

'Paradoxical Questions concerning the morals & actions of Athanasius & his followers'

Author: Isaac Newton

Source: **N563M3 P222, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, Los Angeles, California, USA

Published online: January 2004

<1r>

Paradoxical Questions concerning the morals & actions of Athanasius & his followers

See this copy by Sir I. Newton ending with these words ought to be corrected

— — Quæst 1.

**Whether that ignominious death of Arius {in a bog-house} was not a story put about by Athanasius
abo{ve twenty years} after his death?**

How Arius died I reckon a question of {no moment but} because it leads to other things of moment {I chuse to} begin with it. We are told in history {that he} was {excommunicated by} the Council of Nice & banished by {the Emperor Constantine the great,} & soone times after released out of banishment by the {illeg} same Emperor, {& that he} died at Constantinople {in a bog-house} miserably by the effusion of his bowels the day before he was to hav{e been absolved from excommunication}. Now {this story of his} death was not spread abroad till about {24 years after his} death; & then it was first vented by his {greatest enemy} Athanasius in a clandestine way & therefore deserves to be called {illeg}. For Athanasius in the end of the reign of Constantius {being forced to} retire from his Bishopric into the wilderness of Egypt{, broached that} story there amongst the monks by sending {about a narra}tive in a timorous & cautious {manner} {charging} them not to transcribe it but to return it {back to him} so soon as they had read it. And this app{ears by a letter} which he sent about {at the same} time to those Monks in which he writes {thus. For the} full condemnation & rejection of the heresy_{of the Arians}_ye are to believe that the judgment of God {in the death} of Arius is sufficient: which ye have eve{n now learnt}_by others. ffor what God has constituted let no {man annull,} & whom he has condemned, who shall pro{nounce just. For} who from so great a signe knows not th{at this heresy}_is hated of God, notwithstanding that it {is defended by}_men. When therefore you have rea{d it pray for us} & exhort one another to it & strai{ght way send back} those things to us & publish no copy {thereof nor tran}scribe any for yourselves{, but be ye content as just usurers}_with the bare {reading of it altho ye may}. <1v> desire to read it often. †^[1] ffor it is not safe that those {our} writings should come to posterity which we composed as {bablers} & unlearned. Thus far Athanasius. In this {epistle he} mentions his own flight & the placing of George {in the chair} of Alexandria which happened A.C. 356. He mentions also the subscription of Liberius A.C. 358 & both the lapse & the death of Hosius, the first of which happened at Sirmium A.C. 357, & the last in or after the Council of {Arimi}num as Baronius proves: & therefore this epistle was {written} between the Council of Ariminum & death of Constantius & by cons{equence A.C.} 359 or soon after that is 24 years after the ignominious death of Arius or above. this Epistle, & by consequence before the year 337. he died according to the relation of Atha{nasius before} the Council of Tyre

which met A.C. 355, or {according to} the relation of the Ecclesiastical historians soon after: & the Council of Arim{inum sat A.C. 359.}

Now at the same time that this libel or narrative {of the death} of Arius went about in the wilderness among the {Moncks, one} Serapion upon a dispute arising whether Arius died in {communion with} the Church, wrote to Athanasius {to know his} opinion about it: to whom Athanasius returned {this answer.} I have read the letters of your Revere{nce in which you} desire that I would write to you those thin{gs which are at} this time done against me, & concerning the {wicked Heresy} of the Arians by which we suffer these things, & {how Arius} ended his life. Two of these three requests I ha{ve willingly} performed & sent to your piety. what I have w{ritten to the} Monks. ffor thence you may learn what relates {both to} our troubles & to the heresy. But concerning the third head, namely the death of Arius, I much doubted with my self about it, fearing least in doing it, I should seem to {insult} over the death of the man. But yet because a disputation amongst you concerning the heresy ended in this ques{tion,} whether Arius died in communion with the Church: for ending the dispute about his death I will tell you the truth, accounting it the same thing to tell this as to end the contention. ffor I perswade my selfe that the miracle of his death being known, it will no longer be doubted whether the Arian heresy be odious to God or not. Truly I was not at Constantinople when he died but Ma{carius the} Presbyter was there & I learnt it by his {relation.} – Arius by the endeavour of the Eusebians {being} called to the Emperor Constantine & at his {entrance being} asked by the Emperor, if he kept the faith {of the Catho}lick Church, affirmed upon oath, that he {beleived aright,} suppressing what he had been excommunic{ated for by} Alexander his Bishop & colour{ing over his profession} with scripture expressions. W{hen therefore he had sworn} that he had done none of {those things for which he was}, <2r> was by Alexander excommunicated, the Emperor {dismist} him with these words: If thy faith be right, th{ou hast} well sworn, but if impious & yet thou hast swo{rn, God} will condemn thee for thy oath. Him therefore {thus de}parting from the Emperor the Eusebians by the {ir usual} force would have introduced into the Church: but {Alexander} Bishop of Constantinople contradicted it, saying,{that the} Inventor of a heresy ought not to be received into communion. Then the Eusebians threatned saying: As we h{ave} procured against your will that he should be called b{y} the Emperor, so to morrow notwithstanding tis again{st} your mind we will bring Arius into communion with us in this Church. It was the Sabbath [that is Saturday] when they said this. Which Alexander hearing & being much trouble{d} he went into the Church & lifting up his hands to {God} lamented & falling upon his face on the g{round} prayed. Macarius was then present praying with him {and} hearing his words. Now he requested one of these things If Arius, saith he, must to morrow be brought into the congregation, let thy servant now depart & destroy not the righteous with the wicked: but if thou wilt spare thy Church (for I know thou wilt spare it) look upon the words of the Eusebians & give not thy inheritance into destruction & disgrace: & † take away {Arius} least he being received into the Church his heresy may seem also to be received with him & so impiety counted for piety. The Bishop having thus prayed went thence very thoughtful & there followed {a} thing wonderfull & incredible. ffor the Eusebians threatning, the Bishop prayed: but Arius confiding in the Eusebians & prating much, went into a Bog-house, as if to ease himself & † suddenly (as 'tis written) fall{ing} headlong burst in sunder & died upon the ground, be{ing} deprived both of communion & life. Such was the end of Arius. And the Eusebians being greatly ashamed buried their fellow conspirator, but the Church rejoicing, Alexander celebrated the communion in piety & sound faith with all the brethren praying & greatly glorifying God: not as if he rejoiced at his death, (far be it, for it is appointed all men once to dy,) but because this thing appeared above all humane judgment, ffor the Lord himself judging between the threatnings of the <4r> Eusebians & the prayer of Alexander condemned the {Arian} heresy, shewing it unworthy of the communion of {the Church} & manifesting to all men that altho it be co{untenanced} by the Emperor & by all mortals yet tis cond{emned by} the Church. – – Certainly many of those who we{re deceived} before, were converted, namely because God him{self had} condemned the heresy & shewn it to be incommun{icable to} the Church. Wherefore let the Question cease among {you.} To them which moved this Question let this be read togeth{er} with what I wrote in briefto the Monks concerning th{is} heresy, that they being thence instructed may more & {more} condemn it. But let no copy of these things be transcrib{ed} nor transcribe any for your selfe: ffor this I have als{o} enjoyned the Monks: but according to your candor if a{n}y thing be wanting, in the writings, add it & strei{ght} way return them to us, &c. Thus far Athanasius So then the story of Arius's death was first broached by Athanasius at that time when Arianism was countenanced by the Emperor & by all mortals & by consequence after the compliance {of} the Council of Ariminum, & Athanasius pretended no other author for it then Macarius a dead man & propounded it amongst his ignorant & credulous Monks with much timorousness charging them to retu{rn} the writing quickly to him within letting any copys be taken least it should at length get into such hands as he could not trust. ffor, saith he, it is not safe that it should come to

posterity. But a while after when the story was once spread abroad so that he might tell it within danger of being reputed its author, he tells it again in his first Oration without any such caution.

Now, the reasons which make me suspect the truth of this story are these.

1. Because the prayer of Macarius is contrary to the temper & spirit of true Christianity & it is not likely that God would hear a wicked prayer.

2. Bec. The story came to us not from Constantinople as it ought to have done but from {Egypt &} was not broached there till 24 years after the death of Arius, or above. Athanasius & the Bishops of Egypt when collected < insertion from f 3v > {in a Council} at Alexandria five years after the Council of Tyre knew {nothing of} it as you may perceive by the letter which that Council wrote in {defence of} Athanasius against Arius & the Council of Tyre. Nor did Iulius Bishop of Rome know anything of it {when he w}rote in defense of Athanasius. Nor did the Council of Sar{dica (where} Athanasius & his friends were assembled together o{ut of all the} Empire) know any thing of it, as you may perceive {by their} letters. Athanasius long after these times told it as a se{cret & out} of his writings the Ecclesiastical Historians propagated it to posterity.

< text from f 4r resumes >

3. Bec It was broached & spread abroad by the grand enemy of Arius without any pretence of proof or other evidence then the credit of the reporter. For detracting stories never look well when told by a profest enemy. Such a person may be an accuser but not a witness & accusations without pro{of are by the general rule of all courts} accounted calumnies.

4. Because Athanasius broached it (as he confesseth) to blast the name & religion of his enemies & that at a nick of time when he was reduced to the greatest despair.

<5r>

5. Because he broached it in a clandestine way in the wilderness amongst the ignorant & credulous Monks of his own party: & was fearful lest the writings by which he broached it should come into other hands which he could not trust, or remain upon record. ffor saith he Tis not safe that they should come to posterity.

6. Bec. The story after he had broached it spread but slowly, being not generally known till the ecclesiastical historians about ninety years after {the death of Arius} set it down in their histories, as †^[2] Theodoret informs us. Ruffin # < insertion from f 4v > {& Sulpiti}us Severus who wrote their histories above 30 years after {Athanasius} broacht it knew nothing of it, & yet the first of them {had trav}ailed through the east. It seems to have made little noise {in the} world before the Greek Historians met with it in the writings {of At}hanasius & put it about.

< text from f 5r resumes >

7. And tho it came originally from Egypt & was not known in the world till above 24 years after the death of Arius, yet Athanasius to give credit to it amongst the Egyptian Monks told it then & there as if it had been well known at Constantinople from the beginning. For how it could be so publicly known there at first & not spread thence into Egypt & other regions before Athanasius told it I understand not.

Lastly the main design of the story is to represent that Arius died miserably without the pale of the Church & yet its most certain that he was received into communion before he died. < insertion from f 4v >

{&} for that end Athanasius represents as if he died at Constantinople immediately {after} he was recalled thither from banishment before the Eusebians {had ti}me enough to receive him into communion & at sometime after the death of Arius the Council of Tyre and Ierusalem received the Arians & yet it's certain {Arius} lived longer & went afterwards from Constantinople to Tyre & Ierusalem & Alexandria {and was} received into communion before he died.

& for that end Athanasius in his letter to Serapion represents as if Arius died at Constantinople immediately after he was recalled thither from banishment before the Eusebians had time enough to receive him into

communion & in his letter to the Monks {after he} had mentioned the ignominious death of Arius he subjoyns {illeg} the Eusebians not very long after {he pub}lished what they had been endeavouring at Constantinople {illeg} receiving the Arians into communion (meaning at Ierusalem) & {illeg}ging the Emperors command & not blushing after the depositi{on of} Athanasius to write in their letter (that is in a letter of the {illeg} of Ierusalem to Alexandria) the envy was ceased & that they {illeg} received the Arians & boasted the Emperors command for it not {illeg}ing to add that the faith of the Arians was right. Thus does {Atha}nasius in these his two letters that he may make Arius dy{e} without the pale of the Church place his death at Constantinople before the Arians were received at Ierusalem. And yet it's certain that Arius went from {Const}antinople to Tyre & Ierusalem & Alexandria before he died & {was} one of those whome the Council of Ierusalem received into com{mun}ion. < text from f 5r resumes > ffor Constantine the great recalled him & Euzoius together from banishment, & after he had allowed their profession of faith, sent them to the Council of Tyre to be received into communion & that Council (which Eusebius represents a greater Council than that of Nice) removing to Ierusalem received them there & sent them with a recommendatory letter to Alexandria to be readmitted to their places. This story is told not only by the Ecclesiastical b^[3] Historians but also by the Council it self in that letter, & by that Council met again in the council of Antioch, where they write that they being judges of the faith of Arius had received him rather then followed him. Tis acknowledged also by Athanasius himself in his book de synodis Arimini et Seleucia where he recites the letter of the Council of Ierusalem & then adds that that council ^[4] after the banishm^t of Athanasius wrote in this letter to A{lex}andria that ^{c[5]} they should receive Arius & those {that were} with him. And the memory & tradition of his reception at Tyre re{mained in} Egypt till Athanasius by a contrary story e{xtinguished it} as is manifest by <6r> the opposition that the story of the death of Arius met with at first, some disputing that he died in communion till Athanasius commanded them silence. Historians therefore finding that < insertion from f 5v > {Ari}us was certainly received at Tyre & went thence to Alexandria, have {ende}avoured to mend the narrative of Athanasius by placing the death {of} Arius not immediately after his return from banishm^t to Constantinople as Atha{nas}ius doth but after his return from Alexandria thither: & yet to allow {as some} do {that} Arius was received into communion at Ierusalem & by {con}sequence died within the pale of the Church is contrary to the {de}signe of the story; & to tell that the Eusebians after they had {re}ceived him at Ierusalem would have received him at Constantinople {as} if they had not received him before is contrary not only to the narrative of Athanasius but also to common sense. Of one excommunication there is but one absolution.

< text from f 6r resumes >

These are the reasons which incline me to suspect the story of the death of Arius: And whilst Athanasius wrote his book de synodis Arimini et Seleucia long after the death of Macarius & therein relates the reception of Arius at Ierusalem: I suspect also that he knew nothing then of the story of Arius dying out of communion & therefore had it not from Macarius as he pretends but invented it himself.

<10r>

Quest. 2

Whether the Meletians deserved that ill Character which Athanasius gave them.

In Dioclesian's Persecution there arose a contension between Peter the Bishop of Alexandria & Meletius the first of the Bishops under him which caused a schism in the Churches of Egypt both parties notwithstanding keeping communion with the Churches abroad. When Athanasius succeeded in the Bishopric of Alexandria he was accused of tyrannical behaviour towards the Meletians so as in the time of the Sacrament to break the communion cup of one Ischyra a Meletian Presbyter in Mareote & subvert the communion table & cause the Church to be speedily demolished, & some time after to kill Arsenius a Bishop the successor of Meletius in Hypsalita. Whereupon the Meletians accusing Athanasius he was tryed & condemned in the Council of Tyre & banished by the Emperor Constantine the great. And this caused great enmity between Athanasius & the Meletians. Athanasius therefore in his second Apology^[6] gives this character of Meletius, that he was, by Peter the Bishop of Alexandria in a common Synod of the Bishops convicted of many crimes & particularly that he had sacrificed to Idols & for these things deposed & that he thereupon made a schism so that his followers instead of Christians were called Meletians. But Epiphanius relates the original of the schism much otherwise. ffor he calls Meletius a Confessor & saith that when he & Peter & other martyrs & confessors

were in prison together, there arose a dispute about the reception of lapsed persons, Peter out of mercy being for a speedy reception & Meletius & Peleus & many other martyrs & confessors out of zeal for piety being for a competent time of penitence before they were received, so that the sincerity of their penitence might first appear, & thereupon they divided, the greater part following Meletius. Afterwards Peter suffered martyrdom & Meletius for some time was condemned to the mines.

Now that which makes me suspect the relation <10v> of Athanasius is first because the character given by the greatest enemy is always the most to be suspected & yⁿ because the Council of Nice did not receive Meletius & his party into communion as they would have done had they been excommunicate before, but without any absolution continued them in their bishopricks & only for putting an end to the schism confined Meletius to his city & deprived him of the power of ordaining, as you may see in the epistle of this Council to the Churches of Egypt.^[7] For if Meletius & his party continued in communion without ever being absolved from excommunication (as it's plain by that epistle of the council of Nice that they did) then they were never excommunicate, & if so, then the story of Athanasius about their being excommunicate for various crimes is a fiction.

<11r>

Quest. 3

Whether the Council of Tyre & Ierusalem was not an orthodox authentic Council bigger then that of Nice

The friends of Athanasius endeavour all they can, for his credit to diminish this Council & make it a Conventicle of a few Bishops selected by his enemies for oppressing him. So Socrates tells us it consisted of but 60 Bishops. And yet by considering earlier records I suspect it was as big or bigger than the Council of Nice. For the designe of this Council being very great it needed great credit & authority to support it. They were not only to examin the cause of Athanasius but also to receive into communion Arius & Euzoius with their followers in Egypt as men who had been opprest by a fals representation of their faith: & it was an ^a[8] ancient Canon of the Church, as well as a necessary one, that no man should be received by a less number of Bishops than those by which he had been ejected. And therefore the Emperor sent his letters into all the Eastern Empire requiring the attendance of the Bishops that the Council might be full. For this the 80 eastern Bishops in the letter which at their return from the Council of Sardica they wrote at Philippolis, affirm, in these words Concilium ... post alterum annum in Tyro propter Athanasij facinora necessariò iterum celebratur. Advenerunt Episcopi de Macedonia & de Pannonia Bithynia & omnibus partibus Orientis, Imperatoris jussione constricti. The eastern Bishops objected against Athanasius that by returning to his Bishopric without being restored by as many Bishops as had deposed him he had violated the ancient Canon: but the friends of Athanasius never retorted the accusation upon the Eastern Bishops as if they had broken the same Canon in receiving the Arians at Tyre. In the times next after the Council the Athanasians never excepted against it for not being big enough. They never desired that a fuller council should be called in the East to examin the Acts of this: but as if a fuller could not well be called there, or, if called, would not be for their advantage, they appealed to the West. And thereupon arose a quarrel, not between the West & a few Bishops of the East but between the Eastern & western Churches, <14r> But let's hear how Eusebius who was in both Councils & so is a good witnesse, describes this & compares it with the other. For he tells us how the remoter regions of Macedonia, Pannonia, Mæsia & Persia sent their Metropolitans thither & then adds ^[9] Bithyni quoque et Thraces præsentia sua conventum ornabant nec deerant & Ciliciæ Episcopis clarissimi quique. Ex Cappadocia item qui doctrina et eloquentia præstabant in medio concessu enituerunt. Ad hæc Syria omnis, Mesopotamia, Phœnice, Arabia et Palætina, ipsa Ægyptus quoque et Libya et qui Thebaidem incolunt, omnes in unum congregati magnum illum Dei Chorum implebant. Quos ex omnibus Provinciis innumerabilis hominum multitudo sequebatur. And a little after. Hanc secundam Synodum, omnium quidem ques novimus maximam, Imperator Hierosolymis congregavit, post primam illam quam in urbe Bithyniæ nobilissima collegerat. Sed illa quidem triumphalis erat; in Imperij vicennialibus preces ac vota pro victoria de hostibus parta in urbe victoriæ cognomina persolvens: Haec vero tricennialium festivitatem ornavit, cum Imperator. Deo omnium bonorum auctori, Martyrium velut quoddam pacis donarium, in ipso Servatoris nostri monumento dedicaret. Thus far Eusebius, giving the preeminence to the latter Synod as being called upon the more holy & solemn occasion to celebrate the Emperors greatest year.

<12r>

Now for the authority of this Council that has indeed been undermined by reconning this among the Arian Councils. But

This Council has been reputed Arian & on that account of no authority: but this accusation was never proved & an accusation without proof is of no credit. The accusation indeed has gained credit among the followers of Athanasius for a long time, but this makes it no more than popular fame & popular fame without original evidence tho of five thousand years standing {is} but popular fame nor can any man take up with it without making himself one of the giddy mobile. Such fame indeed when the original of it is forgotten may make a strong presumption, but when we know the original & see that it was spread abroad without evidence can be of no moment. Wise men must look only to the evidence. Now all the evidence that this Council was Arian is only this that they received Arius into communion & banished Athanasius. This is all the ground upon which the fame of their being Arian was spread abroad by the mobile of Athanasius his party & this is no just ground at all. For they did not receive Arius without his disowning those things for which he had been condemned at Nice nor condemn Athanasius for his owning the Nicene decrees & {I} conceive tis not the receiving or condemning men but receiving or condemning opinions that can make any Council heretical. So far was this Council from being Arian that the Bishops thereof in almost all their following Councils declared against Arianism & anathematized the opinions for which Arius had been condemned. If you say they dissembled & were Arian in their heart while they were orthodox in their language I must ask you how you or any man else can know {that} For an accusation without knowledge is that which the world calls clamour calumny & malice. Had Athanasius & his Monks the gift of searching & knowing men's hearts We have no other means of knowing men's faith but by profession & outward communion & way of worship: & by all the characters the fathers of this Council were orthodox. They constantly profest against Arianism & were in communion with the Churches of all the world & worshipt as other churches of that age did. For they were never reprehended by their enemies upon any of these heads. Should any church of our age charge {heresy} upon any body of men of their own communion, & should men reply that they always were of the communion of that Church & always profest her faith & used her worship & still continue in the profession & practise & should the accusers grant all this & only reply that notwithstanding their communion profession & practise they were hereticks in their hearts & should the Judges upon this accusation condemn them to death: I think such proceedings would by all sober men be accounted as malicious & barbarous as any we ever heard of. And yet this seems to be the case of the Council of Tyre who without any proof are accused of heresy by those of their own communion contrary to their constant profession & practise, & their authority murdered upon this accusation.

If you say that Fathers of the Tyrian Council did afterwards in the Councils of Ariminum & Seleucia declare for Arianism I answer that you may † < insertion from f 12v > † with better reason say that they declared against Arianism in the Council of Nice, or if you please that the Nicene Council was Arian because the Tyrian was so. For the < text from f 13r resumes > Councils of Nice & Tyre being {great} & general Councils of one & the same greek Church collected within the space of 10 years under one & the same Emperor have a far greater affinity with one another than the the Council of Tyre & Seleucia collected under different Emperors at {the distance} of 23 years. If some of the Tyrian {fathers} were at Seleucia many more of the Nice were at Tyre. This Council being collected so soon after that of Nice consisted partly of the Nicene fathers & partly of their immediate disciples & successors; nor had Constantine the great done any thing to make the fathers of the greek Churches alter their opinions between these two Councils: so that to accuse the Tyrian council of Arianism is in effect to say that the generality of the Nicene Fathers were Arians in their hearts {&} dissembled in their subscriptions. For they refused to subscribe against Arius till Constantine came in person into the Council & overawed them, & then they subscribed with reserves. But between the times of the Council of Tyre & Seleucia there was time enough for Constantius to work a change in the Bishops & Constantius was the more likely man to work it: so that if there was any change wrought in {the} greek Bishops between the Councils of Nice & Seleucia its {much more} reasonable to believe that Constantius wrought it after the Council of Tyre then Constantine before.

But what if some of the Tyrian Bishops, what if many of them were Arians? does this invalidate the authority of the Council of Tyre? Surely not. The Athanasians sometimes complain as if the {Eusebi} <13v> was dissembled in the Council of Nice, but yet would never allow that the authority of the Council was invalidated thereby. The authority of a Judge depends not upon his religion or sincerity but upon his incorporation into the body politick & upon his Commission to act: & so the authority of a Council depends not upon the secret religion & sincerity of the men but upon their being an external communion with the

Church Catholick & having a legal Commission to meet & act in Council For otherwise we could never be certain that any Council is authentic. And upon this ground the Council of Tyre was as authentick as any greek council ever was or could be since the Apostles days, they being in communion with the Church catholick & legally convened by the letters of Constantine the great.

Now {that} this was an authentic Council is manifest also {by the} the consen{t of} all parties in that age. For Athanasius & his party in that ag{e} {que}stioned not the authority of the Council but only complained as if they had abused their authority by corrupt judgment. They endeavoured by fixing the imputation of Arian upon y^m not to invalidate their authority but to bring their sincerity into question. And {th}erefore Iulius Bishop of Rome cited the eastern bishops to {a}pppear before him in a Council at Rome to justify not their authority but their integrity. And when they would not appear, he absolved Athanasius {in t}hat Council from excommunication & received him into communion acknowledging thereby that Athanasius by the sentence of the Council of Tyre did really & truly & regularly stand excommunicate from the western Churches as well as from the eastern & by consequence from the Church catholick untill that absolution. And agreeable to this it is that Athanasius to prove that Arius died without the pale of the Church represents that he died the night before he was to have been received into communion by the Eusebians. ffor by this story he acknow{le}dges that those who were received into commu{ni}on by the Eusebians were in communion with the Church ca{th}olic. So then by the consent of Athanasius Pope Iulius & all their party, the Eusebian councils before the rupture between the eastern & western churches were authentick & their acts valid & binding.

It remains therefore that we enquire whether the Council of Tyre dealt sincerely or corruptly in the cause of Athanasius.

<15r>

Quest. 4

Whether it was a dead man's hand in a bag or the dead body of Arsenius which was laid before the Council of Tyre to prove that Arsenius was dead.

Quest. 4

Whether it was Arsenius alive or only his letter which Athanasius produced in the Council of Tyre to prove that he was not dead.

Quest. 5.

Whether the story of the dead man's hand & the living Arsenius was not feigned by Athanasius about 25 years after the time of the Council of Tyre.

