

# Drafts on the history of the Church (Section 2)

**Author:** Isaac Newton

**Source:** Yahuda Ms. 15.2, National Library of Israel, Jerusalem, Israel

**Published online:** May 2006

---

<23r>

## Chap. 2

**Of the Prince of the host or Messiah the Prince & of his host composed of Iews & Gentiles united by charity.**

1 The God of the Iews & Gentiles was one & the same God the creator of heaven & earth, & the Christian religion was one & the same with the Iewish till the calling of the Gentiles, with this only addition that Iesus who was crucified under Pontius Pilate was the Prince of the host or head of the Church the seed of the woman which was to bruise the serpents head, the Shiloh who was to come before the scepter departed from Israel, the Prophet promised by Moses & prefigured by the Paschal lamb, the holy David who was not to be left in the grave nor to see corruption, the servant of God who was wounded for our transgressions & bruised for our iniquities & brought as a lamb to the slaughter & made an offering for sin, & the Messiah or Christ the Prince predicted by Daniel (whence came the name of the Christian religion;) & that he rose from the dead & shall judge the quick & the dead; & that we are to give him honour & glory on account of his death & to commemorate it often & to direct our prayers to God in his name as our great high Priest the mediator between God & man. But when this doctrine had been preached to the nation of the Iews about seven years, & they received it not, God began to call the Gentiles without obliging them to observe the law of Moses, & soon after caused the Iewish worship to cease & the Iews to be dispersed into all nations.

The street & wall of Ierusalem were finished in the 28<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes Longimanus as above & were to continue 62 weeks of years in troublesome times untill the coming of the Messiah Dan. 9.25. And those weeks ended two or three years before the vulgar Æra. And at that time Iesus Christ the author of the christian religion was born.

The Messiah the Christ & the Anointed are words of the same signification in several languages. He came to be the Messiah or the annointed Prince of the Iews but his kingdom was not of this world. ffor after his first coming which was at the end of the 62 weeks, when he had preached the gospel to the Iews & executed his fathers will, he was cut off & the people rejected from being his & the people of another Prince to come (the Romans) destroyed the city & the sanctuary & the end thereof was with a flood & unto the end of the war desolations were made in the land

Yet he was annointed a king by his death & resurrection, having thereby a name given him above every <24r> name that at the name of Iesus every knee should bow & he kept the covenant with many of his people for a week of years untill the calling of Cornelius & the Gentiles, by which the Iews ceased to be his peculiar people And in half a week of years the desolator caused the sacrifice & oblation to cease & upon a wing of abominations overspread the land, the made it desolate as it is at this day, & untill the consummation & time determined it shall continue upon the desolate, even untill the commandment goes forth to cause to return & to build Ierusalem, & the sanctuary be cleansed.

2 Before this desolation the Jews continued a people & holy city seventy weeks of years untill the finishing of transgression & making an end of sins & making a reconciliation for iniquity & bringing in everlasting righteousness & fulfilling the vision & the prophesy & anointing the most holy: that is, from the time of the incorporation of the Jews into a body politique or holy city untill the death of the Messiah & his resurrection from the dead whereby he washed away our sins in his blood, reconciled us to God & was anointed to be the Prince or king of the Jews. Now in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, by the Kings commission granted to Ezra to set magistrates & judges over the land with power to judge according to the law of God & the king & to punish by death or banishment or confiscation of goods or imprisonment, the Jews were incorporated into a polity & became a people & holy city. Seventy weeks of years counted from that period of time end in the year of the vulgar Æra 33 or 34 & then was Iesus the Messiah slain & raised from the dead & the Christian religion began to be preached among the Jews & seven years after among the Gentiles, who were thereby grafted into the stock of the Jews & became Gods people or Church called by Daniel the host of heaven, & persevered under the heathen Roman Emperors in various afflictions & persecutions, the last of which was that vehement & lasting persecution under the Emperors Dioclesian Galerius & Maximinus, which ended in the conversion of the Roman Empire to the Christian religion by the victories of Constantine the great over Maxentius Maximinus & Licinius in the years of our Lord 312, 314 & 318.

☉ Herod was made king by the Senate &c

The law of the Jews & Christians, except the ceremonial part, was one & the same law. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart & with all thy soul & with all thy mind. This is the first & great commandment, & the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self. On these two commandments, saith Christ, hang all the law & the Prophets. Mat. 22.37. And on <25r> was unlike the things created by him & in all things like the father. And that this interpretation was entred in the Acts of the Council is manifest by what another Council which met at Antioch in the reign of Iovian A.C. 363 wrote to that Emperor. <sup>[1]</sup> We approve, say they, & constantly retain the faith of the holy Synod heretofore assembled at Nice: since the word consubstantial which was used in that Council, & to some seems new & unusual, was [there] explained by the fathers with a cautious interpretation so as to signify that the Son was begotten of the substance of the father & is like the father according to substance Nicetas<sup>[2]</sup> tells us that some of the Nicene fathers in subscribing the decrees of that Council wrote by way of explanation that the Son was ὁμοιούσιος to the father. And that they did so is manifest by the Creed of the Council of Illyricum assembled in the reign of Valentinian & Valens A.C. 373, in which they wrote thus. <sup>[3]</sup> We confess according to the great & orthodox Synod that the Son is consubstantial to the father. Nor do we understand consubstantial in such a manner as some formerly expounded who did not subscribe sincerely & according to the truth & as others do now who call those men fathers, abolishing the force of this word, & following the example of those who have written that the word signifies like, namely that the son is like none of the creatures which were made by him but bears the likeness of the father only. For they that thus expound it, impiously teach that the Son of God is an 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 entring in their subscriptions that the Son was ὁμοιούσιος to the father & ὅμοιος κατ' ὁυσίαν. And the accusing these subscriptions as insincere strengthens the evidence that there were such subscriptions. They could not deny the fact & therefore they accused it of insincerity tho the accusation reflects upon the Council it self who had allowed that interpretation, & in whose presence & by whose permission those subscriptions were made. They said in their Creed that the Son was begotten of the father that is of the substance of the father. He is therefore according to this Creed the son of the fathers substance: but certainly not the son of his own substance. And therefore the substance of the son is not the substance of the father. If the father is the substance of the father as is affirmed in this Creed, then the son is the substance of the son, & this substance is the son of the fathers substance & the father & son are not the same but like substances. ⚡ For Athanasius himself in explaining this article of the Nicene Creed <sup>a[4]</sup> allows the son to have an ὁυσία not created but consubstantial to the father, & describes the ὁυσία of the son to be της ὁυσίας πατρικης γένημα καὶ ὁμοιότης αὐτης, the ofspring & similitude of the fathers substance & saith that ὁμοούσιος signifes the same thing with ὁμοιουσιος & εκ ὁυσία together. < insertion from f 25v > ⚡ For Athanasius himself in explaining this article of the Nicene Creed <sup>a[5]</sup> allows the son to have an ὁυσία not created but consubstantial to the father, & <sup>b[6]</sup> describes the ὁυσία of the son to be της

ὁυσίας πατρικῆς γήνημα καὶ ὁμοιότης αὐτῆς the offspring & similitude or image of the fathers ὁυσία; & <sup>c[7]</sup> saith that ὁμοούσιος signifies the same thing with ὁμοιούσιος & ἕξ ὁυσίας together; & <sup>a[8]</sup> that every son is ὁμοούσιος to his father & if the son of God be a true natural son he must be ὁμοούσιος; & <sup>d[9]</sup> that the son being the image of the father, & like him with an invariable likeness, to express this more fully the Council wrote him consubstantial: & in the name of Theognostus he <sup>e[10]</sup> saith that the ὁυσία of the son is not taken from without nor deduced out of nothing, but born of the fathers ὁυσία & flows from it as the splendor of light & the vapour of water, & that by this nativity the fathers ὁυσία suffers no change, having the son its image. And if such a similitude of substance was the sence of the Council & c < text from f 25r resumes > And if this was the sense of the Council we need not wonder if it were explained in the acts of the Council & that more fully then in the Creed.

The Greeks therefore for checking & abolishing the <26r> monousian faith which by the language of una substantia una usia & una hypostasis had been spread in the west & in Egypt & was contrary to the Nicene faith & by the eastern Churches accounted Sabellianism & Paulinianism, & Montanism, introduced the Acts of the Nicene Council against it, & endeavoured in several Councils A.C. 357, 358, 359 & 360 to abolish that language & revive the ancient decree of the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosat. And particularly in the Council of Constantinople A.C. 360 they decreed that the word hypostasis, or (as Theodoret writes) one hypostasis should not be named of the father son & holy Ghost. And henceforward the language of one hypostasis began to cease.

For in the reign of the Emperor Julian A.C. 362, Athanasius & about 14 or 16 other bishops most of Egypt returning from banishment & meeting in Council at Alexandria agreed that the language of one usia & one hypostasis should signify that the father & son were one substance not in number but in nature only, & that the language of three hypostases might be used to signify that the father son & holy Ghost were three substances in number tho but one in nature. And further to free themselves from the imputation of sabellianism & Paulinianism for using the language of una usia they anathematized those heresies, & to free those from the imputation of Arianism who used the language of three hypostases, they rejected as spurious a table of faith which had hitherto been handed about as the faith of the Council of Serdica. ffor this Council of Serdica used the language of one hypostasis & condemned that of three as Arian.

