





C. J. Inkleo  
quoni-am  
e libris

C. Thornton



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. VIII.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR WILLIAM STRAKER,

443, WEST STRAND.

MDCCCXXXIV.



THE  
FRENCH CHURCH'S

APOLOGY

FOR THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

OR,

THE OBJECTIONS OF DISSENTERS AGAINST THE ARTICLES,  
HOMILIES, LITURGY, AND CANONS OF THE ENGLISH  
CHURCH, CONSIDERED, AND ANSWERED UPON  
THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMED  
CHURCH OF FRANCE.

A WORK CHIEFLY EXTRACTED OUT OF THE AUTHENTIC ACTS AND  
DECREES OF THE FRENCH NATIONAL SYNODS, AND THE MOST  
APPROVED WRITERS OF THAT CHURCH.

---

BY THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M. A.

*And some time Fellow of University College in Oxford.*



TO THE  
MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,  
THOMAS,

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,

*Primate of all England, and Metropolitan, and one of Her Majesty's  
most honorable Privy Council, &c.*



MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE,

IN regard to the eminency of your office and station in the Church, which entitles you more than ordinarily to be a defender of the present constitution, and a patronizer of all honest endeavours that are used to support it, I do with great submission present to your grace this following discourse; which contains a modest vindication of the doctrine, worship, government and discipline of our Church, from the chief objections of dissenters, and returns answer to them upon the principles of the reformed Church of France. The argument, I confess, is something singular: there being few that have trod in the same path before, and none that I know of, who have set themselves purposely to examine the French synods, with any design to justify the

Church of England thereby. But I hope the rareness of the argument will be so far from being a prejudice against it, that it will excite the curiosity of those, for whose benefit it is intended, to make a new search into these matters: and when they find so exact an harmony and agreement betwixt the French and English Church upon the chief points controverted, that may perhaps induce them to lay aside their prejudices and mistakes, and return to their ancient communion again, from which, if the French Church may be allowed to be judge, they have unreasonably departed. The business of lay-communion I have not very much insisted on, because that dispute seems to be almost at an end: it being confest by dissenters themselves, as well in their writings as practice upon some occasions, that lay-communion with the Church of England is not unlawful. But that, which is now chiefly pretended to keep up the present unhappy separation, is the difficulty of clerical communion; that is, the hard terms and conditions, which are required of those that are to enter into the ministry: I have therefore more industriously all along in this discourse set myself to examine these; and by stating things exactly, made it appear, that the terms of clerical communion are not more difficult in the English Church, than they are in the reformed Church of France: and that if dissenters will allow themselves to be determined and concluded either by the opinion and judgment, or the synodical rules and discipline of the French Church, they ought to submit to the settled

rules and orders of the English Church, and put an end to the present separation. The mischiefs of division are so apparently great and dangerous at this juncture, that they will authorize any man to offer an argument in a rational and peaceable way, which may tend to put a stop to them. I have done what I could towards this in the present discourse: and therefore as I cannot doubt of your Grace's favorable acceptance and approbation of it, so I will presume to hope it may do some service to the Church and dissenters together, in promoting the great ends of unity and peace, which is the only thing aimed at therein by him, who is,

With all due observance,

Your Grace's most obedient Servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.



## THE PREFACE.

---

THAT which first put me upon compiling this work, and furnished me with the principal part of the materials for it, was the perusal of a book entitled, *Synodicon in Gallia reformatata*, or, *The Acts, Decrees, and Canons of the National Councils of the reformed Churches in France*; published in two volumes in *folio*, Lond. 1692. by one *Mr. John Quick*, who styles himself a minister of the Gospel; that is, as he elsewhere owns himself to be, a dissenting minister among the presbyterians. I was the more inclined to make a curious search into these Synods, because the title page tells us, the whole was collected out of the original manuscript acts of those Synods; being a work never before extant in any language; and that therein were contained many excellent expedients for preventing and healing Schisms in the Churches, and for re-uniting the dismembered body of divided protestants. I considered that there never was greater occasion for such expedients, than at this present juncture; and that if these Synods afforded any such expedients, they were likely to weigh as much with dissenters, especially those of the presbyterian party, as any other arguments: considering 1st. That they themselves have

commonly made their appeals to the foreign Churches against the Church of England; blaming her establishment, and methods, and measures of reformation; and requiring her to be reformed in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, according to the example of the best reformed Churches, which are the very words of the solemn league and covenant. 2. That in all probability, they will freely own the French Church to be one of the best reformed Churches, and let her authority be of some consideration with them. 3. That the translator and publisher of these Synods, being one of themselves, a professed dissenting minister, cannot by them be suspected to have translated any thing partially in favour of the Church of England. If therefore it could be made appear to them out of these very Synods, which are the most public and authentic rule of the French Church, that the methods and measures of reformation in the Church of England, are the same that the French Church did take, or would have taken if she could: that our expedients for preventing and healing schisms in the Church, are no other than what are laid down and prescribed in these Synods: that our articles and homilies contain no other doctrine, but what is publicly taught in the articles and homilies of the French Church: that the obligations against our Liturgy and Rubricks, will hold as well against the Liturgy and public offices that are used among them: and finally, that our canons require but the same things, or things equivalent to, what the canons of

these Synods enjoin : I say, if all this, or but the greatest part of it, could be made appear ; I was willing to persuade myself, that the sober and peaceable nonconformists might be brought to entertain a better notion of the English Church, for the sake of its agreement with the reformed Church of France.

Now these Synods give us the greatest light in this matter, of any thing that was ever yet published ; and evidently prove, that the difference betwixt the French and English Church, whether in principles or practice, is not so great as some have studiously endeavoured to represent it. In most things they are agreed : and in such things wherein the French Church differs from ours, she owns there is no necessity our Church should be tied to follow her example. For in some things, she freely owns our Church to be more happy and perfect than herself : and in other points, wherein they have different usages, that our Church's practice is no more to be condemned than her own ; because every Church has power in such things to prescribe for herself, and is not bound to take her model from the example of any other. Upon which ground, the French Church resolves it to be unlawful to make a separation from the Church of England, notwithstanding some different customs here, which are not to be found in the French Churches ; or some customs among them, which are not used among us : for these things are not of that moment, as to authorize any man to make a separation.

If these things were duly and impartially considered, upon the principles of the French Church, they would go a great way towards healing our present divisions, and would settle a more lasting peace among us, than is to be expected from any other methods; whilst men retain such notions of things, and wrong principles, as are destructive of unity and peace in all communions. The following collections will shew, that the same persons, who are nonconformists and dissenters in England, must have been nonconformists also in the Church of France, had they lived there, and acted upon the same reasons and principles that they do against the Church of England. Therefore it must be worth their while to consider what is here said, lest they act upon such principles as would oblige them, if directly followed, to separate from all the Churches of the reformation. The Church of France is by their own confession one of the best reformed Churches: and these national Synods are the best authority of the Church of France: so that if these Synods justify the proceedings of the Church of England, and vindicate her constitution, it must be owned by dissenters themselves, that she has one of the best human authorities on her side that any Church can boast of: and how far that consideration ought to weigh with them, I must leave to their own consciences to determine.

For my own part, I can safely say, I have had no other ends to serve in this discourse, but the ends of truth and peace: I am one of those who are peaceable and faithful in

Israel: I could easily be content to sacrifice any interest of my own, to re-unite dissenters into one communion; but I cannot sacrifice truth to any interest or design though never so peaceable, without forfeiting the other part of the character, of being faithful also. It is required in stewards, that they be found faithful; and I hope I have answered this character, both in the general design of these collections and the particular use and application of them. I am not sensible that I have quoted any one passage wrong, or misapplied it to a wrong use. In citing the Synods I keep as near as may be to Mr. Quick's translation; and for the other French authors I use, I quote their words from the authors themselves, and in their sense, to the best of my understanding. I have also purposely avoided all personal reflections in speaking of adversaries; and never pursued their character, but only their arguments and their cause. The principal person, whom I take objections from, and answer them, upon the principles and grounds of the French Church, is Mr. Baxter, in one of his last books, entitled, *English Nonconformity*, as under K. Charles II. and K. James II. stated and argued. 4to. Lon. 1689. where he has summed up the principal reasons of their nonconformity. To these I return answers, either from the French Synods, or their most approved writers, as the subject requires; and having competently satisfied them, if there be any other objections not here answered in this book, it may be presumed from the specimen I have given, that they are capable of

good answers upon the same grounds, and may be the subject of further enquiry, according as men are disposed to seek for satisfaction.

Meanwhile I heartily pray to God to give all men sober thoughts, and reasonable consideration, to perceive in time whither our divisions tend; lest, as King James once told the French Church, the sparks of dissention inflame us into such a schism, as will consume us all. For there is an enemy that makes his advantage of these our divisions, and perhaps secretly instigates and encourages them, who hates the very name and profession of the Protestant religion in general.

If it be said, that it concerns the Church of England to prevent this danger, as much as the dissenters; I freely own it, and say, he is no true Churchman, nor true Protestant, who will not contribute his utmost endeavour toward it: but then I cannot think the true method of preventing our dangers, is to make such concessions to dissenters, as will shake or destroy the present constitution; but to reason them into union upon such principles as are common to all the Churches of the reformation: for such principles are doubtless both the most proper, and most secure method of uniting and preserving us against the common enemy, and consequently not only the most reasonable, but the most seasonable method also: and those are the only principles I have insisted on in this discourse.

Now if an union could once happily be effected upon this

foot, or there were but a fair prospect and tendency towards it, then perhaps it might become the wisdom of our ecclesiastical Synods to consider, when they could do it freely, and without any danger to the constitution, whether there be any obsolete forms, or expressions, or rubricks, rules and canons, which might be more adapted to the present state and circumstances of the Church. But as this is none of my concern, so I intermeddle not in it, but leave it to the wisdom and discretion of our superiors legally assembled, and sufficiently authorized to proceed upon so important an affair.



# CONTENTS.

---

## BOOK I.

OF THE GENERAL RULES AND EXPEDIENTS FOR PRESERVING THE UNITY AND PEACE OF THE CHURCH; SHEWING, THAT THE SAME METHODS ARE USED IN THE FRENCH CHURCH, IN ORDER TO THIS END, THAT ARE USED IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

### CHAP. I.

*Of the Use and Expediency of Ecclesiastical Synods, to preserve the Unity and Peace of the Church; and of the contrary Principles of Latitudinarians and Independents, condemned by the French Church.*

### CHAP. II.

*Of the Expediency of Uniformity, to preserve Unity and Peace in the Church; and that it is no less required by the Church of France than the Church of England.*

### CHAP. III.

*That Subscription and Oaths, the third Expedient for Unity, are rather more required in the French Church, than in the Church of England.*

### CHAP. IV.

*That Subscription in some Points is rather more difficult in the Church of France than in the Church of England.*

### CHAP. V.

*That the French Discipline allows not of nonconforming Ministers, or separate Meetings.*

### CHAP. VI.

*That the French Church condemns and censures occasional Communion, as much as the Church of England does; and in one thing exceeds her, viz. in admitting none to Civil Offices, but such as have Testimonials from the Church.*

## BOOK II.

THE OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE ARTICLES AND HOMILIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND CONSIDERED AND ANSWERED, FROM THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH OF FRANCE.

## CHAP. I.

*That the approved Writers of the French Church allow the Articles of the Church of England as lawful to be subscribed.*

## CHAP. II.

*That the Doctrine of the 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, Articles, is agreeable to the Doctrine of the French Church.*

## CHAP. III.

*That the Church's Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, according to the 20th Article, is acknowledged by the French Church.*

## CHAP. IV.

*That to decree Rites and Ceremonies, is no usurping Dominion over Men's Consciences, or infringing their Christian Liberty.*

## CHAP. V.

*That to decree Rites and Ceremonies, is not to add to the Word of God.*

## CHAP. VI.

*That the French Church does not reject Ceremonies because they are significant, but likes them the better upon that account.*

## CHAP. VII.

*That the French Church makes her Ceremonies as necessary as the Church of England does.*

## CHAP. VIII.

*That the French Church does not think the Imposition of an Uniform Observance of the same Rites and Ceremonies, to be the cause of Schism; nor does she abrogate or dispense with her Laws, because some are offended at them.*

## CHAP. IX.

*That the Doctrine of the 21, 23, and 25 Articles, is agreeable to the Doctrine of the French Church.*

## CHAP. X.

*That the 6th Article, which treats of the Canonical Scripture, is no ways defective.*

## CHAP. XI.

*Exceptions against the 35th Article, and Book of Homilies, answered.*

## CHAP. XII.

*Objections against the Declaration of King Charles the First, which commands all Men to take the Articles in the Literal and Grammatical Sense, answered, and the 16, 20, 34, and 37 Articles vindicated from exceptions made against them upon account of the King's Declaration.*

## CHAP. XIII.

*That the 39 Articles are not defective, but as complete a confession of Faith as the French Confession.*

## BOOK III.

THE OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, CONSIDERED AND ANSWERED UPON THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH OF FRANCE.

## CHAP. I.

*That the French Church hath a public Liturgy, or Form of Prayer, and administration of Sacraments, &c. which all Ministers are obliged to use in their daily Service.*

## CHAP. II.

*That the French Church allows of Communion with the Church of England in her Liturgy, and condemns those that separate from her upon the account of it.*

## CHAP. III.

*That the French Church requires Assent and Consent to her Liturgy, &c. as strictly as the Church of England.*

## CHAP. IV.

*That the French Church requires Assent and Consent to a Translation of the Bible, which she owns has some failures in it.*

## CHAP. V.

*That the French Church does not condemn the Use of the Apocryphal Books in such Churches where they are publicly read, though she forbids them to be read in her own Church Assemblies.*

## CHAP. VI.

*Of Assenting to read Common Prayer daily, either privately or openly.*

## CHAP. VII.

*Of making the Surplice and other Ornaments necessary to Ministration: and of Mr. Baxter's great mistake about the Ornaments appointed to be used in the 2d Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth.*

## CHAP. VIII.

*Of the Rules for finding out Easter: that supposing them to contradict one another, yet a Man may honestly give his Assent and Consent to use the Common Prayer Book: in like manner, as both the French and English Churches, and even Dissenters themselves, assent to use Translations of the Bible, which might be more exactly made according to the Original.*

## CHAP. IX.

*Of the Confession and Absolution in the Liturgy of the Church of England. That Calvin commends both public and private Absolution, as used in our Church. That he would have brought public Absolution into Use in the Church of Geneva, but could not. That both kneeling and standing in Divine Service, are Postures in Use in the French Church.*

## CHAP. X.

*That the French Church esteems the Lord's Prayer a Form of Prayer, and as such frequently uses it in Divine Service.*

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the Use of the Apostolical Creed in the French Church: that it is used both in their Ordinary Prayers, and Forms of Baptism.*

## CHAP. XII.

*That the French Church approves of the Athanasian Creed, and requires Assent and Consent unto it, notwithstanding the pretended Damnatory clauses in it.*

## CHAP. XIII.

*That the French Church does not condemn kneeling at the reception of the Eucharist, nor administer it to persons sitting, but requires all Communicants to receive it in a different Posture, viz. standing singly before the Communion Table. That she denies sitting to be the Posture in which Christ celebrated the First Supper; and thinks every Church is at liberty to use what Posture she thinks most convenient.*

## CHAP. XIV.

*That the French Church thinks it lawful to oblige all Members of the Church to frequent Communion, under pain of Excommunication.*

## CHAP. XV.

*That the French Church uses a form of Words at the delivery of the Sacrament, and obliges every Communicant ordinarily to receive it only from the Hands of the Minister.*

## CHAP. XVI.

*Of the Doxology in the Communion Office, which speaks of Archangels in Heaven; and the vanity of those who except against it.*

## CHAP. XVII.

*That the French Church does not condemn the Use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism; and that she enjoins several Things of the like Nature.*

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Of the saving generation of Infants, that it is a Doctrine of the French Church, as much as the Church of England.*

## CHAP. XIX.

*That the Church of England admits of none to be baptized, but such as are allowed Baptism also in the French Church.*

## CHAP. XX.

*That the French Church allows and recommends the use of Sponsors or Sureties in Baptism: that their practice is the same with that of the Church of England in all cases; and in some cases Sponsors are made necessary to the Administration of Baptism also.*

## CHAP. XXI.

*That the French Church approves of the English way of Confirmation, and exacts something equivalent to it, before she admits any person to the Communion.*

## CHAP. XXII.

*Of the Form of Marriage, Visitation of the Sick, Communion of the Sick, Burial of the Dead, Thanksgiving after Childbirth, the office of Communion, and the Church's wish for the restoration of Ecclesiastical Discipline.*

## BOOK IV.

THE OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE CANONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, CONSIDERED AND ANSWERED BY THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH OF FRANCE.

## CHAP. I.

*That as strict an Oath of Canonical obedience is required in the French Church, as in the Church of England. Also of Chancellors.*

## CHAP. II.

*Of the Fourth Canon of our Church: that the French Church allows no one to call in question the Lawfulness of any part of her Liturgy, or Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments, under pain of Excommunication.*

## CHAP. III.

*That the French Church censures Impugners of her Articles, and Discipline, and Rites and Ceremonies, according to the 5th and 6th Canons of the Church of England.*

## CHAP. IV.

*Of the 7th Canon of the Church of England: that the French Church allows of the English Diocesan Episcopacy, and upon some Occasions has expressed a readiness to embrace the same if she might have it: that she not only thinks it lawful to submit to the Authority and Jurisdiction of Bishops, where they are regularly settled, but condemns those who oppose them, or separate from them, or call them Antichristian.*

## CHAP. V.

*Of the 8th Canon: that the French Church does not impugn our Form of Ordaining Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; or say, that they who are consecrated by that Form, are not lawfully made, nor ought to be accounted truly Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, until they have some other Calling; that they allow not the People in France to chuse their own Pastors, nor all Ministers to preach without a License, &c.*

## CHAP. VI.

*Of the 9th 10th, and 11th Canons: that the French Church reckons Schismaticks and their abettors to be out of the Visible Catholic Church, and denies her Communion to them, till they return and make satisfaction.*

## CHAP. VII.

*That the French Church observes some Festivals: and allows, even upon Popish Holidays, the same Services to be performed, that are required upon our Festivals by the 13th Canon of our Church: that Festivals were many Years observed at Geneva, and that Calvin had no hand in the Abrogation of them: that Churches at Geneva are still called by the Names of St. Peter and St. Gervaise, &c.*

## CHAP. VIII.

*Of the 18, 21, 24, 25, 26th Canons: particularly of bowing at the Name of Jesus, required in the 18th Canon: that it is not condemned by the French Church: and of the Reason for bowing at the Name of Jesus, rather than any other.*

## CHAP. IX.

*Of the 27, 28, 29, 30, 36, 38th Canons: more particularly of the 38th Canon, which censures those that revolt after Subscription.*

## CHAP. X.

*Of the 49th Canon, which forbids Ministers, who are not Licensed Preachers, to expound the Scripture.*

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the 55th Canon, which speaks of Prayer before Sermon ; and the 57th which forbids Persons to go for Baptism and Communion from their own Parish Churches, because their own Minister is not a preacher.*

## CHAP. XII.

*Of the 58th Canon, which treats of the Surplice and Hood. And the 65th, which requires Ministers to denounce Recusants and other Excommunicate Persons solemnly in the Church every Six Months. Also of the 68th Canon about Baptizing and Burying.*

## CHAP. XIII.

*Of the 72d Canon, which forbids Ministers to appoint Public or private Fasts, or to exercise Demoniacks, unless they have special License from the Bishop : that the same rule is observed in effect in the French Church.*

## CHAP. XIV.

*Of the respect paid to National Synods in the French Church, and that it is greater than is required by the 139th Canon of the Church of England. Also of the two last Canons, and Mr. Baxter's Reproach of the Church for the Number of her Canons, because they are 141.*

## CHAP. XV.

*That the French Church allows of Communion with the Lutheran Churches (which are more liable to Exception than the Church of England) upon this Principle, that all defects and inconveniences which are not our sins, are to be borne with, rather than we should make a Schism in the Church.*

## THE CONCLUSION.

*Containing a Serious Address to Dissenters, and the Refugees of the French Church, to join in constant and full Communion with the Church of England.*

THE  
FRENCH CHURCH'S APOLOGY  
FOR THE  
*CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

---

BOOK I.

OF THE GENERAL RULES AND EXPEDIENTS FOR PRESERVING THE UNITY AND PEACE OF THE CHURCH; SHEWING, THAT THE SAME METHODS ARE USED IN THE FRENCH CHURCH, IN ORDER TO THIS END, THAT ARE USED IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

---

CHAP I.

*Of the Use and Expediency of Ecclesiastical Synods, to preserve the Unity and Peace of the Church; and of the contrary Principles of Latitudinarians and Independents, condemned by the French Church.*

WHEN we discourse of the unity and peace of the Church in general, there are none, who call themselves Christians, of any denomination whatsoever, but will readily acknowledge both themselves and others to be under an obligation to preserve "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace:" but when we descend to particular enquiries, about the proper methods and expedients to preserve this unity;

here it is, that difference arises, and men are unaccountably divided in their sentiments from one another.

The Church of England, as appears both from her constitution and practice, has generally thought the free use of Ecclesiastical Synods one good expedient for preserving unity: another has been the obligation arising either from royal injunctions, or canons, or acts of uniformity: a third, the obligation of subscriptions, and oaths in some certain cases: a fourth, the censuring and silencing non-conformists, and prohibiting separate assemblies: a fifth, the denying separatists, the privilege of occasional communion: with some others of the like nature.

Now these are commonly cried out against, as arbitrary and tyrannical proceedings in the Church, by those who are of different sentiments, or different interests from her; as if these methods were but so many encroachments upon the rights and privileges of Englishmen, and the singular unparalleled impositions of the Church of England. But if we can shew, that these methods are not so peculiar to the Church of England, but that the very same methods have ever been most strictly observed and practiced in the reformed Church of France; then at least the charge of singularity will vanish, and either the English Church be justified, or the French Church involved in the same accusations. I will therefore compare the practice of the two Churches upon these heads in this book, beginning with the free use of Ecclesiastical Synods, which is the first expedient for preserving unity.

Some there are, who resolve all Church-power into congregational assemblies, and deny not only the authority of Synods in determining controversies of faith, but even their power to decree any thing that concerns external order and discipline. This I take to be the avowed doctrine of the independents. Others say, they do not think all Synods simply unlawful; but yet it is plain by their sly insinuations and scandalous reflections on the practice of the whole Catholic Church, that they intend to signify so much: for they say, "It may reasonably be doubted, whether ever the Church had such happy times, as that all the conditions

requisite in a true Christian Synod, were ever observed in any one Synod, except that of the Apostles; and consequently whether Synods have not done more harm than good to the Church; as the history of all Synods does manifestly declare: and that it had been better for the Church, if there never had been any Synod called to decide any controversies of faith." So Limborch,\* and others who follow his Latitudinarian principles, with no other design but to establish their own errors, by enervating and disgracing that authority, which of all others was most likely to give a check to them.

My business at present is not with this, or any other foreign divine; though I could not but take notice of this passage *in transitu*; and perhaps it may provoke some abler hand to examine his chapter *de Synodis*, and lay open his fallacious reasonings in it. The only persons I am concerned with here, are those among ourselves, who challenge the Church of England of usurpation, for using her Synodical power as an expedient to preserve her own peace. Now if this be any crime, it is much more imputable to the Church of France, who reckon their Synods the main preservatives of union and concord against heresies and schisms; and expressly condemn the principles of independency, which tend to undermine the authority of them. Their book of discipline (which, I shall shew, all ministers by their subscription and oath are obliged to observe) has this Canon: cap. 6. art. 5. "Ministers shall inform their churches, that our ecclesiastical assemblies of Colloquies and Synods, whether provincial or national, are the bands and buttresses of their concord and union against schisms, heresies, and all other inconveniences; that so they may discharge their duty in the use of means for the continuance and upholding of those ecclesiastical assemblies."

Their very practice proves the sense they had of the usefulness of them. For they had no less than twenty nine National Synods in less than the space of an hundred

---

Limborch Theol. Christ. lib. vii. cap. 19. n. 4.

years ; besides Provincial Synods yearly in every province, where appeals were made, all causes heard, controversies decided, heresies and schisms nipped in the bud, and necessary rules and canons made for the well-being and government of the Church.

As to the contrary principles of the independents, none can express themselves more zealously against them, than both their private writers and Public Synods do. Monsieur Daille in his answer to Adam and Cottiby, having occasion to speak of them by name, says, " They were a novel sect never heard of before by our forefathers or us, whose pernicious maxims several of our writers have publicly refuted ; being such as would utterly subvert the whole order of our churches, as well as the kingdoms and estates of the world." *Replique à Messieurs Adam and Cottiby. Par. ii. c. 21. p. 127.*

He says also in the title of the chapter, " We are reproached for dethroning kings, and putting them to death by form of justice : but our answer is, that this is a mere calumny of Mr Cottiby's, who falsely imputes to us the action of some factious persons in England, wherein we had no concern ; and who are of a religion also, which we do not in any wise acknowledge.

By this it is evident, they not only disavowed those state principles of the independents, which led them to put the king to death by form of justice, but also their anti-Synodical principles, which tend to bring disorder and confusion into the Church.

And that it was so appears yet more evidently from an express Canon of the whole French Church, made against the independents by name, in the 3d Synod of Charenton, 1644, as soon as ever the name began to be known among them. " Upon report made by certain deputies of the maritime provinces, that there do arrive unto them from other countries, certain persons going by the name of independents, and so called ; for that they teach that every particular church should of right be governed by its own laws without any dependency or subordination unto any person whatsoever in ecclesiastical matters ; and without being

obliged to own or acknowledge the authority of classes or Synods in matters of discipline and order ; and that they settle their dwellings in this kingdom : a thing of great and dangerous consequence, if not in time carefully prevented. This assembly fearing, lest the contagion of this poison should diffuse itself insensibly, and bring in with it a world of disorders and confusions upon us ; and judging the said sect of independentism not only prejudicial to the Church of God (because as much as in it lieth, it doth usher in confusion, and opens a door to all kinds of singularities, irregularities, and extravagancies ; and barreth the use of those means, which would most effectually prevent them) but also is most dangerous to the civil state ; for in case it should prevail and gain ground among us, it would form as many religions as there be parishes and distinct particular assemblies among us. All the provinces therefore are enjoined, but more especially those which border upon the sea, to be exceeding careful, that this evil do not get footing in this kingdom ; that so peace and uniformity in religion and discipline may be preserved inviolably, and nothing may be innovated or changed among us, which may in any wise derogate from that duty and service which we owe to God and the king." Synod of Charenton, 1644. cap. xii. art. 9.

## CHAP. II.

### *Uniformity required by the Church of France as well as the Church of England.*

It appears from the foregoing Canon, that among other reasons which the Synod assigns against independency, this was none of the least considerable in their opinion, that it was likely to divide the Church into several sects, and destroy that peace and uniformity in religion and discipline which they think ought to be preserved in every National Church. And this one thing were enough to give us their

judgment on this point, whether the governors of a Church may not lawfully exact uniformity in Divine worship from all those who are professed members of it? But besides this, which is only spoken by the by in this canon against independents, the Synods are very frequent and express in requiring and enjoining uniformity both in minister and people in all their churches.

To this purpose we find a Canon in the Synod of Orleance, 1562, cap. iii. art. 4. "Whereas our brother, the Minister of Varennes, doth usually administer the Lord's Supper every month, the Council doth advise our brother of Montmejour, to admonish him, in the Council's name, to follow the general practice of our churches; that so there may be no diversity among us, and our uniformity may be preserved." It seems they had so great a regard for uniformity, that they thought a singular practice even in a good thing; viz. holding monthly communions, ought to give way to it: which is something more than ever the Church of England used her authority to require.

The Synod of Gap, 1603, cap. iii. art. 2, "commands all the churches to observe one and the same form in ordination of pastors; by which the person to be ordained shall, during that action, be humbly on his knees," &c.

And in the 4th and 5th articles of the same chapter, suspension is threatened to all preachers, who refuse to conform themselves to the established order about preaching and catechising.

The Synod of St. Maixant, 1609, made several decrees of the same import. As that, cap. iii. art. 1, "It being represented, that the different courses taken in divers provinces, about the choice, examination, and ordination of ministers, brought with it a world of inconveniences: this Synod judgeth it exceeding needful to establish an express canon, to be observed exactly, universally and uniformly, by all the provinces." Accordingly, they made a canon; which is there recited, and inserted into the body of their ecclesiastical discipline, cap. i. art. 4 and 5, which they are all sworn to observe.

The same Synod appointed a form of prayer, to be used

at ordination; and adds, in the conclusion of all, "This canon and form shall be unanimously observed by all the provinces." *Ibid.* cap. 3, art. 4.

So again, cap. iii. art. 8. Giving orders about several other matters, the close is, "If any province act otherwise, they are enjoined for the future to conform to this order."

Particularly, about the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, cap. vi. art. 14, "That hereafter there may be a general uniformity in the churches of this kingdom, in the administration of the Lord's Supper; and all scruples (by reason of difference and singularity) arising in weak but honest hearts, incapable of distinguishing between the substance and circumstance of the sacred action, may be prevented; all pastors are enjoined to abstain from any new or private methods of their own; as of reading the words of institution between the ordinary long prayer, and that appointed particularly for this Sacrament, which ought indeed to be read after: nor shall they uncover the bread and wine whilst they read the words of institution: nor shall they bring the people up in ranks unto the table, there to sit or stand; but make them come up one by one unto it: nor shall the cup be given by the faithful, one to another; it being contrary to the express letter of a canon of our discipline, which ordereth pastors to deliver it," &c.

These are some few of those Canons, which expressly require uniformity in the French Churches: but I must transcribe their whole doctrine, discipline, liturgy, and canons of no less than twenty-nine National Synods, should I produce all that might be alleged under this head out of them: for every canon and constitution among them, runs in a style of authority, and requires submission and obedience, both in ministers and people, to whatever is prescribed by them; as any one that peruses them, will easily perceive.

## CHAP. III.

*Subscription and Oaths required in the French Church, more than in the Church of England.*

As to what concerns the ministry in particular, I have this thing further to observe, that they are obliged to conformity and uniformity, not only by the bare authority of their Synods and Canons, but also by many personal obligations of subscriptions and oaths, which all persons make at their entrance on the ministry, and frequently repeat in their Synodical meetings, and on many other occasions.

One of the Canons of their book of discipline is this: "Our confession of faith and Church discipline, shall be subscribed by such as are chosen into the ministry, both in the churches in which they are ordained, and in those unto which they are sent. Book of Discipline, cap. i. art. 9 and 21.

The same is required by the canons of their national Synods of Orleance, 1562, cap. 2, art. 2. Rochel, 1571, cap. 3, art. 5. Privas, 1612, cap. iv. art. 2.

It is exacted also of all regents and masters of schools, by their Book of Discipline, cap. ii. art. 2; and by the Synod of Alez, 1620, cap. 5, art. 11.

As also of all Doctors and Professors of Divinity in their Universities. See the Discipline, cap. ii. art. 3. Synod of Nismes, 1572, cap. iii. art. 15. Synod of Gap, 1603, cap. iii. art. 7.

All Elders and Deacons are obliged to make the same subscription at their ordination. Synod of Vertuel, 1567, cap. iii. art. 17. Book of Discipline, cap. iii. art. 1.

And in some cases it was required of private persons; as appears from a Canon of the Synod of Alez, 1620, cap. v. art. 12. Where the question being moved, "Whether a person that was never called to the office of an elder, might warrantably read the Word of God and the Common

Prayers unto the Church, in the minister's absence; especially in lesser churches which have no consistories, nor any persons fit to read? It was answered by the Synod, that the Consistory had full liberty to choose any person, whom it conceived meet, to read the Scriptures and Prayers, although he be not in the eldership, provided he be of sufficient years and unblameable life; and that he have subscribed the Confession of Faith and Church Discipline."

But in their National Synods, the custom was for the deputies of the provinces, not only to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Church Discipline, but also to swear to them. Thus in the Synod of Saumur, 1596, cap. ii. art. 1, "The Confession of Faith was read, approved, and sworn to by all the deputies of this present Synod; and the Discipline of our Church being read, all the deputies approved it, and swore to see it carefully observed." *Ibid.* cap. iii.

So again in the Synod of Gergeau, 1601, cap. ii. art. 2, "The Confession of Faith being read, the pastors and elders did all unanimously protest to live and die in the said confession. And cap. iii. art. 50, the pastors and elders deputed from the provinces unto this assembly, have sworn and protested in the name of their provinces, to cause the discipline ordained by this Synod to be used and observed to the utmost of their power."

In the second Synod of Vitre, 1617, cap. 3, "The Confession of Faith of these Reformed Churches, in the kingdom of France, was read word by word from the beginning to the end, and approved in all its articles by all the deputies, as well for themselves as for their provinces that sent them; and all of them swore for themselves and provinces, that they would teach and preach it; because they believed that it did perfectly agree with the Word of God; and they would use their best endeavour, that as it had been hitherto so it should be evermore received and taught in their churches and provinces."

The like form of subscription and oath occurs in most of the other national Synods. As that of Rochel, 1571. Gap, 1603. St. Maixant, 1609. Tonneins, 1614. Alez, 1620. Charenton 1623. Castres, 1626. Alanson, 1637. and Loudun, 1659.

I observe further, that they not only subscribe the book of articles and discipline, but also promise to approve and submit to the decrees and resolutions of their National Synods, even before they are made. For their letters of deputation, which the provinces give to their respective deputies, when they send them in their name to represent them in a National Synod, do always regularly contain a clause promising approbation and submission to the decrees of the Synod. Therefore in the second Synod of Rochel, 1607. cap. i. it being observed in reading the letters of deputation, that those of certain provinces wanted that clause, which promised approbation and submission to the decrees and resolutions of the Synod; they were thereupon admonished in no wise for the future to omit it. The like admonition was given in the Synod of Tonneins, 1614. cap. ii. And, to cut off all disputes that might arise about the different wording this form of submission, the second Synod of Vitre, 1617. cap. ii. art. 1. agreed upon a precise form of words; which they ordered to be inserted into the letters of commission, given to the deputies of each province: "we promise before God to submit ourselves to all that shall be concluded and determined in your holy assembly, to obey and execute it to the utmost of our power; being persuaded that God will preside among you, and lead you by his Holy Spirit into all truth and equity by the rule of his word, for the good and edification of his Church, &c." And this form was required and insisted on by the next National Synod of Alez, 1620. cap. i. art. 16. and never cancelled or revoked by any of the following Synods. Now I believe it can hardly be shewn, that ever any such form of subscription, or oath, was required by the Church of England.

Yet these were not all the subscriptions and oaths required in the French Church. For, besides their subscribing their own liturgy, confession of faith, canons, and discipline; they were also obliged to subscribe and swear to the decrees of the Synod of Dort, by their two great National Councils of Alez and Charenton. The form of the oath, as it is appointed to be taken by the Synod of Alez, 1620. cap. xiii. is in these words. "I, N. N. do swear and protest,

before God and this holy assembly, that I do receive, approve, and embrace all the doctrines taught and decided by the Synod of Dort, as perfectly agreeing with the Word of God, and the confession of our Churches. I swear and promise to persevere in the profession of this doctrine during my whole life, and to defend it to the utmost of my power; and that I will never, neither by preaching, nor teaching, nor writing, depart from it. I declare also, that I condemn the doctrine of the Arminians, because it makes God's decrees of election to depend upon the mutable will of man, &c. It reduceth into the Church of God old ejected Pelagianism, and is a mask and vizard for popery to creep in among us under that disguise, and subverteth all assurance of everlasting life. And so may God help me, and be propitious unto me; as I swear all this without any ambiguity, equivocation, or mental reservation."

The next Synod of Charenton, 1623. cap. xiv. art. 2. enjoined the same oath, only with this difference; that whereas they were informed by the king's commissioner, that it was a thing displeasing to him to oblige any of his subjects to swear to any decrees made in the city of Dort, which was a dependance and member of a foreign commonwealth; they so ordered the matter, that the oath should be turned into a new form, and taken without any mention or reference had to the city or Synod of Dort. Hereupon they drew up a body of canons and decrees in ninety-three articles, explaining and confirming the decrees of Dort; yet not as the decrees of Dort, but as the doctrine of the French Church, established in this present Synod, and inviolably to be observed by all the Churches and Universities of the Kingdom. At the close of which there is this form of subscription and oath, taken by all the deputies then present in the Synod. "We pastors and elders, whose names are here underwritten, deputies for the reformed Churches of France, unto the national Synod of Charenton, do declare with all possible sincerity, the articles and canons above mentioned, to be grounded on the Word of God, and agreeable to the confession of faith owned and received in the reformed Churches of this kingdom; from which, in the presence of

God we do protest, that through His Grace we will never depart."

In succeeding times, the business of subscription and oaths still grew and multiplied. For by an act of the third Synod of Charenton, 1645. cap. x. art. 8. All persons to be ordained, were obliged to subscribe the confession of faith, the liturgy of the Church, and the canons of Alez, Charenton, and Alenson, and the act of that present Synod.

If now we inquire, why all this caution and strictness was used by the French Churches? They themselves tell us, it was to keep unity and peace among them. "That a strict conformity may be upheld among us," says their last Synod of Loudun, 1659. cap. x. art. 25. "all classes and Provincial Synods, when they receive proposants into the ministry, shall not use, with respect to these points, any particular forms; but oblige them only to sign and swear to our Confession of Faith and Church-discipline, and protest with hands lifted up unto heaven, calling God to witness upon their souls, that they do reject all errors rejected by the decrees of those national Synods of Alanson and Charenton, about the doctrine of predestination, and grace, &c."

The Synod of Privas assigns the same reason for drawing up that solemn oath, which they call the oath of Union, to be taken by all the deputies in the national Synods; the tenor of which is as follows. "We whose names are here subscribed—— knowing by experience that nothing is more necessary to preserve the peace and welfare of the Church, that an holy union and concord, both in doctrine and discipline, and their dependencies; and that the said churches cannot long subsist without an intimate union and conjunction one with another;—we have in the name of all our churches, sworn, and protested to remain inseparably united in that confession of faith of the reformed churches of this kingdom, read in this Synod; swearing not only in our own name, but also in the respective names of all the churches of our provinces, that have deputed us unto this Synod, that we will live and die in it. As also we protest in our own and their names, to keep inviolably that ecclesiastical discipline, established in the reformed churches of this

kingdom." Synod of Privas, 1612. cap. iii. art. 1. See also the same oath repeated in the Synod of Tonneins, 1614. cap. 15. Synod of Vitre, 1617. cap. ii. art. 6. Synod of Alez, 1620. cap. 3.

#### CHAP. IV.

##### *Subscription more difficult in the Church of France, than in the Church of England.*

IF it be said, notwithstanding all this, that subscription in the French Church is not so heavy a burden as it is in the Church of England: the trial of this will depend upon the examination and comparison of particulars, which I have collected and considered in the following books. At present I observe one thing, which in a great measure takes off at once the main force of this objection, and very much commends the moderation of the Church of England, that her first reformers and compilers of her Articles seem industriously to have avoided the determination of some points, and nicer explication of others, on purpose to make subscription easy (in things that do not so nearly touch upon the foundation,) to men of different apprehensions. If we compare the doctrines of the French and English Church upon this head, we shall find the advantage lies on the side of the English in this respect, that the French Church in her Articles and Canons requires subscription to several things which are not required to be subscribed in the Church of England.

I will instance in two or three points, instead of many. First, The doctrine of justification is explained with much greater nicety in the French Confession, than it is in ours; and with such a nicety as has occasioned some dispute among learned men. For whereas the eleventh Article of our Church says of justification, "that we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and

Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings:" which contains the substance of the whole doctrine of justification, and which any orthodox Christian without any scruple may subscribe: the 18th of the French Confession goes much further, and requires men to believe, that the obedience of Jesus Christ is imputed to them; which doctrine would not go down with Piscator and some other German divines, who asserted that man's justification was only wrought out by Christ's death and passion, and not by his life and active obedience. This occasioned a long dispute betwixt them. The Synod of Gap, 1603, cap. ii. art. 2. expressed its detestation of their errors in particular, who denied the imputation of Christ's active and passive obedience unto us for righteousness; and ordered all provincial Synods, Classes and Consistories, to have a careful eye on those persons who were tainted with that error, whether they were ministers or private Christians; and by the authority of the present Synod to silence them; and in case any ministers persisted stubbornly in their error, to depose them from their ministerial function." Letters also were sent to Piscator from the Synod, to deal with him to retract his opinion: but instead of that, he sent his answer four years after to the next Synod of Rochel, wherein he gave them his arguments and reasons for his doctrine. Hereupon they reinforced the decree of the Synod of Gap, "ordering all pastors in their respective churches wholly to conform themselves in their teaching to the doctrine which had been hitherto taught among them; to wit, that the whole obedience of Christ both in his life and death, is imputed to us for the full remission of sins, &c. Synod of Rochel, 1607. cap. ii. art. 4.

And that no doctrine contrary to this might be preached in their churches, the Synod of Privas, 1612. cap. iv. art. 2. ordered all pastors in actual service, and all proposants, who were to be received into the ministry, to sign this following article. "I, whose name is here underwritten, do receive and approve the contents of the Confession of faith of the reformed Churches of this kingdom; and do promise to persevere in it until death. And whereas some persons

contend about the sense of the 18th Article, which treats of justification; I do declare, and protest before God, that I understand it in the same sense in which it is received in our churches, approved by our national Synods; which is, that our Lord Jesus Christ was obedient to the moral and ceremonial law, not only for our good, but also in our stead; and that his whole obedience, yielded by him thereunto, is imputed to us; and that our justification consists not only in the forgiveness of sins, but also in the imputation of his active righteousness.—I do also promise, that I will never depart from the doctrine received in our churches; and that I will yield all obedience to the Canons of our national Synods in this matter.”

By this time the rumour of this controversy was spread abroad in all Protestant countries, and the fame of it here in England coming to the ears of king James; he took upon him to be mediator betwixt the French and German Churches; sending his letters by Mr. Hume to the next national Synod of France, held at Tonneins, 1614, the tenor of which was thus. “Sirs,—Having received intelligence that your assembly would be held in Gaseony the 1st of May, in which some persons may be engaged to revive that controversy about justification; and to urge the consciences of others to assent against their own judgment, unto matters not sufficiently understood by them: we thought good to send you Monsieur Hume, one of our subjects, and of your pastors, with this our letter; to exhort you in our name, not to suffer the spirits of your pastors and professors to be embittered one against another, about distinctions more subtle than profitable, more curious than needful; ——— lest the sparkles of dissention inflame you into such a schism, as will consume you all, &c.” See the King’s letter in the Synod of Tonneins, 1614. cap. xix.

Together with this letter, he gave Mr Hume in charge, by word of mouth, to advise the assembly as from him, “to procure a firm union in points of doctrine, among the pastors, professors, and other members of their own Church; without quarrelling with the divines of Germany, or any persons teaching otherwise; who handled the point of jus-

tification in a different manner from them." Which message, together with the king's letter, Mr. Hume delivered accordingly; as is related in the Acts of the Synod, cap. iii. art. 5.

And thus far the king's mediation seems to have had its effect, that we find no further disputes between them and the German divines: but as to the members of their own Church, they took the same measures they had done before; "enjoining all persons chosen into the ministry, to promise before God, not to teach the doctrine of justification any otherwise than they there explained it; and charging all consistories, classes, and Provincial Synods, to exert their whole authority to see this canon punctually observed; inspecting their ministers, and all other persons, that none act contrary hereunto; and to prosecute such as do, with all the censures of the Church." Synod of Tonneins, cap. vi. art. 19.

The question now, upon the full relation of this controversy, that I would ask any man, (without entering into the merits of the cause betwixt Piscator and the French,) is only this: whether the Article of the Church of England about justification, be not less liable to exception, than that of the French Confession? and may not more easily and generally be subscribed by all Protestants, since it contains nothing but what they are all agreed in? He must be very partial to a cause, that will have the confidence to deny this.

Another instance, in which it will evidently appear, that subscription in the French Church was for some time at least more difficult than in the Church of England, is, the doctrine of original sin, which has been variously explained in the French Church. At first, indeed, it was exactly the same with the 9th Article of the Church of England; which says, "That original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is inclined to evil; so that the flesh lusteth against the Spirit." And the 10th and 11th Articles of the French Confession say no more than this: for no notice is taken of the imputation of Adam's sin at all. But afterwards the French Church brought this also into the

notion of original sin: for when Mr. de la Place had published a discourse of original sin, wherein he asserted, "that the nature of it consisted only in that corruption, which is hereditary to all Adam's posterity, and inherent originally in all men, and not in the imputation of his first sin;" the third Synod of Charenton, 1644, "condemned his doctrine for restraining the nature of original sin, to the sole hereditary corruption of Adam's posterity, to the excluding of the imputation of that first sin by which he fell; and interdicted, upon pain of Church censures, all pastors, professors, and others who should treat of this question, to depart from the common received opinion of the Protestant Churches. Also, all Synods and Classes, who should hereafter proceed to the reception of scholars into the ministry, were obliged to see them sign and subscribe that present act of the Synod of Charenton." Synod of Charent. cap. 14. art. 10.

Now that this determination was thought a little too severe, we need no other proof than the subsequent decree that was made in the Synod of Loudun fifteen years after. For there it is said, "that at the request of divers provinces, demanding with great importunity that the Canon of Charenton might be moderated; it was decreed, that for the future, all pastors and proposants, who should offer themselves to the ministry, should only be obliged to subscribe the 10th and 11th Articles of the Confession of Faith. Yet still all persons should be forbidden to preach or print any thing against the imputation mentioned in the canon of Charenton." Synod of Loudun, 1659. cap. viii. art. 11.

A third instance to this purpose, is their doctrine concerning the call of their first reformers, which every one is to believe not to have been any ordinary call from man or the Church, but an extraordinary commission by an inward powerful impulse from God. For so the Synod of Gap, 1603, cap. ii. art. 4. expressly words it. "This Synod doth judge, that according to the 31st Article of our Confession, we ought to ascribe their authority for preaching and reforming, simply to their extraordinary vocation, (whereby they were, by an inward powerful impulse from God, raised

up and commanded to exercise their ministry,) and not to the relies of their corrupted call and ordination in the Romish Church."

The following Synod of Rochel, 1607, made some corrections upon this, cap. iv. art. 3. "In that Article of the Synod of Gap," say they, "which speaks of the call of the first pastors in our reformed Churches, these words, 'and to teach,'\* which are found in some certain copies, shall be razed; and instead of 'simply,' shall be inserted 'principally;' and that last clause, 'Not unto the small remainders of their corrupted call,' shall be read thus, 'Rather than unto the small remainders of their ordinary call.'" Yet these corrections do not so clear all doubts, but that many men would find themselves under great difficulties to subscribe their doctrine in this particular also.

To these instances in points of belief, I will subjoin a few more which relate to practice, and which make subscription in the French Church rather more difficult than the former. It is one Article of their Book of Discipline, cap. xiv. art. 27. "That all dancing shall be suppressed; and such as make a trade of dancing, or use to be present at dances, having been sundry times admonished, in case they prove contumacious or rebellious, shall be excommunicated; and all Consistories are charged to see that this canon be most heedfully kept and observed." It is here to be noted, that all ministers are sworn to the execution of this discipline; and consequently under an oath to excommunicate all persons, who use to frequent dances without reforming. What particular reasons they might have in France for this severity, I know not; but certainly it would be esteemed a very rigorous canon among us; first to prohibit all dancing as a thing unlawful, and then oblige ministers by an oath to excommunicate all that used and practised it.

They have other Canons no less severe with respect to habits; and ministers are equally bound upon oath to put them

---

\* These words, "And to teach," are in sense the same with "preaching" in the Synod of Gap.

in execution. The Synod of Rochel, 1581, cap. iv. art. 21. declares, "That such habits are not to be allowed in common wearing, as carry with them evident marks of lasciviousness, dissolution, and excessive new-fangled fashions, such as painting, slashing, cutting in pieces, trimming with locks and tassels, or any other that may discover nakedness, or naked breasts; or fardingals, or the like sort of garments, with which men and women do wickedly clothe and adorn themselves. And Consistories shall do their utmost to suppress such dissolutions by their censures; and in case the delinquents are contumacious and rebellious, they shall proceed against them, even to excommunication." See also the Book of Discipline, cap. xiv. art. 26. Synod of St. Foy, 1578, cap. iv. art. 21. Synod of Montauban, 1594, cap. iv. art. 45. Synod of Gergeau, 1601, cap. iii. art. 45. all to the same purpose; save only that in the Synod of Gergeau, poincons and fardingals are excepted out of the number of habits, for the use of which persons were to be punished with excommunication.

By another of their Canons in the Book of Discipline, cap. xiv. art. 28. "No mumblings nor jugglings are to be suffered, nor wassail-days, nor keeping of Shrovetide, nor players at heypass, nor tumblers, nor tricks of goblets, nor puppet-plays. Moreover it shall not be lawful for the faithful to go to comedies, tragedies, interludes, farces, or other stage-plays, acted in public or private." Some editions of the Discipline also forbid the setting-up of May-poles. But this was ordered to be razed out of the Canon, by the Synod of Gergeau, 1601, cap. iii. art. 46.

Cards also, and dice, and other games of hazard, and lotteries, are prohibited under pain of ecclesiastical censure. Book of Discipl. cap. xiv. art. 29. Synod of Gergeau, 1601, cap. iii. art. 47.

All ministers are prohibited the study of chemistry, by a Canon of the Synod of St. Maixant, 1609, cap. iii. art. 6. "Classes and Synods shall have a watchful eye over those ministers who study chemistry, and grievously reprove and censure them."

And they are under oath not to practise physic, except out

of charity to the neighbourhood, which if they transgress, they are liable also to suspension. Book of Discipl. cap. i. art. 19. Synod of St. Foy, 1978, cap. iv. art. 2. Synod of Loudun, 1659, cap. ix. art. 9.

Now I cannot but think that some of these things at least are as hard to be subscribed and sworn to, as any of the Canons of the Church of England; for we have no such Canons as oblige us to excommunicate every person that frequents dancing, or wears a fardingal, &c.

## CHAP. V.

### *The French Discipline allows not of Nonconforming Ministers, or separate Meetings.*

If we enquire in the next place, what regard the French Church had to such ministers, who had any scruples upon them as to swearing and subscribing, and such as could not conform; though it was the peculiar happiness of that Church to have as few instances of that kind as ever any Church had; yet when there were any, they were either debarred from entering into the ministry at first, or else silenced and deposed if they were in actual service: for their National Synods never suffered their authority to be contemned. It is a Canon of their Book of Discipline, cap. v. art. 32. "That if a pastor or elder break the Church's union, or stir up contention about any point of doctrine or discipline which he had subscribed, or about the form of catechising, or administration of sacraments, and celebration of marriage, and conform not to the determination of the classis, he shall then be suspended from his office, and be further prosecuted by the provincial, or national Synod.

The Synod of Montauban, 1594, cap. iv. art. 19. "allows not ministers to make any alteration in the forms of public prayers and administration of the sacraments, the whole having been prudently and piously ordained, and for the most part in plain and express terms of Holy Scripture.

The same Synod has a severe Canon against all ministers that officiate in interdicted churches, cap. iii. art. 10. "If any churches refuse payment of their contributions, towards the defraying those expenses which are unavoidably contracted by journies, and attendance in Synodical and other ecclesiastical assemblies, kept and held for the common good of all churches, they shall be deprived of the ministry of the Gospel, and be reputed deserters of that holy union which ought to be preserved among us.—And, *N.B.*, all ministers in such churches are interdicted the exercise of their ministry, upon pain of being denounced schismatics." And this they order to be entered among the Canons of their discipline, which all ministers are sworn to observe.

Here we see what authority they claim to themselves; first, in laying contributions upon the churches upon necessary occasions. Secondly, in interdicting the churches which refuse payment. Thirdly, in depriving the ministers, and treating them as schismatics, if they pretend to officiate in any of those interdicted churches. And yet this was but a pecuniary matter at most, which affords ground for so much censure.

Their Book of Discipline, cap. vi. art. 4. lays down several rules for managing disputes with the papists about religion; and particularly this, which it backs with a most severe sanction: "Ministers shall not adventure upon any general conference, without the advice of all the Churches assembled in a National Synod; upon pain of being declared apostates and deserters of the Churches' union." See also Synod of Gergeau, 1601, cap. iii. art. 23.

The Synod of Gap proceeds in like manner, with persons tainted with the prevailing errors (as it calls them) about justification. "Be they ministers or private Christians, by the authority of this present Synod they shall be silenced; and in case of a stubborn persistency, if ministers, be deposed." Synod of Gap, 1603. cap. ii. art. 2. See also cap. iii. art. 4 & 5.

It is a known instance, which Dr. Durel has heretofore given of this Church's power, in the case of Mr. Welsh a Scotchman, and minister in the province of Xaintonge;

who being commanded by the Synod of St. Maixant, to conform himself, both in his preaching and the exercise of discipline, to the order and manner used in the Church of France; upon his refusal was obliged to leave his ministry, and quit the kingdom. See the Synod of St. Maixant, 1609. cap. iii. art. 35. and Durel's *Vindiciæ*, cap. 22. p. 243.

To this let me add that famous decree of the Synod of Alez, 1620. cap. x. art. 22. where, upon advice craved by some of the deputies, what course should be taken with those, who took out prohibitions from the court of parliament against the orders and censures of the Church: the assembly enjoined all Synods, classes, and consistories, to proceed against such persons, as rebels, against the discipline of the Church: and inflict upon them the heaviest censure of excommunication. We find at the end of almost every National Synod, a roll of deposed ministers and deserters; and yet we never hear of any of these setting up to preach in separate protestant meetings. It was against their rules there to preach, when silenced by the authority of a national Synod, where lay the last appeal: and therefore, in all their Synods we scarce meet with three instances to the contrary. The Synod of St. Maixant made a peremptory Canon, cap. vi. art. 17. "If any deposed minister shall presume to celebrate any public ordinances, he shall be pronounced excommunicate immediately." They would not allow such an one the lowest privilege of a private christian, so much as to esteem him a member of the Church.

They enacted other proper laws for the people; that they should not hear, or follow, or encourage any such, under pain of censure also. "Forasmuch, (says the Book of Discipline, cap. xiv. art. 12.) as that it is neither lawful nor expedient to hear the popish preachers, nor any others who have intruded themselves without a lawful call; the flocks shall be hindered by the pastors from going to them; and such, as shall go, shall be called into the consistory, and censured according to the nature of their offence."

Now two things are to be observed in this Canon; 1. That it is no more lawful to go to hear preachers, who

intrude themselves without a lawful call, than it is to go and hear popish preachers. 2. That all persons are intruders and have no lawful call, who take upon themselves the office of preaching, contrary to the known rules and orders of the establish'd Church; or else preach after they have been silenced, suspended, or deposed by lawful authority. So that if our controversies in England were to be determined by this Canon of the French Church, separation would quickly be at an end, if men would but be once persuaded to believe it unlawful to preach, or hear others preach, without a lawful call, and contrary to the rules and orders of the establish'd Church.

That this was the constant sense of the French Church, appears from another Canon made in the Synod of Gergeau, 1601. cap. iv. art. 22. in reference to the people of Montauban; where it is decreed, "That because they suffered and encouraged one Girard, a minister that had been suspended by the Synod of Languedoc, to preach among them after his suspension, they should thereby incur censures themselves."

The Synod of Alez also made a very good Canon to prevent disorders of this nature, "That whereas it might happen, through the corruption of the age, that a minister deposed in one classis or province, may intrude himself into another, and take upon him to preach the Word, before the meeting of the National Synod, by which all the churches, of this kingdom may be advised of the said deposed person; this assembly doth exhort all pastors and consistories, not easily to admit any stranger from another province into the pulpits; unless they be very well acquainted with him. And as for apostates, the pastors of the adjoining churches in which the revolted live, shall give speedy and public notice of these apostates; that so none of our churches or ministers may be surprised by them."

We see all possible care was taken to prevent the preaching, and hearing, of silenced and deposed ministers both in separate meetings, and their own churches. And this good piece of discipline was always observed in the French churches, being instilled into them by Beza, and their first reformers. For the judgment of Beza against

preaching, when silenced by authority, was peremptory, and famous not only in the Church of France, but England also. For, being consulted upon this very point by some dissenting brethren in England, about the year 1568. when subscription was pressed by the Queen's authority, he gave them this answer: "As to the silenced ministers," says he, "if the pressing of subscription continues, my advice is, rather to live privately than to yield to it. For either they must act against their consciences, or else quit their employments. For as for the third thing which might be supposed in this case, that is, the exercising their functions against the will of the Queen and the Bishops; we tremble at the thoughts of it, for such reasons as may easily be imagined, though I say never a word about them." Beza, Ep. 12. ad fratres Angl. p. 105.

This answer and resolution of Beza, to give it its just praise, seems to have done good service in England, in stopping the intended separation at that time: and probably might leave those useful impressions upon the minds of our old nonconformists, which we find the sober part of them were possessed with; that if they were silenced for not subscribing, they ought to submit and live as private Christians in the communion of the Church; and not set up separate meetings, and preach against the will of their superiors. Which was the known judgment of Mr. Fox, Dr. Humphreys, Perkins, Gifford, Rathband, Ball, Bradshaw, Hildersham, and Dod; whose authorities have often been produced by others, and it is beside my present purpose here to repeat; who am only concerned to shew what was the judgment and practice of the French Church.

I will end this chapter with the 26th Article of the French Confession of Faith. "We believe that it is not lawful for any man to withdraw himself from the congregations of God's saints, and content himself with private devotion; but all are jointly bound to keep and maintain the unity of the Church, &c. And whoever separate themselves from the established order, do resist the ordinance of God.\*

*Note.* That this last clause is in Mr. Quick's translation, though it be not in some other editions.

And in case they draw others aside with them, they do act very perversely, and are to be accounted as mortal plagues.”

Mr. Quick himself observes,\* that discipline was always strictly exercised upon delinquent ministers in the worst of times: they were deposed and ejected, if they deserved it: but yet he cannot say, any of these set up separate protestant meetings; but they generally turned papists, and took up for good and all in the Romish synagogue. So effectual was their discipline in silencing delinquent ministers, and yet happy in keeping all that called themselves protestants, to one church and one communion.

## CHAP. VI.

*That the French Church condemns occasional Conformity, as much as the Church of England.*

The last expedient of the Church of England to preserve unity, was the censuring of separatists, and denying them the privilege of occasional communion. I speak not now of the late bills about occasional conformity, which have been the subject of a warm debate among those who are professed members of the Church: for these not being yet enacted into laws, and being rather civil than ecclesiastical acts, come not within the compass of this discourse: but I speak of such laws as are actually in being, which all the members of the Church must acknowledge to be laws; I mean the Canons which are in force, and may legally and with good authority be put in execution. The 27th of these Canons speaks to this effect: “No minister, when he celebrateth the communion, shall wittingly administer the same to any that refuse to be present at public prayers, according to the orders of the Church of England; nor to any that are common and notorious depravers of the Book of Common

---

\* Quick's Introduct. to the Synod, sect. 13. p. 58.

Prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and of the orders, rites, and ceremonies therein prescribed, or of any thing that is contained in any of the Articles agreed upon in the convocation, 1562, or of any thing contained in the book of ordering priests and bishops; or to any that have spoken against and depraved his Majesty's sovereign authority in causes ecclesiastical; except every such person shall first acknowledge to the minister, before the churchwardens, his repentance for the same, and promise by word, if he cannot write, that he will do so no more; and except, if he can write, he shall first do the same under his hand-writing, &c."

The title of the Canon is, "That schismatics are not to be admitted to the communion:" and it is agreed on all hands, both by churchmen and dissenters, that the design of the canon was to deny separatists the privilege of occasional communion. For every minister, so far as he is obliged by this canon, is under an obligation not to admit them to communion, but upon the conditions specified in the canon.

Now the question is concerning the legality and justice of this Canon. Dissenters say, it is simply and universally unlawful, and give it as one reason, among others, for their nonconformity. See Mr. Baxter's *Engl. Nonconform. c. 29.*

To which I say, that the same reason will hold for nonconformity in the Church of France: for their rules require ministers to use the very same discipline. Beza, in his *Epistle to the French Church in London*, passing his judgment upon certain articles drawn up by them, approves this among the rest: "They that are either lawfully excommunicate, or do unlawfully and with scandal withdraw themselves from any Church, ought not to be allowed the use of the sacraments, till they have made legal satisfaction to the Church." Beza, *Ep. xxiv. art. 21.*

The 13th Article in the same epistle says further, "That whoever is lawfully excommunicate in any particular Church, or unlawfully cuts himself off from it, does thereby exclude himself from all the privileges of the Catholic Church, and is not to be received into any other particular Church, without making satisfaction, &c."

Now I presume a legal satisfaction will at least imply an

acknowledgment of the fault, and a promise of amendment for the future. And if so; if the same conditions be required of separatists in the French Church, before they are to be admitted to the communion, wherein does their discipline differ from that of the Church of England?

Calvin says in general, "Of all such as fall off from the Church, either through rigor of discipline, or scandal of the cross, if they make an open separation from the Church, they are by no means to be admitted to the holy supper. *Sin palam discessionem ab ecclesia faciunt, ac eos Evangelii pudet vel tædet, nullo modo admittendi sunt ad sacram cœnam.*" Ep. to Menso Poppius, p. 205, 327.

If it be said, these are only private authorities; I answer, they are such as are agreeable to the Canons in the Book of Discipline; one of which says, "Such as care not to come to our public Christian congregations, but only upon those days when the sacrament of the Lord's supper is celebrated, shall be censured, and admonished of their duty; and to this purpose, they shall join themselves to one certain particular church." Discipl. cap. xiii. art. 12.

And the next Canon says, "They who make a trade of hearing the Word of God in one church, and of receiving the sacraments in another, shall be censured; and by the advice of the classis or provincial Synod, they shall be appointed to join themselves to that church which is nearest and most convenient for them." Ibid, art. 13.

These Canons not only prohibit occasional communion to such as absent themselves from the service of the Church, but also to such as frequent not their own Parochial churches. Which justifies another Canon of our Church, which Mr. B. also excepts against; that is, the 28th can. which says, "Ministers shall not admit strangers to the Lord's table among others, but forbid them, and remit such home to their own parish churches and ministers, there to receive the communion with the rest of their neighbours." I can see no difference between this Canon, and that last mentioned of the French discipline: and yet Mr. B. makes this point also a sufficient reason for ministers nonconformity. Eng. Noncon. c. 30.

He says, "Parish bounds are but an human order for conveniency." As if parish bounds in France were not the same thing that they are in England! "But the benefit of an able faithful minister, and the choice and use of such, where they may be had, is of Divine appointment." Then at least the French Church sins as much as the Church of England, in remanding every one back to his own parish, against a Divine appointment. "But some parishes have ministers, that cannot, or may not, be suffered to preach." And I shall shew in due time that this was the case of the Church of France too; which defect they supplied, by ordering Calvin's Homilies\* to be read: and yet they did not think this a sufficient reason to allow men to go for communion from their own parish churches. But he says, "Every Christian is related to all the Catholic Church, and as he hath need, hath right to the communion of saints out of his parish." There is no question but that both the French and English Church knew this as well as Mr. B. But what is this to those that have no need to go out of their parish for communion? Is there no difference between ordinary and extraordinary cases? Then all ordinary rules may be broken, because they do not bind in extraordinary cases. If men have occasion to travel to other parishes or countries, it is fitting they should be allowed to communicate in those places, whither necessity calls them: but it does not hence follow, that it is unlawful to bind men by a canon to communicate in their own parish churches, who have no necessity to do otherwise. And yet thus Mr. B. argues, both against the French and English Churches; though he designed it only against the Church of England.

I observe two things further in the practice and discipline of the French Church, relating to this matter; 1. That no stranger can be admitted to communion in any church, without testimonials from his own church; which was an old rule of the primitive Church, revived by the second Synod of Paris, 1565, cap. xi. art. 26. which says, "Ministers are

---

\* See below, Book II. chap. 2. and Book IV. chap. 10.

advised not to receive the members of any other churches to the Lord's supper, without a sufficient attestation produced by them, under the hands of their pastors or elders, if it may be had." And Beza says, they observe a like rule at Geneva, unless either the persons be otherwise sufficiently known, or will submit to a private examination. Beza, Ep. xx. p. 140.

The other thing I observe in their constitution, is something more remarkable, being an instance of power that the Church of England could never yet lay claim to; which was, that no protestant could enjoy any such civil offices among them, as were particularly specified by the edict of Nantz, unless he was recommended by the public testimonials of the Church. For so the Synod of Tonneins decreed, with a menace of excommunication to them that should do otherwise. "This assembly ordained, that such persons who get themselves preferred to the government of our cautionary towns, or unto the office of counsellors in the mixed courts, or shall obtain any other places granted to gentlemen professing our religion, without taking the necessary testimonials, according to the letter and import of the king's writ for governors, and the particular articles for counsellors in sovereign courts; they shall be declared deserters of the union of our churches, and prosecuted with all Church-censures." Synod of Tonneins, 1614, cap. viii. art. 11.

The ground of this Canon was the 49th Article of those which are called the secret articles of the edict of Nantz; which says, "The vacant offices, of which those of the said religion shall be provided in the chambers of the edict, shall be supplied with persons capable; who shall bring a certificate from the Synod or classis unto which they do belong, that they are of the said religion, and honest men." See this art. in the 1 vol. of the Synodicon, p. 93.

This is a plain evidence, that to qualify men for those civil offices, the testimonials of the Church were required; and it is not to be supposed that they would give their testimonials to any that were not of their Church, or made a separation from it. Whence it appears, that they not only

prohibited occasional communion, but had power to deny those that were not of their communion, the privilege of civil offices; which none could regularly obtain, without testimonials from the Church: which is something more than is now exacted in the Church of England.

If it be said notwithstanding all this, that men had not the same reasons for scrupling conformity in the French Church, or separating from it, that they have in the Church of England: though I have already taken off the main force of this plea in the fourth chapter of this book; by shewing, that subscription is rather more difficult in many cases in the French Church, than it is in the Church of England; yet, to answer it more fully, I will proceed to examine the several particular objections that are made against our Church, relating either, 1. To her articles and homilies. Or, 2. To her liturgy. Or, 3. To her ordinations, government, and canons; and shew, that all such objections may be answered, and the things excepted against be fairly justified, upon the principles and practice of the reformed Church of France. I will begin with the objections made against the Articles and Homilies; which shall be the subject of the next book.

## BOOK II.

THE OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE ARTICLES AND  
HOMILIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, CON-  
SIDERED, AND ANSWERED UPON THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH  
OF FRANCE.

---

CHAP. I.

*That approved Writers of the French Church, allow the Articles of the Church of England, as lawful to be subscribed.*

WHAT is meant by subscription to the Articles of our Church, is not exactly agreed by those that subscribe them. Some take them only for articles of peace; and they by subscription mean no more than this; that they will so far own and submit to them, as not publicly to dissent from them, or teach any doctrine that is contrary to any thing contained in them. This seems to have been the judgment of archbishop Bramhall, bishop Fowler, and others. But generally, subscription is considered in a stricter sense; as implying a declaration of our own opinion, and not as a bare obligation to silence only: and this seems rather to have been the intent and meaning of the Church. But now in

this stricter sense, Beza professes in his letters to bishop Grindal, that he knows no orthodox Frenchman, but who could as heartily subscribe the English confession, as their own. "For, says he, in one place, we believe your Churches do in all points of doctrine agree with ours." And in another; "as to what concerns your faith or doctrine, received by public consent, and confirmed by royal authority; I suppose there is no man that thinks rightly of these matters, but will embrace it as true and certain." Beza, Ep. 8. & 69.

Peter du Moulin speaks much to the same purpose, in his defence of the French Confession, against Arnoux the jesuit. "Our adversaries," says he, "under pretence that the Church of England hath another form of discipline than ours is, charge us that our religion is diverse: but experience confuteth this accusation; for we assemble with the English in their churches; we participate together in the holy supper of our Lord; the doctrine of their confession is wholly agreeable unto ours." Buckler of Faith, p. 345.

Mr. le Moyne says, "the English Confession has been highly approved by all the protestant world, and that it really deserves the praises of all good Christians. For there cannot be any thing made more wise than that Confession, and the Articles of faith were never collected with a more just and reasonable discretion. Letter to the bishop of London," at the end of Dr. Stunginfect's Unreasonable of Separation.

## CHAP. II.

*Of particular Exceptions against the 39 Articles, and Consent of the French Church in the controverted Articles, 3, 4, 8, &c. to the 20th.*

Mr. B. in his Engl. Nonconform. cap. 24. professes, he can subscribe all the doctrinal Articles as true; but he says, "the words of them, in the obvious sense, are many times

liable to exception; and there are many things in the Articles that good men may scruple." His first instance is the third Article. He says, "learned men doubt of Christ's going down into hell." Then sure they must doubt of the Apostles' Creed too: for it is an article of that, as well as of the English confession. But I suppose he would have said, that some doubt of the exposition of that doctrine of Christ's descent into hell. Yet this will not mend the matter: for the Church gives no exposition of it in that Article; but only says, it is to be believed that He went down into hell. Now who those good men are that doubt of this, and allow at the same time of the Apostles' Creed, one would be glad to know, for their rare faculty of distinguishing without a difference: or if they doubt of the Apostles' Creed, as well as the Article of the Church of England, the question will then be, whether they are good men. The French Church says nothing in particular of this article in her confession; but yet she allows the Article, because she owns every article of the Apostles' Creed; whereof this is one. So that here is no difference between the two Churches upon this point: they both own the Article in terms; and our Church gives no exposition of it, but leaves men to a reasonable latitude with sobriety to put their own sense and meaning on it. So much was Mr. B. mistaken, when he said, that learned and good men doubt of Christ's going down into hell! This is ominous to make such a blunder in his first exception; let us see whether he was more lucky in his second.

2. He says next, that the doctrine of the 4th art. "that Christ's body in heaven hath flesh and bones, is contrary to two general Councils; the 2d of Nice, and that of Constantinople before it."\* What follows hence? That good men may scruple this Article? Then by the same reason they may

\* The ancient Councils and Fathers generally maintain the doctrine of the 4th article; "That the body of Christ hath flesh and bones in Heaven."

Pope Damasus, in his Confession of Faith, recorded by Theodoret, Hist. lib. v. c. 11. uses the following expressions: "If any one shall affirm, that Christ sits not in the flesh, which He assumed, at the right hand of God, in which also He shall come to judge the quick and dead, let him be anathema."

scruple the 28 art. which denies transubstantiation; for the contrary doctrine was established at least in two such general councils, Lateran and Trent. We see any argument will serve against the Church's Articles, though it open a door for popery, under pretence of easing scrupulous men. But it is well the French Confession may be scrupled by his good men upon the same ground. For the 15th art. of their confession,\* "proves the truth and propriety of our Saviour's human nature, after his assumption into heaven; from that text of St. Luke, 24. 39." "A Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." It is the same thing with them, not to have flesh and bones, as not to have a true human nature. So that if we deny, that Christ hath flesh and bones in heaven, we might as well deny, the truth of His humanity also. But the French Church never thought fit to condescend so far to these scrupulous men, as in compliment to them to drop the article, which asserts the truth of our Saviour's human nature.

3. He says the 8th art. is scrupled by many conformists, because it requires the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed to be wholly received and believed. What kind of conformists these are I know not; but I have shewn elsewhere, that their scruples would have been no less, about these damnatory clauses, in the Church of France.

4. He says, bishop Taylor was against the 9th art. about original sin. Then, I say, he was against the 10th and 11th art. of the French confession. A private man's opinion is no reason for the Church to throw away her doctrine: but if he does bishop Taylor wrong, he must answer for it.

5. Many, called Arminians, are against the 10th art. which says, we have no power to do good works without the grace of God preventing us. It was kindly done of Mr. B. to put the Arminians among those good men, whose scruples ought to be considered: but neither the assembly of divines, who drew up the Confession of Faith to be presented to the parliament in 1646, nor the French Church, ever had

---

\* See also Calvin Admon. ult. ad Westphal. p. 714.

any regard to such scruples. For the former decreed, "that man by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation: so as a natural man being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereto." See the advice of the Assembly of Div. to the Parl. cap. 9. Art 3. And for the other, I have proved before in the chapter about subscription, that the French Church obliged all her ministers not only to subscribe, but swear to the Decrees of the Synod of Dort against the Arminians; and made almost an hundred canons of her own in one Synod to secure the same points against them. How comes this then to be a charge also against the Church of England for want of moderation?

6. But many conformists are against those words of the 11th art. "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of Christ." I doubt Mr. B. was mistaken in his men, and does them manifest wrong; for I never yet heard of any such conformists. But if any such there be, they must be as much against the protestant doctrine of justification in all other Churches; and particularly the 18th art. of the French confession, which says, "we believe that our whole righteousness is founded in the remission of our sins; which, as David saith, is our only happiness. Wherefore we do utterly reject all other means, by which men think they may be justified before God; and casting away all opinion of our virtues and merits, we do altogether rest upon the sole obedience of Jesus Christ," &c.

As for Mr. B.'s reason, which he brings to prove, that the conformists contradict this article; because they say, there is a subordinate righteousness spoken of in Scripture; Calvin has long ago proved that to be a mistake, or rather a sophism in argumentation. For things that are subordinate do not contradict one another; as he argues well against the Council of Trent. "We freely confess, that the good works of the faithful are sometimes honoured with the title of righteousness. But forasmuch as all the whole worth of such works flows from no other fountain but that of free grace, it would be absurd to say they take off any from that.

Why do they not remember, what they learned when they were boys at school, that what is subordinate to another thing, does not contradict it." Antidot. Concil. Trid. sess. vi. tom. viii. p. 245.

If Calvin had had to do with Mr. B. he would have sent him to school again with the Fathers of Trent, to have learned that a subordinate righteousness does not contradict our being accounted righteous only for the merits of Christ.

7. He says, many think that good works spring not necessarily from faith, as the 12th art. speaks, but freely. But if any think so, they are ignorant objectors, and contend about words to no purpose. For necessarily and freely do not always contradict one another. However, the 22d art. of the French has the very same word.

8. Many think that merit of congruity may be held, against the 13th art. "And that men by natural or antecedent works may be made meet to receive grace; which Dr. Hammond in his annotations seemeth much to insist upon, under the name of probity." But does the Dr. ever say that men by mere natural works, done without all Grace, may deserve Grace? does he own this merit of congruity? Does he not always ascribe all goodness to the Grace of God? Even the probity he speaks of, was an effect of Grace, in such Jewish proselytes as Cornelius, and such other devout men, who feared God, and wrought righteousness, and were accepted of Him, Act. 10. 35. But the Dr.'s authority, right or wrong, must be made use of to justify Pelagians, and such good men, who have scruples upon them about the Grace of God, and man's natural ability to do good.

9. His next concern is for Dr. Hammond again, and his followers, who subscribe the 14th art. and yet "write for good works over and above God's commandments, as only counselled by God, and voluntarily done; which this article calls arrogancy and impiety." That which the Article condemns is the popish doctrine of works of supererogation; that is, "such voluntary works, whereby men declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do; but that they do more for his sake than of

bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly, "When ye have done all that are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants." If Dr. Hammond, or any of his followers, writ for works of sepperogation against this Article, the Church had no reason to consider their scruples: for this is the doctrine of all Protestant Churches. But if Mr. B. again charges them falsely, he alone must answer for it.

10. He says next, the 15th art. is denied by them that think infants sinless when baptised. What then must these good men's scruples also be considered, and the Church cashier this article, which only asserts Christ's prerogative, against the papists, of being the only person in our nature that ever was without sin? This were to own not only the Virgin Mary, but all other infants, to be born without original sin, and to give a supersedeas to the 9th Article, and this together, contrary to the doctrine of all other Protestant Churches.

11. Many deny falling from Grace given, against the 16th art. But did ever any good Christian deny falling from Grace in the sense of the Article; that is, falling into deadly sin after baptism? Let us hear the words of the Article itself: "Not every deadly sin, willingly committed after baptism, is the sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from Grace given, and fall into sin, and by the Grace of God we may rise again, and amend our lives; and therefore they are to be condemned, who say, they can no more sin, as long as they live here; or deny place of forgiveness to such as truly repent." Here falling from Grace given, is explained by falling into deadly sin after baptism, which none ever denied, except Catharists or Libertines, who call their foulest vices no sins after regeneration; if learned men give us a true account of their doctrine.\* And would the Church do well to favour these men's scruples also?

12. He says, Dr. Hammond and his followers seem to

---

Calvin cont. Libertin. cap. xviii. tom. viii. p. 389.

Dr. Joh. Rainold. Theses de Scriptura. Thes. i. n. 9. p. 69.

deny the absolute election described in the 17th art. This is but faintly spoken, he durst not charge them home here. They only seem to deny it: then perhaps Mr. B. misunderstood them, and they did not deny it. But if they did, the Church is not obliged to alter her doctrine in compliment to them, no more than the Dutch or French Churches did, out of respect to Arminius, in the Synods of Dort and Charonton.

13. But many good men think some are saved that live up to the light of nature; "And yet the 18th art. curseth them that say so." Mr. B. does not deal fairly with this Article; for he leaves out the principai thing upon which the curse is laid; which is, that salvation may be had other ways than by the name of Christ. The words of the Article are these; "They are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law, or sect, which he professeth; so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved."

Now there is a great difference between saying, every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, without any regard to the name or merit of Christ; and saying, some are saved that live up to the light of nature, when those, who say it, affirm at the same time, that they are not saved by virtue of the Law of Nature, though that be the only law they have to walk by, but by the name and merit of Christ, without which no one can be saved. The one is expressly condemned and accursed in the article; but some think the other is not so, because it derogates nothing from the death and satisfaction of Christ, who may be a Saviour by God's infinite mercy to some, who never had any more than a virtual and implicit knowledge of Him. The one is a doctrine of the Aleoran, invented on purpose to promote the policy of the Turkish empire; the other a doctrine embraced by Christians of note in all ages, from Justin Martyr to Zuinglius, and the reformation; and, by those that embrace it, is not thought contrary to the present Article; though Mr. B. makes them flatly contradict one another.

But however that matter be, it is certain the Church of England advances no other doctrine, than is delivered in several Articles of the French Confession, more especially the 13th and 17th which says, “ that the sacrifice of Christ is the only thing that reconciles us unto God ; and that there is no other means or remedy, whereby to obtain remission of sins, but only his death for our sakes. If so, salvation cannot be attained by the law of nature, excluding the name of Christ.

14. His next exception is in favour of the Churchmen, who “ like not the description given of the visible Church in the 19th art. and think that the Church of Rome never erred in matters of faith ; contrary to what is there asserted.” But what is that description of the visible Church, which they dislike ? Why, “ That it is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments are duly administered, according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.” And are there any churchmen that dislike this ? Yes, because there is no mention of bishops or their government in it. And would Mr. B. have liked it ever the better if there had ? No, but he is concerned for the churchmen, who cannot subscribe this Article, but contrary to their judgment. But these episcopal churchmen have often told him and others, that it is not contrary to their judgment to subscribe this Article: for in all their disputes with the papists, they never require more than these two notes of the Church. They say with Bishop Andrews, “ that though episcopal government be of divine institution, yet is not so absolutely necessary, as that there can be no Church, nor sacraments, nor salvation without it. He is blind that sees not many Churches flourishing without it ; and he must have an heart as hard as iron, that will deny them salvation. Something may be wanting, that is of Divine right, in the exterior regimen of the Church ; and yet salvation be obtained therein.” Respons. ad 2. Epist. Moli-næi, inter Opuse. p. 176.

Now this is the case of the French Church, which bishop Andrews and his followers allow to have all the necessary

and essential notes of a true Church, though episcopal government was never settled among them.

On the other hand, the French Churches furnish the episcopal divines with arguments against Mr. B. and their other adversaries. For they say, that where episcopal government and superiority is regularly settled in any Church, there it is so far necessary to submit to it, as that they, who do otherwise, are guilty of raising a schism in the Church. So that though episcopal government be not an essential note of the Church, where it cannot be had; yet it is so far necessary to the well-being of a Church, where it is legally established, and may be had, that it is schismatical to attempt any innovations, or raise stirs and divisions about it. And if thus much be granted to these episcopal divines, they will have no need to have episcopal government put into the article as a third note of the Church; though the good men, the Brownists, were once for having discipline made a third note; and so aggrieved for the want of it, that they unchurched the Church of England, and forsook her communion upon it; and I wonder Mr. B. should forget to mention their scruples also here, as fit to be considered.

But Mr. B.'s eye was only upon the churchmen, whom he would fain charge with opposition to this Article: therefore he says further, some of them deny that the Church of Rome hath erred *de fide*. I have heard of some churchmen, who would charitably think, that the fundamentals of Christianity have been all along preserved among the corruptions of the Romish Church; but I never heard of any that undertook her vindication so far, as to say, she was never guilty of any errors in matters of faith: and if Mr. B. knew any such, he would have done well to have named them. But admit there were any, their dissent is no argument to the Church to alter her doctrine, which is the same that is maintained in all the reformed Churches. I will here recite the 28th art. of the French confession; and let the reader judge, whether it does not rather bear harder upon the Romish Church for her errors, than our Article does. "We protest that where the word of God is not received, nor any profession of obedience made to it, and where there

is no use of the sacraments, that there, properly speaking, we cannot judge there is any Church. Therefore we condemn the popish assemblies, because the pure Word of God is banished out of them; and also the sacraments of faith corrupted, adulterated, falsified, or even abolished; and for that all kinds of superstitions and idolatries reign in them. Therefore we hold, that all those, who join in such actions, and communicate with them, do separate themselves from the body of Christ. Yet because there are some small footsteps of a Church in the papacy, and the substance of baptism remains among them, the efficacy of which depends not upon him that administers it; we confess that they, that are baptised there, do not need a second baptism."

Calvin speaks much after the same manner in his letter to Zozinus, p. 51. "*Sic papistis detrahimus ecclesiæ nomen, ut tamen illic quasdam manere reliquias ecclesiæ non negemus. We so deny the name of a Church to papists, as only to say, there remain some relics of a Church among them.*" Upon which account he thinks baptism administered by them to be valid, though it be administered by idolaters, and corrupted by their superstitions. See also his 2d Epistle to Zozinus, p. 57. And his Epistle to Farel, p. 258.

### CHAP. III.

*That the Church's Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, according to the 20th Art. is acknowledged by the French Church.*

MANY and various are the objections against this part of the 20th Art. That the Church hath power to decree, rites, or ceremonies. 1. Some say, all ceremonies are to be left to Christian liberty, and therefore the Church has no power to enjoin any. So the Scotch minister told king James,

“ that he would hold conformity with his Majesty's ordinances for matters of doctrine ; but for matters of ceremony, they were to be left in Christian liberty unto every man.” See Roger's Expos. of the Art. p. 104.

2. Others go further, and assert upon a worse principle, that the Church has no power to decree rites and ceremonies, because nothing is to be done in the worship of God, for which we have not an express Divine command in particular to determine us. Both which are such absurd paradoxes, that Mr. B. himself could never digest them ; and it must be owned he has written as severely as any man against them. But yet he cannot let this Article pass wholly without a stricture. For he says, “ The Church's power to decree ceremonies, being unlimited in this article, is doubted of by good Christians.” But those good Christians sure were none of Calvin's disciples, nor governed by the discipline of the French Church, which asserts the same power to herself and all other Churches, without any other limitations than those expressed in our Article ; that is, that such ceremonies be not contrary to God's Word, nor enforced upon men as things absolutely necessary in order to salvation. In the 32d Art. of their confession, they thus express themselves: “ We believe it to be expedient, that they, who are chosen governors of any Church, should consult among themselves, by what means the whole body may conveniently be governed ; yet so, as that they do not swerve from what Christ hath appointed. And this doth not hinder, but that some Churches may have peculiar constitutions, as they shall think most convenient for themselves.” Then certainly, every Church is judge for herself, both of what is expedient, and what is agreeable to the appointment of Christ.

The next Article says, “ We exclude all such human devices and laws, as are introduced under pretence of Divine worship, to bind the conscience ; but we admit such as serve to maintain concord, and keep every man in due obedience.” That is, such laws as are only made for order and uniformity, they willingly allow of. Which they express more clearly in another confession extant among Calvin's works :

“ We acknowledge, say they, that all Churches have power to make laws and ordinances, for establishing a common policy among themselves; because all things in the House of God ought to be done regularly and in order. And therefore all such constitutions are to be obeyed, provided they be not superstitious, nor ensnare the conscience with an opinion of necessity. And such as refuse obedience in this case, we esteem self-conceited and stubborn. *Cerebrosi et Perricaces apud nos habentur.* See this confession among Calvin’s *Opuseula*, p. 254.

Calvin has a very excellent and long discourse upon this matter, in his *Institutions*, lib. iv. c. x. n. 27, &c. too long to be here inserted: I will select only a few remarkable passages out of it. First, he says, “ If we would consult the welfare of the Church, we must have an especial regard to that rule of the Apostle, ‘ Let all things be done decently, and according to order.’ But now, because there is such diversity in the dispositions of men, such variety in their minds, and difference in their judgments and tempers; no polity can be upheld, but by certain laws, nor any rites be observed, without a stated form. Therefore we are so far from condemning the laws, which conduce to this end, that we say, to take them away, is to cut the sinews of the Church, and render it both weak and deformed. For there can be no order and decency observed, as the Apostle requires, unless laws be added, as certain ties, to bind men up to the observance of them. Only in such laws, two things must always be excepted. 1. That they be not believed necessary to salvation, and imposed upon the conscience as such. 2. That they be not taken for parts of God’s worship, and religion be placed in them.”

Then he tells us what he means by decency and order. “ The end of decency is, partly that by appointing such rites as will create a reverence for holy things, we may by such helps be excited to devotion: partly that our modesty and gravity, which is commendable in all our actions, may there more especially appear. And for order, he places it in the governor’s making, and the people’s obeying, such constitutions as are proper to take away all confusion, barbarity,

contumacy, tumults and dissensions out of the Church; and preserve its peace and tranquility inviolable. He gives several instances in each kind, and then concludes with these remarkable words; "*Ita omnes ecclesiasticas constitutiones, quas pro sanctis et salutaribus recipimus, in duo capita referre licet: alteræ enim ad ritus et ceremonias, alteræ ad disciplinam et pacem respiciunt. All ecclesiastical laws, which we esteem holy and useful, may be referred to these two heads; such as relate to rites and ceremonies, and such as relate to discipline and peace.*" Ibid. Numb. 28. & 29.

Can any one speak plainer to the sense of the Article than this? If ecclesiastical laws made about rites and ceremonies, may be holy and useful, then doubtless the Church has power to decree them.

In the next paragraph he answers the scruples of those whom he terms over timorous men, *nimis meticulosos*, who with the Flaccians in Germany, and our Brownists in England, rejected all Church laws about rites and ceremonies, as mere human inventions, because they were not particularly prescribed in the word of God. To these he answers, "that such laws are founded on the authority of Scripture, and so are both human and divine." Which he illustrates by the instance of kneeling at public prayer, which is the law of France and Geneva. "If it be asked," says he, "whether this be an human tradition, which any man may refuse or neglect at pleasure: I answer, it is so human, as also to be divine. It is of God, as it is part of that decency commended to us by the Apostle, 1 Cor. 14. 40. But it is of men, as it particularly points out and specifies what the Scripture only declared in general. By this one example we may make an estimate of all things of this kind. Forasmuch as Christ hath not only fully comprised, but also clearly expounded to us in His Holy Oracles, the whole sum of true righteousness, and all the parts of Divine worship, and whatever is necessary to salvation; in these things we are only to hear our Master. But in outward discipline and ceremonies, He would not particularly prescribe what we should do, because He foresaw that would depend upon the

different condition of times, and He did not judge one form agreeable to all ages: therefore in this case we must have recourse to those general rules He has left us, and thereby square those laws that are proper to be made for the preservation of order and decency in the Church."

This is a full answer upon true principles, to those who condemn all ceremonies as human inventions in the worship of God, that are not particularly commanded in Scripture. It were easy to add many other testimonies out of Calvin's Epistles, and Beza, Spanheim, Chamier, Amyrault, Rivet, Turretin, &c. but as some of these have been produced by others, so I need not heap up authorities in so plain a matter. I only add the advice which Calvin gave to Farel, and wish all who are concerned would follow it. "Use your endeavour, that the brethren may not pertinaciously contend about ceremonies: we are free from all men, yet let us be the servants of peace and concord. *Nos ab omnibus liberi, servi simus pacis et concordiae.*" They are words fit to be written in letters of gold, and would all men but follow the direction which is given, we should have no disputes about ceremonies in the Church. Vide Calvin. Ep. v. ad Farel. p. 5.

But alas, men have been so terrified with frightful arguments against ecclesiastical laws about rites and ceremonies, that they are scarce themselves when they think of them. They have been made to believe, that it is usurping dominion over their consciencies, a depriving them of their Christian liberty, adding to the Word of God, inventing new sacraments, and imposing other necessary terms of salvation upon them, more than what Christ appointed. Now though it might be sufficient to answer all this in general, by saying, that whatever force there is in any of these objections, it holds as well against the French Church as ours, whose doctrine I have shewn to be the same: yet because these arguments are popular, and gain by noise and terror, what they could not do by strength, I will consider them distinctly, and shew what answers are given to each of them in particular, by the best writers of the French Church.

## CHAP. IV.

*That to decree Rites and Ceremonies, is no usurping Dominion over Men's Consciences, or infringing their Christian Liberty.*

The ground of this objection is only the false notion men have entertained of the freedom of conscience and Christian liberty; which consists not in being set free from obedience to human laws and decrees, whether of Church or state, for we are obliged to obey for conscience sake, but it is an internal liberty of the mind, which cannot be bound to take any doctrine or law to be of absolute necessity to salvation, but only such as are imposed upon it expressly by God alone. For no king nor Church can make new articles of faith for us to believe, nor impose their laws with an opinion of absolute and immutable necessity, as if the things commanded were not indifferent in their own nature, but simply and universally necessary, so as no human power could alter them upon any occasion whatsoever: for so to tie up the conscience belongs only to God. But if our judgment be left free as to the nature of indifferent things, then it is no usurping dominion over our consciences, or infringing our Christian liberty, though we be restrained in the outward act, upon just reasons, by the laws of Church or state. For charity restrains our Christian liberty in some cases without infringing it, and so may the laws of just authority in others.

This is the resolution of Calvin,\* Rivet, and Spanheim, whose authorities are produced at large by Dr. Durel. I add that of Beza, in his epistle to the French Church in London; where he has these words of the same import. "Forasmuch

---

\* Calvin. Inst. lib. iv. c. 10. n. 31. Rivet. Synop. Pur. Theol. Disp. 35. n. 39. Spanheim, Thes. de Libert. Christ.

as the Spirit of God commands us to submit to every ordinance of man, as well the magistrate, who is the guardian of political order, as also those who preside and watch over our souls:—It follows, that he abuses his Christian liberty, who obeys not willingly either the magistrate, or those who are set over him in the Lord.” Beza, Ep. 24. p. 151.

Again p. 155. “The use of indifferent things may be restrained, either by a civil or ecclesiastical constitution. For though God only can properly bind the conscience, yet so far as either the magistrate, who is the minister of God, judges it convenient for the commonwealth, that something in its own nature lawful, should not be done; or the Church having respect to order, decency and edification, makes laws about indifferent things; such laws are carefully to be observed by the faithful; who are bound in conscience, not knowingly and wittingly with a rebellious mind, either to do what is prohibited, or omit what is commanded.

Beza did not think Church laws about rites and ceremonies were against men’s consciences, when he requires submission to them for conscience sake. So does also their late eminent professor at Geneva, Mr. Turretin, and his contractor Riissenius; saying, “that obedience is due to human laws, whether political, or ecclesiastical, and that for conscience sake.—Pastors have power to make canons and constitutions about indifferent things, which concern not faith and worship, but decency and order; such as time and place, and the forms and rules of prayer, and sermons, and administration of sacraments, and fastings,” &c. Riissen. Compend. Turretin, p. 228.

They all say, indeed, that such Canons do not directly and immediately oblige the conscience, as God’s laws do, by virtue of any intrinsic power of their own; but their obligatory power is from the command of God, who bids us obey them for conscience sake. But this distinction, as explained by them against the papists, though mistaken by some, does very much confirm what I have been asserting, that it is not against conscience and Christian liberty to obey the decrees of the Church, provided they be not thrust upon us as the unalterable commands of God, or prescribe in matters of faith

and substantial of God's worship, which they have no power to meddle with; but only indifferent things, and circumstantial of religion.

## CHAP. V.

*That to decree Rites and Ceremonies is not to add to the Word of God.*

This objection proceeds upon the same mistaken principle with the former; to wit, that the Scripture has prescribed not only the substantial, but also the circumstantial of religious worship, and that it is unlawful to use any rite or ceremony not expressly enjoined in Scripture. The absurdity of which principle is sufficiently exposed by learned men,\* who shew, that it is impossible to have any religious worship at all, if this principle should thoroughly prevail. All I am here to prove is, that it is no doctrine of the French Church to assert, that the decreeing rites and ceremonies is adding to the Word of God. They have often occasion to speak of this in their disputes with the papists, whom they urge with this argument against unwritten traditions; so that we cannot be at a loss to know their sense about it. Chamier has two or three whole chapters against Bellarmin and others upon this very point, that it is unlawful to add to the Word of God: but then he explains his meaning to be only in matters of faith and manners necessary to salvation. "If nothing be to be added to the Scripture, nor taken from it, then the Scripture perfectly contains all things necessary to salvation." Tom. 1. de Canone, lib. 8. c. 6. n. 1.

He does not say the Scripture contains all rites and ceremonies that are lawful to be used, and that to use any other, is to add to the Word of God: no, he expressly denies that

---

\* Dr. Sherlock's Defence of Dr. Stil. c. ii. p. 34. Dr. Whitby, Prot. Reconcil. part. 2.

to be any part of the controversy. Therefore when Hosius urged, that the reformed Churches were as much guilty of adding to the Word of God as the papists, because they had several new rites and customs not to be found in Scripture; "he charges him with ignorance of the thing in dispute, for turning the controversy from doctrines of faith, to points of discipline and ceremony, which Christians have always thought to be matters of free observation." Ibid. lib. 9. c. 11. n. 3.

He instances in the custom of singing the Psalms promiscuously, men and women together, and singing them in French rhymes. "They say," says he, "this is not to be found in Scripture. But what they infer from thence, that we add to the Word of God as much as they, is weak and foolish. As if this were to be reckoned among articles of faith, which ought to be always the same; and not among matters of decency and order, which may be changed according as the difference of place, times and persons requires. In all such matters as rites and ceremonies, St. Austin's counsel is best to be followed, which he gives in his 119th epistle, *una in his saluberrima regula tenenda est, &c.* There is one safe rule to be observed in these; that whatever things we see or know to be ordained in any Church, which are not contrary to faith nor good manners, and have any thing in them to excite us to good life, we should not only not condemn them, but commend and imitate them, if the weakness of some do not so far hinder, that it would be more harm than good to do it." Thus far Chamier in the same place, n. 5.

From whence it is plain, that the crime of adding to the Word of God is not committed by appointing new rites and ceremonies not commanded in Scripture; but in propounding new doctrines of faith and manners, which God has not commanded as things necessary to salvation. And the reason, which Chamier gives for this difference, is very sound and rational: because the one are precisely determined by God; the other not so, but left to the liberty and discretion of every Church, to determine as she sees occasion, by that general rule of the Apostle; "let all things be done decently and in order."

Dr. Rivet states the question about adding unwritten traditions to the Word of God, after the very same manner. "The question," says he, "is not about things pertaining to decency and order in ecclesiastical assemblies, the circumstances of which, we confess, are not found particularized in Scripture; but only general rules, out of which Church governors, whose duty it is to keep order in the Church, may with prayer to God, and consideration of circumstances, appoint what, and how far any thing is to be observed in the Church. Therefore he charges the papists with changing the state of the controversy, from matters of faith to matters of ceremony, when they object to protestants, that they add to the Word of God by their unwritten ceremonies, as much as papists do by their unwritten traditions in matters of faith. This he justly terms false argumentation. Rivet, Exercit. 13. in Gen. 2. p. 71.

To the same purpose Peter du Moulin in his answer to Pereron, of the novelty of popery, lib. i. c. li. p. 151. speaking of the pretended power and authority of the Church to add unto Scripture, says notwithstanding, "there be many things that concern ecclesiastical policy, and outward order, which we do not reject, although they be not in Scripture; provided there be nothing in them against good manners, and that they exceed not in number, and that they be not given as necessary to salvation, and equalled to the doctrine of faith contained in Scripture."

So again in his "Buckler of Faith," or defence of the French confession, against the exceptions of Arnoux the jesuit. Arnoux having said, that the 5th article of the confession rejected all observations and customs of the Church, under the notion of additions to the Word of God; he replies, that this was a misrepresentation of their belief: "it is false, that we reject all traditions; for besides that the Scripture itself is a tradition, there are many things which concern ecclesiastical policy, and exterior order, which are not specified in the Scripture. We only reject those traditions, which, if they were received, the consequence would be, that the Scripture contained not all doctrines necessary to salvation." Buckler of Faith, p. 42.

These allegations do sufficiently shew us the sense of the French Church, that by additions to the Word of God, they do not mean as our dissenters do, ecclesiastical laws or traditions about indifferent rites and ceremonies; but such traditions as obtrude upon men other doctrines of faith, and rules of life, as necessarily required by God in order to salvation.

I shall only add to these the testimony of le Blanc, a man famous for his candour and skill, in exact stating of the controversies betwixt protestants and papists. Now he tells us, it is the "sense of all their Divines, that a distinction is to be made betwixt those things, wherein the substance and body of Christian religion consists, and which are necessary by Divine institution, not only to form our faith, but our manners, and the polity of the Church; and those other things, which are but as it were the appendices to the substance and ornaments of the body; and which neither in their own nature nor by Divine institution, are necessary, but indifferent, and only received into use for the sake of order and decency: such as many parts of ecclesiastical discipline appointed by canon, and various rites and ceremonies, both universal and particular, which are matters of free observation; save only, that no one by his own private authority, may, or ought to contemn or reject them. All things of the former kind, we assert to be contained in Scripture; but not these latter, which are only accidental to the faith and manners, and discipline of the Church: for there are many things appertaining to the circumstances of Divine worship and ecclesiastical polity, which we confess are not delivered particularly in Scripture; but left to the prudence of Church-governors, under this general precept, that all things be done decently, and in order, in the Church of God. And therefore, he says, the doctors of the Romish Church labour in vain, to prove the reformed Churches as much guilty of adding to the Word of God as themselves; because they observe some rites and ceremonies in Divine worship and ecclesiastical polity, which are not particularly enjoined in Scripture; for the controversy is not

about these. Le Blanc. *Thes. de Scripturæ Plenitud.* part. 1. n. 6. and 7. p. 56.

## CHAP. VI.

*That the French Church does not reject Ceremonies, because they are significant, but likes them the better upon that Account.*

Some there are, who allow the Church power to decree rites and ceremonies, but except against the undue use and exercise of this power; by which they tell us, she presumes to go beyond her commission. 1. In appointing significant or symbolical ceremonies. 2, In making the observance of them necessary to communion and salvation. 3. In imposing them with scandal and offence to such as cannot comply with them, and thereby causing schism and division in the Church. Now, though these objections concern not the 20th article, which only challenges a legal power to the Church, to decree rites and ceremonies; yet because they are some of the most popular objections against ceremonies, now that we are upon this subject, I will here examine them, by the rules and principles commonly received in the French Church; and shew that the Church of England is neither so singular, nor so assuming, as some falsely represent her.

First, some accuse her for appointing significant ceremonies; which yet is really a commendation: and it would be a more real objection, if they were otherwise. For to what purpose should any Church appoint useless ceremonies, that signify nothing? But where is the harm, so long as they signify nothing but what is good and useful, and decent, and becoming the worship of God? Calvin would have liked them the better for this; for it is one of the conditions which he requires in lawful ceremonies, "that they be significant and expressive of our modesty and gravity in

religious actions; and that they be such rites as will conciliate a reverence for holy things, and be proper helps to excite us to piety." Which sure they cannot do, without signifying something.

He says further, "That the decency of a ceremony, consists in an aptitude to create veneration for sacred mysteries; so as it may prove, *Idoneum ad Pietatem Exercitium*, an exercise conducing to devotion; or at least, may be such a congruous ornament to the sacred action, as may have its use in admonishing the faithful with what modesty, religion, and reverence they ought to handle sacred things. Calvin, Inst. lib. iv. c. 10. n. 28, 29.

Now can all this be done by ceremonies that signify nothing? But he says further, "*Ut Pietatis Exercitia sint Ceremoniæ, ad Christum rectà nos deducant necesse est*; that ceremonies may be exercises or instruments of piety; they should be such as will lead us in the right way to Christ." But insignificant ceremonies can never do this: they must be significant, if they be instructive; and they must put men in mind of something that is good, if they be instruments of piety, and helps to devotion: for devotion is an internal act of the mind, and cannot be raised by outward ceremonies, any otherwise, than as they signify something that may move and effect us by its signification.

In another place he expressly approves such ceremonies as are symbolical. "Lest any one," says he, "should accuse me falsely, I would have all pious readers here bear me witness, that I do not contend about ceremonies, which serve only for decency and order; nor yet against such as are either symbols of or incitements to that reverence, which we owe to God. De Reform. Eccl. c. 16. p. 278. *Vel etiam Symbola sunt et Incitamenta ejus, quam Deo deferimus, Reverentiæ.*

Calvin then did not think it was to appoint new sacraments, if the church used any symbolical rites, which by their significaney might put men in mind of some Spiritual duty, and be outward signs to prompt men to inward devotion. If all such ceremonies were new sacraments, the French Church which followed Calvin's rules in this matter, would

have been as guilty of making new sacraments, as any other : for there are abundance of significant ceremonies in her Liturgy, and forms of Divine service. I will instance in some few.

Their Book of Discipline, cap. x. art. 1. requires "all persons to uncover their heads, and bow their knees, both at public and private prayers, in the church, and in the family for this reason ; to wit, that they may evidence by those external signs the inward humility of their hearts, and that homage which they pay to God." Are not these then significant rites, if they be external signs to evidence and signify men's humility and devotion ? They say, "The contrary customs argue great irreverence, and give suspicion of pride, and scandalize those that fear God, and therefore they reject them." Significaney, we see, is their reason still : for, as they appointed the one, because they signified reverence, and humility ; so they forbid the other, because they signified irreverence and pride, and were an hindrance to other men's devotion.

In the form of ordination described in the same book, cap. 1. art. 8. there are four significant ceremonies appointed. 1. The minister, that ordains, must pray standing upright below the pulpit. 2. He must lay his hands upon the head of the person to be ordained. 3. He, that is to be ordained, must kneel humbly on his knees. 4. When he is ordained, the ministers must give him the right hand of fellowship before the people. And this form is unanimously to be observed in all the churches of the kingdom.

They do not here tell us, as before, what those ceremonies signify, but the signification of each is so very natural and obvious, that there needs no comment to explain them. The minister, who ordains, prays standing, to signify, that he acts in the name of God, and by His authority. He lays his hands upon the head of the person to be ordained, to signify the conveyance of Spiritual blessing to him. The person to be ordained, kneels upon his knees to signify his humility. And when he is ordained, the ministers give him the right hand of fellowship, to signify that they now acknowledge him for a fellow-labourer and partner in the

work of the Lord. These are as significant ceremonies as any used in the Church of England; even as kneeling at the communion, or bowing at the name of Jesus, or signing with the sign of the cross in Baptism; and whatever may be objected against the one for their significancy, may be as well objected against the other. Yea, sitting itself is a significant ceremony; and some men, when they please, can make use of its significancy as an argument, to prove it to be the most convenient gesture at the communion; because it signifies our rest in Christ. So Didoelavins of old in his *Altare Damascenum*, “sitting is commended *per significationem mysterii*, for its signifying a mystery; to wit, our rest in Christ.” And the authors of the admonition to the Parliament, say, it betokens rest and full accomplishment of legal ceremonies in Christ. See these authors in Hamon L’Estrange *Allyane*. c. i. p. 29.

One would hardly have guessed at this signification, had not those ritualists expounded it to us: however, we are glad to find it has no worse signification in England; for in some countries it has a signification which is intolerable. The arians in Poland use it to signify their familiarity with Christ as their fellow creature. For which reason it is forbidden by four general Synods of Lithuania and Poland; to wit, the Synods of Sendomeir, Cracow, Peterkow, and Ulodislow, which may be seen in the *Consensus Polonus*, and the *Harmony of Confessions*. I have often thought, if there was no other reason why sitting should not be used, this one thing were enough to give any man a dislike to it, that it is no where used as a necessary posture, save only by these arians, who first pleaded the example of our Saviour. For though it be used in the Dutch Church (which, as Dr. Forbes has proved,\* is the only Protestant Church that uses sitting,) yet it is not used by them as any necessary posture, but as an indifferent rite and circumstance of the sacrament, which may be used or not used, as the Church thinks fit: for they condemn none that practise otherwise. And for the French Church, they are so far from

---

\* Forbes *Irenie*. lib. ii. c. 16.

thinking sitting necessary, that they absolutely forbid it, and enjoin a contrary posture; as I shall prove when I come to speak particularly to that point. At present I only observe, that the significancy of ceremonies is no just exception against them, unless they signify something that is evil; in which case they ought to be rejected, as the Polish Churches reject sitting at the communion table for the reason I have mentioned: but if they signify nothing but what is good, and are useful helps to stir up our minds to piety and devotion; then their significancy is their commendation; and he, that quarrels with them upon that account, must declare himself an adversary to Calvin and all the French Church. As Mr. B. in effect does, when he sets himself formally to prove in a whole chapter (cap. xii. of English Nonconf.) that the cross in baptism is made an human sacrament; 1. Because it is made an outward visible sign of grace. 2. Because it is an instituted means of conveying grace. 3. Because it is a covenanting sign. 4. And a symbol or badge of the order professed. The main of this is a false charge, but so much of it as is true, will equally hold against Calvin, and all the French Church. 1. It is false that it is made any visible sign of grace. 2. It is as false that it is made a covenanting dedicating sign to God; for it is only a declarative sign to man, or a token that the person baptized is received into the Church, and is obliged by virtue of his baptism, to live as a member of Christ. This being no more than what is common in all societies, to take in members by some solemn rite of admission, in token that they own themselves members of the society, as Dr. Stillingfleet well explains it. *Unreas. of Separ.* p. 350. 3dly, It is false that it is made an instrument or means of conveying grace to men, unless he could prove that the Church pretends to apply the merits of Christ by it, as she does by the other sacraments. But as to its being a professing sign, or badge or symbol of our profession, signifying our admission into the Church of a crucified Lord, and our resolution to continue stedfast in it; there is no more harm in that than any other ceremony which signifies our present state, and wills and intentions to abide in it. Stand-

ing up at the creed must be a new sacrament, as well as the sign of the cross, if this were a true rule of judging what were sacraments?

But Mr. B. will have it, that the cross is a sacrament, because the preface in the Common Prayer Book about ceremonies says, "The Church only retains such ceremonies as serve to a decent order, and Godly discipline, and such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and spiritual signification (so he reads it instead of *special* signification) whereby he may be edified." Hence he infers, "That the cross is a sacrament, because it signifies Christ crucified, with the benefits of his cross; and the grace of edification, by stirring up our dull minds by the moral causality of the cause, and binding us to constancy to Christ."

But then all significant and edifying ceremonies must be new sacraments, as well as the cross, especially if they be apt to stir up our dull minds to the remembrance of our duty to God, by any notable and special signification. And putting off the hat, and kneeling at prayers, which are ceremonies of the French Church, will be sacraments as well as any other. For I hope no one will deny but that they are special significations of our inward reverence and humility, and are apt to stir up our dull minds to the remembrance of those duties also. Then Calvin's rules will turn all ceremonies into sacraments, because he requires ceremonies to be incitements to that reverence which we owe to God, and to be exercises or instruments of piety, and lead us in the way to Christ; such as will create a reverence in our minds for holy things, and be proper helps to excite us to devotion, and admonish us with what modesty, religion and observance we ought to handle sacred actions. This, in the Church's language, is to stir up our dull minds by significant ceremonies; but, in Mr. B.'s style, it is to make new sacraments.

As if nothing could put us in mind of our duty, but presently it must commence a sacrament; when as there is scarce any thing in the world but may suggest to us some good thought in an ordinary way, and work upon us as

external objects do, or reasonable words and good admonitions; which yet it would be new Divinity to term sacraments, though perhaps some of them might bid fairer for the name than the sign of the cross, or any other significant ceremonies of the Church, upon which Mr. B. fastens the imputation. Nothing can be a sacrament, but what is instituted to convey supernatural grace in a supernatural way. Now let any man prove the Church appoints any ceremonies for this purpose, and I will own she deserves the charge of usurping God's authority: but if it cannot be shewn that she appoints them to signify, or by their significancy, to work any other than common and ordinary effects upon our minds, in an ordinary and natural way; such as external objects, and decent circumstances of action (which may be helps to devotion) commonly do work; then men do ill to wound and terrify the consciences of the simple, by making them believe so false a charge against the Church; which tends not only to the prejudice of truth and peace here, but to the scandal of all the Churches of the Reformation, and more particularly the Church of France, whose principles and practice I have shewn to be the same with those of the Church of England, and consequently as liable to the same accusation.

I have insisted a little the longer upon clearing and vindicating this point, because the charge that is brought against the Church is so very heavy, and urged with so much confidence by those that form it.

## CHAP. VII.

*That the French Church makes her Rites and Ceremonies as necessary as the Church of England does.*

The next charge against our Church is, that she uses an exorbitant power in making indifferent rites and ceremonies become necessary; which is to alter their nature, and make new terms of communion and everlasting salvation. To

which I answer, that the charge is false in every part of it: the Church neither alters the nature of indifferent things, nor makes them properly new terms of communion, or terms of salvation. First, she makes no alteration in the nature of indifferent things, but only restrains their use in the outward act, without laying any doctrinal necessity upon them, which is the only thing that can alter their nature. She does not say, they are absolutely necessary and immutable in their own nature, nor impose them as necessary for all times and places, nor oblige any other Church besides her own members, nor her own members to take them for particular commands of God which no man can alter; but all she requires is, conformity in the outward act, for the sake of peace and union, and decency and order. This declaration is made by the Church herself in the Preface of the Common Prayer Book, about ceremonies. "Those ceremonies which remain, were retained for a discipline and order, which upon just reasons may be altered and changed, and therefore are not to be esteemed equal with God's law. And in these our doings, we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe any thing but to our own people only. For we think it convenient, that every country should use ceremonies, as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory." This certainly is the true liberty of all Christian Churches, to appoint what indifferent ceremonies they think fit for their own members: but it is no part of Christian liberty, for the particular members of any Church, to contemn and slight the laws of their community, when made by the aforesaid rules, about indifferent things. For the things are still indifferent in their own nature, and yet they are bound to observe them. Nor is there any absurdity at all in this, to say, that things are still indifferent and free in their own nature, though a necessity of outward obedience be laid upon us, unless the wisdom of all Churches be deceived. Le Blanc speaks in the name of all the French Church, when he says, "That rites and ceremonies appointed by the Church, are *Observationes liberæ*, matters of free observation; yet so, as that no one, by his private authority, may, or ought to contemn, or reject them." They may be commanded then, and yet

remain indifferent and free, according to the true notion of indifferency, which he there gives: which is, "That all things are indifferent and free, which are not necessary either in their own nature, or by Divine institution." *Le Blanc Thes. de Script. Plenit. Par. i. n. 6, p. 56.*

Now the ceremonies of our Church are thus indifferent and free, even after they are appointed: for they are neither said to be necessary in their own nature, nor by Divine institution; but only necessary to be observed for order's sake. And when men have disputed never so long, this is the case of the French and all other Churches, that act and speak judiciously about indifferent things.

But the Church of England makes rites and ceremonies necessary terms of Church communion, and consequently necessary terms of everlasting salvation. Here I ask again, does the Church make any of her particular rites so necessary to be observed by any doctrinal necessity, as to say, except ye use these particular rites ye cannot be saved? Does she say, that if men be not signed with the cross in baptism, their baptism is not valid to make them members of Christ, and heirs of salvation? If they do not receive the eucharist kneeling, they cannot otherwise be partakers of Christ's body and blood? No; but she enjoins these ceremonies, and no one can ordinarily have the sacraments without them: and does that make them new terms of communion and salvation? If so, then the French Church, and all Churches in the world, yea dissenters themselves, are guilty of making new terms of communion. I will put a plain case, in which I think all Churches are concerned. Suppose any man desires to be admitted to baptism, or the communion, in any Church; is it not necessary for him to comply with the particular orders of that Church, as to the time when, and the place where, those sacraments are to be administered? He must go to a church, and not to a river or a pond, to be baptized; and he must meet the assembly in a church, and not in an upper room; in the morning precisely at a stated hour, if he will hold communion with them. Now, suppose any man should be so weak, or so perverse, as to refuse communicating with the Church, because she has

appointed this particular time and place for administering the sacraments, (which are confessed to be indifferent circumstances in themselves,) and say, Christ appointed no such terms of communion, but left all times and places indifferent; and therefore he could not communicate with them, unless they left him at liberty to do it where and when he pleased. Would this be a just charge against the Church, and prove her guilty of adding other necessary terms of communion, because she determines these particular circumstances of time and place, which are indifferent in their own nature? I suppose, none but a delirious, or a fanatical man will think so. And yet this is the charge brought against the Church of England, for determining some indifferent circumstances relating to the administration of the sacraments: a charge that recoils back upon the head of those that make it, and wounds all protestant Churches, and more particularly the French; as I shall have occasion more particularly to shew, when I come to treat of baptism, and the communion of the Lord's supper; where I shall make it appear, that they require several indifferent circumstances, rites, and ceremonies to be observed, and yet do not think themselves guilty of making new terms of communion. All I shall say further here, is only to note in general the true notion of making new terms of communion; the want of attending to which, seems to be the only ground of this objection. Now a Church is guilty of making new terms of communion, when she requires any thing as a necessary condition, which Christ has given her no authority to require. And this may be done, 1. By requiring the belief of some new article of faith. Or, 2. some sinful practice, as conditions of communion. Or, 3. by prescribing any rite as simply necessary in its own nature, which is indifferent, and condemning all others as sinful. For this indeed were to correct Christ's laws, and to alter the nature of indifferent things; which no Church has power to do. Nor, 4. may she impose her own ceremonies upon other Churches, and refuse to communicate with those that will not receive them. For all Churches are at liberty to prescribe rites for themselves; and if any Church undertakes

to prescribe to others, she goes beyond her commission, and makes new terms of communion. But the case is different, when a Church only prescribes rites and ceremonies for the members of her own communion; for then she does nothing but what Christ has given her authority to do; and therefore to determine of particular circumstances of time, place, habit, gesture, methods, forms, &c. for the sake of order and decency, and peace and union, cannot be making new terms of communion, because she has a general commission from Christ, to take care that all things be done decently and orderly, to the benefit and edification of the Church. Indeed, to speak properly, such determinations are so far from being new terms of communion, that, in strictness, they are no terms of communion at all; unless any one will call all orders and rules of church-government and discipline, terms of communion; the consequence of which will be, that all Churches in the world, even the objectors themselves, are guilty of making new terms of communion; because they determine many particular circumstances, such as time, place, gesture, &c. in administering the sacraments, which Christ has left undetermined. And is the Church of England only guilty, when all other Churches do the same?

If it be said, that the Church of England refuses to admit any to her communion, who will not comply with her orders: I answer, 1. That in all cases this is not true; for she admits many to her communion, which do not in all things comply with her orders. 2. In many cases, it is not the Church that refuses men her communion, but they that refuse themselves. For if men will not meet the Church at the time and place appointed for Divine service, they can have no communion with her; but that is not the Church's fault, but their own, who refuse to comply with her necessary orders; which she makes not terms of communion, but only rules of discipline, to preserve unity and avoid confusion in her religious assemblies. 3. In such cases, where the Church thinks it expedient to deny her communion to those, who refuse to obey her rules, as to those, who refuse to be signed with the cross in baptism, or receive the communion kneeling, or from a minister, who wears a surplice,

or reads common-prayer, and the like; either it must be said, that the Church has no power to make such rules; or if she has power to make them, she has power to see them kept and observed, by inflicting proper censures upon those that contemn them. And yet these rules are not, properly speaking, terms of communion. For as a judicious\* writer well observes, "There are two distinct reasons, why a Church may deny her communion to any person; either because they renounce the terms of her communion, or because they refuse to submit to her laws and rules of worship: and therefore it is a ridiculous thing to say, that a Church makes every thing a term of her communion, for the refusal of which she denies her communion to her own members. We may call these, if we please, the terms of her particular communion; but this is no greater fault for any Church to make such terms of communion, than to make laws for government and discipline; for such terms are nothing else. They are but the same terms which are required in the French Church, by many canons of her Book of Discipline and Synods; of which more hereafter in their proper place.

## CHAP VIII.

*That the French Church does not think the Imposition of an Uniform Observance of the same Rites and Ceremonies, to be the Cause of Schism; nor does she abrogate or dispense with her Laws, because some are offended at them.*

The last objection against the Church's privilege to appoint rites and ceremonies, is made by those, who are always haranguing about the mischief of impositions, which they say are the causes of schism and divisions in the Church; which might be cured, if either the present laws about cere-

---

\* Dr. Sherlock's Vind. of the Rights of Eccl. Author. p. 115.

monies were abrogated, or but so far dispensed with, as to leave all ceremonies indifferent in their use to all such as have any scruples against them. What truth there is in this argument, as it relates to the case of the Church of England, has been examined by others;\* who have shewn, 1. That some circumstances, indifferent in themselves, are necessary to be determined for the preservation of order in religious assemblies, such as time, place, &c. for there can be nothing but confusion without them. 2. Others are necessary to be determined upon the account of decency in God's worship; that no public scorn be put upon God, under pretence of public worship. 3. That to leave all the externals of religion at liberty, is so far from being the cure of divisions, that it would be a greater cause of them. 4. That the opinion of dissenters, that indifferent things are unlawful in the worship of God, is no just and necessary reason for parting with them; because religion can never be stript so naked, but there will remain some indifferent rites and usages, which some men or other will condemn or scruple, as the quakers do praying with their hats off, and appropriating Churches to Divine service, &c. 5. That it is of much greater consequence to common Christianity, to deliver men from such superstitious conceits, as the imagining indifferent things to be sinful, and to maintain true Gospel-liberty and freedom, than to receive such men into the Church, by indulging their superstition. 6. That though parting with two or three indifferent ceremonies, would be of no great consequence, in order to cure a schism; yet to part with the doctrine of the lawfulness of indifferent things, and throw away all ceremonies upon that principle, would be to corrupt the Gospel, and to enslave the consciences of Christians. For which reasons the Church is not obliged, nor can consent, to part with all indifferent things that any men think fit to scruple; though she has power to alter rites and ceremonies, as prudence, charity, and expediency shall direct her. Now all that I shall add to these considerations,

---

\* Dr. Sherlock's Defence of Dr. Stillingfl. c. ii. p. 44, &c.

is to shew that they go upon the very principles and practice of the French Church.

For first, she thinks it necessary to determine many indifferent circumstances and ceremonies in God's worship, partly for order's sake, to avoid confusion, and partly to preserve the decency and dignity of God's external worship, that men may not affront Him, under pretence of honouring Him. Upon this account, she gives many rules about praying, and preaching, and administering the sacraments, &c. That all men shall pray kneeling, and with their hats off; that baptism shall not be administered but in Church-assemblies: that the communion shall be received standing, and that the minister shall deliver it singly into every man's hand, and use a certain form of words at the distribution of it to every individual; with many the like prescriptions in her Liturgy and Canons; but especially her Book of Discipline, which contains above two hundred Canons, whereof no inconsiderable number are to regulate matters in Church assemblies, and the public exercise of Divine service.

2. She is so far from thinking that such impositions are the causes of schism and dissention, that she declares uniformity, and injunctions to bind men to it, to be the best preservers of union, and the surest way to avoid scandals and offences. As on the contrary, to leave the externals of religion to every man's liberty, is the way to create factions and divisions, tumults and disorders, and to bring innumerable scandals and inconveniences into the Church. Upon this account, as I have proved before, in the chapter about uniformity and subscription, she requires all her ministers to subscribe, and in some cases swear to observe all the rules prescribed in her Canons, Book of Discipline, and Liturgy; which sure is not to leave every man at liberty to practise as he pleases. I shall repeat none of these Canons here, save only two or three, which more expressly deliver her judgment and opinion about the usefulness of uniformity, and expediency of injunctions in order to preserve union.

The Synod of St. Maixant, 1609, cap. iii. art. 1. has this Canon. "It being represented, that the different courses

taken in divers provinces, about, the choice, examination, and ordination of ministers, brought with it a world of inconveniences, this Synod judged it exceeding needful to establish an express Canon, to be observed exactly, universally, and uniformly, by all the provinces."

So again, cap. vi. art. 14. "That hereafter there may be a general uniformity in the churches of this kingdom, in the administration of the Lord's supper, and all scruples by reason of difference and singularity arising in weak but honest hearts, incapable of distinguishing between the substance and circumstance of the sacred action, may be prevented; all pastors are enjoined to abstain from any new or private methods of their own." And that we may not think these private methods, which they condemn, were any other than such as only concerned the outward circumstances and rites of administration, the Canon goes on to tell us what they were; viz. such as these, "the reading the words of institution between the ordinary long prayer, and that appointed particularly for this sacrament, which ought to be read after: the uncovering the bread and wine, whilst they read the words of institution: the bringing the people up in companies unto the table, there to sit or stand; whereas they should make them come up one by one unto it: the suffering the people to give the cup one to another, it being contrary to the express letter of a Canon of our discipline, which ordereth pastors to deliver it.

These are plain evidences, that the French Church did not think it most advisable, to leave all men to their own private methods in celebrating Divine service, and administering the sacraments: they knew that if men were left to do as they would, they would have very different and singular ways; and that would raise scruples in the minds of weak people, and tempt them to think either that it was not the same action, or that one way was much better than another; the consequences of which must be doubtings and jealousies, if not sidings and factions, and following one teacher above another, with many such scandals and inconveniences that might attend it. To remedy all which, the

Church knew no better method, than to oblige all her ministers and people to a strict uniformity, that there might be no occasions of strife among them.

This was the ground of that famous oath, called the oath of union, which was drawn up in the Synod of Privas, 1612. and confirmed in the following Synods of Tonneins, Vitre, and Alez, and runs in this form. “ We knowing by experience, that nothing is more necessary to preserve the peace and welfare of the Church, than an holy union and concord, both in doctrine and discipline, and their dependencies, and that the Church cannot long subsist without it,—have, in the name of all our Churches, sworn and protested to remain inseparably united in that confession of faith, and keep inviolably that ecclesiastical discipline, which is established in the reformed Churches of this kingdom.”

That which I chiefly remark in this oath, is the reason given for imposing it; to wit, the preservation of union and concord in the Church; to maintain which, they did not think it sufficient that they were all agreed in the same confession of faith, unless they kept inviolably to the observation of the same discipline also; and therefore they entered upon a most strict oath to keep it uniformly, and see that all their Churches walked by the same rule in the public exercise of Divine service. I hope no one will say, this was to leave all indifferent circumstances, rites and ceremonies, to every man’s liberty, to use or not use at his pleasure.

3. If any particular Church or persons were aggrieved with these impositions, and desired to be freed from them, either by altering the laws that enjoined them, or relaxing their force, and leaving them to their liberty, their petitions were seldom granted; unless in some very weighty case, that obliged them to change a law, or grant a general dispensation. It was a rule made in the Synod of Tonneins, 1614. cap. viii. art. 8. “ That even national Synods should not innovate any thing in the confession of faith, catechism, liturgy, and discipline of the Church, unless the matter had been first proposed by one or more provinces, and unless

also it were a thing of very great importance." I shall have occasion hereafter to shew upon many particular heads, how often they refused to make alterations, or so much as tolerate practices contrary to their rules of discipline, though often importunately solicited to do it; not only by single persons, but sometimes whole Churches. Mr. Diodati desired to have a new translation of the Bible brought into the Church, but his petition was rejected in the Synod of Alanson. The Church of Montauban desired leave to continue an old custom that had been among them; which was for elders to deliver the cup to the people in the sacrament, but they could not be heard in the Synod of Alez, because it was contrary to a rule of their discipline, and therefore their pastors were peremptorily commanded to conform to the established order. The Churches of Nismes and Montpellier made fresh instances for the same privilege in the Synods of Alanson and Charenton, but they had no answer, save this, that they should conform themselves to the Canon of their discipline, on pain of being prosecuted with all ecclesiastical censures. And so in many the like cases.

4. If it be said, this rigour was not used toward men that scrupled or doubted, of the lawfulness of any part of their discipline, but only when they desired alterations or dispensations upon some other reasons; I answer, that is not true; for their Book of Discipline supposes and provides against many such cases, and gives directions what is to be done with men that dissent, and stir up contention, and break the Church's union about any point of doctrine, or of discipline, or about the form of catechising, or administration of the sacraments, or of public prayers, or the celebration of marriage. And the rules they give for satisfying dissenters in these cases, are first, "that the consistory of the place shall endeavour to remove their scruples with all meekness, from the Word of God: but in case they do not rest satisfied with that, then their arguments are to be heard before a Classis, after that before a provincial Synod, and last of all before a national Synod; unto which if they refuse to yield full obedience, and in express terms disclaim

their errors, they are to be cut off by excommunication from the body of the Church." Book of Discipl. c. v. art. 31.

It cannot be denied, but that this Canon speaks of dissenters, that have real scruples upon them, touching discipline and ceremonies: yet the method which the French Church orders to be taken with them, is not to accuse herself of unjust impositions, and comply with their errors by a needless alteration of her own laws, or such indulgences as would breed greater disturbances and confusion; but to admonish and instruct them soberly out of the Word of God, time after time, till they utterly refused to hear her voice: in which case she would have them no longer treated as sons, but cast out of her communion, as incorrigible offenders against the discipline of the Church.

They now who condemn the Church of England, for not complying with dissenters so far as to leave all things at liberty that any men scruple and think unlawful, and would have her reform by the example of the best reformed Churches, would do well to consider, whether the example they propound for her imitation, do not rather exceed her in rigour and stiffness, as they call it, and teach her a more severe discipline instead of condescension. It appears from what I have discoursed, that there is no other power challenged or exercised by the Church of England, in this whole matter relating to rites and ceremonies, but what is as fully exercised in the French Church; which is abundantly sufficient to justify, so far as I have undertaken to do, the twentieth Article of our Church, from the exceptions of Mr. B. and all others, who have raised causeless clamours against it. I will now proceed to consider what is said against the remaining Articles.

## CHAP. IX.

*An Answer to some Reflections made on the twenty-first, twenty-third and twenty-fifth Articles, by Mr. Baxter.*

THE twenty-first Article of our Church is so entirely levelled against the popish doctrines, relating to the calling and infallibility of general Councils, that one would wonder what any protestant writer could find to except against it. The words of the Article are, "General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining unto God.

Now Mr. B. says, "too many deny what is here said against gathering general Councils without the will of princes; and that Councils may err in things pertaining to God." But who are these good men that have such scruples upon them? Mr. B. names none, but leaves his reader to guess, who will easily imagine that he can mean no other but papists, since none but papists deny either part of this article. I should abuse my readers' patience, should I go about to prove, that the French writers are none of those who deny it: I shall only observe one thing; that by the same reason Mr. B. mentions this Article as excepted against by too many, he might have said the same of the next that follows, however he came to miss it. For the same persons that deny the twenty-first Article, deny also the twenty-second, which says, "the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as reliques, and also invocation of saints is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God." It must be owned, there are too many who deny this Article; but what then? Must the Church waive this Article too, in compliance with the scruples of those who deny it? No, Mr. B. himself does not think fit to say so. Then I think he ought not to have mentioned the twenty-first Arti-

ele upon that account; since the very same persons who defend the infallibility of general Councils, defend the doctrines of purgatory, pardons, image-worship, &c.

He says next, the twenty-third Article seems defective about calling ministers, to them that are for uninterrupted Canonical succession. He names none, but if he meant any true ministers of the Church of England, I dare say he was mistaken. For they who speak the most for uninterrupted succession never said this Article was defective, for they say uninterrupted succession is implied in the Article itself, which speaks of ordinary vocation in these terms: "Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." Now persons, who have public authority to call others, are such as have received that authority from others before, who had power to give it; and they again received that power from others so qualified before them; and so on, till the succession may be traced up even to the Apostles. And this is true in all ordinary and common vocations of ministers, which the Article speaks of. As for extraordinary cases, and cases of absolute necessity, I know no one that insists upon uninterrupted succession in them; for such cases come not within the compass of ordinary rules, which are only made for common and ordinary cases. The French Confession in the thirty-first Article, which speaks of the vocation of ministers, expressly puts in this caution: "We believe that it is not lawful for any man of his own authority to take upon himself the government of the Church, but that every one ought to be admitted thereunto by a lawful election, if it may possibly be done, and that the Lord do so permit it. Which exception we have expressly added, because that sometime, as it hath fallen out in our days, the state of the Church being interrupted, God hath raised up some persons in an extraordinary manner, for to repair the ruins of the decayed Church." I dispute not now whether this be true of Calvin and their first reformers, that they had such an extraordinary vocation

from God; that perhaps would admit of some debate: but the thing I hence observe, admits of none, *viz.* that they were wholly for uninterrupted succession, except in extraordinary eases.\* And that is sufficient to justify both the sense I have given the Article of our Church, which I say implies an uninterrupted succession, and also those whom Mr. B. wrongfully charges with believing the Article to be defective.

The twenty-fourth Article Mr. B. passes over, though I do not see why he might not as well have taken it in his way, and censured it among the rest; at least, with as good reason as he does the twenty-first. For though it be very true, “that it is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.” Yet there are too many who deny this; and that was Mr. B.’s good reason against the twenty-first Article which will hold every jot as well against this.

However the twenty-fifth Article could not escape him. He says, “some great churchmen think contrary to it, that confirmation is a Gospel sacrament.” He was too wise to name names, lest perhaps the persons might have justified themselves, and proved him a misrepresenter of their doctrine. But admit the charge were true, what is it to the Church, or her Articles? “Why then, he says, it is evident that many subscribers are great nonconformists, and if they speak their mind, are excommunicated *ipso facto.*” The inference from all which, if there be any sense or reason in what he said at first, must be, that they, who thus speak or write

---

\* *Note*, Calvin himself defends uninterrupted succession as much as any man, in ordinary cases; as appears from his letter to the King of Poland, p. 87. Optandum esset, ut valeret continua successio, ut functio ipsa quasi per manus traderetur.——Quia autem Papæ Tyrannide abrupta fuit vera ordinationis series, novo subsidio nunc opus est ad ecclesiæ instaurationem.——Omnino extraordinarium fuit hoc munus quod Dominus nobis injunxit, dum opera nostra ad colligendas ecclesias usus est. Qui ergo ita præter spem hominum insolito modo repente apparuerunt sinceræ pietatis vindices, eorum vocatio a communi regula æstimari non debet. See also his Letter to N. N. p. 214.

against the Articles, may be good men for all that, and it is very rigorous in the Church to excommunicate them for it. The pretended rigour of this excommunication will be considered in another place, when I come to speak of the Canons of the Church: here I only observe what a character Mr. B. gives many of these his good men, who have scruples against the Articles, when he stiles them subscribing nonconformists: the English of which is, either that they subscribe against their conscience, or at least make no conscience to write against their subscription: neither of which are very commendable qualities in any men, and least of all in men of repute and character for their goodness. But be their goodness what it will in other respects, the Church has no reason to alter her doctrine for their scruples, any more than is done in the Church of France, whose doctrine I have proved to be the same with our Articles in every point that any of these good men scruple. And so I have done with Mr. B.'s exceptions, which he professes to be made not in his own behalf, but in behalf of others.

## CHAP. X.

### *Of some other Objections against the Articles, made by other Dissenters.*

IN the year 1660, there was a book written by divers ministers of sundry counties in England, entituled, "Reasons, shewing the Necessity of Reformation of the Public Doctrine, Worship, Rites and Ceremonies, Church-Government and Discipline:" in which several other objections are advanced against the Articles, under the first head of reforming the public doctrine.

They object against the sixth Article, "that it is defective, because it enumerates not all the books of the New Testament, but only says, all the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and

account Canonical. And because in the same Article it is said, by Canonical Books we understand such, of whose authority there was never any doubt in the Church. Now, say they, it is well known, that there have been doubts in the Church, about the Epistle of James, the second of Peter, and several other books and passages in the New Testament. Therefore the article is defective in not enumerating all the books of the New Testament.

Now the question is, whether the Article do not as plainly signify what books of the New Testament are to be received as canonical, as if it had particularly enumerated them: since it says, all the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account canonical. Who is there so ignorant, as not to know what books of the New Testament are now commonly received in all the Churches of Europe, popish as well as protestant? Therefore there was no occasion to enumerate them, because there was no doubt made about them. "Yes, they say, there have been doubts in the Church about the Epistle of St. James, the second of Peter, and several other books and passages in the New Testament." But this is either a great mistake, or a great fallacy: for if they mean the Catholic Church, or the major part of it, it is a great mistake to say there ever were any such doubts in the Church: but if they mean particular men's opinions, then it is a fallacy put upon the reader, to call such doubts in the Church; for the Article denies not that some of these books were doubted of by particular persons, but the meaning is, that they were never generally doubted of in the Catholic Church. And therefore it was sufficient to say, we receive them as they are commonly received, and ever have been received, without any doubt in the Catholic Church.

If this were any real defect in the Article, or objection against it, the argument would be much stronger against the confessions of most of the reformed Churches, which neither enumerate the books of the Old Testament, nor the New, but only say, they receive the Canonical Scripture, or the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, as it is in the Saxon confession, art. 1. The Helvetic, art. 1. Scottish

art. 18. Bohemic, art. 1. and that of Wittenberg, art. 29. which uses the very expression of our Article, to declare what books of the Old Testament, as well as the New, are to be taken for Canonical Scripture, without enumerating either the one or the other. “ By the Holy Scripture we understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority there never was any doubt in the Church.

Yea, the French and Belgic confessions, which are the only confessions that particularly enumerate all the books both of the Old and New Testament, do not enumerate the several passages of the New Testament, of which some have doubted: such as the last chapter of St. Mark, the beginning of the 8th chapter of St. John, and that part of the 22d chapter of St. Luke, which relates the history of our Saviour’s bloody sweat. For though some particular persons doubted of these passages, yet the Church never did; and they are now commonly received for Canonical and authentic. Upon which account, the French Church had no need to specify these particular places, but only to say they received the Gospels of Mark, Luke, and John, as they ever were, and now are commonly received. And what justifies the Church of France justifies also the Church of England from this trifling objection.

## CHAP. XI.

### *Of the thirty-fifth Article, and the Homilies.*

ANOTHER of their attacks is upon the thirty-fifth Article “ which says the Book of Homilies contains a Godly and wholesome doctrine necessary for these times, and is therefore to be read in churches by the ministers diligently. Now by this means, they say, men must subscribe false doctrines or assertions, because there are some things false in the Homilies; and they instance in two particulars.

\*1. In the Homily of the time and place of prayer part. ii. p. 147. it is said, that plurality of wives was by special prerogative suffered to the Fathers of the Old Testament, not for satisfying their carnal and fleshly lusts, but to have many children, because every one of them hoped, and begged oft-times of God in their prayers, that that blessed seed which God promised should come into the world to break the serpent's head, might come and be born of his stock and kindred." Now this, they say, is false, because every one knew out of what tribe Christ was to issue.

To which I answer ; 1. That supposing this were a mistake in the homily, (as it is not, but only a mistake in the objectors,) yet it is not of that consequence, as to hinder the Book of Homilies from being a book that contains a Godly and wholesome doctrine, fit to be read in Churches : which is all that men subscribe and not as the objectors say that we subscribe to false doctrines, and false assertions : which is a false assertion in them. It is well known, that Clemens's Epistle, which has the story of the Phoenix in it, was anciently read in many Churches. So was also Hermes Pastor, and the Homilies of Ephraim Cyrus, and several other Fathers, which perhaps had as great mistakes in them. And what comes nearer to my purpose, Beza tells us, that Calvin's Homilies upon Job were read both publicly and privately with great benefit, in many parts of the French Church, where they supplied the place of pastors, when pastors were wanting. Beza Pref. Homil. Calvin in Job.

And Hottinger says the same of Bullinger's Decads of sermons, that in Holland and the rest of the Belgic Churches, they were ordered by public authority, from the beginning of the reformation, to be read in such places as wanted ministers to preach to them. Hotting. Hist. Eccl. sect. xvi. part iv. p. 960.

Now it is great odds, but that in two such large volumes

---

\* Note. That the words which the objectors alledge, are not in the Homily, of the "Time and Place of Prayer," but in the first part of the Homily, intituled, "An Information for them which take offence at certain Places of the Holy Scripture."

as Bullinger's Decads, and Calvin's Homilies upon Job, some nice critics, if they would set about it, might find as great faults as our objectors suppose this to be which they mention. But what then, must the Churches of France and Belgium be said to subscribe to the truth of every tittle contained in those two books, mistakes and all, because they think them to contain a Godly and wholesome doctrine, fit to be authorized publicly to be read in their congregations? No, certainly: Beza himself was not so great an admirer of Calvin, as to think that all his sermons and comments were without their failings. He expressly owns the contrary in one of his epistles, where yet he defends his catechism as free from faults, against the exceptions of one Adrian, a Dutchman. Beza, Ep. 4. p. 41.

And this were a sufficient answer to our objectors, supposing the passage in the homily they quote to be a real mistake.

2. But after all, the mistake is only in themselves, and not in the homily. For the homily does not speak of such fathers, as might know that the promised seed was to issue out of the tribe of Judah; but of Abraham and Jacob, who lived long before Judah was born, or the promise confined to that tribe; which was not till Jacob's death at least, who then first made mention of the Shiloh's coming out of the tribe of Judah. And this our objectors could not be ignorant of; but if they had dealt fairly with the homily and their readers, they had spoiled their own objection. For though the fathers of other tribes could not pray that the promised seed might come of their stock and kindred, after the promise was clearly understood to be confined to the tribe of Judah; yet Abraham and Jacob might pray for this, as doubtless they did; and that is all the homily asserts, as any one will be satisfied that consults it.

Their other objection is against a passage in the second part of the Homily of Alms, p. 160, where are these words: "The same lesson doth the Holy Ghost also teach, in sundry places of the Scripture;" saying, "Mercifulness and Alms-giving purgeth from all sins, and delivereth from death, and suffereth not the soul to come into darkness. A great con-

fidence may they have before the High God, that shew mercy and compassion to them that are afflicted." Now over against these words in the margin is cited Tobit, 4. Whence our objectors conclude that the homily stands chargeable with these two gross errors. 1. That the book of Tobit is to be taken for Holy Scripture. 2. That it was indited by the Holy Ghost.

To which I answer, First, That there is no necessity of either of these charges. For though Tobit be cited in the margin, yet the first text alleged is not to be found in Tobit, but in the canonical book of Proverbs, xvi. 6. "By mercy and truth iniquity is purged." And the next expression, "Mercifulness delivereth from death," may as well be ascribed to Solomon also. Prov. x. 2. and xi. 4, where he says, "Righteousness delivereth from death," that is, mercifulness, as the original signifies, and as it is sometimes translated.

Since therefore the principal part of these texts are to be found in the Canonical Scripture, it is reasonable to believe the homily refers to them in that expression, "The same lesson doth the Holy Ghost also teach in sundry places of the Scripture." And though Tobit and Ecclesiasticus be cited in the margin at the same time, that does not prove them to be Canonical Scripture, indited by the Holy Ghost.

But, secondly, suppose the homily had said this in express terms; yet the same candour and favourable construction, which is commonly allowed by all protestant writers to the primitive Fathers, will take off the seeming harshness and solecism of this expression. For though the Fathers had generally the same opinion of the canonical and apocryphal books that we have, yet many of them in their free and popular discourses cite the apocryphal books under the title of Holy Scripture, and canonical writings, inspired by the Holy Ghost. And yet we do not think fit to condemn them, or yield up their testimonies to the papists, but expound them to an allowable sense by a soft and favourable interpretation. Thus Chamier observes, that Athanasius, in his book *de Virginitate*, cites Ecclesiasticus, under the title of *θεϊα γευφη* *Divine Scripture*; and Hilary on the 135th

Psalm, calls the author of the Book of Wisdom by the name of Prophet, *Id docet Propheta*. Yet he will not allow that these Fathers believed these books to be strictly canonical and inspired writings, because the same Fathers elsewhere call them apocryphal. Therefore he says, "Though they cited them sometimes *cum præfatione honoris*, with such honourable titles, yet it does not follow that those books are canonical, though the Fathers alledge them under the name of Holy Scripture and the Holy Ghost, because they did not then stand to examine their authority to the quick." Chamier, tom. 1. de Canon. lib. iv. c. iv. n. 5.

And so Rivet in like manner apologizes for them against Baily the Jesuit. "We do not deny," says he, "that many of the ancients before St. Jerom's time, or thereabouts, did sometimes cite the controverted books as sacred and Divine Scriptures, and commended them as prophetic writings. Thus St. Ambrose calls the Book of Tobit, *Scriptura Prophetica*, Prophetical Scripture. Lib. de Tobia. c. 1. Clemens Alexandrinus calls Baruch, Divine Scripture. Pædag. l. ii. c. 3. And Theodoret, in his exposition of Baruch, does the same. Cyprian terms the History of Susannah, Divine. *Lib. de Lapsis*. And St. Ambrose does the like, *de Spiritu Sancto*. c. 7. Cyprian cites the Book of Wisdom by the title of Divine Scripture, *de Habitu Virg*. And Cyril of Alexandria follows him therein. Lib. 2. cont. Julian. Yet it does not hence follow that they believed these books to be strictly Canonical Scripture.—We answer as Bellarmine does about the Canons of the Councils and Popes, when he says, though they be distinguished from, and postponed to the Divine Scripture, yet they are and may be called, *suo modo*, in their way, sacred and canonical writing, as the 7th general Council calls the Decrees of Councils, Divinely inspired constitutions. And Pope Innocent III. cites a saying of St. Austin's, out of his 17th Homily, de Verbis Apostoli. under the title of Holy Scripture. So we say of these apocryphal books, that some of the Fathers call them at large, and after some sort, Sacred and Divine; when they speak not accurately, but popularly, and to such with whom they had no controversy about them. As we ourselves sometimes

cite them, to illustrate things contained in the Canonical Scripture. Nor do we deny, but that though these books cannot be esteemed truly canonical, yet they are of greater authority than any other uncanonical writings; to distinguish them from which, they are comparatively by some in a less accurate signification termed Sacred and Divine." Thus far Rivet in his answer to the Jesuit's objection. *Cathol. Orthod. Tract 1. q. xiii. n. 7.*

Now use but the same candour and distinction for this expression in the Homilies, as these learned Frenchmen do for the primitive Fathers, and our objector's argument will vanish into nothing. For at worst it is but an inaccurate expression in a popular discourse, and may be allowed as well as those sayings of the primitive Fathers; whom we do not presently damn as heterodox and absurd, but allow them the justice of a fair and reasonable interpretation.

