

Drafts on the history of the Church (Section 1)

Author: Isaac Newton

Source: Yahuda Ms. 15.1, National Library of Israel, Jerusalem, Israel

Published online: March 2006

<1r>

But for understanding how this Article came into the Creed, I should acquaint you that Athanasius being accused of several crimes by the Meletians & condemned for them by the Council of Tyre & banished into Gallia by Constantine the great A.C. 335, & sent back into Egypt by his son Constantine A.C. 338, & this Constantine the son being **{illeg}** A.C. 340 the Council of Antioch which consisted of about 97 bishops & met in the beginning of the next Spring A.C. 341 made one Gregory bishop of Alexandria in the room of Athanasius & sent an account of these proceedings to the emperors & Churches for their approbation as was usual & Athanasius at the same time calling a Council of about 90 Bishops of Egypt & Libya wrote also to the Churches in his own defense While the Legates of both parties were going with the Letters to Rome, the Eastern Emperor Constantius sent Gregory to Alexandria with an armed force at Easter, & then Athanasius fled to Rome, as did also Paul of Constantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra & Asclepas of Gaza whom the Eastern Bishops had also deposed. These bishops appealed from the Eastern Councils to Iulius Bishop of Rome, & he accepted of the appeal examined them, received them into communion & called a Council of about 50 or 60 Bishops of Italy & the parts adjacent to meet at Rome A.C. 342 & cited the eastern Bishops then met in the said Council of Antioch to appear in this Council & justify their proceedings. The eastern Bishops came not, but wrote back to Iulius a reprimanding Letter, telling him that they were his equals & their synods had an unshaken authority & the Iudge is used reproachfully whose judgment is reexamined; that when the western Bishops condemned Novatian the eastern acquiesced & when the eastern condemned Paul of Samosat the western acquiesced; that to communicate with persons excommunicated by others without the consent of those who excommunicated them is criminal by the constitutions of the Church; & that if he desisted they would have peace with him, otherwise not. When the Council met at Rome & the eastern Bishops came not, the Council communicated with Athanasius & the rest as Iulius had done before, & Iulius by their <2r> order wrote back to the eastern Bishops complaining of the sharpness of their Letter, of their not coming to the Council & of their favouring the Arians & defending Athanasius at large, & blaming them for acting in their Councils in matters of such consequence without giving him notice to whom it belonged to do justice. Cur igitur, saith he, et imprimis de Alexandrina civitate nihil nobis scribere voluistis? An ignari estis hanc consuetudinem esse ut primum nobis scribatur, ut hinc quod justum est definiri possit? Quapropter si istic hujusmodi suspicio in Episcopum concepta fuerat, id huc ad nostram ecclesiam referri oportuit. Thus Iulius in contending for the universal Bishopric, gained the Bishops of Italy to his party together with the friends of Athanasius & some others in Egypt Libya & some other places, & persisted in his designe.

About four year after when by spreading a clamour against the eastern Bishops as if they were Arians, the party of the Bishop of Rome was sufficiently encreased, the Emperors by the working of the western Bishops were induced to call a general Council to meet the next year A.C. 347, at Serdica a city in the confine of both Empires to examin the matter, but first to treat of the faith. And there came thither about 80 eastern & a much greater number of western & Egyptian Bishops. But before the two parties met the eastern hearing that the Western communicated with Athanasius Marcellus & some others who stood excommunicated by them, sent to them several times to dismiss the excommunicated persons from their assembly. And the western Bishops on the other hand summoned the eastern several times to come to the barr of their tribunal & justify their

proceedings against Athanasius & the rest. And when neither party would yeild, five of the six eastern Bishops who had been sent by the Council of Tyre into Egypt to examin the matters of Athanasius upon the place proposed to the western that an equal number of Bishops of both parties should be sent from Serdica into Egypt to reexamin the matter upon the place; & if the report which they had made to the Council of Tyre proved false then they would quietly submit to be excommunicated without ever complaining to any Emperor Council or Bishop, & if their report was found true then five of the western Bishops who absolved Athanasius should be excommunicated without ever complaining. But this proposal would not be accepted. Nothing would satisfy the western Bishops but to make themselves & the excommunicated persons judges over the eastern. And therefor the eastern Bishops seeing that the western would not joyn with them in Council to hear the excommunicated persons at the barr but contended for preeminence & dominion, went back from Serdica to Philippopolis, & both parties writing circulatory letters in defence of their own proceedings, the western in their letter accused the eastern as guilty both because they appeared not when Iulius cited them & because they now fled from justice. They declared also in the same letter their faith of one $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ & one $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ of the father son & <3r> holy Ghost, & the equality of the Son to the ffather & his assumption of a man. 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 all their churches to his authority, constituting him their Oecumenical Bishop & themselves Roman Catholics; & endeavoured that the eastern Churches should be brought into the same subjection.

[1] 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^[2] that they did compose a new form of faith prolixer then the Nicene but conteining the same opinion & not much differing in words, & that Hosius & Protogenes wrote to Iulius Bishop of Rome that they confirmed the Nicene faith, but for greater perspicuity 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 published & handed about for some years in the name of this Council, & I mistake if it was not the following Creed. We beleive in one God, the ffather Almighty, the maker of all things visible & invisible; & in one Lord Iesus Christ the son of God, begotten of the father, the only begotten, 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 father by whom all things were made which are in heaven & in earth, visible & invisible: who for us men & for our salvation descended, was incarnate & made man, that is, begotten perfectly of Mary always a Virgin by the holy Ghost: who had truly & not only in appearance a body soul & mind & all things which are in men except sin: who suffered, that is, was crucified buried & rose again the third day & ascended into heaven in glory in the same body: sitteth at the right hand of the father & shall come again in the same body in glory to judge the quick & the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And we beleive in the holy Ghost who is not alien from the ffather & the Son but is consubstantial to the ffather & the Son; who is uncreated, perfect, the Paraclete, who spake in the Law & in the Prophets & in the Gospells, who descended on Iourdan, preached to the Apostles, dwelt in the saints. And we beleive in this one only catholick & Apostolick Church, in one baptism for the remission of sins, in the resurrection of the dead in eternal judgment of souls & bodies, in the kingdom of heaven & in life everlasting. But those who say there was a time when the son was not, or there was a time when the holy Ghost was not, or that he was made out of nothing, or that the son of God or holy Ghost was of another $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ or another $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$, or mutable or variable, We anathematize because our catholick mother & Apostolick Church anathematizes them. And We anathematize all those who confess not the resurrection of the flesh, & every heresy, that is, all those who do not hold this faith of the holy & only Catholick <4r> Church. This Creed was found in a very old parchment Manuscript in the Vatican amongst the works of Cyrill & in {another} MS in the king of France's library & printed in the works of Athanasius at Paris A.C. 1698,^[3] & was certainly composed before the meeting of the Council of Alexandria A.C. 362. For it uses the language of one hypostasis of the father son & Holy Ghost, which language was abolished in that Council. In the Manuscript it is attributed to Athanasius but runs in the plural number, We beleive &c, & after the manner of a Creed made by a Council anathematizes hereticks, & has all the characters of the Serdican Creed. ffor it is the Nicene Creed enlarged with the Serdican faith & with so much of the Creed of the Latines called the Apostles Creed as was then wanting in the Nicene & therefore was made by Athanasius & the Latines together for completing the Nicene Creed. And it uses the word $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in such a sense as no other Council did besides that of Serdica. And as the Serdican fathers proposed only by their Creed to confirm the Nicene & explain it more at large, so this Creed above recited is in the Manuscript called an Interpretation

upon the holy Creed. I have therefore recited it as the oldest Creed in which the ffather Son & holy Ghost are declared consubstantial.

The Council of Serdica being convened by the Emperors to treat of the faith in the first place, the eastern Bishops also in their return from Serdica published a profession of their faith composed about two years before by a Council at Antioch: which Profession was as follows. We beleive in one God the father Almighty the creator & maker of all things from whom all paternity in heaven & earth is named, & in his only begotten son our Lord Iesus Christ, begotten of the father before all ages, God of God, light of light by whom all things were made in heaven & in earth visible & invisible; who is the Word, the wisdom the power the life & the true light; who in the last days, for us, was made man, & born of the holy Virgin. crucified dead & buried & rose again from the dead the third day & was taken up into heaven & sitteth at the right hand of God the ffather, who shall come in the end of ages to judge the quick & the dead & to give unto every one according to his works, whose kingdom without intermission continues to endless ages. For he sitteth at the right hand of the ffather, not only in this world but also in that which is to come. We beleive also in the holy Ghost, that is, in the Paraclete, whom Christ, having promised him to his Apostles, after his resurrection sent to teach them & admonish <5r> them all things, by whom also the souls of those are sanctified who sincerely beleive in him. But those who say the Son was of nothing, or of another substance & not of God, or that there was a time or age when he was not, the Catholick Church accounts alien from her; & those likewise who say there are three Gods, or that Christ was not God before the ages, or that he is neither Christ nor the son of God, or that the ffather Son & holy Ghost are the same, or that the Son is unbegotten, or that the ffather did not beget the Son by his Counsel & will the holy & catholick Church anathematizes.