Yet it was some years before the language of one hypostases fully ceased. ffor {δ} ☉ Hitherto the words . . . . . < insertion from f 25v > ☉ Hitherto the words ὁυσία ὑπόστασις & substantia had been used in one & the same sense, the proper sense of the words. ffor the Council of Nice in saying that the son was begotten of the father that is of the ὁυσία of the father, meant by ὁυσία not the common essence or nature of the father & son but the proper substance or ὑπόστασις of the father. ffor at the end of their Creed they anathematize those that should say that the son was of another ὁυσία or ὑποστάσις, meaning of another substance then that of the father. And hence it came to pass that in the language μιας ὁυσίς, μιας ὑποστάσεως & unius substantiæ, which come from {illeg} the words ὁυσία υποστασις & substantia were taken for the fathers substance as if the son was not only of the fathers substance but also had no other substance untill ~ ~ first Hilary & then Athanasius & those with him for freeing their party from the imputation of Sabellianism & Montanism taught them to change the signification of the words ὁυσία & substantia & use them to signify not the proper substance of a thing but the common nature species or kind of substance which Hilary calls the essence of a thing, & also gave them leave to change the language of one hypostasis into that of three, so that ὁμοούσιος & μιας ὁυσίας might no longer be taken for a single substance but only import the relation of the single substances of the father son & holy ghost to one another. And this I take to be the original of using the words usia & hypostasis in different senses.

Yet the language of one usia & one hypostasis had taken such root that notwithstanding the great authority of Athanasius & the Council of Alexandria, it was some years before the language of one usia & three hypostases could take place. For Epiphanius fully ceased. For Epiphanius (who wrote in the reign of Valens) tells us <sup>a[11]</sup> that ὁμοούσιος signifies one hypostasis, <sup>b[12]</sup> that it is the same thing to say hypostasis & usia, & <sup>c[13]</sup> that the Trinity are τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποστάσεως of one hypostasis. And Paulinus bishop of Antioch with his party in the reign of Valens called the three persons one hypostasis & were blamed for it by Basil in <sup>d[14]</sup> his 349 Epistle. And Athanasius himself & a Council of 90 bishops of Egypt & Libya in their Epistle to the Africans written about the year 369 say that ὁυσία & ὑπόστασις are words of the same signification. And

Victorinus Afer <sup>e[15]</sup> saith: Hoc esse Græce ὁυσίαν vel ὑπόστασιν dicunt quod nos uno nomine Latine substantiam dicimus. And Pope Liberius in his letter to Athanasius (if it be genuine) calls the three persons one hypostasis. And in the letter which Pope Damasus & the Council of Rome < text from f 26r resumes > in the letter which Pope Damasus & the Council of Rome sent to the Council of Illyricum A.C. 373, the holy Ghost is said to be one hypostasis with the father & son And Ierome about the year 377 coming into Syria & being there pressed to use the language of three hypostases, he scrupled it as Arian & for scrupling it was accounted an heretick, as you may see in his letters to Pope Damasus about this matter. Quia vocabula, saith he, non ediscimus, hæretici judicamur. Siquis autem hypostasim usiam intelligens non in tribus personis unam hypostasim dicit alienus a Christo est, et sub hac confessione vobiscum pariter cauterio unionis inurimur. Discernite si placet obsecro, non timebo tres hypostases dicere: si jubetis condatur nova post Nicænam fidem & similibus verbis cum Arianis confiteamur orthodoxi. Tota sæcularium schola nihil aliud hypostasin nisi usiam novit, & quis rogo ore sacrilego tres substantias prædicabit?

The Council of Antioch A.C. 344 or 345 in a long declaration of their faith which they sent to the Latines, anathematized them who should say that the father son & holy ghost were one thing & one person & declared that they were three. And the Council of Sirmium which condemned Photinus A.C. 351 repeated the anathema. This was done in opposition to Sabellianism which was then spreading in the west. And hence I seem to gather that the language of three persons as well as that of one substance was already begun amongst the Latines. But the word <27r> person being of an ambiguous signification, the Greeks to make it signify a substance & not a mere power or form of a substance used the language of τρία πράγματα & τρεις ὑποστάσεις three things & three hypostases as well as that of τρία πρόσωπα three persons. And hence arose that controversy about words which Athanasius composed in the little Council of Alexandria above mentioned, & of which Gregory Nazianzen in his Oration upon Athanasius gives this account. There being, saith he, one usia & three hypostases piously professed by us (for the one denotes the nature of the deity, & the other the properties of the three) & these being in like manner understood by the Latines who by reason of the narrowness of their language & want of names, could not distinguish hypostases from usia: they therefore introduced the language of three persons least they should admit three usias. And what happened from thence? A thing very ridiculous or rather miserable. That light & empty contention about the sound of words seemed to amount unto a difference of faith. Then was Sabellianism imputed to the language of three persons & Arianism to that of three hypostases: both which names were feigned by the parties contending for victory. And what followed? When something was ever added to the troubles (the troubles I say made by the contentiousness of parties) at length the ends of the earth were in danger of being broken together with the syllables. Therefore that blessed man [Athanasius], that man of God truly so called, that great dispenser of souls, seing & hearing these things, did not think that such an absurd & unreasonable section of the word should be neglected but he himself applied a medicine to the distemper. And what was that? Calling both parties together before him with lenity & mildness [in the said Council of Alexandria] & accurately considering the sense & meaning of their words: after he found them agreeing & not at all differing in opinion he indulged them the use of their words & bound them only by the things. Thus far Gregory. And henceforward the two contending parties began to allow one anothers language & the Latines, that they might exclude the Sabellian signification of three persons invented the language of three subsistencies & began also by degrees to use the language of three hypostases. And this I take to be the true original of the language of the Latine Empire which continues still in use, viz<sup>t</sup> una substantia & tres personæ subsistentiæ & hypostases.

<27v>

After the signification of ὁυσία & substantia were changed & the words were used as common names denoting the common nature of the divine persons, & the language of one hypostasis for avoiding the infamy of Sabellianism was changed into that of three, the language three hypostases of one usia & three subsistencies or persons of one substance continued for many ages in the Churches of both Greeks & Latines to signify three intelligent substances of one essence, nature or kind as has been sufficiently shewed by Petavius, Curcelleus, Cudworth, Bull & Hueteius. This appears plainly by the writings of Athanasius, Hilary, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Greg Nyssen, Ambrose, Ierome, Maximus the Martyr Chrysostom Augustin Theodoret Leontius Byzantinus, Iohn Damascene, Theodorus Abucara, Euthymius Zygabenus, Theorianus, Manuel Calecas &c. & also by the Acts of several Councils. The Council of Antoch A.C. 363.



And again to Epiphanius<sup>[16]</sup> the bishop writ a little after the death of Athanasius suppose about the year 376 in mentioning the schism between the parties of Meletius & Paulinus two contemporary bishops of Antioch & siding with the party of Meletius & censuring that of Paulinus he adds. That also pleases me that amongst other decisions becoming a divine your diligence has added that it is necessary to confess three hypostases that the brethren may have this who are at Antioch 1. Yea they have learned it. ffor certainly you would scarce have cherished their communion if they had not made you safe in this point. And Basil in his 10<sup>th</sup> Epistle written to Gregory Nazianzen reflecting upon the western Churches as heretical for using this language of one hypostasis : But if saith he the anger of God remains [upon us] what help can we expect from the pride & superciliousness of the western Churches, who neither know the truth nor can bear to be taught it? but being prepossessed with faire opinions do those things now which they did formerly in Marcellus, namely contending with those who tell them the truth, & establishing heresy by themselves. I my self would truly have written to their leader [the Bishop of Rome] without the usual forms of letters: truly concerning ecclesiastical affairs nothing but by enigmas, because they understand not the truth of our people, nor embrace-|\_admit the method by which they may learn But in general I would have signified this by letters that they should not insult over those who are humbled & oppressed by afflictions nor reccon pride an honour, it being rather a crime which alone may render God an enemy. Thus doth Basil tax the western churches with haughtiness & heresy, the heresy which they formerly favoured in defending Marcellus a Sabellian ¶ < insertion from lower down f 27v > ¶ against the Greeks & still continued to favour by adhering to his doctrine of one hypostasis against the Greeks who tell him the truth. ffor there being at this time no article of faith in dispute between the Greeks & Latines but that of one hypostasis affirmed by the Latines & three hypostases affirmed by almost all the Greeks: the heresy with which Basil here taxes the Latines must be that of holding one hypostasis with Marcellus & the Sabellians] < text from higher up f 27v resumes > & still continued to favour \* < insertion from lower down f 27v > [\* by defending the Sabellian doctrine of one hypostasis < text from higher up f 27v resumes > against the Greeks who tell them the truth

And in another Epistle <sup>[17]</sup> he saith, We anathematise those who hold that wicked opinion concerning the confusion of the hypostases, in which the most impious heresy of Sabellius is revived. which heresy can be no other then that of one hypostasis] Thus doth Basil tax the western Churches with hautines & heresy in opposing the Greeks as they did formerly in the case of Marcellus. And this heresy can be no other then that of their maintaining with Marcellus one hypostasis in the deity. For this was the only article of faith at this time in dispute between the Greeks & Latines, & in defending Marcellus a Sabellian was asserted by the Latines in the Council of Serdica & was by Basil accounted Sabellianism. So in another Epistle it is to be understood that Basil taxes the Latines in the west as well as the party of Paulinus in the east with the same heresy where he saith We anathematize those who hold that wicked opinion concerning the confusion of the hypostases, in which the most impious heresy of Sabellius is revived. And this was the heresy of which the homousian Greeks accused Ierome. For Ierome ..... prædicabit. By all which it may be understood that the western Churches used the language of one hypostasis from before the first beginning of the reign of Theodosius the great & were all this time accounted Sabellians & Montanists by the Greeks notwithstanding the endeavour of Athanasius to reconcile the matter.

