lord God:" to which the people answered, "it is meet and right so to do:" as he speaks in his Epistles⁶ to Dardanus and Honoratus, and in his Book of the Gift of Perseverance against the Pelagians, and *De Spiritu et Litera*, and

¹ Aug. Hom. 83. de Diversis. tom. x. p. 556. Tenetis sacramentum ordine suo. Primo post orationem admonemini sursum habere cor, &c. Ideò cùm dicitur, 'sursum cor,' respondetis, 'Habemus ad Dominum.'—Sequitur episcopus vel presbyter, qui offert, et dicit, 'Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro! et vos attestamini, 'Dignum et justum est,' dicentes. Deinde post sanctificationem sacrificii dicimus Orationem Dominicam. Post istam dicitur, 'Pax vobiscum:' et osculantur se Christiani osculo sancto.

² Aug. Ep. lix. ad Paulin.

³ Ep. cxxi. ad Proban. Enchirid. ad

Laurent. cap. lxxi. Homil. xlii. inter 50.

⁴ Chap. vii. sect. 9.

⁵ Aug. de Verâ Relig. cap. ii. Serm. 54. et 64. de Temp. Ep. clvi. ad Proban.

⁶ Ep. lvii. ad Dardanum, et Ep. cxx. ad Honoratum. De Bono Persever. cap. xiii. De Spiritu et Literâ. lib. i. c. 11. De Bono Viduitatis, cap. xvi.

De Bono Viduitatis, which being all to the same purpose, need not here be repeated. He also mentions in his other writings the solemn form of the priest's saying, "Peace be with you," and the people's giving one another thereupon the kiss of peace, which was a symbol¹ of that innocence and peace, which ought to be the qualification of true Christian doves. And this rite, he says, was observed not only by the Catholics, but by the Donatists also.² So that here is unquestionable evidence for the use of all these forms in the writings of St. Austin. And though he does not give us the whole forms of the longer prayers made by the bishop at the altar, yet he mentions some parts of them, and makes such references and appeals to them both in his discourses to the Orthodox, and confutations of heretics, as plainly shews they were common forms, which they were well acquainted with, and by remembering them might understand the doctrine of the Church. Thus in his *Book of Perseverance*,³ he says, "those of the Church need not any operose disputations to convince them of the necessity of God's grace to persevere; they need only remember her daily prayers, how she prays, that infidels may believe, and that believers may persevere." And again,⁴ he tells them, "it is the safest way for weak men in this dispute, to look upon these prayers which the Church always had, and always will have to the end of the world. For when did not the Church pray for infidels and her enemies, that they might believe? or who ever, when he heard the priest pray-

¹ Aug. Hom. vi. in Joan. tom. ix. p. 21. Habere cum fratribus veram pacem, quam significant oscula columbarum, &c.

² Cont. Literas Petilian. lib. ii. cap. xxiii. Illum commemoro, Optatum Gildonianum, cui pacis osculum inter sacramenta copulabatis.

³ De Bono Persever. cap. vii. In hâc re non operosas disputationes expectet Ecclesia, sed attendat quotidianas orationes suas. Orat, ut credentes perseverent.

⁴ Ibid. cap. xxiii. Ut magis intuerentur orationes suas, quas semper habuit et habebit Ecclesia.—Quando enim non oratum est in Ecclesiâ pro infidelibus atque inimicis ejus, ut crederent?—Aut quis sacerdotem super fideles Dominum invocantem, si quando dixit, 'da illis, Domine, in te perseverare usque in finem, non solùm voce ausus est, sed saltem cogitatione reprehendere; ac non potius super ejus talem benedictionem, et corde credente et ore confitente respondit Amen: cùm aliud in ipsâ Oratione Dominicâ non orant fideles, &c.

ing over the faithful, and saying ‘ Grant, O Lord, that they may persevere in Thee unto the end,’ durst either in word or thought find fault with him, and not rather with faith in his heart, and confession in his mouth, answer amen to such a benediction? When the faithful pray no otherwise in the Lord’s prayer, especially when they say, ‘ Lead us not into temptation.’ By all which it appears, that both the larger and the shorter prayers, in the communion-office of the African Church in St. Austin’s time, were offered up in such forms, as the people could easily remember, when he referred to them as evidence in some disputes, which this was an easy way to determine.

Fourthly, there was one sort of prayers more, which St. Austin distinguishes from the former, by the name of the common-prayers, dictated or indicted to the people by the voice of the deacon. Now these prayers, as I shall shew more fully hereafter,¹ differed from the bishop’s prayer in this, that the bishop’s prayer was a direct and continued invocation of God, to which the people answered only, amen! in the conclusion; but the deacon’s prayer was a sort of bidding-prayer, or direction to the people what particulars they were to pray for; the deacon going before them, and repeating every petition, to which they made answer, “ Lord hear us,” or “ Lord help us,” or “ Lord have mercy,” or the like. And this sort of prayer St. Austin expressly calls,² “ *Communis Oratio voce Diaconi indicta, common prayer dictated by the voice of the deacon.*” And he seems in one of his Epistles³ to specify some of the particular petitions contained in that prayer. For writing to one, who was infected with the Pelagian doctrine, maintaining that infidels were only to be preached to, and not prayed for, because faith was not the work of God’s grace, but the effect of man’s own free-will, he urges him with the known prayers of the Church, which the man himself frequented. “ Exercise,” says he, “ your disputations against the prayers of the Church, and when you hear the priest of God at the altar exhorting the people of

¹ Book xv. chap. i. sect. 2.
cap. xviii.

² Aug. Ep. 119. ad. Paulin.
³ Ep. 107. ad. Vitalem. p. 187.

God to pray for unbelievers, ‘ that they may be converted to the faith ;’ and for catechumens, ‘ that God would inspire them with a desire of regeneration ;’ and for the faithful, ‘ that by his gift they may persevere in that wherein they have begun ;’ mock at these pious words, and say, you do not do what you here are exhorted to do.” And again,¹ “ when you hear the priest of God at the altar exhorting the people to pray to God, or else hear him praying with an audible voice, ‘ that God would compel the unbelieving Gentiles to come in to his faith,’ do you not answer and say, ‘ amen ?” These seem to be usual parts of the prayer for the whole state of the world, in which infidels were prayed for as well as others, to which St. Austin refers, as things well known to all that frequented the prayers of the Church.

Besides these, there were some occasional offices, such as the office of exorcism, and the institution of the catechumens, and baptism, in which many forms, and rites, and ceremonies were observed, agreeable to the practice then obtaining in the Church: but of these I have had occasion to speak largely out of St. Austin and other writers in a former book,² and therefore think it needless to repeat them in this place. All, I shall further add, is two or three canons of the African Councils, held in St. Austin’s time, at some of which he was present and assisted. He was a member of the third Council of Carthage, in one of whose canons there are several orders and directions given concerning the public prayers,³ that no one in prayers should name the Father for the Son, or the Son for the Father. And when they stood at the altar, all prayers should be directed to the Father. And whatever prayers any one writ out for himself, or from other books, he should not use them before they were examined by his more learned brethren. This is as plain an argument for set forms as can be given, and yet some, I know not by what means, make

¹ Ep. 107. ad Vitalem. p. 191.

² Books ix, and x.

³ Con. Carthag. iii. can. 23. Ut nemo in precibus vel Patrem pro Filio, vel Filium pro Patre nominet. Et cum ad altare assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio. Et quicumque sibi preces aliunde describit, (al. quascunque sibi preces aliquis describit) non eis utatur, priusquam eas cum instructoribus fratribus contulerit.

it an argument against them. The design of the canon was plainly to prevent all irregularities and corruptions creeping into the devotions of the Church: and therefore the Fathers made an order, that no bishop should use any prayers in his Church, but such as were first examined and approved by his fellow-bishops in a Council. As another canon in the African Code explains it,¹ “ that such prayers should be used by all, as had been authorised and confirmed in synod, whether they were prefaces, or commendations, or impositions of hands, and that no other should be brought in against the faith, but those only be said, which were collected or examined by men of greater abilities and understanding.” And this is repeated again in the Council of Milevis almost in the same words.² These African Fathers probably had observed, that there were some country bishops, who had not sufficient abilities to compose orthodox forms for the use of their own Churches: and therefore they a little restrained the ancient liberty, which every bishop had of composing a form of prayer for his own Church, and obliged them to use such as were composed by men of greater abilities, or such as had been approved in synod, that no heretical opinion might creep into the public worship, either by their ignorance or want of care in their compositions. By all this it appears, that the public devotions of the African Church, were at this time directed by certain forms of worship, and those not left to every bishop to compose for himself, but he must use such prayers as were first approved by his brethren, or established and confirmed in Council. And this seems to be the first beginning of that custom, which afterward prevailed all over the Church, as has been before observed in this chapter,³ that all provin-

¹ Cod. Afric. can. 106. “Ὡστε τὰς κεκυρώμενας ἱκεσίας, εἴτε οἶμα, εἴτε παραθέσεις εἴτε τὰς τῆς χειρὸς ἐπιθέσεις ἀπὸ παντῶν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. ἢ παντελῶς ἄλλας κατὰ τῆς πίστεως μηδέποτε προσενεχθῆναι, ἀλλ’ αἵτινες δῆποτε ἀπὸ τῶν συνεπωτέρων συνήχθησαν, λεχθῆσονται.”

² Con. Milevit. can. xii. Placuit etiam et illud, ut preces vel orationes seu missæ, quæ probatæ fuerint in synodo, sive præfationes, sive commendationes, sive manûs impositiones, ab omnibus celebrentur. Nec aliæ omninò dicantur, nisi quæ à prudentioribus tractatæ, vel comprobatæ in synodo fuerint, ne forte aliquid contra fidem, vel per ignorantiam, vel per minus studium sit compositum.

³ See before in this chap. sect. 2.

cial bishops should use the same form of prayer, that was established in the Churches of their metropolitans.

I need not now insist upon these same councils speaking of the solemn interrogatories¹ and answers to be made in baptism; nor of their mentioning the Lord's prayer, as a form of so necessary and general a use,² that the Pelagians themselves, who did not like one petition in it unless interpreted to a very perverse sense, durst not presume to lay aside the use of it. For as the first of these is a known practice, so the second will have a more particular handling, when we come to consider the use of the Lord's prayer in a chapter by itself. And so I put an end to this chapter concerning the use of Liturgies in the ancient Church.

CHAP. VI.

An Extract of the Ancient Liturgy out of the genuine Writings of St. Chrysostom.

SECT. I.—Parts of the Liturgy in the first Tome.

It has often been wished by learned men, that some one would represent the ancient Liturgy in its several parts and offices, as it may be collected out of the genuine and undoubted writings of St. Chrysostom; forasmuch as that Liturgy, which goes under his name, cannot be so certainly depended on as his genuine offspring: but there are a great many parts of ancient Liturgy of unquestionable credit, which may be gathered up out of his other discourses. Mr. Hales, of Eaton, a diligent reader of Chrysostom, is said to have designed such a collection, but he did not effect it. Therefore till some one else pursues his design more completely, I think it not improper, for its relation to the present subject, to give the reader in one view a specimen of such passages as plainly refer to the several parts of the ancient

¹ Con. Carthag. iii. can. 34.

² Con. Milevit. can. viii.

Liturgy, observing the order of St. Chrysostom's works according to the Paris edition 1609, and that of Commelin 1617.

In the first Tome, Homily first, p. 1, he plainly intimates, that the Scriptures were read then in some order by a stated rule of the Church, because his sermon that day was upon a passage, that had been read in the course of morning service. 1 Tim. v. 23. "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine." In his second Homily, p. 32, he says again his text was taken out of the Epistle then read for the day, which was, 2 Tim. vi. 17. "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded." In his third Homily, p. 45, he says, the Lord's-prayer was by appointment of the Church the peculiar privilege of those only, who were baptised. For before their initiation in the holy mysteries, they were not allowed to use it. In his seventh Homily, p. 106, he observes, that the Book of Genesis was always appointed to be read in Lent: and accordingly it was then read for the day, and he preached upon the first words of it, "In the beginning God created heaven and earth." In his fifteenth Homily, p. 191, he says, the whole city met together, and *with one common voice*, τῆ μιᾷ κοινῇ φωνῇ, made their litany or supplications to God. And in the same discourse he intimates, that a portion of the prophet Zachary, v. concerning the flying roll against swearers, had then been read for the day, which he accommodated to the subject of vain oaths, against which he was then discoursing. In his eighteenth Homily, p. 226, he says, he preached upon the Epistle, which had been read that day, Phil. iv. 4. "Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say, rejoice." And in his sixteenth Homily, p. 234, he notes the same, that the words upon which he preached out of the Epistle to Philemon, "Paul the prisoner of Jesus Christ, &c." had been read that day. In his twenty-first Homily, p. 266, he takes notice of the use of the hymn called the Trisagion, or cherubical hymn, Holy! Holy! Holy! in the celebration of the eucharist; arguing to his hearers in this manner upon it: "what an absurdity is it for a man, after he has heard that mystical song, that was brought down from heaven, brought down, I say, by the cherubims,

to pollute his ears with the songs of harlots, and the effeminate music of the theatre?" In the same Homily he twice takes notice of the form of renouncing the devil in baptism, p. 267. "We are commanded to say, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι Σατανᾶ, *I renounce thee, O Satan,* that we may never more return to him." And again, p. 273, "Remember," says he, "those words, which you spake when you were initiated in the holy mysteries, I renounce thee, O Satan, and thy pomp, and thy worship, and service." In his twenty-second Homily upon Anger and Forgiving Enemies, he argues for the necessity of pardoning offences from the necessary obligation, that is laid upon all men to say the Lord's prayer. "For this reason," says he, p. 287, "we are commanded to say, 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.'" And again, p. 288, "When you say, 'Forgive us, as we forgive,' If you do not forgive, you ask nothing else of God, but that he would deprive you of all excuse and pardon." And whereas some pleaded, that they did not say the whole prayer, but omitted that clause, "As we forgive them that trespass against us," he rebukes them for it, and bids them not be so vainly cautious, as to think they were excused by curtailing the prayer, but advises them to use the whole prayer, as Christ appointed it to be used, that the necessity of this petition might daily terrify them from revenge, and compel them to grant pardon to their neighbours. In his twenty-fourth Homily of the baptism of Christ, p. 317, he again speaks of the cherubical hymn in the communion-service. "Do you think," says he, "that you have any secular business at that hour? Do you then imagine yourself to be upon earth, or conversing among men? Whose heart is so stony, as to think, that at that time he stands upon the earth, and is not rather in a choir of angels, with whom you sing that mystical hymn, with whom you send up that triumphal song to God?" In his twenty-eighth Homily, (which is the third of the incomprehensible nature of God,) p. 363, he speaks of the common prayer, as sent up with one common voice of the whole congregation speaking and crying aloud to God with one accord. Some would have excused themselves from these prayers of the Church, by this frivolous plea, that they could pray at

home, but they could not hear a sermon or discourse of instruction in their own houses; and therefore they would come to sermon but not to prayers. To whom he makes this reply, "You deceive yourself, O man: for though you may pray at home, yet you cannot pray there in that manner as you do in the Church, where there are so many fathers together, and where the cry of your prayers is sent up to God with one consent. You are not heard so well, when you pray to God by yourself alone, as when you pray with your brethren. For there is something more here, consent of mind, and consent of voice, and the bond of charity, and the prayers of the priests together. For the priests for this very reason preside in the Church, that the people's prayers, which are weaker of themselves, laying hold of those that are stronger, may together with them mount up to heaven." This is a plain description of such common prayers, wherein both priests and people joined not only in heart, but in one common form of words, whereby they cried aloud to God together. A little after, p. 365, he describes these prayers again by "the people's *sending up their tremendous cry all at once*, βωῶσι τὴν φρικοδεῶτην βοήν." And he makes this difference between the manner of the energumens supplicating God, and that of the people, that the one spake not a word, but only supplicated by the posture of their bodies, bowing down their heads, whilst the people, who were allowed to speak audibly in prayers, spake aloud for those, who could not speak for themselves. "For this reason," says he, "the deacon at the time of the oblation brings forth the energumens, or those that are possessed with evil spirits, and bids them bow their heads only, and signify their supplications by this bodily gesture: for they are not permitted to pray with the common assembly of the brethren: therefore he presents them before the congregation, that you pitying both their vexation, and their disability to speak for themselves, might by the freedom and liberty of speech, which is allowed you, grant them your patronage and assistance." From this it appears, that these prayers, for the energumens were in a certain form, in which all the people vocally joined together. In his twenty-ninth Homily, which is the fourth

De Incomprehensibili, p. 374, he repeats the same account of the deacon's calling forth the energumens, and bidding them bow their heads, and the people's praying to God, "ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν μετὰ σφοδραῖς βοῆς, *with one consent and with strong cries*, that he would shew mercy on them." A little after in the same Homily, p. 375, he mentions another form used by the deacon, as the herald of the Church, who was appointed to call upon the people ever now and then, and excite them to fervency in devotion, by using this form of words, "Ὁρθοὶ ἐὼμεν καλῶς, *Let us elevate our minds, and attend with decency to our devotions.*" "For," as he there explains it, "this admonition did not so much respect the body, as the mind. When the deacon," says he, "calls upon us, and says, 'Let us stand elevated with decency,' it was not without good reason, that this admonition was by the rule of the Church appointed, but that we should elevate our thoughts that lie grovelling upon the ground; that, casting away the distraction that arises from secular affairs, we should be able to present our souls upright and raised to a spiritual sense in the presence of God. Let no man therefore," adds he, "join in those sacred and mystical hymns with remissness of mind; let no man entertain the thoughts of this life at that time; but driving away all earthly concerns, let him translate himself wholly into heaven, as standing then close by the throne of glory, and flying with the seraphims: and so let him offer up τὸν πανάγιον ὕμνον, *that most holy hymn*, (meaning the Trisagion, or else the hymn called, Glory be to God on high,) to the God of majesty and glory. It is upon this account we are called upon at this time, ἐπάναί καλῶς, *to compose ourselves decently*, as it becomes men, who stand in the presence of God, with fear and trembling. with a vigilant and elevated soul." In his thirty-fourth Homily, which is the first against the Jews, p. 443, he speaks of another form used by the deacon, and that frequently, before the participation of the holy mysteries: he then cried out, "Ἐπιγινώσκετε ἀλλήλους, *discern and know one another:*" which was an admonition to the people, that they should suffer no Jew, infidel, heretic, catechumen, or penitent to communicate among them. In his fortieth Homily upon the martyrs, Juventinus

and Maximus, p. 550, he says, "the Church kept her vigils all the night with continual psalmody, which was nothing but forms of prayers and praises out of the Holy Scriptures." In the forty-seventh Homily upon Julian, the martyr, p. 613, he again mentions the solemn form of renunciation in baptism. "You renounced," says he, "all this kind of pomp, (harlot's songs and obscene words used in the theatre,) and made a covenant with Christ, in that day when you were initiated in the holy mysteries. Remember, therefore those words, and your covenant, and beware you do not transgress it." In his fifty-first Homily upon Bernice, p. 635, he says, they used hymns and prayers and psalms at the funerals of Christians; and particularly the words of the cxvi. psalm, "Return unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee." Implying, that the death of a Christian was a kindness and a rest: for he, that is entered into that rest, hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his. In his fifty-fifth Homily, which is the fifth of Repentance, p. 672, he plainly intimates, that his discourse was made upon the Epistle that had been read for the day. 2 Cor. xii. 21. "Lest when I come again, I shall bewail many, who have sinned, and have not repented." In his sixtieth Homily, which is his catechetical instruction to those that were preparing for baptism, he takes notice of several forms and rules made by the Church, relating to that matter, p. 797, as first, the solemn words by which every man entered into covenant with Christ. For speaking of the danger and ill consequences of deferring baptism to a sick-bed, he says, "When he that is baptised knows none that are about him, when he cannot hear a word that is spoken, when he cannot utter those words, wherewith he should make the blessed covenant with our common Lord, but lies like a stock or a stone, differing nothing from a dead man; what advantage is it to such an one to be initiated in the holy mysteries in such a state of insensibility?" This implies, that the party baptised was to make his compact with God in a solemn and usual form of words, which a man at the point of death was not able to utter. After this he goes on to shew, that the Church had appointed the time of Lent

chiefly above other times for exorcism and baptism; and that the catechumens, after they were instructed, were remitted over to the exorcists, to have their exorcisms or prayers said over them; and that during this time they were obliged to walk discalceate, and wear only one coat: which were appointments of the Church, he says, established for good reasons, and not without their mystical signification. In his seventy-fourth Homily, in which is a panegyric upon the Martyrs, p. 900, he speaks again of the Trisagion, or cherubical hymn, as used to be sung in the celebration of the eucharist, "The martyrs," says he, "are now joining in concert and partaking in the mystical songs of the heavenly choir: for if, whilst they were in the body, whenever they communicated in the holy mysteries, they made part of that choir, singing with the cherubims the trisagion hymn, Holy! Holy! Holy! as all ye, that are initiated in those mysteries, very well understand: much more now, being joined with them, whose partners they were in the earthly choir, they do with greater freedom partake in those solemn blessings and glorifications of God in heaven above."

SECT. 2.—Parts of the Liturgy in the second Tome of St. Chrysostom's Works.

The second Tome of St. Chrysostom's works, is his Homilies upon Genesis, which were preached in Lent, when that book was always read in the Church, as appears from his first Homily, p. 10, and from what has been observed before out of his seventh Homily to the people of Antioch in the foregoing section. In his twenty-seventh Homily upon this book, he plainly intimates, that the Lord's-prayer was always a part of the communion-office. For speaking of the duty of forgiving enemies, he says, p. 358, "If we do this, we may then with a pure conscience come to this holy and tremendous table, and boldly say the words that are contained in that prayer. They, who are initiated in the holy mysteries, know what I mean." He covertly intends that petition of the Lord's prayer, "forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." In his thirty-third

Homily, p. 478, he acquaints us, that though the Book of Genesis was by the order of the Church read in Lent, yet when they came to the Thursday in the Passion-week, the day on which our Saviour was betrayed, then they had proper lessons for that day, and Good-Friday, and Easter-day, and all the time between Easter and Pentecost, when it was customary to read the Acts of the Apostles, as a demonstration of our Saviour's resurrection. In his fifty-fourth Homily, p. 731, he says, Christ commanded the use of the Lord's-prayer, prescribing us therein the bounds and rules of praying for temporal things, whilst he enjoins us to say those words, "Give us this day our daily bread." In his second Homily upon the prayer of Hannah, in the same volume, p. 965, he says, "when Christ commanded his disciples not to pray after the manner of the heathen, using vain repetitions, He also taught us the measure of prayer," meaning the form, which He appointed. He repeats the same in the third Homily upon Saul and David p. 1053. "Although," says he, "you are guilty of a thousand crimes, yet, if you sincerely offer up that prayer, which promises, that if you forgive your enemies, your Father will forgive your trespasses," you shall with great confidence obtain the remission of all your sins."

SECT. 3.—Parts of the ancient Liturgy in the third Tome.

The third Tome contains St. Chrysostom's Commentaries and Homilies on the Psalms and the Prophet Isaiah, where he frequently refers to the known parts of the Liturgy then in use in the Church. In his Comment upon the cxii. psalm he three times mentions the necessary use of the Lord's-prayer, p. 369. "As Christ," says he, "when He would induce us to unanimity and charity in our prayers, enjoins us to make common prayer, and obliges the whole Church, as if it were but one person, to say, 'Our Father;' and 'give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil;' always using a word of the plural number, and commanding every one, whether he pray alone by himself, or in common with

others, still to make prayer for his brethren: so here the prophet David calls all men to a consent in prayer, saying, ‘ Praise the Lord, O ye servants: praise the name of the Lord.’” Again, p. 370, speaking of glorifying God, he says, “ Christ hath commanded us to pray for this, saying, whenever we pray, ‘ Hallowed be thy name.’” And p. 372, “ Christ in his Gospel hath commanded us to pray, and say, ‘ Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.’” In like manner, on the cxiv. psalm, p. 394, speaking of the life to come, and how we ought to desire it, and make all our actions tend that way, he adds, “ for this reason we are commanded to say in our prayer, ‘ thy kingdom come ;’ that we may always have respect to that day.” He repeats the same words on the cxix. psalm, p. 425, and on the cxxvii psalm, p. 465. “ We are commanded to use a prayer, in which there is but one petition relating to this life, ‘ Give us this day our daily bread !’” Which he repeats again on the cxl psalm, p. 551. On the cxliv. psalm, p. 595, he says, “ we are commanded to say in our prayer, ‘ Hallowed be thy name.’” And on the cxlix. psalm, p. 633, he calls it the prayer, which was offered up by all in common, and always in the plural number, “ Our Father, &c.” On the cl. psalm, p. 636, he says, “ this prayer was peculiar in its use to the sons of God only, who could call God their Father by virtue of their regeneration and adoption. Our prayer,” says he, “ is prefaced with this title. For it belongs to them only to say, ‘ Our Father,’ who can give him thanks for the gifts, which they have received, and shew forth them all in that name. For he that calls God his Father, confesses the adoption of sons: and he, that confesses the adoption of sons, owns and declares both justification, and sanctification, and redemption, and remission of sins, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. For all these must go before, that we may thereby enjoy the adoption of sons, and be thought worthy to call God our Father.” By which reasoning of St. Chrysostom it appears, that he was so far from thinking the Lord’s-prayer a carnal form, not proper to be used by spiritual men, because it was a form, that on the contrary he thought none were duly qualified to use it, but such as were regenerated, and adopted,

and endowed with the gifts of the Holy Spirit, who alone had the true title to call God their Father. And this, I shall shew in the next chapter, was the general sense of all the ancient writers.

But to return to St. Chrysostom. In his Comment on the cxvii. psalm, p. 406, he takes notice, that the people were used in their responses to return one verse of this psalm, which was; "This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it." This kind of responses he calls, *ὑπηχεῖν* and *ὑποψάλλειν*, because it was the people's subjoining their response to something that the minister had read before out of the same psalm. And it seems to have been appointed for the service of Easter-day, or Christmas-day, or the Lord's-day, because he adds, the people were wont to make this response chiefly on that spiritual assembly and heavenly festival; plainly referring to some eminent festival then well known to the people. And that this custom was introduced by a law and order of the Church, is evident from what follows: for he says, their fore-fathers had appointed the people to sing this verse, "*ὑπηχεῖν ἐνομοθέτησαν*," both because it was sonorous and also contained a sublime doctrine, that forasmuch as they knew not the whole psalm, they might from this one verse be perfectly instructed in the mystery of it. This was the wisdom of the ancient Church, according to Chrysostom, to teach the people the mysteries of religion, by obliging them to bear a part in the usual service.

In his Comment on the cxxxvii. psalm, p. 518, he declares again, that the psalmody was performed partly by the priests, and partly by the people's joining with them: the priests began, and the people answered to them. On the cxl. psalm he notes, p. 544, that this psalm was constantly sung in the order of the daily evening service, whence it had the name of the evening psalm, as the lxii. had the name of the morning psalm, because it was always sung in the morning service. Of which, because I shall give a more particular account of it hereafter,¹ I say no more in this place. On the cxliv. psalm, p. 594, he acquaints us, that this psalm was always sung alternately by the priest

¹ See Book xiii. chap. x. and xi.

and people at the Lord's table, chiefly upon the account of these words in it; "The eyes of all wait upon Thee, and Thou givest them their meat in due season." Of which custom we shall have another occasion to speak further in its proper place.¹

In his Sermon on the cxlv. psalm, p. 823, he tells us, that psalm was used to be sung in the passion week; "Praise the Lord, O my soul, while I live, will I praise the Lord, &c." In his first sermon on Isaiah, p. 834, he says, the Trisagion, or cherubical hymn, "Holy! Holy! Holy!" was sung by the seraphims in heaven above, and by men on earth beneath. And, p. 83, he takes notice of the angelical doxology, "Glory be to God on high!" as used in the Church: and the forms, "Κυριε ἐλέησον, and σώσον, *Lord have mercy upon us!* and, *Lord save us!*" as usual prayers and responses of the people: and reproving the people's clamours, and negligence, and indecent gesticulations in the Church, he reprimands them in this manner: "How dare you mix the devil's sport with this doxology of angels? Why do you not revere the words, which you yourselves use in that place, 'serve the Lord in fear, and rejoice unto him with reverence?' Is this to serve him in fear, when you thus theatrically toss and stretch your bodies, and know not what you say yourselves for your disorderly vociferation?" This plainly implies, that the people bear their part, though sometimes without a just decorum, in all these doxologies, prayers and responses. In his Sermon upon the Seraphims, which is the sixth upon Isaiah, p. 890, he gives a large account again of the use of the seraphical hymn, 'Holy! Holy! Holy!' at the communion table: which because I shall recite at length hereafter, I only just barely hint it in this place.²

In his second Homily upon the obscurity of the ancient prophecies, p. 946, in answer to that vulgar plea, that men could pray at home, he replies in such a manner, as shews that the people bear a part with their own tongues in the common prayers of the Church. "You may pray at home," says he, "but your prayer is not of that efficacy and power, as when the whole body of the Church, *with one mind, and one voice*,—ὁμοθυμαδὸν μᾶ φωνῇ, send up their prayers to-

¹ See Book xv. chap. v. sect. 10.

² See Book xv.

gether, the priests assisting, and offering up the prayers of the whole multitude in common." He there also speaks of the deacon's form in bidding prayer for all orders of men in the world, which I shall not recite here, because I shall do it more fully in its proper place.¹

SECT. 4.—Parts of the ancient Liturgy in the fourth Tome of St. Chrysostom's Works.

The fourth Tome of St. Chrysostom's works consists chiefly of private discourses, which have not much relation to the public Liturgy of the Church: yet some few passages are worthy to be noted among these. In his famous Discourse upon Eutropius, p. 554, among other arguments, whereby he presses the people to lay aside their anger against him, and pardon the injury he had done them, he urges this: "How will you otherwise," says he, "take the holy sacrament into your hands, and use the words of that prayer, wherein we are commanded to say, 'forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us,' if you exact punishment of your debtor?" This shews that the Lord's prayer was used then as an usual part of the communion-service. In the third Homily of Repentance, p. 562, he speaks of the seraphical hymn under the title of 'Μυστικὸν Μῆλος, *the Mystical Song*,' because it was used in the celebration of the holy mysteries. And again in his second Epistle to Olympius, p. 715, he mentions it under the same title. And in his Sermon after his return from banishment, p. 971 he speaks of the form "Εἰρήνη πᾶσι, *Peace be to you all*," as a solemn form used frequently in the Church.

SECT. 5.—In the fifth Tome.

