

Drafts on the history of the Church (Section 7)

Author: Isaac Newton

Source: Yahuda Ms. 15.7, National Library of Israel, Jerusalem, Israel

Published online: April 2007

<116r>

described, & is their fundamental error [called by the Apostle Paul the mystery of iniquity.] And as they agreed in one common fundamental error which made them Idolaters & Polytheists, so they were united into one common body {by} baptism. ffor when the Church of Rome had allowed the Baptism of Pra{xias} a patripassian, & the practise of allowing the baptism of hereticks began to be of some standing in that Church, Stephen Bishop of Rome in a letter to Cyprian defended it by the like practise of the hereticks amongst themselves who allowed one anothers baptism. But the rest of the Churches of Christ disagreed from the Church of Rome in this point, contending that Christ had given no authority to Antichristians to baptize. There was but one God one Christ one spirit one Church one faith & one baptism And This baptism was in the name of that God & that Christ & that Spirit & into that faith & by it men were admitted into that Church. Whereas Antichristians denied that God & that Christ & had not that Spirit nor that faith & were enemies to that Church & by another baptism into another faith admitted men into another Church.

The education of learned men in the principles of Plato & other heathen philosophers before they became Christians, the study of the heathen learning by some learned men after they became Christians & the reception of Montanism by the bishop of Rome about the end of the 2^d century & the easy admission of hereticks into the latine Church all in the third century & the writings of Tertullian & some other learned men gave occasion to the spreading of some erroneous opinions in the very early Church her self, & particularly to the spreading of the opinion the son of God was the Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος — — — from the Sun. For Athenagoras in his Apology for the Christians, after he — — — — — quæ est Patris et filij.

When the Nicene Council at the importunity of the Emperor had decreed the son to be ὁμοούσιος to the father, Hosius who published the creed of the Council translated this word by unius substantiæ & some Greek translated unius substantiæ by μίας ὁυσίας & μίας ὑποστάσεος & these translations being capable of several senses became a stumbling block to the people, especially to the Latines & in a few years led them in great numbers into the errors of Montanus & Sabellius.

The education of learned men in the principles of Plato before they became Christians gave occasion to the propagating of those opinions not only amongst such as separated from the Church but even in the

When the opinion that the Son or Word is the inward λόγος of the λογος ενδιαθετος the inward reason & wisdom was thus far spread in the Churches as has been described, & the Emperor Const with the bishops of this opinion had prevailed with the Council of Nice to decree the Son to be ὁμοούσιος to the Father: Hosius who published the Creed of the Council translated the word ὁμοούσιος unius substantiæ & others for unius substantiæ wrote μίας ὁυσίας & μίας ὑποστάσεος. And these translations by their ambiguity became a stumbling block to the people & led many of them into the errors of Montanus & Sabellius, as I gather from what Hilary A.C. 358 wrote to the Bishops of Gallia & Britain. Multi ex vobis, saith he,

<116v>

You have heard out of Ireæus, that all the Churches throughout the whole world agreed in one & the same faith till his days, that is till towards the latter end of the second century, & that the people were so zealous for this faith that even the illiterate Germans upon hearing the opinions of the old hereticks would stop their ears & run away. And what their opinion was in those days in relation to the unity of the deity & how zealous they were for it in opposition to the metaphysical opinions of the hereticks about it, is thus described by Tertullian in his book against Praxeas written in the end of the second century or beginning of the third. Simples quosque, saith he, ne dixerim imprudentes et idiotæ quæ major semper credentium pars est.

This Oeconomy of the Montanists consisted in explaining how the father Son & holy Ghost were one by unity of substance, and credentium pars major, the major part of beleivers were certainly the christians of the Church catholick. And Tertullian complains that these in the Greek Empire would not understand the Oeconomy of the Montanists & in the Latine empire in opposition to it cried out Monarchiam tenemus pronouncing the word Monarchy emphatically with a loud voice, & in generall were affrighted & trembled at this Oeconomy accounting the Trinity of the Montanists a division of that unity which the Church beleived & in which the Monarchy was founded & affirming that the Montanists worshiped two or three Gods

<117r>

ουσια with its compounds ὁμοουσιος {ὁμοι}ουσιος This was first done by the Council of Sirmium A.C. 357 in a Creed subscribed by Hosius & Potunius. Then in another Council of Sirmium A.C. 359 in a Creed in which they professed the son to be similis Patri secundum scripturas. Which Creed was published before the Emperor at Sirmium & subscribed the same year by the Councils of Ariminum in Italy & Nice in Thrace. And the same year the Council of Seleucia abolished the use of those words both in their preface to the Creed of Lucius the martyr, & at the end of that Creed where they confirm the said faith of Sirmium . And the next year A.C. 360 the Council of Constantinople subscribed it without any material alteration of words. The reasons given for abolishing the use of those words were because they were not extant in the scripture nor allowed by ancient Councils nor understood by the people. For by The Apostles rule they were to hold fast the form of sound words. The Council of Antioch convened against Paul of Samosat 60 years before the Council of Nice, rejected the Sons being ὁμοούσιος to the father & the sentence of this Council was communicated to & approved by all the Churches of the Roman Empire & therefore could not be revoked. The Council of Nice had admitted the word Ὅμοούσιος hastily & without due deliberation being pressed by the Emperor then present & the word was misinterpreted & thereby proved a stumbling block to people leading them into the errors of Sabellius, Montanus & the Gnosticks. For the Council of Nice took the word in the same sense with ὁμοιούσιος, as appeared by the Acts of the Council produced at Ariminum, but the Latines translated it unius substantiæ & unius hypostasis & the people were apt to understand this translation in the sense of those hereticks. Hilary in the third year of his banishment A.C. 358, writing to the bishops of Gaull & Britain & taking pains to make them understand in what sense the father & son were to be called una substantia, speaks thus to them, Multi ex vobis fratres charissimi — — — — — in some of those corrupt senses. And a little after he repeats the objection several times without denying the matter of fact Sed forte dicetur, saith he idcirco [homousion] improbari oportere qu{illeg}itiose intelligentem? Male homousion Samosatenus confessus est? Sed nunquid melius Ariani negaverunt? Octoginta episcopi olim respuerunt: sed trecenti decem & octo nuper receperunt. And that the word ὁυσία was misunderstood by the people & led them into error was acknowledge{d} also by all the bishops who subscribed the Creed of the Councils of Sirmium Nice & Ariminum in which are these words. Nomen autem substantiæ | ὁυσίας, quod simplicius a patribus positum, a populisque minime intellectum offensionis causa sit: quod etiam in scripturis non contineatur, de medio tolli placuit. Thus did the eastern Churches for putting a stop to the growth of Sabellianism, Montanism, & Gnosticism &c prevail with the western Churches to lay aside the ὁμοούσιος as the Council of Antioch with the approbation of the Church Catholick had done long before for putting a stop to the growth of the heresy of Paul of Samosat. And now the eastern & western Churches being reunited in outward profession of faith became once more the visible Church Catholick of the Roman Empire. I speak of the visible church whose communion is measured by outward profession of faith. For God alone is the searcher of hearts. If it be said that this Church was Arrian in outward profession of faith, for rejecting the word ὁμοούσιος, I do not see how the Church catholic in the days of Paul of Samosat can be excused for doing the like

Hilary in his book de synodis written in Asia A.C. 358, tells the western Bishops, Tantum ecclesiarum Orientalium periculum est, ut ravum sit hujus fidei [sc. 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 intra quas consisto, vere Deum nesciunt. This state of things <117v> increased so much that in the reign of Iovian which was about five years after

The faith which Athanasius & his followers began now to preach was the Serdican with this alteration that instead of calling the father son & h.g. one usia & one hypostasis they called them one usia & three hypostases, changing the language of one hypostasis into that of three hypostases for clearing themselves from the imputation of Sabellianism under which they had hitherto lain. ffor by one usia & hypostasis, or as the Latines exprest it, una substantia et tres personæ they meant one substance in nature & species & three substances in number the word person being taken for an intelligent substance. This faith Athanasius Eusebius verc. & 12 or 15 other Bishops returning from banishment had agreed upon at Alexandria a few months before abolishing the use of the words usia & hypostasis except in opposition to Sabellianism. But afterwards they retained una usia in conformity to the una substantia of the Latines & distinguished the persons only by the name of hypostases.

& abolished the use of the word usia. The reasons they gave for abolishing it are thus set down by Hilary. De homœusio quod est similis essentiæ, commune iudicium est. De homousio vestro quod est unius substantiæ tractantes primum idcirco respuendum pronunciastis, quia [per] verbi hujus enunciationem — — — — nusquam scriptum repenaretur./. The meaning of the first of these reasons is that whereas the word ὁμοούσιος properly signifes a substance derived from another substance by some sort of separation or distinction, & the Council of Nice agreed that the word was not to be taken in such a sense, nor to signify any thing more then ὁμοιούσιος similis substantiæ & yet the Latines translated the word unius substantiæ & thereby laid aside the interpretation agreed upon by the Nicene Council, & gave occasion to the people to understand the Nicene decree in favour of the erros of Sabellius Montanus & the Gnosticks; for puting a stop to these errors it was fit the word usia should be laid aside. And that the word usia was misinterpreted by the people Hilary himself is witness. Multi ex nobis, fratres charissimi — — — — quam inter se duo pares habeant. Here Hilary describes three corrupt senses in which the people understood the Nicene decree, the first in favour of Sabellianism, the second in favour of Montanism & the third in favour of the errors of Hieracas & the Gnosticks, & says that many of his party understood unam substantiam in some of these corrupt senses And for making it appear that the ὁμοούσιος was not to be understood in any of these senses, the Acts of the Nicene Council were produced, in which the word was interpreted to signify nothing more then ὁμοιούσιος or ὁμιος κατ' ὀυσίαν.

For understanding the force of the second reason it is to be considered that the sentence of the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosat, by which the Council rejected the ὁμοούσιος, communicated to & approved by all the Churches of the Roman Empire without any dispute arising thereupon. And the Councils of Sirmium Nicæa Ariminum Seleucia & Constantinople are not to be blamed for restoring a decree which had been made by the Council of Antioch & established by the consent of the Church Catholick above 90 years before, & so had the tradition of the Church catholick on its side.

The third reason, namely that the ὁμοούσιος which the Nicene fathers had been compelled to admit, was not to be received because not in scripture, is made stronger by the Apostles command: Hold fast the form of sound words. A command which no Council whatever had authority to repeal or trans

Vpon these reasons the Council of Sirmium

<118r>

[1]Epiphanius tells us that the Scribes held various traditions some of which they derived from Moses, others from Akkiba others from Andanus or Ananus & others from the Assamonæans, & celebrated these traditions under the name of wisdom & learning. And that the pharisees[2] added to the Doctrines of the scribes, & attributed much to fate & Astronomy[3] translating the greek names of the seven Planets & 12 signes into the hebrew language. Whence its probable that the Cabbala was handed down by the Scribes & Pharisees & Doctors of the law. For Akkiba is reconned among the Cabbalists. New heresies began first {amongst} the Jews. For Hegesippus tells us that from the sects of the Jews founded by Thebutis simon & others came the sects of Menander Marcion Carpocrates Valentinus Basilides Saturnilis &c.

<119r>

And that every son is ὁμοούσιος to his father, & if the son of God be a true natural son he must be also ὁμοούσιος, & 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) that the ὁυσία of the son is not taken from without nor deduced out of nothing but born of the fathers ουσία & flows from it as the splendor of light & the vapour of water, & yet by this nativity the ουσία of the father suffers no division or change, having the son its image. And if such a similitude of substance was the sense of the Council

these these

<119v>

For Sir Isaac Newton
at his House
in S^t Martin's street
near Leciester fields
London

<120r>

8 Hod æs. 2 Cochmah gradus plumbi **{illeg}** Chesil argentum. 1 Icod argentum vivum. 5 Geberah **{illeg}** 1 Kether radim metallica p. 117. 3 Binal stannum p. 117. 6 Tophereth ferrum p. 118 7 Nezach æs **{illeg}** 10 Malchuth medicina metallorum p. 118. 4 Gedulah argentum p. 118. 9 Iesod plumbum p 118 **{illeg}** fæmina metallica, aqua auri. p. 118. 1, 2, 3 Chether Cochlin bina principia metallica. 4 Gedulah Chesed argentum. 5 Geburah aurum. 6 Tipherath ferrum 7 Nezach stannum 8 Hod æs. 9 9 Iesod plumbum 10 Malcuth argentum vivum fæmina metallica aqua auri. p. 118.

but Hyparchus & Ptolomy placed a primum mobile above it & Theologus has placed an infinite & immoaveable calm empyrean above that, & accordingly the Cabbalists have placed three sephiroths above the planetary orbs (Kether Cochmah & Binah) & comprehended them under the name of Arech Anpin they called the crown to signify that it encompasses all the rest & made it infinite they supposed to be infinite & called it the crown to signify that it encompasses all the rest. And some of the Gnosticks in like manner placed more Æons then one above the orbs of the Planets & equalled the first Æon to the supreme father.

And the Gnosticks also imitated the heathens & Cabbalists in the manner of generating their Æons, making them either males & females or hermaphrodites & to generate in a litteral sense that is by emission of substance as animals generate other animals of the same species by seminal emissions. And thence the

The Cabbalists placed Æn Soph the Infinite or first God in the highest heav{en.} And under him they placed a sphære which they called his garment & under that a sphere of splendor or light & under that a space of the first aer which some have called the soul of the world, & in this space they say the ten sephirahs were gradually produced. The first or highest was the sphere called Kether the Crown & the highest crown because it encompassed the other nine. This sphere was much less then the sphere of splendor there being a vast empty space between them. And within this sphere were the spheres of the other nine Sephiroths the lowest of which was Malcath the kingdom. These sephiroths they distinguished into two classes, called Arich Anpin & Seir Anpin the man with a great face & the man with a little face & in Seir Anpin comprehended the seven lower sephiroths & put the names of these seven sephiroths to signify the seven metals. Whence it seems to me that they made the orbs of the seven Planets & that this Cabbalistical philosophy had it's rise from Aristotles system of the world. He being the master of Alexander the great, his philosophy came into request in the reign of the successors of Alexander especially in Egypt The three superior Sephiras comprehended in Arich Anpin, answer to the Cœlum empyreum the primum mobile & the firmamentum stellatum. And thus the ten sephirahs are nothing else then the intelligences which Aristotle & his successors placed in the heavenly Orbs Aristotel made but eight Orbs seven of the Planets & one of the fixt stars & thence came the ogdoas of Æons as I said above. Hyparchus & Ptolomy added a ninth called the Primum mobile, &

Theologers have added the *cœlum empyreum* & reckon it the seat of the blessed. The Cabbalists also supposed that the souls of men come down from above & passed into various bodies till they had performed all that they were to do And thus does the philosophy of the Cabbalists agree with that of the Gnosticks.

<120v>

For the Gnosticks Simon Menander Nicolas Saturninus Basilides Carpocras, Valentinus, Secundus Ptolomæus Epiphanes Marcus Heracleon Calarbasus Tatian & the Cainites Ophites Sethians Barbelites Phibeonites Militaries &c made many emissions Æons or Deities male & female & derived them from the first God & from one another by generation, or emission of substance or vertue & from them derived Archangels & Angels & the souls of men & said that the world was made not by the first God but either by the Angels or by one or more of the Æons. And placing their Æons with Angels under them in the orbs of the seven Planets & fixt stars made an Ogdoas of principal Æons or intelligencies with Angels under them according to the number of the Orbs & said that they governed the world tyrannically & kept the souls of men below & made them pass into various bodies. And that either the supreme God or one of the Æons descended from the highest heaven to teach men the knowledge by which their souls might be saved from the tyranny of the Angels & enabled after death to escape them & ascend upwards through the Orbs to their first station & condition. [And some of them as Simon Menander Saturninus Basilides Cerdo Marcion said that this Saviour descended with a putative body & appeared as a man but was not a true man, & others as & Cerinthus, Carpocras Valentinus, Secundus, Epiphanes, Colarbasus Marcus & in general the Nicolaitans with their various sects of Sethians, Ophites, Cainites, Gnosticks properly so called, Phibionites &c that Christ the saviour descended upon Iesus the son of Mary & did the supernatural works. And some of these as Cerinthus said that Iesus was the son of Ioseph & Mary, others as the Sethians & Ophites that he was the son of the Virgin Mary by the power of God & others as Valentinus & Secundus that he descended from above & in descending thro the orbs formed to himself out of the elements a true body of flesh & bones without taking flesh of the Virgin, & Valentinus said that he passed through the Virgin as water through a pipe.] And from their pretending to science & particularly to the knowledge which the Saviour came down to teach, & placing their religion in this science they were called Gnosticks. And this mystery of iniquity, these endless genealogies, these oppositions of science falsely so called these fables, old wives fables, Iewish fables began to work in the Apostles days, & consisted of the metaphysical theology of the heathens & Cabbalists introduced into the Christian religion, & particularly of the Egyptian Pythagoric, Platonic & Cabbalistic transmigration of souls, & of the heathen Gods & Astrological Intelligencies & Cabbalisticall sephiroths seated in the orbs of the starry firmament & seven Planets For the Cabbalists put the names of the seven last Sephiroths for the seven metals & the Gods to which the seven metals are dedicated are the Gods of the seven planetary orbs The Cabbalists distinguished their ten Sephiroths into Arich Anpin & Seir Anpin, the man with a great face & the man with a little face [& by Arich Anpin understood the first or highest sephiroth] & by Seir Anpin understood the seven lower Sephiroths or Gods of the Planetary orbs the sephiroth or sephirots above the Planetary orbs & by Arich Anpin the first or highest above the Planetary orbs. This 8th heaven was at first called only the starry firmament, but Hypparchus & Ptolomy distinguished it into the starry firmament & the *primum mobile* & Theologers gave the name of *cœlum empyreum* to the infinite immoveable space beyond the *primum mobile* & so made up the number of ten heavens with their Sephiroths the three first of which were comprehended in Arich Anpin & the seven last in Seir Anpin. ffor the Cabbalists refer the three first Sephiroths called Kether Cochma & Binah to Arich Anpin & so have turned the Ogdoas into a Decas of Æons. And The Gnosticks increased the number of their Æons more then the Cabbalists did, making them at length as many as days in the month or year, & placing many of them above the Planetary Orbs.

<121v>

The religion of the Encratites was set on foot **{illeg}** by Tatian & Montanus, two Gnosticks. And the religion of the Moncks is of the same kind, but more absurd. Monckery was set up in Egypt by Antony & soon after in Syria by Hilarion, & spread so much that soon after the reign of Iulian the apostate a third part of the Egyptians were got into the deserts of Egypt. They lived first singly in cells, then associated into *cænobia* & at length came into towns, & filled the churches with bishops presbyters & deacons. Athanasius in his younger days poured water upon the hands of his master Antony He was first a monck then a Deacon & then a bishop & finding the Moncks faithful to him made many of them bishops & Presbyters in Egypt & these bishops erected Monasteries in their cities, out of which they chose Presbyters & sent bishops to other cities. And the like was done in Syria. Spiridion & Epiphanius of Cyprus, Iames of Nisibis Cyril of Ierusalem,

Eustachius of Sebastia in Armenia Eusebius of Emissa, Titus of Bostra, Basilius of Ancyra, Acacius of Cæsarea in Palæstine Elpidius of Laodicæa Melitius, & Flavian of Antioch, Theodorus of Tyre, Protogenes of Carrhæ, Acacius of Berekæa, Theodotus of Hierapolis Eusebius of Chalcedon, Amphilocheus of Iconium were both bishops & monks. Eustachius Sebastenus Basil, Gregory Nazianzen & Gregory Nyssen had monasteries of Clergymen in their cities, & were the first who propagated this sort of Monckery in Armenia & Pontus Eusebius Vercellensis, & Martin carried this sort of Monckery into the west & Austin carried it into Afric, & all these being both bishops & monks erected monasteries of clergymen in their cities out of which bishops were sent to other cities who in like manner erected monasteries in their cities till the churches were supplied with Bishops out of the monasteries Whence Ierom in a letter written about the year 385^[4] saith of the Clergy: Quasi et ipsi aliud sint quam Monachi & non quicquid in Monachos dicitur redundit in Clericos qui patres sunt Monachorum Detrimentum pecoris pastoris ignominia est. And in his book against Vigilantius Quid facient Orientis Ecclesiæ? quid Ægypti & sedis Apostolicæ? quæ aut virgines Clericos accipiunt, aut continentes, aut si uxores habuerint mariti esse desistunt.

Thus the encratites invaded the Churches of God & got the Empire into their hands. And now you may understand the meaning of the Apostles words where he saith. ^[5]Now the spirit speaks expresly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits & doctrines of ghosts: speaking lies in hypocrisy (in their legends & figments of miracles done by the dead) having consciences seared as with a hot iron: forbidding to marry & commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who beleive & know the truth. For every creature of God is good & nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving.

<122r>

the days of Iustin Martyr without falling out about their different opinions. ffor when Trypho the Jew put Iustin upon proving that Christ was God before the world began & was afterwards born & became a man: Iustin in returning an answer subjoins. Veruntamen, O Tripho, non perierit illud, Christum hunc esse Dei, si demonstrare nequeam, et fuisse prius filium conditoris universitatis hujus Dei, esseque Deum, & genitum esse hominem ex virgine; Sed ex omni ostenso [sequatur tantum] quod hic est Christus Dei, quicumque tandem sit. Si non demonstravero, inquam, eum et prius extitisse et nasci hominem sustinuisse ijsdem nobiscum passionibus obnoxium, carnem habentem secundum Patris consilium & voluntatem: in eo ipso tantum æquum fuerit me errore lapsum esse dicere, non autem negare hunc esse Christum illum, si modo tanquam homo ex hominibus genitus, esse appareat et electione Christus factus esse ostendatur. Sunt enim aliqui, O amici, ex genere nostro, profitentes ipsum Christum esse, sed hominem tamen ex hominibus genitum affirmantes: quibus non assentior, neque id sane multi, qui in eadem mecum sententia sunt, dixerint Iustin. Dial. cum Tryphon p. 267

The Christians therefore who beleived that Christ was before the world began, were much the greater number in the days of Iustin Martyr but did not yet looke upon the Christians of the other opinion as hereticks Or think the difference between the two opinions material to the truth of the Christian religion. And in this state things continued till the days of Victor. ffor Victor excommunicated one Theodotus a Tanner for affirming that Christ was a mere man born of the virgin Mary by the power of the holy Ghost, & elected for his justice & vertue. And henceforward those of this opinion were accounted hereticks & Theodotus was accounted the first author of the heresy. But those who beleived Christ to be but a mere man & ^{e[6]} particularly the followers of Artemon) represented that this was the doctrine of the Christians till the times of Victor & that from the times of his successor Zepherinus (in whose days Artemon was condemned in the east for the like opinion) the truth was adulterated.

Also the Church of Rome in the days of Pope Victor began to place religion in ceremonies & to err in the faith. ffor this Pope excommunicated the Churches of Asia for keeping Easter upon the 14th day of the first month of the Iewish year a thing in its own nature indifferent & wrote communicatory letters to the Churches of the Montanists in Asia & Phrygia, & then turned Patripassian & recalled those letters, as Tertullian a Montanist in his book against Praxeas written about the year 201 thus mentions. — — — — — crucifixit. The Predecessors of Victor who had opposed the Montanists were Soter & Eleutherus. ffor Soter wrote against them at their first rise, & Irenæus was sent to Rome by the church of Lyons to conferr with Eleutherus against

them. And therefore Victor was the first Bishop of Rome who turned Montanist. He seems to have closed with the Montanists of Asia & Phrygia in opposition to the true Church he excommunicated.

The changes therefore wrought in the Church of Rome by Pope Victor in respect of the faith were so very great that we may begin the third state or age of the church with the Papacy of {St} Victor or reign of the Emperor Severus.

<122v>

And this is to be understood as well of the Christians of the circumcision as of the Christians of the uncircumcision. ffor Iustin Martyr in his Dialogue with Tryphon written between the years 140 & 150, represents that Christian Iews might keep the law & circumcise their children but Christian Gentiles might not. His words are: Si ipsi [Iudæi] propter animi imbecilitatem, etiam quæcunque nunc possunt ex Mosæ constitutionibus, quæ ob duritiam cordis populi sancita esse intelligimus, unà cum concepta in hunc Christum spes atque perpetuis naturæ comparatis justitiæ et religionis veræ actionibus, servare, & cum Christianis fidelibusque vivere voluerint; ut modo illis non suadeant pariter cum eis circumcidi ac sabbata agere aliaque quæcunque tandem sunt ejusmodi, exequi: eos recipiendos & ad communionem verum omnium ut fratres, eorundemque viscerum homines, admittendos esse censuerim. Sin qui generis vestri sunt, in hunc Christum se credere asseverantes, O Trypho, omnibus modis secundum legem per Mosem latam eos vivere cogant qui ex gentibus in hunc Christum credunt; aut cum illis qui sic instituuntur communicare recusant: consimiliter et hos non susceperim. Eos vero (ex gentibus fideles) qui {illeg} observatione in Christum professionis, in legalem cum illis consentiant politiam, itidem non salvari putem. And this I account the state of the Church catholic in point of the faith & communion of the churches till the death of Iustin & the days of Pope Eleutherus & his successor Victor. For about that time some Christians began to make additions to their creed mixing strong meats with the milk which was to be given to babes. And particularly in opposition to the Gnosticks who denyed the resurrection of the body & maintained that the souls of men after various transmigrations returned into God, some Latines began to add the resurrection of the body & the life everlasting to the end of their Creed, & in opposition to the Ebionites some Greeks began to insert the creation of the world by Iesus Christ.

For in the first age of Christianity there were Christians (especially among the Iews) who beleived that Iesus took his beginning from the Virgin Mary, & for his vertue was chosen before other men & annointed king of the Iews by the Holy Ghost & thence called the Messiah or Christ that is the annointed, & there were other Christians (especially among the Gentiles) who beleived that Iesus was before the world began & that the world was created by him. And these two sorts of Christians conversed together as brethren & communicated with one another as members of the Catholick Ch. till

<122Ar>

☐ – holy men. The Talmudists in setting down the measures of Herods Temple, omitted some measures from north to south on either side of the altar, & the later Iewish writers dividing the summ of the omitted cubits into two equal parts have placed the altar nearer to the south side of the Priests court then to the north side: whereas they should have divided that summ unequally so that the altar might have stood in the center of the court. The altar was 32 cubits broad & between it & the little rail on the north side were 24 rings in the pavement for tying down the sacrifices to be slain. From the altar to the rings was a space of eight cubits. The rings took up 24 cubits & there were two cubits more to the little rail. And on the south side of the altar there was a sloping ascent to the altar without steps. This ascent took up 30 cubits upon the pavement & there remained a space of four cubits more to the little rail. And thus much concerning the Temple. It remains that we see &c

<122Av>

Solis vero diameter mediocris apparens 32' 15" & parallaxis horizontalis 10" usurpari potest. Lunæ diameter mediocris apparens in syzygij 31' 30", in Quadraturis 31'.3 & parallaxis horizontalis mediocris in syzygijs 57. 30 in quadraturis 55 40, in Octantibus 57. 5

<123r>

What the Ebionites meant by the first of these three opinions I do not well understand unless perhaps they meant that Christ was the Adam Kadmon or first Man of the Cabbalists, that is, their first Sephiroth or Æon called by them Cochmah the Crown or supreme Sephiroth & by the Gnosticks Αρχή the beginning or Principle. But be that as it will it is manifest that the Ebionites according to all the three opinions here ascribed to them taught that Christ was as old as the creation of the world, & according to the second & third opinion & perhaps the 1st also that he was above the Angels & the Archangels & reigned over them, & all things else from the beginning [& so by the Cabbalists must be taken for Adam Kadmon & by all th not inferior either in time or dominion to the Adam Kadmon of the Cabbalists, or to the Angel of Gods presence in the scriptures.] And tho they said that he was created yet those of the second sort meant surely not that he was created out of nothing but rather that he was the first begotten of every creature the beginning & those of the third that he was not generated in the usual signification of the word, that is, by emission of the fathers substance, as men are generated & as the heathens supposed their Gods to be generated. The main difference between the Ebionites was about the incarnation of this Christ some of them sa] & came down from heaven & was either incarnate of the virgin or descended upon Iesus. And whereas they said that he was created they meant in the sense of the words then in use.

<123v>

And if the Ebionites made Christ as old as the creation & took him to be the supreme being next under the father & Lord of the Universe much more did the Nazarenes. ffor the Nazarenes generally called Christ the son of God which those Ebionites who said that Iesus was the son of Ioseph, did not. Those Ebionites said only that Iesus was the son of God by election & by the descent of Christ upon him, but they allowed no generation of Christ as the Nazarenes did, nor did they say that Christ suffered on the cross & rose again from the dead. These things they attributed only to Iesus the son of Ioseph & Mary but therefore the Nazarenes who said that Christ (meaning what we call the divine nature) was the son of God & suffered & rose again & ascended, were of the opinion of those who beleived that Christ came down from heaven, took flesh of the Virgin by the power of God & was born of her & suffered & rose again from the dead & ascended where he was before, & by reason of his supernatural incarnation was called the son of God.

Vpon the Iewish war commencing, the Christian Iews fled from Ierusalem into other countries & chiefly into Peræa on the eastern side of Iordan. And there they acquired the name of Ebionites, being called Ebionites by them selves & their freinds & Nazarenes by their enemies the unbeleiving Iews. ffor they gloried in the name of Ebionites & said that they knew of no such man as Ebion, but from the times of the Apostles had distributed their goods to the poor & by that means being generally impoverished were called Ebionites from the word Ebion which in their language signifies a poor man. And divers among them being so zealous of the law as not only to observe it themselves but also to impose it on the converted Gentiles & these zelots also falling into the opinion that Christ descended upon Iesus the son of Ioseph & Mary, the name of Ebionites at length degenerated into the name of this heresy those only being called Ebionites who said that Iesus was the son of Ioseph & Mary & that Christ descended upon Iesus, that is the divine nature upon the humane. And from all this it is hence manifest that the Christians of the Church of Ierusalem whether Ebionites or others beleived from the beginning that Christ was from the time of the creation a being superior to the Angels & Archangels & at length came down from heaven & either was incarnate or descended upon Iesus. And this faith spread from Ierusalem into all the earth. By the descending of Christ upon Iesus they meant * < insertion from lower down f 123v > * in our language < text from higher up f 123v resumes > the descent of the divine nature upon the humane

Also what has been deteined for seigniorage & for the charge of the first melting according to the rules of the mint & whether all the rest have been delivered out of the Mint to the Paymasters: & if not, then who has had the profit made by the lightness & coarsness of the new money & how the Queen must have satisfaction. Also what evidence the Paymasters have (suppose by the books of the Mint & of the Melter or by Receipts or Certificates or living witnesses) that they have / I suspect that the Mint Master has paid out five two Ryal pieces for every ounce coined or an hundred for every twenty ounces & deteined 3 or 4 or perhaps 5 peices for seigniorage: If this be so, then Inquiry should be made Who has had the profit of the remainder. For every twenty ounces of Ingot produces about 110 two ryal pieces.

<123Av>

That this word was not an emanation or emission or λόγος ἐνδιάθετος ἢ προφορικὸς a thing emitted without a proper & distinct will & understanding but a person or Being with a proper will & understanding. [not the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος ἢ προφορικὸς but a person or Being with a proper will & understanding.]

but also to avoid the communion of the churches of the Gentiles who did not observe it, they were censured by those Churches for this separation & distinguished

And these Jews even from the days of the Apostles being for the most part so zealous of the law as not only to observe it themselves but also to avoid the communion of the Churches of the gentiles who did not observe it, they were for this separation censured & condemned by the Churches of the Gentiles & at length distinguished from the rest of the Nazarenes by the Name of Ebionites. ffor Ierome tells us that the Ebionites were anathematized by the fathers for nothing else but mingling the law with the Gospel.

<124r>

Chap XVI

Of the contest between the host of heaven and the transgressors of the holy covenant.

We have hitherto described the state of the Host of heaven or Church of God down from the days of the Apostles to the times in which the invocation of Saints called by Daniel the transgression of desolation began to be introduced. It remains that we shew how the authors of this invocation separated from the Church of God, & set up an antichurch of transgressors. For the transgressors who trode the Host of heaven & the sanctuary under foot must of necessity be a distinct body of men from the host which they trampled upon. And the authors of the invocation of Saints separated from the Church of God & oppressed her at the same time that they set up that transgression

In the reign of the Emperor Iulian the apostate A.C. 362, Athanasius & about fourteen or sixteen other excommunicated bishops, most of them of Egypt, returning from banishment,

{illeg}

Due to M ^r Spelman	at Midsummer	1707	1.	{0.}	{6.}
		1708	81.		
		1709	161.		
	at Christmas	1709	201.		
Paid M ^r Molins	30.13.4 & 22.15.0	53.	8.	4	
Paid M ^r Walker		32.	0.	0	
Taxes 12 ^{li} & 12 ^{li} & 6		30.	0.	0	
Lent 32 ^{li}		<u>32.</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
		147.	8.	4	
		21.	13.	4.	
Due at Lady day	1708	0.	0.	0	Due to M ^r Spelman at Lady day 1708.
	1709	80.	0.	0	Paid to M ^r Walker
Christmas	1709	<u>60.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>0</u>	Spelman
					21. 53. 4

	140.	0.	0		32.	00.	0
Paid M ^r Molins	22	15.	0.	M ^r Molins	22	15.	0
M ^r Walker	16				16.	2.	6
M ^r Spelman	32.	0.	0	Taxes	20.	10.	0
Taxes	6.	0.	0		<u>21.</u>	<u>00</u>	<u>0</u>
					<u>150.</u>	<u>0.</u>	<u>10</u>
					<u>145.</u>	<u>6.</u>	<u>8</u>
					4.	13.	2

Lady day 1708 advanced	32		
Lent Ian 22 170 $\frac{8}{9}$	32		
Paid M ^r Molins	22.	15	
Taxes a year & 3 quarters	21		
Paid Octob 16 1709 15 Guineas	16.	2.	6
Paid Ian 171 $\frac{0}{1}$	<u>20.</u>	<u>10.</u>	<u>0</u>
Rent due 140 ^{li}	144.	7.	6
	140.	0.	0

{illeg}p tot:: AB-EF. AB. Et p tot. resist:: AB+EF. AB-EF
p columnæ resist:: AB+EF. AB. Velocitas cadendo ab I ad H acquisita.
 \sqrt{IH} . \sqrt{IG} :: $\odot EF$. $\odot AB$:: IJ. IO:: IO. IG.

<125v>

understand that the party of Athanasius was very small & the **{illeg}** some part of the reign of Valens & that those who **{illeg}** ans were more numerous & those whom they called Arians and **{illeg}** at that time the **{flourishing}** religion of the eastern Empire; & that the **{illeg}** (except the church of Millain) in the first three or four **{years of}** Valentinian & Valens returned to the homousian faith & embraced the com**{munio}**n of both the Athanasians & Macedonians without meddling with the **{illeg}** dispute between them concerning the deity of the holy Ghost; but with **{illeg}** at **{length he}** declared for the Athanasians & threatned to turn the Macedonians out of their bishopricks if they did not come over to the faith of three persons & one God, And at the same time one or more Councils in Spain declared for the same faith. And from this time forward, that is during the last six or seven years of the reign of Valens there was a very sharp contention.