<28v>

The language of three hypostases was therefore difficultly received by the homousians because it imported three substances. And yet for clearing themselves from the imputation of Sabellianism, they were at length forced to admit it. So Athanasius in his Exposition of the faith tells us that the Sabellians making the father & son μονοούσιον & not ὁμοούσιον do thereby take away the being of the son. And Epiphanius that the son was not ταυτοούσιος to the father but ὁμοούσιος & that the word ταυτοούσιος being used by some, draws to Sabellianism. And Basil that it is not enough to number the differences of persons but we must confess that every person subsists in a true hypostasis. ffor Sabellius himself would not reject that figment of persons which have not singly their proper hypostases: seeing he said that the same God being one as to substance was upon every necessary occasion transformed & spake sometimes as the father sometimes as the son & sometimes as the holy ghost. Epist 64. p 859. And again: What calumny can be more grievous . . . nomina. And that Basil by hypostases means substances is evident. ffor he tells us that because the Son is the image of the father he is consubstantial to him; that ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν ἀπαρραττες like according to substance with an invariable likenes is the same with ὁμοούσιος in the sense of the Nicene Council, that there is one οὐσία of

Peter & Paul, & that the relation which a common name hath to a proper one that same relation ουσία hath to ὑπόστασις. And in his Epistle

And in general Petavius Curcellæus D<sup>r</sup> Cudworth D<sup>r</sup> Bull & Huetius have shewn beyond all quæstion that the three Hypostases were taken by the writers of the 4<sup>th</sup> & following Centuries for three substances of one essence or nature [by the writers of the fourth & following centuries.] Athanasius, Hilary, Epiphanius Basil Gregory Nazianzen Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Maximus martyr, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Ambrose Ierome Austin, Leontius Byzantinus, Iohn Damascene, Theodorus Abucara, Euthymius Zygabius & Theorianus Manuel Calecas are cleare in this matter & so are several Councils. The Council of Antioch A.C. 363 say that the Council of Nice cautiously explained the consubstantiality of the son by his likeness to the father The third general Council decreed that the two hypostases of God & man were united & became one & certainly the hypostasis of the man was a substance composed of body & soul & that united hypostasis of God & man was also a substance. The fourth general Council said that Christ was consubstantial to the father as touching his godhead & consubstantial to us as touching his manhood & in one & the same short sentence consubstantial must have one & the same signification.. And in the 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> sessions of the Council of Florence A.C. 1449 When Iohn bishop of Fano in the name of the Latines had said [that in divinity substantia is really the same with persona & hypostasis but differs in the mode of conception, a person consisting of a substance & its properties together, & that substantia is communicated [or is common but the properties not: Marcus bishop of Ephesus answers in the name of the Greeks that ουσία & ὑπόστασις differ as a common name differs from a proper one & as the ουσία of a man taken in common differs from the person & hypostasis of a man; & supposes that both parties agree in this notion. And in the 19<sup>th</sup> session of this Council 1, in explaining these things Marcus saith that a brother is non of his brother hypostasis but of his nature as connatural & ὁμοούσιος. And Andreas bishop of Rhodus that in the common Theology of the doctors of both Greeks & Latines the divine substance differs from the substance of the father & son, the divine substance signifying what is common to the father son or holy ghost, & the substance of the father signifying the person of the father. And in the rest of the debate both parties agree that ουσία substantia hath a double signification being taken sometimes for what is common as where the three persons are said to be of one ουσία and one substance, & sometimes for what is proper and then it signifies the same thing with hypostasis & person, as where the Nicene fathers said that the son is of the ουσία of the father & not of another ουσία or ὑπόστασις; & that the common usia essence or nature is understood to be divided into the persons, when we say the ουσία of the father, the ουσία of the son & the ουσία of the holy Ghost, & thereby mean {their} proper hypostases or persons. So the opinion of three substances in number & one in nature continued to be the doctrine of the Churches of both Greeks & Latines till the times of the Council of Florence. But yet the tautosian faith began to be revealed among the Latines by the schoolmen & to be much spread in the west before the times of this Council. For Peter Lombard the master of the sentences in the middle of the 12 century affirming: Vnam et summam quandam rem est divinam essentiam & non dici divinam essentiam genuisse essentiam ne eadem res seipsam genuerit Ioachim the Abbot who held three substances in the Deity, objected that Peter Lombard made a quaternity in the Deity, the three hypostases & the one divine essence. And the Lateran Council A.C. 1215, declared against Ioachim that there was only a Trinity & not a quaternity in God: every person being that divine essence. For say they the father in generating gave his substance to the son, not a part of it so as to retain the remaining part to him self least the divine substance should be divisible, nor the whole so as not to retain it himself, least he should cease to be a substance: but he gave them the whole so as to retain it also himself without diminution, & to have the same substance with the son. And so the father & son are one thing together with the spirit. This was the doctrine of the Council. And now the tautosian faith being taught by the schoolmen & favoured by a Council of 412 Bishops could not but get grownd till it overspread the Latine Churches.

You have heard out of Hilary that the Bishops of the Churches of the Latines neare the end of the reign of the Emperor Constantius took the words unius substantiæ in four several senses, three of which Hilary condemnes as impious & the fourth his own namely that the father & son were two like & equal substances called one because of one nature essence & species. [And this opinion he explains a little after by saying una [substantia] ex similitudine, non ex solitudine & again Quæ nihil differunt unum sunt non unione personæ se æqualitate naturæ & again una [substantia] non personæ unitate seu generis. And again Quis enim sanæ mentis tertiam substantiam quæ et patri & filio communis sit, prædicabit? Vel quis secundum Samosatenum, in Christo renatus, & filium confessus & patrem: quod Christus in se sibi et pater & filius sit, confitebitur? He means that is the father & son have a common substance, that substance will be its own father & its own son]

But there was another reason of the unity given by some for they said that the father son & holy ghost were three cohering hypostases in one undivided substance. So Athanasius compared the father & son to a fountain & river which are undivided & to the sun & its ray which are unseparated & Gregory Naz. compared the Trinity to three Suns which are joyned to one another & intermix their rays And hence the trinity is usually said to be undivided. Now as three cohering parts of one undivided stone may properly be called one substance; so may three uniform cohering spirits; but yet with this difference that the parts of a stone are in several places, but the spirits if infinite are all of them every where. Which manner of cohering & being in one another the Greeks call περιχωρησις & the Latines circuminsessio words which imply that the three persons are substances pervading one another.

**{illeg}** similitudine non ex solitudine — Prædicantes itaque fratres **{illeg}** filium in omnibus patri nihil aliud quem æqualem prædicamus: perfectæ æqualitatis habet significantiam similitudo, & hoc ex sacris scripturis intelligendum est. Leginus namque: Vixit Adam centum triginta annis et genuit [filium] secundum effigiem & similitudinem suam, & cognominavit nomen ejus Seth. Quæro ejusmodi effigiem & similitudinem quam Adam in Seth genuerit. — Quæ nihil differunt unum sunt, non unione personæ sed æqualitate naturæ. — Æqualitas autem naturæ non potest esse nisi una sit: una vero non personæ unitate sed generis. — Quis enim sanæ mentis tertiam substantiam quæ et patri et filio communis sit prædicabit? Vel quis secundum Samosateum in Christo renatus et filium confessus ac patrem: quod Christus in se sibi {esse} et pater & filius sit, confitebitur? Par itaque in condemnandis impietatibus hæreticorum nostra sententia est, & hanc in homousij intelligentiam non modo responit sed et odit. — Male intelligitur homousion? quid ad me bene intelligentem . . . . receperunt. — Synodo Samosatenæ . . . . Ariani. — Ariani non essent: cur negando homousion censemur in Ariani?\*[quoad {eo} substantiam]