Chamier makes the same apology for those Fathers, who say the translation of the Septuagint was made by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. *Tom. 1. lib. xiii. c. iv. n. 4.* "I answer," says he, "that all the faithful are inspired by the Holy Ghost, whenever they do any good thing. Whence they are said to be taught of God, and to have the Spirit of God dwelling in them. But there are different degrees of this inspiration, the highest of which is, when men are so moved, as to be immediately and extraordinarily illuminated, as the Prophets and Apostles were. After whom there is great diversity of Spiritual gifts; some receive more, some less of that infinite abundance, but none come up to those of the first rank, though all may be said to be moved by the Holy Ghost. As Gaudentius said of St. Ambrose, 'He will speak by the Holy Ghost, with which he is filled, and out of his belly will flow rivers of living water.'" In this lower sense he allows the authors of the Septuagint to be inspired; but then he says it does not follow that their translation was properly Divine and authentic. And those Fathers which said it was done by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, must be understood of this inferior and ordinary sort of inspiration.

The same we say of the authors of the Homilies, that

supposing they had quoted Tobit and Ecclesiasticus as inspired writings, they must of necessity be understood of this lower and ordinary kind of inspiration. In the same sense as Calvin says of himself, that he doubted not but that he had the assistance of God in writing his catechism. "*In quo scribendo Dominum mihi adfuisse confido.*" Ep. ad N. p. 263. And as the Synod of Tonneins told King James in their letter to him, "that they received with all reverence and submission his good and wholesome counsels, as flowing from the Holy Spirit of God." Synod of Tonneins, 1614, c. 19. p. 438.

I suppose no one will think, that either Calvin took himself to be inspired, or that the Frenchmen at Tonneins had such a veneration for king James, as to take his counsels for Divine oracles. Yet they might say truly that his counsels flowed from the Holy Spirit of God, in the common and ordinary way of Divine assistance; reserving it still as the peculiar privilege of Prophets and Apostles, to be extraordinarily and infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost.

## CHAP. XII.

*Of the Objections made against the sixteenth, twentieth, thirty-fourth, and thirty-seventh Articles, by the aforesaid Authors.*

The same authors express themselves much aggrieved at a declaration put forth by King Charles the First, and prefixed to the Book of Articles, wherein among other things it is ordered, "That no man shall either print or preach, to draw any article aside any way, nor put his own sense or comment upon it, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense of it. Now, by this means, they say, all ministers are deprived of the liberty of interpreting any one of the articles. So that whereas it is said in the sixteenth Article, not every deadly sin willingly committed after bap-

tism, is the sin against the Holy Ghost; no minister may dare to open the nature of deadly sin, nor say that all sins are deadly, contrary to the popish distinction of sins into mortal and venial; nor explain what is meant by falling from grace. So again, whereas it is said in the twentieth Article, the Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith; ministers may not enquire what is meant by the Church, whether the Church Catholic, or Church of England; nor what the Church of England is; what rites or ceremonies it may ordain; or how far her authority extends in controversies of faith. And if she happen to ordain ought contrary to God's word, or expound one place of Scripture repugnant to another, or enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation, that is beside the word, no man may question it: but we must assent and subscribe to it in the literal and grammatical sense of it, or be deprived of all ecclesiastical promotions."

"And whereas the 34th Article treats of the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, ordained by common authority, &c. we must not curiously enquire what is meant by traditions; whether the traditions of the Church of Rome, or any other Church; whether traditions be distinct from ceremonies, or the same with them; how a tradition may be said to be ordained; or what is meant by common authority." Thus far the objectors in their plea for reformation of doctrine, p. 3.

To which I answer, 1. That the literal and grammatical sense, is the sense in which all Churches commonly desire their Articles to be understood; and to understand them in any other sense, is either to force unnatural interpretations upon plain words, or make nonsense of them. It is a known controversy betwixt Protestants and Papists, concerning the literal and mystical sense of Scripture; where the question is not, whether the Scripture be ordinarily to be taken in a literal sense, and sometimes in a mystical: for in this both sides are agreed; as any one that pleases may satisfy himself, by consulting any of the following authors. Chamier, tom. 1. de sensu Scripturæ, lib. xv. c. 1. says, "*sensum*

*literalem et mysticum agnoscimus, We acknowledge both a mystical and literal sense in Scripture.*" So Whitaker, de Script. Interpr. q. v. c. 2. "We affirm there is one true, proper, genuine sense of Scripture, arising from the words rightly understood, which we call literal, &c." Rivet speaks often to the same purpose in his controversial writings. Rivet Isagog. in Scriptur. c. 14. It. Cathol. Orth. Tr. 1. Q. 7. n. 2.

Therefore the objectors were very weak to quarrel with the king's declaration, for ordering men to take the Articles in their literal and grammatical sense, which is the only sense, in which they can be rationally understood, by the unanimous judgment of all protestant writers.

2. Their several inferences from thence, are altogether as absurd; that therefore ministers may not explain those passages in the several articles they mention, because they must only take them in their literal and grammatical sense. They might as well have said, with the very same truth and modesty, that Protestant Churches forbid their ministers to explain any passage of Scripture, or write any comments upon it, because they say the Scripture is to be understood in its literal and grammatical sense; when yet that means no more than this, that words are to be taken in their true, proper, genuine sense, as they may reasonably be supposed to be taken by the author that makes use of them; which is so far from hindering any man from explaining them, that it is the most certain rule and guide to direct us how to explain them right, according to the true sense and meaning of the author. So much were our objectors mistaken, both in their premises and their conclusion.

Their objection against the 37th Article, is a very trifle. They cannot consent to read it as it is now printed, and to be taken in the literal sense, because it says, "the queen's majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, &c." For now they think it should be the king's majesty, since queen Elizabeth is dead.

But why did not such men's scruples lead them as well to complain of subscribing the Bible, and to require some alterations to be made in it? For there are many such ex-

pressions as this in the Scripture itself. Thus Gen. 35. 20. "That is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day," must not be taken in the literal sense; because, though it was in being when Moses wrote, yet now it is no where to be found. Gen. 47. 26. "Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day, that Pharaoh should have the fifth part of the land," &c. But if we take the words in the rigor our objectors do, neither Pharaoh nor the law are at this day in being: but they were when Moses wrote it. And so was queen Elizabeth, when the Article was made; and that is enough to justify the expression, as appears from those instances I have given out of Scripture, and a thousand others that might be produced of the like nature.

And yet if this had been an insuperable scruple with the objectors to hinder them from reading the Articles, or subscribing them, they might have found some copies for the ease of their consciences, where this alteration is made. For the editions, of Mr. Rogers's Exposition, read it, "the king's majesty hath the chief power," &c. though by what authority he made that alteration, I know not, nor shall I here stand to enquire.

### CHAP. XIII.

*That the 39 Articles are as complete as the French Confession.*

There is one objection more made by the same authors, which concerns the Articles in general; that is, "that they are defective, because there are sundry points of popery not condemned in them; and because they contain nothing of the creation, of providence, of the fall of man, of sin, of the punishment of sin, of God's covenants, of effectual calling, adoption, sanctification, faith, repentance, perseverance, the law of God, Christian liberty, and liberty of conscience, re-

ligious worship, the Sabbath or Lord's day, marriage and divorce, the communion of saints, Church-government and discipline, resurrection and the last judgment. All which the Scripture teacheth as necessary, as appears by the comprising most of them in the Apostles' Creed, &c."

But 1. Is it not a wonder to hear men contradict themselves so grossly in the very same paragraph? They own most of these points are comprised in the Apostles' Creed, and at the same time say our articles contain nothing of them; when yet the Articles expressly declare, that "the Apostles' Creed is thoroughly to be received and believed."

2. They are no more defective than the Articles of the French Confession are, which exceed them but one in number, and say as little upon many of those points, as our Articles do: and yet no French protestant ever accused them for being defective.

3. The French writers own our Articles to be a complete profession of the pure and sincere doctrine of the Gospel. That is the very character which Beza gives them in his Epistle Dedicatory to Queen Elizabeth, before his New Testament.

Mr. Le Moynes was so far from thinking them defective, that he says no confession can be contrived more wisely than the English is, and that the Articles of Faith were never collected with a more just and reasonable discretion. See his letter cited before in the beginning of this book, chap. 1.

If this be true, dissenters have no reason to quarrel with our Articles, upon one account or other. Mr. Baxter may complain, that they are redundant; and these gentlemen, that they are defective: but wise men will conclude, that they are both in the wrong, and that the Church has observed a decent moderation. A learned person\* has long ago proved, against these later objectors, that there

---

\* The author is said to be Bishop Pearson.

is no necessity of reforming the doctrine of our Church, in a discourse, entitled, "No necessity of reforming, &c." whither I refer the reader, who values learning and antiquity, for fuller satisfaction. I content myself with having shewn what I here proposed, that the doctrine of our Church, in all the controverted Articles, is exactly agreeable to the doctrine of the French Church; and that they, who object against, or separate from the one, upon the account of her doctrine, must by the same reason be obliged to withdraw their communion from the other also.

## BOOK III.

THE OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE LITURGY OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND CONSIDERED, AND AN-  
SWERED UPON THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES  
OF THE REFORMED CHURCH OF FRANCE.

## CHAP. I.

*That the French Church hath a Public Liturgy or Form of Prayers and Administration of Sacraments, which all Ministers are obliged to use in their daily Service.*

The French Liturgy is so often mentioned in many parts of their Book of Discipline and Canons, already cited in this discourse, that I think it needless to offer any further proofs, that they have an established Liturgy among them. But there is one thing which it will not be amiss to evidence and confirm a little further, which is, that they require all ministers to use it constantly, and in no wise to vary or deviate from it. Calvin gave this advice to the heads of the English reformation in king Edward's days, and we need not doubt but he took care to put it in practice in his own country. "As to what concerns a form of prayer and ecclesiastical rites," says he, "I highly approve of it, that there be a certain form, from which the ministers be not allowed to vary: that first, some provision may be made to help the simplicity and unskillfulness of some. Secondly, that the consent and harmony of the Churches, one with another, may appear. And lastly, that the capricious giddiness and levity of such as effect innovations, may be prevented. To which end I have shewn that a catechism will be very useful. Therefore there ought to be a stated catechism, a stated form of prayer and administration of the sacraments." Calvin Ep. ad Protector. Angl. p. 4169.

If we had no clearer light or evidence concerning the practice of the French Church in this matter, this were a

strong presumption what it must be, considering how great a hand Calvin had in its reformation. But we have most certain and undeniable evidences in the case. Their Book of Discipline in one canon determines the controversy beyond all dispute, cap. 5. art. 32. where it says, "If any pastor break the Church's union, or stir up contention about any point of doctrine, or discipline, or about the form of catechising, or administration of the sacraments, or of our common prayers and celebration of marriage, and conform not to the determination of the Classis, he shall then be suspended from his office, and be further prosecuted by the provincial or national Synod." Here we see conformity to the Liturgy and all its parts, as well as to the confession of faith and discipline, is made necessary to the Church's union. And this is demonstrable of every particular office contained in it.

First, for their ordinary public prayers, they covenant, as much as we do, to use their prescribed form and no other. Nor do they ever pretend to deviate from this rule in their ordinary service, but only allow of extraordinary prayers in some cases, and upon some particular occasions, such as the minister's prayer before sermon, and prayers composed for solemn fasts and thanksgivings. He that pleases may see this fully proved by that learned Frenchman Ludovicus Capellus, in a long discourse about set forms of prayer, where he shews that their Liturgy is not a mere directory, but a precise form, to be used in all the offices it appoints, by all the ministers of the kingdom; and he answers all objections brought against it. *Thes. Salmur. Par. 3. Disp. 37.*

So that Mr. B's three arguments against the subscription required of ministers in the 36th canon, which is, that they will use in public prayer the forms prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer and no other, are altogether as strong against the French Church. 1. First he says, "the bishops themselves by the king's order, do upon special occasions of fasts and thanksgivings, prescribe, impose and use other forms: and we must not covenant to disobey them. 2. The

public ministers have and do in the pulpits before sermons use other forms; and so break this covenant themselves. 3. It belongs to the office of a pastor to word his own prayers, as well as his own sermons: and it is sinful to renounce so much of the work of the office, which we are vowed and ordained to." Engl. Nonconf. cap. viii. p. 43.

Then first, I say the French Church is guilty of perjury, and breach of vow also: for they use particular forms prescribed upon special occasions of fasts and thanksgivings, besides their ordinary form of prayer. Calvin here will be our witness, who tells us in one of his epistles, "That in the year 1541. when Germany was infested both with war and pestilence, he prevailed with the magistrates of Geneva to appoint a solemn day of extraordinary supplications for them, and that he himself composed the prayers that were to be used on that occasion. *Precaationes, quibus in iis uterentur, conscripsi.*" Calvin, Ep. p. 263. And there is such a form now annexed to his liturgy. Tom, 8, p. 31.

The French Canons often mention such solemn days of fasting and extraordinary supplications, in which they used some new prayers besides their ordinary service. And yet they never thought themselves guilty of perjury or breach of covenant, because these were cases, which in the covenant itself were presumed to be excepted.

2. They use other forms of prayer in the pulpit before their sermons, as the ministers in England do. Dr. Bernard, who put forth the book, called "Bishop Usher's Judgment," &c. p. 315. says, both the Dutch and French Churches are so strict in this matter, as to keep always to the same form. The Geneva Liturgy allows every minister to choose what form he thinks most convenient for his purpose. *Precaationis Formulam ad id aptam Minister sibi pro arbitrio deligit.* Calvin Formul. Prec. Eccl. T. 8. p. 29.

Thus the Synod of St. Maixant allows the minister, that ordains another, to use a prayer of his own composing, till he comes to the prayer of consecration, and then he must use the form which they prescribe, and no other. See this cited a little after in this same chapter.

Any one, that will turn over any volume of Calvin's ser-

mons, will find at the end of every homily a short prayer of his own, about the length of one of our collects, suited to the matter or subject of his discourse, which he constantly used besides the long prayer prescribed in the Liturgy to be used after sermon.

3. The French Church did not think it belonged so absolutely to the office of a pastor, to word his own prayers; no, nor yet his own sermons, as Mr. B. says it does, who therein condemns himself; that in 1661. presented a new liturgy to the bishops, which words the pastors' prayers for them, as much as the old liturgy does. And I cannot think whom Mr. B. intended to serve by making this objection, unless those, who reject the use of all set forms in general, as simply unlawful. For if it belong to the office of a minister to word his own prayers, then he sins in using a set form: and if so, all protestant ministers are to blame, both in the French and all other protestant Churches; for they do not always word their own prayers, but use the forms that are prescribed for them. But then they do not contradict and condemn themselves, and say with Mr. B. that it belongs to the office of a pastor to word his own prayers, but think that in most cases, it is better the church by common consent should word them for him; and in some cases, it is more advisable to word men's sermons for them too, where pastors are weak and ignorant as many were in England, France, Holland, &c. in the beginning of the reformation, for the assistance of whom, Calvin's Sermons, and Bullinger's Decads, and our Book of Homilies, were allowed to be read in churches. But of this I have spoken before. I now proceed with the business of set forms in other offices.

Conformity to the rubrick and canons, which appoint the form of administering the holy communion, is strictly required by the Synod of St. Maixant, under pain of ecclesiastical censure; cap. 6. art. 14. "That hereafter there may be a general uniformity in the Churches of this kingdom, in the administration of the Lord's Supper,—all pastors are enjoined to abstain from any new or private methods of their own; as of reading the words of institution between the ordinary long prayer, and that appointed particularly for this sacrament, &c." Then after several other rites men-

tioned and enjoined, they conclude with this sanction: "Classes and Synods shall have their eyes over those, who act contrary to this order, and reduce them to their duty by all befitting censures."

Here we have express mention, not only of a form of prayer to be used, but in what order, and with what rites and ceremonies the whole administration is to be performed; of which I shall speak more fully, when I come to consider the particular objections that are made against our office for celebrating the holy communion. At present it is sufficient to have observed, how this Synod enjoins the use of a set form in administering the communion as strictly as any rule, canon, or rubrick in the Church of England.

I observe the same exactness required in keeping close to the rule and form appointed for the administration of the other sacrament of baptism. Of which I will only give this one instance out of a canon of the Synod of Vitre, 1583. cap. ii. art. 8. The question being proposed, "Whether the usual form of prayer should be recited at the baptism of infants born out of matrimony, or in adultery, or incest, because there are in it those words, 'Begotten of Father and Mother whom thou hast called into thy Church?' The Synod judged, that there should be no dispute made about it, for reasons which they there assign." Whence I infer, that if they would not suffer any variation to be made in the usual form of baptism, in so extraordinary and singular a case, much less would they allow it to any upon common and ordinary occasions.

And as they strictly keep to their form in the baptism of infants, so do they likewise in the baptism of adult persons.

The 3d Synod of Charenton, 1645. composed a particular form for the baptism of persons, converted from paganism, judaism, mahometanism, and anabaptism, which is inserted into the acts of that Synod. cap. 9. where there is a long prayer, and particular interrogatories and answers for each person, containing a renunciation of his former errors, &c. "Which form by order of that Synod is enjoined to be used particularly on those occasions, whenever God shall be pleased to make any additions to His Church, of such converts." Synodie. T. 2. p. 447.

Next for the form and manner of catechising, they enjoin the use of Calvin's Catechism, and allow not the least variation from it. Some motions were made once, and again in the Synods of Montauban and Saumur, whether Calvin's Catechism should not be changed. "But it was decreed, that it should be retained, without the least alteration made therein, nor should ministers be suffered to expound any other." Synod of Montauban, 1594. cap. iv. art. 4. Saumur, 1596. cap. iv. art. 2.

The Synod of Gap. 1603. renewed the same injunction, and added this further Canon about the manner of expounding it. "That whereas some chose a particular text, and accommodated it to that particular section of the catechism they would treat of, they were required not to alter the established order, but to conform as others did unto it." Cap. iii. art. 5.

And in the Synod of Loudun, 1659. cap. viii. art. 2. it was ordered, "that in those churches which have two sermons on the Lord's day, the second sermon should be turned into an exposition of the catechism, by way of common-place." So nice were they in prescribing not only the form and words of a catechism, but the very manner also in which it should be expounded.

They are as strict in observing a precise rule and form in ordination of ministers. The Synod of St. Maixant leaves the pastors at liberty to conceive a prayer of their own before the consecration, but when they come to that, they must insert these or the like words: "we beseech thee, O God, to enrich and furnish this thy servant, duly chosen according to the order established in this thy Church, with the gifts and graces of thy Holy Spirit, &c. whom we do now dedicate and consecrate by this our prayer unto the office of a Gospel-minister. And at these words the pastor praying shall stand up, and lay his hand on the head of the ordained minister, who shall kneel before him at the foot of the pulpit. And prayer being ended, and the new pastor risen up, the minister shall give him the right hand of fellowship, in the presence of all the people. And this Canon and form shall be unanimously observed in all the provinces of the kingdom." Synod of St. Maixant. cap. iii. art. 4.

Here we have not only a form of words, but the very ceremonies enjoined, to be used both at and after consecration. And that none might vary from them, it is ordered, that this Canon should be inserted into the Book of Discipline, where now it stands, cap. i. art 8. and all swear to observe it.

Next for their office of matrimony, they are very precise in prescribing rules about it; some of which I will here transcribe out of their book of discipline, which has a whole chapter consisting of thirty-two canons, relating to it.

The 23d Canon requires "all marriages to be publicly solemnized in the religious assemblies of the faithful, according to the Word of God, and by the ministry of the pastors, and not of any others." Which is also a canon of the Synod of Montauban, 1594. cap. iii. art. 19.

The 24th Canon says, "no marriage shall be solemnized on those days in which the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is administered. And this canon shall not be broken but upon very great considerations, to be allowed by the consistory. Nor shall any marriage be celebrated on days of public prayer and fasting."

The Synod of Loudun, 1659, cap. x. art. 5. prescribes canonical hours also. "No ministers shall marry any persons in their churches, excepting at the hours accustomed for such solemnities." And there every provincial Synod is impowered to make canons about the times and places of celebrating marriages.

The Synod of Vertuele, 1567. cap. x. art. 6. orders, "that no marriage shall be celebrated on any week-day, except there be a sermon, nor upon the Lord's day, except at nine o'clock in the morning; when the parties are to come before sermon, or else to be turned away unmarried."

The 15th Canon of the Book of Discipline, requires "all marriages to be propounded first to the consistory, with a sufficient certificate of the promises."

The 19th Canon says, "the Churches shall not suffer any persons to be married, without an ample knowledge and approbation of them."

The 21st. "If one of the parties, who would marry, be excommunicated, the marriage shall not be permitted in any

of our churches, unless the party have done penance for his offences."

The 16th requires "the banns of marriage to be published in those places where the parties dwell: and if they have a mind to celebrate their marriage elsewhere, they shall carry with them a sufficient certificate, that the banns have been thrice published."

The 17th Canon says, "the banns shall be published on three Sabbath days following, in those places where the Word of God is preached, and in other places when common prayers are read"

Now these rules are in a great measure the same that are prescribed in our Church, or at least justify our Canons and rubricks, in restraining marriage to certain times and places, and canonical hours, and the benediction of a lawful minister, and the use of banns, certificates, &c.

And the very office of marriage is prescribed in their Liturgy, to be with certain prayers and benedictions, and gift of body also; which is the same with that expression in our office, which some have so much scrupled, "with my body I thee worship." The ring indeed is not used, as it is with us and some other protestant Churches: but now Mr. B. says, that good old objection is laid aside; for the commissioners at Sion College in 1661. had nothing to say against it, Engl. Nonconf. cap. ii. So that I need not look further how to justify it from the rules or practice of the French Church.

There is one form more prescribed in the French Church, which is not in ours,\* but left to the discretion of the bishop, which is the form of excommunication, décreed by the Synod of Alez. 1620. and by the following Synod at Charenton, incorporated with the Canons of Church discipline, cap. v. art. 17. whereby it was made a common form, which the ministers were obliged upon oath to use in all the churches of the kingdom.

---

\* There was anciently a form of excommunication appointed in our Church as I find in the canons made in the Synod under Archbishop Parker, 1571. entitled, *Articuli de sacro ministerio et procuratione Ecclesiarum*; at the end of which is annexed a form of the sentence of excommunication. Vid. Sparrow. Collect. p. 242.

As to a funeral office, it is true they have none prescribed: but then I observe they are not at liberty to use what they please, but under an express prohibition and injunction to use none at all: for their Canons expressly forbid it. "At funerals there shall be neither prayers, nor sermons, nor any dole of public alms; that so all superstitions, and other inconveniences may be avoided," says their book of discipline. cap. x. art. 5. And the same decree occurs in the Synods of Orleans, 1562. Figeac, 1579. Montauban, 1594. and Saumur, 1596. In the last of which a motion was made, "by the deputy of Normandy, to alter this, and permit exhortations to be made at the interring of the dead. But the Synod decreed, that there should be nothing innovated in that article." Synod of Saumur, 1596. cap. 3.

So that here they were as much obliged to negative conformity in this point, as they were to positive conformity in the rest. They might neither pray with, nor without a form, at a funeral, nor so much as make a funeral sermon to the people.

Upon the whole, it appears that every thing among them was to be done by rule and order: where they had forms prescribed, they were obliged to observe them; where any thing was to be done and no form prescribed, then they were at liberty, as we are, to make a form for themselves; but where any thing was forbidden, as prayers and sermons at funerals, there they presumed not to speak a word in public, with or without a form, being upon oath to follow their rules of discipline throughout the kingdom. And I can see no difference betwixt the French Church and ours in this whole matter, save only that they were commonly more strict in exacting conformity to their orders and prescriptions.

I have hitherto considered the general agreement of the two Churches on this point, in that both of them have an established Liturgy, to which all ministers in their practice are obliged to conform: but that is not sufficient to vindicate the English Liturgy, unless we take off the particular exceptions that are made against it. Therefore I shall in the next place examine what opinion the French Church has always had of our Liturgy and Communion in particular, and shew

that the chief objections made against it by dissenters, may be answered upon the principles and practice of the French Church.

## CHAP. II.

*That the French Church allows of Communion with the Church of England, and condemns those, that separate from it upon the Account of her Liturgy or Public Service.*

If we examine the sentiments of the French Church from the beginning of the reformation to this time, we shall always find, that they allowed it lawful to communicate with the Church of England in her Liturgy, and condemned separation from it as criminal schism. When the discontented exiles at Frankford, Knox, Whittingham, &c. wrote to Calvin, giving him an account of the English Liturgy, he sent them this pacifying answer; "that in the Liturgy, as they described it to him, he found some *tolerabiles ineptias*, things not so fitly ordained as were to be wished, yet such as might be borne with for a season, forasmuch as no manifest impiety was contained in them. And therefore he advised them not to be over-rigid in their disputes about them." Calv. Ep. 200. ad Anglos Frankford. p. 98.

Now as Mr. Sprint in his *Cassander Anglicus* long ago observed, this answer was made to that description which Knox and Whittingham gave him of the English Liturgy, which probably was none of the fairest representations: yet he so far justified it, as to say there was nothing impious or intolerable in it, that might justify a separation. He is so free indeed as to say, there were some remains of popish dregs in it; yet he would not have them divide communion upon it, but wait for a further reformation.

Beza was of the same mind, when he wrote to the discontented brethren in England, conjuring them by all that is good and sacred, not to forsake the communion of the Church for such indifferent rites and ceremonies, as were then imposed upon them. I have produced the passage at large

before, out of his 12th epistle, and therefore need not here repeat it. See Book I. c. 5.

But I will add what he wrote to Bishop Grindal, upon occasion of the first separation that was begun in England by those that disliked the Liturgy: "*Non sine acerbissimo dolore intelleximus, usque eo vexari Ecclesias, ut nonnulli jam seorsim suos cœtus habeant.* It is not without most bitter sorrow of heart that I understand your Churches are so far disturbed, as that some begin to hold separate meetings among you, &c. Ep. 23. ad Grindal."

No one doubtless would have used such passionate expressions against separate meetings to an English bishop, who thought communion with the Church in her Liturgy unlawful, and that it was necessary to make a separation from her.

But we have a greater testimony from the mouth of Beza. It was in the year 1564 some years after the reformation was completed by Queen Elizabeth, that Beza dedicated his New Testament to her; where, in the epistle dedicatory he tells her, "*That England owed to her, verum Dei cultum, nunc tandem a sordidissimis illis antichristianismi sordibus repurgatum;* the true worship of God now at length purged from the sordid dregs of antichristianism. Which thing did deservedly set her above all kings in the world: for some kings could not reform as they would; others were utter enemies to all reformation; and those few, that did reform, did it in such a manner, as to leave religion still deformed with many failings, especially in point of ecclesiastical discipline. Some condemned idolatry, but did not cast out the idols; others cast out the popish mass, only to introduce another of their own. All unanimously agreed in rejecting transubstantiation, but yet many endeavoured to establish as fond doctrines in its room. But you, O Queen," says he, "and your people by your means, enjoy what perhaps no other kingdom does, the complete profession of the pure and sincere doctrine of the Gospel. To which, if you add (what all good men hope for, and the most faithful bishops of your kingdoms have long ago desired) the full restoration of ecclesiastical discipline also; in truth I do

not see what England can desire more of you, or your majesty can confer more upon it."

Here are none of those home-bred charges of superstition, idolatry, antichristianism, popery, brought against the Liturgy; but it is owned to be the pure worship of God, purged from the filth and dregs of antichristianism. Our doctrine also, contained in the Articles, is commended as a complete system of the pure and sincere doctrine of the Gospel, free from those errors and defects, which may be found in some other Churches. And for discipline, it is not so defective as to make the Church deformed, as he says some others are for want of it; only he wishes it were more completely and fully restored, which is the Church's own wish in the office of commination. Now either Beza strained a point to compliment the Queen, or else he highly justifies the Church of England: for I cannot see what any of her own sons, that had studied for it, could have said more in her commendation.

If from these we descend to authors of later days, who had better opportunities to acquaint themselves with the knowledge of the English Liturgy than the former, we shall find as ample testimonies given of it, as of the English Church.

Isaac Casauban, a man inferior to none in learning and knowledge of ecclesiastical antiquity, gives this character of the Church of England, as it stood reformed by Queen Elizabeth and King James, that no Church in the world came nearer to the form of the most flourishing primitive Church; having observed a middle way betwixt the two extremes of such others, as failed either by excess or defect, by which moderation she obtained this privilege, that even those, who envied her happiness, were constrained to extol her in comparison of other Churches." *Præf. Exercit. in Baron.* See also his answer to Card. Perron, cited by Bishop Morton of Episcopacy, p. 4.

About the same time Dr. Rivet, being then scribe of the National Synod of Tonneins, wrote in the name of the whole Synod, a letter full of high respect to King James, in which they not only give him in particular the title of the

bright-shining star in the heaven of God's Church, with some other elogiums of the like nature, but also tell him it was their most earnest desire to maintain a good correspondence with the Churches of his kingdoms." Which had been altogether false and ridiculous, had they believed the Liturgy or the Communion of the English Church unlawful. See this letter in the acts of the Synod, cap. xix. p. 438.

Ludovicus le Blanc, a man of accurate judgment, and one who had viewed the English Liturgy, having occasion to cite it, though but upon a particular account, yet gives it such a character, as shews he had a general liking of it and did not think any part of it, superstitious or unlawful. Otherwise he would scarce have alleged it with so honourable a title, as "*Celebris illa Liturgia Anglicana*, the famed English Liturgy," and much less have used its authority to pay some respect to the Apocryphal Books, (as I shall shew hereafter that he does) had he believed it so mean or imperfect a work, as some would make it. Vid. le Blanc. Thes. de Script. Canon. et Apochr. p. 175.

I do not here add the testimonies of those three late eminent divines, Mr. de l'Angle, Mr. le Moyne, and Mr. le Claude, because their whole letters on this subject may be seen at the end of Bishop Stillingfleet's "Unreasonableness of Separation." And many others I omit, which have been already produced by Mr. Durel; only I will crave leave to repeat one testimony cited by him out of Ludovicus Capellus, divinity professor at Saumur; who, in his discourse about Liturgies among the *Theses Salmurienses*, gives this testimony to the Liturgy of the Church of England, among the rest that were compiled by the first reformers in every nation. "At the Reformation," says he, "the Liturgy, or service of the Church was purged from all popish superstition and idolatry, and all such ceremonies as were either too burthensome, or of no use towards edification. And then set forms of Liturgy were composed and prescribed, by the several authors of the reformation, in the countries where they lived; as in Germany, France, England, Scotland, Belgium, &c. varying as little as might be

from the ancient forms of the primitive Church. And these set forms have hitherto been happily used with profit and advantage, by the reformed Churches in every nation; till at last, of very late, there arose in England a sort of morose and froward, nice and scrupulous, not to say superstitious men, who upon very slight and slender reasons have thought fit not only to disparage, but abrogate the Liturgy hitherto used in the Church, (together with the whole hierarchy of bishops) and instead of the Liturgy, have substituted the Directory (as they call it) in its room; which contains no certain form in express words, but only the heads of such things as either in prayers, or administration of the Sacraments, or the use of other rites and ceremonies, are to be said, done, asked of God, or propounded to the people; meanwhile leaving it to the liberty of every pastor to express himself in what words he pleases. To which some other furious and mad men have added; that it is unlawful to use any prescribed form of prayers, either in public or in private, and that a Godly man cannot with a safe conscience be present at them. *Thes. Salmur. part. 3. Disp. 47 de Liturgia, p. 658.*

This he calls matter of fact; after which he proceeds to dispute *de Jure*, concerning the lawfulness and necessity of set forms in all the parts of divine service, and answers all the common pleas that are made against such impositions and injunctions; which I leave the reader to consult at his leisure, and go on to consider the exceptions that are made against our Liturgy in particular, beginning with the business of assent and consent, which some make the ground of all their scruples.

## CHAP. III.

*That the French Church requires Assent and Consent to her Liturgy, &c. as strictly as the Church of England.*

To make this appear, it will be necessary to shew first what the Church of England means by assent and consent: for the straining of this too high, and putting too rigid a sense upon it, seems to minister the chief occasion of objections against it. Now it is to be observed, that assent and consent are words of the very same importance, as Dr. Falkner proves from many instances in our statute-law, and mean no more, when applied to things to be practiced, ordered, or used, save only an allowance that they may lawfully be used or practiced. Thus we give our unfeigned assent and consent, to all and every thing contained and prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, &c. that is, that we allow it to be a book that has nothing contrary to God's holy ordinances in it; but is such as may lawfully and piously be used in all the offices prescribed therein, and that as such we ourselves will use it to the edification of his Church. In the same manner we give our assent and consent to the Book of Homilies, that (as the 35th Article expresses it) they contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, necessary for these times, and fit to be read in churches by the ministers, that the people may understand them." Now supposing there should be in any of these some lesser mistakes or errors of small moment; such as a wrong quotation of an author, a weak consequence in argumentation, a misapplication of a text of Scripture, or a doubtful interpretation of any, or a parochonism in point of history, or the like: these are errors indeed, which in strictness no man can assent to as truths, (if that were the precise meaning of assenting:) but he may give his unfeigned assent and consent to the use of those books, notwithstanding any such errors contained in them. For they are not of that moment, as to make the books unlawful or unfit to be used, as containing any false

doctrine, destructive of faith or manners, or any ways tending to corrupt men's minds, or hinder their edification. If they be sound in all substantial points, and every way fitted to instruct and edify men in the truth of Christian faith and piety, they have all that is requisite in strictness for a man to assent and consent to the public use of them. Thus Dr. Falkner says well; "That even such persons, who conceive some things or expressions prescribed, either in the phrases of common prayer, or in the pointing of the Psalms, or in the translation of the Psalms, or other Scriptures, not to be suitable to their own desires or apprehensions, (yet to be free from sin, and of such a nature, as that the whole remaineth useful to guide the exercises of piety) those persons may safely, and with a good conscience make this declaration of assent, with respect to other weighty considerations of submission to authority, promoting peace, order, unity and the edification of the Church in the united exercise of a right religious worship. Even as such learned men, who may judge even our last translation of the Bible, not to have fitly expressed the sense of some difficult places, may yet both unfeignedly assent, and earnestly persuade to the diligent use thereof, as knowing it to be of excellent advantage to pious and humble readers, for their profitable learning the Gospel doctrine, and the will of God." *Libert. Eccles. p. 94.*

I say the same of the Homilies. A man may safely, and with a good conscience, give assent and consent to the use of them, though there be some small errors or mistakes in them. I will instance in one: in the 2d part of the Homily against the peril of idolatry, p. 35. it is said, that the Council of Eliberis, and the Council of Frankford, were held about the same time, and that Felix, the author of the Felician heresy was president in the Council of Eliberis. Now all that are acquainted with ecclesiastical history, know this to be a mistake, and a parachronism of near 500 years. What then? May not a man with a good conscience give his assent and consent to the Homilies for all this? If assent and consent indeed signified, that we believed the Homilies to be free from all manner of mistakes, I do not

see how any man could fairly assent to them: for this is a mistake too palpable to be denied, and no man can honestly depose that an error is truth, of what kind soever it be. But if assent and consent be taken as it ought to be, only for a declaration that we believe the book of Homilies to be a book that contains wholesome and sound doctrine, fit and lawful to be read in churches for the edification of the people; then assent and consent may be given to the use of it, notwithstanding this or any other errors of the like nature. For this is not to affirm that those errors are truths, as some strain the word assent, and say we mean what we do not mean, but only that it is a profitable book, that may be piously used and read with all its failings.

Admit now there were some as palpable mistakes as this I have mentioned, in the Liturgy itself; though I confess, after all the objections that have been made against it, I know of no such, yet why might not a man for all that give his assent and consent to the use of it? Since the intent of that declaration is only to say, he believes the book and every office in it, to be such as may be lawfully used without sin, and that as such he will conform to it, and use it. Which might be done, though it could be proved there were some little mistakes in it, such as some pretend to say there is in the rules for finding out Easter, and the translation of the Psalms. For notwithstanding this, a man might consent to read the Psalms, and to keep an Easter with the Church by one rule or other, which is all that is required of him. But of these more hereafter.

I am now to shew, that the French Church requires assent and consent to her Liturgy and form of administration of sacraments, &c. as strictly as the Church of England: and I need not stand long upon the proof of this point, having in effect done it more than once already, in discoursing about their Liturgy and Book of Discipline, which I shewed they not only subscribed, but sware to use and observe; which is the most solemn way of assenting and consenting. I will here only remind the reader of two things. 1. That they do not take their Liturgy for a mere directory, prescribing the substance of things only, and leaving particular

forms to every man's pleasure; but they assent to it as a precise rule, to be observed and followed without variation in all its injunctions. For Ludovicus Capellus makes this difference betwixt a Liturgy and a Directory; that a Liturgy prescribes a certain form in express words to be used in prayers and administration of Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies; whereas a directory contains only the heads of such things as are to be said or done, but leaves it to the liberty of every pastor to express himself in what words he pleases. And he says their form of prayer is a Liturgy in this proper sense, as contradistinct from a directory, which he sets himself to dispute against and impugn. Vid. Thes. Salmur. Par. iii. Disp. xlvii. de Liturg. p. 658. cited in the last chapter.

2. They allow no nonconformists to continue in the ministry without censure, much less such as raise contention about any point of doctrine or discipline, or about the form of catechising, or administration of Sacraments, &c. But if they break the Church's union, they are to be suspended by a classis, and prosecuted further by a Provincial or a National Synod. These are undeniable proofs that they require assent and consent to their Liturgy, as much as is required in the Church of England.

Therefore waving all further proof of this, I will now proceed to consider the particular exceptions that are made against it.

#### CHAP. IV.

*That the French Church requires Assent and Consent to the use of a Translation of the Bible, which she owns has some Failures in it.*

ONE reason why some persons have refused subscription to the Liturgy, is because it requires assent and consent to be given to an old translation of the Psalms, which has

several errors in it. I shall not now stand to examine, whether those errors be real, or only pretended, which has been done by other hands already; by Dr. Falkner in particular, in that excellent book of his, called *Libertas Ecclesiastica*: but, I say, supposing them to be real mistakes in the translation, yet the Liturgy may be subscribed, and assent and consent given to that translation, notwithstanding those mistakes. For when we give assent and consent to this translation, we do not thereby declare it either to be the best translation, or absolutely without faults, but only such an one as we can piously use and read publicly in the Church. And unless this be the meaning of assent and consent, I know no translation of the Bible that could be assented to, till we could have a translation made by the same Spirit that first dictated the original; which I know no Church that ever pretended to, unless perhaps the Roman Catholic.

As to what concerns the translation used in the reformed Church of France, it is owned on all hands, that it is far from being accurate and perfect: yet ministers are bound both by Canon and oath to use no other in their churches. Monsieur le Cene, a late author, in his book, entitled, *Project d'une Nouvelle Version Francoise de la Bible*, Roterd. 1696. has collected mistaken passages enough to fill a volume. Nor do the French Synods deny the possibility of a more exact translation; yet they would never hearken to any proposals made to bring in any other into common use in their churches. The Synod of Montauban, 1594. cap. iv. art. 3. has an express Canon to this purpose. "Reserving liberty to the Church for a more exact translation, our Churches imitating the primitive Church, are exhorted to receive and use in their public assemblies the last translation revised by the pastors and professors of the Church of Geneva."

This was the translation of 1588, which the famous Mr. Diodati many years after revised and corrected, and wrote a long letter to the Synod of Alanson, to persuade them to authorise his new translation; but notwithstanding all his arguments, among which he urges the acknowledgment of the foresaid Synod of Montauban, and the concurring

judgment of many other persons of note and quality; yet the Synod would not hearken to him, but ordered the old version to be continued in use in all their churches. See Diodati's letter at the end of the Synod of Alanson, 1637. p. 413.

Again, after this, when complaint was made in their last Synod of Loudun, 1659, "That some pastors read the texts of their sermons in other translations differing from that which was commonly used in their churches: that Synod decreed, that no person should dare to use any other version than that which was ordinarily used, neither in reading the Scripture, nor in taking their texts out of it." Synod of Loudun, cap. x. art. 1.

Now let any one say whether this be not as much requiring assent and consent to an old translation, as is required in the Church of England.

## CHAP. V.

*That the French Church does not condemn the Use of the Apocrypha, though she forbids it to be read in her Church Assemblies.*

As to the next point, which some have urged as a reason against subscription, that our Church requires the Apocrypha to be read on some certain days; it shall be readily owned, that the French Church has no such injunction, but the contrary: for the Synod of Montauban, 1594. cap. iv. art. 2. orders the Churches to see that their readers and deacons do not read publicly the Apocrypha, but the canonical books of Holy Scripture. But then they do not prohibit this as a thing absolutely unlawful, nor condemn those Churches which enjoin the reading of it, but only use their own liberty in prescribing what they think fit in their own Church; being ready to give under their hands at the same time, that they believe it lawful to be read in those Churches, which appoint it: nay, if occasion be, they

will take their oath upon it. To prove which, I need only observe, that they have always expressed themselves willing to subscribe the Belgic Confession, and they actually did subscribe it in the Synod of Vitre, 1583. cap. ii. art. 2. Now it is one article of the Belgic Confession,\* “That the apoeryphal books may be read in churehes, and instructions be drawn from them so far as they are consonant to the canonical books, but no further: which is exactly the doctrine of the Church of England.” So that by the same reason that the French Church subscribes the Belgic confession, she would, no doubt, subscribe and assent to the prescription of the Church of England in this point as well as any other.

Some of her best writers speak honourably of the English Liturgy, for this very reason, for which others condemn it. Among these we may reckon the testimony of the famous Ludovius le Blanc; who in his theological disputation, *de Libris Canonicis et Apochryphis*, p. 175. has these words: “As the ancient Christian Church, though she did not equal these books to those that are divine, yet had them in great honour and esteem, and judged them worthy to be read not only privately, but publiely, as exceedingly useful for edification in manners: so we also at this day do not deny them an honourable place in the Church of God, but allow them a privilege above the common rank of other Ecclesiastical writings. A proof of which is, that we use to bind them up in the same volume with the sacred canonical books, and often think fit to alledge them in our sermons. Moreover in Great Britain the custom is to read lessons out of these books, in their public and ordinary worship; as appears from that celebrated English Liturgy, which is in use in that kingdom.” This is not spoken like one that could not subscribe the English Liturgy, because it appointed the reading of the apoeryphal books.

Chamier does not expressly mention the Church of England, but he virtually commends her practice in

---

\* Confess. Belg. in Corp. Confess. art. vi. p. 164. Apocryphi Libri legi quidem in ecclesia possint, &c.

commending the practice of the primitive Church, which was the same. For Ruffin says, the Fathers of the Church sometimes distinguished all books into three sorts, canonical, ecclesiastical, and apocryphal: the canonical were the same which we call so now, which they used to confirm articles of faith: ecclesiastical were those which we now call apocryphal, which they allowed to be read in churches, but not to be of authority to confirm articles of faith: the third sort which they called apocryphal were not those which we now call so, but other hurtful books, which they would not allow to be read in churches. Now says Chamier, speaking of this account which Ruffin gives, "this distinction is doubtless very useful, and pleases me very well. *Distinctio utilis est sine dubio, mihiq̄ valde placet.*" Chamier, tom. 1. lib. iv. c. 1. n. 10.

And yet some judicious persons are of opinion, that the Apocryphal Books are not so strictly enjoined, but that ministers are authorised and allowed to change the lessons taken out of them for others of the New Testament more edifying. For the admonition to ministers before the second Book of Homilies says, "That whereas it may chance that some one or other chapter of the Old Testament may fall in order to be read upon the Sundays or holy days, which were better to be changed with some other of the New Testament of more edification, it shall be well done of ministers to spend their time to consider of such chapters beforehand, whereby their prudence and diligence in their office may appear, and the people may have cause to glorify God for them, &c.

Hammond l'Estrange thinks this administers probable occasion of conjecture, that our Church hereby intended an allowance of declining apocryphal lessons on holy days, that the history of the saints might be the better completed by some express chapters of the New Testament; forasmuch as both the canonical and apocryphal books go under the complex notion of the Old Testament. Alliane. of Div. Offic. c. 1. p. 25.

And Mr. Baxter himself was not ignorant of this admoni-

tion in the homilies: for in his reformation of the Liturgy in 1661. p. 35. he refers to it, desiring this alteration to be made in the calendar, and inserted as a rubric into the new Common Prayer Book; "That after the Psalms for the day, the minister shall read a chapter of the Old Testament, such as he finds most seasonable; or with the liberty expressed in the admonition before the second book of Homilies." So that when he had a mind to come a little near the Church, he could find a liberty granted to change any lesson of the Old Testament for a more edifying one in the New: but when he set himself to dispute against the Church, then we have not a word of this liberty, but a terrible argument formed against the rubric, for appointing some useful lessons of the apocrypha to be read, though sufficiently distinguished from canonical Scripture. For the sixth Article does put a manifest difference between them; and any minister who finds his people so ignorant as not to know what the apocrypha means, may inform them by reading the article to them: though Mr. B. was so confident as to say some readers of common prayer are forbidden by the canon to expound even that one word to them. Engl. Noncon. cap. 17.

## CHAP. VI.

*Of assenting to read Common Prayer daily, either privately or openly.*

In the preface to the Common Prayer Book, concerning the service of the Church, there is a rubric which "orders all priests and deacons to say daily the morning and evening prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness or some other urgent cause."

Mr. B. says, "when the Book was first made, to help the ignorant vulgar out of popery, every day to use the common prayer was a very good help to them. But the case is

much altered, and people now have more suitable helps, and ministers have so much other work to do in their studies, and with their neighbours, and some prayers to use more suitable to their families and closets, that it must needs be a sinful impediment against other duties to say common prayer twice a day." Engl. Nonconform. cap. 41.

Any one may perceive whither this discourse tends, viz. to discourage the daily use of public common prayer in the church, which it was doubtless the design, and a very laudable design in our first reformers to establish, as far as possible, throughout the nation. This appears from the rubric which immediately follows that which Mr. B. excepts against, where it is ordered, " That the curate that ministreth in every parish church or chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish church or chapel where he ministreth, &c. that the people may come to hear God's word, and to pray with him."

Now he that quarrels with this, must think it improper that men should meet every day to worship God in public. For otherwise, why should it be a sinful impediment of other duties, to say common prayer daily? If it be said there ought to be no public prayers without a sermon, and no man is qualified to preach every day in the year: I answer, 1. That in effect common prayer is never read without a sermon: for the lessons out of God's word are a very instructive one, if duly attended to. But 2. If by a sermon be meant a set discourse of the minister's own composing, of such a length, and in a certain form, &c. then it is false, and a rash accusation of God's Church, to say there ought to be no public prayers without a sermon. For all Churches allow it, and most encourage and recommend it. The French Church in particular has several Canons, which suppose and authorise this practice. When the Synod of Castres says, " Baptism may be administered on any day when common prayer is said without sermon:" Does not that suppose an allowance of common prayer to be used without a sermon? See the Synod of Castres, 1626. cap. 25. art. 15.

The second Synod of Vitre, 1617. cap. ix. art. 3. "leaves it to the prudence of consistories to congregate the people on all popish holy days, either to hear the word preached; or to join in common public prayers, as they shall find to be most expedient. Does not this authorise reading of common prayer without a sermon, when it leaves it to the discretion of consistories to appoint it, if they thought convenient?"

3. The cases of reading common prayer, and preaching a sermon of the minister's own composing every day, are very different from one another. For the one cannot be done without a great expence of time before hand, to prepare the composition; whereas the other is a form composed to the minister's hand, and needs no other time to be spent upon it, but what is necessary for the act of celebration. And yet some persons have that quickness and ability, as to preach as well as pray publicly every day in the week. So Calvin was used to do, as Beza tells us in his life, (p. 74.) and yet this did not hinder his other business. Yet such examples are not proper to be made a rule; because all men cannot preach every day in the week, (no, not though Calvin's method were brought again into use, which was but to expound for about a quarter of an hour some portion of Scripture) for though many men have the same ability, yet all have not; whereas no man wants ability to read common prayer daily, if he can have a congregation to join with him. If not. the Church would have him supply that defect, by using it morning and evening in his own family, unless hindered by sickness or some other urgent cause. Beyond this the injunction cannot be supposed to extend: because it being common prayer, and several parts of it at least, as the absolution, &c. supposing a congregation, it cannot be thought a rule for closet devotion. Nor is the injunction so strict to use it daily either in the church or family, but that an urgent cause may dispense with the omission of it. And what are urgent causes every man must judge for himself, considering his own circumstances, with Christian prudence and discretion. The present rubric only mentions sickness, but in former

rubrics it was worded thus, "except they be let by preaching, studying divinity, or by some other urgent cause. See Hammond l'Estrange Allyn. of Div. Offic. c. 1. p. 10. and the editions of the common prayer before 1661.

## CHAP VII.

### *Of making the Surplice and other Habits necessary to Ministration.*

In the rubric before the order for morning prayer, it is appointed, "That such ornaments of the church, and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the sixth."

Against this Mr. B. has three exceptions. "1. We know not," says he, "what was then in use, and therefore cannot consent to, we know not what. 2. We are told that the albe and many other ornaments were then in use, which are since put down, and we may not consent to restore them, without more reason than we hear. And the canon enumerating the ornaments now, we suppose the addition of all those will contradict it. 3. We meet with few conformists that know what was then in use; and we see that all those, that subscribe or consent to this, yet use them not, &c."

There is but one true word in all this, which is, that Mr. B. was really ignorant (as he confesses he was) of what he both might and ought to have known, before he had formed his objections against the rubric. To shew that his exceptions are founded upon mere ignorance and mistake, and to inform all those who labour under the same prejudice, I will here set down the old rubrick, as it was in the second year of King Edward, and also the words of the 58th canon, which Mr. B. refers to; and let any ingenuous reader try whether he can find any contradiction between them.

The words of the old Rubrick are these, “ In the saying or singing of matins and even-song, baptizing and burying, the minister in parish churches and chapels shall use a surplice. And in all cathedral churches and colleges, the arch-deacons, deans, provosts, masters, prebendaries and fellows, being graduates, may use in the choir besides their surplices such hoods as pertain to their several degrees, which they have taken in any university within this realm. But in all other places every minister shall be at liberty to use any surplice or no. It is also seemly, that graduates, when they do preach, should use such hoods as pertain to their several degrees.

This is all that concerns private ministers in that rubrick. The rest that follows belongs to bishops only, which says, “ They shall have upon them in time of their ministration, besides their rochet, a surplice or albe, and a cope or vestment, and also their pastoral staff in their hand, or else borne or holden by their chaplain.”

Now this was it that led Mr. B. into his mistake. He had heard something of albes and other ornaments in use in King Edward’s time,\* but he unluckily puts the bishop’s robes upon every private minister; whereas no other ornaments belonged to them but only the hood and surplice, the one enjoined, the other allowed or recommended.

Next let us hear the 58th Canon. “ Every minister saying the public prayers, or ministring the sacraments, or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice. And such ministers, as are graduates, shall wear upon their surplices at such times, such hoods as by the orders of the universities are agreeable to their degrees.”

Where now is the contradiction between this Canon and the Rubricks? They all speak of surplices and hoods, but

---

\* There are two other Rubricks in King Edward’s first Liturgy, in the Communion Office, which order the minister upon communion days to wear with their Albes, Vestments, or Copes or Tunicles. The first Rubrick is in the beginning, the other in the end of the Communion Office; cited by Hammond l’Estrange c. 6. and 7. p. 151. et 196.

But the minister’s Albe is there expressly said to be the same with the Surplice, being only another name for it; though some Albes were probably different from it.

of no other ornaments belonging to private ministers. And Mr. B. might have known this, had he either consulted the old Rubrick, or Hammond l'Estrange who compares the new and old together: but his business was not so much to enquire into the meaning of rubricks, as to find out some exceptions against them.

Having thus settled the controversy about what ornaments are to be used, the next question is, whether it be lawful to use them in Divine service? And here dissenters are divided. Some say they are absolutely unlawful, superstitious, popish, antichristian, &c. Others are ashamed of this, and say they are not against the use of them, but only against the imposition of them, and ejecting men from the ministry, who dare not use them. So Mr. B. cap. 3. and 33. of his English Nonconformity.

Let us now compare the writers of the French Church, with both these sorts of objectors. And first I observe of Calvin, that he was not against the use of a scholastic habit, nor yet against enjoining it: for he himself wore a gown, or long robe, as was the custom of ministers at Geneva; for which he never met but with one rebuff in all his life, and that was from a silly woman, who declaimed against long garments, "as marks of false prophets, and indecent clothing, which the clergy used to the great scandal of the Church." She pretended to prove this from the Gospel, saying, "Is it not written, they shall come to you in long garments?" When Calvin shewed her, "That this was a falsification of the Gospel, and that there was no such expression to be found, unless it was in the Gospel of Manichees: she called him and his brethren all tyrants, because they would not suffer her to talk at this extravagant rate what she would against them: and so the dispute ended. "For," says Calvin, "these wounds I leave untouched, as seeming to me incurable, till it shall please God to put his healing hand to them." Calvin, Ep. to Farel. p. 38. 64.

Persons who have so little sense, as to think the wearing of a gown for distinction or decency's sake, is against the

rules of the Gospel, are not fit to be argued with, in Calvin's opinion, but to be pitied and prayed for, and if they continue obstinate, to be left to God's mercy in his due time to convince them.

But what if men will forsake our communion because we wear a gown or surplice; or where these things are enjoined, will utterly refuse to submit to the use of them? As to the gown, Calvin had occasion to resolve this question, upon a particular case that happened at Geneva, during his own regency there in the university; of which he gives this account in another epistle to Farel, p. 259. "You know," says he, "by the laws of our city, all students are to lay aside their swords, and appear only in their scholastic habit, when they come to the holy communion. But some foolish Frenchmen, who study here, are so addicted to their own humour, that they will rather renounce their profession of studying, than submit to these laws. Now because this appears to be manifest contumacy, I resolved not to endure it: for I had rather they should all be gone, than stay here to the prejudice and loss of our discipline." This, I think, is insisting upon the use of an habit, as much as ever is done in the Church of England. It matters not whether it be gown or surplice, or any other habit; for the reason will hold for one habit as well as another, so long as the law appoints it.

Calvin did not think the surplice, or bishop's albe unlawful: for writing to Bullinger about the behaviour of Bishop Hooper, he says, "As I commend his constancy in refusing unction, so I could wish he would not contend so much *de Pileo et Veste linea*, about the cap and surplice, though in my judgment I had not approved of them: and this advice I gave him myself not long ago." Ep. p. 60. 98.

Beza was of the same mind, when he wrote to the discontented brethren in England, who complained to him about the imposition of the surplice, and some other such indifferent things. "These ceremonies," says he, "are not of that kind of things that are impious in themselves; and therefore they are not of so great moment, as that either the pastors should forsake their ministry, rather than wear

those garments; or that the people should rather forsake their spiritual guides, than hear them in such a vesture."

Peter Martyr gave this advice to a friend in England, who scrupled the surplice; "For my own part, I could wish that all things might be done with the greatest simplicity: yet I consider, that if an union in points of doctrine could be obtained between our Churches and those of Saxony, we should never make any separation upon the account of such vestments in divine service." Ep. 41. ad Amic. p. 1127.

In another epistle to Bishop Hooper, he more largely defends the lawfulness of them, and answers all the bishop's arguments, whereby he endeavoured to prove the use of them impious and unlawful. "Your reasons," says he, "do not persuade me to determine the use of such habits to be pernicious, or in its own nature contrary to the word of God, but I believe it to be altogether an indifferent thing. Though I be not, in my own opinion, for retaining this distinction of habits, yet I can by no means call it impious; I dare not condemn those whom I see observe it. If I had been so persuaded, I would never have communicated here with the Church of England, in which this distinction is still observed. For though I do not altogether like it, yet I am sure many such indifferent things, though troublesome and burthensome, are to be borne with; lest whilst we contend more bitterly than is meet about them we hinder the progress of the Gospel, and by our vehement contention, teach those things to be impious, which are in their own nature indifferent. By this means we shall so alienate mens minds from us, that they will not hearken to solid doctrine, or give any heed to our most necessary discourses. Besides, if we go on to dissuade men from these indifferent things, as pernicious and impious, we must condemn very many Evangelical Churches, and bitterly tax all the ancient Churches, which are so worthily celebrated by us. I know, indeed, the authority of no Church, ancient or modern, ought so far to weigh with us, as to make us suppress the truth of God's word; but what I contend for is, that for indifferent things we

should neither condemn any Church, nor speak irreverently of it."

After this he goes on to answer the bishop's arguments; where he shews, 1. That all imitation of the Jewish rites is not unlawful. 2. That this distinction of habits is not the invention of popery or antichrist, because it was used in the primitive Church long before popery was known in the world. Which he proves from many passages of Eusebius, Cyprian, Tertullian, Chrysostom, and some known usages of the Church. 3. That all human inventions, in the circumstances of God's worship, are not unlawful. Otherwise it would be unlawful to communicate before dinner. 4. "That the wearing of a surplice may have a good and useful signification, and that agreeable to the Scripture. For the ministers of the Church are called angels and messengers of God. Now the Angels almost always made their appearances in white garments: How then shall we deprive the Church of this liberty, that she may not signify something by her rites and actions, provided they be not made parts of God's worship, and be modest and few, so as not to burthen Christian people with ceremonies, and be used to promote, or not impede some better things? If you say, men should make themselves angels, and not signify it by outward signs: I answer, the same thing might have been replied to St. Paul, when he ordered among the Corinthians, that women should be covered, and men uncovered: because he only urges the reason of outward signification. One might have replied, that a man may demonstrate himself to be the head of the woman, and the woman to be subject to her own husband, better by their lives and actions, than any outward signs. But the Apostle knew it to be useful, not only that we should live well, but also that we should use both words and signs, to put us in mind of our duty." 5. He adds in the last place, "*Neque ilico tyrannidem induci arbitror, si quid in Ecclesia indifferens suscipiatur agendum, et a multis constanter servetur.* I do not think it tyranny in any Church, that agrees to observe an indifferent thing; and generally practises according to such an order: for it is now become a rule to admi-

nister the Eucharist only in the morning, and we refuse to celebrate it in our assemblies after dinner. But will any man call this tyrannical, which all men freely consent to observe?" Pet. Martyr, ep. iv. ad Hooper, p. 1086, &c.

This discourse of Peter Martyr, not only justifies the use of the surplice, but also frees the imposition of it from that charge of tyranny, which Mr. B. and others now so confidently bring against it: and it is the more considerable, because it comes from one, who in his own judgment was for laying it aside, but had so much of the Christian temper and discretion, that he resolved to make no contention about it. God give all men the same temper, and we shall hear no more disputes about a surplice!

Peter du Moulin was so far from scrupling any habits, that he was used to say, with relation to those that scrupled them here, "that if the Queen Regent of France would but give him leave to preach before her, he would do it though it were in a friar's coat;" as his son, who writes his life, says he had it from his own mouth. Life of du Moulin, before his Novelty of Popery, p. 18. And I believe there are few Frenchmen, but who would be glad to enjoy the liberty of preaching, and freedom of their religion in their native country, upon much harder conditions than being obliged to wear a surplice.

## CHAP. VIII.

*Of the Rules for finding out Easter: that supposing them to contradict one another, yet a Man may honestly give his Assent and Consent to use the Common Prayer Book.*

THERE is no one thing, which Mr. Baxter oftener repeats in all his books, than this objection about the Church's rule for finding out Easter day. He says, "the calendar gives a true rule to find it; but then there is another rule added to find it always, which is frequently false, as every almanack will tell us: that is, that it is always the first Sun-

day after the first full moon, which happens next after the one and twentieth day of March." Engl. Nonconf. cap. xv.

I will not now stand to examine, whether the rule, he excepts against as false, be liable to that charge. It is agreed on all hands by those that understand calculations and astronomy, that it is generally true, and it is not every almanack that will shew its falshood. But admit it were always wrong; what is that to our giving assent and consent to the use of the Liturgy? I have shewed before, that assent and consent does not mean that every tittle and saying in any book is infallibly true, but that it contains no such errors repugnant to God's word, as render it unfit to be used in Divine service; which is the sense of all English writers\* upon this subject. Now suppose this rule to be false; why may we not consent to use the Liturgy for all that? Especially considering that this pretended discovery of its falseness is but lately made, and we are neither obliged to say it is a true rule, nor any ways confined to use it; because we have another rule, which is confessedly true, and fully answers the Church's design, which is to keep one Easter in a year, and no more; though Mr. B. says, we are obliged to keep two. If such failings as these would hinder assent and consent, it would be hard to find any human writing, which a man could honestly assent to. The French Church has not our rules for finding out Easter, but follows the new style of Pope Gregory, and keeps it eleven days before us; yea, sometimes at a month or five weeks distance, if my author † do not deceive me. Now many excellent chronologers, such as Scaliger, Calvisius, Mæstlinus and Origanus, have undertaken to prove, that the new calendar has many errors and mistakes in it, and in time will prove as false a rule for finding out Easter, as that rule of ours, which was the rule of the Council of Nice. But may not the French Church assent to use this calendar, and keep their Easter by it, notwithstanding such mistakes? What end should we have of heresies and schisms, if such things as these should raise scruples in men's minds, and hinder their assent and

---

\* See before, the chapter about assent and consent; and Dr. Sherlock's Defence of Dr. Still. p. 105.  
 † Meggerlin Commentar. Chronol. cap. x. p. 91.

consent to the use of a pious book fitted for Divine service. I have already proved, that the French Church requires assent and consent to the use of a translation of the Bible, which she owns has some failures in it. Though every tittle be not accurately and exactly translated according to the original, (and consequently not to be assented to in that sense, as if it were an exact translation, when they own it to be otherwise) yet every minister is obliged to give his assent and consent to it as a translation that is lawful, and not repugnant to the word of God to use it; and he must use that, and no other in his ministration. Now why may we not as innocently assent to use a Liturgy, which has a mistaken rule for finding out Easter, as the French Church does to use a translation of the Bible, which she owns has some things in it not exactly according to the original? If it be assenting to a small lie, as Mr. B. modestly terms it, in the English ministers, I cannot see how the French will escape the same imputation. I will not recriminate, nor give him the lie, but only take leave to say, that he, and all others, who thus charge the Church of England, are under a mistake about assent and consent, and understand not truly her constitution. Nor indeed can they account for their own practice in assenting to read the Bible, upon their principles and hypothesis: for the very best translation which they consent to use as well as we, is thought by many critics of the best rank, to have some mistaken passages, more material than the rule about finding out Easter, which need a more exact translation. I will only instance in one, which was the discovery of the late eminent Dr. Pocock, a person whose modesty no less than his learning, so conspicuous in all his writings, rendered him famous over all the world. The place I mean, is Mic. 5. ii. where the present translation reads it; "Thou Bethlehem Ephratah though thou be little among the thousands of Judah;" whereas that learned person proves it ought to be translated quite otherwise, "Thou Bethhelem Ephratah art very great among the thousands of Judah." For, as he observes, the original word, *tsair*, or *segor*, signifies both little and great: and as in some places, where the sense requires it, it ought to be translated, little, so here, in this place, it ought to

be translated, great. For so St. Matthew quotes it, "Thou Bethlehem art not the least," that is, art very great, "among the princes of Judah," &c. Mat. ii. 6. Which shews that the word *tsair*, in Micah, was understood by the Evangelist to signify great, and therefore ought now to be so translated; as learned men now, since this discovery has been made, do generally agree. See Dr. Pocock, Not. Miscel. in Port. Mos. cap. ii. p. 17. and his Comment. on Mic. 5. ii. As also Dr. Hammond's Annot. on Mat. ii. 6. Hottinger Smegma Oriental. And Frischmuth Dissert. de Mich. & Mat. cited by Mr. Le Cene, Projet d' une Nouvelle Version. p. 166.

Now if the Dissenters' rule be true, that no one can, without a small lie, give assent and consent to any book, which contains any the least mistake in it, how shall those who are convinced by Dr. Pocock's reasons, that the fore-mentioned passage is wrong translated, give their assent and consent to the present translation? Or must neither the Church nor dissenters use the Bible in their assemblies, till they can have a translation free from all manner of mistakes? And where shall we have such an infallible translation? Will dissenters of any denomination undertake to make it? Or will they excuse every minister from reading the Bible in the church, till they have done it? If there be some little mistakes in the present translation, why do they not object against it, as well as the Liturgy, and set immediately about a new one; and leave it to men's censures when they have done, and to every man's liberty that can find any faults in it, to assent or not assent, use or not use it at his pleasure? There is no one but is sensible how dangerous and absurd the consequences of such a liberty as this would be: and yet the reason is as strong against the present translation of the Bible, as against the Liturgy, for having a supposed mistake in one of its rules for finding out Easter. If nothing else can convince men, yet I hope this may; that it is dangerous to strain assent and consent too high, lest at last they come to this pass, that they cannot assent to the Bible itself, as ordered to be read in the Church, in any human translation.

## CHAP. IX.

*Of the Confession and Absolution, as used in the Church of England; and of Kneeling and Standing in Divine Service.*

Come we now to the several parts of the Liturgy; where the first thing is, the general Confession to be said of the whole congregation, after the minister, all kneeling. There are some, who except against the shortness of this Confession; which, if it be any fault, is equally chargeable on the Confession in Calvin's Liturgy, used by all the French Church, which, for the sake of those who never heard it, I think it not improper here to transcribe out of Calvin's works. "O Lord God, Eternal and Almighty Father, we acknowledge and confess before thy Sacred Majesty, that we are miserable sinners, conceived and born in sin and iniquity; prone to evil, and indisposed to every good work; and that being vicious, we make no end of transgressing thy holy commandments. Hereby we call destruction upon ourselves from thy just judgment. But yet, O Lord, we are heartily sorry for having offended thee, and we condemn ourselves and sins by true repentance, desiring thy grace may relieve our misery. Therefore, O God, Merciful Father, vouchsafe us thy mercy, in the name of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Blot out our sins, and purge away all our filth, and daily increase in us the gifts of thy Holy Spirit: that we acknowledging our iniquity from the bottom of our hearts, may more and more displease ourselves, and be excited to true repentance; which mortifying us and all our sins, may produce in us the fruits of righteousness and innocence, acceptable unto Thee: through the same Jesus Christ our Lord." Calvin. Formul. Prec. tom. viii. p. 29.

It is true, the whole congregation is not obliged to say this Confession after the minister, as we do, but only to go

along with him in their minds: but the difference in this circumstance is so very inconsiderable, that they must have a very great inclination to dispute, that can raise any controversy about it.

As to the posture of kneeling, that is precisely enjoined in the French Church to all people, without respect of quality or persons. "That great irreverence," says their Book of Discipline, cap. x. art. 1. "which is found in divers persons, who at public and private prayers do neither uncover their heads, nor bow their knees, shall be reformed, which is a matter repugnant unto piety, and giveth suspicion of pride, and scandalizes them that fear God. Wherefore all pastors shall be advised, as also elders and heads of families, carefully to oversee, that in time of prayer, all persons, without exception or acceptance, do evidence by those exterior signs, the inward humility of their hearts and homage which they yield to God; unless any one be hindered from so doing by sickness or otherwise."

Now compare this with our Rubrick and 18th Canon, which says, "No man shall cover his head in the church or chapel in the time of divine service, except he have some infirmity. And all manner of persons, then present, shall reverently kneel upon their knees, when the general Confession, Litany, and other prayers are read." If any one censures our Church for these rules of decency, he may see himself more severely condemned by the discipline of the French Church.

Next for the Absolution. I own Calvin's Liturgy has no such form in it: but he himself says, it was an omission in him at first, and a defect in his Liturgy; which he afterwards would have rectified and amended, but could not. He makes this ingenuous confession in one of his epistles: "There is none of us," says he, "but must acknowledge it to be very useful, that after the general Confession some remarkable promise of Scripture should follow, whereby sinners might be raised to the hopes of pardon and reconciliation. And I would have introduced this custom from the beginning, but some fearing that the novelty of it would give offence, I was over easy in yielding to them; so the

thing was omitted. And now it would not be seasonable to make any change; because the greatest part of our people begin to rise up before we come to the end of the Confession." Therefore he advises those he writes to, whilst they had it in their power, to accustom their people to an Absolution, as well as a Confession: "*Quo magis optamus, dum vobis integrum est, populum vestrum ad utrumque assueferi.*" Epist. de quibusd. Eccles. Ritib. p. 206, 529.

Nay, I must do that justice to Calvin here, by the way, to say, that he was no enemy to private absolution neither, as used in the Church of England. For in one of his answers to Westphalus, he thus expresses his mind about it: "I have no intent to deny the usefulness of private absolution; but as I commend it in several places of my writings, provided the use be left to men's liberty, and free from superstition; so to bind men's consciences by a law to it, is neither lawful nor expedient." Defens. 2. ad Westphal. tom. viii. p. 678.

Here we have Calvin's judgment, fully and entirely, for the usefulness both of public and private absolution. He owns it to be a defect in his Liturgy, that it wants a public absolution. But the French Church took care to supply this defect in some measure; and, as far as they could without hazarding the peace of their congregations. For the second Synod of Paris, 1565, cap. ix. art. 17, made this Canon: "That such Churches as were accustomed upon Sacrament days, or other Sabbaths, after the Confession of Sins, to pronounce a general Absolution, may, if they please, continue in it: but where this custom is not introduced, the Synod adviseth the Churches not to admit it, because of the dangerous consequences which may ensue."

They approve the thing, and encourage it where it was in use already, but thought it dangerous to offer at any alteration where it was not; for fear the novelty might give offence, or occasion some disturbance. Whence it appears, that it was not choice, but necessity, that made both Calvin and the French Church omit the inserting a public Absolution into their Liturgy: they did not dislike the thing, but

had no favorable opportunity, as the Church of England had, to introduce it.

As for the custom of the ministers standing up at the absolution, and some other prayers, as the Rubrick appoints; I observe the same practice to be enjoined in some cases in the French Church. For in the form of ordination appointed by the Synod of St. Maixant, it is expressly ordered, "that the minister, who ordains, shall rise up when he comes to the consecration prayer, and repeat that standing." And probably those churches, which use the Absolution, do it in the same posture, as also the Creed, &c.: but I can say nothing positively of these, for I find no express Canon or Rubrick about what posture they are to be said in.

## CHAP. X.

*That the French Church esteems the Lord's Prayer a Form of Prayer, and as such frequently uses it in Divine Service.*

Two things are commonly said against the use of the Lord's Prayer in our Church. 1. That we use it as a form. 2. That we repeat it too often in Divine service. To the first objection Chamier answers copiously, that our Saviour gave it to his disciples as a form; that they used it as a form in their daily prayers, as did also the whole primitive Church; which he proves from the testimonies of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Austin. And hence he takes occasion to prove against his popish adversary, Gerhard, that the Virgin Mary was not free from sin, because she used the Lord's Prayer with the Apostles. "It is reasonable to believe," says he, "that the Holy Virgin prayed to God in the most exquisite manner: but there is no better manner of praying to God, than that which Christ delivered." As Cyprian says, "What prayer can be more spiritual than that which was given us by Christ, who also gives us the Holy Spirit?"

What can be more true prayer before God, than that which was uttered from the mouth of his Son, who is truth itself? Secondly, it is plain from St. Luke, that Mary prayed with the rest of the disciples, Acts i. 14. "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary, the mother of Jesus." "Now," says he, "*Si orabant unà, ergo communis erat omnibus formula; if they prayed together, they had all one common form.*" Thirdly, St. Austin says, "That it is necessary not only for the faithful in general, but for every one in particular, to use the prayer which our Lord gave to his disciples." These are Chamier's arguments, to prove that the Virgin Mary, as well as all other persons, were obliged to use the Lord's Prayer. Tom. 3. de Pec. Orig. lib. v. c. xii. n. 10.

Against this his popish adversary urged, 1. That it could not be proved out of Scripture, or any ancient writer, that ever the Virgin Mary used the Lord's Prayer. 2. The Lord's Prayer was made for the sake of the rude and ignorant; that knew not how to pray: But the Virgin Mary was taught of God from her infancy to pray, and had forms of prayer of her own. To which he answers, "1. That it was false, that it could not be proved out of Scripture that the Virgin Mary did use the Lord's Prayer: For she prayed with the disciples, and the disciples prayed, saying, 'Our Father;' therefore she also prayed, saying, 'Our Father.'" To the second he answers, "that the Lord's Prayer was made for the simple and ignorant indeed, but in the same manner as David says the whole word of God was written, 'to give light and understanding to the simple,' Psal. 19. that is, so to instruct the simple, as that it should be not only useful, but necessary, to the greatest proficients also." Chamier, *ibid.* n. 12, 13.

So far was this learned Frenchman from having that contemptible notion of the Lord's Prayer as a form, which some have, that with St. Austin and the rest of the primitive Church, he thought it necessary to be used as a form, both in Church assemblies, and by every private Christian.

Rivet was of the same mind: for among other arguments to prove the lawfulness and expediency of set forms, he

urges this; that Christ taught his own disciples a form of prayer. "It is made a question by some, whether set forms of prayer be lawful to be used in public or in private? But we hold, that set forms, if they be pronounced with due attention of mind, are not only lawful, but very profitable also; because every Christian is not able to conceive new prayers with such decency as is fitting, and the attention of the hearers in great assemblies, is not a little helped by accustomed forms. Upon which account God himself prescribed a form of benediction, to be used by the priests in the Old Testament, Num. 6. 24. And Christ upon the cross used a form of deprecation, which David, his type, had used before him. Mat. 27. 46. The disciples also, Luk. 11. 2. desired him to teach them to pray, as John taught his disciples: to whom Christ gave this answer; 'when ye pray, say, Our Father which art in Heaven,' &c. From the circumstances of which words it is evident, that this Prayer of Christ is not only a rule of praying aright, but also a form of prayer to be ordinarily used; as without all controversy, the whole primitive Church ever esteemed it to be." Synops. Pur. Theolog. Disp. 36. n. 33. where we have the judgment of the Dutch and French divines together.

What they observe of the primitive Church, is so very true, that I dare undertake to prove, that for 1500 years together, none ever disliked the use of the Lord's Prayer, but only the Pelagians; and they did not wholly reject the use of it neither, nor dislike it because it was a form, but for another reason; because it contradicted one of their principal tenets, which was, that some men were so perfect in this world, that they needed not to pray to God for the forgiveness of their own sins, but only for the sins of others. In regard to which tenet, they could have wished that the use of the Lord's Prayer had been wholly laid aside; but because it was so generally used by the whole Catholic Church, they despaired of gaining that point; and therefore continued to use it, contenting themselves with that perverse gloss put upon the fifth petition; that they prayed not for forgiveness of their own sins, but for others; as appears

from the Council of Milevis, cap. 7. and the African Code. can. 116, and 117. where their errors are condemned.

I hope none now dislike the use of the Lord's Prayer upon the same principle: but however, to reject it upon any principle, is a great fault; and such an one as is condemned by the whole Catholic Church, and in particular, by the reformed Church of France.

But it is said, our Church enjoins the use of the Lord's Prayer too often, and that is the thing that offends so many. To which I answer, 1. That admit it were not so commodious as they could wish, yet all inconveniences do not make a Liturgy unlawful, or justify separation from it, as I shall fully prove, upon the principles of the French Church. 2. Our Church seldom enjoins the use of it above once or twice in any particular office; and so much is commonly done in the French Church: their ordinary prayer both before and after sermon, as well morning as evening, concludes with it. So does also their prayer at infant baptism; as also the prayer at baptism of adult persons, appointed by the last Synod of Charenton, where they say it is Christ's own appointment, who hath commanded us to call upon God, saying, "Our Father which art in Heaven, &c." cap. 9. p. 452.

So that supposing different offices to be used, it must of necessity follow, that the Lord's Prayer will be often repeated. Besides which, Dr. Durel has observed, that the ministers commonly say it three times over, whilst they continue in the pulpit, both in the French and Dutch Churches. Conform of Reform. Chur. p. 37.

In Calvin's Liturgy used at Geneva, it occurs almost in every office: as 1. In the minister's own prayer before sermon, he might use it if he pleased.

2. In the long prayer prescribed to be used after sermon, there is a kind of paraphrase made of it to conclude with.\*  
3. In the form of extraordinary supplications for fast days,

---

\* I am credibly informed, that at Charenton, instead of the Paraphrase, the ministers used to repeat the prayer only as a form.

it is inserted verbatim, into the middle of the prayer after sermon. 4. It is used also to conclude the prayer of consecration at infant baptism. Formul. Prec. Eccles. tom. 8.

So that the difference betwixt the French and English Church in this matter is so small, that whoever objects against the one, will find himself obliged to condemn the other also. And when that is done, it will never justify the practice of those, who deny the Lord's Prayer to be a form, and wholly reject the use of it. Mr. Capel reckons those no better than madmen, whose zeal against set forms transport them to such an excess: "*quīs illorum furorem ferat, ac non potius execretur, &c.* Who can have patience to bear, and not rather abhor their madness, who boast that they have never, or not for many years repeated the Lord's Prayer, and give God thanks upon that account? Do they think, Christ taught his disciples that prayer, that they should never use it, nor offer it to God? Or do they think the Apostles never used it, but only as a rule and example to compose their own prayers by? How then come all ecclesiastical writers and doctors of the Primitive Church to tell us, that the Apostles consecrated the eucharist only with this prayer, and that the whole Primitive Church followed their example? And how is it that in all Protestant Churches, when we cannot particularly enumerate all our wants in our own prayers, we think it necessary to conclude them with that prayer, which comprehends in short whatever things are omitted in our own? Upon which account we commonly usher it in with this form of words; 'these things, O Lord, and whatever else thou knowest to be necessary for us, we ask of Thee, in the name of Christ, in that form of prayer which He Himself hath taught us, 'Our Father,' &c.'" Ludov. Capel. Disp. 37. de Liturg. n. 13. inter Thes. Salmur. par. 3.

This both vindicates the necessary use of the Lord's Prayer, and the frequent use of it; that is, as often as we make any petitions of our own, or if we divide our service into different parts, we may use the Lord's Prayer in each part; and that is agreeable to the custom of the French Church, and perhaps all other Protestant Churches also.

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the use of the Apostolical Creed in the French Church.*

Concerning this Creed I observe four things in the practice of the French Church. 1. That they give it the name of the Apostles' Creed, as we do in our Liturgy: their confession stiles it, *Symbolum Apostolicum*, the Apostolical Creed, Art. 5. As also their Liturgy and catechism, wherever they speak of it. 2. They agree with our Church, as to what concerns the reason of this name. "It is commonly called the Apostles' Creed," says their catechism, "because it has ever been received among the faithful from the foundation of the Church; and because it was either taken from the mouths of the Apostles, or collected faithfully out of their writings." Calvin. Catech. tom. 8. p. 12.

So that the design either of the English or French Church in giving it the name of the Apostles' Creed, was not to tie men up in the strictest sense, to believe it to be of the Apostles' immediate composing; but to take it for an orthodox and primitive summary of faith, either delivered by the Apostles themselves, or collected out of their writings by their immediate successors. A liberty is granted to either of these opinions, because neither of them derogates from the faith itself.

3. I observe that the French Church uses it in the same holy offices as the Church of England does; as in her form of infant baptism composed by Calvin; in her form of baptism of adult persons composed by the Synod of Charenton, and in her usual form of public prayers on the Lord's Day. The words of their Liturgy after morning prayer, are, *post hæc recitatur Apostolorum Symbolum*: then shall be rehearsed the Apostles' Creed.

And yet here we may note, that both the French and English Church in this last point differ from the practice of

the Primitive Church: for the Primitive Church for near six hundred years made no other public use of the Creed in divine service, but only in catechising, and as a form of professing their faith at baptism; as Hamond PEstrange and Vossius, and others have made it appear. Whence it follows, that primitive practice was no rule in indifferent matters, either to the French or English Church, but they made use of their own power and liberty in appointing such things as they thought most expedient and meet for edification: and therefore this custom of repeating the Creed as a part of the public Liturgy, though new in comparison, being found to be a most useful and edifying practice, was thought fit to be retained in the liturgies of all Protestant Churches. And Mr. Baxter himself is so far from objecting against the use of it, that in his reformation of the English Liturgy, he orders all the three Creeds to be read: "Next let one of the Creeds be read by the minister, saying, 'in the profession of this holy Christian faith we are here assembled. I believe in God the Father, &c. I believe in one God, &c.'" And sometimes Athanasius's Creed." *Petition for peace and reform of the Liturgy*, p. 26.

4. But to return to the French Church; I observe in the last place, that though they do not enjoin the people to stand up and bear their part in the repetition of the Creed, yet they have no objection against this. For in many cases they allow of the standing posture in time of divine worship. As in their form of ordination, I have shewn already, that the minister, who ordains, is obliged to pray standing at the foot of the pulpit: and I shall shew hereafter, that all the people are obliged to come up and receive the communion, standing before the communion table. And I have been informed, from those who are sufficiently acquainted with their practice, that they stand up whilst they sing the last verse of the 118th Psalm, and the prayer at the end of the ten commandments: and as to standing up at the Creed, it is what many of the people do, and all of them may do if they please, though some chuse to continue kneeling. For the minister, who in his prayer closes his hands together, as a posture proper for that office; when he comes to

recite the Creed, unfolds them, and by such change of posture, intimates them to be at liberty to stand up if they please.

## CHAP. XII.

*That the French Church approves of the Athanasian Creed, and requires Assent and Consent unto it.*

One reason, why some cannot subscribe the Articles and the Liturgy, is, because they command the belief and use of the Athanasian Creed. The 8th Article says, "it ought to be thoroughly received and believed, because it may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." And the Rubrick in the Liturgy, upon certain days, enjoins the reading of it. Now, they say, they cannot subscribe entirely to the belief or use of it, because of the damnatory clauses that are contained therein. Baxter Nonconform. cap. 40.

But this objection will hold as well against subscribing the French confession. For the 5th Article is in these words: "we therefore approve of those three Creeds, the Apostolical, the Nicene, and the Athanasian; because they are agreeable to the written word of God." Does the Article of the Church of England say any more than this? And may we not read in the church what is agreeable to the word of God, if our Rubrick enjoins it?

I must here note again, what I have proved at large before, that no minister could be ordained in France, till he had first subscribed this confession of faith, whereof that Article about the Athanasian Creed is one: so that they who scruple conformity upon this account here, must have been nonconformists in the Church of France also.

If any are offended further with our Articles or Liturgy, because they call this Creed Athanasius's Creed; they are to consider, that the Church designed not to determine any thing thereby, to oblige men to take it for a Creed of Ath-

nasius's composing, but only to give it a name by which it might be distinguished from the other Creeds; as is done in all other confessions: for the French calls it *Symbolum Athanasianum*, Art. 5. The Helvetic, *Symbolum Athanasii*, Art. 2. As also the Belgic, Art. 9. *Symbolum Athanasii*. And the Saxon, *Symbolum Athanasianum*, Art. 1. Yet all that is designed by any of these confessions, is only that men should take this for an orthodox Creed, without tying them up to believe Athanasius to be the author of it: which being a matter purely historical, is left to the discussion of learned men to determine for or against it, as they see reasons to convince them. And therefore though Bishop Andrews and Rivet say they believe it to be Athanasius's own composeure, yet it is no crime in Bishop Usher or Bishop Pearson, Hamond l'Estrange, or Dr. Cave, to dissent from them, and ascribe it to a much later and a Latin author.\* The Church is not concerned in this dispute, so long as the Creed itself is allowed to be the orthodox: and in that they are all agreed.

Nay I must add, that Mr. B. himself was once agreed with the Church about the use of this Creed, however in his last books his spirit came to be embittered against it. For in his petition for peace and reformation of the Liturgy, p. 26. he orders the Athanasian Creed to be read sometimes instead of the other: surely then at that time, when he drew up the form of a new liturgy to be presented to the bishops in 1661, he had none of these objections against the damnatory clauses in it. And if he had considered that just apology, which Dr. Falkner and some others have made for it, he would never have shewn himself so weak, as to have gratified the Socinians with unreasonable scruples against it. See Dr. Falkner *Libert. Eceles.* p. 145, &c.

---

\* *Vigilius Tapsensis*, an African bishop, who lived in the latter end of the fifth century, in the time of the Vandalic Arian persecution.

## CHAP. XIII.

*That the French Church does not receive the Communion sitting, but requires all Communicants to receive it in another Posture.*

There are two sorts of persons, who dispute with the Church of England about kneeling at the communion. Some absolutely and universally condemn the posture, as sinful and unlawful; because it is a deviation from the practice and example of Christ, who administered the communion to his disciples sitting; which therefore they say, is the only lawful posture. Others are not altogether so rigid as this, but say, they believe it to be lawful to receive the eucharist kneeling, and, upon occasion, themselves do so receive it; but their quarrel at the Liturgy and Canon is, for rejecting those from communion, who dare not kneel in the act of receiving: of this latter sort of objectors, Mr. Baxter is the principal. Case of Engl. Nonconform. c. 14. "I myself," says he, "am for the lawfulness of organs, rails, and coming up to them; and for the lawfulness of kneeling when we sing Psalms, or read the Scripture, or hear the preacher: but I am not for the lawfulness of hanging or damning men, that herein are not of my mind; nor for turning unnecessary things, because they are lawful, into conditions of Church communion, and making kneeling necessary to salvation."

Now, whatever there is in either of these charges, they affect the French Church as much as they do the Church of England. For though the French Church does not receive the communion kneeling, yet neither, 1. does she condemn kneeling as unlawful; nor 2dly, does she use sitting, but a contrary posture, that is, standing; which is as much a deviation from the example of Christ, as kneeling is. Nor 3dly, does she admit any to communion, but such as receive in

that posture and manner as her Rubricks and Canons appoint. So that if there be any force in the arguments urged against the Church of England, they equally hold against the Church of France; or if the one may be justified, so may the other. Let us therefore examine these particulars.

That 1. the French Church condemns not kneeling as unlawful, appears from this; that she allows it lawful to communicate with the English, Lutheran, and Polonian Churches; all which receive the communion kneeling, and in no other posture. Besides, Beza says, "that kneeling at the communion hath a shew of Godly and Christian reverence, and therefore might be used with benefit heretofore. Only he thinks, that since bread-worship came in at this door, those Churches did well who received another gesture. However, he condemns none that still retain it: for, he says, it is not idolatrous in itself; and therefore he determines of it, as of many other ceremonies, that it is not of that moment, as that ministers should leave their office, or the people forsake the communion, because of it." Beza, Ep. 12. p. 107, & 109.

Peter Martyr, who was sometime a minister of the French Church, goes a little further, and says, "it is not material whether we receive the Lord's Supper standing, sitting, or kneeling, so long as the institution of Christ be observed, and all occasion of superstition be cut off." Loc. Com. Class. 2. c. 4. n. 39.

And in his defence of the eucharist against Gardiner, he says, "adoration may be used in time of receiving, provided our minds be applied, not to the elements, but to the thing signified. For then, if we adore the Lord by kneeling, we do not thereby testify any real or corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament." De Euchar. part 1. fol. 5.

He tells us in another place. "That many men piously bow the knee and worship, when they hear those words of the Gospel, 'the Word was made flesh:' and yet we may not say, they worship the words, but the Thing signified. So," says he, "what hinders but that we may do the same,

when we receive the eucharist; provided we worship not the external signs, but the 'Thing signified by them.' Loc. Com. Class. 4. c. 10. n. 50.

This learned man did not think kneeling so superstitious, as some would make it; nor sitting so necessary by any command or example of Christ, but that any other decent posture would as well comport with the end of the institution.

And indeed this was always the judgment of all knowing men in the French Church, that the posture of receiving was none of those things, which are of the substance of the sacrament, or which we are precisely bound to follow the example of Christ in; but an accidental circumstance, left to the liberty of the Church, as many other things are, to determine, as she sees most useful and expedient. Take the testimony of one, which may stand for the judgment of the whole Church, because his works were approved by two or three national Synods; that is, the learned Chamier, who in his books de Eucharista, thus answers the popish argument, for mixing water with wine, taken from the example of Christ: "it follows not," says he, "that because Christ did it, therefore we are bound to do the same; for he washed his disciples feet at supper, but no man thinks we are bound to do so under pain of mortal sin. He consecrated at even and after supper; which now the Church of Rome forbids. Again, he consecrated lying at table; which custom is long ago laid aside, and observed by none. This gives us to understand, that every thing is not necessary to be done, that Christ did only accidentally or occasionally, in celebrating the eucharist; but only such things as he did, *propter ipsius sacramenti plenitudinem*, to make it a complete and perfect Sacrament; to which neither washing the feet, nor celebrating at even, nor lying at table, nor mixing water with the wine do appertain." Chamier de Euchar. tom. 4. lib. 6. c. 3. n. 11.

So again, lib. 7. c. 15. n. 13. "All things are not necessary to be imitated that Christ did, when they are only circumstances of his actions. For instance, He celebrated the

eucharist at even, after supper, lying at table, at the time of the passover. In such things every Church is at liberty to act as she pleases."

Who sees not by all this, that in the judgment of the French Church, sitting at table in the reception of the eucharist, is none of those things which we are necessarily obliged to by the example of Christ, but only an accidental circumstance, which may be altered at the discretion of the Church? Accordingly the French Church used her liberty at the reformation, and took standing at the eucharist as her ordinary receiving posture: and what is more, not only used standing, but enjoined it precisely, and forbad any to receive it sitting at the table, for the same reason that the Church of England forbids it, viz. that there might be a general uniformity in the Church. The words of the Synod of St. Maixant are expressly these: "that hereafter there may be a general uniformity in the churches of this kingdom, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, and all scruples by reason of difference and singularity, arising in weak, but honest hearts, uncapable of distinguishing between the substance and circumstance of the sacred action, may be prevented; all pastors are enjoined to abstain from any new and private methods of their own. Among which, they forbid that of bringing the people up in ranks unto the table, there to sit or stand; whereas they ought to make them come singly, one after another up unto it. Synod of St. Maixant, 1609. cap. 6. Art. 14.

Here I observe, they not only forbid men to receive the eucharist sitting in companies at the table as at a feast, which is the thing that is so much pleaded for among us, but they will not allow them to receive it in companies standing about the table neither; for they must come up singly one after another.

Now supposing any one should make a scruple at this, and object against receiving standing singly, as varying from the example of Christ at the institution of the first supper: if there be any strength in the objection, does it not hold as well against the French Church, as the Church of England? For standing is as different from sitting, as

kneeling is ; and standing singly, is something more. What then! must the ministers give the communion to persons sitting in companies at the table, who dare not receive it otherwise? This the Canon forbids, and they are upon their oath to observe the Canon, and liable to suspension if they do otherwise. Where then is the difference betwixt their case, and the ministers of the Church of England? The English Rubrick, and the 27th Canon, which interprets the Rubrick, says ; “ that no minister, when he celebrateth the communion, shall wittingly administer the same to any but such as kneel, under pain of suspension.” And the French Canon says, “ no minister shall give the communion to persons sitting in ranks at the table, but make them come up and receive standing singly one after another.” And the ministers are upon oath to observe this Canon, and liable to censure if they transgress it. Where then, I say, is the difference? If kneeling be a deviation from the institution and example of Christ, standing is so too. If to enjoin kneeling be to add a new term of communion, to enjoin standing must be an imposition of the same nature: and Mr. Baxter's six arguments will hold as well against the French, as the English posture. For he may say with equal truth, that their imposition of standing is a sin: “ 1. Because it maketh new terms of Church communion. 2. It contradicts Christ's appointed terms, which require all Christians to receive each other in love and concord. 3. They must answer for depriving Christ's members of their right, as truly as if they oppressed widows and orphans. 4. They must answer for schismatical tearing of the Church by their engines. 5. And for usurping a needless and hurtful dominion over men's faith and consciences by their church legislation. 6. And for using that office, which is made for the comfort and edifying of the faithful, to drive conscience and obedience to God out of the world, by making doubtful ensnaring impositions, &c.” Engl. Nonconform. cap. 4.

How would a French minister answer these arguments? why plainly by saying they were slanders, not arguments. For the requiring men to use the standing posture, was not to make any new term of communion. Otherwise it would be a

new term of communion to require men to receive in a church, or in leavened bread, or in a morning, or on any other day besides the passover, or in wine not mixed with water: for all these circumstances differ from our Saviour's practice at the first institution; yet they are enjoined by the French and all other Protestant Churches; and no one can communicate with them that will not comply with these injunctions. But will any one say, all these are new terms of communion, or that they contradict Christ's appointed terms, or deprive Christ's members of their right, or schismatically tear the Church, or that they are an usurpation upon men's faith, or drive conscience and obedience out of the world; when they are only the determination of indifferent circumstances, which are left to the liberty of every Church?

If this be a good answer and apology for the French Church, which enjoins standing, it will hold as well for the Church of England, which enjoins kneeling; since their case is the same, and they must both stand or fall together.

But what, if after all, our Saviour celebrated the eucharist neither sitting, nor kneeling, nor standing, but in a different posture from all these; to wit, lying along at table? What then becomes of the argument from Christ's example? Does it not affect the dissenters, as much as the Church of England? And are not they concerned to answer their own argument as well as we? For if this be true, that Christ celebrated lying along, then sitting is as much a deviation from that posture, as standing or kneeling is. If they ask how it appears, that Christ celebrated lying along, rather than sitting? I refer them to those French authors who undertake to prove it against Cardinal Perron, and such other popish writers, that say our Saviour celebrated sitting, and that sitting is a posture of adoration.

Monsieur Daille says, "it is a thing confessed among learned men, and evidently proved by the Gospels, that the Apostles, at the time when they received the eucharist with our Saviour, did not sit, but lie along upon beds as the custom then was." *Apostolos, quo tempore eucharistiam sumpserunt, non sedisse, sed in lectis de sæculi illius more, semisupinos recubuisse, & Evangelia apertissime docent, &*

*omnes eruditi confitentur.* Dall. de Cultu Relig. lib. 2. c. p. 227.

The same is asserted by Chamier,\* Rivet, and other writers of the French Church; who upon their principles, consonant to those of the Church of England, do rationally account for their Church's practice in using a different posture: because they say well, that the posture of receiving is to be reckoned among the indifferent circumstances of the action, and not among those things which are of necessary prescription or observation; and therefore every Church has power to appoint what posture she thinks fit in her own discretion. But Dissenters cannot thus account for their practice upon their principles: for if it be a necessary rule, as they say it is, to receive in the same posture which our Saviour used; and that be true which the French writers maintain, that he used not sitting, but lying along; then their practice contradicts their own rule, and they condemn themselves in going contrary to the example of Christ, whilst they think themselves obliged to follow it. And this is a further proof, that in this whole matter they differ as much both in principles and practice from the French Church, as they do from the Church of England.

#### CHAP. XIV.

*That the French Church thinks it lawful to oblige all Members of the Church to frequent Communion under Pain of Excommunication.*

The Rubrick at the end of the communion-office requires every parishioner to communicate at least three times in the year, of which Easter shall be one. "And the 112th

---

\* Chamier Panstrat. tom. iv. de Euchar. lib. vi. c. 3. n. 11. It. lib. vii. c. 15. n. 13. cited before in this chapter.

Rivet Synop. Pur. Theol. Disp. 45. n. 12. Non sedentes, sed accumulantes, &c.

Canon enjoins the minister, church-wardens, quest-men and assistants of every parish church and chapel, yearly within forty days after Easter, to exhibit to the bishop or his chancellor the names and surnames of all the parishioners, as well men as women, who being of the age of sixteen years, received not the communion at Easter before."

Mr. Baxter has ten reasons against this, which I shall not here repeat, but only observe by the by, with the learned Dr. Falkner, how nonconformity hath run its changes at such a variance, as if both the extremes were to be preferred to the middle way. Mr. Baxter thinks the Church has done too much in directing men to communicate, and ordering the minister to present those that neglect it. But both Mr. Cartwright, the chief opposer of the Liturgy in Queen Elizabeth's time, and Didoclavius the author of the *Allare Damascenum*, who was the most violent censurer thereof in King James's time, thought that too little was done herein: for both of them would have all, who are in the Church's communion, forced to receive the Lord's supper at stated times. Mr. Cartwright was for inflicting civil punishments on refusers; and both of them condemn those who abstain from the Lord's table out of fear, as guilty of superstition, and say they ought not to be borne with. See T. C. reply, p. 117, and Altar. Damasc. c. 10. cited by Dr. Falkner, lib. Eccles. p. 209.

One might possibly give many other such instances out of the writings of our old nonconformists: but my business is to shew the sense of the French Church in this matter. And here I observe first of all, that the judgment of Beza was entirely conformable to the rule of the Church of England: for in his 73d Epistle, p. 330, he gives this advice to a certain magistrate, "That he should enjoin all men professing the same religion with himself, to frequent the Lord's Supper, and they that should neglect it, should be called before the consistory, to answer for their contempt." Their Book of Discipline has a Canon to the same purpose, cap. xii. art. 11. where it is ordered, "That if any out of contempt refuse for a long time to communicate, they shall be cut off from the body of the Church." And what

they mean by contempt, we may learn from other Canons, which speak of stated communions among them four times a year. Thus the 14th Canon of the same chapter: "Although it hath not been the custom to administer the Lord's Supper in the greatest part of our churches more than four times a year, yet it were to be desired that it might be oftener; because it is very profitable, &c., and the example of the Primitive Church doth invite us to it. Therefore our National Synods shall take that care and order in this matter, which is requisite to the welfare of our churches."

The Synod of Paris, 1565, Can. 29. speaks to the same purpose. "Although in our churches the Lord's Supper for the most part is administered only four times a year, yet the more frequent celebration of it is very desirable, due reverence in approaching it being always observed," &c.

Here we see, four times a year are insisted on as the received custom of all the Churches, and more frequent celebration is commended, yet not precisely enjoined: but four times a year it was expected every member should communicate, else he was deemed guilty of a contempt of their discipline, and accordingly censured by the consistory of the Church, which had power to proceed even to excommunication. This is something more than our Church requires, both as to times and punishment; for she only requires three times a year, and says nothing of excommunication, but leaves the censure and manner of punishment to the bishop's discretion. However, Mr. Baxter thinks fit to say, "that they are then to be excommunicated if they refuse, and to lie in gaol till they die, when taken by the writ *de excommunicato capiendo*:" though there is not a word of this, either in the Rubrick or Canon. And yet if it had been so, it is no more than is commonly done by the magistrates of Geneva, who imprison or banish, as they think fit, all incorrigible contemners of the orders of the Church.

I will end this chapter with two citations out of Calvin. In one of his epistles, he tells us, he laboured hard in the beginning of the reformation, to have communions brought to once a month. "I should be most pleased," says he, "to have a monthly communion, rather than have the people in-

vited only four times a year, as now the custom is among us. When I first came hither, it was administered only three times a year: I was for a communion once a month; but when I could not prevail, I thought it better to indulge a little the people's infirmity, than to contend over much about it. Nevertheless, I took care to have it entered upon record, that this was an evil custom, to the end that posterity might with more ease and liberty correct it." Resp. de Quibusd. Eccles. Ritib. p. 206, 529.

In another place he pleads for a weekly communion, and says, "It was not instituted to be received only once a year, as then the popish custom was; but to be received frequently, in memory of our Saviour's passion, and for many other good ends," which he there recounts. This was the practice of the Apostolical Church: they communicated once a week, (Act. ii. 42. 1 Cor. xi. 20.) and it continued so for some ages after, which he proves from many ancient Canons, as those called the Apostolical Canons, the Councils of Antioch and Toledo, and the writings of St. Austin and Chrysostom: and concludes, "that the custom of communicating only once a year was most certainly an invention of the devil's. *Sane hæc consuetudo, quæ semel quotannis communicare jubet, certissimum est diaboli inventum.*" Calvin Instit. lib. iv. c. xvii. n. 44, 46.

Can we think now Calvin would have complained of the English Rubrick, for enjoining men three times a year to communicate, who says, "the enjoining them but once only was the devil's invention!" This was his quarrel with the Church of Rome for enjoining it no oftener than she did: sure then he would not blame the Church of England for prescribing it more frequently. He himself prescribed it four times a year, and would have enjoined a monthly communion, but was overborne in it. He commends the ancient practice of communicating weekly, and the ancient discipline which excommunicated all that refused it. He would have the ancient practice restored again, though not by the ancient discipline; for though it was proper for those times, yet he thinks it too severe for the present, and therefore would have men invited only, not compelled, to weekly communions. All which is exactly agreeable to the sense

and practice of the Church of England, which encourages monthly and weekly communions, but compels none to them: she only requires men's attendance three times a year, upon pain of ecclesiastical censure.

## CHAP. XV.

*That the French Church uses a Form of Words at the Delivery of the Sacrament, and obliges every Communicant to receive it only from the Hands of the Minister.*

By the Rubrick of the Church of England, all ministers are enjoined to deliver the elements to every communicant's hand, and to use a certain form of words, 'the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.' particularly to every one at the distribution. Now this is also censured by some as a thing contrary to the practice of Christ: nay, they say, it is a studying to be wiser than our Master, and not to be obedient to Him. An heavy charge indeed, if it were really true!

But here again Calvin and Beza express their dissent. Calvin says, "men ought not to contend about such matters as these; whether they shall take the elements into their own hands, or not; whether they shall divide them among themselves, or every one take the part which is given to them; whether they shall return the cup into the deacon's hands, or give it to their next neighbour; whether the bread shall be leavened or unleavened; the wine red or white: for these are indifferent things, and left to the liberty of the Church. Calvin. Instit. lib. 4. c. 17. n. 43

Beza speaks much to the same purpose in his second Epistle to du Tillet. "It is probable," says he, "that at the first supper the Apostles received the cup from one another, and all drank of the same cup. But what then? shall we therefore say all Churches sin, where the custom is not to take the elements from one another, but every one singly from the hands of the minister or deacon? By no means: because, though we are commanded to receive, yet the manner of the reception is not precisely enjoined."

They, who speak thus, could not think, as our objectors

do, that the practice of our Church was so contrary to the rule of Christ, as to be an act of disobedience, and a studying to be wiser than Him.

But the enjoining it perhaps is the thing they most scruple at, as contrary to the example of Christ, because it makes a new term of communion. If so, the Church of France is bound to answer it, for making so many canons, enjoining all communicants to receive only from the hands of the minister, (except in cases of absolute necessity) with a certain form of words also to be used at the distribution to every one. Their Book of Discipline has two canons to this purpose, Cap. 12. Art. 8 and 9. The Churches shall be informed, "That it belongeth only unto ministers to give the cup. And this they may do with the accustomed form of words, &c."

This is repeated in the Synod of Montauban, cap. 4. art. 33. Synod of Lyons, 1563. cap 10. Synod of Vertueil, 1567, cap. 8. art. 9. and with greater strictness in the Synod of Gergeau, 1601. Cap. 6. Art. 7. where it is decreed, "That the bread and cup in the holy eucharist shall be distributed by none but the ministers and elders, who shall with their own hands put them into the hands of every individual communicant."

The Synod of St. Maixant, 1609. Cap. 6. Art. 14. speaks in as peremptory terms as may be, "That the cup shall not be given by the faithful, one to another, it being contrary to an express canon of our discipline; which ordereth pastors, if possible, to deliver it; or where they cannot, the elders to assist the pastors in populous churches."

Where it is to be noted that elders are to have no hand in it but only in cases of absolute necessity, which is so far insisted on, that in another canon they condemned one Royer, who wrote a book to prove it lawful for elders ordinarily to give the cup in the sacrament, and recite the words of institution at the delivery of it. The censure is in these words: "This Synod having already determined what should be done herein, by an express canon inserted into our discipline; in which nothing shall be changed, for whatever difficulties may arise about the delivery of the

cup, it cannot by any means approve of the said Royer, &c. But our advice is, that forasmuch as pastors in populous churches cannot without excessive toil deliver the cup to every individual communicant, they may use the help of elders, but yet enjoin them silence, and the pastors only shall speak when the sacred elements are distributed, that so it may be generally and manifestly known, that the administration of the sacraments is wholly appropriated to the pastoral office." Synod of St. Maixant, Cap. 8. Art. 35.

The non-conformity of some pastors and churches gave them still fresh occasion to repeat this injunction. Therefore in the Synod of Alez. 1620. they reinforced their discipline with this Canon: " In all provinces pastors shall be obliged to administer the cup, as well as the bread, unto every individual communicant, without distinction of persons. And also they shall use meet words in the administration of both the elements, to quicken the hearts and spirits of the communicants at the Lord's table. And express order is given to all Provincial Synods, to take special care that pastors do not in the least transgress this canon." Cap. 5. Art. 14.

The Church of Montauban made a remonstrance against this, and pleaded, that it had been an ancient custom with them for elders to deliver the cup, and therefore they desired license to continue their ancient practice. But the Synod refused, and peremptorily commanded all pastors without exception, to conform to the established order. Synod of Alez. Cap. 14. Art. 37.

The two following Synods of Charenton and Castres reinforced the said decree, " Expressly enjoining all the Churches to observe most uniformly the canon of the Synod of Alez: see the Synod of Charenton, 1623. Cap. 6. Art. 3. and Castres 1626. Cap. 14. Art. 5.

And whereas in the next Synod of Charenton 1631. a complaint was made against the Churches of Nismes and Montpellier, for non-execution of the canon of Alez, about delivering the cup at the Lord's table by pastors only; that Synod judged the province of lower Languedoc to have incurred a censure for their overmuch indulgence to those Churches: and it highly censured the consistories of those Churches also, and enjoined them for the future to

follow the practice of the other Churches of the kingdom, on pain of being prosecuted with all ecclesiastical censures." See the second Synod of Charenton, Cap. 19. Art. 28.

The Church of Nismes not conforming for all this, another decree passed in the following Synod of Alanson, 1637. Cap. 8. Art 4. enjoining them to submit, and "conform themselves to the canon of their discipline, which orders all Churches to be informed, that it belongeth to ministers only to administer the cup, and this for the avoiding many evil consequences."

These canons I presume will be owned to run full in as high and peremptory terms, as the Rubrick of the Church of England, which enjoins the minister to deliver the elements to every communicant's hand, and use a form of words particularly to every one at the distribution of them. Our dissenters call this an act of disobedience to Christ, and a studying to be wiser than our master: but the French Synods say, many evil consequences would attend the contrary practice, and therefore they universally and severely prohibit it, and subject the transgressors to all ecclesiastical censures.

I have one thing more to add upon this head, that whereas lay-elders in the Church of Geneva, were wont sometimes to assist the pastors in the delivery of the cup: in the year 1623, "The pastors of the Church and professors of the University, sent letters to the National Synod of Charenton, telling them, that now they had resolved for the future that it should be done by the pastors only." Synod of Charenton, 1623. Cap. 5.

And long before this they had declared their willingness to comply with this custom. For in the National Synod of Lyons, 1563, the brethren of Geneva being demanded, whether at the Lord's table pastors only should distribute the bread and wine to the people? they gave this answer, "That it were certainly best, if it might be conveniently done at all times; but where it would be impracticable and too great a burden for the pastor, as it would be in some churches, there the elders and deacons might come in to his assistance and distribute the elements unto those who were more remote from him." Synod of Lyons, 1563. p. 53.

So that here we have the concurring judgment both of France and Geneva, not only for the lawfulness but also the expediency of the English way of distributing the elements to the people; which rule is never to be broken but in cases of absolute necessity, when they allow elders and deacons to distribute, but never the people to receive from one another. This either justifies the Church of England, or condemns the French Church for disobeying the law of Christ. Let those now, who are concerned, tell us, whether of the two it does, for we can see no difference between them.

## CHAP. XVI.

### *Of the Doxology in the Communion-office, which speaks of Archangels in Heaven.*

I find another objection made against the communion-office, by the authors of the book called, the Necessity of Reformation, 1660. because in the doxology a little before the prayer of consecration, there is mention made of Archangels as well as Angels in heaven. Now they say, "This is an uncertainty, if not an untruth; for the scripture never speaks of more Archangels than one. Dan. 10. 21. 1 Thes. 4. 16. Jude v. 12. Rev. 12. 7. This one is Michael, to wit, Christ the Prince of his people." So those reformers, p. 29.

To which I answer, 1. That supposing there was but one Archangel, yet this expression might be justified by many passages of Scripture, where the plural number is used, when only a single person is meant. As Matt. 27. 44. "The thieves also that were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth:" when yet it appears from Luke 23. 39. that it was but one of the thieves that railed on him. See the like instances, Matt. 26. 8. Heb. 11. 33. 37. Matt. 21. 2. cited in Mr. Pool's Synopsis, on Mat. 27. 44. To which may be added, Job 1. 5. Jud. 12. 7.

Now as St. Matthew speaks truth, when he says, men of all sorts mocked Christ, to wit, the chief priests, the scribes, the people, the soldiers, and even the thieves that were

crucified with him, though it was but one of the thieves that did so: in like manner our Church speaks truth, when she says, "with Angels and Archangels, and all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name;" though it could be certainly proved, that there was but one Archangel in heaven. For still it will be true, that heavenly Spirits of all sorts, Angels, Archangels, &c. praise the name of God in heaven.

But 2dly. It is a mistake in the objectors, when they say the scripture never speaks of more Archangels than one. For Dan. 10. 12. Michael the Archangel is called one of the chief princes: which I think plainly signifies that there are more than one. And so St. Austin says expressly in his Enchiridion, cap. 58. *Sint tamen et illic Archangeli*, that there are Angels and Archangels in heaven; though he will not undertake with Dionysius and the schoolmen to distinguish them into nine orders and tell what is the exact difference between them. Rivet commends St. Austin's modesty,\* and does not dislike his opinion of more Archangels than one. Rivet Cathol. Orth. Tract. 2. Q. 46. n. 3.

And Peter Martyr says, "The names of Archangel, Cherubim, and Seraphim do denote that there are both different orders and different offices among the celestial Spirits. And he thinks Principalities and Archangels in Scripture mean the same order, to wit, those higher Spirits, to whose care only is committed the protection of provinces, empires, and kingdoms.

\* That the ancients were generally of opinion, that there were more Archangels than one, is evident from hence, that they reckon Archangels one of the orders of created Angels.—The Council of Sardica says expressly, that Christ was the Creator and Maker of Archangels and Angels, &c. Ep. Synod ap. Theodoret. l. 2. c. 8. Pope Damasus in his Confession of Faith says, we are baptized in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, not in the name of Angels or Archangels, ap. Theodoret. lib. 5. c. 11. Chrysostom adv. Vituperator. Vitæ. Monast. lib. 3. p. 498. tom. 4. Ibid. p. 505. with Angels and Archangels. It. serm. 3. de incomprehens. Dei naturâ ἀρχάγγελοι εἰσονται t. 1. p. 365. ser. 4. p. 365. ser. 32. de Cruce et Latrone. t. 1. p. 498. ser. 2. de Verb. Esai. t. 3. p. 849. Greg. Nazianzen. Orat. 1. Apol. de Fugâ. Hieron. Ep. 53. ad Reparium. Cassian. Collat. 7. c. 13. Collat. 8. c. 15. Id. Collat. 18. c. 16. Ambros. de Fide. lib. v. c. 8. Theodoret. ser. 3. de Angel. t. 4. p. 522.

“ This, he says, was Daniel’s meaning, when he wrote of the Prince of the Grecians, and Persians, and Michael the Prince of the people of God, Dan. 10. 13, and 12. 1. Pet. Mart. Loc. Com. par. 1. c. 12. n. 20, 21.

So that in his opinion, the Prince of Grecia, and the Prince of Persia are of the same order with Michael the Prince of the people of God.

And that shews, that he did not believe Michael to be Christ nor the only Archangel that is mentioned in Scripture.

## CHAP. XVII.

### *Of the Use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, how far justified by the French Church.*

The next particular office that is found fault with is the office of baptism, against which nonconformists have several exceptions. That, which has made the most noise, with the least reason, is the rubrick, which enjoins the minister to sign the child after baptism with the sign of the cross. Some say it is superstition, others that it is popery: but Mr. Baxter has two new charges against it, first, he says, it is inventing a new sacrament, and 2dly, it alters the term of Christ’s covenant, and directly contradicts the fundamental law of Christianity. Eng. Nonconform. Cap. 13.

Let us hear the judgment of the French Church, whether that be so severe as this. They neither enjoin this ceremony nor use it, I own, but neither do they condemn it as superstitious, or simply unlawful, nor give our Church those hard names for enjoining it as Mr. Baxter and some others do.

Beza was not for the enjoining it, yet he gives this advice to the brethren of England, that wrote to him about this and many other ceremonies, “ That forasmuch as they were not idolatrous in themselves, it was not fit that ministers should leave their office, or people forsake the communion because of it. Beza Epist. 12. p. 107, and 109.

In another place he says, " I know that some Churches (meaning the English and Lutheran) renouncing the adoration of the cross, do still retain the use of this sign: *utantur igitur ipsi, sicuti par est, suâ Libertate*; let them therefore use their own liberty as it is meet they should; we in the French Churches for sundry reasons do not permit it to be used. Beza Cont. Baldwin cited by Mr. Sprint in his *Cassander Anglicus* p. 249.

This is spoken candidly with a just moderation and temper: every Church may use her own liberty in this matter and therefore as the Church of England does not condemn the French for not retaining this ceremony, so neither does the French condemn the English for retaining it. For they are both agreed that it is not in itself unlawful.

Peter Martyr says, " The sign of the cross is worn by kings upon their crowns without superstition, because by that sign they only profess and declare, tha they reverence and maintain the Christian religion. And if it be lawful for a man to bear the coat of arms belonging to his family, it is lawful also to profess ourselves Christians by the sign of the cross" .*Loc. Com. part. 2. c. 5. n. 20.*

What does the Church of England more than this, when she uses this sign only as a token of professing the Christian religion, that we are not ashamed to own the faith of Christ crucified, &c. ? May we not as innocently use this sign in baptism, as a prince wear it on his crown, in token that he reverences and maintains the Christian religion ? A disputing head, I confess may work a new sacrament out of either; but Peter Martyr was not so quick sighted as to discern any such mystery in them.

Nor surely did the National Synod of St. Maixant see any harm in it, when they resolved, " That protestant soldiers, to receive the relief granted by his Majesty, unto those who had been maimed in his servive, might wear the cross on their cloaks, not as a badge of superstition, but as a mark and cognizance of their afflicted condition, and that they should not therefore be excluded from the communion at the Lord's table." *Synod of St. Maixant. 1609. Cap. 6. Art. 11.*

But it may be said, that though the French Church

allow it to be lawful, yet they did not like the imposing it. Suppose they did not: what follows from thence? That therefore to impose it was to make a new sacrament, and alter the terms of Christ's covenant, and destroy the fundamental law of Christianity, as Mr. Baxter words it? No such thing; for how then could Beza persuade ministers to comply with it, if it was so manifestly repugnant to the Christian religion? Would he have exhorted both pastors and people to have submitted to it, had he thought it a new sacrament, or that it altered the terms of the covenant of God? Beza knew too well, that the enjoining some indifferent circumstance or ceremony was not to alter the terms of the covenant: otherwise the French Church had been as guilty as any other. For though they do not enjoin the sign of the cross in baptism, yet they do some other things, which Christ has no more commanded than the sign of the cross.

At Geneva it is enacted by a law, for some reasons of state, that no minister shall baptize a child with the name of Balthasar.\* And though this sometimes occasions troubles and tumults, yet the ministers are bound precisely to observe it, as Beza himself informs us in the life of Calvin. "*In Gervasii templo tumultum non parvum eo pretextu excitarunt, quod Minister infanti ad baptismum oblato, indere Balthasaris nomen, quoniam id diserte leges scriptæ ob certam causam prohibebant, recusaret.*" Beza Vit. Calvin p. 84.

In the other Churches of France ministers are enjoined by canon not to baptize any child with any name that is ascribed to God in Scripture, as Immanuel, and others of the like nature. So their Book of Discipline. Cap. 11. Art. 14.

And the Synod of Orleans, 1562. Cap. 2. Art. 21. says expressly; "Ministers shall reject the names of old paganism, nor shall they give unto infants such names as are attributed to God; nor names of office, such as Baptist, Angel, Archangel." See also the Synod of Nismes, 1572, Cap. 2. Art. 3. Synod of Figeac, 1579. Cap. 2. Art. 4. Synod of Vitre, 1583. Cap. 3.

---

\* The reason of prohibiting this name, I conceive, was only because Balthasar Pacimontanus was the ring-leader of the Anabaptists.

They are further obliged not to baptize any children but upon a sermon-day. The Synod of Tonneins, 1614. Cap. 6. Art. 7. "It shall not be lawful to celebrate baptism, unless there be a sermon either before or after." The same was decreed in the Synod of St. Maixant, 1609. Cap. 3. Art. 10. and the Synod of Privus, 1612. Cap. 6. Art. 7.

Now the question to be asked upon all this is, whether any of these things be conditions of baptism enjoined by Christ? If not; (for no one, I presume will say they are,) then by what authority does the Church of France enjoin them? Why must no child be baptized but on a sermon-day? Why not with an heathen name, or the name of Balthasar, or Immanuel, or Baptist, or Angel, &c? Hath Christ made any of these things conditions of baptism? No, but at Mr. Baxter's rate of arguing, the French canons do. For they say no one shall be baptized, unless the parents will first agree not to call him by the name of Balthasar, or Immanuel, or Baptist, &c, Now what if the parents insist upon it and require the child to be named so, and plead as Mr. Baxter does, that Christ required none of these conditions, and therefore if the ministers refuse to baptize, they are guilty of altering the terms of Christ's covenant and sacrament: would this charge at all affect the Church of France? If not, how comes it more to affect the Church of England, which only requires submission to her injunction in the same manner as the Church of France does to hers? "Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment;" excuse the one, or condemn both.

If it be said, that the French canons do not deprive any of baptism: I answer, they do as much as the Church of England does, supposing men to be so weak or superstitious, as to think them an encroachment upon their Christian liberty, and an altering the terms of Christ's covenant; for whilst they are under that prejudice, they will think it unlawful to comply with them, and that they are obliged to shew their Christian liberty by standing stiff against them; in which case they can have no baptism, unless the canons are transgressed, or else give way to their weakness or stubbornness, call it what you will: so that the case is the same in both Churches, only the one

has been so happy as scarce ever to have met with any opposition upon such points, whilst the other has felt the sad effects of inveterate prejudice to her great sorrow and distraction.

But then experience, you will say, should make men wise and teach them at last to take this stumbling block out of the way, and leave every one at liberty whether he would use the cross or not. I answer this belongs to convocations and Synods, and not to private men to alter. The French Church saw reason to alter one of the forementioned constitutions. For the Synod of Castres, 1626. Cap, 25. Art. 15. does not confine men to baptize only on sermon-days, but allows baptism to be celebrated "on any day when common prayer is said without sermon." And it was finally determined by the following Synod of Charenton, 1631. Cap. 19. Art. 22. "That every Church should be left to their own usage and custom, to baptize with or without a sermon as they thought convenient." But so long as the former constitution continued in force, private men were not to contemn, but pay a due respect and obedience to it. And that is our case here in England. When the wisdom of our superiors shall think it expedient to make any alteration in this matter; ministers may baptize with, or without the cross, as now is done in private baptism: but till then rubricks must be their rule, and not humour or fancy. Meanwhile dissenters have been often told, that if taking away the cross, or leaving it at liberty, would cure the schism, the Church of England could as easily dispense with it, as the French Church does with a sermon, and go many steps further for the sake of peace and union,\* if such conditions would procure it.

---

\* See Dr. Stillingfleet's preface to *Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 82. And Dr. Sherlock's defence, p. 12.

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Of the Saving Regeneration of Infants, that it is a Doctrine of the French Church, as much as of the Church of England.*

The next thing that is scrupled in the office of baptism is the rubrick at the end of it, which says, "It is certain by God's word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." Mr. Baxter is so offended with this, that he says, were there but this one thing, it would oblige them to nonconformity, whatever they suffer for it. Case of English Nonconformists, Cap. 9.

Sure there must be some extraordinary evil in it then, which makes it so frightful: yes, he says, it is a new article of faith, and a dangerous adding to the word of God and a doctrine never heard of till the last alteration of the Liturgy. All which is abundantly proved to be false by Dr. Falkner in his *Libertas Ecclesiastica* pag. 230. &c. whither I refer the reader for satisfaction. All, I am here concerned to shew, is, that this rubrick is agreeable to the doctrine of the French Church. Which will appear if we compare it with the 35th article of their confession, which says, "That baptism is administred to us to testify our adoption, because by it we are ingrafted into the body of Christ, washed by his blood, and renewed by his spirit unto holiness of life." Now are not those, who are washed by the blood of Christ and renewed by his spirit, truly regenerated, and undoubtedly saved, if they commit no actual sin to reverse and cancel the benefit of their baptism? How comes the Church of England then to be charged with making a new article of faith? Why, because it is not certain by God's word that all children that are baptized, are saved: particularly not the children of infidels and heathens, though they should be baptized. And does the Church of England say this? No, but Mr. Baxter says she means so, and that is

enough to charge her with making a new article of faith. But why may not the Church of France mean so too, seeing her words are as indefinite and without exception? No, that would spoil another charge of Mr. Baxter's, who says, the Church of England presumptuously condemns the reformed Churches and the Christian world. So that in short, here is no controversy upon this point, unless we will allow Mr. Baxter the liberty of fixing what sense he pleases upon words, and let him partially load the Church of England, and excuse the French and other reformed Churches, when yet they all speak and mean the same thing, which is no more than this; that all children who have a just right to baptism, and are truly qualified for it, and are lawfully and duly baptized, are thereby put into a salvable condition, in which if they die without committing actual sin, they will certainly be saved. And if this be not truth, the whole doctrine of infant baptism must be false and to no purpose, and it is in vain to dispute with Pelagians and Anabaptists any longer about it.

But what if the Church of England had said, that all children that were baptized were undoubtedly saved, &c. ought not this in reason by every candid interpreter to be construed of children only that had a true right to baptism, that is, of children of believing parents, and not of Turks and infidels, as Mr. Baxter will needs understand it? And then what is it more than is said by other Churches? Calvin and Beza were for the salvation of all infants baptized, if Rivet rightly understood their doctrine: for he says in answer to a jesuist, that it is most false, that Calvin and Beza ever said, that some baptized infants are damned, dying in their infancy before they commit any actual sin.

Rivet. Cathol. Orthod. tract. 3. Q. 3. sect. 6. *Falsissimum est eos unquam dixisse, quosdam infantes jam baptizatos damnari, si in infantia moriuntur, antequam peccata actualia sine pœnitentiâ commiserint.*

And Peter Martyr's words are as general as those of our rubrick, that children dying with baptism are saved, which he proves by Scripture-arguments, though Mr. Baxter says there is no Scripture for it. Pet. Mart. Loc. com. part. 4 Cap. 8. n. 19.

But I have a greater authority to urge than either Calvin

or Beza, which is the authority of a National Synod held at Charenton, 1623. Cap. 26. Art, 17. where they say, “that the word of God testifieth, that the children of believers are holy through the singular benefit of the covenant of grace, in which they are included with their parents: therefore fathers and mothers fearing God should not doubt of their children’s election and salvation, whom God takes upon himself in their infancy.” Now if even the unbaptized children of the faithful are saved, much more the baptized.

And it is to be observed that this was one of those canons, which were made to explain the decrees of the Synod of Dort, which every French minister subscribes, and swears to believe and maintain: so that after all Mr. Baxter’s declamations and invectives against the English Rubrick, it deserves them no more than this French canon, or the Synod of Dort; since it speaks only of the children of believers, who have a right to baptism, and no others. And this leads us to another controversy raised by Mr. Baxter, concerning those who have right to baptism by the rules of the Church of England, which shall be the subject of the following chapter.

## CHAP. XIX.

*That the Church of England admits of none to be baptized but what are allowed Baptism in the French Church.*

Mr. Baxter in his 34th chap. of Engl. Nonconformity lays it to the charge of the Church, that she obliges all her ministers under pain of suspension, to baptize the children of atheists, Jews, infidels, heretics, blasphemers, or any other that are brought to church to them. The only ground of this charge are the words of the 68th Canon, which are these, “No minister shall refuse or delay to christen any child, according to the form of the Book of Common-prayer, that is brought to the church to him upon

Sundays or holy-days to be christened; whence he infers, that no minister may refuse to baptize the children of Jews or infidels, or so much as enquire whether the godfathers be Christians, Jews, or infidels, because it is said, he must baptize them without delay.

I could hardly have thought it possible for any man to have put such a perverse interpretation upon the words of an innocent canon. But this is Mr. Baxter's ordinary way of disputing, to strain words to an unnatural sense, and then fight against his own chimeras. Who besides him would have thought or said, that the children of Jews and infidels, as such, were comprised in this canon, when it is so plain that it speaks only of such as have a just right to christian baptism? whom the minister is not to refuse or delay to christen, when they are offered, for any private reason of his own; such reasons, suppose, as was that of Snape in Queen Elizabeth's time, who, as Bishop Bancroft informs us, would not baptize a certain child, only because the parents insisted upon having him called Richard.—Bancroft. Danger. Posit. l. 3. c. 12.

This indeed might have been allowed in a French minister, who, (as I have shewn), is prohibited by canon to give any heathen name to children at their baptism; but it was no rule of the Church of England, and therefore probably Bishop Bancroft, who was president of the convocation, when the canons were made, might have his eye upon the very thing, and insert this canon on purpose to prevent this abuse in others of the like nature. But whether that was the occasion of the canon or not: it is certain, it can have no such sense as Mr. Baxter puts upon it, that is, to oblige ministers to baptize the children of Jews and infidels, who have no right to baptism. It is certain our Church in this matter goes by no other rule than all the reformed Churches, which exclude the children of Turks, Jews, and infidels from baptism, as being out of the covenant, and unclean, except in some particular cases; as when they are adopted into Christian families, either by the voluntary consent of the parents themselves, transferring their right of education to Christians; or children that are exposed by their parents and taken up in charity by Christians, to be brought up

by them ; or are made lawful captives of war, and by that means become the legal possession of Christian masters. In these cases, their adoption into Christian families, where they are designed a Christian education, gives them a qualification for Christian baptism. And if in such cases, the Church of England admits the children of Jews, Turks, or heathens to be baptized ; it is no more than what Rivet and Walæus tell us is done by most other reformed Churches, who think that by such means those children gain a right to baptism, after the same manner that Abraham's servants, bought with his money, did to circumcision, as well as those that were born in his house. And they say further, that this was so common a practice, and so beyond all controversy in the Primitive Church, that St. Austin made use of it to prove free grace and election against the Pelagians. Vid. Synops. pur. Theol. Disp. 44. n. 49.

Where then is the fault of the Church of England in this matter, if she acts by the same rule that the Primitive Church and all Reformed Churches go by ? If she admits not the children of Jews and pagans to baptism, but only in such cases as all other Churches do ; it is a slandering her constitution for any man to say, she obliges her ministers by canon, to refuse none, though they be the children of Jews or infidels, if they be but brought to church to be baptized.

But however, she admits the children of wicked Christians, and commands the minister to baptize them. And where is the harm of that ? Is it not much better, than to perplex her ministers, as many dissenters do themselves, with doubting consciences and endless scruples about the parents' godliness, which they cannot always, nay very seldom, certainly know. The forementioned authors, Rivet and Walæus, tell us in the same place (n. 50.) that their Churches do not exclude the children of Christian parents from baptism, though the parents have rendered their own baptism null, as to any efficacy upon themselves, by an ungodly life or impure faith ; and their reason is, because the son is not to bear the iniquity of the father : God is still the God of those children.

What then, must all children be admitted, that are

brought to baptism? Suppose the children of atheists, heretics, blasphemers, incestuous, adulterers, or even excommunicate persons; must none of these be delayed or refused, but be immediately baptized? I answer, the children of the three last mentioned are to be baptized by the rules of the French Discipline. For in the Synod of Vitre, 1583, Cap. Art. 8. This case was proposed, "Whether the usual form of prayer should be recited at the baptism of infants born out of matrimony, or in adultery, or incest, because there are in it those words, 'begotten of father and mother whom thou hast called into thy Church.' And the Synod judged, that there needed be no dispute made about it; because that under the name of father and mother are not only comprised the more immediate parents, but also their ancestors to a thousand generations; and this also should be considered, that though the parents be faulty; yet they are not therefore totally excluded the covenant of God." See also Book of Discipline, Cap. 11. Art. 19.

In the Synod of Rochel, 1607. Cap. 10. Art. 35. this other case was proposed, "Whether a child born in marriage disallowed by their discipline, being presented by Godly sureties, might be baptized? and answer was given, that the parents' fault cannot prejudice the children, so that there is no difficulty at all in the case; nor should any scruple in the least be made about admitting such infants unto baptism, especially when as Godly persons will become sureties for their religious education."

Nay Beza says farther, that the children of excommunicate persons have a right to baptism. "Charity, says he, bids us hope well of all, and labour to restore those, who are taken captive in the snare of the devil: therefore, God forbid we should conclude, that when parents are excommunicate, their posterity belong not to the kingdom of God." He gives many reasons for his assertion, much of the same nature with those of the foresaid Synod of Vitre, and then infers from them all, "That such children ought to be baptized, *modo idoneus Sponsor interveniat*, provided some fit surety will undertake to the Church for their Christian education, which the ministers and other pious persons

ought to procure, rather than the baptism of such should be deferred. Beza. Ep. 10. ad Neocomenses, p. 97, and the Book of Discipline, Cap. 11. Art. 4.

But what shall we say to Mr. Baxter's three instances of atheists, heretics and blasphemers? Why, I say, by the same rules, for ought I can see, the French Church would determine that their children should be baptized, provided some pious surety would undertake for their education: for they may have pious ancestors, and then they say the wickedness of the immediate parents does not prejudice the children; so that whatever is done in England in these matters, it is sufficiently justified by the rules and practice of the French Church. As to what concerns heretics in particular, they expressly put them into the same rank with excommunicated persons, and say, their children may be baptized. "Children," says their Book of Discipline, "both whose parents are members of the Church of Rome (who are heretics in their account) and those of excommunicated persons shall not be baptized unless the parents require it, and resign up their authority unto the sureties," &c. Cap. 11. Art. 4. This implies that they might be baptized, if they desired it, by proper sureties. And the next canon says, "The children of Saracens and Gypsies may be admitted unto baptism upon the same conditions."

As for atheists and blasphemers, I find no particular canon in the French Church about their children, and therefore can say nothing further about them. If any one proves they have no right to baptism, he proves at the same time that no minister is obliged to baptize them; since the canon is only to be understood of such children as have an undoubted right to be baptized.

## CHAP XX.

*That the French Church allows and commends the Use of Sponsors or Sureties in Baptism.*

We have already heard in the last chapter, that in some cases the French Church requires sureties as of absolute necessity, that is, in case the parents be excommunicate or unfit: here I shall shew that in all cases she recommends, and so far requires the use of them, as to censure those for contentious persons, who refuse to comply with the received custom. The only difference is, that she does not so precisely enjoin it to all, as the Church of England does: for her canon in this point runs in a different strain from almost all the rest. Book of Discipline, cap. 11. art. 7. "Forasmuch as we have no commandment from the Lord to take godfathers and godmothers, who may present our children unto baptism, there cannot be any particular canon made, which shall bind persons to do it. But since it is a very ancient custom, and introduced for a good end, to wit, to testify the sureties' faith, and the baptism of the infant, and also for that they charge themselves with the care of educating the child, in case it should be deprived of its parents by death; and for that it doth maintain a sweet communion among the faithful, by a conjunction of friendship, they who will not observe it, but will by themselves present their own children, shall be earnestly entreated not to be contentious, but to conform unto the ancient and accustomed order, it being very good and profitable."

This I freely own is no necessary injunction, but it may have very near the force of one; for the earnest exhortation of a Church is next to a command, and a general custom and order falls very little short of a law. "If any man will be contentious," says the Apostle, "we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God." He thought there

was some force in custom, else he would not have drawn it into an argument to quiet the contentions.

But the question is not altogether whether it be enjoined, but whether men ought not to comply with the received order of any church, whether it be founded on law, or only on general custom? And on this point there is no difference between the two Churches. Nay, Beza plainly justifies the enjoining it, writing to Bishop Grindal: "To use," says he, "a convenient form of prayer, and explication of the nature of baptism, and sponsors to undertake for the child's religious education, being rights of an innocent simplicity and gravity, and no ways symbolical, and free from giving the least occasion to superstition; *Quis tandem damnare ausit?* Who is there that dares to condemn them, unless he will incur the Apostle's censure, who commands all things to be done decently and according to order?" It seems Beza thought that text of the Apostle a sufficient ground to authorize the enjoining it, though some of his brethren were of another opinion.

Rivet says it is an useful custom, *utilis infantibus*, and therefore they retain it: and though it be not absolutely necessary to salvation, yet he thinks there may be both general and particular reasons fetched out of Scripture to persuade men to the use of it; and he derives its original from the Jewish rites in circumcision. *Cathol. Orth. tr. 1. Q. 9. n. 21.*

But now admitting it only to be a custom and practice, not a law of France: wherein does their practice differ from ours? Why first, Mr. Baxter says, "we forbid parents to be godfathers with the rest, or to speak one word, or to dedicate their children to Christ;" for which he quotes the 29th canon, which says, "No parent shall be urged to be present, nor be admitted to answer as godfather for his own child." *Case of Eng. Nonconf. C. 10. p. 59.*

Some of this is true, and some false. It is false that the Church forbids parents to be godfathers with the rest, or to dedicate their children to Christ. The Church forbids parents to be sole sponsors for their own children, and requires them to get others to answer for them: but this

does not supersede the obligation of parents, but only superinduces a further obligation upon other persons for greater security of performance, as Bishop Stillingfleet well words it. The parent may make an express compact with the sponsor, if he will; at least the desiring him to be sponsor is an implicit compact, and a transferring all his right and power upon him. The parent also may be present at baptism, and there express his consent, and dedicate his child to Christ with sponsors, but not without them. How then are parents excluded from giving their consent, or being godfathers with the rest in effect, when they have so many ways to testify their consent? This is all that is commonly done in the French Churches, and they that will do more are deemed contentious persons.

But 2dly. Mr. Baxter says, "Our Church allows godfathers without any difference, to bring the children of any atheists, sadducees, jews, infidels, or open enemies of Christ, without taking them for their own." This I have shewn already in the last chapter, to be in a great measure a false charge, but so far as the Church is concerned in it, she is fully justified by the practice of the French Church, which has no such condition as sponsors taking children to be their own, but only to take care of their education in case their parents die, which yet is not to be found in all editions of their Discipline, as Mr. Quick himself acquaints us.

3dly. But Mr. Baxter says further, "Our sponsors personate the child without authority," which is only repeating a false accusation over again, for they have always the parents' right and authority by their consent, if they be living; and if they be dead, there is no need of their authority: for baptism may be administered upon other grounds without it, as a learned person has unanswerably proved from the general consent and practice of the Catholic Church. See Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation, p. 382.

4thly. He says, "Our sponsors in personating the child, do make him say at present, 'I believe, I renounce, I desire,' &c. falsely intimating, that infants are bound at present to do this by another,—when as God requireth no faith or

repentance of infants, but only that they be the seed of penitent believers, devoted to Christ." But sure he had not this doctrine from Calvin, who owns a sort of faith in infants, though not formed as it is in adult persons, yet *in semine*, and that wrought by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Calvin. Inst. lib. iv. cap. 16. n. 19 and 20. Which was also the opinion of Melancthon, Chemnitius, Rivet, and generally of all the Lutheran and French Churches, whose arguments Bellarmin essayed to answer, though I know not whether Mr. Baxter ever did. Vide Bellarm. de Bapt. lib. 1. cap. 11.

But suppose there were no such faith in infants, yet Mr. Baxter might have known that the apologists of the Church of England justify her practice another way. They say, it is sufficient that the faith which referreth to infants, have only some general agreement in its notion with the faith of the adult. Now since the faith of the adult is an acceptance of the covenant of grace and the Gospel-doctrine, with a submission thereunto, which in their state is an active exercise of the soul; when an infant is said to believe, this must consist in such an acceptance of, and submission to the Gospel, as his state is capable of, which is passively. Thus by being baptized he accepteth Christ and the covenant of grace, and is united to and made a member of the Church, entering upon the profession of Christianity, which his sureties declare, and himself stands obliged to own, when he comes to years of understanding. So Dr. Falkner and others; and questionless, this was the sense of the Catholic Church, as appears from St. Augustin, Ep. 23. and his Book De Peccatorum Meritis, lib. 1. cap. 19. where he says, infants are called believers and penitents, because they do in some measure make profession of faith, and renounce the devil and the world in the words of those that carry them. So that whether we consider the sense of the first reformers, or the sense of the Catholic Church, the answers given in baptism do not proceed upon such a false intimation, as Mr. Baxter would make it, that children do at present believe, renounce, &c.

And therefore the Lutheran Churches, as Chemnitius

informs us, retain the old form; and those Churches, which changed it, did it not upon Mr. Baxter's principle, as if it were absurd to say in any sense that children believe, renounce, &c. For they prayed for faith for them, as it is in the Tigurine Liturgy, lately translated into English, page 82. "Let us pray to God to grant faith unto this child, that this outward baptism, as it is administered outwardly, may also be done inwardly by the internal power of the Holy Ghost."

5thly. But the worst, he says, is yet behind. That is the common perfidiousness of godfathers, who either understand not what they promise, or take no care to perform it. And must the Church bear the blame of all this, and allow it for a just cause of separation? Yes, because she admits atheists, infidels, or any wicked men not excommunicate to be godfathers: he should have named the canon that allows atheists and infidels to be godfathers. For my part, I know no such canon. If they be secret atheists or infidels, no minister can take any cognizance of them: but if they be professed ones, he may find a way to refuse them; for he may reject them from the communion, and such as he may reject from the communion, I conceive he may reject from being sponsors at baptism. As for others, who are not under any censure of the Church, they are allowed to be sponsors in all nations, particularly in France they have this canon, "that although the faithful be ill reported of, yet in case they be not by the consistory suspended from the Lord's table, they shall be admitted sureties for infants in baptism." Synod of Gergeau, 1601. Cap. 5. Art. 9.

And their Book of Discipline, cap. 11. art. 10. requires no other conditions, but that the sureties "be of sufficient age, in their 14th year at least, and shall have communicated at the Lord's table, or if they be well stricken in years, and have not yet communicated, they shall protest seriously that they will do it, and in order to it that they will suffer themselves to be duly catechized." Here we see persons may be admitted as sponsors, who want catechizing in order to receive the Lord's supper themselves.

The next canon excepts persons suspended from the Lord's supper, " They may not present children in the quality of sureties unto baptism so long as their suspension shall stand in force against them."

The 9th canon also excepts strangers that want testimonials. " A surety coming from another Church, shall not be admitted to present a child unto baptism, unless he bring with him a certificate from his own Church;" which is a good canon.

These are all the rules they give about sponsors and their qualifications; the rest is only matter of advice, can. 12. " That pastors shall diligently exhort all godfathers and godmothers to weigh and consider their promises made at the celebration of baptism, and parents also to choose such sureties for their children, as are well instructed in religion and of a godly life and conversation, and that are as much as may be of their acquaintance, and by whose means, if there should be a necessity for it in the course of God's providence, it is most likely that their children will have a religious education."

And may not the pastors of the Church of England do all this, and something more if they please? Or why must all neglects, either in pastors or sponsors presently be charged upon the Church, as if the institution itself were unlawful? There are too many faults committed in the exercise of it indeed, but that is not the fault of the thing itself, but the persons who are concerned in it: and I believe most Churches find reason enough for such complaints, which they know not how to help. Peter Martyr gives an honourable testimony to the institution itself, " calling it *utile Institutum*, a very useful order, that when children are received into the Church by baptism, they should be committed to the care of godfathers and godmothers to instruct them; but, says he, though the sponsors pawn their faith to do this, yet now-a-days there is nothing which they less regard." Loc. Com. part. 4. cap. 8. n. 5.

I hope I have now made it appear that Mr. Baxter's exceptions are all either false or trifling, and such as would hold against the practice of the reformed Church of France, as

well as the Church of England: and his last great argument upon which he lays the most stress, would hold as well against baptism itself; for there is more perfidiousness committed by persons that break their baptismal vow, than by godfathers that break their covenants as sponsors; yet we may not lay baptism aside, or charge men's faults upon the institution.

After all, he owns our baptism with all its faults to be valid, and dares not say it is null and void; though the arguments are not very good which he uses to prove it. For he says, "If it were no minister, or one unauthorised, that baptized, it would not be a mere nullity, if by mistake it were supposed well done. *Factum valet*, was judged by some, when Athanasius by a boy was baptized in sport;" p. 65. He should have said, when Athanasius being a boy, baptized some other boys in sport; for it was not Athanasius that was baptized by a boy, but he was the boy that baptized others, as Sozomen and Ruffin tell the story. But that is but a small mistake. If Mr. Baxter had been a minister in France, he must have recanted, not only his history, but his doctrine also. For their discipline requires men to subscribe and teach the contrary, and repeals all such baptisms, as are only administered by women, laymen, or any unordained person. It is a canon of their Book of Discipline cap. 11. art. 1, "That baptism administered by an unordained person is wholly void and null. Therefore in the Synod of Poitiers, 1560. Cap. 6. Art. 11, the question being put, what was to be done in case a child had been baptized by a private person? The answer was given, that the baptism shall be declared null, and the child shall be brought publicly into the Church, there to receive true baptism."

The same resolution was given in many other National Synods, as the first and second of Rochel, the Synod of Gap, and the Synod of Alanson, 1637. cap. 25, where, though the king had sent them a letter, requiring them to reverse their decree, and allow of the baptism of women and others, according as is done in the Romish Church, yet they utterly refused to allow of any such baptism, as a thing formally

contrary to their belief. So that this one thing would have made Mr. Baxter a nonconformist, had he lived in the Church of France.

He that would see their arguments upon this point, and their answers to Mr. Baxter's instance of Athanasius, may read Rivet's *Cathol. Orthod. Tract.* 3. Q. 7. and Chamier de *Baptismo*, lib. 1. cap. 14. Beza contra *Heshusium*. Calvin *Ep. to Menso Poppius*, &c. 326.

I have but two things more to observe upon this head. The first is, that the French Church allows of sponsors by proxy, which Mr. Baxter also dislikes, and reckons next to ridiculous. But the Synod of Montauban thought fit to grant this privilege, at least, to kings and great princes; which shews, that they did not think it simply unlawful. Synod of Montauban, 1594. Cap. 4. Art. 30. "No sureties shall present children unto baptism by their proxies, unless it be kings and great princes, who by reason of their weighty affairs cannot always be present at the time of baptizing." And the following Synod of Saumur, 1596. took off this very restriction, and left all sponsors at liberty to act by proxy, as need required, Cap. 4. Art. 8.

The other thing I would remark is, that they require sponsors for adult persons also, and no one can be baptized without them. For in the third Synod of Charenton, 1645, a form of baptizing pagans, jews, mahometans, and anabaptists, was composed and inserted into the acts of that Synod, cap. 9, where among other things we find it ordered, that the minister shall address himself to the sureties, who present the catechumen, in these words: "do you not promise before God and this holy assembly, to continue more and more to strengthen and confirm him in the faith, and to stir him up unto all good works?" And they must answer, "Yes." Where I observe, that this being part of the office prescribed and enjoined, baptism cannot regularly be administered without it; and the French ministers are under the same obligation not to baptize adult persons without sponsors, as the English ministers are not to baptize infants publicly without them. And this will serve as an answer to Mr. Baxter's other charge in his eleventh chapter

of English Nonconformity; where he says, the Church of England makes godfathers essential to baptism. Which is false, unless he can prove, first, that it is never administered without them, and then secondly, that it is required, not only as an useful order of the Church, but a necessary part of baptism of God's appointing; which neither he nor any one else have ever done. But admit the charge had something in it, what does it prove against the Church of England, more than the French Church, which made the same order about sponsors for adult persons? If it be schismatical imposing here, I would know by what name it is to be called in the Church of France.

