

# Drafts on the history of the Church (Section 6)

**Author:** Isaac Newton

**Source:** Yahuda Ms. 15.6, National Library of Israel, Jerusalem, Israel

**Published online:** September 2006

---

<100r>

Thus far Irenæus concerning the Creed delivered down by universal tradition from the beginning of the Gospel, representing that it was not lawfull for any man to enlarge diminish or alter it: ffor no man is above his master & by the institution of Christ & his Apostles it conteins that one ffaith by which & baptism all Christians were admitted into the Church Catholick from the beginning of the Gospel. Polycarp was the disciple of Iohn the Apostle & conversed with others also who had seen the Lord, & Irenæus was the disciple of Polycarp, & therefore in reciting the sense of the primitive Creed & telling us that it was received from the Apostles & their disciples deserves to be credited

The same Irenæus in the 4<sup>th</sup> Chapter of his third book writes thus of the Creed. If a dispute should arise concerning any small question ought we not to have recourse to the most ancient Churches in which the Apostles conversed & take from them that which is certain & manifest concerning the present question? And if the Apostles had left us nothing in writing, ought we not to follow the order of tradition which they delivered to those to whom they committed the churches? To which ordination many barbarous nations who beleive in Christ give their assent, having salvation written without paper & ink by the spirit in their hearts & diligently keeping the old Tradition, beleiving in one God the maker of heaven & earth & of all things in them, by Christ Iesus the son of God, who out of his most eminent love towards his work, underwent the being born of a Virgin, uniting man to God by himself, & suffering under Pontius Pilate & rising again & being received with bightness into glory, shall come the saviour of those that are saved & the judge of those which are judged, sending into eternal fire the corrupters of the truth & the contemnors of his father & of his coming. This faith they who have beleived without lett{illeg}s to our language are barbarians, but as to opinion & practise & conversation, by reason of the faith are most wise & please God conversing in all justice & chastity & wisdom. To whom if any man speaking to them in their own language should tell the inventions of hereticks, they would presently shutting their ears, fly far away not enduring to hear the blasphemous discourse. Thus by means of that ancient Tradition of the Apostles they do not so much as admit into their thoughts the monstrous speeches of the heretics. Thus far Irenæus. Now By this discourse of Irenæus, you may perceive that many nations who understood not the language of the Greeks & Latines nor had the scriptures translated into their language {received} the faith & delivered it down to posterity by oral tradition {illeg} which faith was the doctrine of the Creed {illeg} by means of the faith <100v> & by means of this faith & baptism they became members of the Church Catholick. Without having any written scriptures, And as the faith by which they became members of the Church & heirs of salvation lay in a few things easy to be learned & remembred without writing so did the practise They commemorated the creation of the world by keeping the sabbath, the resurrection of Christ by keeping the morning of the Lords day before sunrise & the passion by breaking of bread & were were to love God with all their heart & soul & their neighbours as themselves; & live quietly under governments. & avoid [sorcery which consists in attributing supernatural vertue to ceremonies dead things & forms of words] superstition. And all this with such a form of government as might be convenient for exercising this religion releiving the poor admitting proselites & admonishing evil men or expelling them from communion comprehends the whole faith & practise of the christian religion, & might be easily remembred & propagated down to posterity by oral tradition amongst

the barbarous nations mentioned by Irenæus without having the scriptures or any thing else in writing.. There are indeed many truths of a higher nature which Paul compares to strong meats for men of ripe age, but these are not necessary to communion. Men may learn as much of them as they can in their private capacity, & teach their neighbours in a peaceable manner, but ought not to contend or disturb the peace of the Church with disputes about them. The strong in the faith must bear with the weak & the weak must not judge the strong.

Conformable to these Creeds of Irenæus is a Creed recited by Tertullian in his book de virginibus velandis in these words Regula quidem fidei una omnino est sola immobilis et irreformabilis credendi scilicet in unicum Deum mundi conditorem, & filium ejus Iesum Christum natum ex virgine Maria, curifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in cælis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem And in his book de Præscriptione Hæreticorum he paraphrases the Creed in this manner. Credimus unum omnino Deum esse, nec alium præter mundi conditorem qui universa [de nihilo] produxerit per Verbum suum primo omnium demissum: Id Verbum filium ejus **{illeg}** in nomine Dei varie visum a Patriarchis Prophe <101r> tis semper auditum, postremo delatum ex spiritu Patris Dei et virtute in Virginem Mariam, carnem factum in utero ejus, & ex ea natum egisse Iesum Christum, exinde prædicasse novam legem & novam promissionem regni cælorum, virtutes fecisse, fixum cruci, tertia die resurrexisse in cælum ereptum sedisse ad dextram Patris, misisse vicariam vim spiritus sancti qui credentes agat, venturum cum claritate ad sumendos sanctos in vitæ æternæ & promissorum cœlestium fructum & ad profanos adjudicandos igni perpetuo, facta utriusque partis resurrectione cum carnis restitutione. Hæc regula a Christo instituta nullas habet apud nos quæstiones nisi quas hæreses inferunt & quæ hæreticos faciunt. And again, in his book adversus Praxeam, he thus paraphrases the Creed. Vnicum quidem Deum credimus; sub hac tamen dispensatione quam œconomiam dicimus ut unci Dei sit et ffilius sermo ipsius qui ex ipso processerit per quem omnia facta sunt & sine quo factum est nihil. Hunc missum a patre in Virginem & ex ea natum hominem & Deum, filium hominis et filium Dei, & cognominatum Iesum Christum: hunc passum, hunc mortuum & sepultum secundum scripturas & resuscitatum a patre & in cœlos resumptum sedere ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos, qui exinde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, a Patre spiritum sanctum sanctum Paracletum, sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem & filium et spiritum sanctum. Hanc Regulam ab initio Evangelij decurrisse, etiam ante priores quosque Hæreticos, nedum ante Praxeam hesternum, probabit tam ipsa posteritas omnium hæreticorum, quam ipsa novellitas Praxeæ hesterni.

In the fourth Century they began to insert new Articles into the Creed, & one of the first new articles was that of the Catholick Church. Alexander bishop of Alexandria in making a prolix declaration of his faith inserts it in these words We confess also one Holy Ghost – – & one only Catholick Apostolick Church which is ever inextinguishable tho the whole world attack it – – – Apud Theodoritum Eccl. Hist. l. 1. c. 4.

And hence the Article the Catholick Church crept into the Creed of the Church of Ierusalem which is thus recited by Cyrill bishop of that City. I beleive in one God the father Almighty maker of heaven & earth & of all things visible & invisible. And in the Lord Iesus Christ the only begotten son of God begotten of his father before all worlds, the true God by whom all things were made, who was incarnate & made man crucified & buried rose again from the dead the third day & ascended into heaven & sitteth at the right hand of the father & shall come to judge the quick & the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost the Comforter who spake by the Prophets, & in one Holy Catholick Church & in the resurrection of the flesh & **{in}** life everlasting.

<101v>

The same Article crept also into the Creed of the City Hippo in Afric<sup>[1]</sup> which is thus recited by Austin bishop thereof I beleive in God the father Almighty maker of heaven & earth & in Iesus Christ his only son who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary was crucified under Pontius Pilate & buried rose again the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven & sitteth at the right hand of God the father from whence he shall come to judge the quick & the dead I beleive in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholick Church, the forgiveness of sins & the resurrection of the flesh.

The next article that was inserted was the consubstantiality of the father & son. Eusebius of Cæsarea in the Council of Nice produced the Creed which he had received from his ancestors & into which he had been

baptized, & it is this. We beleive in one God the father almighty, creator of all things visible & invisible: & in one Lord Iesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, light of light Life of life, the only begotten son, the first begotten of every creature, begotten of his father before all worlds, by whom all things were made, who for our salvation was incarnate & conversed among men, who suffered & rose again the third day, & ascended to his father, & shall come again with glory to judge the quick & the dead. We beleive also in one Holy Ghost. This Creed was approved by the Emperor Constantine & all the Council, but the Emperor proposed & pressed to have the consubstantiality of the Son inserted & so the Council composed this Creed. We beleive in one God, the father Almighty, the maker of all things visible & invisible: & in one Lord Iesus Christ the son of God, the only begotten of his father, that is, of the substance of his father: God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten not made; consubstantial to the father, by whom all things were made which are in heaven & in earth; Who for us men & for our salvation descended, & was incarnate, made man, suffered, & rose again the third day; ascended to heaven, & shall come to judge the quick & the dead: & in the Holy Ghost. In this Creed by the word consubstantial they understand that the father & son are two substances of the same nature. For the words ὁμοούσιος & consubstantial, were always by the Greeks & Latines taken for two substances of the same essence nature or species. When applied to corporeal things they signify two substances taken out of the same mass, when to incorporeal ones they signify two substances as like one another as if they had been taken out of the same mass. And therefore Epiphanius tells us that they do not say that the son is ταυτοούσιος or μονοουσιος to the father but ὁμοούσιος. And the Council of

said that the son was consubstantial to the father as touching his Godhead & consubstantial to us as touching his manhood. And in this Creed the son is said to be begotten of his father, that is of the substance of his father: Which would be improper if the substance of the father was the substance of the son. And that the word ὁμοουσιος might be limited to signify only the likeness of two substances without the division of one substance into two, several of the Nicene fathers in subscribing explained the word ὁμοούσιος by ☩ < insertion from the left margin of f 101v > ☩ adding τουτέστιν ὁμοιούσιος. < text from f 101v resumes > for so the father would be the substance of the son & the son would be begotten of his own substance. As the father is by this Creed declared to be the substance of the father so the son is the substance of the Son & therefore according to this Creed the substance of the son was begotten of the substance of the father. And it is further observable that the Greeks called the father & son two Hypostases, & Hypostases <102r> signify substances & cannot signify persons in any other sense then as persons are taken for substantial persons or personal substances. In this sense the Latines took persons till the dark ages came on & then the Latines ceasing to to understand any thing of the Greek language, began to take Hypostases or personal substances for something else then substances.