<29r>

Protasius lay buried whose bodies being dug up were translated into the church & did many miracles & part of them were distributed to other churches. Of the miracles Ambrose in a sermon <sup>a[18]</sup> makes this mention, Cognovistis imò vidistis ipsi multos a dæmonijs purgatos, plurimos etiam ubi vestem sanctorum manibus contigerunt his quibus laborabant debilitatibus absolutos. Reparata vetusti temporis miracula. And in a sermon <sup>b[19]</sup> made the next day on this occasion: Arriani dicunt: Non sunt isti Martyres nec torqueré diabolum possunt nec aliquem liberare; cum tormenta dæmonum ipsorum voce probentur et beneficia martyrum remedijs cæcorum & absolutorum indicijs declarentur. Negant cæcum illuminatum, sed ille non negat se sanatum. ☩ < insertion from f 29v > ☩ se sanatum. — Sed quæro quid non credant? utrum a martyribus possint aliqui visitari? hoc est Christo non credere. Ipse enim dixit: Et majora his facietis. An ab istis martyribus quorum merita jamdudum vigent, corpora dudum reperta sunt? Si mihi invident, nunquid a me aliquæ virtutes fiunt? Nunquid meo opere, meo nomine? Cur igitur mihi invident quod meum non est? Si martyribus (restat enim ut si mihi non invideant martyribus invidere videantur) ostendunt alterius fidei esse martyres quam ipsi credunt. Neque enim aliter eorum operibus inviderent nisi fidem in his fuisse eam quam isti non habent judicarent. Fidem illam majorum traditione firmatam quam dæmones ipsi negare non possunt sed Ariani negant. Audivimus hodie dicentes eos quibus manus imponebatur neminem posse esse salvum qui patrem & filium & spiritum sanctum negaret qui trinitatis omnipotentem virtutem non crederet. Confitetur hoc diabolus sed Ariani nolunt fateri. Dicit diabolus, sic torqueatur quemadmodum ipse a martyribus torquebatur qui spiritus sancti Deitatem negarit. Non accipio diaboli testimonium sed confessionem. The whole story &c < text from f 29r resumes > The whole story you have described by Paulinus of Nola in the life of Ambrose, by Austin of Hippo in several parts of his works & by Ambrose himself in his 85<sup>th</sup> Epistle & 91<sup>th</sup> Sermon. In propagating these superstitions the ringleaders were the Monks, And since Egypt & Syria in the end of the reign of Constantius abounded with Moncks & Monckery was not yet spread into other countries & the Egyptians had very many Martyrs & by keeping the bodies of the Martyrs unburied in their houses had the greatest opportunities of raising stories of miracles done by such bodies & Chrysostom calls Alexandria the Metropolis of the whole world for spreading this sort of devotion: it makes me suspect that the cry of such miracles began in Egypt in the two or three last years of Constantius & soon spread thence into Phœnicia & Syria & from Egypt & Syria was propagated with Monkery into all the Empire in the reign of Valens & Theodosius, the Moncks feigning such Miracles in opposition to Constantius, Iulian & all their enemies, & running up & down all the Empire with reliques or pretended reliques of Martyrs till the Emperor Theodosius A.C. 386 put out this Edict. Humatum corpus nemo ad alterum locum transferat: nemo martyrem distrahat, nemo mercetur. Habeant vero in potestate, si quolibet in loco sanctorum est aliquis conditus, pro

ejus veneratione, quod Martyrium vocendum sit, addant quod voluerint fabricarum. Dat IV Kal. Mart. Constantinopoli, Honorio nob. puerò et Euodio Coss.

And after this they filled the fields & high-ways with altars erected to ☩ Martyrs < insertion from f 29v > ☩ martyrs, which they pretended to discover by dreams & revelations. And this occasioned the making of the fourteenth Canon of the fift Council of Carthage A.C. 398. Placuit ut altaria quæ passim per agros aut vias, tanquam memoriæ martyrum constituuntur in quibus nullum corpus aut reliquiæ martyrum conditæ probantur, ab Episcopis qui illis locis præsent, si fieri potest, evertantur. Si autem hoc propter tumultus populares non sinitur, plebes tamen admoneantur ne illa loca frequentent, ut qui recte sapiunt nulla ibi superstitione devincti teneantur. Et omnino nulla memoria martyrum probabiliter acceptetur, nisi ille aut corpus aut aliquæ certæ reliquæ sint, aut ibi origo alicujus habitationis vel possessionis vel passionis fidelissima origine traditur. Nam quæ per somnia & per inanes revelationes quorumlibet hominum ubique constituuntur altaria, omnimode reprobentur.

< text from f 29r resumes >

Now by these miracles the invocation of Saints was quickly set on foot. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Ephrem Syrus & other Monks set it on foot in the east in the reign of Valens & Pope Damasus Ambrose & Hilary did the like in the west as may be seen in their writings. I shall content my self with a few instances. Basil who died in the year 378, in his oration on the Martyr Mamas, saith: Be ye mindfull of the Martyr as many of you as have enjoyed him in your dreams, as many of you as in this place have been assisted by him in prayer, as many of you as upon invoking him by name have had him present in your works, as many as he has reduced into the way from wandering, as many as he has restored to health, as many as have had their dead children restored by him to life, as many as have had their lives prolonged by him. △ < insertion from f 29v > △ And a little after: At the memory of the martyr the whole region is moved: at his festival the whole city is transported with joy. Nor do the kindred of the rich turn aside to the sepulchres of their ancestors: but all go to the place of piety. And in the end of the Homily he prays that God would preserve the Church thus fortified with the great towers of the martyrs. And in his Oration on the 40 martyrs. < text from f 29r resumes > And in his Oration on the 40 Martyrs: These are they, saith he, who obtaining our country like certain towers, afford us safety against the incursions

<30r>

Protasius in dedicating a Church without Martyrs was admonished by the people how he should dedicate & thereupon dreamt where two Mar] where you will find re

The Arians represented to the Empress Iustina these were no martyrs but Ambrose had hired men to feign themselves/ And in a sermon made on this occasion: Arriani dicunt; Non sunt isti Martyres nec torquere diabolus possunt, nec aliquem liberare; cum tormenta dæmonum ipsorum voce probentur & beneficia martyrum remedijs cæcorum et absolutorum indicijs declarentur. Negant cæcum illuminatum sed ille non negat se sanatum. The whole story you have described by Paulinus of Nola in the life of Ambrose, by Austin of Hippo in several parts of his works & by Ambrose himself in his 85<sup>t</sup> Epistle & 91<sup>th</sup> Sermon.

& grew general before the year 390. ffor between the years 380 & 390 the Emperors by by severe edicts prohibited all assemblies throughout the whole Empire besides those of the Catholicks one of which Edicts is as follows. Apollinarianos cæterosque diversarum hæresum sectatores ab omnibus locis jubemus inhiberi, a mœnibus urbium a congressu honestorum, a communione sanctorum: instituendorum Clericorum non habeant potestatem: colligendarum congregationum vel in publicis vel in privatis Ecclesijs careant facultate: nulla ijs faciendorum Episcoporum præbeatur auctoritas: ipsi quoque episcopi nomine destituti appellationem hujus dignitatis amittant. Adeant loca, quæ hos potissimum quasi vallo quodammodo ab humana communione secludant. His etiam illud nectimus, ut supramemoratis omnibus adeundi atque interpellandi serenitatem nostram aditus denegetur. Dat VI Idus Martij Thessalonicae Theodosio A. 11 et Cynegio Coss. [A.C. 388.] I do not heare that there were at this time two sorts of Catholicks, one who invoked the saints & another who opposed that invocation & therefore I reckon that all the Churches throughout the whole Empire were henceforward in the hands of the saint-worshippers.

At the same time came in the custome of going on pilgrimage to visit sacred places which made Ierusalem frequented by great crowds of people from all nations as Ierome an eye witness represents in some of his



Epistles. And corporal Pennances came in about the same time. I perceive by this Edict of the Emperor Theodosius **{illeg}** Quadragesimæ diebus nulla supplicia sint corporis **{illeg}** absolutio expectatur animarum. Datum VIII Idus Sept{embris} **{illeg}**ro Flam. Timasio et Promoto Coss. [A.C. 389.] At the {same} time also with Monkery came in the Cælibacy of the Clergy <30v> So Ierome in his {Epistle} against Vigilantius Quid facient Orientis **{illeg}**ræ? quid Ægypti et sedis Apostlicæ: quæ aut virgines cler**{illeg}** accipiunt, aut continentes, aut si uxores habuerint mariti esse de**{illeg}**stunt? And at the same time came in also a greater load of ceremonies into the Churches of the Catholicks then the Iews were ever burdened with: as Austin of Hippo in his 119<sup>th</sup> Epistle written to Ianuarius concerning the rites of the Church, thus complains: Hoc minus doleo quia multa quæ in divinis libris saluberrima præcepta sunt; minus curantur & tam multis præsumptionibus sic plena sunt omnia ut gravius corripiatur qui per Octavas suas terram nudo pede tetigerit quam qui mentem vinolentia sepelierit. — Ipsam religionem, quam paucissimis & manifestissimis celebrationum sacramentis misericordia Dei esse liberam voluit, servilibus oneribus premunt, ut tolerabilior sit conditio Iudæorum, qui etiamsi tempus libertatis non agnoverint, legalibus tamen sarcinis non humanis præsumptionibus subjiciuntur.

<31v>

Vigilantius a Presbyter of Gallia was the only catholic upon record who opposed it, as idolatrous & he could not be heard so as to make a party or leave any followers. ffor the world was against him, as Ierom in writing against him A.C. 406 affirms in these words. Male facit ergo Romanus episcopus qui super mortuorum hominum Petri et Pauli secundum nos ossa veneranda, secundum te vile pulvisculum offert domino sacrificia & tumulos eorum Christi arbitatur altaria? Et non solum unius urbis sed totius orbis erant episcopi, qui cauponem Vigilantium contemnentes, ingrediuntur basilicas mortuorum &c.