The next public office, which is the form of catechism, I pass over, as finding no other objections made against it but what have been considered before, or will be considered in the next chapter about confirmation.

## CHAP. XXI.

*That the French Church approves of the English Way of Confirmation, and exacts something equivalent to it, before she admits any Person to Communion.*

Mr. Baxter in his 19th chapter of English Nonconformity declares, that he is so far from scrupling the true use of confirmation, that he thinks the want of it is the greatest corruption of the Church of any outward thing he remembers. But then he likes not the English way of confirmation, he says, nor can consent to reject all from the communion, who desire not our episcopal confirmation.

His objection against our English way of confirmation is, that here it is made impossible to be done any otherwise ordinarily than as a ceremony, and game for boys, as he modestly words it. His reason is, because the dioceses are so vast, that the bishop cannot do this and other his offices for the hundredth part of his flock. Whence he says

it follows. 1. That there is not one of an hundred confirmed at all. 2. That all the thousands that are unconfirmed may come to the sacrament when they will. 3. That ministers do not concern themselves to keep any back from the sacrament for not being confirmed, or being desirous of it. 4. That it is usually performed as a running ceremony.

To all which I answer. 1. That there are many, both bishops and inferior pastors, whose constant practice prove this to be a mere calumny and slander in every instance. 2. Admit there be some defects or abuses committed in the non-administration or mal-administration of it: upon whom are these faults to be charged? Upon the persons, or the Church and her institution? That they are not to be charged upon the institution itself, I prove from Mr. Baxter's own mouth. He says, Dr. Hammond and Mr. Elderfield, and divers others of the highest episcopal divines, have written as earnestly for the true use of confirmation as himself. Now either they wrote agreeably to the principles and institutions of the Church of England, or against them: that they wrote against them, Mr. Baxter will never persuade any of his rational readers to believe; but if they wrote according to them, then there may be a true use of confirmation according to the institution of the Church of England; and all Mr. Baxter's exceptions are frivolous, because they charge personal faults upon the institution, which the Church may lament, but cannot always help: for all forms of government are liable to abuses; and the putting confirmation into every ordinary pastor's hands would never mend the failings that are now complained of in the exercise of it, but rather increase them, unless some diligent inspectors were appointed to look into their behaviour, with sufficient power to correct them. And every private minister has now a sufficient power in his hands (if he will make use of it) by serious catechizing to qualify persons under his charge for confirmation, and either actually procure it for them, or at least teach them to be desirous of it, which is all that the Rubrick requires: and such a desire is a tacit confirmation

of their baptismal covenant, when the other, more solemn and public, cannot be had.

But Mr. Baxter cannot consent to keep any persons back from the communion who are not desirous of episcopal confirmation. "For many godly persons scruple it as sinful. 1. Because the words of the collect make it seem to some to be yet made a sacrament, which are, "Upon whom after the example of thy holy Apostles, we have now laid our hands, to certify them by this sign of thy favour and gracious goodness toward them." Here," he says, "is an outward visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given to them, said to be done in imitation of Christ's Apostles, as a means whereby they receive the same, and a pledge to assure them thereof; which is the catechism's definition of a sacrament."

Mr. Baxter takes any hint to prove the Church guilty of making new sacraments, but his method is absurd, and will prove the French Church, and all Protestant Churches, as guilty in this particular as the Church of England. For, 1. No Church does more expressly deny confirmation to be a sacrament than the Church of England does, both in her Catechism and 25th Article, which says, "Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be accounted for sacraments of the Gospel." She does not so much as call imposition of hands a temporary sacrament, though Calvin, in his Book, *De Vera Ratione Reformandæ Ecclesiæ*, scruples not to call it by that name, accusing the papists of absurdity for changing a temporary sacrament, given peculiarly to the Apostles, into a perpetual one. *Pro sacramento habendum esse fateor, sed ex temporali imperite perpetuum faciunt.* See Calvin, tom. viii. p. 285, where he says the same of the apostolical unction.

2. If all imposition of hands, after the example of the Apostles, used as a sign to certify men of God's favour and goodness, does thereby become a sacrament; then both confirmation, and ordination, and reconciliation of penitents are sacraments also. For the French writers refer confirma-

tion, and the imposition of hands used therein, to an apostolical original, and say, it is used as a blessing, as all prayer accompanied with imposition of hands was ever understood to be.

Rivet says expressly, "That the imposition of hands, joined with the doctrine of baptism, Heb. vi. 2, refers to that solemn benediction of baptized persons, which the ancients so often speak of, and which was in use in the Primitive Church, which was, that when children, who were baptized in infancy, could give an account of their faith to the satisfaction of the pastor, he then laid his hands upon them, and blessed them, commending them to God, and thereby confirming them in the profession of the Christian religion." Which custom, having been corrupted among the papists, he says they had restored to its lawful use, by catechizing, instruction, and benediction of children in prayer, before they were admitted to the Lord's supper. Rivet. *Cathol. Orth. Tract iii. q. ix. n. 3.*

In another place he speaks at once, both the sense of the French and Dutch Churches. "It is probable," he says, "that the doctrine of laying on of hands, joined with the doctrine of baptism, Heb. vi. 2. refers to that care which the Primitive Church used, in bringing children, after they were catechized, to give an account of their faith in the Church, before they were admitted to the communion; when, also, they recommended them to God by prayer, and the solemn right of imposition of hands, which was a gesture used in prayer and blessing in the time of the patriarchs and afterwards. If they of the Church of Rome would be content with this prayer and commendation of adult persons to God, after a solemn examination, we should willingly acquiesce therein; if they would demand no more than that rite which Calvin wished to have restored, and which, for the substance of it, is now religiously observed in our Churches." *Synops. Pur. Theo. Disp. 47. n. 13.*

Here, if I mistake not, imposition of hands is referred to an apostolical original, and said to be done in imitation of the Apostles, as much as that of the Church of England. And if benediction and prayer be means of obtaining God's

favour, then imposition of hands (a rite accompanying them in the opinion of these learned writers) was no less an outward sign of God's favour in that primitive confirmation, than now it is in ours. So, that if Mr. Baxter's argument proves any thing, it proves confirmation to be made a sacrament in the Primitive Church as well as in the Church of England. For this is the common doctrine of learned Frenchmen, that it is a benediction by imposition of hands, done in imitation of the Apostles. Calvin, in his comment on the aforesaid text, Heb. vi. 2, says expressly, "That this one place does abundantly prove, that the original of this ceremony came from the Apostles. Therefore we ought now to retain the purity of the institution, and correct the superstition that has been added to it." And Beza is of the same judgment. Annot. in Heb. vi. 2.

But if we believe Mr. Baxter, the superstition still remains uncorrected amongst us, merely because we retain that rite: for we use imposition of hands in confirmation as an apostolical rite, and as a sign of God's favour and blessing; which, in his opinion, is to make a sacrament of it. And then it follows that ordination and reconciliation of penitents by the same rule are sacraments also: for imposition of hands was used in both those holy offices, after the example of the Apostles, and as an outward sign of benediction. At which rate, we must come to the number of seven sacraments again, though both the French and English Church utterly disclaim that doctrine.

3. I must observe one thing further of Mr. Baxter's ingenuity in representing the Church's doctrine. He says we make imposition of hands a means whereby to receive spiritual grace, and a pledge to assure men of it (as the collects shew) which is the catechism's definition of a sacrament. But by his leave, that is but one part of the definition; for to make a complete sacrament, the catechism requires that it be ordained by Christ himself, which he cunningly omits and makes the collects say, what they do not say,—that imposition of hands is a means to convey grace: there is not one word in them tending to this purpose: there are some prayers indeed used to implore God's blessing upon the

persons confirmed, and those in some sense may be said to be means of grace; but if that makes a sacrament, then every collect in the Liturgy, and every prayer any man makes to God for his grace is a new sacrament; which I presume is too absurd for any man seriously to maintain.

But Mr. Baxter has two other reasons why godly persons may scruple our confirmation as sinful. He says, "They that are against our diocesan sort of prelacy, dare not seem to own it, by coming to them for confirmation appropriated to them." I suppose the same persons will not come to diocesan churches, prayers, nor communion neither, for fear of seeming to own diocesan prelacy. And what need any man be concerned for being obliged to deny such the communion, who will not take it though it were offered them?

"But some think that a great and holy duty is made a mere mockery to delude souls, and corrupt the Church; while every one in England that will but take this ceremony, is pronounced to God in prayer to be regenerate by the Holy Ghost, and all their sins forgiven them; these dare not join themselves with the profaners in their delusory way."

This is spoken like Mr. Baxter indeed, in a strain of eloquence peculiar to himself. To which all I shall say is, that he had done of these flowers of rhetoric from Calvin, or any famed author of the French Church, who detest any man that shall bespatter the English episcopal confirmation with such opprobrious terms, as mockery, delusion of souls, corruption of the Church, and profanation of an holy duty. Calvin speaks honourably of the ancient episcopal confirmation, and any one that will observe the account, which he gives of it, will find it exactly agreeable to the form prescribed in the Church of England. "It was an ancient custom," says he, "that the children of Christian parents, when they were grown up, should be presented to the bishop, to do that office which was required of persons who were baptized at adult age.—Forasmuch as that being baptised in infancy, they could not then make any confession of their faith before the Church, they were again brought by their parents before the bishop, and examined by him in the catechism, which they had then in a certain form of words. And that this

act, which ought to be grave and sacred, might have the greater reverence, the ceremony of imposition of hands was used in the exercise of it. And so the youth, after their faith was approved, were dismissed with a solemn benediction. Now such an imposition of hands as this, which is used purely as a blessing, I very much approve of, and wish it were now restored to its pure and primitive use." Calvin. Institut. lib. 4. cap. 19. n. 4.

He had no quarrel against it, because it was administered by diocesan bishops; much less did he think their administration of it a delusive mockery of souls, or the corruption of the Church, or a profanation of the institution; which are Mr. Baxter's compliments to the Church of England.

But Mr. Daille, as a learned man, quotes him,\* gives her a compliment of a very different nature: he says her way of confirmation is to be preferred before the practice of the Primitive Church in the fourth century. His reason, I presume, was, because in the Primitive Church, as they received infants to the communion, so in many places they confirmed them immediately after baptism. If this be true, (as I see no reason to question it, though some learned persons are of a different opinion, and refuse to receive his compliment) he had very good reason to prefer the English way of confirming adult persons, before that which allowed infants to be confirmed: for the one much better answers the end of the institution than the other: but if he was mistaken in his opinion of the Primitive Church, he however shews his respect to the Church of England, whilst he allows and commends her way of confirmation, and solemnly protests that, in the large volume, which he wrote upon that subject, he never meant to speak one word in derogation of it.

If it be said, that Calvin and Daille and all the French Church think it lawful for presbyters to confirm; I answer that is not the question at present, but only whether it be lawful in an established episcopal Church, for presbyters to set up against their bishops, and take confirmation out of

---

\* Dr. Beverige, Cod. Can. Vind. Procem. n. 11.

their hands. This neither Calvin, nor Daille, nor any other French author that I know of, will justify, but rather condemn as schismatical usurpation. The case of necessity, where there are none but presbyters to confirm, differs very much from ours, where bishops retain their privilege, and either are or ought to be diligent in administering confirmation. I said before, if there be any neglects, personal faults are not to be charged upon the institution, which I have proved to be holy and pious in the judgment of the best writers of the French Church; some of which say, it agrees with the practice of the Primitive Church, and others say it exceeds it.

Yet Mr. Baxter is so bold as to call it a delusory profanation, because of those words in the collect, "Almighty God, who has vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins." This, he says, is pronouncing every one regenerate, that will but take this ceremony: which is a manifest slander; for the words imply no more than a general charitable presumption, that such as come to confirm their baptismal vow, were once truly baptized, and now come in a serious and religious manner to ratify their baptismal covenant in person. Upon which presumption they are charitably supposed to be in a state of regeneration. Such charitable presumptions are frequent in St. Paul's Epistles and almost all public offices and prayers of the Church, which suppose the congregation to be holy and sanctified, though many particulars may be otherwise. Thus it is in the thanksgiving after the communion, not only in our office, but in Calvin's Liturgy, where the form of thanksgiving after the reception of the Eucharist, runs in these words, "We render Thee our eternal thanks and praise, O Heavenly Father, for this great benefit which Thou hast bestowed upon us miserable sinners, in bringing us to the participation of thy son Jesus Christ, whom Thou didst suffer to be delivered up unto death for our sakes, and hast now imparted Him unto us to be our food unto eternal life." Calvin. Formul. Pree. tom. 8. p. 30.

I ask now whether these expressions, participating of

Christ, and having Him imparted to us as the food of eternal life, be not equivalent and parallel to being regenerate, and having forgiveness of all our sins? If they be, then either our confirmation office may be justified, or the French Liturgy is to be condemned, as a delusory profanation of the communion service. I know Mr. Baxter himself would not have ventured to have said this of the French Church, however he makes bold to say what he pleases of the Church of England.

I have now considered all his exceptions against our confirmation office, and shewn them to be unreasonable upon the principles of the French Church. The result is, that upon the same principles, communion may lawfully be denied to those who refuse episcopal confirmation in an episcopal Church. For not to enquire now either how far confirmation is necessary in itself, or necessary to be performed by a bishop: thus much is certain and agreed upon, that the rules and discipline of every Church relating to communion, ought to be submitted to by all the members of it; and it being a rule in the Church of England, that all persons before they be admitted to communion shall be confirmed by the bishop, or be at least prepared for and desirous of it; it follows, that such persons as obstinately refuse to submit to this order, may as lawfully be denied communion here, as those are in the French Church, who refuse to submit to their order of confirmation. Calvin says, "it is their law, that no children shall be admitted to the Lord's table, till they have first given an account of their faith, and are approved by their ministers." Defens. 2. Cont. Westphal. p. 678.

And to this agrees that French Canon in the Book of Discipline, Cap. 12. Art. 2, "that children under twelve years of age shall not be admitted to the Lord's table; and when they are above that age, it is left unto the minister's discretion to judge whether they have sufficient knowledge to qualify them for their admission to it." Now the only difference between their rule and ours is, that we oblige all persons not only to give an account of their faith to their private minister, but to the bishop also, and receive his benediction upon it: but if they have no opportunity to do this,

then it is sufficient to satisfy their own minister, that they are prepared for the communion, and willing to approve their faith and preparation before the bishop as opportunity shall permit them. And he that will not do this in an episcopal Church, is refractory, and liable to be censured, by the rules and discipline of the French communion, which is the thing I undertook to prove.

## CHAP. XXII.

*Of the Form of Marriage, Visitation of the Sick, Communion of the Sick, Burial of the Dead, Thanksgiving after Childbirth, Commination and the Church's Wish for the Restoration of Ecclesiastical Discipline.*

Concerning several of these offices in our Church I need not say much in this place. The form of marriage I have considered already, in the chapter about set forms of prayer, and shewn the French manner of celebrating it to be a sufficient justification to ours. For the other offices, I own, they have no forms: but then they do neither absolutely condemn the use of such forms in general, nor ours in particular. The visitation of the sick is left to every minister's wisdom and discretion, and that is an office wherein our Church allows some liberty likewise, and I meet with no objections against it.

They have no form for administering the communion to the sick, because the practice of the thing itself is not in use among them. But the want of it is rather their misfortune than their choice, if what some of them tell us be true, that they cannot have it, because the magistrate permits them not to exercise the offices of their religion, but only in public places. So Mr. Drelineourt, cited by Dr. Durel. Conform. of Ref. Church, p. 50. Calvin also in his own opinion was entirely for the use of it, as appears from his Epistle to the Church of Mompelgard, where he gives them this advice,

“ My opinion is, that the custom of giving the communion to the sick ought readily to be admitted, when the sick man's ease and opportunity will allow it. But with this proviso, that it be a true communion, that is, that there be a certain number of the faithful to make it some sort of congregation.”

So in another Epistle written about some rites of the Church. p. 206. “ There are many and weighty reasons which incline me to think that the communion ought not to be denied to the sick. Yet I am sensible this practice is very liable to abuse. Therefore there ought always to be some congregation of the sick man's kindred, or acquaintance, or neighbours, that so distribution may be made according to the law of Christ.” Which is the very rule of the Church of England in the Rubrick before the communion of the sick, that there shall be two or three besides the sick person to make up a congregation.

If it be asked, why then Calvin did not bring this custom into the Church of Geneva, seeing he so much approved of it? He answers for himself in his epistle to Olevian, p. 207. “ You know what reasons I have for granting the communion to the sick, but I would not have any disturbance raised upon that account. The custom is otherwise in our Church, and I acquiesce, because it would not be profitable to contend about it.” See also Respons. 2. ad Westphal. p. 678.

It seems this was one of those things, which Calvin freely owns needed a further reformation in the Church of Geneva; but he was willing to tolerate such a defect, lest the danger of alteration might prove more fatal in its consequence than the inconvenience itself; which may teach some men these two things by the way. 1. That the peace and communion of a Church is not to be broken for every inconvenience or defect. 2. That they should not call those things the corruptions of our Church, which wiser men deem the happinesses of her reformation.

But to proceed; the French Church, it is confessed, has no burial office, neither with nor without a form; no, nor so much as any funeral exhortation, as I have shewn before in the chapter of Liturgies. But then it is not because she

thinks such an office or form in itself unlawful, but because of some inconveniences and superstitions, which, so long as protestants live mixed among the papists, she presumed would accidentally attend it. For when the French ministers are in other countries, as in England, &c. where this reason ceases, they scruple not to use a funeral office as others do. Nor do any of them raise those objections against our form of burial that dissenters do. For being brought up in a Church, where discipline by reason of continual synods was kept in force, they are sensible that our office of burial is a very excellent form, supposing the due exercise of ecclesiastical discipline; upon presumption and hopes of which, it was evidently framed. For allowing the due exercise of discipline, all the objections made against the office will vanish of their own accord, and as the case stands now with us, the office is not so liable to objection as some imagine. For as a learned person observes,\* “There is one thing to be said in this matter, which, though it be not ordinarily taken notice of, seems to be of great moment, and justifies every minister in taking a liberty to omit such passages as our dissenters except against in the burial of papists, schismatics, or incorrigible sinners.” I add notorious and professed heretics, condemned by the unanimous vote of the whole Catholic Church.

By the Rubrick, all excommunicate persons are excepted from Christian burial; “Now there are two sorts of excommunication allowed in our Church, *excommunicatio sub judice, et latae sententiæ*; the first is, when men are formally excommunicated by the ecclesiastical judge; the second is that which Mr. Baxter so often talks of. The excommunication *ipso facto*, when by the Canons of the Church, a man who is guilty of such offences as are there specified, is declared to be excommunicate, before any judicial sentence passes on him. Now the Rubrick, which forbids the burial of excommunicated persons, does not confine this to any one sort of excommunication, and therefore if a minister, either

---

\* Dr. Sherlock's Def. of Dr. Stillingfleet, p. 103.

in visiting the sick, or by any other means, finds any man under this sentence, though not actually inflicted on him by an ecclesiastical judge; yet he may, by virtue of this Rubrick, refuse to bury him by that form prescribed in our Liturgy, because by the Canons of the Church, he is under the sentence of excommunication. This authority is expressly allowed the minister, in repelling those from the communion of the Lord's supper, who are notorious and open evil livers; and the same reason holds in the office of burial," as that learned person delivers his opinion, with submission to the judgment of his superiors.

Admitting the truth of this discourse, which I find none of our superiors to have disapproved; it follows, that every minister is impowered to deny the use of that office, in whole, or in part, to all who have rendered themselves incapable or unworthy of it. And such a limitation does abundantly clear the seeming difficulty that appears at first in assenting to the use of it. Yet because the use of it, even with this restriction, may create great troubles and hatred to ministers, and sometimes vexatious law suits to their utter undoing: I cannot but say, with the forenamed author, "I wish with all my heart, that some expressions were altered, to prevent any scandal to the scrupulous or the profane; or which is more desirable, that discipline were revived, which would soon answer all these objections." Mr. Baxter himself says the same, "that if true discipline in the Church did make a just separation of the capable and incapable, he could like all the office very well, and even those words which are most excepted against." Eng. Nonconform. cap. 16.

But our adversaries tell us, this is another of our Church's faults, that she wants ecclesiastical discipline. That she has not the exercise of discipline in that perfection, which were to be wished, I freely own, and the Church herself both owns and laments it: but that she wholly wants ecclesiastical discipline, I utterly deny; for her rubricks, and injunctions, and canons, which some so much clamour against, are nothing else but what in other Churches are called rules of discipline. And for that particular branch of it, which is called abstention from the Eucharist and excommunication,

our Church is not without rules for the exercise of that neither. Every minister, as was but just now observed, has power to repel those from the communion, who are notorious and open evil livers, and the bishops have power to proceed to excommunication. If these things are not always done, or not so happily and effectually as it were to be wished, other reasons may be assigned for it; among which I reckon the factions and schisms that divide the Church, to be none of the least; for they loosen the bands of ecclesiastical discipline, and make it impracticable in its true perfection; whilst men who are excluded from one communion, can be received and caressed in another. And is it not hard, for men first to cast blocks in the way and then charge it as a fault upon the Church which is her misfortune, and chiefly owing to the iniquity of the times, that it is not remedied?

But admit the decay of an ancient discipline were wholly the fault of the Church, or her ministers, to what does this charge amount? That therefore there is no discipline in our Church, because it is not in its utmost perfection? Or that men may lawfully desert her communion, because there is not such exactness observed in the administration of it as were to be wished? Neither of these, I am confident, were the sentiments of Calvin or Beza; though Beza looked upon the face of discipline to be the worst aspect of the Church of England; yet he owns that she was tolerably well reformed in that point also, in comparison of other Churches: and all he desires more is, *plenam Ecclesiasticæ Disciplinæ instaurationem, the perfect restoration of ecclesiastical discipline*, which is the wish of the Church and all good men in it. See Beza, Epist. Dedicat. to Queen Eliz. before his New Test. cited above, chap. 2.

Surely he did not think the want of discipline then altogether so great as some imagine, much less a just cause of separation from the Church of England, whose reformation in all respects he so highly extols above most other Protestant Churches.

But suppose there were a total want of discipline in our

Church, either through necessity, or want of zeal in the ministers, or by some defect in our constitution ; yet Calvin will by no means allow any of these to be reasonable causes of separation. It was the common case, he says, of the first reformers in all places, when they came to the point of discipline, they could only express their wishes and their groans, but it was not in their power to mend it. For so he expresses himself in a consolatory letter to Farel upon this subject, who had complained to him that he could not get discipline settled in his Church. To shew him that his case was not singular, he tells him, Melancthon and the rest were under the same unfortunate necessity. " When discipline comes to be talked of, Melancthon after the manner of others, only sighs and mourns about it. For the most he can do, is rather to deplore the miserable condition of the Church in this matter, than correct it ; that you may not think you are the only persons that labour under this misfortune." Calv. Ep. Farello, p. 6.

His advice is not that the ministers should forsake their calling, or the people forsake their ministers and the Church for want of discipline ; but to be content to take part in a common calamity, which was their misfortune, not their fault, so long as they had no power to redress it.

In another place, he owns that discipline was not rightly exercised at Geneva, but he charges himself with no fault upon that account, because it was not he, but others, that hindered it. " And yet they had the face," he says, " to object the want of discipline to him, though they themselves were the causes of it. *Dissipationem cujus ipsi causa sunt, probri loco nobis objectant.*" Calv. de Necess. Reform. Eccl. t. viii. p. 56.

Some Protestant Churches have no use of excommunication at all, as the Churches of Helvetia and the palatinate : yet Calvin is so far from condemning their communion for this defect, that he rather makes a soft and kind apology for them, presuming they had reasons for what they did ; that they set up such a discipline as the times and place, or magistrates and people would admit of. Thus writing to the ministers of Zurich, where excommunication was laid

aside, he says, " All men have not exactly the same sentiments of excommunication at present : I know there are some pious and learned men, who think it not necessary under Christian princes ; though I hope no sober man disallows the use of it. For my part, I believe it to be a doctrine of Christ. But if a people cannot be prevailed with to take this yoke of Christ upon them, after the pastors have done their endeavour to get it settled, they are excusable, though we are not, if we suffer it to be pulled down where it once obtains." *Calv. Ep. Minist. Tigar. p. 75.*

He that thought the communion of a Church lawful, where excommunication was wholly laid aside, as unnecessary under Christian magistrates, would doubtless not condemn a Church where the use of excommunication is settled by law, though there may be some imperfections in the exercise of it.

It is generally agreed that there are some cases in which the exact rigour of discipline would do more harm than good to the Church ; as where it would be attended with a general revolt of the people, or a severe persecution : in such cases, it has ever been thought a point of christian prudence, rather to relax a little the reins of discipline, than use that which was designed for the Church's edification, to her destruction. *St. Augustin* pleads this above twenty times in his *Epistles* and writings against the *Donatists*, which it is none of my business to recite at present ; I may perhaps have a more convenient occasion to do it hereafter, in an historical account of the exercise of ancient Church discipline : at present I only observe, that the *French Church*, which is famed for the exactness and rigour of *Synodical discipline*, approves *St. Augustin's* doctrine, and allows of a mitigation of discipline in the forementioned cases. Thus in the *Synod of Rochel, 1571. Cap. 11. Art. 1.* " The question being put, what course should be taken in the censuring of revolvers in times of persecution ? It was answered in the words of *St. Augustin*, concerning a numerous Church of drunkards, that it were much better to have a vicious Church than none at all."

The following Synod of Nismes, 1572. Cap. 3. Art 5. resolves another case concerning apostates to the Romish religion, who were also become enemies and persecutors of the Church; "that they should not be formally and publicly by name excommunicated in the Church, because this would only make them rage more bitterly against her, and do her more and greater mischief." There was no need to excommunicate such, who had already abandoned the Church's communion. Private notice to the people to beware of them, was sufficient in such cases. "Therefore all ministers and consistories are warned in procedures of this nature, to use all manner of moderation and prudence; because that Church censures and canons of discipline are only used for edification, and not for destruction; remembering always that saying of St. Augustin, that medicines, which are more hurtful than profitable, should be wholly forborne."

If St. Augustin spake the sense of the Catholic Church, and these Synods the sense of the French Church, then there are some allowed cases, in which the rigour of excommunication is to be abated, when either delinquents are become very numerous or formidable within the Church, or deserters very malicious and powerful without it; when more harm than good will accrue to the Church by the use of it, and the remedy prove worse than the disease.

So that here are three things fairly suggested by the French writers, in answer to this objection about want of discipline in the Church of England. 1. That for the main, it is a false charge; because excommunication and other parts of discipline are in force by our laws, and when occasion requires, reducible to practice. 2. Supposing excommunication were wholly laid aside, that would no more make our communion unlawful than it does in the Helvetian and Palatine Churches. 3. There may be particular reasons for mitigating the rigour of discipline in some Churches, and at some seasons, more than others: and it should be considered whether that has not for a long time been, and

still is the case of the Church of England: whether the sects and schisms that are among us do not greatly hinder the exercise of discipline; and whether a formal excommunication of all that deserve it, might not raise a greater and more dangerous schism than any yet among us, and instead of purging the bad from the good, only enrage a party to contrive her ruin and destruction: whether in such a case, it be not better to suffer the tares to grow among the wheat, and patiently bear with some corrupt members of the Church, rather than expose her to so great inconveniences; remembering that saying of St. Augustine's and the Synod of Nismes, "That when medicines will do more harm than good, they are to be forborne." Whether this be actually the case of the Church of England, I leave wiser men to determine: if it be, her practice is her prudence, and what others call her fault, is, properly speaking, the effect of her charity and discretion: but if it be otherwise, if she might have an exact discipline, and will not, though that be a fault, yet it will not justify a separation from her, as I have proved from the principles of the French Church. And so I think I have fully answered this objection about want of discipline in the Church of England.

As to the commination office, which was appointed to be used, till discipline could happily be restored, it is so useful and innocent, that I do not find many persons that have any thing to object against it. Only the authors of the Necessity of Reformation in 1660, bring some railing accusations against it. They say, p. 31, "it is a necessitating people to curse themselves, and employing ministers of the Gospel, whose office is to be the messengers of peace, in cursing the people, as part of their office; which is an inhuman and unchristianlike invention, that has no warrant from the Word of God, nor from the practice of the Primitive Church, but is a latter spawn of Antichrist in his popish services."

Some men have used their tongues and pens so much to opprobrious language, that they can scarce speak of any thing they dislike, but under the reviling names of popish

and antichristian. I would ask such men, whether it be not part of the minister's office to declare God's threatenings, as well as his promises? or whether the Gospel be all promises, and no revelation of the wrath of God against the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men? as St. Paul says it is, Rom. i. 18. If there be declarations of God's judgments in the Gospel, as well as promises of pardon and peace, how comes the one to be the minister's duty more than the other? Or why must the declaration of God's judgments be called cursing the people, or the people's consenting to the truth and equity of them be called cursing themselves, as cursing signifies imprecation of evil upon men? concerning which there is not one word in the commination office. But if by cursing, they mean only denunciation of God's judgments against unrepenting sinners, then their charge of popish and antichristian is not so much against our office, as the Gospel itself. Perhaps the Primitive Church had no such set form in her Liturgy, nor has the French Church any that I know of: but doubtless the ministers both of the one and the other did frequently do the same thing in their sermons and homilies; notwithstanding that they were ministers of the Gospel of Peace. And I challenge any person to shew us any passage in a French writer, where such an office is called popish and antichristian.

Besides the office of thanksgiving after childbirth, (which I remember not any objection made against,) there remains but one office more in the Liturgy to be spoken to, which is the form of ordaining bishops, priests, and deacons; against which Mr. Baxter has a great many objections, in speaking of the eighth Canon of our Church; which, because they will be more properly considered under that title, I refer the reader to the next Book, and here put an end to this part of my discourse; having made it appear, that there is no office in our Liturgy, in ordinary use among us, nor any particular Rubrick or prescription in any office, but may be assented to, and justified upon the principles and practice of the Reformed Church of France. In some things our Liturgy exceeds theirs, as in the form of absolution and communion of

the sick, the want of which Calvin confesses to be defects in his Liturgy, which he could not help: in other forms they exactly agree, and in such forms as we have more than they, or they more than we, it is so far agreed, that there is nothing repugnant to the word of God in either. Whence it follows, that they are unreasonable, who separate from our Church upon account of the Liturgy, because it is not reformed according to the example of the best Reformed Church.

## BOOK IV.

THE OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE CANONS OF THE  
 CHURCH OF ENGLAND CONSIDERED AND AN-  
 SWERED UPON THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE  
 OF THE REFORMED CHURCH OF FRANCE.

---

## CHAP. I.

*Of Ordinaries and Chancellors, and that as strict an Oath of Canonical Obedience is required in the French Church, as in the Church of England.*

BEFORE I speak of the Canons in particular, it will be necessary to say something of the promise and oath of canonical obedience, which refers to them all in general. In the form of ordination, this question is put to every priest and deacon: "Will you reverently obey your ordinary, and other chief ministers, to whom is committed the charge and government over you; following with a glad mind and will their Godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their Godly judgments?" And the answer is, "I will do so, the Lord being my help!" In like manner every beneficiary, when he is instituted into any benefice, swears, that he will pay true and canonical obedience to the bishop and his successors *in omnibus licitis et honestis*. Now we have no controversy with dissenters, about the meaning of this promise or oath: it is agreed on both sides, that canonical obedience in effect, is no more than obedience to the orders and Canons of the Church, and does not subject men to any unlimited power, or require any new duty from

them, but such as the bishop may require by virtue of the Canons: so that if the Canons be lawful, one would think the oath of canonical obedience should be lawful also. Yet Mr. Baxter has several objections against it. Eng. Non-form. Cap. 6.

1. He likes not the word successors: "Little know we of what religion their successors will be, or who will have the choosing of them. I'll not swear to I know not who." But here he forgot what was just now said and agreed upon, that canonical obedience in effect, is obedience to the Canons, and the bishop's successors are as much obliged to rule by the Canons, as the bishop in being; so that if obedience be due to the one, ruling by the Canons, it is with the same proviso due to the other also. In the French Church, their oath of canonical obedience is taken to the Canons, or Book of Discipline, and decrees of their national Synods, of which I have given a full account in the first Book, chap. 3. Where the reader may observe, that though neither consistories, classes, nor provincial synods be expressly mentioned in the oath, yet obedience to them and their successors is implied: for they are the ordinaries, which are to see the Canons executed by every particular minister, and have power to punish delinquents, which they could not have, unless by their rules canonical obedience was due to them. Nor is the minister's oath supposed to be taken only to the present consistories, classes, or synods, but to all that shall succeed in their place and office, during the minister's whole life, so long as they exact no other obedience from him but what is due by the Canons. So that, for ought I can see, the word successors does not at all make our oath of canonical obedience difficult to any, but such as are willing to make a stumbling-block of disobedience of it. If Mr. Baxter could not swear to he knew not who, how would he have done in the French Church, to have sworn to he knew not what? I mean to the decrees and Canons of their national Synods before they were made, as I have shewn, the French ministers did;\* when they

---

\* See Book I. chap. 3.

sent any deputies to a National Synod; "They promised before God to submit themselves to all that should be concluded and determined in their holy assembly, and to obey and execute it to the utmost of their power, &c." as the oath runs in express terms in the form prescribed in the second Synod of Vitre, 1617. Cap. 2, art. 1. We have no such oath of canonical obedience in England, and I cannot but think this one thing would have made Mr. Baxter a non-conformist in the Church of France.

2. But he says, suppose our oath of canonical obedience to imply only obedience according to the Canons: yet there are abundance of things in "the Canons, which he thinks greater sins than he thinks meet to call them." It would have done well, if Mr. Baxter had but kept to this degree of modesty, which he here professes; but I believe I shall shew, that he speaks as bad things of them as he could think of, and with as little reason as modesty, forgetting both the rules of decency and argumentation too: but of this more by and by in the following chapters.

3. He says, "Bishops rule by their chancellors, and suffer laymen to exercise the church keys, by decretive excommunications and absolutions which wise men think to be sacrilegious usurpation, and a profanation of a dreadful part of Christ's government." Here he begins immediately to exalt his style, and give the Church as hard words as he could think of. But, 1st. How does he prove that lay-chancellors and civilians use the keys for excommunication and absolution? Why that he takes for granted, which others tells us is a great mistake. For though civilians are used to declare what is law, yet the sentence of excommunication and absolution is the act of a minister, both in court and church assembly; and if any thing be declared as law, which is contrary to Canon, the minister is not bound by his oath to execute the sentence. But then perhaps he may suffer for it, and be ruined, and the bishop cannot help him. I know of no such cases at present; but if there be any, they concern not the oath of canonical obedience, which obliges a minister only to keep a good conscience, but it may be cannot always secure him from suffering.

But secondly, suppose civilians were allowed to use the keys in England; are there no lay elders allowed in France to exercise Church discipline, neither separately, nor conjunctly with others? He is a great stranger to the affairs of that Church, who knows not that lay elders have a decisive voice both in Consistories, Classes, and Synods, whether it be to make new rules of discipline, or punish delinquents by the old ones with suspension and excommunication. I will not so much as trouble the reader with a single proof of this, because it is so plain and known a case; but I will acquaint him with one thing, which I believe is not so commonly known, which is, that lay elders by the Canons of three National Synods successively, had power granted them to exercise discipline, without, or against the will of the pastor, so far as to suspend from the Lord's table. In the Synod of Privas, 1612. Cap. 5. Art. 11, a case was moved, "Whether in those Churches, where there is but one pastor, and an appeal is brought against him, the elders may judge of this controversy. And the Synod determined, that elders may judge of all emerging differences, yea, so far as of suspension from the Lord's table, matters of doctrine and excommunication only excepted; in which two points elders may not judge without their pastor."

This Canon was confirmed in the next Synod of Tonneins, 1614. Cap. 6. Art. 3. Where it is said, "In reading that Article, which gives leave unto elders, the pastor being refused and excepted at, to judge of some emerging differences, yea, even to suspension from the Lord's Supper, the province of Lower Languedoc demanded that there might be some mitigation of its rigour. But the assembly judged that that Article should abide as it was conceived, without any alteration at all." The same Article being by some means omitted in the transcript of the acts of that Synod, was inserted by the following Synod of Vitre, both into their own acts, and the former Synod of Tonneins, with an order, that it should abide in those very self same words, in which it was couched at first. Synod of Vitre, 1617. Cap. 5. Art. 2.

Now let any one judge, whether this does not put the exercise of Church discipline more into laymen's hands, than

can be pretended in the Church of England? And whether the French ministers, while those Canons were in force, were not obliged by their oath of Canonical obedience, to grant lay elders this power, and to submit to their decisions and judgment?

It is true, the following Synod of Alez, 1620, a little moderated the rigour of this Canon: for they decreed, Cap. 6, Art. 2, "that in such a case, where the pastor was excepted against, the elders only by themselves should not proceed to suspend any person from the Lord's table, without the presence and approbation of a neighbour pastor." But still it seems the pastor was to be concluded by their act, if a neighbour pastor did but consent to it. Whence it follows, that in such cases every pastor was obliged by Canon to take his neighbour pastor for his ordinary, and pay canonical obedience to his admonition and judgment, in such things as related to the exercise of Church keys: and yet Mr. Baxter makes this also an objection against the Church of England, that ministers promise at their ordination to obey their ordinary, and other chief ministers, to whom is committed the charge and government over them, that is archdeacons, surrogates, &c. As if persons empowered with authority by canon, to oblige others to submit to their judicial acts, were not the same things in France that they are in England, whatever names they are called by.

"But if so, then we must confess that the power of the keys is not proper to a bishop, but may be validly used by a priest." We confess it: all priests by our laws and Canons have the ordinary use of the keys in many cases: they admit persons to baptism, and suspend them from the Lord's table, &c. by virtue of this power, and they are judges, though not sole judges, in these cases, but under the direction of the Canons: other priests are entrusted with a larger share of this power, by a more extraordinary and particular commission and delegation from the bishop and the laws, to proceed against delinquents, even to excommunication, &c. Now what follows from hence? Nothing that I can see, but only that it is lawful to promise obedience to any chief

ministers thus legally empowered, so far as the canons require it. Which is the direct contrary, to what Mr. Baxter by his argument intended.

But he says still, “ it is the layman that decreeth the excommunication, which is the judicial act ; and when we use a surrogate priest, it is but as an hireling servant to pronounce the decree, to ‘ mock the Church with a formality.’ ” This is a very modest character of the Church and surrogate priests together ! Every rule of the Church, and every act of a priest is but a formality, when it stands in the way of a keen objector. But be it what it will, I have shewn that his censures hitherto fall as heavy upon the French Church, as they do upon the Church of England.

4. His next reason against the oath is taken from the nature and frame of diocesan episcopacy, “ which,” he says, “ is unlawful, *totâ specie*, and they dare not justify it and its several abuses by confederacy in such an oath.” But I shall shew, the French Church had another opinion of diocesan episcopacy and our English bishops, when I come to speak of the 7th Canon in the 4th chapter of this book ; and therefore I need not say any thing further here of this objection.

5. “ Bishops are not elected by the clergy and people as by ancient Canons they ought to be : therefore they are usurpers : we cannot conceive how any man can be the pastor of those that consent not ; therefore though we can submit to these and live peaceably, we cannot swear obedience to them.” By this rule all the pastors of France are made usurpers : for none of them are elected by the people, but by classes or provincial Synods, as I shall evidently make it appear in the 5th chapter of this book.

His remaining arguments are such as these, which equally affect the French Church : 1. “ It is the prerogative of kings in all nations to have subjects swear allegiance to them, and dangerous to make them swear obedience to every justice or inferior officer. 2. Subjects may be entangled between their oath to the king and such officers. 3. Many oaths make government a snare to the conscientious. 4. Much swearing makes oaths contemptible and

brings in perjury." These would have been excellent reasons in a French Synod, where every deputy swore for himself and his province, to submit to the Canons of the Church, and where so many oaths of canonical obedience, notwithstanding these dangers, were still appointed. But perhaps the French Canons are more innocent than ours, as to the matter of them. That is the only plea that can bear the face of an argument: but I shall satisfy that, by examining and comparing the particular Canons, in the following chapters of this book.

## CHAP. II.

*That the French Church allows no one to call in Question the Lawfulness of any Part of her Liturgy, or Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, agreeably to the 4th Canon of the Church of England.*

The first Canon which is commonly objected against, is in order the 4th, made against the impugners of the public worship of God established in the Church of England in these words, "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the form of God's worship in the Church of England, established by law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and administration of sacraments, is a corrupt, superstitious, or unlawful worship of God, or containeth any thing in it that is repugnant to the Scriptures: let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*," &c.

Mr. Baxter in his case of English Nonconformity, Cap. 13, gives the Church very hard words upon the account of this Canon; he charges it with no less crimes than puritanism, pharisaism, and popery. "These men," says he, "that call themselves the Church of England, do not only justify a large volume of forms, orders, rubricks and calendars, but also force all other men to justify it all as sinless; and he shall be no minister that will not do it, nor a Chris-

tian member of the Church that denieth it: as if the perfection of their works were an article of the creed, and necessary to salvation to be believed. Is not this puritanism, pharisaical, and a justification of works?"

It were a much modester question, to ask, whether this be not such a rant, and run of boisterous style, as any good man that had looked over his writings in sober thoughts a second time, would have thought fit to have softened and corrected? But be the charge what it will, it holds no more against the Church of England, than it does against the Reformed Church of France, and it may be all other settled Protestant Churches. So that at this rate of arguing, all National Reformed Churches shall be pharisees, puritans and papists together.

As to the Church of France, I have already proved, that they oblige every minister not only to subscribe, but many times swear to their Liturgy, or Book of Common Prayer, catechism, administration of sacraments, &c. Now I hope they would not make men swear to that which they did not at least believe to be agreeable to the word of God, and were satisfied that it contained nothing in it repugnant to the Scriptures. But if so, then they were puritans, pharisees, and papists in Mr. Baxter's account, for forcing men to justify a large volume of forms, orders, rubricks, &c. all as sinless. But the Church of England forces the people as well as the ministers to be modest, and not rail at the Liturgy as a corrupt, superstitious, unlawful worship, repugnant to the word of God, under pain of excommunication. And is it not fit such men's mouths should be stopped, who traduce and speak evil of the worship of God, to the disturbance of the peace of the Church, and detriment of piety and religion? Such were the continued declamations of Goodman, Gilby, Penry, and the rest of that strain, which may be seen collected by Bishop Bancroft, in his Book called Dangerous Positions, &c. Lib. 2. and which probably might give occasion to the making of this very Canon. But whatever was the occasion of it, it is the very same in substance with a Canon of the French Church in their Book of Discipline, cap. 5. art. 31. which is in these words: "If one or more of

the people stir up contention, and do thereby break the Church's union in any point of doctrine or discipline, or about the form of catechizing, or administration of sacraments, or public prayers, or the celebration of marriage, and that private admonitions have not been effectual remedies to appease them; the Consistory of that place shall endeavour to compose the whole affair; and in case the dissenters do not acquiesce therein, the Consistory shall intreat the Classis to assemble at a convenient time and place, they having first engaged the said dissenters in express terms, and upon record, to promise, that they will not spread their opinions in any manner or way till the meeting of the Classis, upon pain of being censured as schismatics. And if they refuse to give the said promises, they shall be censured for rebels, according to our discipline. Then it is ordered, that if the Classis cannot bring them to be quiet and conform, they shall be referred to a Provincial Synod, and from that to a National Synod; unto which if they refuse to yield full obedience, and in express terms to disclaim their recorded errors, they shall be cut off by excommunication from the body of our Church."

Does not this Canon denounce excommunication against obstinate traducers of the French Liturgy, in as full terms as the Canon of the Church of England? The only difference is, that the one orders a long process against them, the other proceeds more summarily with them, as supposing the things in controversy to have been sufficiently argued and handled already, and that there need not be recourse to a Provincial or National Synod upon every such occasion. Mean while all proper methods may be used to instruct or convince gainsayers, notwithstanding this excommunication *ipso facto* denounced against them. And it is further to be observed, that this Canon is not intended against those, who have scruples in their own minds, or modestly propose their scruples to their spiritual guides, in order to obtain satisfaction: but against such only as speak evil of the Liturgy with scandal and offence, and with a malicious design to vilify and disparage it.

## CHAP. III.

*That the French Church censures Impugners of her Articles, and Discipline, and Rights, and Ceremonies, according to the 5th and 6th Canons of the Church of England.*

The 5th Canon is in these words: "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that any of the nine and thirty articles are in any part superstitious, or erroneous, or such as may not with a good conscience be subscribed: let him be excommunicated," &c.

The 6th is this, "Whoever shall affirm, that the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England by law established, are wicked, antichristian, or superstitious, or such as being commanded by lawful authority, men who are zealously and Godly affected, may not with any good conscience approve them, use them, or as occasion requireth, subscribe unto them: let them be excommunicated *ipso facto*," &c.

These Canons are to be understood in the same sense and latitude as the former. Every man does not deserve excommunication that has any scruples about any of the Articles or ceremonies, or modestly and seasonably proposes his scruples for information: but the factious and turbulent may deserve it, who declaim against every thing they like not, as wicked, superstitious and antichristian, and thereby scandalize the weak, and disturb the peace of the Church, and destroy its union. Admit that some things in the Articles and ceremonies are matters of small moment: yet it is not a thing of small moment to break the Church's peace by raising contention about them. Suppose they be not articles of faith, nor necessary to salvation, yet peace is a necessary duty, and strife and contention great sins, be the matters never so small which men contend about. Therefore, though men should not deserve to be cast out of the Church for their bare dissent, yet they may for their factious and turbulent spirits, for their bitterness and

clamours, and evil speakings, for their strifes and seditious and contentious humours: for these things will exclude them from the kingdom of heaven. And it can be no crime to excommunicate such, who first by their strife and contention excommunicate themselves. Or if it be a crime, it is such a one as the National Church of France has always been guilty of, who by that Canon of their Book of Discipline which I but now mentioned, decree, "that if one or more of the people stir up contention, and do thereby break the Church's union in any point of doctrine or discipline, or about the form of catechising, or administration of sacraments, or public prayers, &c. and cannot be wrought upon in express terms to disclaim their errors, they shall be cut off by excommunication from the body of the Church."

Is not this to make matters of small moment and dubious, Articles of the creed, and necessary to church communion, as much as the Church of England does? Are not all men cast out of the Church that dissent from them? Does not this excommunication extend to laymen in France as well as England? Is it not as harsh there, to lay so great stress on every ceremony of the Church, as to excommunicate every one that calleth any one of them unlawful? Does the Church of England equal her constitutions to the ten commandments and the creed, any more than the Church of France does? And yet thus Mr. Baxter argues against these two Canons of our Church, Chap. 24 and 25 of his Eng. Nonconform. and then cries out, what is pharisaical if this be not?

He might as well have said, it was Turcism, Popery, and Paganism. For what is calunny, if this be not? The Church of England requires all her members, as the Church of France does, to raise no contentions about her doctrine or ceremonies, not to impugn or traduce them as antichristian or unlawful, and thereby raise schisms and divisions about them. And this he calls equalling them to the creed and ten commandments, as if the Church of England required men to take them all for necessary points of faith and terms of salvation; when yet she does not forbid a modest dissent from them, but only men's expressing their

dissent in such a way as tends to create divisions, and draw them off from her communion. It is one thing to dissent and err in opinion, and another to express that dissent with contempt and disdain either by word or action. The one may deserve pity, whilst the other calls for censures and rebuke. And if the Church censure such with excommunication, she does no more than what the Primitive Church did and all other settled Churches now do, and what she seems authorized to do by an Apostolical Canon, "Mark those that cause divisions among you, and avoid them."

Dr. Sutcliff observed long ago, before our Canons were made, that the practice of France and Geneva was very severe in this particular. "For that John Morelly disputed in a certain treatise, that the words 'Tell the Church' belonged not to the consistory; his book was burnt, and the man excommunicated. Two ministers at Geneva were deposed and banished for speaking against usury allowed in that state. And another was glad to fly, for speaking against unleavened bread." Sutcliff. of Ecel. Discipl. c. 7. sect. 5. p. 132.

Monsieur Amyraut, Professor of divinity at Saumur, delivers it as his opinion from the chair, "That that man is not to be reputed a Christian, who despises and tramples on the laws of the Church. Forasmuch as they derogate nothing from christian liberty, and ought not to be esteemed a slavery, being but few in number, where the Church is rightly governed, and such as recommend themselves to the consciences of men; so that the faithful observe them with a willing mind." Amyraut. Thes. de Libert. Christ. n. 13. inter Thes. Salmur.

By this rule then, to rail at the doctrine of the 20th Article, which speaks of the Church's power to decree rites and ceremonies, may be a crime deserving excommunication.

Calvin in one of his epistles to Viret, p. 61. speaks of a certain petulant preacher, called Maurisius, who was used to vent in his sermons bitter invectives against the ministers of Geneva, and more especially Calvin himself; saying, that they were worse than the papists, and taught false doctrine contrary to the word of God, &c. Now it came to be

a question among Calvin and his colleagues, what course should be taken with him? Calvin was not very forward to have him censured, because of some personal reflections made upon himself; but the rest were urgent for it, saying, "It was not to be any longer endured, that the common doctrine of the Church should be publicly traduced and condemned, and they see and hear and take no notice of it. *Non ulterius ferendum, ut publice nobis videntibus et scientibus damnetur communis Ecclesiæ nostræ Doctrina.*" p. 99.

Calvin says in another of his epistles, that it is one rule in the Geneva discipline, "That if any one spreads opinions contrary to the received doctrine of the Church, and persists obstinately in them, he is to be suspended from the Lord's Table, and complained of to the senate also." And then "the senate may proceed against him as a contumacious rebel, and despiser of the Church's censures." Ep. ad Magistr. Genevens. p. 76 et 77.

This, I am sure, is as much, if not something more than the present Canons speak of, which are so disliked in the Church of England.

#### CHAP. IV.

*Of the 7th Canon of the Church of England: that the French Church allows of the English Diocesan Episcopacy, and thinks it lawful to submit to the Authority and Jurisdiction of Bishops, and condemns those who call them Antichristian.*

THE principal thing in which the Church of France seems to differ from the Church of England, is in the point of Church government. They allow no pastor to have any primacy or superiority over another; but by the 30th Article of their Confession, declare them all to be of equal authority and power. But then they do not condemn other Churches which have this inequality among their ministers;

nor do they refuse to communicate with them, nor to submit to episcopal government in those Churches where it is legally established, if we may believe either their Synods or the best advocates of their cause.

The Synod of Tonneins, 1614, has a whole chapter about expedients for re-uniting the Protestant Churches into one entire body and communion with one another. One of these expedients is this, “ That concerning ceremonies and Church government, a mutual declaration shall be made by the deputies appointed to treat of this union, by which, in the names of their principals, they shall declare, that the Churches shall not judge or condemn one another for this difference; it not hindering our mutual agreement in the same true faith and doctrine, and that for all this, we may cordially embrace each other as true believers and joint members of one and the same body. And as a pledge of this their mutual concord, the Lord’s supper shall be celebrated, wherein the pastors from England and the other nations shall all mutually communicate together.” Synod of Tonneins, 1614. Cap. 18. Art. 7.

Peter du Moulin was an eminent professor of the French Church about this time, and he wrote an apology for the Confession of Faith against Arnoux, the Jesuit, where he delivers his judgment to the same purpose in these words: “ As touching ecclesiastical policy, we do not refuse to acknowledge those for pure and true Churches, where equality of ministers is not observed; because we esteem not this order to be a point of faith, nor a doctrine tending to salvation. We live, God be praised, in brotherly concord with the neighbouring Churches, which observes another form, and where bishops have some superiority.”

I know, that under pretence that the Church of England hath another form of discipline than ours is, “ our adversaries (the papists) charge us that our religion is divers. But experience confuteth this accusation; for we assemble with the English men in their churches, we participate together in the holy supper of our Lord: the doctrine of their confession is wholly agreeable unto ours. The most excellent servants of God in our Churches, Peter Martyr, Calvin,

Zanchius, Beza, &c. have often written letters full of respect and amity to the prelates of England."

He abuseth himself, who believeth that the word bishop, used in the Holy Scripture, is odious in our Churches; "and our adversaries unjustly accuse us to be enemies of the episcopal order. For we must be altogether ignorant in history, if we do not know that antiquity speaks honourably of that degree. Eusebius, in his chronicle, witnesseth that a year after our Lord's death, James, our Lord's brother, was established Bishop of Jerusalem; and that ten years after, Euodius was created Bishop of Antioch; and that after James succeeded Simon in the bishoprick of Jerusalem, from whence descended the succession of bishops in Jerusalem. St. Jerom, in his Book of Ecclesiastical Writers, saith that Polycarp, St. John's disciple, was by that Apostle made Bishop of Smyrna. In the same book he saith, that St. Paul established Timothy Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus Bishop of Crete. And Tertullian, in the 32d chapter of the Book of Prescriptions, calleth those Churches, Apostolical Churches, and buds and sprigs of the Apostles, whose bishops were established by the Apostles, &c."

After a deal more to the same purpose, he concludes thus: "All these allegations," says he, "tend to shew, that notwithstanding the diversity of ecclesiastical policy, two particular Churches may live in peace and concord under the band of one faith and religion; and that if sometimes we speak against the authority of bishops, we condemn not episcopal order in itself, but speak only of the corruption which the Church of Rome has induced into it," &c. Moulin's Buckler of Faith, p. 345 Ed. Lond. 1631.

If this learned person rightly understood and represented the doctrine of the French Church, in whose name he speaks, their doctrine is, that though episcopal superiority be not expressly commanded in the New Testament, yet there are some instances of it in apostolical practice, and that it is agreeable to the practice of all antiquity: that it is not to be condemned in those Churches which retain it; and that they would willingly and heartily have submitted to bishops, had bishops been their reformers.

This inclination of theirs to submit to episcopal government, is further evident from their ready compliance to some motions of this kind that were actually made to them; particularly to that proposal made by the Bishop of Troyes, of which Peter Martyr gives us an account in an epistle to Beza, at the end of his common places. It is as remarkable a passage as any that occurs in the whole history of the Reformation, and therefore I will insert it in his own words. "*Trojæ numerosa est admodum ecclesia et indies augetur. Episcopus jam Christi regnum serio promovet; nec tantum suas oves ipse pure docet, sed quia ei gravis scrupulus injectus est de suâ vocatione, quòd in eâ Ecclesiæ et populi electionem seu confirmationem non habuerit, ideo, seniores Ecclesiæ Reformatæ accersivit, rogavitque ut pie ac prudenter dispicerent, an cum vellent eligere, confirmare ac pro episcopo habere? Quod si judicarent faciendum, se daturum operam, ut sicut cæpit ita pergeret ecclesiam sibi commissam docendo et hortando pro viribus ædificare et augere. Sin vero existimarent illum minus idoneum ad tantum munus, libere atque aperte dicerent, se autem paratum esse loco cedere, modo ei liceat in Ecclesiâ Reformatâ vivere juxta sanctam evangelii disciplinam. Rogavitque ut eâ de re maturè cum Ecclesiâ deliberarent: quod cum factum esset, ab omnibus unanimitè ut verus episcopus agnitus est et receptus. Quare illius authoritas et pietas multum Ecclesiæ Christi commodat: Deus laudetur qui ad hunc modum Filii sui regnum gubernat et dirigit.*" Pet. Mart. Ep. 57. ad Bezam, an. 1561. p.p. 1143.

"The Church of Troyes is very great and increases daily. The Bishop thereof is now become a zealous promoter of the kingdom of Christ, and instructs his flock in the purity of the Gospel. But having a scruple upon him about his calling, because he had not the election and confirmation of the Church and people concurring to it, he therefore sent for the elders of the Reformed Church, and desired them to consult among themselves, prudently and piously, whether they might elect, confirm, and accept of him for their bishop? If they did, he would then go on, as he had begun, to edify and augment to the utmost of his power the

*Church committed to his charge. But if they thought him not qualified for so great a work, they should deal freely and plainly with him: for in that case, he was resolved to resign his bishoprick, and live as a private Christian among them. He pressed them again to deliberate upon the matter with the whole Church, and take their most mature advice upon it. Which when they had done, he was unanimously acknowledged and received by them all as a true bishop: and his authority and piety did great service to the Church of Christ: praised be God, who takes these methods to govern and advance the kingdom of his Son.\**

Can we have a fuller testimony, either of the usefulness of episcopal authority, or of the willingness and readiness of the French to have submitted to it, could they have been so happy as to have had it quietly settled among them? But it was their misfortune at first, that they could not have it, though their inclinations led them to embrace it. For no sooner did the popish party hear of the least suspicion of any bishop's leaning towards the protestant cause, but immediately the whole power both of France and Rome was armed against them. Thuanus tells us, that this example of Caraccioli (for that was the bishop's name) was looked upon by the adverse party to be a matter of such dangerous consequence, that they laboured with all their might to ruin him, and never ceased till they had prevailed with the king to force him to quit his station. Thuan. tom. ii. an. 1561. lib. 2<sup>d</sup>. p. 48.

The popish authors themselves tell us, there were about this time several other bishops in France, who were well wishers to the Reformation, such as Odet, Colinius, Cardinal Castilion, the Admiral's brother; Johannes Monlue, Bishop of Valence; Sanromanus, Bishop of Aix; Johannes

---

\* Matthias Jagan, Bishop of Brandenburg, was a Protestant, and designed to have ordained George, Prince of Anhalt, Bishop of Mersburg, but died before he could perform it. Wittenhal. Duty of Preaching, c. 3. p. 708. cites Georg. Anhalt. Præfat. de Ordin. p. 62.

Upon this necessity, George was ordained Bishop of Mersburg by Presbyters. Melanethon penned his Letters Testimonial. See Meleh. Adam. Vit. Germ. Theol. p. 246.

Barbanson, Bishop of Pamiers; Johannes de Sangelasio, Bishop of Utica; Francis de Noailles, Bishop of Aquæ Augustæ; Carolus Gillarius, Bishop of Chartres, together with Lewis d'Albert and Claudius Reginus, two Bishops of the Territory of Bern under the Protestant Queen of Navarre. But no sooner did they in the least shew themselves favourers of that way, but they were presently accused of heresy, and cited to appear before the Consistory of the Inquisition at Rome, where three of them were deprived, and the rest suspended, till they should make their personal appearance, and clear themselves of the heresy laid to their charge. This opposition made most of them draw back and recant, and so they kept their bishopricks: but Cardinal Castilion, and Sangelasius, with the Bishop of Troyes, turned Protestants, and continued for some time to act as bishops, but at last were forced by the secular power to withdraw, and betake themselves to a private station.

Spondanus is our author for all this, An. 1563. n. 21. And some intimations of the same thing are given by Thuanus, lib. 35. Homerus Tortora Hist. Franc. lib. 3. Gabutius Vit. Pii, 5. lib. 2. cap. 4. Catellus Hist. Occitan. et Onuphrius Vit. Pii. 4. Out of whom Spondanus collects his history.

Luther dedicates his *Forma Missæ. in usum Ecclesiæ Witteberg.* to Hausman, Bishop of Cygnea Ecclesia, who appears to have been an encourager of the Reformation. Luther. Oper. tom. 2.

Luther in his Epistle to Spalatinum, t. 2. p. 183, cited by Scultetus, Annal. Evangel. Decad. 1 An. 1524. p. 204. says, "*Episcopus tandem unus Christo nomen dedit, et evangelizat in Prussiâ, nempe Sambiensis, quem fovet ac erudit Joannes Brismannus, quem illuc misimus, abjecto cucullo. Ut et Prussia regno Satanae valedicere incipiat.*" Scultetus adds, "*Episcopus iste fuit Georgius de Polentiâ, cui Lutherus Commentarium suum in Genesin inscripsit.*"

Luther and Melancthon wrote letters of commendation to John Thurzo, Bishop of Breslaw, in Silesia, who was a favourer of the Reformation. Their letters are in Scultetus' Annals, an. 1520. p. 59, &c.

Melancthon's words are very remarkable. "*Qui unus nobis, quod sciam equidem, in Germaniâ Episcopi παράδειγμα absolvisti, Auctoritate, Literis, ac Pietate. Quod si respublica decem haberet tui similes συμφοῶδμονες, non dubitarem renasci Christum.*"

Scultetus adds, p. 63, that the Bishop died, before he received those letters, on the 2d of August, 1520. Upon which Luther gloried, that this excellent Bishop died a Protestant. "*Ideo Lutherus gloriatur Episcopum hunc optimum in Fide Evangelicâ mortuum esse.*" Ex tom. 2. Epist. Luther. p. 7.

By this we see, it was not any aversion the French Protestants had to episcopacy in general, but rather the iniquity of the times, that hindered bishops from being settled among them. And Dr. du Moulin, son of the famous Peter, before mentioned, confirms this by another instance in the case of the Bishop of Meaux and some others. Preface to his father's Book, called, *The Novelty of Popery*, p. 3. "How soon," says he, "both pastors and people may be brought to submit to bishops, hath been tried by the Bishop of Troyes, and that of Meaux, who, as soon as they began to forsake the errors of popery, were acknowledged by the Protestant Churches within the verge of their jurisdiction for their diocesans. The Archbishop of Vienna and Bishop of Orleans were once about to have done as much, and would have found the like obedience from the Protestant party; but the great stream of the State proved too strong for them to swim against."

He tells us further, there was a time when some of their prime men, feeling the inconveniences that follow the want of ecclesiastical subordination, moved Cardinal Richelieu to place it among them by his authority, pretending that it would bring them nearer to the Roman Church: but he flatly denied to give way to it, and told them, "If you had that order, you would look too like a Church." *Ib.* p. 2.

The same author gives us there also the judgment of that eminent Lord du Plessis Mornay, whose learning and government made him equally famous in the French Church. "His opinion was, that though presbyterian government

might agree very well with popular states, such as Geneva and Switzerland; yet in kingdoms and monarchies, episcopal government was rather to be chosen, to sustain the dignity of the Church, and shelter it from oppression," & *Ibid.* p. 8.

All which proves, that though the French Protestants were willing to justify their own government as an allowable thing among themselves; yet they were far from crying down episcopacy as antichristian, or pulling down bishops merely to set up themselves. Calvin himself was as far from this as any man, witness that solemn declaration of his, in his Book, *De Necessitate Reformandæ Ecclesiæ*. "*Talem si nobis exhibeant hierarchiam, in quâ sic emineant episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent—ut ab illo tanquam unico Capite pendeant, et ad ipsum referentur—tum nullo non anathemate dignos fateor, si qui erunt qui non eam reverentè, summâque obedientiâ observent. Give us such an hierarchy,*" says he, "*in which bishops preside, who are subject to Christ, and Him alone as their only Head; and then I will own no curse too bad for him that shall not pay the utmost respect and obedience to such an hierarchy as that.*" Tom. 8. p. 60.

Beza was of the same mind, with relation particularly to the Bishops of England: "The Church of England," says he, "after the reformation, was supported and stood by the authority of archbishops and bishops, of which order she had many, not only famous martyrs, but excellent doctors and pastors; and *may she for ever enjoy that singular blessing of God upon her. Fruatur sane istâ singulari Dei benificentiâ, quæ utinam ei sit perpetua.*" Beza Resp. ad Sarav. cap. 18.

The truth is, Calvin and Beza, and the French Church set up such a government and discipline at the reformation, as the state of their affairs would bear; but they never absolutely condemned episcopacy, or thought their own model ought to be a rule to other Churches. Beza expressly disclaims that as a false and slanderous imputation in any that should say, "They prescribed their own example to be followed by any other Church, like those ignorant men, who

think nothing right done but what they do themselves." Beza, *Ibid.* cap. 21.

So that if any zealots among the French have either condemned episcopal government as unlawful, or sought to impose their own form as necessary upon other Churches; they had no authority for so doing, either from their first reformers, or their National Synods, or the best writers in their own Church, who, as I have shewn, have always spoken honourably of the English diocesan episcopacy, and expressed themselves ready to submit to such a form of government, if ever it could have been settled among them. Let but the same temper and moderation be shewn by our English dissenters, and then this controversy about bishops must needs have an end: but whilst they continue to decry episcopacy as antichristian, and seek to destroy the order as unlawful, and invade the power of bishops by ordaining ministers, against their authority legally settled among us; they may not flatter themselves to think their case is the same with that of the French Church: for if there be any truth in what I have now discoursed, their practice in every point does manifestly contradict it. Calvin himself would not have scrupled to subscribe the 7th Canon of our Church, which says, "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the government of the Church of England under his Majesty by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same, is antichristian or repugnant to the word of God; let him be excommunicated, *ipso facto*, &c." For what does he say less in those words which I have cited before, "*Nulla non Anathemate dignos fateor, &c. I confess no excommunication too bad for them*, that will not pay the utmost respect and obedience to such an hierarchy as that." If it be said, that Calvin mentions neither archbishops, deans, nor archdeacons, nor the rest that bear office in the Church of England: it is true; but he that approves of bishops as settled in England, does virtually and consequentially approve of all the rest mentioned in that Canon, and may with a safe conscience submit to their government, as not repugnant to the word of God.

It is certain the French authors themselves thus under-

stand Calvin, as speaking of the English hierarchy. Monsieur de l'Angle, minister of the French Church at Charenton, in his letter to the Bishop of London, 1680, cites his authority to the same purpose that I have done. "Since the Church of England," says he, "is a true Church of our Lord; since her worship and doctrines are pure, and have nothing in them contrary to the word of God; and since that when the reformation was there received, it was received together with episcopacy, and with the establishment of the Liturgy and ceremonies, which are there in use at this day; it is without doubt the duty of all the reformed in your realm, to keep themselves inseparably united to the Church. And those that do not this, upon pretence that they desire more simplicity in their ceremonies, and less inequality among the ministers, do certainly commit a very great sin. For schism is the most formidable evil that can befall the Church: and for the avoiding of this, Christian charity obliges all good men to bear with their brethren, in some things much less tolerable than those now in dispute ought to seem, even in the eyes of those that have the most aversion for them. This was so much the opinion of our great and excellent Calvin, that in his treatise of the necessity of the reformation, he makes no difficulty to say, that if there should be any so unreasonable, as to refuse the communion of a Church that was pure in its worship and doctrine, and not to submit himself with respect to its government, under pretence that it had retained an episcopacy qualified as yours is, there would be no censure nor rigour of discipline that ought not to be exercised upon them."\*

To this I add the testimony of Monsieur Daille, shewn me by the kind information of a learned and worthy person of that Church, in his book called, *Replique a Messieurs Adam et Cottiby*, part 3. c. 20. p. 261, he says, "Calvin himself honoured all bishops that were not subjects of the Pope, and that taught the pure and sincere doctrine of the apostles, purged from the leaven of human traditions; such

---

\* See this Letter at the end of Bishop Stillingleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 421.

as were the prelates of England, Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury; Hooper Bishop of Worcester, and others. We ourselves also have ever maintained, and do still maintain, the same Christian communion in faith and charity with their successors, notwithstanding the different manner of ecclesiastical government, that is found betwixt them and us. We confess that the foundation of their charge is good and lawful, established by the Apostles, according to the command of Christ, in the Churches which they founded." And this he says is the difference betwixt bishops, and the Pope and monks, "That the latter were never instituted by Jesus Christ, nor by his Apostles; nor can there any footsteps of their order be found, either in the word of God, or in the genuine monuments of the Ancient Church."

The title of the chapter has the same words: "There is this grand difference between bishops, and the Pope and monks, *Que l'Episcopat est institué de Dieu, that episcopacy is instituted of God*; but popes and monks are the inventions of men, and are the authors of disorder and abuses."

This plainly refers the original of episcopacy to Apostolical and Divine institution. Some others, I confess, among whom is Lud. Capellus and Rivet, do not carry it so high, but derive it only from ecclesiastical order: yet they all agree in this, that to make a separation in a Church upon the account of episcopacy, where it is regularly settled, and reformed according to the model of the Ancient Church, is criminal schism, and a breach of the unity and peace of the Church. Dr. Rivet says expressly, "*That if Aerius separated from the Church for the distinction of superiors and inferiors, he was a bold and schismatical man; because such distinction was introduced into the Church at least by human order, upon very just and reasonable causes, and is no ways contrary to the faith. Audax fuit et schismaticus Aerius, si ob inferiorum ac superiorum distinctionem, fidei non contrariam, ac æquis de causis humanâ Institutione introductam, se ab Ecclesiâ separavit.*" Rivet. Cathol. Orth. tract. 1. q. 23. n. 6.

I leave those who are concerned to make the application.

## CHAP. V.

*Of the 8th Canon: that the French Church does not impugn our Form of ordaining Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, or say they are not true Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, who are ordained by it, until they have some other Calling: that they allow not the People in France to choose their own Pastors, &c.*

The words of the 8th Canon are, "Whosoever shall affirm or teach, that the form and manner of making and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons, contains any thing in it that is repugnant to the word of God; or that they, who are made bishops, priests and deacons in that form, are not lawfully made, nor ought to be accounted either by themselves or others, to be truly either bishops, priests, or deacons, until they have some other calling to those divine offices, let him be excommunicate," &c.

The doctrinal part of this canon is the very same with the 36th article, which says, "The Book of Consecration of archbishops and bishops, and ordering of priests and deacons, set forth in the time of Edward the 6th, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering: neither hath it any thing that of itself is superstitious and ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the rites of that book, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites, we decree all such to be rightly and orderly and lawfully consecrated and ordered."

So that every one, who can subscribe the doctrine of this article, must needs allow the same to be true in the Canon also. But I have proved before in the Second Book, chap. 1. &c. that the French Church allows our Articles, both in general and particular, as lawful to be subscribed; and I have made it appear in the very last chapter before this, that

the French have no exception against our diocesan bishops, or their ordination. So that the only difficulty, which seems to remain, is as to practice: whether it be fit to excommunicate such as vent their dislike of our bishops, priests, or deacons, in such a way as the Canon specifies; that is, who say they are so unlawful and repugnant to the word of God, as that they ought not to be taken for lawful bishops, priests or deacons, until they have some other calling to their respective offices? We say, they deserve excommunication; but Mr. Baxter says, no; and undertakes their apology, and offers reasons against the Canon. I will first shew briefly, what reason there was for making the Canon, and then examine his reasons against it.

Bishop Bancroft, in his book, called *Dangerous Positions*, tells us, it was become a common practice in Queen Elizabeth's days, among those, who liked not the discipline and government of the Church of England, "to renounce the calling which they had from the bishops, and take it again from the approbation of the classis: they were content to accept orders from the bishop, as a civil matter, but did not thereby account themselves ministers, until the brethren of some classis had allowed them: they taught, that all ministers, who were called according to the order of the Church of England were unlawful; and therefore urged as many as they durst trust, to seek at their classis a new approbation, which they termed the Lord's ordinance. *Danger. Posit. lib. 3. cap. 14. p. 113.*

Now when we consider, that Bishop Bancroft was president of the convocation when the Canons were made, we cannot doubt but that this history points out to us the plain reason of the present Canon. A design was formed to nullify all the orders of the Church of England, and subvert its whole discipline, government, and constitution, by pretending that her ministers were no lawful ministers, nor could officiate as such, until they had another calling, more consonant to the ordinance of God. And was it not high time to give a check to such a pretence as this? Could any established Church, in prudence, suffer such dangerous positions and practices to go uncensured? Can any man think,

the national Synods of France would have tamely suffered unreasonable men thus to have struck at the foundation of their ministry, and call in question the legality of their whole order and constitution, without so much as threatening them, in case of obstinacy, with excommunication? They who rose up so severely against the independent principles, as I have shewn they did,\* because they thought them pernicious and destructive of their classical and synodical constitution, would doubtless much more have exerted themselves against any, that should presume to null their whole ministry and manner of ordaining.

But it may be, the form and manner of ordaining in the French Church is not so liable to exception as the forms of the Church of England. To which I say, supposing our forms to be lawful, as the French Church in subscribing our 36th Article owns them to be, there can be no difference, at least no material objections against the one, which will not equally hold against the other. And if we examine Mr. Baxter's arguments, we shall plainly find it so. In his 27th chap. of Eng. Non-conform. he offers five arguments to prove it lawful to call our ordinations sinful. His first is, "that we thereby obtrude pastors on the churches, upon the bare choice of a patron, without, or against the people's wills." But if the nomination of the patrons must be called obtruding, then pastors might have been obtruded upon the churches in France. For by several of their Canons, patrons are allowed the same liberty of presenting and right of nomination, as they have in England. The Synod of Vitre, 1583. cap. 2. Art. 15, says expressly, "gentlemen and others enjoying right of patronage, shall not be urged to forsake their just titles." The Synod of Montauban says further, "that lay patrons may enjoy their privilege of laying claim by protestation unto their rights and emoluments, that so their title to them may be preserved, though they could not at present collate, because none but papists might be collated, and it was against their conscience and religion

---

\* See Book 1. Chap. 1.

to collate them. But this I think plainly implies, that by the laws of the Church they had liberty to collate protestant ministers, whenever the laws of the realm would give way to it. See Synod of Montauban, Cap. 4. Art. 44. and Book of Discipline, cap. 14. art. 3.

But whatever became of the right of patrons, it is certain the people had no right of nominating or electing; no, nor yet of consenting, any otherwise than they have in England. For the right of probation and election belonged wholly to classes and Synods, and all that the people had power to do, was only to object against the nominated party; but if they had nothing material to object against him, their silence was taken for consent, and the minister was immediately ordained, without asking any other vote or consent of the people. He is much mistaken, who thinks that pastors in France were chosen by poll or popular election.

Their Book of Discipline, cap. 1. art. 4, refers the election of ministers wholly to classes, or provincial Synods. "A minister of the Gospel, unless in times of difficulty, and cases of very great necessity, in which he may be chosen by three pastors, together with the consistory of the place, shall not be admitted into this holy office, but by the provincial Synod, or a classis composed of seven pastors.—And the minister elect shall be presented with good and valid testimonials, not only from the universities, and particular Churches, but also from the classis of that Church, where he hath been most conversant."

Here we see ministers are called elect, not from the election of the people, but from the choice of provincial Synods, or classes: and though in cases of great necessity, three pastors and the consistory of the place were allowed to choose, yet the election is never referred to the vote of the people.

The next Canon says, "after the Synod or classis have examined any minister elect, they shall notify his election by their act or letters, to the Church whither he is to be sent, and their letters shall be delivered or read to them by a pastor or elder." This again plainly shews, that the election is made, before the people have any knowledge of it.

Then follows in the 6th Canon what it is the people are allowed to do: "he, whose election shall be declared unto the Church, shall preach publicly on three several Sabbaths in the audience of the whole congregation, and the said auditory shall be expressly charged, that if any one of them do know any impediment, for which his ordination, who shall be then mentioned by his name, may not be completed, or why he may not be accepted, that they do then come and give notice of it unto the consistory, which shall patiently hear the reasons of both parties, that so they may proceed to judgment. The people's silence shall be taken for a full consent." This was all the people had to do in the election of their pastors, which can no more be called election, than in our congregations, the people may be said to elect husbands and wives for persons to be married, because whenever the banns are published, they are charged, "that if any one of them do know any cause or just impediment, why those persons should not be joined together in holy matrimony, they should declare it." Only in the French Canon, lest eternal quarrels and animosities should rise between pastor and people, in case they were obstinately, though wrongfully set against him, there is this proviso made, "that although the minister elect be justified in Synod against all impeachments brought against him by the people, yet shall he not be given as pastor to that people against their will, nor to the discontentment of the greatest part of them." And there may be something of prudence in this, for which reason it is also commonly practised in England: but still I say, this does not give the people power of election. For at most, it is but an indulgence of their weakness and passions in some particular cases, when differences cannot otherwise be composed; which is far from granting them a proper and inherent right of choosing their pastors.

And I must add, that at Geneva, there is no such regard had to the people's moroseness; but they must have some real objections, of which the magistrates make themselves judges. Their manner of electing and calling ministers, as Beza describes it, is thus: "first they are examined, both as

to learning and morals, by a classis of both city and country ministers, which meet weekly on Fridays at Geneva. Then such as are approved by the ministers, are presented to the senate. The senate again examines both their doctrine and morals, and if they like them, they give them their approbation: if not, the ministers proceed to a new examination of other persons. When the examination is ended, the Sunday following the probationer's name is publicly mentioned in every church of the city, and particularly that church of the city or country, where he is designed to serve; and if any one knows any impediment, which may render him unfit for the ministry, he is required within eight days to give notice of it to the magistrate: if nothing be objected against him, he is then immediately ordained, and sent to take possession of his cure." See Beza's Ep. 20. p. 139. and Calvin's Ep. to Olevian, p. 142. and 228.

In this whole affair, the people's consent is not so much as asked; but only if they have any thing to object, they may give information to the magistrates, who have power with the classis to hear and judge of the reasonableness of their objections. And the very same liberty is allowed the people in the Church of England.

But Mr. Baxter thinks this is against ancient Canon, and the privilege of the people in the Primitive Church. A great many learned persons not only think, but prove the contrary.\* But admit Mr. Baxter were in the right: does our practice differ more from ancient Canon than that of France and Geneva does? Beza had the same objection thrown in his way; and his answer was, *quid vero fuerit in multis locis in vetere ecclesiâ usurpatum in episcoporum electionibus, non tam spectandum arbitror, quam quo jure, and quo successu fuerit factitatum.* "I do not think, we are so much to consider what was done in some places, about the election of bishops in the Primitive Church, as by what right, and with what success they did it." Beza, Ep. 83. p. 402.

---

\* Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separ. Part. 3. Sect. 25. p. 314, &c.

His meaning is, 1. That the practice was not general, but only in some parts of the Church. 2. That it was no Divine and inherent right of the people, but only what they had obtained by custom and indulgence. 3. That many great inconveniences did attend it: for popular elections were commonly accompanied with popular tumults, as it was too frequently verified in this very case, in those places where popular elections were grown into fashion. And therefore there was good reason to make Canons, as many of the primitive councils did, to lay some restraint upon this pretended power of the people. I hope this is a full answer to Mr. Baxter's first argument, whereby he would prove the ordinations of the Church of England sinful, because they obtrude pastors upon the Churches, without or against the will of the people.

2. His next argument is, "that our ordinations are sinful, because the Church ordains such as by Canon she forbids to preach or expound any doctrine." I presume he means the 49th Canon, which shall be considered in its due place, chap. 10. Here I only observe, that there is no consequence at all in this argument. For admit the Canon he speaks of were faulty: that would not prove our forms of ordination sinful; because they were used above 50 years before that Canon was made. The Church might be to blame for making such a Canon, if it were faulty; but that would not affect her forms of ordination.

3. He says, "we determine that bishops, priests, and deacons are three distinct orders, which yet is an undetermined controversy among even the most learned papists. And what follows hence? Why, that we damn and cut off men for that which the very papists leave at liberty." I must here take leave to say again, that Mr. Baxter was out in his argumentation. For our Church does not damn or cut off all that think that bishops, priests and deacons are not three distinct orders, in the sense in which the papists take order as distinct from jurisdiction; nor do all that deny them to be three distinct orders in that sense, call in question the lawfulness of our bishops, priests, or deacons, or nullify our forms of ordination. Many French writers think

bishops and priests to be the same order; and yet they do not say, that our forms of ordination are repugnant to the word of God, or that those are no true bishops or priests that are made by them: nor on the other hand, does the Church of England damn or cut them off from her communion, because they believe bishops and presbyters to be the same order. Some of our best episcopal divines, and true sons of the Church of England, have said the same, distinguishing betwixt order and jurisdiction, and made use of this doctrine and distinction to justify the ordinations of the reformed churches against the Romanists. So Mr. Mason,\* Dr. Forbes, Bishop Usher, and others, who yet defend episcopal superiority and jurisdiction as of Divine appointment, at the same time that they say bishops and presbyters are but one order. And will Mr. Baxter's argument ever be able to persuade the world, that these men liked not our forms of ordination, or that the Church damned her own sons and champions, and cut them off from her communion? yet this is the method he takes to prove our forms of ordination sinful; because they damn all that do not say bishops, priests and deacons are three distinct orders. Respect to truth and modesty, if not to the Church of England, might have engaged a wise man to have dropped this argument, which makes such a wild conclusion.

4. But he says we ordain men to an office, which the Scripture maketh no mention of. "For Dr. Hammond saith, it cannot be proved there were any presbyters subject to bishops in Scripture-times, nor any but bishops: none that had not power of ordination and the keys; nor any bishops of a multitude of churches and presbyters, both which are here ordained: *Ergo*, our forms of ordination are sinful."

But 1. What if Dr. Hammond was mistaken? What then becomes of this argument? 2. Admit that there were no presbyters, subject to bishops, mentioned in Scripture: how does it follow that our forms of ordination are sinful? Does

---

\* Mason's Defence of the Ordination of the Protestant Ministers beyond Seas, p. 132. Forbe's Irenic, 1. 2. c. 11. Bp. Usher's Judgment of Ordination by Presbyters, &c. p. 112.

Dr. Hammond say so ? No. Does the French Church say so ? No. Does the practice of the Primitive Catholic Church condemn our forms ? No ; for she ordained bishops, priests and deacons after the same manner. Only Mr. Baxter will bear us down against all opposition and authority, that our forms are sinful. But to lay aside authority and answer to this reason : suppose in Scripture-times every bishop's Church was but a single congregation, and that for that time he had no need of presbyters to assist him : yet why might not he be then invested with a power to ordain himself as many presbyters or assistants as he should need, when the number of converts in any city or diocese became too great for a single congregation ? Then it will not follow, that because there were no presbyters, subject to bishops in Scripture-times, that therefore the Scripture makes no mention of the office ; or that because there were no such presbyters whilst the bishops had no occasion for them, that therefore there never should be any, when they should have occasion for them. Yet this is Mr. Baxter's way of proving our order of bishops and presbyters to be unlawful : which is as much contrary to Dr. Hammond's sense, to the sense of Scripture, to the sense of the Catholic Church, and the French Church, as it is to the Church of England.

5. His last argument is, " that our ordinations are sinful, because they make bishops swear obedience to archbishops and their sees ; and priests to covenant obedience to their ordinaries." But I have already shewn in the first chapter, that the French Church does the same in effect, requiring an oath of canonical obedience, and submission to classes and Synods, which answer to ordinaries in the Church of England.

Upon the whole it appears, that notwithstanding these objections, our forms of ordination are lawful in the opinion of the French Church ; and though men might have leave to dissent, or express their dissent in a modest way, as Mr. Baxter pleads ; yet to do it in that dangerous and disorderly way, which the Canon mentions, tending manifestly to subvert and destroy the whole constitution, may be a crime deserving the penalty of excommunication by the French dis-

cipline, as well as that of the Church of England, though Mr. Baxter is of a contrary opinion from both.

## CHAP. VI.

*That the French Church reckons Schismatics and their Maintainers to be out of the visible Catholic Church, and denies Communion to them till they return and make Satisfaction.*

THE next Canons which Mr. Baxter finds fault with, are the 9th, 10th and 11th, against schismatics, and maintainers of schismatics, and maintainers of conventicles.

Can. 9. Whosoever shall hereafter separate themselves from the communion of Saints, as it is approved by the Apostles' rules in the Church of England, and combine themselves together in a new brotherhood, accounting the Christians, who are conformable to the doctrine, government, rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, to be profane and unmeet for them to join with in Christian profession: let them be excommunicated, *ipso facto*, &c.

Can. 10. Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that such ministers, as refuse to subscribe to the form and manner of God's worship in the Church of England prescribed in the Communion Book, and their adherents, may truly take unto them the name of another Church not established by law, &c. let them be excommunicated, and not restored until they repent.

Can. 11. Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations of the king's born subjects, than such as by the laws of this land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful Churches, let him be excommunicated, &c.

Now there is nothing in these Canons but what is agreeable to the practice and discipline of the French Church,

which reckons all excommunicated persons and schismatics to be cut off and separated from the communion of the visible Catholic Church, by being separated from those particular Churches whereof they ought to be members; and consequently esteem all meetings or assemblies of such persons to be illegal conventicles, not true and lawful Churches, since there can be no such out of the communion of the visible Catholic Church.

Among Beza's epistles there is one to the French Church in London, wherein he passes his judgment upon certain Articles, which they had drawn up and sent to him to desire his opinion of them; two of which are to our present purpose. Article 21. "They, who are either lawfully excommunicated, or do unlawfully and with scandal withdraw themselves from any Church, forasmuch as they banish themselves from the kingdom of Christ and salvation, may not be admitted to perform any public offices of the Church, or be allowed the use of the Sacraments in any Church, till they have made legal satisfaction," &c.

The 13th Article is to the same purpose, "that whoever is lawfully excommunicated in any particular Church, or unlawfully cuts himself off from it, does thereby exclude himself from all the privileges of the Catholic Church, and is not to be received into any other particular Church, without making satisfaction;" &c. Beza, Ep. 24. ad Eccles. Peregrin.

Is not this as severe against schismatics, as the Canons of the Church of England are? To say, that schismatics exclude themselves from all the privileges of the Catholic Church; that they exile themselves from the kingdom of Christ and salvation; that they may not be admitted to perform any public offices of the Church, nor be received into communion with any particular Church, till they have made legal satisfaction? If such persons should have combined themselves into a society, and called themselves a Church, would Beza or the French Church have allowed them the name of a true and lawful Church, whom they did not esteem members of the Catholic Church, and thought them unworthy of communion in any Church, till they repented and made legal satisfaction?

The Canons of the French Church are no less severe against schismatics, whilst they renew that ancient Canon of the Primitive Church, that no person who forsakes the communion of his own Church, shall be received into another. Their Canons commonly run in this style, as particularly that of Lyons does, Ann. 1663, Art. 25, "Vagrants, heretics, and schismatics, shall be notified to all churches, that they may be aware of them." That is, as I suppose, that they may not be allowed to perform any public offices as ministers, nor be admitted to communion as private Christians. Certainly then they would not allow such to set up separate meetings, and dignify them with the name of true and lawful Churches. And if Mr. Quick has rightly published the French confession, in its 26th article, they have much harder words given them: for there it is said, "that they that separate themselves from the congregations of God's saints, do resist the ordinance of God, and in case they draw others aside with them, they do act very perversely, and are to be accounted as mortal plagues.\*"

If it be said, as Mr. Baxter says, that we allow the Church of Rome the name of a true Church, and that schismatics are at least as true a Church as the Church of Rome: I answer, this is only playing with an equivocal sense of the word, true Church, which may either signify a Church, with which it is lawful to communicate in all points, as the word true and lawful Church, is taken in the Canons; or else a Church so much corrupted, that a man cannot lawfully and with safety communicate with it, notwithstanding there may be so much of the remains of Christianity in it, as that she may bring forth sons to God by baptism, which need not be repeated: in which sense, Protestants commonly allow the Church of Rome to be a true Church,† and the like may

\* Confess. Gall, art. 26, of Mr. Quick's Edit.

† Vide Crackanthorp. Cont. Spalat. c. 16. et 21.

To know how far Protestants allow the Church of Rome to be called a Church, the reader may consult Calvin's Epistle to Zozinus, p. 17. Beza's Epist. 10, and the 28th Article of the French Confession, which I have produced in another place, in vindicating the doctrine of the 18th Article of our Church.

be said of some heretical and schismatical congregations. But yet for all this, it would not be proper to allow the Church of Rome to be called a true and lawful Church, as set up in opposition to the legal established Church of England; no more can a schismatical Church be called a true and lawful Church in that sense, and that I conceive is all the Canon intended.

## CHAP. VII.

*That the French Church requires the Observation of some Holidays according to the Prescription of the 13th Canon of our Church.*

The 13th Canon is this, “all persons within the Church of England shall keep the Lord’s Day and other holidays according to God’s will, and the orders of the Church of England; that is, in hearing the word of God read and taught, in private and public prayers, in acknowledging their offences to God, and amendment of the same, in reconciling themselves charitably to their neighbours, where displeasure hath been, in often times receiving the Communion of the body and blood of Christ, in visiting of the poor and sick, using all Godly and sober conversation.”

This rule for observation of festivals cannot possibly be charged either with superstition or idolatry. For it orders no adoration to be paid to the Saints, nor are the days dedicated to them, but set apart for Divine Service. Only the Saints are historically honoured by commemorating their good actions, and rehearsing their just praises, and giving God thanks for those gifts and graces, which he bestowed on them, and by them on his Church; that all men hereby may remember their faith, and life, and conversation, and be excited to imitate their examples. It is well known that these days are thus far observed in most Protestant Churches; and in the Palatinate there is one more, which for its rarity

I will here mention, because I believe but few persons have taken notice of it; that is, the day of Jubilee for the Reformation, mentioned by Philip Paræus in his Epistle Dedicatory before Ursin's Catechism, where he has these words, Anno, 1617, *Celebratum Jubilæum Restituti Evangelii*; "This year was kept a Jubilee for the Restoration of the Gospel."

But it is beside my purpose to enquire further into the practice of any other Protestant Churches, save only the French, concerning which I observe three things.

1. That they keep the festivals of our Saviour's Nativity, Circumcision, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and Descent of the Holy Ghost, as we do, with prayers, sermons, &c.

2. They are obliged by the Edict of Nantes to forbear working on popish holidays: and their Book of Discipline takes a due care to see that order of the edict put in execution. For there all ministers are obliged by an express Canon, "according to his Majesty's Edict, to exhort the faithful to give none offence by working upon holidays." Discip. cap. 14. art. 21.

3. They are so far from condemning the other festivals, as kept in memory of the Saints in the Church of England, that they allow the same exercises mentioned in our Canon, to be performed even on popish holidays, and that by the order of two National Synods.

The Synod of Gergeau, 1601, Cap. 4. Art. 20, "heard an appeal of one Mr. Joubert from the order of the Provincial Synod of Burgundy upon this point; and upon hearing, ratified the order of the said Synod, leaving the Churches at liberty to have public prayers and sermons on the Romish holidays, if they liked it."

The second Synod of Vitre, 1617. Cap. 9. Art. 3, at the request of divers persons of quality renewed the same order. "Forasmuch as our mechanics are obliged by the King's Edict to forbear working on the festivals of the Romish Church, over and besides the Lord's day; it is left to the prudence of Consistories to congregate the people on such holidays, either to hear the word preached, or to

join in common public prayers, as they shall find to be most expedient.

Besides, the French writers expressly vindicate the use of holidays in our Church from the charge of superstition. It was objected to Mr. Daille by his popish adversaries, Adam and Cottiby, that the French condemned the Papists for the observance of such things, as they allowed in the Protestants of Germany and England; and they instance in the observation of the festivals of the Saints. To this he replies, "Some holidays I confess they observe, such as those of the Holy Apostles, and it may be a few others, to perpetuate the memory of their piety. But do they direct their vows, prayers or invocations to them, as you do? Do they exercise any other acts of religious worship, which you offer to the Saints? No; they reject and impugn them as much as we, and accuse them as will-worship and human inventions; that is to say, superstitious devotions. But, say you, they have temples which bear the names of Saints. And do not they of Geneva, whom you cannot deny to be our nearest brethren, call the places of their religious assemblies by the names of St. Peter and St. Gervais? But neither the one nor the other consecrate the relics of any saints in their churches, nor give any religious worship to them; which are properly the things we cannot bear in your churches." *Replique a Messieurs Adam & Cottiby. Part 2. cap. 10. p. 71.*

This is an ample testimony, and generous vindication of the practice of the English and German Churches from the charge of superstition, idolatry, and will-worship, in the observation of festivals. And it is well observed, that if calling a church by the name of a Saint, was any consecration of it to the honour of the Saint, or any other ways superstitious, as some plead among us; Geneva itself is as liable to the charge as any other place, for calling their churches or temples by the names of St. Peter, and St. Gervais, &c.

Many other testimonies of the like nature might here be brought; but I will only add the judgment of Calvin, and give some account of the practice of Geneva relating to the observation of festivals.

The practice of the Church of Geneva has undergone

some changes in this matter, as Calvin tells us in his Epistle to Hallerus, a divine of Zurich, which is written by way of apology for himself, to satisfy the Helvetians that he had no hand at all in abrogating the festivals, as some falsely accused him.

“ I can solemnly protest,” says he, “ that this was done without my knowledge and desire, *me inscio ac ne optante quidem*. Before ever I came to this city, their custom was to observe no holidays except the Lord's day. But the same decree that expelled me and Farel, brought in the observation of the same holidays that are observed by you in the Helvetian Churches. Which decree, though it was tumultuously and violently obtained against us; yet, upon my return, I observed this moderation in reference to it, that the festival of Christ's nativity should be observed after the same manner as it is with you; and for the rest, they should be kept with prayers extraordinary in the morning, the shops being shut till after dinner, when men should be allowed to resume their business again. But there were some headstrong men, who, through preposterous malice, would still dissent from the common custom. Therefore, forasmuch as different usages in a well ordered Church are not tolerable, and are apt to create suspicion among foreigners, that people do not well agree among themselves, I exhorted the senate that they would find out some convenient way to cure this dissension for the future. Shortly after, I was surprized with the news, as a perfect stranger, that they had passed a decree, abrogating holidays, &c. In this I had no hand at all: I neither advised nor encouraged the passing of it, though I am not much displeas'd that it has so happened. Yet I would have all men know, that if it had been put to my choice, I would not have given my opinion for making such a decree. And yet I must say, there is no reason why men should be exasperated against us only for using our liberty, as the edification of our Church may require: as, on the other hand, it is not fit that our custom should be a rule to other Churches.” P. 101.

We have here Calvin's judgment upon this matter, as well as the practice of the Church of Geneva. Every

Church has power to appoint or abrogate holidays, as she thinks most expedient for edification; and the rules and practice of one Church ought not to prejudice or prescribe to any other. But the custom of every Church is to be observed by its own members, and they are perveracious and stubborn who refuse obedience to it. The first reformation at Geneva allowed of no holidays but the Lord's day: and whilst that decree lasted, Calvin and the rest of the ministers complied with it.\* Afterwards, the use of holidays was brought in, An. 1537, in compliance with the custom of the Helvetian Churches. And then Calvin freely consented to observe them; as appears not only from the forecited Epistle, but many other places. For this decree continued in force till the year 1551, during all which time they had sermons on Christ's nativity, and solemn prayers on the other holidays. Calvin, in an Epistle to Farel, written An. 1551, speaks of his own preaching on Christmas day. "*Die Natali concione habitâ,*" &c. And in another Epistle,† he says, "Though he could upon his return from banishment in a moment have disannulled that decree which introduced the observation of the festivals, (so great was his power among the major part of the people,) yet he willingly acquiesced in it; save only that he could not but say, he thought it preposterously ordered, to omit the day of our Saviour's passion, whilst they kept his circumcision."

So that Calvin was so far from being against the observation of these holidays, when settled by law, that he thought it reasonable one more at least should have been added to them. He says, in the same place, "he took some pains to satisfy and calm those of the adverse party, who still clamoured, and cried out for the abolishing of them, insomuch that they accused him for being lukewarm in the matter.

\* Calvin Ep. Ministro Burensi. p. 63. Antequam urbem hanc primo adventu ingressus essem, abrogati erant dies festi omnes præter Dominicum. Farello et Vireto hoc utile visum fuerat. Ego receptæ consuetudini libenter acquievi.

† Ibid. p. 63. Reversus, quum momento possem convellere, placide quievi.

The dispute ran so high betwixt the contending parties, that it came once to the drawing of swords; which immoderate heat on both sides he endeavoured to compose, by getting a decree made, that holidays should only be kept in the morning with shops shut, and men be allowed to return to their ordinary work in the afternoon. And thus it continued for nine years; but that did not end the quarrel: for some would have their shops shut, and some open, which shewed that the old controversy was still on foot among them. This made Calvin once more address the senate, to take this evil of dissension into consideration, and find out an expedient for it. "But," says he, "I spake not a word about abrogating the holidays, but rather commended the senate for their moderation, in that, for peace sake, they had complied with the custom of the Helvetian Churches. And when I heard that these days were abrogated by an ordinance of the people, it was so unexpected a thing to me, that I was almost astonished at the news of it." p. 102.

I have repeated these passages more at large, to do justice to Calvin, and shew that he had no hand, first or last, in abrogating the observation of holidays at Geneva: but his opinion was, that in such matters, all men ought to comply with the received laws and customs of the Church where they live. This was the rule he himself walked by, and the advice which he gave to others, as may be seen in his Letter to the Church of Mompelgard, p. 25; and that to Menso Poppus, p. 205; and a third to Anonymus, p. 218. And his Book, *De verâ Ratione Reformandæ Ecclesiæ*, written against the Interim, p. 293, where he allows of such festivals as may serve to put us in mind of the virtues of the Saints, and provoke us to their imitation. Which is all that is required by any rule or Canon of the Church of England.

## CHAP. VIII.

*Of the 18th, 21st, 24th, 25th, and 26th Canons: particularly of bowing at the Name of Jesus, required in the 18th Canon: that it is not condemned by the French Church.*

The words of the Canon are, “When in time of Divine service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed.” Where note, 1. That this is not prescribed as necessary by Divine command, but as a laudable custom of the Church. 2. The reverence is not to be paid to the name or word in itself, but to the person of the Lord Jesus at the mention of his name. 3. If any one cannot think this lawful, yet he may hold communion with the Church, and join with those that do, as Christian brethren. And thus far I am sure the French Church will go along with us. For though they have no Canon to enjoin this practice, yet neither have they to condemn it; nor do any of their writers speak against it as superstitious or unlawful. Peter Martyr says a thing that will fully justify it, for he tells us, “It is a pious custom among some to bow the knee and worship, whenever they hear those words of St. John, ‘The Word was made flesh:’ and we cannot, nor ought not to say, they worship the bare words, but the Person signified thereby.” *Loc. Com. Class. 4. c. 10. n. 50.*

If it be lawful, and a pious custom, to bow the knee, and do reverence to Christ, at the hearing of the name *Logos*, or *Word*, which is one of the names of Christ; is it not altogether as lawful and pious to do the same thing at the hearing of another of his names, provided the reverence be not done to the name itself, but to the Person whose name it is? Peter Martyr, no doubt, would have said as much of the one as the other, had his argument led him to it: but he brings his instance only to justify kneeling at the Eucharist, of which I have spoken more fully before in its proper place.

But some ask us, why the Church enjoins bowing at the name of Jesus, and not as well at the name of Christ, or God or the Holy Ghost, &c. To which I answer, if there were no other reason to be given for this, but only the custom of the Church of God, that were sufficient in this case: but if we look to the first rise and original of the custom, a much more rational account may be given of the reason of this difference, which was this: the name Jesus was become a name of reproach among the Jews, they always blasphemed and reviled him by this name, terming him, by way of reproach, Jesus the magician, and Jesus the impostor; which terms of infamy and disgrace they endeavoured to fasten on him, and propagate, not only in Judea, but over all the world: for Justin Martyr tells us in his dialogue with Trypho, that immediately after our Saviour's death, they sent forth their apostles, or emissaries from Jerusalem, to all the Synagogues in the world, to tell them, there was a certain impious, lawless sect, risen up under one Jesus, a Galilean impostor. So that the name Jesus was become a name of infamy among the Jews; whereas the name of Messiah, or Christ, and God, and Holy Ghost, were always names of respect and honour among them. For this reason, the Church of Christ, to do a peculiar honour to their Lord, took up this decent custom of expressing their respect to Him, at the mention of that very name, by which the Jews blasphemed and reviled Him; to shew that that Jesus, whom they hated and reproached, was honoured by them as their Lord and Christ.

Now if that was the original of this custom, as Zanchy,\* and some other learned persons own it to be; and the testimony I have cited out of Justin Martyr makes it very probable; then it must be confessed to have been very pious in its first rise: and unless some mighty superstition has crept into it by tract of time, it cannot now be condemned as sinful. What corruption may happen in the practice of private

---

\* Zanch. Com. in Phil. ii. 10. tom. vi. p. 128. Hinc non dubito, quin profecta sit illa antiquissima consuetudo in ecclesiis, ut cum nominatur Jesus, omnes aperiant caput, in testimonium reverentiæ, &c.

persons, I know not: if any worship the name itself, or bow the knee without devotion to Christ in their hearts, they must answer for their own faults; the Church gives no encouragement to any such superstition, or heartless devotion: what she requires is, "That men should testify by this outward gesture their inward devotion, and due acknowledgment, that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world, in whom alone all the mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind, for this life, and the life to come, are fully and wholly comprised, as the Canon words it. Which thing the Jews continue still to deny, and not only deny, but curse and blaspheme Jesus of Nazareth to this very day, in their ritual books, and talmudical writings, as Sixtus Senensis, and Grotius,\* and other learned persons, who are acquainted with them, inform us.

Where then is the harm to express our reverence to Christ, at the mention of that name, which the Jews still continue to hate and blaspheme? Zanchy says, "it was at first *Consuetudo non improbanda, a laudable custom, and not to be disliked*, as used against the Jews, Arians, and other heretics; but afterwards it degenerated into superstition, as many other things did, which were religiously and piously ordained." But if it may be freed from all superstition, then the use of it may be laudable still. And so Scultetus prudently determines the matter saying, "if it be done with devotion of mind, it is commendable; but if otherwise, blameworthy."

*Idea Concion. in Esai. 45. 23. Si cum animi devotione id fiat, laudandum; sin autem, vituperandum.†*

There are some other prescriptions in this same Canon, against which some take exceptions, such as the injunction to be uncovered all the time of Divine Service, and kneeling

\* Grot. in Luc. 6. 22. Otho Lexic. Rabbin. p. 79, Sixt. Senensis Bibliothec. lib. 2. p. 129. Ter quotidie orantes in odium Jesu Nazareni.

† I add D. Paræus' opinion. De genuculatione et capitis apertione vel inclinatione ad Nomen Jesus prolatum, si Latherani et Papistæ ut de Reverentia Adiaphosa consentiunt, nihil ab us nos dissentimus, nam et nos eam ceremoniam (nisi ubi superstitionis species aut confirmatio vitanda est) libere observamus. David Par. Irenic. c. 24. art. 15.—R. B.

at the confession and litany, and other prayers, and standing up at the belief, Gospel, &c. But of these I have spoken in the former book, and therefore need not here repeat them. See book 3. c. 9, and 11.

For the same reason I omit the exceptions which are made against the 21st Canon, which obligeth every parishioner to receive the communion three times a year, and the minister to deliver both the bread and wine to every communicant severally. For of these I have spoken before in treating of the communion.

The 24th and 25th Canons speak of habits, surplice, hoods, copes, &c. But I have already dispatched Mr. Baxter's arguments about them, in treating of that rubrick in the Common Prayer, which says all ornaments shall be in use, which were appointed in the 2d year of the reign of King Edward VI. See book 3. c. 7.

The 26th Canon ought not to be omitted, not because I find any objections against it, but because it is so plain a disproof of the confident and ignorant pretence of some, who say our Church allows no ordinary exercise of discipline to private ministers, when yet the very express words of this Canon are, "that no minister shall in any wise admit to the receiving of the holy communion, any of his cure or flock, who are openly known to live in sin notorious, without repentance, nor any who have maliciously and openly contended with their neighbours, until they shall be reconciled. Nor any church-wardens, &c. who break their oaths in refusing to present such enormities, and public offences as they know themselves to be committed in their parishes. This is agreeable to the rubrick in the communion office, which authorizes the minister to repel notorious and open evil livers from the Lord's table; which is not to be understood with that restriction which some put upon it, as if it meant only persons formally and judicially excommunicated, or notorious in law, but all such persons whom the minister certainly knows to be guilty of any public scandalous crimes, in which they persist without repentance; as learned persons well expound it.

See Bishop Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation

tion, part 3. n. 15. p. 275. And Dr. Sherlock's Defence of Stilling. p. 103.

## CHAP. IX

*Of the 27th Canon, which forbids Schismatics to be admitted to Communion: the 28th Canon, which denies Communion to Strangers: the 29th, which forbids Fathers to be Godfathers for their own Children: the 30th, which explains the Use of the Cross in Baptism: 36th, which requires Subscription of Ministers: 38th, which censures Revolters after Subscription.*

ALL these Canons, except the last, have been considered before. The 27th, which forbids schismatics to be admitted to the communion, unless they make protestation of repentance; and the 28th which remits strangers back to their own parish to receive the communion there, have been spoken to in the first book, chap. 6. where I treat of occasional communion. The 29th, which forbids fathers to be sole sponsors for their own children, is justified also before, book 2. c. 20. where I discourse of the use of sponsors in the French Church. The 30th, which explains the use of the sign of the cross in baptism, is treated of in the same book, chap. 17. The 36th, which requires subscription of ministers, is handled at large, book 1. c. 3. where I treat of subscription in general, and book 2. c. 1. which treats of subscription to the Articles. And book 3. c. 1st, 2d, and 3d, which handle the business of assent and consent, and the use of the forms prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. And what concerns subscription to the Book of ordering bishops, priests and deacons, has been considered already in this book, c. 5. in speaking of the 8th Canon. The only Canon therefore which I shall say any thing further of in this chapter, is the 38th, which censures revolters after subscription, in this manner, "if any minister, after he hath

once subscribed to the said three Articles, shall omit to use the Form of Prayer, or any of the orders or ceremonies prescribed in the Communion Book, let him be suspended: and if after a month he do not reform, and submit himself, let him be excommunicated: and then if he shall not submit himself within the space of another month, let him be deposed from the ministry."

"Mr. B. says, this is excommunicating men for repenting of sin, and such an abuse of excommunication, as that our Saviour speaks of, 'they shall cast out your names as evil doers,' " &c. Engl. Noncon. c. 31.

Let us try whether the French Church does not abuse excommunication after the same manner, to use his phrase about it. There is a Canon in their Book of Discipline, which I have often had occasion to recite, and must here make use of it once more, which says, "a pastor or elder breaking the Church's union, stirring up contention about any point of doctrine, or of the discipline which he had subscribed, or about the form of catechizing, or administration of the Sacraments, or of our common prayers, and celebration of marriage, and not conforming to the determination of the Classis, he shall be then suspended from his office, and be further prosecuted by the provincial, or national Synod." Disciplin. cap. 5. art. 32.

Now this I take to be exactly the same with our Canon. Revolters after subscription are to be suspended by the Classis; and if upon that they do not reform, and submit themselves, they are to be further prosecuted by the provincial, or national Synod. And what can that further prosecution be, but deposition or excommunication? And if the Synod excommunicate them, every minister in France is bound by his oath of Canonical obedience, to publish the excommunication, if he be required. So that if our Canon deserves those hard names, which Mr. B. gives it, when he says, it obliges us to excommunicate men only for repenting of sin, meaning their subscription, I cannot see how the French discipline will be cleared or their rules escape the same imputation.

But besides this Canon they have many rules of the

like nature. In the same Book of Discipline, cap. 1. art. 47. “among other crimes for which a minister may be deposed, rejecting of the counsels of the consistory is one, and schism another, and rebellion against the discipline of the Church a third.” It seems, if after admonition and suspension, they do not conform to the order of the Church, then they are to be deposed.

The Synod of Alez. 1620. Cap. 10. Art. 22. speaking of rebels against the discipline of the Church, says, “classes, consistories, and Synods shall inflict upon them the heaviest censure of excommunication.”

The Synod of Montauban, 1594. Cap. 4. Art. 19. says, “ministers shall have no alteration in the forms of public prayers, and administration of the Sacraments, the whole having been prudently and piously ordained, and for the most part in plain and express terms of holy Scripture.”

Now compare these Canons together, and see what they amount to. Ministers must make no alteration in the forms of public prayers, &c. If they do, they are liable to be suspended; if after that, they persist obstinate, they are to be deemed rebels against the discipline of the Church, and to be proceeded against as such by deposition or excommunication.

They have other Canons which suspend men for transgressing their rules about preaching, one or two of which it will not be amiss here to mention. The Book of Discipline, cap. 1. art. 12. gives these directions to preachers: “They shall never preach without having for foundation of their discourse, a text of Holy Scripture.—They shall forbear all needless enlargements, all superfluous heaping up of Scripture quotations, and vain recitals of various and different expositions. They shall very rarely alledge the writings of the fathers, nor at any time profane histories and authors; that so they may reserve unto the Scripture entirely, its own authority. Moreover they shall not handle any doctrine in a scholastic way of disputation, nor with a mixture of languages.—And that this Canon may be more carefully observed, consistories, classes, and Synods shall put to their helping hand.” And what they mean by their

helping hand, is explained in the Synod of Gap, 1603. Cap. 3. Art. 4. which orders them to suspend all that observe not the foresaid rules. "All provincial Synods, classes, and consistories, are enjoined, as they would avoid the greatest censures, to have a strict eye over such who act contrary to the eleventh Article of the first chapter of our Discipline, and to suspend them from the ministry. And they also shall be liable to the same censure, who leaving the true and genuine sense of Scripture expounded by itself, do rather pitch upon the glosses of fathers, and school men, and launch out into allegories: larding their sermons with philosophical discourses, quoting the fathers, and bringing their books with them into the pulpit; and they also, who in time of Lent, or on such noted seasons, do chuse the self same texts with the Popish preachers."

Here it is plain, that all who transgress these rules about preaching are to be suspended; and then if they rebel against the discipline of the Church, or reject the counsels of the consistory, by that rule of the Synod of Alez and Book of Discipline, Chap. 1. Art. 47. they are to be deposed and censured with excommunication. I know not what Mr. Baxter would have thought or said of these Canons, or how far he would have complied with them, either in his own preaching, or censuring transgressors: but I am sure, after all his tragical outeries against the Canon of the Church of England, there is nothing in it, but what is fully justified by these rules of discipline in the reformed Church of France.

## CHAP. X.

*Of the 49th Canon, which forbids Ministers, who are not licensed Preachers, to expound the Scripture, &c. That the same Thing in effect, is done in the Church of France.*

The words of this Canon are, "No person whatsoever not examined and approved by the bishop of the diocese, or not

licensed for a sufficient or convenient preacher, shall take upon him to expound in his own cure or elsewhere, any Scripture or matter of doctrine, but shall only study to read plainly and aptly, without glossing or adding, the homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be published by lawful authority, for the confirmation of the true faith, and for the good instruction and edification of the people."

Mr. Baxter is very angry with this Canon, and after his usual manner, says, "It binds us to sacrilege, perfidiousness, and uncharitable inhumanity. 1. Men are at once made Christ's ministers and forbid to exercise that which they are ordained to. 2. We are laid under the heinous guilt of breaking our vow, when they have engaged us to make it; and of betraying men's souls, by omitting a vowed duty. 3. We are forbidden that which is the duty of every lay-christian that is able, as if they would suppress religion and charity itself.

This is all the charity Mr. Baxter had for the religion of the English Churchmen! I will first shew what was the practice of the French Church in this matter, and then examine his reasons against the English Canon.

As to the case of the French Church, I observe that they lay under the same unfortunate necessity for many years after the reformation, that the English Church did; that is, that in many parts of the kingdom they could not have their churches supplied by fit and able preachers, who could compose sermons of their own for the use of the people; but for want of such, they were forced to appoint Calvin's homilies upon Job to be read publicly in the churches. And Beza says this was done with very great benefit to such churches as could not be better supplied. Beza Præf. in Calvin. Homil. in Job.

Ludovicus Capellus considers this matter particularly, and his resolution is this: "That postils, homilies, and such other set forms of preaching, are to be allowed as little in the use of the Church as may be; not because they are absolutely and simply unlawful, or wholly to be prohibited, but because they would be an occasion of sloth and idleness

and breed ignorance in pastors. Yet forasmuch as in all places, especially in country villages and hamlets, in so great a number and multitude of country churches, it would be no easy matter to procure so many learned and able ministers, that could of themselves continually make new sermons for the edification of the people, as their occasions and necessities should require, it is much better that they should read and preach to the people either dominical postils, or whole homilies composed by learned and pious men, by the public authority of the Church, rather than say nothing at all. To confirm this his opinion and judgment, he alledges the authority and practice of the Church of England. " This, says he, was heretofore done in England, when the reformation was first begun there ; together with the Liturgy, a great volume of homilies was composed, which were read to the people on every Lord's day and holiday, by such pastors as could not make sermons of their own. And histories tell us, that the same thing was anciently done in France by Charles the Great, at whose command, his master Alcuin is said to have composed a set of homilies, which were read in order to the people on all Sundays and holidays, the year round. And who knows not, that in all the Eastern, Southern, and Northern parts of the world out of Europe, in Asia, and Africa, there are scarce any pastors among the Christians there at this day, that can preach to the people sermons of their own composing ? And is it not better they should preach sermons of other men's composing than none at all ? Thus far Capellus, in his disputation about Liturgies, part. 3. n. 9, 10, among the Theses Salmurienses, p. 659.

We see the case of the French and English Church was the same : it was not choice but necessity that led them both to take the best measures that they could ; and the French writers are so far from condemning the English Church with Mr. Baxter, that they make use of her authority to justify their own Church's practice, in appointing homilies to be read to the people in such places, where the pastors had not sufficient ability and skill to preach sermons of their own com-

posing. And I have shewn elsewhere,\* that the Dutch Churches did the same, in appointing Bullinger's decads to be read instead of sermons, from the beginning of the reformation.

Let us now hear Mr. Baxter's arguments against our Church's Canon, and consider what they amount to. 1. He says, "Men are at once made Christ's ministers, and forbidden to exercise that, which they are ordained to. But are any ordained to preach sermons of their own composing, whether they be able to compose them or no? Suppose ordination be a vow and dedication to the sacred office, as both he and we say it is: does the office consist altogether in preaching sermons of the minister's own making? What then becomes of all the Churches of the East, South, and North in Asia and Africa, where Capellus tells us the ministers are not able to preach sermons of their own, but only homilies, to the people? Are such ministers guilty of breach of vow? Or is there no performance of the sacred office among them? Were all those French and Dutch Churches also without the sacred office of preaching, who had no other sermons but Calvin's homilies, or Bullinger's decads read to them? Why is not this preaching the word of God to the people, as well when these sermons are read out of a printed book, as when they were first spoken by Bullinger or Calvin, provided it be done by a public minister regularly appointed to perform Divine service? The contrary notion, which Mr. Baxter advances, is so absurd in itself, and so great a reproach to half the Christian world (Churches that Mr. Baxter upon other occasions expresses a great value for, and often appeals to them) that in compliment to them he might have dropped this argument, though he had no respect for the Church of England.

2. But he says, "This Canon lays us under the heinous guilt of breaking our vow, when the Church has engaged us to make it; and of betraying men's souls, by omitting a vowed duty." This will be best understood by considering

---

\* See Book 2, chap 11.

the minister's promise at his ordination, which is the covenant and vow he talks so much of. For if there be nothing in our ordination promise, but what is consistent with this canon, and agreeable to the practice of all other Churches, then his whole argument falls to the ground.

Now the covenant made at ordination is, I think, the same that is made in other Churches. In our form, it runs thus: "Quest. Are you determined out of the Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge? Ans. I have so determined by God's grace. Quest. Will you give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, &c. that you may teach the people committed to your care and charge, with all diligence to keep and observe the same? Ans. I will so do by the help of the Lord. Quest. Will you be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word, and to use both public and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick, as to the whole within your cure, as need shall require, and occasion shall be given? Ans. I will, the Lord being my helper."

Mr. Baxter breaks out into a very indecent and unmannerly passion upon this; saying, "Is it not treachery to draw men into all these vows, and then to command them never to preach or expound any doctrine, &c. Doth it not come near to an atheistical prohibition of religion?" I will not answer railing with railing, but ask a few more pertinent and reasonable questions. 1. Whether this vow obliges men to preach the Gospel precisely after one and the same way? 2. Whether reading the Scriptures and homilies be not preaching God's word to the people? and if a man, who is not able to do more, do this carefully and diligently, does he not discharge his ordination vow to the best of his power? If any man say, no; then let him answer for the practice of the French Church. 3. Whether all preachers, notwithstanding their ordination vow, be not under some certain rules and limitations of ecclesiastical laws and discipline, as to the particular exercise of their function? I am sure they are in the French Church: for I have proved before in the very last

chapter, that they are limited to a precise form and method in their preaching, which they may not transgress under pain of suspension, deposition and excommunication. They must also keep to their own parish churches, and not rove about and preach where they please. “ Ministers shall not be vagrants, says their Book of Discipline, (chap. 1. art. 24.) nor have liberty to intrude themselves of their own authority into any place which best pleaseth them. And if they do, they are liable to be deposed. Now this, I think, is to tie men up to some rules and orders in preaching, which unless they observe, they may not preach at all, notwithstanding their covenant and vow at ordination. 4. I ask whether all preachers be not obliged to conform to those rules and orders of any Church, which they themselves have subscribed and promised to observe in preaching, praying, administering the Sacraments, &c. And 5. If they do not conform to them, whether they may not lawfully be suspended or deposed, as well for their nonconformity to such rules, as for preaching heretical doctrine? 6. Whether if they be silenced or deposed by legal authority for such nonconformity, they ought not to submit, and leave off preaching (till licensed by the same authority again) notwithstanding their vow at ordination? If any man says, no, to all these questions, as Mr. Baxter must do by his principles, and thinks there is a necessity laid upon him to preach the Gospel against all rules and orders of the Church, that would put any restraint upon him : then I desire him to answer and account for the discipline and practice of the French Church, which obliges all her ministers to subscribe to her rule about preaching, praying, administering the Sacraments, and all other points of her discipline ; and if they do not conform to those rules, she suspends and deposes them ; and then if they rebel against her discipline, and preach when silenced, she makes them liable to the heaviest censure of excommunication, as I have proved before beyond all possibility of contradiction.

The result of all is this : either men may be under some limitation as to preaching, notwithstanding their ordination vow ; or else the French Church sins grievously in laying so many limitations upon her ministers, as to the exercise of

their gifts and talents, after she has ordained them: to use Mr. Baxter's phrase, she treacherously draws men into vows to preach, and when she has done that, commands them not to preach. But if this be an unjust character of the French Church, it is no less a slander of the Church of England.

3. What Mr. Baxter urges as a further argument, is still a greater calumny. He says, "this Canon forbids that, which is the duty of every lay Christian that is able, as if they would suppress religion and charity itself." I wonder where Mr. Baxter's charity was when he uttered this. As if it were the duty of every lay Christian to compose sermons, and preach them publicly to the people! The Canon forbids not private instructions to any persons, whether licensed preachers or not licensed; but only confines such as are not thought sufficiently qualified to compose sermons of their own, to preach only the Scriptures and homilies set forth by authority for the instruction of the people. And the same thing, when necessity required it, was done in the Church of France.

4. But what a priest is that, who must be forbidden to teach the people in the Church? If he means by teaching, preaching of Scripture, or homilies, or other public forms composed by the Church, then it is false that any priest is forbidden to teach the people in the Church: but if he meant that nothing is teaching the people besides preaching sermons of the minister's own composing, I have already proved that to be absurd, and contrary to the sense of the French Church, which, in cases of necessity, allows such priests as only read homilies, and yet does not think she forbids them to teach the people.

5 "But if reading the Scripture and homilies will qualify men for the priesthood, then one may be a priest, that knows no more than an infidel, or atheist; and if reading will qualify men for a benefice, many will study for no more, and the people will value them accordingly." Suppose this were true, would it not be as true in France as England? But how does it appear that a man as ignorant as an atheist, or an infidel, may be ordained a priest? Mr. B. could not be ignorant that our rules admit of no such, if they be pro-

fessed atheists or infidels: and if they be secret ones, they may have more knowledge than will qualify them to be made priests, and they may perhaps be made priests too, and no Church know it, or be able to help it. There will be Julians and Judases in all communions, after all the care that is taken to prevent them. "But if reading will qualify men for a benefice, many will study for no more, and the people will value them accordingly." What is this to the purpose? Our Church never allows of bare readers but only in cases of necessity, as all other Churches must, when they can have no better. This, God be thanked! is not our present case, and therefore there is no such danger of an idle and ignorant clergy now: for whilst the Church is supplied with a sufficient number of able preachers, men must study for a little more than reading, or else the benefices will hardly fall to their share. And so Mr. B.'s fear of the contempt of the clergy upon that account, is answered.

6. But the grand objection is yet behind, for the sake of which all the rest were made. He says, "This Canon makes the ministry arbitrary to the bishop's will. He may bind us to the office, and when he hath done, keep us from it. As many are kept from it by the new Act of Uniformity, who are denied licenses without new professions, &c. And heretofore such excellent men as the world is not worthy of, Ames, Bayn, Parker, Hildersham, Dod, &c. have been forbidden to preach."

Now the sum of this charge amounts only to this, that the bishops are arbitrary men, because they act according to law and canon. I had thought arbitrary power had signified a quite different thing, and that it was impossible for men to be arbitrary, so long as they were tied to act by rules, as I am sure our bishops are, in granting licenses, and such other things. If men be qualified for licenses by the law, the bishop cannot deny them; but if they be not, it is not the bishops arbitrary will, but the law that denies them. And this is the case of noneonformists: it is not the will of the bishops, but the law that denies them licenses. And the same law denies them licenses in France; as appears from the case of

Morelly, and Mr. Welsh, and what I have discoursed in the foregoing chapter, and other places of this Book.\* So that if men were never so excellent in other respects, if they would not conform to the laws and discipline of France; Classes and Synods had as much arbitrary power, if we must needs call it so, to deny them licenses, or take them away by silencing, or deposing them, as any bishops in England have. And ministers there did not presume to think this power unlawful, or that they might lawfully act against it. Yea, I must add, that those excellent men Mr. B. speaks of, were of the same opinion: they had this one excellent quality, which though he did not think fit to mention, yet to their praise be it spoken, that when they were silenced for their non-conformity, they did not think themselves obliged by their ordination covenant to set up separate meetings, or preach against the rules of the Church, and will of their superiors. Three of the five Mr. B. mentions, I am sure, were of this opinion. Parker wrote against the separation, and wished it had never been made. *Utinam, O utinam, nata nunquam fuisset!* are his words about it. De Politeia Eccles. lib. 1. c. 14. n. I.

Hildersham was four times silenced during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, King James I. and King Charles I. Yet it does not appear by his printed lectures, that he ever took upon him to preach in the intervals.

See G. G. History of the Church of Great Britain, p. 302. and Hildersham Lectur. on the 51st Psal.

Mr. Dod refused to preach, when deprived for refusal of subscription in the third year of King James. And to a certain minister, urging him with Mr. B.'s argument from the ordination vow, "that he was a minister not of man, but of Jesus Christ; he replied, it is true, he was a minister of Jesus Christ, but by man, and not from Christ, as the Apostles only were; and therefore if by the laws of men he was prohibited preaching, he ought to obey and he never did preach till his patron, Mr. Knightly, procured him a license from Archbishop Abbot." See Sir Hen. Yelverton's Preface to Bishop Morton of Episcopacy. p. 47.

---

See Book i. c. 5. and Book iv. c. 3.

This was not according to Mr. B.'s principle, who reckons preaching without a license so necessary a duty, by reason of the ordination-vow; that not to preach when silenced by authority, is no less a sin with him than breach of covenant, and omitting a vowed duty. These old non-conformists were of another opinion; and if the principles and practice of the present non-conformists be more agreeable to Mr. B.'s notion, yet they may consider that they differ as much from the principles of these excellent men, as they do from the rules of the French Church and the Church of England.

Now I hope I have satisfied all Mr. B.'s objections against this Canon, which restrains ordained ministers from preaching without a license, in some certain cases, when the law requires it; having made it appear, that there is nothing singular in our Church's practice, nor any objection against it, but what is equally levelled at the rules and discipline of the reformed Church of France.

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the 55th Canon, which speaks of Prayer before Sermon: and the 57th, which forbids Persons to go offr Baptism and the Communion from their own Parish Churches, because their own Minister is not a Preacher.*

The 55th Canon I had not here mentioned, but only to justify the common practice of our ministers in using a form of prayer before sermon, different from any enjoined in the Common Prayer Book. Mr. B. in his Eng. Non-confor. c. 8. p. 43. charges all ministers with breach of covenant, "because having subscribed, that they will use in public prayer the forms prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and no other, they yet do, in the pulpits before sermons, use other forms." As if the subscription of the 36th Canon could not in common sense be understood any otherwise, but so as to clash and interfere with the 55th. When yet it is plain enough to any candid and ingenuous reader, that they

speak of different things, which may very well consist with one another. The 36th Canon speaks of such offices, for which there are forms prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and the meaning of subscription is, that for such offices as the Common Prayer Book specifies, and there are forms there prescribed, the minister will use those forms and no other: but it does not mean, as Mr. B. disingenuously strains it, that in other offices, for which there is no form there, the minister shall use no form at all, though otherwise permitted or enjoined, as this office of praying before sermon is, by the 55th Canon. The Canons are to be understood according to the subject matter they treat of, and limited to that, and then there is no contradiction between them. Otherwise the French Church, and all other Churches which have stinted Liturgies, would be guilty of breach of covenant as well as the Church of England. But of this I have spoken enough before. Book 3. c. 1.

Here I only observe further, that the 55th Canon does not confine ministers precisely to a form, but leaves them at liberty, either to use that form, or one to the same effect. And therefore if there be some little difference in the minister's practice, if some use these very words here set down in the Canon, and others vary a little from them; neither the one, nor the other are to be censured, for a modest use of that liberty which the Canon allows them. Which I say, lest any should condemn the one as formalists, and the other as non-conformists. The next Canon against which Mr. B. has any thing to say, is the 57th. Which says, the Sacraments are not to be refused at the hands of unpreaching ministers. But the reason of making this Canon, does sufficiently vindicate it from all his exceptions, which are only a repetition of some things already answered in the former chapter. The reason of the Canon is assigned in the Canon itself. "Whereas divers persons, seduced by false teachers, do refuse to have their children baptized by a minister that is no preacher, and to receive the holy Communion at his hands in the same respect as though the virtue of those sacraments did depend upon his ability to preach: forasmuch as the doctrine both of baptism and the Lord's supper is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer to be

used at the administration of the said Sacraments, as nothing can be added unto it that is material or necessary: we do require and charge every such person seduced as aforesaid, to reform that their wilfulness, and to submit to the order of the Church in that behalf; both the said Sacraments being equally effectual, whether they be ministered by a minister that is no preacher, or one that is a preacher." Upon this ground, the Canon ordereth obstinate offenders in this kind to be presented, suspended, and excommunicated, if they do not amend; and requires ministers not to receive any such to the Communion, which are not of his own parish, nor baptize their children, thereby strengthening them in their said errors, under pain of suspension.

This plainly shews, that this Canon was only designed to prevent a growing error, which Mr. B. cannot deny to be an error: "but he thinks, notwithstanding, all men ought to be allowed the liberty to choose better pastors than ignorant readers, as their need and God's law oblige them; and then it is their duty to communicate with him, whom they take for their pastor." Engl. Non-con. c. 32.

Let us try whether this be agreeable to the French discipline; and in order to it, canvass a little their doctrine and sentiments upon these three points: 1. Whether it be lawful for the people to leave their own ministers, whom their superiors set over them, and take others for their pastors, whom they shall think fit to choose for their greater edification? 2. Whether he who refuses the Sacraments from the hands of an unpreaching minister, because he is such, be justly liable to censure? 3. Whether that minister, who encourages men in either of those practices, be not worthy of suspension?

For the first point, it is plainly determined by their discipline, which, as it allows the people no hand in choosing their pastors, as I have evidently proved before;\* so neither does it permit them to leave their own parish church and minister, and assemble themselves constantly with any other. "The faithful," says their Book of Discipline. Cap. 12. Art. 13. "that make a trade of hearing the word of God

---

\* Book iv. c. 25.

in one church, and of receiving the Sacraments in another, shall be censured, and by the advice of the Classis, or provincial Synod, they shall be appointed to join themselves unto that church which is nearest, and most convenient for them." This I presume, means their own parish church.

Another Canon says, "ministers shall not receive the members of any other churches to the Lord's supper, without a sufficient attestation produced by them, under the hands of their pastors or elders, if it may be had." Synod of Paris, 1565. Cap. 11. Art. 26.

A third Canon says, "Synods and Classes shall consult how to fix the limits and extent of that Church, wherein a minister shall exercise his ordinary calling." Synod of Rochel. 1581. Cap. 3. Art. 38. Book of Discipline. Cap. 5. Art. 3.

It seems they had parish bounds, as well as we: and it belonged to classes and Synods to fix them, and choose ministers for them; and they had power to confine both ministers and people to their own parish church, and would not suffer any man to forsake his own pastor, and choose a better for himself, and communicate ordinarily with such a pastor in prejudice of that pastor whom they had appointed. All this is as evident from these Canons, as the sun at noon-day.

2. Hence it follows also, that where reading ministers were allowed, men might not leave them, and go to other parishes for baptism, or the Lord's supper, on pretence that such ministers were not qualified to administer the Sacraments; because they read Calvin's Homilies instead of preaching sermons of their own composing. For the Canons make no exceptions of parishes which had only such readers, and consequently confined the people to receive the Sacraments from them, as well as others.

Besides, their writers tell us, that a sermon of the minister's own composing is not necessary to be preached at the administration of the Sacraments: it was sufficient to read that homily, or discourse about baptism, or the Lord's supper, which is set down in their Liturgy, in a certain form of words, which the minister was bound to use, containing an

explication of the nature of each Sacrament, and the words of institution, &c. which therefore they called *Verbum concionatorium et prædicatum*, the word preached, and made it essential to the Sacraments, and a necessary part of their consecration. For prayer, together with this repetition of the words of institution, declaring the nature and use of the Sacraments, makes up their form of consecration, as it does ours. But the minister's sermon before the Sacraments might be made, or let alone, without any detriment to the Sacraments themselves; or omission of any thing material and necessary to their administration. As Chamier answers Bellarmin, who pretended to say, that Protestants made a minister's sermon necessary to the right of administration of the Sacraments: he tells him this is false, for they distinguished between the minister's sermon and the *Verbum concionatorium & consecratorium*, that is, the form of consecration in their Liturgies. The one was used, *non propter essentialiam Sacramenti, sed propter ordinem Ecclesiæ*, not because it was of the essence of the Sacrament, but because it was an order of the Church, &c. But the other did properly belong to the Sacraments, and was so essential to them, that they were not, or could not be Sacraments without it.

Chamier, tom. 4. de Sacram, lib. 1. c. 15. n. 11. *Mitte ergo Concionem: a quâ prorsus distinctæ sunt Liturgiæ; in quibus vere continetur verbum illud consecratorium, simul et concionatorium, proprie pertinens ad sacramenta. Quod nos quidem tam essentielle statuimus, ut sine eo nulla omnino esse, aut esse posse sacramenta certissimi simus.*

This is agreeable to the doctrine of our Canon, that all things material, necessary, and essential to the Sacraments, are contained in our forms of administration, and therefore the Sacraments may be rightly and duly administered by those forms, by a minister who makes no other sermon, but only that which those forms contain, read audibly and reverently to the people. This is what the French call *verbum sacramentale prædicatum*, in opposition to the popish muttering of the words of consecration.

But Mr. B. says, "if mere reading will make a pastor,

then all this may be done by a woman, or a boy of twelve years of age, who can read as well as such a pastor. This may be agreeable to Mr. B.'s principles, who, in another place, reckons the Sacraments valid, though ministered by such a boy as Athanasius was; but it is not according to the principles either of the French or English Church, who require not only reading, but a solemn ordination, or vocation, and mission of ministers, to qualify them to administer the Sacraments; and they never grant this commission to women, or boys of twelve years old. Therefore Mr. B.'s instance was not parallel.

There is as little sense or modesty in his other comparison. "A Turk, that believeth not the Gospel, may read it: and you may write it on a pillar, and that may teach men, and yet pillars and books are not pastors." Are not these very decent expressions for reading ministers, to make Turks, and pillars, and posts of them, after the Church has made them readers in cases of great necessity, when she cannot be supplied with others? But perhaps he thought they were as good words as they deserved: for he says, "they want essential abilities to make them true ministers of Christ. Since essential ability as certainly reacheth to the work of teaching, as to administering Sacraments." Be that so, that an ability to teach is essential to the ministry; yet the manner of teaching, either by compositions of their own, or by publishing the authorized compositions of the Church, may still be left at liberty: and it is evident, the French Church by teaching, does not mean what Mr. B. means; that is, preaching a sermon of the minister's own composing, but a solemn preaching of those forms of the Church, which contain the whole doctrine of the Sacraments, and all that is necessary to be said, or done in those matters, either to perform those sacred mysteries aright, or instruct the people in the knowledge of them. They call this Gospel teaching, though Mr. B. is pleased to say, it is no more than women and boys of twelve years old may perform; nay, Turks, and pillars, and books may teach men as well as this, with reverence to the French Church be it spoken. As if pillars and books could speak with the

tongues of men ; or Turks, or women, or boys, though they could speak, and read, could do it authoritatively in public offices, without God's commission, and the Church's ordination. I believe the discipline of the French Church was not so remiss, as to have let such indecent reflections upon the meanest of the reading clergy, pass without a censure: but I am sure it gave no encouragement to the people to contemn her offices of baptism, and the Lord's supper, because they were administered without a sermon: for, according to her doctrine, the very offices themselves are an instructive sermon; and he that goes from his own parish church upon the contrary notion, acts against her discipline, and incurs her censure.

3. And much more liable to punishment were the ministers, if they either encouraged any such notion, or received communicants from other parishes, against their common rules and discipline. For all ministers were under the obligation of subscription and oath to observe their discipline, and liable to the censure of Classes, and Synods, if they transgressed it: they might be admonished, suspended, silenced, excommunicated, and deposed, only for receiving communicants from other parishes, in contempt of their laws and discipline. And if this was no fault, thus to censure ministers in France, it cannot be a reasonable charge against the Church of England. Especially, when it is considered that there is a good reason for the Canon: for, in cases of necessity, when the Church cannot supply every cure with a preaching minister, it is fitting she should take the best care of them otherwise that she can, by placing ministers of less abilities, to perform Divine offices, according to the forms which are prescribed for them; and when she has done that, it is as fitting she should secure such ministers and their ministry from contempt, and the people from such erroneous opinions as that is, that the virtue of the Sacraments depends upon the minister's ability to preach. And the preventing these mischiefs all that this Canon intended. But the reason of the Canon being now in a great measure ceased, by God's blessing, there is seldom or never occasion to put the Canon in execution; and consequently, as little

occasion, if men would be reasonable, to clamour against it. Besides that, except in this one case of the Sacraments, the due administration of which is so well provided for by our public forms, the Canon does not prohibit the people to have recourse to other ministers upon some occasions. The exhortation before the Communion expressly allows this liberty to such as are troubled in mind, "if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort, or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief," &c. And the 28th Canon only notes such as come often and commonly from other parishes to hear sermons; in which case, the minister is bound to take notice of them, but not upon every single occasion, unless they offer themselves to the communion; in which case, he is to remit them home to their own parish churches. And in this whole affair, the Church of England goes upon no other grounds, nor acts by any other rules, than what I have shewn to be agreeable to the rules and discipline of the French Churches.

## CHAP. XII.

*Of the 58th Canon, which treats of the Hood, and Surplice. The 65th, which requires Ministers to denounce Recusants, and excommunicated Persons every six Months. And the 68th, which enjoins Ministers to baptize, and bury without Delay.*

Two of these Canons have already been considered in preceding parts of this discourse: the 58th I have spoken to in the third book, chap. 7, which treats of the ornaments of the church, used in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI. And the 68th Canon, with Mr. B.'s objections against it, I have considered in the same book, chap. 19. and 22. where I treat of the forms of baptism, and burial. All that remains therefore to be spoken in this chapter, is of

the 65th Canon, about denouncing recusants, &c. The words of the Canon are these, “ all ordinaries shall, in their several jurisdictions, carefully see, and give order, that as well those, who for obstinate refusing to frequent Divine service,—as those also, especially of the better sort and condition, who for notorious contumacy, or other notable crimes, stand lawfully excommunicated—be every six months ensuing, as well in the parish church, as in the Cathedral Church of the diocess, in which they remain, by the minister openly in time of Divine service upon some Sunday, denounced, and declared excommunicate, that others may be thereby both admonished to refrain their company and society, and excited the rather to procure out a writ, *de excommunicato capiendo*, &c.

The plain design of this Canon is no more than to make obstinate offenders known to the Church, after they are once lawfully excommunicated, that all persons may shun and avoid their company, as by Apostolical precept they are obliged to do. It was the old rule of the primitive Catholic Church, and is still the standing rule of the French discipline. As is evident. 1. From their form of excommunication, which runs in these terms: “ In the name, and by the authority of our Lord Jesus, by the advice and authority of the pastors and elders assembled in Classis, and of the consistory of this Church, we have cut off, and do cut off N. N. from the communion of the Church of God: we do excommunicate and deprive him of the fellowship of Saints, that so he may be unto you as a pagan, or publican, and that among true believers he may be an *anathema* and execration. Let his company be reputed contagious! and his example possess your souls with astonishment,” &c. The conclusion is, “ if any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be *anathema maranatha!* Amen!”

See this form in the Book of Discipline, cap. v. art. 17. and the Synod of Alex. 1620. cap. 10.

2. Next after this, they gave notice of his excommunication to all other Churches, that he that was excommunicated in one Church, might be excluded and avoided in all others. Synod of Lyons, 1563, chap. ix. art. 25. “ Vagrants, here-

tics, and schismatics shall be notified unto all Churches, that they may be aware of them."

Now, if the excommunication be lawful at first, and may be published in the congregation once, and notified to all other Churches; I see no harm in denouncing the same persons excommunicate every six months, in case they do not reform, and obtain absolution. Nor has Mr. B. any thing to say against that: but his exceptions are, 1. "that it makes ministers the agents of laymen's excommunicating." And 2. "the instruments of Godly men's excommunications, and ruins." Engl. Non-con. c. 22.

To the first of these I have fully answered before in the first chapter of this book, which discusses the point of canonical obedience. And I could better have answered the second, had he specified whom he means by Godly men, that ministers are obliged by this Canon to excommunicate, and ruin. But to make some conjecture, and guess at his meaning: I suppose, 1. He did not mean Popish recusants by Godly men; nor 2. Such as stand lawfully excommunicated for notable crimes: therefore he must mean, 3. Such as are excommunicated for notorious contumacy against the orders and discipline of the Church. For none but these three sorts are mentioned in the Canon. Now then the question is, whether these men may be lawfully excommunicated. And if this be to be determined by the rules of the French discipline, the matter is already decided. For they excommunicate all who either despise the admonitions of the consistory, or rebel against the discipline of the Church; of which I have given some proofs before\* out of the Synod of Alex. cap. x. art. 22. and the Book of discipline, cap. i. art. 47. I had here two Canons of the first Synod of Paris, 1559, where the first model of their Discipline was framed, to show that this was ever an invariable rule among them. In that Synod, cap. ii. art. 29. "Persons who are to be excommunicated, and cut off, not only from the Sacrament, but from all communion with the whole Church, are specified under the titles of heretics, contentious

---

\* Book iv. c. 9.

persons, rebels against the consistory, traitors to the Church," &c.

And the next Canon says, "such as are excommunicated for heresy, schism, treason, and rebellion against the Church—shall be denounced excommunicate persons before the people, together with the causes of their excommunication."

I will not say whether this was to excommunicate Godly men or no; but I am sure it gives contumacious persons both as hard names, and as severe treatment, as any they have from the Church of England. And if there be no writ *de excommunicato capiendo*, mentioned in the French Synods, yet there is in the ordinances of Geneva, where the magistrates support the Church, and vindicate her authority, by punishing contumacious persons with imprisonment, banishment, and sometimes death itself. For the proof of which, we need go no further than Calvin's Epistles; one of which gives us the heads of their ecclesiastical discipline, where the first article runs in this style, "if any one spread doctrines contrary to the received doctrine of the Church, and upon admonition persists obstinate, and pertinaciously addicted to his error, then let him be suspended from the Lord's supper, and complained of to the Senate. *Deferatur ad Senatam.*" The next article is in the same style: "if any persons neglect the sacred assemblies, and it appear to be done out of contempt, &c. after three admonitions, let them be suspended from the Lord's Supper, and information be given to the magistrate against them. *Idq; magistratui indicetur.*" Calvin Ep. Magistrat. Genév. p. 76.

Now the reason of giving information to the magistrate in such cases, was, as Calvin words it a little after, "*Ut duros et indomitos homines coerceatis, quibus contemptui est spiritualis correctio, that such obdurate, and undisciplinable men might be corrected with civil punishments, who contemned the spiritual.*" After the consistory has performed their part, they are commanded to inform you, the magistrates, *ne contemptores impune adversus ecclesiam lasciviant, that despisers of the Church, should not wantonly trample upon her authority.* It is the consistory's right to

excommunicate, and in your power to correct, as you see fit, those that rebel against it."

Ibid. p. 77. See also his Epistle to Menso Poppius, p. 205. Where, speaking of such as contemn the censures of the Church, he says, "I see not what the elders have more to do, unless it be to move the magistrates to handle them a little more severely."

This I think is equivalent to a writ *de excommunicato capiendo*, and makes the Geneva Discipline as liable to Mr. B.'s exception in every respect, as the present Canon of the English Church.

### CHAP. XIII.

#### *Of the 72d Canon, and the Rule for appointing Public Fasts in the French Church.*

AMONG other things excepted against by nonconformists the prescription of the 72d Canon is one. That Canon enjoins, "that no minister, or ministers shall, without license and direction of the bishop of the diocese first obtained and had, under his hand and seal, appoint, and keep any solemn fasts, either publicly, or in private houses, other than such as by law are, or by public authority shall be appointed; nor shall they be wittingly present at any of them, under pain of suspension for the first fault, of excommunication for the second, and of deposition from the ministry for the third. Neither shall any minister, not licensed as is aforesaid, presume to appoint, or hold any meetings for sermons,—nor attempt by fasting and prayer to cast out any devil," &c.

Mr. Baxter, in his scurrilous way, compares this to the forbidding Christianity, or reading Scripture in a known tongue, and to the forbidding law, and the use of reason; and asks, "are not those men over subject to prelacy, that

will swear obedience in this, any more than against preaching the Gospel?" Case of Non-conform. cap. 35.

Yet as subject as he makes these men to prelaey, the ministers of France are as subject to the orders of the presbytery, and swear the same Canonical obedience to them. For, by a Canon of their Church discipline, all fasts are to be held only at the appointment, and discretion of the Church. Cap. x. art. 3. "In times of sore persecution, and of war, pestilence, or famine, or any other grievous affliction; as also when ministers of the Gospel are to be ordained, and when a question is moved about calling a National Synod, one day, or more may be set apart for public, and extraordinary prayers, and fasting; yet without any scruple, or superstition: and all this shall be done upon mature consideration of the grounds and causes of these Providences. And the Churches shall be advised to celebrate the fast, as much as possibly they can, at the same time, &c."

Now does not this suppose, that it belongs only to the governors of the Church, and not to every individual minister, to appoint the times of solemn fasting? Else why should they limit particular Churches, both as to the causes and times of fasting, as it is plain they do in this Canon?