The fifth Tome of his works affords us many more examples. Here he no less than eight times mentions the Lord's prayer as a form in common use by the commandment of Christ. In his sixth Homily upon Lazarus, p. 107, "We are commanded in our prayer to say, 'forgive us our trespasses,' that by the continual use of that prayer we may be put in mind, that we are liable to punishment." In his

¹ Book. xv. chap. i.

eighth Homily on our Saviour's prayer, "Father if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," p. 134, he says, "Christ prayed, to teach his disciples to pray. But they were to learn not only to pray, but after what manner to pray: and therefore he delivered them a prayer in these words, commanding them and us to say, 'Our Father, which art in heaven, &c.'" In his tenth Homily, p. 154, he says, "Christ taught us what we are to say in prayer, and in a few words instructed us in all manner of virtue." In his sixteenth Homily upon those words, "if thine enemy hunger feed him," p. 237, he urges forgiveness of injuries with this argument, "for this reason we are taught to say, 'forgive us, as we forgive,' that we may learn, that the measure of forgiveness takes it rise from ourselves." In his thirty-sixth Homily upon Pentecost, p. 552, he says, praying by the Lord's prayer is praying by the spirit: his words are these, "If there was no Holy Ghost, we that are believers could not pray to God: for we say, 'Our Father which art in heaven.' As therefore we could not say, that Jesus was the Lord, so neither could we call God our Father, without the Holy Ghost. How does that appear? From the same Apostle, who says, because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, *Abba, Father.*" In his thirty-eighth Homily of Repentance and the Eucharist, p. 570, he thus again argues for forgiving enemies. "When we go into the Church, let us approach God as becomes his majesty, lest, if we have designs of revenge in our hearts when we pray, we pray against ourselves, saying, 'forgive us as we forgive them that trespass against us.' These are terrible words, and the same as if one said to God, 'Lord, I have forgiven my enemy, forgive Thou me: I have loosed him, loose Thou me: I have pardoned my enemy, pardon me; if I have retained his sins, retain Thou mine: if I have not loosed my neighbour, do not Thou loose my offences: what measure I have meted to him, measure to me again.'" In his fifty-first Homily upon the Prayers of Christ, p. 691, he says, "Christ taught his disciples to pray both in words and actions;" meaning the words of the Lord's prayer, together with his own example. And in the sixty-second Homily upon the Paralytic, p. 934, he says; "this prayer was the

peculiar privilege of the faithful, and not allowed to any unbaptised catechumen: for before we have washed away our sins in the font of the holy waters, we cannot call God our Father: but when we return from thence, having put off the burden of our sins, then we say, ‘Our Father, which art in heaven.’”

Besides this account of the various use of the Lord’s prayer, he mentions several other parcels of the Liturgy in this volume. In the sixteenth Homily, p. 229, he takes notice of the use of the seraphical hymn in the eucharistical service. “Consider,” says he, “you that are initiated, what a mystical service you have been employed in; with whom you have sent up that mystical song; with whom you have cried out, *Τρισάγιος!* Holy! Holy! Holy!” In the thirty-sixth Homily upon Pentecost and the Holy Spirit, p. 553, he treats at large of that ancient form of salutation used in every office, “Peace be with you,” or, “the Lord be with you,” and the people’s answering always, “and with thy spirit.” “Our common father and teacher,” says he, meaning the “bishop, when he goes up into his throne, says, ‘Peace be to you all,’ and you all make answer with one common voice, ‘and with thy spirit.’ Neither do you make this answer only, when he goes into his throne, or when he preaches to you, or when he prays for you, but when he stands by the holy table: when he is about to offer that tremendous sacrifice, (they that are initiated know what I say,) before he touches the elements lying upon the table, he prays, ‘The grace of the Lord be with you,’ and ye reply, ‘And with thy spirit,’ reminding yourselves by this answer, that it is not the minister that effects any thing in this matter, neither is the consecration of the gifts the work of human nature, but that it is the grace of the Spirit then present, and descending upon the elements, which consummates that mystical sacrifice.” In the thirty-eighth Homily on the Eucharist and Repentance, p. 569, he takes notice of another known form in the communion-service, where the priest says, “Let us lift up our minds and hearts,” and the people answer, “*We lift them up unto the Lord,*” *Ἐχομεν πρὸς Κύριον.* This is the same form as we have seen before in Cyprian, “*Sursum Corda,*” and

“*Habemus ad Dominum.*” In the forty-seventh Homily, p. 632, he speaks again of the seraphical hymn, taken out of Isaiah, under the name of Μυσικὸν Μέλος, *the Mystical Song*. And Homily, fifty-second, *In eos, qui pascha jejulant*, p. 713, persuading men to peace and unity, he argues again from the frequent use of the form, “*Ειρήνη πάσι, Peace be with you all,*” in every office of the Church. “There is nothing,” says he, “can be compared with peace and concord. Therefore the bishop when he first enters the church, before he goes up into his throne, prays, saying, ‘Peace be with you all.’ And when he rises up, he does not begin to preach, before he says again ‘Peace be with you all.’ And the priests, when they are about to say any prayer of benediction, do not begin the blessing, before they have used the same form of salutation. And the deacon, when he bids men pray with others, enjoins them this in their prayers, that they should pray for the angel of peace,¹ and that all their purposes may be directed to a peaceable end: and when he dismisses you from this assembly, he prays thus, saying, ‘Πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, go in peace:’ and nothing is said or done without this.” So that it seems, this was a form, that had its return in every particular office, and was sometimes used six or seven times at one assembly of the Church. In his thirty-fifth Homily upon the Ascension, p. 535, he more particularly takes notice of this form of the deacon’s bidding men pray for the angel of peace. In his admonition to those, that are scandalised at the evils which befall the Church, cap. iv. p. 863, he has again occasion to mention the seraphical hymn under the foresaid title of the mystical song of sanctification. In his sixty-third Homily, p. 949, he shews us, how by the order of the Church, on the day of our Saviour’s passion, all such portions of Scripture were read, as had any relation to the cross; and on the great sabbath, on Saturday following, such Scriptures as contained the history of his being betrayed, crucified, dead, and buried. And he adds, p. 951, that on Easter-day they read such passages as gave an account of his resurrection, and on every festival the things

¹ See this Form explained, Book xiv. chap. v. sect. 4.

that happened at that season. Only the Acts of the Apostles, which contain the history of the miracles done by the Apostles after Pentecost, after the Holy Ghost was come upon them, were for a particular reason ordered to be read before Pentecost, that is, immediately after Easter, because the miracles of the Apostles, contained in that book, were the great demonstration of our Saviour's resurrection: for which reason the Church appointed the book of the Acts always to be read in the time between Easter and Whitsuntide, immediately after the resurrection of Christ, to give men the evidences and proofs of that holy mystery, which was the completion of their redemption. Thus, according to Chrysostom, the Church in great wisdom ordered and methodised her Liturgy by exact rules, for the better instruction and edification of the people.

SECT. 6.—In the sixth Tome.

The sixth Tome is chiefly made up of such Tracts, as do not acknowledge Chrysostom for their author: and therefore among these we shall not be very curious in searching for the forms of the ancient Liturgy. Some of them are supposed by learned men to be written by Severianus, bishop of Gabala, cotemporary with Chrysostom, and these may be reckoned of the same authority as Chrysostom's own writings. Among the Homilies of this sort is reckoned the thirty-seventh upon the parable of the prodigal son, where the author, p. 375, commenting upon those words, "they began to be merry," thus discourses: "ye know what spiritual mirth is, who have tasted of it, who have been partakers of the holy mysteries, and have seen the deacons or ministers of divine-service, imitating the wings of angels with their little veils lying upon their left shoulders, and traversing the church, and crying, let no catechumen be present, none of those that may not eat, no spy, none of those that may not see the feast of the fatted calf, none of those that may not look upon the heavenly blood shed for the remission of sins, no one that is unworthy of the living sacrifice, no one that is yet unbaptised, no one that may not with his polluted lips touch the tremendous mysteries: ye remember how after this the angels from heaven sing the hymns and praises,

saying, ‘ Holy is the Father, who willed the fatted calf to be slain, who knew no sin,’ as saith the prophet Isaiah, ‘ who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth:’ holy is the Son, the calf that is always willingly slain, and always lives: holy is the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, which perfects the sacrifice.” These are plain references and allusions to the usual forms of the Church, viz. to the deacons vested in their proper habit and badge, calling to all non-communicants to withdraw; and to the seraphical hymn, Holy! Holy! Holy! which was always sung in the communion-service. The same writer a little after, p. 377, as plainly alludes to the use of the Lord’s prayer at the eucharist, when he brings in the father thus speaking to the elder son: “ Son, thou art ever with me: thou standest by the altar, and there criest out with freedom, Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name.” In the first Homily in this volume, intituled, *De Uno Legislatore*, p. 10, there is mention made of the ceremony of laying the book of the Gospels upon a bishop’s head at his ordination. “ For this reason,” says the author, “ when priests are ordained in the Church, the Gospel of Christ is laid upon their heads, that he, that is ordained, may learn, that he receives the true tire or covering of the Gospel; and that he may be taught, that though he be the head of all, yet he is subject to those laws; though he rules over all, he is under the rule of those laws: though he gives laws to all others, he is to be governed by the law himself.” The critics are not agreed upon the author of this discourse. Du Pin¹ rejects it as none of Chrysostom’s: but Photius quotes it under his name, and Bishop Pearson² has a long dissertation to vindicate the authority of it out of Photius and several ancient writers before him, where he answers all the objections that Bishop Usher and some other learned men had raised against it. Without deciding this controversy, it is sufficient for our present purpose, the Homily either acknowledges Chrysostom or some such other ancient writer for its author, and the ceremony here spoken of was certainly a custom ob-

¹ Du Pin *Bibliothec. Cent.* v. p. 22.
Ignat. part i. cap. ix. p. 311.

² Pearson. *Vindic.*

served in the ordination of bishops in the time of Chrysostom, as appears not only from other places in Chrysostom, but also from the authors of the Constitutions and the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and the Canon of the fourth Council of Carthage, which I have had an occasion to produce in a former Book¹ to which I refer the reader, and go on with Chrysostom in order.

In the fifty-second Homily upon the Circus in this volume, p. 491, the author makes mention of that ancient custom of saying, “ Δόξα σοι Κύριε, *Glory be to Thee, O Lord,*” at the reading of the Gospel. “When we are met together,” says he, “in the ecclesiastical theatre, as soon as the deacon opens the book of the Gospels, we all look upon him with silence, and when he begins to read, we presently rise up, and say, ‘Glory be to Thee, O Lord.’”

SECT. 7.—In the seventh Tome of his Homilies on St. Matthew.

In his eleventh Homily on St. Matthew, p. 108, he mentions the people’s joining in psalmody and the accustomed prayers. “When ye have borne your part *in singing two or three psalms, δύο ψαλμοὺς ἢ τρεῖς ὑπηχήσαντες, and have made your usual prayers, τὰς συνήθειας εὐχὰς ποιέμενοι,* ye think ye have done enough for your salvation.” In the thirty-third Homily, p. 318, he notes the customary form of the minister’s saying, “Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, *Peace be unto you all,*” when he first enters the Church: and he forms this exhortation upon it: “when I say, ‘Peace be unto you;’ and ye answer again, ‘and with thy spirit;’ do not say this only in words, but in mind; not with your mouth, but with your heart. For if you say here in the Church, ‘Peace be with thy spirit;’ but as soon as you are gone out, begin to oppress me, despise me, accuse me, and load me with a thousand reproaches, what peace is this?” In his sixty-ninth Homily, p. 600, speaking of the monks, and their manner of worshipping God, he says, “as soon as they were out of their beds, they made a choir, and sang hymns to God, *συμφώνως ἅπαντες ὡσπερ ἕξ ἐνὸς στόματος,* *all together with one*

¹ Book ii, chap. xi. sect. 8.

voice, and as it were with one mouth: and among these, they particularly addressed that angelical hymn to God, ‘Glory be to God on high, on earth peace, good-will towards men!’” In his seventy-second Homily, p. 624,¹ he speaks of three prayers, one of which was for the demoniacs, the second for the penitents, and the third for the faithful or communicants, all conceived in a certain form of words; which is evident from this circumstance, which he there subjoins, “that in the last of these prayers the children of the Church joined with the rest of the people in crying to God for mercy. The people prayed alone without the children, when they prayed for the demoniacs and penitents; but when they prayed for themselves, they strengthened their prayers with the cries and intercessions of their children, whose innocence and simplicity they esteemed to be prevailing motives with God to hear them!” By this account it is plain, these prayers must be in certain forms known both to the people and the children: otherwise it is impossible to imagine, how they should all join vocally in crying to God for mercy. In his twentieth Homily, which is upon the Lord’s prayer, he not only mentions the use of this form of prayer, but says, it was the peculiar privilege of communicants or baptised persons to use it. “That this prayer,” says he, p. 200, “belongs to the faithful only, is evidenced both from the laws of the Church, and the first words of the prayer itself. For no unbaptised person can call God his Father.” In the same Homily, he takes notice of the ceremonies used in the reception of the eucharist, particularly the custom of giving one another the holy kiss of peace. And in the seventh Homily, p. 70, he alludes to the custom of the priest’s saying, “*Ἄγια τοῖς ἁγίοις*,” in the celebration of the eucharist, when he says, “*Christ gives holy things to holy men.*”

SECT. 8.—In the eighth Tome on St. John and the Acts of the Apostles.

The eighth Tome of St. Chrysostom’s works, contains his Homilies on St. John and the Acts of the Apostles. In

¹ Vid. Hom. lxxiii. al. lxxiv. p. 634.

his preface to St. John, he mentions the form of renouncing the devil, and covenanting with Christ. "Ye, which are initiated," says he, "know what compact ye made with us, or rather with Christ, when he admitted you to his holy mystery, what you said to him concerning the pomp of Satan, how after you had renounced Satan and his angels, you renounced this also, and promised never to look toward it again."

In Homily forty-second, he speaks of the Lord's prayer, as "a form of spiritual prayer, which Christ taught his disciples and all Christians."

In Homily forty-fourth, he says, "every good Christian used this prayer daily, saying those holy words, 'thy kingdom come,' implying a belief of the resurrection."

In Homily sixty-first, he makes mention of hymns and psalms, as the honour of Christian funerals.

In Homily seventy-seventh, he takes notice of the kiss of peace, and the common prayers made for the whole state of the world in the communion-service. "We salute one another," says he, "in the holy mysteries, that being many, we may be made one; and we make common prayers for those that are unbaptised, and supplications for the sick, and for the fruits of the world both by sea and land." Which plainly refers to the known forms then commonly used in the Church.

In Homily nineteenth on the Acts of the Apostles, he speaks of several customary forms observed in the reading of the Scriptures: the deacon, the common minister of the Church, first stood up, and cried with a loud voice, "Πρόσχωμεν, *Let us give attention:*" and this he repeated over and over again. After that, the reader names the prophet Esaias, or the like, and before he begins to read, he cries out, "Τάδε λέγει Κύριος, *Thus saith the Lord.*"

In Homily twenty-first, he refers to the bidding prayer of the deacon, in which he was used to admonish the people in these words, among many other petitions, "Let us pray for those that sleep in Christ, and for those that make commemorations for them, for the Church, for the priests, for the people, for the martyrs, &c."

In Homily twenty-fourth, he mentions the hymns that

were used by all in common at the communion-table. "Know you not, that you then stand with angels, and sing with them, and send up hymns and praises to God with them?" Meaning the Trisagion, or cherubical hymn, "Holy! Holy! Holy! Lord God of hosts, &c." which was a known part of the eucharistical service.

SECT. 9.—In the ninth Tome on Romans, and first and second to the Corinthians.

The ninth Tome of his works contains his Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans, and the first and second to the Corinthians. In his seventh Homily on Romans, p. 68, he speaks of common prayer sent up to God with one voice for the energumens, or persons vexed with evil spirits. Which was by a certain form, as we have seen before in his seventy-first Homily on St. Matthew, and is evident, from the very manner of expressing it here: for the people could not pray with one voice, unless a form of words was some way or other dictated to them. This dictating of prayers to be used by the whole assembly was commonly the office of the deacon, as Chrysostom informs us in the fourteenth Homily upon this same Epistle, p. 165, where he shews the different state of the Church in the Apostles' days, from that of his own time. For explaining those words, "The Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered," he says, "this was an obscure expression, because many of the miraculous gifts, which were then in being, were since ceased: as the gift of prophecy, the gift of wisdom, the gift of healing the sick, the gift of raising the dead, the gift of tongues, and among the rest the gift of prayer, which was then distinguished by the name of the spirit: and he, that had this gift, prayed for the whole congregation. Upon which account the Apostle gives the name of the spirit both to this gift, and to the soul that was endowed with it, who made intercession with groanings unto God, asking of God such things as were of general use and advantage to the whole congregation: the image or symbol of which is now the deacon, who offers up prayers for the people." Here, according to Chrysostom, the spirit of praying was an extraordinary gift, like that of tongues; and the difference be-

tween the apostolical age and his own was this, that at first both the matter and words of their prayers were inspired in an extraordinary way, but afterward the deacons prayed by ordinary forms, without any such immediate inspiration.

In his Comments upon the first Epistle to the Corinthians, Homily twenty-fourth, p. 532, he rehearses the heads of the solemn thanksgiving at the consecration of the eucharist. "We rehearse," says he, "over the cup the ineffable blessings of God, and whatever benefits we enjoy; and so we offer it at the holy table, and communicate, giving Him thanks that He hath delivered mankind from error; that when we were afar off, He hath made us near; that when we had no hope, and were without God, He hath made us brethren and fellow-heirs with Himself; for these and all the like blessings we give Him thanks, and so come to his holy table." In Homily thirty-five, p. 640, he notes the words, "Εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, *for ever and ever*," to be the common conclusion of their eucharistical thanksgivings, to which a layman, if they were said in an unknown tongue, could not answer, amen. In Homily thirty-sixth, p. 652, he mentions the form, "Peace be with you all," to which the people answered, "and with thy spirit;" which he derives from apostolical practice, when both minister and people were used to speak by immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost. He further observes, p. 653, that they all sang in common, both in the Apostles' days and in his own time: and that the bishop at the entrance into the church, said always, "peace be to you all," as a proper salutation when he came into his Father's house; though he laments, "that whilst they retained the name of peace, they had lost the thing." Again, p. 655, he takes notice, that when a single reader sung the psalms, all the people, as it were with one mouth, "did ὑπηχῆν, *return their answer* to him," that is, either by singing the verses alternately, or by joining in the close of every verse; of which more in the next book, chap. i. In Homily fortieth, p. 688, he observes, that every person at his baptism was, by the rule of the Church, obliged to make profession of his faith in the solemn words of the Creed; and among other articles particularly said, "I believe the resurrection of the dead:" by which form of pro-

fession Chrysostom explains that noted passage of St. Paul, “ why are they then baptised for the dead ?” “ That is, if the dead rise not, why do they profess at their baptism, that they believe the resurrection of the dead ?” In Homily forty-first, p. 702, he mentions part of the solemn form of prayer for the dead, then in use in the Church. “ It is not without reason,” says he, “ that he, that stands at the altar, when the holy mysteries are celebrated, says, we offer for all those who are dead in Christ, and for all those, who make commemorations for them.” And a little after, “ we at that time also make prayers for the whole world, and name the dead with martyrs, and confessors, and priests: for we are all one body, though some members exceed other members in glory.”

In his second Homily upon the second Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 740, he styles the Lord's-prayer, “ *Εὐχὴν νενομισμένην, the prayer which Christ brought in, and established by law in his Church ;*” and says, “ it was the peculiar privilege of the faithful to use it, for the catechumens were not allowed so great a favour before baptism.” There also he mentions several forms of the deacon's calling upon the people to pray: as that, “ *Στῶμεν καλῶς, διηδῶμεν, Let us stand devoutly, and pray :*” which, he says, was addressed not only to the priests, but also to the people: and again, “ let us pray ardently for the catechumens:” after which admonition the deacon recited the particular petitions they were to make for them, which Chrysostom there relates at length in the very form that was used, which I shall omit to recite here, because the reader may find it whole hereafter in the service of the catechumens, book xiv. chap. v. A little after in this same Homily, p. 743, he mentions the usual form of renunciation in baptism: “ Ye that are initiated,” says he, “ know what I say: for ye easily remember those words, whereby ye renounce the tyranny of the devil, falling upon your knees, and going over to Christ your king, and uttering those tremendous words, whereby we are taught to pay no manner of obedience to the tyrant.” And, p. 745, he adds, “ that in the service of the faithful, that is, the communion-service, the deacon again bids them supplicate and address God for bishops, for presbyters, for

kings, for emperors, for all by sea and land, for the temperature of the air, and for the whole world." Which are but so many hints of the deacons' bidding prayer in the service of the faithful, more fully related in the fifteenth book, chap. i. In Homily fifth, p. 775, he speaks of the obligation men have to use the Lord's prayer. In Homily eighteenth, p. 872, he intimates a form of prayer used by the people at the time of ordaining ministers. "The suffrage of the people," says he, "is no little ornament to those, who are called to any spiritual dignity. And therefore he, that performs the office of ordination, then requires their prayers, and they join their suffrage, and cry out those words, which they that are initiated know, for it is not lawful to speak all things before the unbaptised." A little after, p. 873, he says, "the people had a considerable share in the prayers of the Church. For common prayers were made both by priest and people for the energumens and penitents, and they all say one and the same prayer for them, the prayer is so full of mercy." Again, "when we dismiss those, who may not participate of the holy table, another prayer is to be made, in which we all fall down upon the ground together, and all rise together." He means the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, which was said jointly by the priest and people together. Again, "when the salutation of peace is mutually to be given and received, we all in like manner use this salutation." He means either the kiss of peace, or the form of salutation used between priest and people, "the peace of God be with you, and with thy spirit." But more probably he means the former, because it immediately follows after, "when we come to the tremendous mysteries; then as the priest prays for the people, so the people pray for the priest. For these words, 'And with thy spirit,' signify nothing else." Again, "that prayer wherein we give thanks, is common to both. For not only the priest gives thanks, but all the people. For he first receives their answer, they rejoining, 'it is meet and right so to do,' and then he begins the thanksgiving. And why should any man wonder, that the people should speak together with the priest, when they even join with cherubims and the powers above to send up in common those sacred hymns to heaven?"

Meaning the hymns, *Holy ! Holy ! Holy !* and, *Glory be to God on high !* which were sung by all the people in the communion-service. Chrysostom has a good remark upon all these forms, and the people's obligation to bear a part in them, which therefore I may not here omit, because it shews us the reason why the ancient Church so ordered her service. "I have mentioned all these things," says he, "on purpose to excite the vigilance of those that are in an inferior station, that we may learn, that we are all one body, and only differ, as one member may differ from another ; and that we should not cast all upon the priests, but ourselves be concerned in the care of the whole Church, as of one common body."

SECT. 10. — In the tenth Tome.

The last Tome of St. Chrysostom's works contains his Homilies upon the remaining Epistles of St. Paul. In his first Homily on the Ephesians, p. 1037, he speaks of the forms of profession used in baptism: "What is more gracious," says he, "than those words, by which we renounce the devil? by which we covenant with Christ? what more gracious than that profession, which we make both before and after baptism?" In the third Homily, p. 1051, he tells us, the deacons were wont to use this form of words to all those that were under the Church's censures, to withdraw from the Lord's table, "Ye that are in the state of penance, depart." And, p. 1052, when they were gone, they said again to the communicants, "Let us pray in common all together." And there also he speaks of the hymns, that were sung at the Lord's table. In Homily fourteenth, p. 1127, he argues from the use of the Lord's prayer, that men should not revile those, whom they therein owned to be their brethren. "If he is not thy brother, how dost thou say, 'Our Father?' for that word, 'Our,' denotes many persons." And further, to shew the indecency of such contumelious language, he reminds them of their known custom in singing the sacred hymns with cherubims and seraphims at the communion. "Consider with whom you stand in the time of the holy mysteries. With cherubims, with seraphims. For the seraphims use no reviling. Their

mouth is continually employed in fulfilling one necessary office, that of glorifying and praising God. How then can you say with them, Holy! Holy! Holy! who use your mouth to revile your brethren?" He adds, "you say, 'Our Father!' and what follows that? 'Which art in heaven,' As soon as you say, 'Our Father which art in Heaven,' that word raises you up, and gives wings to your soul, and shews that you have a Father in Heaven. Therefore do nothing, say nothing, of those things that are upon earth. You stand in Heaven, and do you use reviling? You converse with angels, and do you use reviling? You are honoured with the kiss of the Lord, and do you use reviling? God adorns your mouth so many ways with angelical hymns, with meat, not angelical, but above angels, with his own kisses and embraces, and do you still accustom yourself to reviling?"

In Homily twenty-third, p. 1190, he says, "Jesus, the Son of the living God hath brought down to us the celestial hymns. For what the cherubims say above, He hath commanded us to say, Holy! Holy! Holy!"

On the Philippians, in Homily fifteenth, p. 1311, he positively asserts, "that Christ delivered the Lord's prayer as *a form of prayer*, ὅρον εὐχης, teaching us to say, 'give us this day our daily bread.'"

On the Colossians, in Homily third, p. 1337, "We pray, saying, 'thy will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven.' We give thanks, saying, 'glory be to God on high, on earth peace, good will towards men.' We petition in our prayers for the angel of peace, and we pray for peace upon all occasions, for nothing can be compared unto it. The bishop in the church gives the benediction of peace, saying in every office, in prayers, in supplications, in his Homilies, once, twice, thrice, and oftner, 'Peace be with you all.'" Again, p. 1338, "When the bishop enters the church he immediately says, 'Peace be with you all;' when he preaches, 'Peace be with you all!' When he gives the blessing, 'Peace be with you all!' When he bids you salute one another, 'Peace be with you all!' When the sacrifice is offered, 'Peace be with you all:' and in the intervals, 'Grace and Peace be with you.' Is it not therefore absurd, that when we so often hear peace mentioned, we should still be at war among ourselves?"

We receive the salutation of peace and return it to him that gives it, and yet are at war with him. You answer, ‘and with thy spirit:’ yet as soon as you are gone out of the church, you calumniate and revile him.” He adds, p. 1339, “that it was not the bishop, properly speaking, that gave the peace, but Christ, that vouchsafes to speak by his mouth.”

In Homily sixth, on Colossians, p. 1358, he compares the forms of renunciation in baptism, and covenanting with Christ, to an hand-writing or bond, saying, “Let us beware, that we be not convicted by it, after we have said those words, ‘we renounce thee Satan, and we make a covenant with Thee, O Christ.’” Again, p. 1359, “You are taught to say, ‘I renounce thee, and thy pomp, and thy worship, and thy angels.’” He adds, “that every new-baptised person, as soon as he came up out of the water, was appointed to say, ‘Our Father which art in Heaven, thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven.’”

In Homily ninth, on Colossians, p. 1380, on those words, “admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs,” he says, “the faithful know, what is the hymn of the spirits above; what the cherubims above say; what the angels said, ‘Glory be to God on high.’” Meaning that these two hymns were sung by the faithful in the communion-service.

In Homily tenth, p. 1385, he gives the Lord’s prayer the title of “*Εὐχὴ πιστῶν*, the prayer of the faithful,” because it was their peculiar privilege to use it.

In Homily third, on 2 Thess. p. 1502, he mentions two usual forms relating to the reading of the lessons in the Church. “When the reader rises up, and says, ‘thus saith the Lord!’ And the deacon standing up, commands all men to keep silence, he does not say this to honour the reader, but God who speaks to all by him.”

In Homily sixth, on 1 Tim. p. 1553, he proves, that infidels are prayed for as well as others, from the use of the Lord’s prayer. “For when he that prays says, ‘thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven,’ the meaning is, that as there is no infidel in Heaven, so we pray, that there may be none on earth neither.”

In Homily second, on 2 Tim. p. 1638, he says, “the words, whereby the priests consecrate the eucharist, were the same that Christ spake.”

In Homily fourth, on Hebrews, p. 1785, he intimates, that they had set psalms in their funeral-service. “Consider,” says he, “what you sing at that time, ‘Turn again unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath rewarded thee.’ And again, ‘I will fear no evil, for thou art with me.’ And again ‘Thou art my refuge from tribulation, which compasses me about.’ Consider what those psalms mean. You say, ‘Turn again unto thy rest, O my soul:’ and do you still weep? Is not this mere pageantry and hypocrisy? if you believe the things to be true, which you say, it is superfluous to lament.”

In Homily fourteenth, p. 1852, speaking of the hymns sung at the eucharist, he says, “do not we sing the same celestial hymns, which the choirs of incorporeal powers sing above?”

In Homily seventeenth, p. 1870, he mentions a part of the oblation prayer. “In the oblation we offer, or bear and confess our sins, and say, ‘forgive us our transgressions,’ whether voluntary or involuntary: that is, we first remember them, and then ask pardon.” There also, p. 1872, he mentions the deacon’s solemn form of words, admonishing the people to come holy to the holy sacrament: “for this reason the deacon cries out and calls upon the saints, and by these words prompts all men to consider their offences, that no one come unprepared.”

In Homily twenty-second, p. 1898, he tacitly refers to the form, “*Sursum corda, Let us lift up our hearts.*” For having mentioned those words of the psalmist, “Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice,” he adds, “With our hands let us also lift up our hearts. Ye which are initiated, know what I say, you perhaps understand what is spoken, and perceive what I have obscurely hinted. ‘Let us lift up our souls on high.’”

Beside these passages collected out of Chrysostom’s works, published by Froato Ducæus, there are several others in those Homilies, which Sir Henry Savil set forth in Greek, and others in the Latin editions only. Neither of which I

have had opportunity perfectly to examine, and therefore I shall leave them to the more diligent inquiry of the curious reader: only noting, that in the sixth Homily of Repentance,¹ he observes this difference between David's Psalms and the rest of the Scriptures, that the others were read only twice a week in public, but the Psalms were used by all sorts of men, in all places, and upon all occasions. "*In ecclesiis pernoctantibus primus et medius, et novissimus est David. When they held their vigils all night in the church, David's Psalms were in the beginning, and middle, and end of all their service.*" The same was observed in their morning prayer; in their funeral obsequies; by virgins at their needle; by the illiterate and unlearned, who could not read a letter in the book, yet could repeat David's Psalms by heart. David was always in their mouths, not only in the cities and the Churches, but in the courts, in the monasteries, in the desarts and the wilderness. He turned earth into Heaven, and men into angels, being adapted to all orders, and all capacities, children, young men, virgins, old men, and sinners." In the beginning of the same Homily, he says, "the book of Genesis was by appointment of the Church read only once a year at a certain season, which was the time of Lent," as we have heard before in several places of this author, and as we shall see more fully demonstrated from other writers in the next Book.

Among those published in Greek, by Sir H. Savil, the hundred and twenty-third Homily, tom. v. p. 809, speaks of priests using this form of admonition to all communicants in the time, when the holy mysteries were celebrated, "*Ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, holy things are only for holy men.*" And whoever will bestow the pains to peruse the rest of the Homilies, which are in that edition, may doubtless find many other such fragments of the ancient Liturgy, which, as appears from this collection, so much abound in this celebrated writer.

¹ De. Pœnitent. Hom. vi. tom. vii. p. 146. Basil. 1525.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Use of the Lord's-Prayer in the Liturgy of the Ancient Church.

SECT. 1.—The Lord's Prayer by all the Ancients esteemed a Form given by Christ to be used by His Disciples.