This profession of faith Hilary approved & commended as made in short but most absolute definitions. And hitherto the Churches of the Greeks & Latines had continued united in external communion throughout the whole Roman Empire; but now they began to separate, the Latines being offended that the Greeks called the ffather & Son & holy Ghost three hypostases & omitted the word ὁμοούσιος in their Creeds, & the Greeks that the Latines translated it unius hypostasis absolved persons excommunicated by the Greek Church & endeavoured to subject that Church to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, & both parties that five or six of the principal Bishops of their party were excommunicated by those of the other party.

Six years after these things were done Constantius conquered Magnentius the successor of his brother Constance in the western Empire, & two years after that conquest called a Council of above 300 Bishops at Millain to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius. They offered to subscribe if the Nicene faith might be first confirmed, but were made to understand that nothing could be regularly debated or proceed in Councils till they quitted the communion of persons excommunicated that the Emperor called them together for that purpose & they could not go upon other things till they had his leave, that the wilful communicating with persons who stood excommunicated by others was contrary to the rules of the Church & of a criminal nature, & that those who persisted in such communion, must expect, for restoring the peace of the Church disturbed by them to be banished as criminals. Whereupon they all subscribed except Paulinus Tervirensis, Eusebius Vercellensis, Dionysius <6r> Mediolanensis, Lucifer Calaritanus, & Rhodanius, who were therefore banished as was also Liberius bishop of Rome & Hosius of Corduba a little after & Hilary & Dosanus a year after. And all these offered to subscribe if the Nicene faith were confirmed first & thereby they allowed that they could subscribe with a good conscience. There were also Councils called at Arles & Biters in Gallia & at Aquileia, and Messengers sent with publick notaries to take the subscriptions of the rest of the Bishops who staid at home. Hosius also & Liberius after they had been a year or two in banishment subscribed. And thus the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome set up by the Councils of Rome & Serdica over the eastern Churches fell, the Bishop of Rome himself with all the western Bishops except seven or eight & all their Presbyters except a few, subscribing & thereby acknowledging the supreme & absolute judicial authority of the Councils of the Greek churches over her own members

But over the Latine Churches of the Consubstantial faith in Europe, the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome still remained being no ways opposed by Constantius or the Greek Church. And thence it came to pass that when the western Empire was invaded by several barbarous nations, those nations, particularly the Franks in Gallia, the Goths in Spain the Lombards in Italy, & the Saxons in Britain as fast as they became converted to the consubstantial faith, subjected their Churches to the authority of the Bishop of Rome. And all this was done before the Greek Emperor Phocas granted him the universal Bishoprick over the Churches also of his Empire.

After the authority of the Greek Church over her own members was restored, new Councils were called to reconcile the Churches about the faith, & for that end they abolished the use of the word ὁοσία with its compounds ὁμοούσιος & ὁμοιούσιος which had given occasion to the discord. This was first done by the Council of Sirmium A.C. 357 in a Creed subscribed by Hosius. & then in another Council of Sirmium A.C. 359 in a Creed in which they professed the Son to be similis Patri secundum scripturas. This Creed was published in the presence of the Emperor at Sirmium & subscribed the same year by the Councils of Nice in Thrace & Ariminum in Italy. A copy thereof is set down above. The <7r> Council of Seleucia meeting the same year subscribed the Creed of Lucius the Martyr with a preface in which they abolished the use of those words & declared the son to be like the father according to the Apostle & a conclusion in which they approved the sense of the said Creed of Sirmium published before the Emperor. And their Legates in the end of the year subscribed this Creed of Sirmium & so did the Council of Constantinople the next year A.C. 360 without any material variation of words.

The principal reasons for abolishing the use of those words are thus set down by the Council of Seleucia in their preface to the Creed of Lucius: Cum hæ voces ὁμοούσιον & ὁμοιούσιον præteritis temporibus atque etiam nunc multos conturbarent; imò a quibusdam ἁνόμοιον (sive dissimilem patri filium). jam innovari dicatur: ὁμοούσιον (sive dissimilem patri filium). jam innovari dicatur: ὁμοούσιον et ὁμοιούσιον utpote voces a scripturis alienas rejicimus ἁνόμοιον autem anathemate damnamus. And thus by the Council of Sirmium at the end of their Creed: Nomen autem ὁοσίας quod simplicius a Patribus positum, a populisque minime intellectum, offensionis causa sit; quod etiam in scripturis non contineatur, de medio tolli placuit.

And thus by Hilary out of an epistle of some western Bishop, read in the Council of Sirmium: [4] De homousio ... tractantes primùm idcirco respuendum pronuntiastis, quia [per] verbi hujus enunciationem substantia prior intelligeretur, quàm duo inter se partiti essent – Secundo quoque id addidistis quod patres nostri cum Paulus Samosatenus hæreticus pronuntiatus est, etiam homousion repudiaverint. Tertio etiam hæc causa improbandi homousij commemorata a vobis est, quia in Synodo quæ apud Nicæam fuit, coacti patres nostri propter eos qui creaturam filium dicebant, nomen homousij indidissent; quod non recipiendum idcirco sit, quia nusquam scriptum reperietur.

The word ὁοσία with its compounds was therefore laid aside for these reasons. ffirst because the word ὁμοούσιος in its proper signification (of which the Greeks were the best judges) imported a distinction or division of a prior substance into two or the coming of one substance out of another by emanation, emission, projection or partition as light comes from the Sun, a river from the fountain, a branch from the root, a piece from the whole, a child from the mother &c. And in this sense the word implies that the son & holy ghost sprang from the father after the manner of the Æons of the Gnosticks, or were parts of him as in the Trinity of Montanus: & therefore it was not a proper word to be applied to the Trinity. For Basil tells us^[5] that the Council of Antioch in condemning Paul of Samosat rejected the Ὅμοούσιος for this very reason.

Secondly because the Council of Nice had admitted the word hastily & against their inclination, the Emperor being present in the Council & pressing it, & the Council making scruples, & excepting against the signification above <8r> mentioned which was the proper signification of the word & cautioning that it should not be taken in that sense nor for any thing more then ὁμοιούσιος, & admitting it in this sense least the Emperor should be disgusted & return to the heathen religion, & the Bishops in all the East disputing afterwards against the use of the word & contending that it was proper to bodies & ὁμοιούσιος to spirits, & omitting it in a bigger Council at Tyre & in all their Councils which followed. For how universally the Greeks rejected this word may appear by the character which Hilary^[6] A.C 358 gave of the eastern Provinces where he was then in banishment. Tantum ecclesiarum orientalium periculum est, saith he, ut rarum sit hujus fidei [consubstantialis,] quæ qualis sit vos judicate, aut sacerdotes aut populum inveniri. — Nam absque episcopo Eleusio et paucis cum eo, ex majori parte Asianæ decem provinciæ vere deum nesciunt.

Thirdly, because the Latines & their friends among the Greeks had interpreted the word ὁμοούσιος by μίας ὁοσίας & μίας ὕποστασ unius substantiæ, & thereby departed from the sense of the Nicene Council which had interpreted that word by ὁμοιούσιος similis substantiæ, as appeared by the Acts of that Council produced in the Council of Ariminum for convincing the Latines. And there having arisen great disturbances between the Greeks & Latines about the language of similis substantiæ & unius substantiæ, the best way to put an end to those disturbances was to abolish the use of the words which had caused them.

