

# Drafts on the history of the Church (Section 3)

**Author:** Isaac Newton

**Source:** Yahuda Ms. 15.3, National Library of Israel, Jerusalem, Israel

**Published online:** June 2006

---

<43r>

in the seed before he grew in the womb of the Virgin & to express this in the Creed Iesus is called the Son of God & his mother is called a Virgin

Now if the new Articles be omitted the Creed of the Latines called the Apostles Creed will be reduced to this fform. I beleive in God, the ffather Almighty, maker of heaven & earth, & in Iesus Christ his only son our Lord, who was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified dead & buried, the third day he rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven ; from thence he shall come to judge the quick & the dead; And I beleive in the holy Ghost. This Creed is the same in substance with the first Creed of Irenæus & therefore contains the primitive faith which according to Irenæus was preached to all nations in order to baptism, & by the recital of which all Christians from one end of the earth to the other end thereof knew one another to be Christians. Its articles are generally to be met with in the ancient Creeds of both Greeks & Latines: but in the following form it suits better with the Creeds of the Greeks & in the last article thereof includes all the Articles which have been added to the Creed in the language of the Scriptu{re} I beleive in one God, the ffather almighty, maker of heaven & earth, & of all things visible & invisible, & in one Lord Iesus Christ the Son of God, who was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was buried, the third day rose again from the dead: He ascended into heaven & shall come to judge the quick & the dead. And I beleive in the holy Ghost who spake by the Prophets. And if it be thought fit the Articles sitteth at the right hand of God. The resurrection of the body & life everlasting may be {instituted} by way of explication the same being short & in scripture & received into the Creed by the christians of the second century without occasioning any disturbance in the Churches.

Now this Creed is easy to be understood by the meanest capacities & so is fit to be proposed to all men, as the first principles of religion ought to be, & on that account may properly be compared to milk for babes. It is short & easy to be remembered as the Symbols of religion ought to be. All its Articles are in the scriptures in express words & so liable to no disputes. It contains not repetitions nor mere Theories like some of the Articles which we have omitted, but practical truths on which the whole practise of religion depends, & therefore a system of faith fit to be learned in the first place as the foundation of all religion. We must beleive in one God that we may love & fear him. We must beleive that he is the father Almighty, or first author of all things by the almighty power of his will, that we may thank & worship him & him alone for our being <44r> and for all the blessings of this life † < insertion from f 43v > † We must beleive that this is the God of moyses & the Iews who created heaven & earth & the sea & all things therein as is exprest in the ten commandments, that we may not take his name in vain nor worship images or visible resemblances nor have (in our worship) any other God then him. For he is without similitude he is the invisible God whom no eye hath seen nor can see, & therefore is not to be worshipped in any visible shape. He is the only invisible God & the only God whom we are to worship & therefore we are not to worship any visible image picture likeness or form. We are not forbidden to give the name of Gods to Angels & Kings but we are forbidden to worship them as Gods. For tho there be that are called Gods whether in heaven or in earth (as there are Gods many & Lords many), yet to us there is but one God the ffather of whom are all things & we in him & our Lord Iesus Christ by whom are all things & we in him, that is, but one God & one Lord in our worship: One God & one

mediator between God & man the man Christ Jesus. We are forbidden to worship two Gods but we are not forbidden to worship one God, & one Lord: one God for creating all things & one Lord for redeeming us with his blood. We must not pray to two Gods, but we may pray to one God in the name of one Lord. We must beleive therefore in one Lord Iesus Christ that we may behave our selves obediently towards him as subjects & keep his laws, & give him that honour & glory & worship which is due to him as our Lord & King or else we are not his people. We must beleive that this Lord Iesus is the Christ, or Messiah the Prince predicted by Daniel, & we must worship him as the Messiah or else we are no Christians. The Iews who were taught to have but one God were also taught to expect a king, & the Christians are taught in their Creed to have the same God & to beleive that Iesus is that King. And that we may give him the more honour we must beleive also that he is the Son of God born of the Virgin Mary without any other ffather then God himself. Who is a lyar, saith Iohn, but he that denyeth that Iesus is the Christ? He is Antichrist that denyeth the ffather & the Son. And we are authorized also to call him God: for the name of God is in him. Exod. 23.21. And we must beleive also that by his incarnation of the Virgin he came in the flesh not in appearance only but really & truly, being in all things made like unto his brethren (Heb. 2 17) for which reason he is called also the son of man. For many deceivers, saith Iohn, are entred into the world who confess not that Iesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver & an Antichrist. 2. Iohn. 7. < text from f 44r resumes > We must beleive that he was crucified being slain at the Passover as a propitiatory sacrifice for us, that in gratitude we may give him honour & glory & blessing as the Lamb of God which was slain & hath redeemed us & washed us from our sins in his own blood & made us Kings & Priests unto God his ffather. We must beleive that he rose again from the dead that we may expect the like resurrection & that he ascended into heaven to prepare a place or mansion for the blessed that by the expectation of such a glorious & incorruptible inheritance we may endeavour to deserve it. ☉ < insertion from f 43v > ☉ We must beleive that he is exalted to the right hand of God (Acts 2 ) or is next in dignity to God the ffather Almighty, being the first begotten the heir of all things & Lord over all the creation next under God, & we must give him suitable worship. For because he humbled himself to death even the death of the cross therefore God hath highly exalted him & given him a name above every name that at the name of Iesus every knee should bow of things in heaven & earth & under the earth & every tongue confess that Iesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the ffather. The worship which we are directed in scripture to give to Iesus Christ respects his death & exaltation to the right hand of God & is given to him as our Lord & King & tends to the glory of God the ffather. Should we give the father that worship which is due to the Son we should be Patripassians, & should we give the Son all that worship which is due to the father we should make two creators & be guilty of polytheism & in both cases we should practically deny the father & the son. We may give blessing & honour & glory & power unto God & the Lamb together but it must be in different respects, to God as he is God the ffather Almighty who created the heaven & earth & to the Lamb as he is the Lord who was slain for us & washed away our sins in his own blood & is exalted to the right hand of God the father. In worshipping them we must keep to the Characters given them in the primitive Creed & then we are safe. We must also beleive that Iesus Christ shall come to judge the quick & the dead, that is to reign over them with justice & judgment untill he shall subdue all rule & all < text from f 44r resumes > We must beleive that he sits at the right hand of God or is next in dignity to God Almighty & give him suitable worship because he humbled himself to death even the death of the cross therefore God hath highly exalted him & given him a name above every name that at the name of Iesus every knee should bow. We must beleive also that he shall come not from the right hand of God but from heaven to judge the quick & the dead, that is, to reign over them with justice & judgement untill he shal subdue all rule & all authority & power, & all enemies be put under his feet the last of which is death & by consequence untill all the dead be raised & judged. For he sits at the right hand of God not only in this world but also in that which is to come untill all enemies be put under his feet. And this his coming to judgment we must beleive that we may with understanding pray for the coming of this kingdom & fit our selves to stand before him in that day, & to deserve an early resurrection, knowing that the dead in Christ shall rise first & judgement shall begin at the house of God & that the saints who are first judged shall reign with him over the quick & dead untill all the dead be raised in the body & be judged, & the ungodly, the blasphemers, the unjust, the lawless & all the workers of iniquity be sent into places of misery suitable to their merits & the saints go to the place of eternal happiness which Christ is now preparing for them in heaven. And we must beleive that there is a holy prophetic spirit by which Moses & the Prophets & Apostles were influenced that we may study their writings as the Oracles of truth, & thereby grow in grace & in the knowledge of our Lord Iesus Christ to the end of our lives.

For besides the first principles & fundamentals of religion contained in the doctrine of baptism & laying on of hands & in the Creed which all are to learn before baptism, & which the Apostle therefore compares to milk

for babes, there are many truths of great importance but more difficult to be understood & not absolutely necessary to salvation. And these the Apostle compares to strong meats for men of full age who by use have their senses exercised to discern both good & evil. With these truths the mind is to be fed continually as the body is with meats. And to these truths I referr

<45r>

We must beleive that there is one God or supreme Monarch that we may fear & obey him & keep his laws & give him honour & glory. We must beleive that he is the father of whom are all things, & that he loves his people as his children that they may mutually love him & obey him as their father. We must beleive that he is παντοκράτωρ Lord of all things with an irresistible & boundless power & dominion that we may not hope to escape if we rebell & set up other Gods or transgress the laws of his monarchy & that we may expect great rewards if we do his will. We must beleive that he is the God of the Iews who created the heaven & earth all things therein as is exprest in the ten commandments that we may thank him for our being & for all the blessings of this life, & forbear to take his name in vain or worship images or other Gods. We are not forbidden to give the name of Gods to Angels & Kings, but we are forbidden to have them as Gods in our worship. For tho there be that are called God whether in heaven or in earth (as there are Gods many & Lords many, yet to us there is but one God the father of whom are all things & we in him & one Lord Iesus Christ by whom are all things & we by him: that is, but one God & one Lord in our worship.

The Church catholick during the two first Centuries accounted the unity of the Deity monarchical, & were zealous against a metaphysical unity

This Tertullian who was for a metaphysical unity testifies in his book against Praxias in these words — — — — — This was the metaphysical {belief} of the Montanists Oeconomy [of the Montanists consisted in explaining how the f. s. & h.G. were one by unity of substance. And The credentium pars major was certainly the Church Catholick. These both Greeks & Latins were affrighted & waxed pale at this metaphysical Oeconomy [of the Montanists: & this Oeconomy consisted in explaining how the father son & holy Ghost were one by unity of substance] & opposed to it their own tradition of a monarchical unity of God & Christ & did it with zeale pronouncing the word monarchy aloud. As Irenæus tells us that same faith was preacht in all the Churches throughout the whole world in his day & that illiterate Churches in Germany in keeping to their traditions were impatient & ready to stop their ears when they heard the opinions of the ancient hereticks, & in like manner, the common people whom Tertullian calls simplices & imprudentes, both Greeks & Latines were impatient & in a passion at hearing the metaphysical Oeconomy of the Montanists & with zeale opposed it to their own faith of a monarchical unity. And therefore the faith of a monarchical unity was the tradition of the Church Catholick till the days of Tertullian. For this testimony of Tertullian being against his own party is very strong & unexceptionable. The common people to whom the Gospel was preached from the beginning were tenacious of their traditions. Tertullian, & such as were bred up in the learning of the heathens & Cabbalists being puffed up with a conceipt of their own learning & wisdom looked upon the generality of Christians as ignorant & silly people & by degrees mixed their own metaphysical learning with the Christian religion.

About 70 years after Tertullian wrote against Praxeas,

The heathen Philosophers & first hereticks generally made their Gods to be either part, or powers of one substance. This Doctrine the Montanists Sabellians & Paulinists applied to the Trinity, making the unity of the Deity Metaphysical, while the Church catholick made it monarchical. For the people of the Church cath. were zealous for a monarchical unity against a metaphysical one during the two first centuries. This Tertullian who was — — — — of the heathen Philosophers.

<47v>

For Athanasius in his Orations contra Gentes & de incarnatione Verbi Dei written before the Arian controversy began & in several other parts of his works, teaches this doctrine

For Lactantius

– began to creep into the churches even before the end of the 2<sup>d</sup> century the Phygian heresy in those days spreading very fast.

For Athenagoras in his Apology written to the Emperors Marcus & Commodus about the year 176 exprest himself of this opinion. ffor after he had explained one supreme eternal invisible Deity the first author of all things he proceeds thus: Quin et Dei filium mente complectimur

The names given to Iesus related generally to his offices of Priest Prophet & King & to the Prophecies of the old Testament concerning him He was called the Lamb of God to signify that he was prefigured in the Paschal Lamb. The Christ or Messiah to signify that he is the Messiah predicted in Daniels prophesy of the 70 weeks, the son of Man to signify that he is the son of Man predicted in Daniels prophesy of the four Beasts, the son of David to signify that he is that Son of whose government upon the throne of David there shall be no end. Isa. 9.6, 7. the son of God to signify that he is the person spoken of in the second Psalm in these words The Lord hath said unto me Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee; Ask of me & I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance & the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt breake them with a rod of iron: thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potters vessel. He is also called the Prince of the kings of the earth & the King of Kings & Lord of lords Apoc 10 to signify that he is the Prince of Princes spoken of in Daniels prophesy of the Ram & he Goat, & Michael (Apoc 12) to signify that he is the Michael spoken of in Daniels prophesy of the scripture of truth where he is called Michael the great Prince which standeth for the Children of Israel, & the Word of God the faithful & true witness, whose testimony is the spirit of prophesy (Apoc 19.10, 13 & 3.14.) to signify that he is the Oracle of God, the Prophet foretold by Moses Deut 18 15, 18. For in relation to his being called in the Apocalyps the faithfull & true Witness, the beginning of the creation of God ( Chap 3.14) Iohn in the beginning of his Gospel calls him the Word which was in the beginning with God & by whom all things were made, putting his name the Word instead of his name the faithfull & true witness. And therefore those names are equippollent.

But men of corrupt minds, not attending to the relation which the names of Christ have to the prophecies concerning him, & which the several parts of scripture have to one another; but taking things in a littoral & natural sense which were spoken allegorically & morally with relation to piety & virtue, & wresting the expressions of scripture to the opinions of philosophers, have brought into the Christian religion many philosophical opinions to which the first Christians were strangers. So where Christ saith This is my body, meaning a type of his body, the Roman Catholicks understand it literally as if the bread was changed into Christs body in a littoral sense. Where Christ saith, The father is greater then I, meaning in power, some have thence inferred that the Son is a part of the father.

<48r>

bishops & in the several cities as they had been taught by the law, the Prophets & our Lord.