He was accused by the Meletians of killing Arsenius, one of their bishops & of seuerall other crimes & condemned for them — — — — — this Council wrote also to the Churches in defense of Athanasius & in their Letter represent that Arsenius was alive & desired to be joyned in communion with them, & did not expect other testimony to prove that he was alive but he himself confessed that he was alive by his letters which he wrote to our bishop Athanasius whom they affirmed to be his murderer. Nor were those wicked men ashamed to charge him with killing a man who was at so great a distance from us by land & sea, & whose place of abode at that time was known to no man. Yea they dared to hide him & make him disappear when he had suffered nothing And if it could have been, they would have translated him into another world, or rather have killed him that they might have killed Athanasius by objecting either a true or feigned murder. But herein thanks be to the divine providence which suffered nothing unjust to prevail, but produced Arsenius alive [vizt by his letters] before the eyes of all men & manifestly reprov'd their conspiracy & calumny. For he does not

avoid us as his murderers nor hates us as injurious to him. for he hath suffered no harm at all, but desires to join in communion with us, & wishes to be amongst us, as he hath written in his Letter. This was all that Athanasius & 90 bishops of Egypt & Libya had at that time to say for themselves. They knew nothing of the hand of Arsenius in a bag or of his appearing alive before the Council of Tyre otherwise then by his Letter. On the contrary they say that Arsenius expected no other testimonies of his being alive besides the Letter which he had sent to Athanasius & by which he exprest his desire to be amongst them. This letter it seems was produced at the Council of Tyre to prove that Arsenius was alive & the Bishops of Egypt in this Council of Alexandria insisted upon it as a sufficient proof of his being alive & of his † < insertion from lower down f 125v > † desire to be amongst them: which is a demonstration that he was not yet amongst them & that they had no better evidence of his being alive & desiring to be amongst them then this Letter. The letter is extant in the apology of Athanasius against the Arians & has an air of fiction. And if Arsenius had appeared alive before the Council of Tyre it is not to be imagined that the Council would have persisted in condemning them for the murder or that Athanasius would have fled from the Council or been banished by the Emperor Constantine. When Athanasius was first accused of killing Arsenius he made the Emperor beleive that Arsenius was alive. But Arsenius not appearing the Emperor commanded that the cause should be heard before the Council of Athanasius came not & the Emperor the next year commanded that the cause should be heard before the Council of Tyre & threatned Athanasius that if he would not goe thither he should be carried by force. Athanasius then went with a great multitude of Egyptians. The Council heard the cause between him & his accusers & for their further satisfaction sent six of their number into Egypt to inform themselves upon the spot. Vpon the report of the six bishops Athanasius fled to the Emperor. The Council sent some of their number to acquaint the Emperor with their proceedings, & upon hearing the whole matter the Emperor banished Athanasius into Gallia & after five years more Athanasius & the 90 bishops of Egypt Libya made the defence above mentioned. But no one witness is named in history who had ever seen Arsenius alive after Athanasius was accused of killing him. < text from higher up f 125v resumes > : which

When the Easter next after these Councils of Antioch & Alexandria approched, the eastern Emperor Constantius sent Gregory to Alexandria — — — — — Greek Church over her own members

Some bishops were also banished in Egypt for adhering to Athanasius & making disturbances, & on these accounts the Emperor has been railed at as a great persecutor tho he was of a very mild & pious temper

<126r>

about 10 years after the Council of Sirmium] By his making the {body} of Christ to be moved & actual{ed} by the Word without a humane soul you may know what was the opinion of the Patripassians Sabellius Noetus Praxeas Hermogenes & the rest touching the incarnation

The Council of Antioch which condemned Paul represented that he fell into the heresy of Artemas [And Artemas (called also Artemon) was condemned as a heretick about 50 or 60 or perhaps 70 years before. And if Theodotus the Tanner whom Pope Victor condemned was the same man with Theodotus the Cataphrygian he might not differ much in opinion from Æschines Artemas & Paul] & Artemas flourished in the reigh of Severus or soon after. And

Eustathius the disciple of Mon bishop of Antioch was deposed for Sabellianism A.C. 328 & banished by the Emperor Constantine the great. He was

The Jews of the circumcision called Ebionites & some of the Nazarenes held that Christ was a mere man & therefore received not the writings of Iohn in which he is called the λόγος. Of the same opinion were also some Christians of the uncircumcision called Alogi by Epiphanius. The Ebionites were such as the Apostle Paul reprehends for imposing the law upon the Gentiles. For they arose from the Christians of the circumcision who fled to Pella upon the sige of Ierusalem & they were a branch of the Church of Ierusalem under James & communicated with the Churches of the circumcision () but were schismatics for refusing to communicate with Christians of the uncircumcision. The Nazarenes & Alogi continued in communion with the Churches of the uncircumcision till about the end of the second century. For Iustin Martyr in his dialogue against Tryphon speaks to him in this manner,^[7] Verum enim vero, Trypho, dixi, non perierit illud Christum hunc esse Dei si demonstrare nequeam et fuisse prius filium conditoris universitatis esseque Deum et genitum esse hominem ex virgine: sed ex omni demonstrat sequatum tantum quod hic sit

Christus Dei quicumque tandem fuerit. At si non demonstravero inquam, eum et prius extitisse et nasci hominem sustinuisse — — — — — qui in eadem mecum sententia sunt dixerint. The Alogi therefore were not yet accounted hereticks. Epiphanius tells us that this heresy arose after that of the Cataphrygians, that is, they began then to be accounted hereticks. But I do not find that they were when Theodotus the currier of Byzantium was condemned by Pope Victor for holding Christ to be a mere man & soon after I think in the days of Zepherin the successor of Victor Artemon the master of Theodotus was condemned by the Greeks for the same error, their disciples alledged that their opinion was taught by the Apostles & first Christians & the truth of the doctrine preached was conserved to the days of pope Victor, but from the days of his successor Zepherin was adulterated. Yet I do not find that Artemon & Theodotus were of the same opinion with the Ebionites & Alogi. The last rejected the λόγος & the writings of Iohn, the former (so far as I can find) owned both. ffor Epiphanius argues against Theodotus out of the writings of Iohn concerning the λόγος. If this Theodotus was the same with Theodotus the Cataphrygian, & Artemon was Artemas the master of Paul of Samosat, they might be of the same opinion with Paul Marcellus & Photinus. For Theodotus & Artemas or Artemon & Paul & Marcellus & Photinus are all of them equally accused of making Christ a mere man. By which opinion I conceive they meant that Iesus was a mere man inhabited by the λόγος as a Prophet is by the holy Ghost.

For the hereticks thinking it below the dignity of the principal Gods — — —

And about this time the bishops began to meet in councils in Asia & Afric

{illeg} of God the God of our Lord Iesus Christ, the God **{illeg}**

⊙ **{illeg}** church or distinguished from other Christians by any proper name till Epiphanius because of their not receiving the writings of Iohn concerning the λογος gave them the name Alogi. For it was late before all the writings of the new Testament were generally received. Neare the end of the second century when this heresy is said to have risen Theodotus the Currier of Byzantium —

<126v>

Some of the Gnosticks [as Marcion & Valentine] **{illeg}** Gods **{illeg}** Bythos & Sige or Depth & Silence feigning the **{illeg}** & produced the λόγος or word by speaking & this act they call the generation of the Son. An**{illeg}** in general that in explaining the generation of the Son they co{mpare} him to a word spoken by a man [Iren. l. 2. c. 45.] But yet they make him not a vanishing voice but a permanent emission.

Of the host of heaven

Marcellus bishop of Ancyra the metropolis of Galatia was deposed by the Council of Constantinople A.C. 336 & again by the Council of Antioch A.C. 341 for holding the opinions of Sabellius. & his opinions recited out of his own book by Eusebius Pamphili who wrote thre books against him, were as follows: That the Word of God was eternally in God the father as a mans reason or wisdom is in a man without a proper substance. That before the beginning there was rest & quietness in God (called silence by some of the Gnosticks) the Word being with him inwardly & nothing existing then but God. That when all things were to be made he came out of the father with an operating power, & became Verbum prolativum & that all things were made by this word & that this Word is called an angel by Moses, & that his coming out of the father with an operating power to create the world is not called his nativity nor constitutes him the son of God but only the word of God. That this word assumed flesh & was united to it & was born with humane flesh of the Virgin, & by this nativity became the son of God & the son of man, being only the Word of God before & that before this nativity he was not the son of God nor the image of God but by means of his {visible} body became the image of the invisible God. And that the word was in the body only by an operative vertue to move it & do those things which are related in the gospels being joined in substance to God as his word inseparable & undistinguishable from him. And that he must reign till he hath put all things under his feet & then become subject to the father & be in the father as before his incarnation, relinquishing the flesh or body which he had assumed. And for these opinions he was deposed by the council convened at Constantinople out of Pontus, Cappadocia, Asia, Phrygia, Bithynia, Thrace & other remoter regions.]

His opinions are recited out of his own book by Eusebius & were these. That there is but one single substance of God & his Word & that before the beginning God was alone & there was nothing but God. & the word was

in him & with him inwardly from all eternity as a mans reason & understanding is in a man without a proper substance & there was rest & quietness (the Silence of the Gnosticks) & when all things were to be made the word came out of God with an operating power & became Verbum prolativum, & by him all things were made & he is called an Angel by Moses but had no proper substance. That this Word assumed flesh, was united to it & born with it of the Virgin & by this birth became the Son of God & the son of Man, & the image of the invisible God, being neither the son of God nor the image of God but only the Word before this nativity. That the Word was in the body only by an operative vertue to move it & do those things which are related in the Gospels, being joined in substance to God as his Word inseparable & undistinguishable from him. And that he must reign in the body till he hath put all things under his feet & then become subject to the father & be in the father as before his incarnation, relinquishing the body which he had assumed. And for these opinions he was deposed in the reign of Constantine the great by the Council convened at Constantinople out of Pontus, Cappadocia, Asia, Phrygia Bithynia, Thrace & other remoter regions. And his disciple Eustathius bishop of Antioch was condemned of Sabellianism about seven or eight years before by the Council of Antioch & banished by Constantine the great. And Photinus another of his disciples was condemned of the same

<127r>

The Cabbalists distinguished their ten sephiroths into two classes which they called Arich Anpin & Seir Anpin the man with a great face & the man with a little face, & by Seir Anpin understood the seven lower Sephiroths, & by their names called the seven metalls & therefore took them for the Gods of the metalls & by consequence for intelligences seated in the orbs of the seven Planets, Whence Arich Anpin must be seated in the heaven above the orbs of the Planets. In this heaven above the firmament of the fixed stars Hipparchus & Ptolomy have placed a primum mobile & above that Theologers have placed an infinite & immoveable cœlum empyreum the seat of the blessed & to these three orbs answer the three first sephiroths Kether Cochmah & Binah contained in Arich Anpin. The first of them is supposed infinite & called Kether the crown to denote that it encompasses all the rest. Let this systeme be compared with the Ogdoas of the Gnosticks. For some of the Gnosticks have placed more then one Æon in the heaven above the Orbs of the seven Planets

The Cabbalists placed the root & fountain of the Sephiroths above & said that the first sephiroth Kether was a sphære which comprehended the other nine sephirahs & was there called the highest crown the

– retracted himself from a great spherical space in which he designed to create the worlds, & emitted gradually into this space ten subordinate emanations which they called – – – first Being. Next under God they placed a sphere which they called his garment & next under that a sphere of splendor or light [the cœlum empyreum or seat of the blessed], & under [that a space of the first aer which they called Tohu. And] that a large empty sphere & under that the sphere of the & under that the sphere of the first sephiroth called Cochmah the highest Crown because it encompassed the other nine. And the last world called Asia & mundus fabricationis some of them said was the corporeal world of the spheres or cælestial orbs & all corporeal things therein to the very center of the earth & some of the oldest of the Cabalistical writers now extant said that the Sun Moon & Planets were moved by intelligences. Whence I gather that they received the Aristotelick systeme of the heavens, & that their Sephiroths were originally the supreme intelligences which Aristotel placed in the spheres to move them, & the world Briah was the system of Intelligences under them & the world Iezirah the system of Angels under them. ffor they distinguishehd the sephiroths into two classes which they called Arich Anpin & Seir Anpin, the man with a great face & the man with a little face & in Seir Anpin comprehended the seven lower sephiroths & called the seven metals by the names of these seven Sephiroths. Whence I gather that these seven Sephirots were originally the Gods to which the heathens dedicated the seven metals & the seven Planets & which Aristotel called intelligences & seated in the Orbs of the seven Planets to move them. And hence came the philosophy of the Gnosticks who placed an Ogdoas of Æons in the orbs of the seven Planets & the heaven above them or the starry firmament. By Arich Anpin they understood the first Sephiroth called Kether the crown because the starry firmament was the highest Orb & encompassed the system of the Planets. Aristotle made only these eight heavens supposing the starry firmament to be the first mover but later Astronomers have distinguished this heaven into more orbs then one placing the first mover above the starry firmament & the cœlum crystallinum between them & accordingly some refer the second & third Sephiroths to Arich Anpin. And as the

And if the theology of the cabbalists be compared with that of the Gnosticks it will appear that the Cabbalists were Iewish Gnosticks & the Gnosticks were Christian Cabbalists. For as the Gnosticks placed their Æons in the Orbs of the stars & Planets so did the Cabbalists their Sephiroths, following therein the doctrine of Aristotel who placed Intelligences in the Planetary Orbs to move them. Aristotel was the master of Alexander the Great & his philosophy was in request in the reign of Alexanders successors especially in Egypt & his systeme of the heavens ^{a[8]} was received by the oldest of the Cabbalists. For they said that the world Asia (called also world of the fabric) was the corporeal world of the spheres or celestial Orbs & of all [corporeal] things therein to the very center of the earth, & that the sun Moon & stars were moved by intelligences; & allotted to every sephira his orb, placing ^{b[9]} the first Sephira in the highest Orb under a sphere of splendor & calling it Kether the crown the highest crown & the crown of the Aziluthis world because it was the highest & encompassed all the rest & the next sephiroth in the second Orb & so on, & distinguishing the Sephiras into three superior & seven inferior

<127v>

^[10] new, they referred the orbs of the seven Planets to the inferior & the heavens above the Planets to the superior., viz^t the 8th sphere or firmament of the fixt stars & 12 signes to Binah, the ninth or sphere of the diurnal motion to Cochmah & the tenth or world of Intelligence which gives power & vertue to all the stars & circles to Kether. The orb of Saturn they referred to Gedula that of {♀} to Gebura. The three superior Sephiras they called Arich Anpin the man with a great face & the seven inferior Seir Anpin the man with a little face & the Chymical Cabbalists gave the names of these seven inferior Sephirahs to the seven metals. Above the Planetary Orbs Aristotel made but one heaven, the starry firmament.) & thence it comes to pass that the Cabbalists frequently take Arich Anpin only for the first Sephiroth Kether & in this sence Arich Anpin & Seir Anpin compose the Ogdoas of Æons. But as later Astronomers have distinguished the eight heaven into more orbs then One so the Cabbalists have referred those Orbs to more Sephirahs then one, & so also the later Gnosticks have increased the number of their Æons in the heavens above the planetary Orbs. And from all this & the opinions common to the Gnosticks & Cabbalists that the world was made by the Angels & that the souls of men came from above passed through various bodies till they had performed all things requisite & then returned up, it is manifest that the Apostle in condemning Iewish fables endless genealogies & oppositions of science falsly so called had relation to the fabulous learning of the Cabbalists then entering into the Christian religion [And this is the great mystery of iniquity which then began to work & was to work untill the man of sin should be revealed whose coming was to be after the working of Satan with all [magical] power & signes & lying wonders in them that perish because they received not the love of the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousnes, For the time was coming when they (the generality of Christians) should not endure sound doctrine [the doctrine of the unlearned Apostles], but after their own lusts should heap to themselves [learned] teachers, having itching ears [after science falsly so called] & should turn away their ears from the truth & be turned unto [Iewish] fables] This fablous learning the primitive Gnosticks of the circumcision principally followed & their disciples added to it out of the Poets & Philosophers of the Greeks.

a Cabb denudatæ Pars 2 p. 181, 182, 203, 204 b

And thus there are only eight sephiroths or splendors of the celestial Orbs, namely the splendor of the starry firmament & the splendors of the seven Planets, & Arich Anpin & Seir Anpin compose the primitive Ogdoas of Æons. — — — sephiras then one inserting Cochmah & Binah & calling Cochmah the father & Binah the mother of the seven inferior Sephiras.

<128r>

As the Sephiroths of the Iewish Cabbalists were nothing else then the powers & affections of God the father, considered as so many divine persons (namely his Crown or first & supreme emanation conteining all the other Sephiroths in it self his Wisdom, his prudence, his Magnificence, his Power, his Beuty his Eternity, his Glory, his supporting all things & his reign) : so the Æons of the Gnosticks were of the same kind. Simon said that Ennoia was the first conception (or Idea) of his mind. The unknown father whom the Cabbalists called Æn Soph the Infinite As or immense Magnitude & from him & his wife Ennoëa Valentinus {illeg} derived Bythos & Megethi {profundity} Nous & Alatheia the Mind & Truth & from these two Logos & Zoe the Word & life. He had this doctrine from his master Basilides: ffor Basilides said that the God emitted Nous

& Nous emitted Logos, & Logos emitted Φρόνησις Prudence. They both lived at Alexandria & might have this doctrine from the Cabbalistical Jews of Egypt. ☉ Ptolomæus a disciple of Valentinus assigned to the unknown father two wives Ennoëa & Theleus Understanding & Will & called them the affections of the unknown father, & said that the understanding was the older wife because the understanding precedes the will. Ennoëa & Nous with Truth are here nothing else then various modes or powers of the inherent mind of God called by the Greeks λογος ενδιάθετος & Logos with life is his λογος προφορικὸς. ffor so the Valentinians themselves explained this their philosophy & the words are cited by Epiphanius out of one of their books. In the beginning, say they, the {word} of himself in the father contained all things within himself. Then the Ennoëa which was in him (whom some call Ennoëa & others properly Charis because she effuses the treasures of Magnitude [Æn Soph] upon those who are from Magnitude, but others more truly call her silence because by cogitation without the use of speech Magnitud{e} performs all things,) she, I say, the uncorrupt Æonia being willing to extricate her self from her bonds enticed Magnitude to her embraces & brought forth the ffather of Truth, whom those that are perfect call the Man [viz Adam Kadmon] because he bears the likeness of the unbegotten. Afterwards Sige & the Man being conjoyned by thir will brought forth Truth in the likeness of Sige. This Man they also call Nous. But whereas the Gnosticks made Nous the son of Ennoëa Irenæus tells them that they should rather have made Ennoëa the daughter of Nous because Nous the Mind is the fountain of thinking & Ennoia thinking is the motion. The first motion of Nous the Mind is Ennoia & if it persevere & encreas it is called Euthymosis, & after much perseverance & becoming perfect it is called perception, & at length it becomes Council & Council by persevering with motion is deliberation & deliberation at length becomes λόγος ενδιάθετος reason & from reason is emitted λογος προφορικὸς a word or speech. And all these things are but one thing in several degrees, & have place only in the Mind of man. They err therefore saith Irenæus in ascribing to God the affections & passions of man & making him a compound. ffor God is not as man nor are his thoughts like ours. He is simple & not compound. He is all like & equal to himself all sense all spirit all perception all Ennoëa all λόγος all ear, all eye all light. He is all sense which cannot be separated from it self, nor is there any thing in him which can be emitted from any thing else. Thus does Irenæus represent & confute the Metaphysicks of the Gnosticks. And whereas after the Apostle Iohn had said In the beginning was <128v> Word & the Word was with God, the Gnosticks called the beginning Nous & the ffather Proarche, & took the Word for the λογος ενδιαθετος ἢ προφορικὸς & feigned that silence preceded the Word & thence called Ennoëa by the name of Sige: Irenæus tells the Gnosticks that Logos & Sige could not be in Bythos at one & the same time no more then light & darkness. And if they say that this λόγος was ενδιάθετος (for it seems this was the language of these Gnosticks) then Σιγὴ will be also ενδιάθετος: which two saith he are inconsistent, & therefore Σιγὴ is not ενδιάθετος. Iren l. 2. c. 14, 15, 16, 47, 48, 49.

& that Angelical powers of several sorts inhabit the several celestial orbs. & said that Ennoia was beautiful & incited the powers to lust.

✦ The two last of them whom Valentinus calls Ἄνθρωπος & Εκκλησία seem to be the Seir Anpin of the Cabbalists & his wife Malcuth. ffor by Seir Anpin a man with a little face, the Cabbalists understood the systeme of the seven last sephiroths & by Malcuth his kingdom or church. And as the Cabbalists from their Sephiroths derived a great number of other intelligences Archangels & Angels & three worlds so Basilides from his Æons derived the first Principalities powers & Angels & from these the supreme heaven or celestial world with other Angels & from those a second heaven or world of other Angels, & from those a third heaven or world & from those others to the number of days in the year. And his scholar Valentinus multiplied the Æons to the number of years in the age of Christ before he was baptized & began to act & from these Æons derived Powers & Angels & the world. Well therefore might the Apostle caution the churches against the Jewish fables & endless genealogies of the first hereticks & their oppositions of science falsly so called.

And whereas Iohn wrote in his Gospel In the beginning was the Word & the word was with God — In him was life — And the Word was made flesh & dwelt among us – full of grace & truth: they interpreted these words of their Æons saying that the Beginning ἄρχη was Gods first male emission or Æon & the Word which was in the beginning was the next & Grace & Truth & Life were their wives Charis Alethea & Zoe.

And that these Gnosticks —

They agreed with Simon in placing several Powers or Intelligences in several orbs & the supreme power with his wife Prunicus in the supreme orb & making her beautiful & lustful, & the incarnation & passion of Iesus to be only in appearance: & therefore are justly reputed Simonians

They said with Saturninus,

<129ar>

For Basilides said that the father of all things emitted Nous & Nous emitted Logos & Logos emitted Phronesis, . And these were the four first Deities in the Iewish Cabbala. The father of all things was called Bythos & Magnitude by the Gnosticks to denote his immensity & so answers to the first God in the Iewish Cabbala called *Æn Soph* the Infinite. The first *Æon* Nous was called *Αρχή* & the Man & the Father or supreme Sephiroth & cause of causes & Adam Kadmon the first man & the father of Cochma & Arech Anpin a man with a large face. And as the Gnosticks made Nous like & equal to the father & said that he contained all the other *Æons* virtually in himself: so the Cabbalists said that Adam Kadmon comprehended all the other Sephiroths. The second *Æon* called *λόγος* reason understanding & wisdom answers to the second Sephiroth called Cochmah wisdom, & the third *Æon* called by Basilides *Φρόνησις* Prudence answers also to the third Sephiroth called Binah Prudence. But *Φρόνησις* being a female Valentinus changed her to a Man & these four Gods with their wives made the first Ogdoas of Valentinus & the following leaders of the Gnosticks Secundus Marcus Heracleon & some others After Basilides had been instructed by his master Menander he & his scholar Valentinus lived in Egypt & had there an opportunity of learning the cabbala of the Egyptian Iews,

And that these Gnosticks by their *Æons* understood the powers & affections operations & Ideas of the supreme God is further manifest by what Epiphanius cites out of their writings in these words In the beginning, say they, he who ————— likeness of Sige. Ptolomæus another of these Gnosticks assigned to the supreme father two wives ————— precedes the will; & that Ennoëa thought of an emission but could not emit it till the power of the will came to her assistance & then she emitted Nous & Alatheia. And whereas the Gnosticks made Nous the son of Aletheia Irenæus tells them — — — came originally from the Gnosticks Basilides & Valentinus & their disciples Secundus Ptolomæus Marcus Heracleon & perhaps also from Saturninus the fellow disciple of Basilides & Menander the common master of Saturninus & Basilides, & disciple of Simon. For Irenæus — — — — — to a word spoken by a man. And Eusebius tells us that Marcellus — — — —

< insertion from f 129v >

⊙ For the Cabbalists called the first God *Æn Soph* the infinite or immense, & said that his first Sephiroth or emanation which they called the Crown *η Αρχη* & Adam Cadmon the first Man retained all the other nine Sephiroths eminently in {it self &} the Gnosticks called the first God Bythos & Megathos the Profundity & the Magnitude, meaning magnitude without bounds. And his first emission Nous they called the Man & the Son & the only begotten & Adam Cadmon] & *ή Αρχη* the Principle [Cether, the Crown] & *Αρχη* the Principle & said that he was the Principle which contained all the other *Æons* in himself. And whereas Iohn had said in the beginning of his Gospel *Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος* In the beginning was the Word, they said that *ή ἀρχή* the beginning was Nous & in this Nous was the *λόγος* & thence concluded that Nous & Logos were the two first *Æons* [Iren. l 1. c. 1. sect 18.] The *λόγος* answers to the second sephiroth called Cochma reason or wisdom & *φρόνησις* Prudence the third *Æon* of Basilides is the third sephiroth of the Cabbalists And the Ennoëa of Simon & Menander they retained & made her the wife of Bythos & called her Sige silence because silence preceded Logos called Binah Prudence, & Charis favour because by her favour the treasures of Bythos were effused into the *Æons*. For that this was their philosophy is described by Irenæus in the beginning of his first book & by the Valentinians themselves in one of their letters cited by Epiphanius in these words. In the beginning, say they, he who of himself is the father — — — — — likeness of Sige. This Man they also called the father & Nous & said that Bythos was unknown to all the *Æons* except Nous & these four Bythos & Sige Nous & Aletheia they called the Tetractys of Pythagoras & said that Nous & Aletheia emitted Logos & Zoe. & Ptolomæus assigned to the unknown father two wives Ennoëa & Thelesia Understanding & will, & called them the affections of the unknown father & said that the Understanding was the older wife because the understanding precedes the Will. And that Ennoëa thought of an emission but could not emit it till the power of the will came to her assistance & then emitted Nous & Aletheia. And by all this it is manifest that the *Æons* of these Gnosticks were nothing else then the powers affections & Notions or Ideas of the

supreme God distinguished from one another & represented by divine persons. And whereas the Gnosticks made Nous the son of Ennœa Irenæus tells them — — — — — is not ἑνδιάθετος. [Iren. l. 2. c. 14, 15, 16, 47, 48, 49.] // The doctrine therefore that the λόγος or Word of God was the λογος ἑνδιάθετος of the father & was emitted or exerted & thereby generated into a son before the world began came originally from the Gnosticks Basilides Valentinus, ^e Secundus? Ptolomæus, f^[11] Marcus g^[12] Heracleon, & perhaps also from Saturninus the fellow disciple of Basilides. ffor Irenæus tells us that Valentinus had his opinions ^a[13] from his masters & blames Saturninus Basilides Valentinus & Marcion & the Gnosticks in general [Iren l. 2. c. 18, 48, 49] for pretending to know the generation of the Word & explaining it by comparing to a Word spoken by a Man. And this opinion seems to have been as old as the days of Simon magus. For ^h[14] Eusebius tells us that Marcellus in making Quiet to precede the Logos imitated that impious ringleader of the hereticks who said atheistically: ἦν Θεὸς καὶ Σιγή There was God & Silence. And Gregory Nazianzen alluding to this doctrine of Simon & his followers saith that the Simons & the Marcions & the Valentines & the Basilides's & Cerdons & Cerinthus & Carpocrates & all their trifles & juggling tricks were delivered τῷ ἑατῶν βυθῷ καὶ τῇ σιγῇ to their own abyss & silence. . Whence it seems that after the writing of the Apocalyps & Epistle to the Hebrews in which Christ is called ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, the Gnosticks began to compare him to the λόγος of a man, which is first silently conceived in the mind & then emitted with a voice after silence to make him the son of God & Silence. & after the writing of the Gospel, to make him the son of Ἀρχὴ & Ἀρχὴ the son of God & Silence. ffor I think it will easily be granted that Ennoia had the name of silence not from her son Ἀρχὴ but from her son λόγος. And therefore the opinion that λόγος was the son of Sige was older then the Heresy of Basilides & must be attributed to the disciples of Simon of which Menander was {the} chief.

{illeg} of the same kind was that of the Nicolaitans The Ennoia of Simon they called Prunicus & Barbelo. {illeg} placing her in the eighth heaven & <129br> that Ialdabaoth (or as others called him, Sabaoth) was her son & placed him in the seventh heaven, & other inferior Æons they placed in the inferior heavens calling one of them {Iautacouth} & said that ({illeg}) that Barbelo was beautifull & enticed the other powers to her embraces: And upon such fables founded their lasciviousness. [And the Phibionites a sect of these Nicolaitan Gnosticks, placed 365 Princes in so many cœlestial orbs giving names to each of them.] In the first Orb they placed Iao, in the second {Saclan} the God of lust, in the third Seth, in the fourth Daden, in the fifth Abonæus, in the sixth Philæus in the seventh Ialdabaoth or Sabaoth the maker of heaven & earth, , the God of the Jews, in the eighth & highest orb they placed Barbelo & the God of the universe & another Christ was begotten of himself & Christ who descended & revealed this knowledge to mankind, who was also called Jesus & was manifested by Mary but not born of her nor took flesh otherwise then in appearance. And these eight Orbs with their intelligences seems to have given occasion to the Ogdoas of the Gnosticks. ffor Valentinus suited his Ogdoas to seven Orbs placing the unknown father above them. And further the Phibionites a sect of the Nicolaitans, multiplied the Orbs to the number of days in the year & in these 365 orbs placed so many Princes or Æons giving to each of them his proper name. Which placing the Æons in the celestial Orbs & increasing the number of Orbs from eight to 365 & giving a phantastic body to Jesus makes it evident that the Nicolaitans were Gnosticks of the same kind with the followers of Basilides & Valentinus but being of Iudea gave hebrew names to their Æons, & countenanced their unclean actions by the copulation & generation of their Æons. And no doubt the Nicolaitans were the older hereticks, their doctrine & deeds & denial that Jesus Christ was come in the flesh being condemned by Iohn, & their Iewish fables endless genealogies profane & vain babblings & profession of science falsly so called being censured by the Apostle Paul as amounting to a denial of the faith.

< text from f 129ar resumes >
<130r>

Chap Of the faith unity & universality of the Primitive Church

Chap Of the breaking of the primitive Church into parties & the rise of Popery

The Christian religion continued in its purity till the death of the Apostolic men who had seen Christ the last of which was Iohn the Apostle who died A.C. 99 & Simon bishop of Ierusalem who was crucified A.C. 107. After their deaths heresies increased continually; but yet the Church kept her grownd against them during her

afflictions, under the persecutions of the heathen Roman Empire , as the Apostle Paul had predicted saying that there should come a falling away & the Man of Sin should be revealed & that the mystery of iniquity worked even in his days, for only that which letted should lett untill it should be taken out of the way, that is the heathen Roman Empire which letted the rise of antichristian Roman communion, & then that wicked one should be revealed & sit as the **{illeg}** Church of God & continue till the coming of our Lord.

In opposition to those heresies the Christians of the third century added some new articles to their Creed , & while the articles were in the scripture language & for that reason created no disputes among the Churches about them, they did no hurt to the unity of the Church catholick. But after the practise of adding new Articles became of some standing & was reputed authentic & the Bishops began to add such articles as were not in the scripture language they soon rent the Church Catholick into parties. ffor when the Council of Nice inserted into their Creed that the Son was ὁμοούσιος to the ffather & allowed that the word ὁμοούσιος when applied to things spiritual signified nothing more | did not import any emanation emission projection or division of substance, nor any thing more then ὁμοιούσιος or ὅμοιος κατ' ὄυσιν of like substance or like according to substance: Hosius or whoever translated that Creed into Latin instead of translating the word ὁμοούσιος by the word consubstial & interpreting consubstantial by similis substantiæ, translated it unius substantiæ. And this different interpretation of the word created great criticisms upon the word & **{vain}** disputing in **{illeg}** among the Greeks in the reign of Constantine the great & the beginning of the reign of Constantius, while the western Churches remained quiet.

For some among the Greeks took the Son to be an emanation or emission from the ffather as light is from the sun or a river from the fountain & on that account said that he was ὁμοούσιος to the father (of which sort were the Gnosticks Cataphrygians or Montanists) others took him to be an attribute of the fathers substance namely the fathers wisdom reason & word spoken without which the ffather would be ἄσοφος & ἄλογος (of which sort were the Montanists & Sabellians:) And all these embracing the latin translation of the Nicene Creed affirmed that the ffather & Son were μίας ὑσίας & μίας <130v> υποστάσεως of one essence or substance & one hypostasis, & represented the denyal of this to be a denyal of the Nicene faith & the maintaining of three hypostases to be the introducing of a plurality of Gods. And those who with the Council of Nice held the son to be of like substance with the father looked upon those who held him to be of one hypostasis with the father to speak impiously as if they asserted the son to be without proper subsistence & were of the same opinions with Montanus & Sabellius. For Montanus made the Son a part of the fathers substance & by consequence without any other substance then that of the father. And hence arose great disputing in private among the Greeks in the reign of Constantine the great & in the beginning of that of Constantius & great criticising upon the word ὁμοούσιος. And those who took ὁμοούσιος for one substance were thought by those of the other opinion to speak impiously as if they asserted the Son to be without proper subsistence & were of the same opinions with Montanus & Sabellius During these disputes, Eustathius bishop of Antioch was accused by Eusebius Pamphili & deposed as a Sabellian. And those who took them for like substances were looked upon by the other party as Gentiles introducing a plurality of Gods (Socr. l. 1. c. 23 & Sozom l. 2. c. 18.) And when Eusebius of Nicomedia who opposed the language of one substance was accused as if he opposed the ὁμοούσιος & taxed for it by the Emperor Constantine the great he shewed the Emperor his garment & answered boldly: If this garment should be divided before my eyes yet I would never say that the two parts were τῆς αὐτῆς ὀυσίας of the same substance. Sozom. l. 2. c. 21. By this answer Eusebius seemsto have satisfied the Emperor who knew that the Council of Nice had approved the language of like substance: for the Emperor afterwards had him in great honour & was baptized by him & trusted him with his last will & Testament & banished Eustathius for the other opinion & consented that Arius upon retracting his novel expressions & confining himself to the faith & language of the Church should be received into communion. I cannot find that the Emperor or his son Constantius receded from the Nicene faith, but rather that they adhered to it constantly in the sense of the Council < insertion from lower down f 130v > which was that ὁμοούσιος signified not unius substantiæ but ὅμοιος κατ' ουσίαν.

< text from higher up f 130v resumes >

[During the reign of Constantine the western Churches were quiet & these disputes were only among the Greeks . But after a while they reached the West & made a breach beteen the Greeks & Latines in the following manner.]