Historians tell us that when Athanasius was accused of the death of Arsenius he represented that Arsenius was alive & thereupon the accusers to prove that he was dead produced in the Council of Tyre a dead mans hand in a bag, repre{s}enting that it} was the hand of Arsenius cut of by Athanasius for magical uses & Athanasius confuted them by setting the living Arsenius before the Council. & pulling out his two hands from under his cloak to let the Cou{ncil see that} n{either of his} hand{s were cut} off: a{t which the accusers of} Ath{anasius were} ashame{d & the} Council {proceeded} no f{urther in} that ac{cusation} there {being some} among {them who} kn{ew Arsenius} Now the truth of this story I question because I find it was unknown in the times next after the Council ffor about 4 or 5 years after, (A. C.) Athanasius when he was ready to be expelled his Bishopric the second time, {ca}lled a Council at Alexandria of 90 Egyptian Bishops & in their name wrote a large elaborate {let}ter to all the world in his own defense against the accusations proceedings in the Council of Tyre, & seem to omit nothing that could be thought of in his be{half} yet say not one word of the dead mans hand nor of Arsenius appearing {at} Tyre. Neither is there any mention of these t{hings in} the letter which Pope Iulius about two yeares after wrote to the eastern Bishops from a Counc{il on} behalf of Athanasius who was then amongst them. N{either are they men}tioned in his two larger letters which Athanasius & an hundred Bishops of Egypt together with 150 other Church Bishops convened in the Council of Sardica wr{iting} {illeg} to the same purpose the one to the Church of Alexandria, the other {to all the Churches}. <16r> also these letters they talk of Arsenius & say he was alive but they do not say that he appeared alive at Tyre tho that one thing had it been true would have been more to the purpose than all the rest which they say. They do not so much as say that they or any of the{m} had seen him {alive, or} that they

had {any} witnesses of his {being} alive as they m{ight} (and surely would) have done h{ad} he been seen al{ive} before all the {world} at Tyre. But that which makes me most doubt of the story is that I find it otherwise related {b}y Athanasius & his friends in these very letters of the {C}ouncils of Alexandria & Sardica: For in these letters which being recorded by Athanasius himself in his second Apology as well as writ by him & his friends of unquestionable authority) they tell the story as if the a{ccus}ers produced before the Council not {a} dead man's hand but a dead {body} & Athanasius produced aga{inst them} not {Arseni}us a{l}ive but his} letter {only & the accusers were so far from being shamed that the Council not}with{s}tanding the Letters} proce{eded to con}demn {Athanasius} for th{e murder}.

the Council of Sardica in their letter to the Church of Alexandria tells us that the Council of Tyre commanded the dead body of Arsenius to be laid before them. The words of the letter are these. They said & lamented that Athanasius had committed murder & killed one Arsenius a Meletian Bishop, which thing they bewailed with feigned groans & fals tears {illeg} ἡξίου του ζωντος ὡς τεθνηκότος τὸ σῶμα ἀποδοθῆναι & commanded the BODY of him that lived as if if he had been dead to be brought before them. † < insertion from f 15v > {Bu}t their falacies did not lye hid ffor all men knew that the man {did live} & was proved to be alive {viz^t by his letter.}. And yet when these versatile {men} saw their figments thus confuted (for Arsenius being alive has {shewn} that he was not killed nor dead) they would not thus acquiesce but {after}wards in the reign {[of] Constantius} added new fals accusations to the old ones {that they} might again involve the mann in calumnies. So then < text from f 16r resumes > So then it was not a magical salted hand but the whole preserved body of a dead man which the accusers of Athanasius laid before the Council. In cases of murder tis {usu}al to have dead bodies viewed for passing judgment upon them; & this was done in the Council, tha{t} by the features & other marks & wounds & testimo{ny} of those who knew Arsenius or had seen his bod{y} at the time of the murder & buried it & d{ug} it up again the Council might be satisfied wheth{er} he was murdered & how. But it seems to sham{e the} proceedings of the Council some Iugler (for I will not say sorcerer) has transformed the whole {body into a magical hand.} And on the contrary by the same art the letter of Arsenius has been transformed into Arsenius himself. ffor that Athanasius & his friends had no other evidence of Arsenius's being alive outside that letter, he & his Bishops in the Council {of} Alexandr{ia} <7r> have plainly acknowledged in these words Athanasius, say they, was accused of killing one Arsenius & breaking the communion cup. But Arsenius is alive & {in his letter} desires your communion, & expects not other testimonies that he should appear alive, but he himself confesses that he lives, writing in his own letters to our fellow Bishop Athanasius whom they assert his murderer. Nor were the impious ashamed to affirm him the murderer of one who was in a remote place divided from us by journeys both by sea & land, living in a region at that time unknown to all men. Yea they studied to hide him & make him disappear when he suffered nothing. And as far as they were able they translated him into another world, being ready to kill him that either by his real or feigned murder they might kill A{tha}nasius. But thanks be to the divine providence {who suffers} nothing unjust to prosper but hath before the e{yes of all} men produced Arsenius living & openly detecting {their} {ca}lurny & deceit. ffor he does not shun us as {his murderers} nor hate us as injurious to him (for he suffer{s no evil} from us:) but desires to communicate with us & {to be of our} number as his Letter shews: And yet notwithstanding this they proceeded against Athanasius & banished him a murderer. ffor it was not the Emperor Constantine {but} their calumnies which banished him. Here you see tha{t Athanasius and his Bishops are} so far from pretending that Arsenius appeared alive {at} Tyre that on the contrary they insist only upon {the} evidence of his letter & represent that no other {evidence} was to be expected & by consequence had no other{, & mag}nify this evidence so much as if God had thereby {produced} Arsenius alive before the eyes of all men, & {that} that notwithstanding this Letter the Council of {Tyre} proceeded against Athanasius & banished him {as a} murderer. This they wrote five years after the Cou{ncil of Tyre} when things were fresh in their memory & {contrary stories were not yet invented}

<8r>

So then this letter is the whole grownd of all that {co}nfidence wherewith Athanasius & his friends so consta{ntly} reported that Arsenius was alive. And thô they {tell us} sometimes that that they knew he was alive, or th{at they h}ad shewed that he was not dead, or that God {had produc}ed him living & openly detecting the c{alumny} before the eyes of all men, yet they mean only {by his} letter. This evidence they magnify thus extra{vagantly} because they had no other. For had they kno{wn where} he was or where any witnesses were which had {seen} him they would have known of multitudes had he been seen by all the {world at Tyre} they would have sent for him or the witnesses & {had} them in readiness at their Councils to

satisfy all their party & made a greater noise about such evidence then about a Letter which no upright Court of Iudicature would allow for any evidence at all. And yet I cannot find that in all their endeavours to overthrow the Council of Tyre they ever pretended to have so much as one living witness who had seen Arsenius alive if the fable of illeg be excepted of which I shall speak presently. So far are the Egyptian Bishops from saying that any of them or any body else had seen Arsenius at Tyre that they insist only on the evidence of his letter & say that he expects no other testimonies of his being alive, that is that he contented himself with having given them that testimony, & therefore they are not to look for any other. So far are they from saying that he in person put the accusers to shame, or stop the proceedings of the Council upon this accusation, that on the contrary they say that the Council proceeded against Athanasius notwithstanding the evidence of the letter & banished him as a murderer: which deserves well to be noted. For in this one thing | passage you have the concurrent testimony of both parties against his being seen alive in the Council that of Athanasius & his Egyptian Bishops in objecting nothing more then the letter of Arsenius against the proceedings of the Council; & that of the Eastern Bishops in proceeding on to condemn Athanasius for the murder. For in doing this they adjudged & declared that Arsenius was murdered & by consequence not seen alive in the Council. Nor did they only adjudge & declare this in the Council but afterwards constantly persisted in it: as you may see in their Letter from the Council of Antioch to Pope Julius & in that which in their return from the Council of Sardica they wrote at Philippolis to all the world. And for my part I can more easily believe what both parties affirmed in that age before newer stories were invented: then that the Bishops of all the east should condemn Athanasius for murdering a man who appeared alive before them in the midst of the Council & owned himself to be Arsenius & be able to satisfy the Emperor Constantine & the eastern nations of the justness of such a sentence. For upon Athanasius's appealing from the Council, the Emperor heard the cause over again between Athanasius & the Legates of the Council & he & the east were satisfied in their proceedings.

So then the story of the dead man's hand & the living Arsenius at Tyre seems to be a fable unknown in those times and therefore invented afterwards. And I suspect Athanasius to be the inventor of it because he tells it first of any man in his second Apology written in the Wilderness at the same time that he broached the story of the death illeg. For if he knew it to be false (as he did if it were so) then he was not imposed upon by others, but told it upon others & so is the Author.

<17r>

Quest. 6

Whether the Letter of Pinnes for proving Arsenius to be alive was not feigned by Athanasius at the same time with the story of the dead mans hand.

In all the times of the Controversy about the Council of Tyre I cannot find that Athanasius or his friends pretended that Arsenius had been seen alive by any living witnesses. The Councils Alexandria Rome & Sardica knew nothing of any such witnesses. But afterwards when Athanasius was condemned by all the world & so saw that the letter of Arsenius without some further evidence would not any longer support the belief that Arsenius was alive, he put about a story amongst his credulous followers as if Arsenius himself in person had been found alive first in Egypt with one Pinnes & then at Tyre. & tell the story of his first finding thus.

Now that Arsenius was hidden by the Meletians that they might make his murder more probable, his friends who were with him testified. For in seeking him we found one of them who wrote to John (another actor in the same false accusation) the following Letter.

To the beloved Brother John, Pinnes a Presbyter of illeg of the house of Ptemengyris which is in the Nome of Anteopolis, wisheth health.

I would have you know that Athanasius sent his Deacon into Thebais to search all places for Arsenius. Pegasus the Presbyter & Silvanus the brother of Helias & Tapenacerameus & Paul the monk of Hypsaes being first found, confessed that Arsenius was with us. But learning that, we caused him to be put into a ship & carried down with Helias the monk into the lower parts of Egypt. And soon after the

Deacon with some others coming {upon us went} into our house & found him not by {reason that} we had sent him as was said into the lower part{s: But} **{illeg}** me & Helias the Monck {who had} conveyed him away, they carried away with them to Alexandria, & brought us before the Governo{ur} & I could not deny but confessed that he {lived & was not killed.} The same thing also was confessed by {the Monck who had carried him away. Wherefore,} o Father, {I make to} <17v> {you} these things that you may not accuse Athanasius. For they said that he was alive & hidden with us, & it was made known to all Egypt & cannot any longer be concealed. I Paphnutius a Monck of the same house who have written this Epistle salute you much. Farewell.

Now the truth of this Epistle I suspect for these reasons. ffirst because Athanasius & his friends knew nothing of this evidence in the Councils of Alexandria Rome & Sardica. So many living witnesses of Arsenius's being alive & the proof of it by some of the witnesses before the Governour of Egypt, would have made a much greater noise in the Council of Tyre & afterward, then the single Letter of Arsenius & yet Athanasius & his friends at that time insisted only upon the evidence of this letter, representing that Arsenius himself had shewed by his letter that he was alive & intended no other evidence of his being alive & complaining that the Council of Tyre banished Athanasius notwithstanding that letter. This was all that Athana{sus &} his friends had then to allege, as we {have} shewed out of the letter of the Council of Alexandria.

And secondly I suspect the letter of Pinnes beca{use it represen}ts things contrary to what Athanasius **{illeg}** did in the letter of the Council of Alexandria. For here we are told that Arsenius at first lay hi{d in} upper Egypt till the Deac{on of} Athanasius upon search discover{ed} him & that he then retired into the lower Egypt & soon after (as Athanasius adds) wrote his famous Letter. B{ut} in the letter of the Council of Alexandria we are {to}ld that the Accusers of Athanasius were not ashamed to affirm him the {mur}derer of one who was in a remote place divided {from the} Egyptians by journeys both by sea & land, living {in a} region at that time unknown to all men, & **{illeg}** being hidden by them & translated (as far as could {be} into} another world untill he made himself known by {his} letter.

And lastly the stories of finding Arsenius {first in Egypt} & then at Tyre are of a kind & were told b{y the same} man at the same time & therefore must sta{nd or fall to}gether.

<19r>

Quest. 7

Whether the Letter of Arsenius was not feigned by Athanasius before the convening of the Council of Tyre?

This famous letter, pretended to be writ by Arsenius after he had for some time lain hidden, runs thus.

To Athanasius the blessed Pope, Arsenius bishop of the city Hypselita which was formerly under Meletius, & to the Presbyters & Deacons much health in the Lord.

And we loving peace & union with the Catholic Church which you by the grace of God are set over, & desiring to be subject to the ecclesiastical canon according to the ancient law, do write to you beloved Pope, promising in the name of the Lord that we will not hence forward communicate with schismatics & such as are not in peace with the Catholick Church, whether they be Bishops of Presbyters of Deacons; neither will we assemble our selves with them in any Synod, nor send them letters of peace, nor receive such letters from y^m, nor without the advice & assent of you the metropolitan Bishop make any decree about bishops, or about any other common ecclesiastical opinion; but we will give place to the received Canons after the manner of Ammonianus, Tyrannus, Plusianus & the other Bishops. Moreover we beseech your humanity there{fore} to write back to us as soon as may be, & also to our fellow Bishops concerning us; & shew them that we now stand to the ancient decrees, being at peace with the Cath. Church, & united to our fellow Bishops of those regions. And we beleive that by your prayers as being powerfull, this peace will remain firm & indissolvable to the end, according to the will of God the Lord of all things through Iesus Christ our Lord. The whole Clergy which is under you we & they that are with us salute, & so soon as God shall {permit} we will come to your humanity. I Arsenius {wish} ye may long fare well, most happy P{ope.}[11]

<20r>

Now the truth of this letter I suspect first because it has not the form & humour of a free letter but look{s} like some formal covenant of submission drawn up by a Lawyer to be imposed on Arsenius or like a recantation imposed on him by a magistrate. Then because Arsenius had he been of the mind here exprest would certainly have made good his promise of coming to Athanasius. He would not have suffered the whole Rom{an} world for many years to continue in war & confusion about his death, but have speedily shewn himself to the Emperor & to the world to the confusion of all the enemies of his dear friend Athanasius. Thirdly because were this letter genuine Athanasius must have known how to write back to Arsenius & consequently knowing where he was would have sent & fetcht him by fair means or by foul & shewed him alive to the Emperor. Lastly because I find {this} Letter directly contradicted by Athanasius himself. ffor he in his Apology pag. 783 tells the story of the hand {af}ter this manner Ἐγνωσθη κρυπτόμενος ὁ{illeg}ιος &c Arsenius saith he was first found hid in Egypt, after{wards} those of our side found him hidden at Tyre. And which is strange, when he was found he would not confesse himself to be Arsenius untill in {judgem}ent he was convicted by Paul Bishop of Tyre & from that {time} being ashamed he denyed himself no more. Now he did that {to keep} the compact which he had made with the Eusebians, lea{st he be}ing found & discovered, the plot should be laid open & diss{olved}. {This p}assage I say wherein Arsenius is represented confederate {with} the Eusebians till the Council of Tyre, does absolutely contra{dict this} letter wherein he is made to renounce that party & side with Athanasius before. {Nor} can it be pretended that Arseni{us} turned to & fro, {seing} Athanasius with his Bishops in the Council of Alexandria {four} or five years after the Council of Tyre pleaded from this {letter} that Arsenius then desired their communion. So then both {these con}tradiction records cannot be true; or rather they must {both be false} destroying one another. ffor had Arsenius been disco{vered in} such a manner at Tyre, then would not Athanas{ius & his B}ishops a while after in the Council of Alexandria have {collected} & pleaded from his letter writ before, that he did {at that time} desire their communion. And had the letter been {genuine Atha}nasius would not afterwards have overthrown the {credit of it by} telling that contrary story of Arsenius at Tyre. {But it seems} his memory failed him.

Quest 8

Whether the Letter of Ischyrras was not feigned by Athanasius

When Athanasius was accused of the above mentioned crimes by Ischyrras, he pretended that Ischyrras became penitent & wrote the following letter.

To the blessed Pope Athanasius, Ischyrras wisheth health in the Lord.

Seeing upon my coming to you, Lord Bishop, to be received into the Church, you chid me for what I had heretofore spoken as if I did that on my own accord, I have therefore sent you this Apology in writing that you might know that there was force done to me & that I was beaten by Isaac & Heraclides & Isaac of Leotis & by their companions. But I calling God to witness upon this do say for my excuse that I am conscious of none of those things done by you of which they speak. ffor neither was there any cup broken nor holy Table overthrown, but all these calumnies they urged me to by force. These things I apologize for my self & give you in writing, desiring to be one of your assembly. Farewell in the Lord. I have given this my hand to you Bishop Athanasius in the presence of the Presbyters Ammon of Dicelle, Heraclius of Phasco Boccon of Chenebri, Achillas of Myrsene, Didymus of Taphosiris & Iustus of Bomotheus: & of the Deacons of Alexandria Paul, Peter & Olympius & these of Mareote Ammonius, Pistus, Demetrius & Gaius.

Now this letter I suspect because it looks as if contrived rather for the interest of Athanasius than that of Ischyrras, & seems more like a formal recantation or certificate than a free letter, & also contains a ridiculous story. ffor who ever went about to procure false accusers or witnesses by forcing & beating them? And were a fals accuser or witsnesse so procured, tis not likely that after his discovering the knavery, he would go on in accusing or witnessing, as Ischyrras did to the end. Could a beating bout make Ischyrras so hearty in the cause?

And further if Ischyrras went to Athanasius to be reconciled to him & received into communion as this Letter represents, he went with designe either to confesse his fault or not. If to confesse, how came Athanasius to let him go without taking his confession before witnesses If not to confesse how could he hope to be pardoned & received by Athanasius? And afterwards if he sent this letter of confession how came Athanasius then to neglect sending for him & making his advantage of the opportunity. Would Athanasius send up & down the world to seek Arsenius & not accept of Ischyrras when he offered to come in, but content himself with a bare Letter? These things don't consist.

< text from f 22r resumes >

But that which looks most odly is the witnessing of this letter. For witnesses are never set to letters. They are set to no sorts of writings but such as are designed for evidence in legal proceedings & therefore shew that the author of this letter designed it for evidence; that is he designed by those witnesses to make it evidence for Athanasius against Ischyrras. For there was no need of such evidence against any body else. Were these witnesses added to give credit to this Letter with Athanasius? There was no need of that. Were they added to give credit to it with others? Then the designe of it was not to make an interest with Athanasius for Ischyrras but to make an interest with others for Athanasius against Ischyrras. Had Ischyrras been penitent & desired to be reconciled to Athanasius as this letter represents; he would not have sent a certificate to Athanasius against himselfe, but have wrote an insinuating letter in general terms, & have reserved himself to be useful to Athanasius as an evidence upon condition of pardon & reconciliation: & no doubt Athanasius would have accepted the condition with both hands.

There is another thing which looks very suspiciously. For many persons are named as witnesses, but their hands were not to the letter. {W}ould any man call his friends together to be witnesses to a writing & not make them set their hands to it? If Ischyrras wrote this letter he either designed it for evidence or he did not. If he did not he would have made no mention of witnesses. If he did, he would certainly have caused them to set their hands It looks therefore as written by somebody else who had a mind to give credit to it by witnesses, but knew not how either to procure or counterfeit their hands.

And the suspicion is much increased by considering that the truth of this letter was never proved (that I can find) by the actual testimony of any of the witnesses. The letter was written before the Council of Tyre & by consequence alleged in that Council & in the Councils of Alexandria Rome & Sardica where Athanasius was present: but no witnesses that I can read of, were ever brought to prove it. <22v> I would ask therefore whether Athanasius & his friends did try to get these letters proved in the Council of Tyre & on other occasions or not: If they did not it argues a guilty conscience ffor without any examination of the businesse they took it for granted that the witnesses would be against them & therefore did not beleive the reality of their testimony to the letters. But if they did try & upon examining the witnesses found them against this letter, then is the letter false by the concurrent testimony of those very witnesses cited to prove them true. And this is to me a very great argument of suspicion. For the case is as if a man should produce a bond, wherein tis written that the party pretended to be bound signed it before such & such witnesses but whose hands are not to the bond, & before a Iudge should produce none of the witnesses but confesse that he never spake with them or that they are all against him being the Defendants friends & only plead that they are good witnesses because in the bond (pretend to be sent (sent to the Plaintiff in a letter) tis written that the Defendant signed it in their presence. So impudent a case as this was scarce ever brought before a civil Magistrate, & I cannot find that it was allowed in the ecclesiastical Courts of Athanasius's own party, except in the Council of Alexandria wherein Athanasius himself presided. ffor tho the Councils of Rome & Sardica in their letters plead much against Ischyrras, yet his recantation (which was the main thing against him if true) they do not say one word of, & by consequence confided not in it.

<23r>

Quest 9

Whether the Recantation of Valens & Vrsatius was not feigned by the friends of Athanasius.

When Athanasius being banished first by Constantine the great & then by his son Constantius appealed from the Council of Tyre to the Pope, & the Eastern Bishops were thereupon summoned first to the Council of Rome & then to the Council of Sardica to appear & plead their cause but would not subject themselves to the authority of the Pope & jurisdiction of the western Bishops: Constans Emperor of the West by the impulse of

the Western Bishops wrote this letter to his brother Constantius, threatening that if he would not restore Athanasius & animadvert upon his adversaries he would come himself & restore him by force. Whereupon Constantius being reduced to great straits called many of the Eastern Bishops together & they advised him that it was better to let Athanasius have his Church then undertake a civil war. Constantius therefore invited Athanasius back by courteous letters, & a while after Vrsatius & Valens two Bishops of Pannonia who had bin principal actors in the condemnation of Athanasius, were said to have written voluntarily two letters one from Aquileia to Athanasius wherein they declare that they desire his communion, the other at Rome to the Pope as follows.

To our Lord the blessed Pope Iulius, Valens & Vrsatius wisheth health.

[13]

Since it is manifest that we formerly insinuated by our letters many heinous things concerning Athanasius, & being convened by the letters of your holiness, could not give an account of what we had signified: we confesse to your Holinesse, in the presence of all the Presbyters our brethren, that all things which heretofore came to our ears concerning Athanasius are false & feigned & of no force. And therefore we most <24r> willingly embrace the communion of the said Athanasius especially since your Holinesse according to your innate goodnesse, hath been pleased to pardon our error. We professe also that if at any time the Oriental Bishops or even Eusebius himself shal with an evil mind call us into judgment concerning this thing, we will not go thither without your consent. And the heretick Arius # < insertion from f 23v > # And the heretic Arius & his followers who say There was a time wⁿ the Son was not, & affirm that the Son is of nothing, & deny that he was before all ages, as by our former confession which we made at Millain so now & always we anathematize.

This last Epistle is said by Hilary to have been written upon occasion of a Council convening at Sirmium against Photinus two years after the Council of Millain & by consequence four years after the Council of Sardica. ffor Petavius & Valesius agree with Socrates in placing this Council of Sirmium in the year 351, & Liberius in his Epistle to Constantius written after George was made Bishop of Alexandria & by consequence A.C. 356 or 357 reconns eight years from the Council of Millain to the writing of that Epistle, & therefore the Council of Millain was celebrated A.C. 348 or 349 .

Now this second Epistle of Vrsatius & Valens I suspect for many reasons.

1. It is a confession attested by nameles witnesses & was never proved.
2. The crime is too great & shamefull for Bishops to acknowledge voluntarily as Valens & Vrsatius are here represented to have done.
3. Eusebius who is mentioned in the Epistle was dead before & if with Hilary & Sozomen to avoyd this objection you write Athanasius for Eusebius, the sense is hard. For Athanasius will be accused of an evil mind which is contrary to the designe of the **{illeg}** Epistle.
4. The saying that Valens & Vrsatius being required to prove the things charged ag^t Ath. could not do it, is not consistent with the proceedings in the Council of Sardica. For there five of the six Bishops then living who had been sent from the Council of Tyre to Mareote to examin the businesse of Ischyas, (two of which five were Valens & Vrsatius) propounded to the Western Bishops that an equal number of both parties should be sent again to Mareote to examin things anew & if the crime did not appear , they five would be excommunicated, but if it did the like number of the western Bishops who created the disturbance should be excomunicated by the eastern. But the Western Bishops would not accept of equal terms The Eastern must submit to the authority of the Pope & jurisdiction of the western or go for criminals.
5. Pope Liberius ^a in his Letters to Constantius in behalf of Athanasius makes no mention of this confession of Vrsatius & Valens; in this Epistle as he would surely have done had it been newly made to his predecessor.
6. The great Council of Ariminum ^{b[14]} in their Letter to Constantius accused Vrsatius & Valens of the first Confession made at Millan saying that after they had been excommunicated upon suspicion of Arianism, they

begged pardon & were absolved at the Council of Millan before the legates of the Pope. But of the second Confession & absolution they make no mention, tho that would have been more material had it been true.

7. Vrsatius & Valens were excommunicated but once, that is to say in the Council of Sardica; & one excommunication admits but of one absolution. I

If you place the Council of Millan before the Council of Sardica the first confession & absolution will be before the western Bishops excommunicated any of the Eastern for Arianism, & the 2^d before Athanasius went from Rome into the East both which are plainly absurd. ffor the second confession was afterwards sent to Athanasius out of the west by Paulinus Bishop of Treves. And further the Council of Sardica in their letters whereby they declare < text from f 24r resumes > Valens & Vrsatius excommunicate for Arianism, would have taken notice of their former excommunication, recantation & absolution had there been any such thing. But if you place the Council of Millan after the Council of Sardica as you ought to do then Valens & Vrsatius will recant & be absolved twice from one excommunication: & which increases the absurdity, the Bishop of Rome alone will absolve them from what a Council (where he himself was present by his Legates) had absolved them before. ffor their second recantation plainly respects the proceedings of the Council of Sardica

So then there is no place for this second recantation & therefore I suspect that after Constantius, to avoyd a civil war, recalled Athanasius, Vrsatius & Valens went to Rome & thence to Millain to satisfy the Pope & Council about their faith & make their peace, & that afterwards somebody took occasion from thence to feign a second confession as if those made at Rome & Millan had been different confessions & the former made two years after the latter.

<24v>

<25r>

Quest. 10

Whether Athanasius was accused of adultery before the Council of Tyre.

Philostorgius^[16] tells us that Athenasius being impelled by the Emperors threatning, came to Tyre, he would not submit to stand in judgment, but sent in a big bellied woman which he had hired to accuse Eusebius of adultery, hoping that by the tumult which would probably be raised, he might escape being tried. But when Eusebius asked her if she knew the man & whether he was amongst the Bishops then present, she answered that she was not so senselesse as to accuse such men of base lust, & by those words discovered the fraud.

This story the other Historians Sozomen & Theodoret^[17] invert as if the whore was hired by the Eusebians to accuse Athanasius & the fraud detected by one of Athanasius's friends to the confusion of his accusers. But this last story was unknown to Athanasius & his friends in the times next after the Council of Tyre. For in the letters of the Councils of Alexandria Rome & Sardica they mention it not though they omit nothing which made against that Council & this story had it been true would have made more against it then anything else they say. Nor does Athanasius mention it in all his works. Whence I suspect his friends sometime after the writing of his Apologies, inverted the story of the accusation

<26r>

Quaest. 11

Whether Athanasius did sincerely acquit himself of the crime of breaking the communion cup of Ischyras.