About 56 years after the Council of Nice had made this Creed, the worship of the Holy Ghost was inserted into it by the Council of Constantinople in these words. I beleive in one God, the father Almighty, maker of heaven & earth & of all things visible & invisible. And in one Lord Iesus Christ the only begotten son of God, begotten of the father before all worlds, that is, of the substance of the father, God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten not made, Cons substantial to the father, by whom all things were made, who for us men & our salvation descended from heaven & was incarnate by the holy Ghost of the Virgin & was made man & crucified for us under Pontius Pilate & buried & rose again the third day according to the Scriptures & ascended into heaven & sitteth on the right hand of the father & shall come again in glory to judge the quick & the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost the Lord & giver of life, who proceedeth from the father, who with the father & son together is worshipped & glorified, who spake by the Prophets: And in one catholick & Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins & look for the resurrection of the dead & the life of the world to come. Henceforward the father son & holy ghost were accounted three substances of one & the same usia, essence, nature or species, as Peter Iames & Iohn are three individual persons of one species. For that this was the received opinion in the fourth & fift centuries D<sup>r</sup> Cudworth as & Curcellæus have proved at large beyond any possibility of doubting.

Another new Article inserted into the Creed was the descent of Christ into the infernal regions. The Council of Ariminum first inserted it in their Creed which runs thus – – – It is also found in the following Creed of Aquileia into which Ruffin saith that he was baptized. Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem et in Christum Iesum unicum filium ejus Dominum nostrum: qui natus est de spiritu sancto ex Maria Virgine, crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato & sepultus, descendit in inferna, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris: inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos: et in spiritum sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam

Catholicam, remissionem peccatorum, hujus carnis resurrectionem. This article is also found in the Creed usually called the Apostles Creed, the word Hades or Hell being there put for the infernal regions.

Another new Article was the Communion of Saints as in the Creed of the Roman Church commonly called the Apostles Creed which runs thus. I beleive in God the father Almighty maker of heaven & earth & in Iesus Christ his only son our Lord who was conceived by the Holy Ghost born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate was crucified dead & buried, descended into Hell, the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth on the right hand of God the father, shall come again to judge the quick & the dead. I beleive in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholick Church the communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body <102v> & life everlasting. The descent into the infernal regions called Hell was added for asserting that Christ had a humane soul, & the communion of saints for asserting that the saints departed this life held communion with the Church militant, knew our affairs heard our prayers & were able to do us good or hurt. ffor so Austin Bishop of Hippo explains it in his commentary on this Creed Serm 181 de Temp.

Now if all these Creeds be compared with one another & the Articles inserted in the fourth Century be omitted, it will appear that the tradition of faith which was handed down from the Apostles & by which & baptism all nations during the first three hundred years were admitted into the Church consisted in these articles. I beleive in one God, the father Almighty, the maker of heaven & earth & of all things therein visible & invisible: And in one Lord Iesus Christ his only Son, our Lord, who was incarnate by the Holy Ghost, crucified under Pontius Pilate died & buried, the third day he arose from the dead, ascended into heaven & sitteth at the right hand of God the father; from whence he shall come to judge the quick & also the dead raised again to life in the body : And I believe in the Holy Ghost who spake by the Prophets This Creed I say seems to me to contein all the fundamental points of faith which were required to Baptism & communion with the Church during the three first Centuries of the Christian religion. For the Creation of the world by Iesus Christ & his appearing to the Patriarchs was wanting in all the western Creeds & some of the eastern & therefore might be learnt as well after baptism as before being one of those mysterious truths which the Apostle Paul compares to strong meats. And what was not necessary to baptism in the first ages of the Christian religion could not be made necessary afterwards by any power on earth. None of the strong meats were to be forced upon babes instead of milk. And yet the Bishops of the fourth Century took the liberty of inserting many new articles into the Creed as above & thereby brake the Church into parties & raised great disputes animosities & commotions in the whole Empire, which lasted with the greatest violence all that century & part of the next.

<103r>

I beleive in one God the father Almighty, maker of heaven & earth & in Iesus Christ his only son who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary. (M.T. & P.C)

<103v>

How this unwritten tradition this form of doctrine was delivered to the Churches is best learnt by reciting the Creeds of the first ages of Christianity & comparing them together to see how far they agree. For tho the several Creeds propagated down to posterity by memory in several Churches may happen to differ in some modes of expression yet so far as they agree in the substance of the faith & sense of the words without any dispute arising between the Churches about them they may be reckoned one & the same tradition. And this tradition is thus recorded by Irenæus.

— according to his humanity. And the faith of this Council was confirmed by the 5<sup>t</sup> 6<sup>t</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> General Councils & some other councils of less note & much celebrated by several Popes as <sup>a[2]</sup>Leo M, <sup>b[3]</sup>Gelasius, <sup>c[4]</sup>Gregory M. <sup>d[5]</sup>Martin I. [And the Article of their faith here recited was professed by Iohn Bishop of Antioch Cyrill bishop of Alexandria & Flavian bishop of Constantinople before the Council & preached by Leo bishop of Rome]

And its further observable that Iohn Bishop of Antioch with other oriental Bishops presently after the third General Council composed this profession of faith. We confess that our Lord Iesus Christ the only begotten Son of God is perfect God & perfect Man of a reasonable soul & a body. [consisting] begotten of the father

before all worlds according to his Deity, & in the last times for us & our salvation born of the Virgin Mary according to his humanity: ὁμοούσιος to the father according to his Deity & ὁμοούσιος to us according to his humanity. ffor there is an union made of the two natures, by reason whereof we confess one Christ one Son one Lord. In this sense of an unconfused unity we confess that the holy Virgin is θεοτόκος. And This profession of faith was approved by Cyrill bishop of Alexandria, & by Flavian bishop of Constantinople & afterwards established by the Council of Chalcedon with an anathema against all who beleived otherwise. And this Council consisted of 630 bishops collected out of all the eastern Empire & Pope Leo the great by his delegates presided in it & subscribed it & in point of faith it was confirmed by the 5<sup>t</sup> 6<sup>t</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> General Councils & some other Councils of less note & was zealously asserted & much celebrated by the several Bishops of Rome, & generally received in the Greek & Latin Churches. Leo the great by his Legates presided in it & subscribed it & afterwards preached that the son as God was consubstantial to the ffather & as man was consubstantiall to his mother. [Serm 10 in Solennitate Nativitatis Domini.] & he & the Popes Gelasius, Gregory the Great & Martin the 1<sup>st</sup> were zealus for the faith of this Council.] And by consequence it was the general opinion of the 5<sup>t</sup> 6<sup>t</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> & 9<sup>th</sup> centuries, especially in the Greek Churches, that the son was ὁμοούσιος to the father according to his Godhead & ὁμοούσιος to us according to his manhood. not ταυτοούσιος of the same individual substance but ὁμοούσιος of the same species of substance. And in the same sence the vulgar Creed called the Creed < insertion from f 103r > of Athanasius saith that the son is God of the substance of the father & man of the substance of his mother, that is, substance of substance. If the father had not a substance proper to himself the son could not be called God of the substance of the father. One of the principal arguments used in the 4<sup>th</sup> Century to prove the son to be consubstantial to the father was that he would otherwise be called the Son abusively & not be the true natural son of the father as one man is the true son of another, & this argument would have been of no force if the son were not substance of substance. When therefore the Greeks began to call the father son & Holy Ghost three Hypostases & one usia & by the Latines were called Arians for this languag both Greeks & Latines by their by three Hypostases understood three substances. ffor the Latines in the Council of Serdica took Hypostasis in the same sense with ΟυσΙΑ in Greek & substantia in Latine. & so did those Greeks who said there was but one Hypostasis in the Deity. And therefore those who said there were three Hypostases & one Vsia meant three substances in number & one in essence or nature. [And Athanasius upon examining some of the Latines declared that they meant the same thing by three Persons & one substance] And the Latines who said there were three Persons & one substance after Athanasius had reconciled them with the Greeks meant three substantial persons or personal substances in number & one in nature, untill the dark ages came on & the Schoolmen taught the Latines to take one substance for one number./ Nor would the Greeks have called the father & son two hypostases nor have concluded the consubstantiality of the son to the father from the consubstantiality of a man to his father as they generally did. And lastly the writers of the fourth & fift & some following centuries generally interpreted the Nicene consubstantiality of two substances in number & one in nature, as has been sufficiently shewed by Curcellæus & D<sup>r</sup> Cudworth out of the writings of Athanasius, Hilary, Epiphanius, Basil, Greg. Naz. Greg. Nyss. Ambrose, Chrysostom, Ierome, Iustin, Theodoret Maximus, Cyrill of Alex. Marius Victorinus, Anastasius Theopolitanus, Iohn Damascene, & Euthymius Zygabenus.

The Greeks by & by arguing the consubstantiality of the Son to the ffather from the likeness of a man to his father understood them to be two like substances, & signified this by calling them two hypostases. And the Latines also in those days tooke Hypostases for substances as is manifest by the general Epistle of the Council of Serdica. And if the latines now take hypostasis for something else then substance, it is because they follow the Divinity of the Schoolmen who understood not Greek.

< text from f 103v resumes >  
<104r>

## Chap. 8 Of the rise of the Roman Catholick Church.

Chap. XIV.  
**Of the host given to the last horn of the Goat by transgression against the daily worship for trampling the sanctuary & the host of heaven under foot.**

**Chap. XV.**  
**A further account of the Host of heaven & of the corruptions which crept into it.**

<105r>

& **{illeg}** the Father & the Word were one ουσία not in nature only but also in number, as I gather also from a[6] his asking Narcissus bishop of **{Nervonias}** whether he beleived with Eusebius of Cæsarea that there were two usias. & from his translating ὁμοούσιος in the Creed by unius substantiæ rather then by consubstantialis, & from

As the heathens derived — — — — resurrection of the body. This was the doctrine of Simon as you have heard above, & Menander held the same opinions with Simon. And Saturninus — — — — — purgatory.

As the Jews tolerated the Saducees who denyed the resurrection & all the prophets except Moses, so the first Christians tolerated some erroneous opinions which their successors declared to be heresy. The converted Jews which were for imposing the law upon the Gentiles were in communion with the Church at Ierusalem . So the first Gnosticks might have staid in communion longer then they did if they had not separated themselves. They went out from us saith Iohn because they were not of us for if they had been of us they would have continued with us. And Iude: These are they that separate themselves. ② Those who held that Christ was a mere man actuated by a spirit from above continued in communion till after the days of Iustin Martyr. For Iustin gives us this account of them. Verum enim vero Trypho, saith he, non **{perisit}** — — — — sententia sunt dixerint. ① Those who said that Christ descended upon Iesus knew nothing of the Logus & yet were not condemned as hereticks till towards the latter end of the 2<sup>d</sup> century. For there Epiphanius places the beginning of the heresy of the Alogi. ③ But about the end of the second century Theodotus the Tanner was excommunicated in the west & Artemas soon after in the East for this opinion. And then their disciples pretended that their opinion was taught by the Apostles & ancient Christians & the truth of the doctrine conserved till the days of Po{pe} Victor, but from the days of his successor Zepherine was adulterated. Iustin lets us know that they were but few in his days & by consequence that their opinion was only tolerated in the west till the days of Pope Victor & in the East till the days of Pope Zepherine. After those days this opinion was constantly accounted heretical being condemned in Noetus, Sabellius, Paul, Eustathius, Marcellus & Photinus. All these held that the Logus or spirit by which Iesus was actuated was not a person. But they that said the Logus was a person, were reputed to make Iesus both God & man & allowed to continue in communion: without inquiring particularly into their opinion about the nature of the Logus & his incarnation. And by that means they were enabled to propagate their opinon silently in the churches till the dispute arose between Alexander & Arius.