ffourthly, the words homousios, ex substantia, & unius substantiæ were very ambiguous & apt to be misunderstood & taken together, very much favoured the errors of the Gnosticks Cataphrygians & Sabellians & caused them to spread in the west. For Hilary in his banishment wrote thus to the Bishops of Gallia & Britian. Multi ex nobis, fratres charissimi, ita unam substantiam Patris et Filij prædicant, ut videri possint non magis id pie quam impie prædicare: habet enim hoc verbum in se et fidei conscientiam et fraudem paratam Nam si secundum naturæ proprietatem ac similitudinem ut similitudo non speciem suam auferat, sed genus teneat, religiose unam substantiam prædicamus, dummodo unam substantiam proprietatis similitudinem intelligamus, ut quod unum sunt non singularem significet sed æquales: æqualitatem dico, id est, indifferentiam similitudinis, ut similitudo habeatur æqualitas. Æqualitas verò unum idcirco dicitur esse quia par sit. Vnum autem in quo par significatur, non ad unicum vendicetur. Una igitur substantia si non personam subsistentem perimat, nec unam <9r> substantiam partitam in duas dividat, religiose prædicabitur: Quæ ex nativitatis proprietate & ex naturæ similitudine ita indifferens sit, ut una dicatur. At verò si idcirco unius substantiæ pater et filius dicatur ut hic subsistens, sub significatione licet duûm nominum unus ac solus sit: confessum nomine filium conscientia non tenemus, si unam substantiam [cum Sabellio] confitentes ipsum sibi unicum ac singularem & patrem esse dicimus et filium. Quinetiam et hujus tanti erroris occurrit occasio, ut divisus a se ipse pater intelligatur, & partem execuisset quæ esset sibi filius. Id enim hæretici [Cataphryges sc.] unam substantiam prædicantes contendunt. Et his multum piæ confessionis nostræ sermo blanditur; ut dum hoc verbum indefinita brevitate dubium est, proficiat ad errorem. Est præterea error hic tertius ut cum unius substantiæ pater et filius esse dicuntur, significari existimetur substantia prior, quam inter se duo pares [juxta Theologiam Gnosticorum] haberent: ac si tres res sermo significet, substantiam unam, et duos unius substantiæ velut cohæredes. Here Hilary gives four significations of unius substantiæ three of which were heretical, & tells his brethren the western Bishops that many of them taught it in the heretical senses, & instructs them in the fourth signification, namely that the union was only specific or that the father & son were two equal substances in number & one in nature & species. It was not therefore without some reason that when Hilary came to the Council of Seleucia the Oriental Bishops examined him, ac primum quæsitum ab eo, saith Sulpicius, quæ esset Gallorum fides: qui tum, Arianis prava de nobis vulgantibus, suspecti ab orientalibus habebamur trionymam solitarij Dei unionem secundum Sabellium credidisse. Sed exposita fide sua [de unitate specifica] juxta ea quæ Nicææ erant a patribus conscripta, Occidentalibus perhibuit testimonium. The language of homousios, & unius substantiæ being therefore a stumbling block to Christians & leading them to dangerous heresies & the worship of fals Gods, was for that reason abolished by the Greeks.

ffiftly, this language was first used by hereticks such [†] as were the Cataphrygians & Sabellians. It was their language & was condemned by the ancient Church, & gave occasion to the Arian controversy. For when Abimander bishop of Alexandria ^{a[7]} maintained an essential unity of the father & son, Arius took it for the una substantia of Sabellius & thereupon set himself to oppose it. Vna substantia was also the language of the Montanists, & so was ὁμοούσιος. And this last word was condemned in Paul of Samosat by a Council of 80 eastern bishops or above voluntarily convened at Antioch about 60 years before the Council of Nice, & the sentence against Paul ^{b[8]} was communicated to all the Churches of the Roman Empire for their approbation & approved by them without any controversy arising upon it. And Paul was ejected by the consent of the Bishops <10r> of Rome & Italy under their hands in writing, so that the sentence against him was the sentence of the Church catholick. And for this & other reasons the Council of Nice scrupled the homousion, admitted it only at the importunity of the Emperor & limited its signification; & as soon as the fathers of that Council were at liberty, they disputed against it vehemently & dropt it in all their following Councils & never desisted till they got it repealed. If numbers of bishops are to be considered the Council of Ariminum was bigger then the Nicene: if antiquity freedom & universal approbation, the Council of Antioch must take place. But Hilary is of another opinion. Male intelligitur homousion saith he; quid ad me bene intelligentem? Male homousion Samosatenus confessus est, sed nunquid melius Ariani negaverunt? Octaginta Episcopi olim respuerunt, sed trecenti decem et octo nuper receperunt. Thus Hilary argues for repealing the sentence of the primitive Church against Paul, as if the best way of opposing Arius was to receive the language of the old hereticks, & as if the Greeks did not enough in condemning the language of Arius unless they receded from the decrees of their ancestors & received the language of Paul & Montanus & the Sabellians & Manichees & ancient Gnosticks. For the Greeks condemned the language of Arius in almost all their Councils.

A sixth reason alledged for omitting the word ὁμοούσιος was that the Nicene fathers had admitted it out of simplicity (or without due examination) & by compulsion. For Constantine the great soon after his victory

over Licinius A.C. 324 hearing of the controversy between Alexander & Arius & sending to them by Hosius a letter to forebear disturbing the Empire by their trifling disputes & Arius not submitting but representing that he had the multitude & particularly all Libya: the Emperor set against him vehemently & resolved to suppress this multitude & for that end composed against them a florid epistle directed to Arius & the Arians & caused it to be published in every city throughout the whole Empire & then called the Council of Nice. This letter was to silence the multitude in all places till the Council could meet. It began thus. Malus interpret negotium est diaboli ejusque effigies ac imago. And in the body of the Epistle the Emperor repeating the words of Arius, Multitudinem habemus, replies, Ipse igitur exiguus propius accedam ut insanorum bellorum spectator sim. Ego ipse, inquam, propius accedam qui hominum dementium bella sedare consuevi. And a little after: O audaciam dignam quæ fulminibus deponatur. And again: At dices magnum hominum numerum tecum facere et sublevare <11r> curas tuas. Audi et parumper aures præbe nefane Ari, intellige dementiam tuam &c. And in another part of the Letter: Vnum dicis Deum: habes ejusdem me sententiæ: sic igitur sentias. Ejus essentiae Verbum & principij et finis expers Verbum esse dicis: eo contentus sum. ita crede. Si quid præterea adjungis, id tollo. Si quid ad impiam separationem fraudulenter consuis, id nec videre nec intelligere me confiteor. Si hospitium corporis assumis ad divinorum operum dispensationem non improbo.^[9]

Alexander in his circulatory epistle against Arius sent to all the Churches, had declared the Son to be the internal or essential reason or wisdom of the father. 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 & sapientiæ expertem fuisse. The Emperor in his circulatory epistle published in all the cities of the Empire declared himself (in his words last mentioned) to be of the same opinion. And therefore this was the opinion of the party of Alexander & the grownd of their declaring the father & Son to be consubstantial & of one substance in opposition to Arius who taught that the Son was another Word. And after the Emperor had declared to all the Empire that he was of this opinion, & for establishing it called the Council, came into it in person, & proposed the ὁμοούσιος & pressed it: the Bishops 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 ὁμοούσιος for the same reason. But the Emperor might have thought him self highly affronted & flown off from the Christian to the heathen religion. And therefore they limited the signification of the word, dropt it in their following Councils & rejected it as soon as they were at liberty And in rejecting the new language of both parties without introducing a new language of their own, they were of neither party but kept the faith of their ancestors.

A seventh reason alledged for repealing the word ὁυσία with its compounds was because it was not in scripture. And this reason is the stronger because we are commanded by the Apostle^[10] to hold fast the form of sound words. Contending for a language which was not handed down from the Prophets & Apostles is a breach of this command & they that break it are also guilty of the disturbances & schisms occasioned thereby. It is not enough to say that an article of faith may be deduced from scripture. It must be exprest in the very form of sound words in which it was delivered by the Apostles. Otherwise there can be no lasting unity nor peace of the Church catholick. ffor men are apt to vary dispute & run into parties about deductions. All the old Heresies lay in deductions, the true faith was in the text.

<12r>

The Greek & Latin Churches being reunited in the outward profession of faith by the Councils of Sirmium Nice, Ariminum, Seleucia & Constantinople, continued in this united state till the reign of Iovian & his successors & then met with new disturbances from Athanasius & his party. For Gregory Nazianzen who lived in those days, tells us that when Iovian came to the throne, he released Athanasius & the rest of the bishops from banishment, & then subjoins. ^[11] Quinetiam fidei nostræ veritatem a multis laceratam et perturbatam, atque in sexcentas opiniones partesque distractam, sibi tradi postulavit. — Atque hic potissimum Athanasius puritatis suæ, fideique in Christum firmæ et constantis, specimen edidit. Nam cum cæteri omnes qui doctrinam nostram profitebantur trifariam divisi essent ac multi circa filium, plures etiam circa spiritum sanctum ægram fidem haberent (ubi levior impietas pietatis opinionem ferebat) pauci autem utrinque sani et inclumes essent, primus ille et solus aut cum admodum paucis veritatem palam apertisque verbis promulgare non dubitavit, unam trium personarum divinitatem et essentiam scripto confessus: et quod multis illis patribus circa filium prius concessum fuerat, idem ipse postea in asserenda spiritus sancti divinitate superno afflatu consecutus. Atque Imperatori domum vere regium offert scriptam nempe fidei confessionem adversus novum dogma

nusquam in Scriptura expressum: ut sic et Imperatorem Imperator et doctrinam doctrina et libellum libellus frangeret atque opprimeret. Hujus confessionis ut mihi videtur, autoritate permoti, tum Occidentales, tum quicquid in Oriente vitale est, partim animo tenus pietatem colunt (siquid ipsorum verbis fidei habendum est) ulterius autem non proferunt; partim eam igniculi cujusdam instar, nonnihil accendunt, hactenus scilicet ut tempori atque acrioribus et ferventibus orthodoxis aut piæ plebi utcunque satisfaciant: partim denique omni verborum libertate veritatem prædicant. This was written by Gregory in an Oration upon the death of Athanasius A.C. 373.