In the days of Pope Victor or not long before, in opposition to the Gnosticks who denied the resurrection of the body & maintained that the souls of men after various transmigrations returned into God, some Latines began to add the resurrection of the body & life everlasting to the end of their Creed.

The easy admission of hereticks into the Church of Rome gave them opportunity of propagating their doctrines early in that Church. And those doctrines were most apt to be propagated which were most generally taught by the hereticks: Such as was the opinion that the son of God arose from the father as a river from the fountain a tree from the root & a ray from the sun & that he was the internal wisdom reason & word of the ffather without which the father was ασοφος & ἄλογος . ffor this was the common language of Montanus & Paul of Samosat & Sabellius & had its rise from the Gnosticks who considered their Æons as such emissions & called them Ennoia, vous, λογος σοφια δυναμις & such like attributes powers & vertues. by the names of And this sort of language insinuated it self into the Churches by degrees in the third & fourth Centuries [And this opinion overspread the Roman Empire in the third & fourth century] For Alexander Bishop of Alexandria in a letter which he wrote to all the bishops of the Church catholic against Arius, relates that Arius had been condemned by a Council of almost 100 Bishops of Egypt , this doctrine & teaching (amongst other things) that the Son of God was neque verum ac genuinum Dei Verbum nec vera ejusdem sapientia – – – abusive autem Verbum dicitur atque sapientia: quippe cum et ipse extiterit per proprium Dei

Verbum et per sapientiam quæ in Deo est in qua Deus tum cætera omnia tum eum ipsum fecit. And to this opinion of Arius Alexander replies. Quod si filius ratio Patris est ac sapientia, quomodo fuit tempus cum non esset? Perinde enim est ac si dicerent ἄλογον καὶ ἄσοφον ποτὲ τὸν θεόν, Deum aliquando rationis et sapientiæ expertem fuisse. This letter being sent to all the bishops was subscribed by some & rejected by others. And they that subscribed it were doubtless of the same opinion with Alexander above mentioned

This doctrine was also proclaimed by the Emperor Constantine the great in all the cities of the Roman Empire. For when he had wrote without success to Alexander & Arius to forbear their frivolous disputes but could not prevail & therefore resolved to suppress the party of Arius, & for that end to call the Council of Nice, he wrote a threatening Letter against Arius & sent it to all the cities: & in that letter Constantine speaks thus to Arius. Vnum dicis Deum: habes ejusdem me sententiæ. Sic igitur sentias. Ejus essentiæ Verbum & principij et finis expers, Verbum esse dicis: eo contentus sum ita crede Siquid præterea adjungis, id tollo. Siquid ad impiam separationem fraudulenter consuis, id nec videre nec intelligere me confiteor Si hospitium corporis assumis ad divinorum operum dispensationem, non improbo. Epiphan hæres. 69. Baron ad An. 319. sect. 6. Socr. l. 1. c. 9 in fine

[1] And the bishops of Egypt & the west in the Council of Serdica in their circulatory letter had these words. Confitemur filium esse virtutem patris. Confitemur illum esse Verbum Dei patris præter quod nullum est aliud: et Verbum verum Deum & sapientiam et virtutem esse.

<48v>

By this you may understand that the Church Cath. in respect of the faith & communion of Christians continued in her primitive constitution till the days of Iustin/ This was the state of the primitive Church : in respect of circumcision & the law of Moses in the days of Iustin. And I do not see but that in respect of the whole faith & communion of her members she continued in her primitive constitution till the days of Eluetherus & his successor Pope Victor.

For when Iustin had represented to Trypho the Jew that Christ was God before the world began & was afterwards born & became a man, & Trypho put him upon proving this; Iustin replied that tho he should fail in proving that Christ was God before the world began, yet if he could but prove that Iesus was the Christ, it was sufficient for the Christian religion, some of the Christians beleiving that Christ was only a man. Verum tamen, o Trypho saith he — — —

And the relaxation of discipline giving lapsed persons too easy readmission to communion, seems to have offended Novatian & his followers who running into the other extreme denied the remission of all such sins as were committed after baptism, & occasioned the inserting a new article vizt the remission of sins, into the creed.

At the same time Liberius bishop of Rome wrote letters to the western Churches to receive the Arians without baptism as Pope Siricus mentions in his decretal epistle to Himerius, & then the Council of Constantinople usually called the second General council, composed & settled the matter between the Church of Rome & the other Churches by a Canon in writing that the Arians, Macedonians, Sabbatians, Novatians, Aristerans, Tesseradecatites & Apollinarists might upon anathematizing all heretical opinions be received without new baptism by signing & anointing the forehead, eyes, nose mouth & ears, with holy Chrism & at the same time calling this the sign of the gift of the holy ghost. But the Eunomians Montanists Sabellians & all other hereticks were to be exorcised catechised & baptized. Concil. Const. Can. 7.

<49r>

tiality of the Son should be inserted, & so the Council in the presence of the Emperour after some disputing agreed to this Creed. [2] We beleive in one God, the ffather almighty, the maker of all things visible & invisible: and in our Lord Iesus Christ the son of God, the only begotten of the father, that is of the substance of the father, God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten not made, consubstantial to the ffather, 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; who rose again the third day, ascended to heaven, & shall come to judge the quick & the dead. We beleive also in the Holy Ghost.

The word ὁμοούσιος which was used by the Nicene Council in this Creed & which is here translated Consubstantial, was by the Latines improperly translated unius substantiæ. ffor unius substantiæ may signify two things of one & the same common substance: but the words ὁμοούσιος & consubstantial were always taken by the ancient Greeks & Latines for two substances of one & the same essence nature or species. For Eusebius of Cæsarea writing to his Church in the time of this Council & giving them an account of what passed in it concerning the faith, told them that it was agreed by the Council that the son's being consubstantial to the father signified nothing more then that the son of God had no similitude with the creatures which were made by him, but was in all respects like the father & from no other substance then the fathers. And the Nicene fathers a considerable number of them in subscribing the decrees of the Council wrote by way of explanation that the son was ὁμοιούσιος to the father. And after Constantius came to the throne & conquered the west the authority of the Council of Nice was alledged with success against the opinion of a singular substance, the son being in the Acts of that Council called ὁμοιούσιος. And in the Creed it self the son is said to be begotten of the father, that is of the substance of the father. He is therefore according to this Creed, the son of his father's substance, but certainly not the son of his own substance. If the ffather is the substance of the father as is affirmed in this Creed, the son is the substance of the son, & this substance is the son of the fathers substance. But if the father is not the substance of the father, he is not a substance & so can be no father: & if the son is not the substance of the son, he is not a substance & so can be no son. And it's further observable that the Greeks called the ffather & Son two Hypostases, that is two substances: for the Greeks always took Hypostases for substances, & so did the Latines <50r> till the dark ages came on & Greek ceased to be understood in the Latine churches.

The word ὁμοούσιος had been universally rejected in the reign of Constantius because it was a novel word & to introduce it was a breach of the Apostles rule of holding fast the form of sound words, because it had been rejected long ago by the Council of Antioch which met against Paul of Samosat & the rejection had been quietly approved by the Churches of both east & west to whom that Council sent their circulatory letters, & because it was a word not understood by the people & liable to various significations. Properly it related to bodies & implied a previous substance divided into two & so might be taken in favour of their opinions who held that God was corporeal, or that the son was a part of the father or an emanation or efflux or prolation of his substance or his only wisdom & understanding without which he was ἄσοφος & ἄλογος: for preventing of which misinterpretations the Council of Nice had in their Acts allowed that it signified nothing more then that the son was of the substance of the father & ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ πατρὶ like the father in substance & had permitted as many of the fathers as thought fit to explain the word in their subscriptions by the word ὁμοιούσιος. But this explanation not being in the Creed it self but lying hid in the Acts of the Council was no security against misinterpretations. The Latines in their version of the creed wrote unius substantiæ & by this phrase gave occasion to a great part of the west to turn Monousians before they knew that unius substantiæ was put for similis substantiæ or unius substantiæ quoad speciem & naturam . Sulpicius Severus speaking of the homousian faith, saith that the Council of Nice was accounted to have been finished by means of Hosius, that is by his influence over the Emperor, He influenced also the Council of Serdica & therefore was a Monousian & th

The Importer delivers his bullion in Ingots by weight & assay to the Master & Warden of her Majestys Mint to be coined & if it be not in Ingots, he reduces it into Ingots at his own charge before the Master can receive it by weight & assay. & the charge of coynage is then born out of the coinage Duty. The money of Scotland is delivered by the people to the Bank of Scotland & by the Bank to three Commissioners who see it melted into ingots & deliver the Ingots by weight & assay to the Master of that Mint to be coined. The Bank is paid for their service out of the Equivalent. Quære 1 may the three Commissioners be paid for their service out of the Coynage Duty of that Mint collected before the Vnion. Or if they must be paid out of the Equivalent Quære 2 Who must order the payment & by what method.

<49v>

The Council of Nice therefore did most certainly in their Acts explain the word ὁμοούσιος by ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν Eusebius of Cæsarea represents & by consequence gave leave to as many of the Bishops as thought fit to enter that interpretation in their subscriptions. And that they did so is further manifest by the Creed of the Council of Illyricum assembled in the reign of Valentinian & Valens, wherein they wrote thus. We confess ———— excellent creature. Here this Council in their Creed allows that some fathers in the Council of Nice did interpret the word ὁμοούσιος of such a similitude as Eusebius describes, & subscribed the Acts of that

Council according to this interpretation, that is by entering in their subscriptions that the son was ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν or ὁμοιούσιος This Council of Illyricum complains indeed of those subscriptions as unsincere, but their complaint is a reflection upon the Council of Nice it self for approving | that interpretation. To the testimony of these two Councils we may add that of the Council of Chalcedon which was the fourth general Council & consisted of 630 Bishops & must be allowed to have understood the Nicene Creed. And they in their Creed affirmed that the son was ὁμοούσιος to the father according to his Deity & ὁμοούσιος to us according to his humanity. He was therefore till the days of this Council ὁμοούσιος to the father in such a sense as he is ὁμοούσιος to us, that is by similitude of substance & this sense was ratified in the churches by the authority of this Council. And lastly to the testimony of these three Councils we may add the testimony of the writers of fourth & fifth & some following centuries. [as Athanasius, Hilary, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Ierom, Augustin, Theodoret, Cyrill of Alexandria, Marius Victorinus, Anastasius Theopolitanus Iohn Damascene, Euthymius Zygabenus.] ffor Curcelleius & D<sup>r</sup> Cudworth have plainly shewn that the writers of those ages (Athanasius, Hilary, Epiphanius, Basil, Greg. Naz. Gr Nys. Ambrose, Chrys. Ierom. Augustin, Theodoret, Cyrill of Al. Marius Vict. Anastasius Theop. Iohn Damsc. Euth understood the father son & Holy Ghost to be three substances of one essence nature or species.

Which interpretation & subscriptions being admitted by the Council, cannot be complained of as unsincere without reflecting upon the Council it self, & differing from it in opinion. If the word ὁμοιούσιος is no security against Arianism the word ὁμοούσιος is none because by the approbation of the Council both the words are to be understood in the same sense when applied to spirits. Ierom tells us that the Stoicks & the Manichees & the Priscillianists reputed the souls of men to be parts of the substance of God & any heretick may with as much reason say that they are consubstantial to God

And the complaint against these subscriptions as insincere strengthens the evidence that there were such subscriptions in the Acts of the Council.

<50v>

And at the same time many of the Latines understood the latine version of the Nicene Creed in a very different sense taking the words unius substantiæ to signify that the father & son had one & the same common substance. ffor the Western Bishops in the Council of Serdica condemned Vrsatius & Valens for saying that there were three Hypostases or substances of the father son & Holy Ghost & in opposition to them affirmed that there was of all three but one Hypostasis or substance which the hereticks call Vsia, & that the Hypostasis of the son was that which alone is the Hypostasis of the ffather. And this mistake created a great misunderstanding between the eastern & western Bishops the eastern bishops calling those Sabellians who held but one substance & the western calling those Arians who held three. But when the Eastern Emperor Constantius conquered Magnentius & extended his dominion over all the west, the authority of the Council of Nice was alledged with success against this opinion of a singular substance, the Acts of the Council being produced in the times of the councils of Ariminum & Seleucia. And by this means the bishops of the whole Empire a very few excepted came into the opinion that the son was ὁμοιούσιος to the father like the father according to substance. Against the use of the word ὁμοούσιος three reasons were now alledged, as Hillary mentions (lib. de Synodis sub finem), 1 because that word in its most proper signification implies a partition of an antecedent substance into two, 2 because the 89 Bishops which convened at Antioch against Paul of Samosat 61 years before the Council of Nice rejected the ὁμοούσιος, 3 because the word was not in scripture for which reason the Bishops at Ariminum & Seleucia omitted also the word ὁμοιούσιος & used only the word ὅμοιος ‡ < insertion from lower down f 50v > ‡ saying in their Creed that the son was like the father according to the scriptures. By which expression they intended to exclude the word οὐσία which is not in the scriptures & & to declare the likeness of the son to be such as is described in the scriptures by calling him the image of the invisible God & the express image of his substance. They condemned also the language of one Hypostasis of the father son & H. Ghost. And tho after the reign of Constantius the word ὁμοούσιος was again received yet it was not any more taken for a single substance till the dark ages came on. Liberius Bishop of Rome subscribed to the word ὁμοιούσιος in the reign of Constantius & after his death returned to use the word ὁμοούσιος but took it in the same sense with ὁμοιούσιος. ffor in the reign of Valentinian & Valens when the Macedonians came to him & professed the son to be in all things like the father & that ὁμοούσιος differed not from ὅμοιος, he received them [Socr. l. 4. c. 12.] And the Council which met at



Antioch in the reign of Iovian < text from higher up f 50v resumes > And tho after reign of Constantius the word ὁμοούσιος was again received yet it was not any more taken for a single substance till the dark ages came on.