In this state things continued till toward the end of the 2<sup>d</sup> century when Theodotus the Tanner was excommunicated at Rome & soon after Artemas in the east for this opinion. And this gave occasion to their disciples to pretend that their opinion . . . . . was only tolerated in the Churches till **{con}**demnation of Theodotus & Artemon in the days of those two Popes. **{illeg}** I understand of those who beleived that the spirit from above by which the Man Iesu **{illeg}** assisted was not a person but only a power emitted by the father. All **{illeg}** **{illeg}**ard of this opinion as Praxeas Noetus Sabellius Paul Eustathius Marcellus & Photinus were excommunicated But those that said **{illeg}**t by which the man Iesus was assisted, was a person **{illeg}** him were not reconned to make Iesus a mere man, but continued **{illeg}** till the controversy arose between Alexander & Arius.

**{illeg}** revolt & oppress & persecute their brethren who revolted not, & these revoltors **{illeg}** **{illeg}** **{tr}**ansgressors & **{illeg}** last horn of the He Goat & their brethren in a state of **{illeg}** state of affliction persecution dispersion & captivity is

So then the Gnosticks & Manietes who were a sort **{illeg}** & the **{illeg}** & Angels & the souls of men consubstantial to **{illeg}** **{Mani}**chees made the son a part of the father.

<105v>

**{illeg}**{t}his son of Iupiter, this Æon of the Gnosticks, the Montanists **{illeg}** be joyned & united to a man the son of the Virgin **{illeg}** in one person, called both God & Man in several respects, & that this **{illeg}**n the



womb & still continues, but was made without confus{illeg} further conjunction of substance then that which is {illeg} man & the holy spirit which dwells in him. Si enim Sermo, {illeg}an — — — — occurrerunt. And a little after: Quanquam cum {illeg} id est carnem. By this it is manifest that the Montanists {illeg} made such an union between the Logus & {illeg} {illeg} as the ancients hereticks made between {illeg}e & Iesus & therefore were Nicolaitans. In words They professed an union {illeg}{illeg}him the ancients hereticks (according to Irenæus) did between Christ & Iesus & they made that more lasting, but not of a different kind. The Logus according to this philosopher dwells in Iesus as the holy spirit doth in good men, without alteration or mixture of substances And when they called them one person, they meant one in outward form & appearance, but not in substance life will & power one in name & two in nature.

In words they professed an union, as the ancients hereticks did & they made this union more lasting but not more intimate & real or of another kind. When they called them one person they meant in outward form & appearance but not in substance, life, will, understanding, power, or anything else which was real: one in name & two in nature, The Logus according to these men only dwelt & operated in Iesus as the spirit of God doth in good men or as Christ was supposed to operate in Iesus. And if for eluding the force of scripture they said that The Logus was born or died they equivocated & meant not what they said: for they accounted the Logus immortal impassible & unchangeable & that the man alone was really born & suffered. And again if they said that Iesus did miracles they equivocated & meant not the man but the Word. Just as the Nicolaitans gave the common name of Iesus Christ to the composition of Iesus & Christ & called them one without meaning what they said, the Montanists gave the common name of Iesus the Logus to the composition of Iesus & the Logus & called them one without meaning what they said & therefore they held the doctrine of the Nicolaitans. For by the Logus they meant what the ancients Nicolaitans meant by Christ. The difference is only in words They denied that Iesus was the Logus & that the Logus came in the flesh as much as the ancients Nicolaitans denied that Iesus was the Christ or that Christ came in the flesh & in the same manner, & therefore they were Nicolaitans & liars & antichristians in the sense of the scriptures.

seem to have been the same with the opinion of the Patripassians Praxeas Hermogenes Noetus & Sabellius the disciple of Noetus, excepting that these received not the prophecies of Montanus. For Ierome speaking of the Montanists saith: Illi Sabellij dogma rectantes Trinitatem in unius personæ angustias cogunt. He means the Montanists κατά Æschian.

Praxeas held such an union of the Logus with the Man Iesus as the Montanists did & that he was born & died in the same sense, that is not really but by imputation: or in language only: being immortal & impassible in himself & only compassible to the man Iesus who alone was really passible. And because he made the Logus one person with the father, Tertullian told him that he made the father compassible & crucified him in words which was blasphemy: & hence they were called Patripassians The name was not owned by them but imposed upon them by their enemies as a consequence of their words. For Tertullian argues thus against Praxeas: Ergo, inquis, et nos eadem ratione Patrem mortuum dicentes qua vos filium non blasphemamus in Dominum Deum: non enim ex divina sed ex humana substantia mortuum dicimus, — — — — — blasphemavit ——— Times dicere passibilem quam dicis compassibilem.

Sabellius was the disciple of Noetus & held the same opinion with him, & Theodoret tells us that this heresy was invented by Epigonus, propagated by Cleomenes, & renewed by Noetus. Now Sabellius made the father son & H.G. . . . . . as Simon did. Alexander of Alexandria in his general Epistle tells us that the son was begotten not of nothing but of the father, not after the manner of bodies by incisions & efflux arising from divisions as seemed to Sabellius & Valentinus, but after an inexplicable manner. Which imports that Sabellius like the Valentinians derived the Son from the father by an efflux of substance after the manner of bodies with some separation not of the Son from the father but of the parts which flowed out from those which did not flow out: yet so as to leave the father & son one person actuated with no other life then that of the father. Or that Or taught that the f s. & h g. like the body soul & spirit of a man, are three distinct substances & yet compose but one person. — that as Valentinus derived his Æons from the father by an efflux & projection of substance after the manner of bodies, with some separation of parts: so did Sabellius derive the son from the father by an efflux of substance & separation of the parts flowing out from those which did not flow out, as a ray of light by flowing out from the sun departs from the sun. But notwithstanding he made a connection between the father & son as one person as a man & his arm {stret}ched out are but one, or as the body soul & spirit are three distinct substances & yet compose but one person <106r> And as the heathens & the Gnosticks feigned that their Gods were first begotten & then born, & that the supreme Iupiter was both

male & female Minerva being born out of his brain, & Bacchus out of his thigh, according to the heathens & Ennœa the Minerva of the heathens being the first conception of his mind according to Simon & the Gnosticks: so the Montanists feigned that the Son of God was begotten before the world began & born when God said Fiat lux & that he was born as it were out of the womb of the father. And further; as the Gnosticks feigned that the Logus was first conceived in Gods mind as his active Wisdom & λόγος ενδιαθετος & then emitted as it were out of his mouth as his Word & λόγος προφορικὸς & thereby born the son of God: so Montanists taught that the Logus was first conceived as wisdom in Gods Mind & then emitted as a Word sent out of his mouth by eructation. Itaque Sophiam — — — — sermonem optimum. Thus did the Montanists teach that the Son was first conceived as it were in Gods womb before the creation in order to contrive the univers & then born of him in order to produce outwardly what God had conceived in his mind. And so the Theology of the Montanists is of the same kind with that of the heathens & Gnosticks & the big bellied Father & his Son in this Theology is the Iupiter of the heathens & Gnosticks & the son of this Iupiter. And whereas the Gnostick And this son of Iupiters brain was both male & female like Minerva For What the heathens called Minerva & the Gnosticks Ennœa, Montanus called Sophia; before his birth & Logus afterwards making but one Æon of Ennœa, Nus & Logus, & feigning that this Æon conceived all things virtually in himself as Ennœa & Nus & the Platonic Logus or Idea of Ideas were feigned to do. And for the unity of this Trinity the Montanists alledged the text in the first epistle of Iohn: There are three that beare record the spirit the water & the blood & these three are one, pretending that the spirit the water & the blood represented the father son & h.g. the spirit signifying the father (Iohn 4.24) the water the holy g. (Iohn 7.38, 39) & the blood the son.

And tho the Montanists for reconciling their heresy to the monarchy of the father, made the son inferior to him, yet in some respects they made him equal. ffor the text of Paul τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ they alledged for an equality, taking ἴσα for an adjective of equality, whereas with a dative case after it, it is always an adverb of similitude.

And it is further observable that they made Christ to be a part of the fathers substance not by juxta-position after the manner of bodies, but by the son's being in the father & the father in the son in all places; both of them being every where present to the other which kind of conjunction some some have called περιχὺν εἰς & circumincesso. So Tertullian:<sup>[7]</sup> Habes patrem in cælis, habes filium in terris: Non est separatio ista, sed dispositio divina. Cæterum scimus Deum etiam intra abyssos esse & ubique consistere sed vi et potestate: Filium quoque ut individuum, cum ipso ubique.

And this Logus of Plato this son of Iupiter this Æon of the Gnosticks, the Montanists feigned to be joyned & united to a man the son of the Virgin Mary in one person, God & Man without confusion of substance. [ffor say they by mixture of substance they would become a third substance which is neither of the components as electrum {comp}osed by mixture of gold & silver is neither gold nor silver but when {illeg} the spirit & flesh, or God & man, remain distinct each with the property of its own {illeg} {illeg} {substa}nce so that the spirit performs the virtues works & miracles without being passible & the flesh {illeg} {illeg} undergoes the passions of hunger thirst sorrow & death. And tho the Word is said {illeg}t to dy yet it is only with respect to the man to which it is {illeg}im sermo, saith Tertullian ex transfiguratione & demutatione {illeg} factus est, una jam erit substantia Iesus ex duabus, ex {illeg} mixtura ut elecrum ex auro et argento; et incipit nec {illeg} spiritus; neque argentum, id est caro dum alterum altero {illeg} quid efficitur. Neque ergo Deus erit Iesus: sermo enim {illeg}ctus est; neque caro id est homo — — — — utrumque. And a little {illeg}m statum — — — — — occurrerunt.