The faith which Athanasius & his followers began now to preach was the Serdican with this alteration that instead of calling the ffather Son & holy Ghost one usia & one hypostasis they called them one usia & three hypostases, changing the language of one hypostasis to that of three hypostases for clearing themselves from the imputation of Sabellianism under which they had hitherto lain. ffor by one usia & three hypostases, or as the Latines exprest it, una substantia & tres personæ they meant one substance in nature & species & three substances in number the word person being taken for an intelligent substance <13r> Athanasius, Eusebius Vercellensis & 12 or 15 other bishops returning from banishment, had consulted about the faith at Alexandria a few months before & resolved to relinquish the use of the words usia & hypostasis except in opposition to Sabellianism: but afterwards they thought fit to retain the words una usia in conformity to the una substantia of the Latines & to distinguish the persons only by the name of three hypostases.

In the said Council of seventeen Bishops at Alexandria it was agreed that the Bishops who had subscribed in the late Councils of Sirmium, Nice, Ariminum Seleucia & Constantinople were no hereticks for doing so, or for being of that communion, & therefore might be received by the party of Athanasius without losing their Bishopricks. Post reditum confessorum, saith Ierome,^[12] in Alexandrina postea synodo constitutum est, ut exceptis autoribus hæreseos, quos error excusare non poterat, pænitentes Ecclesiæ sociarentur: non quod Episcopi possint esse qui hæretici fuerant, sed quod constaret eos qui reciperentur, hæreticos non fuisse. Assensus est huic sententiæ Occidens, et per tam necessarium consilium, e Satanæ faucibus ereptus est mundus.

In propagating this faith Athanasius had the assistance of all the Moncks in his diocess, which were about one third part of the people of Egypt. ffor he had poured water upon the hands of Antony their founder & therefore was one of that body. And Paulinus a schismatical Bishop of Antioch sided with Athanasius & was assisted by all the Moncks in Syria & the parts adjacent within his diocess. For the Moncks were generally homousians & at this time in such estimation for sanctity that it came now into fashion to chuse Bishops & Presbyters out of their body & to erect Monasteries in cities for that purpose: so that the principal Churchmen henceforward (as Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Flavian, Chrysostom, Theodoret Ierome, Ruffin, Augustine, Martin, Sulpicius Severus &c) were Moncks & monasteries became sacred.

In the beginning of this new contention Liberius bishop of Rome fell off to the party of Athanasius & Paulinus & in three years gained at least one half of the people of Rome. ffor upon his death which happened in September, A.C. 366, Vrsisinus (whom Ierome calls an Arian) contended with Damasus an homousian for the Bishopric, & the election being in the people, their parties came to blows with great violence & almost equal force, as Ammianus Marcellinus thus mentions. ^[13] Damasus et Vriscinus supra humanum modum ad rapiendam episcopalem sedem ardentes, scissis studijs acerrime conflictabantur, adusque mortis vulnorumque discrimina adjumentis utriusque progressis: quæ nec corrigere sufficiens Viventius [Vrbis Præfectus] nec mollire, vi magna coactus secessit in suburbanum: et in concertatione superaverat Damasus, parte quæ ei <14r> favebat instante. Constatque in basilica Sicinini, ubi ritus Christiani est conventiculum, uno die centum triginta septem reperta cadavera peremptorum: efferatamque diu plebem ægre postea delinitam. Neque ego abnuo, ostentationem rerum considerans verbanarum, hujus rei cupidus ob impetrandum quod appetunt omni contentione {laterum} jurgari debere, quum id adepti, futuri sunt ita securi ut ditentur oblationibus matronarum, procedantque vehiculis circumspecte vestiti, epulas curantes profusas, adeo ut eorum convivia regales superent mensas.

In six years more the party of the Bishop of Rome was so far encreased in the west that Damasus A.C. 373 called a Council of 93 bishops at Rome against Auxentius bishop of Millain who had hitherto opposed him & this Council sending a letter to the Oriental Bishops of his communion & another to the Bishops of Illyricum, the Oriental bishops convened at Antioch to the number of 146, & subscribed the Roman faith, & so did a good number of bishops convened in Illyricum. And the Council of Illyricum sending their faith to the

Churches of Asia & Phrygia, the western Emperors Valentinian & Gratian backt their letter with an edict directed to the same Churches. Cum in Illyrico, say they, tot Episcoporum Synodus congregata esset, post accuratam inquisitionem de salutari verbo, declararunt beatissimi Pontifices consubstantialem trinitatem Patris ac filij ac spiritus sancti. Nostra verò majestas eandem ubique prædicari præcepit.

Yet the Greek Emperor Valens opposed the homousion & I do not find that during his reign the Deity of the Holy Ghost was preached publickly in his Empire. But after his death the preaching of it made a great commotion.

Nam talis orbis motio
Nunquam, reor, fuit,
Quam sanctus est cum spiritus
Dictus Deus palam
Ob idque me liquit favor
Chari mei gregis. Greg. Nazianz. Iamb. 23

For Gratian presently after the death of Valens, A.C. 378, commanded by an edict that the Bishops whom Valens had banished should be restored to their seats & that the Churches should be delivered to those who communicated with Damasus bishop of Rome, & sent Sapor Master of the horse into the east to put this law in execution. At that time Sapor delivered the bishopric of Antioch to Meletius, & the bishop of Rome sent Peter to Alexandria to succeed Lucius who had succeeded Athanasius in that bishopric about six years before. And the delivering of the Churches to those of the communion of the Bishop of Rome & {their} beginning to preach the deity of the Holy Ghost openly made the great commotion mentioned <15r> by Gregory Nazianzen. And neare the beginning of the year 379 ‡

< insertion from lower down f 15r >

1 ‡ Neare the beginning of the year 379 about five months after the death of Valens, Theodosius a Spaniard was made Emperor of the east by Gratian & by new edicts in the years 380 & 381 completed the delivery of the churches of the eastern Empire to those in communion with the bishop of Rome.

< text from higher up f 15r resumes >

2 In the time between the reign of Valens & Theodosius A.C. 378 The supremacy of the Bishop of Rome over the western Churches was also confirmed by an Edict of the Emperors Gratian & Valentinian in these words. Volumus autem ut quicumque judicio Damasi, quod ille cum consilio quinque vel septem habuerit Episcoporum, vel eorum qui catholici sunt judicio vel concilio condemnatus fuerit; si juste voluerit Ecclesiam retentare, ut qui evocatus ad sacerdotale judicium per contumaciam non ivisset: ut ab illustribus viris Præfectis Prætorio Galliæ atque Italiæ autoritate adhibita, ad episcopale judicium remittatur, sive a Consularibus vel Vicarijs; ut ad urbem Romam sub prosecutione perveniat: aut si in longinquioribus partibus alicujus ferocitas talis emergerit, omnis ejus causæ edictio ad Metropolitæ in eadem provincia Episcopi deduceretur examen: vel si ipse Metropolitanus est, Romam necessario, vel ad eos quos Romanus Episcopus judices dederit, sine dilatione contendat.

3. Vpon the death of Meletius Bishop of Antioch The council of Constantinople called the second general council, created Flavian his successor setting aside Paulinus for his discord with Meletius. They ordeined also that the Bishop of Constantinople should have the chief honour after the Bishop of Rome because that city was new Rome. But the Bishops of Rome & Alexandria were much offended thereat having communicated with Paulinus, & to compose the matter a general Council was called by the Imperial letters to meet the next year at Rome. The Eastern Bishops came no further then to Constantinople & there celebrating a Council sent Legates to Rome to excuse their coming no further & in their letters called Damasus & the Bishops convened at Rome their brethren & fellow ministers. Thus the eastern bishops maintained the authority of their Councils against the Bishop of Rome, but the <15v> western submitted

[14] 4 For Himerius bishop of Tarraco the head city of a Province in Spain, writing to Damasus for his direction about certain Ecclesiastical matters & the letter not arriving at Rome till after the death of Damasus A.C. 384; his successor Siricius answered the letter with a patriarchall authority telling him of one thing: Cum hoc fieri – missa ad provincias a venerandæ memorias prædecessore meo Liberio generalia decreta

prohibeant. Of another, Hoc ne fiat omnibus modis inhibemus? Of another, Noverint se ab omni Ecclesiastico honore quo indigne usi sunt, Apostolicæ sedis autoritate dejectos. Of another: Scituri posthac Omnium provinciarum summi antistites, quod si ultro ad sacros ordines quenquam de talibus esse assumendum, et de suo, et de eorum statu, quos contra canones et interdicta nostra provexerint, congruam ab Apostolica sede promendam esse sententiam. And the Epistle he concludes in this manner: Explicuimus ut arbitror frater charissime universa quæ digesta sunt in querelam: et ad singulas ansas de quibus ad Romanam Ecclesiam, utpote ad caput tui corporis, retulisti, sufficientia, quantum opinor, responso reddidimus. Nunc fraternitatis tuæ animum ad servandos canones et tenenda decretalia constituta magis ac magis incitamus; ut hæc quæ ad tua consulta rescripsimus in omnium coepiscoporum nostrorum perferri facias notionem, et non solum eorum qui in tua sunt diœcesi constituti: sed etiam ad universos Carthaginenses ac Bœticos; Lusitanos atque Gallicos, vel eos qui vicinis tibi collimitant hinc inde provincijs, hæc quæ a nobis sunt salubri ordinatione disposita, sub litterarum tuarum prosecutione mittantur. Et quanquam statuta sedis Apostolicæ, vel canonum venerabilia definita, nulla sacerdotum domini ignorare sit liberum &c.