In the mean time The Meletians a party of Christians who thinking the Bishop of Alexandria too forward in receiving lapsed persons into communion had withdrawn themselves from his jurisdiction accused Athanasius before the Council of Tyre A.C. 335 of killing Arsenius one of their Bishops & of some other crimes, & the Council having heard the cause, for their further satisfaction, sent six of their own number into Egypt to examin matters upon the place & after their return deposed him. When sentence was ready to be pronounced Athanasius fled to the Emperor Constantine who reheard the cause & banished him into Gallia. After the death of Constantine his eldest son Constantine sent back Athanasius into Egypt A.C. 338, and the Council of Antioch which consisted of about 97 bishops

And Ierome: Animas humanas de cælo lapsus esse Pythagoras Omnesque Platonici et Origines putant: a propria Dei substantia esse Stoici Manichæus & Hispaniæ Prisciliani hæresis suspicantur: continuo creari volunt alij, alij ex traduce ut Tertulianus Apollinarius & maxima pars Occidentalium. Ad Marcellinum Epis 82. This last opinion that souls are ex traduce that is by emission of substance seems to be of the same kind with that of the heathens & first hereticks who traduced their Gods & Æons from one another by such emissions & made them descend from heaven into humane bodies. And in opposition to the opinions of those traduced all things from the substance of God emitted in various forms the primitive Christians taught that God made all things out of nothing.

<131r>

Some hereticks as Simon Magus, Noëtus Praxeas & Sabellius gave the name of father son & holy Ghost to one & the same substance in respect of several appearances, attributes qualities dispositions or actions, or to the attributes of that substance & some called their emissions by the names of Gods attributes pretending that the attributes of God were substances emitted

Some hereticks as Simon Magus Basilides Marcion thinking it below the nature of their Gods to be really incarnate & to suffer really on the Cross, said that Christ was not really incarnate but appeared to men only in shew. Others as Carpocrates Cerinthus & Paul of Samosat said that Iesus was born of Ioseph & Mary after the manner of other men & that a vertue called Christ descended upon him & dwelt in him as the holy Spirit doth in good men & deserted him at his passion.

The Gnosticks beginning from Nicolas & Simon Magus the first authors of their heresy permitted the promiscuous use of weomen. They also attributed supernatural effects to invocation & ceremonies, &

Some hereticks as Saturninus Marcion Tatian & their followers the Encratites

Some hereticks, as _____ called the emissions by the names of Gods attributes. And some as Simon Magus, Noetus, Praxeas & Sabellius gave the names of ffather Son & Holy Ghost to one & the same substance in respect of several appearances attributes dispositions actions or partes. Sabellius compared the ffather Son & holy Ghost to the body soul & spirit of a man & to the body light & heat of the Sun, & the ffather & Son he compared to a man & his reason & speech making the son the inward reason & wisdom of the father before the creation & his word spoken at the creation by which all things were created.

Montanus refining the errors of the Gnosticks made the Son & h. Ghost emissions from the ffather & subordinate to him. His opinion Tertullian a Montanist thus sets down. Protulit enim Deus Sermonem, quemadmodum Paracelsus (id est Montanus) docet, sicut radix fruticem & fons fluvium et Sol radium; quia omnis origo parens est, et omne quod ex origine profertur progenies est: multo magis Sermo Dei, qui etiam proprie nomen filij accepit: nec frutex tamen a radice nec fluvius a fonte nec radius a sole discernitur sicut nec a Deo sermo. Igitur secundum — — — — proprietates suas ducit: Ita Trinitas per consertos et connexos gradus decurrit. And a little after. Pater tota substantia est, filius verò derivatio totius et portio, sicut ipse profiter, Quia pater major me est. Tertul. adv. Prax.

Tertullian a Montanist represents that God had reason & wisdom in himself by which he contrived all things before he created them, but as a mans reason & ideas are only internal in a man, before he declares them outwardly by speaking so Gods reason or wisdom & his conceptions or notions of all things were only internal in God untill he began to speak & make them appear outwardly in their species & substances. And

when he said Fiat lux, then his reason or λογος was formed outwardly into speech or voice not empty transient & vanid like the voice of a man but permanent & substantial. For nothing can want substance which ‡ < insertion from f 130v > ‡ proceeds from so great a substance. Thus Tertullian describes the philosophy of the Montanists & a little after calling Montanus the Paraclete, he adds Protulit Deus sermonem — — — me est. [Tertul adv. Prax.] Afterwards Tertullian calls the Trinity three persons in one substance & represents the persons distinct from one another but not divided, saying adhærebat illi [Patri] filius secunda persona sermo ipsius & tertia spiritus in sermone. And a little after. Vbique teneo unam substantiam in tribus cohærentibus. Tertul. adv. Praxeam

< text from f 131r resumes >
<131v>

By the mystery of iniquity he means the heresies which began to spring up in his days & were to work till they ended in the great apostacy or Man of Sin. And Those heresies consisted principally in certain heathen opinions & superstitions & impieties which men converted from the heathen religion endeavoured under various disguises & specious pretenses to bring into the Christian. The chief of those opinions was that all things came from one first being by emanation or emission of substance & returned into it , ffor this was the opinion of the ancient Egyptians {Phenicians} & Greeks & the opinion of the Indian Brachmans to this day, & of this opinion were Simon Magus & his successors the Gnosticks. Simon & Menander called the first emitted substance Ennoia & the next Angels & said that Angels created the world. Basilides called the first emission Nouç & said that Nouç was Christ & from Nouç derived a series of other emissions the last of which were Angels, & the world created by them. Nicolaus Valentinus, Secundus Marcus Heracleon Ophitæ & Tatian called such emissions Æons & Irenæus tells us that this doctrine of Æons came from Hesiods Genealogies of the heathen Gods. With Hesiods genealogies may be joyned the Phœnician in Sanchomiato, the Egyptian in Manetho & the {illeg} in the fragment of Byrsus Montanus made the Son & Holy Ghost emissions from the father & subordinate to him & Tertullian a Montanist called them consubstantial & said that the son was a part of the father father was the whole substance & the son an emanation of a derivation & {property} of the father & part of him, & I mistake if Paul of Samosat did not call the Father & Son consubstantial in the sense of the Gnosticks. These Hereticks also taught the heathen transmigration of souls & derived the souls of men from the supreme God by emission reputed them parts of his substance & making every soul to have various bodies denyed the resurrection of the body. For Simon Magus said that the first emission called Ennoia was shut up in a woman by Angels & passed from woman to woman & was in Minerva & afterwards in Helen in the time of Trojan war . & that the Angels passed into humane bodies that they might enjoy her Saturninus or Saturnilis taught that when the Angels who made the world had formed a man they were not able to give him life, but the virtue from above emitted a spark of life which made the man live, & which after death should return to those things which are of the same nature with it self. Carpocrates & Marcion held the transmigration of souls The Montanists said that Man was not only made by a rational author but animated ^{a[15]} ex substantia ejus And The Manichees Priscilianists & Stoicks (as Ierome tells us) that the souls of men were particles of the substance of God. And in the same sense I understand Epiphanius where he tells us that Valentinus & Colarbasus & all the Gnosticks & Manichees make certain traductions of souls & transmigrations into various bodies Hæres. 42. Refut. 24. And ^{a[16]} Augustin Bishop of Hippo Gnostici Manichæi Priscilianistæ animas humanas de substantia Dei confectas Deoque consubstantiales esse docebant. And in opposition to these doctrines, the true Christians taught that God created all things out of nothing.

Some hereticks took away the substance of the son & holy Ghost making them & the ffather one & the same substance in several respects; as Simon Magus who said that he was that substance & appeared as the ffather in Samaria, as the Son in Iudæa & as the holy Ghost in other countries; viz^t in respect of several bodies animated by the Deity according to the doctrine of the transmigration of souls: And Praxeas Sabellius & such as others as gave the name of ffather Son & holy Ghost to one & the same substance in respect of several attributes qualities, dispositions or actions. But some to avoid the name of Sabellians said that the attributes of God were substances.

Some hereticks as Saturninus Marcion Tatian & the Encratites condemned marriage & the eating of the flesh of Animals & Montanus taught to abstain from marriage & from some sorts of meat. And several other errors & superstitious practises were set on foot by the old Hæreticks.

And some heresies spread so much that in the end of the second Century or beginning of the third, the Bishop of Rome himself became first a Montanist & then a Praxeian. Tertull. adv. Praxeian.

Now in opposition to the heresies which arose in the second & third Centuries the Christians of those days added some new Articles to their Creed. And while the Articles were in the scripture language &c.

<132r>

In obedience &

76 × 24

304

18240

We humbly represent to your Lordship that we have considered the same, and upon the best computation we can make, we do find that at the Expiration of the present contract there will be so much Tin unsold in her majesty's hands as will amount to about £180000. we are humbly of opinion that upon a new contract the same deed which will remain the Interest of which being computed at six per cent per annum (being what is allowed for the £10000. advanced to the Tinner in Cornwall) her Majesty cannot in safety afford to give more then £3. 10. – per hundred stannary Weight, the Tinner paying the coynage duty and post groats or an equivalent,

and upon supposition that her Majesty purchases no more Tin then the consumption will annually carry off,

– that if her Majesty purchases 1600 Tunns of Tin per annum stannary weight at 3^{li} 10^s per Tunn without abating the coinage duty & Post groats & 6 per cent (the interest at which her Majesty lends money to Cornwall) be allowed upon all the rest of the money advanced, which we estimate at about 180000 the value of the Tin which according to the best estimate we can make will remain at the end of the present contract to be sold at 3^{li} 16^s per cwt averdupois: there will be allowed to her Majesty only about 1458.^l 18.^s annually, to answer all unforeseen accidents & expences which at a medium have hitherto amounted to 3 or 4 thousand pounds yearly & there will be added to the dead stock annually about 90 Tunns averdupois the excess of the quantity received annually fom both Cornwall & Devonshire above the quantity which has been sold annually duringthe last four years

that if her Majesty purchases 1520 Tunns per annum at 3^{li} 10^s per cwt stannary weight without remitting the Coinage duty & post groats & if 6 per cent be allowed upon

If her Majesty should purchase annually 1520 Tunns per annum at 3^{li} 9^s per cwt st. weight there would

<132v>

— that the consumption during the last four & the present has at a medium amounted annually to about 1560 Tunns from which if 44 Tunns of Devonshire Tin be deducted there will remain 1516 Tunns the annual consumption of the Cornish Tin That at the end of the present contract there will remain a dead stock of about 2400 Tunns averdupois which at 76^{li} per Tunn is worth 182400^{li} or in round numbers, about 180000 & 6 per cent (the Interest paid by Cornwall for moneys advanced to them by her Majesty) be recconed upon the standing dead stock of 182400^{li} during the next contract, & the contract be for 1600 Tunns per annum & this quantity should be carried off annually that the dead stock may remain the same, & her Majesty gives 3^{li} 10^s per cwt stannary weight, the state of the contract will be as in the following account

Paid annually for 1600 Tunns of Tinn at 3 ^{li} 10 ^s per cwt	112000
ffreight to London	2142 163
Salaries in London	1350

Incidents & Porters in London	200
Passing accounts	94
Salaries in Cornwal & 30 ^{li} to Truro	1540
Incidents in Cornwall	700
Interest of 182400 ^l at 6 per cent	<u>10124</u>
	122958
Insurance & accidents	<u>5027</u> $\frac{5}{7}$
Annual produce of Tin sold at 3 ^{li} 16 ^s per cwt averdupois	127985 $\frac{5}{7}$
84 Tuns stannary weight or 90 averdupois added annually to make up 1600 Tunns per annum makes an annual addition of 6840 ^{li} to the value of the dead stock the interest of all which additions in seven years at 6 per cent comes to	11491 $\frac{1}{5}$

That by the course of the sale during this & the four last years there will remain at the end of the present contract a dead stock of Tinn which at 76^{li} per Tunn averdupois will be worth about 180000^{li}.

That if her Majesty contracts for 1600 Tunns of Tin annually at 3^{li} 10^s per cwt stannary weight, without remitting the Coinage duty & Post groats & this quantity shall be sold off annually so that the dead stock of 180000^{li} may more or less remain the same during all that contract, & if 6 per cent (the interest now paid by those in Cornwall for moneys advanced to them by her Majesty) be allowed upon the said dead stock: the state of the contract will be as follows.

1600 Tunns of Tin at 3 ^{li} 10 ^s per cwt stannary weight	112000
ffreight to London	2142. 163
Salaries in London	1350
Incidents & Porters in London	200
Passing accounts	94
Salaries in Cornwall & 30 ^{li} to Truro	1540
Incidents in Cornwall	700
Interest of 180000 ^{li} at 6 per cent	<u>10800</u>
	128826. 16.3
Insurance & other accidents & unforeseen charges	<u>1458.</u> 18.0
Produced annually by sale of the Tin at 3 ^l 16 ^s per cwt averdupois	130285. 14.3

⊙ If &c. < insertion from f 133r > ⊙ In this reckoning If 10800 should be thought too great an interest upon dead stock, 1458.^{li} 18^s, is as much too little for insurance & other accidents & unforeseen charges. < text from f 132v resumes > During this & the four last years the sale of the Tin by our accounts has at a medium amounted to about 1560 Tunns per annum stannary weight which being deducted from 1600 Tunns received annually from Cornwall & about 44 Tunns received annually from Devonshire leaves 84 Tuns stannary or

90 Tunns averdepois {being valued} at 76^{li} per Ton is 6840^{li} to be annually added to the dead stock: the interest of which additions if the contract should continue seven years amounts to 8618.^{li} 8^s besides the loss by the fall of the price in the end of the contract which may amount to 13860^{li} more if the Tin should then fall only to 54.^s per cwt averdepois <133r> ffor we are humbly of opinion that whenever the crown shall sell the dead stock it will clog the markets & bring down the price of Tin very low. Thus the Crown by contracting for 1600 Tunns of Tin at 3^{li} 10^s per cwt would lose in the space of 7 years about 2348.8 or above if the consumption should continue as it has been this & the last four years. & this loss in four years more would be more then doubled.

We have grownded this recconing upon a supposition that the sale of the Tin will continues uniform. How much it may increase or decrease by peace or new wars we do not know & without a certainty can make no estimate of what may be got or lost

— Before the determination of this present contract for making a new one at such a price as that her Majesty may be no loser thereby & desire that it may be for a greater quantity: we have according to the best of judgments stated the account of the price & quantity at which her Majesty may contract without being a loser & supposing the sale continues one year with another at the same rate as in this & the four last years, which one year with another amounts to about 1560 Tunns per annum we find that if her Majesty purchases 1600 Tunns of Tin per annum at 30 10^s per cwt stannary weight she will bea loser only by a dead stock of about 84 Tunns per annum lying upon her hands

<133v>

1 If all the purchase goes off her Majesty may give

3^l 10^s per cwt for {illeg}

3. 10^s. 8^l₂ for {illeg}

3. 11. 4 18{illeg}

2 100 Tunns remaining annually upon her Majestys hands is in the end of seven years a loss of 126 Tuns in the interest & 220 Tuns by the fall of the price in the end of the contract.

2 Every Tunn remaining in her Majestys hands is in 7 years a loss of 90 li in the

If any spiritual being be called an Angel, they understand the word absolutely & in a metaphysical sense for a being of a certain species: whereas the word is relative & moral, denoting a messenger or servant sent upon messages by his Lord. In this sense Christ is the Angel messenger or servant of God & the Prophetick spiritus the Angel or servant of God & Christ & when any inferior spirits are called the Angels of God it signifies that they are the servants or ministers of God. If the holy spirit be said to proceed from the father they take it for a metaphysical procession of his substance whereas he is said to proceed from the father as a messenger to confirm the truth of his message. The Comforter who is the holy Ghost whom the father will send in my name he shall teach you all things Iohn 14.26. When the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the spirit of truth who proceedeth [or comes] from the Father, he shall testify of me Iohn 15.26. He shall not speak of himself but whatsoever he shall hear that he shall speak, & he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine & shall shew it unto you. All things that the ffather hath are mine: therefore I said that he shall take of mine & shall shew it unto you. Iohn 16.13, 14, 15. And in the same sense Christ also proceeded from God. I proceeded forth, saith he, & came from God: neither came I of my self, but he sent me. Iohn 8.42. If Christ be called the λόγος — — — —

If Moses saith Thou shalt not suffer a Witch to live we take it for a Woman who hath a metaphysical power of conversing with spirits, a & in the same sense we understand the word wizard as if there were real conjurers & necromancers whereas the words signify only such deceivers as pretend to the art of divining by spirits. So Astrologers, Augurs, Aurspices, are such as pretend to art of divining by the starrs, by the flying of birds by

the entrails of sacrifices, & Sorcerers & Magicians are such as pretend to do supernatural {works} by certain words & ceremonies without being able to do what they pretend to.

If Moses saith There shall not be found among you any one that useth divination or an observer of times [that is of days lucky & unlucky] or an enchanter or a witch or a consulter with familiar spirits or a wizzard or a necromancer: for because of these things the Lord thy God doth drive them [the nations] out from before thee: superstitious men are apt to understand by these names such men & weomen as have a metaphysical power of divining, inchanting, bewitching conversing with spirits conjuring & raising the souls of the dead; whereas they should take the names in a moral sense for deceivers, such as falsly pretend to a power of doing these things, & thereby deceive & delude the people, & seduce them to put their trust in imaginary spirits & ghosts or dæmons which is a degree of idolatry. ffor what else were the Idols of the Gentiles but enchanted statues. And so Astrologers, Augurs & Aruspices are such as pretend to the art of divining by the stars, by the motions of birds, & by the entrails of sacrifices, but are not able to divine & sorcerers & enchanters are such as deceive the people by attributing supernatural effects to certain words & ceremonies, called charms & spells, which in truth are of no efficacy. And to beleive that men or weomen can really divine, charm enchant, bewitch or converse with spirits is a superstition of the same nature with beleiving that the Idols of the Gentiles were not vanities but had spirits really seated in them. [All this is the doctrine of Dæmons condemned by the Apostle. For he that can conjure up a spirit may conjure it into a statue & he that can divine by a spirit can make himself a Priest to an Oracle.

<134ar>

Athanasius being accused of several crimes & condemned by the Council of Tyre A.C. 335 was banished by Constantine the great after he had also heard the cause. So soon as Constantine was dead Iulius bishop of Rome A.C. 337 wrote to the eastern bishops a chiding letter representing that no bishop accused of crimes was to be judged but in a lawful synod called by Apostolic authority & that the privilege of calling general Councils & hearing the {greater} causes belonged to the first seat, & the first seat was the Roman not only by the Canons & decrees of the holy fathers but also by the words of our saviour saying Thou art Peter & upon this rock will I build my Church & whatsoever thou shalt bind or lose on earth shall be bound or losed in heaven. And that without the sentence of the Bishop of Rome Councils were not to be celebrated nor a Bishop condemned because the holy Roman Church has the Primacy over all the Churches. And as Peter was the first of the Apostles so the church of Rome was the first of the Churches & to her all the greater ecclesiastical causes & judgments of bishops ought to be referred & nothing be determined without the Bishop of Rome. And this letter of the Bishop of Rome to the Oriental Bishops was the first attempt to the universal Bishopric, & the beginning of Popery. To this letter the Eastern Bishops wrote a sharp answer representing that he dissolved their Council & sought to destroy em & unless he would forbear these

< insertion from f 135v >

Now if the Articles which have been inserted into the Creeds since the beginning {be} omitted, the Creed of the Latines usually called the Apostles Creed wll be reduced to this form. I beleive in God the ffather Almighty maker of heaven & earth & in Iesus Christ his only son our Lord who was conceivd by the holy Ghost born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified dead & buried, the third day rose again from the dead; He ascended into heaven & sitteth at the right hand of God the ffather almighty; From thence he shall come to judge the quick & the dead And I beleive in the holy Ghost. And in this Creed there still remain some Articles which seem to have been inserted since the beginning. ②

< insertion from lower down f 135r >

① The Article sitteth at the right hand of God the father almighty [hath also ben inserted by the Latins since the beginning. ffor in] is wanting in the two Creeds of Irenæus, & in those of Eusebius, & Lucius, & in one of Tertullians & in the Nicene, & therefore was not one of those articles of faith into which all nations were baptized in the beginning of the Gospel nor is necessary to baptism, but has been put into the Creed between the articles ascended into heaven, & from thence he shall come to judge the qu. ffor it interrupts the reference: which those articles have to one another the words from thence relating to the word heaven ffor he comes from heaven to judge the quick & the dead & not from the right hand of the father for he sits at the

right hand of the father not only in this world but also in that which is to come as the Greeks represented in one of their Creeds

< text from f 135v resumes >

For the article conceived by the Holy Ghost is wanting in the two Creeds of Irenæus & in those of Eusebius of Cæsarea & Lucius the Martyr & Cyril of Ierusalem & in two of Tertullians & in all the Creeds of the Councils of Nice, Antioch, Sirmium, Ariminum, Seleucia & Constantinople & therefore it came not from the Grek Church in the beginning of the Gospel it being generally wanting in their Creeds, nor was necessary to baptism many nations being baptized without it, & therefore was not put into the Creed by the Apostles in order to baptism but after their days was inserted out of Lukes Gospel & that improperly because it was improper to mention the holy Ghost in the Creed before the Article, I beleive in the Holy Ghost. And indeed it obscures the true sense of the primitive Creeds which teach that God is the ffather & the Virgin Mary the Mother of Iesus, or that he was incarnate of the Virgin Mary by the almighty power of God the father himself & had no other father then God & is the only begotten son of God, all other men being begotten by the ordinary course of nature. As he was raised from the dead by the Almighty power of the father & therefore is called the first begotten of the dead & the first born from the dead & the son of God of whom God saith Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Apoc. 1.5 Colos. 1.18, Act 13.33: so he was incarnate by the same almighty power & therefore also is called the Son of God. The Angel said unto the Virgin Mary, a holy Spirit (the λογος or Shekinah or Angel of Gods presence) shal come upon thee & the power of the Highest (the almighty power of God the ffather) shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God Luke 1.35. He is not the Son of the Holy Ghost but the Son of God the father. ①

① As God the father in the creation of the world by his almighty power formed the seeds of all animals & vegetables before they grew in the earth & in the waters Gen. 1.11, 21, 24, & therefore Adam is called the son of God Luke 3.38: so the same God by the almighty power of his counsel, choise & will incarnated Iesus & formed him in the seed before he grew in the womb of the Virgin & to express this in the Creed, Iesus is called the Son of God & his mother is called a Virgin. God formed the seeds of other things in the earth & waters by him & him in the womb of the Virgin by his own immediate power & operation {& therefore} he is called the only Son & the only begotten son of God the father. <134v> The titles given to Iesus have generally a relation to the prophesies in the old testament concerning him, & were given to him for explaining those prophesies & signifying that he is the person predicted in them. He is called the son of man to signify that he is the person spoken of by that name in Daniels prophesy of the four Beasts. He is called Michael Apoc 12 to signify that he is that Michael spoken of by Daniel in these words And at that time shall Michael stand up the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people Dan. 12. He is called the Christ or Messiah to signify that he is the Messiah spoken of in the prophesy of Daniels weeks. He is called the king of kings & Lord of Lords to signify that he is the Prince of the host & the Prince of Princes spoken of in Daniels prophesy of the Ram & he Goat. He is called the Λογος or Word of God to signify that he is the Oracle of God whose testimony is the spirit of prophesy the great Prophet foretold by Moses. He is called the Lamb of God to signify that he was prefigured by the Paschal Lamb in the law of Moses. He is called the son of David to signify that he is the seed of David whose throne shall be established for ever Psal. 89. Luc. 1.32. He is called the son of God to signify that he is the person of whom God said in the Psalms Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Which prophesy Peter applies to Christs being begotten by his resurrection from the dead Act. 13.33 & the Angel Gabriel & the Creed to his being conceived or begotten of the Virgin by the power of the most High. Luc. 1.35.] And in the same sense he is called in the Creed the Son of God born of the Virgin Mary, [& the relation which these two Articles have to one another is interrupted & clouded by inserting between them that he was conceived by the h. G]

< insertion from the left margin of f 134v > But the following form suits better with the Creeds of the Greeks < text from f 134v resumes > Now if these two articles be omitted the Apostles Creed will be reduced to this form. I beleive in God, the father Almighty, maker of heaven & earth, & in Iesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was born of the Virgin Mary suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified dead & buried, the third day he rose again from the dead & ascended into heaven, from thence he shall come to judge the quick & the dead & I beleive in the holy Ghost. This Creed is the same in substance with the first Creed of Irenæus, & therefore contains the primitive faith which according to Irenæus was preached to all nations in order to baptism & by the recital of which all Christians from one end of the earth to the other knew one another to be

Christians. Its articles are generally to be met with in the ancient Creeds of both Greeks & Latines, but in the Creeds of the Greeks are better exprest by teaching to beleive in one God the father & in one Lord Iesus Christ the son of God & in the h. Ghost who spake by the Prophets as in the following form I beleive in one God, the ffather almighty, maker of heaven & earth, & of all things visible & invisible, & in one Lord Iesus Christ the Son of God, who was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was buried, & the third day he rose again from the dead, He ascended into heaven, from thence he shall come to judge the quick & the dead & reward every one according to his works sending the ungodly & the blasphemers & the unjust & the lawless into everlasting fire & receiving into his own kingdom with glory all those who have lived well either from the beginning or after repentance & I beleive in the holy Ghost who spake by the Prophets.

These Creeds, which are the same in substance, are easy to be understood by the meanest capacities & so are fit to be proposed to all men, as the first principles of religion ought to be & on that account may properly be compared to milk for babes. They are short & easy to be remembred as the symbols of religion ought to be. They are not mere Theories but practical truths on which the whole practise of religion depends & therefore to be learned in the first place as the foundation of all religion. We must beleive in one God that we love him. We must beleive that he is the father <134br> almighty or first author of all things by the almighty power of his will, that we may thank & worship him for our being & for all the blessings of this life. We must beleive that Iesus who was born of the Virgin Mary & suffered under Pontius Pilate is the Christ or Messiah the Prince predicted by Daniel or else we are no Christians. We must beleive that he is our Lord or King that we may behave our selves obediently towards him as subjects & keep his laws. And that we may give him the more {honour} We must beleive that he was not an ordinary man but incarnate by the almighty power of God & born of a Virgin without any other father then God him self. We must beleive that by the same almighty power of God he rose from the dead & that he shall come to be our judge that we may expect the like resurrection & fit our selves to stand before him in the day of judgment & to deserve an early resurrection. And we must beleive that there is a holy prophetic spirit by which Moses & the Prophets & Apostles were influenced, that we may study their writing as the oracles of truth & thereby grow in grace & in the knowledge of our Lord Iesus Christ to the end of our lives. // ffor besides the first principles & fundamentals of religion contained in the Creed, which all are to learn before baptism & which the Apostle therefore compares to milk for babes there are many truths of great importance but more difficult to be understood & not absolutely necessary to salvation. And these the Apostle compares to strong meats for men of full age who by use have their senses exercised to discern both good & evil. With these truths the mind is to be fed continually as the body is with meats. And to these truths I refer what Christ did before his incarnation & between his death & resurrection what he doth in heaven how long < insertion from the left margin > & how he {reins} in the day of judgment untill all enemies are put under his feet, the last of which is death that is untill all the dead are raised & judged < text from f 134br resumes > & what he or we shall do after the day of judgment, as also all disputable questions about Providence predestination free will, the nature of Angels, the state of the dead between death & the resurrection, the bodies with which the dead shal rise, the power of the keys, forms of Church government the keeping of Easter & other holydays & the like. About these & such like things we are to learn all we can & to instruct one another, but not to fall out about them. The strong in faith & knowledge must not despise the weak & the weak must not judge & censure the strong but all Christians keeping the common faith into which they were baptized & whereby they were admitted into the Church & united into one mystical body of Christ must beare with one anothers infirmities & abound with love & charity & meekness towards one another more then with fondness towards their own opinions. ffor knowledg puffeth up & self conceit & pride of mind tends to wrangling & enmity & contention & schism, whereas the man of God must not strive. ffor Charity is the fulfilling of the law, & without it all other graces & all knowledge whatsoever profit nothing. In this consists the unity & peace of the Church & wo be to them through whom offences come.

Now altho strong meats should not be mixed with milk which is to be given to babes. yet the Latine Churches have done it. In opposition to hereticks they have added divers new articles to their Creed & thereby altered the foundation upon which the Church was built by Christ & his Apostles which they had no authority to do. They might anathematize or excommunicate men for wicked practices, & for denying or perverting the faith into which they were baptized. But were not to enlarge diminish or alter that faith themselves. ffor the servant is not above his master. All the articles of faith necessary to baptism were put into the Creed by the Apostles & nothing unnecessary was to be added afterwards. The symbol by which the Christians of all nations till the days of Irenæus knew one another to be Christians & in which the unity of the Church Catholick consisted should not have been changed. But they changed it & by inserting new articles at length that unity was

dissolved While the new articles were in the language of the scriptures they made no disputes: but when they varied from the scripture language the Church was rent asunder by the contentions which arose thereupon

< text from f 134ar resumes >
<136r>

So that the sentence against him was the sentence of the Church Catholick. But the Council of Nice scrupled the homousios, admitted it 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 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. Hilary indeed te

Basil in his 300th Epistle represents that the Council of Antioch in the case of Paul of Samosat rejected the word ὁμοούσιος because when a substance with its properties became divided into parts it represented those parts And this was true in brass & money coyned out of it but had no place in God the father & God the son

ffor Basil tells us that the Council of Antioch in condemnnng Paul of Samosat rejected the ὁμοούσιος for this very reason.

To Sir Isaac Newton Knight

Master and Worker of Her
Majesties Mint,

These

After the authority of the Greek Church over her own members was restored, new Councils were called to reconcile the Churches about the faith. These met at Sirmium, Nicæa in Thrace, Ariminum Seleucia & Constantinople in the years 357, 358, 359 & 360, & abolished the use of the word οὐσία & its compounds for these reasons 1 because it was not in scripture 2^{dly} because it had been condemned by the Council of Antioch with the approbation of all the Churches 60 years before the Council of Nice & 3^{dly} because it was a stumbling block to the people & led them into dangerous errors being commonly understood by them in a different sense from that of the Council of Nice, for proving of which the Acts of the Council were produced. † declared in their Creed that the son was similis patri secundum scripturas. And this Creed was the next year subscribed by the Councils of Nicæ & Ariminum & in the end of the year by the Legates of the Council of Seleucia & the year following by the Council of Constantinople. This Creed we recited above. And thus were the eastern & western Churches reconciled & reunited in the outward profession of faith. And in this united state things continued till the end of the reign of Constantius & during the reign of Iulian the Apostate who be

at Sirmium in the years 357 358 & 359, at Nicæ in Thrace, Ariminum & Seleucia in the year 359

<136v>

The words were laid aside therefore 1st for putting an end to the great disturbances which {they} had made in the Churches, the Council of Nice & eastern Churches interpreting the ὁμοούσιος by ὁμοιούσιος similis substantiæ, the western by unius substantiæ. And for convincing the western Churches that

The words were laid aside therefore for these reasons. 1st because the word ομοουσιος in its proper signification (of which the Greek 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, & so was not a proper word to be applied to the Trinity.

2^{dly} Because the Council of Nice had admitted the word hastily & by **{illeg}** the Emperor being present in the Council & pressing it, & the Council making scruples & excepting against the signification above 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 & the Bishops in all the east disputing afterwards against the use of the word & omitting it in a bigger Council at Tyre & in all their Councils which followed {contending} that ομοούσιος was proper to bodies & ομοιουσιος to spirits. For how universally the Greeks rejected the ομοούσιος may appear by the character which Hilary A.C. 358 gave of the Eastern provinces where he was then in banishment.

3^{dly} Because the Latines had translated the word ομοούσιος by unius substantiæ & thereby departed from the sense of the Nicene Council which had interpreted the word by ὁμοιουσιος similis substantiæ as appeared by the Acts of the 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 unius substantiæ & similis substantiæ the best way to put an end to those disturbances was to abolish the use of the words which had caused them.

4 Because the words ex usia, homousios & unius substantiæ taken together, very much **{illeg}** the errors of Montanus & Sabellius, & caused them to spread in the west & the best {way to} put a stop to the growth of those errors was to remove the cause For Hilary in the year 358 wrote thus to the Bishops of Gallia & Britain. Multi ex nobis &c

5 Because the word homousios was rejected by the Council of Antioch

6 Because it was not in scripture.

Vir celeberrime

Principes nobilissimi

Quod in regiones nostras discendi gratia peregre profectientes **{illeg}** gaudeo cum inde augurer quod vestris auspicijs humaniores scientiæ in regno Moscovitico augmentum sument & maxime floreant.

<137r>

From this opinion of the Egyptians Plato had his doctrine of Ideas & the Jews, who in the reign of the Greeks were numerous in Egypt, had theirs of the ten Sephiroths or splendors which were a{ether}eal emanations from the supreme deity.

From this opinion came the metaphysical philosophy of the heathens about the origin of the world the generation & nature of the Gods & the transmigration of Souls. And this doctrine of Dæmons was as old as the Idolatry of the heathens. ffor their Idolatry was grownded upon it. And therefore Moses to prevent the spreading of this sort of Philosophy among the Israelites wrote the history of the creation of the world in a very different manner from the Cosmogonias of the heathens, attributing the production of all things to the immediate will of the supreme God. Yet the Israelites by conversing with the heathens frequently lapsed into the worship of their Gods & by consequence received their Theology untill they were captivated for these transgressions. And afterwards by conversing with the Chaldæans Egyptians & Greeks they imbibed their Metaphysical Theology as is manifest by the Cabbala of the Jews which consists chiefly in describing how the first Being whom they call Æn-Soph the infinite emitted ten gradual subordinate emanations which they call Sephiroths or Splendors, the first immediately from himself, the second from the first, the third from the first or second & so on. And these ten emanations they name after Gods attributes & powers, calling the first Kether the Crown, the second Cochmah wisdom, the third Binah Prudence the fourth Gedulah magnificence, the fift Geburah strength the sixt Tipherah beauty & the last Melcoth the **{illeg}**. And after these ten which they call mundus azilutheus the emanative world they make three lower worlds which they call Briah the

throne of glory & world of separate intelligences, Iezirah the world of Angels & Asiah the corporeal world that is the world in which we live. And they say that the influence & power of the first cause which they call Æn-Soph & the Ænsophic world reaches through all things & that of Kether & Cochmah & Binah through all things below them & that by means of the superior powers the Azaluthic kingdom formed the world Briah, the Briathic kingdom formed the world Iezirah & the Iezirathic kingdom formed the lowest world Asiah: & that the souls of men come from above revolve & pass into several bodies & after death return to the internal light of the Shekinah.