IF there were no other argument to prove the lawfulness of set forms of prayer in the judgment of the Ancients, the opinion, which they had of the Lord's prayer, and their practice pursuant to that opinion, would sufficiently do it. And therefore, though several things have been occasionally hinted already about this matter, yet it will not be amiss to give it a distinct handling in this chapter. And first of all I observe, that the Ancients did not only esteem it as a rule and pattern to conform our prayers to, but looked upon it as a particular form of prayer, which Christ enjoined all his disciples to use in the same words that he delivered it. Tertullian says,¹ “ Our Lord prescribed a new form of prayer for his new disciples of the New Testament: and that though John had taught his disciples a form of prayer, yet all that he did was only as a fore-runner of Christ; when Christ was increased, as John had foretold, ‘ He must increase, but I must decrease,’ then the whole work of the servant passed over to the Lord.” And therefore it is not so much as extant now in what words John taught his disciples to pray, because earthly things were to give way to heaven-

¹ Tertul. de Orat. cap. i. Dominus noster novis discipulis Novi Testamenti novam orationis formam determinavit.—Docuerat et Joannes discipulos suos adorare. Sed omnia Joannis Christo præstruebantur, donec ipso aucto (sicut idem Joannes prænunciabat, illum augeri oportere, se verò diminui) totum præministri opus cum ipso spiritu transiret ad Dominum. Ideò nec extat in quæ verba docuerit Joannes adorare, quòd terrena cælestibus cesserint.

ly." So again,¹ "The religion of prayer was ordained by Christ himself, and this prayer being animated by his spirit from the time that it came out of his heavenly mouth, ascends up to heaven with a privilege, commending to the Father what the Son taught. But because our Lord, who foresaw the necessities of man, after He had given this rule of praying, said also, 'ask and ye shall receive;' and there are many things, which men's particular circumstances oblige every one to ask; therefore we have a right to make additional requests, and build other prayers upon this, always premising this appointed and ordinary prayer, as the foundation." So that according to Tertullian, it was, not only a rule prescribing the method, and matter of prayer, but a form to be used in the words in which Christ delivered it, and to be added to all other prayers as the foundation of a superstructure. After the same manner St. Cyprian says,² "that Christ, among many other wholesome admonitions and divine precepts, by which he provided for the salvation of his people, has given us also a form of prayer, teaching and admonishing us what we are to pray for." And a little after,³ "We are to learn from our Lord's information, what we are to pray for: for, he said, pray thus: 'Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, &c.'" St. Austin assures us,⁴ "that as the Church always used this prayer, so she used it by the command of Christ. He said, Pray thus: he said to his disciples, Pray thus: He said to his disciples, he said to

¹ Tertul. de Orat. cap. ix. Ab ipso ordinata religio orationis, et de spiritu ipsius jam tunc cum ex ore divino ferretur, animata suo privilegio ascendit in cœlum, commendans Patri quæ Filius docuit. Quoniam tamen Dominus prospector humanarum necessitatum, seorsum post traditam orandi disciplinam, 'Petite,' inquit, 'et accipietis,' et sunt quæ petantur pro circumstantia cujusque, præmissâ legitimâ et ordinariâ oratione quasi fundamento, accidentium jus est desideriorum, jus est superstruendi extrinsecus petitiones.

² Cypr. de Orat. Domin. p. 139. Inter cætera salutaria sua monita et præcepta divina, quibus populo suo consuluit ad salutem, etiam orandi ipse formam dedit; ipse quid precaremur, monuit et instruxit.

³ Ibid. p. 141. Cognoscamus, docente Domino et quid oremus. 'Sic,' inquit, 'orate: Pater noster qui es in cœlis, &c.'

⁴ Aug. Hom. 29. de Verbis Apost. tom. x. p. 150. Ecclesiæ oratio est, vox est de magisterio Domini veniens. Ipse dixit, 'Sic orate:' discipulis dixit, 'Sic orate:' discipulis dixit, apostolis dixit, et nobis, qualescunque agnificuli sumus, dixit, arietibus gregis dixit, 'Sic orate.'

his Apostles, and to us, who are the lambs, he said, and to the rams of his flock he said, Pray thus." In another place,¹ " This prayer is necessary for all, which the Lord gave to the rams of his flock, that is, to his Apostles, that every one of them should say, ' forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' For if there is any one, to whom these words in the prayer are not necessary, he must be said to be without sin. And if Christ had foreseen, that there would have been any such so much better than his Apostles, He would have taught them another prayer, in which they should not have asked forgiveness of sins for themselves, who had already obtained remission of all in baptism." Again he says,² " If any one say, that this prayer is not necessary in this life for every saint of God, that knows and does the will of God, except One, the Holy of Holies, he is in a manifest error, and pleases not that God, whom he pretends to praise. For this prayer which we use,³ was given as a rule to the Apostles by the heavenly Lawgiver, who said to them, Pray thus. He enjoined the rams of his flock, the leaders of his sheep, the chief members of the great shepherd, to use it. And they thence learned to say, ' Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us.' " In his Retractions he confirms all this,⁴ calling it one of Christ's commands to use this prayer, which the whole Church will continue to use to the end of the world. St. Chrysostom, in two volumes of his works, the third and fifth, repeats this almost twenty times, that the Lord's prayer was a common

¹ Aug. Ep. 89. ad Hilarium. Omnibus necessaria est Oratio Dominica, quam etiam ipsis arietibus gregis, id est, apostolis suis dominus dedit, ut unusquisque Deo dicat, ' Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris, &c.'

² Aug. de Peccator. Meritis. lib. iii. cap. 13. Quam orationem quisquis cuilibet etiam homini sancto, et Dei voluntatem scienti atque facienti, præter unum sanctum sanctorum, dicit in hâc vitâ necessariam non fuisse, multum errat, nec potest illi ipsi placere quem laudat.

³ Aug. in Psal. 142. p. 675. Ipsi didicerunt orare quod oramus, ipsis data est regula postulandi à Jurisperito cælesti. ' Sic orate,' inquit, ' &c.'

⁴ Aug. Retractat. lib. i. cap. 19. In eisdem mandatis est etiam quod jubemur dicere, ' Dimitte nobis debita nostra, &c.' Quam orationem usque ad finem sæculi tota dicit ecclesia.

form in use among them by the express command of Christ. And there are many other scattered passages throughout his writings to the same purpose, which, because I have produced them at large in the last chapter, I need not here repeat them.

SECT. 2.—And accordingly it was used by the Primitive Church in all her public Offices: particularly in the Administration of Baptism.

Evident it is beyond dispute, that the whole primitive Church constantly used it in all her holy offices, out of consciousness and regard to Christ's command. This, as we have heard Tertullian word it, "was laid, as the foundation of all other prayers."¹ It is the prayer of the Church; the whole Church says, "forgive us our trespasses," as we have it before in the testimony of St. Austin.² And the practice was so universal and well known from the beginning, that Lucian the heathen is thought to refer to it in one of his Dialogues,³ where he speaks, in the person of a Christian, of the prayer which began "Ἀπό τῶ πατρὸς," with "*Our Father*." But we have more certain evidence from the records and offices of the Church. For there was no considerable divine office, in the celebration of which this prayer did not always make a solemn part. Particularly in baptism, as soon as the person baptised came up out of the water, he was enjoined to say, "Our Father, which art in heaven." "Immediately after this," says the author of the Constitutions,⁴ "let him stand and pray the prayer, which the Lord hath taught us." And so Chrysostom,⁵ "as soon as he rises out of the water, he says those words, 'Our Father which art in heaven, &c.'"

SECT. 3.—And in the Celebration of the Eucharist.

In like manner in the celebration of the other sacrament of Christ's body and blood, it was commonly used at the

¹ Tertul. de Orat. cap. ix. cited before.
de Verbis Apost. p. 150.

² Aug. Hom. 29.

³ Lucian. Philopatris.

⁴ Constit. Apost. lib. vii. cap. 44.

⁵ Chrys. Hom. vi. in Colos.

p. 1359. It. Hom. 62. in Paralyticum, tom. v. p. 934.

close of the consecration prayer. So it is expressly more than once noted by St. Austin:¹ “after the sanctification of the sacrifice we say the Lord’s prayer:” and again,² “The whole Church almost concludes the prayer of benediction and sanctification with the Lord’s prayer.” Upon this account, he tells his hearers, that all, who were communicants,³ heard this prayer said daily at the altar. And he expressly makes this difference between the Lord’s prayer and the Creed, that men might remember the former by hearing it daily repeated at the altar; but the Creed was not so, for as yet it was never publicly used, but only in the occasional service of baptism; whereas the Lord’s prayer was of constant use by being a daily part of the communion-service. Cyril, in his *Mystagogical Catechism to the Illuminated*,⁴ gives the same account of it. “After the oblation prayer we say that prayer, which our Saviour delivered to his disciples, calling God our Father with a pure conscience, and saying, ‘Our Father which art in heaven.’” And St. Jerom,⁵ though he do not so precisely note what part of the communion-office it was used in, yet in general, he says, “Christ taught his Apostles this prayer, that believers might every day in the sacrifice of his body have boldness to say, ‘Our Father which art in heaven.’” And St. Chrysostom⁶ in a covert way intimates the same, when he tells his hearers, “that, if they forgive their enemies, they may come with a pure conscience to the holy and tremendous table, and boldly say the words that are contained in the prayer. The initiated know what I mean.” He means that petition of the Lord’s prayer, “Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.” Which he expresses thus covertly, because of non-communicants, catechumens or infidels, that might be present at a popular discourse in

¹ Aug. Hom. 83. de Diversis. p. 556. Post sanctificationem sacrificii dicimus Orationem Dominicam.

² Aug. Ep. 59. ad Paulin. quæst. 5. Quam totam petitionem ferè omnis ecclesia Dominicâ Oratione concludit.

³ Hom. 42. inter 50. tom. x. p. 197. In ecclesiâ ad altare quotidie dicitur ista Oratio Dominica, et audiunt illam fideles.

⁴ Cyril. Catech. myst. v. p. 298.

⁵ Hieron. lib. iii. cont. Pelag. cap. v. Docuit Apostolos suos, ut quotidie in corporis illius sacrificio credentes audeant loqui, ‘Pater noster qui es in cœlis, &c.’

⁶ Chrys. Hom. 27. in Genes. p. 358.

a general assembly. He speaks more plainly in his sermon upon Eutropius,¹ where pressing the people to forgive the injury, which that great statesman had done the Church, he uses this argument to them: "How otherwise will you take the holy sacrament into your hands, and use the words of that prayer wherein we are commanded to say, 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.'" This plainly shews, that the Lord's prayer was then used as an ordinary and constant part of the communion-service. Only with this difference, that in the Greek Church and the Gallican Church it was said by the priest and all the people together, as Mabillon² proves out of Gregory of Tours, and Leontius, in the Life of Johannes Eleemosynarius, bishop of Alexandria, and the Epistles of Gregory the Great, who expressly notes the difference between the Greek and Latin Church in this particular: among the Greeks the Lord's prayer³ is said by all the people, but with us by the priest alone. And in this the Gallican Church chose to follow the way of the Greek Church, as we now follow the Gallican Church, and not the Roman. The manner of the Mosarabic Liturgy in Spain is noted also by Mabillon to be different from both these: for there the priest repeated every petition by itself, and the people answered to each petition separately, Amen. But these differences in the manner of using it only serve to confirm the use of it in general, and shew us that it was never omitted by any Church in the public service of the altar, at least from the beginning of the fourth century, when Cyril of Jerusalem lived, whose mystical catechisms are a clear evidence for it.

SECT. 4.—And in their Morning and Evening Prayers.

It also made a part in their daily morning and evening prayers distinct from the communion-office. Of which we

¹ Chrys. Hom. in Entrop. tom. iv. p. 554. ² Mabill. de Liturg. Gallic. lib. i. cap. v. n. 22. ex Gregor. Turon. de Mirac. Martini. lib. ii. cap. 30. ³ Greg. lib. vii. Ep. 64. Sed et Dominica Oratio apud Græcos ab omni populo dicitur: apud nos verò à solo sacerdote.

have instances in the canons of the Councils of Girone¹ and Toledo,² which shall be recited hereafter, when we come to consider more exactly the several parts of the morning and evening service.

SECT. 5.—And in their private Devotions.

They used it also in their private devotions. As is evident from that passage in St. Chrysostom upon the cxii. psalm, where he says,³ “ that Christ to induce us to unanimity and charity, enjoins us to make common prayer, and obliges the whole Church, as if it were but one person, to say, ‘ Our Father ;’ and ‘ give us this day our daily bread ; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us ; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil :’ always using a word of the plural number, and commanding every one, whether he pray alone by himself, or in common with others, still to make prayer for his brethren.” This implies, that in their private devotions, as well as public, they thought themselves obliged by the command of Christ to use the Lord’s prayer. In another place he gives us an instance in the practice of an holy man, who to the form of his private devotions, which he also there recites, always added the Lord’s prayer, or the prayer of the faithful,⁴ as he styles it, for a particular reason, of which more by and by ; making it both the conclusion and uniting tie of all his other prayers for all men. In compliance with this general practice it is, that the author of the Constitutions⁵ orders every one to use the Lord’s prayer three times a day. And this Cotelerius thinks was done in honour of the Holy Trinity,⁶ citing Theodoret and Isidore for his opinion. St. Ambrose, also writing instructions to virgins,⁷

¹ Con. Gerundens, can. x.

² Con. Toletan. iv. can. 9.

³ Chrys. Com. in Psal. 112. p. 369.

⁴ Chrys. Hom. 10. in Colos.

p. 1385. Ἐπιθεῖς τὴν εὐχὴν τῶν πιστῶν, ὡς κορωνίδα τινὰ καὶ σύνδεσμον ὑπὲρ πάντων εὐχὴν ποιησάμενος.

⁵ Constit. lib. vii. cap. 24. Τρεῖς

τῆς ἡμέρας ἔτω προσεῦχεσθε.

⁶ Coteler. in Loc. ex Theodor.

Ep. 145. et Isidor. Orig. lib. vi. cap. ult.

⁷ Ambros. de Virgin.

lib. iii. p. 115. In ipso cubili volo psalmos cum Oratione Dominica frequentati contextos vice.

directs them to sing psalms in bed, and say the Lord's prayer between every psalm. And the fourth Council of Toledo makes it deprivation for any clergyman to omit¹ using the Lord's prayer daily, either in his public or private offices of devotion, censuring him as a proud contemner of the Lord's injunction.

SECT. 6.—Whence it had the Name of *Oratio Quotidiana*, the Christian's *Daily Prayer*.

Now this being the constant use, that was daily made of the Lord's prayer, it hence took the name of *Oratio Quotidiana*, the *daily prayer*, as is observed in the foresaid canon of that Council. And so we find it styled in Cyprian, who thought that petition, in the Lord's prayer, "give us this day our daily bread," might be taken in a spiritual, as well as a literal sense, and refer to the eucharist, or the body and blood of Christ, the celestial bread,² which they then desired to receive every day. And the Council of Toledo cites St. Hilary to the same purpose:³ "Give us this day our daily bread." "God desires nothing so much as that Christ may dwell in us daily, who is the bread of life, and the bread that comes from heaven. And because this is our daily prayer, we therefore pray daily, that this bread may be given us." St. Austin also⁴ means the Lord's prayer, when he says, "that the Christians daily prayer makes satisfaction for those lesser and daily failings, without which no man lives." Upon which account he says in another place,⁵

¹ Con Tolet. iv. can. 9. Quisquis ergò sacerdotum vel subjaquentium clericorum hanc Orationem Dominicam quotidie aut in publico aut in privato officio præterierit, propter superbiam judicatus, ordinis sui honore privetur.

² Cypr. de Orat. Dom. p. 147. Huuc panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne qui in Christo sumus, et eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus—à Christi corpore separemur.

³ Con. Tolet. iv. can. 9. Sanctus Hilarius dicit, 'Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie.' Quid enim tam vult Deus quam ut quotidie Christus habitet in nobis, qui est panis vitæ et panis è cælo? Et quia quotidiana oratio est, quotidie quoque ut detur, oratur.

⁴ Aug. Enchirid. cap. lxxi. De quotidianis autem brevibus levibusque peccatis, sine quibus hæc vita non ducitur, quotidiana oratio fidelium satisfacit. Eorum enim est Dicere, 'Pater noster qui es in cælis, &c.'

⁵ Aug. Hom. exix. De Tempore. p. 306. Remissio peccatorum non est

“ that this daily prayer is a sort of daily baptism, because in the pious use of it men obtain daily remission of sins, as they did at first in baptism.” Possidius also¹ makes this remark in his *Life*, upon his practice and that of St. Ambrose, “ that they both trusted more in God’s mercy than their own merits, being used to pray in the words of our Lord’s daily prayer, ‘ forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us.’” From all which, and much more that might be alleged upon this head, it appears, that this prayer, in the very words which Christ delivered it in, was not only an allowed form, but a prayer of daily use both in their public and private devotions.

SECT. 7.—And was used by all Heretics and Schismatics as well as Catholics.

Neither were there any sects or heresies, that pretended in those times to object the least thing against the use of it. The Donatists broke off from the Church, and set up conventicles of their own, but they did not alter the way of worship: they still thought themselves obliged, as Optatus says, to use the Lord’s prayer at the altar.² The Pelagians could not relish well one petition in it: “ forgive us our trespasses:” for they proudly thought the saints were without sin, and had nothing to ask forgiveness of: yet they also continued to use it, and accounted for their practice, but putting this false gloss upon it, that they then prayed not for their own sins but the sins of others. We find this often objected to them in the African Councils,³ but never any

in sola ablutione baptismatis sacri, sed etiam in Oratione Dominicâ et Quotidianâ. In illâ invenietis quasi quotidianum baptismum.

¹ Possid. Vit. Aug. cap. xxvii. De bono Domino se dicit magis quam de meritis suis confidere. Cui etiam in Oratione Quotidianâ Dominicâ dicebat: ‘ Dimitte nobis debita nostra, &c.’ ² Optat. lib. ii. p. 57.

Ad altare conversi Dominicam Orationem prætermittere non potestis. It. lib. iii. p. 72. Oratio Dominica apud nos et apud vos una est.

³ Con. Milevitan. can. viii. Quicumque dixerit, in Oratione Dominicâ ideò dicere sanctos, ‘ Dimitte nobis debita nostra,’ ut non pro seipsis hoc dicant, quia non est eis jam necessaria ista petitio, sed pro aliis, qui sunt in populo peccatores: et ideò non dicere unumquemque sanctorum, ‘ Dimitte mihi debita mea,’ sed, ‘ Dimitte nobis debita nostra,’ ut hoc pro aliis potius, quam pro se justus petere intelligatur, anathema sit. Vid. Can. ix. ibid. et Cod. Can. African. c. 116 et 117.

charge brought against them, as if they omitted the Lord's prayer in whole, or even this single petition in it. St. Austin indeed often says,¹ "that their impious tenets and disputations tended to take away the use of the Lord's prayer." But then he explains himself to mean, not that they laid aside the use of it, but that they taught "that a man might come to such perfection in righteousness in this life, by observing all the commands, and that by his own free-will, without the help of the grace of Christ, that he needed not to say, 'forgive us our trespasses,' for himself, but only for others." They owned,² that the Apostles used the Lord's prayer; but then they said, "they were so holy and perfect without all manner of sin, that they did not say for themselves, forgive us our trespasses, but only for other sinners that were yet imperfect." St. Chrysostom mentions another sort of men, who were also offended at this petition because of the condition that was in it, Forgive us, as we forgive others; and therefore they curtailed the prayer by dropping this petition, when they said it: but he rebukes them³ for this, and bids them not be so vainly cautious, as to think they were excused by curtailing the prayer, but advises them to use the whole prayer, as Christ appointed it to be used, that the necessity of this petition might daily terrify them from revenge, and compel them to grant pardon to their neighbours. So that though there were some heretics and other ill men, who did not like this one petition for different reasons, yet they all continued to use the prayer either in whole or in part, and there is no instance of any that totally rejected it.

¹ Aug. Ep. xcii. ad Innocent. Nobis etiam Dominicam Orationem impiis disputationibus conantur auferre.—Dicunt posse hominem in hac vitâ, præceptis Dei cognitis, ad tantam perfectionem justitiæ sine adjutorio gratiæ Salvatoris per solum liberum voluntatis arbitrium pervenire, ut ei non sit jam necessarium dicere, Dimitte nobis debita nostra.'

² Id. de Peccator. Meritis. lib. ii. cap. x. Quidam contra Orationem Dominicam argumentantur; quia etsi orabant eam, inquit, sancti et perfecti jam Apostoli, nullum omninò habentes peccatum, non tamen pro seipsis, sed pro imperfectis adhuc peccatoribus dicebant, 'Dimitte nobis, &c.' Vid. Aug. Ep. xciv. ad Hilarium.

³ Chrys. Hom. xxii. tom. i.

SECT. 8.—That it was esteemed a Divine and Spiritual Form of Prayer.

There was no objection against it in those days, that it was a form, or that it was not a spiritual prayer, because it was used in the very words, in which Christ had delivered it; but on the contrary, it was recommended as the most spiritual and prevalent prayer that could be used, because of the dignity of its author. St. Cyprian thus argues for the use of it: “Christ,” says he, “had foretold, ‘that the hour was coming, when the true worshippers should worship the Father in spirit and in truth:’ and he fulfilled what he had promised before, that we, who had received the spirit and truth by his sanctification, might worship in spirit and truth by his tradition, or the prayer, which he delivered to us. For what prayer can be more spiritual, than that which is given us by Christ,¹ by whom the Holy Spirit is sent to us? What can be esteemed a truer prayer with the Father, than that which came out of the mouth of his Son, who is truth itself? So that to pray otherwise than he has taught us, is not only ignorance, but a crime, since he has laid it down, and said, ‘ye reject the commandment of God, to establish your own tradition.’ Let us therefore, my dearly beloved brethren, pray as our God and Master taught us. It is a friendly and familiar way of praying, to beseech God in his own words, to let the prayer of his Son come up to his ears. Let the Father hear and acknowledge the words of his Son: when we make our prayers, let Him, that dwells in our heart, be also in our voice. And for as much as we have Him our Advocate with the Father for our sins, when we sinners pray for the pardon of our sins, let us bring forth the words of our Advocate. For since He has said, that ‘whatever we ask the Father in his name, He will give it us,’ how much more efficaciously shall we obtain what we ask in the name of Christ, if we ask it in his prayer? “He introduces all this discourse with these words:” He that made us live, taught us to pray, by the same kindness that He confers all other things upon us; that whilst we speak to the Father in the

¹ Cyp. de Orat. Dom. p. 139.

prayer and orison which the Son taught us, we should more easily be heard." So far was this holy man from thinking the Lord's prayer a dead form, that could not be offered with the true spirit of prayer, that on the contrary he labours with all his might to convince men, that no prayer could be more justly styled worshipping God in spirit and in truth, or with greater efficacy and advantages be presented to the Father. St. Chrysostom was of the same mind, that praying by the Lord's prayer, might justly be termed praying by the spirit. For he uses this as an argument for the Holy Spirit's operation upon us. "If there were no Holy Ghost," says he,¹ "we that are believers could not pray to God: for we say, 'Our Father which art in heaven.' As therefore we could not say, that Jesus was the Lord, so neither could we call God our Father without the Holy Ghost. How does that appear? from the same Apostle, who says 'because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, *Abba, Father.*'" And St. Austin² expounding those words of the Apostle, Rom. viii. 26. "we know not what to pray for as we ought: but the spirit helpeth our infirmities;" concludes, "that the spirit's helping and teaching them to pray as they ought, could not mean his helping them to new words and expressions; for both the Apostle, and they to whom he wrote, were well acquainted already with the Lord's prayer; so that there could be no want of the spirit's assistance in that respect; but the want was this; men are commonly ignorant of the real benefit of temporal tribulation and affliction, which tends either to cure the tumour of pride, or exercise and try men's patience, and crown it with a greater reward, or else to chastise and abolish such other sins as they are subject to: men being ignorant of these advantages, are usually most inclined to ask a perfect freedom and immunity from temporal affliction; but the spirit corrects this ignorance, and helps this infirmity, and teaches men rather to ask patience of God, and submission to his will, that they

¹ Chrys. Hom. xxxvi. in Pentecost. tom. v. p. 552.

² Aug. Ep. cxxi. ad Probam. cap. xiv. Neque enim ullo modo credendum est, vel ipsum, vel quibus ista dicebat, Dominicam nescisse Orationem.

may not think themselves neglected of God, though He do not remove such afflictions, but with a devout and pious patience hope for greater good arising from them." This is St. Austin's exposition of that famous passage of the Apostle, concerning the assistance of the spirit in prayer; by which he is so far from derogating from the Lord's prayer, as void of the spirit, that he supposes the very knowledge of it to be antecedently a work of the spirit: and he says further,¹ "that when men believe, and hope, and desire, and consider the things they ask of God in the Lord's prayer, they are then qualified with those graces of the spirit, faith, hope, and charity, which are necessary to bring a pious votary unto God." Men that say such things as these of the Lord's prayer, could not conceive any mean thing about it, derogatory to the spirit of prayer; but must be presumed to entertain the most high and venerable notions of it, of any that can possibly be imagined.

SECT. 9.—And the Use of it a peculiar Privilege, allowed only to Communicants and perfect Christians.

And that they did so, is evident from one thing further, very observable in the ancient discipline and practice: that is, that then the use of the Lord's prayer was not a mark of infamy or reproach, but an honorary privilege, allowed to none but communicants, or complete and perfect Christians. For, as I have had occasion to remark once or twice² in former parts of this work, all catechumens or persons unbaptised were absolutely debarred from the use of this prayer; they were not allowed to call God, "our Father," till they were regenerated and made sons by the waters of baptism. I have noted several passages out of St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret to this purpose, which need not here be repeated. To these I shall only add one passage out of Chrysostom,³ in his Homily upon the Paralytic,

¹ Aug. Ep. cxxi. ad Probam. cap. xiii. Fides ergò et spes et charitas ad Deum perducunt orantem hoc est, erudentem, sperantem, desiderantem, et que petat à Domino in Dominicâ Oratione considerantem.

² Book i. chap. iv. sect. 7. and Book x. chap. v. sect. 9.

³ Chrys. Hom. lxii. tom. v. p. 931.

where speaking of baptism, he says, “ Before we have washed away our sins in the font of the holy waters, we cannot call God, ‘ our Father.’ But when we return from thence, having put off the load of our sins, then we say, ‘ Our Father which art in Heaven.’ ” And upon this account, as has been also noted before, this prayer was peculiarly called Εὐχὴ Πιστῶν, *the prayer of communicants, or believers*, because none had a right to use this prayer, but only such as had a right to communicate at the altar, and there hear it daily repeated.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Use of Habits, and Gesture, and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Service of the Ancient Church.

SECT. I.—No certain Evidence for the Use of distinct Habits in the Apostolical Age, or the two following Ages.

THE next things to be spoken of, are the circumstances and ceremonies of habits, gestures, and times appropriated to divine service. Of all these it may be said in general, that as they are matters of indifferent usage in their own nature, so the Church used her liberty in the appointment and observation of them. The writers of the Romish Church, Baronius, Du Saussay, and Bona, who will have every ceremony to be apostolical, pretend that the Apostles themselves wore a distinct habit in all their sacred ministrations. Bona is very confident,¹ that St. Paul’s cloak which he left at Troas, was a sacerdotal vestment. And others speak of St. Peter’s *Planeta*, which is said to be sent from Antioch to Paris, and kept there as a sacred relic in the temple of St. Genouesa. And others mention St. John’s, which is said to be sent to Gregory the Great. But Bona himself will not undertake to vouch for these, because of the silence

¹ Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. cap. xxiv. n. 1.

of all ancient writers about them.¹ Yet he is very angry with Nicholas Alemannius, for saying, that neither the Apostles nor apostolical men used any sacred vestments,² and that the opinion, which maintains it, is to be exploded as ridiculous, and as what is rejected by learned men. Vicecomes was a diligent inquirer into antiquity, and yet he could find no ground for this assertion, but has some arguments against it, which Bona is put to answer. And till some better arguments can be produced to support it, I think it most prudent to leave uncertain tradition to shift for itself, and proceed to an age, wherein we have more light and certainty in the matter.

SECT. 2.—What Evidence there is for them in the fourth Century.

In the beginning then of the fourth age, when the Church was quietly composed by Constantine, and settled in peace, we are sure a distinction was made in the habits and vestments of divine service. For Constantine himself is said³ to have given a rich vestment embroidered with gold to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, to be worn by him when he celebrated the service of baptism. And it was one of the accusations, that the Arians afterward brought against Cyril, that he had sold it. Valesius thinks that it was not intended for an ordinary habit, whenever the bishop celebrated the office of baptism, but only when he performed the service of the great day of our Lord's baptism, which was the festival of Epiphany, held in great veneration at Jerusalem. This is not so likely in my opinion, but, be it as it will, it makes no alteration in the case: for still it was a sacred vestment to be used in the celebration of the Liturgy or divine service, which is enough to the present purpose. Not long after we find Athanasius accused by his enemies for laying a tax upon the Egyptians, to raise a fund for the linen vestments of the Church. The thing is mentioned both by Athanasius

¹ Bona, lib. i. cap. v. n. 2.
cap. ix. ap. Bonam. Ibid.

² Aleman. de Parietinis Lateran.

³ Theod. lib. ii. cap. xxviii. Τὴν ἱεράν ποδήν, ἵνα ταύτην περιβαλλόμενος, τὴν τῷ Θεῷ βαπτίσματος λειτουργίαν ἐπιτελῶ. &c.

himself¹ and Sozomen,² the one calling them linen sticharia, and the other linen tunicles, which are the same thing. Where we are to observe, that the accusation was not, that he used such vestments in the Church, but only that he laid a tax upon the people to provide them; which supposes them to be in use, else there had been no colour or foundation for such a charge against him. St. Jerom often mentions this distinction of habits as generally observed in his time. I urge not those words, which he has in his Commentary upon Ezekiel, “the religion of God, has one habit in its ministry,³ and another for the common uses of life:” because I think he is there speaking of the Jewish priests, in opposition to the the idol-priests of Isis and Serapis. But what he says in his book against Pelagius, plainly relates to the Christians:⁴ “what harm or enmity, I pray, is it against God, if I use a more cleanly garment? If a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any other of the ecclesiastical order, come forth in a white vestment, when they administer the sacraments?” He says also in his Epitaph upon Nepotian, that Nepotian for his ordinary wearing used the *Pallium*, the cloak that was in common use among Christian philosophers: but in his ministrations he used a tunicle,⁵ which he ordered his uncle Heliodore to send as his legacy to St. Jerom. St. Chrysostom also intimates, that the deacons wore a peculiar habit in their ministrations, when he says,⁶ “their honour, crown and glory did not consist so much in their walking about the church in a white and shining garment, as in their power to repel unworthy communicants from the Lord’s table.” This implies, that they had a distinct

¹ Athan. Apol. ii. p. 778. Πλάττονται πρότην κατηγορίαν περι τυχारीων λινῶν, ὡς ἐμὲ κανόνα τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἐπιβάλλοντος. ² Sozom. lib. ii. cap. xxii. Πρώτην ἀπομένει γραφήν, ὡς χιτωνίων λινῶν φόρον ἐπιτιθεῖς Αἰγυπτίοις.

³ Hieron. Com. in Ezek. cap. xlv. p. 668. Religio divina alterum habitum habet in ministerio, alterum in usu vitæque communi.

⁴ Id. lib. i. cont. Pelag. Quæ sunt, rogo, inimicitiae contra Deum, si tunicam habuero mundiozem? Si episcopus, presbyter, diaconus, et reliquus ordo ecclesiasticus in administratione sacramentorum candidâ veste processerint?

⁵ Id. Ep. iii. ad Heliodor. Hanc tunicam, quâ utebar in ministerio Christi, mitte dilectissimo, &c. It. Epist. ad Præsidium Diaconum. Difficile est locum Stephani implere, et populos subjacentes candenti desuper veste despicere.