Sulpicius Severus saith that the Arians by alledging the Council of Nice for themselves clouded the truth having corrupted the Council by adding a letter & turning ὁμοούσιος to ὁμοιούσιος. But if any such corruption had been discovered it would not have clouded the truth. Against the use of the word ὁμοούσιος three — — — came on. ffor the Council which met at Antioch in the reign of Iovian

Here this Counsel affirms what Eusebius of Cæsarea wrote from the Council to his Church while the Council was sitting

<51r>

hesternum, probabit tam ipsa posteritas omnium hæreticorum quam ipsa novellitas Praxeæ hesterni.

Eusebius of Cæsarea in Palestine who was baptized in the third Century tells us that he received the following Creed from his ancestors & was baptized into it. 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.

Hitherto the Church throughout the whole world continued united in one faith & one Creed as to the sense & substance of it, no disputes arising between the Churches about it: but in the fourth Century new articles of faith began to be inserted And first Alexander Bishop of Alexandria in making a declaration of his faith<sup>[3]</sup> inserted the catholick Church. We confess also, saith he, one Holy Ghost, — & one only Catholick Apostolick Church which is ever inexpugnable tho the whole world attack it, & overcomes every impious faction of hereticks who rise up against it. And henceforward this Article crept into several Creeds, as into that of Ierusalem which is thus recited by Cyrill bishop of that city. I beleive in one God, the ffather Almighty, maker of heaven & earth & of all things visible & invisible. And in one 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. <52r> It crept also into the Creed of the Greeks & Latines ffor it was in the Creeds of Constantinople Aquileia, Ravenna, & Turin, & in the Roman Creed commonly called the Apostles Creed. The Creed of Turin is thus set down by Maximus Taurinensis<sup>[5]</sup> Credo in Deum, Patrem omnipotentem & in Iesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum. Qui natus est de spiritu sancto ex Maria Virgine. Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus, Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris, Inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in spiritum sanctum, sanctam Ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum & carnis resurrectionem And that of Ravenna thus by Petrus Chrysologus. <sup>[6]</sup> Credo in Deum, Patrem omnipotentem. Et in Christum Iesum ffilium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu sancto ex Maria Virgine. Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est & sepultus, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, Ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris. Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo in spiritum sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem et vitam æternam. The same Article crept also into the Creeds of Afric. ffor Austin Bishop of Hippo sets down the Creed in this manner <sup>[7]</sup> Credo in Deum, Patrem omnipotentem qui fecit cœlum & terram et omnia quæ in eis sunt. Et in Iesum Christum filium ejus unigenitum, Dominum nostrum; Qui natus est per spiritum sanctum ex Virgine Maria, qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est & sepultus, tertio die resurrexit ex mortuis, in cœlum ascendit, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris, inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum sanctum, sanctam Ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum & carnis resurrectionem.

♀ Yet the Christians continued quiet till the death of Iulian, & then Athanasius sent his faith to the Emperor Iovian in an Epistle ♀ < insertion from f 51v > ♀ And soon after he presented his faith to the Emperor Iovian



in an Epistle which concludes thus. The Nicene Council that the son might be beleived simply like God but true God of God did not say that he was simply like: but also they wrote him ομοουσιος which is the property of a genuine & true son of a true & natural father. Neither did they alienate the holy Ghost from the father & son but glorified him with the ffather & son in one faith of the holy Trinity, because there is one Godhead in the holy Trinity. And this is that confession of faith celebrated by Gregory Nazianzen by the authority of which the western churches & some of the eastern were induced to separate and preach the truth. For Henceforward they began to return from the Councils {illeg} & Seleucia to the Nicene faith & (as Sozomen tells us) they that professed the son consubstantial to the father, were of the same opinion concerning the Spirit. Which doctrine was was zealously promoted in Syria by Apollinaris Laodicensus, in Ægypt by Athanasius, in Cappadocia & Pontus by Basil & Gregory. And when this question was moved & the contention increased the Bishop of Rome hearing thereof wrote to the eastern churches [by one Elpidius] that they should confess with the western Bishops the Trinity consubstantiall & equal in honour & glory. Which being done they began to acquiesce seing the controversy determined by the judgment of the Bishop of Rome backed with an Imperial Edict. ffor Pope Liberius & Hilary quickly prevailed with the Churches of Italy & Gallia to return to the Nicene faith & joyn the holy Ghost with the father & son in one consubstantial Trinity, as they had done before in the Council of Serdica then at the sollicitation of {Eusebius} Basil & some other eastern Bishops. And then Pope < text from f 52r resumes > [8] Damasus & 90 Bishops of Italy & Gallia assembled at Rome about the year 368 | 370 & wrote by Elpidius to the Bishops of Illyricum in behalf of the Nicene faith & consubstantial Trinity & the Bishops of Illyricum convened in Council wrote by the same Elpidius<sup>[9]</sup> to the Bishops of the Dioces of Asia & all Phrygia how that after much debating they had approved the consubstantial Trinity & complained of them for separating the spirit from the father & son exhorted them to receive the same ☉ < insertion from the right margin of f 52r > ☉ consubstantial faith of all three which Elpidius {illeg}, And the Emperors Valentinian & Gratian wrote at the same time to the same Bishops of the diocess of {Aix} & Phrygia, enjoyning the faith of the consubstantial Trinity which the Council of Illyricum after an accurate inquisition had agreed in & chiding them for their continuation < text from f 52r resumes > faith, & composed a Creed in which they made this confession of faith. We beleive with the late synods of Rome & Gallia that there is one & the same ουσια of the father & son & holy Ghost in three persons that is in three perfect hypostases. We confess also according to the exposition of the Nicene faith that the consubstantial son of God was incarnate of the holy virgin Mary & dwelt among men & for our salvation fulfilled all dispensation in birth, in passion in resurrection in ascension to heaven, & that he shall come again to reward every one in the day of judgment according to his life, being visible to all flesh & to shew his divine power seing he is God who assumed flesh & not man who assumed the Deity. And they that beleive otherwise we anathematize.

<51v>

In the reign of Iulian the Apostate Liberius Bishop of Rome wrote an account of his faith to Athanasius including the H. Ghost in the Deity & representing that there was a Trinity under the Deity & one power & one usia & one hypostasis & that the Deity is {illeg} & the Word of G. assumed a perfect man without sin begotten of the Holy father [read the Holy Ghost] & of the holy Virgin, & desired that Athanasius if he was of this opinion would 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 usia, one glory, one dominion, one image, the Trinity consubstantial. And at that time Athanasius convened Eusebius Vercellensis & the Legate of Lucifer Calaritanus & some other Bishops in a Council at Alexandria which Council (as Socrates (& Sozomen tell us<sup>[10]</sup>) confirmed the Nicene decree, & professing the holy Ghost to be consubstantial to the ffather & Son named them the Trinity & 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 the opinion of Sabellius by calling every one in the Trinity God in his proper hypostasis. ffor it seems the Latines using unius substantiæ for consubstantial & taking the words usia & hypostasis in the same signification with substantia had contended hitherto that there was but one usia & one hypostasis in the Deity, & the Greeks who were of the consubstantial faith translating substantia by usia affirmed that there was one usia & three hypostases, & thereupon the Greeks called the Latines Sabellians for holding but one Hypostasis & the Latines called the Greeks Arians for holding three. But Athanasius now examining both parties found that they agreed in their sense the Latines by one Vsia & one Hypostasis & three persons meaning one

substance in nature & species & three in number & the Greeks by one usia & three hypostases meaning the same thing. & so he made them friends.

<53r>

Now as the metaphysicks of the Iewish Cabbala came from the Theology of the heathens, so the metaphysicall opinions of the ancient hereticks came from both. For the Gnosticks [Simon, Menander, Nicolas Saturninus Basilides, Carpocras, Valentinus Secundus Ptolomæus Epiphanes, Marcus Calarbasus] [Heracleon Tatian & the Cainites Ophates Sethians Barbelites Phibionites, Militaries &c made many emissions the Gnosticks like the heathens & Cabbalists derived Æons or Deities male & female & served them from the first God & from one another by generation: & Irenæus tells us that the doctrine of Æons came from the generation of the heathen Gods recited by the Greek Poets — — — — — affinity with the Iewish Cabbala. And Epiphanius tells us that the heresy of Carpocrates was composed of the errors of all the former hereticks Simon & Menander, &c — — — — — mens wives ought to be in common.

† And because — — — — < insertion from the right margin of f 53r > † And because the hereticks like the heathens derived their Æons from one common substance by emission or projection, they accounted them consubstantial So the Valentines said that the first God Bythos emitted seed into Ennæa & thereby generated Nous like & equal to himself, & by consequence consubstantial in the highest degree. The Gnosticks also applied the word ὁμοούσιος to their Æons as is manifest out of Irenæus & the exerpta taken out of Theodotus in the end of the works of Clemens Alexandrinus. And some of them, the Valentinians, . . . . to the animal.

< text from f 53r resumes >

I think it is not to be doubted but that the hereticks of the circumcision who before their conversion were instructed in the Iewish Cabbala, & other fabulous traditions of that nation would borrow some opinions from thence. For the Apostle in opposition to the first heresies admonishes the Christians not to give heed to Iewish fables endless genealogies & oppositions of science falsly so called. By Iewish fables he seems to mean the fables delivered down — — — — — Gnosticks pretending to science. The first God was by the Cabbalists called Æn-Soph the Infinite & by some of the Gnosticks Βυθος & Μεγθος Depth & Magnitude meaning without bounds. The first Sephiroth was by the Cabbalists called Kether the Crown or the top & first principle of the Sephiroths, & said to contein all the others Sephiroths eminently in self & the first Æon was by the Gnosticks called Ἀρχη the Beginning or Principle & said to contein all the other Æons virtually. The two next Sephiroths were Cochmah & Binah, wisdom & Prudence & the two next Æons were by some of the Gnosticks called λόγος & φρόνησις Reason & Prudence. The first Sephiroth was by the Cabbalists called Adam Kadmon the first Man & the father of {ochmah} & Binah & Arech Anpin the man with a great face, & the first Æon was by some of the Gnosticks called the Man & the Father. And as the Cabbalists said that this world was made not by the first God but by the inferior Sephiroths so the Gnosticks said that it was made not by the first God but either by one or more of the Sephirot Æons or by the Angels.

Irenæus tells us that all heresies had their rise from Simon & calls him the father of all the hereticks. And Simon derived all things from the conceptions or Ideas of God & the first conception of Gods mind he called Ennoea & Prunicus & a holy spirit, & said that by her God conceived in his mind in the beginning to make Powers & Archangels & Angels & placing God & Ennœa above the Spheres or heaven he said that when she came out of him she descended to the lower regions & generated Powers & Angels & that they created the world. And these powers & Angels he placed in the several heavens or Orbs where they were generated & gave barbarous names to the powers or Æons & said that the Angels governed the world amiss contending for dominion & that Ennœa was very beautifull & enticed the Powers & Angels to her embraces & they used her injuriously & deteined her below & knew not the first God. Whence it came to pass that the Gnosticks called him the unknown father. <53v> He said also that the Angels caused her to pass into the bodies of weomen, meaning by a Pythagoric transmigration, & that she was in Minerva & in the Trojan Helena & in many others & at length came into Helena the concubine of Simon. & that the Angels passed into men & beasts & in the bodies of men enjoyed her & made war upon one another for her sake meaning at Troy He said also that she was the lost sheep & that the first God descended to rescue her & save them that acknowledged him from the tyranny of the Angels who deteined their souls below & made them pass into various bodies, & that in descending through the orbs he changed his form in every Orb into that of the Angels in that Orb that they might not know him & among men appeared as a man & seemed to suffer in Iudæa; but did not really suffer.