When Athanasius succeeded in the Bishopric of Alexandria he was accused of tyrannical behaviour towards the Meletians so as with his own hands to break the communion cup of Ischyras a Meletian Presbyter in Mareote then performing sacred rites & to subvert the Altar & cause the Church to be demolished. This was the true accusation as I find by the letter of the 80 eastern Bishops at Sardica recorded in Hilaries fragments.

On the other hand Athanasius & his party represented that Ischyras was no Priest, the place no Church, the day not the Lords day; that Athanasius went not thither himself but only sent Macarius who found Ischyras not celebrating the sacrament but sick in bed & charged him not to proceed in those things, & that Ischyras so

soon as well fled to the Meletians & Eusebians who thereupon composed the accusation. But were this representation genuine there could have been no colour for framing an accusation. For cunning men never venture to frame false accusations within some considerable colour of circumstances handsomely laid together. The mystery therefore I suspect to be this.

I find by a letter of Constantine the great to Athanasius that Athanasius & Macarius were both of them accused: & by the letter which the 80 Eastern Bishops wrote at Phippolis, compared with some passages cited by Pope Iulius out of the Acts of the Council of Tyre, that when indeed Macarius was sent by Athanasius he found Ischyra sick in bed but that Athanasius was accused for coming also himself when Ischyra was administering the Eucharist & for breaking the communion cup & overturing the altar with his own hands. So then it seems (according to the accusation) <27r> Macarius was sent first to forwarn Ischyra of executing the office of a Presbyter & afterwards when he would not desist Athanasius coming at a time proper to find him in the act, overthrew the sacred things & caused the place to be demolished, Macarius perhaps assisting him. Now the accusation lying only against this last act Athanasius to acquit himself confounds this time with the former & undertakes to prove (not before the Council of Tyre where the accusation was understood, but afterwards amongst the credulous western Bishops & others of his own party) that Macarius went alone within Athanasius & found Ischyra sick in bed in a place which was not a Church, on a day which was not the Lords day, & only reproved him: & thence concludes that the accusation that Athanasius found him on the Lords day in a Church administering the Eucharist & subverted the sacred things was a figment. The Acts of the Council of Tyre being left at Rome by the Delegates of the Eastern Churches who fled thence in hast for their safty **{illeg}** some witnesses declared that Macarius found Ischyra sick in bed Athanasius shews the Bishop of Rome in these Acts but conceales the evidence of others (for the Acts were writ in Greek a language not understood by the Latines) & so perswades the Bishop of Rome that Ischyra could not be found in the Church administering the Eucharist on the Lords day since it appeared by the very Acts of the Council that he was found sick in bed. Now if Athanasius shuffled in making this Defense then its plain that he was gravelled & wanted a just defense. Which is enough to decide the Question.

<27v>

Iulius Bishop of Rome in his letter for Ath. tells how Athanasius produced the authentic handwriting of Ischyra confessing that he was suborned He does not say that Athanasius had proved by witnesses that Ischyra wrote that confession but lays the whole stress of the evidence upon the handwriting of Ischyra

<28r>

Quest. 12

Whether Athanasius was not made Bishop of Alexandria by sedition & violence against the canons of that Church.

Sozomen^[18] tells us that in the Council of Tyre Athanasius was accused by all in common that he acquired the Bishoprick by the perjury of certain bishops, when all the Bishops had agreed before that no man should be ordained before they had ended the brawls which were between them. ffor Eusebius^[19] writes that when the Council of Nice was ended there burned an implacable fury of contention among the Egyptians. And Socrates tells us^[20] (out of the letters of the bishops written at that time) that this contention was about the Nicene decree of the word homousios, those who disliked it thinking that the opinion of Sabellius & Montanus was introduced by those who allowed it & therefore calling them impious, as if they took away the existence of the Son of God; & on the contrary those who allowed this word thinking that the worship of many Gods was introduced by their adversaries & therefore shunning them as if they introduced the superstition of the Gentiles. Vpon the death of Alexander therefore, there ^[21] being gathered out of Thebais & all Egypt 44 Bishops, as as the ^d^[22] accusers of Athanasius affirmed, they agreed under oath that no man should be ordained before they had ended these brawls & then they should elect a new bishop by common consent: but some of these bishops violating their oath ordained Athanasius privately without the consent of the rest. ffor ^e^[23] Athanasius with a part of people rushing one evening into the Church called Dionysius's, & finding there certain Bishops shut the doors & caused the Bishops after much reluctancy to ordain him. Whereupon the rest of the Bishops anathematized Athanasius, but he sending letters in the name of the City to the Emperor procured a confirmation of his ordination & thereby silenced his adversaries. This was the

accusation as tis represented by Sozomen & Philostorgius.^[24] And that there was some truth in it is confest by Athanasius & his Bishops in the concil of Alexandria collected about 15 years after this ordination of Athanasius. Their words are these. They [the accusers of Athanasius say that after the death of Alexander^[25] <28v> the Bishop, when some few made mention of Athanasius, six or seven Bishops ordained him secretly & in a hidden place. These things they wrote to the Emperor being not ashamed to write any kind of lye. But we & the whole City & Province are witnesses that all the multitude & all the people of the Catholick church [that is all whom they would acknowledge to be catholick] being assembled as with one soul & body, cried out with great acclamations desiring that Athanasius might be Bishop of the Church. This they intreated of Christ by publick votes & this they adjured us to do for many days & nights, neither departing from the Church themselves nor suffering us to depart. Thus you see while this Council would seem to correct the accusation in point of circumstances, they confess the sedition & violence of the people & that the imprisoned Bishops resisted them, many days & nights together before they would ordain him, & that all the people by whose violence this was done were no more in number then one of the little churches built before the reign of Constantine the great for the 12 parishes of Alexandria was able to hold.

Nor indeed was Athanasius capable of being ordained. ffor he was but a Deacon, & the Canon constituted by Mark the Evangelist & constantly observed till that time, was that there should be 12 Presbyters of that Church & that out of them the Bishop should be always elected.

And besides, he was scarce of age for such a dignity. ffor he was then but a youth scarce 25 years old. Whence the ^{c[26]} Meletians used to cry: O wickedness He a Bishop? or he a boy?

To palliate these things the Athanasians have feigned as if Alexander upon his death bed recommended Athanasius for his successor & Athanasius out of modesty then hid himself. But this as it does not excuse the matter so it looks like a story of later date. ffor the Council of Alexandria who omit nothing that made for Athanasius mention it not & therefore knew nothing of it. By comparing all circumstances its more to be suspected that Athanasius in the controversy between the Clergy of Alexander, inflamed differences, thereby to throw out part of the Clergy & make room for himself & his friends: & when he had thus gotten to be Deacon, the reputation & interest he had got with his friends by that controversy, served him to invade the Bishopric. ffor when the people of his party, shutting up themselves with certain of the Bishops in a Church, importuned those Bishops for many days together to ordain him, I do not hear that he sided with those Bishops against the people.

<29r>

Quest. 13

Whether Athanasius was not justly deposed by the Council of Tyre.

The arguments for the justnesse of the sentence are very great.

1. The Council of Tyre was a very full one. So that if some BPs would have been partial there were others numerous enough to reduce em to modesty. And if it be objected that the Council was not free because the Emperor was present, there by his Deputy with guards of soldiers: the objection lies stronger against the Council of Nice where the Emperor was present in person & that with a designe to influence the decision of the Council, whereas at Tyre his Deputy was there only to see peace kept. The strange heats at Nice between the Bishops admonished the Emperor to prevent the like at Tyre, & if he had not done so there could have been nothing but confusion, ♦ Athanasius bringing a great multitude out of Egypt to create disturbance & behaving himself very turbulently in his try^{a[27]} as the {Coun}cil of Tyre {in their} circulatory letters comp{lained.}

3. When the Legates returned from Tyre & Athanasius was fully heard & condemned he fled from Tyre & appealed to the Emperor Constantine. Whereat the Emperor by an angry letter summoned the Council to come & give an account of their proceedings. But they sent only six Legates. And then the Emperor heard all the cause over again between Athanasius & the Legates, approved the proceedings of the Council & banished Athanasius. Tis true that Athanasius represents that the Legates feigned a new calumny against him whereby the Emperor being incensed banished him in a passion within hearing the case of Arsenius & Ischyra: but the 80 Eastern Bishops in the letter which in their return from Sardica they wrote at Philippopolis say the

contrary. For relating how six Bishops who were sent to Mareote returned to Tyre & confirmed the truth of the accusations, they add: Vnde in præsentem Athanasium dignam pro criminibus sententiam [patres] dicunt. Propter quod Tyro fugiens Imperatorem appellat. Audit etiam Imperator; quique interrogatione habita omnia ejus flagitia recognoscens, sua illum sententia in exilium deportavit.

2 Its objected that at the examination of witnesses at Mareote there was present but one party. The accuser Ischyrras say they was there, but the Defendants Athanasius & Macarius were both absent, nor were any of {the Pres}byters {of Atha}nasius a{llowed to} be pre{sented at the} examin{ations thô} they {desired it.} Well, but if the accusers brought several witnesses to Tyre as no doubt they did, & after both parties had been heard face to face the Council had a mind to give themselves the outmost satisfaction by sending to the place such persons as they thought fit some to cite witnesses others to take <29v> depositions but none to act as judges or accusers & if the Delegates at their return acted the part of witnesses before the Council & the Council as Judges heard the evidence of these witnesses between Athanasius & Ischyrras, is the Council to be blamed for this? For that this was the true case is manifest by the letter of the Council of Alexandria wherein Athanasius & the Egyptian BPs say that^[28] the Delegates of the Council of Tyre were not ashamed of Judges to become witnesses. Had Athanasius desired that witnesses might be examined for him as well as against him & that somebody might go on his behalf to cite the witnesses which were for him, as well as Ischyrras went to cite the witnesses against him, the Council could not in justice have denied such a request. But he pretended not to have any witnesses: for he & his friends never complained that their witnesses were not examined. All their complaint was that they were not admitted to except against the witnesses of Ischyrras, as being either heathens or Catechumeni or Arians, or Meletians or Colluthians or persons suborned or any thing else than the friends of Athanasius. ffor Athanasius & his friends exclaim against the Delegates for examining all those sorts of people, as if heathens were not as good witnesses in matters of fact as any body else. So then whilst Athanasius affirmed there was no Church demolished no altar over-turned, no cup broken, the day not Sunday, the place no Church, & he himself not there: he could produce no witnesses to prove what he affirmed but Ischyrras produced many upon the place to prove the contrary. The Presbyters of Athanasius sent to the Council of Tyre in a letter by some of their members all the e{vi}dence they had, & that was only their own testimony. T{his} evidence (if men can give evidence in their own cause) {the} Council of Tyre had before them to com{pare} it with other evidence & surely knew what stresse to lay upon {it}. So {that} I see not what was wanting to enable them to judge righteously.

4 ffive Years after was the Council of Alexandria of 80 BPs called by Athanasius against the Council of Tyre; but whilst they examined not the cause between Athanasius & his accusers nor sent to Mareote to examin witnesses but but relied on the feigned letters of Arsenius & Ischyrras & such other reports of Athanasius & his Presbyters being most of them his creatures, & whilst Athanasius himself (the party accused & condemned)) presided in the Council & most probably penned their Letter: what they did can amount to nothing <30r> more then prejudice. Neither did the Councils of Rome & Sardica examin the cause between Athanasius & his accusers or send to Mareote to inform themselves, but relied upon the credit of the Council of Alexandria & that of the Presbyters of Athanasius, & were also influenced by ambition, their designe being to make the Pope universal Bishop & under him to exercise jurisdiction over the eastern Churches. For the Pope summoned them to the Council of Rome to be judged & when they checkt him for his ambition & refused to come & subject themselves the Council of Rome absolved Athanasius without any judicial processe, as if the eastern Bishops by not coming to plead had acknowledged themselves guilty. Afterwards the Council of Sardica proceeded upon the same ground, excommunicating the Chief of the eastern Bishops because they would not come to submit themselves, & making a decree that appeals might be made from all the world to the Pope. This intermixing of the concern for the universal Bishoprick puts a prejudice upon the proceedings for Athanasius & makes them irregular & void. And the prejudice is increased by the case of Marcellus who was deposed by the eastern BPs for heresy & absolved & justified by the Councils of Rome & Sardica & yet afterwards acknowledged by all the world to be guilty of the heresy for which he was deposed. Now if the Councils of Alexandria Rome & Sardica neither acted judicially nor without prejudice then has there been nothing done to dissolve the judgment of the Council of Tyre & therefore that Council is still in force.

5. The proceedings against Athanasius are further cleared by a proposal made at the Council of Sardica, by five of the six Bishops which were sent from Tyre to Mareote, namely that an equal number of Bishops should be sent by both parties to the places where Athanasius had committed his crimes to examin things

anew & if the report which those five made to the Council of Tyre appeared to be false they would stand excommunicated within complaining to any body, but if it were found true, then five of those who abetted Athanasius should be excommunicated & complain to no body. But this equal condition the friends of Athanasius durst not accept of.

6. About six years after the Council of Sardica <31r> A.C. 353 Constantius now being Emperor of both East & West called a Council at Arles in Gallia to have the condemnation of Athanasius subscribed ^x < insertion from f 30v > ^x & for that end p^[33] by a courteous letter (sent by Montanus) invited Athanasius to his presence q^[34] designing that his cause should be heard before this Council for the satisfaction of the Western Bishops. But Athanasius declined the judgment as he had done that of the Council of Cæsarea before in the reign of Constantine. In this Council the Popes Legates -- < text from f 31r resumes > b^[36] the Popes Legates Vincentius of Capua & Marcellus proposed that for the peace of the Churches they were ready to subscribe the condemnation provided the heresy of Arius might be first condemned. But being told that they were not to prescribe the order of things all the Council subscribed except Paulinus of Treves who was thereby banished. And thereupon Pope Liberius c^[37] in an epistle to Hosius complained that he beleived that the Gospel of God might have been preserved by his Legate Vincentius, but yet he not only failed of obtaining the proposals he was to insist on, but was brought over to subscribe. Two years after another Council was called at Millan of 300 Bishops & [†] < insertion from f 30v >

[†] Diogenes was sent to bring Athanasius: but being resisted by the people returned without him. In this Council therefore the Bishops all subscribed -- -- < text from f 31r resumes > they all subscribed readily except Lucifer Calaritanus the Popes Legate & Eusebius Vercellensis: Eusebius d^[41] laid down before the Council the Nicene creed promising to do what they desired if that were first subscribed, but when the sentence of k^[42] Athanasius was insisted on as the businesse of the Council he perswaded Dionysius of Millan that the Nicene faith was struck at & fraudulently procured his name to be wiped out of the subscriptions. Whereupon these three were banished. # < insertion from f 30v > {#} {In the begin}ning of the next year Syrianus after he had staid a while at Alexandria attempted to take Athanasius, by force & the same year a Council was called at Bituris in Gallia; But Athanasius after some & the Bishops now convened subscribed his condemnation except Hilary & Rhodianus who promised -- --

In the beginning of the next year Syrianus after he had staid a while at Alexandria attempted to take Athanasius by force & the same year a Council was called at Bituris in Gallia. But Athanasius after some resistance ^{escaped} | fled , & the Bishops now convened subscribed his condemnation. < text from f 31r resumes > at Bytarris in Gallia where e^[43] Hilary & Rhodanius promised to subscribe if Nicene faith were first ratified, but for refusing otherwise to subscribe they were banished. The next year Hosius subscribed at Sirmium but Liberius suffered two years banishment & then sent f^[44] a letter of submission to the Oriental Bishops in which he writes thus. Ego Athanasium non defendo: sed quia suscepit illum bonæ memoriæ Iulius Episcopus decessor meus, verebar ne forte ab aliquo prævaricator judicaret. At ubi cognovi, quando Deus placuit juste vos illum condemnasse; mox consensum meum commodavi sententijs vestris &c. So then Athanasius was now condemned by all the West except six Bishops, & even those g^[45] in objecting the danger of the faith & proposing to condemn him provided the faith was first confirmed, did really condemn him. All the West in making this proposal did freely condemn him antecedently to their subscriptions. By this proposal they sufficiently confest that they had not seen Arsenius alive nor could prove that he had been seen alive either at Tyre or any where else, nor that the Mareotic Acts were false. by this they declined <31v> insisting upon the innocence of Athanasius & discovered that they durst not rely upon it: by this they declared that they had formerly defended him upon other considerations then his innocence, & if those considerations were removed, they were satisfied that they might justly & according to the ecclesiastical Canons subscribe to his condemnation.

7. And if it were not enough for Athanasius to be thus condemned by all the world; I shall leave it to be considered whether he was not also condemned by himself. ffor [‡] < insertion from lower down f 31v > [‡] For if the Council of Cæsarea was convened to hear his cause & he would not go thither thô commanded by the Emperor , & the Council waited long for his coming if the next year being threatned by the Emperor he came to Tyre unwillingly & brought with him a great multitude to create disturbances that judgment might

not proceed, if when he came there he refused to stand in judgment, (all which the Council of Tyre ^{q[46]} in their circulatory letters represented), if both before & after judgment he feigned stories & Letters to justify himself, all this argues a guilty conscience. The very feigning of stories & letters undermines & {over} < text from higher up f 31v resumes > if he feigned stories & letters to justify himself, this argues a guilty conscience. This undermines & overthrows all that was ever said or done for his justification either by himself or others ffor it resolves all his defense into a figment, & such a defense when detected is equipollent to a confession of guilt.

<32r>

Quest. 14 Whether Athanasius was not seditious.

[47] The Council of Tyre in their circulatory letter wherein they declared his condemnation; charged him with turbulent behavior in the Council.

[48] Constantine the great when Antony moved in his behalf replied that he was petulant arrogant & the author of discord & sedition.

The Council of Philippolis represented (as you may see at large in their letter) to the Churches) that after his return from Gallia he was more turbulent & tyrannical then before, creating & setting up Bishops against Bishops in the Eastern Churches where he had no authority to intermeddle, & being as exorbitant in Egypt.

When he was ready to be banished by the Emperor a second time, he called the Council of Alexandria & together with them wrote a letter to all the world, in the end of which they laboured to put all their friends into a tumult against the eastern Churches & by consequence against their Emperor. For after a long complaint against the Eastern Churches they thus conclude with an exhortation to invade & destroy them by open force & violence. Therefore (say they) how these things are not to go unrevenged, even you beloved may see. For they are grievous & remote from the doctrine of Christ. ffor this cause therefore we being assembled together have written in common to you praying your prudence in Christ to receive this our contestation & to grieve together with our fellow Bishop Athanasius, & to conceive indignation against the Eusebians who endeavour these things that wickednesse & malice may not prevail against the Church. ffor we pray & implore you to be revengers of this injustice, citing the saying of the Apostle, Put away from amongst your selves that wicked person. [49] For the things which they do are wicked & not worthy of communion. Therefore heare them not if they write any more against Athanasius: for whatever comes from them is false, even thô they set the hands of the Egyptian Bishops to their epistles. For those Bishops are not us but Meletians. This was the carriage of Athanasius & his creatures towards their Emperor & his Churches: & this being certain record, you may thence know of what spirit they were & judg of their carriage in all the rest.

A while after when their Emperor sent an armed force to displace Athanasius & place Gregory in his room, (for Athanasius & his party would never yeild to any thing but force) he shut himself up in a church with a multitude against the soldiers & when they could defend the Church no longer left it on fire: of which action <32v> Council of Philippolis make this mention Constituto jam in Athanasij locum, ex judicio Concilij sancto et integro sacerdote, ut barbarus hostis ut pestis sacrilega adductis gentilium populis Dei templum incendit, altare commisit, et clam exit de civitate occultéque profugit. Its true, Athanasius^[50] laid the crime upon the friends of George: but whether the Georgians burnt a Church & defact an Altar they were to use themselves or the Athanasians defact & burnt what they could use no longer I leave to the Readers judgment.

When Athanasius was thus displaced, he wrote a circulatory letter to all his friends to stirr them up to revenge. The Letter begins thus

The Epistle of Athanasius to the Orthodox of all regions, when he suffered a persecution by the Arians

The things we have suffered are grievous & intollerable & cannot be sufficiently declared: but yet that I may in brief expresse their grievousness, its proper to remind you of a history out of sacred writ. A Levite being injured in his wife & reflecting upon the greatnesse of the indignity sent her body cut in pieces to all

the tribes of Israel, that they might look upon this common injury as done not only to him but to them all, & that either if they compassionated his case they might revenge it or else if they neglected the wickednesse they might be ashamed. Now The messengers told the fact, & they that heard & saw it said there was never any such thing done since Israel came out of Egypt. Therefore all the tribes were moved, & all of them as if each had suffered were gathered together. In conclusion they that had committed this wickednesse were invaded & conquered & made an anathema by all. For they that came together respected not the kindred of the transgressors but the wickednesse. You know the story, brethren, & what is reported in the scriptures concerning it, & I will say no more of it, seing I write to them that know it, & am earnest to shew you things which transcend these. For I have told you this history, that by comparing those things with the present & understanding how these things exceed the cruelty of those, you may conceive a greater indignation then they did against the transgressors. ffor the bitterness of the persecutions against us is transcendent & the calamity of the Levite is but small if compared with what is now attempted against the Church &c. Then after many things spoken about his expulsion to inflame the western churches he thus goes on. This tragedy, saith he, Eusebius with his companions long since designed & now has put them in execution by means of calumnies By which they have traduc't us to the Emperor. Nor are they content with this, but seek <33r> to kill me & shew themselves so terrible to my friends that they all fly & expect to be slain by them. But ye ought not to conceive feare from their wickednesse but rather to revenge it & be incensed against these innovators. For if when one member suffers all the members suffer, & according to the blessed Apostle we must weep with those that weep. Certainly so great a Church being hurt, every one ought to revenge the injury as if he himself were hurt. ffor it is our common Saviour who is blasphemed by them & they are the Canons of us all which they violate. ffor if you sat in the Church & the people assembled without any complaint & suddenly by the edict of the Prince a successor should be sent to any of you & such things should be done against you, would you not be moved with indignation? would you not seek to revenge it? It's therefore just that you should conceive indignation, least if this thing be past by in silence, the mischief creep by degrees into every Church, & our discipline at length be bought & sold &c. Thus far Athanasius.

And this is enough to let you see the spirit of that man ffor this shews plainly how for the sake of a Bishoprick he laboured to set the whole Roman world on flame, to make a shism between the eastern & western churches & to raise a civil war against his own Emperor. ffor this end therefore he fled from Alexandria to Rome & ceased not to incense the western Bishops till by their interest with the western Emperor Constans, he procured a Council to be called at Sardica wherein 'twas designed that the eastern Bishops should stand at the barr as criminals & be judged by the western. And when this usurpation would not be yeilded to but ended in that schism between the east & west which Athanasius & his Alexandrine Council sollicitied: he ceased not till by the same interest the Emperor Constans was prevaild with to threaten a civil war upon his brother Constantius unlesse he would restore Athanasius. Thus did this Egyptian Levite go on to revenge the losse of his deare spouse the Bishopric of Alexandria, but the eastern bishops being men of a more Christian temper advised their Emperor to peace & so Athanasius was restored again to the mistresse of his affections.

One would think that he was now sufficiently revenged of his Emperor, & yet this great {spirit stopt not} here but afterwards sollicitied the Tyrant {Magnentius} by a letter: which letter after the {ruin and death of that Tyra}nt was found amongst his papers, & <33v> Athanasius indeed in his first Apology saith this letter was not written by him but feigned by them that found it. But he that could feign other men's letters, could deny his own. In this apology he answers three objections, the 1st that he had stirred up the western Emperor Constans against his own Emperor Constantius, the 2^d that he had endeavoured also by that letter to stirr up Magnentius against him & the 3^d that he did not afterwards come into the west when the Emperor sent for him: To the first he answers that he did not stir up Constantius, to the second that he did not write that Letter & to the 3^d that he did not know it was the Emperors will that he should come into the west, the first of the three messengers which were sent for him delivering (as he represents) a lying letter from the Emperor, the next delivering none at all. If you can beleive that he answered sincerely to the first & third objection you may beleive he did so to the second. For my part I rather think that he who wrote two public circulatory letters to stirr up the Western Empire against the Eastern did endeavour to stir it up, & he that refused to obey Constantine the great was also refractory to Constantius, as Sozomen tells us he was.^[51] ffor to me it seems incredible that Constantius should assemble two Councils to hear his cause send for him by first by a messenger with a letter & then by two other messengers successively with armed forces, & yet he not understand all this while that he was sent for. The bringing the Roman Legions against him the third time to

take him by force shews that he did not only know he was sent for, but made some resistance the second time & therefore I take the relation of Sozomen to be true, which was as follows.^[52]

When the first Messenger [Montanus] brought the Emperors Letters, Athanasius & his friends were extreemly troubled thinking it not safe for him to go nor without danger for him to stay. But the advice for his staying prevailed & so the Messenger returned without doing his businesse. The next summer (or rather as Athanasius saith, after 26 months) {another Messen}ger [Diogenes] being sent from the Emperor & coming with <52r> the Rectors of the Province, forct Athanasius from the city & made a sharp war upon his clergy. But when the people of Alexandria resumed courage, this messenger also seing the people prepared to fight returned without compassing his message. Not long after the Roman Legions were called out of Egypt & Libya [to Alexandria by Syrianus the Chief commander] & it being told that Athanasius was hid in the Church called Theon, Syrianus & Hilary who was sent to hasten this businesse, taking the soldiers brake into the church suddenly at an unexpected time of the night to seek for Athanasius, but found him not. Thus far Sozomen. Athanasius represents that he & his people were passing the night together in devotion, but by a letter which they wrote four days after (the last day of Ianuary) to all the people under Athanasius to stirr them up to their assistance, I find that they resisted the soldiers & beat them & by consequence were armed to guard their Bishop & that they kept the church by force & there hung up the arms of the soldiers in triumph. Which is a notable instance of the seditious spirit of Athanasius & his followers. The letter is in Athanasius's works p. 866, & begins thus.

The people of Alexandria to the catholick Church which is under Athanasius the most reverend Bishop.