5 The next year A.C. 386 a Council of 80 bishops at Rome made several Canons to be observed by all catholic Bishops & sent them to the bishops of Afric for that purpose. The first Canon was Vt extra conscientiam sedis Apostolicæ, hoc est Primatis, nemo audeat ordinare. But I do not find that the African Churches submitted to the Roman jurisdiction.

[15] 6. After three years more A.C. 389 a Council of western bishops met at Capua & flavian bishop of Antioch was summoned to appear but came not, alledging that a Council should be called in the east. The Council of Capua therefore ordeined that he should be heard before a council of the Bishops of Egypt, but he came not. For the Bishop of Alexandria sided with the Bishop of Rome being disgusted at the eastern Churches for setting the Bishop of Constantinople before him. Then Ambrose in a letter to The bishop of Alexandria proposed that the cause might be referred to the Bishop of Rome. And all this contention between the eastern & western churches was for the sake of dominion, the eastern churches labouring to preserve the authority of their Councils, the western to subject the Greek Churches & her Councils to the judgment of the Bishop of Rome or of such Councils as he should appoint.

< insertion from f 15r >

7 While these things were doing, the practise of electing Bishops, Presbyters & Deacons out of Monasteries was propagated from the eastern to the western churches. For the western Bishops erected monasteries in their cities for this purpose. And Sulpicius Severus speaking of the moncks under Martin, saith, [16] Plures ex his postea episcopos vidimus. Quæ enim civitas aut Ecclesia, quæ non sede Martini monasterio cuperet habere sacerdotes? ♦ < text from f 15v resumes > <16r> ♦ And Pope Siricius in the 13th article of his decretory Epistle to Himerius above mentioned enjoyns that Moncks should be chosen into the orders of clergimen: So then the affairs of the Church at this time came into the hands of the Moncks. And thereby the Moncks were enabled to bring their superstitions into the church, such as were the celebacy of the clergy & abstinence from flesh on fasting days the veneration of reliques & pictures, the feigning of miracles & legends, the invocation of saints & celebrating them with annual festivals & masses , the superstitious use of holy water & the signe of the cross, auricular confession & corporal pennance & praying by beads, & pilgrimage to holy places.

ffor Pope Siricius in the 7th article of his aforesaid decretory epistle complained that many in Spain had children by their wives & concubines, & declared that all the Clergy from the day of their ordination were bound by an indissolvable law to continency that in offering sacrifices daily they might please God, because he that is in the flesh cannot please him: & denounced that all those who act otherwise are degraded by the authority of the Apostolic See.

How the miracle working power of reliques was cried up & the reliques were sent into all the empire & placed in the Churches & legends were written of the miracles & read in the churches in the reign of Valentinian Gratian & Theodosius & his sons we have shewed above, & also how the Saints at the same time began to be invoked & their pictures to be set up in Oratories & Churches & their solid images soon after. The invocation of Saints began in the reign of Valentinian & Gratian & overspread the Empire before the death of Theodosius. The statue of Constantine the great was worshipped with oblations in Constantinople in the fourth century & in the middle of the fift, the images of Simeon Stylites were placed before all the shoppes

as their guardian (Theodorit. in vita Simeonis.) The superstitious use of the signe of the Cross & annual festivals to the martyrs & crept into the Churches in the the third Century & were generally received by the Catholicks in the fourth . In the reigns of Valens & Theodosius, the moncks Macarius magnus, Aphraates, Macedonius & Iacob & Iohn are said to have cured many sick people & done other miracles by water {illeg} oyle consecrated by the signe of the cross. Paul the Abbot said 300 prayers daily & counted them by throwing so many stones out of his bosom, Macarius said 100, Evagrius as many, a certain virgin 700, Moses the Monck 50, Iames the younger some other certain number: for Pachomius the first founder of Monasteries in Egypt a little after the Nicean Council ordeined that the Moncks should say 12 prayers in the day, 12 at night, 12 in the morning & 3 at 9 a clock & left every Monck at liberty to say any greater number in private. And Paul the Abbot &c.

Also Going on pilgrimage to holy places upon vows came now in fashion. For Palladius ‡ < insertion from lower down f 16r > And Palladius ‡ (in the life of Philoromus a Presbyter) tells us that Philoromus who became a Monck in the days of the Emperor Iulian, went on foot to Rome & Alexandria to pray at the tombs of Peter & Paul & Mark & went also twice on foot to Ierusalem upon vows. And in the life of Ruffin he tells us further. Postquam < text from higher up f 16r resumes > in the life of Ruffin tells us. Postquam Valens Imperator Episcopos Ægypti &c — — — suis fovebant expensis. And Ierome in his 17th Epistle directed to Marcella speaking of those who came to visit Ierusalem saith: Qui in toto orbe sunt primi — gentium diversitates.

Pennance was in use in these days.

Also abstinence from meats was in use in those days. For Socrates^[17] tells us that in keeping Lent some abstained from all animated creatures, <16v> some from all but fishes, some with fishes eat also birds affirming that they were also made out of water, some abstained from all fruits of trees & from eggs, some fed only on bred, others not so much as on bread.

<17r>

put by the fathers & not being understood by the people gives offense, & because it is not in the scriptures, we have thought fit to remove, & that henceforth in speaking of God no more mention be made of ὁυσία, because the holy scriptures no where mention the ὁυσία of the father & the son. But we say that the Son is in all things like the father as the holy scriptures speak & teach. Thus far the Council of Ariminum. The descent into the infernal regions is also found in the following Creed of Aquileia into which Ruffin saith he was baptized. Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, & in Christum Iesum unicum filium ejus, Dominum nostrum: qui natus est de spiritu sancto ex Maria virgine, crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato & sepultus, descendit in inferna, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos: et in Spiritum sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam Catholicam remissionem peccatorum hujus carnis resurrectionem. This article of the descent into Hades or Hell is also found in the Creed of the Latines usually called the Apostles Creed. & as the Serdican fathers proposed by their Creed to confirm the Nicene Creed & explain , so this Creed above recited is in the MS called an interpretation upon the Holy Creed

Another new Article was that the holy Ghost is consubstantial to the ffather & Son. But for understanding how this Article came into the Creed I should acquaint you that Athanasius being accused of severall crimes by the Meletians & condemned for them by the Councill of Tyre & banished into Gallia by Constantine the great A.C. 335 & sent back into Egypt by his son Constantius A.C. 338 a Council of about 97 Eastern Bishops at Antioch in the beginning of Spring A.C. 341 wrote to the Emperors against him & he at the same time calling a council of about 90 bishops of Egypt & Libya wrote letters in his own defense & sent them to the Bishop of Rome, & about Easter one Gregory being made Bishop of Alexandria & sent thither with an armed force Athanasius fled to Rome, as did also Paul of Constantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra & Asclepas of Gaza whom the eastern bishops had deposed. Thereupon Iulius Bishop of Rome summoned a Council of about 50 Bishops of Italy & the parts adjoyning to meet at Rome Whereupon Iulius called a Council of 50 or 60 Western Bishops to meet at Rome A.C. 342 & cited the eastern Bishops then met in the said Council of Antioch to appeare before this Council to give an account of their proceedings against Athanasius & the rest who had appealed to him. And this was the beginning of the open pretensions of the Bishop of Rome to the universal Bishopric. [ffor he ceased not henceforward to contend for an univeral jurisdiction tho he met with repulses a long time before he obtained it.] The eastern Bishops therefore refused to come to this Council, &

wrote back to the Bishop of Rome a reprimanding Letter telling him that they were his equals. Whereupon Iulius & the western bishops who met in this Council, turned the crime upon the eastern Bishops for not appearing, & received Athanasius & the rest into communion, & Iulius in the name of the rest wrote a letter to the Eastern Bishops in defense of his proceedings & complained that they acted in their Councils without him to whom it {belonged} to do justice Cur igitur, saith he, — — oportuit. & about three years after {illeg} procured of the Emperour that a Council should be called at Serdica a city in the confine of both Empires to examin the matter but first to treat of the faith. About 80 eastern bishops & a greater number of western & Egyptian bishops came to Serdica A.C. 347. But before they met the eastern hearing that the western communicated with Athanasius sent to them several times to forbear his communion & the communion of the rest who stood excommunicated by them & with whom they would have no communion the western Bishops on the other hand summoned the eastern Bishops several times to come to the bar of their tribunal & justify their proceedings against Athanasius & the rest, & when neither party would yeild, five of the eastern Bishops who had been sent by the council of Tyre to Egypt to examin the matters of Athanasius upon <17v> the place, proposed to the western that an equal number of Bishops of both parties should be sent from Serdica into Egypt to reexamin the matter upon the place, & if the report which they had made to the Council of Tyre proved false then they would quietly submit to be excommunicated without ever complaining, but if their report was found true then five of the western Bishops who had defended Athanasius should be excommunicated without ever complaining. But this proposal would not be accepted. Nothing would satisfy the western Bishops but to make themselves & the excommunicated persons judges over the Eastern & therefore the eastern Bishops seeing that the western contended for preeminence & would not joyn with them in Council to hear the excommunicated persons at the barr