He said further that God appeared in Samaria on Mount Sina in the person of the father, in Judea in the person of the son & in other nations in the person of the holy ghost, & that he himself was this God that God; meaning in the same sence that his concubine was Ennoëa that is by a Pythagoric transmigration of God into a humane soul or at least by having an apparent body . And in the same sense his Disciple Menander said that he was a power sent by the invisible Æons to be the saviour of the world. ] Simon said also that weomen were to be in common & that the Prophets were inspired by Angels his ennemies & therefore to be rejected & that men were to be saved (he ment from the tyranny of the Angels) not by just works but only by faith in him & Helena & therefore might do what they pleased. And that weomen were to be in common. Whence his Priests lived in lust & used exorcisms & incantations & magical arts & philtres & things enticing weomen to lust & fictions of familiar spirits & of prophetick dreams & worshipped the images of Simon & Helena in the form of Iupiter & Minerva; & in their assemblies had filthy mysteries instituted by Simon which consisted in offering to their Gods the seminal profluvia of men & menstrea of weomen instead of the Eucharist. To the Ogdoas of Powers Intelligences or Æons placed by Simon & his followers in the heavens of the fixt stars & seven Planets some added a decas of Æons answering to the number of the nations which God promised to give to Abraham for a possession & also a Dodecas of Æons answering to the twelve signes of the Zodiac & twelve months in the year: All which made up the 30 Æons of the Valentinians answering to the number of days in the month & of years in the age of Christ before he was baptized & began to act. And some (as Basilidas) equalled the number of Æons to that of days in the year [And they generally held a transmigration of souls feigning with Simon that they came down from above & after a circulation through various bodies under the tyranny the Angels till they had performed all things were at length **{illeg}** a Saviour set at liberty to return up again.] Simon's making every soul to have more bodies then one allowed no resurrection of the body but placed salvation in the ascent of the soul alone through the Orbs to their first station & condition. And his disciples taught that the body was the prison in which the souls of men were **{illeg}** by passing from body to body till they had paid the uttermost farthing, that is till they had done all things which they were to do in the body / And denying the resurrection of the body (for he assigned many bodies to the same soul) he placed salvation in the ascent of the soul alone

<54r>

Epiphanius reckoning Simon to be the predecessor of Nicolaus conjoins the sects of the Gnosticks & Nicolaitans & from the Nicolaitans derives the various sects of the Gnosticks called Gnosticks, Phibionites, ffollowers of Epiphanes Militaries Barbelites Sethians Cainites Ophites & by other names, & so far as I can find they held much the same doctrines with Simon. His Ennoëa they called Prunicus & Barbelo or Barbero, & placed her in the eight heaven & seven Intelligences or Æons in the seven heavens under her, calling the first or highest of them Ialdabacth & Nouç & said also with Simon that Barbelo was beautiful & enticed the other powers to her embraces & that Ialdabacth was her son & made the heaven & earth. They called her Prunicus to signify her lust. They said also that souls destitute of the knowledge were cast down from above & transfused into the bodies of hoggs & other animals but by science & the practise of their sect the soul might be set at liberty to return up & pass by the Princes to the highest heaven. And this they called the saving of the soul. They indulged carnal pleasures & after the example of Nicolas quitted their wives leaving them to the embraces of other men, & bidding them be charitable to the brethren. And after adultery they offered the filthy sacrifice instituted by Simon saying this is my body & this is my blood.<sup>[11]</sup> And some of them (as the Phibionites) not content with an Odoas of Æons encreased them to the number of days in the year. Thus far therefore They seem to have been Gnosticks of the same kind with Simon & his followers. But in their opinions about Iesus Christ they differed

For the Simonian Gnosticks said that Iesus Christ was a putative man & had only an apparent body, the Nicolaitans said with the Ebionites Iesus was a true man visible palpable & passible like other men, but Christ was an impassible spirit or vertue from above, & that Christ descended upon Iesus & composed Iesus Christ, & did the miraculous works. For Irenæus tells us<sup>[12]</sup> that Cerinthus & long before him the Nicolaitans, a branch of the Gnosticks, taught that the maker of the world was one & the father of our Lord was another, the son of the fabricator was one & Christ from above was another who being impassible descended upon Iesus in the form of a Dove & when Iesus was led to Pilate flew back to his pleroma (or Ogdoas of Æons) & that Απχῆ was the only begotten & Λόγος the son of the only begotten & our world was made not by the first God but by a power very inferior & cut off from the communication of those [seven Æons] who are invisible & innominable; & that for abolishing these heresies Iohn wrote in his Gospel that

there was one God who made all things by Iesus Christ.<sup>[13]</sup> And the Sethians & Ophites sects of the Nicolaitans, said that Iesus was a true man born of the Virgin Mary by the power of God & that Christ (the son of God & the first female in conjunction with his sister Sophia descended upon Iesus & composed Iesus Christ & that the souls of Iohn the Baptist & Iesus descended from above For the transmigration of souls was the common opinion of the Gnosticks. The Nicolaitans therefore taught that the soul of Iesus descended from above & that he was a true man born either of Ioseph & Mary as was the doctrine of the {Phibionites} & Cerinthus or of Mary alone by the power of God as was the doctrine of the Sethians & Ophites, & that a superior vertue whom they called Christ descended upon him at his baptism & composed Iesus Christ & revealed the unknown father & did the supernatural works & when Iesus was led to Pilate departed <54v> from him & flew up to his Pleroma, & Iesus alone suffered on the cross crying out My God My God why hast thou forsaken me. Those therefore who followed this doctrine as Cerinthus & Carpocras & his son Epiphanes & Valentinus & Marcus & Colarbatus & Succindus & the Gnosticks properly so called are to be reckoned among the Nicolaitan Gnosticks. Carpocras was of the same opinion with Cerintus saying that a Vertue descended upon Iesus & his Son Epiphanes was reckoned among the Nicolaitans: but Valentinus had a singular opinion. He said that Iesus had a real visible palpable passible body but brought this body with him from heaven & passed through the Virgin as water through a pipe & that Christ descended upon this Iesus. And Secundus seems to have followed Valentinus in this opinion. But Menander Saturninus Basilides Cerdo & Marcion said that Iesus was a putative man & therefore may be reckoned among the Simonian Gnosticks. [or rather among the Menandrian.

< insertion from the left margin of f 54v >

Those therefore who held with {Simon that Iesus} had a putative body, as Menander, the disciple of Simon & **{illeg}** {Saturni}nus Basilides the disciples of Menander & Cerdo & Marion, I reckon among the Simonian Gnosticks, & those who said that Iesus had a real body & that Christ descended upon him, as Cerinthus Carpocrates Epiphanes Valentinus Secundus Marcus Colarbasus & the Gnosticks properly so called & the Phibionites Barbelites {Ophites} &c I reckon among the Nicolaitan. Carpocrates was — — — — followed Valentinus in this opinion.

< text from f 54v resumes >  
<55r>

### Chap The Original of Popery

The Church of Rome began to decay in vertue before the end of the second Century, & to lay the stress of religion upon ceremonies & outward forms as is manifest by Victor's making so great a dust against the Churches of Asia Syria Mesopotamia & Iudæa for keeping Easter upon the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the Moon & threatening to excommunicate them for it. Whether they should commemorate the resurrection on that day as they had done from the beginning or neglect the commemoration thereof till the Lords day following as the Latines Africans & Egyptians had done from the beginning was a thing indifferent in its own nature & Victor could not judge the eastern nations for their practise without usurping the authority of universal bishop.

The same thing is further manifest by the growth of {the Ca}taphrygian heresy in the Church of Rome in the end of that century: a religion full of superstition. For the contagion of this heresy spread it self so as to reach the Bishop of Rome himself & incline him to write pacificatory letters to the Cataphrygians in Asia. Which he had done had not Praxeas the author of another heresy prevented it by converting the Bishop of Rome from the Cataphrygian to the Praxean party, as Tertullian a Montanist or Cataphrygian in his book against Praxeas mentions in these words, Nam idem [Praxeas] tunc Episcopum Romanum agnoscentem jam prophetias Montani Priscæ et Maximillæ & ex ea agnitione pacem Ecclesijs Asiæ & Phrygiæ inferentem, falsa de ipsis Prophetis et Ecclesijs eorum adservando, & præcessorum ejus autoritates defendendo, coegit et literas pacis revocare jam emissas, & a proposito recipendorum charismatum concessare. Ita duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit, prophetiam expulit & hæresin intulit; Paracletum fugavit & Patrem crucifixit. Praxeas maintained that there was one single substance of the father son & holy Ghost called by three names as Sabellius did afterwards & therefore Tertullian reckons him a Patripassian saying Patrem crucifixit. <56r> By these doctrines it appears that the Cataphrygians were Gnosticks ffor Simon Magus & his successors derived all things from one first being by emission of substance. Simon & Menander called the

first emitted substance Ennoia & the next Angels Basilides called the first emission *Nouç* & said that *Nouç* was Christ & from *Nouç* derived a series of other emissions the last of which was Angels. Valentinus Secundus & Tatian called such emissions *Æons*. Simon pretended that Ennoia was seized by Angels & shut up in the body of a woman & according to the Doctrine of the transmigration of Souls passed from woman to woman & in the time of the Trojan war was in Helena, & that he himself was the first God & (I suppose according to the same doctrine of transmigration) appeared in Samaria as the Son, In Iudæa as the father & in other nations as the Holy Ghost. Montanus made the son & holy Ghost emissions from the father & subordinate to him. And (if I mistake not) Cerinthus was of the same opinion. Saturninus or Saturnilis taught that when the Angels who made the world had formed a man they were not able to give him life, but the virtue from above emitted a spark of life which made the man live & which after death should return to those things which are of the same nature with it self. The Montanists that Man was not only made by a rational author (viz<sup>t</sup> the Deity) but animated ex substantia ejus The Manichees Priscilianists & Stoicks (as Ierome tells us) that the souls of men were particles of the substance of God. Of which opinion were also the ancient Egyptians & the Brachmans. for they make all things proceed from the substance of God & return into it. And in the same sense I understand Epiphanius where he tells us that Valentinus & Colorbasus & all the Gnosticks & Manichees made certain traductions of souls & transmigrations into various bodies. Saturninus, Marcion, & Tatian condemned marriage & the eating of the flesh of animals. & Montanus taught to abstain from marriage & from some sorts of Meat.

< insertion from the left margin of f 55v >

& gave occasion to the Arian controversy. For when Alexander Bishop of Alexandria maintained an essential unity of the father son & h.g. Arius tooke it for the una substantia of Sabellius & thereupon set himself to oppse it. Vna substantia was also the language of the Montanists & so was the ὁμοούσιοι. And this last word was condemned in Paul of Samosat

< text from f 56r resumes >

Simon magus feigned that he was the great God & that his woman Helena or Selena resulted from him & was the first conception of his mind, & called Ennoia the mother of all things: for of her he conceived Angels & Archangels & powers by whom the world was made; & that Ennoia was detained & used opprobriously by these Angels & powers which had been emitted from her & was shut up in a humane body & according to the doctrine of the transmigration of souls passed from body to body, being formerly in the Trojan Helena & that he also came among men in the form of a man tho he was not a man, & appeared in Iudæa as the son in Samaria as the father & in other nations as the holy Ghost passing from body to body. His successor Menander feigned in like manner that the world was made by Angels who were emitted from Ennoia. & that the first vertue was unknown to all & sent him down for the salvation of men. And Saturninus or Saturnilus like Menander feigned that there was one father unknown to all who made the Angels Archangels & powers & that the Angels made the world & when they had made a man but were not able to give him life & motion, the Vertue from above emitted a spark of life which made the man live & which after death returns to those things which are of the same nature with it self. And other things resolved into what they were made of. These three hereticks seem to have held much the same opinions deriving all things from one original power or father by such a generation or production as consisted in emission or projection of substance.

And after the Emperor had declared to all the Empire that he was of this opinion & would suppress the contrary opinion & for that end came into the Council in person & proposed the ὁμοούσιος, the Council were no longer at liberty to act freely in examining & adjudging the matter between the two parties. They condemned the novel expressions of Arius because they were not in scripture & disturbed the peace of the Church. They might have condemned the homousion for the same reason, but were afraid of making the Emperor fly off from the Christian to the heathen religion. And therefore they chose rather to limit the signification of the word, & to drop it in their following Councils & to repeale it as soon as they were at liberty.

A seventh reason alledged in the Councils for repealing the word ὁυσία with its compounds was because it was not in scripture. This reason was alledged by the Councils of Sirmium, Nice Ariminum Seleucia & Const & is the stronger because we are commanded by the Apostle to hold fast the form of sound words For to contend for any language which was not handed down from the Prophets & Apostles is a breach of this



divine command, & they that transgress this command are guilty of the disturbances & schisms occasioned thereby. And therefore the said Councils did well in making the scripture their rule & contenting themselves with saying that the son was like the father according to scripture. If it be said that they were Arians I doubt not but there were Arians amongst them, as there were Sabellians & Montanists amongst the western Churches but I am speaking of the visible Church whose being & extent is measured not by the private opinions of men but by their outward profession of faith. What men were in their hearts God only knows: we can only judge of Churches & Councils by their outward professions of faith, & in the professions published by these Councils I meet with nothing Arian. Nor do I find in history that they were called Arians for any thing else then abrogating the language of the ancient hereticks adhering to scripture & holding fast the form of sound words

The Greek & Latine Churches being reunited in the outward profession of faith by the Councils above mentioned continued in this state till the reign of Valentinian & Val

<56v>

The Council of Nice A.C. 325 decreed that among the Bishops the first place in dignity was due to the Bishop of Rome, the second to the Bishop of Alexandria, the third to the Bishop of Antioch. Athanasius being accused ten years after by the Meletians of various crimes before the Council of Tyre & condemned by the Council & banished into Gallia by Constantine the great, Iulius Bishop of Rome so soon as Constantine was dead vizt A.C. 357 wrote to the eastern Bishops a chiding Letter<sup>[20]</sup> representing that no Bishop accused of crimes was to be judged but in a — — — — — was the first attempt to the universal Bishopric & the beginning of Popery.

of Iovian & his successors & then met with new disturbances from Athanasius & his party, of which Gregory Nazianzen who lived in those times gives this account.

excommunicated Iulius Hosius & some others of the western. The western Bishops made some Canons also in which they decreed that appeals might be made from all the world to the Bishop of Rome, It was proposed also in this Council that a new profession of faith should be published for supplying what was wanting to the Nicene Profession. & Sozomen tells us that they did compose a new form of faith prolixer then the Nicene but containng the same opinion & not much differing in words. And that Hosius & Protogenes bishop of Serdica wrote to Iulius that they confirmed the Nicene faith, but for greater perspicuity had explained it more at large that the Arians might not abuse the brevity in which it was written & draw it to an absurd sense. And certainly a new Profession of faith was handed about in the name of this Council. And I mistake if this be not the following Creed found in a —

The Council of Serdica met in the year 347 & in the year 353 Constantius conquered Magnentius the successor of his brother Constans in the western Empire & [thereby becoming Lord of the whole Empire checkt the ambition of the Bishops of Rome & extinguished his supremacy for a time. ffor in the year] & two years after called a Council at Millain & caused the western Bishops to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius by the Council of Tyre, banishing those as seditious who refused to subscribe, & thereby the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome fell & was suppressed for a time. For the Eastern Bishops alledged that the Bishops of the east & west were equal in dignity & had no authority to question one anothers judgments but ought each of them out of Christian love & friendship to acquiesce in the judgments of the other. ffor when the western Bishops condmned Novatian the eastern acquiesced in their judgment & when the eastern condemned Paul of Samosat the western acquiesced in their judgment.