{illeg} Bishop of Antioch was of the same opinion with Sabellius as we {illeg} condemned by the Greeks he was not called a patripassian. {illeg} that he revived the heresy of Artemas a heretick who {illeg} Zephirine & is called Artemon by Nicephorus {illeg} This Council consisted of about {illeg}

<106v>

If from the 25<sup>th</sup> day of Month Elull in the 28<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes Longimanus when the wall was finished & the gates set up which was in the year of Nabonassar 311 or 312 we count 62 weeks of years, they will end one or two years & about 4 months before the beginning of the vulgar Æra. And then was Christ born: supposing that he was just 30 years old when he came to Iohns baptism or at the most but 31. And the covenant that the Jews should be Gods people & he should be their God, {illeg} the Messiah after his app{illeg} kept one week & then by the calling of the gentiles in Cornelius rejected the Jews from being his



peculiar people. And in half a wekk the desolator caused the sacrifice & oblation to cease, ffor the war by which it ceased began in spring A.C. 67 & ending with the burning of the Temple & taking of the city in Autumn A.C 70. For the better understanding of this prophesy I would read it thus. Also 62 weeks it [the captivity] shall return & the street shall be built & the wall: but [this shall be, not in a flourishing state of things like the seven weeks, but] in troublesome times And after [the coming at the end of] the 62 weeks the Mesiah shall [not reign over the Jews as their Prince but] be cut off & it [the city or people or kingdom or dominion] shall not be his, but the people of a Prince that shall come [the Romans] shall destroy the city & the Sanctuary & the end thereof shall be with a flood & unto the end of the war desolations [in the reigns of Vespasian Trajan & Hadrian] are determined. Yet [before they shall cease to be his people] he shall keep the covenant with many [the multitude or nation of the Jews] for one week. And after that in half a week the desolator shall cause the sacrifice & oblation to cease & upon a wing of abominations overspread the land & untill the consummation [or accomplishment to scatter the power of the holy people & the going forth of the commandment to cause to return & to build Ierusalem & cleansing of the sanctuary] that which is determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

He that has not the son has not the father & for the same reason he that has not the holy Ghost has not the son. And therefore he that forsakes this faith has not the father but worships another God & breaks the first & great article of the holy covenant Thou shalt love the lord thy God: And he that violates the rule of Charity breaks the second great article. : Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self. And this second Article is like unto the first: for by this we know that we love him if we keep his commandments; & he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen how shall he love God whom he hath not seen. The Christian religion was preached to bring men over from worshipping the fals gods of the heathens to worship the true one & to love one another & the Creed contains the truth which men were to be instructed in for this end & the question, Dost thou forsake the devil & his works, contains the practise & the being instructed & baptized in this faith & practise was entring into the covenant, & on the contrary the violation of this faith or practise is breaking the covenant & returning into the state of a heathen or publican & therefore deserves excommunication. But he that excommunicates others for such opinions as do not amount to a breach of the holy covenant is uncharitable & separates from the members of Christ & excommunicates him self.

He that beleives amiss concerning the father hath not the father & He that hath not the father worships another God He that beleives ammis concerning the son hath not the Son & he that hath not the Son hath not the father but worships another God & anoth{er} Lord. He that worships another God breaks the first & great {commandment} Thou shalt love the Lord thy God & he that is uncharitable breaks the two great commandments upon which hang all the law & the prophets: for he that loveth not his brother {whom he hath} seen how shall he love God whom he hath not seen?

<107r>

The Sethians called the father of all things the first man & Ennoëa the son of man & the second man, & under them placed the holy Ghost whom they called the first woman & under them they placed the elements water darkness the Abyss & Chaos upon which the spirit was moved, & say that of her the first & second man generated {call} Christ, & from this first was emitted also a second woman called Prunicos & Sophia & she emitted seven sons the first of which was called Ialdabaoth (that is Iah El Dabaoth Deus fortis Sermonum) & these seven with their mother Sophia made their Ogdoas. That Prunicus by the help of Ialdabaoth sent forth two emissions one into Elizabeth the other into Mary whence were born Iohn the baptist & Iesus, & that Christ descended through the seven heavens putting on the likeness of their inhabitants & in conjunction with his sister Sophia descended upon Iesus who by the operation of God was born of a Virgin & was more wise pure & just then all men & so he was made Iesus Christ, who from thence forward did miracles cured diseases & revealed the unknown father, & manifested himself to be the son of the first man. At which the Princes being angry conspired against him, & when he was led to death, Christ & his mother departed & Iesus was crucified, & rose again & sits at the right hand of the father Ialdabaoth. Irenæus l. 1. c. 34 And some of them (the Ophites) say that Sophia became a serpent. ib.

Cerinthus & Carpocrates & the Ebionites said that Iesus was the son of Ioseph & Mary.

The Gnosticks who are from Valentinus say that world was made not by the Word of God but by the Demiurgus, & that the Salvator Iesus the inferior Christ who was from all the Æons was not incarnate nor

suffered but descended like a Dove upon Iesus & when he had declared the unknown father reascended to his pleroma & some say that Iesus (qui ex dispositione fuit) was incarnate & suffered, who, they say, passed through Mary as water through a tube. Others say that the son of the Demiurgus suffered who descended upon Iesus [qui ex dispositione fuit] Others say that Iesus was the son of Ioseph & Mary & Christ who is from above descended upon him being without flesh & impassible. [Iren. l. 3. c. 11.p. 219.] And Christ who is from above suffered according to none of these opinions, being either manifested by a transfiguration without passibility or descending like a Dove upon Iesus the son of Mary.

Simon Menander Saturninus & Basilides Cerdo Marcion said that Iesus was a putative man & the three first that he only appeared to suffer, the fourth that Simon of Cyrene suffered in his room while Iesus stood by in the form of Simon & derided the Iews. Iren l. c. 10, 21, 22, 23.

The Nicolaitans, Sethians, & Ophites Cerinthus, Carpocras, Valentinus, Marcus & their followers said that Christ descended upon Iesus. The former heresy was founded by Simon this by Nicolas. Linga unum Christum Iesum confetentur divisi vero sententia. Iren l. 3. c. 27 pag. 239. col. 2. l. 12.

Apelles said that Christ had a real body of flesh & blood & really suffered on the cross but was not born of the virgin but formed his body out of the heavens in his descent & after his passion in ascending up to heaven resolved his body into elements of which it was formed & left it where he found it.

Valentinus said that Iesus upon whom Christ descended took not flesh & blood of the Virgin but brought a body with him & passed through her as water through a pipe, & suffered, his body being visible palpable & passible Iren p. 29. col. 2. l. 17, 18. & p. 42. l. 30

>The Sethians [a sect of the Nicolaitans] said that Iesus was a true man born of the Virgin by the power of God & that Christ with his sister Sophia descended upon him & thereby he became Iesus Christ.

<108r>

③ The Gnosticks making their Gods either male or female or both taught that they generated by emission of substance as animals generate or as the heathens supposed their Gods to generate & thence accounted them consubstantial. Simon & his followers made the first God impregnate Ennoëa with Powers & Archangels & Angels & all his Gods & Powers & Angels pass into humane bodies by incarnation & become men & weomen & generate amongst one another & by consequence to be consubstantial to one another & also to humane souls. And Menander followed in {Simons} opinions {making} himself the Saviour or first Æon emitted by Ennoëa. Valentinus said that the invisible æternal incomprehensible unbegotten God called Proarche Propator & Bythus, after immense ages of rest & quiet emitted a prolation as seed, into the womb of Ennoëa called also Charis & Sige, & that she conceived & being pregnant brought forth Nus like & equal to his father, that is consubstantial to him & Ennoëa in the highest degree, & this son was called Nus & Monogenes & Ἀρχὴ & the father. And at the same birth was also born Alethea who being impregnated by Nus brought forth Logus & Zoe & these two by copulation generated Anthropus & Ecclesia & ten other Æons & Anthropus & Ecclesia by copulation generated twelve new Æons. And all these generations being performed between male & female by emission of substance from the male into the female, the children must be reckoned as truly consubstantial to their parents & to one another in the most proper signification of the word as all the offspring of Adam & Eve are consubstantial to their parents & to one another. And this being the Philosophy of the Gnosticks we need not wonder if they some times applied the word ὁμοούσιος to their Æons. For that they did so is manifest out of Irenæus [l. 1. c. 1. sect. 9, 10. & c. 5 sec. 2] & the excerpta taken out of Theodotus in the end of the works of Clemens Alexandrinus. Some {illeg} Valentinians distinguishing their Æons into spiritual & animal said that the spiritual were ὁμοούσιοι consubstantial to the spiritual & the animal to the animal, but not the spiritual to the animal.

① The Christian religion is founded in beleiving one God & one Lord & acknowledging the incarnation & passion of this Lord, & the Gnosticks generally eluded all the articles of this faith. They denyed one God & one Lord by distinguishing them into more then one & giving away their worship to fals Gods & fals Lords; as when they derived several Æons from the first God & tell us that one of those Æons was the creator of heaven & earth, another was the father of Christ, one was Christ another was the Saviour another was the Word another was Iesus the son of Mary. They eluded the incarnation & the passion by saying either that

Iesus Christ had a phantastical body or that Christ or the Saviour or the Word was impassible & only descended upon & dwelt in Iesus as the holy spirit doth in a good man. So Irenæus tells us that all heresies say there is one God; but by an evil opinion change him, being ungrateful to him who made them as the gentiles were by their Idolatry. [Iren. l. 1. c. 19]. And again: They blaspheme also our Lord, dividing Iesus from Christ & Christ from the Saviour & the Saviour from the Word & the Word from the Only begotten [Lib. 4 in Proæ- <108v> And again. All the hereticks aforesaid although in tongue they {confess} one Iesus Christ yet they deride themselves, thinking one thing & saying another [Lib. 3. c. 18] And a little after For if one suffered, the other remained impassible, one was born the other descended on him who was born & afterwards left him, they are manifested to be not one but two. [Lib. 3. c. 18] And again They understand Christ to be one & Iesus to be another & teach not one Christ but many, & if they say that they were united, yet they shew that one suffered the other remained impassible Lib. 3. c. 19. And again: Christ was made flesh according to none of the opinions of the hereticks ffor if any one search the rules of them all, he will find that the Word of God & the Christ which is above is by all the hereticks induced without flesh & impassible. For some think that he was manifested in appearance as a transfigured man: for they say that he was neither born nor incarnate. Others, that he did not so much as assume the figure of a man, but descended as a dove upon Iesus who was born of Mary. Therefore Iohn the disciple shewing that all those were fals witnesses, saith: And the Word was made flesh & dwelt among us. [Lib. 3. c. 11.] These opinions therefore according to Irenæus began in the days of the Apostles, & as Iohn condemned them in his Gospel so he condemned in his Epistles saying: He is Antichrist . . . . . also in the Apocalyps. & are called by the Apostle Paul the mystery of iniquity, that mystery which was to work till the coming of the Man of sin [& is written in the forehead of the Whore of Babylon & that iniquity which is upon the heads of the Beast. ffor the Nicolaitans were to continue till Christ at his second coming should fight against them with the sword of his mouth (Apoc 2.16) & destroy the man of sin with the breath of his mouth & the brightness of his coming.] whom Christ should destroy with the breath of his mouth & the brightness of his coming.] whom Christ should destroy with the breath of his mouth & the brightness of his [second] coming. ffor the doctrine of the Nicolaitans was to continue till Christ should come & fight against them with the sword of his mouth Apoc 2.16 & 19.15, 21.