They made some Canons also in which they decreed that appeals might be made from the Councils of all the {churches} to the Bishop of Rome. And by doing so submitted all their churches to the authority of the Bishop of Rome constituting him their Oecumenical Bishop & themselves Roman Catholicks & endeavoured that the Eastern Churches should be brought into the same subjection. It was proposed also in this Council^[18] that a new profession of faith should be published for supplying what was wanting to the Nicene Profession; and Sozomen tells us^[19] that they did compose a new form of faith prolixer then the Nicene but conteining the same opinion & not much differing in words, & that Hosius & Protogenes wrote to Iulius bishop of Rome that they confirmed the Nicene faith, but for greater perspicuity 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 published & handed about for some years in the name of this Council, & I mistake if it was not the following Creed.

they being the people of his kingdom in the world to come.

The ancient Creeds of the Greeks generally ended with the Article of the Holy Ghost, & the primitive Creed or Creeds of the Latines came from the Greeks & therefore ended with the same Article of the holy Ghost & by consequence the following Articles of beleiving the holy catholick church the communion of saints the forgiveness of sins the resurrection of the body & the life everlasting have all of them been added by degrees upon various occasions.

Baptism is performed in the name of the father son & holy Ghost & chatechizing is to teach men that there is a ffather Son & holy Ghost & who they are & what we are to beleive concerning them in order to our being baptized in their name. For this reason the primitive creeds consisted only of three principal branches: the first concerning the ffather the second concerning the son, the third concerning the Holy Ghost: & what we now find added to these three by {the Latines} has been added since the beginning.

<18r>

put by the fathers & not being understood by the people gives offense, & because it is not in the scriptures, we have thought fit to remove, & that henceforth in speaking of God no more mention be made of ὁυσία, because the holy scriptures nowhere mention the ὁυσία of the father & the son. But we say that the Son is in all things like the father as the holy Scriptures speak & teach. Thus far the Council of Ariminum. The descent into the infernal regions is also found in the following Creed of Aquileia into which Ruffin saith he was baptized. Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem et in Christum Iesum unicum filium ejus, Dominum nostrum:

qui natus est de spiritu sancto ex Maria Virgine, crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato & sepultus, descendit in inferna tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris: inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos: et in spiritum sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, remissionem peccatorum, hujus carnis resurrectionem. This article of the descent into Hades or Hell is also found in the Creed of the Latines usually called the Apostles Creed.

Another new Article was that the Holy Ghost is consubstantial to the ffather & Son. And this was asserted by the western Bishops in the Council of Serdica in their general Epistle above-mentioned but got not much footing in the East before the reign of Iovian & his successors. For Gregory Nazianzen tells us that in the reign of that Emperor, when the Christians were divided into three parts & many erred about the Son & many more about the Holy Ghost (where a less impiety was accounted piety) & few were sound in both points: Athanasius first of any man & alone or with but a very few doubted not to profess the truth openly confessing in writing that there was one divinity & essence of the three [persons] & what had been formerly attained by those many fathers [at Nice] about the Son, the same thing he afterward attained by divine inspiration about the Holy Ghost & offered the Emperor [Iovian] a gift truly royall & magnificent a written confession of faith against a new unwritten opinion. And by the authority of this confession it seems to me, saith Gregory, that the western churches & whatsoever is vital in the eastern have been induced to exercise piety & preach the truth.

for understanding how this Article came into the Creed I should acquaint you

These things were done in the year 347 & in this Council some proposed that a new profession of faith should be published for supplying the defects of the Nicene & endeavoured to get it done but others would not have the Nicene faith thought deficient. However, after the Council was ended a Profession of faith was handed about in their name & if I mistake not, the Profession was as follows.

of about 50 Bishops of Italy & the neighbouring parts to meet at Rome A.C. 342 & summoned Eusebius & the bishops the five of the esatern Bishops who had been sent by the Council of Tyre into Egypt to examin the matters of Athanasius, proposed to the western that an equal number of Bishops of both parties should be sent into Egypt to reexamin the matter upon the place, & {if} the report which they had made to the Council of Tyre proved false then they would submit to be excommunicated without complaining to the Emperor, but if their report was found true then five of the western Bishops who had defended Athanasius should be excommunicated without complaining to the Emperors.

at the motion of the Council of Antioch in spring A.C. 341 / & {illeg} 4 years after {illeg} of the Emperors

<18v>

Iulius in the name of the western Bishops who met in this Council wrote an answer to the eastern bishops complaining that they called Councils & acted without him to whom it belonged to do justice. Cur igitur, saith he, et de Alexandrina civitate nihil nobis scribere voluistis? An ignari estis hanc consuetudinem esse ut primum nobis scribatur ut hinc quod justum est definiri posset? Quapropter si istic hujusmodi suspicio in Episcoum concepta fuerat id huc ad nostram Ecclesiam referri oportuit. At length for compassing this supreme judicature Iulius prevailed with the Emperors to call a Council at Serdica a town in the confine of both Empires

– communicated with Athanasius & some others whom the Eastern Bishops had excommunicated

Athanasius being accused by the Meletians of various crimes & condemned by the Council of Tyre was banished into Gallia by Constantine the Great A.C. 335 & after the death of Constantine sent back into Egypt by his eldest son Constantine A.C. 337. The eastern Bishops after the death of Constantine the younger, meeting at Antioch A.C. 341 & being offended that Athanasius who had been deposed by a Council and taken his bishopric without the authority of a Council, made Gregory Bishop of Alexandria & the Emperor Constantius about the time of Easter sent an armed force to expel Athanasius & introduce Gregory. Athanasius fled to Rome & so did some other Bishops who had been deposed in the east, as Paul of Constantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra, & Asclepas of Gaza, & Iulius Bishop of Rome A.C. 342. received them into communion & restored them to their Churches & by them wrote to the Eastern Bishops reprehending

them for not judging right, for troubling the Churches, & for not acquiescing in the Nicene decree, & summoned some of them to come to him upon a day appointed & justify their proceedings, & threatned that he would not suffer them for the future if they did not forbear innovating. And this was the first time that the Bishop of Rome exercised the authority of universal Bishop.

When the eastern Bishops received these letters, they met in a Council at Antioch A.C. 342 or 343 & wrote back to Iulius^[20] telling him that when the Roman Church expelled Novatian the Greeks acquiesced & when the Greeks expelled Paul of Samosat the Latines acquiesced. ffor he seeks enmity who departs from his friend that to communicate with excommunicated persons without the consent of those who excommunicated them was criminal the Canons requiring that he who is excommunicated by some be not received by others during the lives of those by whom he stands excommunicated. That he (Iulius) dissolved the Councils of the eastern Churches the criminals being condemned by the Bishops of the whole east, & their crimes being very great & notoriously known & manifest above 1000 people having perished by their means, & that they would have peace with him if he desisted & the contrary if he resisted their decrees. For if he conspired with the criminals it was manifest that he sought to destroy them. when the Bishop of Rome read these letters he persisted & the eastern Bishops These Letters were sent by Martyrius & Hesychius. And {in the} mean time the eastern Bishops caused Athanasius & Paul to be again <19r> ejected, & Athanasius went again to Rome.

When Iulius received these letters & other Legates came to him from Athanasius he preferred the Legates of Athanasius & the Legates of the eastern Bishops proposing to referr the matter to a general Council,^[21] Iulius sent Elpidius & Philoxenus to the eastern Bishops at Antioch with an answer to their Letter, & cited them to appear at Rome at a certain day to stand in judgment & justify their proceedings, & the Eastern Bishops returned an answer from Antioch by Elpidius & Philoxenus in which they represented that every Synod had an unshaken authority & the judge is used reproachfully whose judgment is examined by others, that when the eastern Bishops in a Council condemned Paul of Samosat the western acquiesced in their judgment, that there was an equal & the same honour in all Bishops, nor was the honour of a bishop to be accounted greater or less according to the greatness of his city, that the time appointed for coming to Rome was too short, & that he did not summon all the Eastern Bishops but directed his letter only Ad Eusebium cum suis, meaning those that were then met at Antioch, & insinuating that they were a party of Eusebians.