⁶ Chrys Hom. 82. ad. 83. in Mat. p. 705. Λευκὸν χιτωνίσκον ἢ ἀποστρίβοντα περιβαλλόμενοι. &c.

habit when they ministered in divine service. And so it is remarked by Sozomen,¹ when speaking of the assault that was made upon the Church by the enemies of Chrysostom, he says, “the priests and deacons were beaten and driven out of the church, as they were in the vestments of their ministration.” And there is among St. Chrysostom’s works an Homily upon the Prodigal Son, written by Severianus, bishop of Gabala, cotemporary with St. Chrysostom, who, speaking of the deacons ministering in the sacred mysteries, says,² “they resembled the wings of angels with their veils or tippets on their left shoulders, running about the church, and crying out, ‘let none of the catechumens be present at the celebration of the mysteries, &c.’” In like manner Nazianzen, in his vision of the Church of Anastasia, represents the deacons standing,³ “ἐν ἑμασι παμφανόωσιν, *in their bright and shining garments.*” And in his will he leaves to his deacon Evagrius, a “κάμοσον,” and a “σιχάριον,” which were then the common names for these surplices or white garments used in divine service.⁴ The Council of Laodicea has two Canons concerning the little habit called the *Orarium*,⁵ which was a scarf or tippet to be worn upon the shoulders, and might be used by bishops, presbyters and deacons, but not by subdeacons, singers or readers, who are expressly debarred the use of it in that Council. The fourth Council of Carthage⁶ speaks of the *Alba* or *Surplice*, which the deacon is ordered to wear when the oblation is made, or the lessons are read. The Council of Narbo⁷ mentions the same. The first Council of Braga⁸ speaks of the *Tunica* and the *Orarium*, as both belonging to deacons. And the third Council of Braga⁹ orders priests to wear the *Orarium* on both shoul-

¹ Sozom. lib. ii. cap. 21. Ἱερέων δὲ καὶ διακόνων τυπτομένων, καὶ πρὸς βίαν, ὧς εἶχον σχήματος, ἐλαυνομένων.

² Chrys. Hom. xxxvii. de Filio Prodigio. tom. vi. p. 375. Τῶν μιμημένων τὰς τῶν ἀγγέλων πτέρυγας ταῖς λεπταῖς ὀθόνηναις ταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀριστερῶν ὤμων κειμένας. &c.

³ Naz. Somnium Anastas. tom. ii. p. 78.

⁴ Id. in Testamento. ap. Brisson. de Formul. lib. vii.

⁵ Con. Laodic. cau. xxii. et xxiii.

⁶ Con. Carth. iv. can. xli. Ut Diaconus in tempore oblationis tantum vel lectionis alba induatur.

⁷ Con. Narbon. an. 589. can. xii.

⁸ Con. Bracar. i. can. xxvii. Quia diacones absconsis infra tunicam utuntur orariis, ita ut nihil differre à subdiacono videantur, de cætero superposito scapulæ, sicut decet, utantur orario.

⁹ Con. Bracar. iii. can. iii. Non aliter accedat quàm orario utroque humero circumseptus.

ders, when they ministered at the altar. By which we learn, that the *Tunica* or *surplice* was common to all the clergy, the *Orarium* on the left shoulder proper to deacons, and on both shoulders the distinguishing badge of priests.

The fourth Council of Toledo is most particular in these distinctions. For in one canon it says, “ that if a bishop, presbyter, or deacon be unjustly degraded, and be found innocent by a synod, yet they shall not be what they were before, unless they receive the degrees they had lost from the hands of the bishops before the altar. If he be a bishop, he must receive his *Orarium*,¹ his ring and his staff: if a presbyter, his *Orarium* and *Planeta*: if a deacon, his *Orarium* and *Alba*.” And in another Canon,² “ that the deacon shall wear but one *Orarium*; and that upon his left shoulder, wherewith he is to give the signal of prayers to the people.” Where we may observe also the reason of the name *Orarium* in the ecclesiastical sense, *ab orando, from praying*; though in common acceptation it signifies no more than an handkerchief to wipe the face, and so comes from *Ore*, in which signification it is sometimes used by St. Ambrose,³ and St. Austin,⁴ as well as by the old Roman authors. But here we take it in the ecclesiastical sense, for a sacred habit appropriated to bishops, priests, and deacons in the solemnities of divine service, in which sense it appears to have been an habit distinct from that of civil and common use, by all the authorities that have been mentioned. The author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament, under the name of St. Austin, speaks also of the *Dalmatica*,⁵ as worn both by bishops and deacons: but whether it was then a garment of sacred use, is not said by him or any other ancient writer, that I know of; and therefore I content myself with the proofs already alleged, as

¹ Con. Tolet. iv. can. xxvii. Episcopus, presbyter aut diaconus, si à gradu suo injustè dejectus, in sanctâ synodo innocens reperiatur, non potest esse quod fuerat, nisi gradus amissos recipiat coram altario de manu episcoporum. Si episcopus est, orarium, annulum et baculum. Si presbyter, orarium et planetam. Si diaconus, orarium et albam.

² Can. xxxix. Unum orarium oportet Levitam gestare in sinistro humero, propter quod orat, id est, prædicat.

³ Ambros. de Obitu Satyri Fratris. Et Epist. liv.

⁴ Aug. de Civ. Dei. lib. xxii. cap. viii. Vid. Pontium Vit. Cyprian.

⁵ Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. q. iv. tom. iv. Quasi non hodiè diaconi Dalmaticis induantur sicut episcopi.

sufficient to shew that in the fourth age a plain distinction of habits was made in the sacred service of the Church.

SECT. 3.—Four Postures of Devotion allowed of by the Ancients. First, Standing, which was particularly enjoined on the Lord's Day, and all the Time between Easter and Pentecost.

The next considerable circumstance in their worship, was the posture observed in their addresses and adorations of God: and of this we find four kinds generally practised and allowed, viz. standing, kneeling, bowing, and prostration. For sitting, which some add as a fifth sort, was never allowed by the Ancients as an ordinary posture of devotion. Standing was the general observation of the whole Church on the Lord's day, and the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, in memory of our Saviour's resurrection. This custom may be traced as high as Irenæus, who derives it from apostolical authority. For the author, under the name of Justin Martyr,¹ gives this account of the use of both postures in prayer: "Forasmuch as we ought to remember both our fall by sin, and the grace of Christ, by which we rise again from our fall: therefore we pray kneeling six days, as a symbol of our fall by sin: but our not kneeling on the Lord's day is a symbol of the resurrection, whereby through the grace of Christ we are delivered from our sins, and from death, that is mortified thereby." And this custom took its original from the times of the Apostles, as St. Irenæus says in his book concerning Easter, wherein he also makes mention of Pentecost, during which time we kneel not, because it is of the same nature with the Lord's day, according to the reason that has been given. Not long after, Tertullian speaks of it,² as an observation among many others handed down from ancient tradition. And Cyprian may be supposed to hint it, when he speaks of their standing in prayer.³

It is mentioned also by Clemens of Alexandria,⁴ and Peter,

¹ Justin. Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodox. q. 115.

² Tertul. de Coron. Mil. cap. iii. Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare. Eâdem immunitate à die Paschæ in Pentecosten usque gaudemus.

³ Cypr. de Orat. p. 152. Quando stamus ad

orationem, &c.

⁴ Clem. Strom. vii. p. 854.

bishop of Alexandria,¹ who died some years before the Council of Nice. He says, “ We keep the Lord’s day as a day of joy, because then our Lord rose from the dead, and our tradition is not to kneel on that day.” In the time of the Council of Nice there was some disagreement about this practice, and therefore that Council made a Canon to bring all Churches to an uniformity in this matter.² “ Because there are some, who kneel on the Lord’s day, and in the days of Pentecost; that all things may be uniformly performed in every parish or diocese, it seems good to the holy synod, that prayers be made to God standing.” After this St. Hilary³ speaks of it again as an apostolical practice, neither to fast, nor worship kneeling on the Lord’s day, or the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost. Epiphanius⁴ says, that on the appointed days they prayed kneeling, but during the whole fifty days of Pentecost they neither fasted nor kneeled. St. Jerom reckons it among the traditions of the universal Church,⁵ neither to fast nor kneel on the Lord’s day or Pentecost. St. Austin is a little doubtful as to the practice of the Church Universal,⁶ but he assures us, that as far as he knew, all Churches in Afric forbore fasting, and prayed standing, and sung Hallelujah! at the altar every Lord’s day, and all the days of Pentecost, in token of our Saviour’s resurrection. We find the same in St. Basil,⁷ who derives it from apostolical practice. And Cassian,⁸ testifies of the Egyptian Churches, that from Saturday night to Sunday

¹ Pet. Alex. can. xv.

² Con. Nic. can. xx.

³ Hilar. Prolog. in Psal. p. 189. Et hæc quidem sabbata sabbatorum est ab apostolis religione celebrata sunt, ut his Quinquagesimæ diebus nullus neque in terram strato corpore adoraret, neque jejuniis festivitatem spiritualis hujus beatitudinis impediret: quod id ipsum etiam extrinsecus in diebus Dominicis est constitutum, &c.

⁴ Epiphan. Expos. Fid. n. 22 et 24.

⁵ Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucifer. cap. iv. Die Dominico et per omnem Pentecosten, nec de geniculis adorare, et jejuniis solvere.

⁶ Aug. Ep. cxix. ad Januarium, cap. xvii. Ut autem stantes in illis diebus et omnibus Dominicis oremus, utrum ubique servetur ignoro. Ibid. cap. xv. Propter hoc et jejunia relaxantur, et stantes oramus: quod est signum resurrectionis. Unde etiam omnibus diebus Dominicis id ad altare observatur, et Halleluia! canitur.

⁷ Basil. de Spir. Sanct. cap. xxvii.

⁸ Cassian. Institut. lib. ii. cap. xviii. Hoc quoque nosse debemus, à vesperâ sabbati, quæ lucescit in diem Dominicum, usque in vesperam sequentem apud Ægyptios genua non curvari; sed nec totis Quinquagesimæ diebus, &c.

night, and all the days of Pentecost, they neither kneeled nor fasted. And in another place he gives the reason of this,¹ “because kneeling was a sign of deep repentance and mourning, which they omitted on those days out of respect and reverence to our Saviour’s resurrection.” Hence it was, that the Author of the Constitutions makes it one of his apostolical orders,² “that all men should pray three times, or three prayers, on the Lord’s day standing, in memory of Him, who rose the third day from the dead.” And from hence came that usual form, so often mentioned by St. Chrysostom³ and others, of the deacons calling upon the people in prayer, “Ὁρθως εἰσῶμεν καλως, *Let us stand upright with reverence and decency;*” alluding to the posture then commonly used in prayer on the Lord’s day. How long this custom continued in the Church, is not easy to determine: but we may observe it to be mentioned by Martin Bracarensis in the sixth century,⁴ and the Council of Trullo in the seventh century,⁵ and the third Council of Tours in the time of Charles the Great.⁶ Nor do we meet with any exception to this rule all this time, save only one relating to the penitents, or those that were under the discipline of the Church; who being, by their falling into scandalous sins, reduced to a state of penance, were not allowed this privilege of standing at prayers on the Lord’s day, but were obliged in token of their humiliation to kneel at all times, not excepting “the days of relaxation,” as the fourth Council of Carthage⁷ words it in a canon made in this behalf. And so we have seen the concurrent testimony of all writers for the antiquity and universality of this practice.

¹ Cassian. Collat. lib. xxi. cap. xx. Ideò in ipsis diebus nec genua in oratione curvantur, quia inflexio genuum velut pœnitentiæ ac luctûs indicium est, &c.

² Constit. lib. ii. cap. lix. Τρις vel τρεῖς εὐχὰς εἰσῶτες ἐπιτελλόμεν, μνήμης χάριν τῆ δια τρωῶν ἀναστασης ἡμερῶν.

³ Chrys. Hom. xxix. al. iv. de Incomprehensibili Dei Naturâ, tom. i. p. 375. Hom. ii. in 2 Cor. p. 740.

⁵ Con. Trull. Can. xc.

⁴ Martin. Bracar. Collect. Canon. cap. lviii.

⁶ Con. Turon. iii. can. 37.

⁷ Con. Carthag. iv. can. 82. Pœnitentes etiam diebus remissionis genua flectant.

SECT. 4.—Secondly, Kneeling at all other Times, especially on the Stationary Days, and other Times of Devotion.

At other times kneeling was the most common and ordinary posture of devotion. This may be concluded from the former exception of the Lord's day and Pentecost from this posture: for that implies, that at other times they used a different posture in their addresses to God. This was the usual posture in their ordinary morning and evening service on the weekly days, and on the stationary or fast-days, which were called *stationary days* not from their standing at prayer, but from their continuing and prolonging the exercise in imitation of the military stations. The only difference between these days and the Lord's day was, that on the Lord's day all prayers were performed standing, but on other days some were said standing, some kneeling. In this sense we must understand St. Chrysostom,¹ when he speaks of the people's falling on the ground, when they said the prayer for the whole state of the Church, and their rising again at the bishop's invocation. And so the Author of the Constitutions² represents them kneeling at the first prayer, and standing up at the second. In like manner Cassian says³ the people performed their private prayers kneeling, and then rose up to the minister's collect or prayer, in which all joined standing. This is to be understood of their prayers on ordinary days, and not of the Lord's day, on which, as we have seen before all their prayers were performed standing. As to the posture of kneeling upon other occasions, it would be endless to cite all the testimonies that may be alleged for it. It was so common among them, that the Author of the Acts of Thecla,⁴ gives prayer the name of "Κλίσις γονάτων, *bending the knees.*" And Arnobius, when he would describe to the Heathen the manner of Christians performing their divine office to God, does it by

¹ Chrys. Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor. p. 873. Πάντες ὁμοίως ἐπ' ἰδάφης κείμεθα, ἔ, πάντες ὁμοίως ἀνιστάμεθα.

² Constit. lib. viii. cap. ix. "Οσοι

πιστοί, κλίνωμεν γόβιν. II. cap. x. Ἐγειρόμεθα δεηθέντες, &c.

³ Cassian. Institut. lib. ii. cap. 7. Cùm is qui orationem collecturus est, è terrâ surrexerit, omnes pariter surgunt, &c.

⁴ Acta Theclæ. ap.

Grabe. Spicileg. tom. i. p. 96.

saying, they all fell down upon the earth,¹ as their custom was, and made their common prayers to Him. Eusebius,² speaking of the great devotion of St. James, bishop of Jerusalem, says, “ he was wont to go into the temple alone, and there pray assiduously upon his knees, making intercession for the sins of the people, till his knees were grown as hard and callous as those of camels, by continual exercise of his devotions.” And so again, speaking of the thundering legion, who in the time of Marcus Aurelius procured rain by their prayers, to save the Roman army, and thunder to destroy their enemies, he says,³ “ they fell upon their knees, as was the usual custom of Christians in their prayers, and so made their supplications to God at the head of the army as it was going forth to the battle.” Tertullian had his eye upon this very story, when he tells Scapula,⁴ “ that the genuculations, or prayers on the bended knee, together with the fastings of Christians, were always effectual in driving away drought and famine.” It were easy to give a thousand other instances of the like practice out of the ancient writers;⁵ but in a case so clear and uncontested, I think it next to impertinence to trouble my reader with them. I only note, that though these two postures of prayer were very indifferent in their own nature, yet it was always esteemed an instance of great negligence, or great perverseness to interchange them unseasonably one for the other: that is, to pray kneeling on the Lord’s day, when the Church required standing; or standing on other days, when the rules and custom of the Church required men to kneel. And therefore as the canons of Nice and Trullo reflect upon those, who were superstitiously bent upon kneeling on the Lord’s

¹ Arnob. lib. i. p. 25. Hic propositus terminus divinatorum officiorum, hic finis, huic omnes ex more prosternimur, hunc collatis precibus adoramus.

² Euseb. lib. ii. cap. 23. *Κείμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασι*, &c.

³ Euseb. lib. v. cap. 5. *Γόνυ θέντας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν κατὰ τὸ οἰκεῖον ἡμῶν τῶν ἐδύων ἔθρος*. &c.

⁴ Tertul. ad Scapul. cap. iv. Quando non genuculationibus et jejunationibus nostris etiam siccitates sunt depulsæ?

⁵ Vid. Hermis Pastor. part i. Vision. i. n. i. Genibus positus, &c.—Clem. Roman. Ep. i. ad Corinth. n. 48. *Προσπίσωμεν*, &c.—Passio Ignatii. p. 176. cum Genuflexione, &c.—Passio Cypriani. p. 13.—Euseb. Vit. Constant. lib. iv. cap. 61.—Aug. de Civ. Dei. lib. xxii. cap. 8.—Chrys. Hom. xxii. de Irâ, tom. i. p. 278.—Prudent. Cathemerin. Hymn. ii.

day: so others with equal severity complain of the remissness and negligence of such, as refused to kneel at other times, when the Church appointed it. “It is a very indecent and irregular thing,” says Cæsarius of Arles,¹ “that when the deacon cries out, ‘Let us bend the knee,’ the people should then stand erect as pillars in the Church.” These were but small observations in themselves, but of great consequence, we see, when done perversely to the scandal and disorder of the Church, whose great rule in all such cases, is that of the Apostle, “Let all things be done decently and in order.”

SECT. 5.—Thirdly, Bowing down the Head.

A third posture of devotion was bowing down the head, or an inclination of the body between the posture of standing and kneeling. This was chiefly used in receiving the the bishop’s or priest’s benedictions, in all direct and formal addresses to God for his mercy and favour upon the people, whether catechumens, penitents, or any other. Thus we find in the Constitutions² the catechumens are bid to bow the head in order to receive the bishop’s benediction in a form of invocation, there appointed to be said over them. So likewise the energumens have the same direction:³ “bow down your heads, ye energumens, and receive the benediction.” In like manner the candidates of baptism⁴ and the penitents⁵ are bid to rise up, after the deacon’s prayer, and bow their heads to receive the benediction. And this may be confirmed out of Chrysostom, who says,⁶ “the deacon in the time of the oblation presented the energumens, and bid them bow their heads only, to indicate at least by the habit and gesture of the body, that they were in a praying posture.” And this he repeats⁷ in other places,

¹ Cæsar. Arelatens. Hom. xxxiv.

² Constit. lib. viii. cap. 6.

Κλινόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὰς κεφαλὰς, εὐλογεῖτω αὐτοῖς ὁ ἐπίσκοπος εὐλογίαν τοιάνδε. &c.

³ Ibid. Κλίνατε οἱ ἐνεργόμενοι, ἕ εὐλογεῖσθε.

⁴ Ibid. cap. vii. Κλίναντες εὐλογεῖσθεσαν. &c.

⁵ Ibid. cap. viii.

Ἀναστάντες κλίνατε ἕ εὐλογεῖσθε.

⁶ Chrys. Hom. xxviii. sive iii.

de Incomprehensibili. tom. i. p. 365. Κελεύει κλίνειν τὴν κεφαλὴν μόνου, ἕ τῷ σχήματι ποιῆσθαι τῆ σῶματος τὰς ἰκετεροῦσας.

⁷ Chrys. Hom. xxix.

tom. i. p. 371.

where he particularly speaks of those, that were possessed of evil spirits.

SECT. 6.—Fourthly, Prostration.

The last posture of devotion was prostration, or lying along in the humblest manner upon the ground. This seems to have been the proper posture for extraordinary humiliations, when men had some singular request more earnestly to recommend to God. We often read of Moses and other saints falling upon their faces in Scripture, when they were to make some extraordinary intercession for the sins of the people. And in imitation of them the same gesture was sometimes used in the Christian Church. Some lapsers, when they sued for admission to a state of penance, did not only fall down upon their knees, but prostrate themselves before the faithful, to beg their prayers as they entered into the church. Which is particularly noted by Socrates of Ecebolius the sophist,¹ who, having lapsed in the time of Julian, desired favour under Jovian; and the more to move compassion, he put himself into the mournfullest posture, falling upon his face before the gate of the church, and crying out, “*Calcate me insipidum salem, Tread me under foot as salt that has lost its savour.*” But this was not the only case, in which they used this mournful posture, but they also practised it upon other occasions, whenever any great necessity urged them with greater ardency to prefer their petitions to God. Thus Socrates observes of Alexander, bishop of Constantinople,² that when he was in a great strait about the admission of Arius into the Church he prostrated himself upon his face under the communion table, and there prayed to God for many days and nights together, that God would give some token to determine which of their doctrine was true: if the doctrine of Arius was true, he desired that he himself might not live to see the day appointed for the disputation: but if his own were true, then he desired that

¹ Socrat. lib. iii. cap. 13. Ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν πρηνῆ πρὸ τῆς πύλης τῆ εὐκτη-
 ρίε οἴκῃ, πατήσατέ με, ἐβόα, τὸ ἄλας τὸ ἀναίσθητον. ² Socrat.
 lib. i. cap. 37. Ὑπὸ τὴν ἱερὰν τράπεζαν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τόμα ἐκτίνας εὐχε-
 ται. &c.

Arius might suffer the punishment due to his impiety. Which he accordingly did, voiding his entrails as he had occasion to go to stool, whilst he was going triumphantly to the church. Theodoret¹ makes a like remark upon the behaviour of Theodosius the Great, that when he first entered the church, after he had been for some time excluded by St. Ambrose, he would neither pray to God standing nor kneeling, but prostrate with his face to the ground; using those words of the Psalmist, “ My soul cleaveth to the dust, O quicken thou me according to thy word.” By which we learn, that this posture was chiefly appropriated to deep humiliations, and expressions of shame or sorrow upon some very remarkable occasion, but scarce ever used as a general practice of the Church.

SECT. 7.—Sitting, not an allowed Posture of Devotion,

There is one posture more, which some plead for as a posture of adoration; but it never had any allowance in the practice of the ancient Church: that is sitting, which Cardinal Perron and some others in the Romish Church pretend was the posture, in which the Apostles received the communion at its first institution, and that this was then a common posture of adoration used among the Heathens. But the learned Mr. Daillo² has abundantly exposed this pretence, and shewed the falsity of it in every particular. For neither did the Heathens sit at their devotions, as the cardinal imposed upon himself by a false interpretation of Plutarch and Tertullian; neither did the Apostles communicate sitting, but lying along on beds or couches, which all men know to be a different posture; neither did they worship the eucharist in any posture; neither did the primitive Christians ever use, or take sitting for a posture of devotion. Tertullian indeed says,³ there were some superstitious persons in his time, admirers of the book called Hermes Pastor,

¹ Theod. lib. v. c. 19. Πρηνης ἐπὶ τῆ δαπέδῃ κείμενος. &c.

² Daillæ. de Objecto Cultus Relig. ii. cap. 2.

³ Tertul. de Orat. cap. xii. Item quod adsignatâ oratione assidendi mos est quibusdam, non perspicio rationem, nisi si Hermas ille, cujus scriptura ferè Pastor inscribitur, transactâ oratione non super lectum assedisset, verùm aliud quid fecisset, id quoque ad observationem vindicarem, &c.

who made it a matter of conscience to sit down for some time, "*ad signata oratione*," that is not, "in time of prayer," as some falsely render it, but "*when prayer was ended*," because they found the example of the pastor in that book to that purpose. For as he sat down upon a bed after prayer, so they thought themselves obliged to do the same in compliance with his example. But this is no proof of their sitting at prayer, but only after prayer was ended: and that too grounded upon a very weak and superstitious opinion, that every circumstance of an action or narration, however indifferent in itself, was to be drawn into example and to be made matter of necessary duty. According to which way of reasoning, as Tertullian observes, they must have worshipped no where but where there was a bed, nor sat upon a chair or bench, because this would have been a deviation from their example. He adds, that the Heathens only were used to sit after prayer before their idols, and for that very reason it was not fit for Christians to imitate their practice.¹ All which shews, that the Christians then were so far from using sitting as a posture of devotion, that they did not think it proper to sit even after prayer in the presence of God, whilst the angel of prayer, (it is his phrase,) stood by them; and because it looked more like an heathenish than a Christian practice.

SECT. 8.—Some superstitious Practices in Devotion noted by Tertullian.

Tertullian in the same book takes notice of some other superstitious observations, which some ran into in their devotions, in imitation of the Heathen. Some thought it necessary to put off their cloaks, when they went to prayer, which he condemns as symbolizing with idolaters. For so, the Heathen were used to do in reverence to their idols.² This was superstition, not religion; and more an affectation

¹ Tertul. de Orat. cap. xli. Porrò eùm perinde faciunt nationes adoratis sigillaribus suis residendo, vel propterea in nobis reprehendi meretur, quod apud idola celebratur, &c.

² Ibid. Hujusmodi non religioni, sed superstitioni deputantur, coacta et affectata, et curiosi potiùs quàm rationalis officii, certè vel eò coerenda, quod gentilibus adæquent. Ut est quorundam positæ penulis orationem facere: sic enim adæcunt ad idola nationes.

and curiosity, than any thing of rational and manly service. Others would not pray without washing the whole body in water, as if that made them more acceptable to God; whereas the true purity was that of the spirit, to lift up holy hands free from deceit, murder, cruelty, witchcraft, idolatry, and other such corruptions,¹ which defile both flesh and spirit. A man, that is free from these, is always clean, being once washed in the blood of Christ: but he, that is inwardly polluted, is unclean, though he wash every member of his body every day. It is the superstition of these practices that Tertullian complains of: for otherwise, the Christians themselves had their fountains before the Church in many places, for men to wash their hands, as a matter of decency, before they went to worship God, as has been shewn in another place.² And the evil of such practices consists not in the bare use of such things, but in laying the opinion of necessity upon them, and affixing holiness to the usage, and making them become essential parts of divine service.

SECT. 9.—That the Ancients uncovered their Heads in their Devotions.

Such practices therefore, as were attended with superstition, they disclaimed: but retained such other rites and ceremonies, as were either proper expressions of decency in their own nature, or by their significancy and symbolical use might be improved to a spiritual advantage. They prayed with the head uncovered, according to the Apostle's direction, as esteeming it a great indecency to do otherwise. So Chrysostom in his comment on the place. Tertullian adds another reason in his Apology to the Gentiles,³ "we pray uncovered, because we are not ashamed to appear with open face; making it a sort of testimony and symbol of their innocency in their addressing God without covering."

¹ Tertul. cap. xi. Hæ sunt veræ munditiæ, non quas plerique superstitiosè curant, ad omnem orationem etiam cum lavacro totius corporis aquam sumentes, &c.

² Book viii. chap. iii. sect. 6.

³ Tertul. Apol. cap. xxx. Capite nudo, quia non erubescimus, precantes sumus semper. &c.

On the other hand, as both nature and custom had made it decent for women to be covered, so they were very precise in requiring this to be observed, especially in religious assemblies. Some pleaded an exemption for virgins in the case, which gave occasion to Tertullian to write his book, *De Velandis Virginibus*,¹ wherein he argues both virgins and matrons to be under the same obligation of being veiled or covered in time of divine service; and he severely inveighs against those, who hanged a fringe of ribband about their heads, and pretended to call that a covering. But some learned persons² think he was too severe in this reflection, and almost singular in applying it to the case of virgins, who were then allowed a greater liberty in this matter above matrons or married women, by the general discipline of the African Church.

SECT. 10.—And lifted up their Hands toward Heaven, sometimes in the Form of a Cross.

It is more uncontested, what Tertullian observes of another ceremony, that they usually prayed with their arms expanded and their hands lift up to heaven,³ and that sometimes in the form of a cross, to represent our Saviour's passion. For this is also noted by Minucius,⁴ when he says, “they worshipped God with a pure mind, and their hands stretched forth in the form of a cross.” And by Asterius Amasenus, in a fragment of his Homily concerning Prayer, preserved in Photius,⁵ who says, “the Christian represents the passion of the cross by his gesture, whilst he expands his arms and lifts them up in the figure of a cross.” After

¹ Tertul. de Veland. Virgin. cap. xvii. Quantam castigationem merentur etiam illæ, quæ inter psalmos, vel in quacunque Dei mentione retectæ perseverant? &c.

² Vid. Du Pin. Bibliothec. tom. i. p. 95.

³ Tertul. Apol. cap. xxx. Manibus expansis, quia innocuis, &c. It. de Orat. cap. xi. Nos verò non attollimus tantùm, sed etiam expandimus, et Dominicâ passione modulantes, et orantes Christo confitemur. ⁴ Minuc. Dial. p. 90. Crucis signum est, cum homo porrectis manibus Deum purâ mente veneratur.

⁵ Aster. ap. Phot. Cod. 271. Ἐκτεταμένως προβαλλόμενος, τὰς χεῖρας, τὸ τῆ παύρῃ πάθος ἐν τῷ σχήματι ἕξικοιζήτι.

this manner Paulinus describes St. Ambrose in his last minutes praying to God,¹ “with his hands expanded in the form of a cross.” And Prudentius relating the passion of Fructuosus, a Spanish bishop and martyr, in the time of Gallienus, says,² “the bands which tied his arms, were first burnt off without touching his skin; for they durst not restrain those arms, which were to be lift up to the Father in the manner of a cross.” And this probably is St. Chrysostom’s meaning, when he says, the sign of the cross was used even by the Emperors upon all occasions, on their purple, on their diadems, in their prayers,³ on their arms, and at the holy table. And in reference to this gesture it is, that Eusebius tells us, that Constantine ordered his own image to be stampd on his golden medals, representing him in the posture of a supplicant,⁴ looking up to heaven, with his arms stretched forth to God. Origen says,⁵ “this was to represent the lifting up of their hearts to God in the heavens.” And Chrysostom⁶ more largely sets forth the use of it in explaining those words of the psalmist, “Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening-sacrifice.” “What means,” says he, “the stretching forth our hands in prayer? Because they are instrumental in many sorts of wickedness, as fighting, murder, robbery, and rapacious avarice, therefore we are commanded to lift them up, that the ministry of prayer may tie them up from vice, and deliver them from wickedness: that when you are inclined to rob, or plunder, or smite your neighbour, you should then remember, that these hands are the advocates, as it were, which you are to send forth to God, and by which you are to offer the spiritual sacrifice of prayer to him; and therefore you ought not to dishonour them, and destroy their confidence by letting them minister to wicked actions; but

¹ Paulin. Vit. Ambros. p. 13. Ab horâ undecimâ diei usque ad illam horam quâ emisit spiritum, expansis manibus in modum crucis orabat.

² Prudent. Peri Stephan. Hymn. 6. in Fructuos. Non ausa est cohibere pœna palmas, in morem crucis ad patrem levandas.

³ Chrysost. Demonstrat. quod Christus sit Deus. cap. viii. tom. v. p. 838. Ἐπὶ εὐχῶν σαυροῦς, ἐπὶ ὄπλων σαυροῦς. &c.

⁴ Euseb. Vit. Constant. lib. iv. cap. 15. Ὡς ἄνω βλέπειν δοκεῖν ἀνατεταμένους πρὸς Θεὸν, τρόπον εὐχομένους.

⁵ Orig. Περὶ Εὐχῆς. n. 20. ⁶ Chrys. in. Psal. 140. p. 550. Vid. Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 854.

rather cleanse them by alms-deeds and humanity and assistance of those that are in want, and so lift them up to God in prayer. For if you cannot endure to lift up unwashed hands, how much less should you think it meet to defile them with sin?" By all this it appears, that these ceremonies, both of washing hands and lifting them up in prayer, were of spiritual use, and designed for pious ends, to put men in mind of internal purity by external symbols, and that this significancy was the chief thing that could justify and account for the use of them, as ceremonies in divine service.

SECT. II. — But yet were great Enemies to all theatrical Gestures.

But as they allowed of such decent and significant ceremonies as those that have been mentioned, so they were great enemies to all light and theatrical gestures. They required a modest and grave and well composed behaviour in all external deportment, as thinking no other becoming the majesty of God, or the character of those, that were to address him. Upon this account Tertullian¹ requires a modesty and humility in his votaries even in lifting up their hands in prayer, that they should not toss them up indecently on high, nor appear with a countenance expressing elation and boldness: because the publican's humility and dejection were more commendable than the audaciousness of the pharisee. He requires also a gentle and submissive voice, since God did not hear men for the sound of their words, or the strength of their lungs or arteries, but the fervency of their hearts: and they that were loud in prayer, he tells them, did nothing else but hinder their neighbour's devotion. St. Cyprian expresses himself much after the same way in his directions about the manner of praying: "Let them that pray," says he,² "do it with an orderly voice, expressing quietness and modesty. Let us consider ourselves as standing in the sight of God,

¹ Tertul. de Orat. cap. xlii. Cum modestiâ et humilitate adorantes, magis commendamus Deo preces nostras, ne ipsis quidem manibus sublimius elatis, sed temperatè ac probè elatis. Ne vultu quidem in audaciam erecto, &c.