③ The Gnosticks after the manner of the Platonists & Cabbalists considered the thoughts or Ideas or intellectual objects seated in Gods mind as real Beings or substances, & supposed them to be male & female & to generate by emission of substance as animals generate or as the heathens supposed their Gods to generate & thence accounted them consubstantial ————— but not the spiritual to the animal.

If Iosephus might date the years of Herod from the first Passover in his reign (which was the way of reckoning among the ancient Iews) & Herod might reign 17 years complete & some months over: Christ might be born a year later & so be just 30 years old at his baptism.

The host of Heaven is the people of God usually called his Church, & The Prince of the Host is the head of the Church the Prince of Princes the Messiah the Prince & the Host which was given to the little horn of the Goat against the daily worship is the Church of the Kingdom of the Goat called in the Apocalyps the synagoge of Satan those who say they are Iews & are not. And And because the little horn magnified himself up to heaven & up to the Prince of the host or up against heaven against the Prince of the host & stood up against the Prince of Princes he is thence by the Apostle Iohn called the Antichrist.

<109r>

ἐνδιάθετος ἢ προφύρικτος, & feigned that silence preceded the Word & thence called Ennoea by the name of Sige: Irenæus tells these Gnosticks that Logos & Sige could not be in Bythus at one & the same time, no more than light & darkness. And that if they say that this λόγος was ἐνδιάθετος (for it seems this was the language of these Gnosticks) then Σιγή will be also ἐνδιάθετος: which two, saith he, are inconsistent, & therefore Σιγή is not ἐνδιάθετος. Thus does Irenæus represent the opinions of these Gnosticks & argue against them.

The doctrine therefore that the λόγος or Word of God was the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος the inherent Word of the father & was exerted or emitted as it were by speaking & thereby generated into a Son before the world began came from the Gnosticks Basilides & Valentinus & their disciples Secundus Ptolomæus <sup>f[8]</sup> Marcus

g[9] Heracleon who from Sige derived Nus & Logus & perhaps also from Saturninus the fellow disciple of Basilides, & from Menander the common master of Saturninus & Basilides & disciple of Simon. ffor Irenæus tells us that Valentinus had his opinions h[10] from his masters & k[11] blames Saturninus Basilides Valentinus & Marcion & the Gnosticks in general for pretending to know the generation of the son & explaining it by comparing it to a word spoken by a man. And this opinion seems to have been as old as the days of the Apostles. For l[12] Eusebius tells us that Marcellus in making Quiet to precede the Logus, imitated that impious ring-leader of the hereticks [Simon] who said atheistically ἦν Θεὸς καὶ Σιγὴ There was God & Silence. And m[13] Gregory Nazianzen alluding to this doctrine of Simon & his followers said that the Simons & the Marcions & the Valentines & the Basilideses & Cerdons & Cerinthus & Carpocrates & all their trifles & juggling tricks were delivered τῷ ἑαυτῶν βυθῷ καὶ σιγῇ to their own Bythus & Sige or abyss & silence. And Ignatius<sup>[14]</sup> tells the Magnesians that they should not be seduced with foreign doctrines [of observing the Law] nor with vain [Jewish] fables which are unprofitable, & in opposition to those fables subjoins that the Word did not proceed out of silence. And the first emission of Ennœa, the Nicolaitans called Nus Ialdabaoth, that is Iah El dabæoth Deus fortis sermonum the potent God of speeches : And speaking implies both a word spoken & silence preceding, Logus the son & Sige the mother. [ffor breaking silence & uttering a word are phrases for speaking. And accordingly Ialdabaoth was Nus or Monogenes the son of Sige & father of Logus.]

<109v>

② As the Sephiroths in the Iewish Cabbala were the powers affections Ideas operations & dignities of God the father considered as so many divine persons (namely his Crown his Wisdom his Prudence, his Magnificence, his Power, his Beauty, his Eternity, his Glory, his being the support & foundation of all things, & his Reign:) so the Æons of the Gnosticks were of the same kind. Simon said that Ennœa was the first conception or Idea of his mind & made her the mother of the other Æons or Idea of Ideas. The Nicolaitans & Cerinthus gave the names of Arche & Nus to the first emission of Ennœa & that of Logus to the next emission The first emission they called also Monogenes & Ialdabaoth & said that Logus was the son of Monogenes. Basilides called the three first Æons Nus, Logus & Phronesis, that is the Mind, the Reason or Wisdom & the Prudence: which names answer to the three first Sephirahs taking Nus or Arche for the Crown or supreme principle which contained all other sephirahs. Valentinus & his followers called the first God Bythus & Megethos, Profundity & Magnitude meaning without bounds & this answers to his Cabbalistical name En-soph the Infinite. And from him & Sige he derived Nus & Alethea the Mind & Truth & from these two Logus & Zoe the Word & life. And that these Gnosticks by their Æons understood the powers affections operations & Ideas of the supreme God is manifest by what Epiphanius cites out of their writings in these Words. In the beginning, say they, he who of himself is the father contained all things within himself. Then the Ennœa which was in him, (which some call Ennœa & others properly Charis because she effuses the treasures of Megethus Magnitude [Æn-soph] upon those who are from Magnitude, but others more truly call her Sige Silence because by cogitation without the use of speech Magnitude performs all things,) She, I say, the uncorrupt Æonia being willing to extricate her self from her bonds enticed Magnitude to her embraces, & brought forth the father of truth whom those that are perfect, [the Christian Cabbalists call the Man [Adam Kadmon & Arich Anpin] because he bears the likeness of the Vnbegotten. Afterwards Sige & the Man being conjoyned by their will brought forth [Alethea Truth in the likeness of Sige. This Man was the Æon which they also called Monogenes Nus & Arche. He was the father of Cochmah & Binah according to the Cabbalists & therefore is here called the father. Ptolomæus another of these Gnosticks assigned to the supreme father two wives Ennœa & Thelesis, Vnderstanding & Will & called them the affections of the unknown father & said that the Vnderstanding was the older wife because the understanding precedes the will, & that Ennœa thought of an emission but could not emitt it till the power of the Will came to her assistance, & then she emitted Nus & Alethea. And whereas the Gnosticks made Nus the son of Ennœa, Irenæus tells them<sup>[15]</sup> that they should rather have made Ennœa the daughter of Nus because Nus the Mind, is the fountain of thinking & Ennœa, Thinking, is the motion. The first motion of Nus the mind saith Ireneus is Ennœa & if it persevere it is called Enthymesis & after much perseverance & becoming perfect it is called perception & at length it becomes Council & council by persevering with motion is deliberation & deliberation at length becomes λόγος ἐνδιάθετος inherent reason & from reason proceeds λόγος προφορικὸς a word or speech sent forth by speaking. And all these things are but one thing in several degrees & have place only in the mind of man. They err therefore in ascribing to God the affections & passions of men & making him a compound. For God is not as man, nor are his thoughts like ours. He is simple & not

compound. He is all like & equal to himself, all sense all spirit, all perception all Ennœa, all λόγος all ear, all eye, all light. He is all sense which cannot be separated from it self, nor is there any thing in him which can be emitted from any thing else. Thus does Irenæus represent & confute the Metaphysicks of the Gnosticks. And whereas, after the Apostle Iohn had said In the beginning was the Word & the Word was with God, the Gnosticks called {the} beginning Nus & God the father Proarche & Bythos & took the Word for the λόγος -->

<110r>

-- Hesiod. ffor the Theology of those ancient Greek Poets was brought into Greece by colonies of Egyptians & Phenicians in the days of Cecrops, Cadmus, & Sesostris The mothers of Orpheus & Linus were Egyptians, & {illeg} said with

Plato travelling into Egypt & Italy had an opportunity of learning the metaphysical opinions of both the Egyptians & Pythagoreans And in descrbing the Theology which he had learnt from them he calls the superior Beings Ideas or formal causes or causes by which

-- The mothers of Linus & Orpheus were Egyptians singing weomen & Orpheus travelled into Egypt & there learnt his Theology -- & Musæus the disciple of Orpheus taught ἐξ ἑνὸς τὰ πάντα γίνεσθαι καὶ εἰς ταυτὸν ἀναλύεσθαι, that all things came from one & should return into one.

Plato

For this doctrine was brought into Greece by colonies of Egyptians & Phœnicians in the days of Cecrops Cadmus & Sesostris. The mothers of Linus & Orpheus were Egyptian singing weomen & Orpheus travelled into Egypt & there learnt his Theology sacred mysteries music & poetry wherein he excelled all the Greeks & Musæus the disciple of Orpheus taught ---- into one.

Plato

Diodor l 4. c. 1. Laertius l. 1 in Proæm.

-- called them Æons. And Irenæus tells us that this doctrine of Æons came from ---- & other Greeks. And Tertullian also derives the heresies of the Greeks from the heathen Philosophers. ----- among the hereticks of the first ages.

cision as Simon ----- I

But the hereticks of the circumcision as Simon Nicolaus Cerinthus Menander would be most apt to derive their opinions from the Iewish Cabbala, & this I take to be the first rise of the metaphysical heresies. For the Apostle in opposition to these doctrines admonishes us not to give heed to Iewish fables & endles genealogies & oppositions of science falsly so called. By Iewish fables he means the fables delivered down by tradition among the Iews in their Cabbala, by endles genealogies, the genealogies of the Sephiroths & separate intellegencies in those fables which may be multiplied to infinity, & by oppositions of science falsly so called the disputes & contentions of the Gnosticks which were apt to arise amongst those who pretended to skill & understanding in this sort of Theology falsly called science. These hereticks & their disciples from their boasting of knowledge were called Gnosticks, & gloried in the name.