This opinion seems to have had its rise from the worshipping & deifying of dead kings & exalting them in the opinion of the people till they made them the highest celestial Gods & took the oldest for the supreme God or for a God descended immediately from him & his successors for a series of Gods descended successively from the oldest, & making this race of Gods as ancient as the world. For the Chaldeans placed a race of ten successive Gods reigning from the beginning of the world to the time of the flood, as is recited in a fragment of Berosus preserved by Eusebius. The Egyptians represented God's creation of the world by a spiders weaving a web out of her own bowels & began their history with a race of Gods & heroes the last of which was Orus. The Phenicians began their history with the creation of the world & a race of above ten successive pairs of Gods as is recited by Sanchoniatho. And from Egypt & Phenicia came the like Theology into Greece as you may see in Hesiods Theogonia. And as the Jews by conversing with the heathens fell into Idolatry frequently before the captivity so by conversing with the Chaldæans <137v> in the time of the Babylonian Captivity they seem to have learnt the Theology of those nations & refined it. ffor they derived their mystical Cabbala by tradition from the days of Ezra & supposed that it came to Ezra from Moses & this Kabbala consists chiefly in describing how the first cause whom they call Æn-Soph the infinite emitted gradually ten subordinate emanations which they call Sephiroths — — — — formed the lowest world Asiah X Each of the ten Sephiroths & < insertion from lower down f 137v > X Each of the ten Sephiroths they called Adam a man & the first of them they called Adam Kadmon the first man & make him the son of God as Adam is called in Scripture. Which confirms the opinion that the ten Sephiroths were originally ten men deified, namely the ten antediluvian patriarchs mentioned by Manetho the first of which was called Alorus by the Chaldæans & Adam by the Jews. < text from higher up f 137v resumes > And as the ancient heathens held the transmigration of souls into various bodies, making them come from God & after various states return upwards from whence they came so the cabalistical Jews held that souls had a revolution; coming from above passing into various bodies & after death returning to the internal light of the Shekinah.

Plato travelling into Egypt when the Jews were numerous in that country learnt there his metaphysical opinions about the superior beings & formal causes of all things, which he calls Idæas & which the Cabbalists call Sephiroths & separate intelligences & the heathens Gods The first being was by the Platonists called the one & the {word} the next was called Αἰὼν Λόγος, εἶδος, Ἰδέα, Ο νοὺς Η´ Σοφία, Æon the word the form the Idea the Mind the Wisdom^[17] And by Philo κόσμος νοητὸς το ἀρχήτυπον παράδειγμα, ἰδέα των Ἰδεων, ὁ θεοῦ λόγος & ὁ ὁρφὸς θεοῦ λόγος προτοτονος {υιος}. the intellectual world, the archetypal exemplar, the generall idea of all things, the word of God, the true first begotten son of God. <138r> The third Being of the Platonists was Psyche the soule of the world. She was supposed to be the wife of Æon & therefore this philosophy had its rise from men & weomen {coupled}. ffrom Psyche they derived the inferior ideas the souls of women & beasts & the materia prima, & made a transmigration of souls into various bodies. Some take the One, the Logos & Psyche of Plato to be the three first Sephiroths of the Cabbalists, Kether, Cochmah & Binah. And its possible that Plato in his travels might converse with the Cabbalists, but whether he did or not is not certain. This only is certain that Plato's Metaphysicks is of the same stamp with the ancient Theology of the heathens & Cabbala of the Jews, all of them deriving the substances of all things from the first cause by emanation & making male & female Gods.

Now as the Metaphysicks of the Cabbalistical Jews came from the Theology of the heathens, so the metaphysical opinions of the ancient hereticks came from them both. Simon & Menander called the first emitted substance Ennoia

The hereticks of the circumcision as Simon Nicolaus Cerinthus Menander would be most apt to derive their opinions from the Iewish Cabbala & this was the rise of the Gnosticks. Those of the uncircumcision arose later & either followed the Gnosticks or the heathen Philosophers.

— — — Philosophers. For some of them, as Carpocrates & his followers, worshipped the Images of several heathen Philosophers Pythagoras Plato Aristotle Homer & some others. At first their opinions were gross but afterwards they refined them by Platonism & applied them to the ffather son & holy Ghost. For Montanus made the Son & h. ghost emissions or Æons emitted from the father & subordinate to him: & misinterpreting the name Logos made the Son to be the internal wisdom reason & word of the ffather, the Λόγος ἑνδιάθετος emitted from not like the empty voice of a man but, but — —

<138v>

Where Christ saith, He that hath seen me hath seen the father, that is in their works, some have understood it literally of seeing their substance & thence inferred that the father & son are one in substance, tho the father is the invisible God whom no eye hath seen nor can see. Where Christ saith, I & the father are one, many have understood it of a metaphysical unity as if they were one in substance, tho Christ himself interprets it of a moral unity by saying, Be ye one as I & the father are one. [Where Christ saith that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the father many have understood it metaphysically as if the substance of the holy Ghost proceeded from the substance of the father by emanation; whereas Christ plainly speaks of his proceeding from the father as a messenger. He tells his disciples that he would send the comforter to them, & to confirm the truth of the message he tells them further that the Comforter proceeds from the father.] Where Christ is called the Son of God many understand it of natural generation from all eternity, whereas it relates to the prophesy Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee, & this Prophesy is applied by Peter to Christs resurrection from the dead. Where Christ is called the Word of God, many understand it of the Λόγος ἑνδιάθετος the only inward reason wisdom & word of the father without which the ffather would be ἄσοφος & ἄλογος: whereas he is called the Word as he is the great Prophet to whom alone God reveals himself immediately & who sends his Angel with the revelations to his servants the Prophets, as Iohn witnesses in these words: The Revelation of Iesus Christ which God gave unto him & he sent his Angel & signified it to his servant Iohn Apoc. 1.1. The book of Prophecy was originally in the hand of God & none was worthy to receive it but the Lamb. (Apoc 4 & 5) who is therefore called the faithful & true witness the Word of God, whose testimony is the spirit of prophesy.

<139r>

For understanding the progress of these heresies it may be convenient to distinguish it into periods of time. And the first period I reckon the age of the Apostles which ended with the death of Iohn in the first or 2^d year of Trajan, A.C. 99, or 100 or about seven years after with the death of Symeon the son of Cleopas & bishop of Ierusalem, the last of the Apostolic men who had seen Christ. For Hegesippus who was contemporary to Irenæus mentioning the death of Symeon, adds that the church continued till that time like a Virgin incorrupt & pure; but after the holy company of Apostles were dead, errors & heresies began to spring up very fast. In this first age there were some hereticks of note as Simon, Menander, Nicolaus & Cerinthus, but these being checked by the authority of Apostolick men who had conversed with Christ, made no great progress.

In The next age arose many hereticks Basilides, Carpocrates, Saturninus, Valentinus, Secundus, Ptolomæus Cerdon Marcion, Apelles, Severus, Marcus, Colarbasus, Montanus, Tatian, Theodotion, Bardasanes, Noetus, & others, & their errors spread till they began to shock the Church which first happened in the reign of Severus, when the Bishop of Rome turned first a Montanist & then a Praxeian (as Tertullian mentions) & excommunicated the Churches of Asia for keeping Easter on the 14th day of the Moon. The third age therefore must begin with the reign of Severus or Episcopacy of Victor.

The next period of moment in respect of ecclesiastical affairs was the sharp persecution of Decius in the end of which anniversary holy days to martyrs were instituted & auricular confession & penance crept into the churches & Stephen Bishop of Rome excommunicated the Churches of Afric for not admitting the baptism of all sorts of hereticks. & by admitting it himself he invited all hereticks to crowd into his church.

{illeg} made the son to be the internal wisdom reason & word of the ffather & emitted from him not like the empty vanid voice of a man but with a substance, like the emissions or Æons of the Gnosticks, nothing being empty & void which proceeds from God. His opinion Tertullian a Montanist thus sets down & defends. Invisibila quæcunque sunt habent apud Deum & suum corpus et suam formam: quanto magis uod ex substantia ipsius missum est sine substantia non erit

⊙Νους of Basilides & the emssions or Æons of the other Gnosticks, [nothing being empty & void which proceeds from God.] For in this manner Tertullian a Montanist sets down the opinion, of Montanus & in defending it contends that Valentinus borrowed his Æons from the truth

The Py

<139v>

Chap. Of the working of the mystery of Iniquity

The Apostle Paul hath told us that before the day of Christ there should be a falling away or an Apostasy & the Man of Sin should be revealed the son of perdition, who opposeth & exalteth himself above all that is called God or that worshipped, so that he as a God sitteth in the Temple of God (as it were upon the throne between the Cherubims) shewing himself that he is a God, & that this mystery of iniquity worked even in his days only that which letted should let untill it should be taken out of the way & then should that wicked one be revealed whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power & signes & lying wonders & a strong delusion & with all deceivableness of unrighteousness & who should reign as a God or Oracle in the temple or Church of God untill the Lord should destroy him with the brightness of his coming. There was to be therefore an Apostasy which should last from the Apostles days to the second coming of Christ & therefore is now in being. It worked in the Apostles days & was to work without dominion untill that which letted its rise should be taken out of the way & then it was to rise up like an angel of light with all power & signs & lying wonders & a strong delusion & reign as a God in the Church untill the day of judgment, that is, it was to reign in the Church with divine authority an authority which all Christians whose names are not written in the book of life should worship & wonder after as the infallible authority of God himself, & by this authority it should change times & laws & they should be given into its hands untill the judgment should sit.

Now that which letted the Apostle does not name , but tells the churches that they knew it already & by the tradition of the first ages of Christianity it was the Roman Empire: not a future Christian Empire (for the Man of Sin was to be a Christian dominion) but the heathen Roman Empire which reigned in the Apostles days While this empire stood the Man of Sin who was to be a Christian Roman dominion could not rise up but so soon as it should be taken out of the way he was to be revealed. And because that which letted was to be taken out of the way therefore the Apostle does not name it least he should be blamed by the heathens as an enemy to their Empire. So then we are here to consider the working of the mystery of iniquity during the reign of the heathen Roman Empire & after the fall of that Empire to expect the rise of the man of sin.

Now the mystery of iniquity which worked in the Apostles days & continued to work till the end of the heathen Roman Empire was the heresies which then sprang up & whose authors Iohn calls Antichrists. Little children saith he, it is the last time; & as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come even now there are many Antichrists whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us but they were not of us &c. Which is as much as to say that as they had heard that Antichrist should come & that the last time was the time of his reign,so by the many hereticks which had separated from the Church & were the forerunners of the great Antichrist, they might know that the last time taken in a large sense so as to comprehend Antichrist with his forerunners was already begun. Those heresies consisted chiefly in — — — — — & used the signe of the cross as an amulet or charm against the devil & his works, as the Montanists.

In Parabola velocitas corporis ad quamvis ab umbilico distantiam est velocitatem **{illeg}** circulo ad eandem a centro distantiam in subduplicata ratione

<140r>

The authority of this Vicar extended over Epire, {as} {illeg}

The bishop of Rome had also his Vicar over the Province of Venice. For Pope Leo in his 87th Epistle directed to Septimus writes thus. Ne imperia possit obtinere fall{acem} Ad metropolitanum Episcopum provinciæ Venetiæ scripta direximus quibus ad status sui periculum {co}gnosceret pertinere si quisquam de Pelagianorum & Cælestianorum consorte veniens in communione Catholica sine professione legitimæ satisfactionis habeatur.

He had also his Vicar over all Gallia & this Vicar was sometimes the bishop of Arles. ffor all the Bishops of this Diocess in their Epistle to Pope Leo I say in favour of their Metropolitan Cui id etiam honoris dignitatisque collatum est, ut non tantum has Provincias [viz^t Viennensem, Narbonensem primam & Norbonensem secundam] potestate propria gubernaret verum etiam omnes Gallias, sibi Apostolicæ sedis vice mandata sub omni Ecclesiastica Regula continteret. And in the same Epistle these bishops say that per beatum beatissimum Petrum Apostolorum principem sacrosancta Ecclesia Romana teneret supra omnes totius mundi Ecclesias principatum. [And Ceretius Salonius & Veranus three other bishops of Gallia in their Epistle to Pope Leo I say Magna præterea et ineffabili quadam nos peculiares tui gratulatione succeressimus] These letters were written A.C. 450 & about 34 years be] And Pope Leo in his epistle to Anastasius bishop of Thessalonica (one of his Vicars) speaking of the subordination of governours saith: De qua forma, episcoporum quoque est orta distinctio, & magna dispositione provisum est, ne omnes sibi omnia vindicarent: sed essent in singulis Provincijs singuli quorum inter fratres haberetur prima sententia: et rursus quidam in majoribus urbibus constituti sollicitudinem suciperent ampliorem per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis Ecclesiæ cura conflueret & nihil usque a suo capite dissideret. Qui ergo scit se quibusdam esse præpositum, non moleste ferat aliquem sibi esse præpositum: sed obedientiam quam exigit etiam ipse dependat. Et sicut non vult gravis oneris sacinam ferre ita non audeat alijs importabile pondus imponere. These words sufficiently shew the form of government then set up in the Churches of the western Empire under the bishop of Rome.

One circumstance of this form of government was that no bishops or others were allowed access to the Pope without the Credentialls of his Vicars, as is mentioned in the decretall Epistle of Pope Zosimus written A.C. 417 to the bishop of Arles his Vicar over all France, in these words

Zosimus universis episcopis per Gallias & septem Provincias constitutis.

Placuit Apostolicæ sedi – – – – concessimus. Which words imply that the power here given to the Popes Vicar over France was given also to his Vicars over other Provinces. < insertion from the left margin of f 140r > For Pope Zosimus A.C. 417 ordeining that none should have {illeg} all Gallia upon the Bishop of Arles by this decree < text from f 140r resumes >

The granting of this jurisdiction to the Pope, gave occasion to several bishops to write to him for his resolutions upon doubtfull cases & to his answering them by decretal Epistles. For in these days he began to give laws to the western Churches by such Epistles. Himmerius bishop of Tarraco &c – – – – of Syricius to Himmerius:

Pope Innocent I – – – – – as the head of their institution.

In the days of Pope Zosimus (A.C. 417) the bishop of Arles wasthe Popes Vicar over all Gallia. For in those days the bishops & others had no access to the Pope without the credentialls of his Vicars, & the power of giving credentials to those of all Gallia was then lodged in this bishop by the Decretal Epistle of Pope Zosimus which ran thus.

Zosimus universis Episcopis per Gallias & septem Provincias constitutis.

Placuit Apostolicæ sedi – – – – – concessimus. And all the bishops in the Diocess of Arles in their Letter to Pope Leo, say, in favour of their Metropolitan: – Cui id etiam – – – – – contineret.

And in pursuance of the vote of the said Council of Rome & the Edict of Gratian thereupon Pope Innocent I in his decretal Epistle to Vatricius bishop of Rouen in France A.C. 404. made this decree: Siquæ — — — — — of their institution

— Rome A.C. 382, that is, presently after the Edict of Gratian. ffrom that time they allowed a superiority to the Pope & soon after their metropolitan became his Vicar.

By vertue of the authority which the Bishop of Rome had been long endeavouring to compass & which the Council of Serdica had given him, Constantius had taken from him & Gratian had restored, he soon began

The bishop of Arles in Province & Vienne in Dauphiny had a lasting controversy about superiority & at length upon some disturbances occasioned thereby

The same Pope

By vertue of this authority, Pope Boniface A.C. 419 upon a complaint of the Clergy of Valentia against Maximus a bishop summoned the Bishops of Gallia & the seven Provinces to convene in a Council in Province against him & saith in his epistle to them that his predecessors had done the like. Vide Bonifacij Epist. 2.

And when the bishops of Arles & Vienne in Province & Dauphiny had a lasting controversy about superiority & the disturbances created thereby were complained of to the Pope, Hillary bishop of Arles was checkt by the Popes Boniface, Cælestine & Leo successively, & upon a citation appeared at Rome before a Council & Pope Leo not only sent a decretal Epistle about this matter to the bishops of Gallia & Province but procured a new Imperial Edict to back the authority of his see.

But Pope Zosimus a litle after, in cititing the Council of Nice for this authority, was discovered by the African Churches, upon consulting the Acts of that Council, to be mistaken. The canon which he cited was a Canon of the Serdican Council not of the Nicene.

The same Pope Zosimus A.C. 417 cited Proculus bishop of Marseils to Rome for illegitimate ordinations & condemned him as he mentions in several of his epistles. He also decreed ordeined that no Bishops or others should have access to him without the testimonial of his Vicars, & particularly that none in all Gallia should have access to him without the testimonial of [the Bishop of [his Vicar for those parts] the Bishop of Arles. His Decree was in this manner. Zosimus universis Episcopis per Gallias & septem Provincias constitutis.

Placuit Apostolicæ sedi — — — — — concessimus.

And whereas the Bishops of Arles & Vien at that time contended for superiority, Pope Zosimus decreed that the bishop of Arles should have the right of ordeining in Gallia Viennensis & Narbonensis prima & secunda as Metropolitan over all those Provinces. Iussimus autem, saith he, præcipuam — — — — — admonemus. But afterwards upon a Letter from Simplicius bishop of Vienn, Pope Zosimus repealed this decree. And the bishop of Arles continuing contentious, Pope Leo cited him to Rome & decreed against him & for quieting this bishop backt his decree with the following Edict of the Emp Valentinian.

{illeg} continued in communion with the Church Catholick from the days of the Ap{ostles who} in the reign of Constantius had opposed & suppress the universal bishoprick erected by the Council of Serdica, — & by this Epistle the Pope made Him the Vicar over all Spain for promulging his Decrees & seing them observed

<141r>

— except the Alan kingdom in Spain which fell in the year 419. And if this by reason of its shortness, is not to be reckoned, we have the Kingdom of the Lombards to make up the ten. This kingdom came into Pannonia in the year 379 under its captains Ibor & Ayon as above & after their death chose Agilmundus the son of Ayon their king. This was done in the Consulship of Honorius & Theodosius that is A.C. 389 according to Prosper. Agilmundus reigned 33 years according to Paulus Warnefridus, & then was slain by the Bulgars a people so called from the river Volga from whence they came originally. He was succeeded by Lamissus in the Consulship of Maxinianus & Asclepiodorus (according to Prosper) i.e. A.C. 423: Lamissus routed the

Bulgars & reigned three years & was succeeded by Lechu who reigned almost 40 years & then was succeeded by his son Hildehoc & he by Gudehoc Clafoo, Tato, Wacho, Walter, Audoin, Albain & others Gudman was contemporary to Odoacer king of the Heruli in Italy & About the year 478 led his people into Rugia on the north side of the Danube over against Noricum. Tato overthrew the kingdom of the Heruli upon the Danube, & Wacho the kingdom of the Sueves, & Audoin returned into Pannonia A.C. 526 & overcame the Gepides Alboin A.C. 551 overthrew the kingdom of the Gepides; & A.C. 563 led his people out of Pannonia into Lombardy where they reigned till the year 774.

Geberic made war also upon the Sarmatæns between Dacia & Moravia & the servants of the Sarmatans being armed against the Goths revolted & made their masters fly into the Roman Empire where Constantine granted them seats. This was in the year 333 or soon after.

They came into the Empire beat the Vandals & seated themselves in Pannonia, A.C. 379 as above. After the death of their captains Ibor & Ayon they had kings Agilmundus, Lamisso, Lechu, Hildehoc, Gudehoc, Clafoo, Tato, Wacho, Walter, Audoin, Alboin, &c. After the death of their captains Ibor & Ayon they made Agilmundus the son of Ayon their king. And this they did (according to Prosper) in the Consulship of Honorius & Theodosius A.C. 389. But considering that they were at this time a small kingdom its probable that they continued in Pannonia by the permission of the Romans & like the other Barbarians lived quietly there till after the death of Theodosius the great. Agilmundus reigned 33 or 34 years according to Paulus Warnefridus & Pros & then was slain by the Bulgars a people so-called from the river Volga. Lamisso routed the Bulgars & reigned 3 years, & Lechu reigned almost 40 years. Gudehoc was contemporary to Odoacer king of the Heruli in Italy, & about the year 478 led his people from Pannonia into Rugia on the north side of the Danube in the borders of Germany & Moravia over against Noricum [from which place Odoacer then carried the Rugians into Italy. Tato overthrew the kingdom of the Heruli upon the Danube, & Wacho the kingdom of the Sueveians. Audoin returned into Pannonia A.C. 526, & overcame the Gepides. Alboin A.C. 551 overthrew the kingdom of the Gepides, & A.C. 563 assisted the Greek Emperor against Totila king of the Ostrogoths, & A.C. 568 led his people out of Pannonia into Lombardy where they reigned till the year 774.

These are the kingdoms into which the Latine Empire was rent at its first breaking. Afterwards some other new kingdoms arose as that of the Alemans in Rhetia, & some of the old ones fell. For it is not to be imagined — — — — — at their first rise.

At this time it was necessary for the Lombards in Pannonia, to arm themselves in their own defence, & assert their liberty

<141v>

In the year 786 Pope Adrian sent two Legates into Britain with twenty Canons to be received by the Saxon king And Charles the great the king of France sent an Abbot. Some of those Canons were there to receive the first six General Councils, & the Decrees of the Pope; To keep the ancient privileges granted to the Churches by the Church of Rome; To give the tenth of all the fruits of the earth & of all their possessions to the Church; & not to pray for those who dye without confession. And these Canons were received & established in Council by Aelfwald king of Northumberland & by Offa king of the Mercians & by their bishops & great men amongst which were the Archbishops of Canterbury & York, Chuniulf king of the Westsaxons promised also to receive them. [And Ethelwolf the son & successor of Egbert A.C. 846 gave Peter pence to the Pope out of all his kingdom & A.C. 854 he gave the tenth part of his kingdom to the Church.] Also Offa going to Rome ordeined further that every house in his kingdom should pay a penny yearly to S^t Peter. And Ethelwolp the son & succesor of Egbert A.C. 846 confirmed these donations of Tiths & Peter pence & extended them to all his kingdom of England. These were therefore the days in which Peter pence & Tyths were given to the Pope & Clergy, & by consequence in which the Woman began to be fed in the wilderness.

And by setting up the worship of Images , & taking upon him to canonize saints & deify a wafer to be worshipped & to grant Indulgences & Pardons & absolve men from their Oaths & Vows & to be infallible in his Decrees &c he has changed times & laws — —

And by setting up the worship of Images & taking upon him to canonize saints & deify a wafer to be worshipped & to absolve men from their vows & oaths & to grant Pardons & Indulgences & to be supreme & infallible in his Decrees &c he has changed times & laws which after his rising up & rooting up three of the first kings were to be given into his hands for a time times & half a time.

& ordeining (in the Council of

Thessalus Prince of Bavaria about the year 765 in the Synodus Aschaemensis granted tyths to the Clergy. And so did Charles the great in the Synodus Duriensis A.C. 779 & in his Capitulare composed A.C. 789, ordeining that all his subjects should pay tiths to the Churches out of all their possessions & out of all the fruits of their labours {And in the} year 803 in the Council of Hall he freed the Saxons from all taxes except tyths. And Pope Adrian in the year 786 sent two Legates into England with twenty Canons to be received by the Saxons; & Charles the great sent an Abbot with them. Some of those Canons – – – – promised also to receive them. Also Charles the great ordeined that every house throughout all France should pay a penny yearly to S^t Peter & Offa above mentioned going to Rome about the year 790 made the {illeg}rant to the Pope of a penny yearly from every house in his kingdom & Ethelwulph – – – of England. And Charles the great established tyths also in Councils at Ments & Rhimes & Arles A.C. 863. These were therefore the days – – –

And in the year 803 in the Councill of Hall celebrated in his Pallace {Salle} he freed the Saxons from all taxes except tyths. And in Councils at Mentz & Reimes & Arles A.C. 313 he established tyths / And when the Emperor Leo Isaurus sent some to apprehend Pope Gregory II, the Pope & Citizens of Rome took those that were sent & many of them were slain A.C. 726. And Pope Leo IV upon the Saracens coming by sea to invade Rome, met them with his own forces & those of Naples & fought them & put them to flight A.C. 8

<142r>

– Arabia to Babylon. And then a new Temple is built for the two tribes whose outward court is given to the Gentiles, the conquering Babylonian Gentiles who captivate & tread the holy city under foot, the nations who were tormented by the 2 witnesses & see their dead bodies in the street of the great city Babylon

The Church catholick is at first represented by the seven churches of Asia, & these are called the seven golden candlesticks, They are the seven candlesticks in the first Temple whose lamps gave light to the church catholick in the first ages of the Christian religion. The same church catholick is represented by the Woman in heaven & this Woman at length is persecuted by the Dragon & receives two Wings of a great Eagle that she may fly from the persecutor, that is, she becomes distinguished into two Churches & these two churches by reason of the persecution are the two witnesses of God, & having once acquired this name they keep it ever after. And when a second Temple is built, two candlesticks of olive tree are placed therein to represent these two Churches or witnesses. In respect of the sevenfold division the Church catholick is represented by the lamb with seven horns & seven eyes appearing in the first Temple & on Mount Sion. In respect of the twofold division the Church catholick is represented by the son of man standing upon the earth & sea with feet as pillars of fire to signify the persecutions of his people in this state of the Church. And when the woman was escaped & separated from the remnant of her seed & the Dragon was gone from her to make war upon that remnant. & the ten horned beast rose out of the sea to succeed the Dragon in the west & the two horned beast rose out of the earth to succeed the Woman in the east & the beast was deified & worshipped with his image & none were suffered to buy & sell except those who were initiated in the Church of the Beast by receiving his mark & name, & all the twelve tribes received this mark except the 144000 who are sealed with the seale of God in their foreheads; then was the first Temple destroyed by the Babylonians in respect of its outward form of church government & a second Temple was built whose outward court was given to the Gentiles. And in this Temple two Candlesticks of Olive tree are placed to represent the two witnesses now separated from the communion of the Woman.

When these times are represented by allusions to the feast of the seventh month & to the sealing in the day of Expiation, then the first Temple with the seven golden candlesticks continue to the end of the visions, & in this Temple the 144000 are sealed & stand with the lamb on mount Sion having the name of God in their foreheads & on the sea of glass having the harps of God. And in this Temple the seven Trumpets & the 7 Vials of wrath are poured out at the sacrifices of the seven days of the feast. And where these times are represented by allusions to the Babylonian captivity, & to the building of a new Temple for the two tribes, the

first Temple is destroyed & a new one built with two Candlesticks to represent the two Churches or witnesses who worship in the measured Courts while the outward court is left open to the Babylonian gentiles.

<142v>

Then the Woman fled from the temple in heaven into the wilderness to commit spiritual fornication, & separated from the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God & have the testimony of Iesus & therefore Christ directed no more {epistles to her.} At that time the two Beasts rose out of the earth & sea & thereby the Empire became divided into two Empires with their Churches false & true {seated} in the earth & sea: the two Empires being the Dragon & tenhorned Beast, their false churches the two horned Beast the Woman & their true Churches the two witnesses. And this great alteration brings in a new scene of things.

He must also be taught in particular what those dead works are of which he is to repent And these are comprehended in the promise made before baptism viz^t to forsake the Devil & all his works the vain pomp & glory of the world with all covetous desires of the same & the carnal desires of the flesh so as not to follow them nor to be led by them: that is he promises to forsake the worship of false Gods called the Devil, with all the works accompanying it; & all ambition & covetousness & unchastity. Love not the world saith Iohn neither the covetous desires of the world. If any man love the world the love of the father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh the lust of the eyes & the pride of life is not of the father but is of the world. So then the first Principles of the Oracles of God or the Principles of the doctrine of Christ called by the Apostle repentance from dead works, faith towards God, the doctrine of Baptisms & of laying on of hands & of the resurrection of the dead & of eternal judgment, are comprehended in these things, in repentance from all Idolatry & the works accompanying it, & from all ambitious, covetous & unchaste desires, in a right belief in God & Christ & the Holy Ghost in whose name we are to be baptized & in the death & resurrection of Christ, in the doctrine of Baptisms & of laying on of hands consequent thereupon, & in that of the resurrection of the dead & of eternal judgment. [Upon renouncing idolatry ambition covetousness & unchastity & professing to believe aright in the father son & holy Ghost & in the resurrection & judgment of the dead [according to the Creed or system of faith in which the Catechumens were instructed from the beginning,] they were admitted into communion by Baptism & laying on of hands. In the beginning of the Gospel nothing more was requisite to communion than these things. And to make any thing requisite to communion now which was not requisite to communion in those days or to excommunicate any man now for any thing which was not requisite to communion in the beginning, is to alter the fundamentals of the Christian religion, to teach another Gospel & to create Schisms in the Church.

Now there were men appointed from the beginning to instruct novices in the first principles of the Christian religion in order to baptism, & those that were so instructed were called Catechumens. And that they were taught from the beginning to forsake idolatry, ambition, covetousness & unchastity & to understand who were t

To forsake these things with the religions of Dæmons & to believe aright & love one another is the sum of what the Catechumens were taught in the Apostles days in order to baptism & admission into Communion. These were the first Principles of the doctrine of Christ in the beginning of the Gospel & there is no power on earth that can increase or diminish the fundamentals of the Christian religion. And almost all these fundamentals are again thus enumerated by the Apostle Paul. I beseech you, saith he,

<143ar>

By repentance from dead works he means repentance from Idolatry, ambition, covetousness & unchastity & the works which accompany them, for we promise before baptism to forsake the devil & all his works the {pomp} of the & the covetous desires of the world & the carnal desires of the flesh. If any love the world saith the Apostle Iohn, the love of the father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh [unchastity] the lust of the eyes [covetousness] & the pride of life [ambition] is not of the father but is of the world. And the Apostle Paul has again summed up –

< insertion from f 143v >

The Church catholick being the mystical body of Christ is represented by his body sometimes in the form of a man with two flaming eyes & two feet burning as in a furnace & sometimes in the form of a Lamb with seven eyes & seven horns. † The first representation relates to the Church catholick as diffused through the Greek & Latine Empires, the two last of the four Empires spoken of by Daniel. The second relates to the Church catholick as represented by the seven churches of Asia. The Church catholick is here compared to the temple & the seven Churches of Asia to the seven candlesticks with seven lamps which enlighten the whole temple to signify that the Church catholick in the first ages of the Christian religion was illuminated not by the sea of Rome but by the seven churches of Asia who had been long instructed by Iohn. The same Church catholick is also represented by the glorious woman in heaven who at length receives two wings of a great Eagle that she partakes of the division of the Roman Empire & ther by begins to be divided into the Greek & Latin Churches. She was distinguished into those Churches before but not yet divided. These wings are given her that she may fly from the persecuting Dragon. ffor the Dragon persecuted her & thence the Churches represen{ted} by her two wings became two witnesses of Christ, & having once obtained the name of two witnesses, they ever after keep that name. To represent these two Churches the son of man stands on the sea with his right foot & on the earth with his left & prophesies concerning the measuring of the inner courts of the Temple, that is, concerning the rebuilding them, & calls the two Witnesses the two Olive trees & two Candlesticks standing before the Go{d} of the earth, that is before God {in} this Temple: & Candlesticks in this prophesy are Churches, (Apoc. 1.20) & so are Olive trees Rom. 1.17, 24.

In relation to the Churches of the greek Latine empires it is represented by the two eyes & two leggs of the inhabitants of the earth & {sea.}

The Church Catholick in relation to the churches of the Greek & latin Empires is represented by the son of man with two leggs & two eyes, & by the woman with two wings of a great eagle & by the temple with two Candlesticks & two Olive trees therein & by the two witnesses & in relation to the seven Churches of Asia it is represented by the Lamb with seven horns & seven eyes & by the Temple with seven golden Candlesticks & seven lamps

The representation of the Church catholick by the first Temple with seven golden candlesticks [& seven lamps therein & by the lamb with seven horns & seven eyes] continues till the times of the seventh seale commence. And if the affairs of that seale be represented by allusions to the feast of the seventh month & day of expiation, the same representation continues to the end of the prophesy. At the opening of that Seal the 144000 are sealed in this Temple with the seale of God in the day of expiation & appear with the Lamb on mount sion in this temple & on the sea of glass singing the song of the Lamb, & the seven trumpets sound & the seven Vials are poured out at the sacrifices of the seven days of the feast in this temple.

But if the affairs of the seventh seal be represented by allusions to the Babylonian captivity then the first Temple is destroyed by the Babylonians & the courts of the temple & Altar & them that worship therein are measured to signify the building of a second Temple, & the outward court is left unmeasured & given to the Babylonian gentiles who captivate & tread under foot the holy city, & two candlesticks are placed in this Temple to represent the two <143br> {churches} {& them that} worship therein & by reason of their sufferings are now called the two witnesses. When the Empire begins to be divided into the Greek & Latin Empires, the Woman in heaven being persecuted by the Dragon receives two wings of a great eagle that she may fly from him & these two wings denote the churches of the Greek & Latine Empires & are Gods witnesses in this persecution. Afterwards when she escapes into the Wilderness & the Dragon goes to persecute the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God & have the testimony of Iesus, this remnant of the two Churches are the two Witnesses till the persecution is ended & the dragon gives the Beast his throne & power & there remain only 144000 sealed out of all the 12 tribes of Israel. These put on sackcloth & by their prophesying torment the peoples & kindreds & tongues & nations that dwell upon the earth untill the 1260 days are ended & then they are politically slain revive & ascend up to heaven in a cloud with the everlasting gospel to preach to every nation & kindred & tongue & people.

When the Dragon comes down amongst the inhabitants of the earth & sea & persecutes the Woman, two wings of a great eagle are given her that she may fly from him. These wings denote two churches the churches of the earth & sea or Greeks & Latines, & these churches are Gods witnesses in this persecution & having once the name of Gods witnesses they always keep it. While the Woman flies from the Temple of

heaven into the Wilderness The Dragon goes to persecute the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God & have the testimony of Iesus. And in this persecution the son of man in the form of an Angel stands with his right foot on the sea & his left foot on the earth & cries with a loud voyce as a lyon roareth, & an hundred forty & four thousand are sealed out of all the twelve tribes of Israel before the four Angels hurt the earth & sea These being sealed out of the inhabitants of the earth & sea to whom the Dragon came down, are gods witnesses in the earth & sea during this persecution. And when the Dragon gives the Beast his throne & power & all the world wonders after the Beast & worships him & his Image, they prophesy against him in sackcloth & torment the peoples & kindreds & tongues & nations untill the 1260 days are ended, & then they are politically slain by the Beast & revive & ascend up to heaven in a cloud with the everlasting gospel to preach unto every nation & kindred & people & tongue.

< text from f 143ar resumes >
< insertion from f 144v >

⊙ ④ The proper opinion of the Nicolaitans namely that Christ descended upon Iesus, or as the Valentians expressed it that the Saviour descended upon Iesus, or as others, that the Word descended upon Iesus & dwelt in him & did the supernatural works, being | ^{was} much more plausible then the common opinion of the Nicolaitans & Simonians which consisted in placing a multitude of Æons in the celestial orbs, & for that reason spread much more & lasted longer being handed down to posterity by Hermogenes Montanus, Proclus or Proculus, Æschines, Praxeas, Tertullian, Artemas, Noetus, Sabellius, Paul of Samosat, Marcellus Eustathius & Photinus & I think Tatian. All these hereticks held this doctrine of the Nicolaitans but yet with some diversity of language & circumstances. For some of them as Tatian Proclus & Tertullian held the Logos to be a person or substance endued with a proper life will & understanding & distinguished but not separated from the substance of the father; & others as Hermogenes, Æschines, Praxeas, Artemas Noetus, Sabellius, Paul, Marcellus & Photinus, held that the Logos was only a power seated in some dilated part of the fathers substance without any other life will or understanding then that of the father. And again, some of them, as Artemas Paul, Marcellus, Eustathius & Photinus held that the Logos only dwelt in Iesus as the holy spirit doth in good men & did the supernatural works & others as Montanus Hermogenes Praxeas Tertullian Noetus & Sabellius & perhaps Proclus & Æschines that he was united to Iesus so as to become passible. And thence Hermogenes Praxeas, Noetus & Sabellius were called patripassians. But all agreed in distinguishing between the divine nature of Christ called the Word & the man who took his beginning of the Virgin & was assumed by the Word.