But there was another Canon made in the Synod of Rochel, 1607. Cap. iii. Art. 21, which speaks more expressly to the purpose. It was made by way of observation on the aforesaid Canon of their discipline. "Their license is given to particular Churches to celebrate a fast, they first consulting with their neighbour Churches, and on great and urgent causes, for which they shall be accountable unto the Classes, and Provincial Synods." It seems they must not do it of their own head, but by the advice of a Classis. And is it not as reasonable to have recourse to a bishop in an Episcopal Church, as to a Classis in a Presbyterian? Change but a few terms, and Mr. Baxter's questions will now hold as well against the Church of France, as the Church of England. "Do you not think that they make very unworthy men ministers, or that they change or main the pastoral office, when no minister, no not the wisest, may

be trusted to fast and pray with his neighbours? What jealousies have such a clergy of one another, and of preaching, and fasting and praying? What if some neighbours have some great temptations, some great guilt, some great danger, by a plague, or the like, or some great affliction; some friends near death, or some important business of great moment, as marriage, travel, navigation, &c. Must the bishop know" (must a Classis or the neighbouring Churches know) "all their secrets that their pastor at home must know? Are not those unworthy ministers, that be not fit to be trusted to fast and pray with their people, while the law is open to punish all abuses of it?" (while they stand accountable to Classes and Provincial Synods for their abuses of it?) "And are not those over subject to prelacy" (over subject to presbytery) "that will swear obedience in this, any more than against preaching the Gospel?"

Who sees not that the Church of France is as much involved in this charge, as the Church of England, for putting unworthy men into the ministry, who cannot be trusted to fast and pray with their people, without consulting a Classis, or their neighbouring Churches?

But I have one thing further to say upon this point, that the French Canons limit their ministers to do nothing without license, in many other cases as material as that of solemn fasts. They have a general rule in the Book of Discipline, cap. vi. art. 2. "That no Church shall assume unto itself a power of undertaking business of great consequence, in which the interest or damage of other Churches may be concerned, without the advice and consent of the Provincial Synod, if it may possibly be convened. And be the affair never so urgent, it shall at least be communicated by letters unto some other Churches in the province, and they shall receive and take their advice about it."

In the same Chapter, Art. 4, this general rule is particularized in a special instance of entering upon disputes with the papists about religion, where it is ordered, "that no ministers shall attempt a public disputation, but with the advice of their consistory, and a select number of pastors, who for this purpose shall be chosen by the Classes, or Pro-

vincial Synods. Nor shall they enter upon any general conference, without the advice of all the Churches assembled in a National Synod; upon pain, if they act otherwise, of being declared apostates, and deserters of the Church's union."

Now is it not as proper to take the advice of the bishop before a man appoints a solemn fast, or goes about to cast out a devil, as it is before he enters upon a solemn disputation? And yet we see, the Church of France would not allow any private minister to undertake this without consulting a Classis, or Synod, lest some inconvenience should happen thereby, for which the whole Church would suffer in her reputation. And that I take to be the true reason of the 72d Canon of our Church also; and whatever is said against it by Mr. Baxter, or others, it is but a reasonable and proper caution. For, it is better to have the ablest ministers under some limitation, than that the Church should be exposed by the follies, and indiscretions of some, who have not ability to judge what is always proper to be done in such extraordinary cases, as appointing of solemn fasts, or casting out devils.

#### CHAP. XIV.

*Of the Respect paid to the National Synods in the French Church, and that it is greater than is required by the 139th Canon of the Church of England.*

THE next Canon Mr. Baxter, and others except against, is the 139th, which is in these words, "whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the sacred Synod of this nation, in the name of Christ, and by the king's authority assembled, is not the true Church of England by representation, let him be excommunicate, and not restored till he repent, and publicly revoke this his wicked error."

Two things they have to except against this: 1. That a

National Synod is not the true Church of England by representation ; and 2dly, If it were, yet they cannot consent, and swear to publish an excommunication against any one that denies it, as the Canon requires.

But if they were ministers of the French Church, they must be obliged to consent to both these. For they must subscribe, and swear to the confession of faith, as the confession of the French Church ; to the discipline, as the discipline of the Church ; to the Canons of the Synods, as the Canons of the Church. Now, how come all these to be the confession, the discipline, and the Canons of the French Church, unless it be, that the Synods in which they were made, were the French Church by representation ? Is it because they are received and confirmed afterwards in particular Churches ? No, but because their pastors in Provincial Synods choose their deputies, and send them in their name, and with their commission, to represent all their Churches. Whence it is, that a National Synod becomes their Church representative. And I know no difference betwixt their Synods and ours in this respect, save only, that they swear beforehand to observe, and execute all the decrees that shall be made in the Synod, to which they send them, which we do not. For in England we have no such anticipating oath, but in France they have, in this form appointed by the Synod of Vitre, 1617. Cap. ii. Art. 1. " We promise before God, to submit ourselves to all that shall be concluded, and determined in your holy assembly, to obey, and execute it to the utmost of our power ; being persuaded that God will preside among you, and lead you, by His Holy Spirit, into all truth and equity, by the rule of His Word, for the good, and edification of His Church, &c." This oath is always inserted into the letters of disputation, by the pastors which send their respective deputies to the National Synod, whereby they acknowledge the Synod not only to be the Church representative, but next to infallible.

After this can we think they would allow any man apertly to call in question the authority of a National Synod, and dispute whether it was the Church representative or not ? And whilst they decree excommunication in many particular

cases against those who transgress but some single Canons, suffer those to go uncensured, who strike at the foundation of their authority, and deny the very essence of their constitution? If all their pastors swear to observe this discipline, are they not then under oath to excommunicate such as refuse to subject them to it? And much more those who speak contemptuously of the Synods that made it? And if this be the case of all the ministers of France, they could never think (whatever our dissenters may) that the requiring obedience to the 139th Canon was a just cause for separation. For they have declared over and over again, that the contempt of National Synods is a crime of very pernicious consequence, and by no means to be endured. Their Book of Discipline, cap. 6. art. 5. orders all Churches to be informed, "that their ecclesiastical assemblies of Classes, and Synods, whether provincial, or national, were the bands and buttresses of their concord and union against schisms, heresies, and all other inconveniencies; that so they might discharge their duty in the use of means, for the continuance, and upholding of those ecclesiastical assemblies."

And the Synod of Montauban adds further to this Canon, "that if any Churches refused payment of their contributions to the defraying those expenses, which are unavoidably contracted by journeys, and attendance in those Synodical assemblies, that they should be deprived of the ministry of the Gospel, and be reputed deserters of that holy union which ought to be preserved among them. And all ministers in such Churches are interdicted the exercise of their ministry upon pain of being denounced schismatics." Synod of Montauban, 1594, Cap. 3. Art 10.

Now what is this but the severest excommunication, to lay Churches under interdict, and deny them the Gospel-ministry? Yet ministers are obliged by this Canon, and their oath of obedience, so to treat whole Churches for their contempt of Synods, upon pain of being denounced schismatics themselves.

There are many other decrees of the like nature in their National Synods: I will only add one more out of the

Synod of Rochel, 1607, Cap. 9. Art. 1. where even a Provincial Synod is severely censured for transgressing a decree of the National Synod of Gap: and it is declared to be a crime of very dangerous consequence; because, if Provincial Synods shall slight the authority of the National, they will open the flood gates, to let in upon us a deluge of unseen mischiefs.

If Provincial Synods may not slight National Synods, much less may particular persons be allowed to speak any thing derogatory, or contemptuously of them: and if they do, it may be a crime deserving excommunication, which is all that the 139th Canon asserts.

What has there been alledged, will serve for an answer also to the exceptions made by Mr. Baxter to the two last Canons. The former of which is, Can. 140. "Whosoever shall affirm, that no manner of persons, either of the clergy, or laity, not being then particularly assembled in the said sacred Synod, are to be subject to the decrees thereof, in causes ecclesiastical, made and ratified by the King's Majesty's supreme authority, as not having given their voice to them: let him be excommunicated," &c.

His exception against this, is, "that he thinks it unjust, to excommunicate any such person, because even general Councils do not bind the absent, till they receive them; the French for a long time received not the Council of Trent, nor many Churches other Councils." Baxter's Case of Non-conformists, cap. 36.

But I have already shewn, that the reformed Church of France had another notion of their National Synods, (whatever the papists had of the Council of Trent) and thought themselves obliged to submit to, and obey their decrees, though they were not present, save only by their delegates, at the making of them. They did not stay to see whether the Churches would receive their decrees, but peremptorily required every individual to obey them. Of which, I shall only give this one instance, in the Synod of Loudun, 1659. Cap. 10. Art. 4. "Provincial Synods are enjoined to make such Canons as they shall judge needful for the stricter obser-

vation of the Lord's day; and every individual member of our Churches," say they, "are most strictly commanded conscientiously to observe, and obey them."

I hope it will not be thought that every individual member of the Church was present in their Synods, yet they are bound in conscience to obey them. And if they were bound in conscience to obey them, I suppose they would not scruple to think those worthy of excommunication, who made no conscience to vilify, and deride the power that made them.

The last Canon is, "whoever shall affirm, that the sacred Synod assembled, as aforesaid, was a company of such persons as did conspire together against Godly and religious professors of the Gospel, and that therefore both they, and their proceedings in making Canons, and constitutions in causes ecclesiastical by the King's authority, ought to be despised and contemned; the same being ratified, confirmed, and enjoined by the said regal power, supremaey, and authority: let them be excommunicated," &c. Mr. Baxter cannot consent to this neither.

It seems, ecclesiastical laws, and governors may be despised and contemned, traduced and reviled at pleasure, and yet the revilers be thought too good Christians to deserve excommunication for it. Otherwise, why should any one refuse to excommunicate such, if required by a lawful superior to do it? This is a scruple in England, but it never was any in the French Church. The clergy there would not refuse to observe the whole body of their discipline, and promise and swear to do it, though there be Canons requiring them to excommunicate persons for less crimes than this of despising dominions, and speaking evil of dignities.

Before I close this point, I cannot but take notice of Mr. Baxter's causeless quarrel, with the number of the Canons also, only because they are 141. "For so many Church commandments we have," says he, "God's ten being but a little part of our religion." *Ibid.* p. 125.

There is nothing so trivial, but if it cannot be made an argument, may be improved into a spiteful reflection. Something he would insinuate in this, as if all Church Canons were an addition to God's word, and the ten commandments. But

be it what it will, the Church of France stands more accountable for multiplying Canons, than ours, by far; for her number is almost double in the Book of Discipline, which contains 254 Canons, besides the Canons of 29 National Synods, which make up the body of their Canon law, and are the rule of governing their Churches. I could also have said here, that Mr. Knox's form of Church policy (which may be seen in Bishop Spotswood's history, lib. 3.) consists of more Canons, but I purposely confine myself to the French Churches, whose Canons, I hope I have made it appear, do sufficiently justify the taking the oath of canonical obedience in the Church of England, in the strictest sense that can be put upon it.

#### CHAP. XV.

*That the French Church allows of Communion with the Lutheran Churches, upon this Principle, that all Defects, which are not our Sins, are to be borne with, rather than make a Schism in any Church.*

I have now gone through all the parts of the English constitution, and shewn, that the chief things excepted against by dissenters, are justifiable upon the principles and practice of the French Church. The inference from all which, is, that either separation upon the account of such things is unlawful in England, or else it is lawful, and necessary in the Church of France; and they who abstain from our communion, must abstain from the other also. For if what I have discoursed be true, the rules of France, and Geneva, would as certainly make men nonconformists, as the laws of England, if they lived there, and acted upon the same principles against either of those constitutions.

But I have one thing further to add before I conclude, which is, that supposing some things to be practised in the Church of England, which might be called faults, inconve-

mences, or defects in her constitution: yet all kinds of faults and defects, will not authorise men to make a separation, if we regard the judgment of the French Church.

Calvin and Beza had often occasion to insist upon this topic, and they do it pathetically, and zealously, as knowing it to be one of the best arguments against schism, and an excellent preserver of peace and unity in the Church. "*Multos Defectus tolerandos judico, ubi emendari non possunt,*" says Calvin, *I think many defects are to be tolerated, when they cannot be amended.* And in my opinion, no brother ought upon that account, to withdraw himself from that Church, whereunto he is assigned, if the greater part of the Church agree upon any thing to his disliking. In such cases, it seems enough to me, that we ourselves endeavour, as far as we may, after what we think better. For though that, which is obtruded on us, may create scandal, and be attended with evil consequences; yet, because it is not in itself repugnant to the word of God, it may be yielded to: especially when the greater number is for it, and he that is but a member of the body, has no power to proceed any further." Calvin Resp. ad Duo certa Capita inter Epist. p. 218.

There are many things remarkable in this answer, and several of our controverted points resolved in it. 1. We must not call all manner of defects in a Church, downright repugnancies to the word of God. 2. We must not separate from the Church, whereof we are members, for such tolerable defects as we may comply with without sin, though they should sin that impose this necessity on us. 3. Even such defects as may be attended with scandal, and other evil consequences, will not authorize us to make a separation, so long as they are not simply evil in themselves. 4. That our complying for peace sake in such cases, does not involve us in any guilt, nor make us partakers of other men's sins. All which are contrary to the common notions so current among dissenters, and destroy the main principles whereby they would establish the present separation.

Calvin wrote after the same healing way, to Mr. Knox in Scotland: "I hope, says he, your rigour about ceremonies,

which is displeasing to many, will keep itself within due bounds of moderation. We ought to endeavour, indeed, to purge the Church of all its filth, which owes its original to error, and superstition: and we are likewise to be careful, that the mysteries of God be not defiled by ludicrous, or insipid mixtures. But these things excepted, *you know some things are to be tolerated, though we do not altogether approve of them. Quædam etsi minus probentur, toleranda esse non ignoras.*" Ep. Joh. Knox. p. 150.

In another epistle, speaking about ceremonies again, he says, "They are not things of that nature, as should occasion us voluntarily to deny ourselves the Lord's supper upon the account of them. If we cannot obtain what we desire, yet we may tolerate such defects, not approving them; so long as there is no impiety, nor any thing repugnant to the word of God in them. Where the doctrine is sound and pure, and the ceremonies are used for decency, or civil ornament, we ought rather silently to pass these things over, than raise contentions, and grievous stirs about them." Ep. ad N. N. p. 147.

Calvin's moderate counsels would go a great way toward healing our divisions, if all men would think themselves obliged not only to put this advice in practice; even but to tolerate what they might with silence, for peace and unity's sake, and raise no violent stirs about them.

I could give many instances of the like sober advice out of Calvin's works, especially his epistles,\* but I will only add one place more, which I think carries this matter something further than anything I have yet related. In an epistle to Farel, written during the time of their expulsion from Geneva, he tells him, "Some of their friends in that Church had sent to him in his exile, to desire his resolution upon these two points: whether it was lawful to receive the Lord's supper from the hands of those ministers who were obtruded upon them in their stead? And whether they might communicate, *cum tantâ hominum Colluvie, with all that scum*

---

\* See Ep. to Farel, p. 6. To the People of Geneva, p. 12. To Farel, p. 17. To the Church of Mompelgard, p. 25.

*and dregs of the people*, which were then in that place?" To these questions, having consulted with Capito, at Strasburg, he says, he returned this answer, "that there ought to be so great an hatred of schism among Christians, that they should avoid it as far as ever possibly they might. That there ought to be such a reverence for the ministry, and Sacraments, that wherever they perceived those to be, they should conclude there was a Church. Since therefore by God's permission, the Church was governed by those ministers, whatever sort of men they were; if they could find the true marks of a Church there, it was better that they should not withdraw themselves from its communion. Nor might it be any obstacle, that *some unsound doctrines, impura quædam Dogmata*, were taught there: for there is scarce any Church which does not retain some relics of ignorance. It is sufficient for us, that the doctrine whereupon the Church of Christ is founded, keep its place, and obtain. Nor should it be any hindrance, that he who now ministered, could not be called a lawful pastor, who had not only fraudulently crept, but wickedly intruded, into the place of the true minister. For there was no reason why every private man should perplex, and molest himself with such kind of scruples: for they communicate in the sacraments with the Church; and bear with the dispensation of them at such minister's hands. It concerns such ministers indeed, very much to consider, whether they lawfully, or unlawfully possess their places, but others may suspend their judgment till they have a legal hearing. Meanwhile they may use their ministry, without danger of seeming either to acknowledge, or approve, or ratify their usurpation." Ep. Farell. p. 5.

This fully answers all those seeming difficulties, and scruples, which some have both against the ministers, and communion of the Church of England; for, admit there were not only some failings, but some corruptions in each; yet, so long as the true marks of a Church are to be found in her, and these supposed corruptions are not of that nature, as to hinder either the sincere preaching of the word, or due administration of the Sacraments; and men are not

compelled to approve, but only silently to tolerate such failings: in such cases, Calvin thinks, there ought to be so great an hatred of schism, that men should rather bear with such defects in the Church, than leave her communion upon the account of them: since there is scarce any Church which has not some relics of ignorance, and failings of this nature.

Beza's judgment was exactly the same, as appears from the answers he gave to persons who moved these very questions and scruples to him. In his second Epistle to Du Tillet, he says, "some are greatly offended with those Churches, which omit the ceremony of breaking the bread in the eucharist, and retain the custom of putting the bread into the communicants' mouths, instead of their hands, as is practised among the papists; and for these failings they condemned those Churches, as guilty of profaning the Lord's supper, and refused to communicate with them." Now to these objectors he returns this answer: "Many things are right, and fit to be done, which yet are not simply and absolutely necessary: and therefore they who so urge the necessity of receiving the bread into their hands, as to think the Lord's supper is profaned in those Churches, where the other custom is still retained without superstition, and much more without impiety, only by the carelessness and oversight of the pastors, and magistrates, or because sudden changing would be dangerous; *I fear they themselves are rather guilty of some ignorance in these matters, or of self-conceit, and moroseness. Vereor ut ipsi potius vel non nulla rerum istarum ignorantia, vel ἀσάδεια peccent.*" Beza, Ep. 2. ad Joh. Tilium. p. 26.

If Beza judge right, there may be inconvenient customs and ceremonies retained in a Church, and that by the fault of the pastors and magistrates too, and yet the communion of the Church be so far from being profaned thereby, that they who condemn it, and separate from it upon that account, are rather to be judged ignorant, and self-conceited men.

He has a great deal more upon this subject in that Epistle, the conclusion of which, is to this purpose: "That they sin

greatly, both against themselves, and their brethren, who, upon the account of such failings, or corruptions, disquiet their own, and other men's consciences, as if Christian religion lay at stake, and were ready to be destroyed.—Admit something is wrong done in some Churches: are they therefore no Christians, nor to be accounted brethren? As certainly we do not account them, if we think it unlawful to communicate with them. But by this means, say they, we shall partake in their sins. No, this is a wrong inference. For, to come rightly prepared to the Lord's supper, it concerns not me to inquire with what conscience other men come, but my concern is only about my own conscience. Therefore, though I come with adulterers, and murderers, and the most profligate wretches, their impurity cannot hurt me that am pure, and no ways accessory to their faults. And what I say of morals, I say also of doctrine, in which both preachers and hearers are many times faulty. Yea, I will say one thing further, though a minister should admit a Turk, or a Jew, wittingly or unwittingly, the fault would be only his, and not mine, and I should come nevertheless to the Lord's table.—How then can I be polluted by any Church's failing in some ceremony about the Eucharist? And why should we for such things deprive ourselves of so great a benefit, and disquiet the consciences of others? But, say they, though we be not polluted with their sin, yet we seem, at least, to cherish their error. Not so neither. For what can be more absurd, than to accuse a man of favouring another's fault, who only bears with his brother's infirmity, in order to gain his person? If the bread be given to you without being broken, or if it be put into your mouth, and not into your hand, these are things you cannot commend indeed: but as for the fault, it is not committed by you, but against you. Therefore you may condemn it privately in your own mind, and also publicly in its proper season, when there may be hopes of edifying your weak brethren. But beware you fly not off from communion, offended, as if Christianity lay at stake, and by your preposterous rigour, destroy others, and rob yourself of so great an advantage." Ibid. p. 29.

These are those sober counsels, and seasonable advices, with which Calvin and Beza endeavoured to qualify, and possess the minds of Protestant people, whenever they found in them any the least tendency toward a separation. I have before observed,\* that Beza did good service to the Church of England, in giving the like advice to some discontented persons here, who were so aggrieved at the ceremonies, that they had thoughts of forsaking the communion of the Church upon it. But Beza being consulted about that matter, better advised them. He told them plainly, “*Possunt ac etiam debent multa tolerari, quæ tamen recte non præcipiuntur,*” &c. *Many things not only may, but ought to be tolerated, which are not rightly enjoined.* Therefore my first answer is, that though it is not rightly done, to bring back those garments into the Church again, at least, in my opinion; yet seeing they are not of that kind of things, which are impious in themselves, they do not seem to me to be of that moment, as that either the pastors thereupon should forsake their ministry, rather than wear them, or the flocks forego their public food, rather than hear their pastors preaching in such garments.—Those things which the pastors have no power to alter, let them bear with, rather than by deserting their churches, give occasion to Satan to introduce greater, and more dangerous evils, which is the thing he so earnestly drives at. And to the people our advice is, that so long as the doctrine continues uncorrupt, they should, notwithstanding these things, hear it attentively, and use the Sacraments religiously, &c. Ep. xii. p. 107, 108.

He gives the same advice, with respect to church music, the cross in baptism; the interrogatories used in baptism; the use of unleavened bread, and kneeling at the Lord's supper. “Since these things are not idolatrous in themselves, I think the same of them, as of those before mentioned:” that is, neither the ministers should forsake their calling, nor the people the communion of the Church, though they did not altogether like or approve of those things.

---

\* Book i. c. 5.

These are undeniable proofs, that, at least, in the opinion of Calvin and Beza, some defects are to be tolerated in all Churches, and that separation is not to be made upon the account of such inconveniencies, as it may be better to bear with, than raise a schism in the Church about them.

I must further observe, that the French Church upon this principle, ever professed a readiness to join in communion with the Lutheran Churches, notwithstanding many more, either real, or supposed defects, than can be objected to the Church of England. For, we are told, the Lutherans receive the use of exorcism in baptism, and the name of the mass for the Eucharist, and stone altars instead of communion tables; that they celebrate in unleavened bread, and have some hymns sung in the Latin tongue; that they retain images for history, in their Churches, and require auricular confession in some sort, with other things of the like nature. Not to mention their doctrines of consubstantiation, ubiquity, &c. which are known errors, commonly embraced by persons of that communion. Yet, notwithstanding all this, the French Churches are so far from encouraging a separation from the Lutheran Churches, that they themselves have ever most heartily, and readily, as they had occasion, communicated with them. Calvin not only subscribed the Augsburgh confession, as he himself tells us in his Epistle to Scalingius,\* but says further, that it was both Bucer's opinion,† and his own, that there was no just cause to divide from Luther upon the account of those external observances, which he retained in the Church.

And Alting assures us, this was the common opinion of the reformed divines, who followed Bucer and Calvin. For proposing this question in his problems, whether the orthodox may lawfully communicate in the Lord's supper with the Lutherans? He resolves it in the affirmative, upon these four arguments. 1. Because they all agree in fundamentals

\* Ep. Schalingio. p. 113. Nec vero Augustanam confessionem repudio, cui pridem velle ac libens, subscripsi, sicuti eam auctor ipse interpretatus est.

† Ep. Farello. p. 39. Non patitur Bucerus, ut ob externas illas observatiunculas a Luthero disjungamur. Nec sane justas esse puto dissidii causas.

2. Because men ought to preserve unity in the Church, and hate schism. 3. Because we have the example of the Prophets, and of Christ and his Apostles for communicating in more corrupt Churches than the Lutherans are. 4. Because the best divines of the last age have approved it, as Capito, Bucer, Calvin, Martyr, Zanchy, Ursin, Tossanus, Paræus, Scultetus, and others; some of whom, as they had occasion, did actually communicate with them. *Alting, Theol. Problem. Par. 2. Probl. 18. p. 331.*

Mr. Quick himself tells us, that Monsieur Toussaint, pastor of the Church of Orleans, being driven into Germany by the heat of Persecution, joined himself readily with the Churches there, and spake honourably of their communion, even when he was cited before Brentius, Jacobus Andreas, and other divines of Stutgard, to give an account of his preaching. He told them, the poor Churches of France breathed after peace with them, and with all the Churches of the Augustan confession, and had written for it, and prayed for it, and these last ten years spilt no other ink but their own blood in defence of the truth. *Quick Introduct. to the Synodicon. p. 59.*

But we have a greater testimony than all these, which is the determination of the National Synod of Tonneins, 1614. *Cap. 18.\** Where treating of expedients for reuniting the Protestant Churches, they say, *Art. 13.* “There are some points in difference betwixt us and the Lutheran Churches, wherein our agreement is very easy; of this nature are the ceremonies of the Lutheran Churches, which may be excused, and tolerated, because they are matters of decency, not necessity.”

And again, *art. 27.* “If a man communicate at the Lord’s table with a person that errs in the doctrine of predestination, or about the nature of Jesus Christ, or, who believes that the body of our Lord is every where, in all places at once; although this error be very great, yet may it not trouble him, who is a communicant with him.—And as for those external ceremonies used, and practised by the Luthe-

---

\* There is a like decree in the second Synod of Charenton, *Chap. xxii. p. 297.*

rans, we have no such difference, but what may be easily composed."

The same proposal was made in the Synod of Vitre, 1583, chap. iv. p. 153. in the name of the King of Navarre, and Mr. Chardieu was appointed to negotiate the matter with the German Churches.

The proposal was again renewed in the Synod of Gap, 1603. chap. vi. p. 239, where the Assembly ordered letters to be dispatched to the Universities of England, Germany, Scotland, Geneva, Basil and Leyden, and to Messieurs de Gordon and Fontaines in London, intreating them to join with them in effecting the same holy union; and that princes may be engaged to put forth their authority herein, that so they might be more firmly united among themselves in the confession of one and the same doctrine.\*

These are truly healing principles indeed, and proper expedients for peace and union. And would all dissenters from the Church of England but consent to govern themselves by these principles, and pursue the methods proposed by the Synod of Tonneins, I dare be bold to say in the words of that Synod, that the difference about the ceremonies used, and practised in our Church, might easily be composed. For they might excuse and tolerate them at least, if not approve, and justify them. Our Church's practice, admitting it to be faulty, is not more corrupt than the Lutherans, nor her communion more unlawful than theirs: and if by the principles of the French Church, a man may safely communicate with the Lutherans, notwithstanding their errors and faults, both in doctrine, and practice, which are apparently greater than any can be pretended in the Church of England; I see not why, upon the same principles it will not follow, that the communion of the Church

---

\* See also the third Synod of Rochel, chap. i. p. 263.

F. Turretin, de necessariâ secessionem ab Eccles. Romanâ. Disput. viii. n. 33. p. 234.

Mat. Bochart, Dialecticon. Sedan. 1662, Svo.—It. His dialogue about the difficulties raised by the missionaries on account of the Synod of Charenton, 1631, tolerating the communion of Lutherans.

Sanct. Bochart, Resp. ad Jesuitam le Barre de tolerandis Lutheranis, 1661.

of England is by all means to be embraced, and separation to be avoided, even though it were proved that there were some things faulty, either in the Church's doctrine, or practice which might admit of a regular and seasonable reformation. And having said this, I conclude, that whatever way we consider this matter, the communion of the Church of England is justified, and the objections of dissenters truly answered, upon the principles of the French Church; which either herself practises the very same things that are expected against in our communion, as I have proved in most instances she does, or else commends and approves what she does not practise; or, at least, allows them, as things tolerable, and such as may be borne with, rather than divide communion, and break the Church's peace: which were the things I at first undertook to shew from the acts, and decrees of the French National Synods, which are the greatest authority of the reformed Church of France.

## THE CONCLUSION.

CONTAINING A SERIOUS ADDRESS TO DISSENTERS,  
AND TO THE REFUGEES OF THE FRENCH CHURCH,  
TO JOIN IN CONSTANT, AND FULL COMMUNION  
WITH THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

I HAVE nothing more to do, but to close this discourse, with a serious exhortation to such persons as are concerned in it, who are chiefly such dissenters, as make use of the arguments I have examined in this Book, to justify their separation from the Church of England. To these, whether laymen, or teachers, I must take leave to say, and here once more remind them of it, that they act, and go upon such principles, as would oblige them to separate from the French Church, and perhaps all other Protestant Churches.

As to what concerns the communion of laymen in particular, I have plainly made it appear, that scarce any conditions are required of them in the English Church, but what are as much insisted on in the Church of France, as well in the offices of baptism, and the Lord's supper, as other parts of divine service. If the English Church challenge to herself a power to decree rites and ceremonies, requiring all her members peaceably to use and submit to them; the French Church does the same in her Councils, and Synods, making laws about indifferent things, and obliging the people conscientiously to obey them. By virtue of this power, she commands all men to pray kneeling, to receive the Communion standing, to baptize their children in the church only on sermon days, to give them no heathen names, nor the names of Angel, Baptist, Emanuel, &c. To receive the Lord's supper in leavened, and common bread only,

consecrated by a form, delivered with a form, and taken from the minister's hands only: with many other ceremonies of the like nature, of which I have given a particular account in the foregoing treatise. Now either men must say, that the Church of England uses but a lawful power, in prescribing such rites as these, and that all men ought peaceably to comply with her rules, and join Christianly in full communion with her; or else that the French Church abuses her power likewise, and that there is as great a necessity to separate from her communion, as from the communion of the Church of England. But if they cannot consent to condemn the French Church, then neither, in justice, ought they to condemn the English: since the reasons of communion, and separation are the very same in both, and he that forsakes the communion of the one, is by his principles obliged to forsake the other also. When men will take time to consider this impartially, as here they are called upon to do, and directed also in this discourse how to make a true judgment of the practice of both Churches compared together, it may then be hoped they will lay aside their prejudices against the Church of England, and quit those principles, which, if truly followed, will lead them to separate from the French Church, and, it may be, all the Churches of the reformation.

I say the same, with respect to the teachers also: the very same reasons and principles that make them keep up, and maintain separate meetings in England, would oblige them to do the like in France, were they resolved to pursue the same measures that they do here. For, conformity, and uniformity is no less strictly required by the rules of the French Church, than it is by the English. The same subscriptions and oaths, and assent and consent, and vows and covenants, and Canonical obedience are exacted of the French ministers, as are of us here, and he that will not, or cannot comply with those conditions, can regularly be no minister of the French Church. He must either be debarred from entering into the ministry at first, or be censured, silenced, and deposed; if after his subscription to their Articles, Liturgy, Discipline, or Canons, he acts contrary to

his subscription, or raises any contention about them. When he is thus deposed, he must peaceably submit to the deposition, and leave off officiating as a minister; not set up a separate meeting, and preach (when silenced) against the will of his superiors. The first is agreeable to the rules both of the French and English Church, but non-conformists in England call it sacrilegious desertion: and therefore they take the other way, and set up separate meetings, and preach when silenced by the law, though that be as contrary to the rules and discipline of the French Church, as it is to those of the Church of England. Hence it is plain, that they who set up, and maintain separate meetings in England, must, upon the same reasons and principles think themselves obliged to do the same in the French Church also. For it cannot now be pretended, that the conditions of the ministry in the English Church are so vastly different from the French, that ministers are forced to set up separate meetings here, which they should not be compelled to do there: since I have shewn this plea to be groundless, by examining the particular exceptions made against subscription in England; and proving that the very same, if not much greater difficulties occur in the subscriptions of the French Church.

Nor do I see what can be urged further in this case, unless it be the business of re-ordination, which some reckon so great a charge against the act of uniformity; because it obliges every beneficiary to receive episcopal ordination, according to the form, and rites of the Church of England. But what harm there is in this, I confess, I never yet could see, and I am sure there is nothing in it contrary to the principles or practice of Geneva, nor perhaps, of the whole French Church. For 1. At Geneva it is their common practice, whenever they remove a minister from one church to another, to give him a new and solemn ordination by imposition of hands, and prayer. This we learn from an epistle of the pastors of Geneva to those of Berne, which is among Calvin's Epistles, p. 264. Where speaking of one Camperel, a minister of Geneva, who was translated to a

country parish, they say,\* “ he suffered himself to be ordained there by our brother Calvin, &c. And we do not think that to be a childish pageantry, when a minister is assigned to any church by a solemn rite, with public invocation of the name of God.” Now if it be lawful by the rules of the Church of Geneva, for a minister to receive a new solemn ordination, when he is translated from one church to another: why cannot men in England consent to receive a new ordination, when the law requires it, in order to settle themselves regularly in any church? Especially when it is for the sake of peace and union, and to take off all manner of doubtfulness, and scruples from the people. I dispute not now, whether their former ordinations were valid: it is certain, they are not more valid than those of Geneva; nor can they themselves think them more valid, than the ministers of Geneva think theirs: wherefore, if it be lawful at Geneva, for a minister to receive a new ordination, because the laws require it: I do not see what can make it unlawful in England to submit to the same thing, in compliance with the law, when men have no other regular way to settle themselves in any cure; let their opinion of their former ordination be what it will, which comes not into the present dispute. For, even supposing their former ordination to be valid, I shew, they may submit to a new ordination, without sin: and if they will be peaceable they ought to do it, after the example of Geneva, rather than set up separate meetings, and preach against the will of their superiors, to the disturbance of the peace of the Church.

2. Whether the same thing be practised all over France that is at Geneva, I have not yet observed: but this we are certain of, which is more to the purpose, that generally the French ministers who come over into England, are ready to receive episcopal ordination, when they can have it. Which is an argument, that they are neither enemies to episcopal

---

\* *Passus est se ordinari illic a fratre nostro Calvino.—Ludum puerilem esse non putamus, quum solenni ritu addicitur uni Ecclesie minister, cum publicâ nominis Dei invocatione.*

power and jurisdiction itself, nor think it contrary to the rules of their Church, or the rules of the Gospel, to receive a new ordination. And if those I am speaking to, will prove to the world, that they are willing to imitate the practice, and walk by the rules of the French Church, they must imitate their ministers in this particular, as well as conform in all other points, wherein I have shewn the agreement of the two Churches. They are here called upon once more to shew their conformity, by imitating the practice of the French Church, where it is agreeable to the Church of England. And sure, they that are peaceable cannot refuse to do this, which is according to their own rule of reformation. To them, therefore, I address this discourse, not to men who are wholly governed by interest, or passion (on whom it is not likely to make any great impression) but to the reasonable and the peaceable, who, it is to be hoped, will take it into their most serious consideration.

My last address, is to those gentlemen of the French Church, who are fled hither for sanctuary, from the heat and fury of the late persecution. What I have to say to them, is, that as they regard the venerable authority of their own National Synods, and the avowed principles of that Church, into which they were baptized; whose doctrine they profess, and by whose discipline they are willing to be governed; they should vigorously maintain, and assert the cause of the Church of England, against all that set up distinct communions, and unreasonably divide themselves from her. The French Church, it is certain, by her principles, is no friend to separation: all her sons, who may be supposed to understand her principles, must needs here join with me: therefore, if there be any who act otherwise, and either secretly, or openly encourage separation, or any principles tending thereto, they must be concluded to act as much against the true interest, and principles of their own Church as they do against the Church of England. I do not, in saying this, intend to accuse any, but only warn them against the force, and subtlety of a dangerous temptation, which they may be liable to, for want of a right apprehension of the principles, and constitution of their own Church, or

those of the Church of England. For, some perhaps may think, that, because there are different rites and ceremonies used in the two Churches, that therefore their principles are different also; or that because the practice of dissenters in some things comes nearer the practice of the French Church, than the practice of the Church of England does, that therefore the principles of the dissenters are the same with the French, and their communion rather to be chosen than that of the Church of England. If any are thus persuaded, I must take leave to tell them, they understand not truly the principles of their own Church, and act directly against them. For it is one grand principle in the French Church, common to her with the Church of England, that every National Church has power to appoint what indifferent rites and ceremonies she judges proper, and expedient for her own edification; and that all the members of any such Church, are bound in conscience, quietly and peaceably to submit to those her orders; and that they who raise contention about such things, and rather separate than comply with them, are guilty of a causeless separation. It is another principle naturally flowing from the former that different rites in distinct National Churches, make no difference in the faith, nor ought to hinder the members of one Church from joining in communion with another; but that every one is bound to use the rites and ceremonies of that Church with which he communicates, though they be different from his own. A Frenchman is bound to receive the Communion kneeling in the English Church, and an Englishman to receive it standing in the French Church, because these are the laws and customs of each communion. Thirdly, it is a further principle of the French Church, that they who separate causelessly from their own Church, are not to be encouraged in their separation by the members of any other Church, nor to be received into their communion, till they have made satisfaction to their own Church. Now supposing all this to be true, it is impossible for any, who are true members of the French Church, whilst they keep to their own principles, and act by their own rules, either to condemn the ceremonies of the English Church, or give any

countenance to the present separation. For, though some of our rites may differ from theirs, yet we are agreed in these common principles, which justify each others rites, and prove it lawful, yea, necessary, to comply with the customs of either Church, when we communicate with them: and they who separate from either Church upon the account of such things, are justly condemned by the principles of both. So that the practice of our dissenters stands condemned by the principles of the French Church, even in those things in which they pretend to imitate her practice: because they act against those common principles of union, which oblige all men to comply with the received laws and customs of their own Church, and not contend about foreign rites, to cause divisions, and needless separation.

When these things are truly weighed, and considered by those of the French communion, they cannot but in justice to their own principles, disclaim both the principles, and practices of dissenters, and heartily espouse the cause of the Church of England against the present separation. If any do not, it is either because they understand not their own principles, or else act upon particular interest, against the common interest, and principles of their Church, for which they are liable to be censured by their own discipline, and canons, and much more by their National Synods, if ever it should please God to restore them to the free use and exercise of their religion in their native soil again. There is this great reason to engage them to join heartily in communion with the Church of England, whilst they sojourn here; because in so doing they keep steady to their own principles, observe their own discipline, and act by the rules of their National Synods, which teach them to comply with the laws of the National Church, wherever they dwell, and more especially the laws of the English Church, for which their synods profess a most profound and deep veneration. By this means, they will do honour to their own Church, and vindicate both her, and their own reputation: they will do great service, both to the Church of England, and dissenters, and themselves at once, by being happy instruments of composing our most unhappy differences, and convincing those of the adverse party, that

their separation is not grounded upon any principles, or parallel practices of the French Church. To be thus instrumental in doing good, only by being true to their own principles and profession, as it is a just debt they owe to religion, and their mother-church, so it cannot want its reward: since it is no less glorious, and meritorious an act, to lend an helping hand towards ending a schism in God's Church, than it is to confess His truth in time of persecution. Thus they may close, and unite both safely and honourably, with the Church of England, upon their own principles, and never find cause to repent of being just and true to their own rules, whether they continue here, or be restored by God's blessing to the land of their nativity again.

Whereas, on the contrary, if they unite with dissenters of any denomination, they must do it upon such principles as directly contradict their own; principles that are neither safe nor honourable, nor lasting; that tend as much to destroy the constitution; and well being of the French Church, as of the Church of England. If they close with the independents, or give any countenance to that way, they are already condemned by one of their own National Synods,\* which declares against the Independent Principles, as utterly pernicious, and destructive of all order and peace, both in Church and state. If they unite with the Presbyterians, they must no longer maintain the principles of the French Church, which both allows the English Diocesan Episcopacy as consonant to the word of God, and condemns all manner of separation from the English Church (whether upon the account of episcopacy, or any other reason) as utterly sinful, and unlawful. These principles cannot possibly consist with the present principles, and practices of the English Presbyterians, who labour for the extirpation of Episcopacy, as a thing repugnant to the word of God, and offer many other pleas to justify separation. So that, as all the members of the French Church regard their own principles, and reverence the authority of their National Synods, and tender the

---

\* Synod of Charenton, 1644. cited Book i. c. 1.

welfare of their own constitution, they are obliged in honour, interest, and conscience, to distinguish themselves upon this occasion, and shew their dislike of the present separation. Otherwise, those very Synods, which now they esteem their glory, will only remain lasting monuments of their reproach; as authentic records, and bodies of good laws are but registers of men's disgrace, when they confute their principles by their practice. I hope there are no French confessors in England, who will not take care to avoid this censure, and have both the honesty, and courage to own their principles here, as they have done elsewhere upon other occasions, in the severest times of persecution. And then, if ever it shall please God to restore them to their ancient rights and privileges, they may return triumphant without blemish, or reproach; having neither denied their faith, nor deserted their principles, nor cancelled their discipline, nor opened a way, by a bad example, for others in like manner to break in upon their establishment, and destroy the union of their Churches; which it has been the wisdom of their National Synods, with so great care to maintain and preserve. They might then also return with Episcopal dignity, if they pleased, more strictly united to us; and that perhaps might make way for a more general union of all Christians; which if it could be once accomplished, as one of their Synods words it,\* "We should then be more considerable, and ministers might preach with more authority, and greater success than ever." I pray God prosper all honest designs that are used to promote so glorious an end, and give every man grace to follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.

---

\* Synod of Tonneins, 1614. cap. 18. art. 21.



A

SERMON

ON THE

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY,

PREACHED AT

*St. Mary's Church,*

BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

ON THE

28th OCTOBER, 1695,

BY THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

THEN FELLOW OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.



## ADDRESS.

---

THE following Preface by my learned Ancestor, now printed from the original manuscript in my possession, appears to have been written by him preparatory to an intended publication of the Sermon to which it refers. But that intention he did not carry into execution; probably from a desire not to keep alive or add acrimony to a spirit of controversy, which had for some time been too prevalent. As, however, this and the following Sermon are evidently the result of deep research, and afford a very striking proof of the intimate knowledge of the doctrines of Antiquity, which the Author had acquired at a comparatively early age, having been, when he delivered them, only in his 27th and 28th years; and further, as there can be no danger, that the publication of these Discourses will excite at this period any of those personal or angry feelings, which my great Grandfather might perhaps have apprehended, I conceive it will be interesting, if not otherwise more importantly useful, to many studious and learned readers, to have an opportunity of perusing the statements and opinions, on abstruse and much controverted subjects of Theology, which were entertained by the Fathers, and other earliest writers, of the Church, as extracted from their authenticated writings, and discussed and commented on by the devout Author of the Antiquities of the Christian Church.

RICHARD BINGHAM, EDITOR.

## THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

---

IT is to prevent all future calumnies and misrepresentations, which, with a little wit, and a great deal of unchristian passion, I have experimented to be some men's best arguments, that I have published the following discourse. I hope it will, in some measure, do justice to the doctrine of Antiquity, which it only defends, to its author, and to the ingenuous reader, who will, without prejudice, peruse and consider it. That it may the better do all this, before I let the reader into the discourse itself, I will detain him a little with a short account of the true state of the present controversy; and tell him what was the occasion of preaching this discourse, and what the necessity of publishing it.

1. As to the state of the present controversy: the question betwixt the preacher, and those gentlemen, who censured him, is not (what some might be apt to imagine from the late decree) whether the Three Persons be Three Substances, as substance signifies nature and essence; or whether they be individual substances divided from one another, as human individuals are; both these the preacher absolutely denies; but the question is, whether the formal notion and definition of a person be not an individual intelligent substance? Whether the Fathers have not two

notions of the term *substantia*, the one signifying common nature, and the other particular or individual substance? And whether, according to those different notions of substance, they do not assert, that the Three Divine Persons are three individual substances in one sense, as well as one substance in another? The preacher pretends only to follow the doctrine of the Primitive Fathers, and the judgment of Antiquity; and does not deny the three Persons to be *unius substantiæ*, or *ὁμοούσιου*, of one substance or consubstantial, in any sense that the Primitive Fathers believed them to be so: but he asserts that the Schoolmen, since the time of the Council of Lateran under Innocent the 3d, have taken one substance in another sense than the Fathers did, and that has been the original of all the confusion. This is the true state of the question as proposed by the preacher: and it being a pure question of fact, whether the Fathers have used and allowed this twofold notion of substance, he thinks it ought only to be determined by producing ancient authorities; and not by the judgment of the Schoolmen, or Calvin, or any other Modern Authors.

2. Next for the occasion of preaching the sermon: it was not,\* as one maliciously insinuates, that the author might ingratiate himself with the Dean of St. Paul's;† or any other person. All that know the preacher's conversation will think otherwise of him; but it was purely to hint to others, what he had satisfied himself was true. He had for some time been consulting originals, which all men have not opportunity, or time, or will to do, and he was sorry to find the genuine sense of Antiquity violently run down, none interposing, though many be sensible of it, under the pre-

---

\* Author of the Preface to the Hist of Valent. Gentil. p. 5.

† Dr. Sherlock, afterwards Bishop of London.

tence of being Tritheism. Therefore having acquainted himself a little in the knowledge of this controversy by perusing and comparing the writings of ancient and modern authors; and having especially observed a different style and explication in the Fathers from that of the Schoolmen; and some propositions advanced by the latter contradicting those that were asserted by the former, which contradictions are proved in the sermon; having further observed, what he thinks very material, though not mentioned in the sermon, that Luther and his followers had generally rejected the innovations of the Council of Lateran and the Schoolmen in this particular; and that many of them had asserted three individual real substances in opposition to modes and relation, as he from the Fathers did; that they accused some of the Calvinists of Sabellianism for defining person by a *τρόπος ὑπαρξέως*; and further having observed the Calvinists to be generally accused by learned men for their new doctrine of Autotheanism, and for following the Schoolmen's niceties more than the plain sense of the Council of Nice in their explications of this great article; I say, having observed these and many other things relating to this controversy, he thought it his duty, having an opportunity to preach before the learned body of the University, to take notice of some of the principal innovations of the Schoolmen, and those modern authors, who refining upon the Schoolmen's hypothesis, had tacitly and in effect charged Tritheism upon the Fathers. He found the Fathers wounded through Dr. Sherlock's sides; whilst he was condemned for saying many things, which the Fathers had said before him. He found the Fathers had made the terms, person and individual intelligent substance, convertible; and had maintained three such persons against Sabellius. He found nature and sub-

stances, *ἁόια* and *essentia*, always explained by such a nature, as would admit of three distinct individuals. Lastly, he found all the arguments of the contrary hypothesis grounded upon one fundamental mistake, viz. that the Fathers by *ὁμοσῆος*, and *una substantia* always understood a singular individual substance; whereas there is nothing more evident, to those, who look into the Fathers, than that by *ὁμοσῆος*, and *una substantia*, they mean such a substance or essence, as three numerical or individual substances may entirely partake of: and three such individual substances or persons, not being essentially different, but all of one unalterable and immutable Divine Nature, they therefore called one substance, nature or essence, and in the same sense One Divinity or One God; adding some other sorts of unity, which are summed up in the close of the sermon.

These are the true and only reasons that engaged him in this undertaking. It was only to vindicate the genuine sense of Antiquity, viz. the true sense of one substance and three persons, from the corruptions of the Schoolmen and the defenders of the innovation of the Lateran Council. Luther and his part of the reformation had done the same before: and the Church of England, professing to follow the sense of the four first General Councils, might be presumed to defend one substance and three persons in the true old sense too; since she had nowhere declared against it. And then it could be no innovation, much less Heresy or Tritheism to endeavour to reduce old words to their first and primitive signification. This and nothing else the reader will find to be the whole design of the following discourse. And that I presume, with unprejudiced men, will justify the undertaking.

3. The reason why it appears abroad now, and not before, is principally to confute the unjust calumnies of a nameless

author, who writes Marginal Annotations upon the life of Valentinus Gentilis. It is there pretended more than once, that the Oxford Preacher, amongst the rest of the followers of Dr. Sherlock, has condemned the Nicene Council, and cast away the usual terms of the Catholic Church, (*ὁμοούσιον, ἰσότης, hypostasis, una substantia,* and the like,) introducing new ones in the room.\* Now allowing men may have a right to censure a doctrine; yet I hope no one will pretend to have a right to misrepresent and calumniate it. Yet this is such an egregious calumny as no one would have been guilty of, but he that is resolved to undermine the defenders of the Primitive Faith, by the same arts, that the great enemy of mankind did its first professors. It is too usual, with men who want better arguments, to betake themselves to misrepresentations and blackening calumnies: that being the surest way to undermine the credit and reputation of any author or doctrine; to say something of them, which will render them odious to the generality of mankind: *Fortiter calumniare et aliquid adhærebit.*

But the greater any calumny is, the more easily it is exposed, when it is once laid open. And there needs nothing more to lay open this calumny, but only to give every ingenuous reader an opportunity to see, and judge of the sermon itself, and what is therein asserted. If he finds me rejecting or quarrelling with any one of the ancient terms, I desire no more favour at his hands, than I have had justice from the animadverting annotator. But if I have done nothing of this nature to give the least occasion for such a slander; but on the contrary have endeavoured to clear and vindicate the old words from novel and corrupted senses, and have put the true ancient *valor* and signification on them;

---

\* Life of Gentil., p. 24 and 43.

if I have put things in a fairer light, by distinguishing the different senses of words, and shewing how the Fathers said three substances and one substance without a contradiction; if I have made the doctrine intelligible, and shewn the explication to be every way agreeable to the Council of Nice, and the expressions of the Primitive Fathers; whose sense and doctrine I only undertake to defend; then I hope every candid reader will free this discourse from the unjust imputation, which the annotator has endeavoured to fix upon it.

I do not here in the least reflect upon any one of those worthy gentlemen, who thought it their duty to censure the sermon. I could have wished for their own sakes indeed and the sake of the public, that they had done it a little more deliberately, and given me that month's time I desired; that I might have tendered my sermon to them, and given them a sight of my reasons, before they had censured me without hearing all that I had to say. And I could have wished also, they had told the world, that I asserted an Indivisible Unity of the Godhead, as well as Three Individual Substances; and further should have been glad to have seen what notion they have of the Three Persons; what the definition of a person is; why the old definition of it, *rationalis naturæ individua substantia*, will not serve us as well as the Primitive Fathers; why it must now be discarded, and those reckoned enemies to truth, who only stand up for it? If we must not believe the Three Persons to be Individual Substances, they would have done well to have determined what they are, that at least others might have known what to have believed, as well as what not to have believed; since it is not a negative faith or a not believing of errors, but a positive belief of truth, that makes a man an orthodox Christian: and now

that the notion of person was come to be disputed, it was necessary to have determined *κατασκευατικῶς* what a person was. But these things were left all to their own discretion, and I only modestly therefore touch upon them. I hope they will pardon me, if for the future I endeavour to do the truth and myself justice, and free both from the malicious calumnies of others; still always retaining a decent respect for their characters, and examining reasons without the least unbecoming reflections on their persons.

The only thing I design to examine, is, on which side the Fathers stand in this dispute: which is a thing, I presume, may be fairly done by producing testimonies without any heat or passion on either side (if men so please) or without any prejudice to religion. And when all is done, indifferent readers must be judges at the last; since this is a controversy that will not be decided by decrees, but only by authorities from the Fathers.

Therefore I must desire the reader to take particular notice of one thing more; viz. that what the publisher of the *Life of Valentinus Gentilis* has said further, with a malicious design to bring all the odium he could upon us, may be answered in one word; that it is as impertinent as it is malicious; being it relates not at all to the present debate. For the question now is not, what Calvin and some of his followers have thought (some, I say; for they are not all of his opinion), but what the Fathers have said upon the subject. If the Fathers prove at last to be of the Preacher's opinion, Calvin's authority will weigh no more, with any reasonable man, in this case against Antiquity, than it does in the business of episcopacy; in which point we think we have just reason to dissent from him. Besides that many of the Lutherans, as I have hinted before, do explode both

Calvin and the Schoolmen too, for following the error of the Council of Lateran in this very point. So that if modern authorities signify any thing in this debate, I can easily upon occasion set the one against the other. But when our inquiry is about Antiquity, all these authorities are foreign to the business in hand; and therefore to condemn the doctrine of three individual substances and one substance, which are always to be put together, though the decree did not do it; I say, to condemn this doctrine from the authority of Calvin or the Senate of Berne, is just as if a man should prove the novelty of Arminianism from the Synod of Dort, or the antiquity of Transubstantiation from the Council of Trent.

Yet the reader may please to consider, that this is not said to vindicate the heresy of Valent. Gentilis, who was certainly an Arian and a professed enemy to the Council of Nice; for which Council the Christian world justly preserves a perpetual veneration. But I must withal add, that the heresy of Gentilis did not consist in asserting the Three Persons to be three single substances, of the same nature, equal to one another in all things: for this I shall shew hereafter to have been the true sense of the Council of Nice, and what Gentilis would never allow; who denied the equality of the Son and made Him a finite circumscribable Substance: adding many other heterodoxies and foolish absurdities, which were attended with many contradictions. I believe I shall be able to oblige the reader with a much clearer account of that heretic's opinions, than has lately been done; but it is wholly impertinent to the present debate; and therefore I shall confine myself to the business of Antiquity and endeavour to clear that point first. The arguments I shall add to the sermon shall be proposed fairly with honesty

and integrity, and with what strength and clearness I can give them; and the more to recommend them, with that decency and temper, in a calm manner, as becomes a Christian disputant. So that if I do not satisfy all men with the strength of my arguments, yet I hope all the sober and rational part of mankind, though differing in opinion, will be satisfied with the manner of proposing them. If there be any loose unguarded expressions in the sermon, being it was never designed for the press, had not some men's calumnies extorted it, I hope the reader will overlook them: to prevent further calumnies I was resolved to make no alterations, being pretty well assured, the substance of it will admit of no material objection to which I shall not be able to return a fair and solid answer.

I must tell the reader one thing further; that he will find some few additions here and there: but generally they are such as I had before prepared to speak, yet was forced to omit, to bring myself within compass. All such additions are included within these marks [ ]: so that the sermon as it was preached still remains entire; and every reader may judge of it for himself. I desire no other favour at his hands, but common justice and humanity; that he will think without prejudice and judge without partiality; that he will read with the same temper I now endeavour to write, and pass no hasty censure before he has seen and considered the reasons that are offered him. If they be unsatisfactory, yet still I can say I meant well, and hope I deserve a candid ingenuous censure.

J. B.

A SERMON  
ON THE TRINITY.

1st JOHN, CHAP. V. VER. 7.

*There are Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these Three are One.*

THOUGH there be no article in our creed more necessary to be known and understood, because none more necessary to be believed, than the doctrine of the Trinity: yet perhaps there is no one thing in the whole body of Divinity, we are generally less ashamed to own ourselves ignorant of, than this most necessary article of religion. Most men are so possessed with a sense of its darkness and obscurity, that they avoid all enquiries of this nature, as utterly despairing of ever attaining any tolerable notion of it. But I wish, this do not rather reflect upon the honour of our religion, as if it obliged us to believe something, which no one will pretend to give a rational account of: if so, the Oracles of God are as dark and unintelligible as the Oracles of Apollo; and we must verify that ancient calumny, so often objected by the Heathens to the Primitive Christians, but as oft with scorn again by them rejected: “*μη̄ ἐξετάζει, ἀλλὰ πίστευσον, κἀ ἡ πίστις σε σώσει σε,*” as Origen give it in the words of Celsus, “*Never enquire, but believe, and your faith will save you.*” Certainly faith presupposes a competent degree of knowledge, and knowledge a competent idea of the object to be

known: else a man may be saved by a faith of words, without sense, and a confident belief of he knows not what. [This I presume shews us the necessity of having some tolerable knowledge of the doctrine of the Trinity, though we can never attain to a full comprehension of it.]

And yet after all, it must be confessed, that this article, according to some authors' explication of it, is one of the most obscure, unintelligible, not to say inconsistent things in the world, and were this obscurity justly chargeable upon the doctrine itself, it were perhaps a very just and rational prejudice against it: it were enough at least to make us despair of ever giving either ourselves or others any tolerable satisfaction concerning it. But if this obscurity be wholly owing to a sect of men, whose business was to invent novelties, and make new additions to old doctrines, for General Councils afterwards to improve into Articles of Faith: I say, if the Schoolmen, and their admirers since, who only drain their fountains, have spoken some things unintelligibly of this doctrine, and utterly inconsistent with themselves, we are not obliged to believe or follow them in all their usurpations: we may safely leave them where they have left Antiquity, and seek for a clearer notion from better expositors: and these certainly were the Fathers, who wrote since the Council of Nice against the heresy of Arius.

It is manifest to any one, who will but be at the pains to compare the doctrine of the Fathers and Schoolmen together, that the latter have made a very great deviation in this particular from the former, and have advanced several propositions quite contradictory to the Fathers, whence it is no wonder, that, mixing truth with error, they have spoken inconsistently with themselves and unintelligibly to their readers.

Some of their deviations will manifestly appear from what will be hereafter said: at present I shall only mention one relating to the notion of Three Persons, which I design to make the main subject of the following discourse. It is agreed both by Fathers and Schoolmen, that the notion of person is an *individual substance of a rational or intelligent nature, rationalis naturæ individua substantia*; according to the defini-

tion given by Boetius, who speaks the sense of the Fathers and is not rejected by the Schoolmen. It is agreed further, at least in expression, that there are Three such Persons in the Godhead, really distinct from one another: thus far they are agreed. [And one might reasonably now expect to hear, that, according to this notion and discourse, they should both agree further in asserting three individual substances in the Unity of the Godhead. This is certainly the natural consequence of allowing three persons, whereof every one is an individual substance.] But herein they differ.

The Fathers, speaking consistently with themselves, and agreeably to their definition of the term Person, say that in the same sense that there are three persons, and every one of those an individual substance, in that sense there are three distinct substances too, that is, Three Minds or Spirits in the Unity of the Godhead. Yet in another sense they safely say, without a contradiction, that there is but one undivided substance in the Godhead, viz. by virtue of a community of nature, and inseparable union; as well as three individual substances by virtue of their real distinction. And this is no absurdity nor inconceivable thing: for three substances may be actually united into one, and yet remain distinct without confusion. Three angels or spirits, suppose they were united into one being (and that is no impossible supposition) would still be three distinct substances; though in another sense they might rationally be likewise said to be one individual substance [by virtue of that common angelic nature of which they all partake] or one undivided being by virtue of their actual union. In like manner, the Fathers tell us, Three Infinite and Eternal Beings, still remaining distinct without confusion, are in a more exquisite manner One: because their union is absolutely natural, necessary and eternal; they are as necessarily three as one, and as necessarily one [by union] as three [by distinction, without separation or division.] And this notion of Unity in Trinity, given us by Antiquity, is, I conceive, a very rational and intelligible account of the Unity of the Divine Nature in a Trinity of Persons: for by this we need neither confound the persons nor divide the substance.

But on the other hand, the Schoolmen, though they allow a person to be an individual substance, and say that there are three such persons in the Godhead, yet they commonly deny three individual substances, in any sense: and assert that the Divine Nature is absolutely a single substance utterly exclusive of three; as the nature of a single Angel is a simply individual substance: which is a manifest deviation from the doctrine of the Fathers, and is in effect to say, that three persons are but one person; which without a great deal of subtlety and nice unintelligible distinctions, will hardly be freed from a contradiction.

Others there are, who have still refined upon the Schoolmen's notion and more corrupted the genuine sense of Antiquity, by introducing new and foreign senses of the term person, which were never heard of in the Catholic Church before. So that the very words are now become a matter of dispute and controversy, and almost as much a mystery as the very mystery they were designed to unfold.

In order therefore to contribute something towards the clearing this controversy, I shall propose these four things to be the subject of this and another discourse.

1. To consider the notions which some modern authors have given of the term person, and shew how unfit it is in their sense to explain the distinction which both Scripture and Antiquity put betwixt Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

2. To shew that the Fathers did believe the Three Persons to be three distinct individual substances in one sense, as well as one substance in another.

3. That this notion is most agreeable to the sense of Scripture.

4. That it is very consistent with any notion the Fathers had of the Unity of the Godhead.

And this I conceive will be a just exposition and intelligible account of the Apostle's words, "There are three, &c." but at present I can only dispatch the two first.

And here I purposely omit all disputes concerning the original and authority of this text, as no way relating to the business in hand: since no one, with whom we are at present concerned, can pretend to raise any scruple about it.

And the learned Dr. Hammond will give any man sufficient satisfaction concerning it; who shews that it was anciently read in the copies used by Cyprian and Tertullian, which was long before Arianism was ever set on foot in the world or dreamed of: and that the first corruptors of the text were the Arians themselves, as he proves from the testimonies of St. Ambrose and St. Jerome, who charge them with the erasing of it.

I omit likewise all direct proofs of the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, as a thing presupposed by all good Catholics, and no ways necessary to be insisted on in an enquiry of this nature, which takes it for granted that they are truly divine, and upon that supposition proceeds to enquire, whether according to the representation made us in Scripture and Antiquity it can be rationally conceived and understood, that there are Three who are truly distinct from one another and yet truly One without a contradiction; that the thing is possible and conceivable, is what I hope clearly to evince.

But first we are to consider the notions which some modern authors give of the term person, and shew how unfit it is in their sense to explain the distinction of the Trinity.

Some Protestant authors, no doubt in their zeal for Christianity, thinking to confute their Socinian adversaries and force them to own three Persons in the Godhead, have forsaken the ancient ecclesiastical notion of the term person, and taken up with the antiquated and foreign sense of it; that I mean so much contended for by Laurentius Valla,\* in the sixth book of his Elegancies 34th Chapter, as the only true Latin notion of it: in which acceptation it signifies, not a substance but only a mode, an office, an habitude or quality; in which sense one and the same man (to go no further for an instance) may sustain no less than an hundred or a thousand persons: i. e. as many persons as there are different relations, circumstances or capacities, under which he may either act or be conceived.

---

\* Valla Elegant. l. 6. c. 34.

Now it is true, this is one very proper and ancient signification of the word person in the Latin tongue, and may very well be allowed in criticism; but it is to be feared, it will not so well answer the end of religion, nor give us that true distinction which the Scripture seems to put betwixt Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For according to this hypothesis, the Father alone may sustain three persons and the Son as many, and the Holy Ghost as many: and so instead of a Trinity we shall have an endless number of persons multiplied *in infinitum*. It is easy to conceive one single person to be three persons in this sense, which if we allow, it is as easy to tell what heresies have gained their point. This opens a way to those ancient heresies so often condemned by the Primitive Church under the names of Praxeas, Noetus Samosetenus and Sabellius: and this is not to confute the Socinian, but really to yield up the cause to him, who will not scruple here to join issue with us, and profess it in his creed, that he believes three persons in the Godhead, if we will once give it under our hands, that by person we mean no more than this. [This, if I mistake not, is however the very thing, which Sabellius of old contended for, and made the first article of his creed: i. e. taking person to signify an individual or particular substance, so there was but one single person in the Godhead; but *τρία πρόσωπα*, and *tres personæ*, let Sabellius have the interpretation of them himself to make them signify only office or mode or quality, in this sense they were his own terms; and he could safely allow three persons or more in one single substance without any detriment to his own hypothesis.] And this I think is sufficient reason to discard this notion of the word person from the doctrine of the Trinity: because if closely followed and maintained, it must bring us at last to those very heresies, which we most studiously design to avoid.

Another disallowable notion, taken from some of the Schoolmen and not much unlike the former, is, that the Three Persons are only one single substance under three modes of subsisting: i. e. That the same single individual Divine substance is in the Father as *quid ingenitum*, in the Son as *quid genitum*, in the Holy Ghost as *quid procedens*. These

men take substance in the strictest sense of that word, as it signifies a single substance utterly exclusive of three in any sense.

But then this hypothesis is only words, that leave us more in the dark than we were before, and labours under very great absurdities: for to say that one single substance, in their sense of substance, subsists in three persons by three modes of subsisting, is what no man clearly understands. Besides that it makes the persons only three modes [at least two of them as distinct from the first must needs be mere modes], and not *tres res subsistentes*; to deny which is Sabellianism, because it confounds the persons into one. And further it will reduce us to this difficulty, and oblige us to say, that the same single substance, or person, is both *genitum* and *ingenitum*, both Father and Son, which cannot be freed from a contradiction.

I know indeed this hypothesis is usually fathered upon the author of the *Expositio Fidei*, under the name of Justin Martyr: for the critics are agreed that that treatise is none of his. That author says, that the three persons in the Trinity do not differ in nature, but only by three different *τρόποι ὑπάρξεως*, or *different modes of subsisting*; hence some very illogically concluded, that person and *τρόπος ὑπάρξεως* were synonymous terms; as if three persons were merely three abstracts and not three things, as well as three modes of subsisting, whereas that author gives no countenance to such a wide conclusion. For his notion is quite different, but, as he explains it, very rational and intelligible. For he tells us, in the explication of it, that Adam and those that came of him (suppose Eve and Seth) do not differ in nature, but only by a different *τρόπος ὑπάρξεως*, by having that common nature three different ways.

Adam, suppose, had his existence from God alone by immediate creation out of dust; and that was his *τρόπος ὑπάρξεως*: Eve had the same nature, but by a different mode of existing, and that was by being created out of the rib of man: and Seth had the very same nature, but by a different way from them both, viz. by being begotten, not created immediately by God as they were. This, though I have somewhat en-

larged and paraphrased the words, is that author's notion of *τρόπος ὑπόρξεως*, common to him with many others; whence a man might as well conclude, that Adam and Eve and Seth were three mere modes of the same single substance, as that the three Persons in the Trinity are only three modes of subsisting; for he says the same of both.\* It is plain therefore that author meant, by nature, common nature, of which several individual substances might partake; and by persons, three such substances partaking of that common nature; and by *τροπος ὑπόρξεως*, the different ways that three such beings might partake of one common nature: so that in his sense he might rationally say, the three Divine Persons (meaning three divine individual substances) did not differ in nature, but only by different *τρόποι ὑπόρξεως*, by partaking of that one common nature three different ways: the Father's *τρόπος* being *ἀγέννησία*, or existing from none: the Son's *γέννησις*, as receiving his Being from the Father, and the Holy Ghost's *ἐκπόρευσις*, as receiving Being from both. This is a rational and intelligible account of three persons in one nature, and agreeable to the sense of all the primitive Fathers; who took not nature for a single individual substance, but for a common nature or substance, that might be contained without division in many particular individuals, so that they, who fix this notion, of three persons being merely three modes of subsisting without three substances that distinctly subsist, upon this author, do manifest injury both to him and all antiquity; as I come now more particularly to prove, by proceeding in the

2nd place to shew, that the Fathers by three persons always understand three distinct individual substances really distinct from one another, though at the same time they

---

\* Pseudo. Just. Exposit. fid. p. 374. Ὡς γὰρ ὁ Ἀδὰμ, καὶ τοὶ γέννησιν μὴ προσηκάμενος, τοῖς ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννηθεῖσι κατὰ τὸ τῆς ἑσίας πάντων εἰς κοινωνίαν συνάπτεται, ἕτως ἕδεις λόγος τὸ κοινὸν τῆς ἑσίας τῷ Πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ ἁγνεῦμα διασπασαῖ διὰ τὸ ἀγέννητον δυνήσεται, h. e. As Adam, though he was himself unbegotten, yet partakes of the very same nature with those that are begotten of him, by an *identity, or sameness of substance*; so the *community of substance*, which is betwixt Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is not destroyed by the Father's being unbegotten.

believe them to be one substance in another sense, as shall be shewn in its proper place.

But because this doctrine is very liable to be mistaken, I must here briefly premise two things, in order to state and settle a little more clearly the true notion of unity and distinction.

1st. I desire it may be observed, that by three distinct substances the Fathers do not mean three of a different nature, but only three numerical substances agreeing in one common nature, which unity of nature is sufficient to denominate any three substances one nature, though not one individual being: for three men or three Angels are, in their sense, but one nature, yet not one undivided being, because separated and divided from each other. Therefore it must be observed further,

2ndly. That by three distinct substances they mean not three actually divided or separated from each other; but three, who by virtue of their infinity must be conceived most inseparably and eternally united into one, yet with distinction and without confusion.

Thus in short the Fathers reconciled their notion of a Trinity with the Unity of the Godhead, making the three persons what we call specifically one by an unity of nature, and numerically one by an undivided union: so that according to their notion something more is required than a bare specific unity to make three persons one being [as well as three;] and that is actual union without confusion: which is the closest unity three persons are capable of without being confounded into one.

Some other notions of unity will be considered, and those more fully explained in their proper place; but thus much was necessary to be premised at present in order to prevent the heavy charge of Tritheism, which some have so liberally, but most unjustly, bestowed upon this hypothesis; thereby arraiging all antiquity at once and condemning the most genuine sense of all the best and primitive Fathers.

The proposition now to be shewn I could make good with great variety of arguments: but they will not come within

the compass of a sermon, therefore I shall content myself barely to hint a few, and to insist upon one which I think will be an infallible argument against the Schoolmen.

Arg. 1. Now then first, the very definition, which the ancients give of *persona* and *hypostasis* does fully evince the thesis, for if one person be defined *rationalis naturæ individua substantia*, then three persons must be *rationalis naturæ tres individuae substantiæ*; unless the Schoolmen can teach us to distinguish between the definition and the thing defined. [It is true the schools retain this very definition, as well as the term *persona* itself; but every man sees, it is utterly inconsistent with their hypothesis of an absolutely single substance, and therefore whilst the Fathers speak sense and reason, in allowing the three Persons to be three Substances in one sense as well as one Substance only in another, the Schoolmen, who deny them to be three real Substances in any sense, are justly charged with a contradiction.]

Arg. 2. The Fathers expressly say, that there are three Substances in the Trinity, taking them for individual Substances agreeing in one common nature: and they tell us further, that to say there is but one absolutely single Substance in that sense, is heresy, and particularly the heresy of Sabellius. [There is nothing more certain than that the Greeks by hypostasis always mean substance and not mere modes or qualities: sometimes it signifies substance or nature in general, the same with the known senses of *ὑπόστασις* and *essentia*; but more commonly it is used by them for a particular substance or individual: and yet in this sense, it is well known they always said there were three hypostases against Sabellius, i. e. three distinct individual substances of the same common nature. In compliance with whom, the Latins, using the word *substantia* in the same sense, say against the same heretic that there are three Substances in the Trinity. St. Hilary in particular\* asserts that they are *per substantiam tria*; and that there is, *propria unius cujusque substantia*,] and upon this account they rejected the

---

\* Hilar. de Synod. p. 227.

words *μονοόσιος* and *ταυτοόσιος*, and even *όμοόσιος* itself, whenever it was abused to signify a particular substance.

Arg. 3. They expressly tell us, that when they say the three Divine Persons are of one nature and one substance, they then take substance in a larger sense, for nature and essence in general which never subsists but in particulars : so that by the three Persons being *όμοόσιοι*, they only mean that they are not *έτεροόσιοι*, of a *different nature from one another*. Thus they often explain themselves, when they distinguish betwixt *δσία* and hypothesis, as betwixt a general and particular substance.

And all this is pretty fairly owned by Estius himself,\* who tells us, that when the Arians demanded of the Orthodox what the three persons were, they would not then say they were *tres Res*, or *tres Entes*, or *tria Entia*, for fear of seeming to own with them that there were three distinct essences of a different nature and unequal to one another, but that at other times they made no scruple to assert that they were *tres Res* and *tria Entia*. Now what are *tres Res* and *tria Entia*, but three individual substances, unless they be mere modes and accidents ? If substances, then immaterial, if immaterial, then rational and intelligent Beings, if rational and intelligent, then three Minds or Spirits ; unless there be any other intelligent substances besides minds or spirits. This deduction is clear and rational, and agreeable to the sense of all antiquity ; who in their discourses of the Trinity always distinguish betwixt general and particular substance ; as carefully as philosophers do betwixt *substantia prima et secunda* : this is so fully demonstrated by Petavius,† in his 4th Book De Trinitate, cap. 7. that though his authorities could not prevail upon him to forsake the hypothesis of the schools, [perhaps for reasons best known to himself,] yet they cannot but convince any impartial reader.

Arg. 4. The Fathers often tell us, that the three Persons are united into one Being without confusion, which is a very inconceivable thing upon the hypothesis of one single substance, mind or spirit ; for whatever things are properly united

\* Esti. Sent. lib. 1. dist. 26, sect. 3.

† Petav. De Trin. lib. 4. c. 7.

must be substances really distinct from one another: for there is one proper union of one single substance with itself. Yet the Ancients looked upon this to be so proper an union, that they made use of it as a known instance to prove that the two natures in Christ, his Divinity and humanity, soul and body, were united without confusion: which would have been a very impertinent instance, had they believed the three persons to be only one single substance. Nay, it would have proved the quite contrary to what they designed, and the heretics might have retorted it upon them and have said, that as the three Persons in the Trinity were but one single Substance, so the two natures in Christ were but one single nature after union.

But I pass over these and the like arguments to insist upon one, which I conceive is an invincible argument (at least *ad hominem*) against the Schoolmen. The Fathers constantly assert, that the substance of the Son is begotten of the substance of the Father: but now the Schoolmen themselves tell us, that the consequence of this assertion is, that the Father and Son are two distinct substances, numerically distinct from one another, whence we may form this regular syllogism.

Arg. 5. They who assert that the substance or being of the Son is begotten of the substance of the Father do thereby assert that the Persons in the Trinity are three distinct individual substances.

But the generality of the Fathers do assert that the substance of the Son is begotten of the substance of the Father; therefore they believed the three Persons to be three individual substances in the sense so often explained.

The first proposition of this syllogism is allowed us by Bellarmin, Estius, and generally all the Schoolmen, who are agreed in this, that the consequence of, *Essentia in Divinis generat essentiam*, must be, that there are distinct individual essences or substances in the Trinity. Estius's words are these, "*Si essentia essentiam gigneret, fatendum esset in Deo esse plures numero essentias.*"\* And Bellarmin to the

---

\* Esti. in Sent. lib. ii. dist. 5. sect. 2. p. 25.

same purpose, “*Si essentia gignit et gignitur ; ergo duæ sunt essentiæ ; nec enim intelligi potest unum et idem a seipso produci ; i. e. If essence begets or is begotten, then there must be two numerical essences ; else this great absurdity will follow, that one and the same thing must be produced by itself.*”\* [I do not now stand to take notice, that this great absurdity does certainly fall upon the Schoolmen by denying the distinct substances of the persons, whilst they allow that the person of the Son is begotten of the person of the Father, but not his essence of his essence ; which distinction of a person from his own proper peculiar essence is an airy notion, that might sufficiently be exposed ; but I only observe what is to our present purpose, viz. that it is confessed by all the schools, that substance generating substance does imply numerically distinct substances.] And here Calvin likewise falls in with the schools ; for in his *Admonitio ad Fratres Polonos contra Blandratam*,† amongst his *Theological Tracts* he makes use of the same principle to prove his own heterodox notion of the Son’s being *αυτοθεις*, *God of himself*, and not of the Father: “if,” says he, “the Father has his essence from himself, and the Son his essence from the Father, and the Holy Ghost from both, then there are three essences:” he means three individual substances or essences only numerically distinct from one another ; which he, as well as the Schoolmen, thinks absurd, but however they all agree in this, that it is the natural consequence of asserting that the Divine substance of the Son is begotten of the substance of the Father.

Therefore if the second proposition of the syllogism can be made good, that the Fathers do generally assert, that the essence of the Son is begotten of the essence of the Father, it will infallibly follow, at least upon the Schoolmen’s principles, that they likewise believed the three persons to be three individual substances or essences numerically distinct from one another, notwithstanding their belief of the indivisible unity of the Godhead. Now that they have asserted

---

\* Bellar. De Christ. lib. ii. c. 7. Tom. 1. contr. sect. at profecto.

† Calvin. Admon. ad Frat. Polon.

this in plain terms, may be fully evidenced from their own words: a few of which I shall therefore beg leave to produce.

Gregory Nazianzen, the famous Bishop of Constantinople, was never suspected for favouring Arianism, or Tritheism, or any other heresy: and yet he expressly asserts, that the Father is the author and cause of the Deity that is in the Son and in the Holy Ghost: his words are, “ Ἀρχὴ καὶ αἴτιος τῆς θεότητος τῆς ἐν υἱῷ καὶ πνεύματι θεωρουμένης;”\* where by the Deity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, he cannot without great violence be understood to mean any thing else but the peculiar numerical substances of the Son and Holy Ghost, as distinct from that of the Father, which was the eternal cause of them both. So that the Schoolmen themselves being judges, Gregory Nazianzen must be one of those who assert three numerical substances in the Trinity, agreeing in one common nature.

Next to Nazianzen I shall produce the testimony of another patriarch, the famous Cyril of Alexandria. He, in his first dialogue De Trinitate calls the Son, “ Τῆς ἀρρήτου φύσεως καρπός,” *the fruit or natural offspring of the Father’s ineffable nature.*† [Here it is plain he evidently distinguishes betwixt the particular nature of the Father and the nature common to the whole Trinity: and asserts that the Son is the offspring of the Father’s nature; but not of the nature of the whole Trinity; for then he must have been the cause of Himself and the Son of Himself, which would be absurd and contradictory.]

The same he asserts more plainly in his excellent book against the Arians, called his Thesaurus; where amongst many other things he has this remarkable expression, “ Ἐχρῆν εἰδέναι καὶ τὴν γεννήσασαν φύσιν καὶ τὴν γεννηθεῖσαν ἐξ αὐτῆς, i. e. *we must both know the nature that begets and the nature that is begotten of that,*”‡ which is the direct contradictory to that assertion of the schools, *Essentia non generat essentiam nec gignitur.* Hence therefore I likewise

\* Naz. Orat. 29. p. 490. Edit. Paris.  
De Trin. p. 395.

† Cyril. Alex. Dial. 2.  
‡ Idem. in Thesaur. lib. i. c. 11. p. 85.

conclude, that Cyril of Alexandria was one of those, who allow three particular substances in the Trinity united in one common nature.

To these I shall add a Latin Father or two, and first, Hilary Bishop of Poitiers, the famous Gallican defender of the Catholic faith against the Arian heresy. [There is nothing more common with him, than to speak of *natura generans* and *natura genita*, meaning the particular natures or substances of the Father and the Son, as they are numerically distinguished from one another. Thus in his Book de Synodis,\* against the Arians, he lays down this assertion, “*Subsistens Filius per naturam in se genitam consistit, the Son subsists by the nature that is begotten in him.*” What is this less than to say that the particular substance of the Son is begotten, and that the particular substance of the Father begat the particular substance of the Son? which implies two distinct individual substances, and is utterly irreconcilable with the opinion of the Schoolmen. To the same purpose he says again,† “*Omnis nativitas, quæcunque est, in naturam suam ex naturâ gignente consistit, every thing that is begotten, whatsoever it be, has its nature from the nature that begets it*: which does certainly suppose that one single nature or substance begets another, though the Schoolmen’s hypothesis will not allow it. But further]

He, particularly speaking of the Son of God, says, “*Ex naturâ generante naturam sumpsit genita natura, the nature of the Son begotten had that essence from the nature of the Father of which he was begotten*: which whoever will pretend to reconcile with the opinion of the Schools may believe anything in the world, and need never stand at any sort of contradictions.

I could demonstrate this to have been the constant judgment of St. Hilary from many other passages both out of this and others of his writings: but these are so clear and evident, that it would be impertinent to add any more to prove this to have been the opinion of so famed an author.

\* Hilar. De Synod. p. 222. Ed. Basil. 1570.

† Id. Ibid. p. 223.

I proceed to other writers of the same century, but for brevity's sake I shall only name two more.

The first is Fulgentius, who, in his Book de Fide ad Petrum, speaking of the Son, says, "we must believe Him so to be the true God, as not to doubt but that his Divinity was begotten of the nature of the Father.\* His words are, "*Sic Deum verum credo, ut Divinitatem ejus de naturâ Patris natam esse non dubites.*" Now what the Divinity of the Son of God (that was begotten) is, but his own proper peculiar substance, as distinct from that of the Father, which is unbegotten, I think will not be very easily explained or understood. [Men may tell us that by nature and Divinity begotten is only meant person; so far they are right, if by person they mean an individual substance proper and peculiar to such a person; that is the thing here contended for, that person, and the individual substance of that person are only two synonymous names for one and the same thing, whence it must follow, that if there be two or three persons, there must be as many individual substances peculiar to those persons, or else some of the persons must want that which should constitute itself: but if by person they only mean mode, and so make both the Divinity of the Son a mode and that which was begotten a mode too, without any substance or essence begotten with it; here I must beg leave to dissent and think the Fathers were of another opinion. If any man's faith be so strong, as to believe that the Divinity begotten is a mode, and not a substance begotten too; or if his head be so acute and subtle as to distinguish that from Sabellianism, he may enjoy his opinion for me; I shall never pretend to go about to convince him to the contrary. Others, I hope, who are not wedded to an opinion, will judge of the doctrine of the Fathers with more candour and a Christian liberty.]

The other testimony and the last I shall produce, is out of the author of the second homily In Diversos Scripturæ Locos, under the name of Origen (printed amongst his works

---

\* Fulgent. De Fide. c. 2.

though it is none of his, but a Latin Author's, who wrote against the Arian heresy.) That author expressly asserts, that the proper substance of the Son is begotten of the proper substance of the Father; *Cor Patris est sua propria substantia, de quâ genita est Filii propria substantia.*\* Here it is plain [he speaks of two distinct substances, the one begotten the other unbegotten, yet] he does not mean that they were two substances of a different nature, or that there was upon this account any inequality betwixt them; but only that they are two distinct numerical substances; whereof the one is the natural and eternal cause of the other: as he brings in our Saviour Himself, asserting there in the words immediately following, "*Ejus substantia est causa Meæ substantiæ.*" This I can safely say is agreeable to the sense of all antiquity.

One amongst the Schoolmen themselves, and no inconsiderable author, is of the same opinion, I mean Richardus de St. Victore, in his 6th book de Trinitate, cap. 22. where he lays down this assertion: "*Absque dubio substantia Filii est genita, substantia Patris ingenita: nec ingenita substantia est genita, nec genita ingenita.*"† And there he severely reflects upon some of his brethren for innovating in this particular, and forsaking the Catholic doctrine of all the Primitive Fathers, and further boldly challenges them to produce but any one single passage of any one author before their own time, that ever denied that the substance of the Son was begotten of the substance of the Father. "*Afferant,*" says he, "*si possunt, auctoritatem, non dicam plures, sed saltem unam, quæ neget substantiam gignere substantiam.*"

This was a bold challenge, but no one of the Schoolmen was ever so bold as to give it a satisfactory answer, and it is no wonder they should not: since perhaps, until Peter Lombard, the Father of the Schoolmen, first innovated in this particular, and was defended in it by the Council of Lateran,‡ (that very Council which established transubstantiation and many other heterodox points in religion) I say, perhaps till that

\* Origen. Hom. 2. In Diversos. p. 129.  
 Vict. de Trin. l. 6. c. 22.

† Richard. De S.

‡ Council. Lat. Sub. Innoc. 3d. cap. 2.

time no one author can be produced that ever denied, that the substance of the Son was begotten of the substance of the Father. [The Ancients indeed often tell us, that the Divine nature or substance in general, absolutely considered without regard to its subsisting in this or that particuler Person, is neither begotten nor unbegotten : for then all the Persons must be either begotten, which, besides other absurdities attending it, would destroy the Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; or else they must be all unbegotten, and that would introduce Tritheism, or *Tria Ingenita*, which is three Gods : for this reason I say, the Fathers always peremptorily deny, that the Divine nature in general is either wholly unbegotten or wholly begotten : but their doctrine is, that it is capable of both. Upon which account it is that the proper substance of the Father is unbegotten, because He is the Father and never the Son ; the proper substance of the Son is begotten, and cannot be said to be unbegotten ; for then He would not be a Son : and the proper substance of the Holy Ghost neither strictly unbegotten as the Father is, nor begotten as the Son is, but in a way (as unknown to us as the generation of the Son) peculiar to Himself, proceeding from Both. And according to this explication I do assert, and challenge any one whomsoever to disprove it, that the Fathers in general do maintain that the Divine substance of the Son is begotten of the substance of the Father : and consequently, according to the Schoolmen's own concession, they must believe Them to be two single or numerical substances, really distinct (but not divided or separated) from each other.]

At present, if any one questions whether I have fairly represented the difference betwixt the Fathers and Schoolmen in this particular, or requires greater satisfaction upon the point, he may please to consult a very competent judge in this case, who perhaps will fully answer all his scruples. I mean the learned Dr. Bull, in his most incomparable and immortal work, his *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ* against the Arians,\* in the 4th section of which book, cap. 1. he undertakes to prove both against Calvin, Petavius and all the Schoolmen, that the Divinity, nature and essence, and the

---

\* Bull, *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*.

*totum esse* of the Son of God was always believed by antiquity to be the natural and eternal Offspring of the Father's nature. [And indeed the very reason of the thing itself will tell a man, that it is absurd to talk, as the Schoolmen do, of a person's being begotten, but not his essence or substance begotten with him: for that makes the formal notion of the person of the Son to be a mere *τρόπος ύπάρξεως*, which with all the subtlety in the world will never be freed from Sabellianism.]

So that this argument [to sum up the minutes of it] both in itself and *ad hominem*, has almost the strength of a demonstration, for if what the Schoolmen say, be true, that wherever there is *substantia genita et ingenita* there must be two distinct numerical substances; then it will infallibly follow, that the Fathers, by asserting that the substance of the Son was begotten of the substance of the Father, do thereby assert, that They are two distinct numerical substances, and consequently that they believed the three Persons in the Trinity to be three distinct individual substances, not only notionally, or modelly, but really distinct from one another, which was the proposition to be shewn.

When I can see this argument fairly answered by any of the Schoolmen, I shall then begin to have a more favourable opinion of them: but till that be done, I must beg leave to think, that they have in this particular, as well as in many others, manifestly prevaricated and deviated from the doctrine of the Fathers.

The Fathers could rationally say, that the substance of the Father was unbegotten and yet the substance of the Son begotten; because this was agreeable to their hypothesis, who believed them to be two distinct numerical substances agreeing in one common nature. But the Schoolmen, who had advanced the hypothesis of one absolutely single substance utterly exclusive of three [substances in any sense] could not say so without a contradiction. And therefore as they had forsaken the Fathers, first in saying there was but one single substance in the Godhead, taking substance in another sense than the Fathers did; so they were forced to forsake them a second time and say that that substance did

neither beget nor was begotten, for fear of involving themselves in a manifest contradiction. For to say, that the same single substance is both begotten and unbegotten, is in the opinion of the Schoolmen themselves, as well as all mankind, a downright contradiction. And then upon that supposition we have an infallible proof, that unless the Ancients spoke most apparent absurdities and contradictions, since they have spoken of a substance begotten, and a substance unbegotten, and a substance proceeding, they could not mean one single substance utterly exclusive of three, but three individual substances agreeing in one common nature. [The consequence of all which is, that the Fathers had a clear notion about the doctrine of the Trinity fairly reconcilable to our reason; whilst the Schoolmen inventing new notions and fixing them upon some old terms (still retained but grossly mistaken,) have involved themselves in inextricable difficulties and contradictions.]

Having thus shewn in the second place, in what sense the Ancients did believe the Father, Son and Holy Ghost to be three, I should now proceed to shew their notion agreeable to Scripture and consistent with any notion they had of the unity of the Godhead. But the time not allowing, I shall only obviate again the charge of Tritheism, by shewing briefly what was their notion of Tritheism, and in what sense they did not believe them to be three, and so conclude.

Now Tritheism or three Gods in the sense of Antiquity, for what I have been able to observe, always implies one of these five things. 1st. Either three Beings of a different nature and unequal to one another; which was the heresy of Arius, who made *Deus maximus, minor, et minimus*: or else 2dly, three Beings actually separated or divided from each other: for all actual separation is utterly inconsistent with union; which yet is absolutely necessary to the Unity of the Godhead: therefore three Beings actually divided or separated from each other, as three men or three Angels are, though they were of the same nature, yet could not be said to be one undivided Being, much less one God: 3dly, when three Beings are supposed to be, as it were three parts of one whole, having Divine perfections amongst them, but none

of them or not all of them possessed of all: this was the Polytheism of some of the Gentiles, who [as Nazianzen in one of his orations observes] divided the government of the world into a Triarchy, assigning Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto their distinct limits of nature as well as jurisdiction: 4thly, when three infinite Beings are supposed to exist equally absolute and independent of each other, without any natural order or subordination to One First, as the first fountain and original of the Deity: this is the heresy of Autotheanism, commonly charged upon Calvin, whether justly or unjustly I shall not now undertake to determine; but only say that three *ἀναρχοι*, or *ἀυτοθεοι*, as the Fathers word it, *i. e.* three co-ordinate Beings, whereof one is not the necessary and eternal cause of the other two, are in the sense of Antiquity three Gods: 5thly and lastly, when three Beings, for want of such a subordination to One First are supposed to be three different Creators or three different Providences clashing and interfering with one another; which was the heresy of the Marcionites and Manichees and other such like heretics, who set up contrary principles, a good and a bad one, thwarting and opposing one another.

These five things the Fathers commonly charge with Polytheism: but none of them are applicable to their notion of the Trinity. For though the three Persons in their sense be three distinct numerical substances yet they are neither, 1st, three Beings of a different nature as Arius meant, nor 2dly, three Beings actually divided or separated from each other, as three men or three Angels are, but most inseparably and eternally (yet without confusion) united into One; which union of substances is so necessary in infinite Beings, that we cannot possibly conceive them otherwise than as actually and eternally united into One: nor, 3dly, are they three parts of one whole, sharing Divine perfections amongst them, but every one is equally possessed of all: [and this naturally follows from their being equal in nature, and so falls in with the first sort of Unity] nor, 4thly, are they three Beings that have Divine nature independently, every one from himself: but the Father alone has his Being from Himself, the Son from the Father, and the Holy Ghost from Both: for though they all have a

Divine nature, that is a necessary existence (for necessary existence is the properest notion we can frame of a Divine nature) yet they have that necessary existence three different ways: the Father necessarily exists, but of Himself alone; the Son necessarily exists but from the Father: the Holy Ghost necessarily exists too, but from the Father and the Son. So that the Son and the Holy Ghost are not properly without original though necessarily existing from all eternity; but are as necessary and eternal emanations of a necessary and eternal Cause, which cannot but produce two such Beings of the same nature with Himself; by a natural and eternal necessity of acting: and this way of existing is what distinguishes the Son and the Holy Ghost both from the Father and the creatures, and at once preserves the Unity of the Godhead. Fifthly and lastly, by virtue of this original and natural subordination of the Son and Holy Ghost to the Father, they are not three opposite principles or three Providences clashing and interfering with one another, but one harmonious Providence and one undivided principle of all other things: for it is impossible to conceive three infinite Beings under the economy of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, without conceiving Them at the same time united in an eternal harmony and concord.

[So that in effect he that says but these two things, 1st, That the Son and Holy Ghost are equal to the Father in infinity of nature and all Divine perfections, and, 2dly, that They have this equality, not unoriginate from themselves, but necessarily and eternally from the Father, so as to make the Father alone the only principle and fountain of the Deity, such an one, if he does not contradict himself, believes all that the Ancients thought necessary to establish the Unity of the Deity: for 1st, he who says They are all infinite and equal in nature, says virtually and by consequence that they are neither parts nor divided from each other: for these would be absurd conceptions of infinite Beings to suppose them either parts or separated from one another: then again 2dly, he who says They are subordinate in their existence, says likewise that They are of one will and operation; since it would be absurd to conceive the Son and Holy Ghost of

a different will or operation from the Father, to whom they are subordinate, and from whom they derive their nature and power of acting: and to one of these heads every thing the Fathers have said of the Unity of the Trinity may very fairly be reduced.]

So that upon the whole, they who believe three infinite Beings [i. e. persons or individual substances] numerically distinct from one another, but under these several limitations [i. e. neither of a different nature, nor divided from one another, nor united as parts that make up a whole, nor collateral and co-ordinate, nor of a different will and operation, but on the contrary one by unity of nature, one by mutual *περιχώρησις*, immanation or perfect union and conjunction, one by unity of principle or subordination, and one by unity of will and action,] they cannot in the sense of Antiquity be justly charged with Tritheism nor be said to believe any more than one God.

And this, I conceive, is an intelligible account of a Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Godhead; and shews us how we may believe, without a contradiction on the one hand or fear of heresy on the other, that “there are Three, who bear record in heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost and yet that these Three are One.”

And thus much may be sufficient to be hinted at present concerning the Primitive notion of Divine Unity; the fuller explication and proof whereof I shall reserve for some other opportunity.



# TWO SERMONS

Preached

BEFORE THE CLERGY AT VISITATIONS HELD IN  
WINCHESTER;

## THE FIRST,

ON THE 12th MAY, 1696,

UPON THE SENSE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, CONCERNING THE  
DIVINITY OF CHRIST, IN OPPOSITION TO PHOTINIANISM,  
ARIANISM, SABELLIANISM, AND TRITHEISM;

AND

## THE SECOND,

ON THE 16th SEPT. 1697,

ON THE GREAT DUTY, MORE ESPECIALLY INCUMBENT ON THOSE  
WHO HAVE UNDERTAKEN THE SOLEMN OFFICE OF THE  
PRIESTHOOD, OF SEARCHING DILIGENTLY AFTER  
TRUTH, AS IT RELATES TO THE DIVINITY  
OF CHRIST, AND OTHER SCRIPTURAL  
POINTS OF DOCTRINE.

---

BY THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M. A.

RECTOR OF HEADBOURN WORTHY, AND LATE FELLOW  
OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.



TO THE REVEREND  
**THE CLERGY**  
OF THE  
DEANERIES OF WINCHESTER AND SOMBORN REGIS,  
IN THE DIOCESE OF WINCHESTER.

---

---

REVEREND SIRS,

THESE discourses being preached in your audience, do now present themselves unto you, desiring your acceptance. Whether they be fit to be inscribed to you or not, belongs not to me to say; the subject of them, however, is such, as being your immediate concern, there can be no solecism in the dedication. But there is another reason why they are now addressed to you; which is, that the author might have an opportunity of giving you a more full account of the occasion of them. To do which, I must give you an account also of another sermon, which I preached before the learned body of the University of Oxford, for which I incurred the displeasure of some of the heads of that place. The main of my crime, though other reasons were pretended, was, that I had tacitly reflected on a leading person in the University, who, under pretence of explaining the notion of three Persons in the Blessed Trinity, had manifestly, though not designedly, given up the cause to the Socinian adversary. For his notion is, that the terms Person, Father, Son,

Generation, &c. are not proper, but only metaphorical terms, as they are used in the doctrine of the Trinity; and that three persons means no more, but either three different names, or offices, or different respects and capacities of one and the same thing, as Tully says of himself, “*Sustineo unus tres personas, mei, adversarii, judicis;*” so God, in his opinion, is no otherwise Three Persons, than as He may be considered under the different habitudes or capacities of a Creator, a Redeemer, and a Sanctifier. This doctrine he delivered publicly both in his sermons before the University, and in his letters against the Socinians; which, though none of his learned brethren, till of late, were pleased to censure, yet the Socinians immediately took notice of it, and declared in print, that if this was all that Catholics meant by a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, they, or however the Sabellians, would subscribe this doctrine, and put an end to all the controversies about it; and indeed it is no wonder they should make such a declaration; for this notion of three persons is no other but that classic equivocal notion, which the Ancient Church always condemned in Sabellius, and the Romanists in Laurentius Valla, and the Protestants in Servetus, who all owned three persons in their own sense, i. e. in the sense that *persona* and *πρόσωπον* are taken in classic authors, as the Socinians now pretend to do. I could not, I confess, but with some regret see the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity thus explained away, and no one but the Socinians take notice of it: who thence also took occasion to invent that scandalous distinction betwixt nominal and real Trinitarians, reckoning the nominals (that is themselves) the only Catholics, and all others Tritheistic Heretics. Having therefore an opportunity to preach before the learned and venerable body of the University, after a strict en-

quiry into the sense of the Catholic Church upon this great Article of our Faith, upon which the whole economy of the Christian religion, as it is Christian, depends, I took occasion modestly, without naming the author, to animadvert upon his novel and heterodox notion, which gave such advantage to the Socinian adversary. And in doing it, I used what I conceived to be the properest method; which was, to oppose to this modern notion the ancient ecclesiastical notion of the term person, as delivered by the primitive Fathers, concerning whose opinion I asserted these three things: 1st, that the notion which they had of the term person in this mystery, was not what the old Roman Classics commonly understand by a person, not an habitude or capacity or the distinction of an office, but what the philosophers meant by a particular or individual substance; which is the account that is given us by Boetius, who defines *persona* to be, *rationalis naturæ individua substantia*, an individual intelligent substance; and by Leontius Byzantinus, who tells us, “ that the Fathers of the Church call that an hypostasis or person, ὅπερ οἱ φιλόσοφοι ἄτομον ἕσταν λέγασσι, which the philosophers call an individual substance: and that they never call any kind of accidents by the name of person or hypostasis.” 2. I asserted also, that agreeably to this notion of the term person the Fathers, in their dispute with the Sabellians (the better to avoid their classic equivocal sense of three persons), did, for distinction’s sake, many times call the Divine Persons three personal substances, and three individual subsisting substances, not in the Arian notion of three substances, which implies a disparity and dissimilitude of essential properties, such as is betwixt created and uncreated substances, but in a Catholic sense as denoting that real distinction which must be betwixt a Father and a Son, whereof the substance

of one is begotten of the substance of the other. This is the account which Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, the first antagonist of Arius, gives in opposition to the Sabellians in that very epistle, where he is refuting Arius (ap. Theodorit. H. E. lib. 1. c. 4.) He tells us, that the Father and Son are δύο τῆ ὑποστάσει φύσεις, *two personal substances or hypostatic natures*. So that there was no dispute betwixt Alexander and Arius upon this point; but they both agreed thus far against the Sabellians, that the three persons were not merely three distinct offices or capacities of one and the same solitary being, but three distinct hypostatic substances: the only question was, whether the substance of the Son was eternally begotten of the substance of the Father, and consequently like and equal to him in all the perfections of the Divine Nature as his proper and natural Son; or whether it was created out of nothing, and inferior as a mere created being? This latter distinction of substances, i. e. disparity and inequality of nature, such as is betwixt God and a creature, Arius asserted, and Alexander denied; who yet at the same time maintained the distinction of personal or hypostatic substances against the Sabellians. 3. I asserted further, that the Fathers were so far from thinking the Divine Persons to be only different habitudes or capacities of one and the same thing, that they believed them to be (what a learned writer had lately called them) distinct personal minds or spirits; not in any Arian or Tritheistic sense, as denoting either an inequality of nature or co-ordination of the persons, but in the forementioned Catholic sense, as denoting intelligent hypostatic substances or proper persons in the true ecclesiastical notion, under the relation of a Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This I conceived to be the meaning of St. Athanasius and St. Basil, when they tell us

expressly, in their discourses against the Sabellians, that we are to believe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be *τρία τέλεια ἀσώματα*, *three perfect or infinite incorporeal Beings, or, as I conceived the sense to be, three infinite Minds or Spirits in a personal acceptation*: for I had regard to the sense and not the mere words alone. If I was mistaken in the translation, I shall only say, I pretend to be no infallible interpreter of Greek or Latin, nor shall I here pretend to say further, what agreement there is betwixt these several terms, three distinct incorporeal beings, three distinct intelligent hypostatic substances, three distinct minds or spirits, and three distinct proper subsisting persons; but leave you and other judicious readers to determine. However, this was the sum of what I then asserted in an historical way concerning the notion which the Fathers had of the Divine Persons; and this with as innocent a design as ever man had, only to shew, that the thing which gave the Socinians occasion to insult over us, as mere nominal Trinitarians, was not the genuine exposition of the sense of the Catholic Church, but only the singular explication of a late leading author, who, with Laurentius Valla and Servetus, had fetched his notion of persons and personal distinctions from Cicero and the Classics, and not from the writings of the Primitive Fathers. Yet this occasioned that heavy censure, which charged me with asserting doctrines, false, impious and heretical; contrary and dissonant to the doctrine of the Catholic Church: though I was doing nothing all the time, but delivering both the words and sense of the Catholic Fathers, in opposition to that leading person, who had despised them all to follow an exotic notion, which was never received by the Catholic Church. But this was not all: the decree was seconded with three other charges

in the prints that followed, viz. that of Arianism, Tritheism, and the Heresy of Valentinus Gentilis. Now these were heavy charges indeed, and if true, enough to give all wise and sober men a just abhorrence of any one, that stood charged with them. This being then my present case, when I first came amongst you, I could not but think myself obliged to wipe off these as unjust and scandalous charges, and free myself from those prejudices, under which, perhaps, I might otherwise have laboured in the opinion of those with whom I was to have my daily converse. Therefore, being called by the command of my superiors to discharge a public office at a Visitation, I thought no subject of discourse so proper, as that which would give me at once an opportunity both of asserting the Catholic faith and wiping off those calumnies, which were causelessly thrown upon me. And this I endeavoured to do in the first of these discourses; wherein I have summed up the main force of the argument from Scripture and Antiquity against the professed adversaries of our Saviour's Divinity, and discovered also certain plain mistakes, which afforded some warm authors a kind of topic for their declamatory harangues and invectives, only for want of a clear stating of those matters, upon which they grounded their accusations. It was said by some, on purpose to aggravate matters, that Valentinus Gentilis was put to death for asserting three infinite Spirits in the Trinity. This I shewed to be either a gross piece of ignorance or a malicious calumny: because Valentinus Gentilis believed and asserted the direct contrary. It was pretended again, that the Council of Nice and Catholic Fathers had universally condemned the doctrine of three personal substances, as Arianism. This I shewed to be still a grosser mistake, by clearing the account of Arianism, and shewing that the Arian notion of three substances, which the Catho-

lic Fathers condemned, always implied such a difference in essential properties or nature, as is betwixt created and uncreated, God and a creature; whereas two personal substances, differing no otherwise than as *gignens* and *genitum*, Father and Son, is so far from being Arianism, that it is the very expression which Alexander and other Catholics used as a proper medium betwixt Arius and Sabellius. For Sabellius would allow no such distinction as that of personal substances. Arius allowed it, but carried it a little further, viz. to a disparity or inequality of nature. For he thought there could not be two persons or personal substances equal to one another in all essential perfections, but this must necessarily imply their being two Gods: and therefore he charged Alexander with Polytheism for asserting it, whence I also made it appear further, that Tritheism is no new charge against the doctrine of the Trinity: but that it is as old as Arius; and, such as it is, grounded merely upon another mistake of the true nature of it; which I shewed to consist properly in asserting three first principles, or three infinite co-ordinate persons, all unoriginated and unbegotten, without any mutual relation or subordination to one another. According to which genuine and only proper notion of Tritheism it could not be laid to the charge of the Primitive Fathers, who never maintained three first principles or three unbegotten and co-ordinate persons: but always taught (equally against Photinians, Arians, Sabellians and Tritheites) that the Divine substance of the Son is eternally originated and begotten of the substance of his Father: which one assertion excludes all manner of heresies; for the divine generation of the Son (taken in a real and proper, not a metaphorical sense, is the true reason why he is neither a creature, as Arius maintained, nor the same person with the Father, as Sabellius belie-

ved ; nor another unbegotten principle. *i. e.* another God, as the Tritheites asserted, but the natural and eternal Son of God, as being neither created, nor yet unbegotten, but eternally begotten of the substance of his Father. I shewed further, that if there was any real ground for the charge of Tritheism at present, it belonged to another sort of men, who in spite of universal tradition (which yet they so much pretend to) had maintained, what no one Catholic author before them ever did, viz. that the Divine substance of the Son is unbegotten : the natural consequence of which is, that He is not a Son, but either the same unbegotten person with the Father, which is Sabellianism ; or else a distinct unbegotten person, which is Polytheism ; though I thought it uncharitable to charge them with either part of the consequence, because they expressly rejecte d both.

Thus I endeavoured to answer the main charges brought indeed (not against me, but) against the doctrine of the primitive Fathers, by setting things in a fairer light, and shewing the falseness of all whether ignorant or malicious accusations : the removal of which, concurring with a desire to establish truth, was the thing that principally engaged my thoughts upon the argument that runs through these discourses. How well I might manage it to your satisfaction, I am not able justly to say : it is sufficient to me, that meeting with a learned, judicious, and unprejudiced auditory, and an assembly of Bereans too, I so far gained your approbation, as not to be thought worthy of another censure ; and this chiefly inclined me to make these discourses public, which at first were only designed for your private satisfaction : not doubting, but that though they may meet with some warm and angry men, who perhaps will be provoked only for being told the truth, yet they will also light

upon many of the same ingenuous temper with yourselves, who will be glad to see truth set in a fair light, and to find plausible errors plainly detected. And if they will contribute anything towards this end, they will answer the design both of their being preached and published.

There is one thing more I would beg leave here to insert concerning the notion which the ancients had of the Divine Persons ; because I have no where done it in either of the following discourses : and yet it tends much to recommend their hypothesis beyond any modern explication : which is, that their notion of persons not only gives us a fair account of a real Trinity, and is liable to no just exception, but also gives us a very clear and intelligible account of all the other mysteries of the Christian religion ; particularly of the incarnation of the Son of God, and of his mediation and intercession for us to the Father. The Christian religion obliges us to believe, that the second Person of the ever blessed Trinity, and He alone, was incarnate ; that is, that his Divine substance was really united to an human body and soul ; and yet neither the Father nor the Holy Ghost incarnate with him. Now supposing, what Alexander and the Catholic Fathers supposed, that the three Divine Persons are not mere habitudes or different capacities of one and the same thing, but three distinct personal or hypostatic substances, it is very easy to conceive how the second person alone was incarnate, and not the other two ; that is, how the personal substance of the Son was united to an human body and soul, without saying the same thing either of the Father or of the Holy Ghost. But upon that hypothesis, which makes only metaphorical persons, and defines them to be only different habitudes or respects, different offices or names of the same thing, this doctrine of the incarnation of

the Son alone is very perplexed and unintelligible. The like may be said of the Father's sending the Son into the world, which is a concomitant of the incarnation, without either sending Himself or being sent by the Son. This will be very intricate and unconceivable upon the hypothesis of metaphorical persons, or persons in a classical sense; for one office or capacity cannot properly be said to send another; nor can the same being, sustaining three persons of this kind, send one person without sending another, and sending himself too. Suppose Tully to be a judge, an orator, and a consul; that is, three persons, as some are pleased to term it: can we, with any tolerable sense say, that Tully the judge sends the orator, that is himself, under another capacity? Is not he that sends, and he that is sent, the very same? How then can one person upon this hypothesis be supposed to send another without sending himself at the same time? This was the absurdity of the Sabellian notion of old, and the main argument that the Catholics urged against it; that this notion of persons, as it made the Father to be incarnate, so it also confounded the distinction betwixt him that sends and him that is sent, and made the thing utterly inconceivable. But now upon the primitive ecclesiastical notion of persons it is very intelligible, how the Father may be conceived to send the Son without sending Himself, supposing Alexander's distinction of personal substances, or Athanasius's distinction of complete incorporeal beings. There is no difficulty in conceiving this: for the distinction betwixt him that sends and him that is sent, upon this notion of persons, lies level to every man's understanding. Thus then the primitive notion of persons has the advantage of that modern explication, in that it gives us (what the other does not) a fair and intelligible account of God's

sending his Son into the world, and of the Son alone being incarnate. And as it gives us a clear account of this, so it does also of that other great mystery, the Son's intercession and mediation to the Father for us. It is very inconceivable how one office should intercede or mediate to another. Intercession is an act of a rational or intelligent being ; and intercession of one to another supposes distinct intelligent beings, one interceding, another to whom the intercession is made. But this cannot be said of distinct offices or capacities in the same being : there can be no intercession of these one to another ; nor can any being upon the account of such capacities both intercede and be interceded to : for nothing properly intercedes to itself, although it be under another capacity. So that the hypothesis of metaphorical persons quite evacuates one principle part of Christianity, whilst it gives us no satisfactory account of the Son's mediating and interceding with the Father for us. But upon the primitive notion of persons this doctrine will be rendered very intelligible. For supposing persons to be individual intelligent substances, as Leontius and Boetius describe them ; or personal substances, as Alexander words it ; or incorporeal and Spiritual Beings, as St. Athanasius and St. Basil call them ; then there is no difficulty in conceiving how one intelligent person performs the rational act of intercession and mediation to another. This is so natural and easy a conception, upon the primitive notion of persons, that any ordinary apprehension may be made to understand it ; whereas upon the other hypothesis, which takes persons in a classical and metaphorical sense, and makes different offices and capacities constitute different persons, the acutest head and subtlest reasoner can never be able to give any clear

account of it, because it suits not to the notion of such sort of persons.

I might here go on through all the mysteries of the Christian religion, and shew how much easier they are to be explained and understood upon the old ecclesiastical notion of the Divine Persons, than upon this new exotic notion fetched out of Roman authors: but I suppose what has been already suggested, is abundantly sufficient to evidence the truth of this. Therefore I cannot but think, that all calm and sober men, who consider things impartially without heat and prejudice, will bear a just regard to that hypothesis, which besides its Catholicism and antiquity, contributes so much towards a clear understanding of all the necessary articles of the Christian faith. And if that be the true advantage of this hypothesis then it can be no disservice to the Christian religion to have endeavoured to give a fair and just account of it: if such an attempt deserves no more, yet I hope it may pretend to deserve a favourable construction; which I am willing to persuade myself, Gentlemen, it has already had from you: and that makes this address but only a necessary return of my grateful acknowledgments for that favour you were pleased to bestow upon

Your respectful humble Servant,

J. B.

SERMON  
ON  
THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

---

2d PETER, CHAP. ii. VER. 1.

*But there were false Prophets also among the People, even as there shall be false Teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable Heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift Destruction.*

IN these words it is very probable the Apostle principally intended to describe the primitive heretics of his own times: for, as appears from the best records of ancient history, four several heretics had broached their doctrines against the person of our Saviour, even whilst many of the Apostles were yet alive; particularly Simon Magus, Nicholaus, Ebion, and Cerinthus. Against the two last of which St. John wrote his Gospel, as Irenæus tells us expressly, who is an author of undoubted credit, and one who was very capable of knowing this, being scholar to Polycarp, who was disciple to St. John. So that it is not improbable, but that St. Peter also might have his eye upon those early corrupters of the truth, who began to sow their tares in the Apostle's days.

But, however, letting this pass at present only as a probability, it is certain he here prophetically describes and characterizes all those heretics, who should, in after ages,

make future attempts upon the Divinity and incarnation of our Saviour, and deny the satisfaction and redemption made by his death. First, he tells us, there would come a generation of men, who would even deny the Lord that bought them. Then, secondly, that they would do this privily and craftily, under the disguise and pretence of truth. Thirdly, that such men, whatever their subtleties and pretences be, were still to be looked upon only as false teachers. Lastly, that their doctrines are not only simply false and erroneous, but heretical and damnable; such as will bring upon the authors swift destruction. In this character the Apostle does so graphically describe the reviving heresies of our own times, and withal so plainly obviate their main pretensions, that (as if what Porphyry said of Daniel's prophecy, were to be applied to this) one might rather take it for an historical account, than a prophetic description.

To make this appear, in the further prosecution of these words, I shall

1. Shew who those are that may be said to deny the Lord that bought them; by drawing an historical parallel betwixt the ancient and modern heresies, which have undermined the true Divinity of our Saviour.

2. I shall point out the principal arts, by which two of the most prevailing heresies, namely, Arianism and Socinianism, do privily recommend themselves and shew that they are these two pretences; first, that many eminent Catholic authors have acknowledged, that their doctrines are not contradicted, either in words or sense, by Scripture or antiquity, for the three first centuries after Christ. Secondly, that though they be erroneous, yet they are not heretical and damnable.

3. In opposition to the first of which pretences, I shall shew in the third place, that, notwithstanding any concessions of Catholic Authors, their doctrines are contrary to the plainest and most indubitable sense of Scripture and primitive writers for the three first centuries after Christ.

4. And in opposition to the second, I shall, in the last place, prove from the same fountains of Antiquity, that they are not only false but heretical and damnable.

And this, I conceive, will be a fair exposition and just comment upon the Apostle's words, "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them."

1. I begin with the first, which is to shew, who those are that may be said to deny the Lord that bought them; by drawing an historical parallel betwixt some of the more noted heresies, ancient and modern, which have undermined the true Divinity of our Saviour. And this I shall endeavour to do the more accurately and exactly, because the very stating rightly of some opinions is with ingenuous men a sufficient confutation of them.

Now heresies, I conceive, may be summed up under these four kinds, Photinianism, Arianism, Sabellianism and Tritheism. The two first deny Him to be God, the two latter to be the Son of God. Photinianism and Arianism ascribe unto Him no Divinity at all; Sabellianism and Tritheism such a Divinity, as destroys his filiation. So that all concur, though in different ways, to undermine the true doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity, and "deny the Lord that bought them."

1. Photinianism allows Him nothing but a bare human nature; making Him a *ψῖλος ἄνθρωπος*, a mere man, that never had a being in the world till he was born of the Virgin Mary. "*Christum hominem tantummodo solitarium adserit, cui principium adscribit ex Mariâ.*" (Vincent. Livin. c. 17. de Photino.) The very same is now asserted by Socinus and his followers; though neither he nor Photinus was the first author of it. It was an heresy begun very early, even in the Apostles' days, by Ebion; against whom St. John therefore is supposed to have levelled the first words of his Gospel, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;" because Ebion denied the Word to be God, and dated his original from the Virgin Mary. From Ebion, the Heresy was first taken by Artemas and Theodosion, two obscure names in ancient history; but was afterwards better known under the names of Paulus Samosatensis and Photinus: the first of which was condemned by two Provincial Councils held at Antioch, and the latter by a General Synod of

the Arians themselves, assembled at Sirmium, where they pronounced anathema against the heresy, and deposed the author. Since which time it was hardly known in the world, till it was unhappily revived in the last age by Socinus, who to the heresy of the ancients has added another of his own, which may be called an original; as being perhaps what was never maintained explicitly in terms by any heretic before, viz. that the death of Christ is no propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of mankind. In this Socinus and his followers seem to have outstripped all that went before them, and so more properly fallen under St. Peter's censure, not only in denying the Lord, but the Lord that bought them.

2. The next heresy against the Divinity of our Saviour is Arianism; which allows Him indeed to have had a being before the world, and ascribes the creation of the world to Him; but yet ranks Him also amongst the creatures, making Him at most but a *Deus factus ex nihilo*, a God created out of nothing; and so of a different nature from the Father, neither consubstantial to Him nor co-eternal. These are the genuine doctrines of Arius, as they were first condemned by the Council of Nice, whose anathema against the Arian blasphemies is expressed in these words: τὰς δὲ λεγοντας κτίσμα, ἢ ποίημα, ἢ ἐξ ἑκ ὄντων, ἢ ἦν ποτε, ὅτε ἑκ ἦν, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, “*The Catholic Church anathematizes those, who call him a creature, or a production, or say that He was made of things which are not, or maintain that there was a time when He did not exist.*” Symbol. Con. Nic. But afterwards there arose a subtler kind of Arianism, which allowed Him to be both consubstantial and co-eternal, and yet denied Him to be infinite in nature or equal to the Father. This was an invention of some politic Arians in St. Austin's days, who kept close to the terms of the Council of Nice, and yet maintained their heresy under them, by putting an equivocal sense upon them. For by consubstantiality, they meant no more, than that the Son was made of the Divine substance, in the same manner as many other primitive heretics (particularly the Manichees, Priscillianists, and Gnostics,) believed concerning the souls of men; viz. that they were made of the very substance of God, and so were of the

same nature with the Deity. Apollinaris asserted the same concerning the flesh of Christ, that it was made of his Divine nature, and was consubstantial to it. Yet none of these heretics believed the souls or bodies of men to be therefore infinite in substance, or properly of a Divine nature equal to their original. No more did these Arians believe the Son to be equal to the Father in nature, though they equivocally played upon terms, and asserted both his consubstantiality and eternity. This is a piece of Arianism, I presume, not very commonly observed: but it is ascribed by St. Austin to the Arians of his own time, and particularly to Donatus, the schismatical Bishop of Carthage, who, besides his being a ring-leader of the sect of the Donatists, was also infected with this sort of Arianism. “*Apparet eum etiam non Catholicam de Trinitate habuisse sententiam: sed quamvis ejusdem substantiæ, minorem tamen Patre Filium; et minorem Filio putasse Spiritum Sanctum.*” August. de Hæres. c. 69.

And this kind of Arianism was revived in the last age by Valentinus Gentilis; who asserted in the same terms that the Son was consubstantial to the Father and co-eternal, but yet of a finite and circumscribable nature. It is true indeed, we have been told very confidently by Curcellæus and some authors since, that Valentinus Gentilis believed three infinite Spirits in the Trinity. But if we may judge of his doctrine by his own assertions, he believed quite the contrary, that it was impossible there should be three infinite Spirits, or Spirits of immense substance. For this is one of his assertions amongst his Protheses: “*Tres Spiritus immensæ substantiæ esse non possunt.*” And for this very reason, though he allowed the Son, with the forementioned Arians, to be consubstantial and eternal (taking these words in an equivocal sense,) yet he still denied his infinity and equality, and made him only a finite and circumscribable substance. These are his own words: “*Filius pro generationis modulo circumscribilis genitus est.*” Upon which account we rank Gentilis, where he must and ought to stand, amongst the Arians, rather than the Tritheites; which, as will presently appear, are heresies very different from one another.

3. The third heresy which undermines the Divinity of our

Saviour, is Sabellianism; which was first begun by Simon Magus, carried on by Noetus and Praxeas, but was more fully known under the name of Sabellius. This destroys our Saviour's Divinity by denying his real and substantial generation; making it only metaphorical and improper: thereby subverting all real and personal distinction betwixt Father and Son, which cannot consist without a true and proper substantial generation. St. Hilary, in his Book de Synodis, thus describes the Sabellian heresy, making it to be that, "*quæ personam genitæ adimit essentiæ,*" which destroys the person of the Son, by denying the generation of his substance. And again, "*quæ unicam ac sine progenie suâ solitarii Dei velit affirmare substantiam,*" that which affirms the substance of God to be singular and solitary without any offspring. In opposition to this the primitive Fathers unanimously maintain the real and proper generation of the substance of the Son, as the foundation of his personal distinction. And many of them, the better to secure this real distinction betwixt the Divine persons, not only use the terms *τρία πρόσωπα* and *tres personas*, but also *τρῆς ὑποστάσεις*, and *τρῆς ὑποστάσει φύσεις*, *τρία ἄσωμάτα τέλεια*, *τρία πράγματα*, *τρία ὑποκείμενα*, and sometimes *tres substantias* in a catholic sense, and *tres substantias individuales*, or *substantias particulariter subsistentes*, which Boetius makes to be the same with an *ὑπόστασις*, or real subsisting person. And there seems to have been very good reason for this accurate variety of expression. For St. Basil tells us, the Sabellians were used to play upon terms as well as the Arians, and vent their own heresy under an equivocal and ambiguous sense of the catholic words *πρόσωπον* and *persona*. Those words will signify either real subsisting beings; or else only different modes, offices, or relations of one and the same solitary being. In this latter sense the Sabellians would not scruple to assert, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were *τρία πρόσωπα* and *tres personæ*: meaning no more than three different offices or capacities of one and the same substantial person, or a single person considered under a triple relation. As Tully is an orator, a philosopher and a consul, so God is a Creator a Redeemer, and a Sanctifier. As He creates the world, He

may be considered under the person or character of a Father; as He redeems it, by becoming incarnate, He may be considered as a Son; and as He sanctifies it by his grace, He sustains the person of an Holy Spirit. This is the genuine notion of the Sabellian Trinity of Persons.

And this is the heresy which was renewed with the very same sophistry in the last ages by Laurentius Valla,\* and Servetus. They both pretended indeed to assert a Trinity of Persons: but upon enquiry, when it comes to be examined, it only proves a Trinity of different qualities, modes, offices, or relations. Melanethon has most excellently described this subtle kind of Sabellianism reviving in Servetus; and therefore I shall choose to give it in his own words, which are these.† “The fanatic Servetus,” says he, “plays upon an equivocal sense of the word person; and pretends that it anciently signified amongst the Latins no more but either a mode or the distinction of an office: as we say, Roscius sometimes sustains the person of Achilles, sometimes the person of Ulysses; or the person of a consul differs from the person of a servant: in like manner as Cicero says, it is a great work to sustain the person of a prince in the Commonwealth, and this ancient signification of the word person he sophistically wrests and applies to the article of the three Persons in the Godhead.” Upon which the same Melanethon takes occasion to reflect in this most pathetic exhortation to his readers, “*Sed has impias præstigijs fugiamus et*

\* Valla, Lib. 6. Elegant. c. 34. In Deo personam ponimus, vel quod nulum aliud vocabulum quadrat (non natura, quo veteres utebantur; non substantia quo Græci utuntur); vel quod verè in Deo triplex est qualitas. Item, dico lucem, vibrationem, calorem in sole esse qualitates, &c. Tales qualitates statuo in Deo, et has dico esse personas, quæ ab eo abesse non possunt; et qualitatem significare, non substantiam, ut Boetius voluit, qui nos barbarè loqui docuit.

† Melaneth. Loc. Com. Tract. de Person. Lusit homo fanaticus, Servetus, de vocabulo personæ; et disputat olim Latinis significasse habitum aut officii distinctionem: ut dicimus Roscium aliàs sustinere personam Achillis, aliàs sustinere personam Ulyssis; seu alia est persona Consulis, alia servi: ut Cicero inquit, magnum est in republicâ tueri personam principis, et hanc veterem significationem vocabuli sycophanticè detorquet ad articulum de tribus Personis Trinitatis, sed has impias, &c.

*excremur, et sciamus in hoc articulo aliter loqui ecclesiam, et personam dici, substantiam individuum intelligentem et incommunicabilem."*

I shall make no further remark upon this history, but only add, that Servetus was burnt at Geneva for this heresy in the year 1553, though his doctrine has been since more plausibly urged by Keekerman and others without any such like censure.

4. The fourth and last heresy, which undermines our Saviour's true Divinity, is Tritheism; which is the asserting of three infinite collateral and co-ordinate Persons; or three absolute independent principles, all simply unoriginate and unbegotten, without any mutual relation or subordination to any first person. Thus it is Tritheism to ascribe the personal prerogative of the Father (*ἀγεννησίαν*) to the Son, making Him a distinct principle or substance unbegotten as the Father is. The true notion of the Christian Trinity is three Divine Persons under the relation and economy of a Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; where the Father is considered as the fountain of the Deity, the Son and Holy Ghost as the natural and eternal emanations of the Father's substance; agreeable to what is said in the Nicene Creed, that the Son is God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, *Deus genitus*, not *ingenitus*, nor *factus*; whereas Tritheism asserts, that the Son is another *ἀγέννητον*, that is, not a Son, but another distinct principle or substance, unbegotten as the Father is, and consequently a distinct God. For *τρεις ἀρχαὶ* and *τρία ἀγέννητα*, three co-ordinate and unbegotten principles, inferring necessarily three Creators and three Providences independent of one another, is, in the sense of the primitive Fathers, the proper notion of three Gods. What modern authors have directly in terms maintained this heresy, I am not able to say. That which seems to come the nighest to it, is that bold determination made in the Council of Lateran, under Innocent the Third; where it was determined in favour of Peter Lombard against Richardus de Sancto Victore,\* that the *Divine Essence does*

---

\* That which seems to have given occasion to the Council of Lateran to

*neither beget nor is begotten, nor does proceed, Essentia Divina nec est generans, nec genita, nec procedens.* The consequence of which would be, if it was urged home, that the Divine substance of the Son is unbegotten; and consequently that the Son is not a son, but another unbegotten principle, that is, a distinct God.

This doctrine which denies the generation of the Divine substance of the Son, was severely reflected on by Luther and Melanethon in the beginning of the reformation, and long before them by Richardus de Sancto Victore; who undertook to shew, that it was contrary to the whole stream of antiquity from Ignatius down to the Council of Lateran. But Richardus had only truth and reason and antiquity on his side: the Council of Lateran had a more effectual argument, that could not be answered, which was power. And by virtue of that, they who could determine that bread and wine was not bread and wine (for this is the same council that established transubstantiation) might with a *non obstante* to all the primitive Fathers, determine likewise, that the substance of the only begotten Son of God was unbegotten: and if they would pretend to determine so, who should pretend to contradict them? From that time therefore the Schoolmen advanced a new proposition never heard in the Catholic Church before: "*Quod Essentia Filii Divina non est genita.*" I am loath to urge the consequence of this assertion; but some of the modern Schoolmen themselves have charged it with Tritheism in the mouth of Calvin; who only expresses their own doctrine in a little different terms: *Quod Filius quatenus Deus, non habet suum esse a Patre,*

---

make this decree, was this expression of Rich. de S. Victore, in his 6th Book de Trinitate, cap. 22. "Absque dubio substantia Filii est genita, substantia Patris ingenita, nec ingenita substantia est genita, nec genita est ingenita:" together with his smart reflection upon Peter Lombard and others, as innovators in this matter, challenging them to produce but so much as one single passage of any Catholic Father, that ever maintained (what they did) that the substance of the Son was unbegotten, and not begotten of the substance of the Father. "Afferant, si possunt, auctoritatem non dicam plures, sed saltem unam, quæ neget substantiam gignere substantiam" Richardus, indeed, is not mentioned in the Council; but it is plain they had their eye upon him in the condemnation of his doctrine.

*nec est Deus de Deo sed Deus a seipso*; which is the very same in sense with *Essentia Filii non est genita*. Now if the Schoolmen will prove Tritheism upon themselves, they hardly deserve an advocate to apologize for them. And yet thus much I shall say for the sake of truth, that men are not always to be charged even with the natural consequence of their own opinion, especially when they expressly reject and disavow it. And therefore though the natural consequence of this opinion should be Tritheism, or *τρία ἀγέννητα*, yet we ought to have so much charity both for Calvin and the Schoolmen, as to believe they never intended to maintain the heresy of three infinite unbegotten collateral principles, having expressly declared against it. However we may not dismiss the Schoolmen without making these two reflections on their partial behaviour towards Calvin: 1st. that the loudest declaimers against heresy are very often, upon enquiry, found to be the nearest to it. 2. That men may be so charmed and bigotted to a set of words, that they will even condemn their own very notions, if they be but expressed in different terms by other men.

And thus I have done with the first thing proposed, which was to shew, who those are that may be said to deny the Lord that bought them: by drawing an historical parallel betwixt four ancient and modern heresies, Photinianism, Arianism, Sabellianism, and Tritheism. The two first of these are at present the most prevailing heresies; and therefore I shall spend the rest of this discourse against them; proceeding in order,

2dly. To shew, that the subtle arts, by which they privily endeavour to introduce their errors, are chiefly these two pretences: 1st. that many eminent Catholic authors have acknowledged, that their doctrines are not contradicted, either in words or sense, by Scripture or antiquity for the three first centuries after Christ. 2. That though they be erroneous, yet they are not heretical and damnable; as contradicting no article of Faith that the Catholic Church ever thought necessary to salvation during the first three hundred years.

These are the ordinary and confident pretences of our late

Arian and Photinian writers. And indeed it cannot be denied, but that many who would be thought no friends to these heresies, have yet accidentally at least proved the main supporters of this confidence, and have done their principal business for them. For as to the first pretence, that their doctrines are not contradicted by Scripture or Antiquity: the authors of the Roman communion (in their extravagant zeal for the authority of the Church and the power of general Councils to make new articles of faith) have not scrupled to assert, that the Divinity of our Saviour and the doctrine of the Trinity are neither defensible from the authority of Scripture, nor the writings of the Primitive Fathers, from the days of the Apostles down to the Council of Nice. Mr. Chillingworth did long ago object this very thing to his Romish adversary; and it were easy upon occasion to confirm his suggestion by multitudes of undeniable proofs, were the matter of any such importance. At present I need only say, that Huetius and Petavius, two of the greatest authors of the Roman communion, have scarce let any one primitive Father go uncensured for Arianism: and in that have done more for the Arian cause than all the Arians in the world, ancient or modern, ever yet could do for themselves. Nor have many Protestant authors (in a contrary zeal for the doctrine of the Church's fallibility, or perhaps rather for want of understanding the true meaning of the ancient hypothesis) been more favourable or impartial in their censures of the primitive Fathers: sometimes condemning the Ante-Nicenes as Arians, and the Post-Nicenes as Tritheites, as Curcellæus and other late authors have done. And though Protestant writers do generally express a greater reverence for Scripture, yet Erasmus and the author of the posthumous annotations under the name of Grotius (for it is to be hoped they were none of his) have interpreted away many of the most considerable texts that make for the Divinity of our Saviour. So that it must be owned, that these heresies have received but too much countenance from the unwary concessions of Catholic authors. The allowing that the primitive Fathers were of their opinion, gives them reason to think the Scriptures are

so too; and that confirms them in the belief that they themselves are the true professors of the primitive Faith.

In this opinion they are still the more confirmed by the concessions of others, who, though they seem to disavow their opinions as heterodox, yet however think them innocent and tolerable; and accordingly so far turn advocates for them, as to plead for the authors as brethren that ought to be admitted into the communion of the Catholic Church. Episcopius and Curcellæus are the great patrons of this opinion: and in favour of it pretend to prove both from Scripture and antiquity the non-necessity of believing the doctrine of our Saviour's eternal generation from the Father.

Now then we need not stand amazed to think, that men, who are otherwise ignorant enough, should hence take heart and confidence, having such mighty pillars to support them. Whilst two such names as Grotius and Erasmus can be alleged against the most considerable texts of Scripture, it is no wonder men of a sinking cause should lay hold of their authorities and pretend ancient readings for their modern heresies. And whilst two such learned antiquaries, as Huetius and Petavius, have so severely played the critics upon the primitive Fathers, it was but natural for the Arian party to make use of their concessions, and raise their own credit upon the ruins of antiquity. And when we consider again in what vogue and authority Episcopius and Curcellæus have been, we need as little wonder, that some should be infected with their poisoned reasonings, and sleep secure in damnable heresy, having such plausible advocates to defend them. This I presume is a very fair account that may be given of the present subtle growth of Arianism and Photinianism in these latter ages.

Now it were to be wished indeed, that the unwary concessions of so many learned men had not given such advantage to the common adversary, as either to harden them in a false belief, or make them pretend to attack the Catholic faith as it were upon its own ground and with its own weapons. But since such dangerous breaches have been made upon the two great bulwarks of Christianity, Scripture and Antiquity, by means of these concessions, it will at least become

those who profess to believe the Divinity of Christ, to be as careful in securing, as others are subtle in undermining, the prime foundations of the Catholic Faith. And therefore in opposition to the first of these concessions and the vain pretence that is built upon them, I proceed,

3dly. To shew that notwithstanding any concessions of Catholic authors, the Arian and Photinian doctrines are contrary to the plainest and most indubitable of Scripture and primitive writers for the three first ages after Christ.

To prove out of Scripture that they are false doctrines, I will endeavour to make this proposition appear: viz. that upon supposition only that the Scripture had designed to say, that our Saviour was truly God, it could not have expressed itself in more significant and emphatical terms to that purpose, than it now has done: consequently, we have as much proof for the truth of our Saviour's Divinity, as the nature of the thing is capable of, or as we can have for the truth of any proposition of this nature: which with unprejudiced men is a very sufficient reason for believing it.

To make this appear to be so, we must first enquire, what are those peculiar terms and characters, by which it is possible to describe a Divine nature, and distinguish it from all other beings: and then shew that these are properly applied to our Saviour. Now these perhaps, upon the strictest enquiry, cannot be conceived to be any other than some of these five sorts: 1. either the proper names and appellations of God, or 2. the incommunicable attributes and properties of such a being; or 3. the operations and actions that belong peculiarly to such a nature; or 4. that peculiar honour and adoration which is solely to be paid to the Sovereign Being; or 5. that which is commonly called the formal notion and definition of a Divine nature. These are the proper and only ways to describe a Divine nature by; so that if it be possible to distinguish a Divine nature from all others by such peculiar characters; (and no one certainly will pretend to call that in question) then if our Saviour be described in Scripture under all these peculiar characters of a Divine nature, He must be verily and truly God. At least we have as great proof of his being so, as the nature of the thing is

capable of, or as is possible to be given; and it would be highly unreasonable to desire more. For this is as much proof for our Saviour's Divinity (supposing Him to be described under these characters) as we have for his humanity. If we were to prove Him to be a man, we could only do it by shewing that He is described under all the characters of human nature. And if his being described under the characters of God will not prove Him to be God, neither will his being described under the characters of man prove Him to be a real man. Therefore those primitive heretics, who denied his humanity, were altogether as reasonable as those who now dispute his Divinity: for the case and proofs being alike in both, he who pretends to question one, may by the very same reason question both. For now we can shew, that we have as much reason to believe our Saviour to be God as to be man; because He is described under all the characters of a divine as well as human nature. 1st. He is properly and without restriction styled God. 2. All the incommunicable attributes and properties of such a being are ascribed to Him. 3. All the actions likewise belonging to a Divine nature. 4. That worship and adoration which is solely due to God. 5. Lastly He is described under the formal notion and definition of a Divine nature.

The time will not permit me to insist upon all these, and therefore I will endeavour to make good that which will the most indisputably prove our Saviour to be God. viz. His being described under the formal notion and definition of a Divine nature. And here we must first enquire what is the proper notion of a Divine nature. Now this, so far as we can frame an idea of Divinity either by the help of reason or revelation, consists in these two things. 1. That God is a being of necessary and eternal existence, not precarious or depending upon the will and pleasure of any other for his being. 2. That He is the arbitrary cause of all other beings, which may be or not be according to the will and pleasure of him who makes them be. These are the first and principal notions we can have of God: and it is what our adversaries themselves allow to be a true description of a Divine nature, as well in revelation as in reason. For as

the Platonist, who speaks the voice of nature, defines God to be, "*mens æterna et causa boni in naturâ :*" so God in Scripture, when He describes Himself, does it by those very characters: 1st. that He is the *ὁ ὢν*, "I am that I am," the Being that eternally exists, the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last: 2dly, that He is the God, who made the world. So that if we can prove, 1. that our Saviour is an eternal being of necessary existence; and 2. that He made the world: we prove every thing to the Socinian that he requires of us. This indeed will not content the Arian, who will sometimes own that Christ is both eternal and the maker of the world, and yet deny that He is God. But if men will be so unreasonable as to maintain perfect contradictions; and assert that the properest idea of a Divine nature belongs to Christ, and yet after all, that He is not of a Divine nature: we are not obliged to convince such men, whose understandings run counter to common sense and are proof against all conviction. It shall suffice therefore to shew, that our Saviour is an eternal necessary existing Being, and that He made the world; consequently that He is of a Divine nature.

To prove these two things from Scripture, though many unanswerable texts might be alleged, I shall only cite two, but they shall be such as will admit of no evasion. The one infallibly proves Him to be a being of necessary existence, and the other as clearly evinces that the world was made by Him. His necessary eternal existence is irrefragably deduced from our Saviour's own character of Himself, John, 5. 26. which is, "that as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given the Son to have life in Himself!" Here by the Father's having life in Himself in the former clause, is undoubtedly meant that eternal necessary existence which is the proper life of God: all other beings, though they do now exist, being only of an arbitrary and precarious existence, that once had no being, and may by the same power that first created them, be again reduced to their primitive nothing. But now the text tells us, the life of Christ is not of this latter kind, but such a life as is the life of God. And that that is necessary eternal existence, it is to be hoped no one that owns any God at all will pretend to deny. So that

if we will believe our Saviour Himself, his own existence is no less necessary and eternal than that of the Father; only with this difference, that the Father has this necessary existence not only in Himself, but from Himself: the Son not from Himself but as the notion of a Son implies, by eternal origination from the Father.

The other passage, proving Him to be the Creator of the world, is that famous allegation of the author to the Hebrews, chap. 1. vers. 10. 11. 12. where what the Psalmist undoubtedly speaks of the Creator, is taken by the Apostle and properly applied to our Saviour. "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands: they shall perish, but Thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt Thou fold them, and they shall be changed: but Thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." This strikes at the very root of Arianism, and proves at once both that our Saviour is the Creator of the world, and that He is of an eternal necessary existence, immutable and unchangeable in his nature. He is not Himself a creature, as Arius pretended, *ἀλλοιωτὸς*, or *mutabiliter factus*, but That Lord, who in the beginning laid the foundations of the earth, and who shall hereafter change it again; That Lord who for ever continues the same, and whose years cannot fail.

Nor can the Socinians deny, but that here the Apostle speaks of the old creation. Only they would have it, that our Saviour is not here said to be the efficient, but only the final cause of the world. *Ἐθεμελίωσας*, i. e., *causa fuisti cur fundaretur: et opus manuum tuarum, id est, propter te factum—quia constabat inter Hebræos mundum hunc Messiae causa conditum*. So the author under the name of Grotius. But if such forced interpretations may be allowed to pass upon plain words, it will be impossible to prove any thing in the world. We prove to the Socinians out of John 1. 3. that all things were made by Christ, and without Him was not any thing made that was made: and out of Col. 1. 16. that by Him all things were created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities and powers: and then they tell us, this is only meant of the metaphorical new-creation under the Gos-

pel. We prove to them again from this passage of the Hebrews, that our Saviour is the author of the first and old creation: and then they tell us, He is not the proper cause of the world, but only the cause why it was made. Now at this rate of interpreting Scripture we can have no certainty of the sense of words, but may as well say that man is the creator of the world, because the world was made for his sake; or that there was no creation at all, because the first of Genesis, by the help of a thing called metaphor, may be interpreted away, as well as the first of St. John. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," according to the Socinian way of interpreting Scripture will be no more but this: in the beginning *i. e.* when there was a necessity of new regulating the world, God, *i. e.* kings and princes or some mighty monarchs, who are called gods in Scripture, created, *i. e.* new modelled and disciplined, heaven and earth, *i. e.* the savage and untractable world of men. And so the old creation is wholly superseded and set aside by this new invented art of criticism.

But now Melanethon's reflection is here again very seasonable: "*Has impias præstigias fugiamus et excremur, et sciamus in hoc articulo aliter Ecclesiam loqui.*" The Catholic Church never allowed such forced interpretations of plain words, but always believed our Saviour to be that eternal necessary existing Being who made the world, which leads me to the second part of the first assertion, viz. to shew that the Divinity of our Saviour was maintained as a most certain truth in the three first ages of the Church.

This, would the time permit, might easily be demonstrated, by shewing that all the five forementioned characters of a Divine nature are properly and without the least amphibology ascribed to Him by the primitive writers. For 1. They always absolutely and without restriction style Him God. This is so well known, that the heathens objected it to them; which they never denied, but still always owned Him for their God. 2. They ascribe unto Him all the peculiar attributes of a Divine nature, omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, &c. 3. The most proper and essential actions of God, as the power of forgiving sins: telling us at the

same time that no one can forgive sins but God. 4. They worshipped Him with Divine honour of all sorts, as well with internal acts of faith, hope, trust, as the external acts of invocation, adoration, doxology and thanksgiving. This is so well known to have been their practice, and withal that it was their doctrine, that no creature whatsoever was to be worshipped but only God, (because it is idolatry to worship any thing which by nature is not God), that he must have a very mean opinion of all the Primitive Fathers, who can think they should so palpably condemn themselves of gross idolatry, as they must needs do upon their own principles, if they gave Divine honour to Christ, whilst they did not believe Him to be God. This argument is so full and strong, that we may challenge all the Socinians in the world to give it the least shadow of an answer. 5. They assert, that He is essentially God, and describe Him under the formal notion and definition of a Divine nature, as that eternal necessarily existent Being that made the world. Which is the only thing at present I am concerned to shew. And this I shall do very briefly, by producing a few clear passages out of the most ancient and authentic writers, which interpret literally all those places of Scripture, that make the essence of Christ consist in necessarily eternal existence, and ascribe unto Him the creation of the world.

I begin with creation. St. Barnabas and Hermes Pastor are two of the most ancient authors we have remaining: and they both ascribe the creation to our Saviour. St. Barnabas says, it was Christ to whom God the Father said, Gen. 1. Let us make man; and that the sun is the work of his hands, ἡλιον ἔργον χειρῶν αὐτοῦ, &c. Barn. Epist. cap. 4. p. 218. Edit. Voss.

In like manner Hermes Pastor, “*Totus ab eo sustentatur orbis, et omnis Dei creatura per Filium ejus sustentatur.*” *The whole world is sustained by Him, and every creature of God is upheld by his Son.* Herm. Similitud. 9.

These apostolical men knew nothing of the modern sophistry of a metaphorical creation, or of Christ's being only the final cause of the old world, and that is a good proof to us, that these new interpreters speak not the sense of the Apostles.

In the next age we have, first, Justin Martyr, who in his Epistle to Diognetus, p. 498, styles our Saviour τὸν τεχνίτην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν ὄλων, *the contriver and maker of all things*. Again, both in his first and second Apology, he tells us, that God did διὰ λόγου τὸν κόσμον ποιῆσαι, *create the world by the Logos, or Word*, by which St. John says all things were made. Just. Apol. 1. p. 44. and Apol. 2. p. 97.

Next after him, Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, in his Second Book to Autolychus, p. 81, tells us, that God made all things by Him, δι' αὐτῆς πάντα ποιήκεν; and that He is called ἀρχὴ, the beginning, or ruler and governor of all things, because He rules and moderates all the works, which He himself made, ὅτι ἄρχει καὶ κυριεύει πάντων τῶν δι' αὐτῆς δεδημιουργημένων. And here we may observe that Theophilus, with many others of the Ancients, did so interpret the First of Genesis, as to make *in principio* to be the same with *in Filio*. In the beginning God made heaven and earth; that is, say many of the Ancients, God the Father by the Son made the world. Hence ἀρχὴ and *principium* became proper names of the Son of God, as well as *Logos*: because He was the author and principle of all things. Thus Origen, in his Comment upon the First of Gen. “*Quod est omnium principium nisi Dominus noster et Salvator omnium Jesus Christus Primogenitus omnis creaturæ? In hoc ergo Principio, hoc est, in Verbo suo, Deus cælum et terram fecit.*” To the same purpose he there applies the words of St. John, “All things were made by Him:” And then concludes, “*Non ergo hic temporale aliquod principium dicit; sed in Principio, id est, in Salvatore, factum esse dicit cælum et terram, et omnia quæ facta sunt.*”

Nay, some of them went so far as to assert, that it was written in the Hebrew original, “By the Son, God made Heaven and earth.” St. Jerome, in his questions upon Genesis, cites three authors for this opinion; Tertullian, in his Book against Praxeas; St. Hilary, in his Comment upon the Psalms; and the author of the Dispute betwixt Jason and Papiseus, who is a very ancient writer, commended by Origen in his 4th Book against Celsus. Now, whether either this reading or the interpretation be true, is none of

our present concern : the only thing we observe at present, is this, that the Primitive Fathers of the three first centuries were so fully persuaded that our Saviour was the Creator of the world, that they thought they could deduce it out of the first of Genesis, which Socinus himself must needs allow to be meant of the first creation.

I might here go on to add many other authors of the second and third centuries remaining yet behind, viz. Athenagoras, Tatian, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Clemens, Alexandrinus, Cyprian, Dionysius Alexandrinus, Dionysius Romanus, Novatian, Arnobius, and Lactantius : of all whom we can safely say, that they interpret all the passages of Scripture, which prove our Saviour to be the creator of the world, to the very same sense, which we now put upon them. And further we may challenge the most learned Socinian in the world to produce us but any one single passage of any one Catholic author, that ever maintained, what they now do, that our Saviour is only the author of the new creation and no more but the final cause of the old world.

Now this being the difference betwixt us and the Socinians, that we have the plain sense of Scripture on our side, and the concurrent judgment of all wise and sober men for sixteen whole centuries together : whilst they are forced to offer the greatest violence to Scripture, and wrest plain words to a most unnatural sense, to defend an hypothesis which was never maintained by any one Catholic author : we think we have all imaginable reason to conclude, that our Saviour is, in the most proper sense, the Creator of the world. Consequently, by the Socinian's own confession, He must be the very and eternal God ; since they themselves own that God and Creator are convertible terms, and differ no otherwise than as the definition and thing defined, which always mutually imply and infer one another.