When the western Bishops had laid aside their supremacy, Constantius ταυτης ουσιας, called the Councils of Sirmium Ariminum & Seleucia who abolished the use of the word ουσια as not in scripture, explained the Nicene faith by the language ὁμοιος κατὰ τὰς γραφάς like according to the scriptures. And now the eastern & western Churches seemed united in communion & outward profession of faith, & continued in this state till the reign of Iovian. A.C. 363. But the seeds of new commotions were laid the year before.

For Liberius Bishop of Rome who had subscribed the condemnation of Athanasius & the faith of Ariminum, after the death of Constantius returned to the serdican faith & began to meditate a revolt, & for that end wrote an account of his faith to Athanasius, representing — — —

**Chap. 1.**  
**Of the Church of God & of her Laws Sanctuary Government & Worship.**

The true religion was propagated by Noah to his posterity, & when they revolted to the worship of their dead Kings & Heros & thereby denied their God & ceased to be his people, it continued in Abraham & his posterity who revolted not. And when they began to worship the Gods of Egypt & Syria, Moses & the Prophets reclaimed them from time to time till they rejected the Messiah from being their Lord, & he rejected them from being his people & called the Gentiles, & thenceforward the beleivers both Iews & Gentiles became his people.

The Laws of this people were first the Precepts of the Sons of Noah, then circumcision & the Law of Moses & precepts of the Prophets & Apostles & the Law of Moses has been handed down to us in the following manner. When Manasses set up a carved Image in the house of the Lord Sect I Of the Laws of the Church — — — — — And no power on earth is authorized to alter this covenant.

**Sect II Of the Sanctuary**

The nation of Israel had first a Tabernacle & then a Temple common to them all for the worship of their God, besides their Synagogues in every city. The Temple looked eastward & stood in a square area &c. — — — — — For God was worshipped daily in the Synagogues & Cathedral Churches.

The God of the Iews & Gentiles was one & the same God the creator of heaven & earth — — — — — & the Iews to be dispersed into all nations

The Law religion of the Iews & Christians , except the ceremonial part &c — — — — —

whereby he became the first begotten of every creature.

If those Churches worship the true Lord God Almighty the Father & the true Lord Iesus Christ the Christ who truly came in the flesh & truly suffered for us & fall out only about smaller matters they are the visible Churches of God & Christ broken into parties & those parties or particular schismatics who either impose any other articles of communion & salvation then what God & Christ has imposed or refuse to comply with any articles imposed by God & Christ & thereby give occasion to the breach. ffor the case is the same with that of those beleiving Iews who imposed the law of Moses upon the beleiving Gentiles & thereby brake communion with them & yet continued in external communion with the true beleiving Churches of the circumcision. But if any of those parties or particular Churches worship a false [ God & separate on that account they cease to be the people of the true God & if they] worship a false Lord Iesus Christ a Christ who was not truly incarnate nor truly suffered for us, & separate on that account, they cease to be the Churches of the true Christ & by the separation become his open enemies: for he that is not with me saith Christ is against me. [And such enemies are in the scriptures called Antichrists & synagogues of Satan]. Who is a liar saith the Apostle but he that denyeth that Iesus is the Christ? He is Antichrist that denyeth the father & the son. Whoever denyeth the son the same hath not the father. ¶ And every spirit that confesseth not that Iesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, & this is the spirit of Antichrist. By Worshipping a fals Christ in secret men cease to be members of the invisible Church of Christ & by worshipping a false Christ openly in a separate congregation they are revealed & manifested to be what they were before in secret They enter into open rebellion, cease to be members of the visible Church of Christ & become false Churches called in scripture synagogues of Satan & Antichrists & These are they that separate themselves saith Iude of Vicious lives & errors in opinion made beleivers become bad christians but did not deprive them of being members of the visible Church of Christ. Separation without a sufficient cause made them factious seditious & schismatical members. And Worshipping a fals Christ made them fals Christians, & enemies of the true Christ, such enemies as say they are Iews & are not, & are in scripture called synagogues of Satan & Antichrists These are they that separate &c First they privily bring in damnable heresies denying the Lord that bought them & then they separate & become open enemies & synagogues of Satan. — And in like manner the mystery of iniquity first worked in the Church privily & then was revealed & fell away from the Church & by going out &



separating became the Man of sin who sitteth in the temple of God as the Church of Christ but opposeth & exalteth him self above every God & by that opposition & pride is known to be Antichristian

<58v>

They that worship the true God are the people or host or church of the true God & they that worship & serve other Gods or Lords are the peoples hosts or Churches of the Gods or Lords whom they worship. & the true religion consists principally in worshipping the true God, & loving those that worship him.

The religion of Gods people in all ages, except the ceremonial part, has ben one & the same. Thou shalt love ——— immutable reason. By loving one another they became one people united in mind friendship & affection & by loving the Lord God they became his people. And hence it came to pass that charity ——— — Victor & Stephen. † < insertion from lower down f 58v > [ † Nothing is more dangerous to the Church then running into parties & separating from her. For a house divided against it self cannot stand. < text from higher up f 58v resumes > And Those parties that separate from the true Church of Christ are against the true Church of Christ & thereby become Anti-churches or in the language of the Scriptures Antichristian: ffor he that is not with me saith Christ is against me. [ And parties that are against the Church of Christ are in the scriptures justly called Antichrists. Vicious lives & errors in opinion made men bad Christians but did not deprive them of being members of the visible Church of Christ. Separation deprived hem of membership & made them other Churches Antichurches Antichristians. These are they that separate themselves saith Iude of the Nicolaitans who turned the grace of God into lasciviousness & denied the only lord God & the Lord Iesus Christ which is the character of Antichristians. And the Apostle Iohn of the many Antichrists: They went out from us because they were not of us for if they had been of us they would have continued with us; but they went out that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us. By their going out from the Church they were made manifest that they were not of her nor any longer with her but against her When they ceased to be with her they became other Churches against her. And in like manner the separation of the great Antichrist from the Church the Apostle Paul calls the revelation or manifestation of the Man of sin The mystery of iniquity worked secretly in the members of the Church before this separation & by this separation they ceased to be of the Church & became the Man of Sin sitting in the Temple of God & opposing & exalting himself above every thing which is called God: by which opposition he is known to be the great Antichrist. The mystery of iniquity consisted in doctrines which amounted to a denyal of the son & the revelation of the Man of sin consisted in a separation from the Church occasioned by these doctrines For it is called by the Apostle a falling away or Apostasy.

How {averse} the first Christians were from falling out with one another ————— & graft the natural branches again into their own olive tree.

## **Sect II Of the scriputes & laws of the Church.**

When Manasses set up a carved image ————— & no power on earth is authorized to alter this covenant.

## **Sect III Of the Sanctuary.**

The Temple of God looked eastward & stood ————— For God was worshipped in the synagogues & cathedral churches.

<59>

the charitable man therefore is long suffering, kind, free from envy & malice, humble modest & decent in his behaviour, not covetous, not passionate, not mischievous just good, veracious, patient, & easy to beleive [{illeg} what tends to the glory of God & the good of mankind is well attested] the truth & hope the promises, not tossed about with every wind of doctrine but {judicious in trying} the spirits of men & discerning between what is reasonable & suitable to Gods wisdom & goodness {illeg} & tends to his glory {illeg} & the good of mankind & what proceed from the useless inventions of fierce, proud, ambitious, immodest, covetous wicked deceitful uncharitable men.

## Chap. XI

### Of the holy covenant.

① The holy covenant between God & his people is that he shall be their God & they shall be his people. They shall honour him trust in him fear him obey him & love him as their God or supreme Emperor & governour & he shall protect them as his people & reward them for their services. To honour him is to worship him with praise & thanks-giving & to wish him glory & dominion . To trust in him is to beleive him & rely upon his promises & pray to him. To love obey & fear him is to live according to his laws. By this we know saith the Apostle that we love him if wee keep his commandments. ③ And the end of love is to unite God & Christ & all his people into one mystical body God loving his people as his children & they loving him as their father the king & their fellow subjects as themselves. ffor this is the Law & the Proph{ets} We must unite & become one by love under one God & one Lord in one spirit one faith, one baptism & one Church or kingdom of God the host of heaven. And to have any other God or any other Lord or any other faith or baptism or to change times & laws by humane impositions or to hate one another is to forsake the holy covenant. Who soever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment & whosoever shall say thou fool shall be in danger of hell-fire. Therefore if thou bringest thy gift to the altar & there remembrest that thy brother hath ought against thee: leave there thy gift before the altar & go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother & then come & offer thy gift. Matt. 5. ② The two tables of the law are called the Tables of the covenant by Moses; but because the house of Israel brake that covenant God rejected them from being his people & has promised that upon their returning to him he will make a new covenant with them. And this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their mind & write them in their hearts, & I will be to them a God & they shall be to me a people. Hebr. 8. Now his laws are fulfilled by love.

4 The Apostle tells us – – –

<60r>

## Chap.

### Of the rise of the Roman Catholick Religion.

The Churches of God continued united in faith & friendship till the days of Hegesippus Irenæus & Eleutherius bishop of Rome as you have heard above. The first schism of moment was that made by Pope Victor who excommunicated the Churches of Asia for keeping Easter on the day of the Iewish passover & wrote communicatory letters to the Montanists. But Praxeas perswaded him to revoke those letters. Then turning Praxean he received Praxeas into the communion of the Church of Rome by imposition of hands alone without baptizing him & thereby made a step toward such an union between the Church of Rome & the Churches of hereticks as there was between the Churches of the hereticks amongst themselves < insertion from the right margin of f 60r > But after this principle began to be received in Egypt & Syria, the Church of Rome {illeg} joyned with those of this principle & in the space of 15 or 20 years propagated her schism with this doctrine into all the empire. The communicating with hereticks in their baptism was a great step towards a separation from those who did not joyn in the communion. Let us now see how the separation was completed. < text from f 60r resumes > For as the heathens of several kingdoms provinces & cities worshipped several Gods & yet were in general of one & the same religion: so the hereticks notwithstanding the variety of their Gods were in general of one & the same religion composed of the heathen & Christian. For they allowed one anothers baptism & by communicating in baptism were in general of one mystical body called by the Apostle the mystery of iniquity. And Pope Victor by allowing the baptism of hereticks united the Church of Rome & the Churches of the hereticks in one baptism, as much as they united to one another by the same principle.

Now this principle after it was of about 55 or 60 {years} standing in the Church of Rome gave occasion to a new schism in the Churches, the Church of Rome contending for the baptism of all hereticks & excommunicating the Churches of Afric & Asia for disallowing them. The controversy was as follows.

<60v>

This principle of allowing the baptism of hereticks beginning in the Church of Rome & spreading by the authority of that Church: we may by this spreading thereof make a judgment of the growth of the authority of that Church from time to time & conclude that the Religion of that Church did not overspread the Roman Empire before the meeting of the aforesaid Council of Alexandria in the reign of Iulian the apostate A.C. 362. How that Church presently after the reign of this Emperor made a schism & within the space of 15 or 20 years by the help of the Monks propagated the schism with this doctrine into all the Empire remains next to be explained.

– the Popes Silvester & Iulius supported the Cæcilianists against the sentence of a Council of the African Churches, Pope Zozimus received the appeal of Apianus against the sentence of some bishops in Afric, & Pope Iulius received the appeals of several persons from the Councils of the Greeks. For Athanasius

In the first case the Bishop of Rome & those with him, by refusing the testimony of living evidence against Cæcilian, succeeded: in the second & third he was baffled.

The Controversy about the universal bishoprick being thus composed the bishops set themselves in the next place to compose the disputes which had arisen about the faith. They had in the Council of Nice & in the Councils of Antioch, Philipopolis, & Sirmium rejected the novel language of Arius with an anathema & now they agreed in the 2<sup>d</sup> & third Council of Sirmium & in those of Nice in Thrace Ariminum Seleucia & Constantinople A.C. 357, 358, 359 & 360 to reject the novel language of Alexander Constantine Hosius & Athanasius, namely the words οὐσία substance ὁμοούσιος & ὁμοιούσιος, as not in scripture nor received by tradition nor understood by the people but condemned in Paul of Samosat by the Council of Antioch with the approbation of the Church catholick above 50 years before the meeting of the Council of Nice, & condemned also by the Apostles, who command us to hold fast the form of sound words which we have received, & to contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints. [They rejected therefore the novel expressions of both parties as not necessary to salvation not belonging to the primitive rule of faith, but tending to strife & faction & schism & therefore not to be imposed without the crime of uncharitableness. And instead of imposing those novel expressions they contented themselves with this profession of faith that the son is like the father according to scriptures, making the scriptures the rule of faith. And hitherto the visible Church catholick of Christ represented by the seven Churches of Asia, prevailed & from the days of the Apostles continued united & constantly diffused through the whole Roman Empire.

But now the schism was at hand which proved its ruin.]