Montanus a Platonist refining the errors of the Gnosticks rejected their Astronomical Theology as too gross & remote from the Christian religion & retained only those Æons which might best be defended. He took the Son & holy Ghost for emissions of the fathers substance, or Æons emitted from him by efflux or projection of substance & made them subordinate to him.

The true Christians which Tertullian here calls simple & imprudent, in other places of his works he calls Psychici – animal people, a name borrowed by the Cataphrygians from the Valentinian heresy. ffor the Valentinians called themselves Pneumatici spiritual men & the true Christians Psychici Which confirms me in the opinion that Montanus refined the Valentinian heresy rejecting the Astronomical Æons & retaining only so much of the Nicolaitan philosophy as was applicable to the Logos & the Paracles & to Angels & the souls of men.

In this philosophy of the Cataphrygians the father is a fals God because the true God emitts nothing from his substance. He is all eye, all ear all sense, all understanding, all wisdom, all power & has nothing in him which can be emitted by speaking, generating, emanation, dilation, projection or any other act, from any thing els that is in him & to worship a God that generates by emission of substance is to worship another God a strange God the God of Simon Magus & the Gnosticks the great Iupiter of the heathens who was a man deified & exalted into the throne of the supreme God & is still said to retain the humane passions of love & lust & generating by emission of substance. Also the Son in this Philosophy is a fals God because a substance generated by emission of the fathers substance, & by consequence the son of God of the Gnosticks the son of the heathen Iupiter, the Logos of Orpheus & Plato, & Philo the λογος ἐνδιάθετος ἢ προφύρικός of the God of the Gnosticks, an Æon emitted from the substance of the God of the Gnosticks as a ray from the sun, a river from its fountain, & a tree from its root. And for the same reason the Paraclete of the Montanists is a false God being an Æon emitted from the God of the Gnosticks. And therefore the Christians in Tertullians days

were not mistaken in proclaiming the Montanists to be polytheists. When Iohn tells us that there were many Antichrists who went out from the church because they were not of the Church, & adds, Who is a lyar but he that denyeth that Iesus is the Christ & He is Antichrist that denyeth the father & the son; Whosoever denyeth the Son the same hath not the father: in these sayings he speaks of the Gnosticks of his days who denied that Iesus was the Christ by distinguishing {betwe}en them {an}d saying that Christ descended upon Iesus, & who by denying that Iesus was the Christ denied the Son, & by denying the Son < text from f 143ar resumes > <144r> & dividing the father into Æons denied the father. And in the same manner that the Gnosticks denied the father & the son the Montanists also denied them & in their stead worshipped fals Gods a fals father & a false son the heathen Iupiter & a part or power of the heathen Iupiter. ffor as worshipping fals Gods is denying the true God (Iob. 31.28) so in the language of Iohn to deny the father is to worship a fals God in his room & to deny the son is to worship another Lord & another God then the father of our Lord Iesus Christ. For when Iohn tells us he that denyeth the Son hath not the father, He doth not mean that he that denieth the son hath no God but that instead of the father he hath another God Every Christian who by fals {wisdom}e} denies that Iesus is the Christ or that Iesus Christ is come in the flesh denies the son & hath a fals son & he that hath a fals son hath a fals father & denyes the true father & the true son & is an idolater & this is the spirit of Antichrist according to the Apostle. To distinguish the supreme God into parts & make him generate by emission of substance is to have & worship the Iupiter of the heathens instead of the God of the Christians & to worship the parts or powers of the supreme God as the son & spirit of the supreme God is to worship the son & spirit of the Iupiter of the heathens. And this was the case of the Montanists as the Christians of those days represented. ffor they accused the Montanists of dividing the unity of the supreme God & thereby becoming polytheists, & when the Montanists excused this division by calling God One God with an œconomy, they waxed pale at this œconomy as a palliation of polytheism like the œconomy of the heathens who siad that they worshipped but one God because all their Gods were but one, being nothing els then parts or powers of the supreme Iupiter. The God of the Gnosticks was the Iupiter of the heathens because they made him generate by emission of seed into Ennœa. And as the heathens sometimes considered their Gods as both male & female & said that Minerva was born of Iupiters brain & Bacchus of his thigh, so the Gnosticks made their supreme God both male & female & said that Ennœa was born of him alone as the first conception of his mind & so the Cataphrygians made the Logus the son of the first God without the help of any other female then himself, & said that he was first conceived in him & then born out of him being the λογος ενδιάθετος by conception & the λόγος προφορικὸς by birth.

And w{h}ereas the Gnosticks had hi{th}erto made a great multitude of Æons generated of this Iupiter & of one another by emission of substance & therefore consubstantial: Montanus for restraining their number to three gave them the name of Τριὰς the Trinity. ffor I do not find that this name was used by any ancients heretick. And his disciples erroneously pretended that baptism was performed in the name of this Trinity & that the spiritt the water & the blood in the first epistle of Iohn were symbols of this trinity. And this was the metaphysical philosophy

being substances. And as a man is first begotten & then born first thinks & reasons & then speaks what he has thought of so according to the Cataphrygian philosophy God first generated Sophia Wisdom by which he so contrived all things secretly in himself & then brought forth this wisdom outwardly as {illeg} & Word & by this Word produced all things in their several species & individuals as it were by speaking, Itaque Sophiam quoque exaudi, saith Tertullian, ut secundam personam conditam. Primo Deus creavit me — — — — cor meum sermonem optimum. The Gnosticks feigned that their Æons were first begotten & then born & that the Logus was first conceived in Gods mind & then emitted by speaking; & in the very same manner the Cataphrygians feigned that the Son of God was first conceived in Gods mind as his wisdom before the creation began & then emitted & brought forth as his Word by speaking & born as it were out of his womb by eructation when God said ffiat Lux. And this Word they supposed to be the same with the Λόγος Father in me. And

was first conceived as Gods active reason & wisdom by which he contrived all things & then born as it were out of Gods womb as his Son, & emitted as it were out of his mouth as his Word when he said: Fiat lux.

And as the Gnosticks made Silence to precede the Λόγος so did the Montanists. Ante omnia, saith Tertullian, Deus erat solus, ipse sibi et mundi et locus et omnia Cæterum ne tunc quidem solus; hebebat enim secum quam habebat in seipso; Rationem suam scilicet. Rationalis enim Deus — etiam ante principium, — tacite cogitando et disponendo secum quæ per Sermonem mox erat dicturus. — Vide cum tacitus tecum ipse

congrederis, ratione hoc ipsum agi intra te Quanto ergo plenius hoc agitur in Deo cujus tu quoque imago et similitudo censeris quod habeat in se etiam tacendo rationem & in ratione sermonem.

<145r>

Among the many nations conquered by Ermaneric I reckon the Lombards. Paulus Diaconus tells us that they lived in Pannonia 42 years, & went thence into Italy in April A.C. 568. They came into Pannonia therefore A.C. 526. They were led thither over the Danube by Audoin their ninth King, the Emperor granting them seats. They were seated before beyond the Danube in the confines of the Heruli & the Suevi, & before that in a country called Rugiland or the country of Rugis, a place on the north side of the Danube over against Noricum whither they were led by Gudehoc that is about the year 476. Paulus Diaconus tells us they were Germans originally called Winuli & from their long beards Longobardi, & came out of Scandinavia (so the ancients under the conduct of two captains Ibor & Ayon who led them against the Vandals whom they routed & that after the death of these two captains they set up kings over them the first of which reigned 33 years & was slain by the Bulgares, & the third reigned 40 years. Whence its probable that they were a Vandalic nation (as the name Winuli imports & above an hundred years before the Heruli invaded Italy, came out of Gothland in the southern parts of the great peninsula of Sweden & Norway by the ancients called Scanzia & Scandinavia & taken for an Island in the Baltic sea, & landing near the Oder, came amongst the Vandals, Bulgars, Rugij, Heruli Suevi & Gepides & other nations subject first to Ermanreic & then to Attila & upon the death of Attila were left on the north side of the Danube neare the Gepides. The Greeks say that the Lombards were descended from the Gepides, & therefore in the opinion of the Greeks they were the subjects of Attila.

Among these nations I reckon also the Lombards who (according to Iornandes) came originally out of Scandinavia or Scanza in the Baltic sea & were called Winuli (that is Vandals) & (from their beards) Longobardi, & under the conduct of their captains Ibor & Ayon attacked & routed the Vandals & after the death of these captains were governed by the following kings. Agilmundus who after a reign of 33 years was slain by the Bulgars a people who came from the river Volga. 2 Larisso Larisso who routed the Bulgars. 3 Lechu who reigned 40 years. 4 Hildehoc. 5 Gudehoc who led them into the seats of the Rugij in the north side of the Danube over against Noricum a little {before} the Ostrogoths invaded the Heruli in Italy, that is, about the year 476 & about 3 years after passed over the Danube into Pannonia, the Emperor granting them seats. The Greeks reckoned them a branch of the Gepides the Gothic nation subject to the Huns in & before the reign of Attila. Whence its probable that the Lombards {led} the Gepides, Heruli, Ostrogoths & other northern nations to the Rhene under the conduct of Attila in his wars against the Romans. The Bulgars came from the river Volga & therefore might come into Europe with the Hunns under Balamir in the days of the Emperor Valens & attack the Lombards in that part of Dacia where the Vandals were seated.

<145v>

The Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Vandals, Gepides, Lombards came all of them {out of} the Peninsula in the Baltic sea containing Swedeland & Norway & by the ancients reckoned an island & {called} Scanzia or Scandinavia. And thence it came to pass that they all spake the same language & agreed in their manners. Paulus Diaconus in his Historia Miscella lib. XIV when he came to the reign of the sons of Theodosius, tells us: Eodem tempore erant Gothi & aliæ gentes multæ & maximæ trans Danubium habitantes: ex quibus rationabiliores quatuor sunt; Gothi scilicet, Huisogothi, Gepides et Vandali, et nomen tantum et nihil aliud mutantes. Omnes autem fidei erant Arianæ malignitatis. Isti sub Arcadio et Honorio Danubium transeuntes locati sunt in terra Romanorum, et Gepides quidem (ex quibus postea diversi sunt Longobardi et Avars) villas quæ sunt circa Singidonem & Sirmium habitavere. And Procopius in the beginning of his Historia Vandalica writes to the same purpose. And Constantinus Porphyrogenita Emperor of Constantinople transcribed out of the History of Theophanes Γήπαιδες ἔξ ὧν ὕστερον διηρέθησαν Λογγοβάρδοι, Gepidæ ex quibus dissidio facto orti Langobardi. And Salmatius out of Greek MSS not yet published Γήπαιδες οἱ λεγόμενοι Λογγοβάρδοι, Gepidæ qui dicuntur Langobardi.

Prosper & Iornandes & Paulus Warnefridus tell us that the Lombards seeking new seats came out of Scandinavia under the conduct of Ibor & Ayon & first set upon the Vandals & routed them, & Prosper places this victory in the year next after the death of Valens Ausonio et Olybrio Coss. A.C. 379. Whence its probable that Lombards came over the Danube with the other Gothic nations in the reign of Valens. The Vandals had

lived quietly in Pannonia about 40 years before this incursion, & tho they now retired from the Lombards, yet they did not quit Pannonia before Stilico invited them against the Western Empire. When therefore the Hunns invaded Pannonia, they found the Lombards there. Prosper tells us that in the Consulship of Timasius & Promotus A.C. 389 the Lombards made Agilmundus their first king & that he was succeeded by Lamissus their second king in year 423.

In the reign of Hermaneric the Lombards came out of Scandinavia under the conduct of Ibor & Ayon to seek new seats. They were then called Winuli but afterwards from their long beards had the name of Longobards given them. When the Gothic nations fled from the Hunns into the Empire the Lombards also came over the Danube under the same captains & beat the Vandals then seated in Pannonia, & remained in Pannonia many years. The Vandals retired westward & the Emperor Gratian went into Gallia against them & the Alemans & the Vandals went back into Pannonia. This was when Theodosius lay sick at Thessalonica A.C. 379. And accordingly Prosper places the victory of the {Lombards} over the Vandals in the Consulship of Ausonius & Olybrius. A part of the Salian Francks were received into Brittain by {the Emp}eror Iulian about the year 358, & the Burgundians in the year 373 or 374 rose from their seats with an army of 80000 & seated themselves on the side of the Rhene. And this state of things continued till/ And now the ten were ready to take up arms & receive power as kings so soon as the Dragon should give the Beast his throne.

<146r>

The Vandals in the reign of Constantine the great were seated in Dacia upon the river Teys between the rivers Maresh & . & in the end of his reign left their seats to the Gepides & seated themselves in Pannonia. And upon death of the Emperor Valens were routed by the Lombards. Yet staid in Pannonia till Stilico called them from thence against the Western Empire. The Gepides came over the Rhene into Pannonia in the Reign of Arcadius & Honorius, & seated themselves in Pannonia neare Singidonum & Sirmium in the borders of the Vandals & Lombards. And after the death of Attila the Gepides with their associates routed the sons of Attila & became lords of all Dacia where they seated themselves making the main body of the Hunns retire beyond them. The Avares retired from Pannonia into Hungary. The Lombards retired over the Danube & seated themselves over the banks of that river over against Pannonia. And the Ostrogoths staid in Pannonia.

The Burgundians between the Vistula & the southern fountain of the Boristhenes where Ptolomy places the Phrugundiones & the Burgiones. The Alans between the northern fountain of the Boristhenes & the mouth of the River Tanais where Ptolomy places the Mons Alaunus. The Roxolani on the western side of the Palus Mœotis, & southern side of the Alans. The Bastarnæ upon the Boristhenes westward not far from the Euxine sea.

Before these nations revolted

The Goths or Ostrogoths were seated in the eastern parts of Dacia, the Vandals in the western upon the river Teys where the rivers Maresh & Karesh run westward into it, the Visigoths between them, the Gepides are placed by upon the Vistula. The Burgundians another Gothic nation were seated between the Vistula & the sothern fountain of the Boristhenes at some distance from the mountain Crapac northward where Ptolomy places them by the names of the Phrugundiones & the Burgiones. The Alans (another Gothic nation according to Procopius) were seated between the northern fountain of the Boristhenes & the mouth of the river Tanais where Ptolomy places the mountain Alaunus. The Rouolani were on the western side of the Palus Mœotis & southern side of the Alans.

The Latine Empire is represented by the little horn of the He-Goat, & the Beast with ten horns. It became a horn of the He Goat by inheriting the kingdom of Attalus in Asia minor. It had seven successive heads common to it self & the Dragon, These began to reign at the opening of the seven seals but its heads are without crowns because in the Dragon whose heads are crowned. & answering to the times of the seven seals because until the Dragon gave the Beast his throne It was wounded to death with a sword in its sixt head during the reign of Constantius. It revived & its deadly wound was healed by the division of the Empire in the beginning of the reign of Valentinian & Valens. After its wound was healed & the division of the Empire between Gratian & Theodosius it rose out of the sea & then this healed wound in its sixt head began the reign of its seventh head. And The Dragon gave him his power & throne at the division of the Empire between the sons of Theodosius. And then the ten horns which hitherto had received no kingdoms & therefore were

without crowns on the Dragons head, receive power as kings & are crowned in the head of the Beast. Because they were upon the head of the Dragon without crowns we are to look for them among the nations which were under the Dominion of the Dragon before the division of the Empire & from time to time came under his dominion untill the Dragon gave the Beast his throne. And because they are crowned on the head of the Beast & received power as kings the same hour with the Beast, we are to look for them among the nations which received power as kings when the Dragon gave the Beast his power & throne & great authority. [But before I give you an account of them it will be convenient to give you some further account of the Monarchy of Dacia.

And on this eighth head are ten horns all of them crowned: but on the Dragons head they are without crowns. They were therefore ten nations over which the Dragon reigned but in the reign of his sixt head had received no kingdoms, but were to receive power as kings about the same time with the Beast, that is, about the same time that the Dragon gave the Beast his power & throne.

< insertion from the left margin of f 146r >

And when the Dragon gave the Beast his throne the seven Trumpets began to sound, the seven thunders began to utter their voices & the seven Vialls of wrath began to be poured out.

< text from f 146r resumes >
<146v>

By the Decree of Gratian the Popes receiving of appeals from the western Churches, his appointing of Vicars in these Churches & his writing Decretal Epistles to be observed by them: his superiority over other Bishops became so far advanced in the West by degrees, that the Council called at Rome by Charles the Great in the year 800 to hear his accusers declared him above all humane judicature, & by that Declaration established his supremacy over the Western Churches. And henceforward times & laws were given into his hands, & not before because he had but newly subdued three of the first kings who were to oppose him in his rise & had but newly acquired a temporal dominion whereby he became a horn of the fourth Beast, & his religion & authority was but newly extended into Germany & tiths were but newly settled on the Church by Charles the great.

The Popes were now chosen by the Romans & confirmed by the Emperors. But Leo VIII A.C. 964 gave power to the Emperor to chuse the Pope. And the Romans still contending for their right of Election the Emperor Henry II made them renounce their right of Election Anno 1046 & Nicolas II Anno 1059 ordered that the Popes should be chosen by the Cardinals & Emperor, & Gregory the VIIth soon after (viz^t 1077) deprived the Emperor of Investitures as Simoniacal, & by excommunications set the Papal power above the Imperial. & had a look more stout then his fellows.

The controversy about worshipping of Images lasted in the Greek Empire till the year 842, & then that worship, after it had been set up by the 2^d Council of Nice under Irene A.C. 787, condemned by a Council at Constantinople under Leo X A.C. 814, was restored & established by a Council at Constantinople under the Empress Theodora, & hath lasted ever since. The doctrine of Transubstantiation was first broached openly by Paschasius Ratbertus a litle after the year 800. It got ground by degrees & continued to be disputed till Berangarius appealed against it, who for opposing it was condemned by Councils at Rome A.C. 1050, & Rome AC 1059, (which last Council decreed the Election of the Pope by the Cardinals with the subsequent approbation of the inferior clergy & then some of the people, salvo Imperatoris honore.) And by these steps the Abomination of Desolation was set up.

Pope Leo III A.C. 804 came into Germany to the Emperor Charles the great attended with his Cardinals Archbishops Bishops & Prelates dedicated new Churches in several parts of Germany granting them many Indulgences And at the instance of the Emperor Charles they went together to the town of Vuerda on the Rhene near Colen & visited the Church & Convent of S^t Sunibert & there Pope Leo with the consent of his Cardinals & Prelates in the presence of the Emperor canonized S. Sunibert with great solemnity, & appointed that day viz^t to be observed yearly by that town in memory of the Canonization & Exaltation of this Saint, & granted special Indulgences for that Church to those who should meet there annually to observe the same.

And at the same time many people of both sexes came together out of the Province to see the Canonization & receive the Popes benediction & remission of their sins.

As Dacia by being formerly a part of the Roman Empire is {hence} {illeg} part of the subject of the prophesies concerning this Empire, so all the nations conquered by it henceforward belong to that third part, & so Germany from the time that it was conquered by the Francks in the reign of Charles the great, became part of the body of the Beast.

<147r>

I have hitherto considered those false Christians (or rather Antichristians) who either separated from the communion of the true Christians or were excommunicated by them. I will now mention some other Christians who continued in communion notwithstanding their opinion that the son was the λόγος προφορικὸς emitted a little before the world began & by that emission generated into a son.

Iustin Martyr who flourished — — — — — Christ is called the son of God

Tatian the disciple of Iustin was also instructed — — — — it began to have considerable effects

Eusebius bishop of Cæsarea — — — — — being all things potentially.

<148r>

the profane & impious may not trample upon the holy things. For we also acknowledge it a benefit received from you that we are preserved safe & intire, & we pray for freedom from danger in time to come. And if there shall be need of greater intercession & deprecation, call together a Quire of your brothers the martyrs & in conjunction with them all intercede for us. Let the prayers of many just ones atone for the sins of the multitude & peoples. Exhort Peter, excite Paul & also Iohn the divine & beloved disciple that they may be solicitous for the Churches which they have erected for which they have been in chains, for which they have undergone dangers & deaths, that the worship of Idols may not lift up its head against us, that heresies may not spring up like thorns in the vineyard, that tares grown up may not choak the wheat, that no rock void of the fatness of true dew, may be against us & render the fruitful power of the word void of a root but by the power of the deprecation of your self & your companions, o admirable man & eminent among the martyrs, the common wealth of Christians may become a field of corn. The same Gregory Nyssen in his Sermon upon the death of Meletius bishop of Antioch, preached at Constantinople the same year (A.C. 381) before the bishops of the second General Council, spake thus of Meletius. The bridegroom, saith he, is not taken from us. He stands in the middle of us tho we do not see him. He is a Priest in the most inward places & face to face intercedes before God for us & the sins of the people. And while Gregory preached this before the Council of Constantinople: you may thence know (saith ^{a[18]} Baronius) that he professed what the whole Council, & therewith the whole Church of those parts beleived, namely that the saints in heaven offer prayers for us before God.

✦ And even the great Athanasius who died in the year 373 was of the same opinion from his youth. For in his Epistle to Marcellinus concerning the book of the Psalms, he introduces an old man calling him his Son & giving him many advices concerning the interpretation & use of this book, which he recommended to Marcellinus particularly that no man under a shew of eloquence should be induced to adorn the Psalms with secular words nor endeavour to transpose the sayings or anywise to change them, but without any artifice to recite & sing them as they are spoken, that the holy men who as Gods servants delivered them to us, knowing their own words may pray with us, or rather that the holy spirit who spake in the holy men seing his own words with which he inspired them, may join [with them] in assisting us in our prayers. Certainly, said the old man, I have heard from prudent men that anciently in Israel by the reading of the scriptures alon{e} they put the devils to flight & detected their stratagems against men. And therefore, said he, they are worthy of all condemnation who omitting these, & using foreign elegant words, from those name themselves exorcists. ffor they rather trifle & offer themselves to be derided by the devils as happened to the sons of Sceva the Iew who attempted to exorcise in this manner. For the Devils hearing such things mock at them but are afraid of the words of the saints & cannot bear them. This was the doctrine which Athanasius imbibed in his youth & in the name of the old man recommended to Marcellinus. For certainly this Epistle & the Exposition of

Athanasius upon the Psalms was writ in the reign of Constantine the great, the discourses therein concerning the Divinity of Christ being suitable to tho{se} <148v> times & conteining nothing which may relate to the times after the Council of Tyre not to say after the Council of Nice. Let these discourses be compared with the discourses of Athanasius in his Orations contra Gentes written before the times of the homousian controversy & they will appear to be much of a piece. For he then attributed supernatural effects to words & the sign of the cross.

Damasus who was made bishop of Rome A.C. 367 & died A.C. 384 — — — — — into the bishopric of Rome A.C. 367.

Hilary who died in the year 368, not only ascribed supernatural effects to the reliques of saints as you have heard but also declared for the invocation of Angels & saints. For upon the 129th Psalm he writes thus. It is not the nature of God but our infirmity which wants the intercession of Angels. ffor they are sent for the sake of those who shall inherit salvation, God being ignorant of none of those things which we do but our infirmity wanting the ministry of spiritual intercession to ask & merit. And so upon the 124th Psalm: Neither the custody of the saints nor the protection of Angels are wanting to those who desire to stand. And a little after: And least we should beleive it to be a light safeguard which is placed in the Apostles or Patriarchs & Prophets or rather in the Angels which do compass the Church with a certain custody, it is added: And the Lord encompasses his people henceforth & for ever. But perhaps the custody of the Apostles or Angels may be thought sufficient: It is true, but &c.

Ambrose who was made Bishop of Millain A.C. 374 & died A.C. 397, concludes — — — — — cohæredes Dei. And in his book de viduis he writes thus. When Peters wives mother was taken with a great feaver, Andrew intreated the Lord for her ——— & thou hast neighbours to supplicate God for thee. Thou hast the Apostles thy neighbours, Thou hast the martyrs thy neighbours — — — The Angels are to be intreated for us who are granted to us for a safeguard the Martyrs are to be intreated whose patronage by the pledge of their bodies we seem to chalenge. They can supplicate for our sins because by their own blood if they had any sins they havewashed them away. For they are the martyrs of God, our Presidents, the inspectors of our lives & actions. Let us not blush therefore to use them as intercessors of our infirmities because when they overcame they knew the infirmities of the body.

<149r>

By vertue of the same Imperial Edict not only Spain {&} Gallia but also Illyricum became subject to the Pope. Damasus made Ascholius or Acholius bishop of Thessalonica the metropolis of Illyricum his Vicar for hearing of causes, & in the year 382 Acholius being summoned by Pope Damasus came to a Council at Rome & Pope Syricius the successor of Damasus decreed that no bishops should be ordeined in Illyricum without the consent of Anysius the successor of Ascholius. And the following Popes gave Rufus the successor of Anysius power of calling Provincial Councils. For in the collections of Holstenius there is an account of a Council of Rome convened under Pope Boniface II in which were produced Letters of Damasus Syricius, Innocent I, Boniface I, & Cœlestine bishops of Rome to Ascholius Anycius & Rufus bishops of Thessalonica, in which letters they commend to them the hearing of causes in Illyricum granted by the Lord & the holy Canons to the Apostolick Sea throughout that Province. † < insertion from lower down f 149r > [† And Syricius saith in his Epistle to Anysius: ^[19]Etiam dudum Frater charissime per Candidianum Episcopum, qui nos præcessit ad Dominum, hujusmodi literas dederamus ut nulla licentia esset, sine consensu tuo in Illyrico Episcopos ordinare præsumere, quæ utrum ad te pervenerint scire non potui. Multa enim gesta sunt per contentionem ab Episcopis in Ordinationibus faciendis, quod tua melius caritas novit. And a little after: ad omnem enim hujusmodi audaciam comprimendam vigilare debet instantia tua, spiritu in te sancto fervente: ut vel ipse, si potes, vel quos judicaveris episcopos idoneos, cum litteris dirigas, dato consensu qui possit in ejus locum qui defunctus vel depositus fuerit, Catholicum episcopum vita et moribus probatum, secundum Nicænæ synodi statuta, vel Ecclesiæ Romanæ, clericum de clero meritum ordinare.] < text from higher up f 149r resumes > And Pope Innocent I saith in his epistle to Anysius:^[20] Cui [Anysio] etiam anteriores tanti ac tales viri prædecessores mei Episcopi, id est, sanctæ memoriæ Damasus Siricius, atque supra memoratus vir ita detulerunt, ut omnia quæ in omnibus illis partibus gererentur sanctitati tuæ quæ plena justitiæ est, traderent cognoscenda. And in his epistle to Rufus:^[21] the successor of Anysius Ita longis intervallis

disternatis a me ecclesijs discat consulendum ut prudentiæ gravitæque tuæ committendam curam causasque, siquæ exoriantur per Achaia Thessalia, Epiri veteris, Epiri novæ & Cretæ, Daciæ mediterraneæ Daciæ Ripensis, Mœsiæ Dardaniæ & Prævali Ecclesias Christo Domino annuente censeam. Vere enim ejus sacratissimus monitis lectissimæ sinceritatis tuæ providentiæ et virtuti hanc injungimus sollicitudinem: non primitus hæc statuentes, sed præcessores nostros Apostolicos imitati; qui beatissimis Acholio et Anysio injungi pro meritis ista voluerunt. And Boniface I in his decretal Epistle to Rufus & the rest of the Bishops in Illyricum: Nullus, ut frequenter dixi, alicujus ordinationem citra ejus [episcopi Thessalonicensis] conscientiam celebrare præsumat: cui, ut supra dictum est, vice nostra cuncta committimus. And Pope Cœlestine in his decretal epistle to the Bishops throughout Illyricum, saith: vicem nostram per vestram provinciam noveritis [Rufo] esse commissam, ita ut ad eum fratres charissimi, quicquid de causis agitur, refereatur sine ejus consilio Nullus ordinetur, nullus usurpet eodem inconscio commissam illi Provinciam. Colligere nisi cum ejus voluntate episcopos non præsumant. ☉ < insertion from f 149v > ☉ And in the cause of Perigenes in the title of his epistle^[22] he thus enumerates the provinces under this bishop: Rufo et cæteris Episcopis per Macedoniam Achaïam Thessaliam, Epirum veterem, Epirum novam, Prævalin & Daciam constitutis. < text from f 149r resumes > And Pope Xystus in a decretal Epistle to the same bishops: Illyricanæ omnes ecclesiæ ut a decessoribus <149v> { nostris} {illeg}, et nos quoque {fecimus}; {illeg} Thessalonicensis Antistitis, ut suo solitudine, siquæ {illeg} assilent, actiones distinguat atque definiat, et ad eum quicquid {illeg} dotibus agitur, referatur. Sit Concilium quotiens causæ fuerint {illeg} pro necessitatibus emergentium ratione decreverit. And Pope Leo in his Epistle to Anastasius bishop of Thessalonica: Singulis autem Metropolitanis sicut potestas ista committitur ut in suis Provinciis jus habeant ordinandi {illeg} eos metropolitanos a te volumus ordinari; maturo tamen & decocto {judicio}

^[23]Synodus Romana sub Felice III circa annum 484 in epistola synodica ad Constantinopolitanos:

The Church of Ravenna (the Metropolis of Flaminia & Æmelia) was also subject to the Pope. For Pope Zosimus A.C. 417 excommunicated some of the Presbyters of that Church, & wrote a commonitory epistle about them to the Clergy of that Church as a branch of the Roman Church. In sua, saith he, hoc est in ecclesia nostra Romana. ③ And Pope Leo I being consulted by Leo bishop of Ravenna about some quæstions, answered him by a decretal Epistle. A.C. 451. ② And Petrus Chrysologus bishop of Ravenna in his epistle to Eutyches extant in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, wrote thus: Nos pro studio pacis et fidei, extra consensum Romanæ civitatis Episcopi, causa fidei audire non possumus. ① And when those of Ravenna having elected a new bishop gave notice thereof to Pope Sixtus, the Pope set him aside & ordeined Peter Chrysologus in his room [See Baronius Anno 433 § 24.] And Petrus Chrysologus possumus. And Pope Leo I being consulted by Leo decretal epistle. And Pope Gregory the great reprehending Iohn bishop of Ravenna about the use of the pallium tells him of a precept of one of his predecessors Pope Iohn commanding that all the privileges granted by his predecessors to the bishop & Church of Ravenna should be kept. And this bishop Iohn returned a submissive answer, & after his death Pope Leo I ordered a visitation of the Church of Ravenna sent the pallium to his successor Maxinian as of ancient custome & confirmed the privileges heretofore granted to this Church [Greg. l. 3. Epist 56, 57 & l 5. Epist 25, 26, 56.] This Church revolted two or three times from the Church of Rome but returned again to its obedience.

<150r>

In like manner the Bishop of Aquileia with his diocese was subject to the Bishop of Rome, & acted by his decrees as is manifest by the 79 decretal Epistle of Pope Leo I directed to Nicetas bishop of Aquileia For the Pope begins this Epistle thus. Regressus ad nos filius meus Adeodatus Diaconus Sedis nostræ, dilectionem tuam poposcisse memoravit, ut de his a nobis auctoritatem Apostolicæ Sedis acciperes, quæ quidem magnam difficultatem dijudicationis videntur afferre. And then he sets down an answer to the Questions proposed by Nicetas, & concludes thus: Hanc autem Epistolam nostram, quam ad consultationem tuæ fraternitatis emissimus ad omnes fratres & comprovinciales tuos Episcopos facies pervenire, ut in {exitium} observantia, data prosit auctoritas. Data 12 Kal. Apr. Majorano Aug. primùm cos. A.C. 458. This Diocess was large extending eastward to Pannonia secunda or inferior & westward to the river Adda which divided it from the Diocess of Millain.^[24] It contained Pannonia prima, Rhætia secunda, Noricum, Istria, Forum Iulium & Venetia. It was then the second city of the western Empire, & was by some called the second Rome. Gregory the great A.C. 595 cited Severus ♦ < insertion from f 149v > ♦ And Gregory the great A.C. 591 cited

Severus bishop of this city to appear before him in judgment in a Council at Rome. Greg. Lib. 1. Indic 9 Epist 16. < text from f 150r resumes >

The Bishops of Aquileia & Millain created one another & therefore were of equal authority & alike subject to the sea of Rome ffor Pope ^{a[25]} Pelagius (about the year 557) testifies this in the following words Mos antiquus fuit, ut quia pro longinquitate vel difficultate itineris ab Apostolico illis onerosum fuerit ordinari ipsi se invicem Mediolanensis & Aquileiensis ordinare episcopos debuissent. □ < insertion from lower down f 150r > □ These words imply that the ordination of these two bishops belonged to the sea of Rome. When Laruentius bishop of Millain had excommunicated Magnus one of his Presbyters & was dead, Gregory the great absolved Magnus & sent the Pallium to the new elected bishop Constantius. [Greg. Lib. 3, Epist 26 & Lib. 4 Epist. 1.] And the next year reprehended him of partiality in judging Fortunatus & commanded him to send Fortunatus to Rome to be judged there [lib. 5. Epist 4.] & four years after appointed the bishops of Millain & Ravenna to hear the cause {on} Maximus. [Lib 9. Epist. 10 & 67. < text from higher up f 150r resumes >] Hence Ambrose bishop of Millain saith: ^[26] Ecclesia Romana hanc consuetudinem non habet, cujus typum in omnibus sequimur & formam. And a little after: In omnibus cupio sequi ecclesiam Romanam. And in his commentary upon 1 Tim. 3: Cum totus mundus Dei sit, tamen domus ejus Ecclesia dicitur cujus hodie rector est Damasus.

<150v>

And two years after (viz A.C. 601) when Constantius was dead, & the people of Millain had elected Deusdedit his successor, & the Lombards had elected another: Gregory wrote to the Notary clergy & people of millain that by the authority of his letters Deusdedit should be ordeined & that he whom the Lombards had ordeined was an unworthy successor of Ambrose [Lib. 11 Epist. 3, 4. Whence I gather that the church of Millain had continued in this state of subordination to the sea of Rome ever since the days of Ambrose. For Ambrose himself acknowledged the authority of the sea of Rome. Ecclesia Romana, saith he, hanc consuetudinem — — — — — rector est Damasus. Auxentius the predecessor of Ambrose was not subject to the sea of Rome & therefore the subjection began in Ambrose. This diocess of Millain contained Liguria with Insubria, the Alpes Cottiae & Rhætia. In the year 844 the bishop of Millain revolted from the sea of Rome & continued in this revolt about 200 years as is thus mentioned by †^[27] Sigonius. Eodem anno [sc. 844] Angilbertus Mediolanensis Archiepiscopus ab Ecclesia Romana parum comperta de causa descivit, tantumque exemplo in posterum valuit, ut non nisi post ducentos annos Ecclesia Mediolanensis ad Romanæ obedientiam auctoritatemque redierit.