2. The writers of the three first centuries are universally agreed, not only that our Saviour is the Creator of the world, who gives an arbitrary, precarious, and contingent being to all other things ; but also that He himself is an eternal, necessarily existent Being, who depends upon the will and pleasure of no other for his being, but is wholly immutable

and unchangeable in his nature. This has been fully and unanswerably made out by the learned Dr. Bull in his *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, which will stand as an eternal confutation of Arianism, notwithstanding the little attempts that have been made against it. Therefore, I shall only here add a passage or two by way of comment upon St. John's words, "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself," to shew that the Ancients understood those words in the same sense we now do; viz. that the life and being of the Son is not the precarious contingent being of the creature, but that essential necessary immutable life and existence, which is the proper life of God.

Ignatius, in his epistle to the Ephesians (p. 21. Ed. Voss,) styles Him the true life, ζωὴ ἀληθινὴ, and exempts Him in his Divine nature from the order of the creatures, calling Him both γενητὸς καὶ ἀγενητὸς, *factus et non factus, created as man, uncreated as God*. Now true life, and life uncreated is doubtless essential life, or life in himself, as St. John styles it. This passage is the more illustrious, because of the antiquity of its author, and his acquaintance with the Apostles. Nor can any one reasonably question its being genuine, because it is now found in the Florentine Greek, published by Vossius, and in the old Latin translations, published by Bishop Usher, and it is cited by three ancient authors of unquestionable credit, Athanasius, Gelasius, and Theodoret, all agreeing in substance, without any material variation.

To Ignatius may be added another piece of venerable antiquity (whoever was the author of it), viz. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs as it called, a treatise written in the second century by a Christian, at least a Judaizing Christian, as learned men have determined. There Simeon, one of the Patriarchs, is introduced prophesying of the Messiah in these words, "*Tunc Dominus Deus magnus Israel apparebit in terrâ ut homo, et salvabit in ipso Adam.*" *Then shall the Great God of Israel appear upon earth as a man, and save mankind thereby.* This, whether it be the speech

of a Jew, or Christian, is certainly a very pregnant proof of the author's faith, and shews that he believed the Messias should be the eternal God: for doubtless the Great God of Israel can be no other but the eternal God, the  $\acute{\omicron} \acute{\omega}\nu$ , or Jehovah, whose very essence is existence or life in Himself.

Justin Martyr expressly tells us in one place, *Parænes ad Græ*, that the God which appeared to Moses in the bush was the  $\acute{\omicron} \acute{\omega}\nu$ , the living and true God. And yet both he and all the Ante-Nicene Fathers agree, that it was God the Son, who appeared to Moses and the other Patriarchs by way of *præliudium* to the incarnation. Now let us put these two things together in form, and they amount to a full proof, that our Saviour is the  $\acute{\omicron} \acute{\omega}\nu$ , or the living and eternal God. For the argument will be thus:

He that appeared to Moses in the bush, is the living and true God:

Christ is the God that appeared to Moses in the bush:

Therefore, Christ is the living and true God.

Both the propositions of this argument are the Father's: therefore, unless we can suppose them to have been the weakest logicians that ever lived, they who give us the premises, must needs own the conclusion.

I shall but add one author more, that is Origen, who has generally been thought a friend to Arianism, but very unjustly: for in one place he styles our Saviour *Essentiale Bonum*,  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\acute{\nu}$  (Lib. 1. c. 5.); and in another place, *ἀντροσοφία*, *ἀντρολόγος*, and *ἀντροαλήθεια*, *essential wisdom, essential reason, and essential truth*. (Cont. Cels. Lib. 3. p. 136.) And in a third place, *ἀθάνατος Θεός Λογος*, *the immortal God*, Ibid. Lib. 4. p. 170.; which is as much as St. Basil's *ἀντροζωνή*, and Athanasius's *ἀντροφῶς*, which certainly are not short of necessary existence or the life of God.

To these it were easy to add many other passages of the same importance: but these I presume are sufficient to shew the sense of the primitive writers concerning the life of Christ; that it is not any created, contingent, or precarious Being, but an essential necessary existence, such as is the life of God. Whence upon the whole it appears, that the

doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity is the true doctrine both of Scripture and Antiquity, both which represent Him under the properest notion and idea of a Divine nature, as an eternal necessarily existent Being who made the world. Consequently the doctrine which denies the Divinity of our Saviour, is a false doctrine, contrary to the plainest and most indubitable sense of Scripture and Antiquity for the three first ages, which was the proposition to be shewn.

4. I am now in the fourth and last place to shew, that it is not only a false doctrine, but also heretical and damnable; a damnable heresy, that will bring upon the authors swift destruction. This will need little proof, if we reflect but upon what has been said in the first part of this discourse, that Socinianism is nothing else but the revival of the ancient heresies of Ebion, Artemas, Theodotus, Theodotion, and Paulus Samosatensis; all which were condemned as heretics by the Catholic Church long before the Council of Nice. These are things so well known to all, who are not wholly unacquainted with Ecclesiastical History and the state of the Primitive Church, that he must betray either very great ignorance or great partiality, whoever goes about to justify Socinianism upon pretence of its being allowed as an innocent error by the Primitive Christians. The learned author of the *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ* has sufficiently accounted with Episcopius for this pretence, and shewn us most accurately exactly, as the manner of that author is, these three things, 1st. that all the Ante-Nicene Fathers have expressly and positively declared, that the doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity is necessarily to be known and believed in order to salvation. 2. That they anathematized and condemned all as heretics who did not believe it. 3. That they put it into their creeds and compendiums of necessary Articles of Faith. Which three considerations are undeniable proof, that they looked upon the belief of our Saviour's Divinity to be necessary to salvation. And yet if this argument needed further confirmation, two other considerations might be added: 1. that they believed it necessary for man's redemption that God should become incarnate; or that the

Mediator, who was to reconcile God and man, should be partaker of both natures. 2. That even to deny his humanity is by them accounted damnable heresy, though a man believe Him to have pre-existed in his spiritual nature. Whence we might now strongly infer, that they, who thought it damnable heresy to deny our Saviour's humanity, could not but think it much more so to deny his Divinity; since, if a reverence be to be had to either, certainly the principal regard is to be shewn to his Divine nature. These things might very seasonably and properly be urged at this juncture, to shew the necessity of believing the incarnation and satisfaction made by our Saviour; but the managing of them would require a longer discourse. I shall therefore only make one short reflection upon what has been said, and therewith conclude.

It appears from the premises, that many learned men have mistaken the sense of the Primitive Fathers concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, and unjustly accused them of Arianism and Tritheism, to the great prejudice of the Catholic faith. Hence I would infer the great danger of relying wholly upon modern authors, and reading primitive writers with other men's eyes, especially the eyes of the Schoolmen: who, to advance particular hypotheses of their own, have made many dangerous breaches upon the common faith of Christians. The sure and only way to find out truth is to seek it in its first fountains and original Scriptures, interpreted by the best Antiquity. Those are known rules of Vincentius Lirinensis and Tertullian. *Id verum quod primum*: and, *Id Catholicum quod semper, quod ubique, quod apud omnes*. He that keeps close to these rules, may, perhaps, sometimes swim against the stream of modern authors; but he has this security on his side, that he shall never mistake the common faith of Christians. For, to use the words of a primitive writer, "What Christ Himself taught, and the Apostles preached, and the Fathers delivered, and the Martyrs confirmed, must needs be the common faith of Christians: and he cannot believe or speak amiss, that believes and speaks as he has been taught by them." There-

fore, to conclude, let us not be shaken by any unwary concessions or false pretences of any modern, however otherwise learned, authors : but first enquire impartially ourselves what the primitive truth was ; and then hold fast the faith which was once delivered to the Saints. So shall we neither be false teachers, nor bring in damnable heresies, nor deny the Lord that bought us.



# BUY THE TRUTH.



## A SERMON

PREACHED AT THE VISITATION AT WINCHESTER,

SEPT. 16, 1697.

---

PROV. CHAP. xxiii. VER. 23.—*Buy the Truth, and sell it not.*

It is the observation of the wise man, whose words we have now repeated, that the purchase of truth and sound wisdom is the most valuable thing in the world. "Happy is the man," says he, "that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth understanding, for the merchandize of it is better than the merchandize of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold: she is more precious than rubies, and all the things thou canst desire, are not to be compared unto her." chap. 3. 13.

And in this he seems only to speak in some measure the general sense of mankind. For though many men be deeply engaged in the grossest errors, yet all pretend to have a concern for truth, and to look upon it as their chiefest happiness. So that should we so far abstract from experience as to consider matters only in the theory, one might be tempted to conclude it impossible that there should be any such thing as error in the world. And doubtless, it would be so, were there neither wickedness nor weakness in human

nature: but by reason of those it commonly fares with truth, as it does with happiness and virtue. They have all many pretended admirers, but few real votaries; the beauty is seemingly courted, but the cloud finally embraced. How eager are men in their enquiries after happiness? and yet after all, how few do truly understand where their real happiness consists? How much fewer take the measures that are proper for the attainment of it? nay, as if human nature were condemned to act by contradictions in a pursuit of happiness, they take those very measures that will make them miserable. Just so is it with truth. All men pretend to be searching and enquiring after it; most men are busy, many warm and zealous, and some even furious and contentious in the pursuit of it. And yet, notwithstanding this, ignorance and error often gain as many proselytes as the cause of truth: whilst either the weakness of men's judgments, or the corruption of their morals, inclines them to take wrong measures, they become an easy prey to the grand deceiver, who knows as well how to disguise error in the habit of truth, as to transform himself into an angel of light. Hence it comes to pass, that the grossest errors are often plausibly vented and entertained without the least suspicion; and many men shew greater zeal for the nominal, than others do for real truths.

The experience of all ages confirms the truth of this observation, yet perhaps none ever more than our own; in which error seems to have taken greater heart and confidence only by giving itself some new and flattering names. Now Atheism walks abroad under the specious name of Deism; the enemy of revelation calls himself the man of reason; the Anti-Trinitarian in his own cant is only a zealous defender of the unity of the Godhead; to deny the incarnation is only to speak honorably of the Deity; and to ridicule a mystery is only to believe cautiously by adequate ideas and full comprehensions. Thus error bespeaks men's favour, as trifling writings usually do their readers with a glorious empty name on purpose to deceive them. And it were well if the cheat in both cases were alike inconsiderable; but alas! it is not an empty name that can make us a sufficient recompense

for the loss of truth. And therefore the wise man's admonition can never be unseasonable, especially at such a juncture: "Buy the truth and sell it not." For the better understanding which words I shall endeavour to give a plain resolution of these four enquiries.

1. What that truth is, we are obliged to buy? since it is certain all truths are not of the same importance.

2. What it is properly to buy the truth, and wherein the purchase of it consists?

3. What are the reasons, why, notwithstanding the possibility of attaining truth, so many fail of the attainment of it?

4. What are the principal rules and cautions to be observed in order to distinguish truth from error?

After which I shall make a moral reflection or two upon the whole, and therewith conclude.

1. We are to enquire what that truth is which we are obliged to buy; because all truths are not of the same importance: as will appear by laying down these four conclusions.

1. That it is not mere philosophical truths we are commanded to enquire after; the knowledge of these indeed may be very honourable, as arguing a sprightly genius, a piercing wit, and a comprehensive understanding: and if they be such truths, as may be instrumental to a better science, they are very useful too. And yet it would be hard to say that the knowledge of them was absolutely necessary, because the greatest part of the world have no opportunity of being acquainted with them. So that we may safely conclude in the first place, that such philosophical truths are no necessary part of that enquiry enjoined us in the text, though by the way the pains which some men take to account for the phenomena of nature, and resolve the mysteries and secrets of it, may justly upbraid both themselves and others, who allow not the least share of their thoughts to consider truths of a far more important nature, which defect is certainly one great cause of error: but of this more by and by.

2. As philosophical truths are not the necessary object of our enquiry, so neither are all the truths of Scripture, for there are some truths we may safely be ignorant of; others which

we cannot possibly know, though we make never so strict an enquiry after them. There are many truths of Scripture, which learned men, *salvâ Pietate*, have always differed about, and taken the liberty to expound every man in his own sense, without any detriment to the common faith or breach of Christian charity. And of such truths a man may safely be ignorant: or else who could be saved.

Again, there are other truths in Scripture, which we cannot possibly know, though we make never so strict an enquiry after them. And it is so far from being our duty to know these, that it is our duty not to know them: I mean not to be too curious, prying or inquisitive, into the deep things of God, which no man knows nor can know, till God shall think fit to make a clearer revelation of them. It was an excellent saying of Scaliger's to this purpose: "*Non velle scire quæ Magister maximus docere non vult, erudita inscitia est.*" "It is a most learned piece of ignorance not to be willing to know what our great Master has no where been pleased to reveal." Our Saviour Himself seems to have taught us this humility and poverty of spirit by his own example. For as He was in the form of a servant, He was content to let his human nature for some time be ignorant of the day of judgment. So the Catholic consent of all antiquity has interpreted that passage of St. Mark, 13. "Of that day and that hour, knoweth no man, no not the Angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father." And Irenæus particularly applies it against the vanity of the Gnostics of his age, who pretended to an universal knowledge, to be much wiser than the Apostles, and to be perfectly acquainted with the *spiritalia* and *supercœlestia*, as they called them, the divine secrets and mysteries of heaven.

But now the wise man is so far from encouraging our search after any such truths as these, that he tells us in another place it is very dangerous meddling with them. "*Scrutator majestatis opprimetur a gloriâ.*" And indeed such enquiries, if we observe it, commonly prove only like Pliny's search of the burning mountain, who perished in the flames, whilst he was too busy in searching out the causes of them. It is but natural for men whose thoughts are

wholly taken up with towering speculations, to neglect the more necessary parts of knowledge, and moral duties: and then, like that other philosopher's inquest, who perished by minding more the course of the stars in heaven than his own steps upon earth, all such kinds of searches must needs prove fatal to the enquirers. Though they with Capernaum exalt themselves to heaven; yet when the scrutiny of judgment has examined their pretences to it, they will in like manner be thrust down to hell; therefore these cannot be the truths the wise man bids us enquire after: since we can hardly purchase them, but at the certain expense of our souls, which is too dear a price to be paid for them.

3. To resolve this enquiry positively, as we have hitherto done it negatively, the truths we are obliged to enquire after are principally those which we cannot be ignorant of without hazarding both our own and other men's salvation. I call them truths in the plural, because of the attempts of a late admired author, who is willing to confine all to one single article, that Jesus is the Messias. Against whom it were easy to shew, were it here necessary, that baptism was never administered in the Christian Church without the explicit belief of many other articles: particularly the belief of three Divine Persons; the doctrine of repentance and remission of sins, grounded upon the satisfaction of a Mediator both God and Man together with the belief of a resurrection from the dead and an eternal judgment; which are articles that some men have no mind to be tied up to, though the Author to the Hebrews sums most of them up under the title of the principles of the doctrine of Christ, and the Scripture speaks of them as of the essentials and fundamentals of Christianity, without which no man can either be a Christian, or have any title under the Gospel economy to the kingdom of heaven.

4. Lastly, after the essentials of Christianity, we are also obliged to make enquiry after those truths which concern the perfection of it. For Christianity is a regular edifice, and no complete structure consists merely of a foundation. Therefore besides the fundamentals of Christianity there are other truths to be enquired after; which though they be not so

absolutely necessary as the former, yet they are necessary in order to bring us to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

Though here, both with respect to the foundation and superstructure, it will be very necessary to distinguish Catholic verities, from the ordinary proofs of them. It is never allowable to question the truth of an article of faith, but yet it may often be reasonable to dispute, whether such or such a text of Scripture be a solid proof of it. For instance, the doctrine of the blessed Trinity is allowed by all good Catholics to be a Catholic verity: and yet many learned men have, not without good reason, questioned, whether it could be solidly proved out of the First of Genesis. "In the beginning God created the Heaven and the earth." Many of the ancients, St. Hilary and St. Austin among the rest, thought that *in principio* was the same with *in filio*; and that hence it might be proved that the Son of God was the Creator of Heaven and earth. Peter Lombard, and the Schoolmen after him, prove the Trinity another way: they take *Elohim*, the original word for God in that text, to be a plural, and to denote three Persons in the Godhead. But Cajetan, Drusius, and Calvin, and the generality of learned men, both Romish and Reformed, after them, reject both these as forced interpretations. And yet it would be hard to charge these men with rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity, only because they reject this text as an incompetent proof of it. Therefore Catharin is justly censured by Sixtus Senensis and others of his own order, as an uncharitable disputatious person, for charging Cajetan with denying the doctrine of the Trinity, when it was so evident his only design was to establish it upon a more solid foundation: which is so far from denying it, that it is really to do it the greater service; as he who brings but one solid argument in favour of any thesis, does thereby greater justice to his cause, than he who brings forty bad ones.

I suppose from these conclusions we have a plain resolution of the first inquiry, what that truth is we are obliged to buy?

2. The next inquiry is, what it is properly to buy that

truth, and wherein the purchase of it consists? Here I suppose it too obvious to need observing, that buying the truth is only a metaphorical expression, and not to be understood in a literal sense; therefore it must denote a man's using his best endeavours to obtain it, so as he may be properly said to have made truth his own propriety by being able to give a rational account of it. Now no man, I think, can be said to have made truth his own, so as to be able to give a rational account of it, till he has done these two things: 1st, till he has got such a competent notion and knowledge of the thing to be believed, as will enable him to give the determinate sense and meaning of it: 2nd, till he knows it upon such solid grounds and evidences, as are proper to build a rational assent upon. For men may know Scripture words and Catholic expressions, and yet be never the nearer knowing the Catholic faith, unless they know the determinate sense and meaning of those expressions. For truth is not mere words, but the sense and meaning of words. Therefore to believe a truth, without a competent notion of it, is only to believe words without sense, and to pretend to know without knowledge. And again to know the determinate meaning of any truth or proposition, without knowing the grounds and reasons of it, is at best but to believe without certainty and to know without reason. Therefore faith in this case is not to be separated from reason and knowledge; for a rational faith, such as Christianity certainly is, always presupposes a rational knowledge: and a rational knowledge supposes again both a competent idea of the thing to be known, and also solid grounds and evidences for believing it. Else a man walks in the dark, and believes he knows not what, he knows not why. Which is a kind of faith the Scripture no where approves of, but often rejects and disallows as injurious to God and reproachful to human nature. To worship we know not what, is a thing chargeable with folly in the judgment of our Saviour: and, if we believe St. Paul, it is but a piece of superstitious devotion to erect an altar to the unknown God. Hence it is that Christianity is so often represented on the contrary to be a reasonable service, because it obliges all its votaries to understand the

meaning of what they believe, to use their judgment in examining the grounds of truth, and to be able to give an answer to every one that shall ask them a reason of the hope that is in them. All which supposes an obligation on men both to get a competent notion or idea of whatever they are to believe, and also to have solid reasons for believing it.

Nor will it hence follow, as some would infer, either that natural reason alone can help us to the knowledge of all necessary truths, or that nothing is to be received as a certain truth, but what we can have an adequate idea or full comprehension of: which are the wild mistakes and fundamental errors of some modern sectaries. For it is certain we may both believe and know many things, of which we have no adequate knowledge or perfect idea; nor indeed any knowledge at all by the light of mere natural reason: as shall be shewn in its proper place. So that all that is meant by getting a competent knowledge of truth or having reason to believe it, is only this: that men must endeavour to understand what they believe so far as the object is capable of being understood: and then believe it upon such reasons as are sufficient to persuade a rational man to yield assent to it. And this I conceive is properly to buy the truth.

3. The third inquiry is into the reasons, why, notwithstanding the possibility of attaining truth, so many men fail of the attainment of it? For the resolution of this inquiry, it will be necessary to consider the causes of error: and the unfolding of them will quickly unfold this mystery. Now the causes of error are many and various, but the principle of them, I take it, may be reduced to these three heads. 1. A want of sincerity and ingenuity in men's inquiries. 2. A want of industry and diligent exercise of men's own reason in examining the certain evidences of truth. 3. A contrary exaltation of human reason beyond its proper bounds.

1. First, error commonly proceeds from a want of sincerity and ingenuity in men's inquiries. Men have often other ends to serve than truth; such a lust or such a vice, such a principle or such a passion to be gratified; and then the question is not, which opinion is the truest, but which is

most agreeable to their genius, and tends most to gratify their several inclinations? This the Scripture calls self-love, and reckons it the principal cause of error. For when men are lovers of themselves more than lovers of truth, and lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, it is but natural for them to resist the truth, whenever it runs counter to their inclinations: and so by their own wicked temper, as well as the judgment of God, they are given over to strong delusion, that they should believe a lie.

This would appear more evident, had we time to look over the several instances of self-love, and consider what a powerful influence they have over the mind of man to warp the understanding. These are pride, vain glory, interest, and prejudice; for these are but so many different ways of expressing a man's love for himself and his own concerns. I shall only speak of the first of them, pride; by which we may make an estimate of all the rest. Now it is certain that pride is a grand enemy to truth. For the proud man is above instruction: he reckons his own notions the only standard of truth, and treats all men in the quality of enemies that entertain any different sentiments from him. This renders him impatient of contradiction, and wholly incapable of receiving better information: so that as Solomon observes, there is commonly more hope of a fool than of him.

Besides, pride is commonly attended with fury, envy, and discontent upon the least opposition or the smallest disappointment; and these passions often engage men to sacrifice truth in a mere revenge, wetting itself by a spirit of contradiction. Thus it is observed all along by the ancient historians, that there was scarce ever any considerable heresy infested the Church, but envy or discontent, the effects of pride, were at the bottom of it.\* It was a discontent that first made Simon Magus take a pique at the Apostles' doctrine; because they denied him the episcopal power of confirmation, he would no longer be a member of the Church, because he could not have the honour to be the head of it. His pride was legible in his very doctrines.

---

\* Vid. Causes of Decay of Christian Piety. Chap. xiii.

For what but a Luciferian pride could prompt a man to such prodigious blasphemies? as that he was the eternal God who gave the law to Moses upon mount Sinai in the person of the Father; appeared putative upon earth in the person of the Son; and descended in the form of cloven tongues upon the Apostles in the person of the Holy Ghost? From whence we may learn also (to note this by the way), who was the first author of the Unitarian heresy, viz. a person who could not blush to receive a Roman statue with this inscription, *Simoni Sancto Deo*,\* as Justin Martyr, an eye witness of it, does inform us.

It was the same cause, a disappointment of a bishoprick, as Eusebius tells us, that made Thebules corrupt the Virgin Church of Jerusalem with the Jewish heresies. He acted his revenge upon it, because Jacobus Justus was preferred before him.

It was a like disgust that led Valentinus to his heresy, because aspiring to the highest order of the Church, he was disappointed by the election of a martyr.

It was a like resentment that first gave occasion to the Novatian schism, because Cornelius was preferred before its Author.

It was *φιλοπρωτεία*, as Eusebius words it, that brought Montanus to enthusiasm.

Theodotion denied our Saviour's Divinity out of a most unaccountable pride, viz. because having denied Christ in time of persecution, he would not have it said that he had denied his God.

---

\* I am not ignorant, that Salmasius and some other critics have excepted against this passage of Justin Martyr, as if by mistake he had read *Simoni Sancto Deo*, instead of *Semoni Sango Deo Fidio*, because such an inscription has been lately found in the place where Justin says the statue of Simon Magus was. But this criticism is of very little weight, being a mere conjecture, without the least foundation; for who can imagine that Justin Martyr, a person so well versed in the heathen theology, was so ignorant as not to be able to distinguish Semo Sangus, a noted Heathen God, from Simon Magus? or if he did, that he would wilfully and confidently go about to impose upon the Roman Senate and people in a matter wherein he might so easily be confuted.

Aerius, being denied the office of a bishop, for that reason became an enemy to the order.

And to name no more but this one, it was a proud resentment of a like disappointment that first made Arius disturb the Christian world. The case was very remarkable, and it was thus. Arius was a man of excellent parts, an acute wit and a florid tongue; a subtle disputant, and a popular preacher at Alexandria. This gave him hopes of succeeding to the Bishoprick upon the death of Achillas. "*Speraverat Episcopatum quia ingenio poterat et eloquio:*" to use Tertullian's expressions in the case of Valentinus. His parts made him think he deserved the greatest preferment. But he was disappointed of it by the promotion of Alexander a more deserving man. This he resented to the highest degree, and through a mixture of pride and envy, conceived an immortal hatred against his innocent competitor, which he resolved to shew upon the first occasion. But Alexander was a man of unspotted morals: so that at his life Arius could take no exception. He resolved therefore to quarrel with his doctrine; and he did it upon this occasion. The good bishop, like a pious Father, instructing his charge in the first principles of the Christian faith, endeavoured to explain and vindicate the doctrine of the blessed Trinity from the sophistry of Sabellianism, which was then very rife in Egypt and those parts of Lybia, where Sabellius had lived. In doing this he had occasion to use a Catholic expression, which malice and disingenuity might easily wrest to an heretical sense. It was that the Father and the Son were *δύο τῆ ὑποστάσει φύσεις*, two personal substances or hypostatic natures perfectly alike and equal in all respects save that the one was the eternal Father of the other. This gave Arius opportunity to charge him with Polytheism, as if he had asserted two self-originated unbegotten principles, *δύο ἀγέννητα*, that is two Gods. And though Alexander had expressly cautioned against this in saying, that the Son was not another *ἀγέννητον*, but a *φύσις μονογενής*, not another unbegotten principle, but the only begotten of the Father; yet Arius's malice would not let him see this, but pushed him on to pursue the charge. And so industriously did he manage his cause with Eusebius of

Nicomedia and others (who had been brought up with him under Lucian in the School of Antioch) that Alexander was blamed by many, and Arius justified; until Constantine was forced to take the matter into his own cognizance and call the great Synod of Nice, where Alexander's doctrine was approved and Arius condemned. This in short was the true origin and occasion of the Arian heresy.

Now from an induction of such a multitude of particulars, I suppose we may safely raise this general conclusion: that a proud man will at any time sacrifice truth in a personal quarrel, and if he can no otherways be revenged on his adversary he will revenge himself on his sentiments, though it be at the expence of the Catholic faith. And if so, it is very easy to account for the origin of many errors: for pride is a very natural distemper of a restless spirit; and so long as there is pride in human nature, there will be error too.

So that from this one instance of self-love and its powerful influence over the mind of man, we see, it is no hard matter to resolve, why men of corrupt minds should also be destitute of the truth? The question seems to be a little more difficult concerning men of upright minds and good intentions, why, notwithstanding their real love for truth, they many times fail of the attainment of it? But this will easily be resolved by considering the second cause of error, which is a want of industry and diligent exercise of men's own reason in examining the certain evidences of truth. Good men are not always the most exact enquirers. Truth often requires a very diligent search, and more time and pains and drudgery than many men are willing to think it their duty to bestow upon it. This makes them take up with shorter ways of finding out truth, which seem at first to be plausible methods, but in the end they often prove delusive. I shall only instance in two particulars of this nature instead of many others.

The first is, when men, out of a kind of religious reverence to some Divine truths, are afraid to let their understandings have free exercise and liberty of thinking about them. This indeed at first looks like a kind of paradox to assert that men should be ignorant of truth out of mere reverence to it, and yet it is too certain that ignorance and error are often the

genuine effects of this cause. For sometimes men are possessed with an opinion, that the doctrines of Christianity are wholly too sublime for human enquiry : and this cuts off all sober endeavours after the knowledge of such truths by making men despair of ever attaining a competent knowledge of them : in so much that some are apt to think it their duty to think nothing at all about them. But certainly, if Christian doctrines be necessary articles of our faith, as we now suppose, and if they were revealed and written for our learning, which is a thing beyond all question ; then we are obliged to know and understand them so far as the revelation goes, which is plain and intelligible in all matters that immediately concern man's salvation.

It is true indeed almost every article of faith has something of difficulty in it, which we are not obliged to understand because it is not yet plainly revealed. But then it is as certain on the other hand, that in every article there is something which we may understand, because it is plainly and intelligibly revealed : and so far we are obliged to understand it. There is an adequate and an inadequate idea of every such thing ; a perfect and an imperfect notion, a knowing in part and a knowing to perfection : and both these are true knowledge, though differing in degrees : for he, who knows a thing but in part by an inadequate idea, has yet as true a knowledge of it, so far as it goes, as he that knows it to perfection. And this is the case of mysteries in religion. There is in every mystery something that may be known and understood, and something that exceeds our comprehension ; and these respectively require different duties from us. That which exceeds our comprehension, which is properly the mystery, requires an humble admiration ; and that, which is knowable in it, requires the exercise of our intellectual faculties to understand it. And as we must not pretend to know every thing of a mystery, because we may know something : so neither must we be ignorant of every thing, because there is something that exceeds our comprehension. If the one be a piece of grand presumption, the other is at least a piece of voluntary humility, which God has no where promised to accept at our hands. And the

mischief of such a misguided reverence is, that it fatally involves men in a lasting prejudice, which makes them continue ignorant of those truths, which are most necessary to be known.

The other instance of a short enquiry is the depending merely upon the authority of learned and pious men, without further enquiry into the grounds of truth. This is that fatal rock upon which so many have split, who have thought themselves secured in the harbour of truth. For a mixture of learning and piety creates so great a reverence for the person in whom they centre, that men are willing to captivate their understandings to so great an authority; and freely admit of that slavery to which Pythagoras is said to have reduced his scholars, *ut etiam sine ratione valeret autoritas*. It was Vincentius Lirinensis's observation concerning Origen, that the fame of his learning and piety had given him such a repute in the world, that men were ready to say, *se malle cum Origine errare quàm cum aliis vera sentire, that they had rather even err with Origen than believe the truth with others*. Not that they were willing to embrace known errors; but they could not suspect those to be errors, which were recommended to them by the authority of so great an oracle.

Now whenever the case happens to be thus, unthinking and less inquisitive men are in manifest danger of being cheated into error. For even the best and wisest men are themselves subject to delusion. No man's piety can secure him from error, nor his learning entitle him to infallibility. And therefore when such men fall, they must needs draw many others with them into error, who depend wholly upon their judgment, and seek for no other evidence but their authority. So that, as Vincentius observed of old, it has always been one of the most dangerous inlets into error, to hold men's persons in admiration.

Our Saviour foresaw this danger, that would attend men in their enquiries after truth: and therefore he forewarned his disciples, that they should call no man master upon earth; that is, receive no mere man's dictates for infallible oracles, but use their own judgment in examining the certain

evidences and grounds of truth. And why of yourselves, says he, judge ye not what is right? As if he had said, why are ye governed by other men's authority, and rather use not your own reason to judge of truth? This, I conceive, is a plain intimation, that depending upon the authority of any mere man is a very fallible way of finding out truth. And it serves to make good our second observation concerning the origin of error, that it often proceeds from a want of industry and diligent exercise of men's own reason in examining the certain evidences of truth.

3. There is yet a third cause of error, and that is a contrary exaltation of human reason beyond its proper bounds. For it is very observable, that the natural faculty of reason may be abused two different ways by two contrary extremes. Some men deny it its just office in religion; of which we have already spoken: others advance it too high, to the destruction of faith, revelation, and mysteries. And these commonly do it upon those two arbitrary pretenses,

1. That nothing is to be received as truth, for which we have not the evidence either of sense or reason amounting to the infallible certainty of a mathematical demonstration.

2. That every thing is to be rejected as imposture, of which we have not an adequate idea and full comprehension. These are those new lights, that have led so many smatterers in philosophy and pretenders to reason into such extravagant heights of blasphemy against God, the Holy Scriptures, revelation and mysteries. And no wonder that whilst these are looked upon as undoubted principles and infallible oracles of reason, the truth of all religion should be called in question. For it is certain there are many things as well in natural as revealed religion, that cannot consist with these supposed principles. For if we must believe nothing but either upon the testimony of sense or a mathematical demonstration, or upon adequate ideas and full comprehensions, we must discard all objects of faith out of religion, and believe nothing that has the least mystery in it, because it admits not of this kind of evidence and demonstration. So that allowing the truth of these principles, all

religion must be false. And that is the true reason why the enemies of religion stand up so zealously in the defence of them: because upon the strength of these pretended oracles they can harangue against religion, and make bold attacks upon the Catholic faith.

But now if this be the case, as it plainly is, it equally concerns all enquirers after truth and friends to religion to see through such dangerous principles, and to be able to discover the vanity of such extravagant pretences. Their being called principles of philosophy and oracles of reason makes it the more necessary to set them in their true light, and bring them back to their proper appellations again, which is to be styled the false suggestions of pretended philosophy and reason. For true philosophy can never set itself against Divinity, nor can the oracles of true reason contradict those of religion. And it is easy to shew, that these pretended principles are not the true oracles of reason, but only the over hasty conceptions and abortive birth of a vitiated understanding. To evince which in as few words as possible, I shall only observe this one thing: that these men quarrel with religion for those very things, which they themselves in other cases are forced to allow, which is a certain argument, that these supposed principles proceed only from a weakness of understanding.

For first as to those who will believe nothing but either upon the evident testimony of sense or the infallible certainty of a mathematicial demonstration: these men of certainty and infallibility, when religion is not concerned, believe ten thousand things without scruple, for which they have no such evidence of sense or reason. They receive many things as true merely upon the strength of human testimony, where neither sense nor reason, but only their human faith, is concerned, and where they can have no other than a moral certainty. And yet matters of faith and revelation must be discarded merely because we come not to the knowledge of them by the sole evidence of sense or natural reason. Which, to give it its due character, is neither better nor worse, than as if a man should deny all manner of sounds and visible objects, only because he could not see with his

ears, or hear with his eyes. So reasonable are these great pretenders to human reason.

Again, those who reject articles of faith and mysteries upon pretence that they cannot have an adequate idea and full comprehension of them, do at the same time believe many things as truths, of which they cannot possibly have any such adequate idea, or full comprehension. For not to mention now all the mysteries of nature, at present we will only suppose these men to believe a God, which it is to be hoped they do not yet deny: and if so, they then believe something of which they cannot have a full comprehension. For before any man can have a full comprehension of God, he must adequately understand his nature, his attributes and all his actions. And yet every one of these has something in it far above the reach of human reason. His nature as a Spirit is wholly incomprehensible: his attributes of infinity, omniscience and eternity far exceed the grasp of human reason, and the modus of his actions is altogether unaccountable; especially that wonderful mystery, the modus of the world's creation out of nothing. He is a bold man indeed that will undertake to know all these by adequate ideas and full comprehensions.

Some of the great pretenders to reason have fairly confessed these difficulties, and therefore to salve their own hypothesis have advanced other notions of God. This made Vorstius first assign him a corporeal substance, as more intelligible in his opinion and more agreeable to reason. And both he and the Socinians generally deny his prescience of future contingents, as a thing irreconcilable with man's free will, and altogether unaccountable. With them the immutability of his decrees is made to change, and immensity is confined to heaven. Volkelius goes one step further and denies the world's creation out of nothing. He was sensible that reason could never account for the modus of a production out of nothing; and therefore he took sanctuary in the schools of philosophy, and provided some pre-existent matter for his impotent God to work upon. I only mention these things to shew to what straits and difficulties these men are driven: either they must own that they

themselves believe something incomprehensible ; or, what is worse, must alter the notion of God, which is in effect to destroy his nature. For he, who can believe, that God is corporeal and finite, ignorant of many things, and mutable in his decrees, may as well believe that He is nothing at all. And indeed this is the very way that Epicurus is said to have gone when he first set up for a great master of Atheism. He would not own his opinion openly to the world, for that would have brought the odium of the world upon him, but he took care to represent God in such a dress, as he knew would render Him as insignificant as if there were none at all. “ *Idque videns Epicurus,*” says the Roman orator, “ *re tollit, oratione relinquit Deos.*” And it were to be wished, that some men did not, at least ignorantly, do what he did with design, whilst they transform the Deity into a fiction of their own reason and make an idol of the living God.

I have now done with the causes of error ; having shewn them to be chiefly these three : 1. A want of sincerity and ingenuity in men’s enquiries. 2. A want of industry and diligent exercise of men’s own reason in examining the certain evidences of truth. 3. A contrary exaltation of human reason beyond its proper bounds. And from these it is very easy to resolve the third inquiry, why, notwithstanding the possibility of attaining truth, so many men fail of the attainment of it ?

4. The fourth and last enquiry is, what are the principal rules and cautions to be observed in order to distinguish truth from error ? For the resolution of which it must be premised, that reason has still its part in religion. Though its office be not to discover every truth merely by its own natural light, or any truth by an adequate comprehension ; yet it is the faculty God has given us to judge of truth by certain rules, whereby we may be able to discern truth from falsehood, and distinguish revelation from imposture, and try the spirits whether they be of God. These rules are most excellently treated of by a late Reverend Prelate in his discourse of trying the spirits, and therefore I shall not need to insist long upon them.

1. One is, that whatever has the certain evidence of a Divine revelation, must needs be true. This is grounded upon the undeniable supposition of God's veracity and power, that He is true in himself, and able to discover many hidden truths to us by such certain evidence as no one can have any reason to question. Now this evidence is miracles, or works wrought by such a supernatural power in confirmation of a rational doctrine, as must needs argue God to be the ultimate author of both. And when any doctrine, which is rational in its own nature and worthy the revelation of God, comes attested with this kind of evidence, we have all imaginable reason to believe it. And to question the truth of it, in this case, were to resist the greatest evidence that could be given, and to make it impossible for God to reveal Himself to mankind.

Yet I deny not but that there may be cases, in which a miracle will not be a sufficient warrant to receive a doctrine or prove it to come from God. As is evident from the 13th of Deuteronomy where a false prophet is supposed to work a miracle by giving a sign or wonder that comes to pass, with an intent to draw men off from the worship of the true God. But then in this case it is evident the doctrine contradicts some immutable principle of religion, of the truth of which we are fully assured before. We have an eternal unalterable obligation to worship the true God and Him alone: therefore the doctrine that teaches to forsake the true God, is so irrational in itself, so unworthy the revelation of God and contradictory to his nature, that though it should be attested by a miracle we might safely conclude it to be imposture. For the permission of such a miracle is only designed by way of probation, to try men's fidelity and ingenuity: and in such cases there are other rules to judge of truth. Therefore ;

2. A second is, that whatever contradicts the principles of natural religion, cannot be the truth of God. The reason of which is plain ; because the principles of natural religion, are themselves the truth of God antecedent to all revelation : and one Divine truth cannot contradict another. Thus it is a principle of natural religion, that God must be the Creator of the

world, and whatever is not the Creator of the world cannot be God. So that should any one pretend never so many miracles to establish the belief or worship of a God, that did not make the world, we might from the very principles of natural religion conclude it to be imposture. It was a remarkable saying of Justin Martyr to this purpose in his book against Marcion, "that he would not have believed our Saviour himself, had he preached any other God than the creator of the world and maker of all things." The book is now lost, but Irenæus preserves the passage, and highly extols and applauds him for it. "*Benè Justinus in eo libro, qui est ad Marcionem, ait, Quoniam ipsi Domino non credidisset, alterum Deum annuncianti præter Fabricatorem et Factorem, Nutritorem nostrum.* Iren. lib. 4. c. 14. So that had we no other reason against Socinianism, we might however from this one rule conclude it to be false, because it introduces the worship of a God, who, upon the principles of the Racovian way, is not the Creator of the world. For according to their hypothesis our Saviour is not the maker of the old world, but only the author of the new creation. Consequently to worship Him upon that hypothesis is to make a God that did not make the world: and that is to contradict one of the first principles of natural religion. Whence we may observe by the way, how justly God sometimes infatuates men's understandings, that these great pretenders to natural religion should themselves act in the most manifest contradiction to it.

Another principle of natural religion is, that there can be but one God: and to introduce the belief or worship of three Gods is consequently an imposture, because it contradicts a principle of natural religion. Now here at least the Unitarians think they have the manifest advantage of those who defend the doctrine of the Christian Trinity, for they immediately conclude, that three Divine persons must needs be a contradiction to this principle of natural religion, and introduce three Gods. But would these men only impartially consult their own reason and consider the true notion of one God, and three, they would quickly find, that the doctrine of the Christian Trinity, as delivered in the Holy Scriptures,

cannot justly stand chargeable with the consequence of introducing three Gods. For the notion of three Gods must needs imply three times as much as the natural notion of one. Now the natural notion of one God always implies one absolute, unbegotten, self-originated principle. Consequently the natural notion of three Gods must needs imply three absolute, unbegotten, self-originated principles, collateral and co-ordinate to one another. But now it is certain, that the doctrine of three Divine persons under the relation and economy of a Father unbegotten, a Son begotten, and a Holy Spirit proceeding, cannot be three absolute, self-originated, unbegotten principles: for it implies a contradiction to say, that the only begotten Son of God is unbegotten; consequently, there not being three unbegotten principles, there cannot be three Gods. This is so evident almost to a demonstration, that were not men of perverse disputings resolved eternally to quarrel with their own reason, as well as with the truth of Holy Scripture, we should never have heard of the charge of Tritheism against the doctrine of the Christian Trinity. For though this mystery be something that our reason could never have told us; yet when revelation has acquainted us with it, our very reason tells us it ought to be believed, since it implies no contradiction to any principle of natural religion. And thus we can fairly join issue with the subtlest adversaries of Christianity as to this particular, that nothing can be truth that contradicts a principle of natural religion, and by this rule at once maintain the truth of the Christian religion, and discover many errors that contradict it.

3. Whatever contradicts the evident testimony of sense or reason cannot be the truth of God. The reason of this is the same with that concerning the principles of natural religion: viz. that the evidence of sense and reason is antecedent to all revelation; and we must suppose the right use of our natural faculties, before we can be assured of the truth of any revelation. And for this reason we reject transubstantiation, not barely because it is above our reason, but because it destroys the right use and exercise of our natural faculties and plainly contradicts them.

4. Lastly, that cannot be truth, which contradicts the analogy of faith or an antecedent revelation. For if so, we might be obliged to believe contradictory truths at once, which is impossible. Upon this account the prophet was to be rejected, who went about to change the worship of the true God, because the true God had given a sufficient manifestation of Himself by the revelation then made to Moses. For the same reason, if either man or Angel should preach any other Gospel, than what we have received, he were to be accursed, for the completion of our faith is the last revelation made by God in Christ, and we are for ever to hold fast this faith, which was once delivered to the saints.

Thus I have done with the resolution of the four enquiries: having shewn first what truth is. 2. What it is to buy the truth. 3. What are the reasons why men often fail of truth. 4. What are the principal rules to be observed in order to distinguish truth from error. I shall now only make two reflections upon the whole and so conclude.

1. The first is general with respect to all men, that they, who have the Holy Scripture, are obliged to something more than bare morality and practice: and that is faith; or the knowledge of those necessary Divine truths, which are revealed in Scripture. Some modern accounts of religion make faith a kind of useless thing, and the scheme of Christianity little better than a system of good morality. As if no more was required to make a man a Christian than what an honest moral heathen may know by the light of natural reason! But if so, to what purpose was the revelation made? Why did God acquaint us with so many noble truths concerning his own nature, the incarnation of his Son, and the satisfaction made by his death, if the knowledge of these were not to stand for something in religion? Why does the Scripture so often require faith in Christ, as well as repentance towards God, if the one as well as the other be not a necessary condition of man's salvation? But if both be necessary, then faith and works must go together, and men must learn to know God, as well as keep his commandments. For since God has revealed his truths to men, he will judge them for their ignorance and infidelity as well as

other crimes : and then a voluntary error in faith may prove as fatal as an immorality in practice.

2. We may hence infer, that if it be the duty of all men to buy the truth, it is much more the duty of those whose office more immediately entitles them to be guardians of truth. The priests' lips should preserve knowledge, and that upon a double account, both because they have greater opportunities of attaining it, and also because they are under an obligation of shewing it to others. They are obliged to acquaint men with the whole council of God ; which supposes that they themselves are first acquainted with it. Therefore this double obligation should lay a double engagement on them to buy the truth. And there is this further encouragement to do it, that to know the truth and shew it unto others will be the occasion of a double reward. For they that be teachers shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.

I conclude all with the exhortation of the Apostle, " Let us take heed to ourselves and to our doctrine, and continue in them : for in doing this we shall both save ourselves and those that hear us."



A

DISCOURSE

CONCERNING

THE MERCY OF GOD

TO

Penitent Sinners:

INTENDED FOR

THE USE OF PERSONS TROUBLED IN MIND.

---

BY THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M. A.

RECTOR OF HAVANT, &c.

2 c 2



DISCOURSE  
ON THE  
MERCY OF GOD.



PSALM ciii. 13.

*As a Father pitieth his Children, so the Lord pitieth them  
that fear Him.*

As there is no quality in God more amiable in itself, or more comfortable in its consideration to human nature, than the attribute of merey: so there is nothing, the Scripture seems more emphatically to impress upon us a firm belief and a right apprehension of, than this. It represents God as delighting and glorying in this character, that He is merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, as God proclaimed before Moses at Mount Sinai, Exod. xxxiv. 6. And the more to make us sensible of this, it condescends to speak to us in the most familiar way, raising ideas of God's mercy in us by things that we are most intimately acquainted with; comparing the actions and disposition of God to those of a tender and compassionate father towards his children: this is very pathetically represented by our Saviour in the parable of

the prodigal son, Luke xv. And here by the Psalmist in the text, “As a Father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him.”

From which words my design is to speak of the mercy of God, not in general, as it relates to all his creatures (for his mercy is over all his works) but as it particularly relates to penitent sinners, who are here described under the character of them that fear Him. In doing this I shall,

1. Give some eminent instances of God’s signal pity and mercy toward penitent sinners:

2. Obviate and answer some difficulties, which often make penitent sinners think they want God’s mercy, when they really enjoy it:

3. Apply the discourse in some practical and moral reflections.

In speaking to the first point, I must not now insist, either first upon God’s sending his Son to die for mankind; though it was a most singular act of God’s mercy, recommending his love towards us, in that whilst we were yet sinners, Christ died for us; nor secondly, upon God’s sending his Holy Spirit to call and prevent us with his assisting grace: because both these are acts of mercy antecedent to our repentance, and offered to sinners in order to make them penitent, and turn them unto God, before they have any power or will to turn themselves. But the acts of pity I am to speak of, are such as God shews to penitent sinners, when they first begin to repent and are actually on their way to God. And these are three. 1. That He takes notice of the first essays and beginnings of goodness in them, and bears with their weakness, till they arrive to strength and a perfect reformation. 2. That He helps and assists them all along in their progress. 3. That He crowns their endeavours by a kind reception, and complete pardon of all their offences.

1. He takes notice of the first essays and beginnings of goodness in them, and bears with their weakness, till they arrive to strength and a perfect reformation. A father does not expect the same manly service from his children, whilst they are children, as he may require of them when they are

arrived to the state of perfect men : nor does he exact the same measure of activity, labour, or sagacity from those of a weaker frame, or meaner parts and abilities, as he does from those whom he knows to be of a more bright and lively genius, or a more robust and athletic constitution. So in like manner it is with God in his dealings with penitent sinners : He does not expect at their first conversion to find in them immediately all the pleasing graces and perfections of nature and full grown Christians. There is a weakness and dullness, and prejudices, and a littleness of faith, which for some time He is willing to bear in them, as Christ did in his own disciples. So long as they are hearty and sincere, He does not exact more than they are able to offer Him : only He requires their prayers, and endeavours after more grace, that they may go on to perfection. He is pleased to hear a sincere heart cry, Lord, I believe, help thou my unbelief. He considers also, that He has not made all his creatures of the same size and abilities, nor given equal measures and portions of his grace to all alike : some have more time and leisure, better opportunities, less incumbrances, quicker understandings, and more faithful memories than others ; some have an happier education, and are qualified to consult the oracles of God themselves ; whilst others, for the little instruction they get, are forced to be beholden to the charity of others. He does not therefore exact the same measures of performance from all alike, but only requires men to be sincere to what they know, and what they are able : “ To whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required : but to whom little is given, of him little shall be required :” only He expects an honest and industrious mind, to do what men are able, according to the proportion of grace that He affords them ; and then the widow’s mites are as acceptable an offering, as the abundance of others ; and in all other cases, if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not. For God is pleased with the first appearances of real goodness in his children, and not only accepts them, but helps and encourages them to go on to perfection. “ The bruised reed He will not break, the smoking flax He will not quench, till He sends forth judgment unto victory.” Which brings

me to the second act of God's mercy toward repenting sinners, which is,

2. That He not only bears with their weakness, but helps and assists them all along in their progress, till they come to full strength and a perfect reformation. This He does by the various methods of his grace ; inviting, nay drawing them to Himself, by the powerful, though many times invisible and undiscernible operations of his Holy Spirit. Which Spirit illuminates their understanding by degrees, and leads them into all necessary truth ; He takes off the hardness of their hearts, and corrects the frowardness of their wills ; He regulates all their affections, and fixes them to their right and proper objects ; giving a new turn and bias to all their inclinations, till they come to a perfect conformity to the will of God ; He opens their hearts and still makes them more and more attentive to the word of God, by the promises whereof He fortifies them against terror and despair, and makes all the seeming difficulties of religion wear off, by adding new strength, succour, and courage to their first endeavours, and keeping their minds warm in devotion, and fixed and intent upon the business of another world. This good Spirit omits no opportunities of doing them good, but takes all the most proper and seasonable occasions to inspire good thoughts into them. Even a thousand seeming accidents of their lives become Providential calls and admonitions to them, whilst the Spirit makes every thing work together for good to them that love God. By these and such like means. (strengthening, not destroying our natural faculties) a man, who before was weak, nay, dead in trespasses and sins, is not only quickened and set at liberty, but able to say with the great Apostle, "I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me." This is the second act of God's mercy toward repenting sinners, that He helps and assists them all along in their progress, till they arrive to full strength and a perfect reformation. Then

Thirdly, He crowns their endeavours by a kind reception into peace, and favour, and a complete pardon of all their offences. Whenever a sinner returns again to him from His evil ways, He immediately lays aside his wrath, cancels his former

displeasure, blots out the sinner's ingratitude, forgets his offences, and remembers his sins no more. He retains no secret grudge, or thoughts of revenge against him; never expostulates the matter with him more about his former life, chides not, upbraids him not with his by-past follies, but passes an act of oblivion upon all his offences, and readily receives him into favour. "If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, shall not be mentioned unto him: in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live," is God's general promise to all repenting sinners, Ezek. xviii. 21, 22. And Jer. xxxi. 34. "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

In which places we are to take notice of the greatness and extensiveness of God's mercy, together with the readiness and quickness of it; which are qualifications that most eminently recommend it above any thing that is ordinarily to be found in human goodness.

For God pardons readily, not only lesser faults, but those of the greatest magnitude. How great were David's crimes, adultery and murder, ingratitude to God, and forgetfulness of his mercies towards him? And yet upon his true repentance God readily pardoned him. He could no sooner make an hearty confession of his sins, but the prophet in God's name gave him a comfortable absolution: "The Lord hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die," 2. Sam. xii. 13. But there was one sin greater, than all these of David put together, which yet God pardoned; and that was murdering Christ his own Son, the Prince of life and glory. Upon which St. Austin makes this discourse, to comfort the greatest of sinners.\* "Let no man say I have done such or such a thing, and I fear it will not be forgiven me. What hast thou done? what great sin hast thou committed? Tell me, some monstrous, grievous, horrible crime, which thou art afraid to think of. Let it be what it will: hast thou

---

\* Aug. de Symbolo, Lib. 1. cap. 7, Tom. 9, p. 294.

killed Christ? There can be no fact worse than that, because there is nothing better than Christ. How great a wickedness is it to murder Christ! But the Jews did murder Him, yet many of them afterwards repented and believed, and drank his blood; and the sin, which they had committed, was forgiven them."

This discourse is founded upon St. Peter's sermon to the Jews, which we read of, Acts ii. 22. Where he first lays before them the greatness of their crime: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders, and signs, which God did by Him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." What then? must they for ever despair of pardon for this? No: "but repent," says he, "and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," ver. 38. And then it follows, v. 41. "that they, who gladly received his word, were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." In the next chapter he discoursed much after the same manner, and with the like good effect. "Ye denied the Holy One, and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you, and killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead," Acts iii. 14. Yet he does not discourage them from seeking pardon, but gives them assurance of obtaining it, if they would take the proper methods to procure it: which was, "repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." And so it was: "for many of them which heard the word, believed; and the number of the men was about five thousand." Acts 44.

These were signal instances of God's mercy, in pardoning the murderers of his own Son, left upon record for our instruction and comfort; that no one might despair of God's mercy, whose sins are not greater than that of murdering Christ.

St. Paul says, he himself obtained mercy for the same

reason, that he might be an encouraging example of God's forbearance to all others, 1. Tim. i. 15, 16. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." For he was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious, and concerned in the murder of St. Stephen, and others of God's saints, who when they were put to death, he gave his voice against them. "Howbeit for this cause," says he, "I obtained mercy, that in me first, or in me, the chiefest of sinners, Jesus Christ might shew forth all long suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe to life everlasting."

But it will be said, all these were sins committed before baptism, which much alters the case: for there is no second baptism for the remission of sins allowed after the first, for those "who are once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame." To which I answer, that this does not at all alter the case: for though the sins of David, and the Jews, and St. Paul were committed before baptism, yet they were not before circumcision, which was the same thing to them, as baptism is now unto us, an entrance into the covenant of God, and the visible seal of it. So that as God allowed of a method of expiation, after circumcision, so He does now after baptism, though baptism be now no more to be repeated over again, than circumcision was. For God in his mercy, as St. Austin observes,\* has allowed us three

---

\* Aug. de Symbolo ad Catechumenos, Lib. i. cap. 7. tom. 9. p. 294. Propter omnia peccata baptismus inventus est: propter levia, sine quibus esse non possumus, oratio inventa. Quid habet oratio? dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut & nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris. Semel abluimur baptismate, quotidie abluimur oratione. Sed nolite illa committere, pro quibus necesse est ut à Christi corpore separemini quod absit à vobis. Illi enim quos videtis agere penitentiam, seclera commiserunt, aut adulteria, aut aliqua facta immania; inde agunt penitentiam. Nam leviasi peccata, ipsorum essent, ad hæc quotidiana oratio delenda sufficeret. Ergo tribus modis dimittuntur peccata in ecclesia, in baptismate, in oratione, in humilitate majore (al. majoris) penitentia, &c.

ways to obtain remission of sins. 1. Baptism, which cleanses us from all manner of sins, original and actual, great and small. 2. Prayer and daily address to the throne of grace for lesser sins of daily incursion, without which no man lives. For pardon of these He has taught us to say, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." 3. For greater and more heinous sins He has allowed us the expiation of a more solemn and particular repentance; and that either public, (in case of scandalous, flagrant, and public crimes, which deserve excommunication from the body of Christ,) or else private repentance between God and ourselves, for such crimes as do not bring us under the public discipline and censures of the Church. So that beside baptism we have a double method of obtaining pardon of sins, according to their different quality and greatness. Which pardon is confirmed and sealed to us in the holy communion, as it were by a visible demonstration, which gives us, as by a deed of conveyance, the body and blood of Christ, and all the expiation and atonement that attends them. So that a sinner needs not complain of God for want of mercy, since there are so many ways of dispensing pardon to us after baptism.

But some, who are actually pardoned by God and in his favour, cannot think themselves so, because they find his hand in some measure still upon them; either first in temporal calamities, which are many times the natural effects of sin; or, secondly in Providential afflictions, which He for wise reasons, and their own good, is pleased to lay and continue upon them; or, thirdly, because they are sometimes under fresh agonies upon the remembrance of their by-past sins; or, fourthly, because God's grace is not so powerful in them, as to cleanse them from all the relics of sinful frailty and corruption, and make them Angels before their time; or, lastly, because they are still liable to temptations, and troubled with black and ugly thoughts, darted into their minds against their wills, by the power and subtlety of Satan. Now to remove these scruples and complaints I proceed to the second general thing proposed, which was,

2. To obviate and answer those difficulties, which often

make penitent sinners think they want God's mercy, when they really enjoy it. And to these I shall answer both in general and in particular.

In general, I say, all this proceeds only from a wrong apprehension of the mercy of God, which does not oblige Him to remove all these several sorts of afflictions, or imperfections from sinners at the moment that He pardons their sins. For Christ had no sin; He was innocence itself, that needed no pardon; and yet He was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief all his life; nay, He was subject to temptations also, as we are, yet without sin, that He might know how to succour them that are tempted. What wonder then, that any mortal sinner should be subject to such calamities, as Christ Himself, the immortal God, who knew no sin, was pleased to submit to, as well for our benefit as instruction.

But to answer a little more particularly and distinctly to the several supples: I observed in the first place, that temporal calamities were many times only the natural effects of sin. And why should any man wonder, that God should permit the natural effects of sin to remain upon the sinner after pardon, when in many cases it could not be otherwise without a special miracle? If a man by a drunken or debauched life, brings upon himself a lingering fever, or a consumption, God may pardon his sin upon his true repentance; but He is not obliged, either by any promise, or by the nature of his mercy, to work a special miracle in his case, to deliver him from his bodily distemper. Nay, perhaps it is a mercy not to deliver him from it; since without a second miracle of preventing grace, perhaps the man as soon as he was healed, would return to his old course again. It is rather mercy therefore to let the natural effects of his sins remain upon him, even after pardon.

2. So again, if God sends some providential afflictions upon men; they are not to interpret these always as acts of anger or judgment, but arguments of his kindness and mercy, designed by God only to prevent sin, and keep them humble. As it was in the case of St. Paul, who was a chosen vessel and a particular favourite of heaven; yet God thought fit to afflict him with a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan,

sent to buffet him, to keep him humble, lest he should be exalted above measure, through the abundance of the revelations that were given him. For this he besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from him : but he only received this answer, that God's grace should be sufficient for him ; that God's strength should be perfected in his weakness. With which answer he was satisfied, and made no further complaints, as if God was wanting to him in his mercy : but, "most gladly therefore," says he, "will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake ; for when I am weak, then am I strong," 2 Cor. xii. 10. The afflictions of Job were, in like manner, not expressions of God's anger, but his infinite wisdom and kindness to him ; to approve his patience to all the world, and give him such a surprising victory over Satan, as made even the adversary himself imagine, there was something more in human nature, assisted by grace, than he before was apprehensive of. So that when God sends Providential afflictions upon penitent sinners, they are not always scourges, but sometimes mercies, to try their patience, or to preserve them from sin. And if their prayers for removal of them are at last heard, as Job's was, they may rejoice and be thankful. If they are denied, as St. Paul's was, they may be patient still, and rejoice in their infirmities with the great Apostle, that the power of Christ may rest upon them.

3. But some penitents are afraid their sins are not pardoned, because they are frequently under fears and apprehensions of God's anger and displeasure recurring upon them. Now, if this be for any new wilful sins committed after pardon, they have reason enough indeed to fear ; because of that saying of our Saviour, "thou art made whole ; sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee." But if it be only for the remembrance of former sins, which are already pardoned, such fears are no indications of their being out of God's favour, but tokens of his mercy, who suffers such fears to recur upon them, to make their repentance commensurate with their lives, and by the abhorrence of by-

passed sins, to keep them from future falling. That it is so, is evident from the case of David, who after his sin, was pardoned by the mouth of the prophet, and he was infallibly assured of it, yet he lay under great agonies and conflicts of soul upon the remembrance of his great transgressions. Hear one or two of his expressions and complaints upon this occasion, Psal. xxxviii. 2. "Thy arrows stick fast in me, and thy hand presseth me sore: there is no soundness in my flesh because of thine anger, neither is there any rest in my bones by reason of my sin. For mine iniquities are gone over mine head, as a sore burden, they are too heavy for me. My wounds stink and are corrupt because of my foolishness; I am troubled, I am bowed down greatly; I go mourning all the day long. For my loins are filled with a loathsome disease, and there is no soundness in my flesh. I am feeble and sore broken: I have roared by reason of the disquietness of my heart." So again, Psal. lxxvii. 2. "My sore ran in the night, and ceased not; my soul refused to be comforted. I remembered God, and was troubled: I complained and my spirit was overwhelmed. Thou holdest mine eyes waking, I am so troubled that I cannot speak. Will the Lord cast off for ever? And will He be no more entreated? Is his mercy clean gone for ever? And doth his promise fail for evermore? Hath God forgotten to be gracious? Hath He in anger shut up his tender mercies?" At last, he recollects, and checks himself for these complaints; "I said this is my own infirmity: but I will remember the years of the right hand of the Most High." I will call to mind what God before has done for me, and then there will be no room nor reason for such complaints as these.

4. But some are afraid their sins are not pardoned, because they find in themselves still the remainders of sin; and grace is not so powerful in them, as to conquer all manner of sin whatsoever. Now, if this be meant of willful, reigning, gross, habitual sins, they have reason indeed to fear: for then their repentance is not sincere, whilst they knowingly cherish any one reigning vice in their souls; for he that keepeth the whole law, and yet offendeth in one point, is guilty of all. He that said, do not commit adultery, said

also, Do not kill: now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law; and so long thou art not in a state of grace and favour with God, because thou art a willful transgressor of his law. But if it be meant only of lesser sins of ignorance, inadvertency, sudden surprise, and human frailty, to which all men are liable, against which they daily strive, but cannot wholly conquer; these are consistent with a state of grace and favour: because the very best of men are still liable to them. In many things we offend all: and in this sense, there is no man lives, and sinneth not. But God in his mercy hath provided a remedy for these, which is our daily prayers: "forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." If it were otherwise, our condition were very deplorable! for then no man could be saved; there being no man, except Christ alone, who ever lived without these. So that if God should be extreme to mark what is done amiss, no man could abide it; if He should strictly enter into judgment with us for these things, no man living could be justified in his sight, for this is only the perfection of Angels, and the privilege of the spirits of just men made perfect. Whilst we are in this body of flesh, there will be those failings and imperfections in us. God has left them in us to exercise our care and vigilance, and to keep us humble and depending upon his grace, and to quicken our addresses to Him for more and more strength to overcome them. Therefore we ought to watch and strive indeed against them as much as we can, and pray, "that his will may be done in earth as it is done in heaven." But, if after all our prayers and endeavours, we cannot wholly free ourselves from them, we are not to despond, because we are only in the condition of all mankind. We ought also to grieve and sorrow for these imperfections, as well as all others, and to aspire after the place that will set us at liberty from them: but, we must not expect to be Angels before our time, but whilst we are in this vale of misery, be content to bear these as part of our afflictions which nothing but death or rather a victory over death and mortality, will wholly conquer. In the mean time, we have assurance, that God will not impute them to us to our condemnation, but pity us, and

pardon us upon our constant prayers and daily repentance. And in this sense it is, that St. Austin calls these venial sins; \* not because any sin is not mortal in its own nature, but because they are such as God will not impute to his servants, who sincerely love him, to their condemnation.

5. But some penitents are afraid their sins are not pardoned, because they are still liable to temptations, and troubled with black and ugly thoughts, darted into their minds against their wills, by the power and subtlety of Satan. Now in this case two things are always diligently to be enquired into. 1. Whether temptations are of men's, own procuring, either by idleness and want of some honest employment, or by putting themselves in the way of temptation, by engaging in any unlawful business or diversion? And 2. whether a man cherishes the temptation, or gives way and consent to it? If either of these be his case, he is guilty of sin. For he that by idleness, or negligence, or any unlawful employment puts himself in the way of temptation, tempts the tempter, as it were, to tempt him. Tertullian tells us of a certain Christian in his time, † who went to the Roman theatre, or stage plays, and returned possess'd with a devil: and the unclean spirit being asked by the exorcist, how he durst presume to attack a Christian? answered confidently, that he had a right to do it, because he found the party upon his own ground. So that if men are engaged in any unlawful business, and a temptation then befalls them; the very temptation itself is their crime, because they make themselves beforehand, parties, and accessaries to it. Or if it befall them without their sin, yet if afterwards they give way, and consent, and yield to the force of it they make it their crime by their sinful compliance with it. But setting aside these two cases, it is no crime to be tempted, whilst we are merely passive in the temptation. Of which we have this infallible proof and demonstration, that Christ Himself was tempted of the devil, yet without sin in any but the tempter. And so long as we keep ourselves pure after the

\* Aug. de Symbolo. Lib. I. cap. vii. Non vobis dico. quia sine peccato hic vivetis: sed sunt venialia, sine quibus vita ista non est.

† Tertull. de spectaculis. cap. 26.

same example; that we neither be accessory in calling the temptation on ourselves, nor by any slavish cowardice in the spirit of bondage, yield a base compliance to it; but as soon as we find it, reject it with indignation and abhorrence, as our Saviour did, "Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." So long, I say, as it makes no further impression on us, but to raise our anger, or zeal, or resolution against it; while we do not receive it with pleasure, nor give any consent, or access, or encouragement to it, so far we are secure: it is the devil's crime, not ours: it may be our affliction, but it is not our sin. It may raise in us horror and astonishment, as any sudden surprise is apt to do; and it may perhaps create us anguish and trouble, to think how we are exposed to the assaults of Satan, who has power to work upon our imaginations, and thereby disturb our fancies, and raise unaccountable thoughts in us: but so long as our wills, over which he has no power, yield no consent, the most fiery of all his darts, the most subtle of all his devices cannot hurt us. Whilst we resist the devil, he must at last fly from us, and yield the victory: and then we may rejoice in the conquest, though perhaps we could not in the very engagement. "For no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness to them that are exercised thereby," Heb. xii. 11. In which respect one Apostle bids us, "Count it all joy when we fall into divers temptations, knowing this, that the trial of our faith worketh patience. Only let patience have her perfect work, "Jam. i. 2. and then it will be joy in the end, when we have baffled the adversary, and gained the victory. And says another apostle, "We glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost that is given us," Rom. v. 3. We do but love God the more in such cases, the more we are tempted by Satan to desert or forsake Him it quickens our zeal, redoubles our care and watch, invigorates our faith, and inflames our devotion, to make us fly with greater frequency, and greater

ardency to the Throne of Grace, to find help in time of need. So the very temptations of Satan turn to our advantage, whilst we resist and repel them; and we are more than conquerors over him, because we invert his wicked designs, and turn those things to our health and strength, which he designed should be an occasion of falling. Therefore we have reason to suppose in such cases, that God permits Satan to tempt us only for our advantage: and it is not only a demonstration of his own wisdom and power, so to counter-mine the wiles of Satan, and draw good out of evil; but also an argument of his mercy to us, to make our graces more illustrious, and our victory more glorious; whilst He perfects his strength in our weakness, and makes us triumph over all the power of the enemy and the very gates of hell, which cannot prevail against us.

I suppose, now it appears plainly to every one, that these things are no impeachments of God's mercy: though He first suffers temporal calamities, and death among these, as the natural effects of sin, to befall the penitent sinners after pardon; though He sometimes, secondly, sends Providential afflictions on them; though thirdly He visits them sometimes with fears and tremblings upon the remembrance of their by-past sins; though fourthly He leaves them still under the remains and strugglings of human infirmity, and lesser failings and corruptions; though fifthly He permits them to be liable to temptations, and to be troubled with black and ugly thoughts, darted into their minds against their wills, by the power and subtlety of Satan; yet for all this He is a merciful father to them: and, "as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him."

I cannot close this discourse without making these few moral reflections on it, by way of inference from what has been said.

1. That the sense of God's mercy in pardoning the greatest of sinners, should encourage all others to return to Him, in the sincerity of their hearts, with hopes of mercy. There can be no sin greater than that of murdering Christ and yet God was pleased to pardon it, for the encourage-

ment of others, who should repent in future ages. There can be no service less than that of the widow's two mites, and yet God was pleased to accept it, because it proceeded from a willing mind, and was answerable to the ability which God had given her, who never requires of any man more than He first enables him to perform.

2. The consideration of God's leaving sometimes temporal afflictions upon men after He pardons their sin, should teach us to entertain right and honourable thoughts of God's mercy; not to repine at his hand or dealings with us in any other respect, if He grants us the remission of our sins; but to be patient and content under any other afflictions, when we are assured they are not arguments of his wrath, but rather indications of his goodness and mercy, who knows what is most convenient for us; as Moses told the Israelites, "thou shalt remember, that as a father chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee."

3. The sense of God's mercy in pardoning our sins, should raise in us the highest affections of love and gratitude to Him again. For what a ravishment is it for a desponding, poor afflicted soul to be delivered from the fears of hell, and to hear Christ say, as it were, "To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise!" What thanks can any man render to God for such a blessing, less than the obedience of his whole life? What zeal can be too great in serving such a master? If we offer our bodies and souls a living sacrifice to God, and serve and glorify Him in both continually, it is but a reasonable service to Him, who hath redeemed both from hell. Let all those therefore, who have the sense of God's favour in the pardon of their sins, be as sensible of their own obligations to glorify Him both in body and soul continually, that they may shew forth the praises of Him, who hath called them out of darkness into his marvellous light.

4. Lastly, the consideration of God's mercy and pity to us, should teach us, in every instance of it, to imitate his blessed example; to put on bowels of mercy, to be kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven us: to pity those, who

know not their own misery, nor have any power or will to help themselves: to have compassion on the ignorant, and them that are out of the way: to bear with their infirmities, and even their prejudices, and dulness, and obstinacy, as God many times does with ours; meekly instructing those who oppose themselves, if God peradventure may give them repentance, to the acknowledgment of the truth. Here every man is allowed to have his share in the Christian priesthood, to call and convert, and save as many as he can, by his private instructions, and public example; that he may in this way also shew forth the praises of Him that hath called him out of darkness into his marvellous light. None are better qualified for this office, than they, who have signally experimented God's mercy themselves. They must needs be the best monitors to others, who have felt the misery and slavery of sin in their own hearts, and know the happiness of pardon and deliverance in their own persons. It was therefore our Saviour's admonition to St. Peter, upon the view of his falling and rising again, "when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." And there are infinite reasons to engage penitent converts to this. First, compassion to human nature, to relieve men from that thralldom, which they themselves were once engaged in. Then again, gratitude to God, to promote his glory; which is chiefly done by the conversion of sinners, whilst our light so shines before men, that they may see our good works, and glorify our Father, which is in heaven. Which is a zeal that ought to be in every true convert, and commonly is in those, who have been themselves great and eminent sinners. For they, to whom God forgives much, commonly love Him the more and labour more abundantly in his service, as St. Paul did, in consideration that he had obtained mercy of God, who had been once the greatest of sinners. Add to this, the honour of the office and employment, than which nothing can be more glorious: for it makes us workers together with God, and a sort of under saviours to mankind. For, says St. James, "brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he, which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a

soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." Finally, it is most beneficial and advantageous to ourselves, as it gives us a title to a greater degree of glory in another world. For they that be teachers, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever. It is impossible to give greater encouragement: God grant us his grace to obtain it, through Jesus Christ our Lord;

To Whom, with the Father, and the Holy Spirit, be ascribed, as is most due, all honour, might, majesty and dominion, both now, and for evermore. Amen.

TWO SERMONS,

AND TWO

LETTERS

TO THE

LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

CONCERNING THE

NATURE AND NECESSITY

OF THE SEVERAL SORTS OF

**ABSOLUTION:**

SHEWING HOW FAR THAT NECESSITY EXTENDS, AND WHERE  
IT CEASES.



BY THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M. A.  
RECTOR OF HAVANT, &c.

These Sermons concerning the Nature and Necessity of the several Sorts of Absolution, and the Two Letters to the Bishop, which follow them, formed in the Original Edition an Appendix to the eighth Volume, and are those alluded to, as intended to be printed in this place, by a note at the end of the sixth Volume of this Edition.

The Two Sermons were first preached in the Cathedral Church of Winchester, and afterward a part of both at a Visitation at Waltham, Sep. 24, 1716. Those parts which were delivered as a Visitation Sermon, are thus marked [“] for distinction’s sake.

RICHARD BINGHAM, EDITOR.

# SERMON

ON

## THE NATURE AND NECESSITY

OF THE SEVERAL SORTS OF

# ABSOLUTION.

---

### SERM. 1.

JOHN XX. 23.

*Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them ;  
and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.*

“THOUGH the doctrine of ministerial absolution, or  
“remission of sins, be a doctrine of great use in Christianity,  
“as a matter wherein our practice is much concerned ; yet  
“I know not by what hard fate it has happened, that there  
“are few doctrines which have been more abused or less  
“understood. The extravagancies of some on the one hand,  
“who would have it almost to do every thing in Christianity,  
“have made others think it could do nothing : as violent  
“disputes usually beget great oppositions, and great oppo-  
“sitions commonly end in different extremes. It will not  
“be amiss therefore to set this useful and necessary doctrine  
“in its proper light, by discoursing of it in a practical way  
“without any dispute, beginning with its original or first  
“institution.

“When our Saviour was about to leave the world, He  
“gave commission to his disciples to act in his name, as his

“ ministers and vicegerents, in all things relating to the  
 “ kingdom of God. This kingdom was founded chiefly upon  
 “ the promise and prospect of pardon or remission of sins:  
 “ and this pardon was to be dispensed, and ascertained to  
 “ men, by the intervention of those, whom he had appointed  
 “ and commissioned for this very purpose. For this was  
 “ part of their commission, to remit or to retain sins, as they  
 “ should judge proper, acting by the rules, which He gave  
 “ them, with a promise that what they did regularly in his  
 “ Church on earth, should be ratified and confirmed by  
 “ Himself in Heaven.

“ In general therefore it is evident beyond dispute, that  
 “ Christ left a power in the hands of his ministers to retain,  
 “ or to forgive men’s sins: but yet to have a more particular  
 “ account and right apprehension of this, three enquiries  
 “ will be necessary to be made further:

“ 1. Into the nature of this power, as it belongs to man.  
 “ For notwithstanding the commission and authority granted  
 “ to man, there is still a vast difference to be made between  
 “ the power of forgiving sins, as exercised by God, and as  
 “ exercised by man.

“ 2. We must enquire into the several acts or ways, in  
 “ which the ministers of Christ are commissioned and autho-  
 “ rised to exemplify his power.

“ 3. How far all men are bound to submit to the lawful  
 “ exercise of it.

“ From the resolution of which points we shall be able to  
 “ reduce this consideration to practice, and easily discern  
 “ what are the proper uses to be made of this doctrine of  
 “ absolution, both as it relates to the ministers of Christ and  
 “ his people.

“ 1. I begin with the first enquiry into the nature of this  
 “ power, as it belongs to man. Where I observe, that notwith-  
 “ standing the commission granted to man, there is still a  
 “ vast difference to be made between the power of forgiving  
 “ sins, as exercised by God, and as exercised by man. For  
 “ the power of God is absolute and sovereign in pardoning  
 “ sins; his judgment unerring and infallible about the sub-  
 “ jects, who are capable of pardon: and consequently his

sentence is always exact, and irreversible by any other power  
 " whatsoever. Whereas the power of man to forgive sins is  
 " not absolute but only ministerial: his commission and  
 " authority is not only derivative, but tied up and bounded  
 " by certain rules, which are to be the measures of his pro-  
 " ceedings in this grand affair with his fellow creatures.  
 " Consequently his judgment is neither infallible, nor his  
 " sentence irreversible, but only so far as he observes the  
 " rules prescribed by his sovereign Lord, who still reserves  
 " to Himself the privilege of reviewing the determinations  
 " of his vicegerents and judges upon earth, and of judging  
 " over again their sentence by his final and unerring judg-  
 " ment. If the ministers of Christ indeed observe exactly  
 " the rules, which he has prescribed, in judging sinners and  
 " pardoning sin; if they neither through haste or partiality,  
 " or ignorance and error, condemn the guiltless, or absolve  
 " the guilty; then their sentence, whether it be of remitting,  
 " or retaining sins, will be confirmed and ratified in Heaven:  
 " because they act according to the tenor of their com-  
 " mission, and only as faithful stewards conforming to the  
 " measures and rules, which their sovereign Lord has ap-  
 " pointed them. But if they chance to deviate from those  
 " rules, either by ignorance of men's case, or the sly pre-  
 " tences of hypocritical sinners; \* or by any neglect, or

---

\* Cyprian to this purpose says: Neque enim præjudicavimus Domino judi-  
 catur, quo minus si pœnitentiam plenam et justam peccatoris invenerit,  
 tunc ratum faciat quod à nobis fuerit hic statutum. Si verò nos aliquis,  
 pœnitentiæ simulatione deluserit; Deus qui non deridetur, et qui cor  
 hominis intuetur, de his quæ nos minùs perspeximus judicet, et servorum  
 sententiam emendet. Cypr. Ep. 52, al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 108, *We do not*  
*prejudge or forestall the Lord, who is to judge; but that if he find the re-*  
*pentance of the sinner to be full and just, he may then ratify that which was*  
*here ordained by us: but if any one do deceive us by a false appearance of*  
*repentance, God, who is not mocked, and who beholdeth the heart of man,*  
*may judge of those things which we did not well discern, and the Lord may*  
*amend the sentence of his servants.* In like manner Pacian. Ep. 1. ad Sem-  
 pronian. bibl. patr. tom. 3. p. 53. Reddet quidem ille rationem, si quid per-  
 peram fecerit, vel si corruptè, and impiè judicarit. Nec præjudicatur Deo,  
 quò minùs mali redificatoris opera rescindat: interèa si pia illa administratio  
 est, adjutor Dei operum perseverat. *The minister shall give an account, if he*  
*has done any thing amiss, or if he has judged corruptly and wickedly: neither*  
*is God forestalled, that he may not undo the works of this evil builder. But*  
*in the meantime, if that administration of his be Godly, he continues an helper*  
*of the works of God.*

“ weakness, or assuming tyranny, or fond indulgence, or  
 “ any other passion incident to human nature; in all such  
 “ cases Christ the supreme Lord will judge things over  
 “ again, and reverse their sentence, whether it be too rigo-  
 “ rous, or too indulgent; because they exceed their com-  
 “ mission, and judge by other rules than what He has ap-  
 “ pointed them. This is that noted difference between the  
 “ power of God and man in forgiving sins; the one does it  
 “ by an absolute and independant authority, the other only  
 “ by a subordinate and restrained commission, which is  
 “ rather a declaration of God’s will, than any sovereign power  
 “ invested in him. For no man can say to his brother, with  
 “ the same authority and infallible assurance, as Christ did  
 “ to the thief upon the cross, “ To-day thou shalt be with me  
 “ in Paradise.” This is the prerogative of God alone, to  
 “ pardon sins with an absolute and uncontrollable power.  
 “ And in this sense it is properly said in Scripture, that  
 “ none can forgive sins but God. And upon this foundation  
 “ Athanasius, and the generality of the ancient writers \*  
 “ always argued for the Divinity of our Saviour against  
 “ Arius, from this topic, that He took upon Him to forgive  
 “ sins with an absolute authority, which was the peculiar  
 “ privilege of God alone.

“ Yet this does not hinder but that man may have a mi-  
 “ nisterial part in the forgiveness of sins, in such acts as are  
 “ by commission entrusted with him: And what those acts  
 “ of his ministry are I come now in the next place to con-  
 “ sider, by proceeding in order to the second enquiry, which  
 “ was;

“ 2. What those special acts or ways are, in which the  
 “ ministers of Christ are commissioned or authorized to  
 “ exemplify this their power of retaining or remitting sins.

“ Now these upon an exact enquiry appear to be these  
 “ four acts of the ministry, whereby the benefit of absolution  
 “ is ordinarily dispensed unto men.

“ 1. The power of administering the two sacraments  
 “ of baptism and the Lord’s supper to all such as are

---

\* See this fully proved, Orig. Eccles. book 19. Chap. 1. Sect. 1.

“ qualified to receive them: which is therefore called sacramental absolution.

“ 2. The power of declaring or publishing the terms of conditions, upon which the Gospel promises pardon and remission of sins, which is called the declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine.

“ 3. The power of interceding with God for pardon of sins through the merits of Christ; which is the absolution of prayer.

“ 4. The power of executing Church discipline and censures upon delinquents; which consists in excluding flagitious and scandalous sinners from the communion of the Church, and receiving penitents again into her communion, when they have given just evidences of a sincere repentance. In these four acts, regularly exercised, consists the ministerial power of retaining or remitting sins, so far as the delegated authority of man can be concerned in it.

“ 1. In the power of administering the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s supper to all such as are qualified to receive them. Baptism is the grand absolution of the Christian Church: \* for by it all men, who are admitted as living members of Christ’s mystical body, the Church, receive certain and universal remission of sins. Whence it had anciently the names of indulgence, and salvation, and remission of sins, † because these were the undoubted effects to all worthy receivers of it. Therefore so far as the ministers of Christ are authorized to admit proselytes and converts into the Church by the sacrament of baptism, so far they are empowered to grant remission of sins; because they administer that, of which the proper effect is the remission of sins; as it is the seal of God’s covenant, and means of conveying all the spiritual blessings of Christ’s death and passion to all those, who come in the sincerity of their hearts with due qualifications to receive it.

---

\* See the sense of the Ancients upon this point, Orig. Eccles. Book 19. Chap. 1. Sect. 2.

† Ibid.

“ Now it is certain the ministers of Christ are invested  
 “ with a power, not only to administer this sacrament  
 “ unto men, but also to judge by certain rules of probation,  
 “ who are proper and capable subjects of it; and according as  
 “ they find them qualified or unqualified, by bringing them  
 “ to the test of those rules, correspondently either to receive  
 “ them, or reject them from the privilege of baptism.  
 “ Which is in effect to grant them, or not grant them remis-  
 “ sion of sins, because it is to grant them, or not grant them  
 “ that ordinary means, which is made by Christ the seal of  
 “ remission of sins. The Ancients commonly found this  
 “ power of remitting or retaining sins in baptism upon these  
 “ very words of the text, and those other words of our  
 “ Saviour to Peter. “ Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,  
 “ shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose  
 “ on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.” St. Cyril of Alex-  
 “ andria expounding the words of the text, says, \* Spiritual  
 “ men remit or retain sins two ways: 1. When they call  
 “ those to baptism, who are worthy of it upon the account of  
 “ a good life and approved faith; or forbid and repel those  
 “ from the Divine gift, who are unworthy of it. 2. When  
 “ they punish and correct the children of the Church for of-  
 “ fending, and pardon them again upon their repentance.  
 “ St. Cyprian and St. Ambrose having to deal with the No-  
 “ vations, who denied the Church all manner of power to  
 “ pardon sins after baptism, argue with them upon this com-  
 “ mon principle acknowledged on both sides, that Christ gave  
 “ his ministers power to remit sins by baptism. For the  
 “ Novations did not deny this; therefore St. Ambrose re-  
 “ duces them to absurdity, with great acuteness, † putting  
 “ this question to them, why do ye baptize, if sins cannot be  
 “ remitted by the ministry of man? What is the difference,  
 “ whether priests assume this power, as given to them in the  
 “ exercise of penance, or in the administration of baptism?  
 “ Plainly implying, that the administration of baptism was  
 “ one way of remitting sins. And it may be said with truth,

---

\* Cyril. lib. 12. in Joan. xx. 23. tom. . p. 1101.

† Ambros. de Pœnitent. lib. 1. cap. 7.

“ that the Ancients were generally in these sentiments, \* and  
 “ perhaps to a man concurring in this opinion, that the mi-  
 “ nisters of Christ are instrumental in remitting of sins by  
 “ the administration of baptism.

“ It is true indeed, this power of giving or refusing  
 “ baptism to men, is not a mere arbitrary, absolute, or  
 “ despotic power, authorising the ministers of Christ  
 “ to give or refuse it at their own mere pleasure; but, as  
 “ was said, it is a ministerial power, tying them to certain  
 “ rules, whereby they are to judge, whether men be duly  
 “ qualified for baptism or not, and accordingly obliging them  
 “ to admit, or reject them. They are to examine, whether  
 “ men sincerely perform the ordinary conditions required of  
 “ all men that come to Christ’s Holy baptism; that is  
 “ whether they make profession of believing such necessary  
 “ articles of the Christian faith, as the Church has commonly  
 “ summed up in her creed; and whether they promise to  
 “ renounce Satan and all his works; and whether they  
 “ actually forsake his service by a manifest and plain con-  
 “ version and turning unto God, engaging themselves by  
 “ covenant to live in constant and perpetual obedience to al-  
 “ the laws of Christ. They, who take upon them these pro-  
 “ fessions, and actually perform these conditions, have a  
 “ right to demand baptism; and the ministers of Christ are  
 “ empowered and obliged to minister it to them; that is, to  
 “ seal unto them the remission of their sins. But if they  
 “ contumaciously refuse any one of these conditions; if  
 “ they either will not make profession of the several articles  
 “ of the Christian faith; or not renounce their old master,  
 “ and promise universal obedience unto Christ; or continue  
 “ in the open and avowed practice of any notorious vice, and  
 “ scandalous profession of life; then the ministers of Christ  
 “ are equally empowered to reject such men from baptism; †

---

\* See this proved, Orig. Eccles. Book 19. Chap. 1. Sect. 2.

† The practice of the primitive Church, in rejecting all such from baptism, who refused any of these necessary conditions, is largely set forth by St. Austin de Fide et Operibus, cap. 15. 17. 18. &c. and both out of him and others, in Orig. Eccles. Book 2. Chap. 5. Sect. 6. and Chap. 7. Sect 6. and 8.

“that is, to retain their sins, by denying them the ordinary means of remission and forgiveness.

“Thus far it is plain even to a demonstration, that the ministers of Christ are invested with a power of retaining or remitting sins, as they are appointed by Christ to be the administrators of baptism, and subordinate judges of the fitness and qualifications of such persons as are to be admitted to it. For they, who are entrusted with the ordinary administration of such a mystery, as conveys or seals remission of sins to men, must be allowed to be the proper instruments of binding and loosing, of retaining and remitting men’s sins, whilst they are authorized to admit the worthy, and reject the unworthy from the participation of such a mystery.

“The case is the very same with respect to their power in administering the other sacrament of the Lord’s supper. For that also is a means of conveying and sealing to men the remission of sins. It only differs from baptism in this; that baptism is the first grant of such a blessing, and the Lord’s supper is a further confirmation, or continuance and repetition of it. So that as ministers are empowered, by virtue of being stewards of Christ’s mysteries, to admit the worthy to a participation of the eucharist, and debar the unworthy, or scandalous and profane livers, from the benefit of such communion; so far they are invested with power of remitting or retaining men’s sins, as being proper judges of men’s qualifications for the reception or not reception of such a mystery, upon which, in the ordinary method and dispensation of God’s grace, remission of sins is made to depend.

“And herein consists the first act of the minister’s power in remitting or retaining sins, by applying to men the sacraments of the Church, in the use of which remission of sins is granted to all worthy receivers.

“2. The second act of this power is the declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine, which consists in publishing the terms and conditions, upon which the Gospel promises pardon and remission of sins. This is either general or particular: the general absolution is such as

“ our Church appoints every minister to pronounce after the  
 “ general confession of sins in her daily service; where it is  
 “ said, that God hath given power and commandment to his  
 “ ministers, to declare and pronounce to his people, being  
 “ penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins; by  
 “ virtue of which power they declare, that God pardoneth  
 “ and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly  
 “ believe his holy Gospel. This in effect, is done, whenever  
 “ a minister publishes or preaches the terms of the Gospel  
 “ to men, declaring in God’s name upon what conditions  
 “ remission of sins may be obtained; and the design of it is  
 “ to excite and encourage all sinners to repent and turn to  
 “ God in hopes of merey, and to give consolation and com-  
 “ fort to all such as do actually and sincerely turn to Him.  
 “ For which reason the Church has thought fit to insert this  
 “ into her public offices, and give it a place in her daily  
 “ Liturgy; which is a peculiar excellency and commen-  
 “ dation of her service, the want whereof is lamented in  
 “ some other Churches. For Calvin declares, \* he was very  
 “ desirous to have had such a general declaratory absolution  
 “ inserted into the Geneva Liturgy, but could not prevail  
 “ with his associates to introduce it.

“ But besides this general declaratory absolution retained in  
 “ our service, there is a more particular absolution appointed  
 “ to be given to single persons in some special cases; that  
 “ is, when men labour under troubles of mind and disquiet  
 “ of conscience for any particular sins, which they make  
 “ confession of to a minister, with proper signs of a genuine  
 “ repentance. In that case the minister is authorized, not  
 “ only to give them ghostly counsel and advice, but also the  
 “ benefit of absolution; that is, if upon a just examination  
 “ of their case, he judges them to be real penitents before  
 “ God, then he may not only declare to them the general  
 “ promises of pardon, but assure them in particular, that as far  
 “ as he can judge of their case by the visible tokens and in-  
 “ dications of their repentance, he esteems them absolved be-  
 “ fore God, and accordingly declares and pronounces to

---

\* Calvin. *Epist. De Quibusdam Ecclesiæ Ritibus.* p. 206.

“ them their absolution. This is no infallible judgment in-  
 “ deed, because one man may deceive another by specious  
 “ pretences of repentance, which are not always real: but  
 “ yet it is as great an assurance, as a prudent, sagacious, and  
 “ pious minister of Christ can give to his fellow creature for  
 “ his satisfaction, without particular inspiration.

“ And it must needs be of considerable weight and mo-  
 “ ment towards the satisfaction and comfort of an afflicted,  
 “ or a doubtful and desponding soul, to have the declaration  
 “ of a skilful physician to rely upon: to have one, who by  
 “ his office is qualified to be a proper judge in such cases,  
 “ to pronounce his absolution.

“ Therefore our Church, for the comfort of such penitent  
 “ sinners, has appointed the minister in two of her offices,  
 “ (the exhortation to the communion, and the visitation of  
 “ the sick), to grant such a particular absolution, saying in  
 “ one of them, “ By the authority of Jesus Christ committed  
 “ unto me, I absolve thee from all thy offences.” Which  
 “ though it be not an absolute authority, yet it is such a de-  
 “ claration of God’s will, as one man can make to another  
 “ upon the nicest enquiry into his state and maturest consi-  
 “ deration. It is like the priest’s declaration under the old  
 “ law concerning the leper, whether he was clean or  
 “ unclean: his declaration or judgment concerning such an  
 “ one is said to be the cleansing or polluting him; the  
 “ making him clean or unclean; though strictly speaking,  
 “ the priest did neither make him leprous, nor not leprous,  
 “ but only declare upon a just examination and view, whe-  
 “ ther he was so or not. In like manner St. Jerom, and the  
 “ master of the sentences, and many others after them, have  
 “ observed, \* that the ministers of the Gospel have that right  
 “ and office, in remitting or retaining sins, which the legal  
 “ priests had of old under the law in curing of the lepers:  
 “ they forgive sins or retain them, whilst they shew and de-  
 “ clare, that they are forgiven or retained by God. And  
 “ such a declaration, proceeding from the mouth of those

---

\* See the testimonies of St. Jerom and Peter Lombard related at length.  
 Orig. Eecles. Book 19. Chap. 2. Sect. 6.

“ who are constituted ministerial judges of particular men’s  
 “ repentance, is justly construed an evangelical absolution,  
 “ sufficient to minister satisfaction and comfort to the peni-  
 “ tent sinner.

“ 3. The third act of this ministerial power is interces-  
 “ sion with God for pardon of sins through the merits of  
 “ Christ; which is what the Church has always called the  
 “ absolution of prayer, joined to the absolution of the word  
 “ and sacraments. This always either implicitly or expressly  
 “ accompanies the other acts of absolution, \* as a chief part  
 “ of the minister’s office, which is to intercede and pray to  
 “ God for the sins of the people. The sacraments are  
 “ sometimes administered in a precatory form, as is that of  
 “ the Eucharist in our Liturgy: “ The body of our Lord  
 “ Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting  
 “ life.” And so some tell us, † that baptism now in the Greek  
 “ Church is administered in the like manner and form,  
 “ *Baptizetur servus Christi in nomine Patris, &c.* *Let the*  
 “ *servant of Christ be baptized in the name of the Father,*  
 “ *Son, and Holy Ghost, by way of prayer.* And though our  
 “ present form, “ I baptize thee,” differ a little from this; yet  
 “ it is always accompanied with prayers, that God would re-  
 “ lease the party baptized of his sins, and grant him all the  
 “ benefits of regeneration. So it is observable, that imme-  
 “ diately after the general declaratory absolution in our  
 “ Liturgy, the Church appoints the Lord’s prayer to be used,  
 “ as that whereby we obtain a general discharge or remis-  
 “ sion of sins of daily incursion. And some of our Church’s  
 “ forms of absolution are plain and direct prayers for pardon  
 “ and forgiveness. As that in the communion office after  
 “ the general confession; where the Rubrick says, “ *Then*  
 “ *shall the priest or the bishop being present, stand up, and*  
 “ *turning himself to the people, pronounce this absolution*  
 “ Almighty God our heavenly Father, who of His great  
 “ mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that  
 “ with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him, have

\* Confer. Orig. Eccles. Book 19. Chap. 1. Sect. 5. and Chap. 2 Sect. 4.

† Decretum Eugenii ad Calcem Con. Florent.

“mercy upon you, pardon and deliver you from all your  
 “sins, confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and  
 “bring you to everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our  
 “Lord.” Here the declaratory absolution, and the pre-  
 “catory are evidently joined together in the same prayer:  
 “for the prayer consists partly of a declaration of God’s  
 “promises to pardon true penitent sinners, and partly of an  
 “intercession with God for actual pardon for those particular  
 “sinners, for whom the minister then makes his application  
 “and address to the throne of grace. And there are many  
 “other such forms of absolution throughout the Liturgy of  
 “our Church. Nay, all the absolutions of the ancient  
 “Church, when penitents after excommunication and a long  
 “course of discipline were received into grace and favour  
 “again, were accompanied with imposition of hands and  
 “prayer,\* to denote that the ministerial benediction and in-  
 “tercession with God for sinners, was a principal, though  
 “not the only act of sacerdotal power in the business of  
 “evangelical absolution. And this was conformable to the  
 “rule of benediction given by Moses to the priests of the  
 “old law, Numb. 3. 27. “They shall put my name upon the  
 “children of Israel, and I will bless them.” It is God, pro-  
 “perly speaking, that blesses and pardons: and yet when  
 “the priests intercede with God for these things, they are  
 “also said in their way to give blessing and absolution. All  
 “which fully evinces intercession and prayer to be one sort  
 “of ministerial absolution, as it is a means in the hand of  
 “man, whereby God is pleased to derive and shower down  
 “the blessing of his absolution upon his people.

“There is yet a fourth instance of this power of remitting  
 “and retaining sins, which is the power of executing Church  
 “discipline and censures upon delinquents. This consists  
 “in excluding flagitious and scandalous sinners from the  
 “communion of the Church, and receiving penitents into  
 “communion again upon their submission and repentance.  
 “This is properly a judicial act: For as the ministers of

---

\* See this fully proved, Orig. Eccles. Book 19. Chap. 2. Sect. 4.

“ Christ are judges of men’s qualifications for their first admission into the Church by baptism, so are they judges of their qualifications for their continuance in the same; and as stewards of the mysteries of God, they are obliged to separate the precious from the vile, and distinguish the worthy receivers of those mysteries from the prophaners and contemners of them. “ Holy things are not to be given unto dogs, neither are pearls to be cast before swine.” And therefore when men debase themselves to those infamous and brutish characters, they have no longer a right to the privileges of Christian communion; but are to be lopt off as unsound branches, partly to avoid contagion and infection of the sound members, and partly to make the sinners themselves ashamed, and thereby bring them to reformation and amendment.

“ It is true indeed, this power is not arbitrary in the ministers of Christ. They are not to use this severest of punishments for every jealousy and suspicion of evil; nor yet for every light and trivial offence, which may be cured by other remedies; nor for greater and more heinous crimes, without previous admonition, and trial of other methods, which Christ has appointed to be used for the reformation of sinners; nor yet upon whole bodies of men, \* where there is danger of rooting up the wheat with the tares, and of doing more harm than good to the Church, by involving the innocent with the guilty, or laying whole Churches under interdict, or occasioning great and dangerous schisms, to the Church’s manifest peril and destruction, For the design of this power and discipline is for edification, and not for destruction; to cleanse and purify the Church, but not to shock its very constitution, and raze and overturn its foundations by an indiscreet and intemperate zeal for the preservation of it. And therefore here, if ever, the ministerial power is to be exercised with the greatest wisdom and prudence, as well as charity and concern for the souls of men, and the good of the whole com-

---

\* See the practice of the primitive Church illustrated in all these cases Orig. Eccles. Book 16. Chap. 3. Sect. 6. &c.]

"munity. Of all which the ministers of Christ are consti-  
 "tuted discretionary judges, invested with power to examine  
 "both men's faith and morals, and to exclude the scandalous  
 "and prophane, and to re-admit the truly penitent upon their  
 "giving evident tokens of a real conversion, and bringing  
 "forth fruits meet for repentance. They are Christ's substi-  
 "tutes and vicegerents in his Church, binding and loosing,  
 "opening and shutting with the keys of the kingdom of  
 "heaven: which so long as they use according to the  
 "rules prescribed them by Christ, their sentence, though  
 "only ministerial, is of great effect in the external commu-  
 "nion of the Church at present, and will be found to be of  
 "force, as a prejudging forerunner of the sentence of the last  
 "day. For under these limitations, and reserving a due pre-  
 "rogative to the infallible sovereignty of Christ, it cannot  
 "be doubted, but that whosoever sins they retain, they are  
 "retained; and whosoever sins they remit, they are  
 "remitted unto them."

"I should now have proceeded to the third enquiry,  
 "how far it is necessary for all men to submit to the minis-  
 "terial exercise of this power in all the four several branches  
 "of it thus explained? and also have reduced this whole  
 "consideration to practice. But because the just exami-  
 "nation of these things would exceed the limits of the pre-  
 "sent discourse, I shall only say these two things by way  
 "of general remark in the close of it.

"1. That the necessity of absolution in any kind is the  
 "same as the necessity of the thing by which it is wrought  
 "and ministered to us. So that if there be any necessity of  
 "receiving the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord's  
 "supper, there is the same necessity of receiving the sacra-  
 "mental absolution, that is conveyed to us by and in the use  
 "of those holy mysteries. If there be any necessity of  
 "having the conditions of the Gospel, and God's general  
 "promises of pardon declared to us, and applied to our  
 "souls; then there is an equal necessity of a general de-  
 "claratory absolution, to excite our hopes, and invigorate  
 "our faith, and engage us to a true repentance and holy  
 "obedience. If there be any necessity for an afflicted soul,

“ that labours under insuperable doubts and troubles of  
 “ mind, to be relieved of her burden, and to be quietly  
 “ settled in a state of comfort and satisfaction; then there is  
 “ a like necessity of a particular declaratory absolution. If  
 “ there be any necessity for the public prayers of the Church  
 “ to implore God’s mercy for the remission of sins to public  
 “ penitents; then there is the same necessity of a precatory  
 “ absolution. And finally, if there be any necessity for scan-  
 “ dalous sinners, who are cast out of the Church, to be  
 “ restored to the peace and communion of the Church  
 “ again, in order to make their peace with God; then there  
 “ is a necessity of a judicial absolution. So far as any of  
 “ these offices and ministries are necessary in the Church, so  
 “ far the several sorts of absolution, which depend upon them,  
 “ must be concluded to be necessary likewise. And so far  
 “ a respect is due to them, as the ordinances of God: inso-  
 “ much as that where they may be ordinarily had, they are  
 “ not ordinarily to be omitted; much less to be despised or  
 “ neglected; because that, in other words, is the same  
 “ thing as contemning the sacraments of Christ, and public  
 “ prayer, and preaching, and the discipline and censures of  
 “ the Church, which are ordinances of God’s own appoint-  
 “ ing.

“ 2. The other thing, I am to remark in the close of this  
 “ discourse, is, that whatever necessity there be of an  
 “ external absolution, yet there is still a greater necessity of  
 “ the internal qualifications of men’s own minds in order to  
 “ receive it. These qualifications are a true faith, a true  
 “ repentance, and new obedience of life; which are the  
 “ Gospel conditions, required to make any human absolution  
 “ effectual to our pardon. God may, and sometimes does,  
 “ where there is no contempt, dispense with the want of  
 “ the former, but He never dispenses with the latter: ‘For  
 “ without holiness no man shall see the Lord.’ It is neither  
 “ confession nor attrition, nor an external absolution of any  
 “ kind, but only a sincere conversion, that will qualify us for  
 “ his pardon. And therefore, as ever we expect to be ab-  
 “ solved in heaven, we must prepare ourselves with those  
 “ qualifications, which alone can give us security at the day

“ of judgment. God of His mercy inspire us all with these  
“ most necessary qualifications, through the intercession and  
“ merits of the great high priest of our profession, Jesus  
“ Christ our blessed Lord and Saviour. To whom,” &c.

## SERMON II.

JOHN XX. 23.

*Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.*

In the former discourse upon these words I proposed three enquiries to be made concerning the doctrine and exercise of ministerial absolution:

1. To examine into the nature of this power in general, as it belongs to man: because, notwithstanding the commission and authority granted to man, there is still a vast difference to be made between the power of forgiving sins as exercised by God, and as exercised by man.

2. To examine more particularly into the nature of the several sorts of absolution, as exercised by man.

3. To enquire how far all men are concerned to submit to the exercise of this power in the several branches of it.

I have already discoursed of the two first, and now proceed to the third enquiry. In resolving of which it will be proper to consider the question distinctly with respect to the four several branches of ministerial absolution: the absolution of the two sacraments; the declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine; the precatory absolution and the judicial absolution of public discipline. Concerning all which it has already been observed in general, that so far as either the sacraments, or preaching of the word, or public prayer, or public discipline, are of any use and force in the Christian Church, so far the absolutions are to be embraced, that attend any of these divine institutions. I shall now make a more particular enquiry into the necessity of each of them.

1. I begin with the necessity of sacramental absolution. Concerning which it must be asserted, that whatever neces-

sity there is of receiving the sacrament of baptism, or the Lord's supper, appointed for all, who have opportunity to receive them; there is the same necessity of receiving the sacramental absolution that depends upon them: because they are so intimately united and linked together, that they cannot be separated from each other; neither does God dispense with the want of sacramental absolution in any case, but where He dispenses with the want of the sacraments themselves. God can indeed, and often does dispense with the want of the sacraments, and supply them by his extraordinary grace, where either by the frowardness of his ministers, or their neglect, or some unforeseen accident, or natural incapacity, there is no possibility of receiving them: \* but men's own neglect or contempt of his ordinances will doubtless be imputed to them as a crime, for which they must expect to give account to the Sovereign Author of these institutions at his great tribunal. So in the like cases, if men through any unavoidable necessity want the absolution, which is exhibited in these two sacraments, God can supply this defect, and by his extraordinary grace grant them absolution in some other way: but if men are justly debarred by the ministers of God from the sacramental absolution, or pardon of sins belonging to these sacraments, not by any necessity, but only for their own contumacy, in refusing to qualify themselves by the performance of such conditions as are required of worthy receivers; in this case the minister's act, in retaining their sins, and refusing them this sacramental absolution, because he judges them apparently unqualified for it, and unworthy of it, will doubtless be ratified and confirmed by Christ, as the supreme judge, and assessor of his own authority given unto men to retain sins, and deny absolution to those, who are professed despisers and contemners of the conditions upon which He has offered it. And this plainly shews what necessity there is of absolution, as that signifies in the first place the absolution of the two sacraments, which is to be granted to the worthy, and, as far as human judgment can go, to no other but those

---

\* See the sense of the Ancients upon this point, Orig. Eccles. Book 10. Chap. 1. Sect. 20. 21. &c.

that are worthy of it. Therefore men are to prepare for this absolution, for the same reasons that they are to prepare for the reception of either of the sacraments, which in the ordinary methods and ways of dispensing God's grace, are made the necessary means of salvation.

2. In the next place for the declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine. Whatever necessity there is of having the truth of God's promises operatively and effectively applied to men's souls, in order to work in them faith and hope, repentance, and new obedience: that very necessity there is of this general declaratory absolution, either at first to create and excite, or afterwards to foment and cherish these good qualities, upon which the pardon of sins depends. "Faith," we are told, "comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." And men do not ordinarily "hear without a preacher," nor ordinarily preach, "except they be sent." Therefore as it is necessary that men should "believe and repent, and obey the Gospel;" so it is necessary they should hear the general declarations of pardon, which God has made in his Gospel on the one hand, and the declarations of wrath revealed from heaven on the other hand, in order to engage them to comply with those terms, upon which the Gospel makes the remission of sins to depend. And as the heralds of the Gospel are obliged to preach and declare the mind of God toward repenting and unrepenting sinners; so every man is concerned to "hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously," as he expects to find favour and mercy of God at the day of judgment. This is the necessity and use of declaratory absolutions, both to beget, and to support that faith, which is the first spring and foundation of a Christian life. It is the word of God, whereby "we are begotten to a lively hope through the Gospel." And we may reasonably suppose, that faith will last no longer than the preaching of the Gospel does in the world. When Antichrist is come to his full height, and seated in the meridian of his kingdom; when instead of Gospel-truth, he shall fill men with error by "signs and lying wonders, and all deceivableness of unrighteousness;" then will be verified what our Saviour has predicted, "when the son of man cometh, shall he find faith on earth?"

It will be impossible to maintain faith generally among men, without the constant declarations of the Gospel to support it. And that, if any thing, may convince us of the necessary use of a true Gospel ministry, or such an order of men, as have authority and commission to declare the will of God, to keep the very faith itself from dwindling into nothing.

But I told you, that besides the general declarations of the Gospel, there was sometimes a more particular declaratory absolution necessary to relieve a distressed and wounded conscience, and extricate a desponding and doubtful sinner out of the fears and perplexing labyrinths of sin: and the very necessity of comfort to the feeble minded, in such a case, is a sufficient argument of the necessity of such an absolution. For whither should an anxious and afflicted soul betake herself, but to those whom God has appointed as proper helps and judges in the case? Whose office invests them with something of authority, and whose studies and experience qualify them to search and examine into the nature of spiritual diseases, and then judge of proper methods of cure, and apply suitable remedies to them. Should such a soul fly immediately and solely to God? That indeed would be very well, had she sufficient faith, and courage, and confidence to approach Him. But He is the person, whom she has offended, and now she thinks of nothing but his wrath and indignation. Should she betake herself to the Son of God, the great intercessor and mediator between God and man? All would be right in this case too, could she come with full assurance of faith to Him, as to a merciful and faithful High Priest, who is both able and willing to save to the uttermost all that truly turn to Him. But that is her great misfortune, and her very disease, that she dares not come now so boldly to the throne of grace to find help in time of need: or if she does come even with prayers and tears to Christ, she is afraid they will not be accepted; because she can now hardly look upon Him as her Saviour, but as her offended Judge. She is overwhelmed and confounded with her own ingratitude, to think, that she was once like an angel of light, pure and im-

maculate in the blood of Christ; but now she has deserted her station, and is fallen from grace. She was once enlightened, and had tasted of the heavenly gift, and was made partaker of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come: but now she is fallen away, and has crucified to herself the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. She has trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith she was sanctified, an unholy thing, and has done despite to the spirit of Grace. And how shall she make her addresses to Christ, whom she has thus shamefully abused? What then? Shall she call in the assistance and counsel of the holy Angels? They are ministring Spirits indeed, sent forth to minister to those who are heirs of salvation; but their ministry is wholly spiritual and indiscernible: they maintain now no visible intercourse with men. But she has need of some visible comforter, to whom she may lay open her grief, and take his advice in the midst of all her sorrows; and this must be some of her visible fellow creatures: and who so proper among these, as those whom God Himself has appointed for this purpose? Private men may shew their charity to such a languishing soul, as far as their knowledge and abilities will direct them: but yet after all there may be a necessity of some further assistance. And whence may that more reasonably be expected, than from the mouths of those, whose lips should preserve knowledge? Whose studies are the holy scriptures; whose business is to explain them to men; to solve their doubts, and take off their scruples; to examine their repentance, and compare it for them with the rule of God's word; and chiefly to guard them against the wiles of Satan, and teach them not to wrest the Scripture to their own destruction. For this is commonly the most difficult part in this whole affair with such distressed souls, to fortify them against the subtleties of Satan, who transforms himself into an Angel of light, and teaches them to plead Scripture against themselves; making that which was designed for their health and strength, become to them an occasion of falling; and robbing them of their peace by that very instrument, which was intended

to raise their hopes, and fix their consolation. Indeed this is Satan's master-piece of temptation, to accost and tempt us in Scripture dialect, and with the tongue of an Angel: and he never speaks more like himself, that is, more artfully subtle and diabolical, than when he speaks to us the language of heaven. Thus he tempted our Saviour Himself, by quoting scripture; by saying, thus and thus it is written. And what wonder then, that he should use the same weapon against other men, who are less able to resist him? But the weaker men are, and the more they are liable to temptation, the greater necessity there is in that case, that they should have recourse to some abler hand, who can give them both succour and direction; who can rightly apply the word of God to their souls, and give them a right apprehension both of God and themselves; who can set every text of Scripture, which Satan abuses, in its proper light; and so baffle all his arguments, and countermines all his plots by the same instrument, which he abuses with a design to beguile men and overthrow them.

It would be well indeed, if all men could so dexterously use the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, as that they might be able of themselves, like our Saviour in his temptation, to answer and repel all Satan's sophistry and false glosses upon the holy Text, by juster comments and more pertinent allegations. But if this cannot be expected from the weaker sort, it is necessary they should in such cases betake themselves for help to those, that are more experienced, and have their senses more exercised to discern between good and evil.

Common reason and interest direct men what to do, when they are under any doubts or difficulties in all other concerns. He who doubts his title to a temporal estate, thinks himself obliged to consult an able lawyer, and take his advice and counsel; and in case of a bodily distemper every man as readily betakes himself to a skilful and experienced physician: and there is the same reason in spiritual distempers to engage a man to consult a spiritual guide, who may be presumed to be as learned and skilful in his profession as either of the former: his office obliges him to a more general

and exact study of the Scriptures; to be more expert and accurate in resolving cases of conscience, and more ready and prepared to answer all the objections, doubts and scruples, which either the natural weakness of men's own fancies, or the subtlety of Satan throws in upon their minds. His business and employment is to understand the nature of God, and his religion, and his laws, and the extent of his mercy, and terms of reconciliation to penitent sinners. He can therefore examine men's transgressions, and judge of their repentance and condition better than themselves. Besides all this he is constituted by God to be his minister here upon earth, for these very purposes; not only in Christ's stead to beseech them to be reconciled to God, and to shew them the method of reconciliation, and to pray for them; but also upon an impartial view of their condition, if he finds them real penitents, to declare them absolved by God, and in his favour: his commission is to assure them, that in spite of all that Satan can suggest to the contrary, there are no sins so great that God cannot pardon, provided they bring the condition of pardon, which is a true repentance: and he can judge, though not with an infallible judgment, yet with a moral certainty, whether their repentance be sincere and perfect; and give them directions to supply it where it is defective; and free them from all unreasonable scruples, which are apt to discompose and trouble their souls: all which must needs be of extraordinary and sovereign use to persons in such a condition, and afford them the surest relief, and the most solid comfort and satisfaction, that can be expected, without a particular revelation, on this side heaven.

So that the use and advantage of spiritual guides in such a case sufficiently discovers the reasonableness and necessity of making application to them, in order to obtain the benefit and comfort of a particular declaratory absolution.

And upon this account our Church, though she lays no necessary injunction upon men to make a particular confession of their sins to her ministers in all cases, yet wisely requires them in this one special case of exigency to do it for their own benefit and satisfaction. "If there be any of you,

who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience (viz. by confession to God alone) but requireth farther comfort and counsel, let him go to some discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." This I take to be the true state of the case, as to what concerns the necessity of a particular confession and a particular declaratory absolution. It is not simply necessary for all men, but only for those whose condition is such, that they cannot have peace and satisfaction without it. And therefore the Church of Rome is highly to blame, which imposes the absolute necessity of a particular confession, and a particular absolution, universally upon all men, in all cases of mortal sin, under pain of damnation. Our Church keeps closer to the rule of Scripture and the practice of the ancient Church, \* in making particular absolution only necessary to those, to whom the necessity of the case itself makes it so. And so much for the necessary use of a general or particular declaratory absolution.

3. The next part of our enquiry is concerning the necessity of a precatory absolution: and of this there is the same necessity that there is of the prayers of the Church for pardon of sins. We have observed before, that prayer usually accompanies all other sorts of absolution, and is an ingredient, and as it were the form of some of them. The sacraments are ordinarily administered with prayer; and prayer always immediately follows the declaration of God's will and intention to pardon penitent sinners in our public Liturgy; and prayer is the means commonly used to reconcile a scandalous offender, who for his crimes has been judicially cast out of the Church, and is now to be received again to peace and favour. So that as necessary as any of those absolutions are, so necessary is the absolution of prayer, that always so necessarily attends them. If it be

---

\* See the practice of the primitive Church in relation to auricular confession. Orig. Eccles. Book 18. Chap. 3. Sect. 1. &c.

necessary at first for a man to be released of his sins by the sacrament of baptism; it must be equally necessary for him to be admitted a member of Christ by the prayer, which the administration of that sacrament either includes or supposes: if he would have absolution by the Eucharist, he must receive it with that usual form of prayer which the Church has appointed to be used in the distribution of it. If he would have the general or particular declaration of God's will to pardon sinners, made effectual to his own absolution, he must join with the minister interceding with God for the pardon of his offences. And if after any excommunication for any scandalous offence, he would be admitted formally into the communion of the Church again, he must implore God's mercy by the public ministry and prayer of his priests, because that is the rite and ceremony of such an admission. \*

4. And hence it follows in the last place, that when men are formally and judicially cast out of the Church, by the power of the keys, for any scandalous offences, there is a necessity they should have as formal and judicial an absolution, by an authentic relaxation of their bonds and censures, to restore them again to the peace and privileges of Church communion. For if the excommunication be just and according to the rules of Christ's Gospel, they must either sue for an absolution in the way that he has appointed, or else the bonds that are laid upon them, will stand in full force against them; and their excommunication and expulsion from the Church on earth will exclude them from the kingdom of Heaven. I say, if their excommunication be just, and legally founded. For it is one thing, when men are unjustly cast out of the Church, and excommunicated without reason, by the rash exercise of a mere tyrannical and arbitrary power; and quite another thing, when they are legally censured for their impenitency, and obstinate persisting in flagrant and notorious crimes, to the scandal of the Church, and reproach of Christ's holy religion. In the former case there is no danger to be feared from excommunication, because it is unjust; but in the latter case it is the

---

\* See Orig. Eccles. Book 19. Chap. 2. Sect. 4.

most dreadful sentence that can be passed upon earth against man; because what is done upon earth, will be ratified in Heaven, and pursue a man unto the day of judgment, unless a timely and sincere repentance and reconciliation intervene to retract the sentence. Which abundantly shews the necessity of this sort of absolution, and of all such things as are previous and necessary to obtain it. Men must truly repent of the crimes which have given the scandal; make humble and public confession of their sins before the Church; modestly submit to her discipline, and give evident tokens of their hearty sorrow for having offended God and man: and then after such satisfaction made, to convince the Church of their true repentance by bringing forth fruits meet for it, they must sue to the same hands to admit them to communion, which were the instruments under Christ of taking it from them: and they by the same authority, wherewith they cast them out of the Church, will receive them again; making prayer and intercession to God for them; and declaring them absolved from the bonds they were under, and now fully restored to all the privileges of Christian communion. But without such a proper satisfaction as this, if men continue obstinate in their sins, in a careless impenitency, or contumacious neglect or contempt of the Church's censures, they may be assured, that an account of these misdemeanors, added to all their other sins, will be required of them another day; when Christ will vindicate the authority of his ministers in all their just proceedings, and confirm their sentence by his unalterable approbation.

What allowances God will make for some men's weakness or ignorance in this affair, belongs not to us to determine. Neither would it be charitable in us, positively to condemn every man that dies excommunicate in *foro externo*, without an actual relaxation of his bonds, when he was truly penitent, and desirous to be reconciled to the Church; but only some unforeseen accident and unavoidable exigency prevented the execution of his good intention. In this case the Church has generally accepted the will for the deed, and

declared such to be virtually in her communion after death,\* in like manner as they, who die without baptism or the eucharist, not by any contempt, but by some pressing necessity, are charitably supposed to die in God's favor by virtue of their faith and repentance, because they do not despise God's ordinances, but heartily desire them: but the case is otherwise with men that live and die in contempt of the Church's discipline and censures; if such men perish, they may thank themselves for it: the Church has no power to absolve those who will not be absolved: if they suffer their sins to be retained on earth, they will be retained in heaven, and follow them to the day of judgment.

And so I have done with the third enquiry, how far all men are bound to submit to the lawful exercise of the ministerial power of retaining and remitting sin? or what necessity there is of absolution in the several cases now before us?

“ It now only remains, that we reduce this whole consideration to practice, and shew what are the proper uses of this doctrine, both as it relates to the ministers of Christ, and his people.

“ As to the ministers of Christ, there is no doctrine in the whole body of Christianity more foreible than this, to engage them either, first, to purity and holiness of life; or secondly, to diligence in their studies and labours; or thirdly, to fidelity in dispensing the mysteries of Christ, and care in their proceedings with penitent and impenitent sinners.

“ 1. In the first place, the commission of power to ministers to retain and remit other men's sins, in whatever sense we take it, is a great engagement on them to lead holy and pure lives themselves. For it looks like an absurdity in practice, and is too often really thought so, that men should be qualified to forgive other men's sins, who are loaded with guilt and impurity themselves. There is nothing so natural and obvious as, ‘Physician, heal thyself:’ and therefore if it be not a real objection

---

\* See Orig. Eccles. Book 19. Chap. 2. Sect. 11.

“ against their office, yet it is an unanswerable one against  
 “ their persons. If it do not destroy the tenour of their com-  
 “ mission in the nature of the thing, yet it certainly diminishes  
 “ their authority and reputation in the opinion of men ; when  
 “ every profligate sinner can retort upon them, and say,  
 “ ‘ Thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself ?  
 “ Thou that preachest, a man should not steal, dost thou  
 “ steal ? Thou that sayest, a man should not commit adultery,  
 “ dost thou commit adultery ? Thou that makest thy boast  
 “ of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou  
 “ God ?’ It must needs take off very much from the veneration  
 “ of the sacrament of baptism, to have a man pretend  
 “ to wash away the sins of others, who is himself polluted  
 “ and profane ; and equally diminish the reverence which  
 “ is due to the tremendous mystery of the Eucharist, to have  
 “ it ministered with unholy hands. It cannot relish well  
 “ with men, to hear an unsanctified mouth give blessing to  
 “ others, who in effect is cursing himself ; praying, that  
 “ the blood of Christ may preserve others to eternal life,  
 “ whilst he himself is eating and drinking his own damna-  
 “ tion, not discerning the Lord’s body. But above all,  
 “ such a man cannot with any tolerable decency or free-  
 “ dom discharge the office of punishing and correcting  
 “ others, who is himself more justly liable to rebuke and  
 “ censure. With what face can he debar others from bap-  
 “ tism or the Eucharist, who is himself unqualified to receive  
 “ either ? Or exclude others from the church, who is him-  
 “ self unworthy to enter into it ? Nothing therefore can be a  
 “ greater engagement upon ministers to lead holy and pure  
 “ lives, than the consideration of the commission which  
 “ Christ has given them to retain or remit other men’s sins,  
 “ whether in a sacramental way, or a declaratory way, or a  
 “ precatory way, or a judicial way : because without purity  
 “ they can by no means answer the end of this office, and  
 “ the nature of their trust, but their mal-administration will  
 “ rise up in judgment against them and condemn them.

“ 2. A second thing, which this office of retaining and  
 “ remitting sins requires of ministers, is great diligence in  
 “ their studies and labours, without which they can never

“ be able sufficiently to discharge it. The Church indeed  
 “ has made some part of this work tolerably easy, by a  
 “ prudent provision of many proper general forms of abso-  
 “ lution; such as the forms of administering the absolution  
 “ of the two sacraments, and many general forms of decla-  
 “ ratory and precatory absolution; to which in her wisdom  
 “ she may add proper forms of excommunication and judi-  
 “ cial absolution. But when this is done, there still re-  
 “ mains a great deal more belonging to the full discharge  
 “ of this office, for which the Church can make no particu-  
 “ lar provision: and therefore that must be left to the indus-  
 “ try and diligence of ministers in their particular studies  
 “ and labours. And this requires both a diffused know-  
 “ ledge, and great application; to be able to understand  
 “ the nature of all God’s laws, and the bounds and distinc-  
 “ tions betwixt every virtue and vice; to be able to resolve  
 “ all ordinary cases of conscience, and answer such doubts  
 “ and scruples as are apt to arise in men’s minds; to know  
 “ the qualifications of particular men, and the nature and  
 “ degrees and sincerity of their repentance, in order to  
 “ give them a satisfactory answer to their demands, and  
 “ grant or refuse them the several sorts of absolution,  
 “ as they shall think proper upon an impartial view of their  
 “ state and condition. He that thinks all this may be done  
 “ without any great labour and study, and a diligent search  
 “ of the holy Scriptures, the rule and record of God’s will,  
 “ seems neither to understand the nature of his office, nor  
 “ the needs of men; nor what it is to stand in the place of  
 “ Christ, and judge for him between God and man. The  
 “ priest’s lips should preserve knowledge: and a man that  
 “ considers the large extent of that knowledge, together  
 “ with the great variety of cases and persons, to which he  
 “ may have occasion to apply it, would rather be tempted  
 “ to cry out with the Apostle, ‘ Who is sufficient for these  
 “ things?’ and if this be not an argument to engage a man  
 “ to industry in the office of a spiritual physician, it is hard  
 “ to say what is so.

“ 3. But as this consideration is an argument for purity  
 “ and industry, so it is no less an engagement to fidelity

“ also. It is required in stewards, the Apostle tells us, that  
 “ a man be found faithful; and more especially in those who  
 “ are stewards of the mysteries of God, because that is the  
 “ greatest concern of any other. It was Moses’s argu-  
 “ ment to temporal judges, Deut. i. 17, “ Ye shall not  
 “ respect persons in judgment, for the judgment is God’s:”  
 “ and the argument will hold much stronger in spiritual  
 “ judgment, because the consequence of the decision is of  
 “ greater importance. Here then a just medium is always  
 “ to be observed between flattery and an imperious stiffness  
 “ and moroseness; between too great indulgence on the  
 “ one hand, and too great severity on the other. The  
 “ judgment is God’s; and therefore men are neither to be  
 “ absolved nor condemned at the mere arbitrary will of the  
 “ minister, but by the rules prescribed by the Sovereign  
 “ Lord. If men are either to be received into the Church,  
 “ or to be cast out of it, the only thing here to be regarded,  
 “ is their performance or non-performance of the conditions  
 “ which the Gospel requires. No true penitent is to be de-  
 “ nied absolution in any kind: no impenitent person for any  
 “ favour or respect to have the benefit of it. If men are qua-  
 “ lified for baptism or the Eucharist, it is not in the minis-  
 “ ter’s power, properly speaking, to deny them the privilege  
 “ of either: if they are utterly unqualified, it is not in his  
 “ power to admit them to either, if he will be just to his  
 “ commission and faithful to his trust. So neither can he,  
 “ with an equitable judgment, declare the impenitent to be  
 “ absolved, nor retain the sins of the penitent: for this is  
 “ slaying the souls that should not die; and saving the  
 “ souls alive, that should not live: it is making the heart of  
 “ the righteous sad, whom God has not made sad; and  
 “ strengthening the hands of the wicked, that he should not  
 “ return from his wicked way, by promising him life; as  
 “ God complains of the false prophets by the prophet  
 “ Ezekiel, Chap. xiii. 19. 22. All this is a manifest abuse of  
 “ the ministerial power, tending directly to discourage vir-  
 “ tue and encourage vice: and all such judgments God  
 “ Himself will reverse, and punish the mal-administration of  
 “ his unfaithful stewards. For as in all cases, so especially

“ in this, he that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord. Nothing therefore is more necessary in the stewards of the mysteries of God, than that they be found faithful; giving to every man his proper portion, peace to the righteous, and terror to the wicked; otherwise they are threatened to have their portion with the hypocrites, where shall be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth. It is a Pharisaical arrogance, St. Jerom says,\* for a bishop or a priest, under pretence of having the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to assume to himself the power of condemning the innocent, or of absolving the guilty. He that does so, abuses his commission, and must expect to give account to God of his illegal administration.

“ Thus we see, what ties and obligations this doctrine lays upon the stewards of God, to be first holy, secondly diligent, thirdly faithful in their service. Let us now see what influence the same doctrine ought to have upon all God’s people.

“ And here I shall not insist upon any personal respect that is due from them to ministers, as the messengers of God and ambassadors of Christ, but only as a religious regard is to be had to the several parts of the office with which they are intrusted. If God has made them the instruments of remission of sins by those four several ways of absolution; then at least it becomes every one to be careful, that he do not by any wilful neglect or contempt deprive himself of any one of those methods of expiation.

“ In baptism be an ordinary means of remission of sins, and so necessary by divine command, that unless a man, who has opportunity, be born again of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God; it highly concerns all men, who are unbaptized, to present themselves and their children to Christ’s holy ordinance, that they may receive the promised remission of sins, and spiritual regeneration. For though zealous martyrs and

---

\* Hieron. Com. in Mat. xvi. tom. 9, p. 49. See the place at length, Orig. Eccles. Book 19. Chap. 2. Sect. 6.

“ pious catechumens may be saved in an extraordinary way,  
 “ yet that is not the condition of despisers.

“ Again, if the Eucharist be another means of absolution,  
 “ then it equally concerns men not to live in the manifest  
 “ neglect or contempt of that holy ordinance, but to be as  
 “ frequent as they can in the reception of it, lest they de-  
 “ prive themselves of the grace and pardon exhibited and  
 “ sealed in that sacred institution.

“ If the prayers of the Church be likewise a further  
 “ means of deriving God’s blessing upon his people, that  
 “ must be allowed to be an argument to engage men con-  
 “ stantly to attend them: and every man should be glad to  
 “ say, we wait for thy loving kindness, O Lord, in the  
 “ midst of thy temple.

“ If the declaratory absolution be of any use and comfort  
 “ to true penitents, that should make men strive to be among  
 “ the first and foremost in God’s service, and rather wait at  
 “ the posts of his doors before the service begins, than come  
 “ dropping in afterwards, as if they were haled into God’s  
 “ presence, when they have lost both the benefit of their  
 “ own confession and his absolution.

“ If a particular declaratory absolution be of any use and  
 “ service to an afflicted conscience and a doubtful mind,  
 “ that should engage those, who cannot quiet their own  
 “ conscience, but require further comfort or counsel, to have  
 “ recourse to some discreet and learned minister of God’s  
 “ word, and open their grief; that by the ministry of God’s  
 “ holy word they may receive the benefit of absolution,  
 “ together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting  
 “ of their conscience, and avoiding all scruple and doubt-  
 “ fulness.

“ Lastly, if it be necessary, that when men are excom-  
 “ municated and cast out of the Church for any scandalous  
 “ crimes, they should endeavour to reconcile themselves  
 “ again to God and his Church, by obtaining a judicial ab-  
 “ solution; that shews what reverence is due to Church dis-  
 “ cipline and censures, that are justly past upon them; and  
 “ that a wilful neglect and contempt of reconciliation in  
 “ such a case may prove more fatal to them than they

“ are apt to imagine; and in the just judgment of Christ,  
“ confirming the sentence of his ministers, finally exclude  
“ them from the kingdom of heaven.

“ But when they have paid the greatest outward reverence imaginable to these ordinances, there is one thing still behind to make them effectual; which if it be wanting, all the absolutions in the world will avail them nothing: and that is the internal qualifications of their own hearts and souls by an unfeigned repentance and sincere obedience; without which all the rest are but mere forms that cannot completely operate, whilst men put in bars and impediments against them. For all absolutions are conditional, and suppose repentance and obedience, before they confer any real benefit on the sinner. The minister can only lend his mouth or his hand toward the external act of an absolution: but he cannot absolve internally, much less the unqualified sinner. Christ himself has assured us, that unless men repent they must inevitably perish; and that unless they forgive men their trespasses, their heavenly Father will not forgive them their trespasses. Now it would be absurd to think, after this, that a sinner who performs neither of these conditions, should notwithstanding be pardoned by God, continuing impenitent still; and only because he chancies surreptitiously to be loosed on earth by some error or fraud, that therefore he should be also most certainly loosed in heaven. This were to imagine one of the vainest things in the world, that Christ to make his priest's words true, would make his own words false: as they must needs be, if any outward absolution, given by a fallible and mistaken man, could translate an impenitent sinner into the kingdom of heaven.

“ I say not this to lessen the reverence that is due to any of the forementioned sorts of absolution, but that the ordinances of God may have their proper effect upon us, whilst the outward and inward acts go together, to make up the perfect work of an absolution; and that Christ may not say to us at the last day, ‘these things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone.’ He

“ that despises an absolution of any kind, which God has  
“ appointed, despises indeed the ordinance of God : but he,  
“ that receives it without repentance and obedience, despises  
“ the weightier things of the law, and only strains at a gnat  
“ to swallow a camel. Let not such a man think he shall  
“ receive any absolution from the Lord, who thus mangles  
“ his institution ; who puts asunder what God has joined  
“ together, and dares to promise himself security, where  
“ God threatens only ruin and destruction. If we would be  
“ secure, we must use God’s ordinances as He has ap-  
“ pointed them ; join the outward and inward act together ;  
“ let the repentance and obedience of our souls prepare the  
“ way for the ministry of his priests : and then what sins  
“ they remit upon earth, shall be remitted in heaven ; when  
“ Christ shall confirm the word of his servants, by his irre-  
“ versible sentence of absolution, saying, ‘ come ye blessed  
“ of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from  
“ the foundation of the world.’ Which God grant unto us  
“ all, through the merits of the same Jesus Christ our Lord :  
“ to whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost be ascribed  
“ all honour and glory world without end. Amen.”

A  
L E T T E R

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND THE

*LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,*

CONCERNING THE

NECESSITY OF ABSOLUTION;

SHEWING HOW FAR THAT NECESSITY EXTENDS AND

WHERE IT CEASES.

—◆—  
MY LORD,

HAVING read your question about the indispensable necessity of absolution in all cases whatsoever, I could not but return this speedy answer to it, so far as the time would permit, from what occurred to my thoughts without any tedious enquiry; reserving the further improvement and confirmation of the things here suggested to a little more diligent search and consideration.

The question about absolution may respect either, 1. that absolution which is given upon private or auricular confession: or, 2. the general absolution, which is given upon a general confession, as it is in our daily service: or, 3. that absolution, which is dispensed in the administration of the sacraments, which are indulgences in the true sense, \* and God's ordinances for obtaining absolution and remission of sins: or, 4. the absolution, that is given by the relaxation of

---

See the sacraments proved to be true indulgences and absolutions, Orig. Eccles. Book 19, Chap. 1. Sect. 2. and 3.

Church censures. Now the absolute and indispensable necessity of these several sorts of absolution in all cases whatsoever, is what, I conceive, neither our Church, nor the primitive Church ever asserted, though some of them are of much greater necessity than others.

For, 1. as to the absolution that is given upon private or auricular confession; that cannot be more necessary than the confession itself, which except in some particular cases, is only matter of advice, rather than strict duty imposed upon all men under pain of damnation; as our Church with the primitive Church defends, against the Roman imposition and yoke laid upon men's consciences in this particular. I shall not trouble your lordship with any ancient testimonies upon this point, unless you please to require me to transcribe some, which may easily be done out of Chrysostom and many others. \*

2. As to a general absolution upon a general confession, which is retained in our Liturgy, and is a defect in Calvin's: though it must be owned to be a very useful and edifying part and form of Divine service, which Calvin wished to have inserted into his Liturgy, † but could not obtain it, yet we cannot say, it is so necessary a part of Divine service, as that no Church can have absolution or remission of sins, without such a form of absolution in her Liturgy. For this would be an unwarrantable condemnation of all Churches that want that particular form, though they otherwise supply it by preaching, which is the declaratory application of God's promises of pardon to his Church.

3. The necessity of the absolution, which is dispensed in the administration of the sacraments, is indeed the same as the necessity of the sacraments themselves. So far therefore as the one is necessary, so far the other is necessary, likewise. But the necessity of the sacraments is not so absolute and indispensable, as that God cannot in many

---

\* See the testimonies against the necessity of auricular confession, collected Orig. Eccles. Book 18. Chap. 3. Sect. 1. and 2. &c.

† Calvin. Epist. de Quibusdam Eccles. Ritibus, p. 206.

cases, where there is no contempt of his ordinances, save men without the external application of them by the hand of his ministers. For in the case of extreme necessity, where men desire baptism, but cannot possibly have it, God supplies invisibly by his holy Spirit what is wanting in the outward administration. I believe there is not one ancient writer, who has spoken upon this head, but has allowed of some exceptions in reference to the absolute necessity of baptism: particularly in two cases: 1. In the case of martyrdom, which they call second baptism, and baptism in men's own blood. 2. In case of a true faith and conversion without martyrdom, when a catechumen was preparing for baptism, and desirous of it, but by some sudden accident was taken away before he had any opportunity to receive it. In these two cases they always maintained, that the baptism of the Spirit might be had without the external washing of water. Tertullian, speaking of martyrdom, \* calls it the Christian's second baptism, and the baptism of blood, of which our Lord spake, when he said, I have a baptism to be baptised with, when he had been baptised before in water. And He adds, this is that baptism, which both compensates for the want of baptism, and restores it, when men have lost the former benefit of it. Cyprian has the like observation upon the catechumens, who were called to shed their blood for Christ before they could be baptised in water: † “We are not to imagine,” says he, “that these men were deprived of the sacrament of baptism: for they were baptised with the most glorious and honourable baptism of their own blood, of which our Lord himself said, ‘I have another baptism to be baptised with.’” And he proves, that they, who were thus baptised in blood, are also sanctified and per-

---

\* Tertul. de Baptismo, cap. 16. p. 263. Edit. Rigalt. Par. 1641. Est quidem nobis etiam secundum lavaerum, unum et ipsum, sanguinis scilicet: de quo Dominus, habeo, inquit, baptismo tingi, quum jam tinctus fuisset.—Hic est baptismus, qui lavaerum et non acceptum representat, et perditum reddit.

† Cypr. Ep. 73. ad Jubaianum, p. 208. Edit. Oxon. Deinde nec privari baptismi sacramento, utpote qui baptizentur gloriosissimo et maximo sanguinis baptismo, de quo et Dominus dicebat, habere se alio baptismo baptizari.

fected by their sufferings, and made partakers of the promises of God, from the declaration made by our Saviour in his Gospel, when he said to the thief upon the cross, who believed in him and confessed him, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise."

St. Austin often mentions this argument of Cyprian, and improves it, to shew that not only martyrdom may sometimes supply the room of baptism, but also a true faith and conversion in case of absolute necessity, \* when a man has no opportunity to receive baptism. That martyrdom, says he, may sometimes supply the place of baptism, is well argued by Cyprian from the example of the thief, to whom, though he was not baptized, it was said, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Which argument I, considering over and over again, do find, that not only martyrdom for the name of Christ may supply what is wanting in baptism, but also faith and a true conversion of heart, if through straightness of time there be no opportunity to celebrate the mystery of baptism. For neither was that thief crucified for the name of Christ, but for the deserts of his own crimes; neither did he suffer because he believed, but only believed whilst he was suffering. Therefore his case declares how far that saying of the Apostle avails without the visible sacrament of baptism, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." But then only this invisible operation, is performed, when baptism is excluded purely by the article of necessity, and not by any contempt of religion. He argues

---

\* Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 4. cap. 22. Tom. 7. p. 56. Edit. Paris. 1635. Baptismi sanè vicem aliquandò implere passionem, de latrone illo, cui non baptizato dictum est, hodiè mecum eris in paradiso, non leve documentum B. Cyprianus assumit: quod etiam atque etiam considerans, invenio non tantùm passionem pro nomine Christi id quod ex baptismo deerat posse supplere, sed etiam fidem conversionemque cordis, si forte ad celebrandum mysterium baptismi in angustiis temporum succurri non potest. Neque enim latro ille pro nomine Christi crucifixus est, sed pro meritis facinorum suorum; nec quia credidit, passus est, sed dum patitur credidit. Quantum igitur valeat sine visibili sacramento baptismi quod ait Apostolus, "Corde creditur ad justitiam, ore autem confessio fit ad salutem," in illo latrone declaratum est: sed tunc impletur invisibilitèr, cùm ministerium baptismi non contemptus religionis, sed articulus necessitatis excludit.

in another place from the same example of the thief, \* that many are sanctified by the invisible grace without the visible sacraments: but yet the visible sacrament is not therefore to be contemned; because the contemner of it cannot by any means be sanctified by the invisible grace thereof.

Hence it is evident, that according to St. Austin's doctrine, it is not the bare want of an external ordinance, whether sacramental absolution, in the article of necessity, when it cannot be had, but the contempt of it when it may be had, that is pernicious and destructive of salvation. For God is able to supply the invisible grace without the visible means in such cases to true believers.

And upon this ground St. Ambrose comforts the surviving friends of the younger Valentinian, who was only a catechumen, preparing for baptism, but suddenly slain by the treachery of Arbogastes before he could come to St. Ambrose to receive it. If any one, says he, † be troubled, that the mysteries of baptism were not solemnized upon him, he may as well conclude, that the martyrs are not crowned, if they die whilst they are only catechumens. But if they be washed in their own blood, then this man also was washed by his piety and desire of baptism.

So that in such cases of necessity, baptism *in voto* is equivalent to actual baptism. God accepts the will for the deed, when men do what they can do, and where it is not contempt of the sacrament, but some unavoidable exigency, that hinders their reception of it. Now then, if in such cases the external ministry of baptism be not absolutely necessary, the external ministry of absolution cannot be necessary either: for they are the very same act in this particular: and if God can save martyrs and believers without visible and external baptism, he can absolve them without visible and external absolution.

---

\* Aug. Quæst. 84. in Levit. tom. 4. Proinde colligitur, invisibilem sanctificationem quibusdam affuisse atque profuisse sine visibilibus sacramentis.—Nec tamen ideò sacramentum visibile contemnendum; nam contemptor ejus sanctificari nullo modo potest.

† Ambros. Orat. de Obitu Valentin. tom. 3. p. 10. Edit. Basil. 1567. Si quia solennitèr non sunt celebrata mysteria, hoc movet: ergo nec martyres, si catechumeni fuerint, coronantur. Quòd si suo abluuntur sanguine, et hunc sua pietas abluit et voluntas.

Abundance of authorities might be added more, \* if there were occasion, in favour of this assertion.

4. For the absolution which is dispensed by the relaxation of the Church censures, though it be necessary to be sought after by true penitents in all ordinary cases, yet there are several exceptions in cases extraordinary, in which pardon may be had without a formal absolution. For what if a bishop for unjust ends, or unworthy designs, refuse to absolve a true penitent, when he both gives true signs of repentance, and humbly desires absolution? Will there be no pardon in heaven for him, who is so unjustly and imperiously denied it on earth by men, who exceed their power, which is only given to edification, and not to destruction? Bellarmine indeed says so, "*negatur remissio illis, quibus noluerint sacerdotes remittere.*" Ballarm. de Pœnit. lib. 3. cap. 2. tom. 2. p. 1287. Ed. Lugd. 1587. "*Forgiveness is denied to them whom the priests will not forgive.*" But this is carrying the priest's authority to an absolute sovereignty and arbitrary power, which has no foundation in scripture or the ancient Canons of the Church. For even Pope Gregory the Great could tell these men, that the bishop in binding and loosing those under his charge, doth often follow the motions of his own will, and not the merits of the cause: † in which case he deprives himself of this power of binding and loosing, who exercises the same according to his own will, and not according to the deserts of those who are subject to him; that is, his unrighteous judgment is of no value; it is reversed and cancelled in the court of Heaven.

The case here is the same as refusing baptism to those who are qualified for it, and very desirous to receive it: the minister's unjust refusal in that case is a very great crime; but it will not prejudice the person, who by such default is forced against his will, or the will of his parents to die

---

\* See more authorities of this kind. Orig. Eccles. Book 10. Chap. 2. Sect. 20. and 21.

† Greg. Hom. 26. in Evangel. tom. 3. p. 83. Edit. Antw. 1615. Sæpe in ligandis et solvendis subditis, suæ voluntatis motus, non autem causarum merita sequitur. Undè fit, ut hæc ipsâ ligandi et solvendi potestate se privet, qui hanc pro suis voluntatibus et non pro subjectorum moribus exercet.

without it. As Hinemar, \* archbishop of Rheims, long ago observed for the consolation of those in France, whose children died without baptism, through the perverse obstinacy of Hinemar, bishop of Laon, who refused them baptism, when their parents and godfathers earnestly desired it. “As the benignity of the Almighty,” says he, “perfected in the thief upon the cross, what was wanting in the sacrament of baptism, and the communion of the body and blood of Christ, because it was wanting not through pride or contempt, but by necessity; and as the faith of others, that is, of godfathers or sureties, answering for little children in baptism, is sufficient for the salvation of those, who are born obnoxious to original, that is, other men’s sin; so the faith and earnest desire of parents or godfathers, who believe with the heart, and with the mouth desire baptism for their infants, who could not obtain it, because you ordered it to be denied them, shall be of advantage to those infants, by the gift of Him, whose spirit is the author of regeneration; and who blows where He listeth.” Whence he concludes in the case of Church censures, that if a penitent dies without absolution, only because the bishop for his own will, or any unjust cause refuses to absolve him; the bishop’s unjust judgment and obstinate refusal, cannot prejudice the true penitent, as to what concerns his salvation and absolution in the kingdom of heaven.

2. But it may happen, that a man may not only desire absolution, but the minister also may be disposed and ready to grant it him; and yet by some unavoidable accident the man may die without it: in this case the canons have determined, that the want of absolution is no prejudice to his sal-

---

\* Hinemar. Opusc. 50. Capitular. cap. 48. tom. 2. p. 572. Edit. Paris. 1645, Sicut in illo latrone, quod ex baptismi sacramento et communicatione corporis et sanguinis Christi defuerat, complevit omnipotentis benignitas, qui non superbiâ, vel contemptu, sed necessitate defuerat; et sicut parvulis naturali, id est, alieno peccato, obnoxiiis, aliorum, id est, patronorum fides pro eis respondentium in baptisate fit ad salutem; ita parvulis, quibus baptismum denegari jussisti, parentum vel patronorum corde credentium, et pro parvulis suis fideli verbo baptisma expetentium, sed non impetrantium, fides et fidelis postulatio prodesse potuerit, dono ejus, ejus Spiritus, quo regeneratio fit, ubi vult, spirat.

vation ; nor was he to be treated as an excommunicate person, but to be received into the communion of the Church, and to be commemorated among the faithful in the service of the Church, though he died without absolution. The fourth council of Carthage and the second of Vaison are plain to this purpose. \*

These allegations plainly shew, what sort of necessity there is of absolution: that it is not the bare want of it, but the proud neglect or contempt of it, when men are under Church censures, that makes it hurtful. But where there is no contempt or neglect, salvation may be had without it. And therefore a true penitent, who submits to the Church's discipline, can be in no danger; because, though he may chance to die without absolution, either through necessity or the obstinate will of his superiors, yet he dies in no neglect or contempt of the Church; and consequently has no reason to doubt of God's absolution in heaven.