Eusebius relates how Constantine with several others in his war against Maxentius saw in the clouds in the day time the signe of the cross over the Sun with this inscription In this thou shalt overcome & afterwards was admonished in a dream to make it the standard of his army. & publickly attributed his successes to it. Hic verò noster Imperator — — — præsidium agnoscerent — Porro Imperator triumphale illud signum colit — omibus præcepit.

ffor it now grew customary fo Christians to use the signe of the cross in a superstitious manner upon all occasions. Whence Cyril of Ierusalem bids you to impress this signe with your fingers confidently upon your forehead & upon every thing else, upon the bread you eat & upon the cups you drink, & to use it in eating in drinking in sitting in lying down in rising up in speaking in walking & in every thing that the Devils seing this royal sign may fly far away with trembling. Catech 4 & 13. And Ruffin tells us that when they demolished the heathen temples in Egypt & amongst others that of Serapis in Alexandria which was A.C. 389 they abolished the symbols of Serapis & in their room painted the signe of the Cross. {The paces} so then as the worshippers of Bacchus were marked with an ivy leaf & the worshippers of Serapis & their houses with the badge of Serapis so the Roman Catholicks & their houses were marked with the signe of the cross this mark succeeding in the room of the marks of the heathen Gods & being used by the Catholicks as the badge of the worshippers of Christ as those marks were used by the heathens as the badges of the worshippers of Bacchus Serapis & the other heathen Gods. See therefore if this mark when used as a Charm in nomine † Patris et † ffiliij et † spiritus sancti to scare away the devil & do other supernatural operations be not the mark of the Beast.

And Ruffin tells us that when they demolished the Temple of Serapis in Alexandria with the temples of the other Gods in Egypt which was in the year 389, they also abolished the breastplates or symbols of Serapis names of the Gods in all places & in their room painted the signe of the cross. Sed et illud apud Alexandriam gestum est, saith he, quod etiam Thoraces Serapis qui per singulas quasque domos in parietibus, in ingressibus, in postibus etiam ac fenestris erant, ita abscissi sunt omnes et abrasi, ut ne vestigium quidem usquam, vel nominis appellatio, aut ipsius aut cujuslibet alterius dæmonis remaneret, sed pro his crucis dominicæ signum unusquisque in postibus in ingressibus in fenestris in paretibus columnisque depingeret. So then as the worshippers of Bacchus were marked with an ivy leaf & the worshippers of Serapis & their houses with the arms of Serapis & the worshippers of other Gods with their symbols Marks or names, so the Roman Catholicks & their Temples & houses were now marked with the signe of the cross & upon abolishing the marks & names of the heathen Gods & dedicating their Temples to Christian uses this mark succeeded in their room being used by the Roman Catholicks as the badge of the worshippers of Christ & the sign or

symbol of the Catholick faith & Christian religion as those marks were used by the heathens as the badge of the worshippers of the heathen Gods. See {illeg} then used as the signe of the Roman catholick religion {illeg} of the Beast, especially if it be used in {illeg} as a charm {illeg} & sanctify things & guard them from evil] & do other super[natural] {illeg} his edicts called the signe of their faith {illeg} {illeg} & commanded that {illeg} <31r> of the heathens should be expiated by placing in them the signe of the Christian religion meaning the signe of the cross. So then as the

<32r>

of our enemies. Neither are they shut up in one place only, but being distributed are sent into many regions & adorn many countries. — You have often endeavoured, you have often laboured to find one who might pray for you: these are forty emitting one voice of prayer. — He that is in affliction flyes to these, he that rejoyces has recourse to these, the first that he may be freed from the evil, the last that he may continue in the happiness. Here a woman praying for her children is heard: she obtains a safe return for her husband from abroad & health for him in his sickness. — O common keepers of mankind, the best companions of our cares, suffragans & coadjutors of prayer, most powerfull ambassadors to God, &c. ✠ Ephræm Syrus < insertion from f 29v > ✠ Ephræm Syrus who died in the year 378 had an Oration on these 40 martyrs. And so had Athanasius who died in the year 373. This Oration of Athanasius is not yet published but Gerard Vossius saw it in MS in the library of Cardinal Ascanius in Italy, as he mentions in his commentary upon the Oration of Ephræm Syrus on these 40 martyrs: & therefore their reliques were dispersed & some of them sent into Egypt in the life time of Athanasius.

< text from f 32r resumes >

Gregory Nazianzen ☐ < insertion from f 32v > ☐ in his sixt Oration written A.C. 373 when he was newly made bishop of Sasima, saith: Let us purify our selves to the martyrs or rather to the God of the martyrs. And a little after he calls the martyrs mediators of obtaining an ascension or divinity. And in the end of his oration upon Athanasius — — — — < text from f 32r resumes > in the end of his Oration upon Athanasius written presently after his death A.C. 372 thus invokes him. Do thou look down upon us from above propitiously & govern this people a perfect adorer of the perfect Trinity, which in the ffather, Son & Holy-ghost is contemplated & adored, & if there shall be peace preserve me & feed my flock with me; but if war, reduce me & assume me & place me with your self & with such as you are, altho it be great which I desire. And in the end of the funeral oration upon Basil written A.C. 378 he thus invokes Basil. But thou, o divine & sacred Head, look down upon us from heaven & by thy prayers either take away that thorn of the flesh which is given us by God for exercise, or perswade that we may beare it with courage, & direct all our life to that which is most conducive & when we depart this life receive us there in your tabernacles that living together & beholding the holy & blessed Trinity more purely & perfectly whereof we have now but an imperfect view, we may there come to the end of our desires & receive this reward of the wars which we have waged or suffered. And in his Oration upon Cyprian Bishop of Carthage he invokes Cyprian after the same manner, & tells us also how a pious virgin called Iustina was protected by invoking the virgin Mary.

Gregory Nyssen in the life of Ephræm Syrus tells how &c — — — — cross in his funeral Oration upon Meletius Bishop of Antioch spoken before the Bishops of the Council of Constantinople A.C. 381, said that Meletius interceded for them & for the sins of the people: by which you may know, saith Baronius, that this was the opinion of the second general Council & by consequence of the Church catholick.

Hilary who died in the year 368

Damasus who was made Bishop of Rome A.C. 367 & died

<32v>

### Chap. Of the Theology of the Heathens Cabbalists & ancient Hereticks.

<33r>

A.C. 384 & adorned the tombs of many saints with verses invoked them as in the following instances. | in the inscriptions,

### Vpon Agnes.

O Agnes verum decus, alma pudoris imago,  
Vt Damasi precibus faveas precor inclyta virgo.

### Vpon Agatha.

Iam remidens quasi sponsa polo  
Pro misero rogita Damaso.

### Vpon Eutychius.

Quæritur, inventus colitur, fovet, omnia præstat.  
Expressit Damasus meritum, venerare sepulchrum.

### Vpon Felix

Versibus his Damasus supplex tibi vota rependo,  
Qui ad te sollicite venientibus omnia præstas.

### Vpon a Greek Martyr

Vt Damasi precibus favias precor inclyte Martyr.

Sanctorum, quicunque legis, venerare sepulchrum;  
Nomina nec numerum potuit retinere vetustas.  
Ornavit Damasus tumulum, cognoscite, Rector;  
Pro reditu cleri Christo præstante triumphans,  
Martyribus sanctis reddit sua vota sacerdos.

And Vpon this inscription Baronius <sup>a[20]</sup> has this remark: Reperitur in antiquis inscriptionibus ☩ < insertion from f 33v > ☩ Reperitur in antiquis inscriptionibus Damasus per unione sanctæ ecclesiæ nuncupasse vota martyribus quæ et persolvit ubi Romanus clerus relicto schismatico Vrsicino, Damaso conjunctus est. The schism therefore upon which Damasus made this vow to the Martyrs was made at the election of Damasus into the bishopric of Rome A.C. 367, & Damasus was then devoted to the saints. & put his trust in them.

Ambrose who was made bishop of Millain A.C. 374 & died A.C. 397 concludes his second preparatory prayer with this invocation. Et ut efficax hæc mea sit deprecatio, beatæ Mariæ virginis suffragia peto – Apostolorum intercessionem imploro – Martyrum preces deosco – Confessorum orationes exostulo. And in his sermon on the Martyrs Nazarius & Celsus<sup>[21]</sup> representing that the patronage of the Martyr was not restrained to the City of Millain he adds. Non clauditur locis quod diffunditur meritis. Invocasti ubique martyrem ubique te exaudit ille qui honoratur in martyre. – Quæ cum ita sint honoremus beatos martyres, principes fidei, intercessores mundi præcones regni, cohæredes Dei. And in his book de viduis he writes thus  
----- infirmities of the body.