When the Council met at Rome, A.C. 343 or 344 & the Eastern Bishops came not the Bishop of Rome laid their Letter before the Council, & at the desire of the Council returned a large answer defending Athanasius & Marcellinus,^[22] insinuating that the Eastern Bishops were afraid to appear out of a guilty conscience & complaining that they acted in their Councils without him. Cur igitur saith he & imprimis de Alexandrina civitate nihil nobis scribere voluistis? An ignari estis hanc consuetudinem esse ut primum nobis scribatur, ut hinc quod justum est definiri posset? Quapropter si istic hujusmodi suspicis in Episcopum concepta fuerat, id huc ad nostram ecclesiam referri oportuit.

About three years after these things the Emperor Constans at the request of Athanasius & Marcellus obtained of his brother Constantius that a general Council should be called at Serdica a city in the confine of the two Empires. And the Council was directed to treat first concerning the faith & then concerning these who were deposed. T

A Council of Eastern Bishops met at Antioch A.C. 340 wrote to the Emperors against him And thereupon Athanasius calling a Council of about 90 bishops of Egypt & Libya wrote letters in his own defense & sent them to the Bishop of Rome. And the next spring A.C. 341, One Gregory being ordeined Bishop of Alexandria by the Council of Antioch & sent thither with an armed force, Athanasius fled to Rome as did also Paul of Constantinople Marcellus of Ancyra & Asclepas of Gaza whom the eastern Bishops had deposed. And then Iulius Bishop of Rome summoned a Council of about 50 Bishops of Italy & the parts adjacent to meet at Rome the next year A.C. 342 & sent Elpidius & Philoxenus to the Council of Tyre to cite the Bishops of that Council to appear in this Council at Rome & give an account of their proceedings against Athanasius & the rest. But At which the eastern Bishops were greatly offended & wrote back that

<19v>

The western Bishops made {illeg} & ordeined that appeals might be made from all the {world} to the Bishop of Rome, & Sozomen tells u / & Iulius by their order wrote back to the eastern Bishops complaining of the

sharpness of their Letter, & of their not coming to the council & defending Athanasius & Marcellus at large, & blaming them for acting in their Councils without giving him notice to whom it belonged to do justice.

About four years after, when by spreading a clamour against the eastern bishops as if they were Arians, his party was sufficiently increased, the Emperors by the working of the Bishops were induced to call a general Council to meet the next year A.C. 347 at Serdica a city in the confine of both Empires to examin the matter but first to treat of the faith. And there came thither & there came thither about 80 eastern & a much greater number of Western & Egyptian Bishops. But before they met.

And in this state things continued till the year 353 in which Constantius conquered Magnentius the successor of Constans & becoming Lord of the whole Roman Empire checkt the ambition of the Church of Rome, & in this interval of time a new Creed was handed about in the name of the Council of Serdica. ffor some proposed & endeavoured in that Council that a new profession of faith should be published for supplying what was wanting to the Nicene profession & endeavoured to compass it & others were unwilling that the Nicene should be thought deficient. They that were for a new Creed no doubt offered one agreeable to the sentiments of the Council & this I conceive to be the Creed which afterwards was handed about in their name. And I mistake if this be not the following Creed found in an old parchment MS in the Vatican & printed in the works of Athanasius at Paris A.C. 1698 We beleive &c This Creed is attributed to Athanasius in the MS, but runs in the plural number We beleive &c & after the manner of a Co. anathematizes all that do not beleive it and therefore was either made by a Council or at least offered to a council where Athanasius was present.. It uses the words usia & hypostasis in one & the same sense, as the Council of Serdica did, & this sense of the word hypostasis was abolished in the Council of Alexandria A.C. 362, & therefore this Creed was older then the Council of Alexandria & suits best with the times of the Council of Serdica. It is the Nicene Creed enlarged with the Serdican faith & with so much of the Creed of the Latines called the Apostles Creed, as was then wanting in the Nicene, & therefore it was composed by the influence of the Latins for supplying what the Latines might account wanting in the Nicene Creed. It wants the descent into hell & the communion of saints & therefore was composed before those articles came into the Creed of the Latines. It has the article of the Creeds of the Greeks whose kingdom shall have no end & therefore was designed by those who composed it, to be for a complete Creed comprehending the whole faith of both Greeks & Latines of Serdica. In delivering the Serdican faith it declares the holy Ghost to be of the οὐσία of the father & ὁμοούσιον to the father & Son & as this article then wanted to be inserted into a Creed, so I cannot find it in any older Creed then this above recited. The Serdican Council was the oldest which declared the consubstantiality of the holy Ghost & this Creed is the oldest I can meet with in which that consubstantiality is professed, & so far as I can observe it contains the faith of the Council of Serdica & western churches in & next after the times of the Council of Serdica truly fully & compleatly.

<20r>

, [& that instead of joyning in Council to hear the excommunicated persons at the bar, they themselves were to be judged & the excommunicated persons were to sit amongst their judges,] went back from Serdica, & both parties writing circulatory letters in defence of their own proceedings the western in their general Letter accused the eastern as guilty both because they appeared not when Iulius cited them & because they now fled from justice. They declared also in the same Letter their faith of one οὐσία and one ὑποστάσις of the father son & holy Ghost & the equality of the Son to the father & his assumption of a man [& excommunicated ten or eleven of the eastern Bishops, & the eastern excommunicated Iulius, Hosius, Protogenus & some others of the western. [Hitherto the Church Catholick had continued united in external communion throughout all the Empire; ffor whilst the two parties excommunicated only a few , its evident that each party looked upon the other as in communion with it self those few men only excepted whom they excommunicated. These things were done in the year 347, & in this state things continued till the year 353 in which Constantius conquered Magnentius the successor of Constans, & becoming Lord of the whole Roman Empire checkt the ambition of the Church of Rome. And in this interval of time a new Profession of faith was handed about in the name of the Council of Serdica For some propposed & endeavoured in that Council that a new Profession of faith should be published for supplying what was wanting to the Nicene Profession, & others were unwilling that the Nicene should be thought defective. They that were for a new Creed no doubt offered one agreeable to the sentiments of the Council, & this I conceive to be the Creed which afterwards was handed about in their name.] And I mistake if this be not the following Creed found in a very old parchment manuscript in the Vatican & printed in the works of Athanasius at Paris A.C 1698. We beleive in one God the ffather

Omnipotent, the maker of all things visible & invisible, & in one Lord Iesus Christ the son of God, begotten of the ffather, God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten not made, consubstantial to the father by whom all things were made which are in heaven & in earth visible & invisible: who for us men & for our salvation came down for our salvation & was incarnate &

<20v>

Another new Article was the consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost to the father & son, & this was first decreed by the Council of Serdica A.C. 347 then confirmed by some other Councils & at length inserted into the Creed commonly attributed to Athanasius.

Another new Article was the worship of the holy Ghost. And this was inserted A.C. 381 {into} the Creed of the second General Council called the Council of Constantinople in these words. I beleive &c -- -- resurrection of the dead & the life of the world to come.

Another new Article was the Communion of Saints. And this began to be inserted into the Creed about the beginning of the fift Century It was inserted into the Apostles Creed & which Eusebius Gallicanus about the year of Christ 420 or 430 commented upon, & into those of S^t Augustin Serm 115, 123 & 181 de Temp. & into that of {Paschatius} {l. 1. c. 1.} Eusebius makes this comment upon it. Credamus -- -- -- contemptu mortis insinuant. And S^t Austin or whoever was the author of serm 181 de Tempore makes this Sanctorum communionem; id est, -- supplicare &c It seems therefore inserted into the Creeds for establishing an opinion of a communion between the saints departed this life & the Church militant on earth, which opinion had overspread the established Churches of the Roman Empire before the end of the fourth century & is described by Augustin bishop of Hippo in his 20th book de Civitate Dei ch. 9, where, after he had explained the kingdom of the Saints Apoc 20 of the present Church & the judgment given to them of the power of the keys he adds Et animæ occisorum - - - et mortuis. And in the same sense the author of the Passion of Perpetua & Felicitas saith in the Preface: Et qui nunc cognoscitis per auditum, communionem habeatis cum sanctis martyribus & per illos cum Domino Iesu

Another new Article was the forgiveness of sins. For this was wanting in the ancient Greek Creeds & did not begin to be generally inserted into Latine Creeds till after the days of Cyprian.