We have long since protested concerning the nocturnal invasion which both we & the Church [or Temple] suffered altho there needs no testimony of what the whole city knows. ffor the bodies of the dead found afterwards were exposed to the people & the arms & bows which were found in the Church do proclaim aloud their wicked fact. Then for stirring up the people to joyne with them they represent that the President Syrianus did it without the Emperors order & was afraid for what he had done & endeavoured by force to compel them to deny that there was any tumult or any body slain by the soldiers, & afterwards go on to tell the story thus. On the 5^t of the Calends of February we were watching [all night] in the church & being at prayers because of the assembly that was to meet on the preparation, the Commander, Syrianus with many Legions of soldiers having drawn swords & other weapons & being armed with helmets & other armour, suddenly set upon us whilst we were at prayers & reading the scriptures, brake the doors & some began to throw darts, others cried an alarm, so that there was made a great clashing of arms the drawn <52v> swords shining by candle light & Virgins were slain & troden under foot. And whilst their leader marshalled his army, the Bishop sat in his throne & exhorted all to prayers & being thrust hither & thither was almost pulled to pieces, & when in a great deliquium he lay for dead & now does not appear, we know not what is become of him. A little after they further add that the arms which were left in the church by those who brake in & which still hang up in the church were no light argument of that hostile incursion so that they could not deny it. For Gorgonius the Governor of the City hath, say they, often sent a military hangman with a Captain to take them down but we would not suffer them that the thing may be known to all men. Then they go on to say how that as they had already resisted unto blood so if it were the Emperors pleasure that they should be thus persecuted, they were all ready to suffer martyrdome, that is to dy in that resistance. Their words run thus. If it be the edict of the Prince to persecute us, we are all ready to suffer martyrdome. But if it be not the Emperors edict we entreat the Prefect of Egypt Maximus & the other Magistrates that they desire the Prince that such things be no more committed & we desire that this our prayer may come to him that no other Bishop be introduced here. In hindring which we have resisted unto blood, desiring the most reverend Athanasius.

The city being thus inflamed by these incendiaries there followed other broiles before it could be quelld of all which which Lucifer Calaritanus in a railing book which he wrote against Constantius, makes this mention. ^[53] Recordare, Constanti, de scelerum tuorum memoria recenti, quam tibi in civitate Alexandrinonum inussisti: quantos per abrupta una tincta subscriptionis tuæ dejecerit, quantos gladio demeti fecerit, quantos fame sitique exedi, vel carceribus necari, quantos intercepto effecerit spiritu strangulari: et tamen his omnibus

crudelitibus in sanctos martyres, quos tuus interfecit gladiatorius animus, cùm sævieris; in nos crudelius sævis, dum retines gladium.

Nor were these stirs of short continuance. ffor <53v> Athanasius exclaiming against the proceedings of Constantius as a vehement persecution & celebrating all those who were slain or taken prisoners as martyrs & confessors, plaid the trumpeter to the rebellion & kept it up for a good while as you may understand by that railing book which Hilary wrote against Constantius, in which he has this passage. Adest mecum Alexandria tot concussa bellis, tantum commotarum expeditionum expavens tumultum. Brevius enim adversum Persam quam adversum eam armis certatum est. Mutati Præfecti, electi Duces, corrupti populi, commotæ Legiones ne ab Athanasio Christus prædicaretur. These words sufficiently shew that the sedition was both great & lasting. So great was it that Constantius whilst it was on foot wrote thus to the citizens of Alexandria.^[54] I know not, saith he, whether any thing ever happened which may be compared with these things seing many in this City were blinded & there presided a man who was emersed from the lowermost hell: who as in the dark, seduced the desirers of truth to lies – – – & the common-wealth was carried as with a torrent, all things as in a flood being contemned: & one ruled the multitude who (to speak most truly) differed nothing from the vulgar mechanicks, having contention with the city only because he could not cast it into hell. But that excellent man durst not come to plead his cause in judgment. And in the end of the Letter. Whilst the most wretched Athanasius convicted of most foule crimes for which he can never be sufficiently punished no not thô he should be ten times killed, wander abroad from place to place, 'twould be absurd to suffer his flatterers & ministers, a sort of jugglers & such as it is not fit to name, to raise seditions here, concerning whom I have long since commanded the judges to put 'em to death: who perhaps may not so perish if in time they return from their former crimes [viz. of raising seditions & shun those to whom the most wicked Athanasius was Leader: who hurt the Common wealth & laid his most impious & wicked hands upon, most holy men.

In short the Egyptians were so seditious that afterwards when Valens would have expell'd Athanasius he could not effect it but found it necessary to desist. For it was not Alexandria alone but all Egypt & Libya which was inflamed by this sedition the people with their Bishops & Presbyters being every where stirred up by the above mentioned letter of the Alexandrians & getting into bodies in the field: whereupon at length followed a skirmish in the <53r> wilderness like that nocturnal one at Alexandria, as Athanasius in his first Apology thus mentions.^[55] Whilst I was wondring, saith he, at these things, behold there came again another grievous report concerning Egypt & Libya: namely that almost ninety bishops were expelled & their churches given to the Arians; sixteen of them being banished & the rest being partly put to flight & partly compelled to dissemble. ffor the persecution there was said to be like that at Alexandria, the brethren being gathered together in a desert place neare a Cæmety to pray on the Passover & on sundays, & the commander of the forces coming with more then three thousand soldiers armed with armour & naked swords & arrows & falling upon the Christians: whereupon followed such slaughters as use to follow in such assaults, the impression being made upon weomen & children who did nothing else but pray. Thus does Athanasius palliate & sanctify these seditions as if his party were assembled out of all Egypt & Libya with so many Bishops & kept the field in a great body together for no other end but to pray on Sundays & as if the Roman Legions came armed to conquer nothing but weomen & children. But this is his flourishing way of talking in all his writings.

<34r>

Quest. 15

Whether Constantius persecuted the Athanasians for religion or only punished them for immorality.

What sort of martyrs & confessors those were which Athanasius so much celebrates in his works you have already heard, & may further understand by what Athanasius says of them in his epistle to the Moncks; where speaking first of the bishops which were banished before the above mentioned skirmish in the wilderness & then of the Bishops of all Egypt Libya & Pentapolis which in that skirmish were partly put to flight & partly taken prisoners & banished as many of them as would not submit, he saith.^[56] Be it that against Athanasius & the other Bishops which they have banished they could feign false pretences of crimes, yet those things are nothing to this new kind of evil. ffor what crime could they feign against all Egypt Libya & Pentapolis? ffor they have not attempted them severally that they might be able to feign fals accusations but have set upon all together, so that if they should feign any thing they should presently be condemned for lyars. To the same

purpose Athanasius has another passage in this Epistle. ^[57] Be it, saith he, that they have made Athanasius a criminal yet what have the other Bishops done? What pretenses of crimes have they against them? What Arsenius was killed by them? or what Macarius or broken cup are they concerned in? or what Meletian acts a part? Therefore by the things laid to their charge those objected against Athanasius are shewed to be false & mutually by what has been framed against Athanasius it is manifest that the things against them are feigned. These passages sufficiently shew that the best of Athanasius's martyrs & confessors suffered as evil doers & seditious persons & that Constantius & his Bishops so studiously avoided punishing them for their faith, that rather than do it they chose to feign false accusations, if you will beleive Athanasius.

Now by the Egyptian martyrs & confessors you may know what those were in other places of all which Lucifer Calaritanus gives you the following account where speaking to Constantius he saith: ^[58] Mactasti quamplurimos in Alexandria, laniasti certos toto in orbe, disperdisti <35r> resistentes tibi varijs in locis. sed hi omnes quod tu audire minimè vis, martyres sunt: illos omnes beatissimos tuo mactatos gladio in paradiso esse credimus. Thus you see the martyrs of the Athanasians for which Constantius is in history recorded a persecutor, were such as perished by the sword in resisting the higher powers.

To these you may add the six or seven Bishops who were banished for not subscribing the Condemnation of Athanasius. For they were deposed by Councils of their own religion, & therefore suffered not for their faith. They endeavoured to keep up a schism between the eastern & western churches, & so were banished as enemies to peace. . They refused to debate upon those matters for which the Emperor called the Councils unless they might have their own matters first dispatcht & so suffered as politicians for usurping upon the Emperors right. They profered to comply if the Nicene Creed were first ratified & so acknowledged it lawful to comply & by consequence were banished for resisting the higher powers where it was their duty to obey.

So soon as the Councils of Ariminum & Seleucia were over Athanasius & his friends falling into a rage at the Emperors successe began to write railing books against him, & Athanasius indeed labours to perswade his Egyptians that the Emperor overcame the western Bishops by tyrannical asperity & terror, & yet the contrary is certainly true. For Hilary in a railing book which he wrote at that very time against the Emperor^[59] attributes the successe to his clemency. He calls this Book a confession & wishes he had wrote it in the reign of Nero or Dioclesian that he might have suffered for it. For saith he I could have endured any death whether to be sawn in pieces with Isaiah or burnt with the three Children or crucified or cast into the sea: & then he goes on in these words. *Adversus enim absolutos hostes felix mihi illud certamen fuisset, quia nec dubium relinqueretur quin persecutores essent qui ad negandum te, pænis, ferro, igni compellerent, neq{ue} ad testificandum plus tibi nos qum mortes nostras liceret impendere. Pugnaremus enim in palam et cum fiducia contra negantes, contra torquentes, contra jugulantes: et nos populi qui tanquam duces suos ad confessionis religionem intelligentia – – <36r> {et nos populi tui tanquam duces suos ad confessionis religionem intelli}gentia persecutionis publicæ comitarentur. At nunc pugnamus contra persecutorem fallentem, < insertion from f 35v > et nos populi tui tanquam duces suos ad confessionis religionem intelligentia persecutionis publicæ comitarentur. At nunc pugnamus contra persecutorem fallentem – – < text from f 36r resumes > contra hostem blandientem, contra Constantium Antichristum qui non dorsa cædit, sed ventrem palpat: non proscribit ad vitam, sed ditat ad mortem: non trudit carcere ad libertatem sed intra palatium honorat ad servitutem: non latera vexat sed cor occupat: non caput gladio desecat sed animam auro occidit: non ignes publice minatur, sed gehennam privatim accendit: non contendit ne vincatur, sed adulatur ut dominetur: Christum confitetur ut neget: unitatem procurat ne pax sit: hæreses comprimit ne Christiani sint: sacerdotes honorat ne Episcopi sint: Ecclesiæ tecta struit ut fidem destruat.* All which is as much as to say that Constantius persecuted not the men but the faith, & did it not by tortures, proscriptions prisons & deaths, but by deceiving, flatering, tickling, enriching & honouring the western clergy & building their churches. And to the same purpose he adds a little after *Omnia sævissima sine invidia gloriosarum mortium peragis Novo inauditoque ingenij triumpho de diabolo vincis et sine martyrio persequeris. Plus crudelitati vestræ Nero; Deci, Maximiane debemus: Diabolum enim per vos vicimus &c. At tu omnium crudelitatum crudelissime damno majore in nos et venia minore de sævis. Subrepis nomine blandientis occidis specie religionis, impietatem peragis, Christi fidem Christi mendax prædicator extinguis. Non relinquis in saltem miseris excusationes, ut æterno judici suo pænas & aliquas laniatorum corporum præferant cicatrices: ut infirmitas defendat necessitatem. Scelestissime mortalium omnia ita temperas ut excludas et in peccato veniam et in confessione martyrium. Sed hæc ille pater tuus artifex humanarum mortium docuit, vincere sine contumacia jugulare sine gladio, persequi sine infamia, odire sine suspicione mentiri sine intelligentia, profiteri sine fide, blandire sine bonitate, agere quid velis nec manifestare quæ velis.* Thus does Hilary in one

& the same breath rail at Constantius as the most cruel of Persecutors & yet declare that his persecution consisted in nothing but love & kindness. By this means he had better success than the heathen Persecutors & therefore was in Hilary's opinion more cruel not to the bodies but to the souls of men. Hilary therefore {finding himself deserted by} almost all {the world, and being thereby reduced to despair, wrote this railing book, &} <37r> {to provoke the Emperor to kill him presented it to him at Constantinople A.C. 360, hoping thereby to fix the name {of} persecutor < insertion from f 36v > to provoke the Emperor to kill him presented it to him at Constantinople A.C. 360 (as Baronius shews^[60]) hoping thereby to fix the name of persecutor < text from f 37r resumes > upon him & that of martyr upon himself. But tho this railing was crimen læsæ majestatis & in that government punishable with death: yet the Emperor was so far from being provoked to do any thing which might but look like persecution that on the contrary he thereupon released Hilary out of banishment & licensed him to return home into Gallia, thus endeavouring to overcome evil with good.

How far this Emperor was from being a Persecutor is further manifested by a story told of him by Gregory Nazianzen,^[61] which in the words of his Interpreter is as follows.

Constantium autem (nam referre hoc convenit,
 Ne vetera sola digna quis verbis putet)
 Verbum extulisse memoria dignum ferunt.
 Quadnam hoc? eum in nos Principum cum quispiam
 Quondam incitaret, non ferens nos consequi
 Tantos honores (namque erat pius admodum
 Vt siquis alius Principum quos novimus,)
 Ac multa fatus tale quid mox subderet:
 Animalne fingi mitius potest ape?
 Atqui legentes pungit hæc favos tamen.
 Audivit: hócne te fugit, vir optime,
 Stimulus nec ipsi quod vacet periculo?
 Namque ipsa pungit, sed statim quoque interit.

The same Gregory Nazianzen also in his 1st Oration against Julian thus expostulates with the soul of the deceased Constantius for making Julian Emperor. Quid tibi accidit, Ô Imperatorum divinissime Christique amantissime (eo: enim provehor ut tecum velut cum præsentate atque audiente expostulem, etsi multò præstantiorem te esse scio quam ut a me reprehendi debeas, utpote qui Deo adjunctus sis, cælestisque gloriæ hæreditatem acceperis atque in tantum a nobis migraris ut imperium cum meliore commutares,) quodnam hoc consilium suscepisti qui omnes non tuæ solum sed etiam superioris memoriæ Imperatores animi solertia et acumine longe antecellebas? And a little after excusing Constantius for doing this he saith: Cum benignitem dixi id apertè dixi quod eum crimine omni ac culpa liberet. Cui enim vel ex ijs quibus non perinde cognitus erat dubium est quin ipse ob pietatem amoremque erga nos ac propensissimam bene de nobis merendi voluntatem non modo illum [sc. Julianum] aut totius generis honorem imperijque {incrementum neglexisset,} verum imperio quoque ipsi {i omnibusque} <37v> {fortunis, atque ipsi denique vitæ quæ nemini quicquam est carius, in collumitatem nostram < insertion from f 36v > fortunis utque ipsi denique vitæ qua nemini quicquam est carius, in collumitatem nostram < text from f 37v resumes > ac salutem haud illiben{ti} animo {prætulisset.} Neque enim usquam unquam ullius rei tam acri {amore} atque cupiditate correptus est, quam ille Christia{nos cresce}re atque in summam gloriæ potentiæque amplitudinem pervenire cupiebat. Ac neque domitæ et subactæ gentes nec respublica præclaris legibus constituta & gubernata nec pecuniarum copia, nec gloriæ magnitudo, nec quod rex regum et esset et appellaretur, nec omnia alia quibus hominum felicitas declaratur, nec denique quicquam ex omnibus rebus tantum ipsi voluptatis afferebat, quantum ut et nos per ipsum et per nos ipse tum apud Deum tum apud homines florere, ac forma semper & stabilis nobis potentia permaneret. — — — — — Qui quidem et siquid nobis molestiæ exhibuit, non nostri contemptu id fecit nec ut nos contumelia afficeret, aut quod alijs quibusdam potius quam nobis commendare cuperet: sed ut omnes in unum coiremus, animorumque consensione jungeremur, nec per schismata inter nos dirempti atque dissecti essemus. Thus far Gregory: which testimony coming freely from the mouth of an enemy & an eye-witnesse of things is as great as can be desired. So Libanius a heathen & therefore another enemy, gives him the same character. For in his Oration called Basiliscus, after he had described the behaviour of Constantius in war, he goes on thus: Verum cùm adeo illustris esset in armis, longe præstantior alijs in rebus, quàm in

bellicis fuit: ut de eo enunciare liceat, Rex probus hic, bellator et acer. Non enim eò se tum meliorem quam alij visum iri autumabat cum magis quam cæteri sæviret, sed si magis qum alij clementia gavisus, omnes nihilo secius superaret &c. In short the vertues of this Emperor were so illustrious that I do not find a better character given of any Prince for clemency, temperance, chastity, contempt of popular fame, affection to Christianity, justice, prudence, princely carriage & good government then is given of him by his very enemies. He kept up the imperial dignity of his person to the height & yet reigned in the hearts of his people & swayed the world by ther love: So far was he from deserving the name of a persecutor. Ammianus indeed objects that he took off his Vnkles, & prosecuted his victory over Magnentius too far: but he did the first because they poisoned his father & the last to secure not himself but Christianity from the attempts of the heathens. And these objections being removed the character which Ammianus gives of him is great & agrees with that of Hilary Libanius & Nazianzen. And if these witnesses suffice not let me add a fift. ffor ^{†[62]} Epiphanius saith that he was mercifull & good & pious in all respects, as the Son of the great & perfect & pious Constantine this only thing excepted that by the influence of his Bishops he erred in the faith. All these witnesses lived in the reign of this Emperor & therefore knew what they wrote & being his enemies would not favour him For they wrote after his death & so were at liberty to speak their minds. And therefore {if any} later author affirms the contrary he ought to be corrected.

<38r>

Quest.

Whether Athanasius & his friends did not corrupt the records of the Councils of Nice & Sardica.

For making you understand the reason of this question I shall first explain what were the true records of these Councils.

The Council of Sardica in their Epistle to Pope Iulius write that, Three things were to be treated of by them For, say they, the most religious Emperors permitted that all things discussed should be wholly disputed afresh & chiefly concerning the holy faith, & concerning the integrity of the truth which they (the Eusebians) had violated, seondly concerning the persons which they said were dejected by unjust judgment that if they could prove it righteous there might be a just confirmation thereof. And the third question was that they had done grievous injuries to the Church in disturbing Bishops Presbyters & Deacons & Banishing all the clergy. What they had done in the two last the Council explains in the following part of the Epistle shewing how the ringleaders of the Eusebians were excommunicated by them for unjust judgment & those retained in communion whom by such judgment they had opprest: but of the first there is not a word now extant in the Epistle. No doubt they gave the Pope an account of what they did in the first as well as of what they did in the other two because they say it was the chief & mention it with designe to tell him what they had done therein. And therefore this letter has been purged.

And that it has, is evident from Sozomen who thus supplies the defect:^[63] They, saith he [at Sardica] published another profession of faith more prolix than the Nicene yet containing the same opinion & not much differing from it in words. And Hosius & Protogenes who were then chief among the Bishops of the west convened at Sardica wrote letters to Iulius & testified that they had ratified the Nicene Decrees & for more perspicuities sake had expounded the same opinion more largely least the Arians abusing the briefnesse of that Creed should take occasion to draw into an absurd sense those that were unskilfull in such kind of disputes.

So then the Council of Sardica did certainly write an exposition of faith. ffor to this exposition Hilary <38v> in his book against Constantius alludes to in these words Thou condemnest also, saith he to the Emperor, the name of Substance whereby thou didst to the western churches falsly pretend thy self pious both to the Synod of Sardica & to that of Sirmium: that is to that of the western bishops met at Sirmium a year or two after the Council of Sardica. And so Soebadius, when Hosius in the next Council of Sirmium had newly subscribed against the homousios wrote thus concerning him. His authority, saith he, is no prescription because he either errs now or always did erre. ffor the world knows what he has beleived hitherto. & with what constancy he assented & condemned the Arians at Sardica & in the Nicene decree. What if he now thinks otherwise & those things are now defended which he heretofore condemned & those condemned which he defended? And of the same Creed speaks the fourth General Council (that of Chalcedon) in their epistle to the Emperor Marcian, where enumerating several confessions of faith which had been formerly made, viz^t the Nicene, the

Constantinopolitan the Ephesine, that of S. Basil & that of Damasus in a Roman Synod) amongst the rest mention the Sardican. ^[64] Those also, say they, who at Sardica strove against the reliques of Arius sent their sentence to the Orientals, Hosius presiding in composing it. And to put the question yet further out of doubt, Theodoret^[65] has recorded the letter of the Council of Sardica to the Churches; in the latter end of which this sentence or confession of faith is contained. But Athanasius for reconciling the Council of Nice & Sardica & stifling an objection against himself hath cut off all the latter part of this letter & denies that the Council of Sardica wrote any definition of faith.

<39r> But to make the point a little clearer it will be convenient to explain why he did so.

The Council of Nice in decreing the Son homousios to the ffather understood that he & the father were two substances of one nature or essence as Curcellæus & Cudworth have proved beyond all cavils. But the word being ambiguous & going abroad without those limits which the Council had put to its signification, every one drew it to his own sense, & particularly in the West some great ones to propagate a notion of a singular substance wrote unius substantiæ in the Latin translation of the Creed, & in turning this language again into Greek affirmed that there was but one hypostasis of the ffather son & Holy Ghost, as you may see in the letter of the Council of Sardica

The Greeks therefore finding the Nicene decree misinterpreted & abused by many for spreading the opinions of Montanus, Praxeas, Noetius, Paul of Samosat Sabellius & such like Gnosticks (for 'twas the opinion of Simon Magus the Father of the Gnosticks) repented of their having decreed the word & began to forbear the use of it. And hence arose a difference between the Greeks & Latines, the Greeks suspecting the Latines of Sabellianism for holding one singular hypostasis or substance & the Latines suspecting the Greeks of Arianism for holding three hypostases. The Greeks therefore to clear themselves from the suspicion of Arianism anathematized the doctrine of <39v> Arius in several Creeds which they then made, all which are very orthodox as they that peruse them must acknowledge. But without the word homousios nothing would satisfy the Latines. And therefore in the Council of Sardica they condemned the Greeks as hereticks for holding three hypostases divided from one another, that is (as we expresse it) three distinct Hypostases & in opposition thereunto decreed that there was but one Hypostasis of the Father Son & Holy Ghost. And on the other hand the Greeks of the same Council anathematized those that held the Son to be the Father Son & Holy Ghost, reflecting thereby upon the una hypostasis of the Latines as the doctrine of Sabellius whereby all three persons were made one thing. And so the businesse came to a schism.

By this means the errors of the Gnosticks still got ground in the west till they came to such a height as Hilary in his book de Synodis (written to the Bishops of Gallia & Brittain in the times between the Councils of Sirmium & Ariminum) describes. For there he tells them of a thre-fold opinion of that kind spread among them by the fallacious language of una substantia, the one of the Son's substance being entirely the substance of the ffather, the other of its being from eternity a part thereof, the third of the substance of the Deity being one at first & then divided into two. It remains, saith he, that without asking you know what things lead you into error out of security of simplicity, that is out of security arising from simplicity in taking the phrase una substantia in its most obvious but erroneous significations. And then going on to explain this, he adds. Many of us, most dear brethren do so preach one substance of the father & the son that they seem to preach it not so much piously as impiously. ffor this word has in it both a conscience of faith & a delusion in readiness. ffor if we preach one substance according to the property & similitude of nature, so that the similitude may not define the <40r> species [that is limit it to a singularity] but signify the genus, we preach it religiously provided that by one substance we understand the similitude of property so that their being one do not signify a singular [substance] but two equals. By equality I mean a similitude without a difference so that similitude be reckoned equality. And equality is therefore called one because tis eaven, I meane one in which equal or eaven is signified & not which is taken for one alone Therefore one substance, if it do not take away one of the subsisting persons nor divide one [former] substance into two will be preacht religiously. But if we so call the Father & son of one substance that he who subsists altho he have two names be notwithstanding one & alone; whilst we confesse the Son in name we do not retain him in conscience if confessing one substance we esteem him with himself one [substance] alone & singular both the Father & the Son. This is the first erroneous sense namely singularity of substance, which according to his description is Sabellianism. And of this, you see, he saith many of the western Bishops were guilty. The other two erroneous senses he thus describes. There is also, saith he, from that word occasion given of this great error that the father be understood divided from himself & to have cut out a part of himself which should be the son. For so hereticks

contend in preaching one substance & the language of our pious confession seems much to favour these men so that whilst this word [one substance] by reason of an indefinite brevity is dubious it leads to error. There is also a third error in that when the ffather & Son are said to be of one substance there may seem to be a former substance which the two equals may have between them : as if the speech signified three things one substance & two coheirs (as it were) of that substance. And then repeating the errors he subjoyns. And so one substance affirmed of the ffather & Son does either signify one thing with two names or one substance by division made two imperfect ones or a third former substance affirmed of two which is therefore called one be- <41r> cause one is divided into two. Thus far Hilary concerning the three western errors arising from the Nicene Creed, the first of which was that of Hermogenes, Praxeas, Noetius, Sabellius, & Simon Magus who made himself all three persons; the second & third those of Montanus, Tertullian, Donatus, Paul of Samosat, Hierax & the Manichees † < insertion from f 40v > † the Maniches & all such Gnosticks & others as derived the Son from the Father by any division, eruption, efflux, projection or emission of substance as they did who before the times of the Nicene Council preacht them consubstantial. For this was then the vulgar notion of consubstantial. But after the time of this Council the first of the three errors became the prevalent opinion. < text from f 41r resumes > But the first was now the prevalent opinion. ffor the Council of Sardica held one substance in this sense as is manifest by their saying: We confess that the Son is the vertue of the ffather, we confess that he is the λόγος word or reason of God the Father besides which there is no other & that the word is true God & wisdom & vertue. This they say in opposition to Arius who denied the Son to be the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος or that inward mind & wisdom of the Father by which he is intelligent & wise, & therefore their opinion was that the Son is that λόγος ἐνδιάθετος or inward mind, that is, the attribute of the hypostasis of the Deity.

Hence therefore when the Greeks condemned Marcellus of Sabellianism the Latines in the Councils of Rome & Sardica defended him as orthodox: thô afterwards when they left their error & he stuck to it, he went for such a heretick as he had been condemned for.

Hence also when Hilary was sent for to the Council of Seleucia, the Council in the first place required the faith of the Gaules, because, saith Sulpitius Severus, the Arians had made the eastern Churches beleive that the western were Sabellian: but when he expounded his faith according to the sense of the Nicene Decree they readily admitted him. By which circumstance it is manifest that it was not the Council of Nice but the abuse of that Council which the eastern Churches at that time laboured against.