< text from f 33r resumes >

✦ Athanasius in his epistle to Marcellinus saith that the words of the Psalms are not to be transposed or anywise changed but to be recited & sung without any artifice as they are written; that the holy men who delivered them knowing them to be their own words may pray with us: or rather that the Holy-ghost who spake in the Holy men, seeing his own words with which he inspired them may joy[n] [with them] in assisting us.

In the year 388 Palladius went into Egypt to visit the Monasteries & telling how he visited the sepulchre of Apollonius & other martyrs of Thebais who had suffered under Maximinus, saith: Iis omnibus Christiani

fecerunt ædem unam ubi nunc multæ virtutes peraguntur. Tanta autem fuit viri gratia ut de ijs quæ esset precatus statim exaudiretur, eum sic honorante servatore. Quem etiam nos in martyrio præcati vidimus, cum ijs qui cum ipso fuerunt martyrio affecti; et Deum adorantes eorum corpora salutavimus.

Eunadius a Heathen but yet a fit witness of what <34r> was done in his own times, relating how the soldiers delivered the heathen temples of Egypt into the hands of the Moncks (which was done in the year 389) rails thus at the Martyrs as succeeding in the room of the old Gods of Egypt. Illi ipsi [milites] Monachos Canobi quoque collocarunt, ut pro Dijs qui animo cernuntur servos et quidem flatitiosos divinis honoribus percolerent, hominum mentibus ad cultum cermoniasque obligatis. Ii namque condita et salita eorum capita qui ob sclerum multitudinem a Iudicibus extremo judicio fuerant affecti pro Divis ostentabant, ijs genua submittebant, eos in Deorum numerum receptabant, ad illorum sepulchra pulvere sordibusque conspurcati. Martyres igitur vocabantur et Ministri quidam et Legati Arbitrique precum apud Deos cum fuerint servitia infida et flagris pessime subacta quæ cicatrices scelerum ac nequitiae vestigia corporibus circumferrent. Ejusmodi tamen Deos fert tellus. This was the opinion which the heathens had of the saint-worship of these times. And some of the old Hereticks had much the same opinion of it. ffor ffaustus an eminent Bishop of the Manichees in Afric thus accused the Catholicks: Vos sacrificia Paganorum vertistis in agapes, Idola in Martyres quos votis similibus colitis, defunctorum umbras vino placatis et dapibus. And this may suffice to shew that the Invocation of Saints began to overspread the Empire between the years 360 & 370 & grew general before the year 390. ffor between the years 380 & 390 the Emperors by severe Edicts prohibited all assemblies throughout the whole Empire besides those of the Catholicks: one of which edicts is as follows. Apollinarianos cæterosque diversarum hæresum sectatores ab omnibus locis jubemus inhiberi, a mœnibus urbium, a congressu honestorum, a communione sanctorum: instituendorum Clericorum non habeant potestatem; colligendarum congregationum vel in publicis vel in privatis ecclesijs careant facultate: nulla ijs faciendorum episcoporum præbeatur auctoritas: ipsi quoque Episcopi nomine destituti appellationem hujus dignitatis amittant. Adeant loca, quæ hos potissimum quasi vallo quodammodo ab humana communione secludant. His etiam illud nectimus, ut

<35r>

#### Chap. IX

**Of the corruption of the Christian religion in discipline and morality.**

<36r>

#### Chap. XIV

**Of the Host of Heaven & the corruptions which crept into it.**

<37r>

In the year 351, four years after the Council of Serdica, the Emperor Constantius coming to Sirmium in Pannonia called a Council against Photinus bishop of that city, & the Council deposed him for holding the opinions of Sabellius & Paul of Samosat, & condemned his opinions very particularly by many anathemas, some of which were those that follow. Siquis Christum Deum Deique filium ante sæcula esse dicens, eundem non confiteatur in creatione omnium rerum Patri ministrasse, anathema sit. Siquis ingenitum aut partem ejus ex Maria natum esse audet dicere, anathema sit. Siquis substantiam Dei dilatari aut contrahi dicat, anathema sit. Siquis dilatam substantiam Dei filium facere dicat, aut dilatationem substantiæ ejus nominet filium, anathema sit. Siquis ἐνδιαθετον ἢ παρφυκὸν λόγος internum aut prolationem Verbum dixerit Dei filium, anathema sit. Siquis filium ex Maria natum, hominem tantum esse dicat, anathema sit. . . . . Siquis illud: faciamus hominem, non patrem dixisse ad filium, sed ad semet ipsum locutum esse Deum asserit, anathema sit. Siquis non filium Abrahamo visum esse dicat, sed ingenitum Deum aut partem illius, anathema sit. Siquis non filium tanquam hominem cum Iacobo colluctatum esse dicat, sed ingenitum Deum aut partem illius, anathema sit. Siquis illud: pluit dominus a domino, non de Patre ac filio intelligat, sed ipsum a semetipso pluisse dicat, anathema sit. Pluit enim dominus filius a domino patre. Siquis audiens dominum patrem et dominum filium; & dominum patrem et filium quia dominus ex domino sit, duos dixerit deos, anathema sit. Non enim filium exæquamus Patri, sed subjectum illi esse intelligimus. . . . . Siquis patrem filium et spiritum sanctum unam personam esse dicat, anathema sit. . . . . Siquis spiritum partem patris et filij esse dixerit, anathema sit.

Now Socrates tells us<sup>[22]</sup> that the deposing of Photinus by this Council for the heresies which they convicted him of was universally approved both then & afterwards as right & just, & Hilary seven years after sending to the bishops of Gallia & Britain a copy of the Creed of this Council<sup>[23]</sup> with the anathemas of the errors of Photinus annexed to it, saith of the Council. Necessitas & tempus admonuit eos qui tum convenerant, per multiplices quæstiones latius ac diffusius expositionem fidei ordinare: quia multis et acutis cuniculis in catholicam domum ea quæ per Photinum renovabatur hæresis, tentaret irrepere: ut per singula genera intemeratæ & illesæ fidei unicuique generi hæreticæ et furtivæ fraudulentia contraireretur: essentque totidem fidei absolutiones, quotidem essent quæsita perfidia ocaciones Ac primum post generalem illam atque indubitata sacra- <38r> sacramentorum expositionem [i.e. post symbolum fidei a Concilio editum,] hinc exponendæ fidei adversum hæreticos cœpit exordium. Then he goes on to repeat the said absolutions or definitions of faith, amongst which are the anathemas above mentioned, & commenting upon them singly he approves them all, & adds: Concludi damnatio ejus hæresis propter quam conventum erat, expositione totius fidei cui adversabatur oportuit. And Vigilius Tapsensis about 120 years after, in his fift book against Eutyches, saith of the many anathemas made by this Council against the errors of Photinus: Illius verò Catholici Concilij apud Sirmium contra Photinum ex toto orbe congregati quis sufficiat multiplices fidei sanctiones comprehendere; quæ apud Nicænâ synodum, quia necessitas fuerat nulla non sunt omnino sancita; quæ nullus fidelium audet respuere aut cunctanter recipere, qui non vult cum Photino anathematis eorum sententiæ subjacere. Such was the credit of this Council that Athanasius himself submitted to it, as you may see in his Exposition of faith where he saith of the son <sup>[24]</sup> I believe in one only begotten Word, Wisdom, son begotten of the father without beginning & from eternity, λόγον δὲ ὁυ προφóρικον ὁυκ ἐνδιάθετον ὁυκ ἀπό ῥρ᾽ οἰαν του τελείου, ου τμησιν της ἀπαθους φύσεως, ὁυτε προβολήν, the word not prolatitious not inherent, not an efflux of the perfect, not a section of the impassible nature, nor a projection.

And thus by the universal approbation of the sentence of this Council against Photinus the growing opinion that the Word of God was his λόγος ἐνδιάθετος ἢ προφóρικος was at length universally exploded as erroneous & worthy of an anathema. And so was the opinion in general that the son was generated by the emission efflux dilatation or projection of any part or power of the fathers substance. Opinions of this kind were the foundation of the metaphysical theology of the heathens, Cabbalists, Gnosticks Montanists & such like hereticks: & therefore what we meet with of these opinions in Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tertullian, Clemens or any other writers of the first ages is to be looked upon as not derived from the Apostles by tradition but unwarily brought into the Church from the Theology of the heathens or Cabbalists in which learned men happened to be educated & instructed before they became Christians, or from the Theology of the hereticks who by their emissaries endeavoured to corrupt the Church. For In the second century there arose some Christians, as Iustin mentions, who taught that the Son & holy ghost & Angels were emissions of Gods powers! Others, as Tatian, that they were parts of him Others teaching creation out of nothing derived only the son & holy Ghost from God by emission . And this opinion being more plausible as it got into the Church so it was taught in various manners by the more refined hereticks Montanus, Noetus, Praxeas, Tertullian, Hermosenes, Sabellius, Paul of Samosat, Marcellus, Eustathius & Photinus, but was baffled by the Councils which condemned the five last of them. And being baffled in the hereticks it was relinquished by those in communion with the Church Catholick.