The bishop of Ravenna (the metropolis of Flaminia & Æmilia) was also subject to the Pope. For Gregory the great upon the death of Iohn bishop of this city appointed a visitation of this Church, sent the pallium to his successor Maxinian as of ancient custome & confirmed the privileges heretofore granted to this church. [Lib. 5 Epist 25, 26, 56. Pope Leo the great in answer to some questions proposed by Leo bishop of Ravenna sent him a decretal Epistle [Epist 37] Petrus Chrysologus bishop of Ravenna in his epistle to Eutyches extant in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon; wrote: Nos pro studio pacis et fidei extra consensum Romanæ civitatis episcopi, causas fidei audire non possumus

In omnibus autem hortamur te frater honorabilis ut his quæ a beatissimo Papa Romanæ civitatis scripta sunt obedienter attendas; quoniam beatus Petrus qui in propria sede & vivit & præsidet, præstat quærentibus Fidei veritatem. Nos enim pro studio pacis & Fidei extra consensum Romanæ civitatis Episcopi, causas Fidei audire non possumus. Petrus Chrysologus Ravennatis episcopus in epistola ad Consilium Chalcedonense adversus Eutychem A.C. 450.

— had done the like. And Petrus Chrysologus bishop of Ravenna in his epistle sent to Eutyches communicated to the Council of Chalcedon Nos enim pro studio pacis et fidei extra consensum Romanæ civitatis episcopi causas fidei audire non possumus.

And a little after they add that the number of bishops convened at Ariminum ought not to have the force of præjudice seing their profession of faith was composed without the consent of the Bishop of Rome whose opinion was to be expected in the first place, & without the consent of Vincentius & some others, & those that did then consent, being since returned to a better mind had testified their dislike of that form.

whose bishops met in Council every half year at Rome as their metropolis. ffor the Council of Nice {ordeined} that Councils should be held in every Province every spring & autumn & according to this Canon the bishops of his Province met every half year at Rome. ffor in this sence Pope Leo I interpreted this Canon of the Co

For that the Bishop of Rome began now to exalt the Council of Rome & to overrule the Councils of other Provinces there are many instances. Pope Zosimus A.C. 417

Thus Pope Zosimus —

And to give you some instances of these proceedings in relation to Councils Pope Zosimus A.C. 417 — —

The bishops of Rome claimed a prærogative over all the west by primitive institutu

And if this Ecclesiatical Monarchy had not yet been erected yet the Imperial edict of Valentinian II was

And the same Pope Leo having in a Council at Rome passed sentence against Hilary bishop of Arles for unlawful ordinations took occasion from thence to procure the following Edict from the western Emperor Valentinian for establishing more absolutely the authority of his Sea over all the Churches of the western Empire — A.C. 445.

There were at this time some barbarian kingdoms in the western Empire but as soon as they became converted to the Roman catholick faith they submitted to the dominion of the sea of Rome.

Now tho the Western Emperors for the peace of their Empire set up this ecclesiastical dominion of their Imperial city, yet the Bishop of Rome coloured over his claim with other pretenses. So Pope Innocent I in his Decretal epistle to Decentius bishop of Eugubium. A.C. 406, represents that — — — — head of their institution: an argument that would subject Rome to Illyricum & both to Asia & Antioch & Antioch to Ierusalem. And in almost all the decretal Epistles obedience to the Apostolic sea & chair of Peter is inculcated, whereas the Church of Rome was of the uncircumcision & Peter was an Apostle of the circumcision & none of the Apostles were bishops of any cities. They were not confined to residence in single cities but sent to preach to the whole world, & left no successors in this mission. Nor were the Churches of Asia during the reign of Vespasian Titus Domitian & Nerva under the government of the Bishops of Rome but under that of the Apostle Iohn And as for that text Thou art Peter & upon this rock will I build my church: it was personal & was fulfilled in Peter when by his first sermon he converted three thousand & therby founded the church of the circumcision & afterwards by the calling of Cornelius founded also the Church of the uncircumcision. Arguments drawn from these heads might help to colour over this dominion with a shew of religion when it was set up: but it was set up & established by the Edicts of Gratian & Valentinian. When the Bishops of Asia deposed Paul of Samosat the heathen Emperor Aurelian referred the matter to the bishop of his imperial city Rome. When the bishops of Afric referred their case to the hearing of the Gallican bishops the Emperor Constantine the great added the bishop of Rome, & soon after the Council of Nice gave him the primacy of honour & when Constantinople was built & made the head of the eastern Empire the second general Council gave the primacy to the bishop of this city next after Rome, as being new Rome.

And the same Pope Leo in another place teaches the same thing in these words. De toto mundo unus Petrus eligitur, qui et universarum gentium vocationi et omnibus Apostolis cunctisque Ecclesiæ patribus præponatur, ut quamvis proprie regat Petrus quos principaliter regat et Christus. Serm. 3 de sua ad Pontificatum assumptione.

And when Ambrose came to the bishop of a certain city of Sardinia, percontatus est ex eo utrum cum Episcopis Catholicis, hoc est cum Romana Ecclesia, conveniret. [Ambr. de obitu fratris Satyri.] And the same Ambrose in conjunction with the Synod of Aquileia A.C. 381 in their synodical epistle to the Emperor Gratian: Totius Orbis Romani caput Romanam Ecclesiam, atque illam sacrosanctam Apostolorum fidem, ne

turbari sineret, obsecranda fuit clementia vestra; inde enim in omnes venerandæ communionis jura dimanant. [Synod. Aquil.

<152r>

And Tertullian is witness that the baptism of hereticks was disallowed by the African Churches before the end of the second century. ffor in his book de baptismo which he wrote before he became a Montanist, he describes the practise of the Churches in Afric {&} saith ^[28]Vnus omninò baptismus et nobis tam ex Domini Evangelio quam ex Apostoli{s} literis, quoniam unus Dominus et unum baptisma et una Ecclesia in cœlis. Sed circa hæreticos sane quid custodiendum sit, digne quis retractet: ad nos enim editum est. Hæretici autem nullum habent consortium nostræ disciplinæ, quos extraneos utique testatur ipsa ademptio communionis. Non debet in illis cognoscere quod mihi est præceptum quia non idem Deus est nobis & illis, nec unus Christus, id est, idem; ideoque me baptismus unus quia non idem; quem cum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent.

The Cataphrygian heresy first spread silently in the Churches & Apollinaris bishop of Hierapolis in his latter days wrote against it & was one of the first who did so & not long after it had created great tumults in the Churches (Euseb. Eccl Hist. l. 4 c. 27) . ffor it was condemned & its professors excommunicated by a Council convened at Hierapolis under Apollinaris & by other Councils convened in Asia (Euseb. l. 5. c. 16, 19) And these were the first Councils of Bishops convened against hereticks so far as I can find in Ecclesiastical history, & by excommunicating the Cataphrygians seeme to have given occasion to Pope Victor to issue communicatory letters to them, this being done as it seems to me in opposition to the proceedings of the Churches of Asia. ffor I see not why he should write communicatory letters to the Cataphrygian Churches of Asia as distinct from the other Churches of Asia before they were distinguished by excommunication: & after they were excommunicated to write communicatory letters to them was to oppose & dissolve the sentence & authority of the Churches & Councils which excommunicated them. And this was the first attempt made by the Bishop of Rome to the universal Bishopric.

When Cyprian — — — — accipiat spiritum sanctum. The doctrine therefore of disallowing the baptism of hereticks continued in the Churches of Afric till after the year 314: but the bishops of Rome & Italy by supporting the party of Cæcilian extirpated it & introduced their own doctrine of allowing that baptism.

In the eastern Churches — — — — — catechised & baptized.

This principle of allowing — — — — — A.C. 362. But after this principle began to be received in Egypt & Syria, it overspread the eastern Empire & became universal in a little time.

It has been a frequent — — — — — Greek Church over her own members.

<153r>

to God had. Athanasius who died in the year 373 // Ephrem Syrus who died in the year 378 had an Oration on these 40 Martyrs not yet published This Oration of Athanasius is not yet published but Gerard Vossius saw the MS in the library of Cardinal Ascanius in Italy, as he mentions in his commentary upon the oration of Ephrem Syrus on these 40 martyrs; & therefore their reliques were dispersed & some of them sent into Egypt in the life time of Athanasius, that is before the year 373.

by him And [Basil] 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 — — —

Ephræm Syrus who was contemporary to Basil & dyed the same year with him, in the end of his Encomium or Oration upon Basil newly dead thus invokes him: Deprecate for me a very miserable man & recall me by thy intercessions, o father [Basil,] thou couragious me a weake one, thou diligent me a negligent one, thou chearful me a sloathful one, thou wise me a foolish one. Thou who hast treasured up a treasure of all virtues reduce me empty of every good work. And in the beginning of his encomium upon the 40 martyrs written at

the same time he thus invokes them. Help me therefore, O ye saints, with your intercessions & o ye beloved, with your holy prayers, that Christ by his grace may guide my tongue to speake &c And afterwards mentioning the mother of one of these 40 martyrs he concludes the Oration with this invocation. I entreat thee o holy faithfull & blessed woman, pray for me to the saints saying: Intercede ye triumphers of Christ for the least & the miserable Ephræim, that I may find mercy & by the grace of Christ may be saved. And again in his second Sermon or Oration on the praises of the holy martyrs of Christ, he thus invokes them. We entreat you, O most holy martyrs to deprecate the Lord for us miserable sinners beset with the squallor of negligence, that he would infuse his divine grace into us. And afterwards neare the end he invokes them again in this manner. Now ye most holy men & glorious martyrs of God, help me a miserable sinner with your prayers: that in that dreadfull hour I may obtēin mercy, when the secrets of hearts shall be made manifest. I am to day become to you, O ye most holy martyrs of Christ, as it were, an unprofitable & unskilfull cup-bearer: for I have delivered to the sons & brothers of your faith a cup of the excellent wine of your warfare & with the excellent table of your victory replenished with all sorts of dainties have endeavoured with the whole affection & desire of my mind to recreate your fathers & brothers kindred & relations which dayly frequent the table: ffor behold they sing & with exultation & jubile glorify God who has adorned the most sacred heads of your vertue with incorruptible & cælestial crowns, & with excessive joy they stand about the sacred reliques of your martyrdome, wishing for a benediction | blessing & desiring to carry away the holy medicines of body & mind. As good disciples & faithfull ministers of our benign Lord & Saviour, bestow therefore a blessing upon them all. And I also, tho weak & feeble, having received strength by your merits & intercessions, with the whole devotion of my mind, have sung a hymn of your praise & glory before your holy reliques. Wherefore I beseech you stand before the throne of the divine majesty for me Ephræm a vile & miserable <153v> sinner that by your prayers I may deserve to obtēin salvation & with you enjoy eternal felicity by the grace & & benignity & **{illeg}** of our Lord & Saviour Iesus Christ to whom with the father & holy ghost be prais honour vertue & glory for ever & ever Amen.

Gregory Nazianzen 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 obtēining an ascension or divinity. And in the end of his Oration upon Athanasius written presently after his death A.C. 373, he thus invokes him. Do thou — — — virgin Mary.

Gregory Nyssen in the life of Ephræm Syrus tells how a certain man returning home from a far country was in great danger by reason that all the ways were intercepted by the armies of barbarous nations; but upon invoking Ephræm by name & saying Holy Ephræm assist me he escaped the danger, neglected the fear of death & beyond his hope got safe home. And in the end of this Oration Gregory invokes Ephræm in the following manner: But thou [o Ephræm] assisting now at the divine altar & sacrificing to the Prince of life & to the most holy Trinity together with the Angels, remember us all & obtēin for us pardon of our sins that wee may enjoy the eternall happiness of the kingdom of heaven. The same Gregory in his Oration on the Martyr Theodorus written A.C. 381, thus describes the power of the martyr & the practise of the people. This martyr, saith he, the last year, quieted the barbaric tempest & put a stop to the horrid war of the fierce & cruel Scythians. — If any one is permitted to carry away the dust with which the tumb is covered wherein the body of the martyr rests, the dust is accepted as a guift & gathered as to be laid up a thing of great price. ffor to touch the reliques themselves, if any such prosperous fortune shall at any time happen, how great a favour that is & not to be obtained without the most earnest prayers they know well who have obtained it. ffor as a living & florid body, they that behold it, imbrace it, applying to the eyes, mouth, ears & all the organs of sense, & then with affection pouring tears upon the martyr as if he was whole & appeared to them, they offer prayers with supplication that it would intercede for them as an advocate praying to him as an Officer attending upon God & invoking him as receiving guifts whenever he will And at length Gregory concludes the Oration with this prayer. O Theodorus we want many blessings. Intercede & deprecate for your country before the common king & Lord. ffor the country of the Martyr is the place of his passion & they are his citizens & brethren & kindred who have him & defend him & adorn & honour him. We fear afflictions, we expect dangers: the wicked Scythians are not far off ready to make war against us. As a soldier fight for us, as a martyr use liberty of speech for your fellow servants. Pray for peace that these publick meetings may not cease, that the furious & wicked barbarian may not rage against the temples & altars, that

And the Latines mutually charged the Greeks with Polytheism & {Arianism} for calling the father & son two hypostases as if the ffather & Son must be two Gods if they be not one by unity of substance & as if all men who did not place the unity of the Deity in the unity of substance were Arians.

Now that Sabellianism & Montanism – – – – ὁμοιούσιος to the father as well as ὁμοούσιος.

After this conviction the homousians began to change their language of one hypostasis to that of three, & to call those sabellians who still adhered to the language of one hypostasis & mutually to be called Arians by them for changing their language. And in this state things continued till the reign of Iulian the Apostate when Athanasius reconciled the two parties about their language telling them that one party by their language of one hypostasis understood one substance in nature & species & the other by their language of three hypostases understood three substances in number. And this exposition was allowed by the Bishop of Rome. ffor Ierom a little after the reign of the Emperor Iulian coming into Syria & there being reprehended for using the language of one hypostasis would not change his language till he had written to Pope Damasus about it.

In these disputes Arius & Athanasius had both of them perplexed the Church with metaphysical opinions & expressed their opinions in novel language not warranted by scripture. The Greeks to preserve the Church from these innovations & metaphysical perplexitys & put an end to the troubles occasioned by them anathematized the novel language of Arius in several of their Councils, & so soon as they were able repealed the novel language of the homousians, & contended that the language of the scripture was to be adhered unto. The Homousians made the father & son one God by a metaphysical unity the unity of substance: the Greek Churches rejected all metaphysical divinity as well that of Arius as that of the Homousians & made the father & son one God by a Monarchical unity, an unity of Dominion, the Son receiving all things from the father, being subject to him, executing his will, sitting in his throne & calling him his God, & so is but one God with the ffather as a king & his viceroy are but one king. ffor the word God relates not to the metaphysical nature of God but to his dominion. It is a relative word & has relation to us as the servants of God. It is a word of the same signification with Lord & King but in a higher degree. For as we say my Lord our Lord your Lord, other Lords, the King of Kings & Lord of Lords, other Lords, the servants of the Lord, serve other Lords so we say my God our God your God, other Gods the God of Gods, the servants of God, serve other Gods. And therefore as a father & his sons cannot be called one King upon account of their being consubstantial but may be called one King by unity of dominion if the son be Viceroy under the father: so God & his son cannot be called one God upon account of their being consubstantial. The heathens made all their Gods of one substance & sometimes called them one God & yet were polytheists. Nothing can make two persons one God but unity of dominion. And if the Father & Son be united in dominion, the son being subordinate to the father & sitting in his throne, they can no more be called two Gods then a King & his Viceroy can be called two kings.

His wrastling with Iacob is as full a proof that he had a body before his incarnation as his being handled by Thomas is a proof that he had a body after his resurrection. Not the body of an Angel which hath not flesh & bones but a body which by the power of his will he could form into the consisten{cy} & solidity of flesh & bones as well before his incarnation as after his resurrection. Such a body as he had after his resurrection, such a body he had before his incarnation. And there

<154v>

Now while the Apostles for the {sake} of the Gospel communicated with all these churches of the Iews & Gentiles: they have {illeg} us an example of charity which deserves to be considered.

<155r>

This Creed {illeg} is attributed to Athanasius in the MSS. It was composed before the reign of Iulian becuase it takes ὁυσία & ὑποστάσις in the same signification. It recites & anathematizes all the particular expressions of Arius & therefore was composed in the heat of that controversy. It comprehends all the Nicene Creed & enlarges it with several articles of the Creeds of the Latines & therefore was writ when Athanasius had to do with the Latin Church & studied to approve himself orthodox to them And these characters agre best to the time when he was in the west & gave an account of his faith to the Latines in order to be received into

communion. This Creed I have recited at large because it is the oldest I can meet with in which the H.G. is declared consubstantial to the father.

The man of sin was to be revealed by a falling away or defection from the Church & to exalt –

The heathens derived all their Gods from one suprem Iupiter, & made {them} all of one usia & in that sence said they were all but one God. The Cab{balists} & Gnosticks limited their number & called them by the names of {their} attributes & powers. The Cataphrygians, Noetians, Sabellians & Paulinists restrained their number to the father son & holy Ghost, but did not make them distinct from all eternity, the homousians who in turning the nicene creed into latin the homousians who took the son for the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος of the father made them as much distinct from all eternity as they are at present.

This mystery of iniquity was to work till there should be a falling away & the man of sin should be revealed & sit in the Tempe of God & exalt himself above every thing that is worshipped, that is till it should make such a great defection from the Church as should overcome it & reign over it & grow into a dominion above all dominions.

They did not at this time separate from the Greek Church, but claimed dominion over them, & the bishops of each party excommunicated six or eight of the other party & thereby declared that they continued in communion with the rest.

And the Montanists taught that the word was God & the flesh was man, & that the word was cloathed with that flesh without confusion of substance & by the union they became one person both God & man. Videmus saith Tertullian duplicem statum non confusum sed conjunctum in una persona, Deum et hominem Iesum. De Christo autem differo Et adeo salva est utriusque proprietatis substantiæ: ut et spiritus res suas egerit in illo; id est virtutes & opera et signa; & caro passionis suas functa sit, esuriens sub diabolo, sitens sub Samaritide, flens Lazarum, anxia usque ad mortem, denique et mortua est. Quod si tertium quid esset ex utroque confusum ut electrum, non tam distincta documenta parerent utriusque substantiæ. Sed et spiritus carnalia et caro spiritualia egisset ex translatione occurrerunt. And

⊕ & wrought the divine works. ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ And to avoid being charged with dividing between Christ & Iesus & making them two, the Montanists taught that the word cloathed with flesh without mixture of substance, by this union became one person with it both God & man, the word being God & the flesh man. Videmus, saith Tert. – – – – – occurrerunt.

But the Council understanding the original word of two substances one of which was ὁμοούσιος to the other, the Bishops of the Greek Church were offended at the translations as leading to Sabellianism & Montanism & in opposition thereunto called the father & son two hypostases & the h.g. a third & the Latines taking the language of two or three hypostases to be a denial of the ὁμοούσιος, & placing the unity of the Deity in the unity of substance, complained of the Greeks for worshipping more Gods then one. And this was that great controversy about the meaning of the word ὁμοούσιος which Socrates compares to a nocturnal war. Verum sicut nos, saith he, – – – – – aversabantur.

<155v>

{This heresy} {began in} the Greek Empire but after a {few years} spread into the western For in relation to this controversy the Council of Antioch A.C. 341 at the end of a declaration of their faith, added that the Father Son & holy Ghost were not mere names but were hypostasi quidem tres, consensu autem unus. And another council of Antioch about 4 or 5 years after, in a declaration of their faith which they composed for the satisfaction of the western Churches & sent to the bishops of Italy they defend themselves against the calumnies of making three Gods, or separating the son from the father & anathematize the opinion of them who make the father Son & h.g. one thing because according to this opinion the son cannot be incarnate & suffer without the father. And on the other hand the western Bishops in the Council of Serdica A.C. 347 in their general Epistle as it is recited intire by Theodorit, call it heresy to say that the father son & h.g. are three hypostases & endeavour to clear themselves from the crime of Sabellianism. But however, that the language of una substantia & una hypostasis became a stumbling block to the western nations & in the space of 33 years led many of the Bishops into the errors of the Sabellians & Montanists Hilary in an epistle which he wrote from Phrygia to the bishops of Gallia & Britain A.C. 358 thus acknowledges.

The bishop of Hispalis (Sevil) was vicar over all Spain till the days of Pope Hormisda & then vicar over Batica & Lusitania only, the vicarage of all the rest being given to the bishop of Tarracon.

Papa Simplicius hæc ad Z{anirem} Hispalensem Episcopum scribat Talibus idcirco gloriantes indicijs, congruum duximus Vicaria sedis nostræ te autoritate fulciri: cujus vigore munitus, Apostolicæ institutionis decreta, vel sanatorum terminos Patrum nullatenus transcendendi permittas. Pene similia scribet Hormisda Pontifex (Epist. 24) ad Ioannem Tarraconensem his verbis: Et quia per insinuationem dilexionis tuæ, hujus est nobis via patefacta providentia, remuneramus sollicitudinem tuam & servatis privilegijs Metropolitanorum, vices nobis Apostolicæ sedis eatinus delegamus, ut inspectis istis, sive ea quæ ad Canones pertinent, sive ea quæ a nobis sunt nuper mandata, servenur. At this time Pope Hormisda made the bishop of Hispalis his vicar over Bætica & Lusitania only & the bishop of Tarracon over all the rest.

In the time of the Council of Nice, Thrace was under the Bishop of Thessalonica. For when the Bishops of the Nicene Council sent the Nicene faith to the Provinces under each of them, the subscription of the Bishop of Thessalonica (as Gelasius Cyzicenus represents was this Alexander Thessalonicae Episcopus, per eos qui sub ipso censentur Ecclesijs in Macedonia prima & secunda cum ijs qui in Græcia & Europa tota, in utraque Scythia, et omnibus denique in Illyrico Thessalia et Achaia: Europa is sometimes taken generally for all Europe sometimes strictly for Thrace alone, & here it is taken in the latter sence. Constantinople at that time was subject to Thessalonica & presided only over the Islands Cyclades. ffor the subscription of Alexander bishop of Constantinople was Ecclesijs omnium cycladum insularum. But upon the building of Constantinople by Constantine the great & the division of the Empire between Rome & Constantinople Thrace became a part of the Eastern Empire while all the rest of the Province of the bishop of Thessalonica remained in the western. And at length the Council of Constantinople called the second general Council giving him the primacy next after the Bishop of Rome, he extended a patriarchal authority over the diocesses of Thrace Asia & Pontus, whose metropolitans were the Bishops of Heraclea, Ephesus & Cæsarea : which gave great offence to the Bishops of Alexandria & Rome.

Syrmium was the Metropolis of Illyricum occidentale till Attila destroyed the city, after which Laureacum became the metropolis of Noricum & both Pannonias, & Salona the metropolis of Dalmatia. [And the Pallium was sent by the Pope to the bishops of Laureacum & Salona [Vide Epistolam Symmachi Papæ ad Theodorum episcopum Laureacensem & Gregorij magni lib. 4 Ep. 53 ad Episcopos per Illyricum.] And the bishops of Laureacum & Salona received the Pallium from the Pope. [Vide Caroli a S. Paulo Geographiam sacram p. 72, 73] And Pope Zosimus in his decretal epistle to Hesychius bishop of Salona, directed him to denounce the Apostolic decrees as well to the bishops of his own Province as to those of the neighbouring Provinces. The first Roman Catholic bishop of Sirmium was Anemius. He was ordeined by Ambrose Bishop of Millain in the reign of Gratian & in the Council of Aquileia under Pope Damasus A.C. 382 these were his words: Caput Illyrici non nisi civitas <157r> Sirmicensis, Ego igitur illius civitatis episcopus sum. Eum qui non confitetur filium Dei æternum et coæternum patri, qui est sempiternus, anathema dico. The next year Anemius & Ambrose & Valerian bishop of Aquileia & Acholius bishop of Thessalonica with many {illeg} went to the Council of Rome which met for overruling the Greek Chur{ch} by the majority of votes & enabling the authority of the Apostolic Sea, as was attempted before in the Council of Serdica.

Magnus ille Ioannes [Chrysostomus] susceptis Ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ gubernaculis, non illi solum civitati, verum et toti Thraciæ, quæ est in sex Episcopatus divisa, & cunctæ etiam Asiæ quæ undecim habet Antistites, Ponticam præterea ecclesiam quæ eundem habet Episcoporum numerum quem Asia, ijsdem legibus adornavit. Theodoret l 5. Hist Eccl. c. 28

Magnus ille Iohannes [Chrysostomus] simul atque Ecclesiæ gubernaculis admotus est, — non urbem duntaxat regiam hujusmodi cura ac sollicitudine gubernabat sed et universam Thraciam quæ in sex Provincias divisa est; et Asiam totam, quæ ab undecim Præsilibus regitur : Ponticam præterea ijsdem legibus exornavit quæ totidem Rectores habet quot Asia. Theod l. 5 Eccl Hist c. 18.

Besides these three Diocesses the Patriarch of Constantinople præsided over some churches without the Roman Empire & particularly over Alania & Russia. For the Alans belonged to the Diocess of Pontus &

Russia to that of Thrace. Balsomm in Can 18 Conc. Chalc.

After the destruction of Ierusalem Cæsarea Stratonis became the Metropolis of Iudæa. & was superior to Ælia till The Council of Nice gave the dignity of Patriarch to the bishop of Ælia by this Canon. Quia consuetudo obtinuit & antiqua traditio ut Æliæ Episcopus honoretur; habeat honoris consequentiam salva metropoli [Cæsariæ] propria dignitate. And henceforward the Bishop of Ierusalem was sometimes named before the bishop of Cæsarea as Patriarch & sometimes the bishop of Cæsarea was named first as Metropolitan, And Cyrill bishop of Ierusalem contending with Acacius bishop of Cæsarea about superiority was deposed by him. [Theod. Eccl. Hist l. 2. c. 27] At this time, as Cæsarea was the metropolis of Palæstine so Antioch was the Metropolis of all the east including Palæstine [Hieron Epist 61 ad Pammachium.] But at length the Council of Chalcedon exempted the three Palæstines from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Antioch & subjected them with their Metropolitans the bishops of Cæsarea Scythopolis & Petra to the power of the bishop of Ierusalem. [Concil. Chalced. Act. 7.]

The Diocess of Asia had its rise from the kingdom of Attalus inherited by the Romans: that of Pontus from the kingdom of Mithridates conquered by them

<157v>

The bishop of Sevil was also the Popes vicar sometimes. ffor Pope Simplicius wrote thus to Zeno bishop of Sevil: Talibus idcirco permittas And Pope Hormisda made the bishop of Sevil his vicar over Bætica & Lusitania & the bishop of Tarraco his vicar over all the rest of Spain, as appears by his Epistles to them.

Aquileia was the second city of the western Empire & was by some called the second Rome. It was the Metropolis of Istria, Forum Iulium & Venetia & its subjection to the sea of Rome is manifest by [the 79th] decretal epistle of Pope Leo I directed to Nicetas bishop of Aquileia. For the Pope begins this Epistle thus. Regressus — — — — A.C. 458. Gregory the great A.C. 591 cited Severus bishop of this city to appear before him in judgment in a Council at Rome. Greg. Lib. 1 Indic. 9 Epist. 16.

<158r>

The abomination lasts till the sanctuary be cleansed & the desolation accompanies the abomination & is caused by the Kings indignation.

ffor as Antiochus Epiphanes when he last returned out of Egypt & interdicted the sacrifices of the Iews & set up the worship of the heathen Gods in all Iudea is said to have indignation against the holy covenant Dan. 11. so by the indignation in the reign of the king who doth according to his will, is to be understood the kings indignation against the holy covenant in favour of the abomination of the Mahuzzims whereby the people of God are persecuted & made desolate & troden under foot untill the sanctuary be cleansed & by consequence all the time of the end.

And this is also described plainly by Daniel in his prophesy of the weeks. The Messiah saith he shall be cut of people of a Prince that shall come shall destroy the city & the sanctuary & the end thereof shall be with a flood & unto the end of the war desolations are determined — & upon a wing of abominations he shall make [the land] desolate, that is by the overspreading of abominations as a bird overspreads her wing he shall make the land desolate See Isa. 8.8. Ier. 48.40 & 49.22.

Chap. 10

Of the daily worship & the abomination of desolation

This horn is also said to stand up against the Prince of Princes And by all these circumstances you may know him to be the great Antichrist & the man of sin, He set up the transgression of desolation & thence is called the man of sin. He magnifies himself even to the prince of the host stands up against the prince of princes, exalts & magnifies himself above every God, & speaks marvellous things against the God of Gods, & from this opposition & exaltation the man of sin is said to oppose & exalt himself above every thing that is called God or that is worshipped. In making laws about religion he doth according to his will & by the transgression

of desolation treads under foot the sanctuary & the host of heaven untill the sanctuary be cleansed & this vision continues till the last end of the indignation: & the man of sin sits in the temple of God till Christ destroy him with the breath of his mouth & the brightness of his coming.

– By his setting up the transgression of desolation, magnifying himself even to the Prince of the host & above every God, standing up against the Prince of Princes & speaking marvelous things against the God of Gods, treading under foot the sanctuary & the host untill the sanctuary be cleansed & reigning in the time of the end & last end of the indignation, you may know that he is the man of sin For the man of sin is the man of transgression & opposes & exalts himself above every God, & sits in the temple of God till Christ destroy him with the breath of his mouth & the brightness of his coming.

This king by reason fo the transgression of desolation is by the Apostle Paul called the man of sin & because he stands up against the Prince of Princes he is by Iohn called the Antichrist & because he speaks marvellous things against the God of Gods & exalts himself above every God & prospers till the sanctuary be cleansed the man of sin is said to oppose & exalt himself above every thing that is called God or that is worshipped & to sit as a God in the temple of God till Christ destroy him by the brightness of his coming.

And in the last place I would observe that the prophesy of the Apostle Paul concern{ing} the man of sin is a commentary upon Daniels prophesies concerning the last hor{n of the} Goat. They that forsake the holy covenant {illeg} <158v> hereticks called mystery of iniquity as I noted above, & {illeg} the king who doth his will is the man of sin so called from the transgression of desolation.

That Mahuzzim here Signifies protectors guardians defenders & helpers such as were the fals gods of the gentiles to those that worshipped them has been sufficiently shewed by M^r Mede, & I shall here only shew how & when the king who doth according to his will became a worshipper of such Gods.

The idolatry of the heathens consisted

And when new emperors were of new opinions they failed not of Councils to repeal the acts of the councils of former Emperors as is manifest in hist. And since the Councils were convened by the civil authority for establishing the opinions & religion of the Court, their decrees are to be looked upon as acts of the Empire Whence Daniel saith

These times which follow the opening of the seals are in the new

[The book was to be opened not only by the prophesy of the Apocalyps but also by the fulfilling of prophesy] testament c

called in the new Testament the latter days, & the latter times But first it will be convenient to explain more at large some things relating to the prophesies of Daniel.

¹ Chap.

Of the Prince of the host

² Chap.

Of the sanctuary of strength.

³ Chap.

Of the holy Covenant & daily worship

Chap

Of those that forsake the holy covenant.

Of the worship of Mahuzzims.

<159>

their land: the second — — — — — Mahuzzims. The first interval is ushered in with these words But it shal not prosper — — — — — shall fall in the reign & by the persecution of this king till the time of the end. For it is to be noted that this second intervall of time consists of two parts. The first part precedes the time of the end; the second is called the time of the end. In the first part the king who doth according to his will sets up the transgression of worshipping the Mahuzzims with a strange God & those of understanding fall & grow few: in the second the people of this king continue to worship the Mahuzzims thus set up & the few remaining saints continue in a state of affliction dispersion & desolation under the persecuting transgressors, whose transgression is therefore called the transgression of desolation.

The Angel Gabriel in interpreting the Vision of the he Goat tells Daniel that this rough goat is the king of Greece & the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king And that being broken whereas four stood up for it four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation but not in his power And in the latter time of their kingdom when the transgressors are come to the full a king of fierce countenance & understanding dark sentences shall stand up & his power shall be mighty but not by his own power. By kings he understands kingdoms. And because the period of time when the transgressors are come to the full relates to the vision concerning the daily worship & the transgression of desolation which was to last 2300 prophetick days, the same Angel Gabriel in the prophesy of the scripture of truth, which (as I said) is a commentary upon the Vision of the he goat, after he had described the rise of he kingdom of Greece represented by the first horn of the Goat & its breaking into four kingdoms represented by the four next horns, to point out the period of time called the latter time of their kingdom when the transgressors are come to the full, he describes the particular actions of the single kings of two of the four kingdoms which he calls the king of the north & south & prosecutes the description to the eighth year of Antiochus Epiphanes, the year in which the Romans conquered Macedon & at that period of time passes from describing the kings of the north & south to describe the affairs of the arms which at that time begin to stand up. And therefore the eighth year of Antiochus is the period of time called the latter time of the kingdom of the four horns when the transgressors are come to the full & the king of fierce countenance begins to stand up & the arms which then begin to stand up are this king of fierce countenance, or last horn of the Goat, & the remaining part of the prophesy of the scripture of truth relates to that horn. And this I take to be the true reason why the Angel after he comes to this period, insists no longer upon the particular actions of the single kings of the north & south but passes on through all the kings following by touching only upon the main turns of affairs relating to the reign of the last horn.

And it is to be observed that the Angel in passing on from this period downwards to the end of the prophesy proceeds by two large intervalls of time answering to the double reign of the last horn, that which followed its waxing great towards the pleasant land & to the host of heaven & that which followed its growing up to the Prince of the host. The first intervall

This practising & prospering relates to the time of the end is ready to co For the vision is said to be at the time of the end & at the last end of the indignation . The setting up the Transgression was attempted by Antiochus Epiphanes but was not then to prosper till the time of the end because the time of the end was not come. But the king who doth according to his will prospers till the indignation be accomplished & therefore the abomination of the mahuzzims lasts all the time of the end till the sanctuary be cleansed. For the time of the end is now commencing.

For after the invocation of saints & the veneration of their reliques & pictures were established: the Empire of the Saracens — — —

The little horn is the power of the

<159v>

of the scripture of truth consist of th

After the Prophet had described the actions of the kings of the north & south down the 8th year of Antiochus Epiphanes, the year in which the (Romans conquered Macedon & began to reign over the Greeks, he proceeds downwards from that period by two large intervals of time to the day of judgment, describing only the greatest turns of affairs. The first interval contains the mighty reign of the Greeks by or under the power of the Romans from the 8th year of Antiochus in which that power began till the division of the Roman Empire & separation of the Greeks from the Latines whereby that reign came to an end. The second contains the reign & fate of the Greek Empire after separation, & this interval is subdivided into two successive parts the last of which is called the time of the end. The first of the two great intervals is ushered in with these words But it shall not prosper – – – – – And the second part of the second interval begins with these words; And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him, & continues to the day of judgment. And in this time of the end the transgress worship of the Mahuzzims set up by the king who doth according to his will continues to overspread the christian world & the saints continue in a state of affliction & desolation & therefore this worship is called the transgression of desolation & this state of desolation of the saints is called the indignation against the holy covenant, & the last end of the indignation meaning by the last end not the last moment but the last interval called the time of the end.