† [Hence also many] < insertion from f 40v > Hence also many of the homousians for some time after the death of Constantius used the language of one Hypostasis as Ierome, the Neocæsarienes & the followers of Paulinus Patriarch of Antioch who pleaded for this language the authority of the Council of Sardica: but yet as many as used this language were by the rest of the homousians accounted Sabellians notwithstanding that they distinguished the hypostasis or substance of the Deity into three πρόσωπα or persons.

And as the eastern Bishops when the western began to call them Arians to baffle that accusation anathematized the positions of Arius: so the homousians after they had been baffled in the Councils of Ariminum & Seleucia as Sabellians, to cleare themselves from that imputation made a great noise against Sabellianism as you may see in their Councils which followed the reign of Constantius.

< text from f 41r resumes >

Those therefore who were for abolishing the word homousios prest it by the abuse thereof. For in one of the Creeds of the Councils of Sirmium & Ariminum & that of Constantinople they decree that the word usia or substance, because it was unwarily put by the [Nicene] ffathers, & being not understood by the people became a stumbling block to them, & because it was not in the scriptures, should be abolished. And immediately after ^{b[66]} in that of Constantinople & Ariminum they add: Neither ought Hypostasis to be named of the Father Son & Holy Ghost. They do not say hypostases but hypostasis in the singular number, & so condemned hereby not the doctrine of three hypostases (for that was their <42r> but the Sardican confession of but one common hypostasis of the Father Son & Holy Ghost.

Hilary in his book de Synodis^[67] mentions three reasons by which the Bishops he wrote to had been induced to abrogate the word homousios in the Council of Sirmium: the first of which was the scandal the word brought by implying one former substance divided into two, the second that the use of the word had been

condemned in the Council of Antioch convened against Paul of Samosat about sixty years before the Council of Nice, & the third that the word was not extant in scripture: & a little after repeating the objection of scandal, he saith But perhaps it will be said this word ought to be rejected because it uses to be corruptly understood: And again; The homousios is understood in an ill sense: what's that to me who understand it in a good one? And again; But you will say the ambiguity of the homousios moves me with its scandal: Hear I pray without scandal & the nakednesse of homæusios moves me. He grants that the homousios by reason of its ambiguity was apt to be misunderstood & had been misunderstood in the west & yet is for continuing the use of it because he understood it in a good sense & others might do so too if they pleased. For which end he takes much pains in the latter end of this book to make the western Bishops understand his notion of una substantia as if they had never heard of it before, as I am apt to think they had not because the Sardican faith had obtained in the west & met not with any opposition there till now, nor was opposed now by any but those of the eastern communion. The minor part was not now opposed & condemned by the major but almost the whole west were convinced of error by the Acts of the Council of Nice

For when the Emperor &c See the backside <43v> < insertion from f 42v > For when the Emperor Constantine the great sitting in the middle of the Bishops of the Council of Nice prest the word homousios upon the Council: they for a time stiffly opposed untill the corrupt significations of the word were rejected & such a signification as they could allow, proposed & agreed upon. For the word signifies either that a thing is of the same subst{ance} with another or that it is of a like substance. ffor ὁμος sometimes signifies like & that in composition as well as alone, as in the word ὁμοπαθῆς obnoxious to like passions ὁμόνεκρος like a dead body as to corruption, ὁμόφλοιος having a like bark, & in this sense ὁμοούσιος signifies nothing more then ὁμοιούσιος of like substance. But vulgarly the word then signified a thing of the same substance with another that is not consisting of the same substance but arisen out of the same substance & that either by division, projection eruption or efflux of the substance. This sense of the word therefore according to these several modes was first considered in the Council & rejected & then the second sense agreed upon as you may see related at large by Eusebius of Cæsarea in the †^[69] letter which he wrote at that very time from the Council to his Church. There was afterwards a third sense put upon the word as if it < text from f 43v resumes > There was afterwards a third sense put upon the word as if it signified one undivided substance totally common to the ffather & Son: & this indeed is the proper signification of una substantia but never was the signification of homousios till the Sabellians made it so. And upon the baffling of this signification in the Councils of Sirmium & Ariminum there was a fourth signification put upon the word of a specific or generical unity: but the sense which the Council it self put upon the word was not any unity of substance but only a similitude, as is manifest by the letter of Eusebius.

Now it was the custome of the Bishops in subscribing to expresse in a sentence or two what it was to which they subscribed, & when they subscribed with any caution or reservation to express it as you may see in the Acts of the Councils of Ephesus & Chalcedon & the second of Nice which are come to our hands entire. Whence †^[70] Valesius conjectures that they subscribed at Nice after some such manner as this I Eusebius of Nicomedia agree & subscribe to the faith above written, but not to the anathema. † < insertion from f 42v > † But when the signification of the word ὁμοούσιος had been much debated in the Council & after many scruples & exceptions agreed upon: it is not to be imagined, that those who had been scrupulous would subscribe without expressing in what sense they took that word. And therefore we are here beholden to Philostorgius for letting us know the matter of fact. For in the end of the first book of his History, as Nicetas relates out of him, he related that in subscribing < text from f 43v resumes > that in subscribing the Nicene faith, some wrote over against their names the word ὁμοούσιος, & others by the advice of Eusebius instead of ὁμοούσιος wrote ὁμοιούσιος. Whence Photius saith that they subscribed fraudulently, even by the testimony of Philostorgius, because under the word ὁμοούσιος they craftily hid the ὁμοιούσιος; that is interpreted the first by the last. If you can beleive with Photius that one part of the Council (& if we may judge by all the following Councils of the east, the much greater part,) were such knaves as to do this fraudulently & Constantine the great with the rest of the Council such fools as to look on & let them do it fraudulently, you'll make a fine Council on't. But it has been the constant practise of the Catholicks to cry out <44r> fraud at every thing which makes against 'em before they know whether it be so or not & thereby they have corrupted all history.

So then the Nicene Fathers first in their debates agreed that ὁμοούσιος signified nothing more then that the Son was of like substance with the father, that is, that he was ὁμοιούσιος to him, & then by way of caution

express this interpretation in their subscriptions. And at length the eastern Bishops by shewing the Acts of the Council with these subscriptions, convinced the western Bishops that they had misinterpreted the Nicene Creed. For Sulpitius Severus speaking of the times of the Councils of Millain & Sirmium saith that the Arians (he means all those in communion with the eastern Churches) began to preach their heresy openly & interpreting the Nicene Council on their side which by the addition of one letter they had corrupted, cast a mist before the truth. ffor where ὁμοούσιον was written, which is of one substance, they said that ὁμοιούσιον was written which is of like substance; granting a similitude so they might but take away the unity. By this means, saith Severus, they cast a mist before the truth, that is they deceived the western Bishops: & by consequence those Bishops who had the sight of the Nicene records & were most concerned to find out the cheat if there had been any, could find out none, but were convinced by what they saw. Hosius himself who knew what was done at Nice could find out none but yielded with the rest. And therefore I wonder how Severus many years after all these things, without so much as seing the original Acts, came to know there was a cheat. But this has been the constant practise of the Moncks to misrepresent & corrupt all things by pretending (without proof) that hereticks had corrupted them before. dispute Its enough that the age before him when these things were in agitation suspected no such fallacy. And how far they were from suspecting any may yet further appear by the following evidence. For the Council of Illyricum collected about six or seven years after that of Ariminum when all things were fresh in memory, composed a Creed of which this was the summ. ^[71] We confesse according to the great & orthodox Synod that the Son is homousios to the father. Neither do we so understand homousios as some heretofore expounded it who did not subscribe sincerely & according to the truth & as some now who <44v> call those men Fathers, abolishing the force of this word & treading in their steps who wrote that the word homousios denoted similitude in that the Son was like none of the creatures which were made by him but bare the similitude of the Father alone. For they that thus expound it, do impiously teach that the Son of God is an excellent & most noble creature. All this plainly respects the Council of Nice: for that was the great & orthodox Synod, the only Synod wherein the homousios was subscribed & the Synod wherein it was interpreted of similitude in that the Son was not like the creatures made by him but like the father only, as you may see in the above mentioned letter of Eusebius. Whence its plain not only that the Nicene ffathers subscribed after this manner but also that the Greek Churches during the reigns of Constantius & Valens did own this Council & by vertue of these subscriptions plead it on their side: & that it was from thence that the language of ὁμοιούσιος had its rise & was spread so easily over all the east.

Now whilst those that held one substance common to the Father & Son grounded their opinion upon the Nicene decree, but upon examining the records found themselves in an error, this opinion received such an universal baffle in the reign of Constantius that it appeared no more in the world for many ages after. For after his reign the Latines tho they then returned again to their language of una substantia, yet they understood it thenceforward of a generical unity only & the Greeks of Athanasius's party bid not only leave the Sardican notion of one hypostasis but the language too. Whence arose a quarrel between them & the Latines these calling those Arians for holding three hypostases & those calling these Sabellians for holding one substance. But Athanasius calling together some of both parties in a little Council held at Alexandria, & examining them told them that they agreed in sense & so reconciled them. And because some of the greeks, & particularly Paulinus Bishop of Antioch with his followers, used the Sardican <74r> with his own.

<54r>

Quest.

Whether Athanasius did not set on foot the invocation of saints.

The Christians of the first ages taught that at the day of judgment, Christ would sentence some immediately to heaven others to perpetual torments & others to be baptized with fire & shut up in prizon till they should pay the outermost farthing. What was the state of souls between death & the day of judgment the Greek Churches of those ages (so far as I can find) determined not till Athanasius in the life of Antony by relating how Antony saw the soul of Ammon ascend up to heaven, brought in an opinion that the souls of the blessed went immediately after death to heaven & by consequence that those of the wicked went immediately to hell & those of the middle degree to Purgatory. And because its absurd that men should be rewarded before they are judged therefore the Athanasians have feigned without any foundation in scripture that there is a double judgment, the first particular of every man at his death & the second general. And to make out this opinion they allege the promise of Christ to the thief which if rightly pointed may run thus. Verily I say unto the to

day, Thou shalt be with me in paradise the words I say say unto the to day being opposed by way of answer to the thiefs petition, Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. They allege also the Parable of Dives & Lazarus applying it to the present time, whereas if they had the same notion of the last day with the first Christians they would understand that it might as well belong to that time: & besides it is but a Parable. They press also S. Paul's saying I desire to be dissolved & be with Christ: not considering that the interval between death & the resurrection is to them that sleep & perceive it not, a moment. They ## They argue also from the vision of Moses & Elias with Christ, thô the vision was not of their souls (for Elias never died) but of their living bodies. On the other hand if the saints go into heaven before the resurrection [then every man is rewarded according to his works before Christ comes to {reward} them & the dead are judged before the time comes that they should be judged Apoc. 11 & Many come from the east & west & sit down with Abraham & Isaac & Jacob in heaven before the last day, Matt. 8 & they that sleep in the dust shine as the stars in the firmam^t before they awake & Daniel stood in his lot as soon as he was dead. Dan. {12} Were not men greatly prejudiced they would consider such texts of scripture as these. In death there is no remembrance of thee in the grave who shall give thee thanks Psal. 6. 5 Shal thy loving kindness be declared in the grave thy wonders in the dark & thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness? Psal 88:11, 12. The dead prais not the Lord neither any that go down into silence Psal 115.17. The dead know not any <55r> thing There is no work nor knowledge nor wisdom in the grave. Eccles: 9.5, 10. The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee Isa. 38. 18. God hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Iesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance in heaven 1 Pet. 1.3, 4 which is as much as to say that without the resurrection there is no hope, no inheritance in heaven. And to the same purpose speaks S. Paul. I would not have you ignorant brethren concerning them which are asleep that ye sorrow not even as other which have no hope ffor if we beleive that Iesus died & rose again even so them also which sleep in Iesus will God bring with him – for the Lord shal descend from heaven – & the dead in Christ shal rise first. Then we which are alive & remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, & so shall we ever be with the Lord. 1 Thes. 4. Here you see the Apostle places all our hopes & comfort in the resurrection & from that time dates our being with Christ in heaven. And to the same purpose it is that Christ himself saith: I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go & prepare a place for you I will come again & receive you to my self, that where I am there ye may be also. Iohn 14.3. So then Saint Paul [†] < insertion from f 54v > [†] is not yet with Christ. He tells you plainly that if the dead rise not our faith is vain the dead in Christ are perished, we are of all most miserable & what shall they do that are baptized for the dead 1 Cor. 15. & Christ tells you also as plainly that God is not the God of the dead & thence inferrs the resurrection because God said to Moses I am the God of Abraham. < text from f 55r resumes >

Now according to the tenour of these texts of scripture the first Christians placed all the dead in Hades, that is, not in hell as we corruptly translate the word, but in the land of darknesse & silence as the old testament sometimes expresseth it. Whence came the opinion that Christ descending into Hades brought with him from thence the Souls of the Patriarchs. But the Egyptians, Platonists & other heathens placed the souls of the better sort of dead men about their sepulchers & statues & temples & in the air & in heaven & so filled all places wth ghosts or Dæmons . And Athanasius by making Antony see the soule of Ammon ascend up to heaven, laid the foundation for introducing into the greek Churches this heathen doctrine of Daemons, together with that Popish one of Purgatory. And this I take to be the true original of worshipping Saints in the Greek Church for Athanasius in the end of his Epistle to Marcelline concerning the interpretation of the Psalms written in a time of [†][72] temptation or trial (as he calls it) & by consequence before the death of Iulian the Apostate, lays down this doctrine. Let not any one, saith he, adorn the Psalms with secular words for eloquence, nor let him endeavour to change the words, or wholly to substitute one thing for another: but let him recite & sing them as they are written, [†][73] that the saints who composed those words, knowing them to be their own, may pray together with us. And a little after. <56r> When the Devils see the words changed they deride them but are afraid of the words of the saints & cannot beare them. In these words Athanasius teaches three things, that the saints understand what we say, that they intercede with God for us, & that in certain forms of words there are supernatural virtues: & these principles readily inferr saint-worship & charms.

[†] What Athanasius taught in Egypt &c [See the bakside of the next leaf.] < insertion from f 57v > [†] And what Athanasius taught in Egypt soon went into Syria ffor [†][74] Sozomen describing how the Oracle at Antioch consulted by the Emperor Iulian was silenced by the reliques of that Martyr Babylas & caused the bones of the Martyr to be carried out, & how the Temple with the speaking statue was thereupon burnt he

adds: ἔδóκει δὲ τοῖς μὲν Χριστιανοῖς κατ' ἄιτησιν τοῦ μάρτυρος &c The Christians thought this fire sent by God upon the Dæmon at the prayer of the Martyr; but the Gentiles said the wickedness was done by the Christians. The truth of the story I take to be this: that the Heathen Priests caused some body to speak through the Oracle & command away the bones of some dead man as if they were the bones of a martyr & therefore offensive & abominable to the God: & that the saint worshipping Christians inverted the story as if the Oracle was silenced & the temple set on fire by the power & intercession of the martyr. And this sufficiently shews that the intercession of the Saints & their knowledge of things done on earth was in the reign of that Emperor the received opinion of the Athanasians at Antioch. < text from f 56r resumes >

Now these doctrines were no sooner started in the east but Hilary in his return thence from banishment carried them with him into the west. For in his commentary upon the 129th Psalm, he saith,^[75] It is not the nature of God but our infirmity which wants the intercession of Angels. ffor they are sent because of them who shall inherit salvation, God being ignorant of none of those things which we do, but our infirmity wanting the ministry of spiritual intercession to ask & obtein. And again upon Psal 124 he saith: Neither are the protections of saints nor the guardes of Angels wanting to those who are willing to stand. And a little after And least you should beleive it a light safeguard which is placed in the Aposles Patriarchs & Prophets or rather in Angels who fence about the Church with a certain protection it is added, And the Lord is round about his people from hence forth & for ever. But perhaps the Protection of the Apostles & Angels may be thought sufficient. It is true, but &c. Thus far Hilary who died four years before Athanasius, A.C. 368. You have heard above how in the year 360 he credited the miracles done in the east by the martyrs at their tombs, & that at the same time he learnt the doctrine of the protection & intercession of Saints & Angels is not much to be doubted. For these things were naturally joyned together.

And that the invocation of Saints came in at the same time I seem to gather from the works of Basil & Ephem Syrus who were contemporaries to Athanasius & died six years after him, A.C. 378. For Basil in his 20th Homily upon the 40 martyrs saith: These are they who obtaining our region, like certain towers afford a refuge against the incursion of the enemy. — Here is prepared a help to Christians, namely a church of martyrs, an army of triumphers, a chorus of such as praise God. You have often endeavoured, you have often laboured to find one who should pray for you; these are fourty, sending forth one voice of prayer. ffor where two or three are gathered together in the name of the Lord there God is; but where there shall be 40, who doubts that <57r> God is present. ὁ θλιβόμενος ἔσπι τοὺς τεσσαράκοντα καταφεύγει, ὁ ἔυφραινόμενος ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς ἀποτρεχει ὁ μὲν ἵνα λύσιν ευρη των δυσχερων, ὁ δὲ ἵνα φυλαχθῇ αὐτῷ τὰ χρησιότερα, He that is in affliction flees to these fourty, he that rejoyces runs to them: the first that he may be delivered from the evils, the last that the good things may be continued to him. Here the woman praying for her sons is heard: she implores a safe return to her husband, gone a journey, & health to him when sick. Therefore with these martyrs let us power out our prayers. O holy chorus, o sacred order, o invincible troop, o common guardians of mankind, good companions, of careful thoughts,^[76] coadjutors of our prayers, most powerfull mediators. And in his 26th Homily concerning the martyr Mammante: Be ye mindfull of this martyr, saith he, as many as have enjoyed him in dreams, as many as in this place have had him an assistant in praying, all those at whose works he hath been present when invoked by name, as many as he hath brought into the way from erring, as many as he hath restored to health, as many as have had their dead children restored by him to life, as many as have had their lives prolonged by him. And a little after At the memory.—commemoration—of the martyr the whole region is moved, at his festival the whole city is transformed into joy. Neither do the kindred of the rich turn aside to the sepulchers of their ancestors but all go to the place of piety. And in the end of the Homily, he prays that God would preserve the Church fortified with the great towers of the Martyrs. Here you have the general practise of the Athanasians in Asia & Ephraim will acquaint you with their like practise in Syria.^[77] We beseech you, saith he, o most holy martyrs — that you will intreat the Lord for us miserable sinners covered over with the filth of negligence, that he would pour his divine grace into us. And in the end of his discourse: Now, saith he, o blessed men & glorious martyrs of God help me a miserable sinner by your prayers that in that terrible hour I may find mercy when the secrets of hearts shall be opened. To day I am to you o most holy martyrs of Christ, as an unprofitable & unskilful cup-bearer [viz^t in administring the Eucharist]:^[78] for I have given a cup of the wine of your noble conflict to the Sons & brothers of your faith, & I have studied with my whole affection to recreate the fathers & Brothers & kindred & your relations daily frequenting your table from this celebrated table <58r> of your victory furnished with all sorts of dishes & dainties. ffor behold they sing & with exultation & jubily glorify God, who hath adorned the most holy heads

of your virtue with incorruptible crowns, & they stand about the sacred Reliques of your conflict with great joy wishing to be blessed & desiring to carry back with them holy remedies of mind & body. Bestow therefore on them all a blessing, as good disciples & faithfull ministers of our most benign Lord & Saviour. I also, altho weake & feeble, having by your merits & intercession received strength, have with the whole devotion of my mind sung a hymn of your praise & glory before your holy reliques. Wherefore I beseech you stand before the throne of the divine majesty, that by your prayers I may deserve to attain salvation & enjoy eternal happiness with you.

These passages are enough to shew that saint worship was the general practise of the Athanasians in the Eastern Empire during the reign of Valens. ffor if they did thus in Asia & Syria they did it much more in Egypt where they were more at liberty & from whence these superstitions had their rise. ffor Palladius^[79] going into Egypt in the year 388 to visit the monasteries telling how he saw in Thebais the sepulcher of one Apollonius who with some others was martyred in the persecution of Maximinus, he saith: The Christians built for them all one house where now many miracles are done. So great was the grace of the man that he was presently heard concerning those things for which he was invoked; our Saviour doing him this honour. Whom also with his fellow martyrs we saw, invoking him in his sepulcher. And Ruffin speaking of the same martyrs saith that many miracles were done by them & that # (see the backside) < insertion from f 59v > (see the foreside) # & that the desires & prayers of all men were received by them & their petitions granted: whether also God vouchsafed to bring him & to grant his desires & prayers. So that the miracles & invocation of these martyrs were of some standing before the year 372 wherein Ruffin visited the monasteries of Egypt. < text from f 58r resumes >

Gregory Nazianzen^[80] in the funeral Oration upon his sister Gorgonia, invokes her with some distrust whether she heard him or not. And after the like manner he invokes the Emperor Constantius.^[81] Heare these things, saith he, O great soul of Constantius, (if the dead have any sense,) & all the pious & Christian souls of those who held the Empire before him, but his soul above the rest, because when he had grown together with the heritage of Christ & had augmented it to the utmost of his power, & confirmed it by length of time, so that on that account he excelled in splendor & glory all those who had at any time enjoyed the Empire, he slipt through ignorance [i.e. in making Iulian Cæsar.] This Oration being written in the reign of Iovian shews that the invocation of dead men was then creeping into Asia. But because he invokes Constantius & Gorgonia with diffidence, some would perswade us that all the invocations of the Dead to be met with in his several Orations were nothing else than oratorical flourishes; which is a mistake. Gregory in the first four or five years of the reign <60r> of Valens either **{illeg}** for fear of feuding **{illeg}** as did not yet receive this doctrine or doubted whether the saints heard us or not but afterwards he went with the tide & invoked them confidently with the rest of the Athanasians. For in his 18th Oration^[82] on the life of Cyprian he tells it for true matter of fact that Iustina a virgin whom Cyprian before his conversion endeavoured by magic arts to enjoy prayed to the Virgin Mary (& that not in vain) that she would deliver her from the danger she was in: This I take to be a fable invented by the Monks for promoting the worship of the Virgin Mary, but whilst Gregory beleived it, it shews that he was in earnest when in the end of this Oration he thus invoked Cyprian. But thou, saith he, look down upon us benignly from heaven & govern our discourses & life & this sacred flock, or assist in feeding them, as well directing it in other things as far as may be to the best, as removing grievous wolves who carp at syllables & words, & granting us a more full & clear splendor of the holy Trinity before which thou now standest. So again in the end of his 21th Oration,^[83] he thus invokes the soul of Athanasius. Do thou look down upon us benignly from above & govern this people a perfect adorer of the trinity which is understood & worshipped in the father Son & holy ghost: & if there shall be peace preserve me in life & assist in feeding my flock, but if the Church shall be in warr, withdraw me or assume me & place me with thy self & such as are like thee, altho it be a great thing which I request. And much after the same manner he invokes his own father Gregory & his friend Basil in his 19th & 20th Orations: the former of which was had in the presence of Basil soon after his fathers death, A.C. 372.

Gregory Nyssen in the life of Ephræm Syrus, telling how a certain man in returning home from a long journey was in great danger by reason that all the ways were stopt with the forces of barbarians subjoyns that he only invoked Ephraem saying Holy Ephræm help me, & so escaped the danger beyond hope being fortified by the protection of Ephræm. Whence you may know that Gregory in the end of this Life where he invokes the ghost of Ephræm, was in good earnest. The same Gregory in his Oration on Theodorus the Martyr, saith: This martyr, as we beleive, the last year [that is A.C. 380] allayed the Barbarian tempest &

checkt & repress the horrid war of the fierce & cruel Scythians &c. And a little after he thus describes the super <45r> stition of the people. If any one be permitted to carry away the dust wherewith the tomb in which the body of the Martyr rests is covered over, he accepts of it as a favour & the earth as a thing of great price is gathered to be laid up. For to touch the reliques, if at any time any such prosperous fortune happen, how much that is a favour to be desired & wisht for & not be obtained without the greatest intreaty they know that have tried & obtained their desire. For they that behold the body, embrace it as if it were living, applying it to their eyes, mouth, ears, & all the instruments of their senses

as if he were whole & appeared τὴν του πρεσβεύειν ἱκεσίαν προσάγουσιν, ὡς δορυφόρον του Θεου παρακαλουντες, ὡς λαμβάνοντα τὰς δωρεὰς ὅταν ἐθέλῃ ἐπικαλούμενοι offering suppliant prayers that he would intercede for them calling to him as the Sergeant of God, invoking him as one that receives favours when ever he pleases. And at length Gregory concludes his Oration with this prayer. We want [O Theodorus] many benefits. Intercede & deprecate for thy country with our common king & Lord. ffor the country of the martyr is the place of his passion, & his citizens & brethren & kindred are they that keep & defend & adorn & honour him. We fear afflictions, we expect dangers. The wicked Scythians are not far off being ready to make war upon us. ὡς στρατιώτης, ὑπερμάχῃσον. ὡς μάρτυς ὑπὲρ των ὁμοδούλων χρῆσαι τη παρρησία, as a souldier fight for us, as a martyr use liberty of speech for us. Intreat peace that these publick assemblies may not cease that the furious & wicked barbarian may not rage against the temples & altars, that the profane & wicked may not trample upon the holy things. ffor we also, that we are hitherto preserved safe & sound, do acknowledge the benefit received of you but we pray also for safety for the time to come. And if there is need also of greater intercession & deprecation, call together the chorus of your brothers the martyrs & together with them all deprecate for us. The prayers of many just blot out the sins of multitudes & nations. Admonish Peter, stir up Paul & Iohn the divine & beloved disciple that they may be sollicitous for the Churches which they have constituted for which they have born chains, for which they have suffered dangers & deaths, least the worship of Idols lift up the head against us, least hereses grow up like thorns in the vineyard least tares springing up choak the wheat, least any rock wanting the unctuousness of sincere dew stand up against us & render the power of fruitfulness of the word void of root. But by the power of thy deprecation, ὁ most <45v> admirable man, & most eminent amongst the martyrs, & of that of thy companions, let the commonwealth of Christians become a field of corn &c. Thus Gregory wrote in the year 381 & the same year in an Oration had at Constantinople in the funeral of Meletius Patriarch of Antioch, he exprest himself thus: The Bridegroom, saith he, speaking of Meletius, is not taken from us: he stands in the middle of us althō we do not see him. He is a Priest in the most Holy – & face to face intercedes with God for us & for the sins of the people. This Gregory taught before the Bishops of the Council of Constantinople commonly called the second general Council, in the time of whose session Meletius died. Whence you may understand (to use the words of a^[84] Baronius) that he profest what the Council & with it the whole Church of those parts now beleived, namely that the saints do pour out prayers before God for us.