And how dangerous this doctrine was you may know by the opinion which the major part of Christians that is the Church catholick in the second century had of it, who accounted it <39r>

<38v>

Tatian the disciple of Iustin made the Son an unseparated part of the father. Natus est autem (saith he)

<40r>

afterwards go on to tell the story thus. On the fift of the Calends of February we were watching [all night] in the Church, & being at prayers because of the Assembly that was to meet on the Preparation, the Commandre Syrianus with many Legions of soldiers having drawn swords & other weapons, & being armed with helmets & other armour, suddenly set upon us while we were at prayers & reading the scriptures, brake the doors & some began to throw darts others cried an Alarm, so that there was made a great clashing of arms the drawn swords shining by candle light, & Virgins were slain & troden underfoot. And whilst their Leader



marshalled his army, the Bishop sat in his throne & exhorted all to prayers & being thrust hither & thither was almost pulled to pieces, & when in a great deliquium he lay for dead & now does not appear, we know not what is become of him. A little after they further add that the arms which were left in the Church by those who brake in & which still hang up in the church, were no light argument of the hostile incursion so that they could not deny it. For Gorgonius the Governour of the City hath, say they, often sent a military Hangman with a Captain to take them down, but we would not suffer them that the thing may be known to all men. Then they go on to say how that as they had already resisted unto blood so if it were the Emperor's pleasure that they should be thus persecuted, they were all ready to suffer martyrdom, that is, to dye in that resistance. Their words run thus. If it be the Edict of the Prince to persecute us we are all ready to suffer martyrdom. But if it be not the Emperors Edict we entreat the Prefect of Egypt Maximus & the other Magistrates, that they desire the Prince that such things be no more committed; & we desire that this our prayer may come to him that no other Bishop be introduced here. In hindring <40v> which we have resisted unto blood, desiring the most reverend Athanasius.

The City being thus inflamed by these incendiaries, there followed other boiles before it could be quieted of all which Lucifer Calaritanus in a railing book which he wrote against his Emperor Constantius, makes this mention. [25] Recordare Constanti de scelerum tuorum memoria recenti, quam tibi in civitate Alexandrinorum inussisti: quantos per abrupta una tincta subscriptionis tuæ dejecerit, quantos gladio demeti fecerit, quantos fame sitique exedi, vel carceribus necari, quantos intercepto effecerit spiritu strangulari: et tamen his omnibus crudelitatibus in sanctos martyres quos tuus interfecit gladiatorius animus, cū sævieris; in nos crudelius sævis dum retines gladium.

Nor were these stirs of short continuance For Athanasius exclaiming against the proceedings of Constantius as a vehement persecution & celebrating all those as martyrs & confessors who were slain or taken prisoners, plaid the trumpeter to the rebellion & kept it up for a good while as you may understand by that railing book which Hilary wrote against his Emperor Constantius, in which he has this passage. Adest mecum Alexandria tot concussa bellis, tantum commotarum expeditionum expavens tumultum. Brevius enim adversum Persam quam adversum eam armis certatum est. Mutati Præfecti, electi Duces, corrupti populi, commotæ Legiones ne ab Athanasio Christus prædicaretur. These words shew that the sedition was both great & lasting. So great was it that Constantius whilst it was on foot, wrote thus to the Citizens of Alexandria. [26] I know not, saith he, whether any thing ever happened which may be compared with these things, seing many in this City were blinded & there presided a man who was emersed from the lowermost hell: who as in the dark, seduced the desirers of truth to lyes — — — — — & the common-wealth was carried as with a torrent, all things as in a flood being contemned: & one ruled the multitude who (to speak most truly) differed nothing from the vulgar Mecha <41r> nicks, having contention with the City only because he could not cast it into Hell. But that excellent man durst not come to plead his cause in judgement. And in the end of the Letter. Whilst the most wretched Athanasius, convicted of most foule crimes for which he can never be sufficiently punished no not tho he should be ten times killed wanders abroad from place to place, 'twould be absurd to suffer his flatterers & ministers, a sort of jugglers & such as it is not fit to name, to raise seditions here, concerning whom I have long since commanded the Judges to put them to death: who perhaps may not so perish if in time they return from their former crimes [viz<sup>t</sup>] of raising seditions] & shun those to whom the most wicked Athanasius was Leader: who hurt the common wealth & laid his most impious & wicked hands upon most holy men.

In short the Egyptians were so seditious that afterwards when Valens would have expelled Athanasius he could not effect it but found it necessary to desist. For it was not Alexandria alone but all Egypt & Libya which was inflamed by this sedition, the people with their Presbyters & Bishops being every where stirred up by the above-mentioned Letter of the Alexandrians & getting into bodies in the field: whereupon at length followed a skirmish in the Wilderness like that nocturnal one at Alexandria, as Athanasius in his first Apology thus mentions. [27] Whilst I was wondring, saith he, at these things behold there came again another grievous report concerning Egypt & Libya: namely that almost ninety Bishops were expelled & their Churches given to the Arians; sixteen of them being banished & the rest being partly put to flight & partly compelled to dissemble. For the Persecution there was said to be like that at Alexandria, the brethren being gathered together in <41v> a desert place neare a Cæmetary to pray on the Passover & on Sundays, & the Commander of the forces coming with more then three thousand soldiers armed with armour & naked swords & arrows & falling upon the Christians: Whereupon followed such slaughters as use to follow in such assaults, the impression being made upon weomen & children who did nothing else but pray. Thus does

Athanasius palliate & sanctify these seditions as if his party were assembled out of all Egypt & Libya with so many Bishops & kept the field in a great body together for no other end but to pray on sundays, & as if the Roman Legions came armed to conquer nothing but weomen & children But this is his flourishing poetical way of talking in all his writings.

<42r>

a horn in the same sense with the other ten Pictures & images began before this time to be set up in Churches but their worship was not yet decreed. At length the Greek Emperor Philippicus a Monothelite A.C. 712 caused the picture of the sixt general Council called against the Monothelites to be abolished. And thereupon Pope Constantine calling a Synod at Rome anathematized the Empreor, forbad setting up of his Images set up in S<sup>t</sup> Peters Church the picture of the six general Councils &, as Sigonius relates, added another decree whereby all who should deny to the holy Images the veneration which was appointed to them by the Church are damned. This was the first decree for the veneration of images. ffor hitherto they had been allowed both in the eastern & western churches only for instructing the people in history.

The Emperor Leo Isaurus about ten years after called a meeting of Counsellours & Bishops in his palace for putting a stop to the spreading of this worship & by their advice put out an edict against it & wrote to Pope Gregory the 2<sup>d</sup> that a general Council might be called. But the Pope thereupon calling a Council at Rome A.C. 726 confirmed the worship of images, excommunicated the Greek Emperor, absolved his subjects in Italy from their obedience & forbad them to pay tribute to him & thereby got the city Rome into his own hands & caused a great part of the Exarchate to revolt & kill Paul the Exarch. And the Lombards also being zealous for the worship of images & pretending to favour the cause of the Pope invaded the cities of the Exarchate,

At length Pope Zechary A.C. 752 fearing the power of the Lombards, deposed Childeric a sloathfull & useless king of ffrance & the last of the race of Merovæus & absolving his subjects from their oath of allegiance gave the kingdom to Pipin king of Austrasia & Suevia for ever, hoping thereby to strengthen himself by making a new & potent friend. And thus by the conjunction of these two kingdoms did one of the ten horns fall before the little horn. This was done in the beginning of the year 752.

The same year in March this Pope died & Stephen succeeded & before the end of the year the Lombards took Ravenna & put an end to the Exarchate. And this is the second of the three kingdoms that fell.

Then Pope Stephen knowing better how to deal with <43r> the Greek Emperor then with the Lombards went the next year to their king to persuade him to return the Exarchate to the Emperor, but this not succeeding he went into France & perswaded Pipin to take the Exarchate & Pentapolis from the Lombards & give it to S<sup>t</sup> Peter. And accordingly Pippin A.C. 754 came with an army into Italy & made Aistulphus king of the Lombards promise the surrender. But the next year Aistulphus on the contrary to revenge himself on the Pope beseiged the city of Rome. Whereupon Pope Stephen sent letters to Pipin wherein he told him that if he came not speedily against the Lombards, pro data sibi potentia alienandum fore a regno Dei et vita æterna, he would excommunicate him as he had done the Greek Emperor. Pipin therefore being devoted to the church of Rome came speedily with an army into Italy raised the siege besieged the Lombards in Papia & forced them to surrender the Exarchate & region of Pentapolis to the Pope for a perpetual possession. And now Ravenna & the rest of the Exarchate were surrendered some few cities excepted & the keys sent to Rome & laid upon the Confession of S<sup>t</sup> Peter, that is upon his Tomb at the high altar in signum veri perpetuique dominij sed pietate Regis gratuita, as the inscription of a coin of Pipin has it. This was in the year 755. And henceforward the Popes left off in their Epistles & Bulls to note the years of the Greek Emperors as they had hitherto done.

Afterwards the Lombards invading the Popes countries, Pope Adrian sent to Charles the great the son of Pipin to come to his assistance, & accordingly Charles entred Italy with an army, invaded the Lombards, overthrew their kingdom, took Desiderius their king prisoner, became master of their countries & restored to the Pope not only what they had taken from him but also the rest of the Exarchate which they had promised Pipin to restore to the Pope but had hitherto deteined & also gave him some cities of the Lombards. These things were done in the years 773 & 774. And now the Pope being arived to his full temporal greatness & freed from the fear of his enemies did henceforward reign prosperously with two Keys the keys of the cities of the two kingdoms in his hand in lieu of a scepter <44r> and a triple crown upon his head.