² Cypr. de Orat. Dom. p. 140.

and that we are to please the divine eyes both with the habit or gesture of our body, and with the manner of our voice. For as it is a sign of an impudent man to make a clamorous noise, so it becomes a modest man to use modesty in his prayers. Therefore when we meet together with our brethren, and celebrate the divine sacrifices with the priest of God, we ought to be mindful of reverence and discipline; not tossing out our prayers with a rude and disorderly voice, nor with a tumultuous loquacity pouring forth these petitions, which ought to be recommended modestly to God. For God is not the hearer of the voice, but the heart: neither needs He to be reminded by noise and clamour, who sees the thoughts of men." It appears from these cautions, that men were apt to run into disorders and excesses in the manner of expressing the external part of their devotions, which needed such rules and admonitions to direct them in the purest ages. And it appears yet more from St. Chrysostom, who has several sharp and severe invectives against some, who accustoming themselves to see the Roman games and plays, brought the manners of the stage into the Church, and corrupted their devotions with theatrical gestures. It will be sufficient to relate a few words out of a single passage¹ in one of his Homilies to this purpose. "O unhappy wretch," says he, "thou oughtest with reverence and fear to send up the angelical hymn, and with trembling make confession to God, and thereby ask pardon of thy offences. Instead of this thou bringest into the church the manners of mimics and dancers, by a disorderly tossing up of thy hands, and beating with thy feet, and agitation of thy whole body. Dost thou not consider, that the Lord himself is present, who measures every man's motions, and examines their consciences? Dost thou not consider, that the angels stand by this tremendous table, and surround it with fear? But thou considerest none of these things, because thy mind is blinded with what thou hast heard and seen in the theatres; and the things, which are done there, thou bringest into the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and with insig-

¹ Chrys. Hom. i. de Verbis Esai. tom. iii. p. 836. Vid. Hom. xix. in Mat. p. 195.

nificant clamours bewrayest the disorder of thy soul. How canst thou expect to incline God to mercy, who offerest thy prayer with such contempt? Thou sayest, ‘ Lord have mercy on me!’ whilst thy behaviour proclaims itself a stranger to mercy : thou criest out, ‘ Lord save me!’ whilst the whole deportment of thy body is in opposition to salvation. For what can those hands, which are always tossed up on high, and disorderly rolled about, contribute toward prayer? What use can there be in vehement clamour, and violent impulse of spirit, that has nothing in it but sound and noise without signification? These are more the practices of strumpets on the high way, or actors on the theatre. And how darest thou to mingle the sports of devils with that doxology, whereby angels glorify God?” Thus far St. Chrysostom in his warmth and zeal against the corruptions, that were creeping in upon devotion by absurd and ridiculous gestures. And this shews us abundantly, that as the Ancients were no way averse to any rites and ceremonies, habits or gestures, that were decent and significant in their own nature, and had any real tendency toward piety : so they were utter enemies to such, as were insignificant and trivial, light and theatrical, and discountenanced them as the effects of superstition or vanity, arising from misapprehensions of religion or evil customs of the world, which they laboured to extirpate, but could not always conquer ; men’s corrupt inclinations disposing them to commute the great things of religion for those, that were small in comparison, and sometimes for those, which were a real detriment and disadvantage to it, as in the cases now before us.

SECT. 12.—Of Ceremonies used at their Entrance into the Church.

But to pass by irregularities and proceed with the observations of the Church. This were a proper place to take notice of several other usages, whereby they expressed their reverence to God at their first entrance into the church. But because some of these have been already considered in a former Book,¹ where we speak of the respect and reve-

¹ Book viii. chap. 10.

rence, which the primitive Christians paid to their churches, I shall but just name them in this place. Such was the ceremony of respect used by kings and emperors, who laid aside their crowns and arms and guards, when they entered into the house of the King of kings. Of which I have only this further to observe here, that probably it was done in imitation of the old Roman magistrates, who, as some authors tell us,¹ were wont to lay aside their *fascēs* and other ensigns of honour, whenever they went into the schools of philosophy at Athens. Such was that other custom of respect observed by the monks of Egypt, who put off their shoes, when they went into the house of God: but this, I shewed, was only a topical custom peculiar to that nation, and not a general one reaching the whole Church. I observed also that there are some reasons to believe the Ancients used the ceremony of bowing towards the altar at their first entrance into the church, though the arguments amount only to a probability, not a demonstration.

SECT. 13.—That the Bishop saluted the People with “*Pax vobis*,” at his Entrance into the Church.

It is more certain, that the bishop saluted the people in the usual form, “*Pax Vobis, Peace be with you*,” at his first entrance into the church. For this is often mentioned by St. Chrysostom,² who derives it from apostolical practice.

SECT. 14.—And the People gave Alms to the Poor, who stood before the Gates of the Church for this Purpose.

St. Chrysostom also mentions another very laudable custom, and he uses all his rhetoric to promote and encourage the practice of it: which was the people’s giving alms to the poor, at their first entrance into the church. “For this reason,” says he,³ “our forefathers appointed the poor to stand before the doors of our churches, that the sight of them might provoke the most backward and inhuman soul

¹ Vid. Pool. Synops. Criticor. in 2 Reg. v. 9. 36. in 1 Cor. p. 652. Hom. iii. in Colos. p. 1335.

² Chrys. Hom.

³ Chrys. Hom. 25. de Verbis Apost. tom. v. p. 369.

to compassion. And as by law and custom we have fountains before our oratories, that they, who go in to worship God, may first wash their hands, and so lift them up in prayer: so our ancestors, instead of fountains and cisterns, placed the poor before the doors of the church; that as we wash our hands in water, so we should cleanse our souls by beneficence and charity first, and then go and offer up our prayers. For water is not more adapted by nature to wash away the spots of the body, than the power of alms-deeds is to cleanse the filth of the soul. As therefore you dare not go in to pray with unwashed hands, though this be but a small offence; so neither should you without alms ever enter the church for prayer. You many times, when your hands are clean, will not lift them up to God, before you have washed them in water: so prevalent is the force of custom with us: let us therefore do the same with respect to alms-deeds: and though we are not conscious to ourselves of any great and heinous crimes, yet let us by charity clear our consciences of lesser spots and blemishes, which we contract in our daily business and conversation." So again in another place,¹ expounding those words, "Thou shalt not appear before the Lord empty:" "these things," says he, "were spoken to the Jews, and how much more to us? Therefore the poor stand before the doors of the church, that no one should go in empty, but enter securely with charity for his companion. You go into the church to obtain mercy: first shew mercy: make God your debtor, and then you may ask of him, and receive with usury. We are not heard barely for the lifting up our hands. Stretch forth your hands, not only to heaven, but to the hands of the poor: if you stretch out your hands to the poor, you touch the very height of heaven. For he that sits there, receives your alms: but, if you lift up barren hands, it profits nothing." He repeats the same in other places,² which shews, that it was an excellent custom prevailing among them, and carefully recommended as a just preparation for

¹ Chrys. Hom. i. in 2 Tim. p. 131.

² Chrys. Hom. ix. de Pœnitent. tom. i. p. 701.

prayer, among many other moral qualifications for this duty, which being vulgar and commonly known, I need not insist upon them in this place.

SECT. 15.—That they worshipped toward the East, with the Reasons for this Practice.

There was one observation more, which must not be omitted, because it was a ceremony almost of general use and practice: and this was the custom of their turning their faces to the East in their solemn adorations. The original of this custom seems to be derived from the ceremonies of baptism, in which, as has been shewn before,¹ it was usual to renounce the devil with their faces to the West, and then turn about to the East, and make their covenant with Christ; from whence, I conceive, it became their common custom to worship God after the same way, that they had first entered into covenant with him. The Ancients give several reasons for this custom, but they all seem to glance at this one.

1. Some say, the East was the symbol of Christ, who was called the Orient, and Light, and Sun of Righteousness in Scripture: and therefore, since they must worship toward some quarter of the world, they chose that which led them to Christ by symbolical representation. As Tertullian tells us in one place,² “that in fact they worshipped toward the East, which made the heathen suspect, that they worshipped the rising sun;” so in another place,³ he says, “the East was the figure of Christ, and therefore both their churches and their prayers were directed that way.” Clemens Alexandrinus, says,⁴ “they worshipped toward the East, because the East is the image of our spiritual nativity, and from thence the light first arises and shines out of darkness, and the day of true knowledge, after the manner of the sun, arises upon those, who lie buried in ignorance.” And

¹ Book xi. chap. vii. sect. 4.

² Tertul. Apol. cap. xvi.

Inde suspicio, quod innotuerit nos ad Orientis regionem precari.

³ Id. cont. Valentin. cap. iii. Nostræ columbæ domus simplex, etiam in editis semper et apertis et ad lucem; amat figuram Spiritûs Sancti, Orientem Christi figuram.

⁴ Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 656.

St. Austin,¹ “when we stand at our prayers, we turn to the East, whence the heavens, or the light of heaven arises: not as if God was only there, and had forsaken all other parts of the world, but to put ourselves in mind of turning to a more excellent nature, that is, to the Lord.” This reason exactly falls in, with that which is given for turning to the East, when they covenanted with Christ in the solemnities of baptism.

2. Another reason, given for it by some, is, that the East was the place of paradise, our ancient habitation and country, which we lost in the first Adam by the fall, and whither we hope to be restored again, as to our native abode and rest, in the second Adam, Christ our Saviour. This reason is given by Gregory Nyssen,² and St. Basil,³ and by the Author of the Constitutions,⁴ and the Author of the Questions and Answers to Antiochus, among the works of Athanasius,⁵ together with Chrysostom, as he is cited by Cotelelius,⁶ and Gregentius,⁷ and many others. Now this is the very reason assigned by St. Cyril for turning to the East, when they covenanted with Christ, and celebrated the mysteries of baptism. So that hitherto we find a clear relation of these ceremonies one to the other, and a perfect agreement between them.

3. Another reason, assigned for this custom, was, that the East was the most honourable part of the creation, as being the seat of light and brightness. The author of the Questions and Answers to the Orthodox gives this reason for it.⁸ “We set apart,” says he, “the most honourable things to the honour of God: and the East in the opinion of men, is the most honourable part of the creation: we therefore in time of prayer turn our faces to the East; as we sign those in the name of Christ, that need consignation, with the right

¹ Aug. de Serm. Dom. in Monte. lib. ii. cap. 5. Cùm ad orationes stamus ad Orientem convertimur, unde cœlum surgit, &c. ut admoneatur animus ad naturam excellentiorem se convertere, id est, ad Dominum.

² Nyss. Hom. v. de Orat. Dom. tom. i. p. 755.

³ Basil. de

Spir. Sanct. cap. 27.

⁴ Constit. lib. ii. cap. 57.

⁵ Athan. Quæst. ad Antioch. q. 37.

⁶ Cotelier. Not. in Con-

stitut. lib. ii. cap. 57. Ex Chrys. in Dan. vi. 10.

⁷ Gregent. Disput. cum Herbaso Judæo. Bibl. Patr. tom. i. p. 217. Gr. Lat.

⁸ Justin. Quæst. ad Orthodox. q. 118.

hand, because it is deemed more honourable than the left, though it differ only in position, not in nature." And Lactantius, without taking any particular notice of this custom, makes this general observation,¹ "That the East was more peculiarly ascribed to God, because he was the fountain of light, and illuminator of all things, and because he makes us rise to eternal life. But the West was ascribed to that wicked and depraved spirit the devil, because he hides the light, and induces darkness always upon men, and makes them fall and perish in their sins." Now this is a reason, that equally holds for turning to the East in baptism, as well as in their daily devotion.

4. There is one reason more assigned for it, which is, that Christ made his appearance on earth in the East, and there ascended into heaven, and there will appear again at the last day. This is one of the three answers, which the Author of the Questions to Antiochus, under the name of Athanasius,² orders to be given to this question: "If a Christian asks the question, he is to be told, they looked toward paradise, beseeching God to restore them to their ancient country and region, from whence they were expelled. If an Heathen put the question, the answer should be, because God is the true Light, for which reason, when they looked upon the created light, they did not worship it, but the Creator of it. If the question was proposed by a Jew, he should be told, they did it because the Holy Ghost had said by David; 'We will worship toward the place where thy feet stood, O Lord.'" Psal. cxxxii. 7. Meaning the place where Christ was born, and lived, and was crucified and rose again, and ascended into heaven. Which seems also to be intimated by St. Hilary on those words of the lxxviii Psalm, according to the translation of the Septuagint, "Sing unto God, who ascended above the heaven of heavens in the East." "The honour of God," says he,³ "who ascended

¹ Lact. lib. ii. cap. 10. Oriens Deo accensetur, quia ipse luminis fons, et illustrator est rerum, et quod oriri nos faciat ad vitam æternam. Occidens autem conturbatæ illi pravæque menti ascribitur, quod lumen abscondat, quòd tenebras semper inducat, et quod hominas faciat occidere ac interire peccatis.

² Athan. Quæst. ad Antioch. q. 37.

³ Hilary in Psal. 67. p. 212. Competenter nunc ascendentis super cælum

above the heaven of heavens in the East, is now reasonably required: and for that reason toward the East, because He, according to the prophet, is the 'East,' or 'Morning from on High;' that He returning to the place, whence He descended, might be known to be the Orient Light, who shall hereafter be the author of men's rising to the same ascent of a celestial habitation."

These several reasons have all a peculiar reference to Christ: and therefore as Christians first used the ceremony of turning to the East, when they entered into covenant with Christ in baptism; so it is probable, that from thence they derived this custom of turning to the East in all their solemn adorations. But whether this were so or not, we are sure there was such a general custom among them, and that it was founded upon some or all the reasons, that have been mentioned; which is as much as is necessary to be said here for the illustration of it.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Times of their religious Assemblies, and the several Parts of Divine Service performed in them.

SECT. I.—No certain Rule for meeting in public, except upon the Lord's Day, in Times of Persecution for the two first Ages.

THERE remains one circumstance more of divine worship, which I have purposely reserved for this place, because the consideration of it will lead us to the several parts of the worship itself: that is, the circumstance of time; concerning which it may be inquired, how often they met in a week, and how often they met in a day, for divine worship? Now, no general answer can be given to these questions, because the times of their assemblies varied according to

cœli ad Orientem Dei honor poscitur.—Ad Orientem verò indireò quia ipse secundùm prophetam Oriens ex alto cit: ut regressus eò unde descenderat, Oriens nosceretur, ipseque sit hominibus in hunc cœlestis sedis ascensum rursus autor oriundi.

the different state and ages of the Church. At first, learned men think they held assemblies every day in the Apostles' time, and whilst the Jewish temple stood: for we read of the Apostles going up to the temple at the ninth hour, being the hour of prayer. Acts iii. 1. And of their continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, or in their house, meaning the church, or house of prayer as others render it. Acts ii. 46. Though their most solemn meetings were on the first day of the week; or the Lord's day. Acts xx. 7. 1 Cor. xvi. 2. In after ages, when the persecutions grew warm, they are thought to have confined themselves to the Lord's day. For the confession, which Pliny took from the mouths of some apostatising Christians, mentions no other:¹ they confessed to him, that the sum of their crime or error was, "That they were used to meet on a certain stated day, before it was light, and sing an hymn to Christ, as to their God; and to bind themselves, by a covenant or sacrament, not into any wickedness, but that they would not commit any theft, or robbery, or adultery, or break their faith, or deny what was committed to their trust; after which they were used to break up their assembly, and return again to a common feast." Which is a plain description of their worship and communion and love feast, called *Agape*, on the Lord's day, but no other. And so Justin Martyr,² describing the Christian worship, says, "that on the day called Sunday there was a general meeting of all that lived both in city and country, when they had the Scriptures read, and a sermon preached, and prayers, and the communion:" but he mentions no assembly for public worship on any other day: whence learned men have concluded,³ that in his time the Church observed no other days of solemn assemblies, but only the

¹ Plin. lib. x. Ep. 97. Affirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ, vel erroris quod essent solisti statim statim die ante lucem convenire: carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem: seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent.—Quibus peractis morem sibi discendendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, &c.

² Justin. Apol. ii. p. 98. Τῇ

τῇ ἡλίᾳ λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μένοντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, &c.

³ Coteler. in Constit. Apots. lib. ii. cap. 59.

Lord's day. His silence, as to all others, is a negative argument against them, unless perhaps some distinction may be made between the general assembly of both city and country on the Lord's day, and the particular assemblies of the city-Christians who had better opportunities to meet on other days: which distinction we often meet with in the following ages, when Christianity was come to its maturity and perfection.

SECT. 2.—The Original of the Stationary Days, or Church Assemblies on Wednesdays and Fridays, and what Divine Service was performed on those Days.

However, it was not long after Justin Martyr's time, before we are sure, the Church observed the custom of meeting solemnly for divine worship on Wednesdays and Fridays, which days are commonly called the stationary days, because they continued their assemblies on these days to a great length, till three o'clock in the afternoon: for which reason they had also the name of *Semi-jejunia*, or *half-fasts*, in opposition to the Lent-fast, which always held till evening, and *Jejunia Quartæ* and *Sextæ Feriæ*, the *fasts of the fourth and sixth days of the week*, that is, Wednesdays and Fridays. These are first mentioned by Tertullian, and Clemens Alexandrinus, and Origen, and after them by most other writers, as fast days generally observed by the Church. But I consider them not here as fasts, which will be more properly done under another head, when we come to speak of the fasts and festivals of the Church, but here only look upon them as days of religious assembly, to discover what public divine worship was performed on them. And for this we are chiefly beholden to Tertullian, who assures us, that on these days they always celebrated the communion; from whence we may infer, that the same service was performed on these days as on the Lord's day, unless perhaps the sermon was wanting. "Some there were," he says, "who objected against receiving the communion on these days, because they were scrupulously afraid, they should break their fast by eating and drinking the bread and wine in the eucha-

rist: and therefore they chose¹ rather to absent themselves from the oblation prayers, than break their fast, as they imagined, by receiving the eucharist." Whom he undeceives by telling them, "that to receive the eucharist on such days would be no infringement of their fast, but bind them closer to God: their station would be so much the more solemn for their standing at the altar of God; they might receive the body of the Lord, and preserve their fast too; and so both would be safe, whilst they both participated of the sacrifice, and discharged their other obligation." Since therefore they received the eucharist on these days, we may conclude they had all the prayers of the communion office, and what other offices were wont to go before them, as the psalmody, and reading of the Scriptures, and prayers for the catechumens and penitents, which together with the sermons were the whole service for the Lord's day. But because even all this could not take up near so much time, as must needs be spent in these stations, it seems most probable, that in two particulars they much enlarged their service on these days, that is, in their psalmody, and private prayers and confession of their sins. The psalms, as we shall see hereafter, were sometimes lengthened to an indefinite number, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, or more, as the occasion of a vigil or a fast required, and between every psalm they had liberty to meditate and fall to their private prayers: and by these two exercises, so lengthened and repeated, it is easy to conceive, how the longest station might be employed. Socrates says,² at Alexandria on these days they had sermons and all other service used at other times, except the communion. But admitting they had the whole service entire, as on the Lord's day, yet it was not commensurate to the time of their stations, unless we suppose their psalmody and private devotions in

¹ Tertul. de Oratione, cap. xiv. Similiter de stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit accepto corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium eucharistia resolvit, an magis Deo obligat? Nomen solennior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Domini, et re servatâ, utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii et executio officii. Some Editions read it, *reservato*, instead of *reservatâ*.

² Socrat. lib. v. cap. 22.

the church to be enlarged on those days to a greater length, than was usual in ordinary service.

St. Basil¹ agrees with Tertullian in making these days not only fasts, but communion days: for, reckoning up how many days in the week they received the communion, he makes Wednesday and Friday to be two of the number. Yet still it is hard to conceive what business they could have to detain them so long in the church: since their collects and public prayers were but few in comparison; and therefore it seems most probable, that a competent share of this time was spent in psalmody, and, as I find a learned person inclined to think,² in private devotions, which always had a share in their service, and was generally intermixed with their singing of psalms, as shall be shewn in their proper places.³

SECT. 3.—Saturday or the Seventh Day anciently observed with great Solemnity, as a Day of public Devotion.

We always find in ancient writers frequent mention made of religious assemblies on the Saturday, or seventh day of the week, which was the Jewish sabbath. It is not easy to tell either the original of this practice, or the reasons of it, because the writers of the first ages are altogether silent about it. In the Latin Churches, excepting Milan, it was kept as a fast; but in all the Greek Churches as a festival: I consider it here only as a day of public divine service, on which, as the authors who mention it, assure us, all the same offices were performed as were used to be on the Lord's day. For Athanasius,⁴ who is one of the first that mentions it, says, "they met on the sabbath, not that they were infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus the Lord of the sabbath." And Timotheus, one of his successors in the see of Alexandria, says,⁵ the communion was administered on this day, as on the Lord's day. Which were the only days in the week that the communion was

¹ Basil. Ep. 289. tom. iii. p. 278.

² Stillingfleet, Orig. Britan. p. 224.

³ See Book xiv. chap. i. Book xv. chap. i. sect. 1.

⁴ Homil. de Sermente, tom. i. p. 1060.

⁵ Timoth. Ep. Canon

can. xiii ap. Bevereg. Pandect. tom. ii.

received by the Christians of his time, at Alexandria. Socrates¹ is a little more particular about the service: for he says, in their assemblies on this day they celebrated the communion, only the Churches of Egypt and Thebais differed in this from the rest of the world, and even from their neighbours at Alexandria, that they had the communion at evening service. In another place, speaking of the Churches of Constantinople in the time of Chrysostom, he reckons Saturday² and the Lord's day the two great weekly festivals, on which they always held church assemblies. And Cassian takes notice of the Egyptian Churches,³ "that among them the service of the Lord's day and the sabbath was always the same: for they had the lessons then read out of the New Testament only, one out of the Gospels and the other out of the Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles; whereas on other days they had them partly out of the Old Testament, and partly out of the New." In another place he observes,⁴ "that in the monasteries of Egypt and Thebais, they had no public assemblies on other days, besides morning and evening, except upon Saturday and the Lord's day, when they met at three o'clock, that is nine in the morning, to celebrate the communion." In the Council of Laodicea there are three canons to the same purpose. One⁵ appoints the Gospels with the other Scriptures to be read upon this day. Another,⁶ that the oblation of the bread in the eucharist shall not be made all the time of Lent, except on the sabbath and the Lord's day. Which implies, that those were communion days, and kept as festivals, even in Lent itself. And for the same reason a third canon⁷

¹ Socrat. lib. v. cap. 22.

² Socrat. lib. vi. cap. 8.

³ Cassian. Institut. lib. ii. cap. 6. In die verò Sabbati vel dominico utraque lectiones de Novo recitant Testamento, id est, unum de Apostolo vel Actibus Apostolorum, et aliam de Evangeliiis.

⁴ Cassian. lib. iii.

cap. 2. Exceptis vespertinis horis ac nocturnis congregationibus, nulla apud eos per diem solennitas, absque die sabbati vel dominicâ, in quibus horâ tertiâ sacræ communionis obtentu conveniunt.

⁵ Con. Laodic.

can. xvi. Περὶ τῆς ἐν σαββάτῳ Εὐαγγέλια μετα τῶν ἑτέρων γραφῶν ἀναγινώσκουσαι.

⁶ Ibid. can. xlix. "Ὅτι ἔδει τῆς τεσσαρακοσῆς ἄρτον προσφέρειν, εἰ μὴ ἐν σαββάτῳ καὶ κυριακῇ μόνον.

⁷ Can. li. "Ὅτι ἔδει ἐν τεσσαρακοσῆ μαρτύρων γενέσθαι ἐπίτελεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων μνείαν ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σαββάτοις καὶ κυριακαῖς.

⁷ Can. li. "Ὅτι ἔδει ἐν τεσσαρακοσῆ μαρτύρων γενέσθαι ἐπίτελεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων μνείαν ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σαββάτοις καὶ κυριακαῖς.

orders that no festivals of martyrs should be kept in Lent but only commemorations of the martyrs be made on the sabbath and the Lord's day. The only difference, that was then made between the sabbath and the Lord's day, was, that Christians were not obliged to rest from bodily labour on the sabbath,¹ but might work on that day, so far as divine service would permit, giving preference in this respect to the Lord's day, whereon they were to rest as Christians. And if any transgressed these rules about working on the sabbath, they were to be deemed Judaizers, and are ordered to be anathematized by another canon of the same Council. By which it appears, that Saturday was kept weekly as a day of public worship, but not as a Jewish sabbath.² Epiphanius mentions it likewise as a day of public assemblies in some places, but not in all. St Basil says,³ it was one of the four days in the week, on which in his time they received the communion. By all which we may perceive, that the Author of the Constitutions had a plain regard to the practice of the Eastern Church, when he prescribed,⁴ that on every sabbath save one, that is the Saturday before Easter-day, and on every Lord's day they should hold religious assemblies, and keep them as the weekly festivals: that is, not only with psalmody, and reading the Scriptures, and common prayers, which was the ordinary service of the morning and evening of every day; but with sermons also, or preaching the Gospel, and the offering of the oblation, and reception of the holy food; as he describes the service of the sabbath and Lord's day in another place.⁵

SECT. 4.—How they observed the Vigils of the Sabbath and Lord's Day, and other incidental Festivals of Martyrs.

Now as these were the two great festivals of every week,

¹ Can. 29. "Οτι ἐ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοις Ἰουδαῖον, ἢ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ. τὴν δὲ κυριακὴν προσιμῶντες, σχολάζειν ὡς Χριστιανοί. εἰ δὲ εἰρηθεῖεν Ἰουδαῖοι, ἔτσωσαν ἀνάθεμα παρὰ Χριστοῦ."

² Epiphanius. *Ephes. tom. i. 1107.* "Ἐν τισὶ δὲ τόποις ἢ ἐν ταῖς σάββασι συνάξεις ἐπιτελεῖσιν."

³ Basil. *Ep. 289. ad Cæsaream Patritiam.* So Austin, *Ep. 118.* Alibi nullus dies omittitur, quo non offeratur, alibi sabbato tantum et dominico.

⁴ Constit. lib. v. cap. 29. II. lib. viii. cap. 33.

⁵ Constit. lib. ii. cap. 59. p. 268.

so they were commonly ushered in by the attendance of preceding pernoctations or vigils, which, as harbingers, went before to make preparations for the solemnities of the following days. These vigils were much of the same nature as the common nocturnal, or daily morning prayer, which was early before it was light: and they only differed from the usual antelucan service in this, that whereas the usual morning service never began till after midnight towards cock-crowing in the morning, these vigils were a longer service, that kept the congregation at Church the greatest part of the night. These the Greeks called Παννυχίδες and the Latins, *Pernoctationes et Pervigilia, watchings all the night*. St Chrysostom often speaks of these: “Go into the church,” says he, “and there see the poor continuing from midnight to break of day: go, and see the holy pernoctations,¹ joining day and night together: behold the people of Christ, fearing neither by night, nor by day, the tyranny of sleep or the necessities of poverty.” In another place² he calls them, “πάννυχοι ἢ διηλεκταὶ στάσεις, *the continued and perfect night-stations*,” in opposition to the stations by day, which were but partial and imperfect. “By these,” he adds, “you imitate the station of the angelical choir, whilst you offer up—ἀκατάπαυτον ὕμνον, *psalmody and hymnody without ceasing* to your Creator. O, the wonderful gifts of Christ! The armies of angels sing glory to God above: and on earth men, keeping their choral stations in the church, sing the same doxology after their example. The cherubims above cry aloud, Holy! Holy! Holy! in the Trisagion hymn: and the congregation of men on earth below send up the same: and so a common general assembly is made of the inhabitants of heaven and earth together. Their thanksgiving is one and the same, their exultation the same, their joyful choral-station the very same.” In which words he plainly gives us to understand, that the angelical hymn, ‘Glory be to God on high,’ and the cherubical hymn, or the Trisagion, as it was called

¹ Chrys. Hom. iv. de Verbis Esaie. tom. iii. p. 865. Βλέπε παννυχίδας ἡμῶν ἡμέρα ἢ νύκτι συναφθεύσας. ² Id. Hom. I de Verb. Esai. p. 831.

from the cherubims thrice repeating the first words, Holy! Holy! Holy! were part of their sacred service in these night stations: which, as I observed before, were but an earlier oblation of the ordinary morning service wherein we shall find the angelical hymn amongst other parts of divine worship always appointed to be used.

It were easy to make a long discourse here of the several sorts of these night stations, or more complete vigils holding all the night through: for they were sometimes held upon extraordinary occasions of prayer, upon great emergencies and necessities of the Church; instances of which the curious reader may find several in Chrysostom,¹ and St. Austin,² and Ruffin,³ and Socrates,⁴ and Sozomen,⁵ and Theodoret.⁶ Sometimes again they were kept as anniversary vigils to usher in the greater festivals of the Nativity, Epiphany, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ, and the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost; of which sort there is mention made in Tertullian,⁷ Lactantius,⁸ Chrysostom,⁹ Socrates,¹⁰ and many others. But the vigils, we are here concerned to speak of, are only such as have some relation to the weekly service, of which number we may reckon those vigils of the sabbath and Lord's day the chief, because they returned constantly in the weekly revolution. Concerning which we have not only the forementioned authority of Chrysostom, but several others. For Socrates,¹¹ giving an account of Athanasius's escape out of the church of Alexandria in the night, when the church was beset with soldiers to take him, says, it was evening, and the people were keeping their nocturnal vigils, because the next day was to be a *Synaxis*, or *Church Assembly*. Therefore Athanasius, fearing lest the people should suffer upon his account, bid the deacon give the signal or call to prayer,

¹ Chrys. Hom. xx. de Statuis. tom. i. p. 252. et Hom. xl. in Juventinum. tom. i. p. 550.

² Aug. Confess. lib. ix. cap. 7. Ep. 119. ad Januarium.

³ Ruffin. lib. i. cap. 12. lib. ii. cap. 16.

⁴ Socrat. lib. i. cap. 37. lib. v. cap. 11.

⁵ Sozom. lib. ii. cap. 29.

lib. iii. cap. 6.

⁶ Theod. lib. i. cap. 14.

⁷ Tertul. ad Uxor.

lib. ii. cap. 4.

⁸ Lactant. lib. vii. cap. 19.

⁹ Chrys.

Hom. xxx. in Genes. p. 124.

¹⁰ Socrat. lib. vii. cap. 5. Vid.

Euseb. Vit. Constant. lib. iv. cap. 57. Hieronym. Com. in Mat. 25.

¹¹ Socrat. lib. ii. cap. 11.

and he commanded a psalm to be sung, and whilst they were singing their psalmody, the soldiers were quiet, and they all meanwhile went out at one door of the church, and Athanasius in the midst of the singers escaped untouched and fled to Rome. Athanasius himself,¹ has the same story in his Apology for his flight, where he says, “some of the people were keeping their night vigil, expecting an assembly the next day.” And Socrates, in another place, speaking of these nocturnal vigils, kept both by the Arians and Catholics, says, they held them against the weekly festivals, the sabbath, and the Lord’s day,² on which days there were used to be general assemblies of the Church. And because the Arians were allowed no churches within the walls, they sung their hymns in the streets and porticos of the city till the morning light, and then went out to their meeting places without the gates. And the historian observes, that Chrysostom, fearing the Arians might gain ground upon the Church by this practice, and draw away some of the more simple people, appointed some of his own people, who were used to nocturnal hymnody, to meet in the streets after the same manner; and to make the solemnity more splendid, the Empress gave them silver crosses to set their lamps in, appointing one of her own eunuchs, called Brison, to be their protector. Which so provoked the Arians, that they fell to blows upon it, and Brison and some others were slain in the engagement: which occasioned the Emperor wholly to put down those Arian meetings, and leave the Catholics quietly to go on with their vigils in the churches, as they had done before. From these accounts we may easily collect, both that there were such weekly vigils frequented by the more zealous and religious sort of people in all parts of the East, and also that psalms and hymns and prayers were the exercises, wherewith they entertained themselves to the morning light. I might add many other testimonies out of Nazianzen,³ and

¹ Athan. Apol. de Fuga. tom. i. p. 716. Τῶ λαῷ τινες ἐπαννύχιζον, προσδοκώμενης συνάξεως, &c.