Your lordship's observation concerning the form, *Absolvo te*, is very just: it is but of a late date, a little before the time of Thomas Aquinas. The ancient forms were all either deprecatory, or declaratory, or else consisted in the application of the sacraments of the Church. And the *Absolvo te* is to be reduced to some of the other forms, as the elder schoolmen commonly reduce it: of all which I will endeavour to give your lordship a more full account in my next, taking it for an honour, that you are pleased to command any service of this kind from,

MY LORD,

your most dutiful and

obedient servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

Winton, Feb. 17, 1712-13.

---

\* Con. Carth. 4. can. 79. Con. Vaison. can. 2. See more of this Orig. Eccles. Book 19. Chap. 2. Sect. 2.

A SECOND  
L E T T E R

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND THE

*LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,*

CONCERNING THE

NECESSITY OF ABSOLUTION, &c.



MY LORD,

IN addition to my last upon the fourth sort of absolution, which is the relaxation of Church censures, I have observed the opinion of Cyprian to be conformable to what I wrote before, that if penitents died in the time of their penance, before they could have the bishop's absolution, their salvation was not to be despaired of. "For the divine mercy," says he, \* "is able to heal them: yet we ought not to be too hasty, nor do any thing inconsiderately or rashly; lest if we over hastily give them the peace of the Church, that is, restore them to communion before their penance was completed, we thereby more grievously offend and provoke

---

\* Cypr. Ep. 12. al. 17. Edit. Oxon. p. 39. Potens est divina misericordia medelam dare: properandum tamen non puto, nec incautè aliquid et festinantè gerendum, ne, dum temerè pax usurpatur, divinæ indignationis offensa graviùs provocetur.

the divine indignation." The case was this: Cyprian was now in exile, and some that had lapsed were very impatient to be restored to communion before his return; which he would not consent to, but ordered them to stay till he should return in peace, and then their cause should be examined before all the Church. If in the mean time they died, whilst they were doing their penance, God's mercy was able to save them without a formal absolution, or reception into the external communion of the Church. The learned bishop Fell gives the same exposition upon the place: "*Rectè auctor noster hoc sufflamen opponit lapsis, qui ad pacem festinarent, quòd non de eorum salute conclamatum sit, quibus ante pœnitentiæ decursum mori contingeret.*"—"Our author," says he, "rightly opposes the lapsers, who were so hasty to be restored, and stops their mouths with this consideration: that their salvation was not to be despaired of, though they chanced to die before their course of penance was ended."

2. It may be observed further, that according to the discipline sometimes used in the ancient Church, some very gross and scandalous criminals were denied the communion and peace of the Church, even at the point of death. The design of which was not absolutely to exclude them from heaven: for they still exhorted such to repent and cast themselves on God's mercy, though they thought fit to exercise such severity and rigour toward them in debarring them wholly from the communion of the Church, to be an example and terror to others. There are no less than twenty canons in the council of Eliberis to this purpose, \* that if men were guilty of such or such crimes there specified, they should not be restored to communion, no not at their last hour. The great council of Sardica has a canon of the like import, to repress some exorbitant usurpations of ambitious men: such an one, say they, † shall not be admitted

\* Con. Eliber. can. 1. 2. 3. 6. 7. 8. 10. 12. 13. 17. 18. 63. 64. 65. 66. 70. 71. 72. 73. 75. See these canons produced at large, Orig. Eccles. Book 18. Chap. 4. Sect. 4.

† Con. Sardic. can. 2. Con. tom. 2. p. 628. Τοιῶτον μηδὲ ἐν τῷ τέλει λαϊκῆς γένῃ ἀξιοῦσθαι κοινωνίας.

to lay communion even at his last hour. Yet they exhorted all such to repent, and accordingly admitted them to a state of public and perpetual penance in the Church, at the same time that they denied them communion to the last: as we find in the letters of Pope Innocent the first, who says, \* the ancient custom was to admit such to penance, but to refuse them communion. And so St. Ambrose, † writing to a consecrated virgin, who had sinned, bids her to continue in doing penance all her life, and not expect to be pardoned by human judgment. For she, that had sinned immediately against the Lord, was to expect absolution from Him alone in the day of judgment.

St. Austin ‡ makes the same observation upon such as relapsed into great crimes, after they had once done public penance in the Church, that a second penance was not allowed them in the Church: yet if they turned to God, He would not forget his mercy and patience toward them. In all these cases therefore, they thought pardon might be had from God, though no absolution was granted them in the Church.

Nor were even the Novatians so rigorous in this matter, as to assert, that God could not pardon those sinners, whom they refused to receive into communion, when they had once lapsed after baptism: for they encouraged them to repent, and hope for mercy from God, though they denied, that the Church had any power to receive them. This appears from what Aselepiades, the Novatian bishop, said in his discourse with Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, as Socrates § relates

\* Innoc. Epist. 3. ad Exuperium, cap. 2. conc. tom. 2. p. 1255. Consuetudo prior tenuit, ut concederetur pœnitentia, sed communio negaretur.

† Ambros. ad Virg. Lapsam, cap. 8. tom. 1. p. 137. Edit. Antwerp. 1567. Inhære pœnitentiæ usque ad extremum vitæ, nec tibi præsumas ab humano die posse veniam dari: quia decipit te, qui hoc tibi polliceri voluerit. Quæ enim propriè in dominium peccasti, ab illo solo te convenit in die iudicii expectare remedium.

‡ Aug. Ep. 44. ad Macedon. tom. 2. p. 92. Quamvis eis in ecclesiâ locum humillimæ pœnitentiæ non concedatur; Deus tamen super eorum patientiæ non obliviscitur. See more of this, Orig. Eccles. Book 18. Chap. 1. Sect. 1.

§ Socrat. lib. 7. cap. 25. p. 367. Edit. Paris. 1668. Θεὸν μόνον τὴν συγχώρησιν αὐτῶν ἐπιτρέποντες.

it, that they dealt with their laity only as the catholics sometimes did with their clergy, excluding them from communion unto death, and leaving their pardon only to God. This account is given of the Novatians by bishop Fell, \* bishop Beveridge, † cardinal Bona, ‡ Albaspinœus, § and others.

Whence it is evident, that though men might be denied absolution on earth, either for discipline's sake, as it was sometimes in the Church; or out of an erroneous opinion, that the Church had no power to receive sinners lapsing after baptism, as it was among the Novatians; yet if they truly repented, they might notwithstanding by God's mercy be received to pardon and absolution in heaven. All these cases do evidently shew it, according to the sense of the ancient Church.

As to the form, *Absolvo te*, it is agreed by learned men, that it was not known in the practice of the Church till a little before the time of Thomas Aquinas, who was one of the first that wrote in defence of it, about the year 1250, against another doctor, who maintained, that the ancient form of absolution in the Church was not this indicative form, but an impetratory form, by way of prayer, deprecation or benediction; viz. "*absolutionem et remissionem tribuat tibi Omnipotens Deus, Almighty God grant thee absolution and forgiveness.*" This doctor alledged the authority of Gulielmus Altissiodorensis, Gulielmus Parisiensis, and Hugo Cardinalis; and said, it was not then above thirty years since this new form began to be used. Thus much is collected out of Aquinas 22. *Opusculum de Formâ Absolutionis*, cap. 5. But we have not that book of Thomas's in our library here, and therefore I only send you what Morinus among the papists, not to mention bishop Usher || or any other protestant writers, has observed out of him concerning the original of this form, *Absolvo te*. Morinus ¶ proves at large, out

\* Fell. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 17. p. 36.

† Bevereg. Not. in Can. 8. Con. Nic. tom. 2. p. 68.

‡ Bona. Rer. Liturgic. lib. 1. cap. 17. Sect. 3.

§ Albaspin. Observat. lib. 2. cap. 21.

|| Usher's Answ. to the Challenge, p. 59. Lond. 1686.

¶ Morin. de Pœnitent. lib. 8. cap. 9. 10. &c.

of all the ancient rituals and Fathers, that the old forms of absolution were all by way of prayer. And it is evident from the ceremony of imposition of hands, which was always accompanied with prayer.

But our quarrel is not with the newness of this form, but with the abuses the Romish Church has affixed to it. For otherwise it may be lawfully used, as our Church appoints in the office of visitation of the sick. But then this power of absolution is only ministerial, not authoritative properly, directly, and absolutely, as our writers commonly word it. It does not empower a priest to open and shut heaven at his pleasure; to absolve without a true contrition, by a sacramental act conferring grace *ex opere operato*, actively, immediately, and instrumentally effecting the grace of justification, as Bellarmin would have it; who makes it also so necessary, that a man is denied forgiveness, if the priest will not forgive him. It may be authoritative and judicial in a ministerial way, as all acts of the ministry are under God. A declarative absolution is so, and an impetratory absolution is so, and an applicatory absolution by the sacraments is so, and a relaxation of Church censures is the same likewise. For all these are done by virtue of power and authority, communicated by God to his ambassadors, as the ministers of reconciliation under him. Only in all these absolutions they must observe certain rules, which if they do not observe, their absolution avails nothing in the court of Heaven.

Now this form, *Absolve te*, is understood to be no other than the declaratory absolution upon a special and particular case; when a man having confessed his sins, and given signs and indications of a true repentance, the minister declares to him, that as far as he can judge by the rule of God's word, his repentance is true; and therefore by virtue thereof he declares him absolved by God: but if there be any illusion or deceit in the man's heart, which no mortal can judge of, then notwithstanding this favourable sentence and judgment of the priest, God will judge him again and rectify the error of the keys by his unerring judgment.

Peter Lombard among the Schoolmen, following St. Jerom among the Ancients, gives this as the most probable sense of that kind of absolution. "We can affirm with truth," says he, \* "and believe, that God alone remits and retains sins: and yet He has given the power of binding and loosing to the Church; but He binds and looses after one manner, and the Church after another. For He remits sin by Himself alone, who cleanses the soul from inward pollution, and looses from the debt of eternal death. But He has not given this power to the priests, to whom yet He has given the power of binding and loosing, that is, of shewing who are bound or loosed. Upon which account the Lord, having first cured the leper by Himself, afterwards sent him to the priests, by whose judgment he was to be declared clean. And having first raised Lazarus to life, He then presented him to his disciples, that they should loose him. For though a man be loosed before God, yet he is not accounted loosed in the face of the Church, but by the judg-

---

\* Lombard Sentent. lib 4. dist. 18. p. 334. Ludg. 1594. Hoc sanè dicere et sentire possumus, quòd solus Deus dimittit peccata et retinet: et tamen ecclesiæ contulit potestatem ligandi et solvendi; sed aliter ipse solvit vel ligat, aliter ecclesia. Ipse enim per se tantùm dimittit peccatum, qui et animam mundat ab interiori maculâ, et à debito æternæ mortis solvit. Non autem hoc sacerdotibus concessit, quibus tamen tribuit potestatem solvendi et ligandi, id est, ostendendi homines ligatos vel solutos. Unde Dominus leprosum sanitati priùs per se restituit, deinde ad sacerdotes misit, quorum judicio ostenderetur mundatus. Ita etiam Lazarum jam vivificatum obtulit discipulis solvendum. Quia etsi aliquis apud Deum sit solutus, non tamen in facie ecclesiæ solutus habetur nisi per judicium sacerdotis. In solvendis ergo culpis vel retinendis ita operatur sacerdos evangelicus et judicat, sicut olim legalis in illis qui contaminati erant leprâ, quæ peccatum signat. Unde Hieronymus super Mat. xvi. ubi Dominus ait Petro, "Tibi dabo claves, &c." hunc, inquit, locum quidam non intelligentes, aliquid sumunt de supercilio Pharisæorum, ut damnare se innoxios, vel salvare se potent noxios; cùm apud Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed reoruna vita quærat. In levitico se ostendere sacerdotibus jubentur leprosi, quos illi non faciunt leprosos vel mundos, sed discernunt qui mundi vel immundi sunt. Ita ethic apertè ostenditur, quòd non semper Deus sequitur ecclesiæ judicium, quæ per surreptionem et ignorantiam interdum judicat: Deus autem semper judicat secundum veritatem. Et in remittendis vel retinendis culpis id juris et officii habent evangelici sacerdotes, quod olim habebant legales sùb lege in curandis leprosis. Hi ergo peccata dimittunt vel retinent, dum dimissa à Deo vel re-tenta judicant et ostendunt. Ponunt enim sacerdotes nomen Domini super filios Israel, sed ipse benedixit, ut legitur in Numeris.

ment of the priest. Therefore the evangelical priest, in loosing and retaining sins, acts and judges after the same manner as the legal priest did heretofore in the case of those who were defiled with leprosy, which is the emblem of sin. Whence St. Jerom commenting upon those words of our Lord to Peter, ‘to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven,’ says, “Some not understanding this place, assume to themselves something of the supercilious pride of the Pharisees, so as to imagine they have power to damn the innocent and save the guilty; whereas before God the only thing that is inquired into, is the life of the criminals, and not the sentence of the priests. In Leviticus the lepers are commanded to shew themselves to the priests, whom they do not make leprous or clean, but only shew who are clean or unclean. So here it is plainly declared, that God does not always follow the judgment of the Church, which sometimes judges by surreption and ignorance, but God always judges according to truth. And in remitting or retaining sins the evangelical priests have the same right and office, as the legal priests had of old under the law in curing the lepers. These therefore remit or retain sins, whilst they judge and declare them to be remitted or retained by God. For the priests put the name of the Lord upon the children of Israel, but He Himself blessed them, as it is read in Numbers vi.”

The Master of the Sentences here cites St. Jerom but imperfectly, and therefore I shall recite his testimony more exactly in his own words: “some bishops and priests,” says he, \* “not understanding that place where our Lord says to

---

\* Hieron. in Mat. 16. tom. 9. p. 49. Istum locum episcopi et presbyteri non intelligentes, aliquid sibi de pharisæorum assumunt supercilio, ut vel damnent innocentes, vel solvere se noxios arbitrentur: cum apud Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed reorum vita queratur. Legimus in Levitico de leprosis ubi jubentur, ut ostendant se sacerdotibus, et si lepram habuerint, tunc à sacerdote immundi fiant: non quo sacerdotes leprosos faciant et immundos, sed quo habeant notitiam leprosi et non leprosi, et possint discernere qui mundus, quive immundus sit. Quomodo ergo ibi leprosum sacerdos mundum vel immundum facit, sic et hic alligat vel solvit episcopus et presbyter, non eos qui insontes sunt vel noxii: sed pro officio suo, cum peccatorum audierit varietates, scit qui ligandus sit, quive solvendus.

Peter. 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,' &c. assume to themselves something of the supercilious pride of the Pharisees, so as to imagine they have power to damn the innocent or absolve the guilty; whereas before God the only thing that is enquired into, is the life of the criminals, and not the sentence of the priests. We read in Leviticus concerning the lepers, where they are commanded to shew themselves to the priests, and if they have the leprosy, they are then made unclean by the priest: not that the priests make them leprous and unclean, but because they had the power of judging who were leprous or not leprous, and might discern who were clean or unclean. As therefore there the priest makes the leper clean or unclean, so here the bishop and presbyter binds or looses; not making them innocent or guilty: but according to the tenour of his office, when he hears the distinction of sins or sinners, he knows who is to be bound, or who to be loosed."

There seems to be something wanting in the grammar of those words, *Non eos qui insontes sunt vel noxii*; and to make it coherent with what goes before, the word *faciens*, or the like, seems needful to be supplied. But all the rest is very plain, that as the priests of old did not properly make a man leprous or clean, but only declare whether he were so or not; so the priests of the new testament bind or loose men from their sins, by declaring who are to be bound or loosed.

Bishop Fell indeed has a more singular notion of the form, *Absolve te*:\* he supposes, that in every crime there are two things to be considered, viz. the offence against God, and the offence against the Church; the former of which is forgiven by God alone upon men's prayers and repentance; but the latter by this authoritative form, *I absolve thee*.

But this, though it may be true with respect to crimes that fall under public discipline, cannot well be the meaning of the form as it is used in our Liturgy, in the office of the visitation of the sick, which is the only place, as I remember, where our Church appoints it to be used. For in private

---

\* Fell. Not. in Cypr. de Lapsis. p. 136.

sins there is no offence given to the Church, and yet it is private sins, confessed privately to a minister, for which that Rubrick orders absolution to be given in this form, *Absolvo te*. So that though his interpretation may be good in reference to the Church's public absolution for public and scandalous crimes, \* which give offence to the Church: yet I think it cannot hold with respect to private crimes, because there no offence is given. Therefore it seems better to resolve it, as St. Jerom and Peter Lombard do, into a declarative form, and explain it by the example of the legal priests cleansing the leper, by declaring him to be clean.

I have now sent your lordship all that I have observed material in this dispute: but if there be any thing omitted or deficient, that you desire should be further considered, your lordship cannot more readily command, than I shall be ready to obey with the greatest pleasure, who am,

MY LORD,

your most dutiful and  
obedient servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

Winton, Feb. 24, 1712-13.

---

\* Vid. Orig. Eccles, Book 19. Chap. 2. Sect. 6.



*That the Reader may more easily have Recourse to the Passages alledged in this Work, I will here set down a Catalogue of the French National Synods, and such other Authors as I have made Use of in compiling the following Collections.*

National Synods of the Reformed Church of France.

- |                           |      |                         |      |
|---------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|
| 1. At Paris, ————         | 1559 | 26. At Charenton, 2d, — | 1631 |
| 2. At Poitiers, ———       | 1560 | 27. At Alençon, ————    | 1637 |
| 3. At Orleance, ———       | 1562 | 28. At Charenton, 3d, — | 1644 |
| 4. At Lyons, ————         | 1563 | 29. At Loudun, ————     | 1659 |
| 5. At Paris, the 2d, ———  | 1565 |                         |      |
| 6. At Vertueil, ————      | 1567 |                         |      |
| 7. At Rochel, ————        | 1571 |                         |      |
| 8. At Nismes, ————        | 1572 |                         |      |
| 9. At St. Foy, ————       | 1578 |                         |      |
| 10. At Figeac, ————       | 1579 |                         |      |
| 11. At Rochel the 2d, —   | 1581 |                         |      |
| 12. At Vitvè, ————        | 1583 |                         |      |
| 13. At Montauban, ———     | 1594 |                         |      |
| 14. At Saumur, ————       | 1596 |                         |      |
| 15. At Montpellier, ———   | 1598 |                         |      |
| 16. At Gergeau, ————      | 1601 |                         |      |
| 17. At Gap, ————          | 1603 |                         |      |
| 18. At Rochel, the 3d, —  | 1607 |                         |      |
| 19. At St. Maixant, ———   | 1609 |                         |      |
| 20. At Privas, ————       | 1612 |                         |      |
| 21. At Tonneins, ————     | 1614 |                         |      |
| 22. At Vitvè, the 2d, ——— | 1617 |                         |      |
| 23. At Alez, ————         | 1620 |                         |      |
| 24. At Charenton, ———     | 1623 |                         |      |
| 25. At Castres, ————      | 1626 |                         |      |

These 29 National Synods are in the same Order I have here set them down, in the Book called, Synodicon in Gallia Reformata, 2 Vol. Fol. Lond. 1692.

In the First Volume of the same Synodicon, there is also the Book of Discipline of the Church of France, and their Confession of Faith, (the same that occurs in the Corpus Confessionum, 4to. Genev. 1612.) together with the Edict of Nantes, and the Edict of Nismes, and the Secret Articles of the Edict of Nantes.

*A Catalogue of some other Writers, and their Editions, here  
alleged or refuted.*

- A Myraldi Theses Salmurienses. Salmur. 1665. 4to.  
 Andrews Opuscula. Lond. 1629. 4to.  
 Assembly of Divines, Advice to the Parliament touching a Confession of Faith. Lond. 1646. 4to.  
 Augustini Opera. Paris, 1635. Fol.  
 Bancroft, Dangerous Positions, &c. Lond. 1640. 4to.  
 Baxter, English Nonconformity stated. Lond. 1689. 4to.  
 ———Petition for Peace, and Reformation of the English Liturgy Lond. 1661. 4to.  
 Beza contra Saraviam. Franc. 1601. 8vo.  
 ———Annotationes in Nov. Test. Genev. 1582. Fol.  
 ———Epistolæ. Genev. 1573. 8vo.  
 ———Vita Calvini ap. Melch. Adam. Vit. Germ. Theologorum. Franc. 1653. 8vo.  
 Beverege Codex Canonum vindicatus. Antwerp. 1698. Fol.  
 Lud. le Blanc Theses Theolog. Lond. 1683. Fol.  
 Calvini, Institutiones. Genev. 1592. 8vo.  
 ———Epistolæ et Responsa. Amst. 1667. Fol.  
 ———Catechismus Ecclesiæ Genevensis.  
 ———Formula Precum Publicarum, &c.  
 ———De Necessitate Reformandæ Ecclesiæ.  
 ———Confessio Fidei. An. 1562.  
 ———Antidotum adv. Decreta Concil. Triden.  
 ———Vera Ecclesiæ Reformandæ Ratio.  
 ———Responsio ad Versipellem.  
 ———Adversus Sectam Libertinorum.  
 ———Secunda Responsio adv. Westphalum.  
 Lud, Capelli Theses Theolog. Salmur. 1665. 4to.  
 Isaac Casaubon Exercitationes in Baron. Lond. 1614.  
 Charles le Cene Projet d'. Une Nouvelle Version Francoise de la Bible. Roterd. 1696. 8vo.  
 Chamier Panstratia Catholica, 4 Tom. Genev. 1626. Fol.  
 Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Antiq. Gr. Lat. per. Ehingerum. Wittebergæ. 1614. 4to.  
 Corpus Confessionum Ecclesiar. Reform. Genev. 1612. 4to.  
 Crakanthorp Defensio Ecclesiæ Angl. contra Spalatensem. Lond. 1625. 4to.  
 Dallæus de Objecto Cultus Religiosi adv. Latinorum Traditionem. Genev. 1664. 4to.  
 ———Replique à Messieurs Adam et Cottiby. Genev. 1662. 4to.  
 Durel Vindicix Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Lond. 1669. 4to.  
 ———Conformity of the Reformed Churches, &c. Ibid. 1661.

} Uno Volumine.  
Amst. 1667. Fol.

- Falkner *Libertas Ecclesiastica*. Lond. 1674. 8vo.
- Joh. Forbesii *Irenicum*. Aberden. 1636. 4to.
- G. G. *History of the Church of Great Britain*. Lond. 1675. 4to.
- Hottinger *Historia Eccles.* Tom. 8. Tigur. 1667. 8vo.
- Hildersham *Lectures on the 51st Psalm*. Lond. 1642. Fol.
- Justin Martyr. Gr. Lat. Paris, 1615. Fol.
- Hamon *L'Estrange Alliance of Divine Offices*. Lond. 1690. Fol.
- Limborch *Theologia Christiana*. Amst. 1686. 4to.
- Pet. Martyr. *Loci Communes*. Lond. 1583. Fol.
- *Epistolæ Theologicæ*, Ibid. in Append. Loc. Com.
- Mason *Defence of the Ordination of Protestant Ministers beyond Seas*. Oxford 1641. 4to.
- Peter Meggerlin *Commentarius Chronologicus*. Basil. 1683. 4to.
- Bishop Morton of *Episcopacy*: With Sir H. Yelverton's Preface. Lond. 1670. 8vo.
- Peter du Moulin *Novelty of Popery*. Lond. 1664. Fol.
- *Buckler of the Faith, or Defence of the French Confession against Arnoux*. Lond. 1631. 4to.
- Hen. Otho *Lexicon Rabbinicum*. Genev. 1675. 8vo.
- Phil. Paræi *Epistola Dedicatoria ante Catechismum Urisini*. Hanov. 1651. 8vo.
- Pocock *Notæ Miscellanæ in Portam Mosis*. Oxon. 1655. 4to.
- *Comment on Micah, &c.*
- Joh. Rainoldi. *Theses de Scriptura et Ecclesia*. Hanov. 1603. 8vo.
- Reasons shewing the Necessity of Reformation, &c. offered to the Parliament by divers Ministers of sundry Counties in England*. Lond. 1660. 4to.
- Riissenius *Compendium Theologiæ Turretini*. Amst. 1695. 4to.
- Andr. Rivet. *Catholicus Orthodoxus*. Roterd, 1692. Fol.
- *Exercitationes in Genesin*. Lug. Bat. 1633. 4to.
- *Synopsis Purioris Theologiæ*. Lug. Bat. 1632. 8vo.
- Sculteti *Idea Concionum in Esaiam*. Genev. 1610. 8vo.
- Sixti Senensis *Bibliotheca Sancta*. Colon. 1586. Fol.
- Spondani *Continuatio Annal. Baron.* 2 Vol. Lugd. 1678.
- Sprint. Cassander *Anglicanus*. Lond. 1618. 4to.
- Stillingfleet *Unreason. of Separation*. Lond 1681. 4to.
- Sherlock *Defence of Unreason. of Separat. &c.* 1681.
- *Answer to Protestant Reconciler*. 1685. 8vo.
- Mat. Sutcliffe *Treatise of Ecclesiastical Discipline*, Lond. 1591. 4to.
- Tigurine *Liturgy*. Lond. 1693. 8vo.
- Thuani *Historia*. 5. Tom, Genev. 1626.
- Usher *Judgment of the Ordinations of Reformed Churches, &c.* Lond. 1657. 8vo.
- Whitaker *de Scriptura*. Cantab. 1588. 4to.
- Zanchii *Opera*. 3 Vol. Genev. 1619. Fol.



## INDEX OF MATTER.

The First Number denotes the Book, the Second the Chapter, and the Third the Section of every Chapter.

- ABBOTS, so called from 'Αββῆς, a Father. 7. 3. 11. Vol. 2. p. 42.
- Their Power over the Monks. 7. 3. 12. Vol. 2. p. 42.
- Their Privilege to vote in Councils. 7. 3. 13. Vol. 2. p. 44.
- Abbot of Huy, in what sense superior to Bishops. 7. 3. 14. Vol. 2. p. 45.
- Abcedariū Psalmi. 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5. p. 16.
- Abortion caused voluntarily, punished as Murder. 16. 10. 4. Vol. 6. p. 342.
- Abracadabra and Abraxas, a Charm used by the Basilidian Heretics. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 229.
- Absolution of four kinds, by the two Sacraments, by Preaching, by Prayer, by Judicial Relaxation of Church Censures. 19. 1. 1. Vol. 6. p. 603.
- In Baptism. 11. 1. 2. Vol. 3. p. 112 and 113.
- In the Eucharist. 15. 3. 28. Vol. 5. p. 287.
- Never granted before Penance performed, except in danger of Death. 19. 2. 1. Vol. 6. p. 618.
- Denied to some Sinners at the hour of Death. 18. 4. 4. Vol. 6. p. 581, 582.
- How this may be cleared from the charge of Novatianism. 18. 4. 5. Vol. 6. p. 587.
- How granted after Death. 19. 2. 11. Vol. 6. p. 635.
- Easter the usual Time of granting it. 19. 2. 10. Vol. 6. p. 634. It. 21. 1. 13. Vol. 7. p. 155.
- Always given in a Precatory Form with Imposition of Hands and Prayer. 19. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 620.
- Indicative Form of, *Ego te absolvo*, not used till the twelfth Century. 19. 2. 5. Vol. 6. p. 625.
- Granted chiefly by the Bishop. 19. 3. 1. Vol. 6. p. 638.
- Sometimes committed to Presbyters. 19. 3. 2. Vol. 6. p. 638. 639.
- In Cases of Necessity committed to Deacons. 2. 20. 12. Vol. 1. p. 226. It. 19. 3. 3. Vol. 6. p. 640.
- In what sense given by Laymen. 19. 3. 4. Vol. 6. p. 641.
- Of great criminals reserved to the Patriarch. 2. 17. 19. Vol. 1. p. 182.

- Absolution*, the Nature and Necessity of the several sorts of, explained in two Sermons and two Letters. Vol. 8. p. 409 to p. 456.
- Abstinence* from flesh how censured. 17. 5. 19. Vol. 6. p. 509. 510.
- Acclamations* at Sermons. 14. 4. 27. Vol. 5. p. 140, 141.
- Accusers*, false with respect to men's Estates how punished. 16. 12. 15. Vol. 6. p. 415. 416.
- With respect to men's Credit how punished. 16. 13. 1. Vol. 6. p. 433. 434.
- With respect to men's lives punished as Murderers. 16, 10. 9. Vol. 6. p. 439.
- 'Αχειροτονητός ὑπηρέσιᾳ. 3. 1. 6. Vol. 1. p. 273. 274.
- Acolythists*, An Order only in the *Latin* Church. 3. 3. 1. Vol. 1. p. 278.
- The meaning of the Name, their Ordination and Office. 3. 3. 2 and 3. Vol. 1. p. 279.
- Acemeta* Monks why so called. 7. 2. 10. Vol. 2. p. 21.
- Acrosticks* and *Acroteuticks* in Psalmody. 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5. p. 16.
- Acts* of the Apostles read in the fifty days of *Pentecost*. 14. 3. 3. It. 20. 6. 2. Vol. 5. p. 49. 7. 96.
- Actors* and *Actresses*. See *Stage-players*.
- Adelphian* Heretics. 20. 3. 5. Vol. 7. p. 48.
- Admonition*, a part of Church-discipline. 16. 2. 6. Vol. 6. p. 79.
- Adult* persons. What required of them in Baptism. 11. 5. 1. Vol. 3. p. 179.
- Adultery* how punished. 16, 11. 2. Vol. 6. p. 361. 362. 363.
- Whether an *Adulterer* might marry an *Adulteress* after the Death of her Husband. 22. 2. 13. Vol. 7. p. 241. 242.
- *Adulterers* incapable of Ordination. 4. 3. 7. Vol. 1. p. 363. 364.
- The husband of an *Adulteress* not to be ordained. 6. 2. 3. Vol. 1. p. 505. 506.
- Clergymen obliged to put away an adulterous Wife. *Ibid.* and 17. 5. 27. Vol. 6. p. 517.
- Adyta*. 8. 6. 7. Vol. 2. p. 143. 144.
- 'Αφορισμός *Excommunicatio Minor*, 16. 2. 7. Vol. 6. p. 80.
- 'Αφορισμός παντελής. *Excommunicatio major*, 16. 2. 8. Vol. 6. p. 82.
- African* Churches never subject to the Bishop of Rome. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 286.
- Four Hundred and Sixty-six Dioceses in the *African* Church. 9. 2. 5. Vol. 2. p. 286.
- Agapæ*, why forbidden. 8. 10. 1. See Love Feasts. Vol. 2. p. 226.
- Agapetæ*, or *συνεισακτοι*. 6. 2. 13. Vol. 1. p. 525. It. 17. 5. 25. Vol. 6. p. 515. 516.
- "Αγιον. The Chancel. 8. 6. 2. Vol. 2. p. 141.
- "Αγιον ἄγιον. The Altar. 8. 6. 2. Vol. 2. p. 141.
- "Αγια ἄγιοις. 1. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 27. It. 15. 3. 31. Vol. 6. p. 291. 292.
- Αἴθριον. The Church-yard or Court before the Church. 8. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- 'Ακολουθία. The Order of Prayers or Liturgy. 13. 1. 9. Vol. 4. p. 21. 22.
- 'Ακροόμενοι. Hearers, Catechumens and Penitents so called. 8. 4. 3. Vol. 2. p. 126. See *Audientes* and *Hearers*.
- 'Ακροτηράειν. Dismembering the

- Body how punished. 16. 10. 7. Vol. 6. p. 346. See *Dismembering*.
- Alba*. A Surplice. 13. 8. 2. Vol. 4. p. 207.
- Albi Citatio*. 16. 12. 10. Vol. 6. p. 409.
- Albis*, Dominica in. 20. 5. 12. Vol. 7. p. 93.
- Albs*. See *White Garments*.
- Albus*. The Roll of the Clergy. 1. 5. 10. Vol. 1. p. 37.
- Aldermanni*. 2. 19. 19. Vol. 1. p. 211.
- Ἀλειτρογησία*. 5. 3. 12. Vol. 1. p. 457.
- Alexander Severus's* Commendation of Electing the Christian Clergy. 4. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 335. 336.
- Alexandria*, Bishop of, the greatest Primate in the World. 2. 16. 23. Vol. 1. p. 164.
- Alienation* of Church-revenues not to be made but upon extraordinary occasions, by common consent of the Bishop, Clergy and Metropolitan. 5. 6. 6. and 7. Vol. 1, p. 492. 493. 494. 495.
- Allegiance* to Princes. 16. 9. 4. Vol. 6. p. 335. 336, &c.
- Allegorists*. Why Christians so nicknamed by the *Millenaries*. 1. 2. 15. Vol. 1. p. 20.
- Alleluia*, and *Alleluatici Psalmi*. 14. 2. 4. Vol. 5. p. 33.
- Alleluia* the Signal to call Church-Assemblies. 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 191.
- Alms* given to the poor at Church. 13. 8. 14. Vol. 4. p. 224. 225.
- Altar* and Holy Table, names indifferently used in the Primitive Church. 8. 6. 12. Vol. 2. p. 150
- In what sense the Ancients say they had no Altars. 8. 6. 13. Vol. 2. p. 152.
- Bishops generally preached at the ascent of the Altar. 8. 5. 4. Vol. 2. p. 132.
- Generally inaccessible to all but the Clergy. 8. 6. 7. Vol. 2. p. 143.
- The Laity in some ages allowed to communicate at the Altar. *Ibid.* p. 144.
- Altars* placed at some distance from the upper end of the Chancel with the Bishop's seat behind them. 8. 6. 11. Vol. 2. p. 149.
- Altars* made of wood till the time of *Constantine*. 8. 6. 15. Vol. 2. p. 153.
- But one Altar in a Church. 8. 6. 16. Vol. 2. p. 155.
- Sometimes but one Altar in a City. 8. 6. 17. Vol. 2. p. 156.
- Canopy of the Altar called *Ciborium*. 8. 6. 18. Vol. 2. p. 158. and 8. 6. 19. p. 158. 159.
- When first the Figure of the Cross set upon the Altar. 8. 6. 20. Vol. 2. p. 160.
- *Justinian's* Inscription upon the Altar of *Sancta Sophia*. 8. 8. 4. Vol. 2. p. 198.
- Altars* when first dedicated distinct from Churches. 8. 9. 10. Vol. 2. p. 223.
- Bowing toward the Altar whether used in the ancient Church. 8. 10. 7. Vol. 2. p. 233.
- Kissing the Altar. 8. 10. 9. Vol. 2. p. 235.
- Altare Portatile*. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 2. p. 166.
- Alumni*. Devils why so called. 3. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 283.
- Ambasiator*. 3. 13, 6. Vol. 1. p. 328.
- Ambon*. The Reading-Desk. 8. 5. 4. Vol. 2. p. 131.
- Amen*. 15. 3. 25. Vol. 5. p. 284.

- Ἀμφίδουρα*. 8. 6. 8. Vol. 2. p. 145.
- Amulets* for curing Diseases censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 226.
- Anathema* the greater Excommunication. 16. 2. 8. Vol. 6. p. 82.
- Anathema Maranatha*. 16. 2. 16. Vol. 6. p. 106. 107.
- Anathema* with Execration. 16. 2. 17. Vol. 6. p. 110.
- Ἀναθήματα*, or *Anathemata*, and other Ornaments of Churches. 8. 8. 1. Vol. 2. p. 193.
- Ἀνακαμπτήρια*. Houses of Entertainment for the Poor and Strangers about the Church. 8. 7. 13. Vol. 2. p. 186.
- Ἀνάκτορα*, and *Basilica*. Roman Halls turned into Churches. 8. 1. 5. Vol. 2. p. 82.
- Ἀναφέρειν ἄρτον*. Offering of Bread and Wine in the *Eucharist* how far allowed to Deacons. 2. 20. 7. and 8. Vol. 1. p. 218. 219.
- Anchorets*. 7. 2. 2. Vol. 2. p. 10.
- Angariæ* and *Parangariæ*. 5. 3. 10. Vol. 1. p. 453.
- Angel* of Peace. 14. 5. 4. Vol. 5. p. 162.
- Angels* of the Churches, a name given to Bishops. 2. 2. 11. Vol. 1. p. 59.
- No Worship of Angels in the Religious Service of the ancient Church. 13. 3. 1. Vol. 4. p. 63.
- Animarum Descriptio*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 441. 442.
- Annunciation-festival*, Original of the, 20. 8. 4. Vol. 7. p. 134.
- Antelucan Assemblies*, Original of. 13. 10. 11. Vol. 4. p. 269.
- Antimensia*, or Consecrated Cloths. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 6. p. 166.
- Anthropolatræ*, Man-worshippers. An abusive Name given to the Catholics by the Apollinarian heretics. 1. 2. 16. Vol. 1. p. 20.
- Council of *Antioch* not an *Arian* Council. 17. 5. 15. Vol. 6. p. 507.
- Antiphonal* or Alternate Singing. 14. 1. 11. Vol. 5. p. 12.
- Antistes*. A name given to Presbyters as well as Bishops. 2. 19. 14. Vol. 1. p. 202.
- Ἀπαντιτης Διάκονος*, or *Apantita Diaconus*. An imaginary Name for an Archdeacon. 2. 21. 9. Vol. 1. p. 243. 244.
- Apiarius*. His famous Case in the business of appealing from the African Church to Rome. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 272.
- Apocalyps*. See *Revelations*.
- Apocrisarius*. A Bishop's Resident at Court. 3. 13. 6. Vol. 1. p. 327.
- Apocryphal* Books not to be published. 17. 5. 18. Vol. 6. p. 509.
- Apocryphal* Books read in some Churches, not in all. 10. 1. 7. Vol. 3. p. 10. It. 14. 3. 15. Vol. 5, p. 66.
- Ἀπολελυμένως*. Ordination given at large without a local title condemned. 4. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 392. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 490.
- Ἀπολυτικά*. Letters Dimissory. 6. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 562.
- Apostates* to *Judaism* how punished. 16. 6. 1. Vol. 6. p. 240.
- To *Heathenism*. 16. 6. 4. Vol. 6. p. 249.
- Not to have benefit of Sanctuary in the Church. 8. 11. 6. Vol. 2. p. 245.
- Apostle*. A Name anciently given to Bishops. 2. 2. 1. Vol. 1. p. 50.
- Apostoleium*. A Church called by the Name of an Apostle. 8. 1. 8. Vol. 2. p. 88.

- Apostolica Sedes.* A Bishop's See. 2. 2. 3. Vol. 1. p. 52.
- The See of the Primate. 2. 16. 24. Vol. 1. p. 165.
- Apostolici.* Heretics so called from a pretended imitation of the Apostles. 22. 1. 6. Vol. 7. p. 209.
- Apostolic Order* of the Monks of Bangor. 7. 2. 13. Vol. 2. p. 23. 24.
- Apotactici.* The same as *Apostolici*.
- Apotaxameni.* Monks so called. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 25. 26.
- Apotclesmatici.* Astrologers censured. 16. 5. 1. Vol. 6. p. 215. 216.
- Appeals* from the Provincial Bishops to the Metropolitan. 2. 16. 16. Vol. 1. p. 159. It. 2. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 71.
- From the Metropolitan to a Provincial Synods. 2. 16. 16. Vol. 1. p. 160.
- From the Provincial Synod to the Patriarch. 2. 17. 14. Vol. 1. p. 178. 179.
- No Appeal from the Patriarch but to a General Council. *Ibid.*
- No Appeals from *Africk* to Rome. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 272. It. 17. 5. 14. Vol. 6. p. 504.
- Appearance* of Evil how to be avoided by the Clergy. 6. 2. 12. Vol. 1. p. 524.
- Apsis.* The Church-porch. 8. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 124. 125. It. 8. 5. 4. Vol. 2. p. 131. 132.
- The Place of the Altar. 8. 6. 9. Vol. 2. p. 146.
- Aquarii.* 15. 2. 7. Vol. 5. p. 214.
- Area.* vid. *Atrium*.
- A Church. 8. 1. 9. Vol. 2. p. 88.
- Aræ Sepulturarum.* 8. 1. 9. Vol. 2. p. 90.
- Aræ Custos.* 2. 21. 5. Vol. 1. p. 239. 240.
- Aræni Disciplina.* 8. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 202.
- Archbishop* the ancient Name of Patriarchs. 2, 17. 1. Vol. 1. p. 165.
- Archdeacons* anciently of the same Order with Deacons. 2. 21. 1. Vol. 1. p. 236.
- Their Original. 2. 21. 11. Vol. 1. p. 245.
- Elected by the Bishop, and not made by Seniority. 2. 21. 2. Vol. 1. p. 237.
- To attend the Bishop, and order the Business of the Inferior Clergy. 2. 21. 4. Vol. 1. p. 239.
- To manage the Church Revenues under the Bishop. 2. 21. 5. Vol. 1. p. 239. 240.
- To censure the Inferior Clergy, but not Presbyters. 2. 21. 8. Vol. 1. p. 242.
- Why called *Cor-Episcopi*. 2. 21. 10. Vol. 1. p. 245.
- Whether they had Power over the whole Diocese. 2. 21. 10. Vol. 1. p. 243.
- Archimandrita.* 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 27.
- Archipresbyteri.* 2. 19. 18. Vol. 1. p. 209.
- Archivus.* The Register of Bishops' Ordination kept in the Primate's Church. 2. 16. 8. Vol. 1. p. 153.
- Archontici.* 11. 2. 2. Vol. 3. p. 125.
- Aræus.* The Church-Porch. 8. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 125.
- Ἀργίας εἶκη.* Laws against idle wandering Beggars. 16. 12. 19. Vol. 6. p. 430.
- Council of *Ariminum* not an *Arian* Council. 6. 3. 10. Vol. 1. p. 553.
- Arms* not to be worn in the Church. 8.

11. 10. Vol. 2. p. 250. It. 8. 10. 8. Vol. 2. p. 234.
- Arms*, not to be carried by Clergymen. 17. 5. 23. Vol. 6. p. 513.
- Arræ Sponsalitiæ*, 22. 3. 3. Vol. 7, p. 248.
- Artotyritæ*. Heretics, who offered Bread and Cheese in the Eucharist. 15. 2. 8. Vol. 5. p. 218.
- Ascodrutæ*. A Sort of Gnosticks. 15. 2. 9. Vol. 5. p. 218. and 11. 2. 1. Vol. 3. p. 124.
- Ascension-Day*. Its Original. 20. 6. 5. Vol. 7. p. 101.
- Ἀσκησις γραφικῆ. 7. 3. 22. Vol. 2. p. 60.
- Ascetics*, called also Σπυδαῖοι. How they differed from Monks. 7. 1. 5. Vol. 2. p. 8. and what the Primitive Ascetics were. 7. 1. 3. Vol. 2. p. 2. 7. 1. 6. Vol. 2. p. 9.
- Ascetria*, 7. 4. 8. Vol. 2. p. 73.
- Ash-Wednesday*, when first added to *Lent*. 18. 2. 2. Vol. 6. p. 539. It. 21. 1. 5. Vol. 7. p. 145.
- Asia Minor* had Four Hundred Dioceses in it. 9. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 321.
- Ἀσπασικὸς οἶκος. The Greeting-House, 8. 7. 8. Vol. 2. p. 178.
- Aspersio*, or *Sprinkling*. 11. 11. 5. Vol. 3. p. 275.
- Astrologers* denied Baptism. 11. 5. 8. Vol. 3. p. 191.
- Cast out of Communion. 16. 5. 1. Vol. 6. p. 213.
- Asylum*. Places of Sanctuary, their Original from the time of *Constantine*. 8. 11. 1. Vol. 2. p. 239.
- The Altar the chief *Asylum* at first, afterward the whole Precincts of the Church. 8. 11. 2. Vol. 2. p. 241.
- What Persons allowed to fly to an *Asylum*. 8. 11. 3. Vol. 2. p. 242.
- Public Debtors denied the Privilege of *Asylum*. 8. 11. 4. Vol. 2. p. 244.
- Also *Jews*, Heretics, and Apostates. 8. 11. 5 and 6. Vol. 2. p. 245.
- And Robbers, Murderers, Adulterers, Ravishers of Virgins, Conspirators. &c. 8. 11. 8. Vol. 2. p. 247.
- The great Abuse of modern *Asylums*. 8. 11. 9. Vol. 2. p. 249.
- No one to fly with Arms to an *Asylum*. 8. 11. 10. Vol. 2, p. 250.
- Ἀτίλεια λειτουργημάτων. Exemption of the Clergy from Civil Offices. 5. 3. 12. Vol. 1. p. 457.
- Atheists*. A Name of Reproach cast upon Christians. 1. 2. 3. Vol. 1. p. 12.
- Atrium Ecclesiæ*. The Church-yard. 8. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- Atrocia Delicta*. 5. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 429.
- Audientes*. An Order of *Catechumens*. 10. 2. 3. Vol. 3. p. 15.
- An Order of *Penitents*. 18. 1. 4. Vol. 6. p. 534.
- Their Station in the Church. 8. 4. 3. Vol. 2. p. 126.
- Audientium Doctor*. The *Catechist*. 3. 10. 2. Vol. 1. p. 307.
- Ave-Maries*, unknown to the Ancients. 14. 4. 15. Vol. 5. p. 117.
- Augury* condemned. 16. 5. 2. Vol. 6. p. 217. 218.
- Ἀυλή. The Court before the Church. 8. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- Auricular Confession* a Novelty. 18. 3. 2. Vol. 6. p. 551.
- Aurum Tironicum*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 445.

- Aurum Pannosum*. A Tax, 5. 3. 6. Vol. 1. p. 448.
- St. *Austin's* Diocese Forty Miles long. 9. 2. 5. Vol. 2. p. 286.
- Ἄντοσιφολοι. The ancient Name of Metropolitans. 2. 18. 1. Vol. 1. p. 185.
- Ἄξιον. The Word used in Electing Bishops. 4. 1. 3. Vol. 1. p. 334. 11. 4. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p. 343.
- Azuma* and *Azymites*. 15. 2. 5. Vol. 5. p. 208. 209.
- B
- BACKBITING. 16. 13. 3. Vol. 6. p. 436 437.
- Βακάντιβοι. Wandering Clerks. 6. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 564.
- Βαλλίζειν and *Ballimathia*. Lascivious Balls and Dancing. How censured. 16. 11. 15. Vol. 6. p. 393.
- Baptism*, why called an Indulgence, or Absolution. 11. 1. 2. Vol. 3. p. 113. 11. 19. 1. 2. Vol. 6. p. 603.
- Why called *Chrism* or *Unction*. 11. 1. 3. Vol. 3. p. 113. 114.
- Why called *Viaticum*. 11. 1. 10. Vol. 3. p. 121. 122.
- Why called φωτισμὸς or Illumination. 11. 1. 4. Vol. 3. p. 115.
- Why called παλιγγενεσία, or Laver of Regeneration. 11. 1. 3. Vol. 3. p. 113. 114.
- Why called *Sacerdotium Laici*, Laymens' Priesthood. 11. 1. 3. Vol. 3. p. 116.
- Why called *Salus*, Life and Salvation. 11. 1. 5. Vol. 3. p. 116.
- Why called σφραγίς, *Signaculum Domini* and *Signaculum Fidei*, the Seal of the Lord. 11. 1. 6. Vol. 3. p. 116. 117.
- Why called the Sacrament of Faith. 11. 1. 8. Vol. 3. p. 120.
- Why called εὐρον, χάρισμα. *Munus*, μύησις, μεταγωγή, τελετή, *Symbolum Domini*. 11. 1. 10. Vol. 3. p. 121. 122. 123.
- By Water rejected by many ancient Heretics. 11. 2. 1. Vol. 3. p. 124.
- Of Infants proved to be the Primitive Practice. 11. 4. 5. Vol. 3. p. 156.
- Not confined to the Eighth Day as Circumcision. 11. 4. 13. Vol. 3. p. 170.
- Case of Infants dying without Baptism. 10. 2. 24. Vol. 3. p. 44.
- Supplied by Martyrdom, Faith, &c. 10. 2. 20. Vol. 3. p. 34.
- Of exposed Children, and the Children of Heathens, Jews, and excommunicate Persons, how given. 11. 4. 15. Vol. 3. p. 173.
- Not to be given to the Dead. 11. 4. 3. Vol. 3. p. 152.
- Nor to the Living for the Dead, and the Apostle's meaning, of being baptized for the dead. 11. 4. 4. Vol. 3. p. 153. 154.
- Granted to Dumb Persons and Energumens in certain cases. 11. 5. 2. 11. 5. 3. Vol. 3. p. 179. to 184.
- Not to be forced upon any against their Will. 11. 5. 5. Vol. 3. p. 185. 186.
- Not to be given to Image-Makers, Stage-players, Gladiators, Racers, Astrologers, Magicians, Charmers, Wandering Beggars and other such Criminals, till they quit such unlawful Professions. 11. 5. 6. &c. Vol. 3. p. 187. to 198.
- Not given to Slaves without the Testimony of their Masters. 11. 5. 4. Vol. 3. p. 184.
- Yet given to Slaves of *Jews*, and

- Heretics together with their Freedom. 8. 11. 7. Vol. 2. p. 246.
- Baptism*, not administered by Presbyters or Deacons without the Bishop's Consent. 2. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 62.
- Administered ordinarily by Deacons in Country-Churches. 2. 20. 9. Vol. 1. p. 222. It, 9. 6. 18. Vol. 2. p. 389.
- And by Laymen in extraordinary Cases. 2. 20. 9. Vol. 1. p. 223.
- And by Laymen. A Scholastical History of the Practice of the primitive Church therein, &c. Latter part of Vol. 3. and beginning of Vol. 4.
- Always administered in the Name of the TRINITY, and in no other Form. 11. 3. 1. Vol. 3. p. 133. It 17. 5. 9. Vol. 6. p. 500.
- Form of *Baptism* changed by *Tritheists*, *Eunomians*, and many other Heretics. 11. 3. 4. &c. Vol. 3. p. 139. 140.
- Confined to no Time or Place in the Age of the Apostles. 11. 6. 9. Vol. 3. p. 211.
- Afterward *Easter*, *Pentecost* and *Epiphany* made more solemn Times of *Baptism*. 11. 6. 7. Vol. 3. p. 206. to 210.
- Unlawful Reasons and Pretences for deferring of *Baptism*. 11. 6. 1. Vol. 3. p. 199.
- Of the Renunciations, Professions of Faith and obedience, Sponsors, Unction, Sign of the Cross, Consecration of the Water, Aspersion or Sprinkling, Dipping or Immersion, White Garments, Kiss of Peace, Lights and Tapers, Milk and Honey, Washing the Feet, and other Ceremonies used in *Baptism*. See under their several Titles.
- Esteemed the grand Absolution or Indulgence of the Church. 19. 1. 2. Vol. 6. p. 603. to 607.
- Indelible character of *Baptism*.
- What meant by it. 11. 1. 7. Vol. 3. p. 119.
- Clinic-Baptism*, of Sick Men upon a Death-Bed, allowed to be done by Sprinkling. 11. 11. 5. Vol. 3. p. 275. to 278.
- Clinic-Baptism* makes Men incapable of Ordination. 4. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 369.
- Heretical Baptism* allowed, when given in due Form. 11. 3. 11. Vol. 3. p. 147. 148. 4. 7. 8. Vol. 1. p. 414.
- Yet *Heretical Baptism* makes Men incapable of Ordination. 4. 3. 12. Vol. 1. p. 370. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 493.
- Crimes before *Baptism* do not debar Men from Orders. 4. 3. 10. Vol. 1. p. 368.
- Why *Baptism* administered chiefly at the Bishop's Church. 8. 7. 6. Vol. 2. p. 176.
- Repetition of, used by the *Marcionites*. 12. 5. 2. Vol. 3. p. 339. See *Rebaptizing*.
- Married persons rejected from, by the same Heretics. 11. 5. 12. Vol. 3. p. 198.
- Baptizing* of Bells, a modern Invention. 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 192. It. 11. 4. 2. Vol. 3, p. 151.
- Baptisteries*. Buildings distinct from the Church. 8. 7. 1. Vol. 2. p. 170.
- Different Apartments in them for men and Women. 8. 7. 1. Vol. 2. p. 171.
- So large as to admit of Councils to sit in them. 8. 7. 2. Vol. 2. p. 172.
- Difference between a *Baptistry* and a *Font*. 8. 7. 4. Vol. 2. p. 173.
- Why called *φωτισήρια*. 8. 7. 3. Vol. 2. p. 173.
- How anciently adorned. 8. 7. 5. Vol. 2. p. 174. 175.

- Baptisteries.* But one Baptistery in a City at the Mother Church. 8. 7. 6. Vol. 2. p. 176. It. 11. 6. 12. Vol. 3. p. 215.
- Barbarous Nations* to have their Bishops from Constantinople. 4. 2. 13. Vol. 1. p. 351.
- Basilicæ* and *Ἀνάκτορα.* Roman Halls turned into Churches. 8. 1. 5. Vol. 2. p. 82.
- Βασίλαιοι οἴκοι.* Houses of the Clergy adjoining to the Church. 8. 7. 13. Vol. 2. p. 185. 186.
- Βασιλικαὶ πύλαι.* The Beautiful and Royal Gates opening into the Nave or Body of the Church. 8. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 128. 129.
- Basilidians* condemned for using Charms. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 229. See *Abra-cadabra.*
- Baths* belonging to the Church. 8. 7. 13. Vol. 2. p. 186.
- These allowed to be places of Refuge. *ibid.*
- Promiscuous Bathing of Men and Women together censured. 16. 11. 14. Vol. 6. p. 391.
- Bathing* forbidden to Penitents in the Time of their Public Penance. 18. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 543.
- Beard.* Shaving of the *Beard* forbidden the Clergy. 6. 4. 15. Vol. 1. p. 581.
- Bear.* The use of *She-Bear's* hair as a Remedy against Witchcraft censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 232.
- Βῆλα.* 8. 6. 8. Vol. 2. p. 145.
- Bells.* When first brought into the Church. 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 191.
- Baptizing of *Bells* a Modern Custom. 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 192. It. 11. 4. 2. Vol. 3. p. 151.
- Bema.* The Bishop's Throne. 8. 6. 10. Vol. 2. p. 147.
- The Altar-part or Sanctuary. 8. 6. 10. Vol. 2. p. 149.
- Βῆμα γινωσκῶν.* The Reading-desk. 8. 5. 4. Vol. 2. p. 131.
- Βήματι προσάγειν* To ordain. 1. 5. 11. Vol. 1. p. 38.
- Benedicite Hymn,* or Song of the Three Children. Its use in the Church. 14. 2. 6. Vol. 5. p. 37.
- Benedictine Monks.* 7. 2. 12. Vol. 2. p. 22. 23.
- Benedictio.* A Prayer so called. 15. 3. 29. Vol. 5. p. 288. 289.
- Benediction* of Bishops. 2. 9. 1. vol. 1. p. 97.
- Βῆρος.* *Birrus.* 6. 4. 19. Vol. 1. p. 586. 587.
- Bessis Centesima.* Usury at Eight per Cent. forbidden. 6. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p. 512.
- Bestiality,* how censured. 16. 11. 9. Vol. 6. p. 380.
- Bethelia.* *Domicilium Deorum.* 9. 2. 8. Vol. 2. p. 302.
- Biathanati.* Self-murderers, how punished. 16. 10. 6. Vol. 6. p. 345.
- A name of reproach cast upon Christians, for their constancy in laying down their lives. 1. 2. 8. Vol. 1. p. 15.
- Bible.* See Scripture.
- Bidding-prayer,* the office of Deacons. 2. 20. 10. Vol. 1. p. 223. 224.
- Forms of Bidding-prayers. 15. 1. 2. Vol. 5. p. 181 to 190.
- Βιωτικὸι.* Seculars. Laymen, so called in contradistinction to the clergy. 1. 5. 5. Vol. 1. p. 34.
- Birrus.* See *Βῆρος.*
- Birthdays* not to be kept in Lent. 21. 1. 23. Vol. 7. p. 172. See *Natales* and *Natalitia.*

- Bishops superior to Presbyters.* 2. 1. 2. Vol. 1. p. 41.
- Of Apostolical institution. 2. 1. 3. Vol. 1. p. 43.
- A catalogue of such Bishops as were ordained by the Apostles. 2. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 45 to 49.
- At first called Apostles. 2. 2. 1. Vol. 1. p. 50.
- Successors of the Apostles. 2. 2. 2. Vol. 1. p. 51.
- Called *Principes Ecclesia, Præpositi, Προεστώτες, Πρόεδροι* "Εφοροι, *Principes Sacerdotum, Pontifices Maximi, Summi Sacerdotes, Papæ, Patres Patrum, Episcopi Episcoporum, Patriarchs, Vicars of Christ, and Angels of the Churches.* 2. 2. 4. vol. 1. p. 52 to 60.
- Bishops' Power and Privileges.*
- Every Bishop had power to form his own *Liturgy* and *Creed*, and to appoint Fasting-days in his own Church. 2. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 85.
- And Power to determine secular causes. 2. 7. 1. Vol. 1. p. 90. It. 5. 2. 1. Vol. 1. p. 425.
- This power not allowed in criminal causes, nor in civil causes, but when the Litigants agreed to take them for Arbitrators. 2. 7. 4. Vol. 1. p. 93.
- Privilege in interceding for criminals to the secular Magistrate, 2. 8. 1. Vol. 1. p. 94. 95.
- Benediction. 2. 9. 1. Vol. 1. p. 97, 98.
- The Ceremony of kissing Bishops' hands. 2. 9. 2. Vol. 1. p. 98, 99.
- Whether Bishops anciently wore a Mitre. 2. 9. 5. Vol. 1. p. 100, 101.
- The form of saluting Bishops *Per Coronam.* 2. 9. 5. Vol. 1. p. 100, 101.
- The titles of *Sanctissimi, Beatissimi*, &c. given to all Bishops. 2. 9. 6. Vol. 1. p. 102.
- Bishop's Throne in the Church.* 2. 9. 7. Vol. 1. p. 102, 103.
- No exemption from the jurisdiction of Bishops. 2. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 73.
- Monks subject to the Bishop of the Diocese. 2. 4. 2. Vol. 1. p. 73. 74.
- Magistrates subject to the same jurisdiction. 2. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 74. 75.
- Power not arbitrary, but a liberty allowed of appealing from them. 2. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 71.
- In the African Church not to censure Presbyters or Deacons without the concurrence of some neighbouring Bishops. 2. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 72.
- Privilege in granting *Litteræ Formata* to all Persons. 2. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 77. 78.
- Power in disposing of the revenues of the Church. 2. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 79.
- Not to alienate the Goods of the Church without the consent of the Clergy and Metropolitan. 5. 6. 7. Vol. 1. p. 495.
- Not to be condemned but upon the Evidence of two or three Witnesses. 5. 1. 5. Vol. 1. p. 422.
- Heretics not allowed to be Evidence against Bishops. 5. 1. 5. Vol. 1. p. 423.
- Nor excommunicate Persons nor scandalous Livers. *Ibid.* p. 423.
- False Accusers of Bishops to be excommunicated or deposed. *Ibid.* p. 424.
- Not to be called into any secular Court to give their Testimony. 5. 2. 1. Vol. 1. p. 425.
- Not obliged to give their Testi-

- mony upon Oath. 5. 2. 2. Vol. 1. p. 426.
- Bishops*, whether the single Evidence of one Bishop was good in Law against the Testimony of many others. 5. 2. 3. Vol. 1. p. 427.
- A Bishop not to excommunicate any Criminal upon his own single Testimony. 16. 3. 10. Vol. 6. p. 152.
- Absolute and independent in their own Churches. 2. 6. 1. Vol. 1. p. 85.
- Every Bishop supposed to be a Bishop of the whole *Catholic* Church. 2. 5. 1. Vol. 1. p. 80. 81.
- Of the Election and Ordination of Bishops.*
- Bishops* to be elected by the Provincial Bishops, Clergy and People. 4. 2. 4. Vol. 1. p. 341. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 491.
- To be chosen within Three Months after a Vacancy. 2. 11. 1. Vol. 1. p. 113.
- To be chosen out of the Clergy of the Church to which they were ordained. 2. 10. 2. Vol. 1. p. 106.
- Not to be ordained under Thirty Years of Age. 2. 10. 1. Vol. 1. p. 104.
- To go through the Inferior Orders of the Church before they attained Episcopal Ordination. 2. 10. 4. Vol. 1. p. 108.
- Yet Deacons sometimes ordained Bishops, though never ordained Presbyters. 2. 10. 5. Vol. 1. p. 109.
- In Cases of Necessity chosen out of the Inferior Orders. 2. 10. 6. p. 110.
- And sometimes ordained immediately from Laymen. 2. 10. 7. Vol. 1. p. 110. 111.
- Three Bishops ordinarily required in the Ordination of a Bishop. 2. 11. 4. Vol. 1. p. 116. 117. 118.
- To be ordained in their own Churches. 2. 11. 7. Vol. 1. p. 120.
- Not to be ordained in small Cities. 2. 12. 1. Vol. 1. p. 124.
- Ordained sometimes in Villages. 2. 12. 3. Vol. 1. p. 126. 127. 128.
- Two Bishops not to be ordained in one City. 2. 13. 1. Vol. 1. p. 129. 130.
- Exceptions to this rule in some extraordinary Cases. 2. 13. 2. Vol. 1. p. 131.
- Anniversary-Day of a Bishop's Ordination kept a Festival. 4. 16. 15. Vol. 1. p. 404. See *Natales Episcoporum*.
- Rules concerning Bishops.*
- Bishops* to reside at their Cathedral Church. 6. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 567. 568. See *Court*.
- Not to remove from one See to another without Leave. 6. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 565. 566.
- Allowed to resign their Sees for the good of the Church. 6. 4. 2. Vol. 1. p. 559. 560.
- To take Place by Seniority. 2. 16. 8. Vol. 1. p. 153. 154.
- Obligated to attend Provincial Synods. 2. 16. 17. Vol. 1. p. 161. It. 17. 5. 38. Vol. 6. p. 525.
- Not to travel without the *Litteræ Formatæ* of their Primate. 2. 16. 19. Vol. 1. p. 162.
- To breed up Youth in their Houses, as Academies, for the Service of the Church. 3. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 272.
- To honor their Fellow-Bishops with the Privilege of Consecrating the *Eucharist*, sitting in their Throne with them, &c. 5. 1. 2. Vol. 1. p. 418.

- Bishops*, not to make Exactions upon their People. 17. 5. 39. Vol. 6. p. 526.
- Dying without Children or Nephews, to make the Church their Heirs. 5. 4. 9. Vol. 1. p. 474.
- Obligated to be constant in Preaching. See *Preaching*.
- To confirm. See *Confirmation*.
- To visit Parochially. See *Visitations*.
- To exercise Discipline, excommunicate, absolve, grant Indulgences. See the several Titles.
- To consecrate Churches, Virgins, &c. See the Titles.
- The Design of *Henry VIIIth* to augment the Number of Bishops in *England*. Conclusion of Book 9 Ch. 8. Vol. 2. p. 435. &c.
- Peculiar Ways of Punishing Delinquent *Bishops* in the *African Church*. 17. 4. 5. Vol. 6. p. 479.
- Liable to Deposition for giving Ordinations contrary to the Canons &c. 17. 5. 35. Vol. 6. p. 523.
- Blasphemy*. How punished. 16. 7. 1. Vol. 6. p. 292.
- Against the HOLY GHOST in what Sense unpardonable. 16. 7. 3. Vol. 6. p. 299.
- Blood*. Eating of it sometime forbidden. 17. 5. 20. Vol. 6. p. 511.
- Clergy not to judge in Cases of *Blood*. 2. 7. 4. Vol. 1. p. 83. It 17. 5. 34. Vol. 6. p. 521.
- Discipline of the Church never went so far as to shed *Blood*. 16. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 69 to 76.
- Body* not to be mangled or dismembered. 4. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 366. 367. It. 16. 10. 7. Vol. 6. p. 346. 347.
- Βωμολοχία*. Filthy Discourse censured. 6. 2. 10. Vol. 1. p. 521. It. 16. 11. 15. Vol. 6. p. 394.
- Βόμῳ ἀνάιμακτος* 8. 6. 13. Vol. 2. p. 152.
- Books*. Lascivious not to be read. 16. 11. 11. Vol. 6. p. 386.
- Heretical. See *Heretical*.
- Βοσκόι*. Monks so called from feeding on Herbs. 7. 2. 11. Vol. 2. p. 21.
- Βοῦά*. *Vota*. An *Heathen* Festival condemned. 16. 4. 17. Vol. 6. p. 203.
- Βαλευται*. Corporation-Men not to be ordained. 4. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 379.
- Bowing* in Prayers. 13. 8. 5. Vol. 4. p. 214.
- Toward the Altar. 8. 10. 7. Vol. 2. p. 233.
- Bread*. Common, not Unleavened, used in the *Eucharist*. 15. 2. 5. Vol. 5. p. 208. to 212. See *Azyma*.
- Broken in the *Eucharist*. 15. 3. 34. Vol. 5. p. 295. 296.
- Day of *Bread*. A name for the *Lord's Day*. 20. 2. 1. Vol. 7. p. 13. It. 15. 9. 2. Vol. 5. p. 454.
- Bribery* censured. 16. 12. 10. Vol. 6. p. 407.
- Bridges*. The Clergy sometimes exempt from contributing toward them. 5. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 452.
- British Church*. Its ancient Liberties and Independency. 2. 18. 2. Vol. 1. p. 186. It. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 273. 274.
- Allegations of *Schelstrate* against the *British* Liberties examined. 9. 1. 12. Vol. 2. p. 275 to 280.
- Church not founded by St. Peter. *Ibid*. p. 277.
- Bishops in the Council of *Arles*. 9. 6. 20. Vol. 2. p. 395.
- Bromialia*. An *Heathen* Festival condemned. 16. 4. 17. Vol. 6. p. 203.

*Brumæ* and *Brumalia* condemned. *Ibid.* 207.

*Burning* the Dead not used by Christians. 23. 2. 4. Vol. 7. p. 313.

*Burying* in Cities not allowed for the first Three Hundred Years. 23. 1. 2. Vol. 7. p. 290 to 294.

—— Nor in Churches for many ages after. 23. 1. 4. Vol. 7. p. 297 to 300.

—— First brought into the *Atrium* or Church-yard, and Porches and Porticos of the Church. 8. 3. 8. Vol. 2. p. 124. It. 23. 1. 6. Vol. 7. p. 301. 302.

—— Hereditary *Burying Places* forbidden till the Twelfth Century. 23. 1. 9. Vol. 7. p. 306.

—— The Care of Christians in *burying* the Dead. 23. 3. 1. Vol. 7. p. 324. 325.

—— Christians usually *buried* by Day, the *Heathens* by Night. 23. 2. 6. Vol. 7. p. 318 to 324.

—— With Psalmody. 23. 3. 8. Vol. 7. p. 333 to 336. It. 23. 3. 11. Vol. 7. p. 338. 339.

—— With Prayers, Communion, and funeral Oration. 23. 3. 10. &c. Vol. 7. p. 337. 338.

—— Particular Orders of Men, *Copiatæ* and *Parabolani* for *burying* the Dead. 3. 8. 1. Vol. 1. p. 299. It. 23. 3. 7. Vol. 7. p. 332.

—— Penitents employed in *burying* the Dead. 18. 2. 11. Vol. 6. p. 547.

—— What Persons were denied the Privilege of Christian Burial. 23. 3. 23. Vol. 7. p. 355 to 358. 18. Vol. 3. p. 32.

—— Nothing to be demanded for *burying* the Dead. 5. 4. 14. Vol. 1. p. 480. See more in Cemeteries, Church-yards, Graves, and Funerals.

## C

CAER-LEON the Metropolis of the

*British Church*. 2. 18. 2. Vol. 1. p. 186. It. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 274.

*Calf*. Heathenish Custom of Offering a Calf on *New Year's Day* censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 230. It. 20. 1. 3. Vol. 7. p. 6.

*Calculatores*, a sort of Diviners and Enchanters censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 231.

*Calculation of Easter*. See *Cycle*.

*Calumny* censured. 16. 12. 15. Vol. 6. p. 415.

*Campana*. The name of a Bell first used by *Bede*. 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 192.

*Cancelli*. 8. 6. 6. Vol. 2. p. 143.

*Candida Casa*. *Whitern* in *Scotland* the first Church that was built of Stone. 8. 1. 10. Vol. 2. p. 91.

*Candlemas-day* not known to the Ancients. 20. 8. 5. Vol. 7. p. 135.

*Canon*. A name for the *Creed*. 10. 3. 2. Vol. 3. p. 53.

—— The Roll or Catalogue of the Clergy. 1. 5. 10. Vol. 1. p. 37. 38.

—— *Et Indictio Canonica*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 441.

—— *Fruentarius*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 442.

—— *Paschalis*. 13. 5. 6. Vol. 4. p. 121.

*Canonica*. See *Epistola*.

*Canonica*. Virgins in the Canon or Roll of the Church. 7. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 63.

*Canonical Hours* of Prayer. Their Original. 7. 3. 17. Vol. 2. p. 48. It. 13. 9. 8. Vol. 4. p. 246. 247.

—— Pensions in what Cases allowed. 6. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 561.

—— Scripture. 14. 3. 16. Vol. 5. p. 68 to 71.

*Canonici*. The Clergy. 1. 5. 10. Vol. 1. p. 37.

—— *Equi*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 445.

- Canonici ψαλται*, or *Psalta* .3. 7. 2. Vol. 1. p. 297.
- Canons* of the Church to be read to Men at their Ordination. 4. 6. 1. Vol. 1. p. 391.
- Of the Church to be studied by the Clergy. 6. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 533. 534.
- Bishops subject to them. 2. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 71.
- Bishops liable to be censured and deposed for neglecting or transgressing them. 17. 5. 35. 36. &c. Vol. 6. p. 522 to 526.
- Canonum Ecclesie universæ Codex*. 17. 5. 15. Vol. 6. p. 507.
- Contempt of the *Canons*, a Crime for which the Laity might be excommunicated and the Clergy degraded. 16. 9. 5. Vol. 6. p. 338. It. 17. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 499.
- Canons Regular*. Their Original. 7. 2. 9. Vol. 2. p. 20.
- Canonical* Obedience due from Presbyters to Bishops. 2. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 61. &c.
- Obedience due from Bishops to their Primates or Metropolitans. 2. 16. 16. 17. &c. Vol. 1. p. 159. 160. 161.
- Canopy* of the Altar. 8. 6. 18. Vol. 2. p. 158.
- Cantabrarii*. A sort of Conjurors. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 232.
- Cantharus*. The Fountain before the Church. 8. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 122.
- Capitatio Humana*. The Capitation Tax upon Men for their Slaves. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 442.
- *Terrena*. Tax upon Land. *Ibid*.
- *Animalium*. Tax upon Cattle. *Ibid*.
- Capitation-tax* imposed upon the Clergy for their Ecclesiastical Possessions. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 443.
- Capitis Censuræ*. The Clergy excused from it. 5. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 439.
- The Virgins of the Church excused from it. 7. 4. 7. Vol. 2. p. 72.
- *Tria Capita*. Payment of Taxes three times a Year, once every four Months. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 442.
- Capitolins*. A name of Reproach cast upon the *Catholics* by the *Novatians*, for receiving such as went to sacrifice at the Capitol. 1. 2. 13. Vol. 1. p. 18. 19.
- Captatores*. Men that flattered Women out of their Estates, censured. 16. 12. 15. Vol. 6. p. 417. 418.
- Captives*, redeemed by selling the Plate of the Church. 5. 6. 6. Vol. 1. p. 494. 495.
- Cardinals*. Their Original. 2. 19. 18. Vol. 1. p. 209.
- Cardinales Ecclesie*. *Ibid*.
- Caracalla*. A *Cassock*. So called from *Antoninus Caracalla* who first brought it into Use among the *Romans*. 6. 4. 20. Vol. 1. p. 590.
- Catacombs* and *Cryptæ*. 23. 1. 3. Vol. 7. p. 294.
- Κατάλογος Ἱερατικῶς*, or *Catalogus Hieraticus*. The Roll of the Clergy. 1. 5. 10. Vol. 1. p. 37.
- Catechetical-schools*. 3. 10. 5. Vol. 1. p. 310.
- Catechists*, no distinct Order of the Church. 3. 10. 1. Vol. 1. p. 306.
- Readers sometimes made *Catechists*. 3. 10. 2. Vol. 1. p. 307.
- Such *Catechists* not allowed to teach publicly in the Church. 3. 10. 4. Vol. 1. p. 308.
- The Substance of the ancient *Catechism*. 10. 1. 6. Vol. 3. p. 8. 9.
- Catechumens*. Their Age. 10. 1. 4. Vol. 3. p. 5.

- Catechumens*, how long they continued in that State. 10. 1. 5. vol. 3. p. 6.
- Their Station in the Church. 8. 4. 3. Vol. 2. p. 126.
- Divided into Four Orders. 10. 2. 2. Vol. 3. p. 14.
- Their Exercises and Instruction. 10. 2. 6. Vol. 3. p. 17.
- Allowed to read the Scripture. 10. 1. 7. Vol. 3. p. 10.
- And to hear the Scripture and Sermon in the Church. 10. 2. 3. Vol. 3. p. 15. It. 13. 1. 2. Vol. 4. p. 8.
- Not allowed to hear or use the *Lord's-Prayer* until a little before Baptism. 1. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 28. It. 10. 2. 10. Vol. 3. p. 23. See *Lord's Prayer*.
- Not allowed to be present at any Prayers in the Church, save only such as were particularly called Prayers for the *Catechumens*. 14. 5. 3. Vol. 5. p. 157. 158.
- Not allowed to be present at the Celebration of any Mysterious Rites. 10. 5. 1. Vol. 3. p. 96.
- Nor allowed to hear Discourses upon the profound Mysteries of Religion. 1. 4. 8. Vol. 1. p. 29.
- Reckoned but imperfect Members of the Church. 1. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 23.
- How punished by the Discipline of the Church upon offending. 10. 2. 17. Vol. 3. p. 30. 31. 32.
- Catechumenorum Missa*. 13. 1. 2. Vol. 4. p. 8 to 11.
- Sacramentum*. 10. 2. 16. Vol. 3. p. 29.
- Catechumena*. The Catechetical Schools. 3. 10. 4. Vol. 1. p. 309.
- The Women's Galleries in the Church. 8. 5. 7. Vol. 2. p. 136.
- Cathedral*. The Bishop's Church where his *Cathedra* or Throne was set. 8. 6. 10. Vol. 2. p. 148.
- Cathedral-Church* to be the Place of the Bishop's constant Residence. 6. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 568.
- Catholic*. The Meaning and Antiquity of the Name. 1. 1. 7. Vol. 1. p. 7.
- Catholic Church*. How its Unity maintained. 16. 1. 8. Vol. 6. p. 36.
- Customs of the *Catholic Church* to be observed. 16. 1. 12. Vol. 6. p. 44. 45.
- Churches and Private Oratorios how distinguished. 8. 1. 4. Vol. 2. p. 81. 82. and 8. 1. 12. Vol. 2. p. 97.
- Catholicus Diaceosus*. A Civil Officer; *Rationalis*, the Emperor's Receiver in a *Roman Diocese*. 9. 1. 12. Vol. 2. p. 279.
- Caupones*. Fraudulent Hucksters censured. 16. 12. 17. Vol. 6. p. 424.
- Cava*. A City and Diocese in *Italy* that had not above Five Hundred Communicants. 9. 8. Conclusion. Vol. 2. p. 437.
- Causa Lucrativa* and *Onerosa*. How they differ in Law. 5. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 455.
- Causes Criminal*. The Clergy liable to be judged for such before the Civil Magistrates. 5. 2. 12. Vol. 1. p. 435.
- Ecclesiastical to be ended in Ecclesiastical Courts. 5. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 420. It. 17. 5. 15. Vol. 6. p. 505.
- Pecuniary between Clergymen and Laymen to be heard in the Civil Courts. 5. 2. 13. Vol. 1. p. 435. 436.
- Ceimeliarches*. The same as *Chartophylax* and *Custos Archivorum*. 3. 13. 3. Vol. 1. p. 323.
- Ceimeliarchium*. 8. 7. 7. Vol. 2. p. 177.
- Celeusma*. The *Alleluia* why so called. 14. 2. 4. Vol. 5. p. 33.

- Celibacy*, not required of the Clergy for the first Three Hundred Years. 4. 5. 5. Vol. 1. p. 384. 385.
- Cells*, Private in the Church for People to read the Scripture in. 8. 5. 8. Vol. 2. p. 136.
- Cellularii*. Monks so called from their living in Cells. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 27.
- Cemetery*. A name used in common for a Church and the Grave of a Martyr. 8. 1. 9. Vol. 2. p. 88. It. 23. 1. 1. Vol. 7. p. 289. 290.
- Consecration of *Cemetaries* not very ancient. 23. 2. 1. Vol. 7. p. 308. 309.
- Canones*. An Order among the *Montanists*. 2. 17. 5. Vol. 1. p. 168.
- Censures* of the Church. See *Discipline*.
- Census Capitis* and *Census Agrorum*. 5. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 439.
- Centenarii*. Centurions among the Monks. 7. 3. 11. Vol. 2. p. 41.
- Centenarii*. Conjurors and Diviners censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 231.
- Centesimæ*. Usury at Twelve in the Hundred, 6. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p. 510.
- Cephaleotæ*. Collectors of the Capitation-Tax. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 442.
- Cerei*. See *Lamps*.
- Ceremonies*. No Necessity of their being the same in all Parts of the Catholic Church. 16. 1. 15. Vol. 6. p. 50 to 54.
- Ceroferarii*, not the same with the *Acolythists* of the ancient Church. 3. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 280.
- Cervolo facere*. An Heathen Custom of sacrificing an Hind on *New Year's Day* censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 230. It. 20. 1. 3. Vol. 7. p. 6.
- Chaldæi*. Astrologers censured. 16. 5. 1. Vol. 6. p. 213 to 217.
- Chancel*. 8. 6. 6. Vol. 2. p. 143.
- Chancellors*. A Conjecture about their Original in the Church. 2. 7. 5. Vol. 1. p. 94.
- Not the same with Defensors in the Primitive Church. 3. 11. 6. Vol. 1. p. 316.
- Character*. What meant by indelible Character of Ordination. 17. 2. 5. Vol. 6. p. 458, 459.
- Indelible of Baptism. 16. 2. 1. Vol. 6. p. 61. It. 11. 1. 7. Vol. 3. p. 120.
- Charisma* and *Chrisma*. Names of Baptisin. 11. 1. 3. Vol. 3. p. 114. and 11. 1. 10. p. 122.
- Chari Dei*. A name of Christians. 1. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 27.
- Charioteers* denied Baptism. 11. 5. 7. Vol. 3. p. 190.
- Denied Communion. 16. 4. 10. Vol. 6. p. 192.
- Charity-Schools* in Country Churches. 8. 7. 12. Vol. 2. p. 184. 185.
- Charms* for curing Diseases condemned. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 226.
- Jewish Charms*. 16. 6. 3. Vol. 6. p. 244 to 249.
- Chartophylax*. 3. 13. 3. Vol. 1. p. 324.
- Cheese*, offered with Bread in the *Eucharist* by Heretics, called *Arto-tyrita*. 15. 2. 8. Vol. 5. p. 218.
- Χεῖμαζόμενοι*. *Demoniacs*. 3. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 286. It. 18. 4. 13. Vol. 6. p. 597.
- Χειρόδοτος*. *Tunica manicata*. 6. 4. 20. Vol. 1. p. 589.
- Χειροθεσία* and *Χειροτομία*. How they differ one from another. 4. 6. 11. Vol. 1. p. 402.
- Χειροθεσία*. Confirmation. 12. 1. 1. Vol. 3. p. 286. 287.
- Χειροσήμαντρα*. 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 191.

- Cherubical Hymn.* 14. 2. 3. Vol. 5. p. 31. 32.
- Children*, not to marry against the Consent of Parents. 16. 9. 2. Vol. 6. p. 332. 333. It. 22. 2. 4. Vol. 7. p. 226. 227.
- Not to become Monks against the Consent of Parents. 7. 3. 4. Vol. 2. p. 31. It. 16. 9. 1. Vol. 6. p. 331. 332.
- Not to be made Monks against their own Consent. 7. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 32.
- Dedicate to the Service of the Church from their Infancy. 3. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 272. See *Parents*.
- Fathers not to disinherit their *Children* to make the Church their Heirs. 5. 4. 13. Vol. 1. p. 477.
- The Power of Parents over their *Children* in Matters of Life and Death restrained by the Christian Laws. 16. 9. 1. Vol. 6. p. 332.
- Chiliarchæ.* A Sort of Diviners censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 232.
- Choreuta.* Heretics that kept the *Sabbath* a Fast. 20. 3. 5. Vol. 7. p. 48.
- Chiromancy* condemned. 16. 5. 2. Vol. 6. p. 418.
- Chorepiscopi.* Three different Opinions about their Order. 2. 14. 2. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 137. 138. 139.
- Allowed to ordain Presbyters and Deacons by Licence from the City Bishop. 2. 14. 6. Vol. 1. p. 140.
- To minister Confirmation. 2. 14. 7. Vol. 1. p. 141.
- To grant Letters Dimissory. 2. 14. 8. Vol. 1. p. 141.
- To vote in Councils. 2. 14. 10. Vol. 1. p. 142.
- Their Power not the same in all Times and Places. 2. 14. 11. Vol. 1. p. 142.
- Their Power first struck at by the Council of *Laodicea*. 2. 14. 12. Vol. 1. p. 143.
- Fifty *Chorepiscopi* in *St. Basil's* Diocese. 9. 3. 2. Vol. 2. p. 324.
- In *Assyria*. 9. 2. 17. Vol. 2. p. 316.
- How censured for transgressing their Duty. 17. 5. 41. Vol. 6. p. 527.
- Chorus.* The Chancel. 8. 6. 5. Vol. 2. p. 143.
- Chrestians*, for Christians. 1. 1. 11. Vol. 1. p. 9.
- CHRIST worshipped together with the FATHER and HOLY GHOST. 13. 2. 1. Vol. 4. p. 31.
- Christian Rules* commended by *Heathens*. 4. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 336. It. 6. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 496. 497.
- Christians*, how called before they were named Christians. 1. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 1. 1. 2.
- Heretics not reckoned *Christians*. 1. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 24.
- Catechumens only imperfect *Christians*. 1. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 23.
- Christemporeia.* *Simony*. 4. 3. 14. Vol. 1. p. 372. 373.
- Christophori.* A Name given to Christians. 1. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 5.
- Chronita.* A name of Reproach cast upon the *Catholics* by the *Arians*. 1. 2. 16. Vol. 1. p. 20.
- Chrysargyrum.* A Tax so called. 5. 3. 6. Vol. 1. p. 448 to 450.
- Churches.*
- Their several Names. 8. 1. 1. Vol. 2. p. 76. 77.
- Their Original from the Time of the Apostles. 8. 1. 13. Vol. 2. p. 97. 98. 99.
- Forty in *Rome* before the last Persecution. 3. 1. 17. Vol. 2. p. 104.

- Churches.* The Difference between Churches in the first Ages and those that followed. 8. 2. 1. Vol. 2. p. 108. 109.
- *Heathen Temples and Jewish Synagogues* turned into Churches. 8. 2. 4. Vol. 2. p. 112 to 116.
- *Roman Basilicæ* turned into Churches. 8. 1. 5. Vol. 2. p. 82. 83. and 8. 2. 4. Vol. 2. p. 116.
- *Constantine's Munificence* in building Churches. 8. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 111.
- An Account of *Justinian's* Church called, *Sanctu Sophia*. 8. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 111. It. 8. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 117.
- All of Wood in *England* till the building of *Candida Casa* at *Whitern*. 8. 2. 1. Vol. 2. p. 109.
- Of different Forms, some oblong or dromical, some round, some square, some in the Form of a Cross, or Figure of an *Octagon*. 8. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 118.
- Of different Situations, chiefly to the *East*, some to the *West*, *North*, and *South*. 8. 3. 2. Vol. 2. p. 119.
- Divided into several Parts, a *Narthex*, a *Nave*, and a *Bema*, or Sanctuary. 8. 3. 3. Vol. 2. p. 120.
- Had distinct Apartments for Men, Women, Virgins, Clergy, Laity, &c. 8. 5. 6. Vol. 2. p. 134.
- Had private Cells for Meditating, Reading the Scripture. &c. 8. 5. 8. Vol. 2. p. 137.
- Adorning of Churches.*
- Adorned with several Gifts of the People, called *Anathemata*, ἐκτυπώματα, &c. 8. 8. 1. Vol. 2. p. 194. and 8. 8. 2. Vol. 2. p. 195.
- With Gilding and *Mosaic Work*. 8. 8. 5. Vol. 2. p. 198.
- With Inscriptions. 8. 8. 4. Vol. 2. p. 197.
- With Texts of Scripture written on the Walls. 8. 5. 9. Vol. 2. p. 138. It. 8. 8. 3. Vol. 2. p. 196.
- With Flowers and Branches. 8. 8. 12. Vol. 2. p. 209.
- Not with Images or Pictures for the First Three Hundred Years. 8. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 200.
- Pictures of Kings and Bishops, when first brought into Churches. 8. 8. 8. Vol. 2. p. 204.
- Consecration and Dedication of Churches.*
- The Original of this Practice in the Fourth Century. 8. 9. 2. Vol. 2. p. 212. 213. 214.
- To be consecrated by the Bishop. 8. 9. 3. Vol. 2. p. 215.
- Not to be built without his leave. 8. 9. 4. Vol. 2. p. 216.
- No Necessity of a Licence from Rome for a Bishop to consecrate a Church. 8. 9. 7. Vol. 2. p. 219.
- Always dedicated to God, and not to Saints, though sometimes named from Saints or their Founders or other Circumstances in the building of them. 8. 9. 8. Vol. 2. p. 220. 221.
- No Church to be consecrated before it was endowed. 8. 9. 11. Vol. 2. p. 223.
- Bishops to exact nothing for consecrating Churches. 8. 9. 12. Vol. 2. p. 224.
- Dedication of Churches celebrated as an Anniversary Festival. 8. 9. 14. Vol. 2. p. 225. It. 20. 8. 1. Vol. 7. p. 128.
- Not to be founded for Lucre. 9. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 433.
- Respect shewn to Churches.*
- Kings laid down their Crowns, when they entered the Church. 8. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 129. It. 8. 10. 8. Vol. 2. p. 234.

- Churches.* No one to carry Arms into the Church. 8. 11. 10. Vol. 2. p. 350. It. 8. 10. 8. Vol. 2. p. 235.
- Men usually washed their Hands at their Entrance into the Church. 8. 10. 5. Vol. 2. p. 232.
- Some put off their Shoes. 8. 10. 6. Vol. 2. p. 232.
- Bowing toward the Altar at the Entrance of the Church. 8. 10. 7. Vol. 2. p. 233.
- Doors and Pillars of the Church and Altar kissed in Token of Love. 8. 10. 9. Vol. 2. p. 235.
- Never put to any Prophane Use. 8. 10. 1. Vol. 2. p. 225. 226.
- Banqueting in the Church forbidden. 8. 10. 1. Vol. 2. p. 227. It. 8. 11. 12. Vol. 2. p. 251.
- What difference made between Churches and Private Houses. 8. 10. 3. Vol. 2. p. 230.
- Used for Private Prayer and Meditation. 8. 10. 10. Vol. 2. p. 236.
- Not to be delivered up to Heretics. 8. 10. 4. Vol. 2. p. 231.
- The safest Repository for Things of Value. 8. 10. 12. Vol. 2. p. 238.
- Made *Asylums* or Places of Refuge. 8. 11. 1. Vol. 2. p. 239. 240. See *Asylum*.
- *Notitia* or Geography of the Church. See *Notitia*.
- State of the Church conformed to the State of the *Roman Empire*. 9. 1. 2. Vol. 2. p. 253.
- Church-Lands* not exempt from Taxes. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 443. 444.
- Obligated to such Burdens as they were tied to before their Donation. 5. 3. 5. Vol. 1. p. 446.
- Church-Revenues.* See *Revenues*.
- Church-Yards* See *Cemeteries*. *Burials*. *Funerals*.
- People not allowed to bury in *Church-Yards* till the Sixth Century. 23. 1. 7. Vol. 7. p. 302.
- Church-Assemblies.* How called together before the Use of Bells. 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 190. 191.
- How far *Jews*, *Heathens* and Heretics might be admitted to *Church-Assemblies*. 8. 4. 4. Vol. 2. p. 127. It. 13. 1. 2. Vol. 4. p. 8. See *Missa Catechumenorum* and *Sermons*.
- Church Laws.* See *Canons*.
- Church-Discipline.* See *Discipline*.
- Ciborium.* The Canopy of the Altar. 8. 6. 18. Vol. 2. p. 158.
- City.* The Difference between a City and a Village. 9. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 284.
- Circus.* The Games thereof censured. 11. 5. 7. Vol. 3. p. 190. It. 16. 4. 10. Vol. 6. p. 191.
- Clergy.*
- The Reason of the Name. 1. 5. 9. Vol. 1. p. 37.
- How distinguished from the Laity. 1. 5. 4. Vol. 1. p. 32. 33. 34.
- Elections of the Clergy. See *Elections*.
- Ordinations of the Clergy. See *Ordinations*.
- Revenues of the Clergy. See *Revenues*.
- Discipline of the Clergy. See *Discipline* and *Degrading*.
- Privileges of the Clergy and Immunities.*
- Obligated to entertain one ano-

- ther, travelling with *Literæ Formatae*, upon necessary Occasions. 5. 1. 1. and 3. Vol. 1. p. 416. 417 and 419.
- Privilege.* To give each other the Honorary Privileges of performing Divine Offices in their Churches. 5. 1. 2. Vol. 1. p. 418.
- Not to sue one another, save only in Ecclesiastical Courts. 5. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 420. 421. It. 17. 5. 15. Vol. 6. p. 505 to 507.
- Exempt from the ordinary Cognizance of secular Courts in Ecclesiastical Causes, 5. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 429.
- Exempt also in lesser Criminal Causes from the same Jurisdiction. 5. 2. 11. Vol. 1. p. 433.
- Not exempt in greater Criminal Causes. 5. 2. 12. Vol. 1. p. 234.
- Exempt by the *Gothic* Laws in *France*. 5. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 421.
- Not exempt by any Divine Right from Taxes. 5. 3. 1. Vol. 1. p. 437.
- Exempt from Personal Taxes or Head-money. 5. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 438.
- Not exempt from Taxes on Land. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 443.
- Exempt from other Taxes, called *Aurum Tironicum*, *Equi Canonici*, *Chrysargyrum* or *Lustralis Colatio*, *Metatum*, *Superindicta*, *Angariae* and *Paranguriae* and *Cursus Publicus*, *Denarismus* and *Descriptio Lucratorum*. 5. 3. 4. &c. Vol. 1. p. 445.
- Exempt sometimes, not always, from contributing to Highways and Bridges. 5. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 453.
- Exempt from all Civil Personal Offices. 5. 3. 12. Vol. 1. p. 456.
- Exempt from all sordid Offices both Predial and Personal. 5. 3. 13. Vol. 1. p. 457.
- Exempt for all Curial or Municipal Offices. 5. 3. 14. Vol. 1. p. 458.
- But Clergymen possessed of Private Estates, not exempt from such Offices. 5. 3. 15. Vol. 1. p. 460.
- Laws relating to the Life and Conversation of the Clergy. 6. 2. 1. &c. Vol. 1. p. 501. 502.
- Laws relating to the Exercise of the Duties and Offices of their Function. 6. 3. 1. Vol. 1. p. 528. to 531.
- For what Crimes the Clergy might be degraded. 6. 2. 3. Vol. 1. p. 505. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 490.
- Not allowed to relinquish their Station without Leave. 6. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 557. 558.
- Not to remove from one Diocese to another without Letters Dimissory. 6. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 562. 563.
- Laws against Wandering Clergy. 6. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 564.
- Obligated to Residence. 6. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 567. to 569.
- Not to have Pluralities or Office in Two Dioceses. 6. 4. 8. Vol. 1. p. 569 to 571.
- Not to take upon them Secular Employments. 6. 4. 9. Vol. 1. p. 571. 572. It. 17. 5. 11. Vol. 6. p. 501. 502.
- Not to be Tutors or Guardians. 6. 4. 10. Vol. 1. p. 573.
- Not to be Sureties or Pleaders at Law. 6. 4. 11. Vol. 1. p. 574.
- The inferior Clergy allowed sometimes to work at Secular Trades. 6. 4. 12. and 13. Vol. 1. p. 574 to 579.
- Not to converse with *Jews* or *Gentile* Philosophers. 6. 4. 14. Vol. 1. p. 580.

- Privilege.* Laws relating to the Habit of the Clergy. 6. 4. 15. Vol. 1. p. 581.
- Not to read Heretical Books, but upon necessary Occasions. 6. 3. 4. Vol. 1. 535 to 538.
- Denying their name and character, to be deposed. 17. 5. 17. Vol. 6. p. 509.
- Deserting their Station, to forfeit their Estates to the Church. 5. 4. 12. Vol. 1. p. 477.
- Dying without Heirs, their Estates to fall to the Church. 5. 4. 9. Vol. 1. p. 474.
- In some Churches lived all in Common. 5. 6. 5. Vol. 1. p. 492.
- Voluntary poverty chosen by some of the Clergy. 6. 2. 8. Vol. 1. p. 517.
- No Law to compel the Clergy to part with their temporal Possessions. 6. 2. 9. Vol. 1. p. 518.
- Not allowed to grow Rich out of the Church Revenues. *Ibid.*
- See more in the Contents of Book IV. 5. 6. 17. which treat of Matters relating to the Clergy,*
- Clerici.* A Name for the Inferior Orders of the Clergy. 1. 5. 9. Vol. 1. p. 37.
- Clydomeni and Clydonizomeni.* *Energumens* vexed with evil Spirits. 18. 4. 13. Vol. 6. p. 599. See *Χεῖμαζόμενοι* and *Hyemantes.*
- Clinick Baptism.* In what cases allowed. 11. 11. 5. Vol. 3. p. 275. to 278.
- Clinicks,* not to be ordained. 4. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 169.
- Cloaca.* The Font. 8. 7. 4. Vol. 2. p. 174.
- Cloca.* A Bell. 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 193.
- Clothing,* promiscuous of Men and Women censured. 16. 11. 16. Vol. 6. p. 395. 396.
- Cloisters* of the Church. 8. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- Coadjutors.* 2. 13. 4. Vol. 1. p. 135.
- Calicola.* A mongrel Sect between *Jews* and *Christians.* 16. 6. 2. Vol. 6. p. 242.
- Camiteria.* Burying Places. 8. 1. 9. Vol. 2. p. 88. 89. It. 23. 1. 1. Vol. 7. p. 209.
- Canobitæ.* A name of Monks. 7. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 10.
- Cohortales.* Apparitors of Judges, not to be ordained. 4. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 377.
- Coin.* Falsifiers of it how punished. 16. 12. 14. Vol. 6. p. 414.
- Collectæ.* Collects. 15. 1. 4. Vol. 5. p. 191.
- Collegiati.* 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 232.
- Colligere Orutionem.* See *Collectæ.*
- Collyridians.* 2. 22. 7. Vol. 1. p. 254.
- Collobium.* 6. 4. 20. Vol. 1. p. 589.
- Comes, sive Lectionarium.* The Calendar of Lessons. 14. 3. 3. Vol. 5. p. 48. to 53.
- Commendationes.* Prayers so called. 15. 1. 4. Vol. 5. p. 193. It. 23. 3. 11. Vol. 7. p. 339.
- Commendatory* Letters given to Strangers. 17. 3. 7. Vol. 6. p. 471. It. 2. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 77.
- Communio Ecclesiastica.* 17. 1. 1. Vol. 6. p. 448.
- *Laica.* 15. 5. 1. Vol. 5. p. 344. It. 17. 2. 1. Vol. 6. p. 454.
- *Peregrina.* 5. 1. 3. Vol. 1. p. 420. It. 15. 5. 1. Vol. 5. p. 345. It. 17. 3. 1. &c. *per tot. cap.* Vol. 6. p. 466. &c.
- *Præsanctificationum.* 15. 4. 12. Vol. 5. p. 328. to 330. It. 15. 5.

1. Vol. 5. p. 348. Vid. *Missæ and Præsanctificata*.
- Communio*. How different Churches maintained Catholic Communion, one with another, in Faith, Worship, Discipline, &c. 16. 1. 8 and 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. Vol. 6. p. 36 to 48.
- Communion* not to be broken for Difference of Ceremonies in different Churches. 16. 1. 10. Vol. 6. p. 38. *Ibid.* 16. 1. 15. p. 50. to 55.
- In both Kinds given to all. 15. 5. 1. Vol. 5. p. 343.
- In one Kind only reckoned Sacrilege. 16. 6. 27. Vol. 6. p. 283.
- Every *Lord's-Day*, and Twice or Thrice a Week, and every Day in some Churches. 15. 9. 1. Vol. 5. p. 451. and 15. 9. 4. p. 456. &c. *It.* 9. 8. 5. Vol. 2. p. 431.
- When first reduced to Three Times a Year. 15. 9. 5. Vol. 5. p. 463.
- When to once a Year. 15. 9. 6. Vol. 5. p. 464.
- What attempt was made at the Reformation to restore frequent *Communion*. 15. 9. 7. Vol. 5. p. 465.
- Weekly *Communions* among the Monks. 7. 3. 17. Vol. 2. p. 52.
- Communion-Cup* of Glass, Wood, Silver, &c. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 2. p. 162.
- Communion-Plate* sold to redeem Captives and relieve the Poor. 5. 6. 6. Vol. 1. p. 493. 494.
- Communion-Cloth*. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 2. p. 161.
- The people allowed to *communicate* standing at the Altar. 8. 6. 7. Vol. 2. p. 144.
- Communicative Life* among the Monks; how distinguished from the *Renunciative Life*. 7. 3. 9. Vol. 2. p. 38. 39.
- Life among the Clergy. 5. 6. 4. Vol. 1. p. 491.
- Community* of Goods, as taught by Heretics, censured. 16. 12. 1. Vol. 6. p. 397. 398.
- Community* of Wives censured. 22. 1. 1. Vol. 7. p. 204.
- Commutation* of Penance allowed. 16. 3. 3. Vol. 6. p. 118.
- Competentes*. An Order of *Catechumens*, the immediate candidates of Baptism. 10. 2. 5. Vol. 3. p. 16.
- Prayers for the *Competentes*. 14. 5. 9. Vol. 5. p. 167. 168.
- Computation* of Easter. See *Cycle* and *Easter*.
- Conchula Bematis*. 8. 6. 9. Vol. 2. p. 146.
- Concilia, Conciliabula, and Conventicula*, ancient Names of Churches. 8. 1. 7. Vol. 2. p. 84. 85.
- Concubinage* condemned. 16. 11. 5. Vol. 6. p. 369 to 371.
- In what sense allowed. 11. 5. 11. Vol. 3. p. 196. 197. *It.* 16. 11. 5. Vol. 6. p. 371.
- They, who marry *Concubines*, not to be ordained. 4. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 381.
- Confessio*. A Church taking its Name from some Confessor or Martyr. 8. 1. 8. Vol. 2. p. 86.
- Confession* of Sins, how far required in Baptism. 11. 7. 14. Vol. 3. p. 237.
- Auricular *Confession* not imposed. 15. 8. 6. Vol. 5. p. 424. *It.* 18. 3. 2. Vol. 6. p. 551 to 556.
- Private *Confession* required in some Cases. 18. 3. 5. Vol. 6. p. 562. 563.
- at Morning Prayer. 14. 1. 1. Vol. 5. p. 3.

- Confession.* Psalm of *Confession.* 13. 10. 13. Vol. 4. p. 272.
- Confirmation*, no Sacrament distinct from Baptism. 12. 1. 4. Vol. 3. p. 291. to 295.
- How far necessary. 12. 3. 7. Vol. 3. p. 319. 320. 321.
- The Office of *Bishops.* 9. 6. 18. Vol. 2. p. 389. It. 12. 2. 1. Vol. 3. p. 297.
- Bishops to *confirm* in Country Churches. 9. 6. 22. Vol. 2. p. 401.
- ministred by Presbyters in some Cases. 12. 2. 2. Vol. 3. p. 301. 302.
- Ministred immediately after Baptism. 12. 1. 1. Vol. 3. p. 286.
- Ministred to Infants. 12. 1. 2. Vol. 3. p. 288. 289.
- Conjurers* censured. 16. 5. 7. Vol. 6. p. 235.
- Consanguinity.* Persons not to marry within the prohibited Degrees thereof. 22. 2. 3. Vol. 7. p. 224. 225. See, *Incest.*
- Consecration* of Churches. See *Churches.*
- Of Water in Baptism made by Prayer. 11. 10. 1. Vol. 3. p. 260.
- Of the *Eucharist* made by Prayer. 15. 3. 11. 12. Vol. 5. p. 250. 251.
- Of the *Eucharist*, in what sense allowed to Deacons. 2. 20. 8. Vol. 1. p. 219. to 222.
- Of Virgins. 7. 4. 6. Vol. 2. p. 68. 69. See *Virgins.*
- Of Ministers. See *Ordination.*
- Consistentes*, Co-standers, the Fourth Order of Penitents. 8. 5. 5. Vol. 2. p. 133. It. 18. 1. 6. Vol. 6. p. 536.
- Consistory* of Bishop and Presbyters. 2. 19. 8. and 11. Vol. 1. p. 193. and 198.
- Constantine's* Munificence in Building Churches. 8. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 111.
- Conventicula.* Churches so called. 8. 1. 7. Vol. 2. p. 84.
- Copiate.* Officers taking care of Funerals. 3. 8. 1. Vol. 1. p. 299. It. 23. 3. 7. Vol. 7. p. 333.
- Corban.* The Treasury of the Church. 5. 4. 2. Vol. 1. p. 467.
- Cor-Episcopi.* A Name of the Arch-deacon. 2. 21. 10. Vol. 1. p. 245.
- Corn*, allowed annually to the Clergy out of the Emperor's Exchequer. 5. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 473.
- Corona Clericalis.* 6. 4. 17. Vol. 1. p. 583.
- *Funeralis.* Not used among Christians. 23. 3. 9. Vol. 7. p. 337.
- *Nuptialis.* 22. 4. 6. Vol. 7. p. 372. 373.
- *Presbyterii.* 2. 19. 6. Vol. 1. p. 192.
- *Sacerdotalis.* 2. 9. 4. Vol. 1. p. 100.
- The Form of saluting Bishops, *per Coronam.* *Ibid.*
- *Virginum.* 7. 4. 6. Vol. 2. p. 70.
- Coronæ Oblationum.* The Communion-Loaves. 15. 2. 6. Vol. 5. p. 213.
- Coronati.* Clergymen. 3. 11. 4. Vol. 1. p. 314.
- Heathen Idolaters wearing Garlands. How censured. 16. 4. 8. Vol. 6. p. 188.
- Coronati Dies.* 8. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 129.
- Corporal* Punishment of the Inferior Clergy and Monks instead of Excommunication. 7. 3. 12. Vol. 2. p. 43. It. 16. 3. 11. Vol. 6. p. 155.

- It. 17. 4. 12. Vol. 6. p. 485. to 487.
- Corporation-Men* not to be ordained. 4. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 377.
- Cousin-Germans* allowed to marry one with another. 16. 11. 4. Vol. 6. p. 366. to 369. It. 22. 2. 3. Vol. 7. p. 225.
- Covetousness*, how censured. 16. 14. 3. Vol. 6. p. 446.
- Court*. Bishops not to appear at Court without the Emperor's leave. 6. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 568.
- Councils*. See *Synods*.
- Creature*. No Worship paid to the *Creature* in the ancient Church. 13. 3. 1. Vol. 4. p. 63. to 66.
- Swearing by the *Creatures* censured. 16. 7. 6. Vol. 6. p. 315. It. 6. 2. 10. Vol. 1. p. 521.
- Creed*. The Rule of Faith. 16. 1. 1. Vol. 6. p. 4.
- Chiefly used in Baptism. 10. 4. 17. Vol. 3. p. 90.
- When first the *Creed* was taken in to be a Part of the daily *Liturgy*. 14. 2. 8. Vol. 5. p. 38. It. 15. 3. 26. Vol. 5. p. 285. It. 10. 4. 17. Vol. 3. p. 91.
- Every Bishop had Power to frame his own *Creed*, keeping to the Analogy of the common Faith. 2. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 85.
- Why called *Symbolum*, *Canon*, *Regula Fidei*, *Mathema*, *γραφη*, &c. 10. 3. 1. and 2. 3. 4. Vol. 3. p. 50. to 55.
- Collection of the ancient *Creeds*. 10. 4. 1. Vol. 3. p. 65.
- Origin of the *Apostles' Creed*. 10. 3. 5. Vol. 3. p. 55, &c.
- *Nicene Creed*. 10. 4. 14. Vol. 3. p. 85.
- *Athanasian-Creed*. 10. 4. 18. Vol. 3. p. 93.
- Criniti Fratres*. Monks with long hair censured. 7. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 33.
- Crimen* and *Peccatum*. How distinguished by *St. Austin*. 6. 1. 3. Vol. 1. p. 505. It. 16. 3. 14. Vol. 6. p. 164.
- Criminal Causes* of the Clergy in great Matters, brought before the Civil Magistrate. 5. 2. 12. Vol. 1. p. 434.
- Cronus*. The Name of a Jewish Temple. 16. 6. 3. Vol. 6. p. 248.
- Cross*. Sign of the *Cross* used in making *Catechumens*. 10. 1. 3. Vol. 3. p. 5.
- Also frequently in the Rites of Baptism. 11. 9. 4. Vol. 3. p. 255. and 11. 10. 3. Vol. 3. p. 263. 264.
- Hands lift up in the Form of a *Cross* in Prayer. 13. 8. 10. Vol. 4. p. 219. 220.
- Sign of the *Cross* used in the Consecration of the *Eucharist*. 15. 3. 7. Vol. 5. p. 242.
- And in the Ordination of Presbyters. 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 207. It. 4. 6. 12. Vol. 1. p. 403.
- *Crosses* of Wood worn by some Monks out of Ignorance and Superstition. 7. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 35.
- When first set upon the Altar. 8. 6. 20. Vol. 2. p. 160.
- Cubicula*. Cells for Reading the Bible, &c. in the Church. 8. 5. 8. Vol. 2. p. 137.
- Cuculli*. Monks' Cowsls. 7. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 34.
- Cucumellum*. A Silver Flaggon. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 2. p. 163.
- Culdees*. 7. 3. 14. Vol. 2. p. 45.
- Cup*, in the Communion, given to all persons. 15. 5. 1. Vol. 5. p. 342. See *Communion in one and both Kinds*.
- Cups* of Glass, Wood, Silver, &c. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 2. p. 162.

- Curial Offices* not imposed upon the Clergy. 5. 3. 14. Vol. 1. p. 458.
- Curiales*, not to be ordained. 4. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 377.
- Not to become Monks. 7. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 28.
- Curia tradi*. What kind of Punishment. 17. 2. 8. Vol. 6. p. 462.
- Cursores Ecclesiæ*. 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 190.
- Cursus Ecclesiasticus*. The Form of Divine Service. 13. 1. 7. Vol. 4. p. 18.
- Cursus Publicus*. 5. 3. 10. Vol. 1. p. 453.
- Cursuales Equi*. Ibid.
- Customs of the Universal Church* to be received by all. 16. 1. 12. Vol. 6. p. 44. 45.
- Of every Particular Church to be submitted to by all its Members. 16. 1. 6. Vol. 6. p. 25.
- Custodes Ecclesiæ*. 3. 13. 2. Vol. 1. p. 322.
- Custodes Locorum Sanctorum*. Ibid.
- Custos Archivorum*. 3. 13. 3. Vol. 1. p. 324.
- Cycle of Easter*. 20. 5. 4. Vol. 7. p. 79.
- Cyprus*. Its ancient Liberties and Independency. 2. 18. 2. Vol. 1. p. 185. It. 9. 2. 10. Vol. 2. p. 308.
- D
- ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΙ*. *Demoniacs*. 3. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 286.
- Dalmatica*. 6. 4. 20. Vol. 1. p. 589. It. 13. 8. 2. Vol. 4. p. 208.
- Dancing*. Lascivious Dancing censured. 16. 11. 15. Vol. 6. p. 393.
- Deacons*. One of the Sacred Orders of the Church. 2. 20. 1. Vol. 1. p. 212. 213.
- In what sense called Priests by *Optatus*. 2. 19. 15. Vol. 1. p. 203. It. 2. 20. 1. Vol. 1. p. 213.
- Commonly distinguished from Priests and Presbyters by the Name of *ὑπηρέται*, *Ministri* and *Levita*. 2. 20. 2. Vol. 1. p. 214.
- Form of Ordaining Deacons. 2. 20. 3. Vol. 1. p. 215.
- To take Care of the Utensils of the Altar. 2. 20. 4. Vol. 1. p. 216.
- To recite the names of such as made Oblations at the Altar. 2. 20. 5. Vol. 1. p. 216. 217. It. 15. 2. 4. Vol. 5. p. 206.
- To read the Gospel. 2. 20. 6. Vol. 1. p. 217. It. 14. 3. 4. Vol. 5. p. 53.
- In what sense to offer the Bread and Wine in the *Eucharist*. 2. 20. 7. Vol. 1. p. 218.
- Not to consecrate the *Eucharist*, nor minister it to a Presbyter. 2. 20. 7 and 8. Vol. 1. p. 219. 220.
- Allowed to baptize. 2. 20. 9. Vol. 1. p. 222.
- To bid Prayers in the Church, and direct the People in all solemn Offices. 2. 20. 10. Vol. 1. p. 223 to 225. It. 15. 1. 2. and 3. Vol. 5. p. 181 to 190. It. 15. 3. 5. Vol. 5. p. 240. and 15. 3. 30. Vol. 5. p. 283. It. 15. 6. 1. Vol. 5. p. 389.
- To dismiss the People with the solemn Form of Words, *ἀπολύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ*, *Go in Peace*. 15. 6. 4. Vol. 5. p. 391.
- To preach in the Absence of Presbyters. 2. 20. 11. Vol. 1. p. 225. It. 14. 4. 1. and 2. Vol. 5. p. 78. 79.
- Allowed to suspend the Inferior Clergy, and to absolve Penitents in Cases of Necessity. 2. 20. 12. Vol. 1. p. 226. It. 19. 3. 3. Vol. 6. p. 640.

- Deacons.* To sit as Representatives of Bishops in General Councils. 2. 20. 13. Vol. 1. p. 227.
- And to vote in some Provincial Councils. *Ibid.* p. 228.
- Performed all the Offices of the Inferior Orders before the Rise of those Orders in the Church. 2. 20. 15. Vol. 1. p. 229.
- The Doorkeepers in the Time of the Oblation. 2. 20. 15. Vol. 1. p. 230.
- The Number of Seven Deacons always retained in the Church of *Rome*. 2. 20. 19. Vol. 1. p. 233.
- To correct the Misdemeanours of the People. 2. 20. 14. Vol. 1. p. 228.
- And to inform the Bishop of them. 2. 20. 17. Vol. 1. p. 231.
- The Bishop's eyes, Mouth, Angels, &c. 2. 20. 18. Vol. 1. p. 232.
- The Bishop's Sub-Almoners. 2. 20. 16. Vol. 1. p. 231.
- Not to be ordained before the Age of Twenty-five years. 2. 20. 20. Vol. 1. p. 234.
- Not to sit in the Presence of a Presbyter without his Leave. 2. 20. 21. Vol. 1. p. 235.
- Deaconesses*, of Apostolical Institution under the names of *διάκονοι, πρεσβυτιδες, Vidua* and *Ministra*. 2. 22. 1. Vol. 1. p. 247.
- To be chosen out of the Widows or Virgins of the Church. 2. 22. 2. Vol. 1. p. 248.
- To be Forty, Fifty, or Sixty Years of Age. 2. 22. 4. Vol. 1. p. 250.
- To be the Wives of one Man. 2. 22. 5. Vol. 1. p. 250. 251.
- How ordained. 2. 22. 6. Vol. 1. p. 251 to 253.
- To assist at the Baptism of Women. 2. 22. 8. Vol. 1. p. 8.
- Not to baptize or perform any Office of the Priesthood. 2. 22. 7. Vol. 1. p. 254. It. 11. 4. 1. Vol. 3. p. 150. It. 14. 4. 5. Vol. 5. p. 91. 92.
- To catechize the Women-Catechumens. 2. 22. 9. Vol. 1. p. 256.
- To visit the Sick, and Prisons, and attend the Women's Gate in the Church. 2. 22. 10. Vol. 1. p. 256.
- How and when the Order came to be extinct. 2. 22. 14. Vol. 1. p. 258.
- Dead.* The Relicks of the *Dead* not to be kept above Ground, but to be buried. 23. 4. 8. Vol. 7. p. 368.
- Their Relicks not to be worshipped. 23. 4. 9. Vol. 10. p. 369 to 372.
- Not to be baptized, nor others for them. 11. 4. 3. Vol. 3. p. 152.
- Of baptizing for the *Dead*. 11. 4. 4. Vol. 3. p. 153. 155.
- Kiss of Peace not to be given to the *Dead*. 23. 3. 14. Vol. 7. p. 344.
- *Eucharist* not to be given to the *Dead*. 15. 4. 19. Vol. 5. p. 338. It. 23. 3. 14. Vol. 7. p. 344.
- Prayer for the *Dead*. 15. 3. 15. Vol. 5. p. 261 to 267. It 23. 3. 13. Vol 7. p. 341 to 344.
- The *Dead*; how excommunicated. 16. 3. 12. Vol. 6. p. 156.
- How Absolution was given after *Death*. 19. 2. 11. Vol. 6. p. 635. 636.
- Deans* in Cathedral Churches much of the same Nature with the old *Archipresbyteri*. 2. 19. 18. Vol. 1. p. 209.

- Debtors.* Public Debtors denied the Benefit of Sanctuary. 8. 11. 4. Vol. 2. p. 244.
- Refusal of paying just *Debts* censured as Theft. 16. 12. 6. Vol. 6. p. 402.
- Decani.* Officers set over every Ten Monks. 7. 3. 11. Vol. 2. p. 41.
- *Copiata.* Officers attending Funerals. 3. 8. 3. Vol. 1. p. 300. 301.
- Decanorum Corpus.* Military Officers belonging to the Emperor's Palace. *Ibid.*
- Decanica.* Prisons belonging to the Church. 8. 7. 9. Vol. 2. p. 179.
- Decimæ.* Tribute paid to the Emperor. 5. 5. 3. Vol. 1. p. 486.
- Decumani.* Tax-gatherers. *Ibid.* p. 486.
- Decuriones.* Common-Council Men not to be ordained. 4. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 277.
- Dedication* of Churches. 8. 9. 2. Vol. 2. p. 212. See more in Churches.
- Defensores.* Lawyers. Their Extortion censured. 16. 12. 12. Vol. 6. p. 410.
- *Pauperum.* 3. 11. 2. Vol. 1. p. 311.
- *Ecclesiæ.* 3. 11. 3. Vol. 1. p. 312.
- Defensors;* both Clergymen and Laymen. 3. 11. 4. Vol. 1. p. 314.
- Not originally invested with any Spiritual Power over the Clergy. 3. 11. 3. Vol. 1. p. 313.
- Marriages sometimes made before the *Defensors.* 22. 4. 2. Vol. 7. p. 268 and 22. 3. 10. p. 260.
- Degradation,* and Excommunication sometimes both inflicted on Delinquent Clergymen, 6. 2. 2. Vol. 1. p. 504. It. 17. 1. 4. Vol. 6. p. 451 and 17. 1. 6. p. 453.
- Sometimes only Partial from an higher Order to a lower. 17. 4. 2. Vol. 6. p. 477.
- *Total;* for what Crimes inflicted. 6. 2. 3. Vol. 1. p. 505. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 490.
- Clerks after *Total Degradation* seldom restored by Penance to their Orders. 17. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 495.
- Demoniacs.* See *Energumens.*
- Denarismus.* A Tax so called. 5. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 455.
- Denarius.* The Offering of a Penny; when first brought into the Eucharistical Oblation. 15. 2. 5. Vol. 5. p. 211.
- Dendrophori.* A sort of Heathen Conjurers. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 232.
- Descriptio Animarum.* A Tax so called. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 442.
- *Lucrativorum:* A Tax so called. 5. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 455.
- Deserters.* Of the Clerical Life; how punished. 3. 1. 5. Vol. 1. p. 273.
- Of the Clerical Life; to forfeit their Estates to the Church. 5. 4. 12. Vol. 1. p. 477. and 6. 4. 1. p. 557.
- Of Religion. See *Apostates.*
- Detraction;* how censured in the Clergy. 6. 2. 10. Vol. 1. p. 521. 522.
- How censured in the Laity. 16. 13. 3. Vol. 6. p. 437.
- Δεξαμενή.* The Font. 8. 7. 4. Vol. 2. p. 174.
- Διάκονοι.* Deaconesses. 2. 22. 1. Vol. 1. p. 247.
- Diaconissa.* A Deacon's Wife. 2. 22. 15. Vol. 1. p. 259.
- Diapsalma.* 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5. p. 16.
- Dicc.* Forbidden to the Clergy. 17. 5. 24. Vol. 6. p. 515.

- Didumarii*. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 232.
- Digamists*; excluded from Ordination. 4. 5. 1. Vol. 1. p. 382.
- What *Digamists* excluded from Communion. 15. 4. 18. Vol. 5. p. 337.
- Dimissory* Letters, granted by the Bishop. 2. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 77.
- Letters granted by the *Chorepiscopi*. 2. 14. 8. Vol. 1. p. 141.
- Letters necessary for the Clergy removing from one Diocese to another. 16. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 562. It. 17. 5. 12. Vol. 6. p. 503; and 17. 5. 40. Vol. 6. p. 526.
- Dinothus*, Abbot of *Bangor*. His famous Defence of the Liberties of the *Britannic* Church against *Austin* the Monk. 2. 18. 2. Vol. 1. p. 186. It. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 273.
- Diocesan* Episcopacy, proved from the ancient Canons. 9. 6. 2. Vol. 2. p. 399.
- Diocesana Ecclesia*, put for Parish-Church. 8. 1. 12. Vol. 2. p. 96. It. 9. 8. 1. Vol. 2. p. 423.
- Diocese*, taken for a Patriarchal District. 9. 1. 12. Vol. 2. p. 279.
- When first applied to Episcopal Sees. 9. 2. 2. Vol. 2. p. 282.
- *St. Austin's* Diocese Forty Miles long. 9. 2. 5. Vol. 2. p. 286.
- *Theodoret's* Diocese had Four hundred Parishes in it. 9. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 312.
- Several Cities in one *Diocese*. 9. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 342.
- *St. Basil's* Diocese had fifty *Chorepiscopi* in it. 9. 3. 2. Vol. 2. p. 324.
- In what sense the whole World but one *Diocese*. 2. 5. 2. Vol. 1. p. 82.
- No Clerk to leave his own *Diocese* without Licence from his Bishop. 6. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 562. It. 17. 5. 12. Vol. 6. p. 503. and 526.
- Dioceses* anciently called *Parochia*, 9. 2. 1. Vol. 2. p. 281.
- The Thirteen 'of the *Roman* Empire. 9. 1. 5. Vol. 2. p. 255 to 257.
- *Majores*, In the Council of *Arles*, explained. 9. 1. 12. Vol. 2. p. 278.
- Conformed to the Limits of a *Roman* City. 9. 2. 3. Vol. 3. p. 284.
- Not generally so large in Nations of the first Conversion, as in the middle Ages of the Church. 9. 2. 4. Vol. 2. p. 285.
- Large *Dioceses* to be divided. 9. 6. 16. Vol. 2. p. 387.
- Not to be divided without Leave from the Primate. 17. 5. 37. Vol. 6. p. 524.
- Four Hundred *Dioceses* in *Asia Minor*. 9. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 321.
- Three Hundred *Dioceses* in *Italy*. 9. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 352. &c.
- In *Italy* confined to the Walls of small Cities. 9. 8. *Conclus*. Vol. 2. p. 435.
- No Clerk to hold Benefices in two *Dioceses*. 6. 4. 8. Vol. 1. p. 569. 570. See *Pluralities*.
- Dipping*, used in Baptism. 11. 11. 4. Vol. 3. p. 273.
- Thrice. 11. 11. 6. Vol. 3. p. 278.
- Diptychs*. An Account of them. 15. 3. 17. Vol. 5. p. 274. It. 16. 3. 12. Vol. 6. p. 156.
- Read in the *Ambon* of the Church. 8. 5. 4. Vol. 2. p. 132.
- Erasing a Man's Name out of the *Diptychs*, the same as Excommunication after Death. 16. 3. 12. Vol. 6. p. 157.

- Diptychs*. Restoring a Man's Name to the *Diptychs* the same as Absolution after Death. 19. 2. 11. Vol. 6. p. 637.
- Discipline of the Church*, a mere Spiritual power. 16. 2. 3. Vol. 6. p. 63.
- Sometimes assisted by the Secular Power. *Ibid.* p. 63. 64. It. 17. 2. 7. Vol. 6. p. 461.
- Yet never so far as to proceed to shedding of Blood. 16. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 69. &c. It. 2. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 76.
- Infringes no man's Natural or Civil Rights, or the Magistrate's Power. 16. 2. 5. Vol. 6. p. 77. It. 2. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 75.
- But consists in Admonition, Suspension, Excommunication, &c. 16. 2. 6. Vol. 6. p. 79.
- Corporal Punishment a part of *Discipline* for Inferiors and Minors. 7. 3. 12. Vol. 2. p. 42. It. 16. 3. 11. Vol. 6. p. 155. It. 17. 4. 12. Vol. 6. p. 485.
- Of the Clergy, how different from that of the Laity. 17. 1. 1. &c. Vol. 6. p. 448.
- Chiefly managed by the Bishop. 19. 3. 3. Vol. 6. p. 640.
- Bishops liable to be deposed for Neglect of *Discipline*. 17. 5. 36. Vol. 6. p. 523.
- See *Excommunication*, *Anathema*, *Suspension*, *Degrading*, *Communio Laica*, and *Communio Peregrina*.
- Diseases*, not to be cured by *Charms*, *Amulets*, *Phylacteries*, *Ligatures*, &c. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 226 to 232.
- Dismembring* the Body, censured as a lower Degree of Murder. 16. 10. 7. Vol. 6. p. 346.
- It unqualifies Men for Orders. 4. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 367.
- Divalis Lex*, and *Constitutiones Divales*. The Emperor's Edicts. 8. 1. 3. Vol. 2. p. 79.
- Divination*, and the several Kinds of it censured. 16. 5. 1. Vol. 6. p. 213. to 217.
- Divining*, by Dreams censured. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 222.
- Divinity of CHRIST*. A Sermon on the Sense of the primitive Church concerning it, in Opposition to Photinianism, Arianism, Sabellianism, and Tritheism. Vol. 8. from p. 337 to 361.
- Divisio Mensura*. The Monthly Dividend of the Clergy. 5. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 468.
- Divorce*. Lawful in Case of Fornication. 22. 5. 1. Vol. 7. p. 278.
- Allowed for other Crimes by the *Civil Law*. 22. 5. 3. Vol. 7. p. 284.
- Whether a person might marry after a lawful Divorce. 22. 2. 12. Vol. 7. p. 234.
- Marrying after unlawful Divorce how censured. 16. 11. 6. Vol. 6. p. 371 to 376.
- They, who marry Women *divorced*, not to be ordained. 4. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 381.
- They, who *divorce* themselves from their Wives, not to be ordained. 4. 5. 4. Vol. 1. p. 388.
- Doctor Audientium*. The *Catechist*. 3. 10. 2. Vol. 1. p. 307.
- Dogma*. An ancient Name for the Christian Religion. 1. 1. 9. Vol. 1. p. 8.
- Δολομέτραι*. They, who use Fraud in Measure, censured. 16. 12. 17. Vol. 6. p. 420. to 423.
- Dolus malus*. 16. 12. 14. Vol. 6. p. 413.
- Dome*. The Name of a Church. 8. 1. 2. Vol. 2. p. 78.
- Dominica Nova*. *Dominica in Albis*.

- The *Sunday after Easter*. 20. 5. 12. Vol. 7. p. 93. 94.
- Dominicum*. Its several Significations. 8. 1. 2. Vol. 2. p. 77.
- Domus Divina*. The Emperor's Palace. 5. 3. 9. Vol. 7. p. 453.
- *Divina, Domus Dei*, and *Domus Ecclesiæ*. How they differed. 8. 1. 3. Vol. 2. p. 79. 80.
- *Columbæ*. The Church. 8. 1. 2. Vol. 2. p. 79.
- Donaria*. 8. 8. 1. Vol. 2. p. 195.
- Doorkeepers*. Their Order instituted in the Third Century. 3. 6. 1. Vol. 1. p. 293.
- Deaconesses to be Doorkeepers at the Women's Gate. 2. 22. 12. Vol. 1. p. 257.
- Δῶρον*. A Name of Baptism. 11. 1. 10. Vol. 3. p. 121.
- Dotalia Instrumenta*. Dowry Instruments, how far necessary to a legal Marriage. 22. 3. 7. and 9. Vol. 7. p. 254. to 258. It. 11. 5. 11. Vol. 3. p. 196.
- Golden *Doves*. Of what use in the Church. 8. 6. 19. Vol. 2. p. 158. 159. It. 15. 4. 11. Vol. 5. p. 327.
- Dorologies*. An Account of them. 14. 2. 1. Vol. 5. p. 24.
- To the whole TRINITY. 13. 2. 1. Vol. 4. p. 30. 31. &c. It. 15. 3. 24. Vol. 5. p. 283.
- Dorologia Major*, viz. *Gloria in excelsis*. &c. 14. 2. 2. Vol. 5. p. 29. 30.
- *Minor*, viz. *Gloria, Patri, Filio*, &c. 14. 2. 1. Vol. 5. p. 24 to 29.
- Dreams*. Divination made upon them censured. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 222. 223. 224.
- Dromical Figure of Churches*. 8. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 117.
- Dungus Drungarius*. 7. 3. 21. Vol. 2. p. 58.
- Drunkenness*, a Crime for which the Clergy might be degraded. 6. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 508.
- And the Laity excommunicated. 16. 11. 13. Vol. 6. p. 389. 390.
- Ducenarii*. 6. 4. 9. Vol. 1. p. 572.
- Dumb Persons*; allowed to be baptized in some Cases. 11. 5. 2. Vol. 3. p. 179.
- Persons; admitted to Penance and Absolution in the same Circumstances. *Ibid*.
- Duumvirate*. The Office of Heathen City Magistrates, not to be taken by a Christian because of the Idolatry that attended it. 16. 4. 9. Vol. 6. p. 189. 190.

## E

- EAST. PRAYING toward the East. 13. 8. 15. Vol. 4. p. 226 to 229.
- Turning to the *East* in the Covenant of Baptism. 11. 7. 4. Vol. 3. p. 222. 223.
- Churches built to the *East*. 8. 3. 2. Vol. 2. p. 119.
- Easter-Festival* how observed. 20. 5. 6. Vol. 7. p. 85.
- Easter*, a solemn Time of Baptism. 11. 6. 7. Vol. 3. p. 206.
- Time of *Easter* to be calculated by the Metropolitans. 2. 16. 21. Vol. 1. p. 163.
- Differences about the Time of keeping *Easter*. 20. 5. 4. Vol. 7. p. 79. 80. &c. See *Paschal-Festival*.
- Ecclesia* and *Ἐκκλησιαστήριον*. The Difference between them. 8. 1. 1. Vol. 2. p. 76.
- *Matrix* and *Diocesana* how distinguished. 8. 1. 12. Vol. 2. p. 95. 96.
- Ecclesiastics*. In what sense that name

- given to all Christians. 1. 1. 8. Vol. 1. p. 8.
- Ecclesiastical Causes*, not to be tried in secular Courts. 5. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 429.
- Ἐγγαστριμίθοι. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 222.
- Ἐκατοντάρχαι. A Sort of Diviners censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 231. 232.
- Ἐκατοστία. Usury at twelve in the Hundred condemned. 6. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p. 510. 511.
- Ἐκδικοί. *Defensors*. 3. 11. 5. Vol. 1. p. 315.
- Ἐκκηρότιον. *Excommunicare*. 16. 2. 8. Vol. 6. p. 82.
- Ἐκκλησιέκδικοι. *Defensors*. 3. 11. 5. Vol. 1. p. 315.
- Ἐκλεκτοί. A Name given to Christians in general. 1. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 1. and 2.
- Ἐκλεκτων ἐκλεκτότεροι. A Name of the Primitive *Ascetics*. 7. 1. 6. Vol. 2. p. 9.
- Ἐκτυπώματα. Symbolical Representations hung up in Churches. 8. 8. 2. Vol. 2. p. 195.
- Elceseans*. Heretics, who altered the Form of Baptism. 11. 3. 6. Vol. 3. p. 142.
- Electi*. A Particular Order of *Catechumens*. 10. 2. 5. Vol. 3. p. 16.
- Elections*, of the Clergy made various Ways. 4. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 329 to 336.
- By Lots, by Revelation, by Suffrage, &c. *Ibid.*
- Of Bishops made by the joint Consent of the Provincial Bishops, Metropolitan, Clergy, and People. 4. 2. 2. Vol. 1. p. 339. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 490. 491.
- By the Bishop's choosing three and leaving the People to choose one out of them. 4. 2. 17. Vol. 1. p. 353.
- By the Bishops and Optimates, excluding the Inferior People. 4. 2. 18. Vol. 1. p. 354.
- By the Emperors alone. 4. 2. 16. Vol. 1. p. 353.
- How Elections came to be devolved upon Patrons and Princes. 4. 2. 19. Vol. 1. p. 355.
- Electors* of the Clergy to testify upon oath for their Qualifications. 4. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 358.
- Also to testify upon Oath, that they chose them freely without any Simoniacal Contract. 4. 3. 14. Vol. 1. p. 373. See *Simony*.
- Embalming* the Dead, much used by Christians. 23. 2. 5. Vol. 7. p. 316.
- Chiefly by the *Egyptians* in their *Gabbaræ* or *Mummies*. 23. 4. 8. Vol. 7. p. 367. 368.
- Ἐμβάτης. The Fountain before the Church. 8. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 122.
- Ember-Weeks* their Original. 4. 6. 6. Vol. 1. p. 397. It. 21. 2. 1. Vol. 7. p. 186.
- Ἐμολία. Usury at Fifty *per Cent* condemned. 6. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p. 511.
- Emperors'* Birthdays observed as Festivals. 21. 1. 4. Vol. 7. p. 6.
- Throne in the Church. 8. 5. 10. Vol. 2. p. 140.
- Emperors*. Not allowed to sit within the Rails of the Altar. *Ibid.*
- Put off their Arms and Crown at their Entrance into the Church. 8. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 129.
- Encenia*. Dedication of Churches observed as an annual Festival. 8. 9. 14. Vol. 2. p. 225. It. 20. 8. 1. Vol. 7. p. 128.
- Energumens*. Persons possessed with an

- evil Spirit, not to be ordained. 4. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 381. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 493.
- Capable of Baptism. 11. 5. 4. Vol. 3. p. 184.
- Capable of the Eucharist. 15. 4. 16. Vol. 5. p. 335.
- Prayers for the Energumens. 14. 5. 7. Vol. 5. p. 164.
- Their Exorcism and Station in the Church. 3. 4. 6. 7. and 8. Vol. 1. p. 285 to 288. It. 8. 4. 3. Vol. 2. p. 126.
- Ethronisticus Sermo*. 2. 11. 10. Vol. 1. p. 123.
- Ethronistica Epistola*. 2. 11. 10. Vol. 1. p. 123.
- Ἐνθεοισασταί*. Diviners censured. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 224.
- Envy*, how censured. 16. 14. 1. Vol. 6. p. 443. 444.
- Ἐορτὰ θεοσεπραῖ*. 8. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 129.
- Ephphata*. 10. 2. 13. Vol. 3. p. 26.
- Ἐπίκλησις*, and *προσφώνησις*. Invocation and Bidding Prayer, how they differed. 2. 20. 10. Vol. 1. p. 224. It. 15. 1, 3. and 4. Vol. 5. p. 185 to 195.
- Epiphany-Festival*, 20. 4. 8. Vol. 7. p. 66.
- Epiphany*. A solemn Time of Baptism in some Churches. 11. 6. 7. Vol. 3. p. 206. &c. It. 20. 4. 8. Vol. 7. p. 66.
- Episcopa*. A Bishop's Wife. 2. 22. 15. Vol. 1. p. 259.
- Episcopacy*, proved from ancient Canons. 9. 6. 20. Vol. 2. p. 399. See *Bishops*.
- A Model for settling a primitive Diocesan Episcopacy in all Protestant Churches. 9. 8. *Conclus*. Vol. 2. p. 435 to 439.
- Episcopus Episcoporum*. 2. 2. 8. Vol. 1. p. 56.
- Episcopi Monachi*. A Corruption in *Bede* for, *Ipsi Monachi*. 7. 3. 14. Vol. 2. p. 46.
- Epistola Canonica*. 2. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 77.
- *Clerica*. 3. 2. 3. Vol. 1. p. 276.
- *Commendatoria*. 2. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 77.
- *Communicatoria*, or *κοινωνικά συγγράμματα*. *Ibid*. It. 2. 11. 10. Vol. 1. p. 123.
- *Concessoria*. 6. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 563.
- *Dimissoria*, *ἀπολυτικά*. 2. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 77. It. 6. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 563. It. 17. 5. 12. Vol. 6. p. 503.
- *Ecclesiastica*. 2. 4. 9. Vol. 1. p. 77.
- *Ethronistica*. 2. 11. 10. Vol. 1. p. 122.
- *Formata*. 2. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 77. It. 5. 1. 3. Vol. 1. p. 419.
- *Pacifica*. *Ibid*. p. 77.
- *Sacra*. 2. 16. 17. Vol. 1. p. 161.
- *Synodica*. *Ibid*. It. 2. 11. 10. Vol. 1. p. 123. It. 2. 16. 17. Vol. 1. p. 161.
- *Systatica*. 5. 1. 3. Vol. 1. p. 419. and 6. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 563.
- *Tractoria*. 2. 16. 17. Vol. 1. p. 161.
- Equi Canonici*. An Imperial Tax so called. 5. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 445.
- *Cursuales*. 5. 3. 10. Vol. 1. p. 454.
- Ἐφόδιον*. *Viaticum*. A name of Baptism. 11. 1. 10. Vol. 3. p. 122.

- Ἐφῶδιον. Viaticum.* A name for the *Eucharist*. 15. 4. 9. Vol. 5. p. 323. It. 18. 4. 3. Vol. 6. p. 579. 580.
- Ἐφῶμιον* The response made in the close of a Verse in Psalmody. 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5 p. 16.
- Espousals.* The Difference between Espousals and Marriage. 22. 3. 1. Vol. 7. p. 245.
- The Manner and Ceremonies observed in Espousals. 22. 3. 3. Vol. 7. p. 248. to 255.
- Ethiopic* Church. The Custom of putting off the Shoes at going into Church still observed in the *Ethiopic* Churches. 8. 10. 6. Vol. 2. p. 232.
- Eucharist* not to be consecrated by Deacons. 2. 20. 8. Vol. 1. p. 220.
- Nor to be given by a Deacon to a Presbyter, but only to the People. 2. 20. 7. Vol. 1. p. 219.
- Consecrated in Common Bread, not in Unleavened Wafers. 15. 2. 5. Vol. 5. p. 208 to 212.
- Consecrated in Wine mixed with Water. 15. 2. 7. Vol. 5. p. 214 to 217.
- Consecrated by prayer. 15. 3. 12. Vol. 5. p. 251 &c.
- Consecrated with an audible Voice, for the People to hear and say, *Amen*. 15. 3. 33. Vol. 5. p. 293. 294.
- Given to the People in both Kinds. 15. 5. 1. Vol. 5. p. 342 to 350.
- Not the Bread dipped in Wine, but separately. 15. 5. 2. Vol. 5. p. 350 to 353.
- Given into the Hands of the People. 15. 5. 6. Vol. 5. p. 377.
- Given with a Form of Words to which the People said, *Amen*. 15. 5. 8. Vol. 5. p. 382.
- Given to the *Energumens*. 15. 4. 16. Vol. 5. p. 335.
- Given to Infants. 12. 1. 3. Vol. 3. p. 290. It. 15. 4. 7. Vol. 5. p. 313 &c. It. 15. 7. 4. Vol. 5. p. 398.
- Given to the Sick and Absent. 15. 4. 9. Vol. 5. p. 323. 324.
- Consecrated sometimes in Private Houses for the Sick. 15. 4. 10. Vol. 5. p. 325. 326.
- Reserved in the Church for the Sick. 15. 4. 11. Vol. 5. p. 327. It. 8. 6. 19. Vol. 2. p. 159.
- Sometimes reserved by Private Persons. 15. 4. 13. Vol. 5. p. 330. 331.
- Not given to the Dead, nor buried with them. 15. 4. 10. and 20. Vol. 5. p. 338. 339. It. 23. 3. 14. Vol. 7. p. 344.
- Given to Dogs by *Donatists*, whose Profanation was remarkably punished. 8. 10. 2. Vol. 2. p. 229. It. 16. 6. 26. Vol. 6. p. 280.
- Not used for Canonical Purgation, as later Ages called it. 15. 5. 9. Vol. 5. p. 384. 385.
- How abused by *Novation* and others. *Ibid*.
- Received fasting. 15. 7. 8. Vol. 5. p. 404.
- Not worshipped with Divine Adoration. 15. 5. 5. Vol. 5. p. 370.
- Remains of the *Eucharist* either burnt or given to Children. 15. 7. 4 and 5. Vol. 5. p. 398. 399. 400.
- The *Eucharist* reckoned an Absolution. 19. 1. 3. Vol. 6. p. 607. to 610.
- Ἐυχαριστία ὀρθρινή.* The Morning Thanksgiving. 13. 10. 7. Vol. 4. p. 263.
- Ἐκκῆριοι οἴκοι.* Churches or Oratories. 8. 1. 4. Vol. 2. p. 81.
- Euchites.* Heretics maintaining that

- Men ought to do nothing but pray. 11. 2. 5. Vol. 3. p. 129.
- Eulogia*, 15. 4. 3. Vol. 5. p. 300. and 15. 4. 8. Vol. 5. p. 322.
- Jewish Eulogia* not to be received. 16. 6. 3. Vol. 6. p. 344.
- Eunuchs* incapable of Ordination, 4. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 366. 367.
- '*Ευχὴ πιστῶν*. Why the *Lord's-Prayer* so called. 1. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 28. It. 13. 7. 9. Vol. 4. p. 204.
- The Communion-Service. 13. 1. 9. Vol. 4. p. 22.
- '*Ευχὴ κατηχεμένων*. The Ante-Communion-Service at which the *Catechumens* might be present. 13. 1. 9. Vol. 5. p. 22. See *Missæ Catechumenorum*.
- Ευχὴ διὰ σωπῆς*. Silent-Prayer. 15. 1. 1. Vol. 5. p. 175. &c.
- Ευχὴ διὰ Προσφωνήσεως*, see *Bidding-Prayer*. 16. 1. 2. Vol. 5. p. 184.
- Evening-Prayer*. 13. 11. 1. Vol. 4. p. 276.
- Evening Hymn*. 13. 11. 5. Vol. 4. p. 279. 280.
- Eunomians* changed the Form of Baptism, and baptized with the Heels upward, 11. 3. 10. Vol. 3. p. 146. It. 11. 11. 4. Vol. 3. p. 273. 274.
- Examination* of Persons to be ordained. 4. 3. 1. Vol. 1. p. 357.
- Exarchs* of the Provinces. The same as Primates or Metropolitans. 2. 16. 5. Vol. 1, p. 151.
- Of a Diocese the same as Patriarchs. 2. 17. 2. Vol. 1. p. 166.
- Exceptores*. Notaries. 3. 13. 5. Vol. 1. p. 325.
- Exchequer*. Allowance made to the Clergy out of it. 5. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 473.
- Excommunicatio Minor*. Suspension from the Communion, 16. 2. 7. Vol. 6. p. 80.
- *Major*. *Anathema*. 16. 2. 8. Vol. 6. p. 82.
- Excommunication, ipso Facto*. 16. 3. 10. Vol. 6. p. 150.
- Managed sometimes by Presbyters, 7. 3. 12. Vol. 2. p. 42.
- Sometimes by Deacons, 2. 20. 12. Vol. 1. p. 227.
- After Death how inflicted. 6. 4. 10. Vol. 1. p. 573. It. 16. 3. 12. Vol. 6. p. 156.
- Notified to other Churches. 16. 2. 9. Vol. 6. p. 85.
- Of innocent Persons dangerous to the Excommunicator. 16. 3. 7. and 8. Vol. 6. p. 144. and 147.
- Not to be pronounced against any without previous Admonition, Evidence of two Witnesses, and those not Heretics, &c. 16. 3. 9. and 10. Vol. 6. p. 149. to 154.
- Forborn sometimes for the Good of the Church. 16. 3. 6. Vol. 6. p. 133. to 144.
- Not ordinarily inflicted on Children and Minors. 16. 3. 11. Vol. 6. p. 154. 155.
- Not inflicted for small Offences. 16. 3. 13. Vol. 6. p. 158. 159.
- Nor for Pecuniary Matters and mere Temporal Causes. 16. 3. 15. Vol. 6. p. 170. 171. 172.
- Nor for Sins only in Design and intention. 16. 3. 17. Vol. 6. p. 174. See *Discipline*.
- Excommunicatæd* Persons avoided in civil Commerce. 16. 2. 11. Vol. 6. p. 91.
- Their Oblations not to be received. 15. 2. 2. Vol. 5. p. 200. It. 16. 2. 13. Vol. 6. p. 98.
- Denied the Privileges of Christian Burial. 16. 2. 11. Vol. 6. p. 92. 93. It. 23. 3. 23. Vol. 7. p. 358.