These crowns I take to be in memory of his acquiring his dominion by the grant of one king & the conquest of two others. The primacy or first place in point of honour was allowed to the sea of Rome & the second & third places to the seas of Alexandria & Antioch before the time of the Council of Nice but none of them were then acknowledged universal Bishops. In the reign of Constantius the western Bishops to strengthen the authority of the western Churches against the eastern laboured that appeals should be made from all the world to the Pope, but did not subject themselves to the Pope as universal Bishop over all the western churches. When the western Empire became divided into ten kingdoms which at first were either heathen or Arian, the Catholicks began to unite against them under the Pope & those kingdoms as fast as they were converted to the catholic religion subjected themselves to the Popes authority in matters ecclesiastical. And first Clodovæus king of ffrance being converted from the heathen to the Catholic religion subjected his kingdom to the Pope & by the advice of Remigius Bishop of Rhemes sent to Pope Hormisda a crown of gold adorned with gemms A.C. 514, & the Pope in recompence made Remigius his deputy Bishop over all the churches of the Franks. And soon after by subverting the kingdom of the Ostrogoths who were of a different religion & setting up the Catholic Exarchate in its room, & by the submission of the Greek Emperors Iustinian & Phocas who granted to the Pope the universal Bishoprick over their dominions, this spiritual crown became fixed on the Popes head, & afterwards by subverting the Exarchate & the kingdom of the Lombards the Pope gained also a temporal dominion, in memory of which he has ever since carried two keys in his hand & added two temporal crowns to the spiritual one upon his head.

<46r>

**PROPOSALS**  
**For PRINTING by**  
**SUBSCRIPTION**  
**THE**  
**Critical HISTORY**  
**OF MANES,**  
**AND OF**  
**MANICHEISM.**  
**WITH**  
**Ample NOTES.**

**Written Originally in *FRENCH*, by the late Reverend and Learned Mr. *DE BEAUSOBRE*, Chaplain to his *Prussian* Majesty:  
**And Translated into *ENGLISH*,**  
**By the Reverend Mr. *GEORGE STEPHEN TACHERON*.****

<47r>

**CONDITIONS.**

- T** 1. **HAT** this Work will be comprised in Two large Volumes in *Quarto*.  
II. **THAT** each Volume will contain above Eight hundred Pages.  
III. **THAT** it will be printed on a good and fine Paper, and a beautiful large Letter, like this Specimen.  
IV. **THAT** the Price to the Subscribers will be Two Guineas in Sheets; One Guinea to be paid at the Time of their subscribing, and the other when they receive the First Volume.  
V. **THAT** the Names of the Subscribers shall be printed at the End of the Second Volume.

*N.B.* The First Volume is ready for the Press, and will be printed as soon as the Translator can have a sufficient Number of Subscriptions.

SUBSCRIPTIONS are taken in by Mr. T. COX, at the *Lamb*, under the *Royal Exchange*; Mr. S. AUSTEN, at the *Angel* and *Bible* in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*; Mr. J. NOURSE, at the *Lamb*, without *Temple-Bar*; Mr. P.

DUNOYER, AT *Erasmus's Head*, in the *Strand*; Mr. A. ROCAYROL, in *Green-street*, the Corner of *Leicester-fields Square*: And by the Translator, at Capt. PAJON'S, at *Wandsworth*, in *Surry*.

<48r>

## The SECOND CHAPTER.

***The Principles of MANICHEISM. The Examination of the First Principle. MANES neither called himself JESUS CHRIST, nor the HOLY GHOST. What Authority he assumed.***

**T**<sup>[28]</sup> HAT we may know, as clearly as we can at this Time, the *Manichean System*, we must before-hand explain the PRINCIPLES thereof. I call *Principles*, certain Propositions or Maxims, which are, as it were, the Foundation of *Mancheism*, and which were in some Manner peculiar to this Heresy.

<sup>[29]</sup> I. *Manes* was not satisfied with appearing in the World, as a great Philosopher, and in the Church, as a Christian Teacher. If he had only taken one or the other of these two Characters, he would have been subject either to the Holy Scripture, which is the common Rule of Christians, or to Reason and Experience, which are the Rules of Philosophers: He would have been obliged to prove his Opinions, either by the Testimonies of the Sacred Books, or by evident Reasonings. But not being able to do either one or the other, he forged a Divine Mission, and took upon himself the Character and the Authority of an *Apostle of Jesus Christ*, even the Authority of an Apostle superior by his Divine Knowledge to the first Apostles, and extraordinarily instructed by the Holy Ghost, in order to reveal to Men Truths, which were unknown before his Ministry, and to reform all established Religions. This was his First Principle.

<sup>[30]</sup> THE Second Principle, which we may consider as a Consequence of the first, is, that tho' he received a great Part of the Writings of the New Testament, yet it was only so far as they agreed with his pretended Revelations, and his erroneous Science, In other Respects, <48v> he undertook to prove the Gospels to be false, affirming that they were not the works of the *Disciples of Jesus Christ*, or that they were adulterated. as for the Old Testament, he considered it as a Collection of Books, composed by *Hebrews*, and for the Use only of the *Hebrews*, stuffed with Precepts unworthy of the Deity, with Fables and *Jewish Superstitions*.

<sup>[31]</sup> THE Third Principle of *Manes*, is, that all the Nations of the World, and especially the *Eastern Nations*, have had their wise Men{,} their Philosophers, their Prophets, &c. who by the Light communicated by Divine Reason, to all who would attend to it, have discovered Truths, which the *Jews* were ignorant of: That these wise Men and these Prophets being the Fathers of the Gentiles, of whom the Christian Church was composed, it is more natural and more reasonable to consult them, than the Prophets of the *Jews*: That those few moral Truths, which are to be found in the *Jewish Religion*, did not come originally from these Prophets, but from the first Parents of Mankind, who lived and dies in the *East*, who had them from good Angels, and transmitted them to their Posterity.

<sup>[32]</sup> *In fine*, the Fourth Principle of *Manes* is, that the Sacred Books, received by the Orthodox, being neither true, nor authentical, ought to be corrected by the other Books, which they had rejected, only because they did not agree with their Errors. From thence came many Apocryphal Books, which the *Manicheans* opposed to the *Canonical* ones, and in which, they pretended, the true Doctrines of the Apostles were contained.

THE fundamental Maxim of the *Manicheans* is in general, that we ought to acknowledge as a Truth, neither Fact, nor Opinion, under whatsoever Name it may be declared, and in whatsoever Book it may be contained, except it agrees with the Doctrine of *Manes*, who is <sup>[33]</sup> *a spiritual Man, who judges all Things, and cannot be judged by any Man*. The Reason thereof is, that being immediately en lightened, and directed by the *Paraclet*, promised and sent by Jesus Christ, he knew and revealed all truths, and corrected all Errors.

<sup>[34]</sup> THESE are the Principles of the *Manicheans*, which I am going to examine. I shall inquire I. What Idea this Heresiarch had a Mind to give the World of his Person and Ministry : II. What He, or at least his Followers, thought of the Old and the New Testa-

[1] Socr. Hist. Ecc. l. 4. c. 12.

[2] Nicet. in Thesauro Orthod. v. 8.

- [3] Apud Theodor. Eccl. Hist. l. 4. c. 8.
- [4] a Epist. 2. ad Serapionem, sec 5
- [5] a Epist. 2 ad Serapionem sect. 5, 6
- [6] b lib. de Synodis sect 48.
- [7] c Ib. sect 41
- [8] a Epist. 2 ad Serapionem sect. 5, 6
- [9] d De decretis Nicænæ synodi sect 20.
- [10] e Ib. sect 25
- [11] a In Anchorato N. 6
- [12] b Hæres 69
- [13] c Hæres 74
- [14] d Ad Terentium Comitem.
- [15] e In opusculo de homousio, & lib. 2 adv. Arium.
- [16] Epist 325
- [17] Epist 345
- [18] a Vide ejus Epist. 85 ad Sororem.
- [19] b Serm 91.
- [20] a Baron. ad A.C. 367. sect. 19.
- [21] Serm. 92
- [22] Socr. Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 29
- [23] Hilar. de Synodis p. 374
- [24] Vide Tom. 1 p. 99. Operuum Athan. Edit Paris. 1699.
- [25] Lucif. lib. Moriend. pro Dei filio.
- [26] Extat Epistola apud Athanasium
- [27] Athan. Apol. 1 pag.
- [28] The Principles of *Manicheism*.
- [29] The first Principle. *Manes* called himself *The Apostle of Jesus Christ*.
- [30] The Second Principle. *He rejects the Old Testament and pretends to correct the New Testament*.



[31] The Third Principle. *He admits the Books of the Philosophers, and makes more Account of the Knowledge of the Eastern Nations, than of that of the Hebrews.*

[32] The Fourth Principle. *He opposes Apocryphal Books to the Books acknowledged by the Church.*

[33] 1.Cor. II.15.

[34] The Subject-matter and Plan of this Book, and of the Second.

---