The first interval contains the reign of this horn by the power of the Romans; the second contains the reign & fate of this horn of the Greeks after separation from the Latines. The first begins with the 8th year of Antiochus inclusively this being the year in which the Romans conquered Macedon & began to reign over the Greeks, & ends with the division of the Roman Empire into the Greek & Latine Empires this division putting an end to the reign of the Romans or Latines over the Greeks. The second interval extends from the time of that division to the end of the prophesy & day of judgment. The first interval comprehends the taking away of the Jewish daily worship & placing the abomination of desolation in their land: the second interval comprehends the taking away of the Christian daily worship & the placing the abomination of desolation in the sanctuary of the Christians which abomination is represented by the honouring of a strange God together with Mahuzzims. The first interval contains the rise of the last horn of the Goat up to the host of heaven & his reign in which he cast down some of stars to the ground, the second interval contains his usurpation of the throne of the Prince of the host

After the Prophet had described the rise of the Greek empire represe

– by two large intervalls of time with relation to the double rise & reign of the last horn of the Goat

– represented by the Goat & the actions of his first horns & particularly of the kings of the north & south or northern & southern horns down to the eighth year of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes the year in which the Romans conquered Macedon & began to reign over the Greeks: he translates his discourse from the first horns to the last & proceeds downwards from this period of time to the day of judgment by two large intervalls of time answering to the double rise & reign of this last horn, & describes only the greatest turns of affairs relating to it. The first interval contains the reign of this horn by another's power or the reign of the Greeks under the dominion of the Latines: the second contains the reign & fate of the Greek Empire after separation from the Latines. The first begins – – – – – day of judgment. The first interval contains the rise of the little horn up to the host of heaven & the first part of his reign wherein he cast down of the host & of the stars to the ground: the second contains the rise of this horn up to the Prince of the host & his taking away the daily worship of the people of the {Prince} & casting down his sanctuary with an host given him by reason of the transgression of desolation. The first interval comprehends the taking away of the Jewish daily worship & placing the abomination of desolation in their

<160r>

When we are commanded to beware of Philosophy & vain d{illeg} & {opposi}tions of science falsly so called: the meaning is, not that we should condemn all Philosophy of falshood, but that we should avoyd falling out with one another about philosophical opinions true or false. When some of the Christians of the Circumcision who came from Iames endeavoured to impose the law of Moses upon the Gentiles, the Apostle Paul called it preaching another Gospel whereby they made void the faith in Christ, not because the law was evil (for the Apostle tells us that it was good;) but because it was not necessary to salvation & therefore not to be imposed as an article of communion. And for the same reason the imposing of any Proposition (true or false) as an Article of Communion which was not an Article of communion from the first preaching of the

gospel, is preaching another Gospel & the persecuting of any true Christians for not receiving that gospel is persecuting Christ in his mystical members & the persecutor in making war upon Christ deserves the name of an Antichristian in a literal sense.

Moses commanded the people of Israel that they should make Iudges & Officers in all their Gates (that is in the Gates of all their citys) to judge the people with just judgment. Deut. 16.18. These Iudges sat in the Gates of the city & were called the Elders of the city & judged of capital causes & **{illeg}** {Mults more often other} matters Deut 21.19, 20, 21: & 22.15, 16, 17, 18, 21. & 25.7, 8. Ruth 4.1, 2, 9, 11, Amos 5.14. This sort of government by Elders for putting the laws of God in execution continued in Israel till the captivity & then was abolished by the Chaldeans (Lament 5.14) & at length restored by the commission of Artaxerxes given to Ezra (Ezra 7.25, 26, & 10.14) And while these Elders met in the Gates of the City to do justice, & were there attended by their under Officers & by such of the people as had business with the Iudges or came to heare the tryalls, there was also a place of worship set apart in the Gate for prayer & for reading of the Law of Moses by which the Elders were to judge the people & the Elders **{illeg}** who sacrificed erected an Altar on the next hill calling it the high place 1 Sam. 9.19, 25. And these Assemblies were at length by the Greeks called Synagogues & the Elders & Presbyters & sometimes the Synagogue were called Churches Matt. 18.17. And the Jews also who were dispersed among the Gentiles, erected Synagogues in every city where they were sufficiently numerous, the Greeks & Romans conniving at this practice. And this form of government descended from them to the Christians, For they ordeined Elders in every city 1 Tit. 5 **{†}** < insertion from lower down f 160r > **†** & the Iewish ceremony of laying on of hands the board of Elders in every city exercised a judicial power even in civil affairs – – – < text from higher up f 160r resumes > the board of Elders in every city exercising a judicial power over civil affairs by the consent of the Christians under them 1 Cor. 6.1, 2, 3, 4, & Tim. 5 This board was by the Greeks called the Presbytery or consistory of Elders 1. Tim. 4.14 & those of the board by the Latines Prebendaries, the chief ruler of the Synagogue the President or Presul or [Ἐπίσκοπος the] Bishop, And a Roman Lawyer called in to assist them in civil affairs, became the Chancellour of their Court. And the Christians of the circumcision called these assemblies Cathedral Churches Synagogues Iames 2.2. & continued to call them so in Iudea till after the middle of the fourth Century as Ierome informs us, who tells us also that the Bishop was by them called the Prince of the Synagogue. And since this form of government was interrupted by the Babylonian captivity & is now much altered from what it was in the beginning of Christianity, **†** < insertion from lower down f 160r > **†** & the Holy Ghost is not given to wicked men by the laying on of hands, & no man has power to give the Holy Ghost to whomsoever he pleases by vertue of a ceremony Christians may hence < text from higher up f 160r resumes > Christians may hence learn to live quietly & to suffer one another to live quietly every man under the government of his own city.

These Elders were elected by the City the people voting & the Presbytery confirming the Elections by laying on of hands <160v> And this form of government descended from them to the Christians. For they ordeined Elders in every city 1 Tit. 1.5 & in ordeining them retained the Iewish ceremony of laying on of hands 1 Tim. 5.22. & the board of Elders in every city exercised a judicial power over the Christians by their consent even in civil affairs 1 Cor. 6.1, 2, 3, 4 & 1 Tim. 5.17, & was by the Greeks called the Presbytery or consistory of Elders 1 Tim 4.14, & the place of their assembling & worshipping was by the christians of the circumcision called their synagogue Iames 2.2.

And after the manner of the Jews the Christians of every city incorporated themselves under a Council or Consistory of Elders or of Presbyters called the Presbytery & headed by a President or Bishop Act. 4.23 1 Tim 1.5 & called the Presbytery & this Council of Presbyters 1 Tim 4.14 admitting them after baptism into the communion of their own city by laying on of the hands of their President & depriving offenders of this communion as they saw reason. They judged also of civil affairs by the consent of the people 1 Cor. 6.1, 2, 3, 4 & 1 Tim. 3.5. & 5.17. [And by reason of a stipend allowed them yearly for their attendance on the business of the Council they were called Prebendaries At length They called in a Roman Lawyer to assist them in civil affairs & this Lawyer becme their Chancellour.] Thus the primitive Christians by ordeining Elders in every City distinguished themselves into as many Communities or Churches as there were cities & those of any one Church communicated with those of any other by Letters communicatory. & being excommunicated by their own Church they lost the communion of all the rest. And in this state things continued till the days of Pope Victor. The places where the Presbytery met were called Churches by the converted Gentiles & Synagogues

by the converted Jews. And the Bishop was by the converted Jews called the Prince of the Synagogue Iames.
2.2. Ierom

And by reason of a stipend allowed the Presbyters yearly for their attendance on the Council they were called Prebendaries. At length they called in a Roman Lawyer to assist them in civil affairs & this Lawyer became their Chancelour.

& Theseus stole Helena^{a[30]} just before the Argona{utic} expedition being then 50 years old & she but seven or as some say ten. {Atachates &} Theseus went also with Perithous to ^{b[31]}steale Proserpina the daughter of Aidoneus & Persephone king & Queen of the Molossi & was imprisoned & while Theseus lay in prison Castor & Pollux released their Sister Hellena & captivated Æthra the mother of Theseus, & then sailed with the Argonauts. Sesostris was therefore contemporary to &c

– And Apollonius Rhodius, that Hypsipyla gave Iason the purple cloak, which the Graces made for Bacchus, & which Bacchus gave to his son Thoas the father of Hypsipyle.

His tuition might begin in the 17th or 18th Olympiad & his Legislature fall upon the 21th or 22th.

Now the daughters of Danaus being contemporary to Theseus, & some of their sons being Argonauts, Danaus with his daughter fled from his brother Sesostris into Greece one {generation} before the Argonautic expedition, & therefore Sesostris returned into Egypt in the reign of Rehoboam & so was Sesac. ffor both of them were kings of all Egypt at one & the same time.

– soon after, & Pricus married Chaleiope the daughter of Ætes & by her had several children & died before the Argonautic expedition

<161r>

For as the Heathens & Hereticks beleived all their Gods to be of one substance with the first God, so all the Christians who beleived the Son to be the λόγος ἐνδιόθετος of the father must of necessity have beleived that he was of one substance with the father, this opinion being the consequence of the former. And yet this opinion was the foundation of the theology of the heathens Cabbalists & Gnosticks & when the Montanists applied it to the Trinity & gave the name of Oeconomy to their disposition of the Trinity, the major part of Christians both Greks & Latines who flourished in the beginning of the third century (that is, the body of the Church Catholick) were frighted at this doctrin (as you have heard out of Tertullian) & accounted it polytheism & therefore looked upon the Montanists as heathens & idolaters. ffor as the heathens were guilty of polytheism notwithstanding that they beleived all their Gods to be of one substance & accounted them all to be but one Iove & sometime called them one God so the Montanists might be polytheists notwithstanding that they beleived the Tinity to be unius substantiæ & called it one God, ffor the affirming the three persons to be but one God amounts to nothing more then a denial of the crime of polytheism, & a bare denial of a crime doth not free men from being guilty. And if it did, it would free the heathens as well as the Montanists from this crime. Tertullian indeed calls the Christians who opposed the Montanists, simplices quosque & imprudentes & Idiotas quæ major semper credentium pars est, but in doing so he calls himself a Gnostick. ffor the Gospel was adapted to the understanding of the meanest of the people, & preached to the poor. Father saith Christ, I thank thee that thou hast hid these things from the wise & prudent of this world & revealed them to babes. And therefore we are to look for Apostolick traditions amongst Tertullians simple people & to account all such learned metaphysical doctrines as are above the reach of these people to be the inventions of the wise & prudent of this world. The common people are tenacious of traditions, the learned are apt to intermix their own opinions.

As by Tertullians testimony it appears that the body of Christians in his days both Greeks & Latines were very averse from placing the unity of the Deity in a metaphysical unity or unity of substance & could not so much as hear the opinion with patience accounting the Montanists to be Idolaters: so it appears by the proceedings of the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosat that the Churches continued against it till those days. This Council met 55 years before the Council of Nice & consisted of about 80 bishops & her

sentence against Paul rejected the ὁμοούσιος & her sentence was communicated to all the Churches & unanimously approved by them & confirmed by the bishops of Rome & Italy even in writing & therefore the ὁμοούσιος or doctrine of the λόγος being one God with the father by unity of substance was then rejected by the voluntary & unanimous consent of the Church Catholick. And when she had once rejected it she had no authority to receive it afterwards, because by rejecting it she declared tradition to be against it. For in matters of faith she has no authority to vary from tradition, no not in point of language. For the faith which was once delivered to the saints is only to be known by the language in which it was delivered, & therefore the Church is commanded to keep to the form of sound words.

And yet by the writings & discourses of Theophilus, Athenagoras, Clemens & Tertullian & their friends & followers, the opinion that the son of God was λόγος ἐνδιάθετος καὶ προφώρικος the internal & prolatitious word of the father, spread so much in the Churches in the third & fourth centurys as to taint the Emperor Constantine the great with his favorite Hosius & the Bishops of Rome & Alexandria with those of their party who subscribed the Letters of the bishop of Alexandria & by their means tho not without much opposition to get the word ὁμοούσιος inserted into the Creed by the Council of Nice. The Emperor to influence the bishops published his opinion in all the Cities before the Council met, & when they met & <161v> could not agree he came in person into the Council upon a day appointed, & proposed & pressed the ὁμοούσιος & got it received into the Creed before he went out of the Council giving the bishops no time to consider the danger of admitting the condemned language of hereticks. Yet the Bishops cautioned that it should not be understood in the sense of the hereticks nor signify any thing more then ὁμοιούσιος the words ὅμος & ὅμοιος being commonly taken in the same signification. But Hosius,^{f[32]} who ^{f[33]}published the Nicene Creed & by consequence translated it into Latin, rendred the word ὁμοούσιος by unius substantiæ & the Greeks of that perswasion translated unius substantiæ by μίας οὐσίας & μίας ὑποστάσεως & this language being frequently used instead of ομοουσιος & being more apt to be understood in the sense of the hereticks became a snare & stumbling block to the people, especially to the Latines who used only the translation. Whence the Greeks^{g[34]} began soon to look upon the Latines as inclining to Montanism & Sabellianism & to put a stop to the growth of those opinions anathematized them in their Councils & the Latines mutually^{h[35]} charged the Greeks with polytheism & Arianism for calling the ffather Son & Holy Ghost three Hypostases & in their ^{i[36]}Councils endeavoured to free themselves from the imputation of Sabellianism. And even those who used the word ὁμοούσιος at length fell out amongst themselves some continuing to call the father son & holy Ghost one hypostasis, others to avoid the imputation of Sabellianism, calling them three hypostases, & these two parties called one another Sabellians & Arians till Athanasius in the reign of Iulian the Apostate reconciled them & made them understand that tho they differed in language yet they agreed in sense, one party by one hypostasis meaning one in species & nature, the other party by three hypostases meaning three in number. And thence forward the homousian Greeks to free themselves from the imputation of Sabellianism, began wholly to leave of the language of one usia & one hypostasis & constantly to use the language of one usia & three hypostases meaning one substance in nature & species & three in number & the Latines thenceforward used the language of one substance & three persons in the same sense.

And that Sabellianism & Montanism by the influence & under the protection of the language of una substantia in Latin translation of the Creed spread very much in the Latin Churches Hilary in an Epistle which he wrote A.C. 358 from Phrygia to the Bishops of Gallia & Britain thus acknowledges. Multi ex nobis, fratres charissimi, ita unam substantiam Patris et ffilij prædicant ut videre possint non magis pie quam impie prædicare: habet enim — — — — — ὁμοιούσιος to the father as well as ὁμοούσιος And by this conviction I conceive it was that Sabellianism fell in the west, & that the homousian Greeks began to use the language of three hypostases & not long after, were generally reconciled to it by Athanasius in order to bring over the Greeks more easily to his party. For at this time <162r> his party was very low & wanted art to revive it the world being now against him But after the reign of Constantius & Iulian, an Emperour of his own opinion came to the crown & began to give new life to his affairs. ffor Iovian succeeding Iulian recalled the excommunicated & banished bishops & demanding an account of their faith favoured that of Athanasius, as his contemporary Gregory Nazianzen thus describes, ^[37]Iovianus, ut pulcherrimum imperij sui fundamentum jaceret rectamque legum sanctionem — — — — — partem animo tenus pietatem colunt — partim eam igniculi cujusdam instar nonnihil accendunt — partim denique omni verborum libertate veritatem prædicant. And this was the state of affairs at the death of Athanasius.

The homousian controversy lasted till the death of the Emperor Valens A.C. 378 & was managed between the Latine Churches & chiefly the Church of Rome on the one hand & the Greek Churches & chiefly the churches of Asia on the other. Th

In the year 341 A.C. Athanasius Bishop of Alexandria, Paul of Constantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra & Asclepas of Gaza having been accused of various crimes & deposed by the Greek Councils, fled to Rome & appealed from the Greek Councils to Iulius bishop of Rome: Iulius accepted of the appeal, examined the appellants, 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 a Council at Antioch, to appear in this Council at Rome & justify their proceedings. — — — — — because they appeared not when Iulius — — — — — act of the eastern & western Churches.

Six years after these things were done Constantius conquered Magnentius the successor — — — — — acknowledging the supreme & absolute judicial authority of the Councils of the Greek Church over her own members.

After these things several Councils meeting at Sirmium, Nice in Thrace Ariminum Seleucia & Constantinople in the years 357, 359 & 360 abolished the use of the words *usia homousios* & *homoiusios* as not being in scripture & occasioning great disturbances, alledging also that the word *homousios* was rejected by their fathers in the council of Antioch long before the meeting of the Council of Nice, & was put by the Council of Nice sudenly or without mature deliberation & was a stumbling block to the people who understood it not in the sense of the Council. For Constantine the great coming in person into the Council proposed & pressed the word *ομοουσιος* & got it decreed in one day, & the bishops having no time to deliberate, admitted the word with an interpretation that it should be taken in the same sense with *ομοιουσιος*, not considering the danger of admitting a word which was usually taken in another sense. : The Latines used not the very word but translated it *unius substantiæ* & by *unius substantiæ* the common people of the Latines & even their Bishops were apt to understand one common substance of the father & son whether a previous substance out of which both were derived by division or one undivided substance in which both subsisted; as Hilary complains in a letter written A.C. 358 to the Bishops of Gallia & Britain, saying, ^[38]Multi ex nobis, fratres charissimi, ita unam substantiam Patris et ffiliij prædicant ut videri possint non magis id pie quam impie prædicare Habet enim hoc verbum in se et fidei conscientiam & fraudem paratam &c &c. And as for the people & clergy of the eastern Churches, how much they were either strangers to the word *homousios* or against it may appear by the character which the same Hilary in the same letter^[39] 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 poulum inveniri. — Nam absque episcopo Eleusio et paucis cum eo, ex majori parte Asianæ decem provinciæ vere Deum nesciunt.*

The new language above mentioned being for these reasons rejected, the Greek & Latin Churches continued still quiet till the end of the reign of the Emperor Constantius & his successor Iulian the last heathen Emperor. And hitherto from the times of the Apostles till the death of Iulian the Greek & latin Churches continued united in one unanimous Church the main body of the visible Church Catholick of Christ without interruption tho not without intestine broiles nor without heretical men intermixt with them in outward communion For Churches may have hereticks in their congregation & yet not be {hereti}cal. There might be Sabellians in communion with the Latin Churches & <163v> yet the Latine Churches if they did not make an open profession of the Sabellian faith were not to be called Sabellian, & there might be Arians in communion with the Greek Churches & yet if the Greek Churches did not make an open profession of Arianism they were not to be called Arian. They were so far from professing Arianism that they anathematized the proper language of Arius in several of their Councils. They published several Professions of faith & I do not meet with any heretical articles in any of them. If the Councils of Sirmium, Ariminum & Seleucia are called Arian for rejecting the use of the word *homousios*, the Council of Antioch which did the same thing 90 years before must also be Arian And if it be said that they were Arians in their hearts; God only knows the hearts of men: we are to judge of visible churches by their outward professions of faith & by their continuing in communion with the Church catholick. The Church composed of the Greek & Latine Churches & of the Churches in Scythia & Germany all of them in commuunion with one another in the reign of Iulian never separated from

the Church Catholick & therefore was not schismatical. These Churches & such others as were in communion with them were the whole body of Christians throughout the whole world a few separatists excepted & therefore they were the church Catholick of Christ. The Greek & Latin Churches never separated from this Church catholick nor from one another & therefore were neither of them schismatical. They contended with one another vehemently in the time of the Council of Serdica, but without excommunicating one another or breaking communion by any publick act. And if they had broke communion the western Churches would have been the schismatics because they imposed the Popes supremacy upon the eastern Churches which was an unjust condition of Communion. & occasioned the schism And when the western Churches desisted from the imposition & acknowledged the authority of the eastern Councils over her own members, subscribing to the sentence of those Councils in the Council of Millain they would have ceased to be schismatics. And as for the faith, the Creed published by the eastern bishops in their return from the Council of Serdica is by Hilary (one of the hottest of the homousians) allowed to be a complete & absolute definition of the faith And the Creed in which the Churches of the whole Empire (both Greeks & Latines) agreed at the Councils of Sirmium, Nice in Thrace, Ariminum, Seleucia & Constantinople is not found fault with except for abolishing the use of the word *usia*. Certainly if the Greek & Latin Churches were in communion with one another & by consequence a member of the Church Catholick before they abolished the use of this word: they could not cease to be a member of the church catholick by abolishing of the use of it, a word which is not in scripture nor received from the Apostles by tradition, a word which had been introduced by hereticks & abolished by the Council of Antioch with the approbation of the Church catholick 90 years before, a word which created great disturbances & was abolished by the Apostles rule of holding fast the form of sound words which they had received from the beginning.

<164r>

Hitherto the Mystery of iniquity was to work without prevailing against the Church. ffor it was to work without prevailing untill the man of sin should be revealed & the Man of Sin was not to be revealed till that which letted should be taken out of the way & that which letted was by the first Christians taken for the Roman Empire S^t Paul had told the churches what it was, but was unwilling to set it down in writing least he should be taken for an enemy to the Empire. Remember ye not, saith he, that when I was with you I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he [the Man of sin] might be revealed in his time. ffor the mystery of iniquity doth already work. Only he who now letteth will let untill he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked one be revealed. That which letted was therefor in being in the days of the Apostles & therefore was the Roman Empire. And this is generally allowed by interpreters. Not a Christian Empire but the Empire then in being, the heathen Roman Empire The Man of sin was to be a Christian dominion & while the Empire continued heathen it was impossible for a Christian dominion to rise up. It was therefore the heathen Empire which letted. This Empire began to be taken out of the way by the conversion of Constantine to the Christian religion & his victories over Maxentius & Licinius: but was not fully taken out of the way before the death of Iulian the last heathen Emperor. And we have shewn that the mystery of iniquity worked till his death, but without prevailing In the reign of Constantius the Bishop of Rome laboured hard for the supremacy, & the Western Emperor Constans with his bishops endeavoured to set up this new dominion which was to be the man of sin: but their endeavours were frustrated & the Church catholick continued entire till the death of Iulian. And now that which letted is taken out of the way it remains that we shew how the mystery of iniquity prevailed over the Church & became the man of sin sitting in the Temple of God. For the revelation of the man of Sin signifies the victory of the mystery of iniquity over the Church & its exaltation into the throne to be worshipped as a God. And this came to pass in the manner following.

When the Emperor Iulian was dead, his successor Iovian, as released Athanasius & some other bishops, from banishment & desired an account of their faith, as Gregory Nazianzen who lived in those days thus mentions. *Quinetiam fidei nostræ veritatem a multis laceratam & perturbatam* — — — — upon the death of Athanasius A.C. 373.

The faith which began now to be preached was agreed upon a few months before by letters between Athanasius & Liberius Bishop of Rome & by a consultation of 12 or 16 banished bishops who were there with Atha <164v> nasius. The Latines had long ago translated homousios by unius substantiæ, & the homousian Greeks had translated the una substantia of the Latines by una *usia* & una hypostasis. And the Latines now declaring the holy Ghost to be consubstantial to the father & son & expressing this faith by una substantia & tres personæ, Athanasius & those with him examined the language translated it una *usia* & tres

hypostases, changing una hypostasis into tres hypostases to clear themselves from the suspicion of Sabellianism. & meaning by una usia & tres hypostases one substance in nature & kind & three personal substances in number. And this was the faith which Athanasius presented to Iovian. It was agreed also by Athanasius & those with him at Alexandria that the Bishops who had subscribed in the late Councils of Sirmium, Nice ————— ereptus est mundus.

The Bishop of Rome therefore separated & by communicating with Athanasius revived his claim to appeals & to strengthen himself sent letters to the western bishops inviting them to separate & come over to him & signifying that they should be received into his communion without losing their bishopricks, & in a few years he & his successor Damasus gained most of the western bishops.

In three years he bained one half of the people of Rome. ffor upon his death, which happened in November A.C. 366 ——— & this Council sending a letter to the bishops of Illyricum they met & subscribed the Roman faith & recommended it to the Churches of Asia & Phrygia & the western Emperors Valentinian & Gratian ——— prædicare præcepit.

In the mean time the bishops of Alexandria & Antioch endeavoured to propagate the same faith in Egypt & Syria & were generally assisted by the Moncks in their diocesses. Yet the Greek Emperor Valens opposed the homousion ————— sine dilatione contendat.

And henceforward the Bishops of Rome began to give laws to the Churches by their Decrees. ffor soon after this edict Himmerius ————— ignorare sit liberum &c. This was the beginning of decretory Epistles.

The next year A.C. 386 a Council of 80 ————— jurisdiction.

After three years more ————— called in the east.

Together with the Popes supremacy & Decretory Epistles, & the worship of three equal substances in the Deity, came in the invocation of saints & the veneration of their miracle working reliques the practis of writing fabulous legends & the superstitious use of the signe of the cross in baptism. ffor the Council of Constantinople usually called the second general council.

— because they appeared not when Iulius cited them & because they now fled from justice and 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 constituted him universal Bishop over the western Churches & as far as lay in their power over the eastern also, & thereby they declared that they continued in communion with the eastern Churches They excommunicated six or eight eastern Bishops by name & thereby also they declared that they continued in communion with all the rest of the eastern Churches. And the eighty eastern bishops excommunicated five or six of the western bishops & thereby they declared that they continued in communion with all the rest of the western Churches These excommunications produced animosities between the common people in the confine of both empires, but the animosities of a small part of the common people are not the act of the eastern & western Churches.

Six years after ————— her own members

<165r>

And when he comes from his father to judg the world he is called **{illeg}** the messenger of the father. For it appears out of Philo that the ancient Iews {} Angels & principally the Angel of Gods presence by the name of λογὸι Legati Orators or messengers sent with Gods word.

May it please your Lordships

In obedience to your Lordships order signified to us by M^r Lowndes his letter of last Ian 29 upon the annexed proposal of M^r Robert Ball merchant viz^t that if your Lordships shall ship off & deliver 200 Tunns of Tinn to

his factor at Leghorn, upon his factors receipt thereof he will pay for the same three pounds 16^s per cwt either here or at Leghorn as your Lordships shall think fit: we have considered this proposal & humbly represent, that Theodore Ianssen paid 4^{li} per cwt to the late Lord Treasurer for Tin run into barrs barrelled & shipt off at her Majestys charge & delivered at Leghorn or Genoa. That in the exportation thereof a considerable quantity of Tin was always imbezzelled by the seamen when ever they touched upon land in their voiage & that the business of her Majestys ffleet required sometimes a removal of the Tinn from ship to ship whereby the barrels of Tin were broken which gave the seamen & soldiers further opportunities of imbezzling the same. & caused a new charge of repairing the barrells. All which being conside{red} we are humbly of opinion that 3^{li} 16^s upon delivery at the Tower is a better price then 4^{li} upon delivery at Leghorn, & therefore the price of four pounds should not be abated.

Besides the unity

You have heard that the three persons were said to be of one substance & consubstantial by reason of their similitude & being of one nature essence & species: but there is yet a further reason. ffor as two cohering parts of one undivided stone are unius lapidis & unius substantiæ & cannot properly be called two stones or two substances til they are broken & separated from one another so the three hypostases were conceived by many of the fourth & following ages to cohære in one undivided substance & for that reason to be of one substance. And hence came the language of the holy & undivided Trinity. So Athanasius their rays, & others compare the Trinity to thre men with this difference that men are separated from one another but the Trinity undivided. And many in the Council of Serdica seemed to be of this opinion when they called it Arianism to make the father son & holy ghost three separated hypostases. But its to be observed that the cohesion & union of the divine hypostases was not to be conceived in a corporeal manner by juxtaposition & cohesion of contiguous tangible parts but by the internal cohesion of three spirits which pervade one another & are each of them omnipresent: which manner of cohæson & conjunction the Greeks called περιχώρησις & the Latines circumincessio. For these words import a mutual penetration & pervasion of substances every where coincident & present to one another.

You have heard that in the times next after the Council of Nice when the language unius substantiæ & unius hypostasis began to be used the Greek Church accused those of Sabellianism & Montanism who used it. By Sabellians they meant those of the tautosian faith, by Montanists those of the homousian faith in the sense of Montanus that is those who held the father & son to be of one substance as parts <165v> co{hæ}ring in one undivided substance. For Tertullian in his book against Praxeas in explaining & defending the doctrine of Montanus κατὰ Proclulum, represented that the son was a cohering part of the father born of him without separation or division of the fathers substance. & that after the nativity of the son the father acted as a person in the remaining part. ffor in explaining how (according to Montanus) the son might suffer without the father, he compares the son to a river which may be muddied while the fountain from whence it flows may remain cleare. The Montanists therefore in comparing the father & son to a fountain & a stream a root & its branch, the sun & its light, understood two cohering hypostases which with the holy Ghost composed one undivided substance in the deity. And this doctrine Sabellianism (which was Montanism κατὰ Æschynem being successively received by Pope Victor & {defended} by Tertullian got root in the western churches & spread silently as is manifest by the character which Hilary gives the bishops of Gallia & Britain in his epistle written to them as has been mentioned above & also by the complaint of the eastern churches that the western was lapsed into the errors of Sabellius & Montanus, & by the approbation which the Trinity of Montanus met with amongst the homousians. For Epiphanius tells us^[40] that Montanus was of the same opinion with the catholick Church concerning the father son & h.g. tho Tertullian confesses that the generality of Christians in his days looked upon the Montanists as guilty of polytheism. Montanism therefore after it was improved by the doctrine of eternal generation, & recommended by the language of unius substantiæ prevailed in the world.

In the first half of the fourth century the disputes were only about the nature of the son. Very little was then said about the holy Ghost. And I do not find that they began to call him God openly before the reign of Iulian the Apostate. In his reign Athanasius & the little Council at Alexandria above mentioned declared an undivided consubstantial Trinity & yet but one deity, & that it was Arianism to separate the holy Ghost from the father & son or call him a creature. But Athanasius being soon forced to fly, matters rested till the reign of Iovian. And then Athanasius presented to Iovian the Nicene faith with a profession of the Deity & worship of

the holy ghost added to it. For the Nicene fathers, saith he, that the son should not be beleived only like God but true God of God, did not only say that the son was like the father, [that he should not be beleived only like God, but true God of God:] but they wrote him ὁμοούσιος which is proper to a genuine & true son of a true & natural father. Neither did they alienate the holy Ghost from the father & the son but rather glorified him with the father & son in one faith of the holy Trinity, because in the holy trinity there is one deity. [Thus did Athanasius endeavour to fasten his own opinions upon the Nicene Council by way of consequence: whereas the Council expresly cautioned that ὁμοούσιος should not be understood in any corporeal sence nor signify any thing more then like according to substance; & by consequence not be illustrated by corporeal similitudes, such as are those of a bodily father & son, a fountain & its stream, a root & its branch, a sun & its ray, so as to make any inference from these similitudes beyond what the Council allowed. ffor these were the similitudes by which the Gnosticks & Montanists supported their doctrine of Æons, & therefore are not to be applied to the actions of God the father without great caution. Neither did] But certainly the Council of Nice did not establish or declare any thing about the procession, consubstantiality Deity or worship of the holy Ghost. Nor do I meet with any disputes about his Deity & worship before the reign of Iulian the Apostate & Iovian And I find Basil & Gregory Nazianzen who lived in those days to be of the same opinion. For Basil writes thus. The confession of faith which the Nicene fathers composed I prefer to all the confessions which were afterwards invented, in which the son is confessed consubstantial to the father. — But because the quæstion which νὺν ἀκύναν at this present time is started by those who are always labouring to innovate, being passed over in silence by those of the former age because it was not denied, was left indiscussed, I mean the question concerning the holy ghost; we must add the explication of this also according to the meaning of the holy scripture : namely that we beleive accordingly as we are baptized, & give glory as we beleive. And therefore because baptism was instituted by our saviour in the name of the father & son & holy ghost, we exhibit a confession of faith <166r> {according} to baptism & a doxology according to the faith, glorifying the holy ghost with {the} father & son. Here Basil tells us the time when the controversy about the Deity of the holy ghost began & the fundamental argument upon which this Deity was founded & the ancient doxology changed. {And as} the ancient Creed was in one God, the father almighty maker of heaven & earth & in one Lord Iesus Christ the son of God who was crucified for us, & in the holy Ghost & this faith was taught to the new converted Christians in catechizing them before baptism that they might know who were the father & son & holy ghost in whose names they were to be baptized: so it is to be understood that when the primitive Christians were baptized in the name of the father & son & holy ghost they were baptized not in the name of one God the father son & holy ghost but in the name of one God the father almighty the maker of heaven & earth & of one Lord Iesus Christ the son of God who was crucified for us & in the name of the holy ghost.

And the primitive doxology was suited to the Creed.

The time when the controversy about the deity of the holy Ghost began is told us also by Gregory Nazianzen, & who began it. Iovian, saith he,

& founded this worship & deity of the h.g. upon the form of baptism. We beleive saith he as we are baptized. He should have said on the contrary: We are baptized as we beleive. ffor the primitive Christians were Catechised before baptism that when they came to be baptized they might understand who were the father son & h.g. in whose name they were baptized. And in catechizing them they wre taught to beleive in one God the father almighty maker of h & e & in one Lord I.C. the son of God who was crucified for us & in the h.g the spirit of truth & therefore they were baptized not in one God the father son & h.g. but in one God the father almighty maker of h. & e & in one Lord I C. the son of God who was crucified for us & in one h.g. the spirit of truth, & accordingly they might give glory to the father as the one God, the God almighty who created the heaven & earth & to the son as the one Lord the Lord Iesus Christ who died for us & redeemed us with his blood & rose again from the dead with a name above every name, & they might also wish for grace from the holy ghost that in him they might glorify the father & the son the father as one God & the son as one Lord. For There is one God & one mediator between God & man the man Christ Iesus, but there is no mediator between the h.g. & man nor between the Trinity & man, no mediator in whose name we may invoke any other God then the father. And we want a mediator that our prayers may be heard. In that day saith Christ ye shall ask me nothing, Whatsoever ye shall ask the father in my name he will do it for you. This was the primitive faith, the primitive baptism & the primitive worship & is of divine authority & sufficient to salvation. For the doxology is thus set down in scripture. Here we are authorized to glorify the father in the son & we are also authorized to glorify the father & the son, but in different senses represented by the

different names of God & the Lamb. Here we are authorised by God himself to give glory to the father & the son as they are God & the Lamb that was slain or the God & the Lord & we may give this glory in or by the assistance & grace of the holy spirit, but we are no where authorised to give glory to the father & the <166v> th{e so}n in any other sense then as they are God & the Lamb or God & the mediator between God & man or the God & the Lord neither are we authorized to give glory to God & to the Lamb that was slain & to the holy Ghost One God or to God & the Mediator between God & Man the man Christ Iesus & to the holy Ghost one God, or to one God the father almighty & to one Lord who was crucified & to the holy Ghost one God. ffor according to Basil we are to glorify as we beleive & were baptized.

First by this method there is more allowed by way of deduction of duties then all the Duties either paid or laid by Act of Parliam amount unto.

By the Act of the 2^d of Q. Ann no more then the nett Duties payable to the Queen & the $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for prompt payment & 6 per cent for Warehouse room were to be deducted: but by this method the deduction is more then all these to the manifest detriment of the revenue.