- Not to be absolved but in their own Church. 16. 2. 10. Vol. 6. p. 86.
- Excommunicated* Persons not to be Evidence against Bishops. 5. 1. 5. Vol. 1. p. 423.
- Exedra*. The Reading-Desk. 8. 5. 4. Vol. 2. p. 132.
- The Place of the Altar. 8. 6. 9. Vol. 2. p. 146.
- Exedrae*. All the outer Buildings of the Church. 8. 7. 1. Vol. 2. p. 170.
- Exemption* of the Clergy from Taxes and Civil Offices. See *Clergy*.
- Exomologesis* not the same as Auricular Confession. 18. 3. 1. Vol. 6. p. 548. 549.
- Ἐξομολογήσεως ψαλμὸς. The Penitential Psalm or Psalm of Confession. 13. 10. 13. Vol. 4. p. 271. 272.
- Exorcism* of the *Catechumens*. 10. 2. 8. Vol. 3. p. 19. 20.
- Forms of *Exorcism*. 3. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 285.
- Exorcists* at first no peculiar Order of the Clergy. 3. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 281.
- Made an Order in the Third Century. 3. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 284.
- Form of Ordaining *Exorcists*. 3. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 285.
- In what sense every Man his own *Exorcist*. 3. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 283.
- Ἐξοθενήμεινοι. 2. 7. 2. Vol. 1. p. 91.
- Exposing* of Infants reputed Murder. 16. 10. 11. Vol. 6. p. 351. 352.
- F.
- Face*. Malefactors not to be branded in the Face. 16. 10. 7. Vol. 6. p. 347.
- Faith*, Profession of, according to the
- Articles of the *Creed* required in Baptism. 11. 7. 8. Vol. 3. p. 228. 229. 230.
- What Faith required in Persons to be ordained. 4. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 357. 358.
- Unity of Faith fundamental to the Being of the Church. 16. 1. 1. Vol. 6. p. 1. to 9.
- Unity of Faith how maintained in the *Catholic* Church without one visible Head. 16. 1. 8. and 9. Vol. 6. p. 36. 37. It. 16. 1. 14. Vol. 6. p. 48. 49. See *Unity*.
- The Rule of *Faith*. 16. 1. 1. Vol. 6. p. 4. It. 10. 3. 2. Vol. 3. p. 53. See *Creed*.
- Fanatici*. Diviners censured. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 224.
- Fans*. Of what use in the Church. 15. 3. 6. Vol. 5. p. 240. 241. See ῥήματα.
- Fast*. *Lent-Fast*. See *Lent*.
- *Rogation-Fast*. 21. 2. 8. Vol. 7. p. 192.
- *Fasting-Days* appointed by Bishops in their own Churches. 2. 6. 4. Vol. 1. p. 87.
- Fastings* of the Monks voluntary, not imposed. 7. 3. 16. Vol. 2. p. 48.
- Fasting* forbidden on the *Lord's-day*. 16. 8. 3. Vol. 6. p. 327. It. 20. 2. 5. Vol. 7. p. 30.
- Forbidden also in the Fifty Days of *Pentecost*. 20. 6. 3. Vol. 7. p. 98.
- Fasts* of the Four Seasons. 21. 2. 1. Vol. 7. p. 186.
- Of *Ember-Weeks*. 21. 2. 7. Vol. 7. p. 191.
- Of *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*. 21. 3. 1. Vol. 7. p. 194.
- *Occasional Fasts*. 21. 3. 5. Vol. 7. p. 201.

- Fathers.* A name given to Bishops. 2. 2. 7. Vol. 1. p. 54.
- To Abbots also. 7. 3. 11. Vol. 2. p. 42.
- The People called *Fathers* from their Concern in the Election of Bishops. 4. 2. 9. Vol. 1. p. 346.
- Feasts of Charity at the Communion.* 15. 7. 6. 7. and 8. Vol. 5. p. 401. 402. 403.
- Why forbidden. 8. 10. 1. Vol. 2. p. 226. It. 15. 7. 9. Vol. 5. p. 408. 409.
- At the Graves of the Dead. 23. 3. 16. and 17. Vol. 7. p. 346. 347.
- At the Graves of the Martyrs how abused. 20. 7. 10. Vol. 7. p. 118. 119. 120.
- On the Anniversary-Days of the Dedication of Churches. 8. 9. 14. Vol. 2. p. 225. It. 20. 8. 1. Vol. 7. p. 128.
- Fencing-Masters* censured as Murderers. 16. 10. 13. Vol. 6. p. 354.
- Ferix Æstivæ and Autumnales.* 20. 1. 2. Vol. 7. p. 2. 3. 4.
- Ferix Quarta and Sextæ Jejunium.* See *Fasts*
- Fermentum.* The *Eucharist* so named from the Use of Leavened and Common Bread. 15. 2. 5. Vol. 5. p. 210.
- Ferule.* Why one Part of the Church so called. 8. 4. 2. Vol. 2. p. 126.
- Festival of all Martyrs in general.* 20. 7. 14. Vol. 7. p. 126. &c.
- Festivals Civil and Ecclesiastical.* The Account of both. 20. 1. 1. Vol. 7. p. 1.
- Of Martyrs how observed. 13. 9. 5. Vol. 4. p. 241. 242. It. 20. 7. 5. Vol. 7. p. 109. 110.
- Observed upon the Anniversary Day of Bishops' Ordinations. 20. 8. 2. Vol. 7. p. 129. 130. 4. 6. 15. Vol. 1. p. 404.
- In Memory of any great Deliverance. 20. 8. 3. Vol. 7. p. 133.
- Fideles.* Believers baptized, or Communicants. Their Privileges above Catechumens. 1. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 27.
- Fidelium Oratio.* The *Lord's-Prayer.* 1. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 28. It. 10. 5. 9. Vol. 3. p. 106. 107. It. 13. 7. 9. Vol. 4. p. 203.
- Fidelium Missa.* The Communion-Service. 13. 1. 3. Vol. 4. p. 12. It. 15. 1. 1. Vol. 5. p. 175.
- First-Fruits.* The Oblation of them and their Original. 5. 5. 4. Vol. 1. p. 487.
- Of the *Gentile* Converts ordained for the Ministry. 4. 1. 2. Vol. 1. p. 331.
- Flagellantes.* Monks, exercising themselves with voluntary whipping, condemned. 7. 3. 12. Vol. 2. p. 43.
- Flagellum Monachorum.* Whipping of Monks and the Inferior Clergy for some Crimes allowed. *Ibid.* Et. 16. 3. 11. Vol. 6. p. 155.
- Flamines.* Christians taking upon them the Office of *Heathen* Priests censured. 16. 4. 8. Vol. 6. p. 187.
- Flattery* how punished. 16. 12. 15. Vol. 6. p. 417. 418.
- Flentes.* The Weepers or Mourners, the lowest Rank of Penitents. 18. 1. 3. Vol. 6. p. 532.
- Flesh.* Superstitious Abstinence from it censured. 17. 5. 19. Vol. 6. p. 510.
- Flowers* strewed upon the Graves of the Dead. 23. 3. 20. Vol. 7. p. 352.
- Fonts* anciently separate from the Church. 8. 4. 5. Vol. 2. p. 127.

- How *Founts* and *Baptisteries* differed. 8. 7. 4. Vol. 2. p. 173. 174.
- Forgery* how Punished. 16. 12. 14. Vol. 6. p. 413. 414.
- Forehead*. See *Face not to be branded*.
- Bishops to grant *Formatae* to all others. 2. 3. 5. Vol. 1. p. 77.
- Clergymen not to travel without their *Formatae*. 5. 1. 3. Vol. 1. p. 419.
- Forms* of Prayer. Their Antiquity proved. 13. 5. 1. Vol. 4. p. 96. 97. 98.
- Of Exorcising. 3. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 285.
- Form* of Ordaining Presbyters. 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 206. 207. 208.
- Of Baptism not to be changed. 11. 3. 1. Vol. 3. p. 133. 134. It. 17. 5. 9. Vol. 6. p. 500.
- Every Bishop had Power to make *Forms* of Prayer for his own Church. 2. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 85.
- Formatae Literæ*. 2. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 77.
- Bishops to take *Formatae* from the Metropolitan when they travel. 2. 16. 10. Vol. 1. p. 162.
- Fornication* taught by many Heretics as lawful. 22. 1. 1. Vol. 7. p. 203. 204.
- How punished. 16. 11. 1. Vol. 6. p. 360.
- Fossarii*. 3. 8. 1. Vol. 1. p. 229.
- Fountains* at the Entrance of Churches. 8. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 122.
- France*. Churches of *France* not anciently subject to the Bishop of *Rome*. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 271. 273.
- Fraud* and *Forgery* how punished. 16. 12. 14. Vol. 6. p. 414.
- In Trust censured. 16. 12. 16. Vol. 6. p. 419.
- In Traffic censured. 16. 12. 17. Vol. 6. p. 420. to 426.
- Frediani*. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 232.
- Frugality* of the Clergy. 6. 2. 8. Vol. 1. p. 515.
- Fruventius* ordained Bishop of *India* at *Alexandria*. 4. 2. 13. Vol. 1. p. 351.
- Funeral Robes*. 23. 3. 4. Vol. 7. p. 327. 328.
- Funerals*. The Account of them. 23. 3. 1. 2. and 3. Vol. 7. p. 324. 325.
- Ordered by the *Copiatæ* and *Parabolani*, officers appointed for that Purpose. 23. 3. 7. Vol. 7. p. 332. It. 3. 8. 4. Vol. 1. p. 301.
- Psalmody at. 23. 3. 8. Vol. 7. p. 333.
- See more in *Burying the Dead*.
- G.
- GABBARÆ. *Egyptian Mummies*. 23. 4. 8. Vol. 7. p. 367.
- Galileans*. A Name of Reproach cast upon Christians. 1. 2. 2. Vol. 1. p. 11.
- Gamesters* denied Baptism. 11. 5. 7. Vol. 3. p. 190.
- Gaming* censured. 16. 12. 20. Vol. 6. p. 430. 431. 432.
- A Crime for which the Clergy were degraded. 6. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 508. It 17. 5. 24. Vol. 6. p. 514.
- Gates*. Beautiful and Royal *Gates* of the Church. 8. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 129.
- Holy *Gates* of the Chancel. 8. 6. 8. Vol. 2. p. 145.
- Gazophylacium* of the Church. 8. 7. 11. Vol. 2. p. 181.
- Genethlia*. *Birth-Days*. See *Natales* and *Birth-Days*.

- Genethliaci*. Astrologers or Calculators of Nativities censured. 16. 5. 1. Vol. 6. p. 216.
- Genius* of the Emperors not to be sworn by. 16. 7. 7. Vol. 6. p. 317.
- Genuflectentes*. An order of *Catechumens*. 10. 2. 4. Vol. 3. p. 15.
- Also an Order of Penitents. 18. 1. 5. Vol. 6. p. 535.
- GHOST, HOLY worshipped with the FATHER and SON. 13. 2. 4. Vol. 4. p. 55. to 62.
- Sin against the HOLY GHOST how censured. 16. 7. 3. Vol. 6. p. 294. to 308.
- Gilding* of Churches. 8. 8. 5. Vol. 2. p. 198.
- Gladiators* rejected from Baptism. 11. 5. 7. Vol. 3. p. 190.
- Rejected from Communion. 16. 4. 10. Vol. 6. p. 191.
- Gloria Patri*, &c. 14. 1. 8. Vol. 5. p. 10. It. 14. 2. 1. Vol. 5. p. 24. to 29.
- Gloria in excelsis*. 14. 2. 2. Vol. 5. p. 29. 30. It. 15. 3. 31. Vol. 5. p. 291. 292.
- *Glory be to thee, O Lord*, said after reading the Gospel. 14. 3. 10. Vol. 5. p. 59. 60.
- Gnostici*. Why Christians anciently so called. 1. 1. 3. Vol. 1. p. 3.
- Gnostic* heretics condemned Marriage and practised abominable Impurities. 22. 1. 3. Vol. 7. p. 206.
- Γονυκλίνοντες. See *Genuflectentes*.
- Gospel* and *Epistle*. 14. 3. 5. Vol. 5. p. 55.
- People stood up at the Reading of the Gospel. 14. 3. 10. Vol. 5. p. 59.
- Laid upon the Head of Bishops at their Ordination. 2. 11. 8. Vol. 1. p. 121.
- Lights at the Readings of the *Gospel*. 14. 3. 11. Vol. 5. p. 61.
- Swearing by the *Gospels* when first used. 16. 7. 7. Vol. 6. p. 320.
- Γραφή and Γράμμα. Names of the *Creed*. 10. 3. 4. Vol. 3. p. 54.
- Graves* reckoned sacred by all Nations. 23. 2. 2. Vol. 7. p. 309. 313.
- How adorned by *Heathens* and *Christians*. 23. 2. 3. Vol. 7. p. 310. 311. 312.
- Robbers of *Graves* how punished. 23. 4. 1. Vol. 7. p. 359.
- Robbing of *Graves* accounted Sacrilege. 16. 6. 24. Vol. 6. p. 277.
- Greeks*. A name of Reproach cast upon Christians. 1. 2. 4. Vol. 1. p. 12.
- Greeting-House*. 8. 7. 8. Vol. 2. p. 178.
- Guardians* of Orphans not to be ordained till their Office expired. 4. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 380.
- Clergymen not to be made *Guardians*. 6. 4. 10. Vol. 1. p. 573.
- Not to marry Orphans in their Minority. 22. 2. 10. Vol. 7. p. 233.
- Gyrovagi*. A Sort of Rambling Monks condemned. 7. 2. 12. Vol. 2. p. 23.

## H.

- HABITS used in Divine Service. 13. 8. 2. Vol. 4. p. 205. &c.
- Habits* of the Clergy. 6. 4. 15. Vol. 1. p. 481.
- To be decent. 17. 5. 23. Vol. 6. p. 513.
- How far the *Habit* of the Clergy distinguished them from Laymen. 6. 4. 18. Vol. 1. p. 584.
- Of Monks. 7. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 33. 34. 35.
- Promiscuous *Habits* of Men

- and Women forbidden. 16. 11. 16. Vol. 6. p. 395. 396.
- Hæredipeta.* 16. 12. 15. Vol. 6. p. 418.
- Hair cut off or dishevelled in the Exercise of Penance. 18. 2. 3. Vol. 6. p. 541. &c.
- Untied in marriage. 22. 4. 5. Vol. 7. p. 271.
- Long Hair censured in the Clergy. 6. 4. 15. Vol. 1. p. 581.
- Hands, Joining of.* A Ceremony used in Esponsals and in Marriages. 22. 3. 6. Vol. 7. p. 253. It. 22. 4. 4. Vol. 7. p. 270.
- Harioli.* Soothsayers censured. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 223.
- Hartots.* Keepers of them censured. 16. 11. 10. Vol. 6. p. 383. 384. 385.
- Hawks and Hounds* not to be kept by the Clergy. 17. 5. 24. Vol. 6. p. 514.
- Head* uncovered in Divine Worship. 13. 8. 9. Vol. 4. p. 218. 219.
- No Necessity of a Visible *Head* to maintain the Unity of the *Catholic Church.* 16. 1. 14. Vol. 6. p. 48. 49. 50.
- Of the Church a Title given to the Bishop of *Constantinople.* 2. 17. 21. Vol. 1. p. 183.
- Hearers.* An Order of *Catechumens.* 10. 2. 3. Vol. 3. p. 15.
- An Order of Penitents. 18. 1. 4. Vol. 6. p. 534.
- Their Station in the Church. 8. 4. 3. Vol. 2. p. 126.
- Heathen Temples.* See *Temples.*
- Heathens* allowed to hear Sermons in the Church. 8. 4. 4. Vol. 2. p. 127.
- Attesting the Excellency of the Christian Rules. 6. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 496. 497.
- How far the study of *Heathen Books* permitted to the Clergy. 6. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 535.
- Hebdomus Magna.* The Week before *Easter* how observed. 21. 1. 24. Vol. 7. p. 172. 173.
- Hembomadarii.* 7. 3. 17. Vol. 2. p. 52.
- Hegumenia.* 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 27.
- Hemiphorium.* 6. 4. 20. Vol. 1. p. 589. and 591.
- Henry VIII.* His Design to augment the Number of Bishops in *England.* 9. 8. *Conclus.* Vol. 2. p. 436.
- Heresiarchs* more severely treated than their Followers. 16. 6. 18. Vol. 6. p. 270.
- Heretical Baptism* makes Men incapable of Ordination. 4. 3. 12. Vol. 1. p. 370.
- Heretical Conventicles* given to the Church. 5. 4. 11. Vol. 1. p. 476.
- Books to be burned. 16. 2. 14. Vol. 6. p. 99.
- How far the study of *Heretical Books* allowed to the Clergy. 6. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 535.
- Heretics* not accounted *Christians.* 1. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 24.
- Civil Punishments inflicted on *Heretics.* 16. 6. 6. Vol. 6. p. 252. 253. 254.
- Ecclesiastical Punishments inflicted on *Heretics.* 16. 6. 6. Vol. 6. p. 255. 256.
- Marriages not to be made with *Heretics.* 16. 2. 14. Vol. 6. p. 99. It. 22. 2. 1. Vol. 7. p. 215 to 222.
- Not to be communicated with 6. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 556.
- Persons ordained by heretics to be re-ordained. 4. 7. 8. Vol. 1. p. 412.
- Not to be Evidence against Bishops. 5. 1. 5. Vol. 1. p. 423.

- Not to have Benefit of Sanctuary. 8. 11. 6. Vol. 2. p. 245.
- Clergy turning *Heretics* to be degraded, and never admitted again but only to Lay-Communion. 6. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 555.
- Heretics* allowed sometimes to hear Sermons in the Church. 8. 4. 4. Vol. 2. p. 127. It. 13. 1. 2. Vol. 4. p. 18. It. 16. 6. 8. Vol. 6. p. 258.
- What makes a formal *Heretic*. 16. 6. 21. Vol. 6. p. 272.
- What required of *Heretics* in order to Absolution. 19. 2. 9. Vol. 6. p. 632. 633.
- Hermeneutæ*. Interpreters. 3. 13. 4. Vol. 1. p. 324.
- Hermians*. Heretics rejecting Baptism. 11. 2. 3. Vol. 3. p. 126.
- Hesychastæ*. A Sort of Monks. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 25.
- Hexapla* and *Tetrapla*. 14. 3. 17. Vol. 5. p. 72.
- Hierarchy* and *ἱερόμενοι*. Names peculiar to the superior Clergy. 3. 1. 6. Vol. 1. p. 273.
- Highways* and *Bridges*. The Clergy sometimes exempt from contributing to them. 5. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 452.
- Hind*. Offering an *Hind* on *New Year's Day* censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 23. It. 20. 1. 8. Vol. 7. p. 6.
- Histopedes*. A Name given to the *Eunomians* from their baptizing with the Heels upward. 11. 11. 4. Vol. 3. p. 275.
- HOLY GHOST worshipped with the FATHER and SON. 13. 2. 4. Vol. 4. p. 55. to 62.
- Sin against the HOLY GHOST. 16. 7. 3. Vol. 6. p. 294. to 309.
- Form. "Receive the Holy Ghost." not in any ancient Rituals of Ordination. 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 208.
- Holy, Holy, Holy* Hymn. 14. 2. 3. Vol. 5. p. 30. 31. 32.
- Abuse of *Holy Things* how punished with Divine Judgments. 8. 10. 2. Vol. 2. p. 229. It. 16. 6. 26. Vol. 6. p. 280.
- Holy Water*. Its original. 8. 3. 7. Vol. 2. p. 123.
- Homilies*. A Name of Sermons. 14. 4. 1. Vol. 5. p. 76.
- Read in the Church. 2. 20. 11. Vol. 1. p. 225. It. 14. 4. 22. Vol. 5. p. 132. 133.
- Homoousians*. 1. 2. 13. Vol. 1. p. 19.
- Honey* and *Milk* offered at the Altar. 15. 2. 3. Vol. 5. p. 204. See *Milk*.
- Honores* and *Munera Sordida* how distinguished. 5. 3. 12. Vol. 1. p. 456.
- Honor Cathedræ*. A Pension paid to Bishops at their Visitations. 9. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 432.
- Horse-Racing* censured. 16. 4. 10. Vol. 6. p. 192.
- Hosanna*. 2. 9. 3. Vol. 1. p. 99. It. 14. 2. 15. Vol. 5. p. 36.
- Hospitality* of the Clergy. 6. 2. 7. Vol. 1. p. 514.
- No *Hospitality* to entertain the Rich. 6. 2. 8. Vol. 1. p. 515.
- Host-Worship* unknown to the Ancient Church. 15. 5. 5. Vol. 5. p. 370. to 376.
- Hucksters* how punished. 16. 12. 17. Vol. 6. p. 424.
- Husband* of one Wife. The meaning of it. 4. 5. 1. Vol. 1. p. 381. See *Digamists*.
- Women not to marry in the Absence of their *Husbands*. 22. 2. 9. Vol. 7. p. 232..

- Twelve Months after the Death of their *Husbands*. 22. 2. 8. Vol. 7. p. 231.
- Huy Island*. See *Abbot of Huy*.
- Hydroparastatæ*. Heretics that consecrated the *Eucharist* in Water only. 15. 2. 7. Vol. 5. p. 214.
- Hyemantes*. *Demoniacs*. 3. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 286. It. 18. 4. 13. Vol. 6. p. 597 to 600.
- Hymns*. An Account of the ancient Hymns and Doxologies. 14. 2. 1. & 2. Vol. 5. p. 24 to 30.
- *Hymnus Cherubicus*. *Trisagion*. 14. 2. 3. Vol. 5. p. 30. 31. 32.
- *Morning-Hymn*. 13. 9. 9 & 10. & 13. 10. 1. & 2. & 13. 10. 9. Vol. 4. p. 251 to 254. & p. 257 to 259. & 264. 265.
- *Evening-Hymn*. 13. 11. 5. Vol. 4. p. 279 to 281.
- *Hymn of Thanksgiving* after Supper. 7. 3. 17. Vol. 2. p. 51.
- Hypapante*, *Candlemas-Day*. 20. 8. 5. Vol. 7. p. 135.
- Hypopsalma*. 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5. p. 16.
- Hypsistarians*. 16. 6. 2. Vol. 6. p. 242.
- I
- ἸΔΙΩΤΑΙ. Laymen. 1. 5. 6. Vol. 1. p. 35.
- Idleness* censured. 16. 12. 19. Vol. 6. p. 428 to 430.
- Idolaters* of several kinds how punished. 16. 4. 4. Vol. 6. p. 179.
- Idolatry* to worship any creature. 13. 3. 1. Vol. 4. p. 63.
- Encouragers and Connivers at *Idolatry* how censured. 16. 4. 19. Vol. 6. p. 208. &c.
- Idol-Festivals* not to be observed. 16. 4. 17. Vol. 6. p. 202.
- When a Man may be present at an *Idol-Sacrifice*. 16. 4. 15. Vol. 6. p. 198. 199.
- Builders or Adorners of *Idol-Temples* and *Altars* censured. 16. 4. 12. Vol. 6. p. 195.
- Idol-makers* censured. 16. 4. 11. Vol. 6. p. 192.
- Sellers of *Frankincense* and things offered to *Idols* how censured. 16. 4. 13. Vol. 6. p. 196.
- Idolothya*. Eating Things offered to *Idols*. 16. 4. 14. Vol. 6. p. 197. 198.
- Idols* or *Idol-Temples* not to be demolished without Authority. 16. 4. 19. Vol. 6. p. 211.
- Jejunia quatuor temporum*. 4. 6. 6. Vol. 1. p. 396. 397.
- Jerusalem* subject to the *Primate of Casarea*. 2. 18. 4. Vol. 1. p. 187.
- Ἱεροκήρυκες. Deacons. 2. 20. 10. Vol. 1. p. 223.
- Ἱερεργία. 13. 1. 8. Vol. 4. p. .
- Ἱερώμενοι. The superior Clergy. 3. 1. 6. Vol. 1. p. 273.
- Jesseans*. An ancient Name of *Christians*. 1. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 1.
- Jews* allowed to hear *Sermons* in the Church. 8. 4. 4. Vol. 2. p. 127. It. 13. 1. 2. Vol. 4. p. 8. It. 16. 6. 8. Vol. 6. p. 258.
- Not to have Benefit of *Sanctuary*. 8. 11. 5. Vol. 2. p. 245.
- Jews* and *Christians* confounded together by *Heathen Writers*. 1. 1. 10. Vol. 1. p. 9.
- Jewish Apostates* how censured. 16. 6. 1. Vol. 6. p. 241.
- Testimony of *Jewish Apostates* not to be admitted in any Court. 16. 6. 1. Vol. 6. p. 241.

- *Christians* not to marry with *Jews*. 22. 2. 1. Vol. 7. p. 215, to 222.
- Nor to receive *Eulogiæ* from *Jews*. 16. 6. 3. Vol. 6. p. 244, 245.
- Clergymen not to eat with *Jews*. 6. 4. 14. Vol. 1. p. 580.
- Jewish Liturgy*. An account of it. 13. 5. 4. Vol. 4. p. 104 to 109.
- Ignorance* censured in the Clergy. 6. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 531, 532.
- Illuminati*. Baptized Persons. 1. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 25. It. 11. 1. 4. Vol. 3. p. 115.
- Images* not allowed in Churches for above Three Hundred Years. 8. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 199 to 203.
- *Massy Images* or Statues not allowed for many Ages after. 8. 8. 11. Vol. 2. p. 208.
- No *Images* of GOD or the TRINITY allowed till after the second Council of *Nice*. 8. 8. 10. Vol. 2. p. 206, 207.
- Image-Makers* rejected from Baptism. 11. 5. 6. Vol. 3. p. 187, 188.
- And from the Communion. 16. 4. 11. Vol. 6. p. 192 to 195.
- Immersion* used in Baptism. 11. 11. 4. Vol. 3. p. 273, 274.
- Trine Immersion*. 11. 11. 6. Vol. 3. p. 278, 279, 280. See *Dipping* and *Baptism*.
- Immunity* of the Clergy from the secular Courts in Ecclesiastical Causes. 5. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 429.
- From Taxes and Civil Offices. 5. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 438 to 441. See Clergy.
- Impluvium*. The open Court before the Church. 8. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- Imposition* of Hands in making *Catechumens*. 10. 1. 2 Vol. 3. p. 2, 3.
- In making *Penitents*. 18. 2. 1. Vol. 6. p. 537.
- In Absolution. 19. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 621.
- In Confirmation. 12. 3. 5. Vol. 3. p. 313.
- In Exorcising the *Energumens*. 3. 4. 5. & 7. Vol. 1. p. 285 and 287.
- In the Bishop's Prayers of *Benediction*. 13. 10. 8. Vol. 4. p. 263.
- In the Ordination of all the superior Clergy. 4. 6. 11. Vol. 1. p. 402.
- In the Ordination of *Deaconesses*. 2. 22. 6. Vol. 1. p. 251 to 254.
- No *Imposition* of Hands in appointing the *Inferior Orders* of the Clergy. 3. 1. 6. Vol. 1. p. 274.
- Impostors*. A name of Reproach cast upon *Christians* by the *Heathens*. 1. 2. 4. Vol. 1. p. 12.
- Incendiaries*, burnt alive. 16. 12. 3. Vol. 6. p. 400.
- Incense*, not used in the first Ages. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 2. p. 165.
- Incest*, how punished. 16. 11. 3. Vol. 6. p. 364. It. 22. 2. 3. Vol. 7. p. 223 to 225.
- *Marriage* of *Cousin-germans* not reckoned *Incest*. 16. 11. 4. Vol. 6. p. 366, 367.
- Incestuous* *Marriages* forbidden. 22. 2. 3. Vol. 7. p. 223 to 225.
- Inchanters* censured. 16. 5. 5. & 7. Vol. 6. p. 225 and 233.
- Independency* of *Bishops*. 2. 6. 1. Vol. 1. p. 84, 85.
- Of *Bishops* chiefly maintained in the *African Churches*. 2. 6. 5. Vol. 1. p. 87.
- Independency* of the Churches of *Britain*, *Cyprus*, *Armenia*, *Bulgaria*,

- Iberia*, &c. 2. 18. 2. Vol. 1. p. 185, 186. It. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 271 to 275.
- Indicere Orationem*, and *Indicta Oratio*. The meaning of the Phrases. 15. 1. 3. Vol. 5. p. 188. 189.
- Indictio Canonica*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 443.
- Indulgences*, anciently granted by all Bishops in moderating the Rigour of Penance. 18. 4. 8. Vol. 6. p. 593.
- Granted by the Emperors to Prisoners at Easter. 20. 5. 6. Vol. 7. p. 85.
- Baptism the grand *Indulgence* of the Church. 11. 1. 2. Vol. 3. p. 113. It. 19. 1. 2. Vol. 6. p. 603.
- Infant-Baptism*. 11. 4. 5. Vol. 3. p. 156. 157.
- Infants* confirmed. 12. 1. 2. Vol. 3. p. 288 to 290.
- Communicated. 12. 1. 3. Vol. 3. p. 290. It. 15. 4. 7. Vol. 5. p. 313. It. 15. 7. 4. Vol. 5. p. 398. 399.
- Informers*, reputed Murderers. 16. 10. 10. Vol. 6. p. 350.
- Initiati*. 1. 4. 2. Vol. 1. p. 26.
- Injustice*; malicious censured. 16. 12. 3. Vol. 6. p. 399.
- Innocent's Day*. Its Antiquity. 20. 7. 12. Vol. 7. p. 122.
- Insacрати Ministri*. 3. 1. 6. Vol. 1. p. 273.
- Inscriptionis Vinculum*. 16. 10. 9. Vol. 6. p. 350.
- Insulani*. Monks so called. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 27.
- Intercession*, made by Bishops for Criminals to the secular Magistrates. 2. 8. 1. Vol. 1. p. 94. 95. It. 16. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 71.
- Made by Monks also. 7. 3. 21. Vol. 2. p. 57. 58.
- By Magistrates to Bishops. 18. 4. 10. Vol. 6. p. 595.
- Intercessores* and *Interventores*. Bishops managing the Business of vacant Sees. 2. 15. 1. Vol. 1. p. 146. It. 4. 2. 7. Vol. 1. p. 345.
- Interventors*, not to be made Bishops of the Places, where they were Interventors. 4. 2. 14. Vol. 1. p. 351.
- Interdicts*. The Novelty of them. 16. 3. 7. Vol. 6. p. 144. 145.
- Interment*. See *Burying of the Dead*.
- Interpretes Ecclesie*. 3. 13. 4. Vol. 1. p. 324.
- Invitatory Psalm*, at the Celebration of the *Eucharist*. 15. 3. 32. Vol. 5. p. 293.
- Job* and *Jonah* read in the *Passion-Week*. 14. 3. 3. Vol. 5. p. 51.
- Ireland*, never had Three Hundred Sixty-five Bishops at one Time. 9. 6. 19. Vol. 2. p. 392.
- Italy*, had Three Hundred Dioceses in it. 9. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 353.
- Judices electi* what. 2. 16. 16. Vol. 1. p. 160.
- Jugatio* and *Juga*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 442.
- Julian's* Commendation of the Laws of *Christians*. 6. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 496. 497.
- His design to reform the *Heathen* Priests by the Rules of the Primitive Clergy. 6. 5. 9. Vol. 1. p. 602. 603. 604.
- Juramentum de Calumnia*. 16. 7. 4. Vol. 6. p. 311.
- Justinian's* Inscription upon the Altar of *Sancta Sophia*. 8. 8. 4. Vol. 2. p. 198.
- His Boast upon building the Church of *Sancta Sophia*. 8. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 112.

## K.

K. The Letter K the Brand of False Accusers. 16. 13. 1. Vol. 6. p. 434.

*Kalendar*, or *Calendar* of proper Lessons. 14. 3. 3. Vol. 5. p. 48. 49. &c.

*Kalendars*, or *Calendars* of Martyrs. How they differed from Martyrologies. 20. 7. 4. Vol. 7. p. 109.

*Kalends*, or *Calends* of *January*; an *Heathen* Festival much inveighed against. 16. 4. 17. Vol. 6. p. 203. It. 20. 1. 3. Vol. 7. p. 5.

Καθαίρεισις. *Degradation*, 17. 1. 6. Vol. 6. p. 453.

Κανῶν. See *Canon*.

Κανονίζειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας. The Meaning of the Phrase. 8. 9. 7. Vol. 2. p. 219.

Κάπηλοι. Fraudulent Hucksters censured. 16. 12. 17. Vol. 6. p. 424.

Καταγῶγια. Dwelling-Houses belonging to the Church. 8. 7. 13. Vol. 2. p. 185. 186.

Καταπέτασμα μυσικόν. The Veils of the Sanctuary. 8. 6. 8. Vol. 2. p. 145.

Κατεχόμενοι. *Demoniacs*. 3. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 286.

Κήρυκες. *Deacons*. 2. 20. 10. Vol. 1. p. 223.

Κηρύττειν. To bid Prayer. *Ibid*.

Κηρύγματα ἐκκλησιαστικά. Bidding Prayers. 15. 1. 3. Vol. 5. p. 189.

Κιγκλίδες. 8. 6. 6. Vol. 2. p. 143.

Kiss of Peace in Baptism. 12. 4. 5. Vol. 3. p. 327. to 329.

— In the *Eucharist*. 15. 3. 3. Vol. 5. p. 235. 236. It. 8. 10. 9. Vol. 2. p. 235.

— In the Ordination of Bishops. 2. 11. 10. Vol. 1. p. 122.

— In the Ordination of Presbyters. 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 207. It. 4. 6. 14. Vol. 1. p. 404.

*Kissing* of the Altar. 8. 10. 9. Vol. 2. p. 235.

— Of Bishops' Hands. 2. 9. 2. Vol. 1. p. 98.

*Kiss*, Solemn, a Ceremony of Espousals. 22. 3. 6. Vol. 7. p. 253.

— Not to be given to the Dead. 23. 3. 14. Vol. 7. p. 344.

*Kneelers*. A name of some *Catechumens*. 10. 2. 4. Vol. 3. p. 15.

— A Name of one order of Penitents. 18. 1. 5. Vol. 6. p. 535.

*Kneeling* at Prayer. 13. 8. 4. Vol. 4. p. 212. 213.

— At the Communion. 15. 5. 3. Vol. 5. p. 356.

— At the Ordination of Presbyters. 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 207. It. 4. 6. 10. Vol. 1. p. 401.

— Always used by Penitents in Prayer. 18. 2. 9. Vol. 6. p. 546.

Κλυδωνιζόμενοι. *Demoniacs*. 3. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 286. It. 18. 4. 13. Vol. 6. p. 599.

Κοινωνικὸς βίος. 7. 3. 9. Vol. 2. p. 39.

Κολυμβεῖον. The Fountain before the Church. 8. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 122.

Κολυμβήθρα. The Font. 8. 7. 4. Vol. 2. p. 173. 174.

Κρότος. Acclamations at Sermons. 14. 4. 27. Vol. 5. p. 140.

Κυλινδρωτά. Churches built in a round figure. 8. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 118.

Κυριακόν. 8. 1. 2. Vol. 2. p. 77.

*Kyrk*. 8. 1. 2. Vol. 2. p. 77. 78.

## L.

*Laborantes*. An Order among the Inferior Clergy. 3. 8. 1. Vol. 1. p. 299.

*Lacunary* Work in Churches. 8. 8. 5. Vol. 2. p. 198.

*Laici.* Laymen. The Antiquity of the Distinction between Laity and Clergy, 1. 5. 2. Vol. 1. p. 31.

— Offices of *Laity* and *Clergy* always distinct. 1. 5. 4. Vol. 1. p. 32. to 34.

*Lamb.* CHRIST not to be pictured in the Figure of a Lamb. 8. 8. 11. Vol. 2. p. 208. 209.

— Offering of a *Lamb* on *Easter-Day* in the *Roman* Church censured. 15. 2. 3. Vol. 5. p. 205. 206.

*Lampetian* Hereticks, 20. 3. 5. Vol. 7. p. 48.

*Lamps* and *Garlands*, forbidden on *New-Year's-Day*. 16. 4. 17. Vol. 6. p. 204.

— Burning by Day in *Cemeteries* censured as an *Heathenish* Custom. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 2. p. 164. It. 16. 4. 17. Vol. 6. p. 202.

*Lands* a Part of the Church's Revenues. 5. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 468.

— No Laws made to prohibit giving of *Lands* to the Church. 5. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 470. 471.

— Removing of *Landmarks* censured as *Robbery*. 16. 12. 8. Vol. 6. p. 404.

*Lanista.* Fencing-Masters, censured as Murderers. 16. 10. 13. Vol. 6. p. 354.

*Lapides sacri.* *Landmarks*. 16. 12. 8. Vol. 6. p. 404.

*Lapsers* not to be ordained. 4. 3. 7. Vol. 1. p. 363.

— Clergy lapsing to be degraded. 6. 2. 4. Vol. 1. p. 506. 507. It. 17. 5. 1. Vol. 6. p. 488.

*Laura.* A Monastery. 7. 2. 2. Vol. 2. p. 10.

*Laws* of the Church. See *Canons*.

*Laws* Imperial, published in Churches. 2. 17. 18. Vol. 1. p. 181.

*Lawyers*; capable of ordination in some Churches, not in others. 4. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 380.

— Clergymen not to turn *Lawyers*. 6. 4. 11. Vol. 1. p. 574.

— Exactions and Bribery censured. 16. 12. 12. Vol. 6. p. 410. 411.

*Lay-Communion*. 15. 5. 1. Vol. 5. p. 342. to 350. It. 17. 2. 1. Vol. 6. p. 454.

— Reducing a Clerk to *Lay Communion* the same as totally degrading. 17. 2. 3. Vol. 6. p. 455. 456.

*Lay-Chancellors.* Their Original. 2. 7. 5. Vol. 1. p. 93. 94.

*Lay-Elders* not the same with the *Seniores Ecclesie* in the ancient Church, 2. 19. 19. Vol. 1. p. 211.

*Laymen.* See *Laity*.

*Laymen's* Oratory. The Nave of the Church. 8. 5. 2. Vol. 2. p. 129.

— Priesthood. See *Baptism* and *Priesthood*.

*Lecticarii* 3. 8. 1. Vol. 1. p. 299.

*Lectionarium.* The Order of Lessons to be read in the Church. 14. 3. 3. Vol. 5. p. 48. &c.

*Lectors.* See *Readers*.

*Λειτουργία.* 13. 1. 8. Vol. 4. p. 19.

*Lent*, but Thirty-six Days to the Time of *Gregory the Great*. 12. 1. 4. Vol. 7. p. 144.

*Lent-Fast*, whether at first Forty Days, or Forty hours. 21. 1. 2. Vol. 7. p. 139. to 142.

— a perfect Abstinence from eating till Evening. 21. 1. 16. Vol. 7. p. 162.

— *Saturdays* and *Sundays* no Fasting Days in *Lent*. 21. 1. 4; Vol. 7. p. 144. See *Saturday* and *Lord's-Day*.

- Sermons every Day in *Lent*. 13. 9. 6. Vol. 4. p. 243. It. 21. 1. 20. Vol. 7. p. 168.
- Games and Plays forbidden in *Lent*. 21. 1. 22. Vol. 7. p. 170. 171.
- Festivals, Birthdays, and Marriages not to be celebrated in *Lent*. 21. 1. 23. Vol. 7. p. 172. It. 22. 2. 14. Vol. 7. p. 243. 244.
- Disputes between the Church and the *Montanists* about the Observation of *Lent*. 21. 1. 15. Vol. 7. p. 160. 161.
- Leo Sapiens*. His *Notitia* of the Church. 9. 7. 1. Vol. 2. p. 401.
- Lessons*, intermingled with Psalms and Hymns. 14. 3. 1. Vol. 5. p. 44. 45.
- Proper *Lessons* for certain Days. 14. 3. 3. Vol. 5. p. 48. to 53.
- Levites*. The common name of Deacons. 2. 20. 2. Vol. 1. p. 214.
- Libellatici*. 16. 4. 6. Vol. 6. p. 184.
- Libelling* censured. 16. 13. 2. Vol. 6. p. 436.
- Libra Occidua*. 2. 14. 15. Vol. 1. p. 145.
- Libraries* of the Church. 8. 7. 12. Vol. 2. p. 182. 183.
- Ligatures*. The use of them to cure Diseases by way of Charm and Spell censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 226. and 229.
- Lights* or Tapers used at Baptism. 12. 4. 4. Vol. 3. p. 326.
- At reading the Gospel. 14. 3. 11. Vol. 5. p. 61.
- In the Funeral Pomp. 23. 2. 6. Vol. 7. p. 322.
- Limina Martyrum*. Churches. 8. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 93.
- Linca*. Not a *Rochet*. 6. 4. 20. Vol. 1. p. 591.
- Litanies*. Their Original. 13. 1. 10. Vol. 4. p. 24. 25.
- Litania Major* and *Minor*. 13. 1. 11. Vol. 4. p. 27.
- Liturgies*, or stated Forms of Prayer. The Antiquity of them and Use in the Church. 13. 5. 1. Vol. 4. p. 97.
- Formed by Bishops for the Use of their own Churches. 2. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 85. It. 13. 5. 1. Vol. 4. p. 98.
- Clerks to be deposed who neglect to use the *Liturgy*. 17. 5. 8. Vol. 6. p. 499. 500.
- Why most of the ancient *Liturgies* are lost. 13. 5. 3. Vol. 4. p. 100. 101.
- Extract of an ancient *Liturgy* out of St. *Chrysostom's* Works. 13. 6. 1. Vol. 4. p. 162. to 168.
- An Account of the *Jewish Liturgy*. 13. 5. 4. Vol. 4. p. 104. to 110.
- Localis Ordinatio*. The meaning of it. 4. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 392.
- Locus Mulierum*. 8. 5. 6. Vol. 2. p. 133. 134.
- Locus Virginum*. 8. 5. 9. Vol. 2. p. 173. It. 7. 4. 7. Vol. 2. p. 72. 73.
- Longi*. Some Monks so called. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 27.
- Lord's-Day*. Its Original. 20. 2. 1. Vol. 7. p. 10.
- All sports forbidden on this Day. 16. 8. 4. Vol. 6. p. 329. 330.
- Also secular Business, Proceedings at Law, &c. 20. 2. 2. Vol. 7. p. 14. 15.
- Fasting and Kneeling at Public Prayers forbidden on this Day. 16. 8. 3. Vol. 6. p. 327. 328. It. 20. 2. 5. Vol. 7. p. 30. 31. 32. It. 13. 8. 3. Vol. 4. p. 209. 210.

- Communion given standing on this Day. 13. 8. 3. Vol. 4. p. 209. 210
- Zeal of the Ancients in observing the *Lord's-Day*. 20. 2. 7. Vol. 7. p. 33. 34.
- Censure of such as any ways profaned the *Lord's-Day*. 16. 8. 1. Vol. 6. p. 325. It. 20. 2. 12. Vol. 7. p. 39. 40.
- Lost Goods* not to be detained. 16. 12. 5. Vol. 6. p. 401. 402.
- Λόπταγες*. Wandering Beggars censured. 11. 5. 8. Vol. 3. p. 191.
- Lots* for Divination condemned. 16. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 219. 220.
- Divisory *Lots* allowed. 16. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 221. 222.
- Sometime used in the Designation of the Clergy. 4. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 329. 330.
- Love-Feasts* at the Communion. 15. 6. 7. 8. Vol. 5. p. 400. 408.
- Why abolished. 8. 10. 1. Vol. 2. p. 226. It. 15. 7. 9. Vol. 5. p. 408. to 410.
- Λουτρὰ*. Baths belonging to the Church. 8. 7. 13. Vol. 2. p. 186.
- Lucerne*. See *Lamps*.
- Lucernalis Oratio*. 3. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 280.
- Lucernarium* and *Λυχναψία*. 13. 9. 7. Vol. 4. p. 246.
- Lucrative Tax*. 3. 5. 11. Vol. 1. p. 455.
- Lucre* Filthy, censured. 5. 4. 13. Vol. 1. p. 478. It. 6. 2. 9. Vol. 1. p. 520. It. 16. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 219. It. 16. 12. 5. Vol. 6. p. 402.
- Ludi Sacerdotales*. 5. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 446.
- Not to be exhibited to the People by any Christian. 16. 4. 8. Vol. 6. p. 188. See *Munerarii*.

*Luminum. Dies Luminum. Epiphany-Festival*. 20. 4. 7. Vol. 7. p. 65.

*Lustralis Collatio*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 6. Vol. 1. p. 448.

—— The Clergy excused from it. *Ibid.* p. 449.

*Lying* censured. 16. 13. 5. Vol. 6. p. 439. to 443.

## M.

*MACARIANS*. A Name of Reproach cast upon the *Catholics* by the *Donatists*. 16. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 75.

*Maccabees*. Their Festival. 20. 7. 13. Vol. 7. p. 124. 195.

*Mafortes*. Monk's Garments. 7. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 33. to 36.

*Magicians* censured. 16. 5. 5. Vol. 6. p. 224. 225.

—— A Name of Reproach cast upon all *Christians* by the *Heathens*. 1. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 13.

*Magister Disciplina*. The Superintendent of the Inferior Clergy in Bishops' Families. 3. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 272.

*Magistrates*, under the Spiritual jurisdiction of Bishops. 2. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 74.

—— To be Excommunicated for great Offences. 16. 3. 5. Vol. 6. p. 121.

—— But not deprived of their Power by the Discipline of the Church. 16. 2. 5. Vol. 6. p. 77. 78.

—— had Power over the Clergy in greater Criminal Causes. 5. 2. 12. Vol. 1. p. 434. 435.

—— But not in mere Ecclesiastical Causes. 5. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 429.

*Magnificat* Hymn. 14. 2. 7. Vol. 5. p. 38.

*Majores*. A Name of Jewish Ministers. 16. 6. 2. Vol. 6. p. 244.

- Maïuma*. A lascivious Heathen Game censured. 16. 11. 12. Vol. 6. p. 338. 389.
- Malefici*. Magicians censured. 16. 5. 5. Vol. 6. p. 224. 225.
- Man*, Isle of, had but seventeen Parishes in it. 9. 8. *Conclus*. Vol. 2. p. 437.
- Μονήραι*. A Monastery. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 27.
- Manichees* rejected Baptism. 11. 2. 4. Vol. 3. p. 127.
- And Marriage. 22. 1. 7. Vol. 7. p. 210.
- Mansionarii*. Stewards of the Lands under Bishops. 3. 13. 1. Vol. 1. p. 322.
- Man-slaughter*, how punished. 16. 10. 8. Vol. 6. p. 347. 348.
- Man-stealing* censured. 16. 12. 2. Vol. 6. p. 399.
- Manumission*. See *Slaves*.
- Maranatha*. 16. 2. 16. Vol. 6. p. 106. to 109.
- Marcionites* baptized the living for the Dead. 11. 4. 4. Vol. 3. p. 153.
- And rejected all married Persons from Baptism. 11. 5. 12. Vol. 3. p. 198.
- And allowed Baptism to be repeated three Times. 12. 5. 2. Vol. 3. p. 339.
- Marcianists*. 20. 3. 5. Vol. 7. p. 48.
- Marcosians*. Heretics who rejected or corrupted Baptism. 11. 2. 1. Vol. 3. p. 124.
- Marriage* condemned by many ancient Heretics. 22. 1. 5. Vol. 7. p. 208. 209.
- Second Marriages condemned by the *Montanists* and *Novatians*. 16. 11. 7. Vol. 6. p. 376. to 379. It. 22. 1. 10. Vol. 7. p. 213. 214.
- Christians not to marry with Heathens, Jews, Heretics, &c. 22. 2. 1. Vol. 7. p. 215. to 222. It. 16. 6. 10. Vol. 6. p. 261.
- Children not to marry without the Consent of their Parents. 16. 9. 2. Vol. 6. p. 332. to 334. It. 22. 2. 4. Vol. 7. p. 226. 227.
- Nor Slaves without the Consent of their Masters. 16. 9. 3. Vol. 6. p. 335. It. 22. 2. 5. Vol. 7. p. 228.
- Judges not to marry any Woman of their Province during the Time of their Administration. 22. 2. 7. Vol. 7. p. 230. 231.
- Guardians not to marry Orphans in their minority. 22. 2. 10. Vol. 7. p. 233.
- None to marry within the prohibited Degrees of Consanguinity and affinity. 22. 2. 3. Vol. 7. p. 223. to 226. See *Incest*.
- Women not to marry in the Absence of their Husbands, till they be certified of their Death. 22. 2. 9. Vol. 7. p. 232.
- Widows not to marry till Twelve Months after their Husband's Death. 22. 2. 8. Vol. 7. p. 231.
- Penitents not to marry in the Time of their performing Public Penance. 18. 2. 8. Vol. 6. p. 545. 546.
- When first the Marriage of Spiritual Relations began to be forbidden. 11. 8. 12. Vol. 3. p. 249. It. 22. 2. 11. Vol. 7. p. 233.
- Whether a Man or Woman might marry after a lawful Divorce. 16. 11. 6. Vol. 6. p. 371 to 376. 22. 2. 12. Vol. 7. p. 234. to 241.
- Whether an Adulterer might marry an Adulteress. 22. 2. 13. Vol. 7. p. 241 to 243.
- Marriage of the Clergy*. See *Celibacy*.

- Marriage of 9 Monks not annulled.* 7. 3. 23. Vol. 2. p. 60.
- Marriage-Contract to be testified by Witnesses.* 22. 3. 8. Vol. 7. p. 255.
- Marriage-Crown.* 22. 4. 6. Vol. 7. p. 272. 273.
- Marriage-Ring.* See *Ring and Espousals.*
- Marriages forbidden in Lent.* 21. 1. 23. Vol. 7. p. 172. It. 22. 2. 14. Vol. 7. p. 243. 244.
- To be published beforehand in the Church. 22. 2. 2. Vol. 7. p. 222.
- To be celebrated by the Public Ministers of the Church. 22. 4. 1. Vol. 7. p. 262.
- In what Cases allowed, when done by others. 22. 4. 2. Vol. 7. p. 268.
- Married Persons not to turn Monks without mutual Consent.* 7. 3. 3. Vol. 2. p. 30.
- Married persons not to do Penance but by Consent.* 18. 2. 7. Vol. 6. p. 545.
- Martyria and Martyrum Memoria, Martyries or Churches.* 8. 1. 8. Vol. 2. p. 86. and 1. 11. p. 93.
- Martyrarii.* Keepers of such Churches. 8. 7. 11. Vol. 2. p. 181.
- Martyrs* how honoured in the ancient Church. 13. 9. 5. Vol. 4. p. 241. 242.
- Not worshipped. 13. 3. 2. Vol. 4. p. 67.
- Their Festivals or Birth-Days, how observed. 13. 9. 5. Vol. 4. p. 240. to 343. It. 20. 7. 1. Vol. 7. p. 105. 106.
- Their Acts or Passions taken by Notaries. See *Notaries.*
- Their Acts read in Churches. 13. 9. 5. Vol. 4. p. 241. It. 14. 3. 14. Vol. 5. p. 64. It. 20. 7. 5. Vol. 7. p. 109.
- Their Privilege in interceding for Lapsers, and moderating their Penance, 16. 3. 4. Vol. 6. p. 119. It. 18. 4. 10. Vol. 6. p. 595. See *Indulgences.*
- The Estates of *Martyrs*, dying without Heirs, given to the Church. 5. 4. 8. Vol. 1. p. 474.
- Martyrologies and Kalendars, how they differed.* 20. 7. 4. Vol. 7. p. 109.
- Mass or Missa.* The ancient name of Divine Service in general, 13. 1. 4. Vol. 4. p. 1. 13. 14.
- Private *Mass* a Novelty. 15. 4. 4. Vol. 5. p. 301 to 307.
- Presbyters not ordained to say *Mass* for the Quick and Dead, 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 207.
- Mathema.* The Creed. 10. 3. 3. Vol. 3. p. 53.
- Mathematici.* Astrologers censured. 16. 5. 1. Vol. 6. p. 213.
- Matricula.* The Roll of the Church. 1. 5. 10. Vol. 1. p. 37.
- The Register of Bishops' Ordination kept in the Primate's Church. 2. 16. 8. Vol. 1. p. 153.
- Matrix Ecclesia.* 8. 1. 12. Vol. 2. p. 95. It. 8. 7. 6. Vol. 2. p. 176.
- Matrona.* The Name of a Jewish Temple. 16. 6. 3. Vol. 6. p. 246.
- Matutina.* Mattins or Morning Prayer. 13. 9. 10. Vol. 4. p. 253.
- Mediators,* in what Sense Priests so called between God and Men. 2. 19. 16. Vol. 1. p. 205.
- Melotes,* 7. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 34.
- Memorie Martyrum.* Churches. 8. 1. 8. Vol. 2. p. 87.
- Μεμνημένοι Ἰσασιν.* The Meaning of the Phrase, 10. 5. 8. Vol. 3. p. 105.
- Men and Women in distinct Places of*

- the Church. 8. 5. 6. Vol. 2. p. 133 to 135.
- Menandrians*. Heretics that changed the Form of Baptism. 11. 3. 5. Vol. 3. p. 141.
- Mendicants*. None among the ancient Monks. 7. 3. 10. Vol. 2. p. 40.
- Mensa Martyris*. A Church. 8. 1. 9. Vol. 2. p. 89.
- Mensa Mystica*. The Communion Table. 8. 6. 14. Vol. 2. p. 152. 153.
- Mensurna Divisio*. 5. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 468.
- Μήνυτρα*. The Reward for restoring lost Goods. 16. 12. 5. Vol. 6. p. 401.
- Mercy of God to penitent Sinners*. A Sermon thereon. Vol. 8. p. 389 to 406.
- Messalians*. Their Opinion of Baptism. 11. 2. 5. Vol. 3. p. 129 to 132.
- Μετανοιας χώρα*. 8. 1. 17. Vol. 2. p. 106.  
— *Insula Metanææ*. 7. 3. 15. Vol. 2. p. 47.
- Metatum*. A Tax so called, 5. 3. 7. Vol. 1. p. 450. 451.
- Metator Antichristi*. *Ibid*.
- Metatorium*. The Vestry. 8. 7. 10. Vol. 2. p. 180.
- Metrocomia*. A Mother-Village. 9. 2. 7. Vol. 2. p. 298.
- Metropolitans*. See *Primates*.
- Μίθριον*. Temple of the Sun at *Alexandria* given to the Church. 5. 4. 10. Vol. 1. p. 476.
- Milan* never subject to the Bishop of *Rome*. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 271.
- Militia*. A general Name for all Officers Military and Civil. 6. 4. 9. Vol. 1. p. 572.
- Militia Castrensium, Palatina, Præsidialis and Cohortalis*. The difference between them, and that they were all inconsistent with the Clerical Ordination. 4. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 374.
- Milk and Honey* given to the newly Baptized. 12. 4. 6. Vol. 3. p. 329.
- Offered at the Altar upon that Account. 15. 2. 3. Vol. 5. p. 204. 205.
- Miracle-Mongers* censured. 16. 5. 7. Vol. 6. p. 234.
- Missæ*. What it anciently signified. 13. 1. 4. vol. 4. p. 13 to 15.
- Missæ Catechumenorum*, 13. 1. 1 & 2. Vol. 4. p. 8. It. 14. 1. 1. Vol. 5. p. 1.
- Missæ Fidelium*. 13. 1. 3. Vol. 4. p. 11. & 12. It. 15. 1. 1. Vol. 5. p. 175.
- Missæ Præsanctificatorum*. 15. 4. 12. Vol. 5. p. 328 to 330. It. 15. 5. 1. Vol. 5. p. 779.
- Missæ Solitaria*. A Novel Corruption, 15. 4. 4. Vol. 5. p. 301.
- Missæ sicca and Nautica*. Another Corruption. 15. 4. 5. Vol. 5 p. 307. 308. 309.
- Missæ Bifaciata and Trifaciata*. An Invention of later Ages. *Ibid*.
- Missæ Nocturna*. Morning-Prayer. 13. 1. 4. Vol. 4. p. 14.
- Missæ Vespertina*. Evening Prayer. *Ibid*.
- Missæ*. The Lessons of Scripture. *Ibid*.
- Missæ*. The Dismission of the People, who were sent away with the Form, *Ite, Missæ est*, the same as the Greek, *απολύεσθε ἐν εὐρήνῃ* 13. 1. 4. Vol. 5. p. 14.
- Μιτράτον*. See *Metatum*.
- Mitre of Bishops*. 2. 9. 5. Vol. 1. p. 100. 101.
- Mitre of Virgins*. 7. 4. 6. Vol. 2. p. 69.
- Monachus*. See *Monks*.
- Μονὰι*. Monasteries, 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 27.
- Monasteria*. Monasteries, *Ibid*.
- Monasteria*. Ministers. 8. 1. 11 Vol. 2. p. 93. 94.

- Patriarchal *Monasteries*. 7. 3. 14. Vol. 2. p. 46.
- Intrusion into a *Monastery*, a Punishment put upon the Delinquent Clergy. 17. 4. 11. Vol. 6. p. 485.
- Moniales*. Nuns. 7. 4. 8. Vol. 2. p. 73.
- Monks*. Their Original and Difference from the Primitive *Asceticks*. 7. 1. 4. & 5. Vol. 2. p. 5 to 8.
- Originally no more than Laymen. 7. 2. 7. Vol. 2. p. 14.
- Clerical *Monks*. Their Original. 7. 2. 8. Vol. 2. p. 17 to 20.
- Monks* always subject to the Bishop of the Diocese where they lived, 2. 4. 2. Vol. 1. p. 73. It. 7. 3. 14. Vol. 2. p. 44.
- Monks* lived all upon their own Labour. No *Mendicants* among them. 7. 3. 10. Vol. 2. p. 40.
- No solemn Vow required of *Monks*. 7. 3. 7. Vol. 2. p. 36.
- Marriage of *Monks* not annulled. 7. 3. 23. Vol. 2. p. 60.
- Deserting *Monks* how punished. 7. 3. 24. Vol. 2. p. 61.
- Monks* never encroached upon the Rights of the Parochial Clergy. 7. 3. 19. Vol. 2. p. 54.
- Forbidden to dwell in Cities. 7. 3. 20. Vol. 2. p. 55.
- Monks* not to meddle with Civil Offices. 7. 3. 18. Vol. 2. p. 53.
- *Curiales* not to turn *Monks*. 7. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 27. 28.
- Nor Children without Consent of their Parents. 7. 3. 4. Vol. 2. p. 31. It. 16. 9. 1. Vol. 6. p. 331.
- Nor Slaves without the Consent of their Masters. 7. 3. 2. Vol. 2. p. 29.
- Nor married Persons without mutual Consent. 7. 3. 3. Vol. 2. p. 30.
- Children not to be made *Monks* against their own Consent. 7. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 32.
- Officers among the *Monks*, *Decani*, *Centenarii*, *Patres*. 7. 3. 11. Vol. 2. p. 41.
- spiritual Exercises of the *Monks*. 7. 3. 15, &c. Vol. 2. p. 46.
- Monks* of the Renunciative and Communicative Life. How they differed. 7. 3. 9. Vol. 2. p. 38. 39.
- Secular *Monks* and *Canons Regular*. 7. 2. 6. Vol. 2. p. 13. 14.
- Of the names of the ancient *Monks*, *Anchorets*, *Hermits*, *Cænobites*, *Synodites*, *Sarabaitæ*, *Renboth*, *Stylitæ*, *Acæmetæ*, *Βασκοί*, *Benedictins*, *Gyrovagi*, *Apostolics*, *Hesy chastæ*, *Continentes*, *Silentiarii*, *Renunciantes*, *Philothei*, *Therapeutæ*, *Cellulani*, *Culdees*. 7. 2. 1. Vol. 2. p. 9. See under these several Titles, and 7. 3. 14. Vol. 2. p. 45. particularly of the *Culdees*.
- Habit and Tonsure of *Monks*, as wearing Chains and Crosses, and walking barefoot censured, 7. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 33.
- Canonical Hours of Prayer used by some *Monks*, not by others. 7. 3. 17. Vol. 2. p. 49. See *Canonical Hours*.
- Monogamy*. In what Sense required of the Clergy. 4. 5. 2. Vol. 1. p. 382.
- And of Deaconesses. 2. 22. 5. Vol. 1. p. 250.
- And of the Widows of the Church, 7. 4. 9. Vol. 2. p. 73. 74. 75.
- Montanists* changed the Form of Baptism. 11. 3. 7. Vol. 3. p. 142.
- Baptized Men after Death. 11. 4. 3. Vol. 3. p. 153.
- Disputed with the Church about second Marriages. 22. 1. 10. Vol. 7. p. 213. 214.
- And about Fasting. 21. 1. 15. Vol. 7. p. 160. 161.

- And about wearing the Soldier's Crown, and Flying in Time of Persecution. 16. 4. 8. Vol. 6. p. 188. 189.
- Moon*. Superstitious Observation of its Eclipse. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 230.
- *New Moons* superstitiously observed. 16. 4. 17. Vol. 6. p. 203.
- Morning-Prayer*. 13. 9. 7. Vol. 4. p. 244. 245. It. 13. 10. 1. Vol. 4. p. 267.
- Morning-Benediction*, and Thanksgiving. 13. 10. 8. Vol. 4. p. 264.
- Morning-Hymn*. 13. 10. 9. Vol. 4. p. 264. 265.
- Mortal and Venial Sins*, how distinguished in the ancient Discipline of the Church. 16. 3. 14. Vol. 6. p. 159. 170.
- Mosaic Work* in Churches, 8. 8. 5. Vol. 2. p. 198.
- Mother-Churches*. 8. 1. 12. Vol. 2. p. 95. It. 8. 7. 6. Vol. 2. p. 176.
- Mother-Villages*. 9. 2. 7. Vol. 2. p. 297. &c. See *Metrocomia* and *Matrix*.
- Mourners* or Weepers. An order of Penitents so called. 18. 1. 3. Vol. 6. p. 532. 533.
- Mourning-Habit*. 23. 3. 21. Vol. 7. p. 353.
- Mourning-Women*. *Præfica*, hired to lament at Funerals, condemned. 23. 3. 18. Vol. 7. p. 348. 349.
- Μῦησις* and *μυσταγωγία*. Names of Baptism. 11. 1. 10. Vol. 3. p. 123.
- Mummies*, how kept by the Egyptians. 23. 4. 8. Vol. 7. p. 367.
- Munera sordida*. The Clergy exempt from servile Offices under that Name, 5. 3. 12. Vol. 1. p. 456.
- Munera dantes* and *Munerarii*. Christians exhibiting the Public Shows to the People, censured as Idolaters. 16. 4. 8. Vol. 6. p. 188.
- Municipal Men* incapable of Ordination. 4. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 378.
- Offices not put upon Clergymen. 5. 3. 14. Vol. 1. p. 458. 459.
- Murderers* incapable of Ordination. 4. 3. 7. Vol. 1. p. 363.
- Murder*, in its several Kinds, how punished. 16. 10. 1. Vol. 6. p. 340.
- Accessories to *Murder* censured. 16. 10. 9. &c. Vol. 6. p. 349.
- Music*. See *Organs*.
- Musivum*. See *Mosaick Work*.
- Mysteries* concealed from the *Catechumens*, with the Reasons of it. 10. 5. 1. Vol. 3. p. 96. 97.
- Mystica Mensa*. See *Mensa*.
- Mysticum Velum*. 8. 6. 8. Vol. 2. p. 145.
- N.
- ΝΑΟΣ. See *Nave of the Church*.
- Narthex Exterior*. 8. 3. 4. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- *Interior*. 8. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 124. 125.
- Natale Episcopi*. The Day of a Bishop's Ordination observed as an annual Festival. 4. 6. 15. Vol. 1. p. 404. It. 20. 8. 2. Vol. 7. p. 128.
- Natales Christi*. *Christmas-Day*. Its Original and how observed. 20. 4. 1. Vol. 7. p. 52.
- *Imperatorum*. The Emperors' Inauguration Days kept Festival, 20. 1. 4. Vol. 7. p. 6. 7.
- *Martyrum*. The Passions of Martyrs called their Birthdays. 20. 7. 1. Vol. 7. p. 106.
- *Urbium*. Days kept annually in Commemoration of the Cities of Rome and Constantinople. 20. 1. 5. Vol. 7. p. 8. 9.

- Natalitia*. Natural Birthdays not to be kept in *Lent*. 21. 1. 23. Vol. 7. p. 172.
- Natatorium*. The Baptistery. 8. 7. 4. Vol. 2. p. 173. 174.
- Nave of the Church*. 8. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 129.
- Navicularii*. 5. 3. 5. Vol. 1. p. 446. 447.
- Ναυρολόγοι*. Catechists why so called. 3. 10. 3. Vol. 1. p. 307.
- Nazareens*. A Name of Reproach cast upon *Christians*. 1. 2. 1. Vol. 1. p. 10.
- Necromancy* censured. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 222. 223.
- Nemesiaci*. Conjurers censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 232.
- New-Moons* superstitiously observed. 16. 4. 17. Vol. 6. p. 203. and 207. It. 20. 1. 3. Vol. 7. p. 5.
- New-Year's-Day* superstitiously observed by the *Heathen*. 16. 4. 17. Vol. 6. p. 203. and 207. It. 20. 1. 3. Vol. 7. p. 5.
- Νεφελοδιώκται*. Diviners by the Motion of the Clouds censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 231.
- Νεωτερικῆ τάξις*. Explained and vindicated from the Corruption of *Salmasius*. 2. 10. 1. Vol. 1. p. 105.
- Nice*. Dissertation on the 8th Canon of the Council of. Vol. 4. from p. 213. to p. 253.
- Nile*. Cubit of *Nile* laid up in the Church. 8. 10. 12. Vol. 2. p. 238.
- Nocturnæ*. 13. 10. 11. Vol. 4. p. 269.
- Nonna* and *νόνης*. A Nun. 7. 4. 8. Vol. 2. p. 73.
- Non-Residence* censured. 17. 5. 28. Vol. 6. p. 517. It. 6. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 567.
- Noon-Day Service*. 13. 9. 12. Vol. 4. p. 255.
- Notarii*. 3. 13. 5. Vol. 1. p. 325.
- Notitia Imperii*. 9. 1. 5. Vol. 2. p. 255.
- *Ecclesia*. 9. 1. 6. Vol. 2. p. 257. to 263.
- *Ecclesia per Leonem Imper.* 9. 7. Vol. 2. p. 401. to 423.
- Novatians* condemned second Marriages. 16. 11. 7. Vol. 6. p. 377. 378. 379. It. 22. 1. 10. Vol. 7. p. 213.
- How they differed from the *Catholics* in Point of Church-Discipline and Absolution. 18. 4. 5. Vol. 6. p. 587. 588. 589.
- Why received into the Church without a new Ordination. 4. 7. 8. Vol. 1. p. 412.
- Novendiale*. 23. 3. 19. Vol. 7. p. 356.
- Novitioli*. *Catechumens*. 10. 1. 1. Vol. 3. p. 1.
- Nullatenenses*. Bishops without a See. 4. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 392.
- Nun*. See *Nonna*.
- Nunc Dinittis Hymn*. 14. 2. 5. Vol. 5. p. 36.
- Nymphæum*. The Fountain before the Church. 8. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 122.
- O.
- OATHS lawful to be taken upon necessary Occasions. 16. 7. 4. Vol. 6. p. 310.
- Oath of Allegiance*. See *Allegiance*.
- Bishops not obliged to give Testimony upon *Oath*. 5. 2. 2. Vol. 1. p. 427. See *Swearing*.
- Obedience* a necessary Part of the *Baptismal Covenant*. 11. 7. 6. Vol. 3. p. 224.
- Oblationarium*. The Place where the People's Offerings were taken and laid. 8. 6. 22. Vol. 2. p. 167. 168.

- Oblations.* What to be received at the Altar, what not. 15. 2. 3. Vol. 5. p. 203 to 206.
- Not to be received from scandalous Persons. 15. 2. 2. Vol. 5. p. 198.
- Oblation of a Lamb in the Roman Church on Easter Day* censured. 15. 2. 3. Vol. 5. p. 205.
- Oblation-Prayer.* 15. 2. 4. Vol. 5. p. 206.
- The Names of such as made *Oblations* recited. 15. 2. 4. Vol. 5. p. 206. See *Offerre Nomina*.
- Oblations for the Dead.* 23. 3. 13. Vol. 7. p. 341.
- One Part of the Clergy's Revenues. 5. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 466.
- Some Weekly, some Monthly. *Ibid.*
- The most valuable Part of Church Revenues. 5. 4. 15. Vol. 1. p. 481.
- Observation of Days and Accidents* censured. 16. 5. 8. Vol. 6. p. 236. to 240.
- Oeconomus.* The Steward of the Church. 3. 12. 1. Vol. 1. p. 318. 319.
- Oecumenical Bishop.* A Title given to the Bishop of *Constantinople*. 2. 17. 21. Vol. 1. p. 183.
- Offering of Bread and Wine in the Eucharist.* In what Sense allowed to Deacons. 2. 20. 7. Vol. 1. p. 218.
- Offerre Nomina.* The meaning of it. 2. 20. 5. Vol. 1. p. 216. It. 15. 2. 4. Vol. 5. p. 206.
- Offices Personal, Curial, Servile, &c.* not imposed upon the Clergy. 5. 3. 13. Vol. 1. p. 457.
- Οἶκος.* A Church. 8. 1. 13. Vol. 2. p. 98.
- Οἶμια* Prayers called Prefaces. 15. 1. 4. Vol. 5. p. 193.
- Omens.* Observation of them censured. 16. 5. 2. Vol. 6. p. 218. It. 16. 5. 8. Vol. 6. p. 236. &c.
- Ὁμοῶσιον.* Reasons for sticking to that Word against the *Arians*. 6. 3. 10. Vol. 1. p. 551. &c.
- Oppression* censured. 16. 12. 9. Vol. 6. p. 405.
- Optimates.* Their Power in Elections of the Clergy. 4. 2. 18. Vol. 1. p. 354. See *Clergy-Elections*.
- Oraculum Caeleste.* A Name given to the Emperor's Edicts. 8. 1. 3. Vol. 2. p. 79.
- Orare.* To bid Prayer, the Office of Deacons. 2. 20. 10. Vol. 1. p. 223.
- Orarium.* A sacred vestment. 2. 20. 10. Vol. 1. p. 224. It. 13. 8. 2. Vol. 4. p. 208.
- Oratories and Churches.* How they differ. 8. 1. 4. Vol. 2. p. 81.
- Laymen's-Oratory.* 8. 5. 2. Vol. 2. p. 130.
- Orders.* What the Ancients mean by different *Orders* of Bishops and Presbyters. 2. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 39. 40.
- The Inferior *Orders* of the Clergy, not of Apostolical, but only Ecclesiastical Institution. 3. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 267. 268. 269.
- How they differed from the superior *Orders*. 3. 1. 6. Vol. 1. p. 273.
- No Imposition of Hands used in their Ordination. 3. 1. 6. Vol. 1. p. 274.
- Inferior *Orders* a sort of Nursery for the Hierarchy. 3. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 271.
- Inferior *Orders* not to return to a secular Life again. 3. 1. 5. Vol. 1. p. 273.
- Inferior *Orders* allowed to work at a manual Trade. 5. 3. 6.

Vol. 1. p. 449. It. 6. 4. 13. Vol. 1. p. 576.

*Ordination of Bishops.*

— Bishops not to be *ordained* under Thirty Years of Age. 2. 10. 1. Vol. 1. p. 103. 104.

— of Boys to be Bishops in the *Romish Church* censured. 2. 10. 1. Vol. 1. p. 106.

— *Cursory Ordination* of Bishops, not going through the Inferior Orders, censured as uncanonical. 2. 10. 4. Vol. 1. p. 108.

— Yet sometimes Deacons, and the inferior Orders, and Laymen *ordained* Bishops without any Regular Progression. 2. 10. 5. &c. Vol. 1. p. 109.

— What Time allowed after a Bishop's Death to the *Ordination* of a new Bishop. 2. 11. 1. Vol. 1. p. 113. 114. 115.

— of a Bishop, to be performed by Three Bishops. 2. 11. 4. Vol. 1. p. 116. 117.

— By one Bishop sometimes allowed. 2. 11. 5. Vol. 1. p. 118.

— of Bishops to be celebrated in their own Churches. 2. 11. 7. Vol. 1. p. 120.

— Book of the *Gospels*, laid upon the Head of Bishops at their *Ordination*. 2. 11. 8. Vol. 1. p. 121.

— All the Bishops present to lay on Hands in the *Ordination* of a Bishop. *Ibid.*

— Form of Prayer used at a Bishop's *Ordination*. 2. 11. 9. Vol. 1. p. 122.

— No one to be *ordained* Bishop, who was under the sentence of Deposition. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 492.

— Bishops not to *ordain* their own Successors. 2. 13. 4. Vol. 1. p. 135.

It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 494. See *Bishop's Ordination*, under the Title of *Bishops*.

*Ordination* of Presbyters and Deacons never intrusted in the hands of Presbyters only. 2. 3. 5. Vol. 1. p. 64. 65.

*Ordination* of Presbyters to be performed by the Bishops and Presbyters together. 2. 19. 10. Vol. 1. p. 191.

*Ordination* of Presbyters without Uction, or delivering of Vessels, or authority to offer Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead. 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 207. 208. It. 4. 6. 13. Vol. 1. p. 403.

*Ordination* given to Presbyters Kneeling, with the Signs of the Cross, and Kiss of Peace. 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 207. It. 4. 6. 10. Vol. 1. p. 401.

— Form of *ordaining* Deacons. 2. 20. 3. Vol. 1. p. 215.

— Indelible Character of, what meant by. 17. 2. 5. Vol. 6. p. 458. 459.

— Rules about *Ordination* in general. 4. 3. 1. Vol. 1. p. 357. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 490. &c.

— Enquiry to be made into the Faith and Morals of such as were to be *ordained*. 4. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 358.

— The Canons of the Church to be read to every one at his *Ordination*. 4. 6. 1. Vol. 1. p. 391. 392.

*Ordination* not to be given to Strangers out of their own Church. 4. 3. 5. Vol. 1. p. 360.

— Nor to Persons who had done public Penance, 4. 3. 6. Vol. 1. p. 361. It. 17. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 495. 496.

— Nor to Energumens or Demoniacs. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 493. It. 4. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 381.

— Nor to Murderers or Adulterers, or any that had lapsed in Time of Per-

- secution. 4. 3. 7. Vol. 1. p. 363. 364.
- Nor to Usurers or Seditious Persons. 4. 3. 8. Vol. 1. p. 365.
- Nor to such as had dismembered their own Body. 4. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 366. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 493.
- Nor to such as were baptized with Clinick Baptism. 4. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 369.
- Nor to any one unbaptized, or not baptized in due Form. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 493.
- Nor to any one baptized or rebaptized by Heretics. 4. 3. 12. Vol. 1. p. 370. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 494.
- Nor to any who had not first made all their Family *Catholics*. 4. 3. 13. Vol. 1. p. 371.
- Nor to Actors and Stage-Players. 4. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 381.
- *Ordination* not to be given to Soldiers. 4. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 374.
- Nor to Slaves without Consent of their Masters. 4. 4. 2. Vol. 1. p. 375.
- Nor to Corporation-Men tied to other Services. 4. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 377.
- Nor to the *Curiales* or *Decuriones* of any *Roman City*. 4. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 377. 378. 379.
- Nor to Guardians or Factors, till their Offices expired. 4. 4. 5. Vol. 1. p. 380.
- Nor to Lawyers in some Churches. 4. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 380.
- Nor to any who had married Concubines, or Harlots, or Women divorced from a former Husband. 4. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 381.
- Nor to *Digamists*. 4. 5. 4. Vol. 1. p. 383. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 490.
- No Bishop to ordain another Man's Clerk without his Consent. 4. 6. 4. Vol. 1. p. 394. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 491.
- No Bishop to ordain in another man's Diocese without his leave. 2. 5. 3. Vol. 1. p. 83. It. 4. 6. 5. Vol. 1. p. 395.
- The Bishop of *Alexandria* exempted from this Rule, and authorized to ordain in any Diocese of his Province. 2. 16. 23. Vol. 1. p. 164.
- Ordinations*, not to be given *απολειμνωσ* without a Title. 4. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 392. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 490.
- Ordinatio Localis*. 4. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 392.
- No set Times of *Ordination* observed in the Three first Ages. 4. 6. 6. Vol. 1. p. 397.
- Ordinations* not always confined to *Sundays*. 4. 6. 7. Vol. 1. p. 399.
- solemnized in the Time of the Oblation at Morning Service. 4. 6. 8. Vol. 1. p. 400.
- not regularly given except in a Church. 4. 6. 9. Vol. 1. p. 401.
- sometimes given by Force; and when forbid. 4. 2. 8. Vol. 1. p. 346. It. 4. 7. 1. Vol. 1. p. 405.
- Ordo*. The *Liturgy* or Divine Service. 13. 1. 7. Vol. 4. p. 18.
- Organs*. When first brought into Use in the Church. 8. 7. 14. Vol. 2. p. 187. &c.
- "*Οση δύναμις*. The Meaning of the Phrase explained. 6. 3. 5. Vol. 1. p. 538.
- Ostarii*. 3. 6. 1. Vol. 1. p. 293. See *Door-keepers*.
- "*Οξυγράφοι*. *Notaries*. 3. 13. 5. Vol. 1. p. 325.

P.

*PACIS Angelus*. 14. 5. 4. Vol. 5. p. 162.

- Pagans.* The Reason of the Name. 5. 5. 2. Vol. 1. p. 485.
- Pallium.* The Philosophic Habit used by the *Ascetics* and some of the Clergy. 6. 4. 19. Vol. 1. p. 586. &c. It. 7. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 35. It. 1. 2. 4. Vol. 1. p. 13.
- Panders* censured. 16. 11. 10. Vol. 6. p. 383. 384. 385.
- Πανυχίδες.* *Pervigilia.* *Pernoctationes.* *Vigils* kept all the Night. 13. 9. 4. Vol. 4. p. 236. &c.
- Pantheon* at Rome turned into a Church. 8. 2. 4. Vol. 2. p. 115.
- Papa.* The Name of every Bishop. 2. 2. 7. Vol. 1. p. 54.
- Παπαλήτρρα* & *Papa Pisinni.* Ibid.
- Parabolarii.* A Name of Reproach cast upon *Christians*. 1. 2. 9. Vol. 1. p. 16. 17.
- Parabolani.* Officers appointed to take Care of the Sick. 3. 9. 1. Vol. 1. p. 302. It. 23. 3. 7. Vol. 7. p. 333.
- Παραβαπρίσματα.* Baptism in private Houses forbidden. 11. 6. 12. Vol. 3. p. 215.
- Παραθέσεις.* Commendatory Prayers. 15. 1. 4. Vol. 5. p. 192. It. 23. 3. 11. Vol. 7. p. 339.
- Paramonarii.* Stewards of Bishops' Lands. 3. 13. 1. Vol. 1. p. 322.
- Parangaria.* A Tax so called. 5. 3. 10. Vol. 1. p. 454. 455.
- Paratorium.* The *Prothesis* or Table of Oblations. 8. 6. 22. Vol. 2. p. 167.
- Παρατρέπεζον.* The same. *Ibid.*
- Paraveredi.* Horses which the Provincials furnished for conveying the Emperor's Corn, &c. 5. 3. 10. Vol. 1. p. 454.
- Parentalia.* Feasts at the Graves of the Dead censured. 23. 3. 17. Vol. 7. p. 346. 347.
- Parents* by the old *Roman* Law had Power of Life and Death over their Children. 16. 9. 1. Vol. 6. p. 331.
- Might not be deserted by their Children under Pretence of turning *Monks* or entering upon an *Ascetic* Life. 7. 3. 4. Vol. 2. p. 31. It. 16. 9. 1. Vol. 6. p. 331. See *Children*.
- Parochia.* The Ancient Name of a Diocese. 9. 2. 1. Vol. 2. p. 281.
- Parishes* sometimes on the other hand called *Dioceses*. 9. 8. 1. Vol. 2. p. 423.
- Parochial Churches.* Their Original. 5. 6. 5. Vol. 1. p. 492. It. 9. 8. 2. Vol. 2. p. 424.
- *City-Parishes* not always assigned to particular *Presbyters*; but served in common from the Mother-Church. 9. 8. 5. Vol. 2. p. 428.
- Settled Revenues not originally fixed upon *Parish Churches*; but paid in to the common Stock of the Mother-Church. 9. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 431.
- Parochial Churches,* when first endowed with distinct Revenues. 5. 6. 5. Vol. 1. p. 492.
- Parish-Bounds* conformed to the Limits of Manors. 9. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 431.
- Parochial Clergy* never defrauded by the Ancient *Monks*. 7. 3. 19. Vol. 2. p. 54.
- Parochial Visitations* to be made by the Bishop once a year. 9. 6. 16. Vol. 2. p. 387. It. 9. 6. 22. Vol. 2. p. 400.
- Eight Hundred *Parishes* in *Theodore's* Diocese of *Cyprus*. 9. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 312.
- Parricide* how punished. 16. 10. 5. Vol. 6. p. 344.
- Party Names* discouraged by *Christians*. 1. 1. 6. Vol. 1. p. 5. 6. 7.
- Pascha* *πανώσιμον* and *ἀναστάσιμον,* *Pasch* of the Passion and Resurrection includes Two Weeks preceding

- and following *Easter-Day*. 20. 5. 1. Vol. 7. p. 69.
- Paschal Festival*. Disputes with *Hereticks* about the Time of its Observation. 20. 5. 2. Vol. 7. p. 71.
- Disputes in the Church itself about the *Sunday* on which it was to be observed, by Reason of different Cycles and Calculations. 20. 5. 5. Vol. 7. p. 79.
- How religiously the *Paschal Festival* was observed. 20. 5. 6. Vol. 7. p. 84.
- Made a Time of Pardon and Indulgence to Prisoners by the Emperors. 20. 5. 6. Vol. 7. p. 85.
- Passion-Day* how observed. 21. 1. 31. Vol. 7. p. 180. 181. 182.
- Passion-Week* more strictly observed than the rest of *Lent*. 21. 1. 24. Vol. 7. p. 172. &c.
- Pastophoria*. Buildings belonging to the Church. 8. 7. 11. Vol. 2. p. 181.
- Pater Patrum*. A Name of Bishops. 2. 2. 8. Vol. 1. p. 56.
- Patres*. Bishops, *Ibid*. See *Papa*.
- Patres*. Abbots. 7. 3. 11. Vol. 2. p. 42.
- Patriarchs*. A Name sometimes given to all Bishops. 2. 2. 9. Vol. 1. p. 57.
- Patriarchs* among the *Jews*. 2. 17. 4. Vol. 1. p. 167.
- Patriarchs* among the *Montanists*. 2. 17. 5. Vol. 1. p. 168.
- Patriarchs* anciently call'd Archbishops. 2. 17. 1. Vol. 1. p. 165.
- And Exarchs of the Diocese. 2. 17. 2. Vol. 1. p. 166.
- The Name *Patriarch*, first used by *Socrates* and the Council of *Chalcedon*. 2. 17. 6. Vol. 1. p. 169.
- *Salmasius's* Mistake about the first of the Name *Patriarch*. 2. 17. 3. Vol. 1. p. 166.
- Patriarchal Power* established before the Council of *Nice*. 2. 17. 8. Vol. 1. p. 171.
- Patriarch of Constantinople* styled *Oecumenical*. 2. 17: 21. Vol. 1. p. 183.
- His Jurisdiction over Three Dioceses. 2. 17. 10. Vol. 1. p. 174.
- The peculiar Privilege of the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, to ordain all the Bishops in his Diocese. 2. 17. 11. Vol. 1. p. 176. 177.
- Offices of Patriarchs.*
- To ordain Metropolitans. 2. 17. 12. Vol. 1. p. 177.
- Themselves to be ordained in a Patriarchal Synod. 2. 17. 12. Vol. 1. p. 178.
- To call Synods of the whole Patriarchal Diocese. 2. 17. 13. Vol. 1. p. 178.
- To receive Appeals from Primate and Provincial Synods. 2. 17. 14. Vol. 1. p. 178.
- To hear only such Causes as came regularly before them. 2. 17. 14. Vol. 1. p. 179.
- To censure Metropolitans and Suffragans. 2. 17. 15. Vol. 1. p. 179.
- To be consulted by Metropolitans in all Matters of great Moment. 2. 17. 17. Vol. 1. p. 180. 181.
- To notify Imperial Edicts to the Metropolitans relating to the Church. 2. 17. 18. Vol. 1. p. 181.
- Great Criminals reserved to the Absolution of Patriarchs. 2. 17. 19. Vol. 1. p. 182.
- At first all absolute and independent of one another. 2. 17. 20. Vol. 1. p. 182.
- Some afterwards subordinate to others, as those of Ephesus and Cæsarea to Constantinople. 2. 17. 22. Vol. 1. p. 184.

- No Appeal from a Patriarch but to a general Council. 2. 17. 20. Vol. 1. p. 183.
- The Number of Patriarchal Sees in the Church. 2. 17. 20. Vol. 1. p. 182. It. 9. 1. 6. Vol. 3. from p. 257 to p. 263.
- Patrons* Right of Presentation how first brought into the Church. 4. 2. 19. Vol. 1. p. 355. It. 5. 6. 5. Vol. 1. p. 492.
- Not to found Churches to have a Share in the Oblations. 9. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 433.
- Paulianists* changed the Form of Baptism. 11. 3. 9. Vol. 3. p. 145.
- Paulicians* rejected Baptism. 11. 2. 4. Vol. 3. p. 128.
- Paulinus's* Temple at *Tyre* described. 8. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 118.
- Par Vobis*. A Form of Salutation used by the Bishop at his first Entrance into the Church. 13. 8. 13. Vol. 4. p. 224.
- Before Reading the Lessons. 14. 3. 6. Vol. 5. p. 55. 56.
- Before Sermon. 14. 4. 14. Vol. 5. p. 115.
- In Consecrating the *Eucharist*. 15. 3. 2. Vol. 5. p. 230. 231.
- At the Dismission of the Assembly. 13. 10. 8. Vol. 4. p. 264. It. 15. 6. 4. Vol. 5. p. 391.
- Peccatum* and *Crimen* how distinguished. 16. 3. 14. Vol. 6. p. 159.
- Pecuniary* Causes of the Clergy with Laymen to be heard before the secular Judges. 5. 2. 13. Vol. 1. p. 435. 436.
- Pederecti*. *Eunomians* baptizing with the Heels upward. 11. 11. 4. Vol. 3. p. 274. 275.
- Pelusiota*. A Name of Reproach cast upon the *Catholics* by the *Origenians*. 1. 2. 17. Vol. 1. p. 21.
- Penance*. The Manner of Performing it. 18. 2. 1. Vol. 6. p. 537. 538.
- Public Penance allowed but once. 18. 4. 1. Vol. 6. p. 573. &c.
- Imposed on Women as well as Men. 16. 3. 2. Vol. 6. p. 116.
- For the whole Life. 18. 4. 2. Vol. 6. p. 571.
- Married Persons not admitted to Penance by Consent. 18. 2. 7. Vol. 6. p. 545.
- Persons not to marry during the Time of their Penance. 18. 2. 8. Vol. 6. p. 545. 546.
- Commutation of Penance not allowed. 16. 3. 3. Vol. 6. p. 118.
- How far the Intercession of Martyrs allowed to moderate Penance. 16. 3. 4. Vol. 6. p. 118. It. 18. 4. 10. Vol. 6. p. 555.
- No Sinners absolved till they had done their regular Penance. 19. 2. 1. Vol. 6. p. 618. &c.
- Bishops had Power to moderate Penance. 18. 4. 7. Vol. 6. p. 591. &c.
- Persons who had done Public Penance never to be ordained. 4. 3. 6. Vol. 1. p. 361.
- Not sufficient to restore degraded Clerks. 17. 5. 4. Vol. 1. p. 496.
- Penitents* divided into four Orders, *Flectes*, *Audientes*, *Substrati*, and *Consistentes*. 18. 1. 1. Vol. 6. p. 530. &c.
- The first Order of Penitents in the Church-Porch. 8. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 121. It. 18. 1. 4. Vol. 6. p. 534.
- The second Order in the *Narthex* of the Church. 8. 4. 3. Vol. 2. p. 126. It. 18. 1. 4. Vol. 6. p. 534.
- The third Order in the *Nave* of the Church. 8. 5. 3. Vol. 2. p. 130. It. 18. 1. 5. Vol. 6. p. 534.
- The fourth Order among the Faithful. 8. 5. 5. Vol. 2. p. 133. It. 18. 1. 6. Vol. 6. p. 536.

- Penitential Exercises. 18. 2. 2. Vol. 6. p. 538. &c.
- Appeared with Sackcloth and Ashes on their Head. 18. 2. 2. Vol. 6. p. 539. &c.
- Abstained from Bathing, Feasting and all other Diversions. 18. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 543.
- To cut off their Hair and go veiled. 18. 2. 3. Vol. 6. p. 541.
- To observe all the Public Fasts of the Church. 18. 2. 5. Vol. 6. p. 544.
- To restrain themselves in the Conjugal State. 18. 2. 6. Vol. 6. p. 544.
- Not to marry in the Time of their Penance. 18. 2. 8. Vol. 6. p. 546.
- To pray Kneeling on all Festivals. 18. 2. 9. Vol. 6. p. 546.
- To serve the Church in Burying the Dead. 18. 2. 11. Vol. 6. p. 547.
- Prayers for them. 14. 5. 10. Vol. 5. p. 169.
- Absolved by Deacons in Cases of Necessity. 2. 20. 12. Vol. 1. p. 226. See *Absolution*.
- Penitential Psalm*. 13. 10. 13. Vol. 4. p. 272.
- Penitentiary Priest*. 18. 3. 11. Vol. 6. p. 569.
- Pensions* Canonical how far allowed. 6. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 510.
- Pentaeteris*. The Lustral Tax. 5. 3. 6. Vol. 1. p. 448.
- Pentecost* taken in a double sense, for the Fifty Days after *Easter*, and for the single Day of *Whitsunday*. 20. 6. 1. Vol. 7. p. 95.
- Fasting forbidden all *Pentecost*. 20. 6. 3. Vol. 7. p. 97. &c.
- And Kneeling at Prayers forbidden also. 13. 8. 3. Vol. 4. p. 209. It. 20. 6. 3. Vol. 7. p. 97. &c.
- Public Shows prohibited in *Pentecost*, but Law-suits and Bodily Labour allowed. 20. 6. 4. Vol. 7. p. 99.
- *Acts* of the Apostles read all the Time of *Pentecost*. 14. 3. 3. Vol. 5. p. 48. It. 20. 6. 2. Vol. 7. p. 96.
- Pentecost* a solemn Time of Baptism. 11. 6. 7. Vol. 3. p. 206.
- People's* Vote allowed in the Choice of Bishops and Clergy. 4. 2. 3. Vol. 1. p. 540.
- Denied in Case they were Heretics or Schismatics. 4. 2. 12. Vol. 1. p. 350.
- Also in Case of Factions and Divisions among them. 4. 2. 15. Vol. 1. p. 352.
- People*, when wholly excluded from Elections. 4. 2. 18. Vol. 1. p. 354. See *Elections of the Clergy*.
- Allowed to read the Scriptures. 13. 4. 8. Vol. 4. p. 86.
- Allowed to join in Psalmody and Prayer, and proper *Responses* throughout the *Liturgy*. 13. 4. 2. Vol. 4. p. 80.
- Perfecti*. Baptized Persons. 1. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 26.
- Περλάμματα*. Charms forbidden. 11. 5. 8. Vol. 3. p. 192. It. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 226. &c.
- Περριβόλαιον*. See *Pallium*.
- Περριβολον*. The Bounds of the Church. 8. 3. 4. Vol. 2. p. 120.
- Περριόλευται* Itinerant Presbyters. 2. 14. 12. Vol. 1. p. 143.
- Περριαντήρια*. Holy-Water of the *Acathen*. 8. 3. 7. Vol. 1. p. 123. It. 16. 4. 15. Vol. 6. p. 199.

- Peristerion.* Golden Dove. Of what Use in the Church. 8. 6. 19. Vol. 2. p. 158.
- Perjury* censured. 16. 7. 8. Vol. 6. p. 321.
- Pernoctations.* See *Vigils.*
- Personal* and *Predial* Offices not imposed upon the Clergy. 5. 3. 13. Vol. 1. p. 457.
- Phanum.* A Church of Heretics. 8. 1. 6. Vol. 2. p. 84.
- Pharmacy.* Witchcraft censured. 16. 5. 5. Vol. 6. p. 224. &c.
- Pheronymy.* 16. 13. 5. Vol. 6. p. 440.
- Phiala.* The Fountain before the Church. 8. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 122.
- Philosarcha.* A Name of Reproach cast upon the *Catholics* by the *Origenians*. 1. 2. 17. Vol. 1. p. 21.
- Philosophers* not to be conversed with by the Clergy. 17. 5. 31. Vol. 6. p. 520.
- Philothei.* A Name of *Monks*. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 26.
- Philtr.* Love-Potions censured. 16. 5. 5. Vol. 6. p. 225.
- Pholles.* A Coin so called. 5. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 472.
- Phonascus.* The Precentor. 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5. p. 14.
- Φῶτα. *Epiphany*, so called. 20. 4. 7. Vol. 7. p. 65.
- Φωτισμὸς. *Baptism*. 11. 1. 4. Vol. 3. p. 115.
- Φωτισζόμενοι. Persons baptized. 1. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 25.
- Φωτιστήρια. *Baptisteries*. 8. 7. 3. Vol. 2. p. 173.
- Phrontisteria.* *Baptisteria*. 8. 7. 3. Vol. 2. p. 173.
- Phrontisteria.* *Monasteries*. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 27.
- Phylacteries.* Texts of Scripture written in *Bibbands*, and used as *Charms*, censured. 11. 5. 8. Vol. 3. p. 192. It. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 226.
- Phylacterium.* *Baptism*, why so called, 11. 1. 10. Vol. 3. p. 122.
- Physiognomy* censured. 16. 5. 2. Vol. 6. p. 248.
- No *Pictures* in Churches for the first Three hundred Years. 8. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 193. &c.
- First brought in by *Paulinus*. 8. 8. 7. Vol. 2. p. 24.
- Not worshipped when first brought into the Church. 8. 8. 9. Vol. 2. p. 205. See *Images*.
- No *Pictures* of *God* or the *TRINITY* allowed in Churches till after the second *Nicene* Council, which condemned them. 8. 8. 10. Vol. 2. p. 206. 207.
- Pictures* of *Kings* and *Bishops*, when first brought into the Church. 8. 8. 8. Vol. 2. p. 204.
- Symbolical *Picture* of a *Shepherd* upon the *Communion-Cup*. 8. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 203.
- Pisciculi.* Why *Christians* assumed that Name. 1. 1. 2. Vol. 1. p. 2.
- Pisces.* See Ιχθυς.
- Piscina.* The *Font*. 8. 7. 4. Vol. 2. p. 174.
- Πισοί. Persons baptized. 1. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 25.
- Plagiarism* or *Man-stealing*, censured. 16. 12. 2. Vol. 6. p. 398.
- Planeta.* A *Sacred Vestment*. 13. 8. 2. Vol. 4. p. 208.
- Plantina, Prosapia & Pistores.* Names of *Reproach* cast upon *Christians*. 1. 2. 12. Vol. 1. p. 17.
- Plays.* See *Stage-plays*.
- Pluralities*, how far allowed. 6. 4. 8. Vol. 1. p. 368. 369. It. 17. 5. 29. Vol. 6. p. 518.

- Penitentia Major & Minor*, how distinguished. 16. 3. 14. Vol. 6. p. 163. &c.
- Penitentiam accipere & dare*. 18. 1. 4. Vol. 6. p. 534.
- Penitentia Justa & Legitima*. 18. 4. 12. Vol. 6. p. 596.
- Πολιτευόμενοι*. Common-Council Men not to be ordained. 4. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 379.
- Polygamy* censured. 16. 11. 5. Vol. 6. p. 369.
- Pomps of Satan*. 11. 7. 2. Vol. 3. p. 218. It. 16. 5. 8. Vol. 6. p. 236.
- Pomp of Christian Funerals*. 23. 3. 8. Vol. 7. p. 333.
- Pontifex Maximus*. The common Name of all Bishops. 2. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p. 53.
- Porphyrians*. A Name given by Law to the *Arians*. 16. 6. 6. Vol. 6. p. 252.
- Poor of the Church*, laid in the Church Porches. 8. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 125. It. 13. 8. 14. Vol. 4. p. 224.
- Poor to be relieved out of the Revenues of the Church*. 5. 6. 3. Vol. 1. p. 490.
- Communion-Plate sold to relieve the Poor. 5. 6. 6. Vol. 1. p. 493. It. 8. 10. 2. Vol. 2. p. 228.
- Defrauders of the Poor, reputed guilty of Murder. 16. 10. 15. Vol. 6. p. 356.
- No Necessity of Subjection to the Pope. 9. 1. 9. Vol. 2. p. 269.
- Porticoes or Cloysters of the Church*. 8. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- Posture of Devotion*. See Prayer.
- Voluntary Poverty sometimes chosen by the Clergy. 6. 2. 8. Vol. 1. p. 517.
- Præcentor*. 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5. p. 14.
- Præcones*. Deacons. 2. 20. 10. Vol. 1. p. 223.
- Prædicare*. To bid Prayer. *Ibid*.
- Præfationes*. Prayers called Prefaces. 15. 1. 4. Vol. 5. p. 191. &c.
- Præfica*. Women hired to mourn at Funerals censured. 23. 3. 18. Vol. 7. p. 348. &c.
- Præsanctificationum Missa*. 15. 4. 12. Vol. 5. p. 328. &c. See *Missa*.
- Præpositi*. Bishops. 2. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 53.
- Præpositi*. Presbyters. 2. 19. 14. Vol. 1. p. 202.
- Præpositus Domus*. The Inspector of the Inferior Clergy in the Bishop's House. 3. 12. 1. Vol. 1. p. 318.
- Πραγματευτικὸν χρουσίον*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 6. Vol. 1. p. 448.
- Prayers offered to God only*, not to any Creatures, Saints or Angels, &c. 13. 3. 1. Vol. 4. p. 63.
- Morning and Evening Prayer. 13. 9. 7. Vol. 4. p. 244.
- Canonical Hours of Prayer. Their Original. 13. 9. 8. Vol. 4. p. 246. &c.
- Prayer before Sermon. 14. 4. 13. Vol. 5. p. 110. &c.
- For the Catechumens, Eneumens, Competentes and Penitents. 14. 5. 3. Vol. 5. p. 157. &c.
- Prayer for the whole Church and all Orders in it*. 15. 3. 12. Vol. 5. p. 257. It. 15. 1. 2. Vol. 5. p. 181.
- For Kings. 13. 10. 5. Vol. 4. p. 260. It. 15. 3. 14. Vol. 5. p. 260.
- For the Dead. 15. 3. 15. Vol. 5. p. 261. It. 20. 7. 8. Vol. 7. p. 115. and 23. 3. 13. Vol. 7. p. 341.
- Silent Prayer. 15. 1. 1. Vol. 5. p. 175. &c.
- Prayers said with the Head uncovered*. 13. 8. 9. Vol. 4. p. 218.

—— Postures of Prayer, Standing, Kneeling, Bowing and Prostration. 13. 8. 4. Vol. 4. p. 212.

—— Standing at Prayer, used on the *Lord's-Day* and all *Pentecost*. See *Lord's-Day* and *Pentecost*.

—— Sitting never used as a Posture of Prayer. 13. 8. 7. Vol. 4. p. 216.

*Praying* by the SPIRIT. 13. 6. 9. Vol. 4. p. 182. &c. See *Spirit*.

*Lord's-Prayer.*

—— Used as a Form in all Offices. 13. 7. 2. Vol. 4. p. 194.

—— In *Baptism*. 13. 7. 2. Vol. 4. p. 194. It. 12. 4. 7. Vol. 3. p. 330.

—— In the *Eucharist*. 13. 7. 3. Vol. 4. p. 194. &c. It. 15. 3. 27. Vol. 5. p. 286.

—— In Morning and Evening Prayer. 13. 7. 4. Vol. 4. p. 196. It. 13. 11. 7. Vol. 4. p. 283.

—— In Private Devotions. 13. 7. 5. Vol. 4. p. 197.

—— Called the Christian's Daily Prayer. 13. 7. 6. Vol. 4. p. 198. It. 16. 3. 14. Vol. 6. p. 160.

—— Used by Heretics as well as Catholics. 13. 7. 7. Vol. 4. p. 199.

—— Used for the Remission of Daily Sins of a lesser Kind. 16. 3. 14. Vol. 6. p. 161.

—— Accounted a Spiritual Form 13. 7. 8. Vol. 4. p. 201.

—— Allowed as a Privilege to baptized Communicants only, and not to Catechumens. 1. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 28. It. 10. 5. 9. Vol. 3. p. 106. It. 13. 7. 9. Vol. 4. p. 203.

*Preaching.*

*Preaching* the Office of Bishops. 2. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 63. It 14. 4. 2. Vol. 5. p. 79.

—— No Bishop *preached* at *Rome* for Five Hundred Years together. 2. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 64. It. 14. 4. 3. Vol. 5. p. 86. &c.

—— Presbyters in the *African Church* not allowed to *preach* before the Bishop till the time of *St. Austin*. 2. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 63.

—— Presbyters forbidden to *preach* at *Alexandria* for some time after *Arius*. 2. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 64. It. 14. 4. 3. Vol. 5. p. 87.

*Preaching* sometimes committed to Deacons. 2. 20. 11. Vol. 1. p. 225. It. 14. 4. 2. Vol. 5. p. 79.

—— Whether Laymen were ever allowed to *preach*. 14. 4. 4. Vol. 5. p. 88.

—— Women never allowed to *preach*. 14. 4. 5. Vol. 5. p. 91. &c.

—— Rules and Directions about *Preaching*. 6. 3. 7. Vol. 1. p. 540. It. 14. 4. 19. Vol. 5. p. 122. &c.

*Preachers* delivered their Sermons for the most part sitting. 14. 4. 24. Vol. 5. p. 134, &c.

—— Acclamations given to celebrated *Preachers*. 14. 4. 27. Vol. 5. p. 140.

*Preaching* by the SPIRIT. What meant thereby. 14. 4. 12. Vol. 5. p. 109. See *Sermons*.

*Prelatical* and *Sacerdotal Power* but one and the same thing in a Bishop. 2. 19. 15. Vol. 1. p. 203. &c.

*Right of Presentation*, how first devolved upon Princes. 4. 2. 19. Vol. 1. p. 355.

—— And upon Patrons. *Ibid.* See *Patrons*.

Πρεσβύτεροι ἐπιχώριοι. 9. 6. 21. Vol. 2. p. 399.

Πρεσβύτεριδες. Deaconesses. 2. 22. 1. Vol. 1. p. 247.

*Πρεσβυτεριδες & πρεσβυτιδες*, how they differed. 2. 22. 7. Vol. 1. p. 255.

*Presbytera*. A Presbyter's Wife. 2. 22. 15. Vol. 1. p. 259.

*Presbyterium*. The Chancel. 8. 6. 4. Vol. 2. p. 142.

*Presbyterii Confessus*, and *Presbyterii Corona*. The Presbytery of the Church, sitting in a Circle about the Bishop. 2. 19. 5. and 6. Vol. 1. p. 191. It. 8. 6. 4. Vol. 2. p. 142.

#### *Presbyters*.

—— The Meaning of the Name. 2. 19. 1. Vol. 1. p. 188.

—— The Name Presbyter, Bishop and Apostle, sometimes used promiscuously. 2. 19. 2. Vol. 1. p. 188.

—— The Order of Presbyters of Apostolical Institution. 2. 19. 3. Vol. 1. p. 189.

—— The Order of Presbyters inferior to that of Bishops. 2. 1. 2. Vol. 1. p. 41.

—— To do nothing without the Consent of their Bishop. 2. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 61.

—— Not to baptize, or preach, or administer the *Eucharist*, without his Consent. 2. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 62.

—— No Presbyter allowed to preach in the presence of his Bishop in the *African Church*, till the Time of *St. Austin*. 2. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 63. It. 14. 4. 2. Vol. 5. p. 79.

—— Allowed to consecrate Virgins by the Bishop's Leave. 7. 4. 6. Vol. 2. p. 68.

—— Might confirm by the Bishop's Leave, in many Cases. 12. 2. 2. &c. Vol. 3. p. 299.

—— Might grant Absolution, by the Bishop's Direction. 19. 3. 2. Vol. 6. p. 639.

—— Never allowed to ordain others. 2. 3. 5. Vol. 1. p. 64.

—— Ordinations by Presbyters, disannulled by the Church. 2. 3. 6. Vol. 1. p. 66.

—— Accountable to their Bishops. 2. 3. 8. Vol. 1. p. 70.

—— Form of ordaining Presbyters. 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 206. See *Ordination*.

—— Privileged against being examined by Torture, as other Witnesses were. 5. 2. 4. Vol. 1. p. 428.

—— Allowed to sit on Thrones with the Bishop in the Church. 2. 19. 5. Vol. 1. p. 191.

—— The Senate or Council of the Church. 2. 19. 7. Vol. 1. p. 192.

—— Allowed to sit with Bishops in Provincial Councils. 2. 19. 8. Vol. 1. p. 195. It. 2. 19. 12. Vol. 1. p. 199. It. 7. 3. 13. Vol. 2. p. 44.

—— And in Consistorial Councils. 2. 19. 11. Vol. 1. p. 198.

—— And in General Councils. 2. 19. 13. Vol. 1. p. 201.

—— Joined with the Bishops, in Imposition of Hands, and in the Ordination of Presbyters. 2. 19. 10. Vol. 1. p. 197.

—— Itinerant Presbyters. 2. 14. 12. Vol. 1. p. 143.

*Pride*, how censured. 16. 14. 2. Vol. 6. p. 445.

*Priests*. A Name given to Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, by *Optatus*. 2. 19. 15. Vol. 1. p. 203.

—— Women not to execute the Office of Priests. 2. 22. 7. Vol. 1. p. 254.

—— Laymen's Priesthood, why baptism so called. 11. 1. 3. Vol. 3. p. 115.

*Prima sedis Episcopus.* The Title of Metropolitans in *Africk.* 2. 16. 5. Vol. 1. p. 182.

*Primates* or *Metropolitans.* Their Original derived by some from Apostolical Institution. 2. 16. 1. Vol. 1. p. 150

—— By others from the Age next after the Apostles. 2. 16. 2. Vol. 1. p. 148.

—— Before the Council of *Nice.* 2. 16. 3. Vol. 1. p. 148.

—— Their ancient Names, Πρωτοί, Κεφαλαί. *Exarchi Provinciarum. Senes, Principes, Primæ sedis, Episcopi,* Archbishops, Metropolitans. 2. 16. 5. Vol. 1. p. 150. 151.

—— How the *African* Bishops might forfeit their Title to the Primacy. 2. 16. 7. Vol. 1. p. 153. It 2. 16. 16. Vol. 1. p. 159.

—— Three Sorts of Honorary *Primates.* *Primates Ævo,* Titular *Primates,* and *Primates* of Mother-Churches. 2. 16. 9. Vol. 1. p. 154.

*Primates* in *Africa* the Senior Bishops of every Province, except at *Carthage.* 2. 16. 6. Vol. 1. p. 151.

—— Registers of Bishops' Ordinations to be kept in the Churches of the *African Primates,* that Bishops might know their Seniority. 2. 16. 8. Vol. 1. p. 153.

—— To ordain the Bishops of their Province. 2. 16. 12. Vol. 1. p. 156.

—— To be chosen and ordained by the Bishops of their own Province. 2. 16. 15. Vol. 1. p. 158.

—— To receive Appeals from the Bishops of their Province. 2. 16. 16. Vol. 1. p. 159.

—— To summon Provincial Synods. 2. 16. 17. Vol. 1. p. 161.

—— To be determined by the Major Vote of a Provincial Synod. 2. 16. 14. Vol. 1. p. 158.

VOL. IX.

—— Liberty of Appeals from *Primates* to a Provincial Synod. 2. 16. 16. Vol. 1. p. 159. 160.

*Primates* to publish Canons made in the Provincial Synod. 2. 16. 18. Vol. 2. p. 161.

—— To visit any Diocese in their Province. *Ibid.*

—— To grant *Litteræ Formæ* to the Provincial Bishops. 2. 16. 19. Vol. 1. p. 162.

—— To take Care of Vacant Sees. 2. 16. 20. Vol. 1. p. 162.

—— To calculate the time of *Easter.* 2. 16. 21. Vol. 1. p. 163.

The *Primate* of *Alexandria* had Power to Ordain Presbyters and Deacons in any Diocese of his Province. 2. 16. 23. Vol. 1. p. 164.

All *Primates* originally absolute and independent. 2. 18. 1. Vol. 1. p. 185.

*Primicerius Martyrum.* 2. 21. 11. Vol. 1. p. 246.

—— *Diaconorum.* *Ibid.*

—— *Notariorum.* 3. 13. 5. Vol. 1. p. 325.

*Principes Ecclesie.* A Name of Bishops. 2. 2. 4. Vol. 1. p. 52.

—— *Sacerdotum.* The same. 2. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p. 53.

—— This Name forbidden in the *African* Church. 2. 2. 8. Vol. 1. p. 57.

*Princes'* Right of Presentation how first brought into the Church. 4. 2. 19. Vol. 1. p. 355.

—— Allegiance due to *Princes.* 16. 9. 4. Vol. 6. p. 335. &c.

*Priscillianists* changed the Form of Baptism. 11. 3. 4. Vol. 3. p. 139.

—— Condemned for the practice of *Astrology.* 16. 5. 1. Vol. 6. p. 214.

- Prisons of the Church.* 8. 7. 9. Vol. 2. p. 179. It. 17. 4. 12. Vol. 6. p. 485.
- Προαπεια.* The Suburbs of a City what. 9. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 282.
- Processions at Funerals.* 23. 3. 8. Vol. 7. p. 333.
- On *Rogation-Days.* 13. 1. 12. Vol. 4. p. 29.
- Πρόεδροι.* Bishops so called. 2. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 53. It. 2. 19. 14. Vol. 1. p. 201. Deacons so called.
- Προεσῶτες.* Bishops. 2. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 53.
- Πρωκαῤεμναι.* Deaconesses. 2. 22. 13. Vol. 1. p. 258.
- Denial of *Promotion*, a Punishment inflicted on the Clergy. 17. 4. 9. Vol. 6. p. 481.
- No one to seek *Promotion* in the Church from the secular Powers. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 494.
- Πρόναος.* The Ante-Temple within the Walls. 8. 4. 2. Vol. 2. p. 126.
- Profanation of Churches and holy Things* remarkably punished. 8. 10. 2. Vol. 2. p. 228. &c. It. 16. 6. 26. Vol. 6. p. 280. &c.
- Propheteum.* A Church called by the Name of a Prophet. 8. 1. 8. Vol. 2. p. 86.
- Propylæum Magnum.* The Great Porch before the Church. 8. 3. 4. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- Propylæa Minora.* 8. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 124.
- Προσευχὴ ἑωθινή.* 13. 10. 9. Vol. 4. p. 264. It. 14. 2. 2. Vol. 5. p. 29. See *Morning-Hymn.* *Glory be to God on high.*
- Προσεκτήρια.* Churches. 8. 1. 4. Vol. 2. p. 81.
- Προσκλαίοντες.* *Fientes, Mourners.* An Order of Penitents. 18. 1. 3. Vol. 6. p. 532.
- Προσάτης.* A *Defensor.* 3. 11. 5. Vol. 1. p. 315.
- Prostration a Posture of Prayer.* 13. 8. 6. Vol. 4. p. 215.
- Prostrators an Order of Penitents.* 18. 1. 5. Vol. 6. p. 535.
- Προσφώνησις.* Bidding Prayer. 2. 20. 10. Vol. 1. p. 224. It. 15. 1. 2. Vol. 5. p. 181.
- Τρία πρόσωπα.* Three Persons equivocally asserted by the *Sabellians.* 6. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 547.
- Protestant Churches.* A Model of Primitive Episcopacy proposed to be settled in them. 9. 8. *Conclus.* Vol. 2. p. 435.
- Πρωτικῆδικοι.* *Defensors.* 3. 11. 7. Vol. 1. p. 317.
- Πρωῶτοι.* *Primates.* 2. 16. 5. Vol. 1. p. 150.
- Prothesis.* 8. 6. 22. Vol. 2. p. 167.
- Provinces in the Empire and the Church.* 9. 1. 6. Vol. 2. p. 257. &c.
- Provincial Synods.* See *Synods.*
- Psalmody.* 3. 7. 2. Vol. 1. p. 296. It. 14. 1. 1. Vol. 5. p. 1. 2. 3.
- In *Processions.* 23. 2. 6. Vol. 7. p. 320.
- At *Funerals.* 23. 3. 8. Vol. 7. p. 63.
- Used by Monks in conducting Strangers to their Cells. 7. 3. 17. Vol. 2. p. 52. See *Singing.*
- Psalmi Abecedarii.* 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5. p. 16.
- Psalmi Alleluatici.* 14. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 33.
- Psalmus ἐπιλύχνιος.* 13. 11. 5. Vol. 4. p. 280.

- Psalmus Exomologeticus*. The Penitential Psalm. 13. 10. 13. Vol. 4. p. 272.
- Psalmus Invitatorius*. 15. 3. 32. Vol. 5. p. 293.
- Psalmi Responsorii*. 14. 1. 3. Vol. 5. p. 5.
- Psalmista*. 3. 7. 1. Vol. 1. p. 295.
- Psalms* sung at the Communion. 15. 5. 10. Vol. 5. p. 386.
- ψαλταὶ κανονικά. 3. 7. 2. Vol. 1. p. 296.
- Psychici*. A Name of Reproach given to the Catholics by the Montanists. 1. 2. 14. Vol. 1. p. 19.
- Publicans*. Their Extortion censured. 16. 12. 11. Vol. 6. p. 409.
- Πύλωροι. *Doorkeepers* 3. 6. 1. Vol. 1. p. 293.
- Pulpitum*. The Reading-Desk. 3. 5. 4. Vol. 1. p. 291. It. 8. 5. 4. Vol. 2. p. 131.
- Purgatio Canonica*. An Abuse of the Eucharist. 15. 5. 9. Vol. 5. p. 385.
- Purgatory* not regarded in the ancient Prayers for the Dead. 15. 3. 16. Vol. 5. p. 267.
- Pythonici*. Persons speaking by the Spirit of Divination censured. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 222.
- Pyx*e for the Eucharist. A modern Invention. 8. 6. 18. Vol. 2. p. 158.
- Q.
- QUADRAGESIMA. See *Lent*.
- Quintillians*. Heretics rejecting Baptism. 11. 2. 1. Vol. 3. p. 124.
- Quotidiana Oratio*. See *Lord's Prayer*.
- R.
- RAILING and Reviling censured. 16. 13. 4. Vol. 6. p. 438.
- Rails* of the Chancel. 8. 6. 6. Vol. 2. p. 143.
- Rapes* and Ravishment censured. 16. 11. 8. Vol. 6. p. 378.
- Rationalis Diacreses*. 9. 1. 12. Vol. 2. p. 279.
- Readers*. An Order of the Inferior Clergy in the Third Century. 3. 5. 1. Vol. 1. p. 288.
- Children made *Readers*. 3. 5. 5. Vol. 1. p. 292.
- Catechumens made *Readers* at Alexandria. 3. 5. 2. Vol. 1. p. 290.
- Form of Ordaining *Readers*. 3. 5. 3. Vol. 1. p. 290.
- Rebaptization*. Laws against it. 12. 5. 1. Vol. 3. p. 337. It. 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 493.
- Rebellion* censured. 16. 9. 4. Vol. 6. p. 334.
- Receptorium*. 8. 7. 8. Vol. 2. p. 178.
- Redimicula*. 7. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 34.
- Refuge*. See *Asylum*.
- Register* of Baptism and Sponsors kept in the Church. 11. 7. 12. Vol. 3. p. 232. It. 11. 8. 13. Vol. 3. p. 251.
- Of the Ordination of Bishops kept in every Primate's Church. 2. 16. 8. Vol. 1. p. 153.
- Relicks* of the Dead not to be kept above Ground, or be bought or sold. 23. 4. 7. and 8. Vol. 7. p. 366. & 367.
- Not to be worshipped. 23. 4. 9. Vol. 7. p. 368.
- Remmia Lex*. 16. 13. 1. Vol. 6. p. 434.
- Remboth*. A Sort of ungovernable Monks. 7. 2. 4. Vol. 2. p. 11.
- Renunciation* in Baptism. 11. 7. 1. Vol. 3. p. 217.

- Of the World, as taught by several Heretics, censured. 16. 12. 1. Vol. 6. p. 397.
- Renunciantes*. Monks so called. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 26.
- Renunciative* and Communicative Life of Monks, how they differed. 7. 3. 9. Vol. 2. p. 38.
- Reordinations* generally condemned. 4. 7. 5. Vol. 1. p. 408.
- Reordination* of Schismatics and Heretics upon their Return to the Church. 4. 7. 7. Vol. 1. p. 411.
- What *Repentance* required for greater and lesser Sins to qualify Men for the Communion. 15. 8. 3. Vol. 5. p. 418.
- Isle of *Repentance* why so called. 7. 3. 15. Vol. 2. p. 46.
- Residence* of the Clergy. 6. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 567.
- Resignations* how far allowed. 6. 4. 2. Vol. 1. p. 559.
- Clergy not to *resign* without Leave. 6. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 557.
- Responsales*. 3. 13. 6. Vol. 1. p. 327.
- Responsorii Psalmi*. 14. 1. 3. Vol. 5. p. 15. It. 14. 1. 11. Vol. 5. p. 12.
- Revealing* of Secrets censured. 16. 13. 4. Vol. 6. p. 439.
- Revelations* read in *Pentecost*. 14. 3. 3. Vol. 5. p. 50. It. 17. 5. 8. Vol. 6. p. 500.
- The Clergy sometimes chosen by *Revelation* or Designation of the HOLY GHOST. 4. 1. 3. Vol. 1. p. 330.
- Revenues* of the Church, how raised. 5. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 466. See *Oblations*, *Tithes*, *First-fruits*.
- How disposed of by the Bishop. 2. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 79.
- And by the Archdeacon. 2. 21. 5. Vol. 1. p. 239.
- Fixed *Revenues* not immediately settled upon Parish-Churches at their first Division, but paid into the Stock of the Mother-Church. 9. 8. 6. Vol. 1. p. 431.
- Ring* used in Espousals. 22. 3. 5. Vol. 7. p. 250.
- Ῥιπίδια*. Fans. Their Use. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 2. p. 166. It. 15. 3. 6. Vol. 5. p. 240.
- Rites* and Ceremonies need not be the same in all Parts of the Catholic Church. 16. 1. 15. Vol. 6. p. 50.
- Robbery*. See *Theft*.
- Concealers of *Robbers* how punished. 16. 12. 18. Vol. 6. p. 426.
- Rogation-days*. 13. 1. 10. Vol. 4. p. 22. It. 21. 2. 8. Vol. 7. p. 192.
- Rome* Fifty Miles in compass in the time of *Aurelian*. 9. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 354.
- Fe ty Churches in *Rome* before the last Persecution. 8. 1. 17. Vol. 2. p. 104. It. 9. 5. 1. Vol. 2. p. 356.
- The Foundations of *Rome* and *Constantinople* celebrated by annual Festivals. 20. 1. 5. Vol. 7. p. 8. See *Festivals* and *Notales Urbium*.
- Bishop of *Rome's* Metropolitan and Patriarchal Power confined to the Suburbicary Churches. 9. 1. 10. Vol. 2. p. 270.
- Bishop of *Rome* had no Power over the Church of *Milan*, *Ajrick*, *Spain*, *France* or *Britain*. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 271.
- Bishop of *Rome* not privileged to ordain Bishops himself alone. 2. 11. 6. Vol. 1. p. 119.
- Bishop of *Rome's* License not necessary to authorise other Bishops to consecrate Churches. 8. 9. 7. Vol. 2. p. 218.

*Roman Empire.* The State of it in the Days of the Apostles. 9. 1. 1. Vol. 2. p. 252.

—— Division of the *Roman Empire* into Dioceses and Provinces. 9. 1. 5. Vol. 2. p. 255.

—— State of the Church conformed to the State of the *Roman Empire*. 9. 1. 2. Vol. 2. p. 253.

*Errors of the Romish Church and Deviations from the Practice of the Primitive Church, noted in the following Points:*

1. Concerning Absolution granted before Penance performed.

2. Worship of Angels, Saints, Relicks, Images, the Cross, and the Host in the *Eucharist*.

3. Appeals to the Bishop of *Rome*.

4. Apocryphal Books of Scripture.

5. Baptizing of Bells; Absolute necessity of Baptism.

6. Celibacy of the Clergy: Exemption of the Clergy from the Power of the Civil Magistrate.

7. Exemption of Children from the Power of Parents,

8. Auricular Confession and Confirmation made a Sacrament.

9. Communion in one Kind.

10. Abuse of Excommunication in deposing Kings and depriving Magistrates of their Civil Rights, and burning Heretics, under Pretence of Discipline.

11. The Consecration of the *Eucharist* by muttering privately, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, instead of Public and Audible Prayer.

12. The Use of Interdicts, and Indulgences.

13. Offering of a Lamb at *Easter*.

14. Original of *Lent*, and changing the Manner of Fasting.

15. Exemption of Monks from the Jurisdiction of Bishops.

16. Allowing of Mendicants.

17. Disannulling the Marriage of Monks.

18. Forbidding the Marriage of Spiritual Relations.

19. Making the Marriage of Cousin-germans to be Incest.

20. Private and Solitary Mass.

21. Making the Mass a Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead.

22. Purgatory and Canonical Purgation.

23. Prelatical and Sacerdotal Power.

24. Ordination of Boys and Bishops without a Title.

25. Commutation of Penance.

26. Allowance of Sanctuary for the Worst of Criminals.

27. Keeping the Scripture and Divine-Service in an unknown Tongue.

28. Swearing by the Creatures.

29. Transubstantiation.

30. Necessity of a visible Head to keep the Unity of the *Catholic Church*.

31. Using Unleavened Bread and Wafers in the *Eucharist*.

32. Necessity of Subjection to the Pope of *Rome*.

*See under these several Titles.*

*Rotula Panis.* Round Loaves of Bread, not Wafers, in the *Eucharist*. 15. 2. 6. Vol. 5. p. 212.

Some Churches built in a *Round Figure*. 8. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 117.

S.

SABBATIANS. 20. 3. 5. Vol. 7. p. 48.

- Sabbath* or *Saturday*, differently observed, in some Churches a Fast, in others a Festival. 13. 9. 3. Vol. 4. p. 232. It. 20. 3. 1. Vol. 7. p. 41.
- Sabbatum Magnum*. The Great Sabbath or *Saturday* before *Easter*, how observed. 21. 1. 32. Vol. 7. p. 182.
- Sabellians*. Their Equivocation about the Profession of Three Persons in the TRINITY. 6. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 546.
- Their Changing the Form of Baptism. 11. 3. 7. Vol. 3. p. 143.
- Saccophori*. *Manichees* wearing Sackcloth. 16. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 69.
- Sacerdotal* and *Prelatical* Power, the same Thing in a Bishop. 2. 19. 15. Vol. 1. p. 203.
- Sacerdotales* and *Ludi Sacerdotales*. What meant by them. 5. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 445.
- Sacerdotium in secundo et tertio Ordine*. Presbyters and Deacons. 2. 19. 15. Vol. 1. p. 205.
- Sacerdotium Laici*. Baptism. 11. 1. 3. Vol. 3. p. 115.
- Sackcloth* and *Ashes* used by Penitents. 18. 2. 2. Vol. 6. p. 538.
- Sacræ Epistolæ*. The Emperor's Letters. 2. 16. 17. Vol. 1. p. 161.
- Sacramenta*. A general Name for Sacred Rites and Mysteries. 12. 1. 4. Vol. 3. p. 281.
- Baptism and the *Eucharist* in this Sense reckoned Four Sacraments, 12. 1. 4. Vol. 3 p. 282.
- Sacramentum Fidei*. Baptism. 11. 1. 8. Vol. 3. p. 120.
- Sacramentum Catechumenorum*. Salt given to the *Catechumens*. 10. 2. 16. Vol. 3. p. 29.
- Nothing to be demanded for administering Sacraments. 5. 4. 14. Vol. 1. p. 478.
- Profanation of the Sacraments, how punished. 16. 6. 26. Vol. 6. p. 280.
- Sacrarium*. The Chancel. 8. 6. 2. Vol. 2. p. 141.
- Sacrarium Bematis*. 8. 6. 22. Vol. 2. p. 168.
- Sacrificati*. Idolaters. 16. 4. 5. Vol. 6. p. 179.
- Sacrifice*. A general Name given to all Parts of Divine-Service. 13. 1. 5. Vol. 4. p. 16.
- Sacrifice* of the Altar, in what Sense allowed in the ancient Church. 2. 19. 15. Vol. 1. p. 204.
- To offer the *Sacrifice* of the Altar, an Office belonging to Bishops and Presbyters; not to Deacons. 2. 19. 15. Vol. 1. p. 204.
- Sacrilege*, how censured. 16. 6. 23. Vol. 6. p. 274.
- Punished by Divine Judgments, 8. 10. 2. Vol. 2. p. 228.
- Sacrilege* in Robbing of Graves. 16. 6. 24. Vol. 6. p. 277.
- Sacrilege* and Murder to defraud the Poor. 16. 6. 23. Vol. 6. p. 276. It. 16. 10. 15. Vol. 6. p. 356.
- Sacrilege* of the *Traditors*, who delivered the *Bibles* and Church Utensils to be burnt. 16. 6. 25. Vol. 6. p. 279.
- Of profaning the Sacraments, Churches, Altars, the Holy Scriptures, and molesting sacred Persons in Divine-Service. 16. 6. 26. Vol. 6. p. 280.
- In depriving Men of the Use of the Holy Scripture, and the Cup in the *Eucharist*. 16. 6. 27. Vol. 6. p. 282. See *Scripture*, and *Communion* in one Kind.
- Many Things called *Sacrilege* by the *Romanists*, which the Ancients called Virtues. 16. 6. 23. Vol. 6. p. 274.

- Saints* not worshipped. 13. 3. 1. Vol. 4. p. 63.
- Churches not dedicated to *Saints*; but to *God* only. 8. 9. 8. Vol. 2. p. 219.
- Swearing by *Saints* and *Angels*. See *Swearing*.
- Sancta Sanctis*. 15. 3. 31. Vol. 5. p. 291.
- Salutatorium*. The Greeting-House. 8. 7. 8. Vol. 2. p. 178.
- Sanctimoniates*. Sacred Virgins. 7. 4. 8. Vol. 2. p. 73.
- Sancta Sophia*. The famous Church of *Justinian* at *Constantinople*. 8. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 111.
- Of taking Refuge or *Sanctuary* in Churches. 8. 11. 1. Vol. 2. p. 239. &c. See *Asylum*.
- Sarabaitæ*. A Sort of *Monks*. 7. 2. 4. Vol. 2. p. 11.
- Sarmentitii et Semaxii*. Names of Reproach cast upon *Christians* for their Constancy in Suffering. 1. 2. 10. Vol. 1. p. 17.
- Delivering unto *Satan*. 16. 2. 15. Vol. 6. p. 106. &c.
- Divination by Compact with *Satan*. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 222.
- Saturday*. See *Sabbath*.
- Sauches*. A Sort of *Monks*. 7. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 10.
- Scenophylacium Bematis*. The Vestry. 8. 6. 23. Vol. 2. p. 169.
- Scenophylacium Magnum*. The larger Vestry without the Church. 8. 7. 7. Vol. 2. p. 177.
- Scenophylax*. The Keeper of the Vestry. 3. 13. 3. Vol. 1. p. 323.
- Schism*. Several Kinds of it. 16. 1. 17. Vol. 6. p. 57. &c.
- Punishment of *Schism*. 16. 6. 22. Vol. 6. p. 273. 274.
- Schismatics* sometimes re-ordained. 4. 7. 7. Vol. 1. p. 411.
- Clerks turning *Schismatics*, to be degraded, and not re-admitted, but as *Laymen*. 6. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 555.
- Schools* of the Church. 8. 7. 12. Vol. 2. p. 182.
- Catechetic *Schools*. 3. 10. 4. Vol. 1. p. 308. It. 8. 7. 12. Vol. 2. p. 184.
- Charity-Schools. 8. 7. 12. Vol. 2. p. 185. It. 13. 4. 9. Vol. 4. p. 90.
- Scholastici*. Lawyers. Their Extortions censured. 16. 12. 12. Vol. 6. p. 410.
- Not allowed to be ordained in some Churches. 4. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 380.
- Χολάξοντες ἐπίσκοποι. Bishops ordained to Sees that would not receive them. 4. 2. 14. Vol. 1. p. 351.
- Scriptures*. Translated into all Languages. 13. 4. 5. Vol. 4. p. 82.
- Read by *Catechumens*. 10. 1. 7. Vol. 3. p. 10.
- Read by all Men. 13. 4. 8. Vol. 4. p. 86. &c.
- Read by Children. 13. 4. 9. Vol. 4. p. 90.
- Laid in Churches for the People to read. 13. 4. 7. Vol. 4. p. 84.
- Accounted Tyranny and Sacrilege to deny the People the Use of them. 13. 4. 8. Vol. 4. p. 86. &c. It. 16. 6. 27. Vol. 6. p. 282.
- *Traditors* or *Betrayers* of the *Scriptures*, how punished. 16. 6. 25. Vol. 6. p. 279.
- Profaners of *Scriptures* censured. 16. 6. 26. Vol. 6. p. 280.
- Not to be used for Divination or

- Charms. 16. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 218. and 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 227.
- To be read by the Clergy and Monks at their Meals. 6. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 534. It. 7. 3. 17. Vol. 2. p. 51.
- Texts of *Scripture* written on the Walls of the Church. 8. 5. 9. Vol. 2. p. 138. and 8. 8. 3. Vol. 2. p. 196.
- Scriptures* got by Heart by many Monks and Blind Men only by Hearing them read. 7. 3. 17. Vol. 2. p. 50. It. 13. 4. 10. Vol. 4. p. 94.
- Apocryphal *Scripture*. See *Apocrypha*, and *Acts of the Martyrs*, read in Churches. 14. 3. 14. Vol. 5. p. 64.
- Interpreters of *Scripture*. See *Interpreters*.
- Readers of *Scripture*. See *Readers* or *Lectors*.
- Scythia* had but one Bishopric, called *Tomi*. 9. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 324.
- Secretarium Bematis*. 8. 6. 22. Vol. 2. p. 168.
- Secretarium Magnum*. 8. 7. 7. Vol. 2. p. 177.
- Secretaria*. Sessions of Councils, so called from their sitting in the *Secretarium* of the Church. 8. 7. 7. Vol. 2. p. 178.
- Secrets*. Unfaithfulness in Revealing them censured. 16. 13. 4. Vol. 6. p. 438.
- Secular Monks*. 7. 2. 6. Vol. 2. p. 13.
- Secular Offices* forbidden to the Clergy. 6. 4. 9. Vol. 1. p. 571. It. 17. 5. 11. Vol. 6. p. 501.
- Secular Powers* sometimes called in to aid the Church. 2. 4. 4. Vol. 1. p. 76. It. 16. 2. 3. Vol. 6. p. 63. &c. It. 17. 2. 7. Vol. 6. p. 461.
- Delivering up to the *Secular Court*. *Curie tradi*. What meant by it. 17. 2. 8. Vol. 6. p. 462.
- Clergy not to bring Ecclesiastical Causes before *Secular Judges*, 5. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 420. It. 17. 5. 15. Vol. 6. p. 505.
- In what Cases the Clergy were or were not exempt from the Cognizance of *Secular Judges*. 5. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 428. &c. See *Clergy Exemptions*.
- Sees* of Bishops made in Conformity to the Jurisdiction of Cities in the Roman Empire. 9. 1. 7. Vol. 2. p. 263. &c. It. 9. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 284. See *Dioceses*.
- Sedition* how censured. 16. 9. 4. Vol. 6. p. 335.
- Seditious Persons* incapable of ordination. 4. 3. 8. Vol. 1. p. 365.
- To be degraded, if in Orders. 16. 9. 4. Vol. 6. p. 337.
- Σῆκος. A Temple. 8. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 93.
- Seleucian Heretics* rejected Baptism. 11. 2. 3. Vol. 3. p. 126.
- Self-Murder* condemned. 16. 10. 6. Vol. 6. p. 345.
- Self-Murderers* denied Christian Burial, and Commemoration after Death. 7. 3. 12. Vol. 2. p. 43. It. 23. 3. 23. Vol. 7. p. 357.
- Semi-jejunia*. See *Stationary-Days*.
- Σεμνεῖον. A Church. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 27. It. 8. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 9.
- Senatorium*. The Seat of the Magistrates in Modern Churches. 3. 5. 10. Vol. 2. p. 140.
- Senes*. The common Name of Primates in the *African Church*. 2. 16. 6. Vol. 1. p. 151.
- Seniores Ecclesiastici*. Not Lay-Elders. 2. 19. 19. Vol. 1. p. 210.
- Seniority*. Bishops to take Place by *Seniority*. 2. 16. 8. Vol. 1. p. 153.
- Delinquent Bishops to forfeit

- their *Seniority* in the *African Church*. 2. 16. 7. Vol. 1. p. 153. It. 17. 4. 5. Vol. 6. p. 479.
- Loss of *Seniority* inflicted on the other Clergy for lesser Offences. 17. 4. 8. Vol. 6. p. 481.
- Septuagint*. Its Use in the ancient Church. 14. 3. 17. Vol. 5. p. 71.
- Sermons.*
- Two or Three *Sermons* in one Assembly. 14. 4. 6. Vol. 5. p. 93.
- Every Day in some Places, especially in *Lent*. 14. 4. 7. Vol. 5. p. 95.
- Twice a Day in some Churches. 14. 4. 8. Vol. 5. p. 96.
- Not so frequent in Country-Villages. 14. 4. 9. Vol. 5. p. 100.
- Different Sorts of *Sermons*, Expositions, Panegyrics, *de Tempore*, *de Sanctis*, &c. 14. 4. 10. Vol. 5. p. 101. &c.
- *Extempore Sermons*. 14. 4. 11. Vol. 5. p. 105. &c.
- Short Prayers before *Sermons*. 14. 4. 13. Vol. 5. p. 110. &c.
- Always before the Common Prayers. 14. 5. 1. Vol. 5. p. 156.
- *Pax vobis*, but no Use of *Ave Marias* before *Sermons*. 14. 4. 14. Vol. 5. p. 115. It. 14. 4. 15. Vol. 5. p. 117.
- Always upon important Subjects, compared with some ridiculous Homilies set forth by authority in the Church of *Rome*. 14. 4. 18. Vol. 5. p. 119, &c.
- Delivered by the Preacher sitting; heard by the People standing. 14. 4. 24. Vol. 5. p. 134, &c.
- Penning of *Sermons* by the Auditors. 14. 4. 29. Vol. 5. p. 148, &c.
- See *Preaching and the Contents of Book XIV. Chap. iv.*
- Servants*. See *Slaves*.
- Seseuplum*. A grievous Sort of Usury condemned by the Law. 6. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p. 511.
- Shammatha*. 16. 2. 17. Vol. 6. p. 110.
- Shaving* the Head and Beard, censured in the Clergy. 6. 4. 16. Vol. 1. p. 582.
- The Head condemned in Virgins. 7. 4. 6. Vol. 2. p. 70.
- Shoes*, put off by some at their Entrance into the Church. 8. 10. 6. Vol. 2. p. 232.
- Sibyllists*. A Name of Reproach cast upon Christians. 1. 2. 7. Vol. 1. p. 15.
- Sick*. *Eucharist* sent to them. 15. 4. 9. Vol. 5. p. 323.
- Signiferi*. A Sort of Diviners censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 232.
- Silentiarii*. A Sort of Monks. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 26.
- Silent-Prayer*. 15. 1. 1. Vol. 5. p. 175.
- Silentium indicere*. 15. 1. 1. Vol. 5. p. 180.
- Siliquiæ*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 455.
- Simonians*. A Name given to the *Nestorian* Heretics. 16. 6. 6. Vol. 6. p. 252.
- Simonian Idolatry*. 13. 3. 3. Vol. 4. p. 74.
- Simony*. 4. 3. 14. Vol. 1. p. 372. It. 16. 6. 28. Vol. 6. p. 284.
- Singers*. Their Station in the Church. 8. 5. 4. Vol. 3. p. 131.
- When first made an Order in the Church. 3. 7. 2. Vol. 1. p. 296.
- A distinct Order from Readers. 3. 7. 1. Vol. 1. p. 295.

- Canonical Singers. 3. 7. 2. Vol. 1. p. 297.
- Singing allowed to the whole Assembly. 3. 7. 2. Vol. 1. p. 296. It. 14. 1. 13. Vol. 5. p. 17.
- Why *Singing* sometimes forbidden to the People. 3. 7. 2. Vol. 1. p. 297.
- Sins, Mortal and Venial. How distinguished. 16. 3. 14. Vol. 6. p. 159, &c.
- Σιτηρόεσια. An Allowance of Corn to the Clergy out of the Emperor's store-houses. 5. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 473.
- Sitting, no Posture of Devotion. 13. 8. 7. Vol. 4. p. 216. It. 15. 5. 3. Vol. 5. p. 354.
- Slaves, not to be ordained without Consent of their Masters. 4. 4. 2. Vol. 1. p. 375.
- Nor turn Monks without their Consent. 7. 3. 2. Vol. 2. p. 29.
- Nor marry without their Consent. 16. 9. 3. Vol. 6. p. 335. It. 22. 2. 5. Vol. 7. p. 228.
- Nor be baptized without Testimony from their Masters. 11. 5. 4. Vol. 3. p. 184.
- Noblemen not to marry *Slaves*. 22. 2. 6. Vol. 7. p. 228.
- Of *Jews* or Heretical Masters to have their Freedom upon turning Christians. 8. 11. 7. Vol. 2. p. 246. It. 16. 6. 6. Vol. 6. p. 256.
- Manumission of *Slaves* allowed upon *Sundays* or any other Days of Vacation at Law. 20. 2. 2. Vol. 7. p. 15.
- Flying from their Masters not to have Benefit of Sanctuary in the Church. 8. 11. 7. Vol. 2. p. 246.
- Sodomy, how punished. 16. 11. 9. Vol. 6. p. 380.
- Soldiers, in what Cases denied Baptism. 11. 5. 10. Vol. 3. p. 193.
- And Ordination. 4. 4. 1. Vol. 1. p. 374.
- Solea and Σωλεῖον. The Emperor's Throne in the Church. 8. 5. 10. Vol. 2. p. 138.
- Solitarii. A Sect of the *Manichees*. 16. 2. 4. Vol. 6. p. 69.
- Soothsayers, censured. 16. 5. 2. Vol. 6. p. 217.
- Sortes Sacrae and *Virgilianæ*, censured. 16. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 210. See *Lots* and *Divination*.
- Sancta Sophia. 8. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 111.
- Σῶτρα. The Reward for saving lost Goods. 16. 12. 5. Vol. 6. p. 401.
- Spanish Churches, not subject to the Bishop of Rome. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 273.
- Specierum Collatio. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 443.
- Spectators of Stage-Plays, censured. 16. 4. 10. Vol. 6. p. 191. It. 16. 11. 12. Vol. 6. p. 386.
- Of Gladiators, reputed guilty of Murder. 16. 10. 14. Vol. 6. p. 354.
- Praying, by the SPIRIT. 13. 6. 9. Vol. 4. p. 182.
- Preaching, by the SPIRIT. 14. 4. 12. Vol. 5. p. 109.
- Sponsalitia Donationes. 22. 3. 3. Vol. 7. p. 248. See *Espousals*.
- Sponsors. Sureties or Godfathers in Baptism. 11. 8. 1. Vol. 3. p. 238.
- Parents, *Sponsors* for their own Children. 11. 8. 2. Vol. 3. p. 239.
- Not bound to maintain the Children, for whom they are Sureties. 11. 8. 3. Vol. 3. p. 240.
- For Adult Persons. 11. 8. 6. and 7. Vol. 3. p. 245.

- But one *Sponsor* required. 11. 8. 11. Vol. 4. p. 318.
- What Persons might not be *Sponsors*. 11. 8. 10. Vol. 3. p. 249.
- The Names of *Sponsors* registered. 11. 8. 13. Vol. 3. p. 251.
- When first it became a Law, that *Sponsors* might not marry those for whom they were Sureties. 11. 8. 12. Vol. 3. p. 249. It. 22. 2. 11. Vol. 7. p. 233.
- Sportulantes Fratres*. The Clergy. 5. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 468.
- Σπυδαῖοι. A Name given to the Primitive *Ascetics*. 7. 1. 6. Vol. 2. p. 9.
- Σφραγις. Baptism. 11. 1. 6. Vol. 3. p. 116.
- Confirmation. 12. 1. 1. Vol. 3. p. 286.
- Sprinkling*, sometimes used in *Baptism*. 11. 11. 5. Vol. 3. p. 275. See *Baptism*.
- Stage-players* and *Frequenters* of the *Stage*, denied *Baptism*. 11. 5. 6. Vol. 3. p. 188. It. 11. 5. 9. Vol. 3. p. 192.
- Excluded from *Communion*. 16. 4. 10. Vol. 6. p. 191. It. 16. 11. 12. Vol. 6. p. 386.
- Never to be ordained. 4. 4. 7. Vol. 1. p. 381.
- Standing*. The Posture of Prayer on the *Lord's-Days* and the Fifty Days of *Pentecost*. 13. 8. 3. Vol. 4. p. 210. See *Lord's-Day Prayer*, and *Pentecost*.
- In *Psalmody*. 14. 1. 14. Vol. 5. p. 18.
- At *Sermons*. 14. 4. 25. Vol. 5. p. 137.
- At reading the Gospel. 14. 3. 10. Vol. 5. p. 59.
- At the Altar. 8. 6. 7. Vol. 2. p. 144.
- At the Reception of the *Eucharist*. 15. 5. 3. Vol. 5. p. 354.
- Stationes*. *Stationary Days*. The Weekly Half-Fasts of *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*. How observed. 13. 9. 2. Vol. 4. p. 233. It. 21. 3. 4. Vol. 7. p. 199. See *Fasts*.
- The Original of them. 21. 3. 2. Vol. 7. p. 196.
- How they differed from the *Lent-Fast*. 21. 1. 16. Vol. 7. p. 162. It. 21. 3. 3. Vol. 7. p. 197.
- Dispute between the *Montanists* and the *Catholics* about *Stationary Fasts*. 21. 3. 5. Vol. 7. p. 200.
- How the *Wednesday Station* came to be changed to *Saturday* in the *Western Church*. 21. 3. 6. Vol. 7. p. 202.
- *Statues* or *Massy Images*, not allowed in Churches till after the Third Council of *Nice*. 8. 8. 11. Vol. 2. p. 208.
- Statue* of *CHRIST*, made by the *Syro-phænician Woman*, not set in the Church for *Worship*, but laid up in the *Vestry* for *Safety* against the *Abuses* of the *Heathen*. 8. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 203.
- Σταυροπήγιον. 8. 9. 5. Vol. 2. p. 216.
- Stellionatus*. *Fraud* censured. 16. 12. 14. Vol. 6. p. 413.
- Sticharia*. *Sacred Vestments*. 13. 8. 2. Vol. 4. p. 207.
- Στοιαι. *Porticoes* of the Church. 8. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- Stolen Goods*. *Buying* of them censured. 16. 12. 18. Vol. 6. p. 426.
- Strangers*, not to be ordained. 4. 3. 5. Vol. 1. p. 360.
- Communion* of *Strangers*, See *Communio Peregrina*.
- Στρατεία. The General Name for all *Secular Offices*, *Civil* as well as *Mili-*

- tary among the *Romans*. 6. 4. 9. Vol. 1. p. 571.
- Strife* and Contention, censured as a lower Degree of Murder. 16. 10. 17. Vol. 6. p. 358.
- Oblations not to be received from Persons at *Strife* and Variance. 15. 2. 2. Vol. 5. p. 198.
- Στρογγυλοειδής ἄρτος. Communion Loaves. 15. 2. 6. Vol. 5. p. 212.
- Studies* of the Clergy. 6. 3. 1. Vol. 1. p. 528.
- Studitæ*. Monks so called. 7. 2. 10. Vol. 2. p. 21.
- Stylitæ*. Another Name of Monks. 7. 2. 5. Vol. 2. p. 12.
- Sub-deacons*, not mentioned before the Third Century. 3. 2. 1. Vol. 1. p. 274.
- Ordained without Imposition of Hands. 3. 2. 2. Vol. 1. p. 275.
- Their Offices. 3. 2. 3. Vol. 1. p. 275.
- The precise Number of Seven *Subdeacons* retained in the *Roman Church*. 3. 2. 5. Vol. 1. p. 277.
- Subdiaconissa*. A *Subdeacon's* Wife. 2. 22. 15. Vol. 1. p. 259.
- Substrators*. An Order of *Catechumens*. 10. 2. 4. Vol. 3. p. 15.
- An Order of Penitents. 18. 1. 5. Vol. 6. p. 534.
- Their Station in the Church. 8. 5. 3. Vol. 2. p. 130.
- Suburbs* of a City, denotes all the Country Towns and Villages depending upon the Jurisdiction of the City Magistrates. 9. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 283.
- Dioceses of Bishops anciently confined to a City with such depending *Suburbs*. 9. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 284.
- Suburbicariæ Ecclesiæ*. An Account of them. 9. 1. 9. Vol. 2. p. 268.
- Suffragan Bishops*, different from *Chorepiscopi*, in the ancient Church. 2. 14. 13. & 14. Vol. 1. p. 144.
- Summi Sacerdotes*. A Title of Bishops, forbidden in the *African Churches*. 2. 2. 8. Vol. 1. p. 57.
- Sunday*, an ancient Name of the *Lord's-Day*. See *Lord's-Day*.
- Συνείσακτοι. Women forbidden to live with Clergymen. 6. 2. 13. Vol. 1. p. 525. It. 17. 5. 25. Vol. 6. p. 515.
- Συντάττομαι χριστῷ. 11. 7. 6. Vol. 3. p. 224.
- Superindicta*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 443. It. 5. 3. 8. Vol. 1. p. 454.
- Superpositiones*. Extraordinary Fasts. 21. 1. 25. Vol. 7. p. 174.
- Superstitio Nova*. A Name of Reproach cast upon the Christian Religion. 1. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p. 14.
- Supremacy* of Princes above all Ecclesiastics. 5. 2. 14. Vol. 1. p. 436. It. 16. 9. 4. Vol. 6. p. 335. It. 16. 2. 5. Vol. 6. p. 77.
- Of the Pope of *Rome* over all Churches, not allowed in ancient Practice. 9. 1. 9. Vol. 2. p. 268. It. 16. 1. 14. Vol. 6. p. 48. It. 2. 5. 1. Vol. 1. p. 80.
- Sureties* in Baptism. See *Sponsors*.
- Sursum Corda*. A Form used in the *Eucharist*. 15. 3. 8. Vol. 5. p. 242.
- Suspensio a Divisione Mensurâ*. 5. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 668. It. 17. 1. 4. Vol. 6. p. 451.
- Suspensio ab Officio*. 17. 1. 5. Vol. 6. p. 451.
- Suspension* from the *Eucharist*, the lesser Excommunication. 16. 2. 7. Vol. 6. p. 80.