² Socrat. lib. vi. cap. 8.

³ Naz. Carm. Iambic. 18. tom. ii. p. 218. Orat. xi. de Gorgonia, tom. i. p. 183.

other Greek writers, but these are abundantly sufficient to shew us the practice of the Oriental Church.

For the Latin Church we have the authority of St. Jerom, who interpreting the word, "watcher," in Daniel, says, it signifies the angels, who always watch, and are ready to obey the commands of God: and he adds,¹ "we also by our frequent pernoctations or night-watches imitate the office of angels." And it appears from him further, that women and virgins frequented this service, as well as men, for he advises Læta to inure her daughter to these solemn pernoctations;² only cautioning her to keep a guard upon her, and not let her wander from her side; for the same reason I presume, for which the Council of Eliberis thought fit wholly to forbid women the observation of these vigils,³ because many, under pretence of prayer, were found to commit wickedness. There are many other passages in St. Austin, and St. Hilary, and other Latin writers, which speak of vigils; but because they may be understood either of private watchings in prayers at home, or of the common vigils of the ordinary morning prayer before day, I omit them in this place: only alleging that of St. Ambrose,⁴ where he seems to found this practice upon the imitation of Christ's example: "The Lord Jesus," says he, "continued all night in prayer, not that he wanted the help of prayer, but to set thee an example to copy after: He continued all night praying for thee, that thou mightest learn after what manner to pray for thyself."

But besides these stated vigils of the two weekly festivals, there was another sort of incidental ones, which came almost every week throughout the year, or at least were very frequent in some parts of it: those were the vigils of the

¹ Hieron. Com. in Dan. iv. 13. Significat autem angelos, quòd semper vigilant, et ad Dei imperium sint parati. Unde et nos crebris pernoctationibus imitatur angelorum officia.

² Id. Ep. vii. ad Lætam. Vigiliarum dies et solemnes pernoctationes sic virguncula nostra celebret, ut ne transverso quidem ungue à matre discedat.

³ Con. Eliber. can. 35. Placuit prohiberi, ne fœminæ in cœmiterio pervigilent; eò quod sæpe sub obtentu orationis latenter scelera committant.

⁴ Ambr. Serm. 19. in Psal. 118. ver. 157. p. 740. Pernoctabat in oratione Dominus Jesus, non indigens precationis auxilio, sed statuens tibi imitationis exemplum. Ille pro te rogans pernoctabat, ut tu disceres quomodo pro te rogares.

festivals or anniversaries of the martyrs. Those anniversaries, as we shall see by and by, were always in great repute, and observed with the same solemnities of divine worship, as the sabbath, or the Lord's day; and therefore their vigils were also celebrated with the same ceremony, as the vigils or night stations of the two great weekly festivals. St. Chrysostom is an undoubted witness of this: for in an Homily made upon one of these festivals, he takes notice of the preceding vigil, that had continued all the night: ¹ "Ye have turned," says he, "the night into day by keeping your holy stations all the night: do not now turn the day into night again by surfeiting and drunkenness and lascivious songs." And Sidonius Apollinaris will testify the same, at least for some part of the Western Church: for writing about the festival of Justus, bishop of Lyons, he thus describes both the observation of the day, and the preceding vigil: ² "We met," says he, "at the grave of St. Justus; it was a morning procession before day; it was an anniversary solemnity; the confluence of people of both sexes was so great, that the church, though very capacious and surrounded with cloisters, would not contain them. When the Service of the vigil was ended, which the monks and clerical singers performed with alternate melody, we separated for some time, but went not very far away, as being to meet again at three o'clock, that is, nine in the morning, when the priests were to perform divine service," that is, the service of the communion, as on a festival.

SECT. 5.—Of the Festivals of Martyrs. Their Original, and what Divine Service was performed on those Days.

And now that we have mentioned the festivals of martyrs,

¹ Chrys. Hom. 59. in Martyres. tom. v. p. 779. Ἐποιήσατε τὴν νύκτα ἡμέραν διὰ τῶν παννυχίδων τῶν ἁγίων μὴ ποιήσατε πάλιν τὴν ἡμέραν νύκτα διὰ τῆς μέθης. &c.

² Sidon. lib. v. ep. 17. Conveneramus ad Sancti Justi sepulchrum—Processio fuerat antelucana, solennitas anniversaria, populus ingens sexu ex utroque, quem capacissima basilica non caperet et quamlibet cineta diffusis cryptoportibus. Cultu peracto vigiliarum, quas alternante mulce dine monachi clericique psalmicines concelebraverant, quisque in diversa secessimus, non procul tamen, utpote ad tertiam præsto futuri, cum sacerdotibus res divina facienda.

as days of public religious worship, we must take notice of their original, to find out how early they became days of solemn addresses to God, and in what offices of divine service their observation consisted. These festivals were grown so numerous in the time of Chrysostom and Theodoret, that they tell us, it was not once or twice or five times in a year that they celebrated their memorials, but they had oftentimes one or two in the same week,¹ which occasioned frequent solemnities. The original of them is at least to be carried as high as the time of Polycarp, who suffered about the year 168. For the Church of Smyrna, whereof he was bishop, in their Epistle to the Church of Philomelium, recorded by Eusebius,² tell them, “that they intended, if God would permit, to meet at his tomb and celebrate his birth-day, that is, the day of his martyrdom, with joy and gladness, as well for the memory of the sufferer, as for example to posterity.” Tertullian speaks of these anniversary festivals, as observed in his time. “We offer,” says he,³ “oblations for those that are dead, for their nativities on their anniversary-day.” And Cyprian⁴ orders his clergy to note down the days of their decease, that a commemoration of them might be celebrated amongst the memories of the martyrs. And in another place he says,⁵ they offered sacrifices for them, as often as they celebrated their passions, or days of martyrdom, by an anniversary commemoration. These sacrifices were the sacrifices of prayer, and thanksgiving to God for the examples of the martyrs, and the celebration of the eucharist on these days, and the offerings of alms and oblations for the poor; which, together with a panegyric oration or sermon, and reading the acts or passion of the martyr, if they had any such recorded, were the exercises and special acts of devo-

¹ Vid. Chrys. Hom. 40 in Juventinum. tom. i. p. 546. Theod. Serm. viii. de Martyribus. tom. iv. p. 605. Chrys. Hom. 65. de Martyr. tom. iv. p. 971.

² Euseb. lib. iv. cap. 15.

³ Tertul. de Coron. Mil. cap. iii. Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annuâ die facimus.

⁴ Cypr. Ep. 12. al. 37. Denique et dies eorum quibus excedunt annotate, ut commemorationes eorum inter memorias martyrum celebrare possimus.

⁵ Id. Ep. 39. al. 34. p. 77. Sacrificia pro iis semper, ut meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passiones et dies anniversariâ commemoratione celebramus.

tion, in which they spent these days. For these were always esteemed high festivals, and therefore the same service that was performed on the sabbath and Lord's day was always performed on them. They never passed without a full assembly, nor without a sermon or a communion, as appears from some of Chrysostom's Homilies upon such occasions. To dissuade the people from intemperance, he bids them consider,¹ "how absurd it was after such a meeting, after a whole night's vigil, after hearing the holy Scriptures, after participating of the divine mysteries, after such a spiritual repast, for a man or a woman to be found spending whole days in a tavern." The foundation of his argument is built upon this supposition, that they had received the eucharist in the Church before, in celebrating the memorial of a Martyr. And so Sidonius Apollinaris represents the matter in the passage just now cited from him,² that after they had kept the vigil of St. Justus the night preceding, they assembled again by day at nine in the morning, when the priests did "*rem divinam facere, offer the oblation,*" or consecrate the eucharist, as Savarot rightly interprets it.³

But besides the usual solemnities of other festivals, there was one thing peculiar to these festivals of the martyrs: which was, that the history of their passions, as they were taken by the notaries, appointed by the Church for this purpose, were commonly read in the assembly upon such occasions. It was at least the common practice of the African Churches. For St. Austin speaks of it as an usual thing,⁴ indulging his people with liberty to sit, whilst they heard them read, because they were sometimes of a considerable length. And the third Council of Carthage⁵ made a canon to encourage the reading of them. Mabillon⁶ gives several other instances out of Aleimus Avitus, Cæsarius

¹ Chrys. Hom. 59 de Martyribus. tom. v. p. 779.
ep. 17.

³ Savaro. Comment. in Sidon.

² Sidon. lib. v.

⁴ Aug. Hom.

26. ex. 50. tom. x. p. 174. Quando aut passionēs profixæ, aut certè aliquæ lectiones longiores, qui stare non possunt, humiliter et cum silentio sedentes, attentis auribus audient, quæ leguntur.

⁵ Con. Carth. iii. can. 47.

Liceat etiam legi passionēs martyrum, cùm anniversarij dies eorum celebrantur.

⁶ Mabillon. de Cursu Gallicano. p. 403. &c.

Arelatensis, and Ferreolus, to shew that they were read also in the French Churches. Only they were forbid den in the Roman Church by the decree of Pope Gelasius¹ in his synod of seventy bishops, under pretence that they were written by anonymous authors, and sometimes by ignorant heathens, and sometimes by heretical authors, as the passions of Cyricus, Julitta, and St. George. For which reason they had by ancient custom prohibited the reading of them in the Roman Church. But this rule it seems did not then prescribe to other Churches.

SECT. 6.—Solemn Assemblies for preaching and other Acts of Divine Worship held every Day during the whole forty Days of Lent, and the fifty Days between Easter and Whitsuntide.

It may be further observed, that during the whole forty days of Lent, they had continual assemblies not only for prayers, but preaching also: as is evident from Chrysostom's sermons, many of which were preached by him successively one day after another throughout the greatest part of that season; as his Homilies upon Genesis, and those famous discourses called his *Ἀνδροιάντες*, preached at Antioch in Lent upon the occasion of a tumult, wherein the Emperor's statues were demolished. And many other instances may be given of the same practice, of which more hereafter under the head of preaching in the next book.² It is true indeed they did not always consecrate the eucharist in Lent, but only upon the sabbath and Lord's day, as we learn from the Council of Laodicea,³ which expressly forbids the oblation of the bread in Lent upon any other day besides the sabbath and the Lord's day. The reason of which was, that these two days were observed as festivals even in Lent itself; and they did not ordinarily consecrate the eucharist upon the solemn fasts in the time of this Council: but instead of the consecration-service they had probably that,

¹ Gelas. Decret. ap. Crab. tom. i. p. 992. Singulari cautela, secundum antiquam consuetudinem, in sancta Romanâ Ecclesia non leguntur, quia et eorum qui conscripsere, nomina penitus ignorantur; et ab infidelibus idiotis superflua, aut minus apta, quam rei ordo fuerit, scripta esse putantur, sicut cujusdam Cyrici et Julitæ, sicut Georgii aliorumque hujusmodi passiones, quæ ab hæreticis perhibentur compositæ.

² Book xiv. chap. iv.

³ Con. Laodic. can. xlix. "Ὅτι ἐ δὲ τῇ τεσσαροσῆ ἄφρον προσφέρειν, εἰ μὴ ἐν σαββάτῳ ἢ κυριακῇ μόνον.

which in the following ages is called *Προηγυρισμένων Λειτουργία*, *Missa Præsanctificatorum*, the office of the presanctified elements, which was a shorter service for communicating on fast days in the elements, that were consecrated before on the Lord's day festival, about which there is a particular direction in the Council of Trullo. can. 52. So that one way or other they seem to have had both a communion and a sermon every day in Lent.

Then again the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide were a sort of perpetual festival, and observed with great solemnity, as days of joy, from the time of Tertullian, who mentions it, and triumphs over the Heathen upon it,¹ "that besides the Sunday, which returned once in eight days, this one continued festival of Pentecost was more than all the festivals the Heathen could pretend to reckon up in a whole year." He does not tell us here indeed with what solemnity they observed this time, but in another place he assures us,² they had solemn worship every day, and paid the same respect to it as they did to the Lord's day, in that they neither fasted nor prayed kneeling on any day during this whole interval, which was the commemoration of our Saviour's resurrection and ascension. Whence it is no improbable conjecture, that during this season they might have the same complete worship every day, that they had upon the Lord's day.

SECT. 7.—Public Prayer Morning and Evening every Day in the third Century.

And this consideration will lead us to fix the date of the setting up morning and evening prayer daily in the Church. For if the persecutions would give leave in Tertullian's time to keep fifty days together, as solemn festivals; there is no reason to imagine that they could not as well meet every day for their ordinary devotions. And if Wednesdays and Fridays were then observed as stationary days, with more than ordinary attendance, as we have heard him declare be-

¹ Tertul. de Idololat. cap. xiv. Ethnicis semel annuus dies quisque festus est: tibi octavo quoque die. Excerpe singulas solennitates nationum, et in ordinem texe, Pentecosten implere non poterunt.

² Tertul. de Coron. Mil. cap. iii. Die dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare. Eâdem immunitate à die Paschæ in Pentecosten usque gaudemus.

fore ; there is little reason to question, but that every day might have an ordinary vigil or morning assembly. It was not long after Tertullian's time, that Cyprian assures us,¹ they received the eucharist every day ; and he thinks that petition in the Lord's prayer may bear this sense, when we say, " Give us this day our daily bread ;" which was also Tertullian's sense of it before him.² Now this is demonstration then, that they had assemblies for public worship every day, since they received the eucharist every day, which they did not use to consecrate but in public assemblies of the Church. From this time therefore there is no dispute about the Church's daily sacrifice of prayer in her morning assemblies : which in after ages are commonly called *Cætus Antelucani, et Vigilæ, et Horæ Nocturnæ*, because they were a sort of *ordinary vigils, or night-assemblies, held before it was light*, though not so early as those other sort of vigils, or night stations, before the sabbath and Lord's day, which were of longer duration, as has been noted already of them in its proper place.

As to evening prayer, public in the Church, Mr. Mede³ thinks there is no mention made of it in Cyprian or Tertullian, nor in any writers before the Author of the Constitutions and the Council of Laodicea : he thinks the ninth hour of prayer, mentioned by Cyprian,⁴ relates only to private prayer ; which is very probable : and that Tertullian's "*Nocturnæ Convocationes*," mean not evening, but morning prayers early before day ; which is undoubtedly true : but then he seems not to have considered, that in Cyprian's time there was a custom among some of communicating after supper : for he plainly mentions it,⁵ though he did not like the custom : and this custom continued among the Egyptians till the time of Socrates,⁶ who speaks of it then as something

¹ Cypr. de Orat. Domin. p. 147. Hunc panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne qui in Christo sumus, et quotidie eucharistiam ad cibum salutis accipimus, intercedente aliquo graviore delicto—à Christi corpore separeremur.

² Tertul. de Orat. cap. vi. Corpus ejus in pane censetur : hoc est corpus meum. Itaque petendo panem quotidianum, perpetuitatem postulamus in Christo, et individuitatem à corpore ejus.

³ Mede Epist. 66. p. 840.

⁴ Cypr. de Orat. Dom. p. 154.

⁵ Cypr. Ep. 63. Ad Cæcilium. p. 156. An illâ sibi aliquis contemplatione blanditur, quod et si manè aqua sola offerri videtur, tamen cum ad cœnandum venimus, mixtum calicem offerimus ?

⁶ Socrat. lib. v. cap. 22.

peculiar to those Churches. Now if there was a custom in Cyprian's time of communicating after supper, there is no doubt to be made of evening prayer at the same time. Rigaltius¹ and after him Bishop Feli² and Dr. Cave³ carry this custom of communicating after supper as high as Tertullian: but I think they mistake his words: for he does not say, that they communicated after supper,⁴ but that Christ at supper-time gave the command for the sacrament of the eucharist to all, though then they communicated in their morning assemblies, and received it, from the hands of none but their governors. I lay no stress therefore upon this proof, but think the proof of evening prayer may be rationally deduced from that of Cyprian. After whom the Author of the Constitutions not only speaks of it,⁵ but gives us the order both of their morning and evening service, with which I shall present the reader in the following chapters. The Council of Laodicea speaks of the evening service⁶ together with that of the nones, or three in the afternoon, and orders the same service to be used in both. The Greeks commonly called it *Αυχναψία*, and the Latins *Lucernarium*, because it commonly began at the time when the day went off, and when *they lighted candles* for the night. It is likewise frequently styled *Sacrificium Vespertinum*, *the evening sacrifice*, and *Missa Vespertina*, as those names are used to signify in general the service or prayers of the Church. And these two, evening and morning, are the most celebrated times of the ancient daily service, which are to be found almost in every ecclesiastical writer; so that it is altogether needless here to insist any further upon them.

SECT. 8.—The Original of the Canonical Hours of Prayer. No Notice of them for Public Prayer, but only for Private, in the three first Ages.

There remains one question more concerning those times of prayer, which are commonly called the canonical hours,

¹ Rigalt. in Cypr. Ep. lxiii.
locum.

² Fell. in dictum Cypriani

³ Cave, Prim. Christ. par. i. cap. xi. p. 338.

⁴ Tertul. de Cor. Mil. cap. iii. Eucharistiæ sacramentum et in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum à Domino, etiam antelucanis cœtibus, nec de aliorum manu quàm præsidentium sumimus.

⁵ Constit. lib. viii. c. 35.

⁶ Con. Laodic. can. xviii. Περὶ τῆ τὴν αὐτὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν εὐχῶν παντοτε εἰ ἐν ταῖς ἐννάταις εἰ ἐν ταῖς ἑσπεραις ὀφείδειν γίνεσθαι.

that is, besides the fore-mentioned evening and morning prayer, those that are called the first, the third, the sixth, and the ninth hours, with the *Completorium*, or *bed-time*. They, who have made the most exact inquiries into the original of these as fixed hours of public prayer, can find no foot-steps of them in the three first ages, but conclude they came first into the Church with the monastic life. So Mr. Mede,¹ and Bishop Pearson,² who observes that Tertullian mentions the third, sixth, and ninth hours of prayer; but then he is disputing as a Montanist against the Catholics,³ and urging the necessity of observing the rules of the Montanists in all the heights of their austerities, and pretences of mortification and devotion above the Church. And he does not intimate, that either the Montanists or the Catholics observed these hours for public assemblies. Cyprian indeed recommends these hours of prayer,⁴ from the example of Daniel, and other arguments, to Christians in their private devotions: but he does not so much as once suggest, that the Church had then by any rule made these the stated hours of public devotion. That, which evidently confirms this opinion, is an observation to be made out of Cassian, who particularly describes the devotions of these canonical hours, and the gradual rise of them. For they had not all their original at the same time. The first monks of Egypt, who were the founders of the monastic life, he assures us, never observed any other canonical hours for public devotion, but only evening and morning early⁵ before day: all the rest of their time they spent at work privately, joining private meditation of the Scriptures, singing of psalms, and prayers continually with their labour. Not long after the monasteries of Mesopotamia and Palestine set up the practice of meeting publicly at the third, sixth, and ninth hours for performing their psalmody and devotions.⁶ But as yet there was no new morning service, distinct from that of the old morning service before day. This was first begun in the monastery of Bethlehem⁷ and thence propagated into others, but not received in all. And

¹ Mede Epist. lxxvi.
num. 3, 4.

² Pearson Prælect. ii. in Act. Apost.
Domin. p. 154. ³ Tertul. de Jejun. cap. x.

⁴ Cypr. de Orat.

⁵ Cassian. Institut. lib. iii. cap. 2.

⁶ Cass. lib. iii. cap. 3.

⁷ Cass. lib. iii. cap. 4.

the *Completorium*, or *bed-time-service*, was utterly unknown to the Ancients, as distinct from the *Lucernaris*, or *evening service*, as Bona¹ himself proves against Bellarmin. So that these canonical hours came gradually into the Church, and are all of them owing to the rules of the Eastern monasteries for their original. Therefore what a learned man among ourselves says,² must be taken with a little qualification, else it will not be true: “that the Universal Church anciently observed certain set hours of prayer; that all Christians throughout the world might at the same time join together to glorify God: and some of them were of opinion,³ that the angelical host, being acquainted with those hours, took that time to join their prayers and praises with those of the Church.” If this be understood of any rule or the custom of the Universal Church for hours of public prayer besides those of morning and evening, in the three first ages, it will not be true: but if it only mean, that there were directions given for the encouragement of private prayer at those set times, and that Christians generally observed them in private, it may be allowed: since not only Origen, but Cyprian, as we have heard before, writes in favour of them, and Clemens Alexandrinus says,⁴ some allotted set hours for prayer, the third, sixth, and ninth. So necessary is it to distinguish between public and private devotions, and between the first and the following ages, when we speak of canonical hours of prayer, as appointed by the Church Universal. For even after they were set up in the monasteries, they were not immediately observed in all the Churches. For Epiphanius,⁵ speaking of the customs of the Catholic Church, mentions the morning hymns and prayers, and the evening psalms and prayers, but no other. So Chrysostom often mentions the daily service in the Church,⁶ morning and evening: and at the most never speaks of above three times⁷ a day for public assemblies. For thus he brings in

¹ Bona de Psalm. cap. xi. sect. 1. n. 3.

² Patrick of Prayer,

part ii. chap. xi. p. 109.

³ Origen. *Περὶ εὐχῆς*. n. 33. 35.

⁴ Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 854. Ed. Oxon.

⁵ Epiph. Expos.

Fid. n. 23. tom. i. p. 1106. Ἑωθινοὶ τε ὕμνοι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ διηγουκῆς γίνονται, ἔξ προσευχαῖ ἐωθιναῖ, λυχνικοὶ τε ἅμα ψαλμοὶ ἔξ προσευχαῖ.

⁶ Chrys. Hom. xviii. in Act. p. 174. 176. Hom. vi. in 1 Tim. p. 1550.

⁷ Chrys. Hom. iv. de Anna. tom. ii. p. 995. Πῶς δυνατόν ἀνθρώπων

a secular man complaining, and saying, “ how is it possible for me, who am a secular man, and pinned down to the courts of law, to run to church, and pray at the three hours of the day ?” In answer to which Chrysostom does not say, that the Church had these three hours of prayer for laymen, and more for others ; but he tells the man of business, “ that if he could not come to church, because he was so fettered to the court, yet he might pray even as he stood there ; since it was the mind and the voice, and the elevation of the soul, rather than the lifting up of the hands, that was to be regarded in prayer. For Hannah’s prayer was not heard for her loud voice, but because she cried aloud inwardly in her soul.” This seems to intimate, that the Church then only observed three hours of prayer, that is, the evening and morning, and as I conceive the nones, or three in the afternoon. For by this time, in some places, the Church had received that hour as a stated hour of prayer, of which more by and by. Yet it was some time after this, before these hours were admitted in the Gallican and Spanish Churches. For Mabillon shews,¹ out of Gregory Turonensis, that the sixth and ninth hours of prayer were not introduced into the Church of Tours, till the time of Bishop Injuriosus, which was not till the year 530. And it appears from one of the canons of Martin Bracarensis, that they were not in his time admitted into the Spanish Churches. For he calls only the morning and evening service the daily sacrifice of psalmody,² at which all clerks were obliged to be present, under pain of deposition without amendment. This argues, that as yet the other hours were not established in the Churches but only in the monasteries as canonical parts of the daily service. And it is observable further, that most of the writers of the fourth age, who speak of six or seven hours of prayer, speak of the observations of the monks only, and not of the whole body of the Church. As St.

βιωτικόν, δικαστήριον προσηλωμένον, κατὰ τρεῖς ὥρας εὐχεσθαι τῆς ἡμέρας, ἢ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἐκτρέχειν. &c.

¹ Mabil. de Cursu Gallicano. p. 409.

² Martin. Bracar. Capitul. Synod. cap. lxiv. Si quis clericus intra civitatem fuerit, aut in quolibet loco quo ecclesia est, et ad quotidianum psallendi sacrificium non convenerit, deponatur à clero, &c.

Jerom,¹ where he describes the institutions of the monasteries erected by the famous Lady Paula, says, “they sung the psalter in order, in the morning, at the third, and sixth and ninth hours, and at evening, and at midnight.” And giving directions in another place to Læta,² how to educate her daughter in the monastic life, he prescribes the same hours to be observed in devotion. And the like may be seen in St. Basil, Gregory Nyssen, Cassian, Cassiodore, and most other writers; nay, even St. Chrysostom himself, who speaks but of three solemn hours of prayer in the Church, when yet he has occasion to speak of the monks and their institutions, gives in much the same number of canonical hours as others do. He tells us,³ they had their midnight hymns, their morning prayers, their third, and sixth, and ninth hours, and last of all their evening prayers. But I will not deny, that by this time these hours of prayers might in some places of the East be admitted into the Churches. For the Author of the Constitutions has different directions upon this point: in some places he speaks only of morning and evening prayer in the Church;⁴ but in another he prescribes this rule to be observed by the bishops in the Church:⁵ “ye shall make prayers in the morning, and at the third hour, and the sixth, and the ninth, and at evening, and at cock-crowing. In the morning, giving thanks to the Lord for that he hath enlightened you, removing the night, and bringing in the day: at the third hour, because at that time the Lord received sentence of condemnation from Pilate: at the sixth hour, because at that time, after the Lord was crucified, all things were shaken and moved with horror and astonishment at the audacious fact of the impious Jews, detesting the affront that was put upon their Lord: at evening, giving thanks to God, who hath given the night to be a rest from our daily labours: at cock-crowing, because that hour

¹ Hieron. Epitaph. Paulæ. Epist. xxvii. cap. x. Manè, horâ tertiâ, sextâ, nonâ, vespere, noctis medio, per ordinem psalterium cantabant.

² Id. Ep. vii. ad Lætã. Assuescat exemplo ad orationes et psalmos nocte consurgere, manè hymnos canere, tertiâ, sextâ, nonâ, horâ starè in acie, quasi bellatricem Christi; accensâque lucernâ reddere sacrificium vespertinum.

³ Chrys. Hom. xiv. in 1^a Tim. p. 1599.

⁴ Constit. lib. ii.

cap. 59. lib. viii. cap. 35.

⁵ Constit. lib. viii. cap. 34.

brings the welcome news of the day, to work the works of light. If you cannot go to the church because of the infidels, you shall assemble in an house: or if you can neither assemble in an house, nor in the church, then let every one sing, read and pray by himself; or two or three together: ‘For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.’” One may conjecture from this passage, that this author, living in the time, when these canonical hours began to be in request, in the beginning of the fourth century, found them to be admitted into the usage of some Churches, and therefore drew his scheme of directions in conformity to their practice.

SECT. 9.—What Service was allotted to these Canonical Hours by the Church in the fourth Century.

And it being allowed, that about this time they began gradually to take place in the Church, it will not be amiss to take a short view of them in particular, and examine what parts of divine service were performed in each of them. Cassian, speaking of the first institution of them in the monasteries of Mesopotamia and Palestine, where they had their first birth, says,¹ they were appointed to be celebrated with the singing of three psalms at every meeting. And these intermixed with some prayers were the whole service. So that these were but short offices in comparison of the ancient morning and evening service. And there is reason to believe, that the Church did not precisely follow these monastic rules, but made proper offices for herself to be used upon these occasions, partly because the monastic offices were very different from one another, and not always chosen with the greatest discretion. Of which I need but give one proof here out of the Council of Braga, which made a canon to this purpose,² that by common consent one and

¹ Cassian. Institut. lib. iii. cap. 3. Itaque in Palæstinæ vel Mesopotamiæ monasteriis, ac totius Orientis, supradictarum horarum solennitates trinis psalmis quotidie finiuntur.

² Con. Bracarens. i. can. xix. Placuit omnibus communi consensu, ut unus atque idem psallendi ordo in matutinis vel vespertinis officiis teneatur, et non diversæ ac privatæ monasteriorum consuetudines contra ecclesiasticas regulas sint permixtæ, vel cum ecclesiasticis regulis sint permixtæ.

the same order of singing should be observed in the morning and evening offices, and that the private and different customs of the monasteries should not be mingled with the rules of the Church.

The Gallican Church in the time of the second Council of Tours, it is certain, had a very different rule from that of the Eastern monasteries about the number of psalms, hymns, and antiphonas to be said at the several hours and times of prayer. For in one of the canons of that Council,¹ about the year 567, a very peculiar order was made, "that the method of psalmody and number of hymns should be in proportion to the number of the hours or months, in which they were used: the new morning service was to be performed with six antiphonas, and two psalms in the height of summer. In September there were to be seven antiphonas and two psalms; in October eight antiphonas and three psalms; in November nine and three psalms; in December ten and three psalms; and the same in January and February until Easter." So again at the sixth hour there were to be six psalms and the hallelujah, and at the twelfth hour twelve psalms and the hallelujah. And in the whole month of August there should be manications, that is, as Mabillon² explains it out of Aimoinus,³ early matins or morning service without any psalms, because it was harvest time, and men were in haste to be gone to their labour, when they had performed the solemnity of the festivals, which in that month were frequent above others. This shews, that no certain rule was at first observed about these canonical hours, but

¹ Con. Turon. ii. can. xix. Iste ordo psallendi servetur, ut in diebus æstivis ad matutinum sex antiphonæ binis psalmis explicentur. Toto Augusto manicationes fiant, quia festivitates sunt et missæ: Septembri septem antiphonæ explicentur binis psalmis; Octobri octo ternis psalmis: Novembri novem ternis psalmis: Decembri decem ternis psalmis: Januario et Februario, itidem usque ad Pascha.—Superest, ut vel duodecim psalmi expediantur ad matutinum, quia Patrum statuta præceperunt ut ad sextam sex psalmi dicantur cum alleluia; et ad duodeciman duodecim, itemque cum alleluia, &c.

² Mabil. de Cursu Gallicano. n. 54. p. 422.

³ Aimoin Hist. Francor. lib. iii. cap. 81. Porrò toto Augusto, propter crebas festivitates, manicationes fiebant. Manicare autem manè surgere dicitur.

that they varied both as to their number and service in their first original.

SECT. 10.—Of the *Matutina*, or *Prima*, called the *New Morning Service*.

The first of these offices was the *Matutina*, or *Prima*, the *new morning service*, so called in contradistinction to the old morning service, which was always early before day; whereas this was after the day was begun. Cassian tells us,¹ this was first set up in the monastery of Bethlehem, for till that time the morning service used to end with the old nocturnal psalms and prayers and the daily vigils, after which they used to betake themselves to rest till the third hour, which was the first hour of diurnal prayer, till this new office of morning prayer was set up within Cassian's memory, to prevent some inconveniences, which he there mentions. He often gives it the name therefore of *Novella Solennitas*, the *new solemnity*, as being so lately invented. And this is the true reason, why in most of the writers before Cassian, such as St. Jerom, the Author of the Constitutions, St. Basil, and others, who speak particularly of the canonical hours, there is no mention of this first hour, but they always reckon them up after this manner, the morning, meaning the morning vigil before day, the third, the sixth, the ninth, without mentioning the first, because it was not in their time as yet become an accustomed hour of prayer. But when it was once made a canonical hour, to complete the number of seven times a day, then there were psalms particularly appointed for this service, which Cassian² says were these three, the fiftieth, sixty-second, and eighty-ninth; which, according to our computation, are the fifty-first, sixty-third, and ninetieth. The

¹ Cassian. Institut. lib. iii. cap. 4. Sciendum tamen hanc matutinam, quæ nunc observatur in occiduis vel maximè regionibus, canonicam functionem, nostro tempore, in nostro quoque monasterio primitùs institutam, ubi Dominus noster Jesus Christus natus ex virgine.—Usque ad illud enim tempus, hæc solennitate matutinâ, que expletis nocturnis psalmis et orationibus post modicum temporis intervallum solet in Galliæ monasteriis celebrari, cum quotidianis vigiliis pariter consummata, reliquas horas reflectioni corporum deputatas à majoribus nostris invenimus.