The Gnosticks of the uncircumcision rose later then those of the circumcision, & followed either the hereticks of the circumcision or the heathen Philosophers. Hegesippus ----- among the Gentile Gnosticks.

Irenæus tells us ----- from the Nicolaitans

The philosophical errors of the Gnostics ----- in the flesh.

Cerinthus was zealous for ----- went from him when he was let to Pilate.

Ignatius writing with old fables which are unprofitable. ffor saith he, if we still live according to the law we confess that we have not received grace & then he adds that Iesus Christ is the æternal word of God ὁὐκ ἄπὸ

σιγῆς προελθῶν not proceeding from silence. These last words no doubt relate to the old unprofitable fables of those who lived according to the law.

They they agreed with Sabellius in putting but one hypostasis in God but in Christ they put two natures & two hypostases Photius. Epist 34

<110v>

The Ennoia of Simon & Menander was by some of their followers called Sige {mother} {illeg} Sige the first God was by them called Bythos & the {illeg} Sige being taken from the {illeg} which {illeg} speech & thes {illeg} the Poets the first parent of their Gods &c. thence was that some hereticks as Valentinus Ptolomeus & Marcus derived the Æons from Bythos & Sige

For they compared the projection or emission of the first Æons Νοῦς & Λόγος to a mans emitting a Word or speech with a signification. Ireneus tells us that Valentinus had this doctrine from former masters & blames Saturninus Basilides Valentinus & Marcion & the Gnosticks in general for comparing the generation of the Word of God to a mans emitting a Word by speaking. Whence its probable that Saturninus gave the name of Sige to the Ennoia of his Masters Simon & Menander. After Iohn had called Christ the Word of God, these hereticks took this Word for a Word spoken, & imagined that God was silent before he spake. And this I take to be the original of the opinion that Christ was Verbum prolativum the λόγος προφορικὸς of the father. And as a man conceives a thing in his mind before he speaks it: so these hereticks feigned that God first conceived the Λόγος in his mind & then emitted him by speaking. So Valentinus said that ‡

‡ So Valentinus said that Bythos & Sige emitted Mens & Veritas & these emitted Verbum & Vita, by Mens & veritas meaning the λογος ἐνδιάθετος conjoyned with truth & by Verbum & Vita the λογος προφορικὸς conjoyned with life. ‡ < insertion from lower down f 110v > ‡ Ptolomæus assigned to Bythos two wives cogitation & Will & called them the affections, of Bythos & made cogitation the older wife because cogitation precedes the will. But these two wives were nothing else then two modes of the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, & this λόγος was nothing else then the Ennoia of Simon & Menander & their followers called also Sige by Valentinus, Secundus Marcus Heracleon. Ennoia was silent untill she brought forth Νοῦς an Idea or thought & thought brought forth the Word. And from these beginnings &c < text from higher up f 110v resumes > And from these beginnings came the opinion that the Word of God was first the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος & then the λόγος προφορικὸς of the father, But the later hereticks of this kind as Tatian, Montanus, Tertullian, Paul, Manes, Marcellus, Photinus, left of the monstrous language of Bythos & Sige.

Simon Samaritanus ex quo univeræ hæreses substiterunt {illeg} se inter Iudæos quasi ffilium apparuisse, in Samaria quasi Patrem descendisse, in reliquis gentibus quasi spiritum sanctum adventasse. Helenam fæminam Tyriam circumducebat, dicens hanc esse primam mentis ejus conceptionem, matrem omnium per quam in initio concepit Angelos facere et Archangelos. Hanc Ennoiam degredi ad inferiora & generare Angelos et potestates a quibus et mundum hunc factum esse dixit. Hanc in corpore humano inclusam fuisse et transmigrare de corpore in corpus. Hujus mystici sacerdotes libidinose vivunt, magias perficiunt, exorcismis et incantationibus & amatorijs utuntur, et imagines colunt Simonis et Helenæ. Et a Simonianis, ffalsi nominis scientia accepit initia. Irem. l. 1. c. 20.

Simon pater omnium hæreticorum Iren. l. 3. Præf.

Valentinus Cerdon & Marcion flourished in the days of Hyginus Pius & Anicetus. The rest who were called Gnosticks came fom Menander the disciple of Simon Iren. l. 3. c. 4.

The Nicolaitans were a vulsion of the Gnosticks that is a branch of them or a sect separated fom them.

Ebionei credebant Iesum esse filium Ioseph et Mariæ. Iren. l. 5. c. 1

Ecclesia ubique et semper eandem fidem unanimiter tenet ac tradit 46, 4 & 9. 48, 21 228, 2, 34, 368, 2, 29. 430, 1, 20 & 2, 14:

<111r>



oppositions of science falsly so called. By Iewish fables he means the fables in the Iewish Cabala, & by endless genealogies the genealogies of the Sephiroths Intelligencies & Æons of the {first} hereticks & by oppositions of science falsly so called questions in the {illeg} metaphysicks of those hereticks.

2 The Æons being &c                      Some of the Gnosticks &c

4 Irenæus tells us<sup>[16]</sup> that Simon was the father of all the hereticks & that all heresies had their rise from him & that science falsly so called, that is Gnosticism, had its rise from his followers, & particularly from his disciple Menander the master of Saturninus & Basilides., & that the Nicolaitans were also a vulsion of a sect of the Gnosticks And Epiphanius reckoning Simon to be the predecessor of Nicolaus conjoyns the sects of the Gnosticks & Nicolaitans & from the Nicolaitans derives the various sects of the Gnosticks called Gnosticks, Phibionites, followers of Epiphanes, Militaries, Barbelites Cainites, Ophites & by other names And that Caropocrates the father of Epiphanes borrowed some opinions from the Nicolaitans ]

5 The philosophical errors of the Gnosticks consisted chiefly in denying one God & one Lord, & in eluding the incarnation & the passion of the son of God. They denyed one God & one Lord by distinguishing them into more then one, as when they derived several Æons from the first God & tell us that one of those Æons was the creator of heaven & earth, another was the father of Christ; one was the Christ, another was the Saviour, another was Iesus the son of Mary They eluded the incarnation & the passion by saying either that Iesus had a phantastical body or that Christ was impassible & only dwelt in Iesus as the holy spirit doth in a good man. And these opinions were as ancient as the Apostles days being taught by the Nicolaitans & by Cerinthus ffor in opposition to these opinions Iohn saith, He is Antichrist that denyeth the father & the son or that Iesus is the Christ or that Iesus Christ is come in the flesh. And Peter that there should be fals teachers amongst Christians who should bring in damnable heresies even denying the Lord that bought them. And Iude

6 Cerinthus was zealous for imposing the law – – – – was incarnate & suffered. The Gnosticks properly so called & Valentinus & Marcus said also that Christ descended upon Iesus in the form of a Dove at his baptism & went from him when he was led to Pilate [And Carpocrates was of the same opinion with Cerinthus, saying that Iesus was a mere man assisted by certain vertues immitted into him from the father.] And after the writing of Iohn's Gospel, many |<sup>some</sup> of these hereticks changed the language of the Nicolaitans & instead of saying that Christ descended upon Iesus said that the Word was emitted & descended upon Iesus Christ & dwelt in him & did the divine operations. And this was the Philosophy of the Nicolaitans.

7 Some of the Gnosticks – –

3 The hereticks of the circumcision . . . . among the gentile Gnosticks

8 Montanus a Platonist

Epiphanius tells us that Cerinthus was of the same opinion with Carpocrates in all things except that Cerinthus introduced Iewish rites. Both said that Iesus was the son of Ioseph & Mary & as Cerinthus said that Christ descended upon Iesus so Carpocrates said that

This doctrine seems to have been invented after the writing of the Apocalyps & Gospel & first Epistle of Iohn wherein Christ is called the Word & is {illeg} described to be in the beginning with God [& that all things were made by him. And <111v> its probable that Saturninus was the author of it & changed the name of Ennoia (the first female deity of his Master & Menander) into that of Sige < insertion from the left margin of f 111v > & sometimes called Sige by the names of Ennoëa & Charis, so that as Marcus & Tatian Valentinus Ptolomæus & Marcus who said that the Vnbegotten God emitted Mens & Mens emitted Verbum < insertion from higher up the left margin of f 111v > He had this doctrine from Basilides < text from lower down the left margin of f 111v resumes > & Epiphanius tells us that Basilides had it from Saturninus & Simon < text from f 111v resumes > . And whereas the Nicolaitans said that Christ descended upon Iesus, the Gnosticks who received the Gospel & Epistle of Iohn & acknowledged the λόγος, changed the languages & said that the λόγος or Word which was emitted descended upon Iesus Christ & dwelt in him & did the supernatural operations. And from them this opinion descended to Hermogenes Tatian Montanus, Proclus Æschines, Praxeas, Tertullian, Artemas, Noetus, Sabellius, Paul of Samosat, Marcellus, Eustathius & Photinus. All

these hereticks therefore held the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, but yet with some diversity of language & circumstances. For some of them as Proclus & Tertullian held the λόγος to be a person, or substance endued with a proper life will & understanding & others as Hermogenes Æschines, Praxeas, Noetus Sabellius Paul Marcellus & Photinus held that the λογος was only a power seated in some dilated part of the fathers substance without any other life will or understanding then that of the father And again, some of them as Paul Marcellus Eustathius & Photinus held that the λόγος only dwelt in Iesus Christ as the holy spirit doth in good men & others as Montanus Hermogenes Praxeas Tertullian Noetus & Sabellius that he was united to Iesus so as to become passible. And thence Hermogenes Praxeas Noetus & Sabellius were called patripassians. But all agreed in distinguishing between the divine nature of Christ called the Word, & the man Iesus Christ who took his beginning of the virgin & was assumed & actuated by the Word.

Tatian professes that he was educated in the learning of the heathens & followed the philosophy of the Assyrians. And accordingly he held with the heathen Philosophers that all things were produced out of the substance of God & that the Word was Verbum prolativum emitted before all things in order to create the world & was a part of the fathers substance distinguished & divided from the rest of his substance in respect of life but not separated from it: & that as a man communicates his mind to another by speaking without diminishing his own understanding & knowledg & one lamp kindles another without diminishing its own light so the father gave a distinct life with reason understanding & wisdom to the son without losing his own λόγος ἐνδιαθετος & becoming ἄλογος His words are.