I have hitherto described the state of the Greek Church as to saint worship in the times preceding this Council. And by comparing all that has been said it seems to me not only that this worship was generally received by the Athanasians before the time of this Council but also that it was received with great ardor & affection. Nor did they only invoke the Saints as intercessors & mediators but also as Protectors, Rulers & Coadjutors. They accounted them the bulwarks towers & guards of their Cities, & the Patrons & Guardians of their persons; they ascribed deliverances, victories, cures of diseases & other miraculous operations to them & to their reliques; they prayed that they would assist, defend, govern & prosper them & their Churches, & after death receive them into heaven: all which is the highest degree of worship. I will not give it a hard name but leave the reader to consider it. And this was the original of distributing kingdoms, Cities, towns, companies, & persons amongst the Saints so as to assigne to each their proper guardians.

I might add more concerning the vehement superstition of this age. For tho Athanasianism began not in Constantinople till after the reign of Valens, yet before the end of the reign of Theodosius the devotion towards saints was there grown to such a height that in the year 394, when Theodosius was setting forth against Eugenius, he prepared to the war, saith Ruffin,^[85] not so much with the power of arms & weapons as with that of fastings & prayers, & being <46r> fortified not so much with the {illeg} of his guards as with pernoctation in prayer, he together with the Priests & people went about all the places of prayer, & lay prostrate in hair-cloth before the tombs of the Martyrs & prayed for aid & assistance by the faithful intercession of the martyrs. And Sozomen adds that when he was marched seven miles from Constantinople

he prayed there in a church which he had built to Iohn the Baptist, καὶ σύμμαχον αὐτῷ ἐπικαλέσασθαι τὸν βαπτιστὴν & called upon the Baptist to assist him in the warr. This is that Theodosius who for setting up Athanasianism has been honoured with the name of Theodosius the great.

And indeed so great was the devotion of this age towards the Saints that Chrysostom in his exposition on the 114th Psalm neare the end, said πρὸς τῶν μαρτύρων τοὺς τάφους τὰς πόλεις συντρεχούσας, τοὺς δῆμους ἀναπτομένους τῷ πόθῳ. The cities ran together to the sepulchers of the martyrs & the peoples were inflamed with affection toward them. And hence he sometimes endeavours to check this devotion & perswade the people to let God have a fit share of their prayers. So in Gen.19 Hom 44 he saith: When we bring what is from our selves & to this is added the intercession of saints, it profits us very much: but if we are negligent & place the hope of our salvation in them alone, it profits us no more at all. — Knowing this beloved let us fly to the prayers of the saints & pray that they would intercede for us: but let us not trust in their prayers alone, but also let us dispense our own rightly, as is fit. And after the same manner he exhorts the people again in Matt. 2. Hom. 5. Therefore, saith he, let us not with oscitancy & sloth depend upon the merits of others. For in truth the prayers & supplications of the saints are powerful for us & that exceedingly, but it is then when we also desire the same thing through repentance. And a little after. We say these things not to deny that the saints are to be prayed unto, but least we should resolve our selves into idleness & sloth, & sleeping ourselves commit our concerns wholly to the care of others. So then the Athanasians before the end of the fourth Century had run almost all their devotion into saint-worship; being inflamed beyond measure by the great cry of miracles the example of the Monks & the preaching of their Clergy: so that this devotion seems to have been now at its height. For how much the Clergy preached up this superstition may be guest by what we find <46v> in the Homilies & Orations of Chrysostom {illeg} his Oration to the Antiochians on the Martyrs Bernice & Prosdoce, he saith: Perhaps ye burn with not a little love towards those saints. With this ardour therefore let us fall down before their reliques let us embrace their coffins. ffor the coffins of the martyrs may obtain great virtue, even as the bones of the martyrs have great efficacy. Nor on the day of this festivity only but also on other days let us sit by them, let us beseech them, let us intreat them to be our Patrons. ffor they have great assurance not only when living but also when dead & much more when dead. ffor now they bear the marks of Christ & when they shall shew these marks they can obtain all things of the King. Seing therefore they have so great power & so great friendship with the King: when we sitting by them as it were continually & by visiting them perpetually have insinuated our selves into their acquaintance, we shal by their help obtien the mercy of God. And much after the same manner Chrysostom exhorts the Antiochians in his Oration on Iuventinus & Maximus, & in a general Oration on the Martyrs he has these words. But do you desire to enjoy delights? Sit at the Sepulcher of the Martyr, there pour out fountains of tears, afflict your soul, carry away a blessing from the sepulcher, & enjoying his patronage in your prayers, exercise your self frequently in reading the relations of his conflicts, embrace the coffin, adhere to the box of reliques. ffor not only the bones of the martyrs but also their sepulchers & coffins abound with many blessings. How much this Author promoted these superstitions may be further seen in many other ^{a[86]} places & yet the people ran it to a higher pitch then he could approve of: so that he found it requisite to exhort them to let God have a competent share of their prayers. For their devotion towards the saints being enflamed by the cry of miracles, seems to have been in this age at so much a greater pitch then in those which followed, as the cry of miracles was now greater.

If you desire a general description of the state of the Church as to this worship, you may find it in the 8th Book of <47r> Theodoret (the Ecclesiastical historian) De curandis Græcorum affectionibus written neare the beginning of the fift Cent. A.C. 40 For he in that book writes thus. The souls of the triumphant martyrs live now in a heavenly country amongst the Quires of Angels: and their bodies are not entombed severally in several monuments, but divided & distributed amongst the cities & villages, who call them saviors of their souls & physitians of their bodies & venerate them as the Guardians of cities & Presidents of places, & through their mediation & intercessions with God, obtien by them divine guifts. In their bodies therefore though cut in pieces, yet the virtue & grace continues entire; & those little reliques how little soever have the same virtue with the whole undivided martyr. ffor the grace which continues powerful & vigorous distributes guifts to them that ask, measuring its liberality by the faith of the petitioners. — These are therefore the Captains, Princes, Guardians, Keepers of men, by who misfortunes are averted, & the evils which the Devils bring upon us are driven far away. Afterwards mentioning Plato, Hesiod & others, he goes on thus. Now if the Poet Hesiod calls those assistants & conservers of mortals who of old lived holily & well, & [Plato] the best of the Philosophers hath so far confirmed the opinion of this Poet that he accounted the sepulchers of

those men to be worshipped & adored: why do you, O ye Greeks, so much accuse what we do? ffor we after the same manner call those assistants & physitians who have flourished with illustrious piety & were slain for it : but yet we do not call them Dæmons (for be this fury from us) but we say they were friends of God & his faithful servants who used the greatest freedom of speech with him & foretold the most certain coming of good things to us. — Now that the souls of holy men, even when they are out of this body may take care of humane affairs. Plato [your Philosopher] affirms in the eleventh book of Laws & so doth Socrates — But neither Socrates nor any of the Philosophers or Kings or Emperors hath attained so great honours as we see the martyrs of Christ have obtained: Their sepulchers are scarce known but the temples of the martyrs are beheld conspicuous & excelling in greatness & variously adorned with all sorts of ornaments & far the splendor of their beauty. Nor do we go to these once or twice or five times in a year but in them we often celebrate festival days, we often sing praises & hymns day by day to the Lord of those Martyrs: <47v> & they that are in health pray that it may be continued to them & they that are sick that they may be cured. They that want children pray for them & the barren weomen pray to become mothers. They that have obtained any guift pray that it may be preserved to them. They that are undertaking any journey beg of them that they would be their companions in the way & guides of their journey; & they that come back safe return thanks: not going to them as Gods but praying to them as divine men & petitioning that they would be mediators for them. Now that those who ask faithfully obtien what they pray for, is manifest by their guifts which shew the cures. ffor some hang up [in the Temples] the images of eyes others those of feet others those of hands made of gold or silver. — The Philosophers & Orators are forgotten, the names of Emperors & great Capitains are not now so much as known: but the names of the Martyrs are more known to all then those of their most familiar friends. Yea they study to impose their names on their new born children, thence providing security & protection to them. But why do I commemorate Philosophers & Emperors & Comma^{es} since the saints have abolished out of men's minds the memory of them who were every where accounted Gods? For the Temples of these are so destroyed that there remains not so much as the species of their shapes nor do the men of this age know the forms of their altars: but all the materials of these are assigned to the temples of the Martyrs. For the Lord our God hath brought his dead men into the temples instead of your Gods & hath made them void & vain, but hath attributed their honour to these. ffor your Pandiums & Diasiums & Dionysiums & other ffeasts, the solemnities of Peter & Paul & Thomas & Sergius & Marcellus & Leontia & Panteleemon & Antoninus & Mauritius & other Martyrs. — Seeing therefore you understand what advantage accrues by doing honour to the saints, shun, ô my friends, the error of Dæmons & by the previous light & guide of the saints take that way which leads to God. Thus far Theodoret: by all which you may understand that Saint-worship was now of long standing & full growth.

And whilst Theodoret endeavours by the affinity between this religion & heathenism to perswade the heathens to come over to it: this opens the <48r> meaning of that crafty politician Athanasius in setting it up. For when he found himself by means of the Councils of Sirmium Ariminum & Seleucia baffled & deserted by all but the Monks: he contrived his religion for the easy conversion of the heathens by bringing into it as much of the heathen superstitions as the name of Christianity would then bear. ffor when the heathens saw two sorts of Christianity, the one unlike the other like their own religion: it must needs be that they would more readily embrace the latter. And this I take to be the true original of heathen ceremonies & superstitions which continue to this day in the Greek & Latine Churches. ffor who sees not that those superstitions came into Christianity while heathenism was yet in being? And who besides Athanasius had either opportunity or authority enough to bring them in. For Gregory Nazianzen tells us that in & after the reign of Iulian Athanasius gave laws again to the world & turned all mens minds upon him: That whatsoever pleased him was a law to the Monks & whatsoever he disallowed they accounted forbidden, & they looked upon his opinions as the Tables of Moses, & had him in greater veneration then became holy men: & that when he had lead such a course of life that his life was the rule of episcopacy, & his opinions the law of orthodoxy he died in a good old age. Twas this authority & none but this which could bring into the religion of his party, monstrous Legends fals miracles, veneration of reliques, charmes, the doctrine of Ghosts or Dæmons, & their intercession invocation & worship & such other heathen superstitions as were then brought in. ffor as we have shewed that he did allow these things so had he disallowed them his party would not have received them. With a word speaking he might have blasted them. In the end of the reign of Constantius & Iulian when his party had been baffled & broken to pieces & he was deserted & left to begin anew, when those few of his party which remained were of many opinions & knew not what to follow but depended upon his mouth as an Oracle: he was at liberty to set up what religion he pleased amongst them & after the religion <48v> he set up was once generally received among them it became as difficult for any man to innovate as 'tis now to innovate in the Greek & Latin Churches. ffor those few innovations which came in afterwards required a long

time to creep in & met with opposition: but these things were received at first without any opposition of the party.

<61r>

Whether Athanasius did not for promoting his interest set on foot the practise of false miracles.

The first certain intelligence which we have of these miracles is in the life of Antony, < insertion from f 61v > < text from f 61r resumes > & the book of Hilary written at the same time against Constantius. For in this book Hilary saith. ^[87] We owe more to your cruelty O Nero Decius, Maximianus: for we have overcome the Devil by you. The holy blood of the Martyrs is every where received. Whilst in them the Devils bellow, whilst diseases are cured, miracles are beheld as that bodies are lifted up without chords, that weomen hang by the feet & yet their garments do not fall down over their heads, that spirits are burnt without fire, & confess without being asked, to the increase of faith. This Hilary wrote from the Diocese of Antioch A.C. 360 † < insertion from f 61v > † < text from f 61r resumes > So that miracles began about the same time to make a noise amongst the Monks of Egypt & Syria. But it was Egypt which lead the dance. ffor as the persecution of Maximianus had afforded them the greatest plenty of martyrs so they were not content with doing miracles at home but sent into all the Empire the reliques of their Saints & Martyrs to inflame the whole Roman world with this kind of Superstition. For thus Chrysostom ^{a[88]} in an Oration had at Antioch while Alexandria was the first seat of the East & by consequence before the year 381 informs us in these words. Blessed be God, saith he, because Marytrs come out of Egypt, out of that mad Egypt which fought with God, & out of Egypt whence were impious mouths & blasphemous tongues are Martyrs had; not in Egypt only, not in the bordering & neighbouring region, but every where throughout the earth. And as in the greatest plenty of corn & provisions when the inhabitants of Cities see they have greater store than suffices for their own use they transmit it also to forreign cities; as well that they may shew their civility & liberality as that besides the abundance of these things they may mutually acquire from them what they want themselves: so also the Egyptians have done as to the Champions of religion. When they saw that by the blessing of God they had great plenty amongst themselves, they did not shut up the great gift of God within their own city but poured out the treasures of their good things into all the parts of the world: as well that they might shew their love towards the brethren as that they might affect the common Lord of all with <62r> honour & get glory to their City amongst all men, & declare it to be the Metropolis of the whole world. ffor if occasions, which are frivolous & of no value, & bounties which conduce only to this life, could procure this honour to many cities, is it not just that that City should be endowed with this prerogative of honour which bestows not fading & corruptible things, but men who even after death afford security to the cities which fall to their lot? ffor the bodies of those saints do fortify our city more strongly than any adamantine & inexpugnable wall & like high rocks prominent on all sides do not only propell the force of visible enemies but also subvert & dissipate the treacheries of invisible Dæmons & of all the frauds of the Devil, as easily as a valiant man can subvert & prostrate the plays of children. And other kind of devices made by men as walls ditches, arms, armies, & whatever is invented for the security of the inhabitants may be repelled by enemies with more & greater engines & devices: but when a city shall be fortified by the bodies of the saints, altho the enemies should spend an infinite summ of money they could not oppose to the cities where the saints are, any device of like importance. Nor is this possession, Beloved, only profitable against the treacheries of men or against the fallacies of Devils: but if the our common Lord should be angry for the multitude of our sins, we might by laying these bodies before him make him propitious to the city. Thus far Chrysostom who neare the end of this Oration subjoyning: Let us compose our life according to their tolerance & patience, that by their prayers, after we go hence we may see & embrace them & be placed with them in heavenly tabernacles. So then Chrysostom prefers Alexandria to Antioch in point of miracle-working reliques & makes that City the fountain from whence this superstition overflowed the whole world. And therefore since this sort of miracles began to make a great cry about Antioch in or before the year 360, & Athanasius continued Bishop of Alexandria till the ^{a[89]} year 372 we have reason to beleive that this superstition began at Alexandria long before his death & by consequence that he promoted it. And if you compare with the life of Antony you will have reason to suspect that it was Athanasius that set <64r> on foot this humour of miracles. For {the} miracles which he there teaches to do by the signe of the cross & certain wo{rds &} forms of speech are much of the same kind with those done by reliques & consecrated things, & seems to have set on foot that cry of these miracles which followed in Syria upon the publishing of this Life. Ierome tells us^[90] that Hilarion the founder of Monkery in Syria soon after the death of Antony went into Egypt & visited the place of his

death (invited perhaps by reading his life) & that in the last year of Constantius he consecrated oyle & distributed it among the people to cure the biting of serpents & other venemous beasts. Which shews that this sort of miracles was then in use in Egypt. The next year when Iulian the Apostate reigned, the Gentiles ^{b[92]} upon a signe given them by the Emperor demolished the miracle working sepulchers. Whence Gregory Nazianzen in his first Oration against Iulian written in the life time of that Emperor, speaks to him after this manner: Thou hast not been afraid of the Martyrs to whom high honours & feasts are constituted; by whom Devils are driven away & diseases are cured; who have apparitions & prædictions; whose bodies alone can do as much as their holy souls whether they be handled or honoured whose drops of blood alone & the small signes of the cross can do as much as their bodies. These thou dost not worship but contemn & despise. Amongst the miracle-working sepulchers was that of Iohn the Baptist as Ierome in the epitaph of Paula thus mentions. ^[93] Paula, saith he, saw Samaria: There lay Eliseus & Abdias & Iohn the Baptist, where she trembled being astonished at the many miracles. ffor she saw the devils roare with various tortures & men before the sepulchers of the Saints howle like wolves, bark like doggs, roar like lions, hiss like serpents, bellow like bulls; others swing their heads about & touch the ground backward with their crowns, & weomen hang by the feet without their garments falling over their face. <64v> comparing this passage with what we cited above out of Hilary it should seem that miracles were propagated out of Egypt first into Iudea where they began at these sepulchers, & then into remoter provinces. When therefore Iulian gave the word, the Gentiles threw down the sepulcher of Iohn the Baptist among the rest ^{e[94]} & scattered his bones about. But as they were gathering them up again to burn them, some Monks coming from Ierusalem to pray there mixt themselves with the gentiles & stole away with some of the bones & gave them to Philip the ffather of their Monastery. But he thinking them too great a treasure for himself sent them by his Deacon Iulian to Athanasius. who, saith Ruffin, ^[95] having received them, shut them up before a few witnesses in the hollowed wall of a Church to preserve them by a prophetic spirit for the use & benefit of posterity. So then Philip could think of no fitter person then Athanasius to whom he should make a present of these miracle-working reliques & Athanasius who no doubt had heard much of their virtues hid them that after the reign of Iulian they might be used again for the benefit of mankind as before. And this compared with what you have heard out of Chrysostom gives us reason to suspect that he was the grand patron of this superstition & to propagate it sent reliques from Alexandria into all the world.

Now by this great example it soon came into fashion for all other cities to communicate their reliques with one another. So the reliques of the 40 Armenian Martyrs ^{d[96]} were dispersed & sent into many regions & particularly to Alexandria: on which occasion Athanasius composed an Oration on these Martyrs which Gerard Vossius saw in Italy in the Library of Cardinal Ascanius as he mentions in his commentary of the Oration of Ephrem Syrus on the same 40 martyrs. Were that Oration printed it might possibly give us further light into this matter.

Nor were the Athanasians of this age content with dissecting & distributing the bodies of real martyrs, but daily pretended to the discovery of new bodies by dreams & revelations (such as were the bodies of Gervasius & <65r> Protasius found by S Ambrose & ^{a[97]} distributed amongst the Bishops of Italy, France, Afric, Noricum the bones of the Prophets Abacuc & Micheas found by Zebennus bishop of Eleutheropolis, the head of Iohn the Baptist found by two Monks, the 40 Thracian martyrs found by the Empress Pulcheria, the body of the Prophet Zachary found by Calamer, the bodies of the first martyr Stephen, & of Nicodemus & others found by Lucian the Monk & disperst into all the Empire, & innumerable others of less note. the Monks setting up altars in all places of the fields & high ways where such bodies were pretended to be discovered & ^{b[98]} going up & down with reliques from door to door ^{c[99]} to furnish every man. Insomuch that the Emperors & Bishops were soon forced to prohibit these practises by Laws. For in the year 386 the Emperors made this Edict.

The Emperors Gratian Valentinian & Theodosius AAA, to Cynegius P.P.

^[100] Let no man carry a buried body to another place, let no man divide & distribute a martyr, let no man make merchandise of him &c. Dat. 4 Kal. Mart. Honorio et Evodio Coss. And the fift Council of Carthage A.C. 398 ordained this Canon. ^[101] Our pleasure is that the Altars which are every where throughout the fields & ways erected as it were to the memory of the martyrs; in which no body or reliques of martyrs are proved to be intombed be thrown (if it may be) by the Bishops to whom those places are subject. But if by

reason of popular tumults this can not be done, yet let the people be admonished not to frequent those places, so that those who are orthodox may not follow any superstition there. And let no memory of the martyrs be probably received unless a body be there or some certain reliques or the original of some habitation or possession or passion be there shewn by most certain tradition. ffor the Altars which by dreams & vain pretended revelations of some men are every where set up are to be wholly dissallowed & rejected. Thus far that Council. And indeed so numerous were the Martyrs thus discovered & dugg up that ^{g[102]} Theodoret calls them many myriads, & that some accounted this the first resurrection of the Saints. To which opinion S. Ambrose in his ^{†[103]} Oration to the people concerning the Martyrs Protasius & Gervasius A.C. 387 thus alludes Many, saith he, do not unfitly call this the <65v> resurrection of the martyrs. Yet let me see whether certain martyrs be risen to themselves or to us. Ye have known, or rather ye have seen many freed from the Devil &c.

Now what a noise of miracles so great a number of reliques made in the Empire may be learnt out of almost all the writers of that age & particularly out of the 2^d Oration of Chrysostom concerning the martyr Babylas; written at Antioch in the ^{b[104]} year 382. ffor in this Oration speaking of the Miracles of Christ & his Apostles, he saith All which if any man affirm to be scarce credible delusions, certainly those things which are now beheld are more than enough to stop his blasphemous mouth & shame it & check his unbridled tongue. ffor there is no region nor people nor city of this our world where these new & surprising miracles are not the common discourse: which if they were {fig}ments they could not come into so great an admiration of men. And a little after. The miracles which are daily done by the martyrs do sufficiently confirm our discourse, a great multitude of people flocking abundantly together to see them. Well therefore did Ambrose say that ^[105] the miracles of the Apostolic age were now revived. But that you may have some kind of estimate of their prodigious number ^{b[106]} D. Augustin tells you that in his church at Hippo within the space of less than two years there were delivered in to be read to the people, almost seventy books of the miracles done in his Church at Hippo by a small parcel of the reliques of the first Martyr Stephen, besides many other books which were written but not then given in. And that at Calama a neighbouring City where they began sooner to give in such books of miracles done by another parcel of S. Stephens reliques the number of books was incredibly greater. Two of these books are extant ^{d[107]} in some editions of D. Austins works & contein seventeen miracles: at which rate the seventy must contein above 500.

Now for what end Athanasius set on foot these miracles is manifest from hence that they were generally practised & promoted by the Athanasians & opposed by their enemies. For Ierome in his second Epistle against Vigilantius tells us that they were opposed by all the Eunomians. ^[108] Do You laugh at the reliques of the <63r> And that Cassian^[109] mentions how one of the Egyptian Abbots heard the Devil openly confessing that he had published the impiety of the sacrilegious opinion by Arius & Eunomius: & further tells this story. [110] When, saith he, a certain Eunomian endeavoured by the art of disputing to subvert the sincerity of the catholic faith & had already deceived a great multitude of men: the catholicks being greatly troubled at the ruin of so great a subversion intreated Macarius to come & free the simplicity of all Egypt from the shipwrack of infidelity. When therefore the heretick set upon him by the art of disputing & would have drawn him away as an ignorant person, with the Aristotelian thorns: Macarius calling off his talkativeness with Apostolick brevity, said, The kingdom of God consists not in speech but in power. Let us go to the sepulchers & invoke the name of the Lord over the first dead man we shall meet with, & as it is written, shew our faith by our works. The Eunomian pretended to go the next day but fled & Macarius went with all the seduced people & in their presence raised to life one of the Mummies who had lived many ages before under the most ancient Kings of Egypt & after some discourse with him commanded him to sleep again.

These & such like stories sufficiently open the designe of Athanasius & his party in setting on foot this humour of pretending to miracles. They found by experience that their opinions were not to be propagated by disputing & arguing, & therefore ^{a[111]} gave out that their adversaries were crafty people & cunning disputants & their own party simple well meaning men, & therefore imposed ^{b[112]} this law upon the Monks that they should not dispute about the Trinity. Thus they left the success of their cause to the working of miracles & spreading of Monkery.

Whether Athanasius did not for promoting his interest set on foot the way of writing fabulous Legends, & propagate the superstition of Monckery.

That the way of writing fals legends began in the latter end of the reign of Constantius or soon after is manifest by the fabulous lives of Antony, Paul, Hilarion, Martin Pachomius, Simeon & many others writ by Athanasius, Ierom, Ruffin, Palladius Severus Theodoret, & other authors whose writings of this kind are Collected by Rosweydyus. The life of Antony was translated into Latine by Evagrius Bishop of Antioch & by Ierome & soon dispersed all over the world. Hervetus first found & published one of the latine translations A.C. 1555 & at length Iohn Meursius found it in greek & published it A.C. 1616. Hierome tells us^[113] that Marcella learnt of the Presbyters of Alexandria & of Athanasius & Peter at Rome the life of Antony then living & the discipline of the Monasteries in Thebais. Whence Baronius concludes that the life of Antony was written by Athanasius before they came to Rome. But this is a mistake. ffor Ierome does not say that Marcella read the life of Antony or that others read it to her, but that she learnt it of the Presbyters of Alexandria & of Athanasius & Peter, that is she learnt his manner of life by their discourses. Athanasius continued this life in an uniform stile to the death of Antony & in the preface mentions that the Monks of Syria desired him to write how {Antony} lived & died & in the bo{dy of} the histor{y writes that Antony} pr{edicted} the persecuti{on of} the Churches under {Con}stantius two y{ears} before it cam{e to} passe, which pe{rse}cution con{tinued t{hen} when Athana{s}ius wrote this life. He wrote it t{here}fore after t{he} death of Ant{ony} & before the death {of Con}stantius, th{at is,} between the y{ears} 358 & 362. < insertion from f 80v > to write how Antony lived & dyed & in the body of the History writes that Antony predicted the persecution of the Church under Constantius two years before it came to pass: which persecution continued then when Athanasius wrote this life. He wrote it therefore after the death of Antony & before the death of Constantius, that is, between the years 358 & 362. < text from f 80r resumes > And this period concurring with the Councils of Sirmium Ariminum & Seleucia, I conceive that in the time of those those Councils, or immediately after Athanasius finding himself reduced to the utmost desperation & seing no hopes of recovery unlesse by extraordinary practises, set himself upon all kind of sophistry & began with writing this life. so that we may recon it written in the year 358 or 359 the Monks of Syria requesting it soon after Antonies death.