Whether the sentences & opinions imposed were true or false was not the question but whether they were fundamental truths, & delivered in the language of the Apostles, such truths as the Apostle calls milk for babes, such truths as a man must believe before baptism, such truths as were always in the Creed & were conditions of communion from the beginning. If they were not such truths, to impose them as fundamental was to create disturbances factions & schisms, & make the imposers guilty of all the mischiefs which followed thereupon. Wo unto the world saith Christ because of offences, for it must needs be that offences come: but wo to that man by whom the offence cometh. Mat. 18.7. And Now I beseech you, brethren saith the Apostle mark them who cause divisions & offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, & avoid them. For they that are such, serve not our Lord Iesus Christ but their own belly, & by good words & fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple. Rom. 16.17 And again: tho we or an Angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you, then that which ye have received, let him be anathema. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you then that which we have preached, let him be anathema. Gal. 1.8. Circumcision was lawful to the Jews but not imposed on the Gentiles, & as the imposing it on them is here called another Gospel so the imposing of any truth which was not imposed from the beginning of the Gospel is another Gospel & by the Apostles rule deserves an anathema. It is giving offence to weak brethren & wo be to that man through whom offences come. It tends to discord & schism & therefore proceeds from a spirit of uncharitableness, & charity is a greater grace than faith, & more necessary to salvation, & schisms are more damnable than infidelity. For its better not to have known the Lord than to set the members of his mystical body at variance amongst themselves. The bishops therefore rejected the novel language of both parties as not necessary to salvation, not belonging to the primitive Rule of faith, not consisting with the indispensable rule of charity but tending to strife & faction & schism. And instead of imposing those novel expressions they contented themselves with this profession of faith . . . .

When the Novatians refused to communicate with those who lapsed in the persecution of Decius . . . . .  
 . . . were to be exorcised catechised & baptized.

About 59 years after the schism of Novatian began there was another schism made between the Donatists & the Cicilianists in Afric. And this was inflamed & perpetuated by the Church of Rome which supported Cicilian & his small party against Donatus & the Church of Afric in favour of the baptism of hereticks as has been mentioned.

It has been a frequent practise of the Church of Rome to support factious & excommunicated persons against the Churches who opposed or excommunicated them that they might thereby gain to themselves appeals from all the world & make themselves judges over all other Churches And in pursuance of this designe, Pope {Melchiades} & {Pope} Sylvester supported the Cætilianists against the sentence of a Council of the African Church & Pope Iulius received the appeals of several from the Councils of the Greeks . For Athanasius being accused of various crimes by the Meletians & condemned by the council of Tyre . . . . . both because they appeared not when Iulius cited them & because they now fled from justice. They made some Canons also in which they decreed that appeals might be made to the bishop of Rome from all Councils not called by him; & by doing so they submitted the western Churches to his authority, constituting him their Oecumenical Bishop & endeavoured that the eastern churches should be brought into the same subjection.

Hitherto the Churches of the Greeks & Latines had continued united in external communion throughout the whole Roman Empire (except the short schisms made by Victor & Stephen) but now they inclined to a separation. ffor the western bishops at Serdica excommunicated seven or eight of the eastern bishops & the eastern bishops at Philippolis excommunicated Iulius bishop of Rome & Hosius bishop of Corduba & three or four others of the western bishops for receiving & supporting excommunicated persons against the lawful authority of the Councils which excommunicated them & the western at Serdica excommunicated seven or eight eastern bishops by name for not submitting to the judgement of the western & upon other various pretenses. But while a few bishops of each party were excommunicated by the other party it is manifest that both parties looked upon themselves as hitherto in communion in communion with one another. & that they still continued in communion. And this further is further confirmed by the eastern Council of Sirmium which about four years after viz<sup>t</sup> A.C. 351, condemned Photinus & whose sentence was generally approved in the west as well as in the east both then & afterwards.

And now Constantius conquering Magnentius the western Emperor united the whole Empire under himself put a stop to the growing discord & A.C. 355 for reconciling the contending parties, called a council of above 300 bishops at Millain to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius. The western Bishops defended not Athanasius but offered to subscribe if the Nicene faith might be first confirmed: but they were made to understand that nothing could be regularly debated or proceed in Councils till they quitted the communion of persons excommunicated. Whereupon they all subscribed except Paulinus Trevirensis, Eusebius Vercellensis, Dionysius . . . . . over her own members.

And now the Greek & Latin Churches being equalled in authority they agreed in the Councils of Sirmium Nice in Thrace Ariminum <61v> Seleucia & Constantinople A.C. 357, 358, 359 & 360 to lay aside the new language of ὁυσία ὁμοούσιος & ὁμοιούσιος & content themselves with the profession of faith that the son was like the father according to the scriptures, making the scriptures the rule of faith.

Hitherto the Greek & Latine Churches continued united in one Church catholick from the days of the Apostles without interruption or schism excepting two or three short contentions one in the days of Pope Victor a second in the days of Pope Stephen, & a third in the days of Pope Iulius: all of them occasioned by these Popes. The first & second amounted to a schism between some of the churches, but was very quickly healed: the third tended to a schism but after a dispute of four or five years, it ceased by the conquest of the western empire. & in this united state the Church continued till the death of the Emperors Iulian & Iovian A.C. 363. < insertion from the left margin > For if any schism had at any time happened, such as was that early one between the members of the Church of Corinth, that between Victor & the Churches of Asia & Phrygia, & that between Stephen & the Churches of Afric & Asia, it was but partial & of short continuance; & the tendency to a schism beteen the eastern & western Churches in the times next after the Council of

Serdica lasted but four or five years. The bishops of the Council of Nice were on all hands acknowledged in communion with the Church catholick of Christ & in this communion the Greek & Latine Churches continued till the reign of the Emperor Iovian. < text from f 61v resumes > I speak of the external visible Church united in language. ffor God alone knows the hearts of men. The Greek Church exploded & anathematized the novel language of Arius in their Councils & published several Proffessions of their faith all which were free from Arianism & therefore it was not Arian though it might have Arians in its communion, & the Latin Church declared against Sabellianism & therefore was not Sabellian although it might have Sabellians in its communion. Both Churches being united in language & communion were but one Church & this Church together with all forreign Churches in her communion was the visible Church catholick of Christ. And they that were excommunicated by her (whether justly or unjustly,) while they stood excommunicated by her were out of the communion of the visible Church catholick of Christ, & those that separated from her were Schismatics. For the Greek Church never made a Schism & therefore continued in communion of the visible Church catholick of Christ. The Church of Rome made two or three short schisms, but quickly returned into communion with the other Churches, & therefore was also a branch of the visible Church catholick of Christ. To call either of them schismatical is to call the whole schismatical because they were but one. And if they were not schismatical they were in communion with the visible Church catholick of Christ, & those out of their communion were no members of the visible Church.

Now after the death of Iulian & Iovian Liberius Bishop of Rome for gaining the universal Bishopric separated from the communion of this Church pretending it was Arian, & in a few years made a general defection in the west the western Emperor Valentinian leaving the Bishops to their liberty while the eastern Emperor Valens opposed the like defection in the east. And after the death of Valens which happened A.C. 378 the eastern Empire coming into the hands of Gratian & Theod they delivered the churches of that Empire into the hands of those in communion with the Bishop of Rome & thereby propagated the Roman Catholick religion into all the Empire. And the Emperor Gratian by an Edict A.C. 378 granted appeals to the Bishop of Rome from the churches of Spain & Gallia, thereby making him universal bishop over the west. And this Bishop about seven years after by vertue of this new authority, began to give laws to the Churches of the western empire by decretal Epistles, the first epistle of this kind being written by Pope {Scricius} A.C. 385.

<62r>

### **Chap. Of the Roman catholick religion**

The christian religion at the first preaching of the gospel was propagated into all the Roman Empire & some other neighbouring nations as <sup>a[21]</sup> Germany, Scythia, Dacia, Sarmatia, Arabia Ethiopia, & the churches throughout all the Empire continued in communion with one another till the reign of the Emperors Valentinian & Valens, in whose days the church of Rome separated. In the reign of Constantius, the bishop of Rome laboured very hard to make himself universal bishop & for that end received appeals from the Councils of the Greek Church absolved from excommunication those whom the Councils had excommunicated & summoned the bishops of the Greek church to appear before him in a Council at Rome. & give an account of their proceedings against the persons whom they had excommunicated. & to put a good colour upon the designe, it was whispered in the west that the bishops of the Greek Church were Arians & had excommunicated the persons appealing out of malice because they were orthodox. But the Greek bishops instead of coming to Rome, wrote a sharp letter to the bishop of Rome reprimanding him very roundly for his irregular & ambitious practises. These things were done A.C. 341 & 342, & about five years after, a Council was called at Serdica by the consent of both Emperors for examining the matter.

When the Greek bishops came to Serdica,

— — but sprang from the Creed of the Africans mentioned by Cyprian

The article of the resurrection of the flesh was first inserted into the paraphrases & expositions of the article of judging the quick & dead as may be seen in one of the paraphrastical Creeds of Irenæus & in one of Tertullians. In another of Tertullians it is thus inserted into the body of the Creed & shall come to judge the quick & the dead by the resurrection of the flesh. < insertion from the right margin > The resurrection of the dead was exprest in the primitive Creed by the resurrection of Christ from the dead & his coming to judge the

quick & dead. For this implied that the dead should rise again to be judged. Afterwards towards the end of the second century upon some disputes about the bodies with which the dead should arise the resurrection of the flesh began to be inserted into the expositions & paraphrases of the article of < text from f 62r resumes > Afterwards it was separated from the article of judging the quick & the dead & made a distinct article & put after the article of beleiving in the holy Ghost.

It was wanting in one of the Creeds of Irenæus & in one of Tertullians & in the Creeds of Eusebius & Lucian & in the Nicene & that of Theophronius & that of the Councils of Antioch A.C. 342, & 345 & Sirmium A.C. 351. & did not begin to be generally received till after the middle of the fourth century.

Novatian . . . . . mentioned by Cyprian.

Alexander of Alexandria in a letter to Alexander of Byzantium sent an explication of these articles of faith. I beleive in God —

And this is the first Creed that I meet with in which the holy Church & the resurrection of the flesh are made distinct articles & & in which the Church is called catholick & Apostolic & the resurrection of the flesh is set after the article of beleiving in the holy Ghost.

<62v>

As the Council of Nice interpolated the Creed of Eusebius with the new article of consubstantial to the father, so Athanasius a few years after interpolated the Nicene Creed with several other new articles in the manner following — — — —

This Creed was later printed out of the MSS one in the Vatican & another in the King of France's library, & I take it to be that which Athanasius presented to Pope Iulius A.C. 341 & afterwards to the Councils of Rome & Serdica when they examined him about his faith & received him into communion For in this Creed the words ουσία & ὑπόστασις are taken in one & the same sense & therefore this Creed was made by Athanasius while the language of one usia & one hypostasis was in use amongst his party, & by consequence before Athanasius & the Council of Alexandria in the reign of Iulian the Apostate abolished the use of that language for avoiding the imputation of Sabellianism.

The four last Articles of this Creed are found also in the end of the Creed of Ierusalem in these words, & in one baptism for the remission of sins, in one holy catholic church & in the resurrection of the flesh & in life everlasting.

They are found also in the end of the Creed in the Apostolic constitutions in these words; who beleive in the holy catholick Church, in the resurrection of the flesh, in the forgiveness of sins, in the kingdom of heaven & in the life of the world to come.

They were also added by the Council of Constantinople to the end of the Nicene Creed in these words And I beleive one Catholick & Apostolick Church, I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins, & I look for the resurrection of the dead & the life of the world to come.

And while the Greeks of the party of Athanasius added them out of his Creed into theirs, the Latines added them to theirs, & the eastern Churches also for the satisfaction of the Latines added them to one or two of theirs. For the Council of Antioch A.C. 341 added to the end of their creed these two articles. And if, say they, this is to be added, we beleive in the resurrection of the flesh & in life everlasting. And the eastern bishops who came to the council of Serdica A.C. 347, in reciting the Creed which the Council of Antioch had published A.C. 342 & 345, added to the end of it these articles, And we beleive in the holy Church, in the remission of sins, in the resurrection of the flesh & in life everlasting. But four years after, in condemning Photinus, the Greek Council of Sirmium omitted them again as not belonging to this their Creed. And the following Councils of Sirmium A.C. 357 & 359 of Nice in Thrace of Ariminum & Seleucia A.C. 359 & Constantinople A.C. 360 continued to omit them in their Creeds. But after the year 381 the Homousians spread them over all the east.

The addition of these articles to Creeds which wanted them before shews plainly that they are additional articles & crept into the Creeds of both Greeks & Latines in the fourth Century by the authority of Athanasius & the bishop of Rome & by the Councils of Rome Serdica & Constantinople. In the third century & beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> they began to get into the Creeds of the Africans & Egyptians & from thence in the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> they got into the Creeds of Europe & Asia being propagated from Egypt by Alexander & Athanasius into the Churches of the homousians & by the homousians (after the year 381) into all the Empire.

<63r>

but sprang from this Creed of the Africans {mentioned} by Cyprian & Alexander of Alexandria in his profession of faith. which he published to the Churches the year before the council of Nice added the title of catholic to the holy Church & inserted these articles & the resurrection of the flesh in the middle of the Apostolic creed Afterwards The Council of Antioch A.C. 341 added to the end of the Creed of Lucian the resurrection of the body & life everlasting, & about 10 years after Cyril of Ierusalem recited the Creed of that city with these four articles at the end of it & I beleive in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins & in one holy catholick church & in the resurrection of the flesh & in life everlasting. And the Council of Constantinople called the second General council A.C. 381 added the same articles to the Nicene Creed in these words I beleive one Catholick & Apostolick Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead & the life of the world to come.

And about the same time or soon after the Latines added the like articles to the end of their Creeds. For I do not find any of these articles in that long profession of faith which they published at Serdica A.C. 347 in their general Epistle to the Churches recited by Theodoret or which at least was attributed to them in the latter end of the reign of the Emperor Constantius.