And accordingly he taught with the heathen Philosophers that all things were produced out of the substance of God & that the Word which was always seated in him at length became Verbum prolativum being emitted before all things in order to create the world, & that this emitted word was generated by participation of the fathers substance, but not by division from it but not — — — ἄλογος, His words are . . . . . After he had received the Æons of Valentinus he fell in with the doctrines of the Montanists. This was the philosophy of Tatian before he lapsed into the Gnostical opinions of many Æons & of the Word's having a phantastical body.

From them this opinion descended to Tatian, Montanus, Tertullian & others He did not make the Word a mere vertue or operation but permanent emission consubstantiall to the father. ffor Pope <sup>o[17]</sup>Iulius tells us: Marcelli fides confessioque Nicææ spectata est cum Arianis contradiceret. He was therefore of the very same opinion with Paul.

He was zealous for the consubstantiality of the Son as the Montanists Paulinists & Sabellians generally were in the sense explained above

<112r>

To Sir Isaac Newton knight

<112v>

The Priesthood of Noah was propagated down to the heathens, & the Priesthood of Aaron to the unbeleiving Iews: & yet the Heathens notwithstanding their inheriting the Priesthood from Noah, were rejected for their Idolatry for denying their God by Idolatry & the Iews notwithstanding their inheriting the Priesthood from Aaron, were rejected for denying their Lord. And so the Christians, by lapsing into Idolatry or into any other crime or practical opinion which amounts to a denyal of the father or the son, might cease to be the people of God & become the synagogue of Satan notwithstanding any constant succession of Priests or Bishops. He is Antichrist, saith the Apostle, who denyeth the father & the son.

— people untill by Idolatry or some other Act or opinion they should deny the son & thence become Antichristian Churches [& Synagogues of Satan.] The Priesthood of Noah was propagated down to the revolting heathens, & that of Aaron to the unbeleiving Iews, & that of the Christians may be propagated down to the Antichristians. And yet the Heathens by denying the their God ceased to be his people & the Iews by denying the Lord ceased to be the people of God for he that denyeth the son hath not the father. & so the Christians by denying that Iesus is the Christ or that Christ is come in the flesh do cease to be the people of God & become Apostates & Antichristians & synagogues of Satan notwithstanding the continuation of the

Priesthood. By worshipping a false God or a false Lord they deny the true ones fall away & become hæretical Churches & by falling out with one another without a sufficient occasion they become schismatical ones . And those opinions which tend to Apostasy or schism are to be deemed heretical or schismatical. By teaching to break any of the fundament articles or promisses upon which they were baptized & admitted into communion they become hereticks & by teaching to fall out & separate about smaller matters they become schismaticks.

<113r>

Athanasius had been condemned in the Council of Tyre A.C. 335 for killing Arsenius a bishop of a party in Egypt called Meletians, & banished into Gallia by Constantine the great & sent back into Egypt by his son Constantine & again forced to fly by Constantius the second son of Constantine the great. He fled to Iulius Bishop of Rome & so did some other bishops who had been deposed & excommunicated by the Greeks & Iulius calling a Council of western bishops at Rome A.C. 342 summoned the Bishops of the Eastern Empire to appear before him in this Council & give an account of their proceedings against Athanasius & the rest who had appeared to him. And this was the beginning of the open pretensions of the Bishop of Rome to the universal bishopric. ffor he ceased not henceforward to contend for an universal jurisdiction tho he met with repulses for above 200 years before he obtained it The eastern bishops therefore being sensible that the Bish of Rome contended for dominion refused to come to this Council & wrote back to the bishop of Rome a reprimanding letter telling him that they were his equals. Whereupon Iulius & the western Bishops who met in this Council turned the crime upon the eastern Bishops for not appearing, & received Athanasius & the rest into communion, & by means of the western Emperor Constans procured [the consent of the eastern Emperor Constantius] that a Council should be called at Serdica a city in the confine of both Empires to reexamin the matter. And 80 eastern bishops coming to Serdica & hearing that the western & egyptian bishops who were also there communicated with Athanasius sent to them several times to forbear his communion & the communion of the rest who stood excommunicated by them. But the western bishops at Serdica would not forbear but summoned the eastern bishops several times to come & justify their proceedings against Athanasius & the rest. Whereupon the eastern bishops seeing that the western bishops contended for a jurisdiction over them & that instead of being joyned with the western bishops in Council to heare the excommunicated persons at the barr they themselves were to be judged & the excommunicated persons were to sit amongst their judges, went back; & both parties writing circulatory letters in defence of their own proceedings the western in their letters accused the eastern as guilty **{illeg}** because they appeared not when Iulius cited them & because they now fled from justice, & they declared also in their circulatory Epistle their faith of one ουσία & one ὑπόστασις of the father son & holy Ghost & the equality of the son to the father & his assumption of a man, & excommunicated eleven of the eastern bishops & the eastern excommunicated Iulius Hosius & some others of the western & some moved & endeavoured that a new profession of faith should be published for supplying what was wanting to the Nicene, but others would not allow the Nicene to be imperfect. Hitherto the church catholick had continued united in external communion throughout all the Empire but now inclined to a rupture between the eastern & western churches, & yet came not to a full breach of communion. ffor whilst the eastern bishops excommunicated only a few of the western its evident that they looked upon the western churches as in their communion those few men only excepted whom they excommunicated & while the western bishops excommunicated only a few of the eastern its evident that they looked upon the eastern churches as in their communion those few men only excepted whom they excommunicated. These things were done in the year 347 & ✠ < insertion from f 114v > ✠ & after the council rose, a Profession of the faith of this Council was given about I supposenot by this Council **{illeg}** but by them who had offered it to the Council for supplying the defects of the Nicene Creed What this Creed was Historians do not tell us But such a Creed is now extant in the works of Athanasius published at Paris A.C. 1698. It is ascribed to Athanasius but was either made by a Council or presented to a Council for their approbation. For it runs in the plural number as follows. We beleive in one God &c. < text from f 113r resumes > in this state things continued until the year 353 when Constantius conquering the western Emperor Magnentius, & becoming lord of the whole Empire so checkt the ambition of the church of Rome. For within a year he called the Council of Millain & required the western bishops to subscribe to the condemnation of Athanasius it being the ecclesiastical rule for the sake of **{illeg}** that the greek Churches should permit the Latine & the Latine the Greek to govern their own affairs & judge their own members & acquiesce in one anothers judgments without presuming to judge one another, the authority of both being equal. The Latines therefore subscribed, except Liberius, Eusebius <113v> Vercellensis, Lucifer Calaritanus, Paulinus Trevirensis, & Dionysius Mediolanensis & Hilary who were banished for refusing. ♀ < insertion from f 114r

> ♀ The Latines translating the word ὁμοούσιος by una substantia & saying there was but una substantia una οὐσία & una hypostasis of the father son & holy Ghost were taken by the Greeks for sabellians . And this made the Greeks shy of the Latines & desirous to bring them to a better mind. ffor Sulpicius Severus<sup>[18]</sup> tells us that when Hilary was carried to the Council of Seleucia, the bishops there first asked what was the faith of the Gauls because they were suspected of Sabellianism: but when he explained his faith agreeably to the Acts of the Nicene Council, they acquiesced & admitted him into the Council. And on the other hand the Greeks who in opposition to the una substantia of the Latines maintained three hypostases were by the Latines taken for Arians. Constantius therefore seeing how great misunderstandings had arisen in the Churches by the word ομοούσιος, considered how to abolish it & for that end about four years after the Council of Millain called the Councils of Ariminum & Seleucia A.C. 359. And these Councils & the Councils of Sirmium & Nicæa in Thrace & some others laid aside the use of the word. Thus the Churches of the east & west seemed now united in the faith tho not in mind & affection. But Constantius dying about two years after, the union proved but of short continuance

For in the reign of his s < text from f 113v resumes > And four years after viz<sup>t</sup> A.C. 359 Constantius for terminating disputes between the eastern & western Churches about the faith called the Councils of Ariminum & Seleucia. The Council of Seleucia subscribed the Creed of Lucius the Martyr recited above & the Council of Ariminum consisting of above 400 bishops subscribed the Creed which had been composed & subscribed the year before, by the Council of Sirmium & this year was subscribed by the Council of Nicæa in Thrace, & the same Creed in the end of the year was subscribed by the Legates of the Council of Seleucia & the next year by a Council at Constantinople. So that the Churches of the east & West seemed now united in the outward profession of faith, tho not in mind & affection. But Constantius dying the year following, the union proved but of short continuance.

ffor in the reign of his successor Iulian Pope Liberius who had subscribed the condemnation of Athanasius & the Creed of the Counsels of Sirmium & Ariminum & had been restored to his bishopric by Constantius returned to the faith of the Council of Serdica & wrote an account of his faith to Athanasius representing that there was a Trinity under one Deity & one power & one usia & one hypostasis & that the Word assumed a perfect man without sin & desired Athanasius if he was of this opinion to subscribe it. And Athanasius wrote back that the Son of God assumed a Man & that he beleived in one God the father almighty & in his son our Lord Iesus Christ & in the Holy Ghost & that they were of one unity one power one hypostasis, one usia one glory one dominion one image the Trinity consubstantial. At the same time Lucifer Calaritanus Eusebius Versellensis & some other Bishops whom Constantius had banished being set at liberty by Iulian came to Alexandria & Lucifer went thence to Antioch & ordeined Paulinus bishop of that City. But Eusebius staid at Alexandria & with Athanasius & about fourteen other bishops of Egypt & the Legates of Lucifer & Paulinus agreed about the faith set themselves by composed a Council at Alexandria for restoring the homousian faith. And this Council as Socrates & Sozomen tell us confirmed the Nicene decree & professing the holy Ghost to be consubstantial to the ffather & Son named them the Trinity & agreed that the man whom God the Word assumed had not only a body but also a soul & that the words usia & hypostasis having created disturbance in the church should be used no more with relation to the Deity, unless in refuting Sabellius. For those of the consubstantial faith had hitherto differed in the use of the words, some still calling the three persons one usia & one hypostasis & for doing so being accounted Sabellians by others who called them three hypostases. Whereupon Athanasius calling some of both parties to <114r> him examined their language & found that the meaning of both parties was the same, those who called him one substance, one usia & one hypostasis, meaning one substance in nature & species, & those who called him three hypostases & three persons meaning three substances in number By this means Athanasius reconciled the two parties so that the Latines might henceforward use the language of una substantia without danger of being called Sabellians & to put an end to the seeming contradiction of one hypostasis & three hypostases this Council abolished the use of the word hypostasis except in refuting Sabellius, that is, the Council abolished the language of one hypostasis & allowed the language of three. ♠ < insertion from f 114v > ♠ And because a profession of faith had been handed about in the name of the Council of Serdica which was contrary to the present decree, they declared it not authentic. [This profession if I mistake not, was as follows. We beleive in one God the father Almighty, the maker of heaven & earth & of all things visible & invisible & in one Lord Iesus Christ – – – – because our mother the Catholic & Apostolic Church condemnes them with an anathema. For this Creed is ascribed to Athanasius, & since it uses the words usia & hypostasis, in one & the same sense, contrary to the Alexandrine decree it was certainly made before the meeting of this Council, & because it is mixed of the Nicene Creed &