² Cassian. lib. iii. cap. 6. Quinquagesimum verò psalmum, et sexagesimum secundum, et octogesimum nonum huic novellæ solennitati novimus fuisse deputatos.

first of which is that, which the Ancients called properly the psalm of confession, or penitential psalm, which begins; “Have mercy upon me, O God, after thy great goodness: according to the multitude of thy mercies do away mine offences.” This, Cassian says in the same place, was used by all the Churches of Italy in his time as the close of this morning service. The second of these psalms is that, which the Ancients called by a peculiar name, the morning psalm, as we shall see hereafter, because it begins with those words; “O God, my God, early will I awake unto Thee,” or “early will I seek Thee;” and was always used in the old Antelucan service before this new service was set up. The third of these psalms, which is the ninetieth, seems to be taken into this service upon the account of those words in it, suiting the state of human life; “In the morning it is green, and groweth up, but in the evening it is cut down, dried up and withered:” and, “So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.”

SECT. II.—Of the *Tertia*, or *Third Hour of Prayer*.

Next after this, in all such Churches as admitted the first, was the *Tertia*, or *third hour*, that is, nine in the morning; this is mentioned by all the writers, that say any thing of hours of prayer;¹ some saying it was to be observed in regard to our Saviour’s being condemned by Pilate at that time; and others,² in memory of the Holy Ghost’s coming upon the Apostles at that hour: that men might with one mind worship the Holy Spirit, and beg of Him the same sanctification, direction, and protection, imitating David’s prayer, in saying, “Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me.” Psal. li. In another place, “Let thy loving Spirit lead me forth into the land of righteousness.” Psal. cxliii. This is the reason assigned by Cassian and St. Basil, for this solemnity. But whether any particular psalms were appropriated to this service, we are not told, but only in general, Cassian says, three psalms together with

¹ See the Author of the Constitutions lib viii. c.34. Regul. Major. q. 37. Cassian. Institut. lib. iii. c. 3.

² Basil.

prayers were appointed for every hour. But on all festivals this service was omitted, because on Sundays the communion-service was used, which always began at this hour.

SECT. 12.—Of the sixth Hour, or Noon-Day Service.

The next hour was the sixth, or noon-day service. At which time St. Basil says,¹ they used the xc. or xci. psalm, praying for protection against the incursions of the *noon-day devil*,—*δαμονίς μεσημβρινῆς*,—for so the Septuagint and other translations render the words of that psalm; “Thou shalt not be afraid for any terror by night, nor for the arrow that flieth by day; nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness, nor for the sickness, nor the devil, destroying at noon day.” What other psalms they used he tells us not, but probably they might be some that had relation to the death of Christ, because it is agreed by all, that this service was appointed in commemoration of our Saviour’s immaculate sacrifice to the Father at this hour.

SECT. 13.—Of the ninth Hour, or three in the Afternoon.

The last hour of prayer in the day time, was the ninth hour, that is, three in the afternoon, at which time our Saviour expired upon the cross, and by his death triumphed over death and hell. At this hour Cornelius was praying, when he was visited by an angel: as Peter was at the sixth hour, when he had the vision of the sheet let down from heaven. This was the hour, when Peter and John went up into the temple, “at the ninth hour, being the hour of prayer,” and the usual time of the Jewish evening sacrifice. In regard to all which the Church seems to have taken this hour for a solemn time of public prayer, before the two last mentioned. For the Council of Laodicea,² expressly mention the ninth hour of prayer, and orders that the same service should be used in that, as was appointed for evening prayer. And St. Chrysostom,³ speaking of three hours of

¹ Basil. Regul. Major. q. 37.

² Con. Laodic. can. xviii.
p: 1599.

³ Chrys. Hom. xiv. in 1 Tim.

public prayer in the day, may most reasonably be understood to intend this ninth hour as the third of them; because in another place he seems¹ to recommend it as such: for speaking of the Apostles going into the temple at the ninth hour, being the hour of prayer, he says, “they observed this hour not without very good reason; for I have often told you concerning this hour, that it was the time when paradise was opened, and the thief entered into it; this the time when the curse was taken away, when the sacrifice of the world was offered, when the darkness was dissolved, and the light, as well sensible as spiritual, shone forth. It was at the ninth hour, when others after dinner and drunkenness sleep a deep sleep, that they then being sober and vigilant, and fervent in love, made haste to prayer. And if they needed to be so exact and assiduous in prayer, who had such boldness, and were conscious of no evil; what shall we do, who are over-run with wounds and sores, and neglect to use the medicine of prayer?” This character here given of the ninth hour, makes it probable to me, that this was one of those three famous hours of prayer, which in the former place he exhorts all men to frequent in public. We have no particular account in any writer, of the psalms or prayers to be used at this hour, but only what we have heard before out of the Council of Laodicea, that it was to be the same with the evening service: and therefore we must draw our accounts of it from thence. Now because we have a more ample and distinct account of the morning and evening daily service, than of any other stated hours of prayer in the ancient Church, as being both more ancient and more celebrated than the rest, I shall give a more particular and exact description of the several parts, and method of performing those offices, from such records as may be depended on for their truth and fidelity: and have therefore reserved the consideration of these for the two following chapters.

¹ Chrys. Hom. xii. De Inscriptiōne Act. Apost. tom. v. p. 173.

CHAP. X.

The Order of their Daily Morning Service.

SECT. I.—The Order of Morning Service, as described in the Constitutions. This began with the lxxiii. Psalm.

THE most noted and usual times of meeting, besides those of the Lord's day, were the morning and evening of every day, which in times of peace were constantly and regularly observed. I will describe the order of these services, as they are laid down in the Constitutions, and compare the several parts of them with the memorials and accounts, that are left us by other ancient writers. The order for the morning service begins with the appointment of the Ὁρσρινὸς Ψαλμὸς, *the morning psalm*, as the Author of the Constitutions terms it.¹ He names not what psalm it was in this place, but in another place he calls it the sixty-second. That is, in our division, the sixty-third. Which, to show how proper it was to begin their morning service with, both in relation to the night past, and the day approaching, I think it not improper to recite in this place, according to our old version, which comes nearest to the translation of the Septuagint used in the ancient Church.

PSALM LXIII.

1. O God, Thou art my God : early will I seek Thee.
2. My soul thirsteth for Thee, my flesh also longeth after Thee, in a barren and dry land, where no water is.
3. Thus have I looked for Thee in holiness ; that I might behold thy power and glory.
4. For thy loving kindness is better than the life itself : my lips shall praise Thee.

¹ Constit. lib. viii. cap. 37. Confer. lib. ii. c. 59.

5. As long as I live will I magnify Thee on this manner, and lift up my hands in thy name.

6. My soul shall be satisfied even as it were with marrow and fatness, when my mouth praiseth Thee with joyful lips.

7. Have I not remembered Thee in my bed, and thought upon Thee, when I was waking?

8. Because Thou hast been my helper, therefore under the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice.

9. My soul hangeth upon Thee: thy right hand hath upholden me.

10. These also that seek the hurt of my soul, they shall go under the earth.

11. Let them fall (*Septuagint, they shall fall*) upon the edge of the sword, that they may be a portion for foxes.

12. But the king shall rejoice in God; all they also that swear by him shall be commended: but the mouth of them that speak lies, shall be stopped.

SECT. 2.—What Notice we have of this Morning Psalm in other Writers.

St. Chrysostom shews, that the Author of the Constitutions does not impose upon us in this morning psalm: for he says,¹ “the Fathers of the Church appointed it to be said every morning, as a spiritual song and medicine to blot out our sins; to kindle in us a desire of God; to raise our souls, and inflame them with a mighty fire of devotion; to make us overflow with goodness and love, and send us with such preparation to approach and appear before God.” He names not the psalm, but he repeats the first words, “O God, my God, early will I awake unto Thee. My soul thirsteth for Thee.” And, “Thus have I appeared before Thee in holiness, that I might behold thy power and Glory.” By which we may know that it is the same psalm. He says, he had before made an exposition upon this psalm; and refers his reader thither for a large account of it: but that by injury of time is now lost, and we are beholden to this passage by

¹ Chrys. Com. in Psal. 140. tom. iii. p. 545. Τοιαῦτά τός ἐστι ὁ ὁ ἰωβινός ψαλμός, &c.

the by for all the notice we have of this morning psalm out of him, upon the occasion of his commenting upon the evening psalm; of which more hereafter in its proper place. Besides Chrysostom, we have the testimony of Cassian for the use of this psalm; for speaking of the several hours of prayer, and assigning reasons out of Scripture for them, he makes this to be one reason for morning prayer,¹ that the psalm, which was daily sung in that office, did properly instruct men about their obligations to this duty, saying, “O God, my God, early will I seek Thee.” And Athanasius also once or twice recommends this psalm to virgins and others, as proper to be said privately in their morning devotions. “Rising early in the morning,”² says he to Marcellinus, “sing the sixty-second psalm.” And again to the virgins,³ “in the morning sing this psalm, ‘O God, my God, early will I seek Thee.’” These were but private directions indeed, but probably might be suited to the orders and measures of public worship: it being evident from the forecited authors, that this psalm was the usual introduction to their morning devotions.

SECT. 3.—Next to the Psalm followed the Prayers for the Catechumens, Energumens, Competentes, and Penitents.

Immediately after this morning psalm, without mention of any other psalmody or reading any lessons out of the Old or New Testament, follow the prayers for the several orders or catechumens, energumens, candidates of baptism, and penitents, as in the general service of the Lord’s day, which, because I shall recite them at large in that service,⁴ I omit to mention any further in this place. Only observing, that these prayers were performed partly by the deacon’s *προσφώνησις*, *bidding* the people pray, and repeating the several petitions they were to make for those several orders of men;

¹ Cassian. Institut. lib. iii. cap. 3. De matutinâ verò solemnitate etiam illud nos instruit, quod in ipsâ quotidie decantari solet, ‘Deus meus ad te de luce vigilo.’

² Athan. Ep. ad Marcellinum. tom. i. p. 975. Ὁρθρίζων ψάλλε τὸν ἑξηκοστὸν δεύτερον.

³ Id de Virginit. tom. i. p. 1057.

Πρὸς ὄρθρον δὲ τὸν ψαλμὸν τῆτον λέγετε, ὁ Θεὸς, Θεός μου, πρὸς σέ ὀρθρίζω.

⁴ See book xiv. chap. v.

and partly by the bishop's invocation or benediction said over them, as they bowed down to receive the blessing before their dismissal.

SECT. 4.—Then the Prayers for the Faithful, the Peace of the World, and the whole State of Christ's Church.

When these several orders were sent away, there followed the prayers, which on the Lord's day began the communion-service, and which upon that account were usually styled *Εὐχαὶ Πιστῶν*, *the prayers of the faithful*, or communicants, because none but they, who had a right to communicate in the eucharist, might be present at them. These were the prayers for the peace of the world, and all orders of men in the Church, which always went before the consecration of the eucharist. And though there were no consecration of the eucharist on these ordinary days, yet these general prayers were always used in the daily morning service. I omit the reciting of them here for the same reason as I do the former, because the reader may find them rehearsed at large hereafter in the entrance on the communion-service.¹

SECT. 5.—What Notice we have of these Prayers in other Writers.

I only observe here, that there is mention made, in other writers as well as the Constitutions, of these prayers for the whole state of the world, and all orders of men in the Church. For Chrysostom, writing upon those words of St. Paul, "I exhort therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and all that are in authority;" says,² "this word, 'first of all,' relates to the daily worship; wherein they that were initiated knew what was done every day, morning and evening; how we make supplication to God for the whole world, 'for kings and all that are in authority.'" This clearly shews that such prayers were not only made on communion days at the celebration of the eucharist, but every day, both morning and evening also, when it is certain there

¹ See Book xv. chap. i.

² Chrys. Hom. vi. in 1 Tim. p. 1550.

Τῆτο ἴσασιν οἱ μύσαι, πῶς καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν γίνεται ἐν ἐσπέρα ἐπρωτα, πῶς ὑπὲρ παντός, τῷ κόσμῳ, ἐ βασιλείων, ἐ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων ποιόμεθα τὴν δέησιν.

could be no sacrifice but only that of their prayers. For the consecration of the eucharist, in that age was never made at evening prayer. In this sense we may understand many of the ancient Apologists, when they speak of making prayers continually for the Roman government. Thus Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, tells Æmylian the præfect, “we worship the one God, maker of all things, who gave the empire to Valerian and Gallienus, our divine governors:¹ to Him we pray continually for their kingdom that it may be preserved free from disturbance and commotion.” And so Tertullian acquaints Scapula:² “we offer sacrifice for the Emperor’s safety, but to no other God but our God and his; and in that manner as God has appointed, that is to say, by prayer alone without blood.” In like manner Cyprian tells Demetrian:³ “we continually pour forth supplications and prayers for driving away your enemies, and procuring rain, and either for removing or moderating your calamities: and we pray instantly and incessantly day and night for your peace and safety, appeasing God and rendering him propitious unto you.” Origen also answering the objection of Celsus, that the Christians were wanting in their duty to the Emperor, in that they gave him no aid in his wars, and refused to fight for him, among other things tells him,⁴ “that they gave him the most seasonable assistance, procuring him the divine aid, and defending him with the whole armour of God. And this they did in obedience to the Apostle’s admonition, ‘I exhort therefore first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, for kings, and all that are in authority.’” He adds, “that keeping their hands pure, they fought in their prayers to God for their lawful sovereign and those that fought lawfully under

¹ Dionys. Epist. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. 11. *Τάτω διηλεκτῶς ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν ὅπως ἀσάλευτος διαμένη, προσευχόμεθα.*

² Tertull. ad Scapulam. cap. ii. *Sacrificamus pro salute imperatoris, sed Deo nostro et ipsius: sed quo modo præcepit Deus, purâ prece.* Vid. Apol. cap. 30, 31, et 39.

³ Cypr. ad Demetrian. p. 193. *Pro arcendis hostibus et imbribus impetrandis, et vel auferendis vel temperandis adversis, rogamus semper et preces fundimus: et pro pace ac salute vestrâ propitiantes ac placantes Deum, diebus ac noctibus jugiter atque instantur oramus.*

⁴ Orig. cont. Cels.

lib. viii. p. 436.

him, that all opposition and enemies might fall before them, whilst they were lawfully employed. They by their prayers enervated the power of devils, the authors of war, and confounders of leagues, and disturbers of peace; and in doing this they did the Emperor more effectual service, than they that bare arms for him." Athenagoras tells the Emperors themselves in his address to them,¹ "that the Christians prayed for their government and the royal progeny, that the son might succeed the father in his kingdom according to right, and that their empire might be extended and enlarged, all things succeeding according to their desire: and this they did, both that they might lead a quiet and peaceable life, and cheerfully observe all that was commanded them." Now though in all these passages there is no express mention made of morning and evening prayer in the Church; yet their continual prayer, and their praying day and night, may reasonably be presumed to include these, without any prejudice to other times of public or private devotion. I now go on again with the order of morning prayer in the Constitutions.

SECT. 6.—After the general Prayer for the whole State of the Church, followed a short Bidding-Prayer for Preservation in the ensuing Day.

After the prayer for the whole state of the Church was ended, and the deacon had said, "Keep us, O God, and preserve us by thy grace;" which concludes the former prayer; he exhorted the people to pray for peace and prosperity the day ensuing and all their lives, in this manner.

"Let us beg of God his mercies and compassions, that this morning and this day, and all the time of our pilgrimage may be passed by us in peace and without sin: let us beg of God, that He would send us the angel of peace, and give us a Christian end, and be gracious and merciful unto us. Let us commend ourselves and one another to the Living God by his only begotten Son."

What is here said concerning the angel of peace, is a petition, that came often in the devotions of the ancient

¹ Athenag. Legatio. pro Christianis, p. 39.

Church, both when they prayed for themselves and others. For we shall meet with it again in the evening service, and in the prayer for the catechumens, mentioned by St. Chrysostom in several places of his writings,¹ where he often speaks of the deacon's bidding men pray for the angel of peace, and that all their purposes may be directed to a peaceable end. Which agree very well with this prayer of the deacon in the Constitutions.

SECT. 7.—Then the Bishop's Commendation or Thanksgiving.

Immediately after this common prayer of the deacon and people together, the deacon having bid the people commend themselves to God, the bishop makes this commendatory prayer, which is there called,² *Εὐχαριστία Ὁρξρινῆ*, *the morning thanksgiving*, and is in the following words.

“O God, the God of spirits and of all flesh, with whom no one can compare, whom no one can approach, that givest the sun to govern the day, and the moon and the stars to govern the night; look down now upon us with the eyes of thy favour, and receive our morning thanksgivings, and have mercy on us. For we have not spread forth our hands to any strange God. For there is not any new God among us, but Thou our eternal and immortal God; who hast given us our being through Christ, and our wellbeing through Him also. Vouchsafe by Him to bring us to everlasting life, with whom unto Thee be glory, honour and adoration, in the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.”

SECT. 8.—And his Imposition of Hands or Benediction, with the Deacon's Dismission of the Assembly.

After this the deacon bids them bow their heads and receive the imposition of hands, or the bishop's benediction, which follows under the title of *Χειροθεσία Ὁρξρινῆ*, *the imposition of hands in morning prayer*, in the form of words here annexed.

¹ See these places of Chrys. cited Book xiv. chap. v. sect. 4.

² Constl. lib. viii. cap. 38.

“ O God, faithful and true, that shewest mercy to thousands and ten thousands of them that love Thee ; who art the friend of the humble, and defender of the poor, whose aid all things stand in need of, because all things serve Thee : look down upon this thy people, who bow their heads unto Thee, and bless them with thy spiritual benediction ; keep them as the apple of the eye ; preserve them in piety and righteousness, and vouchsafe to bring them to eternal life, in Christ Jesus thy beloved Son, with whom unto Thee be glory, honour and adoration, in the Holy Ghost, now and for ever, world without end. Amen.”

This said, the deacon dismisses the congregation with the usual form, Προέλθετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, *Depart in peace*. Which Chrysostom takes notice of as the solemn word for dismissing every Church assembly. For speaking of the frequent use of the salutation, *Pax vobis, Peace be unto you!* he observes, that as it was used in the beginning of every sacred action, prayer, preaching, blessing, &c. and sometimes in the middle of prayers too, so particularly at the bishop's entrance into the Church, and the deacon's final dismissal of the assembly : “ the deacon,” says he,¹ “ when he sends you away from this meeting, does it with this prayer, Πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, *Go in peace.*”

SECT. 9.—Whether the Morning Hymn was part of the Public Service every Day.

But besides this order of morning prayer laid down in this place by the Author of the Constitutions, there is in another place a prayer or hymn appointed for the morning, but whether for public or private use, is not said : I suppose he intended it only for private devotion, because it is placed among many other private prayers. He gives it the name of Προσευχὴ Ἑωθινή, *the morning prayer*. Other writers call it the hymn, and the angelical hymn, and the great doxology, from the first words of it, “ Glory be to God on high ;” which was the angel's hymn at our Saviour's birth. The form of it in this author runs in these words:²

¹ Chrys. Hom. 52. In eos qui Pascha jejulant. tom. v. p. 713.

² Constit. lib. vii. cap. 47.

“ Glory be to God on high, in earth peace, good-will towards men. We praise Thee, we laud Thee, we bless Thee, we glorify Thee, we worship Thee, by the great High-Priest, Thee the true God, the only unbegotten, whom no one can approach, for thy great glory, O Lord, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty: Lord God, the Father of Christ, the immaculate Lamb, who taketh away the sin of the world, receive our prayer, Thou that sittest upon the cherubims. For Thou only art holy, Thou only Lord Jesus, the Christ of God, the God of every created being, and our King. By whom unto Thee be glory, honour and adoration!”

This same hymn is mentioned also by Athanasius, in his Book *De Virginitate*, but he gives it only as a direction to virgins in their private devotions: “ early in the morning,” says he,¹ “ sing this Psalm, ‘ O God, my God, early will I awake unto Thee. My soul thirsteth for Thee.’ That is the lxiii psalm. When it is light, say, ‘ Bless ye the Lord, all ye works of the Lord.’ That is the song of the three children. And, ‘ Glory be to God on high, on earth peace, good will towards men. We laud Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee;’ and what follows.” It is great pity this author did not give us the whole hymn, that we might have compared it with that in the Constitutions. It was always used in the communion-service, though not exactly in the same form, as we shall see hereafter. But St. Chrysostom speaks of it as used also daily at morning prayer. For, describing the devotions of those who led an ascetic life, he says,² “ as soon as they rose out of bed, they met together and made a choir, and as it were with one mouth sang hymns to God, praising Him, and giving Him thanks for all his blessings both general and particular: and among other things like angels on earth, singing, ‘ Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good will towards men.’” And Mabillon observes out of the Rules of Cæsarius Arelatensis and Aurelian in the beginning of the sixth century,³ that it is there appointed to be sung as matins or morning prayer every Lord’s day, and on Easter day, and such other noted festivals.

¹ Athan. de Virgin. tom. i. p. 1057.
Mat. p. 600.

² Chrys. Hom. lxiix. in

³ Mabil. de Cursu Gallicano. p. 407.

Which shews, that at least in some Churches it was used in other offices beside the communion-service, and among the monks as an ordinary hymn in their daily morning service. And so it is now used among the modern Greeks, as a learned searcher of their rituals informs us in his Account of the Greek Church.¹

SECT. 10.—Whether the Psalms and Lessons were read at the daily Morning Service.

But it seems a little more difficult to account for another thing, which is omitted in the Constitutions. For there is no order there either for psalms or lessons to be read in the morning service, besides that one psalm, which was particularly styled the morning psalm. Whereas other authors, and particularly Cassian,² speak of three psalms read at every assembly through all the canonical hours of the day; and he remarks precisely for the morning service the very psalms that were used,³ namely, the fiftieth, that is our fifty-first, which they commonly called the Penitential Psalm: “Have merey upon me, O God, after thy great goodness: according to the multitude of thy mereies do away my offences:” and together with that, the lxii psalm, that is, the lxiii in our division, which was commonly called the morning psalm, as we have noted before; and the lxxxix, that is our xc psalm, which is appropriated to the funeral office, but is as proper for the service of every day, and fit to be used by all men, whenever they begin a new day, because of those excellent petitions in it for God’s protection and favour, and for wisdom to consider our latter end: “So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom:” and for that it so familiarly puts us in mind of our mortality, comparing our life to a sleep, which fades away suddenly like the grass: “In the morning it is green and groweth up, but in the evening it is cut down, dried up and

¹ Smith of the Greek Church, p. 224. ² Cassian. Institut. lib. iii. cap. 3. In Palæstinæ et Mesopotamiæ monasteriis ac totius Orientis supradictarum horarum solennitates tribus psalmis quotidie finiuntur.

³ Id. lib. iii. cap. 6. Quinquagesimum verò psalmum et sexagesimum secundum et octogésimum nonum huic novellæ solennitati novimus fuisse deputatos.

withered." By which we may judge both of the wisdom and piety of the Ancients in appointing this psalm to be used constantly in the daily course of morning service. Cassian observes further in the same place,¹ that in his time, throughout all the Churches of Italy, their morning hymns were concluded with the Penitential Psalm, that is, the fiftieth according to his account, but with us the fifty-first. And St. Basil remarks the same thing for many of the Churches of the East,² that their vigils, or nocturnal psalmody, were concluded, when the morning appeared, with the Psalm of Confession, by which he means no other but this same fifty-first, or Penitential Psalm, as I have evidently shewn in another place.³ What shall we say then to the Author of the Constitutions, who speaks but of one psalm in the morning service? I answer; first, no doubt there were different customs in different Churches, and in nothing did the practice vary more than in the rules and measures about psalmody, as we shall see more clearly hereafter: so that both accounts may be very true, only applying them to the state and practice of different Churches: second, I have observed before,⁴ that the primitive morning service, in times of persecution especially, was no other but the conclusion of the vigils, or antelucan or nocturnal service, which concluded towards break of day with some proper morning psalm, such as the li, or kiii, or xe, and certain prayers or collects proper to the occasion; the preceding part of the morning having been spent in psalms and hymns to a greater measure and number, sometimes ten, twelve, eighteen or twenty, and these intermingled with lessons of Scripture, and public or private prayers between them; but when the morning service was made a distinct office from the vigils, as it began to be in the fourth or fifth century, then some other psalms were added to the morning psalm, and three psalms at least were read in this as well as in all other offices; and that is the reason why

¹ Cassian. lib. iii. cap. 6. *Denique per Italiam hodièque consummatis matutinalibus hymnis quinquagesimus psalmus in universis ecclesiis canitur.*

² Basil. Ep. 63. ad Neocæsar. tom. iii. p. 96. *Ἡμέρας ἤδη ὑπολαμπέσης— πάντες τὸν τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως ψαλμὸν ἀναφέρουσι τῷ Κυρίῳ.*

³ See

sect. 13. of this chapter.

⁴ Book xiii. chap. ix. sect. 4 and 10.

we meet with but one psalm in the order for morning service in the Constitutions, and three in others, which were of later appointment. Cassian himself, who gives the best account of these things of any writer, plainly favours this observation: for he tells us in one place,¹ “that the Egyptians never admitted of any morning office, distinct from their nocturnal vigils, nor of any other times of public worship, besides the evening hours and nocturnal assemblies, except on the sabbath and the Lord’s day, when they met also at the third hour, that is, at nine in the morning, to celebrate the communion on those days. All other times they spent in labouring privately in their cells, joining continual meditation of the psalms and other Scriptures with their labour, and mingling short prayers and ejaculations with them; so making the whole day but one continued office of devotion, which others performed by intervals of time, and distinction of stated hours of prayer.” In another place he tells us,² “that they, who first brought in this new morning office, distinct from the nocturnal, did not diminish ought of the ancient psalmody from the nocturnal service; for they continued still to conclude their vigils before break of day with the same Psalms as they were used to do before; that is, with cxlviii, cxlix, cl, psalms; only they set apart the ii, lxiii, and xc, psalms, for this new office of morning service.” From all which it seems very probable, that according to the difference of times and places, the number of psalms for the morning service might vary, since there were

Cassian. Institut. lib. iii. cap. 2. Apud illos hæc officia, quæ Domino solvere per distinctiones horarum et temporis intervalla cum admonitione compulsoris adigimur, per totum diei spatium jugiter cum operis adjectione spontaneâ celebrantur.—Quamobrem exceptis vespertinis horis ac nocturnis congregationibus, nulla apud eos per diem publica solennitas absque die sabbati vel dominicâ celebratur, in quibus horâ tertiâ sacræ communionis obtentu conveniunt. ² Ibid. cap. 6. Illud quoque nôsse debemus, nihil à senioribus nostris, qui eandem matutinam solennitatem addi debere censuerunt, de antiquâ psalmodi consuetudine immutatum: sed eodem ordine missam, quo priùs in nocturnis conventibus celebratam. Etenim hymnos, quos in hac regione ad matutinam excepere solennitatem, in fine nocturnarum vigiliarum, quas post gallorum cantum ante auroram finire solent, similiter hodièque decantant, id est, psalmum 148, et reliquos qui sequuntur: quinquagesimum verò psalmum, et sexagesimum secundum, et octogesimum nonum huic novellæ solennitati novinus fuisse deputatos.

such different methods in the observation of this solemnity, and an old and a new office, that both went by the name of morning service.

SECT. 11.—The Original of *Antelucan*, or *Night-Assemblies*, in Times of Persecution.

Having thus far described the order of the old morning service, as it lies in the Constitutions; and hinted, that the morning assemblies were originally the very same with the nocturnal or antelucan meetings for divine service, which we so often read of in ancient writers: for the further illustration of this part of the Christian worship, it will be proper to inquire a little more narrowly into the nature and management of them from their first original; which is known to have had its rise from the severity of the Heathen persecutions. For the Christians, being afraid to meet publicly on the Lord's day for divine worship, were forced to hold their assemblies in the night, meeting early in the morning before day, to avoid the observation of their enemies. This appears from that early account of Pliny, which he had from the mouths of some apostatizing Christians, who confessed to him,¹ "That the sum of their crime or error was, that they were used to meet together on a certain day before it was light, and sing an hymn to Christ as to their God." Hence it is, that the Heathen, in Minucius,² more than once objects to them their night-assemblies, and calls them "a sculking generation, that fled from the light, being mute in public, but free in discourse with one another, when they were got into their private corners." Celsus seems to mean the same thing,³ when he objects to them their holding of "*clancular meetings*, συνθήκας κρύβδην." And Tertullian, to shew Christian women the inconvenience of marrying Heathens, puts them in mind of these

¹ Plin. lib. x. ep. 97. Affirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ, vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire; carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem.

² Minuc. de Idol. Vanit. p. 25. Nocturnis congregationibus—fæderantur, latebrosa et lucifugax natio, in publicum muta, in angulis garrula. II. p. 27. Occultis ac nocturnis sacris apposita suspicio.

³ Origen. cont. Cels. lib. i. p. 4.

night-assemblies: "what husband," says he,¹ "will be willing to suffer his wife to rise from his side, and go to the night-assemblies." And Prudentius, describing the martyrdom of St. Laurence,² introduces the heathen judge telling him, "that he had heard, how they sacrificed in silver, and had their wax lights set in gold for the use of their night-assemblies." And this was the true original of lamps, and oil, and tapers for the use of such meetings in time of persecution.

SECT. 12.—These continued when the Persecutions were over.

Now, though it was necessity, which first gave rise to these assemblies; yet the Church in after ages thought fit to continue them, transferring them from the Lord's day to all other days, partly to keep up the spirit of devotion in the ascetics, or such as had betaken themselves to a stricter life; partly to give leisure and opportunity to men of a secular life to observe a seasonable time of devotion, which they might do early in the morning without any distraction; and partly to guard her children against the temptations and seduction of the Arian sect, who, with great zeal, endeavoured to promote their heresy by their psalmody in such meetings, as appears from what Soerates,³ and Sozomen⁴ say of them, and what Sidonius Apollinaris particularly notes of Theodoric, King of the Goths, that he was so eager a promoter of the Arian cause,⁵ that in his zeal for them he frequented their morning assemblies before day, with a small guard attending him. Now the Catholics, having so many reasons to keep up these assemblies, not only continued them, but with great zeal encouraged them in their discourses. St. Chrysostom⁶ commends the widows

¹ Tertul. ad Uxor. lib. ii. cap. 4. Quis nocturnis convocationibus, si ita oportuerit, à latere suo eximī libenter feret? It. de Coron. Mil. cap. iii.

² Prudent Hymn. ii. de Laurentio.

Argenteis scyphis ferunt fumare sacrum sanguinem,
Auroque nocturnis sacris adstare fixos cereos.

³ Socrat. lib. vi. cap. 8.

⁴ Sozom. lib. viii. cap. 8.

⁵ Sidon. lib. ep. 2. Antelucanos sacerdotum suorum cœtus minimo comitatu expetit.