Now this life is full of prodigious stories such as are the devil's appearing frequently to Antony in several shapes & bignesses & talking with him & afflicting him & struggling with him & sometimes multitudes of devils appearing in various shapes. Christ's appearing in the form of light to Antony & speaking to him. Antony's remaining as fresh & plump after long fasting as if he had not fasted, his curing diseases, casting out devils, escaping Crocodiles by prayer, frighting away devils & curing demoniacks by the signe of the crosse, seing the soul of Ammon ascend up to heaven, being himself lifted up into the air, & having revelations & by a spirit of prophesy foretelling things. These miracles saith Athanasius were done by Antony by virtue of the promise of Christ that if we have faith like <81r> a grain of mustard seed we may remove mountains & nothing shall be impossible to us, & that if we ask we shall receive. Go, saith he, cure the sick, cast out devils, freely ye have received, freely give.

This life — — — — ‡ < insertion from f 80v > ‡ This Life is allowed genuine by Baronius Bellarmin & the the Roman catholicks in general: nor do I hear it questioned by any Protestants of note. But yet because I have met with one or two who cannot beleive that so holy a man as Athanasius would write such monstrous & incredible things as are in this life, & therefore were willing to suspect that the life now extant is the same with that which Athanasius wrote I will consider their arguments. ffor they are such as if duly considered do rather make for it & prove it to be genuine. < text from f 81r resumes >

ffor first, say they, Antonius was learned whereas this Life makes him ignorant of letters. I answer that tho antiquity magnified him yet he was never celebrated for any other learning then what he had without reading. None of the ancients affirm that he could read but some affirm the contrary. Socrates^[114] tells us that when a certain Philosopher asked Antony how he could live being destitute of the solace of books, Antony answered that his book was the nature of things: # < insertion from f 80v > # Cassian^[115] relates from the Monks of Egypt the same thing with some varity of circumstance spea{ks o}f two Philosophers who despised Antony as unskilful & void of letters. < text from f 81r resumes > D. Austin^[116] saith that it was the popular fame that Antony without any knowledge of letters had the scriptures by heart. And Sozomen that Antony neither knew letters nor valued them but commended a good intellect as being older then letters & the inventor of

them. Almost all which was taken out of the life of Antony now extant. For there it is said that Antony ^{a[117]} would not learn letters but yet was so attentive to reading that nothing of those things which were written slipt out of his memory, but he retained all things, & as for the rest meditation was to him instead of books. And ^{c[118]} when certain Philosophers thought to deride him for his ignorance of letters he asked them which was oldest, the mind or letters & which was the cause of the other? to which when they replied that the mind was older then letters & the inventer of them, he answered that he therefore who has a sound mind has no need of letters.

Another objection is those præcepts of a monastick life which Gregory Nazianzen saith were written by Athanasius in the life of Antony, are not found in the life now extant. But this objection is lame on both leggs. ffor Gregory s speaks of no precept. His words are that Athanasius wrote Antony's life, as a law of monastick life, in the form of a narration. And this narration you have at large in the Life of Antony now extant, where Athanasius relates two speeches of Antony to the Monks instructing them how upon all occasions they should behave themselves: which speeches take up one third part of this Life.

Thirdly they object that the life of Antony now extant wants all that **{illeg}** {betwe}en Antony & Paul. <77r> But if there be any thing in this objection we must reject the Gospels: because some want what others have. Athanasius in the preface tells us that he wrote but a small part of what Antony did: & what therefore if he omitted the story of Paul? Or rather what if the whole story of Paul be a Romance of a later date? Before Ierome wrote his life the monks told such monstrous incredible stories of him as Ierome himself was ashamed of, & made him a man hairy all over to the feet like a beast. Ierome represents that he was unknown to all the world till Antony found him that no man saw him but Antony & that he found him by divine revelation & by the direction of a Centaur & of a Satyr, which Satyr had a rational soul & discoursed with Antony in his own language & beleived in Iesus Christ. so that before you can beleive that there was such a man as Paul, you must beleive that Antony found him after this miraculous manner. Well therefore did Ieromes contemporaries deride him, as ^{a[119]} he himself complains, for writing the life of a **{illeg}** who never **{illeg}**

In the last place they object that the life now extant conteins many fabulous & incredible things, which so pious & judicious a man as Athanasius would not write. But I take it to be rather an argument that Athanasius did write them because they are of the same kind with other things which Athanasius then wrote. And if we will beleive antiquity, Athanasius did really write them. For Socrates affirms it in these words.^[120] What kind of man Antony was in the wilderness who openly contested with Devils, discovering all their craft & treachery, & how he did many prodigies & miracles is superfluous for me to commemorate: for Athanasius Bishop of Alexandria has handled that argument already, having written a peculiar book concerning his life. And Sozomen saith that ^[121] Paulus simplex one of Antonies disciples was famous for miracles, & that for vexing & driving away the Devil he was above even Antony himself. ‡ And Ruffin &c^[122] < insertion from f 78v > ‡ And Ruffin that Antony living in the wilderness & conversing only with Beasts & having frequent triumphs over Devils, he pleased God above all mortals, & left the Moncks notable examples of his institution: the telling of all which was prevented by that book which had been written by Athanasius & was published also in Latin. Gregory Nazianzen in his first ^{†[123]} Oration against Iulian written in the reign of Iovian affirms that the Devils tremble at the naming of Christ & that the force of this name is not diminished by the wickedness of the person who pronounces it, & that the Emperor Iulian being set upon by Devils with strange noises & appearances, frighted away the Devils once & again by the signe of the Crosse. And whence I pray had the wisest of the party these notions so early but from the life of Antony? D. Augustin < text from f 77r resumes > D. Austin^[124] tells us that when Pontitianus first acquainted him with the life of Antony, he & those with him were astonished hearing the most strongly attested miracles done so lately in the Church. We all wondred, saith he, both we because they were so great, & Pontianus because we had not heard of them before. He calls these miracles most strongly attested because Athanasius in this life saith, he wrote them according to the relations of the Moncks. ^[125] One of the most incredible stories in this life is that Antony saw the soul of Ammon, immediately after his death, carried up into heaven by angels: & Socrates^[126] tells us expresly that this story was told by Athanasius in the life of Antony. He tells <78r> also how Ammon was carried over the river Lycus by Angels & Palladius in the life of Ammon relating both these stories tells us that Athanasius wrote them in the life of Antony. Sozomen also tells them both almost in the same words in which you may find them in the life of Antony now extant, so that you may be sure he had them from thence.

He saith indeed that these things were related by those who conversed familiarly with Antony & Ammon: but he means that they were related by them not to himself who lived long after their death, but to Athanasius who in the Preface saith he wrote them by the relation of those men & from whose book Sozomen reported them. Amongst the most incredible parts of Antony's life may be also reckoned his having divine visions & foretelling things as a Prophet. And yet Chrysostome assures us that Athanasius wrote such things. His words are: ^[127] Antony was both worthy of the Vision of God & lead such a life as the laws of Christ require. This any man will easily know who shall read that book which contains the history of his life: in which also he shall see Prophecy shining forth. For he prophesied manifestly of those whom the Arian pest invaded; & taught how great a tempest & confusion hung over the churches from them; God revealing these things & setting all things in a figure before his eyes. Which certainly is a principal document of the catholick faith, seeing none of the Hereticks can be shewn to be such a man. But least you should seem to heare these things from me, you shall rather by reading the book learn all things accurately, that you may thence receive the greatest incitements to Philosophy. But I pray that we may not only meditate on the things written therein, but also imitate what is there exprest. Thus far Chrysostom, & what he here speaks of is in the life of Antony now extant.

So then Athanasius wrote such a life as that now extant & what he wrote being found in this life we have no reason to doubt of its being genuine. 'Tis certain that the way of writing Ecclesiastical Romances did begin in that age & no man besides Athanasius had authority enough to break ^{<66r>} the ice in this way of writing. Antiquity tells us not of any other life of Antony besides that written by Athanasius & this life now extant is an entire piece written in his stile. Sozomen tells us many things of Antony^[128] as that he received letters from Constantine the great, lost his parents in his youth, distributed his fathers lands amongst his townsmen, gave the rest of his goods to the poor, conversed with all wise men & imitated what was best in each, ate only bread & salt & drank only water, dined at sunset, often fasted two days or more, often watched all night, slept on a matt & frequently on the bare ground, never annointed nor bathed himself nor saw himself naked, was meek, prudent, pleasant foreknew things but dissuaded the monks from affecting it, spent his time in working, came often to the cities to defend the injured, interceded for them with the Presidents & great men who delighted to see & hear him, but immediately returned to the wilderness saying that as fishes cannot live on dry land so monks in cities lose their virtue: all which you may find in the life of Antony now extant. So that I cannot see the least reason to doubt of its being genuine Bellarmin Baronius & the rest of the Roman Church receive it: & 'tis nothing but a wrong notion of Athanasius which has made some of the Protestants doubt of it.

Now the consequences of this life were these.

ffirst it did set all the Monks upon an humour of of pretending to miracles: so that the whole world presently rang with stories of this kind. And hence it came to passe that the lives of all the first & most eminent Monks were filled with apparitions: of Devils, miraculous cures of diseases, prophecies & other prodigious relations: as you may see in the Collection of Rosweydyus. And this was the original of those ecclesiastical Legends which are still used in the Church of Rome

Secondly the superstitious or to speak more truly the magical use of the signe of the Cross was hereby set on foot & propagated all over the East. In the western Churches it was in use before. ffor they began in the time of Tertullian or before to be tainted with the superstitions of the Montanists. Athanasius in his exile learnt it there & now turning it into an enchantment makes Antony in a large discourse to the Monks teach them how by this signe they may drive away the Devil & dissolve all kinds of enchantments & witchcraft. And this I like to be the original of the Greek & Latine Church using it for this end.

^{<67r>} Thirdly by writing this life Athanasius obliged the Monks & fixt them to his interest. ffor he makes Antony exhort y^m against the religion of Constantius as Arian & Antichristian & prophesy against it by divine inspiration predicting that it should overflow the world.

Fourthly by this life Athanasius propagated Monkery & made it overflow the Roman world like a torrent. For Athanasius in the end of this life commanded the Monks that they should read it to their brethren that is to all Christians & not only to them but also to the heathens to convert them by means of the miracles related therein. And thus this life going speedily into all the Empire, struck its hearers with admiration & made many desire to imitate Antony. — — ^{<67Ar>} & made it overflow the Roman world like a torrent. ffor this life

going into all the Empire struck the homousians with admiration & made many of them desire to imitate Antony; especially when they heard that the gift of miracles continued amongst his successors.

The Clergy also by this means soon became Monks. ffor besides that divers of them became monks after they were clergy men it grew quickly into custome to elect Deacons Presbyters & Bishops out of this order of men as the most holy, & the p^[129] Emperors & q^[130] Pope commanded that they should be elected thence : so that hence forward the ffathers & Bishops of the Church (Athanasius Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Epiphanius Chrysostom, Hilary Eusebius Vercelensis Ambrose, Ierome, Ruffin Austin Martin, &c) were Monks & many of them (as Basil, Nazianzen, Eusebius Vercellensis, Ambrose Martin Augustin the founders of Monckery in Asia, Thrace, Italy, Lombardy, France, Afric) had monasteries out of which they filled their Churches And this was the original of the Cælibacy of the Priests The habit of the Monks was of a dark russet or black colour; & thence the Clergy as many as were Monks wore black, which has been their colour ever since. ffor the b^[132] clergy before wore garments of any other colours like the people. This body of men was at first two fold, Antony planting one body in Egypt headed by the Archbishop & Clergy of Alexandria, & Hilarion planting another in Syria headed by the Archbishop & Clergy of Antioch. Both these bodies began to be numerous a^[133] in the reign of Constantius & from these two fountains Monckery overflowed the world, but yet became not of a long time so numerous in other regions as in these.

Now by propagating this order of men # < insertion from f 67r > # Now by propagating this order of men Athanasius triumphed over all his enemies as [†][134] Sozomen tells you in these words. That the opinion of Apollinaris & Eunomius prevailed not is chiefly to be ascribed to the Monks. For as many as followed the monastick philosophy in Syria & Cappadocia & the Provinces round about, did stifly adhere to the Nicene Decrees. Certainly their heresies were embraced by almost all men throughout all the Provinces of the East But that happened to them which had before happened to the Arians. ffor the people in those regions, while they admired the monks exceedingly for their vertue & works, thought that they were of the right opinion & avoyded those who beleived otherwise as contaminated with adulterate opinions: after the manner that the Egyptians formerly by following the doctrine of their Monks did stoutly resist the Arians. So then Monckery & homousianism grew up together: taking root first in Egypt & soon after in Syria & thence overspreading the whole East. The greatest strength of Athanasius & his predecessor Alexander was in Egypt: & yet in the beginning was scarce greater there then in other places, being every where almost none at all. ffor in the beginning Alexander in d^[135] a letter to his namesake of Byzantium complained that seditions & persecutions were daily stirred up against him, & that by means of the weomen he was summoned before the Iudges. And at the same time when Hosius was sent by Constantine to compose the controversy, Arius wrote back to the Emperor that the multitude were on his side & the Emperor in a satyirical letter written thereupon to all the Empire again makes mention by way of concession. For he replies that he would therefore come & make up the other party. His words are these. The multitude [saith Arius] is on our side. Therefore I a little one, will come neare that I may be a spectator of mad warrs. I my self, I say, will come neare who am used to quiet the warres of mad men. Behold again [he saith] I come suppliant & being powerfull in arms I will not fight but being fortified with the faith of Christ will cure you & others &c. Thus Constantine makes Arius speak & a little after repeating Arius his boasting of the multitude, subjoyns that some of the Sibylls predicted it should be so in Libya: & after a recital of the prophesy subjoyns. What therefore, o thou most crafty man, in what part of <67Av> the world dost thou confess thy self to be in? Namely there [i.e. in Libya] for I have the letters which thou wrotest to me with a frantick pen in which thou affirmest that all the people of Libya assent to thee unto salvation. Thus far Constantine a most unexceptionable witness. And the same thing is hinted by others of the most ancient writers as by Severus, ^[136] where speaking of peace from persecution restored to the Church by Constantine ; he saith, g^[137] that by that peace a far more fearful danger was begotten to all the Churches. For then the heresy of Arius brake forth totumque orbem invuto, errore turbaverat, & by bringing in error troubled the whole world, that is, in the reign of Constantine. But Gregory Nazianen is more plain Arius, saith he, beginning at the city of Alexandria, & there inventing his pestilent opinion, & then like a flame in a feild from a little spark τὸ πολὺ της ὀικουμένης ἐπιδραμὼν overrunning a great part of the world, is opprest by our fathers & that pi{illeg} number which then assembled at Nice & defined theology by certain limits & words. In how large a sense τὸ πολὺ may be here taken by Gregory may be gathered from hence that ^h[138] in another place he calls the same men when in the reign of Constantius they {illeg} were the whole Christian world τὸ πολὺ της ἐκκλησίας And in how large a sense he did really take it, {is} to be understood by a passage in ^k[139] his 21th

Oration; where when he had told how Athanasius was made Bishop of Alexandria he thus goes on. Neither can I sufficiently tell whether he received this sacred dignity as a reward of his virtue or as the fountain & life of the Church. For it was requisite that the Church languishing with the thirst of truth, should like Ismael be refreshed with drink, or like Helias when the earth was dried for want of rain, be refreshed out of the brook; & breathing a little, be recalled to life & left a seed to Israel least we should become like Sodom & Gomorra — — — — — For this reason, when we were cast down a horn of Salvation was raised up to us & a corner stone binding us to it self & to one another was opportunely cast in: — — — — — Thus & for these reasons was he by the voice of all the people not according to the wicked manner which since obtains nor by slaughters & tyranny, but Apostolically & spiritually, exalted to the throne of Mark. Thus far Gregory who as to the general state of the Church of that time could not be mistaken. for he was born before the Council of Nice & conversed much with his father who was made Bishop of Nazianzum two years after that Council & continued 45 years in that Bishopric & then died an hundred years old.

But whereas Gregory saith that Athanasius was made Bishop {by} the voice of all the people, he seems in this particular to have followed the letter of the Council of Alexandria where Athanasius & his Bishops say that all the multitude & all the people of the catholic Church [that is all whom they accounted catholic] coming <75v> together as it were with one soul & body. [] adjoined us for many days & nights together, to make Athanasius Bishop whilst neither they departed from the Church nor gave us leave to depart. So then the catholics of that very great & very populous city Alexandria which had in it twelve parishes were at that time not so many but that one Church (one of those little parochial Churches they built in the reign of Licinius) was big enough to hold them all & afford them room to eat & drink & sleep for many days together. You have heard above

out of Eusebius & Socrates that the Egyptians were now in furious & implacable heats about the word homousios. Eusebius tells us that the Emperor Constantine to quiet these heats called both parties before him, forbore all anger, gave them good words as fathers & Prophets, honoured them with gifts & ratified the Nicene decree exhorting them to peace. By which its manifest that the Egyptian Bishops who then opposed that decree were too numerous & formidable to be dealt with roughly.

But now Athanasius being made Bishop, he made bishops in Egypt ^{a[140]} out of the Monks during all the reign of Constantine Constantius & Valens & by the credit & interest which they had with the people grew at length overcame {illeg}. For he had been formerly one of Antonies disciples in the wilderness as he himself affirms in the life of Antony & this begat that great love & friendship which was between him & Antony, & fixt the order of the Monks to his interest & him to theirs.

< text from f 67Ar resumes >

Some are of opinion that the Monks of this age were most holy men: but this is a great prejudice & such a prejudice as judicious men who have read & considered their lives can scarce fall into. for they seeme to me to have been the most unchast & superstitious part of mankind as well in this first age as in all following ages. For it was a general notion amongst them ^{a[141]} that after any man became a Monk he found himself more tempted by the Devil to lust then before & those who went furthest into the wilderness & profest Monkery most strictly were most tempted, the Devil (as they imagined) tempting them most when it was to divert them from the best purpose. So that to turn a Monk was to run into such temptation as Christ has taught us to pray that God would not lead us into. For lust by being forcibly restrained & by struggling with it is always inflamed. The way to be chaste is not to contend & struggle with unchast thoughts but to decline them {illeg} keep the mind employed about other things: for he that's always thinking of chastity will be always thinking of weomen & every contest with unchast thoughts will leave such impressions upon the mind as shall make those thoughts apt to return more frequently. fasting duly is one of the moral <75r> vertues & has its vitious extremes like all the rest. If duly exercised 'tis temperance & its extremes are intemperance. To pamper the body enflames lust & makes it lesse active & fit for use. And on the other hand To macerate it by fasting & watching beyond measure does the same thing. It does not only render the body feeble & unfit for use but also enflames it & invigorates lustful thoughts. The want of sleep & due refreshment disorders the imagination & at length brings men to a sort of distraction & madnesse so as to make them have visions of weomen conversing with 'em & think they really see & touch them & heare them talk. † † See the backside of the next page < insertion from f 76v > See the leaf before. † as I gather from what the Monks have recorded from their own experience. {illeg}anus in Collat. 22 {illeg}. 2 propounds this Question Cur interdum

remissius jejunantes levioribus carnis {illeg}culeis titillentur & nonnunquam districtius abstinentes afflicto exhaustoque corpore incentivis ac{illeg}ribus urgeantur ita ut experge facti reperiant se humorum naturalium {qu}estione respersos. And subjoyns hujus in festationis triplicem causam Monachorum majores prodidere. And in Collat 2 cap. 17 he affirms gravius se periclitatum somni cibique fastidio quam soporis et gastrimargiæ colluctatione persensit. Et quod pernicius continentia immoderata quam saturitas remissa supplantat. And Evagrus a monk the Master of Palladius, in his book de octo vitiosis cogitationibus writes thus Libidinis Dæmon, inquit, variorum corporum desiderio animas inflamat, acriusque eos qui continentia student, urget: quo nimirum tanquam frustra laborantes institutum suum abrumpant. Atque animam inficiens, et dicere et rursus audire verba facit non secus ac si res ipsa cerneretur ac præsto esset. And this I take to be one of the reasons why the first Monks who fasted most were most frightened with apparitions of Devils as Cassian affirms. Collat. 7. cap 23. < text from f 75r resumes > These are the extremes of intemperance & between these such a moderate fasting as best suits with every mans body so as without unfitting it for use to keep down lust, is the due mean of temperance. ffor my part I have not met with more uncleannesse & greater arguments of unchast minds in any sort of people then in the lives of the ^{t[142]} first Monks: For what else mean their doctrine that its better to contend with & vanquish unchast thoughts then not to have them, their frequent visions of naked weomen, their digging up the bodies of dead weomen with w^{ch} they burned in lust, their lusting even after passive Sodomy & their relating these & other such histories without blus^{hing}

Then for superstition they were eminent. ffor what else is their placing so much of religion in bodily exercises; as in extravagant fasting; in torturing their bodies by irons, ulcers, sordid habitations & the like, in standing daily upon a pillar or in some other strange posture to be seen of men; in using the signe of the cross, dead mens bones, holy water, consecrated oyle & other consecrated things to do supernatural operations; & in praying by number. ffor in the life time of Antony Pachomius one of his disciples founding many monasteries (for he was the first founder of monastical societies) instituted that they should say 12 prayers in the morning, 12 at noon & 12 at night & 3 at nine at nine a clock & pretended he did it by the direction of an Angel which conversed with him, & dictated the laws which he prescribed to his monasteries. Others said a greater number. And that they measured holinesse by the number is manifest by a story which Palladius tells of Paul the Abbot.^[143] It was this man's exercise, saith he, to pray continually. He had 300 prayers exprest & so many stones in his bosom & at every prayer cast away a stone. When he came to Macarius he said, Abbot Macarius I am very much afflicted. In a certain village there lives a certain maid which saith 700 prayers. When I had learnt this I blamed myself because I could say but 300. To which Macarius answered: Tis now sixty years that I have said an hundred set prayers & yet I do not judge my self negligent. For Macarius was he whom ^{r[144]} Antony left heir of his spirit & virtues as Elija did Elisha: ^{s[145]} for Antony himself numbred his prayers. Here you have the original of the Popish custome of praying by beads: & if you desire the original of praying without understanding or (which is all <76r> one) in an unknown tongue, Cassian tells you in these words. ^[146] Antonij hæc erat cælestis & plusquam humana sententia. Non est, inquit, perfecta oratio in qua se Monachus, vel hoc ipsum quod orat intelligit. This was a heavenly & more then humane sentence of Antony: It is not a perfect prayer, saith he, in which the Monk understands himself or what he prays. Which sentence Cassian descanting upon, places the efficacy of prayer in an assurance that God will grant what is fit for us whether it be according to or contrary to what we ask.

They had also the doctrine of Purgatory as I gather from the story which Ruffin tells of Macarius the disciple of Antony.^[147] namely that in going over the sands of Egypt he found a dead mans skull & upon asking it questions the skull answered that he was in hell & that the damned found some ease by the prayers of the Church. This is a step beyond Purgatory.

The first monks also taught blind obedience to superiors For it was ^{h[149]} a saying of Antony to such as came to be admitted his disciples: You may be saved if you have obedience & do whatever I bid you. And such obedience you may find often commended & enjoyed in the lives of the fathers.

Auricular confession & pennance was also the doctrine & practise of the first Monks. For it was a ^{n[150]} saying of Antony: The Monk ought to declare to the Seniors, if it can be, even how many paces he walks & how many cups of water he drinks in his cell

Whether Athanasius & his party did not falsly & maliciously affix the name of Arian upon the Eastern Churches which condemned him:

All parties who find themselves baffled are prone to grow angry & rail

<72r>

Quest.

Whether the Roman Catholicks were not wicked enough to deserve what they suffered under Constantius, Valens & the Vandals.

<79r>

Quest.

Whether the Vandals persecuted the Africans for their faith or only punished them for their immoralities.

Victor in his History of the Vandalick Persecution tells us that Hunneric king of the Vandals began it in this manner. ffirst he commanded the sacred Virgins or Nuns to be assembled & searched by midwives & then hung up with weights at their feet & tortured with heated plates of iron aplied to several parts of their bodies, saying: Confesse to us how your Bishops & Priests lye with you? And this, saith Victor, he did, ut semitam inveniret per cujus aditum publicam, sicut fecit, faceret persecutionem, to find a way to the following persecution. And what that persecution was he describes in the next words telling how 4966 Bishops Priests & Deacons & others, together with a multitude of infants were at once sent into banishment. So then the Nuns as many as upon search were found vitiated, were questioned about those men with whom they had layn & as many as would not confesse their lovers were urged to it by torments: & then the persons whom they confest of, were sent away together with the bastard children into banishment. Now tho this were no more a persecution then the burning an unchast Vestal Virgin among the Romans or the unchast daughters of the Priests among the Iews & putting the fornicators also to death: yet Victor celebrates all these banished Bishops Priests & Deacons for holy martyrs & makes all the Nuns also who confest of them to be chast & spotlesse. But whether they were innocent is not the present question: tis enough that they were punished as criminals. And by this beginning of the Persecution I leave you to guesse at the rest.

<49r>

Quest

Whether the Emperor Valens persecuted the Athanasians for religion or only punished them for their immoralities.

After Constantius reigned Iulian the Apostate two years & then the Empire became divided between Valentinian & Valens. Now Valens who reigned in the East is reconned a very great Persecutor: And yet if you except such as were sentenced as criminals or perished in seditions you will scarce meet with either martyrs or confessors in his reign. The Ecclesiastical historians tell us indeed that he caused eighty Presbyters to be burnt together in a ship at sea. & to make it the more probable the names of some of the Presbyters are added. And this is the great act of cruelty for which he is so much exclaimed against as a Persecutor. But what if this story be a fable? ffor the Historians wrote not till fifty years after the death of Valens, & Greg. Nazianzen who flourished in his reign tells us there was but one Presbyter burnt. ffor thô in an oratorical flourish he speaks ^{b[151]} somewhere in the plural number of dead mens hands cut off & Presbyters burnt yet as he meant but one hand cut off in his 23^d Oration where he tells the story of the ship distinctly he saith: Ναυς φόρτον ἔχουσα τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἕνα, καὶ τουτον οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ κακοῦ τινος, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ πίστε{αις} κινδυνεύοντα, κατα πελάγους ἀφίηται — — — — ἀνάπτεται τὸ πυρ, δαπαναται ἡ ναυς συνδαπαναται ὁ φόρτος, πυρ ὕδατι μίγνυται — — — καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος κόνις &c. A ship was put to sea with one Presbyter in it to be burnt there, not for any wickedness but for his faith, & this Presbyter being a pious man took it chearfully. Whilst the ship set to sail, a multitude of spectators stood on the shore some rejoycing others lamenting & then the ship was set on fire & consumed with the Presbyter. And, saith Gregory, I have many witnesses of this story: for the tragedy of this punishment is come to the ears of many. So then the first rumor spread abroad in Asia minor where Gregory Nazianzen lived & where the thing was said to be done, was of but one Presbyter. This Gregory wrote presently after the reign of Valens as the chief instance of the

persecutions of that reign which he could think of. And whilst I consider how improbable it is that the Emperor should destroy a ship so foolishly: I cannot beleive there was one. The story looks as if framed by somebody who not daring to lay the scene of the execution in any town <49v> where he might have been confuted by the inhabitants contrived it at sea & pretended several spectators on shore to confirm it. ffor one man or two might as easily send abroad the story at first as others could afterwards mend it & enlarge the number of martyrs from one to fourscore. So then to make Valens go for a Persecutor there has been such art & contrivance as would have been unnecessary had he been a persecutor in good earnest.