the Creed of the Latines usually called the Apostles Creed it seems made by Athanasius when he was among the Latines & since it runs in the plural number We beleive &c & therefore was made in the name of more bishops then one it was either made by a Council or offered to a Council for their approbation. And since some in the Council of Serdica requested that something might be written concerning the faith, for supplying what seemed wanting to the Nicene Synod, & endeavoured to have this done; but the Council of Serdica would not suffer any other profession of faith to be published least the Nicene should seem imperfect, & after the Council rose a Creed was handed about in their name : it seems to me that those who moved the Council for a new Creed did offer a form to the Council & afterward handed about the same form as approved by the Council tho not subscribed & published by them, & that the Creed above recited was this form, because it agrees exactly with the opinion of that Council expressed in their general Epistle.] < text from f 114r resumes > This Council also giving the name of Arians to all those who were of the communion of the Councils of Tyre Antioch Millain Sirmium Thracian Nicæa Ariminum Seleucia & Constantinople [& also to all those who owned the Nicene faith without the consubstantiality of the H. Ghost,] that is to all the Christian part of the Roman Empire a very few excepted, decreed that those who would come over to them from the Arian communion should be received. But, say they, to recede from the detestable hæresy of the Arians, is, not to divide the holy Trinity nor to call any thing in it a creature. For they that feign that they profess the Nicene faith & at the same time doubt not to blaspheme the holy Ghost, do nothing more then deny the Arian heresy in words & retain it in their mind & opinion. ⊕ < insertion from f 114v > ⊕ And because some of those of the homousian profession had been accused of Sabellianism for their language of una substantia & una hypostasis, & of the heresy of Paul of Samosat for their language of ὁμοούσιος, & of the heresies of Valentinus & Basilides for making the son the inherent wisdom & λογος of the father without which the father is ἄσοφος & ἄλογος, & of the heresy of the Manichees for making the son ex usia patris the Council of Alexandria anathematized these heresies < text from f 114r resumes > And these things being agreed upon the Council them in an epistle to their friends at Antioch advising them to joyn themselves to Paulinus & his followers. And when this Epistle came to Antioch the things contened in it were agreed unto & subscribed by Paulinus. And now the Bishops of Rome Alexandria & Antioch being agreed in the faith, set themselves to bring back the bishops to their party. They were indeed checkt during the reign of Iulian, but after his death which happened within a few months, they were favoured by the Emperors Iovian Valentinian & Gratian successively & then by Theodosius & his sons & their successors

<114v>

celebrated by Gregory Nazianzen. For

Henceforward therefore the Bishops of Rome & Alexandria with **{illeg}** & some other who had been banished by Constantius set themselves to spread the faith which they had agreed upon, calling it the Nicene faith & separating from those who had subscribed the Councils of Antioch Sirmium, Nicæa in Thrace, Ariminum & Selucia, endeavoured to perswade other Bishops to do the like. ffor which end they called several Councils in Italy & Gallia For the Bishops of the western Empire & those of Egypt who had professed the consubstantial Trinity in the Council of Serdica, easily returned to the same faith. And in the east they that professed the son consubstantial to the father, were — — — Bishop of Rome & the authority of an imperial Edict. ffor Athanasius calling a Council of about 90 bishops of Egypt & Libya, wrote to the Africans & to Damasus bishop of Rome & Damasus thereupon called a Council of about 90 bishops of Italy & Gallia wrote by Elpidius to the bishops of Illyricum in behalf of the Nicene faith & Consubstantial Trinity, & the Bishops of Illyricum met in a numerous Council A.C. 373 & wrote by the same Elpidius to the Bishops of the Diocess of Asia & all Phrygia how that after much debating they had approved the consubstantial Trinity, & exhorted them to receive the same faith which Elpidius would teach them. And the Empero

<115r>

The Apostle tells us of a mystery of iniquity which began to work in his days & should work untill the Man of sin should be revealed & exalt himself (in dominion) above every thing that is called God & subduing | <sup>invading</sup> the Church should sit in the Temple of God & continue till Christ should destroy him with the brightness of his second coming. This mystery of iniquity was the heresies which rose up in the Apostles days & whose authors Iohn calls Antichrists. Little children, saith he, — — — — already begun. The mystery of iniquity was to end in the Man of sin & the many Antichrists in the great Antichrist. For while the heathen Roman Empire stood it was impossible for an heretical Empire to rise up. And because that which letted was



to be taken out of the way therefore the Apostle does not name it least the heathens should think him an enemy to their Empire, but tells the Christians that they knew it already, & the writers of the 4<sup>th</sup> century tell us it was the Roman Empire. This heathen Empire began to be taken out of the way by the victories of Constantine over Maxentius & Licinius, & was fully taken out of the way by the death of Iulian & then the man of sin was to be revealed & come with all signes & lying wonders,

And the Bishop of Rome at the same time obtained a grant of the universal bishopric from the Emperor Gratian (A.C. 378) & thenceforward gave laws to the western churches by decretal epistles. So that instead of the monarchical Theocracy which was set up over the churches by the preaching of the Apostles there was now set up the Roman catholick dominion.] & reign in the Temple of God till the second coming of Christ.

The heresies which in the times of the heathen Empire composed this mystery of iniquity consisted chiefly in certain cabbalistical & heathen — — —

And Cicero in his first book de natura Deorum, saith, Pythagoras qui censuit animum esse per naturam omnem intentum & commentem ex quo nostri animi carperentur non vidit distractione humanorum animorum discerpi et lacerari Deum, et cum miseri animi essent, quod plerisque contingerent, tum Dei partem esse miseram, quod fieri non potest. And a little after he rejects the like opinions of Plato Zenophon Socrates & Zeno & saith that

So then Paul was of the same opinion with Montanus about the Deity: but he & Sabellius & such others as followed Montanus in this point were not called Montanists if they differed from him in other things & did not receive his prophecies.

<115v>

The Council of Antioch which condemned Paul & rejected the homousion consisted of about 70 or 80 Bishops of Asia & Syria. But these Bishops met voluntarily & sent their sentence by a circulatory Epistle to all the Churches. And their sentence was unanimous received & approved by all the Churches [without any controversy arising thereupon] & even by the Church of Rome in writing. ffor when the eastern bishops applied to the Emperor Aurelian to remove Paul out of the Bishops house the Emperor suspended till he had the sentence of the bishops of Rome & Italy [Whereupon they wrote their approbation of the sentence of the Council against Paul & the emperor thereupon ejected him] & then ejected him So then the doctrine of Paul that the Son was ὁμοούσιος to the father was at this time condemned & the use of the word ὁμοούσιος rejected unanimously by the Church catholick.

Now while the opinion that the souls of men were of one substance with God the father, obtained so generally amongst the heathens & old hereticks; & an man of this opinion might affirm that Christ was of one substance with the father without beleiving him to be more then a mere man: [I understand not why the unity of substance should be thought a better argument amongst Christians for worshipping Christ then it was amongst heathens for worshipping the souls of a dead Heroes.] the unity of substance made nothing against any man.

As the heathens were in general reputed of one religion notwithstanding the variety of their Gods & modes of worshipping them in several nations so the primitive hereticks notwithstanding their particular differences may in general be accounted of one religion & called the mystery of iniquity & Church catholick of AntiChrist & of the particular heresies like the particular religions of the heathens were founded in one common principle of worshipping several Gods derived from the supreme Deity by emanation or emission of substance or vertue, & they allowed also one anothers baptism the ceremony by which converts are admitted into the one Church. ffor when Stephen bishop of Rome was induced to allow the baptism of all hereticks, he alledged in a letter to Cyprian the prescription of the hereticks who allowed one anothers baptism. There were therefore in the Roman Empire three sorts of men, Heathens, Christians & Antichristians, & as the Christians composed the Church of Christ, the Antichristians composed the mystery of iniquity

We have hitherto given you an account of several Arch-hereticks or fals Apostles all which agreed [with the heathens &] with one another in one common fundamental error of deducing various Gods from the substance of the supreme Deity, & in that respect were but one general heresy mixed of the heathen &



Christian religions & called by the Apostle Paul the mystery of iniquity. As several heathen nations worshipped several Gods in several manners & yet were in general of one religion: so all the particular heresies were in general but one heretical religion which religion like the heathen consisted in worshipping false Gods.

Iohn saith that there were even in his days many Antichrists & gives them all common character that they denied the father & the son, which is all one as to say that instead of the father & son they worshipped false Gods. This was the definition of an Antichrist. And this Character agrees to all the heresies hitherto

[1] In libro de fide et symbolo. Tom 3. fol. 30.

[2] a Epist 59 ad Marti 73 ad Leon. Aug. Aug. et Serm 10 in Solennitate Nativitatis Domini.

[3] b Gelasius ad Euphemianum, & in Synodo 70 Episcoporum.

[4] c Li 1 Epist 24 Li. 2 Epist. 10. Li. 3 Epist 4. Li 7 Epist 12.

[5] d [Martinus 1] in Synodo Lateranensi sect 5.

[6] [a Marcellus apud Euseb. cont. Marcel. l. 1 c. 4.]

[7] p. 655

[8] f Iren. l. 1. c. 10

[9] g Iren. l. 1. c. 6.

[10] h Iren. l. 2. c. 18.

[11] k Iren. l. 2. c. 18, 48, 49.

[12] l. Euseb. cont. Marcel. l. 2. c. 9.

[13] m Orat

[14] Epist ad Magnes.

[15] Iren. L. 2. c 14, 15, 16, 47, 48, 49.

[16] L. 1.c 20 & Præf L. 3.

[17] o Epist. apud Athanas. Apol. 2

[18] l. 2. sect 58.

---