⁶ Chrys. Hom. 30. in I Cor. p. 591.

and virgins for frequenting the church night and day, and singing psalms in these assemblies. He says,¹ “men ought to come to the sanctuary in the night, and pour out their prayers there.” In another place speaking of the excellency of the city of Antioch, he says, it consisted not in its fine buildings or pillars, but in the morals of the men. “Go into the church,² and there see the excellency of the city. Go into the church and see the poor continuing there from midnight to the morning-light.” And it is remarkable what Socrates says of him,³ when he was bishop of Constantinople, that he made additional prayers for the nocturnal hymns, on purpose to countertermine the practice of the Arians. But I must not stand to repeat all that is said of these famous morning assemblies: for there is scarce an ecclesiastical writer,⁴ that has not given some hint of them, which I need not recite, but rather go on to shew what were the chief exercises of these meetings, which usually began soon after midnight, and continued to the morning light.

SECT. 13.—The Order of Divine Service, which was performed in them, as described by St. Basil.

St. Basil in one of his Epistles gives us a pretty clear description of them, though but in general terms, whilst he makes an apology for the practices of his own Church against some, who charged them with innovation. His words are these: “the customs,” says he,⁵ “which now prevail among us, are consonant and agreeable to all the Churches of God. For with us the people, rising early whilst it is night, come to the house of prayer, and there with much labour and affliction and contrition and tears make confession of their sins to God. When this is done, they rise from prayer, and dispose themselves to psalmody: sometimes dividing themselves into two parts, *they answer*

¹ Chrys. Com. in Psal. 133. tom. iii. p. 488.

² Chrys. Hom. iv. de Verbis. Esaiaæ. tom. iii. p. 865.

³ Socrat.

lib. vi. cap. 7. Ἡἔξῃσε πρῶτος ἐν τὰς περὶ τὰς νυκτερινὰς ὕμνας εὐχὰς.

⁴ Vid. Epiphan. in fine Panarii. Hieronym. Ep. vii. ad Lætam. Hilar. in Psal. lxi. p. 231.

⁵ Basil. Ep. 63. ad Neocæsar. tom. iii. p. 96.

one another in singing, or sing alternately, ἀντιψάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις. After this again they permit one alone to begin the psalm, and the rest *join in the close of every verse*,—ὕπηχῶσι. And thus, with this variety of psalmody, they carry on the night, *praying betwixt whites*, or intermingling prayers with their psalms,—μεταξὺ προσευχόμενοι. At last when the day begins to break forth, they all in common, *as with one mouth and one heart offer up to God the psalm of confession*,—τὸν τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως ψαλμὸν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀναφέρουσι, every one making the words of this psalm to be the expression of his own repentance.” Here we have the plain order of these nocturnal or morning devotions. 1. Confession of sins. 2. Psalms sung alternately. 3. Psalms sung by one alone. 4. Prayers between the psalms. 5. Lastly, the common psalm of confession, or the penitential psalm in the close of all. Whether the first confession of sins was a public or private one, is not very certain:¹ some learned persons take it for a public confession, like that in the beginning of our Liturgy: but I rather think it was a private confession, with which we are sure their offices generally began, as appears from a canon of the Council of Laodicea,² where it is called *the silent prayer*, εὐχή διὰ σιωπῆς, of which I have given a fuller account in the communion-service.³ The later confession was plainly a public one, made by a certain form, being no other but the fifty-first psalm, “Have mercy on me, O God, after thy great goodness: according to the multitude of thy mercies, do away mine offences.” For this psalm was particularly noted among the Ancients by the name of the psalm of confession. Athanasius gives it this title,⁴ telling us that the fiftieth psalm, which is the fifty-first in our division, is “Ψαλμὸς Ἐξομολογήσεως, *the psalm of confession*.” And what further confirms this interpretation, is, that this very psalm by name is appointed to be used in the close of the matins or morning service, which the Western Churches introduced

¹ Hamon Lestrangle, Alliance of Divin. Offic. cap. iii. p. 75.

² Con. Laodic. can. xix.

³ See Book. xv. chap. i. sect. 1.

⁴ Athan. Ep. ad. Marcellinum. de Interpr. Psalmor. tom. i. p. 975.

as distinct from the nocturnal service, as Cassian relates,¹ who was an eye-witness of it.²

SECT. 14.—The Account of them out of Cassian.

What number of psalms or prayers was used in this service, is not particularly noted by St. Basil; nor perhaps was it stinted to any certain number, but according as the length of the psalms or time required. But in the Egyptian Churches they reduced it to the precise number of twelve psalms, from whence some other Churches afterwards took their model, as Cassian informs us, who says,³ that in other regions there were different rules and appointments: for some recited no less than twenty psalms, and these by way of antiphonal or alternate melody: others exceeded this number: others had eighteen: so that there were almost as many ways and rules, as there were monasteries and cells. Nay, in Egypt, before the rule was settled,⁴ some were for having fifty, some sixty psalms: but at last, upon mature advice,⁵ they fixed upon the certain number of twelve psalms, both for their evening and morning service, interposing a prayer between each psalm, and adding two lessons, one out of the Old Testament, and the other out of the New: which was their custom on all days, except Saturdays and Sundays, when they repeated them both out of the New Testament, the one out of St. Paul's Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles, and the other out of the Gospels, as they did also for the whole term of fifty days between Easter, and Whitsuntide. He adds further, that they did not use the alternate way of singing in Egypt, but only one amongst them sung with a plain and even voice, the rest sitting by, and attending to what was said. Neither did they answer,⁶ "Glory be to the Father, and to

¹ Cassian. Institut. lib. iii. cap. 6. ² See before sect. 10. ³ Cassian. lib. ii. cap. 2. Quidam vicanos psalmos, et hos ipsos antiphonarum protelatos melodiis, et adjunctione quârundam modulationum debere dici singulis noctibus censuerunt, &c. ⁴ Cassian. ibid. cap. v. ⁵ Id. cap. vi.

⁶ Cassian. lib. ii. cap. 8. Illud etiam quod in hâc provinciâ, (Gallia.) vidimus, ut uno cantante, in clausulâ psalmi omnes astantes concinant cum clamore; 'Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto;' nusquam per omnem Orientem audivimus; sed cum omnium silentio, ab eo qui cantat finito psal-

one another in singing, or sing alternately, ἀντιψάλλειν ἀλλήλοις. After this again they permit one alone to begin the psalm, and the rest join in the close of every verse,—ὕπηχῶσι. And thus, with this variety of psalmody, they carry on the night, praying betwixt whiles, or intermingling prayers with their psalms,—μεταξὺ προσευχόμενοι. At last when the day begins to break forth, they all in common, as with one mouth and one heart offer up to God the psalm of confession,—τὸν τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως ψαλμὸν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀναφέρουσι, every one making the words of this psalm to be the expression of his own repentance.” Here we have the plain order of these nocturnal or morning devotions. 1. Confession of sins. 2. Psalms sung alternately. 3. Psalms sung by one alone. 4. Prayers between the psalms. 5. Lastly, the common psalm of confession, or the penitential psalm in the close of all. Whether the first confession of sins was a public or private one, is not very certain:¹ some learned persons take it for a public confession, like that in the beginning of our Liturgy: but I rather think it was a private confession, with which we are sure their offices generally began, as appears from a canon of the Council of Laodicea,² where it is called *the silent prayer*, εὐχὴ διὰ σιωπῆς, of which I have given a fuller account in the communion-service.³ The later confession was plainly a public one, made by a certain form, being no other but the fifty-first psalm, “Have mercy on me, O God, after thy great goodness: according to the multitude of thy mercies, do away mine offences.” For this psalm was particularly noted among the Ancients by the name of the psalm of confession. Athanasius gives it this title,⁴ telling us that the fiftieth psalm, which is the fifty-first in our division, is “Ψαλμὸς Ἐξομολογήσεως, *the psalm of confession*.” And what further confirms this interpretation, is, that this very psalm by name is appointed to be used in the close of the matins or morning service, which the Western Churches introduced

¹ Hamon Lestrange, Alliance of Divin. Offic. cap. iii. p. 75.

² Con. Laodic. can. xix.

³ See Book. xv. chap. i. sect. 1.

⁴ Athan. Ep. ad. Marcellinum. de Interpr. Psalmor. tom. i. p. 975.

as distinct from the nocturnal service, as Cassian relates,¹ who was an eye-witness of it.²

SECT. 14.—The Account of them out of Cassian.

What number of psalms or prayers was used in this service, is not particularly noted by St. Basil; nor perhaps was it stinted to any certain number, but according as the length of the psalms or time required. But in the Egyptian Churches they reduced it to the precise number of twelve psalms, from whence some other Churches afterwards took their model, as Cassian informs us, who says,³ that in other regions there were different rules and appointments: for some recited no less than twenty psalms, and these by way of antiphonal or alternate melody: others exceeded this number: others had eighteen: so that there were almost as many ways and rules, as there were monasteries and cells. Nay, in Egypt, before the rule was settled,⁴ some were for having fifty, some sixty psalms: but at last, upon mature advice,⁵ they fixed upon the certain number of twelve psalms, both for their evening and morning service, interposing a prayer between each psalm, and adding two lessons, one out of the Old Testament, and the other out of the New: which was their custom on all days, except Saturdays and Sundays, when they repeated them both out of the New Testament, the one out of St. Paul's Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles, and the other out of the Gospels, as they did also for the whole term of fifty days between Easter, and Whitsuntide. He adds further, that they did not use the alternate way of singing in Egypt, but only one amongst them sung with a plain and even voice, the rest sitting by, and attending to what was said. Neither did they answer,⁶ “ Glory be to the Father, and to

¹ Cassian. Institut. lib. iii. cap. 6.

² See before sect. 10.

³ Cassian.

lib. ii. cap. 2. Quidam vicanos psalmos, et hos ipsos antiphonarum protelatos melodiis, et adjunctione quârundam modulationum debere dici singulis noctibus censuerunt, &c.

⁴ Cassian. ibid. cap. v.

⁵ Id. cap. vi.

⁶ Cassian. lib. ii. cap. 8. Illud etiam quod in hâc provinciâ, (Gallia.) vidimus, ut uno cantante, in clausulâ psalmi omnes astantes concinant cum clamore; ‘Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto;’ nusquam per omnem Orientem audivimus; sed cum omnium silentio, ab eo qui cantat finito psal-

the Son, and to the Holy Ghost," at the end of every psalm, but interposed a prayer which was the custom of all the East, and then at the end of the last psalm, which they called the Allelujah, they subjoined the glorification of the Trinity, which they never used but at the end of that *Antiphonia*, as they called the Allelujah in the Eastern Church. When the psalms were very long, they sometimes divided them into two or three parts, and at the end of every part made a stop to interpose a prayer,¹ thinking it better to use frequent and short prayers to keep up the fervour of devotion. It does not appear, that these were public prayers, but rather private, at the end of which the chief minister officiating, is said, "*colligere precem, to make a collect, or prayer,*" recapitulating the prayers, that were made before by the assembly in private; of which I shall have occasion to give a fuller account in another place.² It is noted further by Cassian concerning the last of their psalms,³ called the *Antiphona*, or *Allelujah*, that no psalm was ever used in this place but only one of those, which had the inscription of *Allelujah* prefixed in the title of it, such as the cxlv, and those that follow, one of which was commonly the concluding psalm, repeated by way of *Antiphona*, or *responses*. It was something particular in the manner of performing this psalmody in those Egyptian monasteries, that he that sung the psalms, only stood up, but the rest heard them sitting: which Cassian⁴ observes to be matter of indulgence in regard to their continual watchings and hard labour. And it was no less peculiar that never above four persons were allowed to repeat the twelve psalms in

mo, orationem succedere. Hanc verò glorificationem Trinitatis tantummodò solere antiphonâ terminari. leg. antiphonam terminare. Vel. ut legit Mabillon. Glorificatione, &c. antiphonâ terminari.

¹ Cassian. Instit. lib. ii. cap. 11. Ne psalmos quidem ipsos, quos in congregationibus decantant, continuatâ student pronunciatione colludere: sed eos pro numero versuum duabus vel tribus intercessionibus cum orationum interjectione divisos distinctim particulatimque consummant.

² See Book. xv. cap. i. sect. 1.

³ Cassian. Ibid. Illud quoque apud eos omni observantiâ custoditur, ut in responsione Allelujæ nullus dicatur psalmus, nisi is, qui in titulo suo Allelujæ inscriptione prænotatur.

⁴ Id. lib. ii. cap. 11, & 12.

one assembly, and that by course, every one singing three in order after one another. Or if there were but three, then each sung four psalms; and if but two, each of them sung six.

SECT. 15.—This Morning Service much frequented by the Laity as well as the Clergy.

And thus far of the nocturnal psalmody, which was the old morning service of the Church. I only add, that though this service was very early in the morning, yet it was frequented, not by the clergy and monks only, but by the people also. For as we have seen before, St. Basil takes notice, that the people came to church to celebrate these morning devotions; and Sidonius has told us also, that Theodoric king of the Goths, was a constant observer of them: so here it is also remarked by Cassian,¹ “That this part of the Church’s devotions was with great exactness observed by many secular men, who, rising early before day, would not engage themselves in any of their most necessary and ordinary wordly business, before they had consecrated the first-fruits of all their actions and labours to God by going to church, and presenting themselves in the divine presence.” A worthy example, fit to be recorded in letters of gold, to excite the emulation of the present age, wherein the daily worship of God at religious assemblies is so little frequented, and by many so much despised; though the same service with that of the Ancients for substance is still retained, with some improvements, and none of the corruptions, which the superstition of darker ages brought into the devotions of the Church; as any one may satisfy himself, that will compare what has been delivered in this chapter with the daily service of our Church.

¹ Cassian. Collation. xxi. cap. 26. Quod devotionis genus multi etiam sæcularium summâ cautione custodiunt, qui ante lucem vel diluculo consurgentes, nequaquam familiaribus ac necessariis mundi hujus actibus implicantur, priusquam cunctorum actuum suorum operationumque primitias, ad ecclesiam concurrentes, divino studeant consecrare conspectui.

CHAP. XI.

The Order of their Daily Evening Service.

SECT. 1.—The Evening Service in most things conformed to that of the Morning.

THE evening service, which was called the *Hora Lucernaris*, because it began at the *time of lighting candles*, towards the close of the day, was in most parts the same with that of the morning, only with such variation of psalms, and hymns, and prayers, as were proper to the occasion. The prayers for the catechumens, energumens, candidates of baptism, and penitents were all the same; so were the prayers for the faithful or communicants, called the prayers for the peace of the world, and the whole state of the Catholic Church, which are described at large in the following books, to which the reader may have recourse.

SECT. 2.—But they differed, first, in that a proper Psalm was appointed for the Evening, called the Evening Psalm by the Author of the Constitutions.

The first thing wherein they differed was, the Initial Psalm: for as the morning service began with the lxiii psalm, so the evening service is appointed to begin with the cxl psalm, which we reckon the cxli. “Lord I call upon Thee, haste Thee unto me, and consider my voice when I cry unto Thee. Let my prayer be set forth in thy sight as the incense, and let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice, &c.” This psalm the Author of the Constitutions calls emphatically Τὸν ἐπιλύχνιον Ψαλμὸν,¹ *the evening psalm*, in the place where he describes the order of this service. And though he does not in that place either name the psalm, or mention any words in it; yet he infallibly means the psalm now spoken of, because in another place² he expressly

¹ Constit. lib. viii. cap. 35.

² Id. lib. ii. cap. 59.

calls it the cxi psalm, requiring it to be used in public assemblies at the daily evening service.

SECT. 3.—This Psalm mentioned under the same Denomination by Chrysostom, and other Writers.

And that, which puts the matter beyond all dispute, is, that Chrysostom in his Comment upon this psalm takes notice of the use of it in the Church upon this particular occasion. “Hearken diligently,” says he,¹ “for it was not without reason that our fathers appointed this psalm to be said every evening; not barely for the sake of that single expression, ‘Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice:’ for other psalms have expressions of the same nature, as that which says, ‘At evening, and morning, and noon-day will I shew forth thy praise:’ and again, ‘The day is thine, and the night is thine:’ and again, ‘Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning:’ and many other such-like psalms may one find, that are proper for the evening season. Therefore our fathers did not order this psalm, to be said upon the account of this expression, but they appointed the reading of it, as a sort of salutary medicine to cleanse us from sin; that whatever defilement we may have contracted throughout the whole day, either abroad, in the market, or at home, or in whatsoever place, when the evening comes, we might put it all off by this spiritual charm, or song, which is a medicine to purge away all such corruption.”

SECT. 4.—Secondly, proper Prayers for Evening Service.

After this psalm was ended, there followed the same prayers for the catechumens, energumens, penitents, and common prayers for the world and the Church, that were used in the morning service: but after them the deacon bid the people pray in a certain form proper for the evening, which the Author of the Constitutions styles Προσφώνησις Ἐπιλύχνιος, *the evening bidding prayer*, and it runs in these words,² “Let us pray to the Lord for his mercies and com-

¹ Chrys. Hom. in Psal. cxi. tom. iii. p. 544. It Hom. 73. al. 74. in Mat. p. 634.

² Constit. lib. viii. cap. 36.

passions ; and intreat Him to send us the angel of peace, and all good things convenient for us, and that He would grant us to make a Christian end. Let us pray, that this evening and night may pass in peace, and without sin, and all the time of our life unblameable and without rebuke. Let us commend ourselves and one another to the living God through his Christ."

This said, the bishop, if present, made this commendatory collect, which is there styled *Ἐπιλύχνιος Ἐὐχαριστία*, *the evening thanksgiving*,¹ and is conceived in the following words : " O God, who art without beginning, and without end, the maker and governor of all things through Christ, the God and Father of Him before all things, the Lord of the spirit and King of all things both intellectual and sensible ; that hast made the day for works of light, and the night to give rest to our weakness : for the day is thine, and the night is thine ; Thou hast prepared the light and the sun ; do Thou now, most kind and gracious Lord, receive this our evening thanksgiving. Thou that hast led us through the length of the day, and brought us to the beginning of the night, keep and preserve us by thy Christ ; grant that we may pass this evening in peace, and this night without sin ; and vouchsafe to bring us to eternal life through thy Christ ; by whom be glory, honour and adoration unto Thee in the Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen."

After this the deacon bids the people, " *Κλίνατε τῆ χειρο-
Σεσία*, *bow down to receive the benediction with imposition of hands*," and then the bishop makes this following prayer : " O God of our fathers, and Lord of mercy, that hast created man by thy wisdom a rational being, and of all thy creatures upon earth dearest unto Thee, that has given him dominion over the earth, and hast made us by thy pleasure to be kings and priests, the one to secure our lives, and the other to preserve thy lawful worship : be pleased now, O Lord Almighty, to bow down and shew the light of thy countenance upon thy people, who bow the neck of their heart before Thee ; and bless them by Christ, by whom Thou

¹ Constit. lib. viii. cap. 37.

hast enlightened us with the light of knowledge, and revealed thyself unto us: with whom is due unto Thee and the Holy Ghost the comforter, all worthy adoration from every rational and holy nature, world without end. Amen.”

There are two expressions in these prayers, which may seem a little unusual to a modern reader; one, where prayer is made for the Angel of peace: and the other, which styles God the Father, Lord of the Spirit: but both these occur in the morning prayers, for the catechumens hereafter,¹ where I shew out of Chrysostom, that prayer for the Angel of peace, was a common petition in many of the known forms of the Church: and for that other expression, which styles the Father, Lord of the Spirit, which is an harsh way of speaking, and looks like Macedonianism, as Cotelerius remarks upon it, I have shewed out of Bishop Bull, that it may fairly be interpreted to a sound and Catholic sense from parallel expressions in Justin Martyr. So that we need not condemn this author as an Arian or Macedonian heretic, only allowing him the favour of a candid interpretation.

To return therefore to the prayers themselves: the deacon, after these collects made by the bishop, dismisses the people with the usual form, as in the morning service, Προ-
 ἔλθτε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, *Depart in peace*. And this is the conclusion of the evening service, according to our author in this place.

SECT. 5.—Of the Evening Hymn.

But in another place he speaks also of an evening hymn,² which he styles Εὐχὴ Ἑσπериώδης, *an evening prayer or thanksgiving*, which is a sort of doxology to God, like that used before in the morning prayer. The form is in these words: “Praise the Lord, ye servants, O praise the name of the Lord. We praise Thee, we laud Thee, we bless Thee, for thy great glory, O Lord and King, the Father of Christ, the unspotted lamb, that taketh away the sin of the world. All praises, and hymns, and glory, are justly rendered unto Thee

¹ Book xiv. chap. v. sect. 3.

Constit. lib. vii. cap. 48.

our God and Father, by thy Son, in the most Holy Spirit for all ages, world without end. Amen. Lord, now lettest Thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which Thou hast prepared before the face of all people; to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, and to be the glory of thy people Israel."

It is not here said, whether this hymn was for public or private use. However, that there were such sort of hymns in use among the Ancients at the first bringing in of candles in the evening, is evident from St. Basil, who mentions one part of such an hymn, which he styles *Ἐπιλύχνιος Εὐχαριστία, the thanksgiving at setting up lights*. "It seemed good," says he,¹ "to our forefathers not to receive the gift of the evening light altogether with silence, but to give thanks immediately upon its appearance. We cannot certainly tell, who was the first author of that thanksgiving at setting up lights: but this we are sure of, that the people have of old used this form of words and no one ever charged them with impiety for so doing, *Ἀινῶμεν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱόν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεῶν, We praise the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God.*"

Bishop Usher² and Dr. Smith³ have given us an ancient form of this kind more at large, out of the Alexandrian Manuscript of the Septuagint, and some other ancient copies of the Psalter in Greek, which it may not be improper to insert in this place. It goes in some books under the title of *Ὑμνος Ἐσπερινός, the evening hymn*; and in others it is called *Ὑμνος τῆς Λυχνικῆς, the hymn said at setting up lights*. We cannot certainly say this is the same that St. Basil refers to, but all that St. Basil mentions out of that ancient hymn, is now found in this; which makes it probable that they are the very same. It is as follows:⁴ "O Jesus Christ, Thou joyful light of the sacred Glory of the immortal, hea-

¹ Basil. de Spir. Sancto. cap. xxix.
p. 35.

² Usserii Diatriba de Symbolis. p. 302.

³ Smith's Account of the Greek Church. p. 302.

⁴ Φῶς ἱλαρὸν ἁγίας δόξης ἀθανάτου Πατρὸς, ἕρανιε, ἅγιε, μάκαρος, Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ· ἰδόντες ἐπὶ τῆ ἡλίου δύσσει, ἰδόντες φῶς ἐσπερινόν, ἠμνῶμεν Πατέρα καὶ Υἱόν καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεῶν, (αἱ. Θεόν.) ἄξιός ἐστι ἐν παντί καιροῖς ἠμνῆσθαι φωνῆς ὁσίας, ῥιέ Θεῶν ζωὴν ὁ διδῶς. διὸ ὁ κόσμος σε δοξάζει.

venly, holy, blessed Father! we now being come to the setting of the sun, and seeing the evening light, do laud and praise the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit of God. (Or the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that is God.) Thou art worthy to have hymns at all times sung unto Thee with holy voices, O Son of God, that givest life. Therefore the world glorifies Thee." Bishop Usher, by mistake, says this hymn was the same as the *Ψαλμὸς Ἐπιδύχνιος*, *the evening psalm*, mentioned in the Constitutions, lib. viii. cap. 35. Whereas indeed that evening psalm was quite another thing from this evening hymn: that being one of David's psalms, as I shewed before out of Chrysostom and the Constitutions themselves; and this an hymn of human composition. Neither is it the same form with the evening hymn related before out of the Constitutions, but seems more likely to be that mentioned by St. Basil, which I conceive was not a form for public, but only for private devotion, to be used at home by all Christians, as a pious ejaculation or hymn to Christ, "the true Light that enlightens every man that comes into the world." But I only offer this as a conjecture, because I find not this hymn mentioned as inserted into the public offices, either by the Author of the Constitutions, or St. Basil, or any other.

SECT. 6.—Whether there were any Hymns, or Psalms, or Lessons read in the Evening Service, beside the cxli Psalm.

But then it may be asked, were there no hymns used in the evening service? Were there no lessons read, nor psalms, besides that called the evening psalm, sung in the Church? I answer, no doubt there were in many Churches: for the custom of Churches varied in this matter; and though the Author of the Constitutions mentions them not in the rituals of the Churches he describes, yet other accounts do. For Cassian¹ describing the customary service of the Eryp-

¹ Cassian. Institut. lib. ii. cap. 6. Exin venerabilis Patrum senatus—decrevit hunc numeram, (xii. psalmodum,) tam in vespertinis, quam in noctur-

tian monasteries, says, “they sung twelve psalms every morning and evening in their solemn meetings, and had two lessons read, one out of the Old Testament, and the other out of the New, and had prayers also between the psalms; and sung the Gloria Patri at the end of the last psalm.” St. Jerom confirms this account, and adds, that they had a sermon made by the abbot, who was always a presbyter, every day after evening prayer. For thus he describes their evening devotions: “at nine o’clock they meet together, then the psalms are sung, and the Scriptures are read;¹ and prayers being ended, they all sit down, and one among them, whom they call their father, begins to discourse to them, whom they hear with the profoundest silence and veneration.” But it may be said, this perhaps was only the custom of the monasteries, and not of the Churches. In answer to which Epiphanius assures us,² it was the custom of the Church to have psalms and hymns continually both at morning and evening prayer. St. Austin also mentions hymns as well as prayers at evening service;³ which implies, that they had more psalms than one sung upon that occasion. St. Hilary, upon those words of the Psalmist, “the out goings of the morning and evening shall praise Thee,” shews the same, when he says,⁴ “the progression of the Church to her morning and evening hymns with delight, is a great sign of God’s mercy. The day is begun with prayers, and the day is closed with hymns to God.” St. Hilary

nis conventiculis custodiri, quibus lectiones geminas adjungentes, id est, unam Veteris et aliam Novi Testamenti, vid cap. viii.

¹ Hieron. Ep. 22. ad Eustochium. cap. xv. Post horam nonam in comune concurritur, psalmi resonant, scripturæ recitantur ex more. Et completis orationibus, cunctisque residentibus, medius quem patrem vocant, incipit disputare, &c.

² Epiphanius. Exposit. Fidei. n. 23. p. 1106.

Εωθινοί τε ὕμνοι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ διηλεκτεῖς γίνονται, ἢ προσεύχαι ἰωθιναί, λυχνικοί τε ἅμα ψαλμοὶ ἢ προσευχαί.

³ Aug. de Civ.

Dei. lib. xxii. cap. viii. p. 1485. Ad vespertinos illic hymnos et orationes cum ancillis suis et quibusdam sanctimonialibus ex mere domina possessionis intravit, atque hymnos cantare cæperunt.

⁴ Hilary. in Psalm. lxiv. p. 231. Progressus ecclesiæ in matutinum, (leg. matulinorum,) et vespertinorum hymnorum delectatione maximum misericordiæ Dei signum est. Dies in orationibus Dei inchoatur, dies hymnis Dei clauditur.

himself is said to be the author of some of those hymns, and St. Ambrose of others, which were of public use in the Church: and though some would have rejected them, because they were only of human composure, and not to be found in Scripture, yet the fourth Council of Toledo¹ ordered them to be retained in the public service of the Church, together with the hymns, "Glory be to the Father," and "Glory be to God on high," which were likewise of human composition. For the Eastern Churches, the like is said by Chrysostom,² that they had hymns at night in their evening prayer, as well as morning. In the Gallican Churches they had, besides their collects and prayers, both hymns and *Antiphonas*, or chapters, as they called them, collected out of the psalms, to be said by way of *Responses*, as appears from the Council of Agde.³ And the second Council of Tours orders,⁴ "that at evening prayer, which they call the twelfth hour of prayer, twelve psalms should be sung, answerable to the order of morning service, which had twelve psalms, as the sixth hour of prayer had six psalms, with the additional psalm called the Allelujah." From all which it is apparent, that a considerable number of psalms and hymns were used, together with the prayers, to make up the daily course of evening, as well as morning service in many Churches.

SECT. 7.—The Lord's Prayer used in many Churches, as the Conclusion of the daily Morning and Evening Service.

And in some Churches the Lord's prayer was always made a part of the daily worship both morning and evening. For the Council of Girone⁵ made a general decree for the

¹ Con. Tolet. iv. can. 12. p. 174.

² Chrys. Hom. 18. in Act.

³ Con. Agathen. can. 30. In conclusione matutinarum vel vespertinarum missarum, post hymnos, capitella de psalmis dici, et plebem, collectâ oratione, ad vesperam ab episcopo cum benedictione dimitti.

⁴ Con. Turon. ii. can. 19. Patrum statuta præceperunt, ut ad sextam sex psalmi dicantur cum Alleluja; et ad duodecimam duodecim, itemque cum Alleluja. It can. 24. Et licet Ambrosianos habeamus hymnos in canone, &c.

⁵ Con. Gerundense. can. 10. Item nobis

Spanish Churches, “that the Lord’s prayer should constantly be used by every priest at the close of the matins and vespers in the daily service.” It had always been used before on Sundays in the communion-office; but it being in the very title and tenour of it, *Quotidiana Oratio*, a *quotidian*, or *daily prayer*, they thought it proper to make it a standing part of their daily offices. And when some priests neglected to obey this order, and still confined the use of it to the Lord’s day, the fourth Council of Toledo made a decree,¹ “that all such of the clergy as contumaciously refused to use it daily both in their public and private offices, should be degraded.”

In the French Churches the practice was the same. For by a Canon of the third Council of Orleance the people are obliged to stay at divine service till the Lord’s prayer was said;² and if the bishop was present, to wait for him to pronounce the benediction, which shews that it was the conclusion of the prayers, since nothing came after but the benediction. It is true, the word used for divine service in this Canon, is *Missa*: which might seem to mean the communion-service, where the Lord’s prayer was always used: but it has been shewn before in the first chapter of this book, that *Missa* is a general name for any part of divine service; and in this canon is particularly taken for the morning and evening sacrifice of prayers. For it immediately follows, that no one should come to the sacrifice of morning or evening mass, that is, morning or evening prayers, with his arms or weapons, which only appertained to the use of

semper placuit observari, ut omnibus diebus post matutinas et vespas Oratio Dominica à sacerdote proferatur.

¹ Con. Tolet. iv. can. 9. Nonnulli sacerdotum in Hispaniis reperiuntur, qui Dominicam Orationem, quam Salvator noster docuit et præcepit, non quotidie, sed tantum die dominicâ dicant—Quisquis ergo sacerdotum, vel subjacentium clericorum, hanc Orationem Dominicam quotidie aut in publico aut in privato officio præterierit, propter superbiam judicatus, ordinis sui honore privetur.

² Con. Aurel. iii. can. 28. Me missis nullis laicorum ante discedat, quam Dominica dicatur Oratio. Et si episcopus præsens fuerit, ejus benedictio expectetur. Sacrificia verò matutina, (leg. matutinarum,) missarum, vel vespertinarum, ne quis cum armis pertinentibus ad bellorum usum, expetat.

war. Besides, that in the communion-service, as we shall see hereafter, the Lord's prayer came always in the middle, and not, as here, in the conclusion of the service.

This is the substance of what I have observed concerning the several parts and order of the daily morning and evening service in the writings of the Fathers and the Canons of the Councils, which are at present the chief rituals of the ancient Church: and I have been the more careful to separate these offices from the great service of the Lord's day, because they are too often confounded in the accounts of modern authors. I now proceed to the offices and service of the Lord's day, which must be the subject of the two following Books.

END OF VOL. IV.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY



0025978489

931
B51
4

01364603

931.
B51 V4