But that you may know what kind of persecutor he was, the first & so far as I can find the greatest act of his persecution (if you set aside what happened upon seditions) was an edict that all those who were banished by Constantius & released by Julian the Apostate should return to banishment. And what sort of persecution followed is discovered by S. Basil in his 220th Epistle in these words. Ἡ ἀνατολὴ πᾶσα σχηδὸν &c Almost all the east, most reverend father, that is all regions from Illyricum to Egypt, is lost with a vehement tempest by the heresy long since spread by Arius the enemy of truth, & now impudently shewing it self again, & as from a bitter root bringing forth deadly fruit, & prevailing now because throughout all the Diocesses, the patrons of orthodoxy ἐκ συκοφαντίας, καὶ ἐπηρείας τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐκπεσεῖν by false accusations & injurious reproaches are deposed from the Churches. He means that they were deposed not in all the diocesses, but in those few where they were. And to the same purpose Gregory Nazianzen in his 32^d Oration^[152] had before the Bishops of the second general Council, after he had mentioned the persecution of Julian speaks thus of Valens. The second was no whit more humane then him, or rather he was more grievous because whilst he bare the name of Christ he was a false Christ & the disgrace of Christians: to whome it was made impious to act & inglorious to suffer, because they did not seem to receive an <50r> injury nor was their martyrdome accompanied with a glorious name, but even here the truth was disguised, so that they who suffered as Christians were recconed to be punished as impious persons.

So again in his Oration in laudem Heronis^[153] he saith that the persecution of Valens was in this respect more sharp then that of Julian, because the conflict of the Martyrs was then apparent & illustrious but now to suffer was inglorious at least before the unjust judges by whom they were condemned to suffer. So then what Valens did whether in punishing seditious persons by temporal Iudges or deposing Clergy men by spiritual ones, was not looked upon by the people during his reign as a persecution, but those that suffered were thought to suffer justly. For Basil also^[154] in his Epistle to the Churches of Gallia & Italia writes to the same purpose. A persecution lays hold of us, most reverend brethren, saith he, the most grievous of all persecutions. For the shepherds are driven away that the flocks may be dispersed. And which is the most grievous, neither they which suffer bear their sufferings patiently to the accomplishing of martyrdome neither does the people honour those as martyrs who suffer; by reason that the persecutors are covered over with the name of Christians. So then torturing imprisoning killing & burning for mere religion was not then in fashion: for such sufferings would have moved pity in the people. And tho they tell us they were persecuted for religion & Basil in this very Epistle writes to the same purpose yet he means that religion was the secret cause for which they suffered under other open pretenses. For he writes thus. There is one crime now vehemently punished, that is an accurate adhering to the traditions of the ffathers. For this thing the pious are driven from their fathers seats & translated into solitudes. With the unjust judges there is no veneration of the hoary head, none of the exercise of piety, none of conversation regulated according to the gospel all the life: but whilst no malefactor is condemned without good evidence, the Bishops are condemned by calumny alone, & without any proof of the accusations are delivered over to <51r> punishment. And some neither knew their accusers nor saw the judgment seats, nor were first accused, but were taken by force in the night time & sent into banishment, being by the calamities of the deserts delivered to death. And what followed these things all men know thô we should be silent, namely the flight of Priests & Deacons & depredations of the whole clergy. Here you see Basil gives the western Bishops a full description of the eastern persecution. Some Bishops, saith he, were banished upon fals accusations, others carried away by force in the night & banished without any trial: that is in cities where the people were tumultuous & would not suffer their Bishops to be brought to trial. In these the Presidents were necessitated to seize the Bishops in the night when the people were asleep & afterwards to disperse their clergy before they could compose the cities & place new bishops there. So you see it was now grown in fashion to abet seditions & celebrate those for martyrs & confessors who suffered for them. Athanasius & others did it in the reign of Constantius & therefore you need not wonder if Basil did it now. ffor in his Epistle to the Alexandrians^[155] he abets & sanctifies all their seditions by the name of persecution on the Emperors side & martyrdome on theirs. And as Athanasius had

before stirred up the Western Emperor against the Eastern so Basil now together with other Eastern Bishops of his party sent several embassies into the west to sollicite the western Bishops to their releife, that is, to solicit them to stirr up the western Emperor Valentinian against his brother Valens. [ffor Basil ^{a[156]} with Meletius Bishop of Antioch & their friends in the ^{b[157]} Epistle to the Bishops of Gallia & Italy newly mentioned (which was sent by Dorotheus one of those Eastern Bishops in the name of the rest,) saith: < insertion from f 50v > For the eastern Bishops Meletius of Antioch, Eusebius, Basilius & the rest of Syria & Asia who held the Consubstantiality sending a common Embassy on this errand to the Bishops of Italy & Gallia: Basil in the Epistle which he then wrote to the same western Bishops (that Epistle which we newly mentioned) saith in the name of them all: We desire chiefly — — — < text from f 51r resumes > We desire chiefly that our troubles & confusion may be made known by your piety to the Emperor of your regions. So you see the practises & persecutions in the reigns of Constantius & Valens were much of a kind excepting that the <71r> Western Bishops having fresh in their memory {the i}ll successe against Constantius durst not meddle with Valens, & that the party of Athanasius in the East being now by the spreading of monkery grown more strong & seditious then before, gave Valens more foile then they had done Constantius. <68r> The meaning is that after the death of Valens, when the Emperor Gratian sent an edict into the east to restore the consubstantialists & establish the faith & communion of the Bishop of Rome, & the Council of Antioch at that time assembled upon the reception of this edict sent Bishops into several parts of the East to preach openly the Consubstantial Trinity: the whole eastern world was put into such a vehement commotion as had scarce ever happened at any time before. And at that time Gregory Nazianzen being sent by the same Council to Constantinople, the flock which at his first coming thither he began to gather, deserted him so soon as he began to preach the deity of the holy Ghost, & (as he tells us in his life,) threw stones at him as if he had preached up a plurality of Gods.

Exarsit in me tota primum civitas^[158]
 Multos perinde ac si Deos inducerem.
 Mirum nec est hoc, instituti sic erant
 Ignota prorsus ut quibus fides pia
 Esset modoque trina quonam est unitas,
 Atque una rursum Trinitas. ———
 Impres tacebo saxeos epulas meas.

This was in the year 378, three years before the second general Council.

So then before this year the Deity of the Holy Ghost was rarely preached in the east for fear of the people. Basil himself was so fearful of doing it that his faith was for a good while suspected by those of his own party. And when he began to use the new Doxology, tho he did not presently reject the old one but for a blind used that & the new one promiscuously, some of the people then present (as ^{b[159]} he tells us rushed upon him saying that he used new & strange words & also such as were contrary to one another. This put Basil upon writing his book de Spiritu Sancto for he wrot it in Defense of the new Doxology. Yet he opposes not the old doxology but grants it was then generally in use & not only then but in the former ages. All that he contends for is that the new doxology may be used & was sometimes used by the Fathers tho so sparingly that he accounts it paradoxical to meet with it in them Yet he thought t{hey} sometimes mi{ght} use it: & in his 29th chapter produces out of antiquity whatever he could meet with to this purpose . But his citations as they are but few so they seem frivolous that only of Dionysius & another of Apricanus the Chronologer excepted. For they are these. Clemens Romanus saith, God lives & the Lord Iesus Christ & the Holy Ghost Irenaeus calls the spirit Θειον divine, Eusebius of Cæsarea hath these words: Invoking with the holy Spirit [that is through his assistance] God the author of light through our Saviour Iesus Christ. Origen in his exposition on the Psalmes sometimes gives glory with the Holy Ghost, that is, in him, or by his assistance. <69r> & in the sixt book of his exposition on Iohn pronounces the Trinity to be adored, & in his commentary on the Romans he saith The holy vertues are capable of the only begotten & of the Deity of the Holy ghost. But Basil here subjoyns that Origen in these last citations contradicts his own opinion: which is as much as to say, that his books had been here corrupted. For Origen was no such tatter-brains as to contradict himself in the first principles of Christianity. † < insertion from f 68v > † Basil further alleges that the Neocæsarienses used the new Doxology & because they were tenacious of the traditions of Gregorius Thaumaturgus, he thence infers that they had it from this Gregory & used it ever since his time. But this is a sophism of Basils. ffor Basil in his 64th Epistle to the Doctors of Neocæsarea tells us that the Neocæsarienses were then lapst

into Sabellianism teaching one hypostasis of the father Son & Holy Ghost & pleading that Gregory in his Creed had said πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν ἐννοία μὲν εἶνα δυὸ, ὑποστάσει δὲ ἓν, that the father & Son were two in the mode of conception, & but one in hypostasis: whereas saith he the heresy of Sabellius was laid asleep by the tradition of this Gregory & in his writing were to be found many words which added strength even to the contrary heresy now reigning as τὸ κτίσμα καὶ τὸ ποίημα καὶ ἔστι τι τοιοῦτη a creature & a facture & if there be any thing else of that kind. The Neocæsarienses therefore had this new doxology not from Gregory but from the Sardican Sabellianism, from whence also the western Churches derived it. Now these allegations are all < text from f 69r resumes > These citations are all that Basil could find in the Fathers for the Deity & worship of the Holy Ghost which being either frivolous or spurious incline me vehemently to suspect that the fathers were absolute strangers to the new doxology. And therefore he that made Dionysius use it & pleade the authority of antiquity for that use, seems to have misrepresented antiquity that by their feigned authority he might perswade his credulous followers to receive it.

In a word the doxology ascribed to Dionysius together with what preceded in the body of his apology is so inconsistent as well with the other writings of Dionysius as with the language of his age & looks so like the artifice of Athanasius that I must accuse him & desire his friends to lay aside their Athanasius dixit & clear him by fair evidence.

<82r>

Whether Athanasius for stifling objections taken from the writings of Dionysius of Alexandria & from the Council of Antioch collected against Paul of Samosat & for changing the ancient Doxology did not feign records.

② About 10 years after this The Council of Antioch consisting of 70 Bishops or according to Hilary of 80) collected out of almost all the East against Paul of Samosat in condemning this Heretick decreed that the son was not homousios to the father. This is expresly acknowledged by ^{a[160]} Athanasius ^[161] Hilary & ^[162] Basil & denied by no body. And this decree was then universally received in the Churches the Council sending about their sentence with circulatory letters to the Bishops of Rome & Alexandria & other Metropolitans to be communicated to the rest of the Bishops, & all the Churches acquiescing in it without any dispute then raised. Nor was this Council generally received in that age only but hath ever since by all the Churches of all ages been acknowledged orthodox, Athanasius himself not daring to oppose it but chusing rather by shams to decline & silence the force of its authority. So that of all the Councils which have been ever since this has the best right to the title of an orthodox & ecumenical Council.

① Dionysius of Alexandria (as ^{d[163]} Athanasius informs us), hearing that some bishops of Pentapolis much propagated the opinion of Sabellius in those parts: wrote against them an Epistle to Ammon & Euphranor; in which he affirmed, that the Son of God was a thing made & formed & not the Father's proper son by nature but alien from him according to essence, as a vine is from the nature of the Husbandman & a ship from that of the workmen: for being a thing made he was not before he was made. For that Dionysius wrote this is acknowledged by Athanasius.

About 55 years after this Council was the Council of Nice which within the space of one day, the Emperor being present & pressing the homousios, debated & through his importunity decreed it, but afterwards understanding that by their over hasty decree they had dissolved the decree of the Council of Antioch, they began to repent of what they had done & complained that the word was unwarily put by the Council & ceased not till by the Councils of Ariminum & Seleucia they got their own decree repealed.

And now Athanasius finding his cause very desparate betook himself to those many artifices which we have described above & <83r> & because the homousios had been abrogated by the authority of the Council of Antioch & the authority of his predecessor Dionysius lay hard upon him, he endeavoured to avoyd them after this manner. He represented^[164] that what Dionysius wrote respected the humane nature of Christ, & that some at that time accusing this Dionysius before Dionysius Bishop of Rome, as if he had said that the Son was ποίημα a creature & not consubstantial to the father, a Council thereupon collected at Rome was offended & troubled at it & the Bishop of Rome wrote back the common sentence of them all, opposing as well the opinions of Arius as those of Sabellius, & desiring Dionysius of Alexandria to explain himself about

what was objected to him. & that Dionysius of Alexandria thereupon wrote his book entitled The accusation & apology; wherein he maintains that Christ was always the word & wisdom — — —

[1] {illeg}

[2] † T{heod. Eccl. Hist.} l.1 {c.13.}

[3] b Socr. l {illeg} 33 37, 38. Sozom l {illeg} c 27, 28, 29.

[4] {illeg}

[5] {illeg}

[6] Athanas. Apol. 2

[7] Apud Theodoretum l 1. c 6.

[8] a Concilium Antiochenum Epist. ad Iu{lium} Papam.

[9] Euseb. in vita Constant. l 4.c 43, 47. ex versione Valesij.

[10] Athanas. Apolog. 2. p 781, 7{illeg}

[11] Athanas {illeg} pag 2{illeg}

[12] Athanas pag. {illeg}

[13] Apud Athan. Apol. 2 & Hilar. fragm.

[14] b Vide Hilar. Fragm.

[15] Ath. Apol. 2 p 77

[16] Philostorg. l. 2. c. 12

[17] Sozom. l. 2. c 25 Theod l 1. c 30

[18] Sozom. l. 2 c. 25

[19] Euseb. Vit. Cons. l. 3. c. 23

[20] Socr. l. 1. c. 23

[21] *The contents of this note are only visible in the diplomatic transcript because they were deleted on the original manuscript*

[22] d Sozom. {illeg} c. 17 & 23

[23] e Philostorg. l. 3. c. 11

[24] *The contents of this note are only visible in the diplomatic transcript because they were deleted on the original manuscript*

[25] E{pist. Concil.} Alex. {apud Athanas.} Apol. {2.}

[26] c. Constan{tin. Imp.} apud Athan{as.} Apol. 2. p. {780.}

[27] a. Sozom. **{illeg}** c. 24.

[28] a μηδὲ τὸ {μαρ}τυρες οἱ δ{ικα}στὰι γενέα{αι} παραιτ{η} μενοι. Ep{ist.} Concil. A{lex.}

[29] a. Hilar. ad Constant.

[30] b. Severus. Hist. l 2 c 55

[31] c Ambros. serm 69 de Natali Eusebij

[32] d. Sozom. l. 4 c. 9

[33] p. Athanas. Apol. 1

[34] q. Constant. Epist. ad Ægyptios apud Athanas. Apol. 1.

[35] z. Sozom. l 4. c 9.

[36] b. Epistola Liberij Papæ apud Lucif. Calar. in. fin. & to 9 Bibl. sanct.

[37] c. Apud. Baron. ann. 353. s. 19.

[38] r. Athan. Apol. 1 Sozom l 4. c 9. Baron. ann. 354. s.17. Athan

[39] *The contents of this note are only visible in the diplomatic transcript because they were deleted on the original manuscript*

[40] *The contents of this note are only visible in the diplomatic transcript because they were deleted on the original manuscript*

[41] d. Hilar. ad Constantium

[42] k. Maximus apud Ambros. serm. 69 de natali Eusebij.

[43] e Sev{erus Hist.} l. 2. c

[44] f. Extat in Hilar. fragm.

[45] g. Sozom. l. 4 c. 9. Sever. l 2 c. 55.

[46] q. Sozom. l 2. c 24

[47] Sozom

[48] Sozom. l. 2. c. 29

[49] 2 Cor. 5

[50] Athan.

[51] Sozom l. 4. c. 9

[52] Sozom. ib

[53] Lucif. li. Moriend. pro Dei filio

[54] Extat Epistola apud Athanasium.

[55] Ath. Apol. 1. p

[56] Athanas. Epist. ad solitariam vitam agentes p. 857

[57] Ib. p. 811

[58] Lucif. lib. moriend. pro filio Dei.

[59] Hilar cont. Constantium. p. 323 Edit. Paris. 1652.

[60] Baron. an.360. sec.3.9.

[61] Greg. Naz. {Carm.} Iamb. 21. {p.23}.

[61] Greg. Naz. Carm. Iamb. 21. p. 23...

[62] † Hæres. 69 sect. 12

[63] Sozom. l: {3} c. 12.

[64] Concil. Calch. Act. 3 initio

[65] Theod Eccl. A{illeg} l c

[66] b Athanas de Synod.

[67] Hilar. p. 390 edit Paris. 1652

[68] † Apud

[69] † Apud

[70] † Notis in Sozom. l. 2. c. 16.

[71] Apud Theod l. 4. c. 8

[72] ἄλλα οὐτῶς ἀτεχνῶς τὰ γεγναμμένα λεγέτω καὶ ψαλλέτω ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοὺς διακονήσαντας ἁγίους αὐτὰ, ἐπιγινώσκοντας τὰ ἑαυτῶν συνεύχεσθαι ἡμῖν

[73] ἄλλα οὐτῶς ἀτεχνῶς τὰ γεγναμμένα λεγέτω καὶ ψαλλέτω ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοὺς διακονήσαντας ἁγίους αὐτὰ, ἐπιγινώσκοντας τὰ ἑαυτῶν συνεύχεσθαι ἡμῖν

[74] Sozom. l. 5. c 20.

[75] Intercessione angelorum non natura Dei indige{illeg} sed infirmities nostra ad rogandu{illeg} promerendum spiritualis intercessionis ministerio {illeg} indigente. Hilar. in Psal. 129. Neque desunt stare volentibus sanctorum custodia neque angelorum munitiones. And a little after Ac ne {illeg}ve præsidium in Apostolis vel Patriarchis vel Prophetis vel potius Angelis qui Ecclesiam quadam custodia circumsepiant, crederimus, &c Hilar in Psal. 124.

[76] δεήσεως συνεργοὶ πρεσβύτατοι δυνά τώτατοι..

[77] Ephræm Syrus Orat 2 De laud. sanctorum Christi martyrum.

[78] Heron senior memoria et oblatione pausantium [i.e. mortuorum] judicabatur indignus. Cassian. Collat. 2. {illeg}

- [79] Pallad. Hist. Laus cap. 67.
- [80] Greg. Naz. Orat. 11.
- [81] Orat
- [82] Orat 18 in Vita Cypr
- [83] Orat. 21 in Laud. Athanasij.
- [84] a Baron. an. 381. sec. 41.
- [85] Ruffin l. 2 & Chrysost. Hom ad populum finem.
- [86] a. Hom 9 in {Gen.} 1 sub finem. {& Hom} 15 in Gen 3 {sub} finem. Hom {illeg} & 43 in Gen {illeg} Exposit. in P{sal} 48, priori pa{rti} Serm. in ascen{illeg} Christi, Serm{illeg} Cæmeterij ap{pel}lationem. Ho{m.} 8, 27 in M{illeg} Hom 1 in {illeg} &c.
- [87] Plus crudelitati{s} vestræ Nero Deci Maximiane debemus. Diabolum enim per vos vicimus. Sanctus ubique martyrum sanguis exceptus est. Dum in his Dæmones mugiunt, dum aegritudines depelluntur dum admirationum opera cernuntur elevari sine laqueis corpora et despe{illeg}sis pede fæminis vestes non defluere in faciem, uri sine ignibus spiritus, confiteri sine interrogantis incremento fidei
- [88] a Chrysostom Orat. in Ma{rty}res Aegyptios
- [89] a Baron an. 372 sect
- [90] Hieron. in Vit. Hilarion.
- [91] Ruffin. Eccl. Hist l.
- [92] b Iulian in Misopagone.
- [93] Hieron epist. 27 ad Eustochum.
- [94] e Ruffin. Hist. l 2 c. 28.
- [95] a Ad Pontifice{m} maximum tunc Athanasium, hosti{æ} immaculatæ reliquias per Iulianum Diaconum suum post etiam Palestinæ urbis Episcopum mittit. Quas ille susceptas paucis arbitris sub cava{illeg} sacrarij pariete inclusas prophetico spiritu profuturi generationi poster{illeg} conservavit R{uff} Eccl. Hist. l.2. c 28.
- [96] d Basil Ora{illeg} in 40 Marty{illeg}
- [97] a Baron. an. 38. sect. 42.
- [98] b D. Augustin de opere monac{illeg} c. 28.
- [99] c Martyres tibi quærantur in cubiculo tuo. Hieron Ep. 22 ad Eustoch.
- [100] Humatum corpus nemo ad alterum locum transferat, nemor martyrem distrahat nemo mercetur, &c. L. ult. de Sepulch. violat. C. Theod.
- [101] Placuit ut altaria quæ passim per agros et {illeg} tanquam memoria martyrum constituuntur, &c. Concil. 5 Carthag. Can. 14.
- [102] g Theod. De curat. Græc affect. cap. 9{illeg} in fine.

- [103] Non immeritò plerique hanc martyrum resurrectionem appellant. Videro tamen utrum sibi an nobis certi martyres resurrexerunt. Cognovistis imò vidistis ipsi multos a Dæmone purgatos, &c. Ambros. Epist. 85 ad Sororem.
- [104] b Vizt. In ye 20th year current after the silencing of the Oracle at Antioch by the bones of Babylas, as Chrysostom mentions in this Oration.
- [105] Reparata vetusti temporis miracula &c. Ambros Ep. 85 Ad Marcellam.
- [106] b D. Augustin. de Civ. Dei, l. 22, c. 8.
- [107] d. Tom. 10 in appendice Edit. Plantan.
- [108] Rides de reliquis martyrum et cum autore hujus hæreseos
- [109] Cassian. Collat. 7. cap. 32.
- [110] Cassian. Collat. 15. cap. 3. Palli{illeg} Laus. 19. Niceph l 19. c 14.
- [111] a Sulpitius Hist. l. 2. c. 57: Liberius Epist. ad Cath. Episc. Ital.
- [112] b Basil. Serm. de Askesi.
- [113] Hieron princip. 90. Hieron. de princip. ep. 16
- [114] Socr. l. 4 c. 23.
Cassian Co{llat.} 8. c. 16.
- [115] Socr. l 4. c 23
Cassian Collat 8 c. 16.
D. Augustin. de doctr Chr. l. 1, Proleg.
- [116] D. Augustin. de doctr Chr. l. {1,} Proleg.
- [116] D. Augustin. de doctr Chr. l. 1, Proleg.
- [117] a Athanas. Vit. A{ntonij} Edit. Paris. A{.C.} 1627: pag 45{2,} 453
- [117] a Athanas. Vit. Antonij Edit Paris, A.C. 1627 pag 452, 453.
- [118] c pag 493.
- [118] c pag. 493.
- [119] a in vita Hilarionis sub initio
- [120] Socr. l. 1. c. 2.
- [121] Sozom l. 1 c {illeg}
- [122] Ruffin. Eccl. l 1. c 8.
- [123] {illeg} 35, 71. 81
- [124] D. Augustin Confess. l 8. c 6.

[125] *The contents of this note are only visible in the diplomatic transcript because they were deleted on the original manuscript*

[126] Socr. l. 4.

[127] Chrysostom Hom. 8 in Matt. 2.

[128] Sozom. l. 1 c 13

[129] p L.16 De Pænis & 32 de Episc et Cler. Cod. Theod.

[130] q Siricius Papa epist. 1. ad Himmerium anno 385. Vide etiam Augustin. ep. 76 ad Papam Himmerium. Et Hieron. **{illeg}** ad Rusticum

[131] t

[132] b See Baron. an. 393 sect 48.

[133] a See the life of Hilarion in the Preface to the life of Antony.

[134] Sozom. l. 6. c 27.

[135] Extat apud **{illeg}**d. l. 1 c 4

[136] f Sever. Hist. l. 2. c 50

[137] g Greg. Naz. Orat. 23 in laudem Heronis

[138] h Greg. Orat. 20 in laud Basil.

[139] k Greg. at 21 in laud. Athanas.

[140] **{V}**ide **{illeg}**lam Athanasij ad Dracontium.

[141] *The contents of this note are only visible in the diplomatic transcript because they were deleted on the original manuscript*

[142] t See the collection of Rosweyus.

[143] Pallad. in vita Pauli Abbatis. cap 23.

[144] r Pallad in vita Macarij Alexandini. c. 20.

[145] s Pallad. in vit. Pauli simplicis c.

[146] Cassian Col**{illeg}** 9 cap 31.

[147] g Ruffin vit.Par**{illeg}** l 2 c et Author Græcus l. 3 c. 16 apud Roswedum.

[148] h

[149] Pallad. in vita Pauli simplicis. cap. 2

[150] n Ruffin. Vit. patr. l **{illeg}** c. 176.

[151] b Orat. 25.

[152] Orat. 32 p. 5{illeg}

[153] Orat. 27

[154] Basil. Ep. 70 p. 860.

[155] Basil. Epis p. 864.

[156] a. Vide Epist. {illeg}

[157] b. Epist. 70 p. 860

[158] Greg. Naz. carm de vita sua.

[159] b Basil de Spiritu Sancto cap. 1.

[160] a Athan.

[161] b Hil. de Synod.

[162] c Basil Epist. 300.

[163] d. Athan. de sent. Dionys. Alex.

[164] Athanas. de sent. Dionys. Alex. & in Apologia 2^{da}.