Two other new Articles were resurrection of the body & the life everlasting. ffor these articles were wanting in all the Creeds of the Greeks till the Council of Constantinople A.C. 381 added them to their Creed, excepting that the Council of Antioch A.C. 341 for pleasing the Latines added them to the end of the Creed of Lucius the Martyr. And the life everlasting was wanting also in most of the old Creeds of the Latines. In the original Creeds these two Articles were tacitely comprehended in the Article of Christs coming to judge the quick & the dead. For this article implies that the dead shall rise again to be judged & rewarded everlastingly according to their works. As it was not thought necessary to mention the resurrection & immortality of Christs body any further then by saying that the third day he rose again from the dead & shall come from heaven to judge the quick & the dead, so it might not be thought necessary in the original Creeds to mention the resurrection & immortality of the bodies of the rest of the dead any further then by saying that they shall be judged at Christs coming & understanding thereby that they shall then rise again from the dead that they may be judged & receive everlasting rewards. ffor if the dead rise not then is Christ not risen 1 Cor 15.13 and therefore if the resurrection & immortality of Christs body be granted the resurrection & immortality of the bodies of the rest of the dead will not be dis{pu}ted, then being then people

<21r>

made man that is, begotten perfectly of Mary always a virgin by the holy Ghost: who had truly & not only in appearance a body soul & mind & all things which are in men except sin: who suffered, that is, was crucified buried & rose again the third day & ascended into heaven in glory in the same body: sitteth at the right hand of the father, & shall come again in the same body in glory to judge the quick & the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And we beleive in the holy Ghost, who is not alien from the father & the Son but is consubstantial to the ffather & the son; who is uncreated, perfect, the Paraclete, who spake in the law & in the Prophets & in the Gospels; who descended on Iourdan, preached to the Apostles, dwelt in the saints. And we beleive in this one only catholick & Apostolick Church, in one baptism of repentance in the remission of sins,

in the resurrection of the dead, in eternal judgment of souls & bodies, in the kingdom of heaven & in life everlasting. But those who say, there was a time when the son was not, or there was a time when the holy Ghost was not, or that he was made out of nothing, or that the son of God or Holy Ghost was of another ὑπόστασις or another οὐσία, or mutable & variable, We anathematize, because our catholick mother & apostolick church anathematizes them. And we anathematize all those who confess not the resurrection of the flesh, & every hæresy, that is, all those who do not hold this faith of the holy & only Catholick Church. < insertion from the right margin > This Creed was found in a very old parchment MS in the Vatican & printed in the works of Athanasius at Paris A.C. 1698 & was certainly – – – < text from f 21r resumes > This Creed was certainly made before the meeting of the Council of Alexandria A.C. 362 because it uses the language of one hypostasis of the father son & holy Ghost which was abolished in that Council In the MS it is attributed to Athanasius but runs in the plural number (We beleive &c) and after the manner of a Creed made by a Council anathematizes all that do not beleive it, & has all the characters of the Serdican Creed. For it is the Nicene Creed enlarged with the Serdican faith & with so much of the Creed of the Latines called the Apostles Creed, as was then wanting in the Nicene. & therefore was made by Athanasius & the Latines together for completing the Nicene Creed & it uses the word ὑπόστασις in such a sense as no other Council did besides that of Serdica. This Creed I have therefore recited as containing the Serdican faith & as the oldest in which the father son & holy Ghost are declared consubstantial.

<21v>

The Council of Serdica being ordered by the Emperors to treat of the faith in the first place (for which end the Bishops of both Empires should have met without the excommunicated persons till their cases could have been heard) the eastern Bishops also in their return from Serdica published a Profession of their faith, composed about two years before by a Council at Antioch, which profession was as follows. We beleive in one God the father Almighty, the maker & creator of all things, from whom all Paternity in heaven & in earth is named & in his only begotten son our Lord Iesus Christ, begotten of the father before all ages God of God, light of light, by whom all things were made in heaven & in earth visible & invisible who is the word the wisdom the power the life & the true light Who in the last days for us was made man & born of the holy Virgin crucified dead & buried & rose again from the dead the third day & was taken up into heaven & sitteth at the right hand of God the father who shall come in the end of ages to judge the quick & dead & to give unto every one according to his works, whose kingdom without intermission continues to endless ages. ffor he sits at the right hand of the father not only in this world but also in that which is to come We beleive also in the Holy Ghost, that is in the Paraclete whom Christ, having promised him to his his Apostles, after his resurrection, sent to teach them & admonish them all things, by whom all the souls of those are sanctified who sincerely beleive in him. But those who say the son was of nothing or of another substance & not of God or that there was a time or an age when he was not the Catholick Church accounts alien from her; & those likewise who say there are three Gods or that Christ was not God before the ages, or that he is neither Christ nor the son of God, or that the ffather Son & Holy Ghost are the same or that the son is unbegotten, or that the Father did not beget the son by his counsel & will, the holy & catholick Church anathematizes. This Profession of faith Hilary approves & commends as made in short but most absolute definitions And hitherto the Churches of the Greeks & Latines had continued united in external communion throughout the whole Roman Empire but now they began to separate the Latines being offended that the Greeks called the father son & holy Ghost three hypostases, & omitted the word ὁμοούσιος in their Creeds & the Greeks that the Latines translated it unius hypostasis, absolved persons excommunicated by the Greek Church & endeavoured to subject that Church to the authority of the Bishop of Rome. & both parties that five or six of the principal Bishops of their party were excommunicated by those of the other party.

Six years after these things were done Constantius conquered Magnentius the successor of his brother Constans in the western Empire & two years after called a Council of above 300 Bishops at Millain, [besides two Councils at Arles & Biterræ in Gallia & a third at Aquileia] to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius They offered to subscribe if the Nicene faith might be first confirmed but were told that nothing could proceed till they quitted the communion of persons excommunicated, for which end they were called together. Whereupon they all subscribed except Paulinus Trevirensis Eusebius Vercellensis Lucifer Calaritanus, Dionysius Mediolanensis & Rhodanus who were therefore banished as was also Liberius bishop of Rome & Hosius a litte after & Hilary & Dosanus a year after. And all these offered to subscribe if the Nicene faith were confirmed first, & thereby they allowed that they could subscribe with a good conscience. There were also Councils called at Arles & Biterris in Gallia & at Aquileia, & Messengers sent with publick

notaries to take the subscriptions of the rest of the Bishops who staid at home. Hosius also & Liberius after they had <22r> been a year or two in banishment subscribed. And thus the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome set up by the Councils of Rome & Serdica over the eastern churches fell, the Bishop of Rome himself with all the western Bishops except seven or eight & all their Presbyters except a very few, subscribing & thereby acknowledging the supreme & absolute judicial authority of the Councils of the Greek Church over her own members. But over the Latine Churches of the consubstantial faith in Europe the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome still remained being no ways opposed by Constantius or the Greek Church. And thence it came to pass that when the western Empire was invaded by several barbarous nations, those nations (particularly the Franks in Gallia the Goths in Spain & the Lombards in Italy), as fast as they became converted to the Consubstantial faith, subjected their Churches to the authority of the Bishop of Rome; & that Socrates who wrote A.C. 429 said then that the Bishops of Rome & Alexandria had of old exceeded the bounds of Priesthood & degenerated into domination (Socr. l. 7. c. 11) & that Ammianus in describing the very bloody contest between Damasus & Vrsinus for the bishopric of Rome A.C. 367, saith

<22v>

but were made to understand that the communicating with persons excommunicated was contrary to the rules of the church & of a criminal nature, that nothing could proceed till they quitted such communion, & returned into communion with the Churches who had excommunicated them, that the Emperor called them together for that purpose & they were not to go upon other things without his leave, & that those who persisted in such communion must expect to be banished as criminals.

but were made to understand that nothing could be debated or proceed in Council till they quitted the communion of persons excommunicated & returned into communion with the bishops with whom they were to debate, that the Emperor called them together for that purpose & they could not go upon other things till they had his leave, that the wilful communicating with persons who stood excommunicated by others was contrary to the rules of the church & of a criminal nature & that those who persisted in such communion excommunicated themselves & must expect for restoring the peace of the Church disturbed by them to be banished as criminals.

[1] Athanas. Epist. ad Antiochenos.

[2] Sozomen. l. 3. c. 12

[3] Tom. 2. p. 1278.

[4] Hilar. de Synod.

[5] Basil. Epist. 300

[6] Hilar. de Synodis p. 381. Edit. Paris. 1652.

[7] a Socr. l. 1. c. 5

[8] b Euseb. Hist. Eccles.

[9] Socr. Hist. l. 1. c. 6.

[10] 1 Tim. 1.13.

[11] Greg. Naz. Orat. 21. p. 394, 395.

[12] Hieron. adv. Lucif. t. 1.

[13] Ammian. l. 27.

[14] Siricij Epist. in Tomis Concil.

[15] Ambros Epist. 78.

[16] Sulp. in vita Martini.

[17] Socr. Hist l. 5. c. 22.

[18] Athanas. Epist. ad Antiochenos.

[19] Sozom. l. 3. c. 12.

[20] Epist. Antioch.

[21] Vide Epistola Iulij

[22] Extat Epistola in Tom. Concil