- Swearing*, in common Conversation censured. 16. 7. 5. Vol. 6. p. 314.
- By Creatures, censured. 6. 2. 10. Vol. 1. p. 521. It. 16. 7. 6. Vol. 6. p. 315.
- By the Emperor's *Genius*, Saints, Angels, &c. not allowed. 16. 7. 7. Vol. 6. p. 316. &c.
- By the Emperor's Safety, in what Sense admitted. 16. 7. 6. Vol. 6. p. 315.
- By the *Alleluia*. What meant by it. 14. 2. 4. Vol. 5. p. 33. See *Oaths* and *Perjury*.
- Symbolical* Representations of God. 8. 8. 10. Vol. 2. p. 206.
- Of CHRIST and the HOLY GHOST. 8. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 199, &c. It. 38. 11. *Ibid.* Vol. 2. p. 208.
- Synagogues* turned into Churches. 8. 2. 4. Vol. 2. p. 115.
- Churches conformed to the Model of *Synagogues*. 8. 6. 10. Vol. 2. p. 148.
- Not to be frequented upon any Account by *Christians*. 16. 6. 3. Vol. 6. p. 246.
- Synedrians*. A Name of Reproach cast upon the *Catholics* by the *Novatians*. 1. 2. 13. Vol. 1. p. 18.
- Synesius*, His irregular Ordination. 4. 3. 3. Vol. 1. p. 358.
- Synodi*. Churches. 8. 1. 7. Vol. 2. p. 84.
- Synodica Epistolæ*. Circular Letters written by Bishops, testifying their Faith, immediately after their Enthronement. 2. 11. 10. Vol. 1. p. 128.
- The Primate's Letters summoning the Provincial Bishops to the Synod. 2. 16. 17. Vol. 1. p. 161.
- Letters written by a Synod.
- Synodite*. A Sort of *Monks*. 7. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 10.
- Synods*, Provincial to be held twice a Year. 2. 3. 9. Vol. 1. p. 72. It. 2. 16. 17. Vol. 1. p. 161.
- Primates to call, and preside in, Provincial *Synods*. 2. 16. 17. Vol. 1. p. 167.
- Bishops obliged to attend Provincial *Synods*. *Ibid.* and 17. 5. 3. Vol. 6. p. 492.
- Liberty of Appeal from Bishops or Primates to a Provincial *Synod*. 2. 16. 16. Vol. 1. p. 160.
- No Appeal from a Provincial *Synod* to Foreign Churches. 9. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 271. It. 17. 5. 14. Vol. 6. p. 504.
- No Clerk, condemned by a Provincial *Synod*, to officiate before he is acquitted by another. 17. 5. 14. Vol. 6. p. 504.
- Patriarchal Synods*. Their Power above Provincial. 2. 17. 14. Vol. 1. p. 178.
- Oecumenical Synods*, or General Councils. Their Use and Power in the Church. 16. 1. 13. Vol. 6. p. 46.
- National Synods*. Their Power. 16. 1. 13. Vol. 7. p. 46. &c.
- Consistorial Synods* of the Bishop and Presbyters. 2. 19. 11. Vol. 1. p. 198.
- Synods*, of Elect Judges. 2. 16. 16. Vol. 1. p. 160.
- Held in the Baptisteries. 8. 7. 2. Vol. 2. p. 172.
- In the *Catechumenia*. 8. 5. 7. Vol. 2. p. 136.
- In the *Secretaria* of the Church. 8. 7. 7. Vol. 2. p. 177.
- Synodica Epistolæ*. 5. 1. 3. Vol. 1. p. 419.
- T.
- TABERNACULA. Churches. 8. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 93.

- Tabula Clericorum.* 1. 5. 10. Vol. 1. p. 37.
- Lex Talionis.* 16. 10. 9. Vol. 6. p. 349.
- Taxes.* Clergy not exempt by Divine Right from them. 5. 3. 1. Vol. 1. p. 437.
- What *Taxes* were not imposed upon the Clergy. 5. 3. 2. Vol. 1. p. 438. See *Clergy-Privileges*.
- Ταξιῶται.* Officers of the Civil Courts not to be ordained among the Clergy. 4. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 376.
- Τάξις βήματος.* The Clergy. 1. 5. 11. Vol. 1. p. 38.
- Ταχυγράφοι.* *Notaries.* 3. 13. 5. Vol. 1. p. 325.
- Te Deum* Hymn. 14. 2. 9. Vol. 5. p. 39.
- Τέλειοι.* Baptized Christians. 1. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 26.
- Τέλειον.* The *Eucharist.* 1. 4. 3. Vol. 1. p. 26.
- Τελετή.* Baptism. 11. 1. 10. Vol. 3. p. 123.
- Τέμενος.* A Temple or Church. 8. 1. 11. Vol. 2. p. 93.
- Tempestarii.* Conjurers censured. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 231.
- Temples.* When that Name was first given to Churches. 8. 1. 6. Vol. 2. p. 82.
- Heathen *Temples* turned into Churches. 8. 2. 4. Vol. 2. p. 112.
- Heathen *Temples* and their Revenues given to the Church. 5. 4. 10. Vol. 1. p. 475.
- Heathen *Temples* not to be built or adorned by Christians. 16. 4. 12. Vol. 6. p. 195.
- Tertiana.* The Bishop's Thirds of all Revenues belonging to the Church. 9. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 434.
- Τεράσθλον.* The Cloisters. 8. 3. 5. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- Thanes.* Lords of Manors. 9. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 433.
- Θαυματοποιοί.* Magicians censured. 16. 5. 7. Vol. 6. p. 233.
- Theft,* censured. 16. 12. 4. Vol. 6. p. 400.
- In detaining lost Goods. *Ibid.*
- Theodoret's* Diocese had Eight Hundred Parishes in it. 9. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 313.
- Θεόληπτοι* and *Θεοφορημένοι.* Diviners condemned. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 224.
- Θεόδρομοι.* and *Θεοπροσβύται,* Messengers sent from one Church to another. 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 190.
- Theophori.* A Name of Christians. 1. 1. 4. Vol. 1. p. 4.
- Therapeutæ.* A Name of Christians. 1. 1. 1. Vol. 1. p. 1.
- A Name of Monks. 7. 2. 14. Vol. 2. p. 26.
- Θόλωτα.* Churches built arch-wise or round. 8. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 118.
- Throne,* of the Emperor in the Church. 8. 5. 10. Vol. 2. p. 138.
- Of the Bishop. 2. 9. 7. Vol. 1. p. 102. *It.* 8. 6. 10. Vol. 2. p. 147.
- Of the Presbyters. 2. 19. 5. Vol. 1. p. 191. *It.* 8. 6. 10. Vol. 2. p. 147.
- Thurarii.* Sellers of Frankincense to the Heathen Temples censured as Contributors to Idolatry. 16. 4. 13. Vol. 6. p. 196.
- Thurificati.* Idolaters censured. 16. 4. 5. Vol. 6. p. 179.
- Thursday,* superstitiously observed in Honour of *Jupiter.* 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 230.
- Θύρωροι.* See *Doorkeepers.*
- Θυσιαστήριον.* The Altar-part or Chancel. 8. 6. 3. Vol. 2. p. 142.
- Tintinnabula.* 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 192. See *Bells.*

- Tirones. Catechumens.* 10. 1. 1. Vol. 3. p. 1.
- Tirones and Aurum Tironicum.* A Tax so called. 5. 3. 4. Vol. 1. p. 445.
- Tithes, due by Divine Right.* 5. 5. 1. Vol. 1. p. 482.
- Why not exacted in the first Ages. 5. 5. 2. Vol. 1. p. 484.
- Settled in the Fourth Century. 5. 5. 3. Vol. 1. p. 485.
- Titular Bishops not allowed.* 4. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 392.
- Ordinations, what and why condemned. 5. 3. 15. Vol. 1. p. 461.
- No one to be ordained without a *Utle.* 4. 6. 2. Vol. 1. p. 392.
- Tituli.* A Name given to some Churches. 8. 1. 10. Vol. 2. p. 92.
- Tomi.* The only Bishopric in *Seythia.* 9. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 342.
- Torcillus* the first Author of Organs in Churches. 8. 7. 14. Vol. 2. p. 167.
- Tonsure of the Clergy, what.* 6. 4. 16. Vol. 1. p. 582.
- Of Monks. 7. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 33.
- Tractoria.* The Primate's Letter of Summons to a Provincial Synod. 2. 16. 17. Vol. 1. p. 161.
- Trades, in some Cases allowed to the Clergy.* 6. 4. 13. Vol. 1. p. 576.
- Traditors of the Bible censured.* 16. 6. 25. Vol. 6. p. 279.
- Traffic, Fraud in censured.* 16. 12. 17. Vol. 6. p. 420.
- Translations, of the Bible into all Languages.* 14. 3. 17. Vol. 5. p. 71. It. 13. 4. 5. Vol. 4. p. 83.
- Translatio Italæ, Vetus, Vulgaris.* 14. 3. 17. Vol. 5. p. 74.
- Translation of the Septuagint.* 14. 3. 17. Vol. 5. p. 74.
- Translation of Bishops from one See to another in what Cases allowed.* 6. 4. 6. Vol. 1. p. 565.
- Transubstantiation not known to the ancient Church.* 15. 5. 4. Vol. 5. p. 358. &c.
- Treason censured.* 16. 9. 4. Vol. 6. p. 335.
- Treatise on the 8th Canon of the Council of Nice.* Vol. 4. from p. 213 to p. 253.
- Trepalium.* 17. 5. 34. Vol. 6. p. 522.
- Tribunal.* The Altar-Part or Sanctuary. 8. 6. 1. Vol. 2. p. 140.
- *Ecclesia.* 3. 5. 4. Vol. 1. p. 291. It. 8. 5. 4. Vol. 2. p. 131.
- Trinity, worshipped in the ancient Church.* 13. 2. 1. Vol. 4. p. 30. &c.
- In Unity, explained. 13. 2. 3. Vol. 4. p. 40. &c.
- Sermon on the Doctrine of the Trinity. Vol. 8. from p. 299. to p. 321.
- Trisagion Hymn.* 14. 2. 3. Vol. 5. p. 30. It. 15. 3. 10. Vol. 5. p. 247.
- Tritheists.* 11. 3. 4. Vol. 3. p. 139. It. 13. 2. 3. Vol. 4. p. 45.
- Trophæus.* Churches why so called. 8. 1. 10. Vol. 2. p. 90.
- Τρόφωτα and Trulla.* 8. 3. 1. Vol. 2. p. 118.
- Trumpets, used to call Church Assemblies.* 8. 7. 15. Vol. 2. p. 190.
- Trust, Fraud in censured.* 16. 12. 16. Vol. 6. p. 419.
- Tunica, a Sacred Vestment.* 13. 8. 2. Vol. 4. p. 207.
- Tychaum.* The Temple of Fortune turned into a Church. 8. 2. 4. Vol. 2. p. 115.

## V.

VACANT Sees under the Care of the Primate. 2. 16. 20. Vol. 1. p. 162.

—— To be filled within Three Months. 2. 11. 1. Vol. 1. p. 113.

- Vagrants* censured. 16. 12. 19. Vol. 6. p. 428.
- Veils*, of the Church. 8. 6. 8. Vol. 2. p. 145.
- Veil*, in Marriage. 22. 4. 4. Vol. 7. p. 270.
- Veiling*, of Penitents. 18. 2. 3. Vol. 6. p. 541.
- Of Virgins. 7. 4. 6. Vol. 2. p. 69.
- Valentinian* Heretics rejected from Baptism. 11. 2. 1. Vol. 3. p. 124.
- Vates*. Diviners censured. 16. 5. 4. Vol. 6. p. 223.
- Vecolo facere*. 20. 1. 3. Vol. 7. p. 6.
- Venefici*. See *Magicians*.
- Venial* and Mortal Sins. 16. 3. 14. Vol. 6. p. 159. &c.
- Vessels* of Wood, Glass, Silver, and Gold, used in the Altar-Service. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 2. p. 160.
- These kept by the Deacons. 2. 20. 4. Vol. 1. p. 216.
- The Custom of delivering *Vessels* into the Hands of Presbyters at their Ordination, not used by the Ancients. 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 207. It. 4. 6. 13. Vol. 1. p. 403.
- Holy *Vessels* never put to any common Use. 8. 10. 2. Vol. 2. p. 227.
- Vestibulum Magnum*. 8. 3. 4. Vol. 2. p. 121.
- Vestry*. 8. 7. 7. Vol. 2. p. 177.
- Viaticum*. *Baptism*. 11. 1. 10. Vol. 3. p. 122.
- The *Eucharist*. 15. 4. 9. Vol. 5. p. 323. It. 18. 4. 3. Vol. 6. p. 579.
- Vicars* of CHRIST. The common Title of all Bishops. 2. 2. 10. Vol. 1. p. 58.
- Vidua*. See *Widows*.
- Vigils*, how observed. 13. 9. 4. Vol. 4. p. 235. It. 20. 7. 9. Vol. 7. p. 117.
- Not to be kept by Women alone. 8. 10. 1. Vol. 2. p. 226. It. 16. 11. 17. Vol. 6. p. 396.
- Villages* and Cities how distinguished. 9. 2. 3. Vol. 2. p. 284.
- Sometimes made Bishops' Sees. 2. 12. 3. Vol. 1. p. 126.
- Village Bishops*, in *Arabia*. 9. 2. 7. Vol. 2. p. 297.
- In *Libya*. 9. 2. 6. Vol. 2. p. 291.
- In *Egypt*. 9. 2. 6. Vol. 2. p. 290.
- Virgins*, Ecclesiastical and Monastical. How they differed. 7. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 63.
- Consecrated by the Bishop. 7. 4. 6. Vol. 2. p. 68.
- Their Habit, Veil, and Mitre. 7. 4. 1. Vol. 2. p. 63.
- Their Place in the Church. 7. 4. 7. Vol. 2. p. 72. It. 8. 5. 9. Vol. 2. p. 137.
- Excused from the Capitation Tax; and other Honours paid to them. 7. 4. 7. Vol. 2. p. 72.
- No solemn Vow required of *Virgins* at first. 7. 4. 2. Vol. 2. p. 64.
- When first subjected to Ecclesiastical Censure for Marrying. 7. 4. 3. Vol. 2. p. 65.
- Virgins* might marry, if consecrated under Forty years of Age. 7. 4. 5. Vol. 2. p. 66.
- Marriage, of professed *Virgins*, never declared null. 7. 4. 4. Vol. 2. p. 65.
- Virgins*, not shaven at their Consecration. 7. 4. 6. Vol. 2. p. 71.

- Sometimes made Deaconesses. 2. 22. 2. Vol. 1. p. 248.
- Ravishers of *Virgins* punished with Death. 16. 11. 8. Vol. 6. p. 379.
- Visitations* Parochial to be made once a Year by the Bishop, or else his Diocese to be divided. 9. 6. 16. Vol. 2. p. 387. It. 9. 6. 22. Vol. 2. p. 400.
- Primates might *visit* all Dioceses in their Province. 2. 16. 18. Vol. 1. p. 161.
- *Honor Cathedræ*. A Pension paid to Bishops at their *Visitations*. 9. 8. 6. Vol. 2. p. 432.
- Visiting-Presbyters*. 2. 14. 12. Vol. 1. p. 143.
- Vituriarii*. 16. 5. 6. Vol. 6. p. 232.
- Unciæ*. A Tax so called. 5. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 455.
- Uncovering the Head in Prayer*. 13. 8. 9. Vol. 4. p. 218.
- Unction*. A Ceremony used in Baptism. 11. 9. 1. Vol. 3. p. 252.
- And in Confirmation. 12. 3. 1. Vol. 3. p. 369.
- No *Unction* in the Ordination of Presbyters. 2. 19. 17. Vol. 1. p. 207. It. 4. 6. 13. Vol. 1. p. 403.
- Extreme *Unction*.
- Unity* of the Church to be maintained by the Clergy. 6. 3. 11. Vol. 1. p. 555.
- Of Faith and obedience necessary as Fundamental to the very Being of the Church. 16. 1. 1. Vol. 6. p. 1.
- Of Charity included therein. 16. 1. 2. Vol. 6. p. 9.
- Other Sorts of *Unity* necessary to the well-being of the Church; as *Unity* of Baptism, Worship, subjection to a lawful Bishop, and subjection to the Discipline of the Church. 16. 1. 3. Vol. 6. p. 10.
- Catholic *Unity*, how maintained. 16. 1. 8. Vol. 6. p. 36.
- No Necessity of a visible Head to maintain the *Catholic Unity* of the Church. 16. 1. 14. Vol. 6. p. 48.
- Catholic *Unity* requires not an Agreement in all Rites and Ceremonies throughout the whole Church. 16. 1. 15. Vol. 6. p. 50.
- Unleavened Bread* not used in the *Eucharist*. 15. 2. 5. Vol. 5. p. 208.
- Breach of *Vows*, how censured. 16. 7. 9. Vol. 6. p. 323.
- No solemn *Vow* required of *Monks* at first. 7. 3. 7. Vol. 2. p. 36.
- Nor of the Clergy. See *Celibacy*.
- Nor of *Virgins*. 7. 4. 2. Vol. 2. p. 64.
- Ἑπακέειν. Joining in the Close of a Verse in *Psalmody*. 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5. p. 14.
- Ἐπέρθεσις. Addition to a Fast. 21. 1. 25. Vol. 7. p. 174.
- Ἐπερώον. A Church. 8. 1. 13. Vol. 2. p. 98.
- Ἐπερώα. The Womens' Galleries in the Church. 8. 5. 7. Vol. 2. p. 136.
- Ἐπηρέται. Deacons. 2. 20. 2. Vol. 1. p. 214.
- Ἐπηχεῖν. 3. 7. 3. Vol. 1. p. 297. It. 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5. p. 14.
- Ἐποβολεῖς. Precentors. 3. 7. 3. Vol. 1. p. 297. It. 14. 1. 12. Vol. 5. p. 14.
- Ἐπογραφεῖς. Notaries. 3. 13. 5. Vol. 1. p. 325.
- Ἐποπίπτοντες. Penitents, called Prostrators or Kneelers. 18. 1. 5. Vol. 6. p. 535.
- Their Station in the Church. 8. 5. 3. Vol. 2. p. 130.

Ἐποπίπροντες. Catechumens. 10. 2.  
4. Vol. 3. p. 15.

Urceola. Water-pots. 8. 6. 21. Vol. 2.  
p. 163.

Usurers not to be ordained. 4. 3. 8.  
Vol. 1. p. 365.

Usury censured. 6. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p.  
509. It. 16. 12. 13. Vol. 6. p. 412.

Usury upon Usury forbidden by the  
Roman Laws. 6. 2. 6. Vol. 1. p. 510.

Vulgar Tongue, used in Divine Service.  
13. 4. 1. Vol. 4. p. 77.

——— Scriptures read in the Vulgar  
Tongue. See *Scriptures*.

### W.

WAFERS not used in the Eucharist.  
15. 2. 5. Vol. 5. p. 208.

Wakes. Their Original. 8. 9. 14. Vol.  
2. p. 225.

Wandering Beggars censured. 11. 5. 8.  
Vol. 3. p. 191.

——— Monks censured. 7. 2. 12.  
Vol. 2. p. 22.

——— Clergy censured. 6. 4. 5. Vol.  
1. 564. It. 16. 12. 19. Vol. 6. p.  
429.

Washing the Hands. A Ceremony  
used by Men at their Entrance into  
the Church. 8. 3. 6. Vol. 2. p. 122.  
It. 8. 10. 5. Vol. 2. p. 232.

——— Of Hands before Consecration  
of the Eucharist. 15. 3. 4. Vol. 5.  
p. 239.

——— The Feet, used by some at  
Baptism. 12. 4. 10. Vol. 3. p. 332.

——— The Dead. 23. 3. 3. Vol. 7.  
p. 326.

——— Of the Catechumens before Bap-  
tism, a mere Civil Rite of Decency.  
12. 4. 10. Vol. 3. p. 333.

Watching with the Dead before Burial.  
23. 3. 5. Vol. 7. p. 329.

——— Continual *Watching* and Prayer  
Day and Night, how observed by  
some Monks. 7. 3. 17. Vol. 2. p. 48.  
See *Acæmetæ*.

——— Women not to *watch* alone in  
the Church. See *Vigils*.

Water mixed with Wine in the Eucha-  
rist. 15. 2. 7. Vol. 5. p. 214.

——— Consecrated by Prayer in Bap-  
tism. 11. 10. 1. Vol. 3. p. 260.

Water-Baptism rejected by many an-  
cient Heretics. 11. 2. 1. Vol. 3.  
p. 124.

Wednesday and Friday Weekly Fasts.  
See *Fasts* and *Stationary Days*.

Whisperers censured. 16. 13. 3. Vol.  
6. p. 436.

Whipping, a Punishment of the inferior  
Clergy. 16. 3. 11. Vol. 6. p. 155.

——— Voluntary Whipping of Monks,  
condemned and censured. 7. 3. 12.  
Vol. 2. p. 43. See *Flagellantes*.

White Garments worn by the Neophytes,  
or newly Baptized. 12. 4. 1. Vol. 3.  
p. 322. It. 20. 6. 6. Vol. 7. p. 104.

——— Also by Ministers in Divine  
Service. 13. 8. 2. Vol. 4. p. 206.

Whitsunday Festival. 20. 6. 6. Vol. 7.  
p. 104.

Widows of the Church. 7. 4. 9. Vol. 2.  
p. 73.

——— Deaconesses. 2. 22. 1. Vol. 1.  
p. 247.

——— Not to Marry until Twelve  
Months after their Husband's Death.  
22. 2. 8. Vol. 7. p. 231.

——— Forging of Wills censured. 16.  
12. 14. Vol. 6. p. 412. or 414.

——— False Witness, how punished.  
16. 13. 1. Vol. 6. p. 433.

——— False Witness against Men's  
Lives, reputed and punished as Mur-  
der. 16. 10. 9. Vol. 6. p. 348.

*Waves.* See *Marriage and Divorce.*

*Women* not to baptize. 2. 22. 7. Vol. 1. p. 254. It. 11. 4. 1. Vol. 3. p. 150.

—— Not to Preach. 14. 4. 5. Vol. 5. p. 91.

*Women,—Priests,* an Heathenish Custom. 2. 22. 7. Vol. 1. p. 254.

*Women's Gate* in the Church. 2. 22. 12. Vol. 1. p. 257.

*Women's Galleries,* or Place in the Church. 8. 5. 7. Vol. 2. p. 136.

—— Not to keep private *Vigils.* See *Vigils.*

—— Penitents. 16. 3. 2. Vol. 6. p. 116.

—— Divine *Worship* not given to any Creature. 13. 3. 1. Vol. 4. p. 61. See *Angels, Images, Martyrs, Relics,* &c.

—— Nor to the *Host* in the *Eucharist.* 15. 5. 5. Vol. 5 p. 370.

—— Daily *Worship* at Church, frequented both by Laity and Clergy. 13. 10. 15. Vol. 4 p. 260. It. 17. 5. 10. Vol. 6. p. 501. It. 6. 3. 6. Vol. 1. p. 539.

## Z.

ZΥΤΟΚΡΟΥΣΤΑΙ. 16. 12. 17. Vol. 6, p. 423.

*Zygostates.* 16. 12. 17. Vol. 6. p. 423.

## INDEX AUCTORUM.

## A.

*Flor. An.*

190. ACTA Andronici. ap. Baron. an. 190.  
 202. Acta Martyrum Scyllitanorum. ap. Baron. 202.  
 303. Acta Euplii. ap. Baron. an. 303.  
 299. Acta Tharaci. ap. Baron. an. 299.  
 303. Acta Felicis, Ampelii, Glycerii, Dativi, Saturnini, Thelicae & aliorum. ap. Baron. an. 301. 302. 303.  
 67. Acta Theclæ. ap. Grabe Spicilegium. Vol. 1. p. 95.  
 Pet. *Ærodius* de Patrio Jure, cum Pandectis. *Par.* 1615. *Folio.*  
*Agathias* de Rebus Gestis Justiniani. *G. L. Par.* 1660. *Folio.*  
 132. *Agrippa* Castor. Fragment. ap. Eusebium.  
 Cornel. *Agrippa* de Vanitate Scientiarum, *Hagæ.* 1662. 8vo.  
 Gabr. *Albaspinaus* Episcopus Aurelianensis. Observationes de veteribus Ecclesiæ Ritibus. *Par.* 1631. *Folio.*  
 ——— Notæ in Optatum, Tertullianum, Concilium Eliberi. & Canones alios antiquos. *Ibid.*  
 ——— Police de l'Ancienne Eglise sur l'Administration de l'Euchariste, &c.  
 Edm. *Albertinus* de Eucharistia. *Daventriæ* 1655. *Folio.*  
 490. *Alcimus* Avitus. in *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 8.  
 780. *Albinus Alcuinus*. in *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 10.  
 Nicol. *Alemannus*. De Parietinis Lateranensibus. *Romæ* 1625. *Folio.*  
 315. *Alexander. Alexandrinus*. Epist. ap. Theodoret. Lib. 1. cap. 4.  
 630. *Alexandrinum* Chronicon. *Gr. Lat. Monachii* 1615. 4to.  
 1166. *Alexius* Aristenus. Synopsis Canonum ap. Justellum & Beverege.  
 1130. *Algerus* de Eucharistia. *Par.* 1610.  
 Pet. *Allix* de Trisagio. *Rothomagi.* 1674. 4to.  
 Leo *Allatius* de Consensione perpetuâ Occidentalis & Orientalis Ecclesiæ. *Colon.* 1648. 4to.  
 ——— De Dominicis & Hebdomadibus Græcorum. *Ibid.*  
 ——— De Missa Præsancificatorum. *Ibid.*  
 ——— De Libris Ecclesiasticis Græcorum. *Par.* 1645. 4to.  
 ——— De Narthece Veteris Ecclesiæ & Templis recentiorum Græcorum. *Par.* 1646. 4to.  
*Alstedius*. Supplementum ad Chamieri Panstratiam.  
 810. *Amalarinus* de Officiis Eccles. *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 10.

*Flor. An.*

810. *Analarivus* De Baptisterio Moguntino. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 8.  
Sixtin. *Amama*. Oratio de Barbarie.
374. *Ambrosii Opera*. 3. Vol. *Basil*. 1567. Folio.
380. *Ammiani* Marcellini Historia cum Notis Lindebrogii. *Hamburg*. 1609. 4to.
370. *Amphilochius*. Epistola Canonica ap. Bevereg. Pandect.
870. *Anastasius* Bibliothecarius de Vitis Pontificum. *Par*. 1649.
561. *Anastasius* Sinaita. Quæstiones & Respons. *Ingolstad*. 1617. 4to.
500. *Andreas* Casariensis. Comment. in Apocalypsin. ad Calcem Operum Chrysostomi. Edit. Commelin. 1596. Folio.
- Andreas* de Decimis inter Opuscula. *Lond*. 1629. 4to.
- Tortura Torti. *Lond*. 1609. 4to.
- Responsio ad Apologiam Bellarmini. *Lond*. 1610. 4to.
- Anonymus* de Francis. ap. Combesis Hist. Monothelitar. p. 429.
250. ——— de Baptismo Hæreticorum ad Calcem Cypriani.
450. ——— de Hæresi Prædestinatorum Edit. a Sirmondo cum Censura Awræi. *Par*. 1645. 8vo.
828. *Ausegisus* Abbas. Capitularia Caroli Magni. *Par*. 1640. 8vo.
160. *Antoninus* Imperator cum Commentar. Gatakeri. *Gr. Lat. Cantab*. 1652. 4to.
- Antonini* Itinerarium Britanniae. cum Notis, *Tho. Gale*. *Lond*. 4to.
- Placentini sive Martyris Itinerarium. ap. Papebrochium in Actis Sanctorum Maii. Tom. 2.
1446. ——— Florentini Chronicon. 3 Vol. *Lugd*. 1586.
- Apuleii* Opera. *Lugd. Batav*. 1623. 12mo.
1250. *Tho. Aquinatis* summa Theologiae. *Colon*. 1604. Folio.
- Ejusdem Opuscula. *Ven*. 1596.
544. *Arator*. Historia Apostolica Carmine. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 8.
276. *Archelaus* Chascorum in Mesopotamia Episcopus. Disputatio & Epistola contra Manichæum. ap. Valesium in Appendice ad Socratem & Sozomenum.
- Pet. *Arcudius* de Concordia Ecclesiae Orientalis et Occidentalis. *Par*. 1670. 4to.
- Pauli *Aringhi* Roma subterranea, 2 Vol. *Rom*. 1651. Folio.
315. *Arius* Hæresiarcha. Epistola ap. Theodoret. Lib. 1. cap. 5.
303. *Arnobii* Opera Notis Elmenhorst. *Hanov*. 1603. 8vo.
460. *Arnobius* Junior. Disputatio cum Serapione ad calcem Irenæi.
401. *Astæpii* Amaseni Homiliæ ap. Combesis Auctario Novo Bibl. Patr. *Gr. Lat.* *Par*. 1648. Folio.
330. *Athanasii* Opera. *Gr. Lat.* 2 Vol. *Par*. 1627. Folio.
177. *Athenugoras*. ad calcem Justin. Mart. *Gr. Lat. Colon*. 1686.
196. *Athenogenis* Hymnus. ap. Basil de Spir. Sancto. cap. 29.
398. *Augustini* Opera. 10 Vol. *Par*. 1637. Folio.
- Anton. *Augustinus* de Emendatione Gratiani. cum Additionibus Baluzii. *Par*. 1672. 8vo.
- Ejusdem Epitome Juris Pontificii. 2 Vol. *Par*. 1641. Folio.
380. *Ansonius* Poeta.
890. *Auxilius* de Ordinationibus Formosi. ad calcem Morini de Ordinationibus. *Azorius*. Institutiones Morales. 3 Vol. *Lugd*. 1612. Folio.

## B

*Flor. An.*

440. BACCHIARIUS de recipiendis Lapsis. *Bibl. Patr. Tom. 3.*  
 Joan. *Baleus* de Scriptoribus Britannicis. 1548. 4to.
1880. Theodor. *Balsamon* Patriarcha Antiochenus. *Commentarius in Canones Apostolorum & Conciliorum. Gr. Lat. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. Oxon. 1672.*  
 ——— *Commentarius in Photii Nomocanonem. ap. Justellum in Bibliotheca Juris Canonici. Tom. 2.*  
 ——— *Collectio Ecclesiasticarum Constitutionum. Gr. Lat. cum Notis Leunclavii & Fabrotti. ap. Justell. Ibid.*  
 ——— *Responsa ad varias Quæstiones Juris Canonici ap. Leunclav. in Jure Græco-Romano. passim per Lib. 2. 5 7.*  
 ——— *Steph. Baluzi Miscellanea sive Collectio Veterum Monumentorum. 4 Vol. Par. 1683. 8vo.*  
 ——— *Notæ ad Gratianum & Antonium Augustinum de Emendatione Gratiani. Par. 1672. 8vo.*  
 ——— *Notæ ad Rheginonem, cum Appendice Auctorum Veterum. Par. 1671. 8vo.*  
 ——— *Concilia Galliæ Narbonensis. Par. 1668. 8vo.*  
 ——— *Nova Collectio Conciliorum. Par. 1683. Folio.*  
 ——— *Notæ ad tres Dissertationes Petri de Marca. Par. 1669. 8vo.*
172. *Bardanes* Syrus de Fato. ap. Euseb. de Præparat. *Evangel. Lib. 6.*  
 Tho. *Barlow.* *Remains. Lond. 8vo.*  
 ——— *Letter to Bishop Usher.*
34. *Barnabæ Epistola* Gr. Lat. ap. Cotel. *Patr. Apostol. Tom. 1.*  
*Baronii* *Annales Ecclesiastici. 12 Vol. Antwerp. 1610.*  
 ——— *Notæ ad Martyrologium Romanum. Colon. 1603. 4to.*  
*Barrow of the Pope's Supremacy and Unity of the Church, among his Works. 3 Vols. Lond. 1687. Folio.*
370. *Basilii Magni Opera* Gr. Lat. 3 Vol. *Par. 1638. Folio.*
448. *Basilii Seleuciensis Opera* Gr. Lat. *Par. 1622. Folio.*  
 Sam. *Basnagii* *Exercitationes Historico-Criticæ ad Baronii Annales. Ultrajecti. 1692. 4to.*  
 Anton. *Baudrand* *Additiones ad Ferrarii Lexicon Geographicum. Par. 1670. Folio.*
701. *Bedæ Opera, 4 Vol. Calen. 1612. Folio.*  
 ——— *Historia Ecclesiast. Lat. & Saxon. Notis Wheelock. Cantab. 1644. Folio.*  
*Bellarmini* *Controversiæ, 3 Vol. Ingolstad. 1590 & Par. 1620. Folio.*  
 ——— *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis. Colon. 1631. 8vo.*
1115. *Bernardi Opera. Par. 1640. Folio.*
1066. *Bernoldus* de Ordine Romano. In *Cassandri Liturgicis.*
840. *Bertramus* sive *Ratramnus* *Monachus Corbeiensis. De Corpore & Sanguine Domini. ap. Illyricum in Catalogo Testium Veritatis. Genev. 1608. Folio.*  
 Gul. *Beverege* *Pandectæ Canonum cum Annotationibus, 2 Vol. Oxon. 1672. Folio.*  
 ——— *Codex Canonum Vindicatus. in Appendice ad Cotelarii Patres Apostol. &c. Tom. 2. Antwerp. 1698. Folio.*

*Flor. An.*

- Beza* Annotat. in Nov. Testam. *Genev.* 1582. Fol.  
 ——— *Epistolæ* Theolog. *Genev.* 1573. 8vo.  
*Bibliotheca* Patrum Latin. 17 Vol. *Par.* 1654.  
*Bibliotheca* Patrum Gr. Lat. 2 Vol. per Fronto. Ducæum. *Par.* 1624. Vid.  
 Combesis Auctarium, &c.  
*Bibliotheca* Juris Canonici. Vid. Justellum.
1480. Gabr. *Biel*. Expositio Canonis Missæ. *Lugdun.* 1542.  
 Jac. *Billius*. Scholia in Nazianzeni Opera.  
 Severin. *Binius*. Concilia General. &c. cum Notis. 4 Vol. *Colon.* 1618.
1330. Mat. *Blustares*. Syntagma Canonum, Gr. Lat. ap. Beverege in Pandectis.  
 Dav. *Blondel*. Apologia pro Sententiâ Hieronymi. *Amst.* 1646. 4to.  
 Sam. *Bochart* Hierozoicon sive de Animalibus. 2 Vol. *Lond.* 1663. Folio.  
 ——— *Geographiâ* Sacra. *Par.* 1651. Folio.  
 Joan. *Bollandus*. Acta Sanctorum. *Antwerp.* 1663. Folio.  
 Joan. *Bona*. de Rebus Liturgicis. *Colon.* 1674. 8vo.  
 ——— *De Psalmodia*. *Par.* 1663. 4to.  
 Edv. *Brerewood*. Patriarchal Government of the ancient Church. *Lond.*  
 1637. 8vo.  
 ——— *Enquiries* about the Diversity of Languages. &c. *Lond.* 1635. 4to.  
 ——— *De Ponderibus & Pretiis* Nummorum. ap. Walton Prolegomena.  
*Breviarium Romanum*. *Par.* 1509. 8vo.  
 Barnab. *Brissonius* de Ritu Nuptiarum. *Par.* 1606. 4to.  
 ——— *De Formulâ* & solennibus Populi Romani verbis. *Par.* 1583.  
 ——— *Commentarius* in Legem, Dominico, de Spectaculis in Codice  
 Theodos. *Par.* 1606. 4to.  
 Ægid. *Bucherius* de Doctrinâ Temporum, *Commentarius* in *Victorii* Cano-  
 nem Paschalem. *Antwerp.* 1634. Folio.  
 John *Buckeridge*. al. *Joannes* Roffensis. *De Potestate* Papæ in Rebus  
 Temporalibus. *Lond.* 1614. 4to.  
 Georg. *Bull* Defensio Fidei Nicenæ. *Oxon.* 1685. 4to.  
 ——— *Opera omnia* per Grabe. *Lond.* 1703. Folio.
996. *Burchardus* Wormatiensis. *Decretum*. *Colon.* 1548. Folio. & passim ap. Cor-  
 rectores Gratiani.
1260. Bonaventur. *Burchardus*. al. *Brocardus*. *Descriptio* Terræ Sanctæ. *Colon.*  
 1624. 8vo.  
 Gilb. *Burnet*. *History* of the Reformation. 2 Vol. *Lond.* 1681. Folio.  
 ——— *Pastoral* Care. 4to.  
 ——— *Vindication* of the Ordinations of the Church of *England* *Lond.*  
 1677. 8vo.  
 ——— *Travels* in several Letters to Mr. *Boyle*. *Rotterd.* 1686. 8vo.  
 Buxtorf *Synagoga* Judaica. *Hanov.* 1622. 8vo.  
*Byzantinæ* *Historiæ* *Scriptores* varii. 17 Vol. *Par.* 1648. 8vo.

## C.

1350. NICOL. *Cabasilas*. *Expositio* Liturgiæ. in *Bibl. Patr.* Gr. Lat. Tom. 2.  
 Jacob. *Cabassutins*. *Notitia* Conciliorum & Canonum. *Lugd.* 1670. 8vo.  
 Julius *Cæsar*. *De Bello* Gallico, &c.

*Flor. An.*

500. *Casarius Arelatensis* Homiliæ in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 2.  
 Tho. *Cajetanus*. Commentar. in Libros Histor. Vet. Testamenti.  
 Joan. *Calvini* Opera. 9 Vol. *Amst.* 1667. Folio.  
 Joan. *Calvin*. al. Kahl. Lexicon Juridicum. *Genev.* 1665. Folio.  
 Hen. *Canisii* Lectiones Antiquæ. 6 Vol. *Ingolstad.* 1601. 4to.  
 Pet. *Canisii* Catechismus. *Colon.* 1586. Folio.
250. *Canones* Apostolici. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. & in Tomis Conciliorum.
1310. Petrus *Cantor*. de Verbo Mirifico. ap. Menardum in Sacramentarium Gregorii. p. 280.  
 ——— Verbum Abbreviatum. ap. Bonam. de Reb. Liturg. Lib. 1. c. 15.  
 Melchior *Canus*. Loci Theologici, & de Sacramentis. *Colon.* 1685. 8vo.  
 Ludov. *Capellus*. Notæ in Nov. Testam. *Amst.* 1657. Et cum Myrothecio Cameronis.  
 Barthol. *Caranza*. Summa Conciliorum. *Lovan.* 1681. 4to.  
 Bishop *Carleton*. Divine Right of Tithes. *Lond.* 1606. 4to.
768. *Carolus Magnus*. Capitularia. ap. Lindebroge in Codice Legum Antiquarum, & ap. Ansegisum Abbatem, & Baluzium.  
 Isaac *Casaubonus*. Exercitationes in Baronii Annales. *Genev.* 1655. 4to.  
 ——— Notæ in Historiæ Augustæ Scriptores. *Par.* 1620. Folio.  
 ——— Notæ in Strabonis Geograph. *Par.* 1620.  
 Georg. *Cassandri* Opera. *Par.* 1616. Folio.  
 ——— Consultatio de Articulis Religionis cum Grotii Annotatis. 1642. 8vo.  
 ——— De Communionem sub utrâque Specie. *Heilmstad.* 1642. 4to.
424. Joan. *Cassiani* Opera. *Basil.* 1575.
514. Marc. Aur. *Cassiodorus* Senator. Historia Tripartita ex Socrate, Sozomeno & Theodorito. *Franc.* 1588. Folio.  
 ——— Commentarius in Psalmos. *Par.* 1519.  
 ——— Variarum Epistolarum Lib. 12. *Lugd.* 1595. 8vo.  
 Alphonsus de *Castro* adversus Hæreses. *Lugd.* 1546. 8vo.  
*Catechismus* ad Parochos ex jussu Concilii Tridentini.  
*Catena* in Job. Gr. Lat. *Lond.* 1637.  
 Gul. *Cave* Historia Literaria. 2 Vol. *Lond.* 1688. & 1698. Folio.  
 ——— Lives of the Apostles and Fathers. 2 Vol. *Lond.* 1677. Folio.  
 ——— Primitive Christianity. *Lond.* 1676. 8vo.  
 ——— Government of the ancient Church by Bishops, Metropolitans and Patriarchs. *Lond.* 1683. 8vo.  
*Cawdrey* Discourse of Patronage. *Lond.* 4to.
1057. Georgii *Cedreni* Annales Gr. Lat. cum Notis Xylandri. *Basil.* 1566. Fol.
423. *Celestinus* Papa. Epistolæ Decretales ap. Justellum, Crab, & Labbin Tomis Conciliorum.  
 Lud. *Cellotius*. Notæ in Capitula Gualteri Aurelianensis. in Concilior. Tom. 8. p. 649.  
*Centuriæ* Magdeburgenses. 3 Vol. *Basil.* 1624. Folio.  
 Chamier Panstratia Catholica. 3 Vol. *Genev.* 1626. Folio.  
 Charisius Grammaticus in Corpore Auctorum Linguæ Latinæ. *Genev.* 1622. 4to.  
 Martin. *Chemnitius*. Examen Concilii Tridentini. *Genev.* 1614. Folio.

*Flor. An.*

430. Pet. *Chrysologi Opera*. *Lugd.* 1672. Folio.  
 Dav. *Chytraus de Statu Ecclesiarum in Græciâ, Asiâ, &c. Franc.* 1583.  
 8vo.
398. Joan. *Chrysostomi Opera*, Gr. Lat. 10 Vol. *Par.* 1616. & ap. Commelin.  
 1617.  
 ——— Opera Græcè, 8 Vol. *Etonæ.* 1613.  
 — Epistola ad Cæsarium Monachum. ap. le Moynes *Varia Sacra*,  
 M. T. *Ciceronis Opera*. *Genev.* 1646. 4to.
1160. Joan. *Cinnami Historia*, Gr. Lat. cum Notis du Fresne. *Par.* 1670. Fol.  
*Claget of the Unity of the Church.* *Lond.* 1693. 8vo.
192. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Opera, Gr. Lat. *Par.* 1641. It. 2 Vol. *Oxon.*  
 ——— Tract. Quis dives salvetur. ap. Combes in *Auctario Novissimo*  
*Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. Par.* 1672.
65. *Clemens Romanus*. Epist. ad Corinthios, Gr. Lat. ap. Coteler. *Patr.*  
 tol. Tom. 1.
564. Joan. *Clinacus*. Opera, Gr. Lat. *Par.* 1633. Fol.  
*Cluverii Italia Vetus.* *Lugd. Bat.* 1622. Fol.  
*Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Universæ*. ap. Justellum.  
*Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ*. ap. Justellum.  
*Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Romanæ*. ap. Justellum.  
*Codex Justinianus*. in *Corpore Juris Civilis*.  
*Codex Theodosianus cum Commentariis Jac. Gothofred.* 6 Vol. *Lugd.*  
 1665. Fol.  
*Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Græcæ.* Vid. Ehingerum.
1460. Georg. *Codinus de Officiis Ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ*, Gr. Lat. cum  
 Notis Jac. Gretscri. *Par.* 1648. Fol.
411. *Collatio Carthaginiensis inter Catholicos et Donatistas ad Calcem Optati.*  
*Par.* 1631.  
*Collectio Constitutionum Ecclesiasticarum.* Vid. Balsamon. ap. Justel-  
 lum.  
*Franc. Combes. Bibl. Patrum, Gr. Lat. Auctarium Novum.* *Par.* 1648.  
 Folio.  
 ——— *Auctarium Novissimum, Par.* 1672. Fol.  
 ——— *Historia Monothelitarum, cum variis Monumentis Patrum.* Gr.  
 Lat. *Par.* 1648. Fol.  
*Comber of Liturgies.* 2 Vol. *Lond.* 8vo.
326. *Commodiani Instructiones adversus Paganos, ad Calcem Cypriani.* Edit.  
 Rigalt. *Par.* 1666.  
*Concilia.* Vid. Binium Crab. Labbé, &c.  
*Corpus Juris Civilis* par Dionys. Gothofredum. *Lugd.* 1589. 2 Vol. 8vo.  
*Corpus Juris Canonici, viz. Gratiani Decretum, Decretales Gregorii, Sextus*  
*Decretalium, Clementinæ & Extravagantes. cum Emendationibus Gre-*  
*gorii XIII.* *Romæ.* 1582. 4 Vol. Fol.  
*Corpus Confessionum Ecclesiarum Reformat. cum Consensu Catholico ex*  
*sententiis Patrum.* *Genev.* 1612. 4to.  
*Corpus Auctorum Linguae Latinæ.* *Genev.* 1622. 4to.  
*Corpus omnium Poetarum.* *Lugd.* 1603. 4to.
325. *Constantinus Magnus.* Epistolæ variæ ap. Eusebium.

*Flor. An.*

250. *Cornelius* Episc. Rom. Epistolæ ad Cyprian, et Eusebium.  
Bishop *Cosins'* Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture. *Lond.*  
1683. 4to.  
—— History of Transubstantiation. *Lond.* 1676. 8vo.  
*Joan. Cotelerius.* Notæ in Patres Apostolicos. 2 Vol. *Antwerp.* 1698.  
Adduntur in Appendice, Beverege Codex Canonum vindicatus, Usserii  
Dissertationes Ignatianæ, et Pearson Vindiciæ Ignatii.  
*Joh. Cotivici* Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum. *Antwerp.* 1619. 4to.  
*Pet. Crabbe.* Concilia Generalia et Provincialia. 3 Vol. *Colan.* 1551. Folio.  
*Rich. Crakanthorp.* Defensio Eccles. Angl. &c. *Lond.* 1625. 4to.
590. *Cresconius Afer.* Breviarium Canonum. ap. Justellum in *Bibl. Juris. Canoni-*  
*nici.*  
*Critici Sacri* in Biblia. 8 Vol. *Amst.* 1698.  
*Critical History of the Creed.* *Lond.* 8vo.  
*Metrophanes Critopolus.* Confessio Ecclesiæ Orientalis, Gr. Lat. *Helm-*  
*stad.* 1661. 4to.  
*Martin Crucius.* Turco-Græcia, Gr. Lat. *Basil.* 1584. Folio.  
*Curcellæus* de Esu sanguinis. inter Opera. *Amst.* 1675.
250. *Cypriani* Opera. *Oxon.* 1682. Folio.  
—— Opera Notis Rigaltii. *Par.* 1648. Fol.
546. *Cyprianus* Gallus. Vita Cæsarii Arelatensis. *Lugd.* 1613. 4to.
412. *Cyrelli* Alexandrini Opera, Gr. Lat. 7 Vol. *Par.* 1638.
350. *Cyrelli* Hierosol. Opera. Gr. Lat. *Oxon.* 1703. Folio.

D.

- LUC. Dacherii* Spicilegium. *Par.* 1665. 4to.
- Joan. Dallæus* de Objecto Cultus Religiosi adversus Latinorum Traditi-  
onem. *Genev.* 1664. 4to.  
—— De Confessione Auriculari. *Genev.* 1661. 4to.  
—— De Confirmatione et Extremâ Unctione. *Genev.* 1659. 4to.  
—— De Jejunii and Quadragesima. *Daventriæ.* 1654. 8vo.  
—— De Imaginibus. *Lug. Bat.* 1642. 8vo.  
—— De Pænis et Satisfactionibus. *Amst.* 1649. 4to.  
—— De Scriptis Ignatii. *Genev.* 1666. 4to.
730. *Joan Damascenus.* Opera, Gr. Lat. *Basil.* 1575.  
*Martin. Delrio* Disquisitiones Magicæ. *Lovan.* 1599. 4to.  
*Demonstration* that the Church of Rome has erred in her Decrees about Com-  
munion in one Kind. *Lond.* 1686. 4to.  
*Dempster* Additiones ad Rosini Antiquitates Roman. *Colon.* 1620. 4to.  
*Depositio* Martyrum. ap. Pearson *Annal. Cyprian.*
370. *Didymus Alexandrinus.* Opera. *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 9. Ludov. de Dieu. Ani-  
madversiones in Epistolas D. Pauli. *Lug. Bat.* 1646. 4to.  
*Dion Cassii* Historia Romana, Gr. Lat. *Franc.* 1592. 8vo.  
*Diogenes Laertius* de Vitis Philosophorum, Gr. Lat. cum. Hesychie Milesio  
and Eunapio de iisdem. *Colon. Allobrog.* 1616. 8vo. cum Notis Is. Ca-  
sauboni.
362. *Dionysius Areopagita.* Opera sub ipsius nomine, Gr. Lat. 2 Vol. *Par*  
1644, cum Scholiis Pachymer. and Maximi.

*Flor. An.*

254. *Diouysius* Alex. Epistolæ variæ ap. Eusebium.  
 533. *Diouysius* Exiguus. Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Romanæ. ap. Justellum. 1d.  
 Bibliotheca Juris Canon.  
 ——— Collectio Decretorum Pontificum Romanorum a Siricio ad Anastasium secundum ap. Justell. Ibid. et in Tomis Conciliorum.  
 ——— Epistolæ Paschales ap. Petavium de Doctrinâ Temporum in Appendice.  
 ——— Cycli Paschalis Fragmentum. ap. Marianum Scotum ad annum 527.  
 Hen. *Dodwel*. Dissertationes Cyprianicæ. Oxon. 1682. Folio.  
 ——— Dissertationes in Irenæum. Oxon. 1689. 8vo.  
 ——— De Jure Laicorum Sacerdotali, contra Grotium. Lond. 1685. 8vo.  
 Marc. Anton. *Dominicy* de Communione Peregrinâ. Paris 1645. 4to.  
 Jerem. *Drexilii* Trismegistus Christianus, sive de triplici Cultu Conscientiæ, Cælitum, Corporis. Colon. 1631.  
 Fran. *Duarenus* de Sacris Ecclesiæ Ministeriis ac Beneficiis. Par. 1551. 4to.  
 Sir Wil. *Dugdale* Monasticon Anglicanum. 2 Vol. Lond. 1655. &c.  
 1286. Gul. *Durantes* sive *Durandus*. Rationale Divinorum Officiorum. Lugd. 1584. 8vo.  
 Steph. *Durantus* de Ritibus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ. Par. 1631. 8vo.

## E.

- ABRAH. *Echelenensis*. Concilii Nicæni Canones Arabici cum Notis. Conc. Tom. 2.  
 1121. *Eadmerus* Monachus. Historia sui Sæculi cum Notis Seldeni. Lond. 1623. Folio.  
 Joan. *Eckius*. Enchiridion adver. Lutherum. Lugd. 1549. 8vo.  
 Elias *Ehingerius*. Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Orientalis. Gr. Lat. *Witeberg*. 1615. 4to.  
 640. *Eligius* Lemovicensis. Homiliæ ei ascriptæ in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 2.  
 430. Paulus *Emesenus*. Homiliæ in Concilior. Tom. 3.  
 511. *Ennodius* Ticinensis. Vita Epiphaniî Ticinen. Episcopi in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 15. et inter Opera cum Notis Sirmondi. 1611. Par. 8vo.  
 526. *Ephremius* Antiochenus. Pro Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus et Synodo Chalcedonensi. ap. Photium in Bibliothecâ Cod. 228 and 229.  
 370. *Ephremius* Syrus. Opera per Vossium Tungrensem. Latinè. *Antwerp*. 1619. Folio.  
 368. *Epiphanius*. Opera Gr. Lat. cum Notis Petavii. 2 Vol Par. 1622. Folio.  
*Episcopi* Institutiones Theolog. *Amst*. 1678. Folio.  
*Erasmi* Opera 9. Vol. *Basil*. 1540. Folio.  
*Estius* in Sententias. 2. Vol. *Par*. 1638. Folio.  
 ——— Commentar. in Epistolas Pauli. *Par*. 1668. Folio.  
 ——— Orationes Theologicæ.  
 594. *Evagrius*. Historia Eccles. cum Notis Valesii. Gr. Lat. *Par*. 1673. and *Cantab*. 1720. Folio.  
 434. *Eucherius* *Lugdunensis*. Homiliæ. *Antwerp*. 1602. 8vo.  
*Euchologium* Græcorum cum Notis Goar. *Par*. 1647. Folio.

*Flor. An.*

581. *Eulogius* Patriarcha Alexandrinus. ap. Photium Cod. 280.  
 380. *Eunapius* Sardonianus de Vitis Philosophorum Gr. Lat. *Colon. Allobrog.* 1616. 8vo.  
 420. *Euodius*. Epistolæ. inter Epistolas Augustini.  
 315. *Eusebius* Cæsariensis. Historia Ecclesiastica cum Notis Valesii. *Par.* 1672. and *Cantab.* 1720. Fol.  
 ——— Præparatio Evangelica. Gr. Lat. *Par.* 1628. Folio.  
 ——— Demonstratio Evangelica. Gr. Lat. *Par.* 1628. Folio.  
 ——— De Martyribus Palæstinæ. ad Calcem. Lib. 8. Historiæ.  
 ——— Chronicon cum Animadversionibus Scaligeri. *Amst.* 1658. Folio.  
 ——— De Laudibus Constantini Oratio, et De Vita Constantini Lib. 4. ad calcem Historiæ.  
 ——— Epistola ad Cæsarienses, de Fide Nicænâ. ap. Socratem Lib. 1. cap. 8. et Theodor. Lib. 1. cap. 12.  
 340. *Eusebius* Emisenus. Homiliæ, sed tamen dubiæ. *Antwerp.* 1602. 8vo.  
 325. *Eustathius* Antiochenus. De Engastrymutho adversus Origenem. Notis Allatii. *Lugd.* 1629. 4to. et in Critic. *Londinens.* Tom. 8.  
 1116. *Euthymius* Zigabenus. Panoplia Orthodoxæ Fidei adversus omnes Hæreses. Lat. *Venet.* 1555. Fol.

## F

- JOAN. *Faber*. Declamatio de Humanæ Vitæ Miseriâ.  
*Car. Fabrotus*. Notæ ad Balsamonis Collectionem Constitutionum Eccles. ap. Justellum in Bibl. Juris Canonici. Tom. 2.  
 540. *Facundus* Hermianensis. Opera. cum Notis Sirmondi. *Par.* 1675. Folio.  
*Fasciculus* Rerum Expetendarum & Fugiendarum. *Lond.* 1690. 2 Vol. Folio.  
 630. *Fasti* Siculi. Vid. Alexandrinum Chronicon.  
*Faulkner*. Libertas Ecclesiastica. *Lond.* 1674. 8vo.  
 ——— Vindication of Liturgies. *Lond.* 1680. 8vo.  
 384. *Faustinus & Marcellinus*. Libellus Precum ad Theodosium Imperatorem. *Oxon.* 1678. 8vo.  
 356. *Felix* Secundus Papa. Epistolæ Decretales in Tomis Conciliorum.  
 483. *Felix* Tertius Papa. Epistolæ. ap. Justellum & in Tomis Conciliorum.  
*Joan. Fell.* Notæ in Cyprian. *Oxon.* 1682.  
 533. *Ferrandus*. Breviarium Canonum in Justelli Bibliothecâ Juris Canonici. Tom. 2.  
*Phil. Ferrarii* Lexicon Geographicum cum Additionibus Baudrand. *Par.* 1670. Folio.  
*Franc. Ferrarius* de Ritu Concionum. *Mediolani.* 1620. 4to.  
*Field* of the Church. *Oxon.* 1635. Folio.  
*Joan. Filesacus*. Commentarius in Vincentium Lirinensem. *Pur.* 1619. 4to.  
 340. *Jul. Firmicus* Maternus de Errore Profanarum Religionum cum Notis *Joan. a Wower.* *Oxon.* 1678. 8vo.  
 ——— Astronomica sive de Mathesi. Lib. 8. *Basil.* 1591.  
 250. *Firmiliani* Epistola inter Epist. Cypriani.  
*Flagellantium* Historia. *Par.* 1700. 8vo.  
*Joan. Forbesius*. Instructiones Historico-Theologicæ. *Amst.* 1645. Folio.  
 ——— Irenicum. *Aberden.* 1636. 4to.

*Flor. An.*

560. Venant. *Fortunatus*. Poemata in Corpore Poetarum. Tom. 2. Lug. 1603. 4to.  
 ——— Vita Radegundis. ap. Surium. 13. Aug.  
 Car. du *Fresne*. Glossarium Græco-barbarum. Lugd. 1688. 2 Vol. Folio.  
 ——— Notæ in Paulum Silentiarium. Par. 1670. Folio.  
 ——— Notæ in Cinnamum et Briennium. *Ibid.*  
*Flaccius* Illyricus de Sectis Papisticis. Basil. 1565. 4to. Vid. Illyricum.  
 Joan. *Fronto* de Canonicis Cardinalibus, cum aliis Opusculis. Par. 1661. 4to.  
*Fronto-Ducaus*. Notæ in Chrysostomi Opera. Par. 1609.  
 262. *Fructuosi* Acta. ap. Baron. an. 262.  
 1007. *Fulbertus* Carnotensis. Opera. Par. 1608.  
 507. *Fulgentius* Ruspensis. Opera. Lugd. 1652.  
 ——— De Fide ad Petrum Diaconum, inter Opera Augustini. Tom. 3.  
 Frid. *Furius* Ceriolanus. Bononia sive de Libris Sacris in vernaculam Linguam convertendis. Basil. 1555. 8vo. Liber Prohibitus in Indice Sotomajor.

## G

- THO. *Gale*. Notæ in Antonini Itinerarium Britannia. Lond. 4to.  
 Mat. *Galen* Catechismus.  
 Tho. *Gatakerus*. Notæ in Libros Antonini. Cantab. 1652. 4to.  
 387. *Gaudentius* Brixienensis. Opera. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 2.  
 492. *Gelasius* Papa. Epistolæ Decretales in Tomis Conciliorum. De duabus Naturis Christi. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 4.  
 476. *Gelasius* Cyzicenus. Historia Concilii Niceni. Gr. Lat. in Concil. Tom. 2. Aul. *Gellii* Opera. Aurel. *Allobrog.* 1609. 8vo.  
 Gilb. *Genebrard*. de Liturgiâ Apostolicâ.  
 495. *Gennadius* Massiliensis. de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis inter Opera Hieronymi.  
 ——— De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis inter Opera Augustini. Tom. 3.  
*Gentilletus*. Examen Concilii Tridentini. Cornchemi. 1678. 8vo.  
 620. *Georgius* Pisides. Vulgo dicitur Auctor Fastorum Siculorum sive Chronici Alexandrini.  
 620. *Georgius* Alexandrinus. Vita Chrysostomi. in Tom. 8. Oper. Chrys. Græcæ.  
 1501. Franc. *Georgius* Venetus. Problemata in S. Scripturam. Venet. 1536. 4to.  
*Georgius* Ambianus. Commentar. in Tertullian. 3. Vol. Folio.  
 1222. *Germanus* Patriarcha Constantinop. Theoria sive Expositio in Liturgiam. Gr. Lat. in Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. Tom. 2.  
 1404. Joan *Gerson*. de Vitâ spirituali. inter Opera. 4 Vol.  
 314. *Gesta* Purgationis Cæciliani Episc. Carthag. ad Calcem Optati. Par. 1631.  
 581. *Gildas* Sapiens. De Excidio Britannia. Bibl. Patr. T. 5.  
 1200. *Giraldus* Cambrensis. Itinerarium Cambriae, et Cambriae Descriptio. Lond. 1585. 8vo.  
 Jac. *Goar*. Notæ ad Euchologium Græcorum. Par. 1647. Folio.  
 Tho. *Godwyn*. Jewish Antiquities.  
 1110. *Goffridus* Vindociniensis Abbas. Opera Notis Sirmondi. Par. 1639.

*Flor. An.*

- Melch. *Goldastus*. Constitutiones Imperiales. 3 Vol. *Hanov.* 1609. Fol.  
 Dionysius *Gothofredus*. Notæ in Codicem Justinian. *Colon.* 1524.  
 Jac. *Gothofredus*. Commentarius in Codicem Theodosianum. 6 Vol. *Lugd.*  
 1665. Folio.  
 Joan. Ernest. *Grabe*. Spicilegium Patrum. 3 Vol. *Oxon.* 1698. &c. 8vo.  
 1130. *Gratianus* Monachus. Decretum sive Concordantia discordantium Canonum.  
 In Corpore Juris Canonici. *Romæ* 1582. Folio.  
 470. *Gregentius* Homeritarum Episcopus. Disputatio cum Herbario Judæo. Gr.  
 Lat. in Auctario Bibl. Patr. Ducæano. Tom. 1. *Par.* 1624.  
 John *Gregory*. Observations on Scripture, and Posthumous Works. *Lond.*  
 1650. 4to.  
 590. *Gregorius* Magnus. Opera. 4. Tom. *Antwerp.* 1615.  
 1227. *Gregorius* IX. Decretalium Libri 5. unâ cum Gratiano. *Rom.* 1582. Folio.  
 370. *Gregorius* Nazianzenus. Opera. Gr. Lat. 2 Vol. *Par.* 1630. Folio.  
 370. *Gregorius* Nyssenus. Opera. Gr. Lat. 3 Vol. *Par.* 1638. Folio.  
 254. *Gregorius* Neocæsariensis sive Thaumaturgus. Opera. Gr. Lat. *Par.* 1621.  
 ——— Epistola Canonica. ap. Justellum.  
 573. *Gregorius* Turonensis. Historia Francorum. *Par.* 1610. 8vo.  
 ——— De Gloriâ Martyrum & Confessorum. *Colon.* 1583. 8vo.  
 Jac. *Gretserus*. Notæ in Codinum. *Par.* 1648. Fol.  
 Hugo *Grotius*. Opera. Vol. 4. *Amst.* 1685.  
 ——— De Jure Belli & Pacis. *Amst.* 1670. 8vo.  
 ——— De Cænæ Administratione ubi Pastores non sunt. *Lond.* 1685.  
 8vo.  
 ——— Notæ in Cassandri Consultationem. 1642.  
*Gruteri* Inscriptiones Antiquæ. *Heidelb.* 1616.  
 1533. *Guido* de Monte Rocherii. Manipulus Curatorum. *Lovan.* 1552. 8vo.  
 Bishop *Gunning's* Discourse of *Lent.* 4to.

## H.

- ISAAC *Habertus*. Archieraticon sive Pontificale Græcorum. *Par.* 1643  
 Folio.  
 Franc. *Hallier* de Hierarchia Ecclesiasticâ. *Par.* 1646. folio.  
 Pet. *Halloir*. Vitæ Scriptorum Orientalium. 2 Vol. *Duaci.* folio.  
 Hen. *Hamond's* Works. 4 Vol. *Lond.* 1684. Folio.  
 Martin. *Hankius* de Scriptoribus Byzantinis. *Lipsiæ.* 1677. 4to.  
 842. *Georg. Hamartolus* MS. ap. Allatium de Hebdomad. Græcorum.  
*Harding's* Answer to *Jewel's* Challenge. *Antwerp.* 1565. 8vo.  
 1150. *Constantin. Harmenopolus*. Epitome Juris Canonici, Gr. Lat. ap. *Leunclavium*  
 in Jure Græco-Romano. Tom. 1.  
 ——— De Sectis Hæreticis, & Confessio de Fide Orthodoxa. *Ibid.* ad *Leunclavium*  
 et in Auctario Bibl. Patr. Ducæano. Tom. 1. Gr. Lat. *Par.*  
 1624.  
 170. *Hegesippus*. Commentarius Actorum Ecclesiasticorum. Fragmenta passim  
 ap. *Eusebium*.  
 Gabr. *Henao*. de Sacrificio Missæ.  
 610. *Heraclius* Imper. Novellæ. ap. *Leunclavium* in Jure Græco-Romano, Tom. 1  
*Herodoti* Historia Gr. Lat. per Hen. *Stephanum*. 1592. Fol.

Flor. An.

- Hesychii* Lexicon. Græce. *Hagenæ*. 1521. Folio.
601. *Hesychius* Patriarcha Hierosolymitanus. Explanatio in Leviticum. *Basil.* 1527. Folio.
- Pet. *Heylin*. *Cosmography*. *Lond.* 1669. Folio.
- Hick's* Jovian, or an Answer to *Julian* the Apostate. *Lond.* 1683. 8vo.
378. *Hieronymi* Opera. 4 Vol. *Basil.* 1565. Folio.
354. *Hilarii* Pictaviensis Opera. *Colou.* 1617. Folio.
461. *Hilarius* Papa. Epistolæ Decretales. in *Tomis* Concilior.
430. *Hilarius* Arelatensis. Epistolæ inter Epistolas Augustini.
845. *Hincmarus* Remensis. Opera. 2 Vol. *Par.* 1645. Folio.
220. *Hippolytus* Portuensis. Canon Paschalis. ap. *Cave* *Histor. Literar.* Tom. 1. p. 68. Eam exhibent etiam *Scaliger*, *Ægidius Bucherius* et *Gruterus*.
- De Consummatione Mundi & Antichristo, Gr. Lat. in *Auctario Bibl. Patr. Ducæano*. Tom. 2.
- Demonstratio de Antichristo. Gr. Lat. ap. *Combesis* in *Auctario Novissimo*. *Par.* 1672. Folio.
- Luc. *Holstenius*. Annotationes in Geographiam Caroli a Sancto-Paulo, in Italiam antiquam *Cluverii*, et *Thesaurum Geographicum Ortelii*. *Romæ*. 1666. 8vo.
- De Sacramento Confirmationis apud Græcos. *Ibid.* in *Appendice*.
- Glossarium et Notæ ad *Benedicti* Codicem Regularum. *Par.* 1663. 4to.
1130. *Honorius* Augustodunensis. *Gemma Animæ de Officio Missæ*. *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 10.
- George Hooper's* Historical Account of *Lent*. *Lond.* 1695. 8vo.
514. *Hormisdas* Papa. *Epist. Decretal.* in *Tomis* Conciliorum.
- Hospinianus* de Templis. *Tigur.* 1587. Folio.
- De Festis Christianorum. *Tigur.* 1593. Folio.
- De Origine Monachatus. *Tigur.* 1588. Folio.
- Historia Sacramentaria. *Tigur.* 1598. Folio.
- Henr. *Hottingerus*. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. 9 Vol. *Hanov.* 1655. 8vo.
- De Translatione Bibliorum. *Heidelberg.* 1660.
- Franc. *Hotomannus* de Castis Incestisque Nuptiis. *Franc.* 1619. 8vo.
- Quæstiones Illustres. 1591. 8vo.
- Pet. Dan. *Huetius*. *Origeniana*. 2 Vol. *Rothomag.* 1668. Folio.
- Demonstratio Evangelica. *Amst.* 1680. 8vo.
1120. *Hugo* de Sancto Victore. Opera. *Venet.* 1588. 3 Vol.
1054. *Humbertus* de Sylvâ Candidâ Cardinalis. Liber de Azymo et Jejunio Sabbatorum contra *Michaelem Cerularium* et *Leonem Achridamum*. ap. *Baronium* in *Appendice*. Tom. 11.

## I.

- JACOBI Liturgia, Gr. Lat. *Bibl. Patr. Auctario Ducæano*. Tom. 2. *Par.* 1624.
385. *Idacius* contra *Varimundum Arianum*. *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 4.
790. *Jesse* Ambianensis de Ordine Baptismi.
101. *Ignatii* Epistolæ, Gr. Lat. intra *Patres Apostolicos*. ap. *Cotelierum*. Tom. 2.
110. Acta *Ignatii*, Gr. Lat. ap. *Grabe* *Spicilegium*. Vol. 2.

## Flor. An.

- Flac. *Illyricus*. Catalogus Testium Veritatis. *Genev.* 1628. Folio.  
*Index* Librorum Prohibitorum et Expurgandorum Hispanicus & Romanus  
per Anten. a Sotomajor. *Madrid.* 1667. Folio.  
*Index* Librorum Expurgandorum per Quirogam Salmur. 1601. 4to,  
*Inæ* Leges. ap. Spelman. Concil.
402. *Innocentius* I. Papa. Epistolæ et Decreta in Tomis Conciliorum.
1198. *Innocentius* III. de Mysteriis Missæ. *Antwerp.* 1540.  
*Joannes* Abbas de Translatione Reliquiarum S. Glodesindis.
530. *Jobius* Monachus. ap. Plotium Cod. 222.  
*Johnson.* *Vade Mecum* for Clergymen, or the Canonical Codes of the Pri-  
mitive Church. *Lond.* 1709. 8vo,
67. *Josephi* Opera, Gr. Lat. *Oxon.* 1720. Folio.
167. *Irenæi* Opera Notis Grabe. *Lond.* 1702. Folio.
595. *Isidorus* Hispalensis de Divinis Officiis. *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 10.  
——— *Origines* sive Etymologiæ, in Corpore Auctorum Linguae Latinæ.  
*Genev.* 1622. 4to.
830. *Isidorus* Mercator. Concilia & Epistolæ Papales in Tomis Conciliorum.
412. *Isidorus* Pelusiota. Epistolarum Lib. 5. Gr. Lat. *Par.* 1638. 4to.  
*John Juel's* Works. *Lond.* 1611. Folio.
361. *Juliani* Imper. Opera, Gr. Lat. Notis Petavii. *Par.* 1631. 4to.
510. *Julianus* Halicarnassensis. Fragmenta Commentarii in Job. ap. Catenam in  
Job. *Lond.* 1637. Folio.
498. *Julianus* Pomerius. de Vitâ Contemplativâ. inter Opera Prosperi, cui vulgo  
tribuitur. *Colon.* 1540. 8vo.
337. *Julius* Papa. Epistola ad Orientales. ap. Athanasium in Apologia 2. Tom. 1.
550. *Junilius* Afer. de Partibus Divinæ Legis. *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 1.  
*Fran. Junius.* Notæ in Tertullianum. *Franckera.* 1597. Fol. Parallela. inter  
Opera, 2 Vol. *Genev.* 1607. Folio.
1092. *Ivo* Carnotensis. Decretorum Liber. *Loran.* 1561. 8vo.  
*Henr. Justellus.* Bibliotheca Juris Canonici. 2 Vol. *Par.* 1661. Folio.
140. *Justinus* Martyr. Opera. Gr. Lat. *Colon.* 1686. Folio.
527. *Justinianus* Imper. Corpus Juris Civilis. 2 Vol. *Lugd.* 1589. 8vo.  
——— Edictum de Fide Orthodoxâ. ap. Leunclavius in Jure Græco-Ro-  
mano. Tom. 1. et in Tom. 5. Conciliorum.
- Juvenalis* Poeta.
330. *Juvenus* Hispanus. Historia Evangelica Carmine Heroico. in Corpore  
Poetarum, Tom. 2. *Dugd.* 1603. 4to.

## K.

- MARTIN *Kempius* de Osculo. *Lipsia.* 1665. 8vo.
- White *Kennet.* Case of Impropriations and Augmentation of Vicarages  
stated by History and Law, from the first Usurpation of Popes and  
Monks. *Lond.* 1704. 8vo.
- Christian. *Cortholt* de Calumniis Paganorum in Veteres Christianos sparsis,  
*Kilon.* 1668. 4to.
- De Vitâ et Moribus Veterum Christianorum. *Kilon.* 1683. 4to.
- De variis Scripturæ Editionibus. *Kilon.* 1686. 4to.

*Flor. An.*

Albert. *Krantius*. *Historia Ecclesiastica sive Metropolis de initus Christianæ Religionis, &c. Franc.* 1590. Folio.

L.

PHIL. *Labbé* Collectio Conciliorum. 17 Vol. *Par.* 1671. Folio.

——— *Historica Synopsis Conciliorum. Par.* 1661. 4to.

——— *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis. 2. Vol. Par.* 1660. 8vo.

303. *Lactantii Opera. Lugd.* 1594. 8vo.

——— *De Mortibus Persecutorum. Oxon* 1680. et in *Baluzii Miscellaneis.*

Gul. *Lambardus* de *Antiquis Legibus Anglorum et Saxonum. Cant.* 1644. Folio.

*Lampridius* inter *Historiæ Augustæ Scriptores. Lug. Bat.* 1632.

900. *Landolphus Sagax.* *Continuatio Pauli Diaconi. Hanov.* 1611.

*Latinus Latinius.* *Epistola ad Antonium Augustinum de Usu Fermenti in Eucharistiâ. Rom.* 1659. 4to.

Laur. *Laudmeter.* de *vetere Clerico et Monacho. Lovan.* 1626. 4to.

Joan. *Lauoius* de *rectâ interpretatione Sexti Canonis Nicæni. Par.* 1662. 8vo.

507. *Laurentius Novariensis.* *Homiliæ in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 2.*

*Lectioarium Gallicanum ap. Mabillon. de Liturgiâ Gallicanâ.*

1013. *Leo Grammaticus.*—*Chronographia cum Notis Combesis. Par.* 1655. Folio.

458. *Leo Imperator et Anthemius.* *Novellæ ad calcem Codicis Theodosiani.*

886. *Leo Sapiens Imp.* *Notitia Ecclesiæ. Gr. Lat. ap. Leunclavius in Jure Græco-Romano. Tom. 1. p. 88.*

——— *Novellæ. ap. Leunclav. Tom. 2. p. 78. et ad calcem Codicis Justiniani.*

440. *Leo Magnus Papa. Opera. Lugdun.* 1672. Folio.

——— *Epistolæ in Tomis Conciliorum.*

*Leo Africanus.* *Descriptio Africæ. Antwerp.* 1556. 8vo.

590. *Leo Byzantinus de Sectis. Gr. Lat. in Auctario Bibl. Patr. Ducæano. Tom. 1. Par.* 1624.

——— *Contra Eutychianos et Nestorianos. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 4.*

Leonard. *Lessius* de *Jure et Justitiâ. Antwerp.* 1626. Folio.

Hamon *Lestrange.* *Alliance of Divine Offices. Lond.* 1690. Folio.

——— *Remonstrance in the Cause of Liturgy, Lond.* 1642. 4to.

——— *Smectymnuo-Mastix, or A Defence of the Remonstrance. Lond.* 1651. 8vo.

Joan. *Leunclavius.* *Jus Græco Romanum. Gr. Lat. 2 Tomis. Franc.* 1594. Folio.

*Lexicon Juridicum per Anonymum. Genev.* 1615. 8vo.

360. *Libanius Sophista. Opera Gr. Lat. 2 Vol. Par.* 1606. Folio.

553. *Liberatus Carthaginiensis.* *Breviarium sive Historia Causæ Nestorianæ et Eutychianæ, cum Appendice. ap. Crab. Concil. Tom. 2. et Notis Garnerii. Par.* 1675. 8vo.

*Lightfoot.* *Temple-service and Temple. Lond.* 1650. 4to.

——— *Horæ Hebraicæ in Mat. et Marc. cum Disquisitione Chorographicâ. 2 Vol. Cantab.* 1658. 8vo.

——— *Opera. 2 Vol.*

*Flor. An.*

- Gul. *Lindanus*. Panoplia Evangelica contra Hæreses. *Colon*. 1575. Folio.  
 Frid. *Lindenbrogius*. Codex Legum Antiquarum, Burgundionum, Alamannorum, &c. *Franc*. 1613. Folio.  
 ——— Observationes in Ammianum Marcellinum. *Hamburg*. 1609. 4to.  
 1422. Gul. *Linwood*. Provinciale editum per Sharrock. *Oxon*. 1664. 8vo.  
 Just. *Lipsius* de Magnitudine Romanâ. *Antwerp*. 1598. 4to.  
 ——— Notæ in Senecæ Opera. *Antwerp*. 1615. Fol.  
 Garsias *Loaisa*. Collectio Conciliorum Hispaniæ cum Notis. *Madrid*. 1593.  
 Fol. et in Tomis Conciliorum Labbæanis.  
 1141. Pet. *Lombardus* Episcopus Parisiënsis. Liber Sententiarum. *Lugd*. 1594. 8vo,  
 Joan. *Lomeier* de Bibliothecis. *Zutphan*. 1669. 8vo.  
 Bishop *Lloyd's* Historical Account of Church Government in *Britain* and  
*Ireland* when they first received the Christian Religion. *Lond*. 1684. 8vo.  
 170. *Lucianus* Atheus. Opera. Gr. Lat. 2. Vol. *Salmur*. 1619. 8vo.  
 253. *Luciani* Confessoris Epistolæ inter Cyprianicas.  
 294. *Luciani* Martyris symbolum. ap. Athanasium de Synodis Arimin. et Seleucia.  
 Et. ap. Socrat. Lib. 1. cap. 10.  
 Christian *Lupus* Scholia in Canones Conciliorum. 5. Vol. *Bruzel*. 1673. 4to.  
 1320. *Lyrani* Glossa in Biblia. *Lugd*. 1589.

## M.

- JOAN. *Mabillon* de Liturgiâ Gallicanâ. *Par*. 1685. 4to.  
 ——— Iter Italicum. sive Collectio Veterum Scriptorum ex Bibliothecis  
 Italicis, inter quos Liber Sacramentorum Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ. *Par*. 1687.  
 4to.  
 ——— Analecta Veterum. 4. Vol. *Par*. 1675. 8vo.  
 373. *Macarius* Ægyptius. Homiliæ, Gr. Lat. *Par*. 1622.  
 380. *Macrobius*. Saturnalia, &c. *Par*. 1585. 8vo.  
*Magdeburgenses* Centuriæ. 3 Vol. *Basil*. 1624. Folio.  
*Maimonides* More Nevochim. *Basil*. 1629. 4to.  
 Joan. *Maldonat* Comment in 4 Evangel. *Mogunt*. 1824. Folio.  
 De Sacramentis. *Ludg*. 1614. 4to. Liber prohibitus.  
 601. Joan. *Malela*. Chronicon, Gr. Lat. *Oxon*. 1691. 8vo.  
 1130. Gul. *Malmbsuriensis* de Rebus gestis Regum Anglorum, &c. *Franc*. 1601.  
 Folio.  
 Petrus de *Marca*. De Concordiâ Sacerdotii et Imperii. *Par*. 1663. Folio.  
 ——— Commentarius in Cap. Clericus. ad calcem Antonii Augustini de  
 Emendatione Gratiani. *Par*. 1672.  
 Dissertationes de Primatibus, &c. *Par*. 1669. 8vo.  
 ——— Opera Posthuma de Institutione Patriarchæ Constantinop. &c. *Par*.  
 1669. 8vo.  
 534. *Marcellinus* Comes. Chronicon cum Eusebii Chronico. *Amst*. 1658.  
*Marei* Liturgia, Gr. Lat. in Auctario Bibl. Patr. Duceæano. Tom. 2. *Par*. 1624.  
 402. *Marcus* Gazensis. Vita Porphyrii. ap. Baron. an. 401.  
 Pet. *Martyr*. Loci Communes. *Lond*. 1583. Folio.  
*Martyrologium* Romanum. Notis Baronii. *Colon*. 4to.  
 1277. *Martinus* Polonus. Chronicon. *Colon*. 1616. Folio.  
 Andreas *Masius* Commentar. in Josua. *Antwerp*. 1574.

*Flor. An.*

- Franc. *Mason*. *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Lond.* 1625. Folio.  
 ——— *Of the Consecration of Bishops.* Folio.  
 ——— *Defence of the Ordination of Ministers in the Reformed Churches.*  
*Oxford.* 1641. 4to.  
*Maximilliani* Martyris Passio, ad calcem Lactantii de Mortibus Persecutorum. *Oxon.* 1680. 8vo.
560. *Martinus* Bracarenensis. *Collectio Canonum in Tomis Conciliorum.*
645. *Maximus* Monachus. *Scholia in Opera Dionysii Areopagitæ, Gr. Lat. Par.* 1644.
422. *Maximus* Taurinensis. *Homiliæ, cum Operibus Leonis et Fulgentii Lugd.* 1652. Folio.
- Henry *Maurice's* *Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy.* *Lond.* 1691. 8vo.  
 ——— *Vindication of the Primitive Church against Mr. Baxter's Church-History.* *Lond.* 1682. 8vo.
- Jos. *Mede's* *Works.* *Lond.* 1677. Folio.
- Hugo *Menardus.* *Notæ in Sacramentarium Gregorii.* *Par.* 1641. 4to.
- Fernandus de *Mendoza.* *Commentarius in Canones Concilii Eliberitani.* *Conc. Tom. 2.*
418. *Marius Mercator.* *Opera cum Notis Garnerii.* *Par.* 1673. Folio.  
*Hieron. Mercurialis* de *Arte Gymnasticâ.* *Amst.* 1672. 4to.  
*Joan. Meursius* *Glossarium Græco-Barbarum.* *Lugd. Bat.* 1614.
1080. *Micrologus* de *Observationibus Ecclesiasticis, in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 10.*  
*Joan. Milles* *Prolegomena in Novum Testamentum.* *Oxon.*
220. *Minucius Felix.* *Dialogus Notis Rigaltii.* *Oxon.* 1678. 8vo.  
*Missale Romanum.* *Antwerp.* 1584.  
*Missale Gothicum.* *Rom.* 1680. *Par.* 1685. 4to.  
*Missa Mozarabum.* *Tolet.* 1500.
- Rich. *Montacutius.* *Diatribæ on the first part of Mr. Selden's History of Tithes.* *Lond.* 1621. 4to.
- Joan. *Morinus* de *Ordinationibus.* *Par.* 1655. Folio.  
 ——— *De Pœnitentiâ.* *Antwerp.* 1682. Fol.
- Philip *Mornæus.* *Mysterium Iniquitatis, sive Historia Papatus.* *Salmur.* 1612. 8vo.
- Tho. *Morton's* *Grand Imposture of the Church of Rome.* *Lond.* 4to.  
 ——— *Catholic Appeal for Protestants.* *Lond.* 1610. Folio.  
 ——— *Apologia Catholica.* *Lond.* 1606. 4to.
- Joan. *Moschus.* *Pratum Spirituale, Gr. Lat. in Auctario Bibl. Patr. Ducaeano.* *Tom. 2. Par.* 1624.
- Pet. du *Moulin's* *Novelty of Popery, against Perron.* *Lond.* 1644. Folio.  
 ——— *Buckler of Faith, or Defence of the Confession of the French Church, against Arnoux.* *Lond.* 1631. 4to.  
 ——— *Vates sive de malis bonisque Prophetis.* *Lugd. Bat.* 1640. 8vo.
- Steph. le *Moyne.* *Varia Sacra. 2 Vol. Gr. Lat. Lugd. Bat.* 1685. 4to.
- Petrus *Mullerus* de *Osculo Sancto.* *Jenæ.* 1675. 4to.

N.

1301. GULIELM. de *Nangiaco.* *Vita St. Ludovici.*  
 Martin. *Navarrus.* *Miscellanea, inter Opera 6 Tom. Venet.* 1602.  
*Nazianzenus.* *Vid. Gregorium.*

*Flor. An.*

1333. *Nicephorus* Callistus. Historia, Gr. Lat. 2. Vol. *Par.* 1630. Folio.  
 806. *Nicephorus* Patriarch. C. P. Antirretica. ap. Combefis. *Par.* 1648.  
 1205. *Nicetas* Choniates. Thesaurus Orthodoxæ Fidei. *Genev.* 1592. 8vo.  
 880. *Nicetas* David Paphlago. Vita Ignatii Patriarchæ Constantinop. Gr. Lat. in  
 Tom. 8. Concilior.  
 535. *Nicetius*. Auctor Hymni, dicti, Te Deum.  
 1077. *Nicetas* Heracliensis. Responsa ap. Leunclavium. Tom. 1. p. 310.  
 1043. *Nilus* Doxopatrius. Notitia Patriarchatum. Gr. Lat. ap. le Moyne Varia  
 Sacra. Tom. 1.  
 858. *Nicolaus* I. Papa. Responsa ad Consulta Bulgarorum. Concil. Tom. 8.  
 Notitia Imperii. Vid. Pancirollum.  
 Notitia Ecclesiæ. vid. Leo. Sapiens.  
 250. *Novatianus* de Trinitate. Inter Opera Tertulliani.

## O.

- ODO Parisiensis. Statuta Synodalia. in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 6.  
 990. *Œcumenius*. Commentar. in Acta et Epistolas. 2 Vol. Gr. Lat. *Par.*  
 1631. Folio.  
*Onuphrius* de Cœmeteriis. *Colon.* 1574. Folio.  
 ——— Interpretationes Vocum Ecclesiasticarum. *Ibid.*  
 ——— Vitæ Pontificum Roman. *Ibid.*  
 ——— De Ritu sepeliendi mortuos. *Ibid.*  
 368. *Optati* Opera. Notis Albaspinæi. *Par.* 1631. Folio.  
 730. *Ordo* Romanus. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 9.  
 230. *Origenis* Opera Latine. 2 Vol. *Basil.* 1571. Fol.  
 ——— Contra Celsum, Gr. Lat. Cantab. 1677. 4to.  
 ——— De Oratione, Gr. Lat. *Oxon.* 8vo.  
 ——— Commentar. sive Opera Exegetica, Gr. Lat. 2 Vol. per Huetium.  
*Rothomagi.* 1668. Fol.  
 ——— Philocalia. ad calcem. Lib. contra Celsum.  
 416. *Orosius*. Historia Ecclesiastica. *Colon.* 1582. 8vo.  
*Ostervald's* Causes of Corruption of Christians. *Lond.* 1702. 8vo.  
 Hen. *Otho*. Lexicon Rabbincum. *Genev.* 1675.  
 1144. *Otho* Frisingensis. Chronicon. *Basil.* 1569. Folio.

## P.

1280. GEORG. *Pachymeres*. Paraphrasis in Dionysium Areopag.  
 340. *Pachomii* Regula. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 15.  
 370. *Paciani* Epistolæ ad Sempronianum contra Novatianos. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 3.  
 Anton. *Pagi*. Critica in Baronii Annales. *Par.* 1689. Folio.  
 401. *Palladius*. Historia Lausiaca. Gr. Lat. in Auctario Bibl. Patr. Ducaëno.  
 Tom. 2.  
 ——— Vita Chrysostomi. inter Opera Chrys. Tom. 2.  
 1330. Petr. *Paludanus*. Comment. in Lib. Sententiarum.  
 Jac. *Pamelii* Liturgica. 2 Tom. *Colon.* 1571.  
 ——— Notæ in Cyprianum.  
 ——— Notæ in Tertullianum.  
 303. *Pamphilus* Martyr. Apologia pro Origene. ap. Photium. Cod. 118.

## Flor. An.

- Guido *Pancirollus*. Commentar. in Notitiam Dignitatum Imperii Romani Orientalis et Occidentalis. *Ven.* 1593. Folio.
- Pandectæ* Canonum. Vide Beveregium.
- Pandectæ* sive Digesta in Corpore Juris Civilis. Tom. 1.
1428. Nicol. Tudeschus, vulgo dictus *Panormitanus*. Commentar. in quinque Libros Decretalium. *Lugd.* 1586. Folio.
- Dan. *Papebrochius*. Conatus Chronico-Historicus ad Catalogum Pontificum Romanorum. *Antwerp.* 1685. Folio.
- Acta Sanctorum Maii. 5 Vol. *Antwerp.* 1680. Folio.
- David. *Paræus*. Notæ in Symbolum Athanasii. ad calcem Catechismi Ursini. *Hanov.* 1651. 8vo.
1240. Mat. *Paris*. Historia Rerum Anglicarum. *Par.* 1644. Folio.
- Mat. *Parker*. Concio in Obitu Bucerii.
- Sim. *Patrick*. Discourse of Prayer. *Lond.* 1686. 8vo.
- Of Repentance, Fasting, and Lent. *Lond.* 1686. 8vo.
- *Patrick*. Devotions of the Romish Church. *Lond.* 1674. 8vo.
390. *Paulinus* Nolanus. Opera cum Notis Rosweydi. *Antwerp.* 1622. 8vo.
420. *Paulinus* Mediolanensis. Vita Ambrosii præfixa Operibus Ambrosii. Carolus a Sancto *Paulo*. Geographia sacra cum Notis et Animadversionibus Holstenii. *Amst.* 1703. Folio.
774. *Paulus* Diaconus. Historia Miscellanea. *Hamburg.* 1611. 4to.
- Joan. *Pearson*. Annales Cyprianici. *Oxon.* 1682. Folio.
- Vindiciæ Epistolarum Ignatii. In Appendice ad Cotelerii Patres Apostol. *Antwerp.* 1698. Folio.
- Exposition of the Creed. *Lond.* 1669. Folio.
- Opera Posthuma. viz. Annales Paulini. Lectiones in Acta Apostolorum. Et de Serie et Successione primorum Romæ Episcoporum. *Lond.* 1688. 4to.
- Penitential* Discipline of the Primitive Church. *Lond.* 1714. 8vo.
- Gul. *Perkins*. Demonstratio Problematis de Romanæ Fidei ementito Catholicismo. *Cantab.* 1604. 4to.
313. Acta *Perpetuæ* et Felicitatis. In Appendice ad Lactantium de Mortibus Persecutorum. *Oxon.* 1680. 8vo.
- Dionys. *Petavius*. Dogmata Theologica. 3 Vol. *Antwerp.* 1700. Folio.
- De Ecclesiasticâ Hierarchiâ. *Ibid.*
- De Episcopis, Diaconis, &c. Dissertationes 2. *Ibid.*
- De Pœnitentiâ Publicâ et Præparatione ad Communionem. *Ibid.*
- De Potestate Consecrandi Sacerdotibus a Deo concessa. *Lond.* 1685. 8vo.
- De Doctrinâ Temporum. 3 Vol. *Par.* 1627. Folio.
- Animadversiones in Epiphanium.
- Notæ in Synesium.
- Sam. *Petitus*. Variarum Lectionum. Lib. 4. *Par.* 1633.
301. *Petrus* Alexandrinus. Canones, Gr. Lat. ap. Beveregium in Pandectis.
380. *Philastrinus* de Hæresibus. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 4.
40. *Philo* Judæus. Opera Gr. Lat. *Par.* 1640. Folio.
858. *Photius*. Bibliotheca. Gr. Lat. *Par.* 1612. Folio.
- Epistolæ. Gr. Lat. Notis Montacutii. *Lond.* 1651. Folio.

*Flor. An.*

- Nomocanon. Gr. Lat. ap. Justellum Bibl. Juris Canonici. Tom. 2.
1185. Joan. *Phocas*. Descriptio Locorum Sanctorum Palæstinæ. ap. Papebrochium in Actis Sanctorum Maii. Tom. 2. p. 1.
425. *Philostorgius*. Historia Eccles. Gr. Lat. *Cantab.* 1720. Folio.  
Ellies du *Pin*. De antiquâ Ecclesiæ Disciplinâ. *Par.* 1686. 8vo.  
———— Bibliothéque, or, *History of Ecclesiastical Writers to the Seventeenth Century.* *Lond.* 1692. &c. Folio.
250. *Pionii* Martyris Acta. ap. Baronium. an. 254.  
*Pet. Pithæus*. Notæ in Fragmenta Veterum Juris-consultorum cum Legibus Mosaicis collata. *Par.* 1573. 4to.
158. *Pius I.* Papa. Epistolæ in Tomis Conciliorum.  
*Plinii* Historia Naturalis. *Basil.* 1525. Folio.  
*Plinii* Epistolæ. *Oxon.* 8vo.  
*Plutarchi* Opera. *Franc.* 1620. 2 Vol. Folio.
108. *Polycarpi* Epistola. Gr. Lat. ap. Cotelerium.  
Martyrium *Polycarpi*. *Ibid.*
196. *Polycrates*. Fragmenta ap. Eusebium.  
*Polydorus* Vergilius, de Inventoribus Rerum. *Basil.* 1540. 8vo. Liber Ex-purgatus in Indice Sotomajor.  
*Franc. Polygranus*. Assertationes quorundam Ecclesiæ Dogmatum, *Colon.* 1571. Liber Prohibitus in Indice Sotomajor.  
Liber *Pontificalis*. Sive Vitæ veterum Paparum sub nomine Damasi. in Tomis Conciliorum.  
*Pontificale* Romanum. *Par.* 1648. Folio.
250. *Pontius*. Vita Cypriani præfixa Operibus Cypriani.  
*Mat. Pool*. Synopsis Criticorum. 5 Vol. *Lond.* 1669. &c.
430. *Possidius*. Calamensis. Vita Augustini præfixa Operibus Augustini.  
*Christ. Potter*. Answer to Charity Mistaken. *Lond.* 1634. 8vo.  
*Franc. Potter*. Interpretation of the Number 666. *Oxon.* 1642.  
*John Potter* Bishop of *Oxford*. Discourse of Church-Government. *Lond.* 1607. 8vo.
1152. *Potho* Prumiensis de Statu Domus Dei. *Hagenœ.* 1532. 8vo.  
*Gabriel Prateolus*. Elenchus Hæreticorum. *Colon.* 1605. 4to.  
*Humph. Prideaux*. Connection of Scripture-History. 2 Vol. *Lond.* 1718. 8vo.
550. *Primasius*. Comment. in Epistolas Pauli. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 1.  
*Phil. Priorius* de Literis Canonicis. *Par.* 1675. 8vo.
434. *Proclus* Constantinopol. de Traditionibus Missæ cum Notis Riccardi. *Rom.* 1630.
527. *Procopius*. Opera Historica. Gr. Lat. *Par.* 1662. Folio.
444. *Prosper* Aquitanus. Opera. *Colon.* 1540. 8vo.  
———— Chronicon. In Appendice Chronici Eusebiani per Scaligerum. *Amst.* 1658. Folio.
405. *Prudentius*. Poemata in Corpore Poetarum.

Q.

JOS. *Quesnel*. Dissertationes et Notæ in Opera Leonis Magni. 2 Vol. *Par.* 1676. 4to.

*Flor. An.*

*Quintiliani Opera.*

Gaspar *Quiroga*, Index Librorum Expurgatorum, Salmur. 1601. 4to.

R.

847. *RABANUS* Maurus de Institutione Clericorum et Ceremoniis Ecclesiæ. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 10.  
 ——— De Proprietate Sermonis.
1101. *Radulphus* Ardens. Sermones de Tempore et de Sanctis. *Antwerp*. 1576. 8vo.
1390. *Radulphus* de Rivo. De Observantia Canonum. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 10.  
*Joan Rainoldus*. Apologia Thesium de Scripturâ et Ecclesiâ. *Hanov.* 1603. 8vo.  
*Ranchins's* Review of the Council of Trent. *Oxon.* 1638. Folio.
170. *Recognitiones* sive Itinerarium Petri sub nomine Clementis Romani. ap. Cotelerium. Tom. 1. Patr. Apostol.  
*Will. Reeves's* Notes on the ancient Apologists. 2 Vol. *Lond.* 8vo.  
*Renaudotius*. Collecti Liturgiarum Orientalium cum Dissertationibus. 2 Vol. *Par.* 1716. 4to.
- 890 *Rhegino* Prumiensis, de Disciplinis Ecclesiasticis et Religione Christianâ, cum Notis Baluzii. *Par.* 1671. 8vo.  
*Vincent. Riccardus*. Commentar. in Proclum de Tradit. Missæ. *Rom.* 1630.  
*Edmund. Richerius*. Historia Conciliorum Generalium. cum Libro de Potestate Ecclesiasticâ et Politicâ: Item Vindiciæ Doctrinæ Majorum Scholæ Parisiensis. 2 Vol. *Colon.* 1683. 4to.  
 ——— De Potestate Ecclesiæ in Rebus Temporalibus. *Colon.* 1691. 4to.  
*Nic. Rigaltius*. Notæ in Cyprianum.  
 ——— Notæ in Minucium.  
*Georg. Rittershusius* de Jure Asylorum. inter Criticos Londinenses.  
*Andr. Rivetus*. Opera. 3 Vol. *Amst.* 1641. Folio.  
 ——— Criticus Sacer. *Genev.* 1626. 8vo.  
 ——— Synopsis Purioris Theologiæ. *Lug. Bat.* 1632. 8vo.  
*Joannes Roffensis*. Fisher. Liber contra Lutherum. *Par.* 1562. 8vo.  
*Joannes Roffensis*. Buckeridge. De Potestate Papæ in Rebus Temporalibus. *Lond.* 1614. 4to.  
*Joan. Rosinus*. Antiquitates Romanæ cum Paralipomenis Dempsteri. *Colon.* 1620. 4to.
360. *Ruffinus*. Historia Ecclesiastica. *Basil.* 1549. Folio.  
 Expositio Symboli inter Opera Cypriani. *Oxon.* 1682.
1111. *Rupertus* Tuitiensis. De Divinis Officiis. Inter Scriptores de Divin. Offic. *Par.* 1610.
470. *Ruricius* Lemovicensis. Epistolæ ap. Canisium. Antiq. Lection. Tom. 5.

S.

LIBER *Sacerdotalis.*

*Salustius.*

*Salmasius* de Primatu. *Lug. Bat.* 1645. 4to.

——— Notæ in Historiæ Augustæ Scriptores.

440. *Salviani* Opera. *Oxon.* 1633. 8vo.

*Pet. Sarpus* de Jure Asylorum. *Lug. Bat.* 1622. 4to.

## Flor. An.

- Joan. Savaro. Commentar. in Sidonium Apollinarem. *Par.* 1609. 4to.  
 Chronicon Saxonicum. *Oxon.* 1692. 4to.  
 Jos. Scaliger de Emendatione Temporum. *Genev.* 1629. Folio.  
 ——— Castigationes in Eusebii Chronicon, cum Canonibus Isagogicis, &c.  
*Amst.* 1658. Fol.  
 Emanuel a Schelstrate. Sacrum Concilium Antiochenum restitutum. *Ant-  
 werp.* 1681. 4to.  
 ——— De Disciplinâ Arcani. *Rom.* 1685. 4to.  
 ——— Dissertation of Patriarchal and Metropolitcal Power against Stil-  
 lingfleet. *Lond.* 1688. 4to.  
 ——— Ecclesia Africana. *Par.* 1679. 4to.  
 Abr. Scultetus. Medulla Patrum. 2 Vol. *Amberg.* 1613. 4to.  
 434. Sedulius. Poemata. &c. *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 8.  
 Joan. Seldenus. Uxor Hebraica. *Lond.* 1646. 4to.  
 ——— De Synedriis. *Lond.* 1650. 4to.  
 ——— De Diis syris cum Additamentis Beyerii. *Lips.* 1668. 8vo.  
 ——— History of Tithes. *Lond.* 1618. 4to.  
 Seneca Opera Notis Lipsii. *Antwerp.* 1615. Fol.  
 Servius in Virgilium.  
 401. Severianus Gabalensis. Homiliæ Gr. Lat. inter Opera Chrysostomi. Tom. 6.  
 et ap. Combefis. in Auctario Novissimo. *Par.* 1672. Fol.  
 401. Sulpicius Severus. Opera. *Amst.* 1656. 8vo.  
 Wil. Sherlock. Discourse of Church-Unity, or Defence of *Stillingfleet's* Un-  
 reasonableness of Separation. *Lond.* 1681. 8vo.  
 Paul Sherlogus. Comment in Cantica. 3 Vol. *Ludg.* 1637.  
 472. Sidonius Apollinaris. Opera cum Notis Savaronis *Par.* 1609. 4to.  
 1307. Siffridus Presbyter. Chronicon. *Franc.* 1583. Fol.  
 1101. Sigibertus Gemblacensis. Chronicon. *Franc.* 1583. Fol. inter Scriptores Ger-  
 manicos a Pistorio editos.  
 Car. Sigonius de antiquo Jure Italiæ et Provinciarum. 2 Vol. *Venet.* 1560. 4to.  
 555. Paulus Silentarius. Descriptio Templi S. Sophiæ. Gr. Lat. cum Notis du  
 Fresne. *Par.* 1670 Fol.  
 467. Simplicius Papa. Epistolæ in Tomis Conciliorum.  
 385. Siricius Papa. Epistolæ in Tomis Conciliorum.  
 1410. Simeon Thessalonicensis. Commentar. de Templo et Ministris et Sacra Mys-  
 tagogia. Gr. Lat. ap. Goar in Rituali Græcorum. *Par.* 1647.  
 ——— Dialogus adversus omnes Hæreses. ——— Responsa ad 85  
 Quæstiones Gabrielis Pentapolitani. M.S. ap. Leonem Allatum de  
 Missa Præsantificatorum.  
 Jacob. Sirmondus. Censura Anonymi de Suburbicariis Regionibus et Ec-  
 clesiis. *Par.* 1618.  
 ——— Historia Pœnitentiæ.—Notæ in Augustinum, Ennodium, &c.  
 ——— Dissertatio de Usu Fermenti in Eucharistiâ. Edita sunt omnia Sir-  
 mondi Opera. 5 Vol. *Par.* 1696. Fol.  
 432. Sixtus Papa 3. Epistolæ Concil. Tom. 3.  
 Sixtus Senensis. Bibliotheca Sancta. *Colon.* 1586. Fol.  
 Joan. Sleidanus. Commentarii de Statu Religionis, &c. Argentorat,  
 1566. 8vo,

*Flor. An.*

- Smectymnus.* 4to.  
 Tho. *Smith.* Account of the *Greek Church.* Lond. 1680. 8vo.  
 439. *Socrates Scholasticus.* *Historia Ecclesiastica Notis Valesii.* Cantab. 1720. Fol.  
*Solinus Polyhistor.* cum *Pomponio Mela et Æthico Cosmographo.* Per *H. Stephan.* 1577. 4to.  
 Hen. *Spelman.* *Concilia Britannica.* 2 Vol. Lond. 1664. Folio.  
 Anton. *Sparrow.* *Rationale on the Common-Prayer.* Lond. 1684. 8vo.  
 Joan. *Spencer* de *Legibus Hebræorum.* Hagæ. 1686. 4to  
 Anton. a *Sotomajor.* *Index Librorum prohibitorum et expurgandorum* Madrid. 1667. Folio.  
 440. *Sozomenus.* *Historia Ecclesiastica, Gr. Lat. cum Notis Valesii.* Cantab. 1720. Folio.  
*Spalatensis* de *Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ.* 3 Vol. Lond. 1617. Folio.  
 Frid. *Spanhemius.* *Historia Imaginum.* Lug. Bat. 1686. 8vo.  
 ——— *Summa Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ ad Sæculum 16.* 2 Vol. Lug. Bat. 1689. 8vo.  
*Spartianus* inter *Augustæ Historiæ Scriptores.*  
 Hen. *Spondanus.* *Epitome Annalium Baronii.* 2 Vol. Par. 1660. Folio.  
 ——— *Continuatio Annalium Baronii.* 2 Vol. Lugd. 1678. Folio.  
 Edw. *Stillingfleet.* *Origines Britannicæ.* Lond. 1685. Folio.  
 ——— *Unreasonableness of Separation.* Lond. 1681. 4to.  
 ——— *Irenicum.* Lond. 1662. 4to.  
 ——— *Idolatry and Fanaticism of the Church of Rome.* Lond. 1676. 8vo.  
 ——— *Defence of the Charge of Idolatry, &c.* Lond. 1676. 8vo.  
 ——— *Answer to Cressy's Apologetical Epistle.* Lond. 1675. 8vo.  
 ——— *Ecclesiastical Cases relating to the Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy.* Lond. 1698. 8vo.  
*Strabonis Geographia.* Gr. Lat. Notis *Casauboni.* Par. 1620. Folio.  
 842. *Walafridus Strabo* de *Rebus Ecclesiasticis.* *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 10.  
*Suetonius.* Oxon. 1676, 8vo.  
 Joan. *Caspar.* *Suicerus.* *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus e Patribus Græcis.* 2. Vol. Amst. 1682. Folio.  
 280. *Suidas.* *Lexicon Notis Æmylii Porti.* 2 Vol. Genev. 1619. Folio.  
 Laur. *Surius.* *Vitæ Sanctorum.* 7 Tom. Colon. 1576.  
 ——— *De Rebus Gestis in toto Orbe ab anno 1500 ad 1574.* Colon. 1574.  
 Mat. *Sutlif.* de *Institutione Monachorum.* Lond. 1600. 4to  
 498. *Symmachus* Papa. *Epistolæ et Decreta in Tomis Conciliorum.*  
 384. Q. *Aurel. Symmachus.* *Epistolæ et Relatio ad Theodosium pro Arâ Victoriæ.* Par. 1604. 4to.  
 410. *Synesii* *Epistolæ.* Gr. Lat. Par. 1605. 8vo.  
 ——— *Opera omnia Notis Petavii.* Gr. Lat. Par. 1633. Folio.  
*Synodicon Pappi.* Gr. Lat. in *Tomis Conciliorum Labbé.*  
*Synodicon Galliæ Reformatæ.* 2 Vol. Lond. 1692. Folio.

## T.

TACITI *Historia et Annales.* Amst. 1664. 8vo.

172. *Tatianus.* *Oratio contra Græcos.* Gr. Lat. ad *Calcem Operum Justin. Martyr.* Colon. 1686. Folio.

*Flor. An.*

- Jer. *Taylor.*. Ductor Dubitantium. *Lond.* 1676. Folio.  
 ——— Worthy Communicant. *Lond.* 1660. 8vo.
192. *Tertullianus*. Opera Notis Fr. Junii. Franekæ. 1597. Fol. Et. Notis Rigaltii. *Paris.* 1634.
- Theocritus*.  
 423. *Theodoritus*. Historia Eccles. Gr. Lat. *Cantab.* 1720. Folio.  
 ——— Opera omnia, Gr. Lat. 4 Vol. *Par.* 1642. Folio.
518. *Theodorus* Lector. Historia. Gr. Lat. Notis Valesii. *Cantab.* 1720. Folio.  
*Theodosius* Imperator. Vid. Codex Theodosianus.
168. *Theophilus* Antioch. Lib. ad Autolyeum. Gr. Lat. *Oxon.* 1684. 8vo. et ad calcem Justin. Mart.
385. *Theophilus* Alex. Epistolæ Heortasticæ. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 3.  
 ——— Canonica Edicta. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. Tom. 2.
1077. *Theophylactus*. Comment. in 4 Evangelia. Gr. Lat. *Par.* 1631. Folio.  
 ——— Comment. in Epistolas S. Pauli. *Lond.* 1636. Folio.
- Thomas* Aquinas. Vid. Aquinas.
- Herbert. *Thorndike*. Of Religious Assemblies, and the Service of God. *Cantab.* 1642. 8vo.  
 ——— Just Weights and Measures. 4to,  
 Joh. Maria *Thomasius*. Liber. Sacramentorum. *Rom.* 1680. 4to.  
 Tigrine Liturgy. *Lond.* 1693. 8vo. See *Wernldy*.  
*Tillesly* of Tithes in Answer to *Selden*.
511. *Timotheus* Constantinop. ap. Combefis Auctar. Novum. Tom. 2.  
*Timothei* Passio. ap. Photium, Cod. 254.
380. *Timotheus* Alexand. Canones ap. Bevereg. Pandect. T. 2.  
 Franc. *Toletus*. Instructio Sacerdotum.  
*Tridentini* Concilii Decreta et Canones cum Declarationibus Cardinalium et Remissionibus Barbosæ. *Colon.* 1621.  
 ——— Catechismus editus Jussu Conc. *Tridentini*. Vide Catechismus ad Parochos.
- 1483 *Erithemius* de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis. *Colon.* 1531. 4to.  
*Turrianus*. Notæ in Canones Arabicos Concilii Nicæni. Conc. Tom. 2.  
 Franc. *Turretinus*. Institutio Theologiæ Elencticæ. 4 Vol. *Genev.* 1688. 4to.
- V.
439. *VALERIANUS* Cemeliensis. Homiliæ. *Lugd.* 1672. Folio.  
*Valerius* Maximus.  
 Henric. *Valesius*. Notæ in Euseb. Socrat. &c. *Cantab.* 1720.  
 ——— Dissertationes variæ ad calcem Euseb. Socrat. &c. Ibid.  
*Varro* de Linguâ Latinâ cum Notis Scaligeri. *Par.* 1585, 8vo.  
*Vedelius*. Exercitationes in Ignatium. *Genev.* 1623. 4to.  
*Vegetius* de Re Militari. *Lug. Bat.* 1592. 8vo.  
*Venantius*. Vid. Fortunatum.  
*Vergilius*. Vid. Polydor. Vergil.  
 Jos. *Vicecomes* de Ritibus Baptismi. *Par.* 1618. 8vo.  
 ——— De Ritibus Eucharistiæ. *Mediolani.* 1618. 4to.  
*Victor*. Epitome Historiæ Romanæ.
401. *Victor* Antiochenus. Comment. in Marcum. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 1.  
 555. *Victor* Tununensis. Chronicon in Appendice Chronicæ Eusebiani. *Par.* 1658.

*Flor. An.*

- Victor* Uticensis sive Vitensis de Persecutione Vandalicâ. *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 7.  
 290. *Victorius* Martyr. Comment. in Apocalypsis. *Bibl. Patr.* Tom. 2.  
 ——— De Fabricâ Mundi, ap. *Cave Histor. Literar.* Tom. 1. p. 103.  
 457. *Victorius* Aquitanus. Canon Paschalis, Notis Bucherii. *Antwerp.* 1634. Fol.  
 540. *Vigilius* I. Papa. Epistolæ in Tomis Conciliorum.  
 484. *Vigilius* Tapsensis. Opera per Chilietium. *Divione.* 1664. 4to.  
 1244. *Vincentius* Bellovacensis. Speculum Historiæ. *Mogunt.* 1474.  
 431. *Vincentius* Lirinensis. Communitorium adversus Hæreses. Notis Filesaci.  
*Par.* 1619. 4to.  
*Virgilius.*  
*Vitruvius* de Architecturâ. *Lug.* 1586. 4to.  
 Ludov. *Vives* de Causis corruptarum Artium et de tradendis Disciplinis.  
*Oxon.* 1612. 8vo.  
*Ulpianus.* Passim in Pandectis Juris Civilis.  
*Vopiscus.* inter Augustæ Historiæ Scriptores.  
 Joan. Gerard. *Vossius.* Theses Theologicæ et Historiæ. *Bellositi Dobunor.*  
 1628. 4to.  
 ——— De Baptismo Disputat. 20. *Amst.* 1648. 4to.  
 ——— De tribus Symbolis. *Amst.* 1642. 4to.  
 Isaac *Vossius.* Notæ in Ignatium, ap. Cotelierium.  
 431. *Uranius.* Vita Paulini Nolani præfixa Operibus Paulini.  
 Jacobus *Usserius.* Antiquitates Britannicarum Ecclesiarum. *Lond.* 1687. Fol.  
 ——— De successione Ecclesiæ. *Ibid.*  
 ——— Answer to the *Jesuit's* Challenge. *Lond.* 1686. 4to.  
 ——— Religion of the ancient *Irish.* *Ibid.*  
 ——— Historia Dogmatica de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis. *Lond.* 1690.  
 4to.  
 ——— De Anno solari Macedonum. *Lond.* 1648. 8vo.  
 ——— Chronologia sacra, cum Dissertatione de Symbolo Apostolico Romanæ Ecclesiæ. *Oxon.* 1660. 4to.  
 ——— Dissertationes. Ignatianæ in Appendice ad Cotelerii Patres Apostolicos. *Antwerp.* 1698. Folio.  
 ——— Life and Letters. *Lond.* 1685. Folio.  
 ——— De Episcoporum et Metropolitanorum Origine. *Lond.* 1687. 8vo.  
 ——— De Asiâ Lydianâ sive Proconsulari. *Ibid.*  
 ——— Judgment of several Subjects, with the reduction of Episcopacy, &c.  
*Lond.* 1658. 8vo.

## W.

- WILLIAM *Wake* Archbishop of *Canterbury's* Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, against *M. De Meaux.* *Lond.* 1686. 4to.  
 Wil. *Wall's* History of Infant-Baptism. *Lond.* 1705.  
 Wil. *Walker's* Modest Plea for Infant-Baptism. *Cantab.* 1677. 8vo.  
*Walo* Messalinus. al. *Salmasius* de Presbyteris et Episcopis contra Petavium.  
*Lug. Bat.* 1641. 8vo.  
*Walterus* Aureliancensis. Capitula Notis Cellotii. *Concil.* Tom. 8.  
 Brian. *Walton.* Prolegomena sive Apparatus ad Polyglot. *Tigur.* 1673. Fol.

*Flor. An.*

- Rich. *Watson*. De antiquâ Libertate Ecclesiæ Britannicæ. *Lond.* 1687. 8vo.  
*Werndly's* Notes on the *Tigurine Liturgy*. *Lond.* 1693. 8vo.  
 1480. *Wesselus* Groningensis, ap. Illyricum Catalog. Test. p. 1908.  
 Edw. *Wettenhal's* Gift of Singing. *Lond.* 8vo.  
 Hen. *Warton*. Appendix ad Cave Histor. Literar. *Lond.* 1689. Folio.  
 Auctarium Historiæ Dogmaticæ Userii. *Lond.* 1690. 4to.  
 ——— Discourse of Pluralities. *Lond.* 1703. 8vo.  
 Abr. *Wheelock*. Notæ in Bedæ Histor. Vid. Bedam.  
 Gul. *Whitakerus*. De Conciliis. *Herborn.* 1601. 8vo.  
 Dan. *Whitby's* Idolatry of Host-Worship. *Lond.* 1671. 8vo.  
 John *Whitgift's* Works. *Lond.* 1674.

## X.

*XYLANDER*. Notæ in Cedrenum.

## Z.

360. *ZENO* Veronensis. Sermones. Bibl. Patr. Tom. 2.  
 Gul. *Zepperus*. Legum Mosaicarum Forensium Explanatio. *Herborn.* 1604. 8vo.  
 Caspar. *Zieglerus*. Animadvertiones in Grotium de Jure Belli et Pacis. *Witteberg.* 1676. 8vo.  
 1118. Joan. *Zonaras*. Comment in Canones Conciliorum. Gr. Lat. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. *Oxon.* 1672. Folio.  
*Zosimus*. Historicus, Gr. Lat.  
 417. *Zosimus* I. Papa. Epistola et Decreta, in Tomis Conciliorum. *Zuinglii* Opera. 4 Vol. *Tigur.* Folio.  
 1440. *Zygomalas*. ap. Crucium in Turco-Græcia.  
*Zago Zabo's* Account of the *Habassin* Religion, in *Gedde's* Church-History *Ethiopia*. *Lond.* 1696. 8vo. and in *Damianus à Goes*.

# INDEX CONCILIORUM

ALPHABETICUS ET CHRONOLOGICUS,

CUM

NUMERO CANONUM.

---

A.

*A. D.*

506. AGATHENSE. Agde. In Gallia Canones. 48. al. 71.  
315. Alexandrinum contra Arium sub Alexandro.  
362. Alexandrinum sub Athanasio.  
349. Agrippinense contra Euphratam Arianum.  
314. Ancyranum in Galatia. Can. 26.  
270. Antiochenum contra Paulum Samosatenum.  
341. Antiochenum in Encænliis. Cujus 25 Canones inserti sunt in Codice  
Canonum Ecclesiæ Universæ.  
578. Antissiodorensis. Auxerre. in. Gallia. Can. 45.  
381. Aquiliense in Italia.  
788. Aquisgranense. Aix la Chapelle in Germania. Capit. 82.  
441. Arausicanum 1. Orange. in Gallia. Can. 30.  
529. Arausicanum 2. Can. 25.  
314. Arelatense 1. Arles in Gallia. contra Donatistas Can. 22.  
451. Arelatense 2. Can. 56.  
813. Arelatense sub Carolo Magno. Can. 26.  
359. Ariminense in Italia.  
535. Arvernense 1. Clermont in Gallia. Can. 16.  
670. Augustodunense. Autun in Gallia. Can. 15.  
511. Aurelianense 1. Orleanse in Gallia. Can. 31.  
533. Aurelianense 2. Can. 21.  
538. Aurelianense 3. Can. 33.

B.

540. BARCINONENSE. Barcelona in Hispania. Can. 10.  
1431. Basiliense.  
563. Bracarense 1. Braga in Hispania. Can. 40.  
572. Bracarense 2. Can. 10.  
570. Martin. Bracarensis Collectio Canonum ex Synodis Græcis. Capit. 85

## C.

*A. D.*

394. CABARSUSITANUM. in Africa.  
 650. Cabillonense 1. Chalon in Gallia. Can. 20.  
 813. Cabillonense sub Carolo Magno. Can. 66.  
 381. Cæsaraugustanum. Saragossa in Hispania. Can. 8.  
 451. Chalcedonense Generale in Bithynia contra Eutychem. Can. 28.  
 787. Chalcutense in Britannia. Capit. 20.  
 256. Carthaginense sub Cypriano, pro Rebaptizandis Hæreticis.  
 348. Carthaginense 1. sub Grato. Can. 14.  
 390. Carthag. 2. sub Genethlio. Can. 13.  
 397. Carthag. 3. sub Aurelio Can. 50.  
 399. Carthag. 4. Can. 104.  
 401. Carthag. 5. sub Aurelio. Can. 15.  
 419. Carthag. 6. sub Aurelio. Capit. 10.  
 419. Carthag. 7. sub Aurelio. Capit. 5.  
 411. Carthaginensis Collatio inter Cathol. et Donatistas.  
 747. Clovishoviense in Britannia. Can. 30.  
 1415. Constantiense.  
 381. C Politanum 1. Generale 2. Can. 7. contra Macedonium.  
 536. C Politanum sub Menna. Can. 14.  
 553. C Politanum Generale 5. de Tribus Capitulis.  
 680. C Politanum Generale 6. contra Monothelitas.  
 692. C Politanum, vulgo Trullanum sive Quinisextum. Can. 102.

## E.

305. ELIBERITANUM in Hispania. Can. 81.  
 517. Epauense. Epone in Gallia. Can. 40.  
 431. Ephesinum Generale 3. contra Nestorium. Can. 7.  
 449. Ephesinum Latrocinale dictum.

## F.

1438. FLORENTINUM.  
 794. Francofordiense in Germania contra Imaginum Adoratores. Can. 56.

## G.

324. GANGRENSE in Paphlagonia contra Eustathium. Can. 20.  
 517. Gerundense. Girone in Hispania. Can. 10.

## H.

673. HERUDFORDENSE in Britannia. Can. 10.  
 393. Hipponense in Africa. Ex cujus Canonibus et Conciliorum sequentium  
 conflatus est Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ. an. 419.  
 590. Hispalense 1. Seville in Hispania. Can. 3.  
 619. Hispalense 2. Can. 13.

## I.

524. ILERDENSE. Lerida in Hispania. Can. 16.

## L.

361. LAODICENUM in Phrygia. Can. 59.

*A. D.*

1215. Lateranense 4. sub Inocentio. 3.  
 1078. Londinense.  
 569. Lucense 1. Lugo in Hispania.  
 572. Lucense 2.

## M.

581. MATISCONENSE 1. Mascon in Gallia. Can. 19.  
 585. Matisconense 2. Can. 20.  
 845. Meldense. Meaux in Gallia. Capit. 66.  
 402. Milevitanum 1.  
 416. Milevitanum 2. Can. 27.  
 813. Moguntiacum. Mayence sive Ments. Can. 55.

## N.

658. NAMNETENSE. Nants in Gallia.  
 589. Narbonense in Gallia. Can. 15.  
 314. Neocæsariense in Ponto. Can. 14.  
 325. Nicænum 1. Generale contra Arium. Can. 20.  
 787. Nicænum 2. pro Adoratione Imaginum. Can. 22.

## O.

1222. OXONIENSE.

## P.

847. PARISIENSE.

## Q.

692. QUINISEXTUM. Sive Trullanum. Can. 102.

## R.

439. REIENSE sive Rhegiense. Riez in Gallia. Can. 8.  
 813. Rhemense sub Carolo Magno. Can. 44.  
 465. Romanum sub Hilario Papa. Can. 5.  
 494. Romanum sub Gelasio.  
 499. Romanum sub Symmacho.

## S.

1022. SALEGUNSTADENSE. Can. 20.  
 391. Sangariense in Bithynia. a Novatianis de Paschate.  
 347. Sardicense in Thracia sive Mæsia. Can. 21.  
 303. Sinuessanum fictitium.  
 351. Sirmiense contra Photinum.

## T.

516. TARRACONENSE. Can. 13.  
 400. Taurinense. Turin in Pedemont. Can. 8.  
 400. Toletanum 1. Can. 21.  
 531. Toletanum 2. Can. 5.

## A. D.

589. Tolet. 3. Can. 23.  
 633. Tolet. 4. Can. 75.  
 636. Tolet. 5. Can. 9.  
 638. Tolet. 6. Can. 19.  
 646. Tolet. 7. Can. 6.  
 653. Tolet. 8. Can. 12.  
 655. Tolet. 9. Can. 17.  
 656. Tolet. 10. Can. 7.  
 675. Tolet. 11. Can. 16.  
 681. Tolet. 12. Can. 13.  
 386. Trevirensis in Germania contra Ithacium.  
 811. Triburiense prope Moguntiam ad Rhenum Capit. 58.  
 1545. Tridentinum, continuatum 1563.  
 692. Trullanum. Vid. Quinisextum.  
 461. Turonense 1. Can. 13.  
 567. Turonense 2. Can. 27.  
 813. Turonense sub Carolo Magno. Can. 51.  
 448. Tyrium.

## V.

524. VALENTINUM Hispaniæ. Can. 6.  
 374. Valentinum Galliæ. Can. 4.  
 442. Vasense sive Vasionense 1. Vaison in Gallia. Can. 10.  
 529. Vasense 2. Can. 5.  
 465. Veneticum. Vanez in Britannia minore. Can. 16.  
 752. Vermeriense. Can. 21.

## W.

1175. WESTMONASTERIENSE. Can. 18.  
 868. Wortmatiense. Can. 80.

## Z.

418. ZELLEENSE in Africa ap. Ferrandum. some read it *Tellense*, others *Te-  
 leptense* : but *Quesnel* and *Du Pin* reckon it a supposititious Synod.

FINIS.

LIST  
OF  
SUBSCRIBERS.

---

HIS MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY GEORGE IV.

TWO COPIES.

- HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS PRINCE WILLIAM FREDERIC DUKE OF GLOUCESTER, *Chancellor of the University of Cambridge.*
- The Most Rev. and Right Hon. his Grace, the late Dr. Charles Manners Sutton, Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY.
- The Most Rev. and Right Hon. his Grace, Dr. William Howley, Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY, two copies.
- The Right Hon. John Scott, Earl of Eldon, late LORD HIGH CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND, *High Steward of the University of Oxford.*
- The Most Rev. and Right Hon. his Grace, Dr. Edward Venables Vernon, Lord Archbishop of YORK.
- The Most Rev. and Right Hon. his Grace, the late Dr. William Stewart, Lord Archbishop of ARMAGH.
- The Most Rev. and Right Hon. his Grace, Dr. J. G. Beresford, Lord Archbishop of ARMAGH.
- The Most Rev. and Right Hon. his Grace, the late Dr. E. Cleaver, Archbishop of DUBLIN.
- The Most Rev. and Right Hon. his Grace, Dr. W. Magee, Lord Archbishop of DUBLIN.
- The Most Rev. and Right Hon. his Grace, the late Dr. C. Broderick, Lord Archbishop of CASHEL.
- The Most Rev. and Right Hon. his Grace, Dr. R. Laurence, Lord Archbishop of CASHEL.
- The Most Noble his Grace, Hugh Percy, Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND.
- The Most Noble his Grace, Richard Temple Nugent Brydges Chandos Greville, Duke of BUCKINGHAM and CHANDOS.
- The Most Hon. ——— Cornwallis, the late Marquess of CORNWALLIS.
- The Right Hon. George Capel Coningsby, Earl of ESSEX.
- The Right Hon. Cropley Ashley Cooper, Earl of SHAFFESBURY.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

- The Right Hon. Montague Bertie, Earl of ABINGDON.  
 The Right Hon. and Rev. Francis North, Earl of GUILDFORD.  
 The Right Hon. Philip Yorke, Earl of HARDWICKE, *High Steward of the University of Cambridge.*  
 The Right Hon. Jacob Pleydell Bouverie, Earl of RADNOR.  
 The Right Hon. Henry George John Spencer, Earl SPENCER.  
 The Right Hon. Henry George Herbert, Earl of CARNARVON.  
 The Right Hon. Edward Clive, Earl of POWIS.  
 The Right Hon. Dudley Ryder, Earl of HARROWBY.  
 The Right Hon. Henry Addington, Lord Viscount SIDMOUTH.  
 The Right Hon. H. I. Temple, Lord Viscount PALMERSTON.  
 The Right Hon. and Right Rev. Dr. Charles James Bloomfield, Lord Bishop of LONDON.  
 The Hon. and Right Rev. the late Dr. Shute Barrington, Lord Bishop of DURHAM, 2 copies.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. William Van Mildert, Lord Bishop of DURHAM.  
 The Right Hon. and Right Rev. the late Sir George Prettyman Tomline, D. D. Lord Bishop of WINCHESTER, *Prelate of the Order of the Garter.*  
 The Right Hon. and Right Rev. Dr. Charles Richard Sumner, Lord Bishop of WINCHESTER, *Prelate of the Order of the Garter.*  
 The Hon. and Right Rev. the late Dr. George Pelham, Lord Bishop of LINCOLN.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. John Kay, Lord Bishop of LINCOLN, *Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.*  
 The Right Rev. Dr. John Luxmore, Lord Bishop of ST. ASAPH.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. H. W. Majendie, Lord Bishop of BANGOR.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. William Carey, Lord Bishop of EXETER.  
 The Right Rev. the late Dr. John Fisher, Lord Bishop of SALISBURY.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. Thomas Burgess, Lord Bishop of SALISBURY.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. HENRY BATHURST, Lord Bishop of NORWICH.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. G. J. Huntingford, Lord Bishop of HEREFORD, 2 copies.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. Bowyer Edward Sparke, Lord Bishop of ELY.  
 The Hon. and Right Rev. the late Dr. Edward Legge, Lord Bishop of OXFORD.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. James Carr, Lord Bishop of CHICHESTER.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. Christopher Butson, Lord Bishop of CLONFERT.  
 The Hon. and Right Rev. Dr. F. St. Laurence, Lord Bishop of CORK and Ross.  
 The Right Rev. Dr. R. Fowler, Lord Bishop of OSSORY.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

- The Hon. and Right Rev. Dr. Richard Burke, Lord Bishop of  
WATERFORD and LISMORE.
- The Hon. and Right Rev. Lord R. P. Tottenham, Bishop of CLOGHER.
- The Right Rev. Dr. John Leslie, Lord Bishop of ELPHIN.
- The Right Rev. Dr. Richard Mant, Lord Bishop of DOWN and CON-  
NOR, 2 copies.
- The Right Rev. the late Dr. C. M. Warburton, Lord Bishop of CLOYNE.
- The Right Rev. Dr. P. Elrington, Lord Bishop of FERNS.
- The Right Hon. George Kenyon, Lord KENYON, 3 copies.
- The Right Hon. William Wyndham Grenville, Lord GRENVILLE,  
*Chancellor of the University of Oxford.*
- The Right Hon. William Scott, Lord STOWELL.
- The Right Hon. Nicholas Vansittart, Lord BEXLEY.
- The Right Hon. Viscountess MANDEVILLE.
- The Right Hon. Lady BOSTON.
- The Right Hon. Lady SELSEY.
- The Right Hon. R. PEEL, M. P.
- The Right Hon. STURGES BOURNE, M. P.
- The Right Hon. CHARLES BATHURST, M. P.

A.

- Aldrich, Rev. Charles.
- Allen, Rev. Robert, B. C. L., New College, Oxford.
- Allen, Henry, Esq. Trinity College, Oxford.
- Armstrong, John, Esq. Priestlands, Lymington.
- Arnold, James H. Esq. L.L. D. Doctor's Commons.
- Astley, Sir J. Dugdale, Bart. M. P., Everleigh-house, Wilts.
- Aylmer, Mr., East Sheen, near Richmond.

B.

- Barnard, Rev. E. Rector of Alverstoke, Hants.
- Barney, J. Esq. Southampton.
- Bedford, Rev. J. G., Twyford, Hants.
- Bingham, late Rear-Admiral Joseph, Grove House, Lymington,  
Hants.
- Blacker, Rev. George, Dublin.
- Birch, —, Esq. Magdalen Hall, Oxford.
- Bloxam, Rev. R. R., B. A., Worcester-College, Oxford.
- Bogue, late Rev. David, D. D., Gosport.
- Booth, Mr., Bookseller, Duke-street, Portland-place.
- Bowles, Hon. and Rev. G. Rushout, Burford, Worcestershire.
- Boyles, Rev. C., Horndean, Hants.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

Broughton, Rev. Brian, Rector of Long Ditton, Surrey.  
Brome, Charles, Esq. Town Malling.  
Burnaby, —, Esq. L.L.D. Doctors' Commons.  
Burrard, Rev. George, Rector of Yarmouth, Isle of Wight, and  
Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty.

C.

Caius College, the Rev. D. M. Davy, the Master of, Cambridge.  
Calvert, Mrs., Fleet-street.  
Carmalt, Rev. William, Putney.  
Carne, the late Lieut.-Colonel, Great Baddow, Essex.  
Carter, Rev. W. D., Abingdon, Berks.  
Carver, William, Esq., Long Stratton, Norfolk.  
Carver, Rev. Wm. J., M. A., Rector of Winfarthing and Snitterton,  
Norfolk.  
Chaplin, Charles, Esq., M. P., Blankney, Lincolnshire.  
Christ-Church, the very Rev. the Dean of, Oxford.  
Clarke, Mr. Newport, Isle of Wight.  
Clifton, M. Waller, Esq., Secretary to the Victualling Board,  
Somerset Place.  
Clifton, Joseph Bingham, Esq., White House, Putney.  
Clive, the Hon. Colonel, James-street, Westminster.  
Cobbett, Pitt, Esq., Bedford-street, Covent-Garden.  
Cory, Robert, Esq. jun., Yarmouth.  
Cook, Rev. Mr., Macclesfield.  
Crew, R. H. Esq., Secretary to the Hon. the Board of Ordnance.  
Cruickshank, R. Esq., Gosport, Hants.  
Cumyns, Rev. R. H., M. A., Minister of All Saints Church, Portsea.  
Curtois, Rev. R. G., B. D., Fellow of C. C. C. Oxford.

D.

Dalrymple, Major-Gen. Sir J., Bart., Woodside Cottage, Lymington.  
Davies, T. L., Esq., Magdalen Hall, Oxford.  
Dods, John, Esq. M. D., R. N. Hospital, Haslar, Hants.  
Douglas, Major-General Sir Howard, Bart.

E.

Edmunds, the late Mr. R., Fareham, Hants.  
Elliot, John, Esq., Pimlico-Lodge.  
Elliot, Philip, Esq., M. D., Bath.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

England, Rev. W., D. D., Archdeacon of Dorset.  
Exeter College Library, Oxford.

F.

Fitzgerald, Rev. —, Castle Town, Delvin, Meath.  
Fleming, J. Esq., M. P., South Stoneham, Hants.  
Forbes, W. Esq., Sleaford, Lincolnshire.  
Frankland, the late Mrs., Chichester.

G.

Gabell, Rev. H., D. D., late Master of Winchester College.  
Garbett, Edw. Esq., Architect, Reading, Berks.  
Gardiner, Sir James S., Bart., Roche Court, near Fareham, Hants.  
Garnier, Rev. W., M. A., Prebendary of Winchester.  
Garrett, Capt. Henry, R. N., Commissioner of the Victualling Board,  
Haslar Hospital.  
Gauntlett, Rev. —, D. D. *late Warden of New College, Oxford.*  
Gell, John Henry, Esq. Cloisters, Westminster.  
Gills, R. F. Esq. Fareham, Hants.  
Goddard, Rev. C., D. D., Archdeacon of Lincoln.  
Goddard, Rev. —, D. D. Cadogan-place, Chelsea.  
Goodall, Rev. J., D. D., Provost of Eton College.  
Gostling, A., Esq. L.L. D. 60, Montague-square.  
Gordon, Sir Jenison W, Bart., Haverholm Priory, Lincolnshire.  
Greenway, George, Esq. Attleborough-Hall, Warwickshire.  
Gronow, Rev. Thomas, Brazen-Nose College, Oxford.  
Grant, W. Esq. Fleetland House, near Fareham, Hants.

H.

Hanson, Mr., Grimoldby, Lincolnshire.  
Hanrott, P. A., Esq. 51, Great Ormond-street.  
Harper, T. Esq. Gosport, Hants.  
Harrison, Rev. W., M. A., Prebendary of Winchester.  
Harrison, S. H. Esq. Southampton.  
Harrisson, Robert Steevens, Esq. Bourn Abbey, Lincolnshire.  
Hallatt, Miss, Broughton, Hants.  
Heathcote, Rev. Gilbert, M. A. Archdeacon of Winchester.  
Henville, Rev. J., M. A., Fellow of New College, Oxford, Wymer-  
ing, Hants.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

Henville, Rev. C. B., M. A., Fellow of Winchester College, Vicar of Portsmouth.  
Hewit, Capt. C., R. N., Lymington.  
Holmes, Mr. H. Solicitor, Romsey, Hants.  
Hull, John, Esq. Lincoln College, Oxford.  
Hume, Rev. T., Canon of Salisbury.  
Huntingford, Rev. H., B. C. L., Fellow of Winchester College.

J.

James, Rev. W., M. A., Vice-Principal of Magdalen Hall, Oxford.  
Jellicoe, S. Esq. Uplands, Fareham, Hants.  
Jenkyns, Rev. H., M. A., Oriel College, Oxford.  
Jervoise, G. P., Esq. M. P., Harriard House, Hants.  
Jesus College, the Rev. the Principal of, Oxford.  
Jolliffe, Hilton, Esq. M. P., Merstham, Surry.  
Jones, Rev. Ellis, Lymington.

K.

Kempson, Rev. W. B., M. A., Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.  
King, Rev. J. Walker, Almoritia, Meath.

L.

Leathe, Rev. George Reading, of Shropham Hall, Norfolk.  
Leeke, Rev. Wm. B. A. Westham, Sussex.  
Legge, Hon. and Rev. the late A. G., B.A., Chancellor of Winchester.  
Lincoln, Chancellor of the Diocese of.  
Lind, John, Esq. M. D. Portsmouth.  
Loggin, Rev. George, Assistant Master of Rugby School.  
Lowndes, the late Mr. C. Marquis-court, Drury-lane.  
Lys, Rev. J. Exeter College, Oxford.

M.

Madan, Rev. Spencer, D. D. Chancellor and Prebendary of Peterborough.  
Magdalen Hall, the Principal of, Oxford.  
Magdalen Hall Library, Oxford.  
Manning, J. Spencer, Esq. 1st Dragoon Guards.  
Mant, G. Esq. Storrington, Sussex.  
Mant, Rev. Robert.  
Marcer, Mrs. F. Andover, Hants.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

Marlow, Lieut. Royal Engineers, Gosport, Hants.  
 Maynard, Lieut. T. B., R. N.  
 Milner, the late Rev. George, Rector of Larling, Norfolk.  
 Missing, R. W. Esq. Posbroke Cottage, Titchfield, Hants.  
 Morris, Rev. Dr.  
 Mossop, Rev. C., Vicar of Helpstone, Northamptonshire.  
 Mountain, Rev. G. Robert, M. A., Rector of Havant, Hants.  
 Mundy, the late E. M. Esq. M. P., Shipley Hall, Derbyshire.

N.

Neele, Mr., Engraver, Strand.  
 New College, the Library of, Oxford.  
 Newland, the late R. Bingham, Esq. Chichester.  
 Nicolson, Rev. J. C., M. A., late of St. John's College, Cambridge.  
 Norris, R., Esq. Basing Park, Hants.

O.

Orde, Sir John, Bart.  
 Oriel College, the Rev. the Provost of, Oxford.

P.

Pack, R. Esq. Floore House, Daventry, Northamptonshire.  
 Paddon, J. Esq., Farcham, Hants.  
 Paley, Rev. James, Vicar of Lacock, Wilts.  
 Parratt, E. Esq.  
 Paris, J. A. Esq. M. D. Dover-street.  
 Parry, Rev. —, Chester.  
 Pearson, the very Rev. Dr. Hugh, Dean of Salisbury.  
 Penn, J. Esq. New-street, Spring-Gardens.  
 Phelps, Rev. W. W., C. C. C., Oxford.  
 Pigott, Rev. W. F., D. D. Fellow of Eton College.  
 Player, G. Esq. Ryde House, Isle of Wight.  
 Plowden, Mrs. Newton Park, Lymington.  
 Prevost, Sir George, Bart., Belmont-house, Hants.  
 Price, Rev. J. Great Munden, Herts.  
 Price, the late Rev. R., D. D., Canon of Salisbury.  
 Pulteney, J. Esq. 36, Grosvenor Place.  
 Pulteney, Mrs. 36, Grosvenor Place.  
 Purvis, late Admiral J. C., Vicar's Hill House, Lymington.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

Q.

Quarrier, D. Esq. M. D. Little Green, Alverstoke.

R.

Radcliffe, the late Rev. A., M. A. late Vicar of Titchfield, Hants.  
 Richards, Rev. Dr., Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, Westminster.  
 Rivett, Rev. T., Kilford, near Lymington.  
 Robinson, Sir Christopher, Bedford-square.  
 Robinson, the late Robert, Esq., Lieut. R. N. Denston Hall, Suffolk.  
 Rowley, Rev. G., M. A., University College, Oxford.

S.

Sadlier, Rev. Francis, D. D., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.  
 Seard, Rev. Thomas, M. A., Bishop's Waltham, Hants.  
 Scarlett, Sir James, Bart. M. P. Abinger Hall, Surrey, 2 copies.  
 Schanck, the late Vice-Admiral John, Barton House, Dawlish,  
 Devon.  
 Schrieber, Rev. Thomas, Rector of Bradwell, Juxta Marc, Essex.  
 Scott, Rev. James, Wadham College, Oxford.  
 Sharp, Mr. W. Romsey, Hants.  
 Shuttleworth, Rev. P. N., D. D., Warden of New College, Oxford.  
 Shrubb, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Bolder, Hants.  
 Sheddon, Col. John, Lymington.  
 Sissmore, Rev. H., Fellow of Winchester College.  
 Sketchly, A. C. Esq. Clapham.  
 Smith, Mrs. Bersted Lodge, near Bognor, Sussex.  
 Smyth, the late J. H. Esq. Heath, Wakefield.  
 Snell, Rev. T. Windlesham, Surrey.  
 Sneyd, Rev. Mr., New Church, Isle of Wight.  
 Staunton, Sir G. T. Bart., Leigh House, Havant, Hants.  
 Storey, Anthony M., Esq., Basset Down House, Wilts.  
 Strutt, Colonel, J. H., M. P., Terling-place, Witham, Essex.  
 Styan, William, Esq. Clapham.  
 Surtees, Rev. Mr.

T.

Thompson, the Rev. Sir Henry, Bart. Bembridge, Isle of Wight.  
 Thresher, Rev. W., M. A., Vicar of Titchfield, Hants.  
 Trinity College, the Library of, Dublin.  
 Trinity College, the Rev. the Provost of, Dublin.  
 Tuxford, P. Esq. Boston, Lincolnshire.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

V. U.

Veck, Rev. H. A., M. A., Curate of Alverstoke.  
 Vickery, Rev. W. H. I., Curate of St. Paul's, Covent Garden.  
 Verity, Richard, Esq. 25, Bolton-street, Piccadilly.  
 University College, the Rev. the Master of, Oxford.  
 University College Library, Oxford.

W.

Walker, Mrs. Church-row, Hampstead.  
 Walther, Mr., Bookseller, Brydges-street.  
 Watson, Joshua, Esq. Clapton.  
 Weddell, D. W., Esq. Gosport, Hants.  
 Westcombe, Rev. T., M. A. Winchester.  
 West, the late Mr. B., Organist, Gosport.  
 Wetherell, Sir Charles, H. M. Attorney-General, M. P.  
 White, Mrs. John, Lymington.  
 Williams, Rev. Dr., Head Master of Winchester College.  
 Williams, R. Esq., M. P., Bridehead, near Dorchester.  
 Willoughby, H. P. Esq. Exeter College, Oxford.  
 Wilson, Rev. Daniel, Islington.  
 Wingrove, Major George P. Royal Marines, Gosport, Hants.  
 Wise, Rev. W., D. D., Vicar of St. Lawrence, Reading.  
 Woodward, Charles, Esq. Magdalen Hall, Oxford.  
 Wool, Rev. John, D. D., Head Master of Rugby School.

Y.

Yates, Rev. Hugh Seymour, Island of Jamaica.  
 Young, Captain T. B., R. N. Gosport, Hants.  
 Young, W. Esq. West Ridge House, Isle of Wight.

Z.

Zillwood, Rev. J. O., M. A. Winchester.

---

ROGERSON AND CO. PRINTERS, 19, OLD BOSWELL COURT, TEMPLE-BAR.









COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY



0025978500

931  
B51  
8

01364723

*Reviewed by Preservation*

931.  
B51 V8