Afterwards the Council of Antioch A.C. 341 added to the end of the Creed of Lucian the resurrection of the flesh & the life everlasting, in these words, And if this is to be added: we beleive the resurrection of the flesh & the life everlasting. They seem to have grownded this addition upon the Apostles words who in speaking of fundamentals names them in this order, repentance from dead works, & faith towards God, the doctrine of baptisms & of laying on of hands & of the resurrection of the dead & of eternal judgment. Heb. 6.1. For from this text & that of Eph. 4.5 they began now to add also one baptism to the end of the Creed. as I gather from the Creed of Ierusalem recited by Cyril about tenn years after this Council of Antioch, in the end of which Creed are these four articles. and I beleive in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins & in one holy Catholick Church & in the resurrection of the flesh & in life everlasting. And the Council of Constantinople called the second general Council, A.C. 381, added the same articles to the Nicene Creed in these words I beleive one Catholic & Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins, & I look for the resurrection of the dead & the life of the world to come. And while the Greeks added these articles to the end of their creeds the Latines added them to the end of theirs. [For I do not find any of these articles in that long profession of faith which the Latines published at Serdica A.C. 347 in < insertion from f 62v > their general epistle recited by Theodoret (l. 1. c ) or which at least was attributed to them in the end of the reign of the Emperor Constantius & therefore they were added by the Latines since the days of that Council.]

And the same articles are at the end of a Creed composed by Athanasius about the same time & lately published out of a MS found in the Vatican. The words in the end of this Creed are: And we beleive in one only Catholick & Apostolick Church, in one baptism of repentance & of remission of sins, in the resurrection of the dead, in æternal judgment of souls & bodies, in the kingdom of heaven & life everlasting. Here the article of eternal judgment is plainly taken from the abovementioned words of the Apostle. And Athanasius being the great oracle of those days its probable that from this his Creed the four articles above mentioned were added to the Creed of Ierusalem recited by Cyrill. They were added also to the Nicene Creed by the general Council of Constantinople A.C. 381 in these words I beleive one catholick & Apostolick Church, I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins, I look for the resurrection of the dead & the life of the world to come. And since these articles were added to old Creeds that wanted them its plain that they were new ones. They are also at the end of the Creed in the Apostolic constitutions. And while the Greeks added them to their Creeds the Latines added them to theirs.



## Chap Of the rule of faith & Schism of the Christian Roman Empire.

The articles of the Creeds of the Greeks which are not found in any of the Creeds of the Latines were not necessary to baptism because the Latin Churches were baptized without them

And for the same reason the article of the communion of saints is to be rejected, it being in none of the Creeds of the Greeks. Neither was it in the Creeds of Tertullian, **{illeg}** or in those of Aquileia, Turin Ravenna, nor in any Creed before the fifth century, [It is not found in any Creed earlier than the fifth century] It was not in the African Creeds when Austin Bishop of Hippo wrote his Enchiridion to Laurentius. For there he affirms Post commemorationem sanctæ Ecclesiæ in ordine confessionis ponitur remissio peccatorum. It is first found in the Creed upon which Eusebius Gallica about the year of Christ 420 or 430 commented, & in that of Augustin of Hippo serm 115, 123, 181 de Tempore & in that of Paschasius a Deacon of the Church of Rome lib. 1. c. 1. Eusebius makes this comment upon it . . . . . et per illos cum Domino Iesu Christo. From all which this article seems to me to have been first inserted into the Creed in opposition to Vigilantius & his followers about the year of Christ 407, or soon after.

The article descended into Hell is not found in any Creed till after the middle of the fourth Century. When Constantius the Emperor was labouring to reconcile the Eastern & western Churches, a question arising whether Christ had a humane soule & the text, Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, being alledged for the affirmative: the Council of Ariminum A.C. 359 for quieting that dispute inserted into their Creed this article that Christ died & descended into the lower regions & there performed what was to be done whom the door-keepers of Hades beholding, trembled. And the next year the Acatians in a council at Constantinople inserted it into their Creed in this manner, dead & buried, descended into the lower regions, whom Hades also feared. And from these Creeds it the words descended into the lower regions crept into the Creeds of Ierusalem & Aquileia & at length into the Creed of Rome. For When Ruffin published the Creed of Aquileia which was neare the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century he assures us that this article was not in Roman. In Ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo, saith he, non habetur additum, descendit ad inferna.

Novatianus in the end of the persecution of Decius A.C. 351 making a schism in the Roman Church & denying remission of sins to them who lapsed after baptism was condemned for it by the Councils at Rome Carthage & Antioch. And the Africans to distinguish themselves from the Novatians inserted this article into their Creed remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam. For Cyprian in his 76<sup>th</sup> Epistle contending that the Novatians had no baptism, argues thus. Quod si aliquis illud opponit ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Catholica Ecclesia tenet; eodem symbolo quo et nos, baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem filium Christum eundem spiritum sanctum et propter hoc usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse quod videatur in interrogatione baptismi a nobis non discrepare, sciat quisquis hoc opponendum putat primum non esse unam nobis et schismaticis symboli legem neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt: Credis remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam: mentiuntur est interrogatione quando non habeant Ecclesiam. ☉ < insertion from the left margin > ☉ And in his 70<sup>th</sup> Epistle writing upon the same subject he saith. Sed et ipsa interrogatio quæ fit in baptisate testis est ventatis. Nam cum dicimus: Credis in vitam æternam et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam Ecclesiam? intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesiam {aeri}. < text from f 63v resumes > This is the first instance that I can meet with of any of these three articles, The holy Church, The remission of sins & the life everlasting, being in any Creed. They were not in the Creeds of Irenæus, Tertullian, Eusebius, Lucian nor in the Nicene

bishops of the Church catholick in the very beginning of the controversy with Arius & subscribed by all those of his party writes thus Quod si ffilius ratio Patris est ac sapientia: quomodo fuit tempus cum non esset? Perinde enim est ac si dicerent ἄλογον καὶ ἄσοφον ποτὲ τὸν Θεόν Deum aliquando rationis et sapientiæ expertem fuisse. This being subscribed by all the Bishops of his party may be taken for their common. And Constantine the great published the same opinion even before he convened the Council of Nice. For in an

epistle which he then sent to the Church of Alexandria & which was published in all the cities of the Roman Empire, he spake thus to Arius: Vnum dicis Deum: habes ejusdem me sententiæ. Sic igitur sentias. Ejus essentia Verbum et principij et finis expers, verbum esse dicis: Eo contentus sum; ita crede. Siquid præterea adjungis, id tollo. Siquid ad impiam separationem fraudulenter consuis, id nec videre nec intelligere me confiteor. Si hospitium corporis assumis ad divinorum operum dispensationem, non improbo. And a little after this the Bishops of Egypt & the West convened at Serdica write thus in their general Epistle to all the Churches. Confitemur filium esse virtutem Patris Confitemur illum esse Verbum Dei Patris præter quod nullum est aliud: et Verbum verum Deum et sapientiam et virtutem esse. Verum autem filium esse tradimus non sicut alij Filij appellamur. Nam hi quidem aut regenerationis causa Dij dicuntur, aut eo quod digni habitui fuerint Filij non cupantur: non autem ob unam ὑποστάσιν substantiam quæ est Patris et ffilij

And the Latines translating the word by unius substantiæ led their people into the errors of the Cataphrygians & Sabellians. As Hilary in an Epistle which he wrote A.C. 358 to the Bishops of Gallia & Britain thus acknowledges Multi ex nobis fratres charissimi —

< insertion from the right margin >

The Bishops therefore at this time laid aside the use of the word οὐσία with its compounds because it was not in scripture & created great disturbances, & also because the word ὁμοούσιος was rejected by their father in the Council of Antioch long before the meeting of the Council of Nice & was admitted by the Council of Nice simply or without {making} deliberation, & became a stumbling block to the people who were apt to understand it in another sense than that of the Council.

< text from f 64r resumes >

This made the Greeks suspect the Latines as inclined to Sabellianism. And therefore when Hilary came to the Council of Seleucia A.C. 35 {359} the Oriental bishops examined him ac primum quæsitur ab eo, saith Sulpicius, quæ esset Gallorum fides — — — — — perhibuit testimonium. However, Sabellianism was so far spread in the western Churches that in opposition to those of this opinion, the Greeks were necessitated to send the Acts of the Council of Nice to the Council of Ariminum for convincing the western Bishops that the father & son were two substances the son being in these Acts called ὁμοίουσιος to the father. And after this conviction, & the preaching of Hil. the Latines (so far as I can find generally took una substantia for two substances in number & one in species, (as two men are one in species but not in number) untill the dark ages came on & the Acts of the Council of Nice were lost & forgotten.

And now you may understand the meaning of the controversy which began presently after the Council of Nice about the decree of that Council, & lasted till the use of the word usia was abrogated in the Councils of Ariminum & Seleucia Socrates thus describes the beginning of it. <sup>[22]</sup>Vox consubstantialis, sicut ac ex varijs epistolisprehendemus quas Episcopi post absolutam synodum ad se scripserunt quorundam animos conturbabat. Quam illi diu — — — — — aversabantur. One party offended at the word ὁμοούσιος & unius substantiæ as being the language of the Sabellian Pa{rty} & Montanism & in the proper & usual signification of the words favoured these here{ticks} <64v> the other party adhered to the words as if the father & son must be two Gods unless they be one ex unitate substantiæ [ & as if they that denied this denied the homousion. For <sup>b[23]</sup>Eusebius of Nicomedia being on this account accused to the Emperor as if he denied the homousios Eusebius shewed the Emperor his garment & undaunted replied that if his garment should be rent before his eyes yet he would not say that the two pieces were της αὐτης οὐσίας of the same substance

And in relation to this controversy bishops of the Greek Church in the Council of Antioch A.C. 341 in the end of one of their Creeds mentioning the institution of baptism <sup>[24]</sup>Ite & docte omnes gentes, baptizantes cunctos in nomine Patris et ffilij et spiritus sancti, added these words: Patris utique vere Patris, et ffilij vere ffilij et Spiritus sancti revera spiritus sancti: ita ut hæc vocabula non sint nuda et sine re vocabula; sed quæ accurate expriment propriam uniuscujusque hypostasim, ordinem ac gloriam: adeo ut hypostasi quidem tres sint consensu autem unus. And the same Bishops in another Council of Antioch about four or five years after in a large declaration of their faith which they composed for the satisfaction of the western churches & sent to the bishops of Italy, say: Eos item qui dicunt tres esse Deos — — — — — aut eundem esse Patrem et ffilium et spiritum sanctum — — — — — anathematizat sancta et universalis ecclesia — — — — — Quamvis autem tres {illeg}

{Xiteamur} res tresque personas Patris videlicet ac Filij & Spiritus sancti juxta sacras scripturas non ideo tamen plures facimus Deos — — — — — Nos vero intelligimus illum non esse duntaxat Verbum Dei prolatum et internum sed verbum vivens ac per se subsistens — — — — — Illos etiam qui eundem esse dicunt Patrem ac ffilium et spiritum sanctum tria hæc nomina de una eademque re ac persona per summam impietatem accipientes, merito ab Ecclesia relegamus, eo quod patrem, qui nec comprehendi nec pati potest passioni et comprehensioni subjiciunt per incarnationem, cujusmodi sunt qui a Romanis quidem Patripassiani ac nobis vero Sabelliani dicuntur. — — — — — Sed neque tametsi dicamus filium per seipsum esse & vivere ac subsistere perinde ac Patrem, illum idcirco a patre separamus. Credimus enim eos absque ullo medio et interstitio conjunctos esse. Those things being written by the Councils of the Greek Church to the Bishops of the Latine for putting a stop to the growth of Sabellianism & for asserting 3 persons, & three hypostases in opposition to it & clearing the assertion from polytheism & from the imputation of separating the hypostases of the father & son; do plainly shew that the controversy mentioned by Socrates was now kindled into a flame between the Greek & Latin Churches. And is still more manifest by the answer which the Latines soon after in the Council of Serdica returned to the Greeks. Hæreticorum factio seu {illeg} pertinaciter asseverat Patris ac Filij et Spiritus sancti diversas esse hypostasis & a seinvicem separatas. Nos vero hanc a majoribus accepimus et didicimus & hanc tenemus catholicam atque Apostolicam traditionem <65r> ac fidem ac professionem unam esse hypostasin quam ipsi hæretici su{illeg}am appellant, Patris ac Filij ac Spiritus sancti. Et si quærant quænam hypostasis Filij, profiteamur eam esse quæ omnium consensu sola est Patris — Nos dicimus Patrem esse ffilium nec {negamus} ffilium esse Patrem — Confitemur filium esse Verbum Dei Patris præter quod nullum est aliud — et verum esse ffilium ob unam hypostasin quæ est Patris et ffilij. By saying Non dicimus Patrem esse ffilium they endeavour to clear themselves from Sabellianism & therefore were taxed with it. And in opposition to this & such like opinions which were spreading in the western Churches the eastern bishops about four years after in a Council at Sirmium made the following Anathemas Siquis ingenitum illum aut partem ejus ex Maria natum dicere ausit, anathema esto Siquis ἐνδιόθετον ἦ προφóρικ{ον} λόγον internum aut prolatitium Verbum esse Dei filium dixerit, anathema Siquis — — Siquis . . . . Siquis — — — Siquis . . . . — Siquis Patrem et ffilium et Spiritum sanctum, unam personam dicat, anathema sit. Siquis . . . — Siquis spiritum Sanctum partem Patris aut ffilij dixerit, anathema sit. Siquis Patrem et filium et Spiritum sanctum tres Deos dixerit, anat{hema} sit. By these anathemas of the old heresies, it seems to me that the mystery of iniquity worked now very strongly in the churches, the language of una usia & una hypostasis being a stumbling block to the people & a shelter to the heresies. For tho Hilary acknowledges many such hereticks in the Latine Churches in his days yet I do not find that any of them either then or at any time since have been excommunicated by the Latines for their heresies.

We must beleive that he is the ff{ather} to whom the Lords prayer is directed & whose dominion is celebrated saying Our father which art in heaven or who art highly exalted in dominion, hallowed be thy name as the glorious & sacred name of the supreme king of the univers , Thy kingdom come by the increase of the number of thy faithful subjects on earth & the coming of thy Christ whom thou hast {annointed} to reign over the quick & the dead. Thy will be done in this lower part of thy monarchy which is on earth as it is done in the higher part thereof which is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread for all things are under thy dominion & in thy disposal. And forgive us our trespasses against the laws of thy kingdom as we forgive our fellow subjects who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation but deliver us fom evill. For we are in thy power ffor thine is the kingdom the power & the glory. And whilst this prayer was composed under the law we must beleive that this father almighty, this universal uncontrolable Monarch is the God of the Iews, the creator of heaven & earth

— till the days of Pope Victor the successor of Eleutherus, For Victor turning first a Montanist & then a Patripassian, & being a hot superstitious & uncharitable The man brake communion with the Churches of Asia for their keeping Easter on the Iewish day of the passover & with the Christians who who beleived that Christ took his beginning of the Virgin by the operation of the holy ghost & was elected for his justice & which being the common opinion of the Nazarenes made them henceforward be looked upon as hereticks. Yet they — — — — — credimus. The Apostles & primitive Chur{ch} of the circumcision continued in communion even with the unbeleiving Iews worshipping in the Temple while it stood & in the synagogues till after the days of Ierome. And therefore they could not refuse to communicate with all the Iews who beleived Christ to be the Messiah & tho they beleived the Messiah to be but a man preferred for his vertue. And this was the charity of the first Christians. So then the Apostles of the circumcision & their disciples for promoting the gospel extended their communion in a very charitable manner to the unconverted Iews, & to the converted Iews & Gentiles whether they beleived Christ to take his beginning of the Virgin or to have been before the

world began. And therefore it is the character of a true Christian spirit to extend the charity of communion for the sake of the Gospel as far as is consistent with pious & vertuous life & conversation.

<65v>

### **Chap Of the revelation of the Man of Sin.**

From the time that the power of influencing religion by Councils came into the hand of the Roman Emperors they modelled the Christian religion so as suited best with their own opinions & that interest of their Empire & therefore influenced by their own opinions they consulted the inclinations of the people that all of them (heathens hereticks & Christians) might unite & become of one mind & one religion for the quiet of the empire. And for the same reason they had chief regard to the Bishop of Rome the first bishop of the Empire & next after him to the bishop of Alexandria & then to the bishop of Antioch. And after Constantinople was made the head of the eastern Empire & its bishop placed those of Alexandria & Antioch they had chief regard to the bishop of Constantinople next after the bishop of Rome.

Not long after the Council of Nice, the Eastern Churches deposed Athanasius bishop of Alexandria, Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra &        bishop of        & some others; & the excommunicated persons appealed to the Bishop of Rome, & he taking hold of the opportunity to make himself universal Bishop summoned the eastern Bishops to appear before a council at Rome & justify themselves But they wrote back a reprimanding letter representing that he had no authority over them & that it was the custome of the eastern & western churches to agree to one anothers Councils. Then by the consent of the Greek & Latin Emperors Constantius & Constans the council of Serdica was called, & the Bishops of both parties came to Sardica but the western bishops still contending to judge the eastern, the eastern refused to submit, & returned back & the western made some Canons importing that appeals lay from all the churches to the Bishop of Rome. This was in the year 347 & about 8 or 10 years after this the eastern Emperor having conquered the western Empire made the western bishops & clergy subscribe to the sen{tence} of the eastern councils against Athanasius, & thereby suppressed for a time the claim of the Bishop of Rome to appeals from the Councils of the eastern empire. And soon after by other Councils the Emperor abolished the use of the word homousion as not being in scripture nor understood by the people nor consistent with the decree of the council of 80 Bishops convened at Antioch against Paul of Samosat: 8 years before which decree was at that time communicated to all the Churches & unanimously apporved by them, & so was the decree of the Church catholick.

The Emperor Constantius was succeeded A.C. 362 by Iulian the Apostate the last heathen Emperor & he A.C. 363 by Iovian, & thereby that which letted was fully taken out of the way

By this it appears that the mystery of iniquity worked in these days very strongly in the west, the language of una substantia being misunderstood by the Latines & leading them into the errors & the language of una usia & una hypostasis being of as ill consequence amongst those Greeks who used it. ffor una hypostasis is on all hands allowed to be sabellianism. Eusebius of Nicomedia observed the ill consequences of this language very early for upon

For Hegesippus being a Jew conversed with the bishops of the converted Gentiles & being also a traveller & an Ecclesiastical historian was acquainted with both Churches & with the state of each from the beginning, & gave an honourable character of both, representing that the primitive Church continued an uncorrupted virgin till the death of Symeon bishop of Ierusalem the last of the Apostolic men who had seen Christ & that the Churches of the uncircumcision also, with whose bishops he had conversed kept the primitive doctrine sincerely handed down to them by the several successions of bishops in the several cities. Which testimony he would never have given to the churches of the uncircumcision had they then broken communion with the churches of his own nation.

<66r>

λελόγχασιν ἴσα θεοισιν Odyss. XI. v. 303. Et de Achille autem {pa}rtem, σε ζαιὸν ἐτίομεν ἴσα θεοισιν Ἀργεῖοι Odyss l. XI v. 444: Deque Eurymacho nondum mortus. τὸν νυν ἴσα θεῶ Ἰθακῆσιοι εἰσορόοισι. Odyss. l. XV, sub finem. Sic et Paulus Apostolus Christum hominem τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ nomen super omne nomen non rapicisse, sed a Deo Patre per obedientiam suam & mortem obtinuisse dicit. Loquitur enim

Apostolus non de divina sed de humana Christi natura a mortuis resuscitata et super omne nomen exaltata ut ab omnibus {colsetur} & dominus omnium agnosceretur in gloriam Patris.

He is ὁ πατήρ ὁ παντοκράτωρ the father almighty , the first author of all things who bears a fatherly affection towards all his offspring, & reigns over them with an universall invincible & irresistible dominion & the son ☉ < insertion from higher up f 66r > ☉ is heir of all things & owes him < text from lower down f 66r resumes > owes him the duty of a son. He hath life in himself originally essentially & independantly & hath given the son to have life in himself. Iohn Iohn 5.26. He hath knowledge & præscience of all things to come in himself & by communication hath given the son to have knowledge & prescience in himself Apoc. 1.1. & 5.3, 5, 7, 9. & Matth. 13.32. He is the God who said thou shalt have no other Gods before me — & who in six days made heaven & earth & the sea & all things in them & his son is the Lord to whom he hath given a name above every name that at the name of Iesus every knee should bow. ☉ < insertion from lower down f 66r > ☉ [For this is life eternal , saith Christ, that they might know thee the only true God & Iesus Christ whom thou hast sent. Iohn. 17.3.] For he is the King of Kings & Lord of Lords & must reign till all things shall be put under his feet & then deliver up the kingdom to his father that God may be all in all. < text from higher up f 66r resumes > For tho there be that are called Gods, as there are Gods many & Lords many, yet to us there is but one God the father of whom are all things & we of him & one Lord Iesus Christ by whom are all things & we by him. And this Lordship this name above every name that all men should honour the son even as they honour the father Iesus obtained by humility. Let this mind [of humility] saith the Apostle be in you which was in Christ Iesus, who being [since his resurrection] ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, did not violently assume τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ a name above every name but evacuated himself [of what he had] & took upon him the form of a servant & was made in the likeness of men & being found in fashion as a man he humbled himself & became obedient to death even the death of the cross: wherefore God hath highly exalted him & given him τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ a name above every name that at the name of Iesus every knee should bow of things in heaven & things in earth & things under the earth & that every tongue should confess that Iesus Christ is Lord to the Glory of God the father, & give him glory & honour & thanks & worship as the Messiah the Christ our Lord & as our Lord & King because he was slain & hath redeemed us with his blood & made us kings & priests to God his father.

0 4. 2. 32. 8. 9. 10. 50. 14 8. 28. 30. 54.

-4 5. 20. 42. 45 -5. 12. 46. 19 (2. 17. 22. 3

+1 4. 9. 23. 2 1. 10. 30. 54 -0. 19. 19. 43

Nov 1. 15. 37. 26 1. 3. 52. 8 -0. 16. 5. 54

4. 6. 49. 51 6. 12. 35. 57 10. 10. 27. 20

23 10. 3. 3. 25 0. 02. 33. 45 - 1. 13. 5

2. 9. 3. 16 6 15. 9. 42 10 9. 14. 15

14,37 ( 1

148

371

519

The scriptures are the rule of truth & the Creed the rule of faith necessary to communion & the keeping to this rule of faith in the bond of love is keeping the holy covenant & being members of the host of heaven the Church militant.

body as he had after his resurrection such a body he had before his incarnation. And therefore as his mortal body by the resurrection became an immortal body, so his immortal body by the incarnation became a mortal one. And it is as easy to beleive the one as the other. That which was from the beginning, saith Iohn, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, which our hands have handled of the Word of life, (for the life was manifested, & we have seen it & bear witness & shew unto you that eternal life which was with the father & was manifested unto us:) that which we have seen & heard declare we unto you. 1. Iohn. 1.1. Iohn thought it no absurdity to speak of the Word as a being visible & tangible. And even Christ himself represents the state which he was in before his incarnation to be like that which he was to be in after his resurrection. Glorify me, saith he to his father, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. Iohn 17.5. ‡ < insertion from lower down f 67r > ‡ before the foundation of the world, vers 24 No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the son of man who was in heaven Iohn 3.13. < text from higher up f 67r resumes > I came forth fom the father & am come into the world & again I leave the world & go to the father Iohn 16.28 & 13.3. And what if ye shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before? Iohn 6.62. As his leaving the world & going to the father & ascending up where he was before is to be understood of the death of his mortal body & the resurrection & ascension of his immortal one: so his coming forth from the father coming down from heaven & coming into the world is to be understood of the descent of his immortal body to be incarnate & of his being born into the world. His immortal body in which he was in glory with the father before the foundation of the world, came down fom heaven became a mortal one, died, rose again an immortal one, & ascended up to heaven to be in the glory which he had with the father before the world was. But the father is a pure spirit invisible intangible & immovable, being alike in all places & incapable of incorporation. ffor he is the invisible God whom no eye hath seen nor can see.

Let nothing be done therefore through strife & vain glory, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better then themselves. Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Iesus who being now in the form of an immortal Lord or God, did not forcibly assume τὸ εἶναι ἰσα θεῷ his present state of glory but evacuated & humbled himself & took upon him the form of a servant & was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man he further humbled himself & became obedient unto death even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, & given him τὸ εἶναι ἰσα θεῷ a name above every name that at the name of Iesus every knee should bow of things in heaven & things in earth & things under the earth, & that every tongue should confess that Iesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the father.

a<sup>[25]</sup> ἰσα adverbium est similitudinis, ut in his exemplis ἰσα τυρω Iob. 10.10 ἰσα ὄνω ἐρημίτη Iob. 11.12 ἰσα σπονδῷ Iob. 13.12 ἰσα ἄσκῳ Iob 13.28. ἰσα πηλῷ Iob 27.16 & 30.19 ἰσα λιθῷ Iob 28.2 ἰσα, διπλοῖδι Iob. 29.14. Homero autem ἰσα θεῷ idem significat quod ἰσόθεος, & honorem denotat in homines vel post mortem vel etiam in hac vita collatum Sic enim de Castore et Polluce jam mortuis verba faciens, addit τιμὴν δε λελογ

One God whom we are to invoke & one mediator in whose name we are to invoke him. One God whom we are to worship as God the father almighty the maker of heaven & earth & one Lord whom we are to worship as the Messiah the Prince Lord & king who redeemed us with his blood.

[1] Apud Theod l. 2. c. 8.

[2] Socr. Eccles. Hist. l. 1 . c. 8. Sozom. l. 1. c. 12

[3] Theodorit. Eccl. Hist. l. 1. c. 4.

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

[5] In Hom. de expositione symboli

[6] Serm. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62.

[7] Agustin de fide et symbolo Tom 3 fol. 30. Et de Symbolo ad Catechumenos lib 1. Tom. 9. fol. 227.

[7] Agustin de fide et symbolo Tom 3 fol. 30. Et de Symbolo ad Catechumenos lib 1. Tom. 9. fol. 227.

[8] Theod. l. 2. c. 22

[9] Theod. l. 4. c. 9

[10] Socr. l. 3. c. 7 Sozom. l.

[11] Epiphan Her. 26.

[12] Iren. l. 3. c 11. & l. 1. c. 25.

[13] Iren l. 1. c. 34.

[14] Iren. l. 3. c. 4.

[15] Epiphan Hæres. 30 sect. 3.

[16] Epiphan Hæres. 30 sect 3

[17] Ib. sect. 14 & 16.

[18] Epiphan. Hæres 42. {Definit} 24.

[19] b Tavernier

[20] Extat Epistola in Tomis Conciliorum.

[21] a Irenæus l. 1. {illeg} Tertullian ad {lu}dæos p: 212

[22] Socr. l 1.c.23. Sozom. l. 2. c. {illeg}

[23] b Sozom. l. 2. c. 21

[24] Socr. l.2.c.10

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

---