The hypostatical union, & purgatory & anniversary Lents were also taught by Montanus & so was the placing holiness in abstinence from marriage & meats which God has created to be received with thanksgiving, so that Monkery & corporal pennance are nothing else then Montanism improved

And in the little Council of Alexandria A.C. 362 for clearing his party from heresy anathematized Basilides & Valentinus to whom those opinions were ascribed

And what opinion the Greeks had of the Latines & their friend Paulinus for the language of 1 hyp & for defending Marcellus, you may further understand by an Epistle of Basil & those with him to the western Churches, [in which they thus endeavour to diswade the Latines from the communion of Paulinus] As for Paulinus, say they, whether he is blamable for what concerns the imposition of hands, you can tell. But it greives us that he beleives the opinions of Marcellus & receives his followers without distinction into communion. You know, most reverend brethren, that the opinion of Marcellus voids all our hope, who confesses not the son in his proper hypostasis, but only as he is produced & is to return to him from whom he proceeded; nor allows the Paraclete a proper & distinct subsistence. Now by all this it may be understood that the western Churches used the language of one hypostasis from the first beginning of their contention with the Greeks about Marcellus & others, till the reign of Theodosius the great, & were all this time accounted Sabellians & Montanists by the Greeks, notwithstanding the endeavour of Athanasius to reconcile them. The language of three hypostases suited not with that of una substantia. And yet the language of one hypostasis being accounted tautousian & Sabellian by almost all the Greeks: the Latines for clearing themselves from the imputation of Sabellianism & reconciling themselves to the Greeks were at length forced to quit it.

Before the nativity of the Son the father was the whole substance, & by the nativity a part of his substance became the son & the father acted no longer in that part least he should be incarnate & suffer. ffor the fountain & river the root & the branch are two cohering parts of the whole.

I suppose Athanasius means that the Council of Nice glorified the holy ghost silently in their heart. ffor they

Now that this was the beginning of the controversy about the Deity of the h.g. I learn further from Basil & Greg. Naz.

Now this profession of faith was approved by the Emperor & thereby gave a beginning to this new controversy about the Deity of the holy Ghost, as I learn further fom Basil & Greg. Naz.

The doxology had hitherto been in these forms Glory be to God or glory be to the father or Glory be to the father by or with the son or Glory be to the father & the Son & when the Holy Ghost was added it was with the particle in & sometimes with the particle by to signify his assistance. But now they changed it into this form Glory be to the father & the son & the holy Ghost. And

Dacia was a large {country} bounded on the south by the Danube on the east by the Euxine sea & the country of the Alans on the north by the river Niester & mountain Crapac & on the west by Germany, being parted from it by the river Tibesis or Teys which runs into the Danube a little above Belgrade. It comprehends the countries now called Transylvania Moldovia & Valechia. Its inhabitants were anciently called Daci by the Latines & Getæ by the Greeks: & from Getæ came the name Goths. Trajan conquered them & reduced their country into a Province of the Roman Empire which promoted the propagation of the Christian religion among them Sometime after they revolted & lived under their own kings & by successive conquests grew into a {illeg} by the conquests of their king Ermaneric were grown into a great monarchy. Vpon that invasion they separated into two bodies called Ostrogoths & Visigoths, The Ostrogoths opposed the Hunns & were conquered by them in the ^{c[41]} consulship of Gratian & Merobaudes A.C. 377. The Visigoths under the conduct of Fritigern fled over the Danube into Mœsia now called Servia & thence invaded the eastern Empire, beat & slew the Emperor Valens A.C. 378, & were beaten by the Emperor Theodosius & upon submission had seats granted them in Thrace as subjects of the Empire A.C. 380.

They were composed of various Gothic nations Ostrogoths Visigoths, Vandals, Gepides, Alans Gepides Heruli &c all speaking the same gothick language & their king Ermaneric was very potent extending his dominion over several neighbouring nations. He died in the reign of Valentinian & Valens & his kingdom by his death became divided into several kingdoms the chief of which were the Ostrogoths & Visigoths. About that time viz^t A.C. 376 or 377 the Huns invaded Dacia, conquered the Ostrogoths & Gepides & made the Visigoths fly to the Danube & entreat for seats in the Roman Empire, whereupon they were allowed to come over the Danube & seat themselves in Thrace. And the Vandals & Alans had seats granted them in Pannonia & the Burgundians who bordered upon Dacia westward fled to the Rhene to the number of 80000.

lived under their own kings & by succesive conquests grew into a large & potent Empire composed of many nations. Their kings Ostrogotha conquered the Gepides, Geberich the Vandals & Ermaneric the Heruli & Veneti, Antes, Sclavi, & many other warlike northern nations of Scythia & Germany. as Iornandes informs us, & amongst others the Æstri seated upon a very long tract of the German Ocean, & the nations called Thuidi, Vasinambrocæ, Mœrens, Mordensimni, Cari, Rocæ, Tadzans, Athual, Naveco, Bubegentæ, & Coldæ. From which conquests some compared him to Alexander the great. About four years before his death 80000 Burgundians fled from the Goths & seated themselves upon the Rhene. The Gepides, Vandals & Alans were Gothic nations & spake the same language with the Goths & agreed with them in manners. And the Lombards & Avars Paulus Diaconus tells us that the Lombards were originally called Winili, which makes it probable that they were of the same stock being derived from the Gepides by division. Ermaneric reigned long being 110 years old when he died. A little before his death the Hunns made war upon him & at his death brake into his kingdom & ruined it, subduing part of his people & putting the rest to flight. Amongst the conquered nations were the <167v> {Gepides} & a part of the Goths called the Ostrogoths. Another part of the Goths called the Visigoths fled to the Danube & were received by the Romans into Thrace. ‡ < insertion from f 167v > ‡ And a body of Vandals & Alans was at the same time received into Pannonia [For They remained there 40 years rose from those seats & invaded the western Empire in the year 407 & therefore fled thither in the year 377. // When the Visigoths came to the Danube they sent Embassadors to the Emperor Valens to beg seats & had seats granted them in Mœsia in Thrace, & The chief of the Embassy was Vlpilas their Bishop or Patriarch. He was Patriarch of all the Goths the Ostrogoths as well as Visigoths, which shews that they had hitherto been one nation. He was at the Council of Constantinople A.C. 360 & his predecessor Theophilus was at the Council of Nice A.C. 325 & therefore the Church of the Goths was hitherto allowed by the Churches of the Roman Empire to be a member of the Church catholick. He invented the Gothick or sclavonian letters & translated the scriptures into the language of the Goths, & promoted the Christian religion much among the Goths of both nations whereupon Athanaricus king of the Ostrogoths raised a persecution against the Christians fearing least it should prevail in his kingdom as it had newly done amongst the Visigoths.

When the Goths were seated in Thrace they wanted food & the Roman commander Lupicinus exacted upon them & invited Frigidernus their king to a feast with a designe to kill him & his retinue. But Frigidernus hearing the groans of those who were first slain escaped narrowly took up arms against the Romans beat them in battel & slew their Emperor Valens, but soon after were beaten by Theodosius & upon submission had seats granted them again in Thrace A.C. 380 where they remained quiet about 18 or 20 years as subjects of the Empire. Then upon new commotions, they took up arms again, made Alaric their captain & troubled the eastern Empire about five years together, & then — — —

His successor Vithimiris or Winitharius after some resistance was slain in battle & Viderich the young son of Vithimir was left under the tuition of Alatheus & Saphrax two eminent Captains. < text from f 167v resumes >

¶ had war with the Vandals & took the name of Lombards from their long beards which makes it probable that the Vandals as well as the Lombards descended from the Gepides. & that after separation from them & from one another the Lombards were called by that name to distinguish them from the other Vandals. for Vandali & Winili are but various pronunciations of one & the same name.

<168r>

And so far was Athanasius from rejecting that interpretation of the word ὁμοούσιος which Eusebius Pamphili in his Epistle above mentioned written to those of Cæsarea represents to have been allowed by the Council, namely that this Word should signify nothing more than that the Son was unlike the creatures & in all things like the father: that in his Epistle or Tract de Decretis Nicænæ Synodi he appealed to this Epistle of Eusebius & subjoined it to the end of the Tract as an evidence of the truth of the proceedings of the Council of Nice, & in his own writings several times inculcates the same sense of the word. And if the signification of the word ὁμοούσιος was debated & it was allowed by the Council to import such a similitude of substance we need not wonder if it were explained in the Acts of the Council & that more fully than in the Creed.

But on the other hand, if by the words ὁμοουσιος, μιας οὐσίας μιας ὑποστάσεως & unius substantiæ we are to understand that the father & son have one common substance, & if the son be incarnate like one of us as the Council of {Chalcedon affirms} (this is, as a man's spirit is incarnate & becomes one person with his soul & body) & suffered & died in the flesh as the same Council of Chalcedon affirms; then the substance of the son was incarnate suffered & died in the flesh. for what ever is done by any thing is done by the supposition or substance of the thing) & by consequence the substance of the father was incarnate suffered & died in the flesh. Which is the absurd consequence from whence the Patripassians had their name. Or if with the Council of Nice we shall say that the father is the substance of the father, & that the son subsists in the father's substance without any substance of his own: this is the opinion of those who make the son λογος προφορικὸς καὶ {illeg} ὑποστατος a Word spoken without a permanent substance which was the known error of the Paulinianists & Sabellians These two opinions of the Patripassians & Sabellians {are} one & the same in substance & differ only in words & shew that the Greek Churches had reason to oppose the Monousian faith.

And whereas Eusebius Pamphili in his letter above {mentioned} written {to those} of Cæsarea, had represented that the Council in their debates had allowed that the word ὁμοούσιος should signify nothing more than that the son was unlike the creatures & in all things like the father: Athanasius in explaining what was done at the C refers to this letter & subjoins it to his Epistle de decretis Nicænæ Synodi to shew that Eusebius had approved the faith of the Council.

And Basil in his 349th Epistle blames those of the party of Paulinus bishop of Antioch in the reign of Valens, for calling the three persons one hypostasis.

By all which it seems that the Latines of both Europe & Afric & some Greeks in the diocese of Antioch & in Egypt received not the language of three hypostases till after the reign of Valentinian & Valens./ {be præpossess} the opinion of Sabellius who said the same thing; namely

– who although he shall openly teach a difference of persons yet shall therewith understand Sabellius who said that there is one God in hypostasis, but who in scripture takes upon him various persons according to the property & exigence of the subject: & sometimes takes upon him the speeches of the father when it is seasonable to put on his person, & sometimes the speeches proper to the son when he is to descend for taking care of us or for other oeconomical operations, & sometimes puts on the person of the holy Ghost when the time requires speeches agreeable to this person. Therefore if there are among us some (he meanes Paulinus bishop of Antioch & those of his party) who say that the father son & holy ghost are one thing as to the subject & yet confess them three perfect persons; how do not seem to exhibit a perfect demonstration of the truth of what we say? Basil Epis 349

You have heard out of Hilary that the Latines Churches abounded with men corrupt in the faith & here you have the like account of the Churches of Syria, those that used the language of one hypostasis being taxed by Basil with holding one suppositum subject or substance in the Deity which opinion notwithstanding any distinction of persons Basil himself taxes with Sabellianism. [ffor that by hypostasis Basil] And that Egypt was not much freer <168v> from these errors may be gathered from the concurrence of their Bishops with the western bishops in the Council of Serdica in the profession of one hypostasis & their saying in their letter to the Africans that hypostasis signified the same thing with usia . And I think it will not be disputed that by hypostasis Basil understands

[Now that hypostasis was taken for substance in the fourth & following centuries & three hypostases of one usia, or three consubstantial hypostases for three substances of one essence nature & kind, has been proved by Petavius, Curcelleius, Cudworth, Bull & Huetius beyond exception.] substance. ffor besides the places produced, he tells us

<169v>

Athanasius libro de Synodis written in the end of the year 359. Si similis dicatur [filius] secundum substantiam, id non idem prorsus significat atque ex substantia quo verbo magis germanum patris filium ipsum esse significatur. Nam stannum est argento simile, canis lupo, aurichalcum vero auro, nec tamen stannum ex argento est, nec lupo canis filius haberi potest. Quandoquidem autem et ex substantia et ὁμοιούσιον similem secundum substantiam eum esse dixerunt, quid aliud his significant quam eum esse ὁμοούσιον consubstantialem? Etenim sicut qui dicit tantum ὁμοίουσιον similem secundum substantiam non prorsus indicat eum ex substantia esse: sic qui dicit, ὁμοουσιον consubstantialem, utriusque dicti sententiam complectetur, & ὁμοιούσιον similem quoad substantiam et ex substantia. sect 41.

Si ffilius non ex participatione filius est sed τη ὁυσία substantiâ ipsâ Verbum est et sapientia Patris: hæc autem ὁυσία substantia paternæ ὁυσίας substantiæ fœtus est & ejus similitudo, velut splendor est similitudo lucis &c ib sect 48.

Simile non de substantijs sed de figuris et qualitatibus dicitur. De substantijs enim non similitudo sed identitas dici debet. Homo igitur hominis similis dicitur non secundum substantiam sed secundum habitum et figuram: quoad substantiam enim ejusdem naturæ sunt. Rursum homo cani non dissimilis dicitur sed diversæ naturæ. Ergo quod ejusdem naturæ est, etiam ὁμοούσιον consubstantiale est et quod diversæ naturæ est etiam ἑτερούσιον diversæ substantiæ.. sect. 53

<170r>

The Bishop of Rome in the end of the second century or beginning of the third became first a Cataphrygian & then a Praxean as Tertullian in the beginning of his book against Praxeas relates & by consequence was of opinion that the Word of God was the λογὸς ἐνδιάθετος of the father from all eternity & at length was emitted outwardly as a ray of light from the sun & as the first word which god spake when he began to exert his power for creating the world, For this was the common opinion of both those hereticks.

The Church of Rome in the days of Pope Victor began to place religion in ceremonies & to err in the faith. ffor this Pope excommunicated — — — — — He seems to have written letters of peace to the Montanists of Asia & Phrygia for strengthning himself against the true Churchs of those parts whom he had newly excommunicated in order to subvert them. And henceforward there remained a perpetual misunderstanding between the Churches of Asia represented in the Apocalyps by the seven Churches & the Church of Rome represented (after separation from the seven Churches) by the woman seated upon seven hills in the wilderness. Now while the Bishop of Rome became first a Cataphrygian & then a Praxean he was certainly of opinion that the Word of God was the λογὸς ἐνδιάθετος of the father from all eternity & at length was emitted outwardly as a ray of light from the Sun & as the first Word which God spake when he began to exert his power for creating the world. For this was the common opinion of both those hereticks. [It was also their common opinion that the father & son were unius substantiæ, tho they differed in their manner of explaining this opinion.]

By these instances it is manifest that the metaphysical theology of Orpheus Plato & other heathen Philosophers began to spread much in the Churches before the end of the second century school of Alexan{dria} & infected not only those who separated & became hereticks of note, but also many others who did not separate & particularly that it insinuated it self into the Churches of Antioch & Rome & the school at Alexandria. And therefore we need not wonder if it still got ground in the third century & prevailed in the fourth. X < insertion from lower down f 170r >

X Antony the father of the Moncks (as Athanasius tells us) taught the people that the son of God was αἰδιος της του πατρὸς οὐσίας λόγος καὶ σοφία, the word & wisdom of the fathers substance & therefore eternal. Athanasius was educated a Monk under Antony pouring water upon his hands as Elisha did upon Elijah, & imbibed the same doctrine. For he taught, as you may see in many places of his works, that the λόγος – < text from higher up f 170r resumes > Athanasius, as you may see in many places of his works [Proclum) as you have heard above. And so far as it appears, Antony & all his disciples the Moncks were of the same opinion with Athanasius. For Athanasius was a Monck bred up in his youth under Antony, & imbibed this opinion in his youth as is manifest by his Orations contra Gentes written before the controversy with Arius began. And I do not find that Antony or any of his disciples found fault with Athanasius or Alexander or any of the bishops who subscribed the Letter of Alexander,] ob unam hypostasin quæ est Patris et filij.

<170v>

But these opinions were only private ones not yet imposed upon Christians the article of faith that Christ

Now according to the opinion of these Christians mentioned by Justin the Son or word of God was the internal λογὸς or λόγος ενδιαθετος of the father from all eternity & emitted from him outwardly as light from the sun before the beginning of the world in order to create it & this metaphysical theology tho it came from the {hea}thens & was the theology of the Cataphrygians yet it spread very quickly in the Churches so as to infect several Christians of Good note before the end of the second century. For Athena{goras} in his Apology after he had been describing the opinion of Plato concerning the Deity subjoyns. Quod si – – – – – – – – – – may subscribe their Creed with{out} beleiving Christ to be more then a mere man.

Arius & those with him in their Epistle sent to Alexander in the beginning of the controversy wrote thus. The Son is not a being which first existed & was afterwards begotten or formed into a son; for you your self, o blessed father, in the middle of the Church & in the session [of the Presbytery] have often confuted them who affirmed these things. And a little after: But if this, I came out from him & out of the womb, & out from the Father, be understood by some as a consubstantial part or an emission: the father will be compound & divisible & mutable & also a body according to those men, & so far as they can effect, the incorporeal father will suffer those things which are proper to bodies. By these words of the Arians I conclude that both parties agreed that the son was begotten before the creation but disputed whether he existed & was in the father before he was begotten & formed into a son some denying it with Arius, & others affirming it: And therefore the council of Nice in anathematizing those who should say that before the son was begotten he was not, confirmed the contrary opinion of those who maintained that the son was in the father from all eternity as his inherent & essential Word & wisdom & at length came out of him by a metaphysical emission for creating the world & called this coming out from the father the nativity or generation of the Son. And therefore the article of their Creed that the son was begotten of the father before all worlds, that is of the substance of the father God of God light of light, very God of very God begotten not made, is to be understood not an eternal generation but of a single act of generation whereby at once the son came out of the father for creating the world, after he had been in the father from all eternity. And in the same sense I conceive that this article of Christs being begotten before all ages was inserted into the Creed of Eusebius & some other Creeds of the Greeks in the times of the third century. It was first inserted into the expositions & paraphrases of the Creed & came thence into the body of it For in this sense Tertullian neare the beginning of that century inserted it into one of his paraphrastical Creeds in these words. Credimus unum omninò Deum esse nec alium præter mundi conditorem qui universa de nihilo produxerit per Verbum suum primo omnium demissum. Id Verbum filium ejus appellatum in nomine Dei varie visum a Patriarchis, in Prophetis semper auditum, postremò delatum ex spiritu Patris Dei et virtute in Virginem Mariam &c.

<171r>

To shew that the Jewish religion is one & the same with the Christian it may be further observed that the various names given to Christ have generally a relation to the old testament to signify that he was there spoken of. He is called the son of man to signify that he ----- desired Samuel to make them a king after the manner of other nations. And after this Angel was rejected from being their king he came to them in the form of a servant. For the Word was made flesh, that is his body ----- & desired a temporal king.

He was received up into heaven & sat on the right hand of God Mar 16.19. Ye shall see the son of man sitting on the right hand of the power & coming in the clouds of heaven Mar. 14.62. Luc. 22.69.

For understanding the Law & the Prophets with relation to the promised Messiah, it may be further observed that the various names ----- temporal king.

The Jews therefore who beleived in the Messiah looked upon themselves as not released from the law by that beleif, & as many of them as understood the calling of the Gentiles by Peters vision looked upon the converted Gentiles as proselites of the Jews whom God had cleansed but not obliged to enter into the covenant of the law by circumcision. And the converted gentiles were of the same opinion concerning themselves & the Jews during the two first centuries. And therefore the Christian religion was not a new one. nor do the Jews offend in keeping the law but the churches of the Gentiles were a branch of a wild Olive grafted into the stock of the Jews, & were not to boast themselves against the natural branches. Rom. 11.17. The law was good & the Jews transgressed not in keeping the ceremonial part of it but in laying the stress of religion upon this part & neglecting the fundamental part of it, such as was to love God with all their heart & soul, & their neighbours as themselves, to be just friendly & merciful to all men & temperate meek & humble in themselves & content with their present condition. These things they ought to have done & not to have left the ceremonial part of the law undone. But while they were hurried on with ambitious & covetous desires of honour & glory & riches in this world & could think of no other Messiah then a temporal king who should exalt the Jews in honour & glory & dominion by conquering all the nations round about : God made use of this their ambition & covetousness to blind their eyes so that they should not understand the prophesies concerning the Messiah nor know him when he came, but crucify him & set up fals Christs against the Romans to their own destruction. And by this means God has rejected them from being his people or kingdom & dispersed them into all nations as at this day, so that at present they are no people or body politique but a scatered servile generation of men without any government of their own & yet in a wonderfull manner continue numerous & distinct from all other nations: which cannot be said of any other captivated nation what ever, & therefore the work of providence. ffor God is able to turn away unrighteousness from Iacob, & graft the natural branches again into their own root.

Now for enlightning the Jews both at the first preaching of the gospel & hereafter whenever it shall please God to have mercy upon that scattered nation there have been many names given to Iesus Christ with relation to the old testament for explaining Moses & the Prophets. He is called the son of man to signify that he ----- & desired a temporal king.

This Angel therefore governed Israel in the days of Moses & the judges untill they rejected him from being their King & desired Samuel to make them a king after the manner of other nations. After which he sent his messenger the holy spirit to the Prophets for a time & at length came to the Jews himself in the form of a servant. And in relation to his being called an Angel or Messenger in the old testament, he is now said in the new to be sent from his father & to come down from heaven & from God.

This coming the Apostle Iohn describes by saying that the word was made flesh, that Word which was in the beginning with God & appeared to Adam Noah & the Patriarchs & wrastled with Iacob became flesh.

<172v>

And even Christ himself represents the state which he was in before his incarnation to be like that which he was to be in after his resurrection. Glorify me, saith he to his father, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was Iohn 17.5. He came out from God & went away to God Iohn 13.3. I came forth from the father & am come into the world & again I leave the world & go to the father. Iohn 16.28. & 13.3.

Sabellius like the Valentinians ^a derived the son from the father by sections or by defluxions & coming from divisions after the manner of bodies & made

Now if the articles within the brackets in all these creeds of both Greeks & Latines be omitted, there will remain this Creed. I beleive in God (or in one God) the father almighty maker of heaven & earth, & in Iesus Christ his only son our Lord (or in one lord Iesus Christ the son of God) who was born of the virgin Mary (of a Virgin) suffered (or was crucified under Pontius Pilate) & was buried, the third day rose again from the dead & ascended into heaven from whence he shall come to judge the quick & the dead: & I beleive in the holy Ghost. And the articles of this Creed being found in all the Creeds without any material variation of words (excepting that the article of the holy Ghost is omitted in Tertullian's & that of judging the quick & dead in Alexanders) it may be thence concluded that they were derived down by tradition in the several churches from the days of the Apostles.

And as they were received by oral tradition so they are also authorised by the written word of God. There is one spirit one Lord one faith one baptism one God & father of all Eph. 4.1. To us there is but one God the father of whom are all things & one Lord Iesus Christ by whom are all things 1 Cor 8.6. Who is a liar but he that denyeth that Iesus is the Christ? He is Antichrist that denyeth the father & the son 1 Iohn. 2.22 There shall be fals teachers among you who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, men denying the Lord that bought them 2 Pete 2.1 God will have all men to be saved & come to the knowledge of the truth: for there is one God & one mediator between God & man the man Christ Iesus who gave himself a ransom for all 1 Tim. 2.4. Whosoever shall confess that Iesus is the son of God, God dwelleth in him & he in God 1 Iohn 4.15. When Philip preached Iesus to the Eunuch, & the Eunuch said I beleive that Iesus Christ is the son of God, Philip baptized him Act 8.37. ☉ < insertion from lower down f 172v > ☉ The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the son of God Luke 1.35. < text from higher up f 172v resumes > every spirit that confesseth that Iesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God & every spirit that confesseth not that Iesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, & this is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come. 1 Iohn 4.2, 3 & 2 Iohn. 7. As the children are partakers of flesh & blood he also partook of the same that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death. For in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren that he might be a merciful & faithfull high Priest in things pertaining to God to make reconciliation for the sins of the people Heb. 2.14, 17. I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures [or propheties of the old Testament concerning him]] & that he was buried & that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures 1 Cor. 15.3, 4. Baptism is a symbol of the burial & resurrection of Christ (Rom. 6.4 Col. 2.12). & therefore to be administered only to such as beleive that Christ died was buried & rose again from the dead. Having obtained help of God &c — — — & the dead 1 Pet 4.5. whom they slew & hanged on a tree him God raised up the third day — & he commanded us to preach unto the people & to testify that it is he who was ordeined of God to be the judge of the quick & dead. To him give all the Prophets witness that through his name whosoever beleiveth in him shall receive remission of sins. Act 10.39, 40, When Paul finding certain disciples at Antioch said unto them, have ye received the holy Ghost & they said unto him we have not so much as heard whether there be any holy Ghost, Paul said unto them, Vnto what then were ye baptized & they said Into Iohns baptism Act. 19.3. Go ye & teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the father & of the son & of the holy Ghost Mat. 22.19. Now by all these places of scripture it is manifest that all the articles of faith last mentioned are truths of divine authority expressed in the language of the scriptures & not only truths but fundamental articles of religion the first principles necessary to baptism & therefore were all of them articles of the primitive rule of faith. It remains that we inquire whether the primitive Rule of faith contained any more articles then these.

<173r>

corruptly

– And for all these reasons it was immutable. † < insertion from lower down f 173r > † There was but one faith & one baptism & this faith all Christians were to keep hold fast & contend for & therefore it was immutable. < text from higher up f 173r resumes > It might be paraphrased & explained at large in preaching & catechising, but not enlarged diminished or altered in the number & sense of the articles. The two Creeds of Irenæus are manifestly paraphrases & therefor differ in words tho they agree in sense. For the original Creed it self or symbol of the primitive christians was not yet committed to writing. Two of the three Creeds

of Tertullian are also paraphrases & have in them a relish of Montanism. The third of his Creeds, that recited above, is in concise words without any paraphrasticall flourishes & the words are very nearly the same with those of other Creeds of the Churches of the Latines published in the fourth & fift centuries, excepting that Tertullian has omitted the article of the holy Ghost & the later Creeds have some articles which are neither in Tertullians nor in those of Irenæus & therefore have been added since their days.

from the heathens: for which end the Apostles but one faith, & the Christians of the first ages called it their symbol implying thereby that it was conceived in a form of words

Now because the first Christians delivered this faith down to the Churches by oral tradition that the heathens might not know it & used it as their symbol but Christians by reciting it might know one another & avoid those as heathens who could not recite it or as hereticks who recited it corruptly: therefore Irenæus did not set it down in the proper form of words but receited it paraphrastically; and so did Tertullian in two of his three Creeds. The third Creed of Tertullian (that set down above) is in concise words without any paraphrasticall flourishes & agrees with the Creeds of the several Churches of the Latines afterwards published by commentators]: excepting such inconsiderable differences of words as might arise either from variety of translations or from the frailty of memory in propagating the faith down by oral tradition in several Churches; & excepting that Tertullian has omitted the article of the holy Ghost & **{illeg}** the resurrection of the body in another manner then is done in other Creeds & the later Latines in opposition to hereticks have added some articles which were not in the Creed when Ireneus & Tertullian wrote. The Creeds of the later Latines I have here set down, including the new articles in brackets that you may compare the rest of the articles with the Creed of Tertullian.

<173v>

The coynage of 104227 pound weight & ten ounces english Troy weight at 16 ^d ob per lw ^t amounts to	7165.13
--	---------

And a penny per pound weight allowed to the moneyers for coyning 103346 pound weight very well amounts to	<u>430.12.2</u>
---	-----------------

7596.5.7

<174r>

The Gnosticks frequently called their Æons by the names of Gods attributes & some of them took the λόγος to be the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος the **{illeg}** inherent word reason wisdom & Idea of the father & feigned that as he emitted the Æons & retracted them back into himself so he emitted & retracted the λόγος & this opinion seems to have been imbibed by the Christians mentioned by Iustin. It was also taught not only by the heresiarchs Tatian, Montanus, Proclus, Æschines, Tertullian, Noetus, Artemas, Sabellius Paul of Samosat, Marcellus & Photinus but also by several others who were never condemned for it as by Theophilus bishop of Antioch Athenagoras bishop of Clemens master of the school at Alexandria & perhaps his successor Origen & Hippolytus the martyr & Lactantius & Constantine the great & Alexander & Athanasius bishops of Alexandria & Antony the father of the Moncks. For Constantin in his epistle — — — Alexander teaches the same opinion expresly in his epistle to Alexander of Byzantium & so doth Athanasius in some places of his works & in the beginning of the life of Antony — — — Now Athanasius tells us thathe powred water upon the hands of Antony & therefore he was bred up a Monk under Antony & probably was instructed by him in the faith.

The Christians of the second & third centuries who held that the λόγος of Iohn was the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος of the father, taught that this λόγος a little before the creation of the world was emitted outwardly as a voice from a man, as a ray of light from the Sun, a river from the fountain, or a branch from the root & called this emission the generation of the son & said that God emitted him in order to create the world. And this emission some explained by projection or dulutation of part of the fathers substance without separation, some by section & separation, into two substances, some by emission & exertion of a power seated in the fathers substance or some part of it. But all those who taught the antemundane generation of the Son in these or any other senses made him generated by the voluntary act of the father & by consequence subject to his will & subordinate to him.] But these opinions of antemundane generation making the father mutable, Alexander

dropt them & with Athanasius & Antony taught that the son was the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος generated from all eternity & argued that otherwise the father would have been ασοφος & ἄλογος before the son was generated. And their adversaries replied that this was to make the son ἀγένετος unbegotten & they never heard before that there were two unbegotten. From these men the opinion of eternal generation descended to the Monks & by their means got ground daily notwithstanding that the opinion that the son was the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος after it was condemned in Photinus decreased & in a few years vanished.

<175v>

The Council of Paris A.C. 365 or 366 confirmed the faith of Hilary Nam homousion sermonem, say they – – – appellatio videretur. The Council of Lampsacum at the same time declaring for the

The the Council of Lampsacum A.C. 365 declaring for the Council of Nice, professed that the son was like the father according to substance: for, say they, the word like must necessarily be added to signify the difference of the hypostases. (Sozom l 6 c 7. Socr l 4. c 4 And three Legates sent from this Council to the Bishop of Rome told him that the son was in all things like the father, & that consubstantial differs not from like: & the bishop of Rome approved their faith Socr l. 4. c 12. The Council of Paris A.C. 360 or 366 confirmed the faith of two substances in number & one in nature, which Hilary had been preaching to them: Nam homousion sermonem, say they, – – – videretur.

Soon after the reign of Iovian Liberius Bishop of Rome hearing what had been done by the little Councils of A & Antioch wrote a circulatory letter to the bishops of Italy soliciting them to return to the Nicene faith. The letter is extant in Hilaries fragments & there is not one word in it about the deity of the holy Ghost. After Valentinian was gone into Gallia the Legates of the Council of Lampsacum arrived in Italy viz^t A.C. 366, & in the name of that Council & the Council of Smyrna & some others presented a confession of their faith to the Bishop of Rome without mentioning the Deity of the holy Ghost & were received into communion by the Bishop of R. without acknowledging that Deity. ffor they were Macedonians, & came from Councils of Macedonian bishops. And therefore the controversy about the deity of the holy Ghost was not yet begun in Italy. Athanasius had proposed it to the Emperor Iovian & had some followers: but they were but few as you have heard out of Gregory Nazianzen, & the Emperor Valens was against them & forced them to be silent in this point upon pain of losing their bishopricks. The western Churches had liberty of speech, but I do not find that they contended for the deity of the holy Ghost before the year 373 & therefor reckon that the year in which this controversy began in the west. After the councils of Sirmium Nicea, Ariminum Seleucia & Constantinople had rejected the use of the word usia with its compounds in relation to the Son, the first work was to restore the use of those words & the authority of the Council of Nice & when this point was gained < insertion from the right margin of f 175v > sometime after by Dorotheus the Presbyter < text from f 175v resumes > , the next <175r> step was to extend this doctrine to the holy Ghost.

For after

Thereupon Macedonius who had hitherto been against the Nicene decree declared for it in the sense of the word ὁμοιούσιος, & had many followers, this being the sence in which the greek church had understood the Nicene faith: for, said the Macedonians, the western churches vitiated the homousios; & Ætius in the east coined a new language: introduced τὸ κατ' οὐσίαν ἄνόμοιον unlike according to substance. And both opinions were wicked. For these [the western] rashly connected the distinct hypostases of the father & son into unity binding them together with the word ὁμοούσιος as with a bond of inequity: & he wholly disjoined the conjunction of the nature of the son with the father by introducing the name of unlike according to substance. Seeing therefore the two opinions run into two extremes, we have accounted the middle way between both agreeable to truth & piety, namely that the son is like the father Socr l. 3 c. 10.

κατ' ὑποστάσιν according to substance Socr l 3 c. 10. And in the reign of Iovian some of them with the Arcadians &c.

I have been attending to acquaint your Lordships board that the East India Company as I understand by M^r Ward are willing to give seven thousand pounds for one hundred Tunns of Tinn, to be paid out of the first moneys they shall receive of your Lordships for salt peter, & in the same moneys, & if your Lordships

approve thereof they desire that the tin may be speedily delivered that they may have time to run it into blocks before the sailing of their fleet. I shall attend at the Treasury to morrow for your Lordships answer.

And yet Liberius & the western Bishops in the answer which they wrote back to those eastern bishops by their Legates acknowledged the agreement of their faith with the faith of the churches of Italy & the west, & call them beloved brethren & fellow ministers.

The Council of Constantinople A.C. 360 had for various crimes deposed Macedonius bishop of Constantinople Eustathius of Sebastia Eleusius of Cyricum Cyril of Ierusalem Sophronius of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia, Dracontius of Pergamus, Neonas of Seleucia where a council had met. Thereupon Macedonius Eustathius Eleusius & some others declared for the Nicene faith & that homousios should be taken in the same sense with homoiusios like the father according to substance. And in the reign of Iovian some of them meeting in a Council at Antioch with Meletius one of the bishops of that city & with Eusebius of Samosat, Acacius of Cæsarea, Titus of Bostra & their friends, presented a profession of this faith to the Emperor Iovian. Afterwards the Macedonians for restoring the Council of Nice met in several Councils in Pamphilia Isauria & Lycia & at Smyrna & Lampsacum. And when the Emperor Valens who in his stay at Constantinople had been prepossessed by Eudoxius bishop of that city came to Heraclea in Bithynia, which was in September A.C. 365, the bishops of the council of Lampsacum applied to him & were rejected, & thereupon resolved to send Legates to the western Emperor Valentinian & the bishop of Rome for their assistance

<176r>

The Christian Iews in the Church of Ierusalem under Iames being dispersed by the siege of that city & flying in great numbers to Pella, bey{ond} Iordan, became the Nazarenes & the Ebionites. ffor they were called Nazarenes before that flight & Ebionites from their poverty. They received only the Gospel of Matthew in hebrew & for the most part beleived Christ to be a mere man without framing to themselves any opinions about the λόγος ffor the Gospel of Iohn was not yet written. The Ebionites were such as the Apostle Paul reprehends for imposing the law upon the Gentiles. They communicated with the Christian Iews but in respect of the Christian Gentiles were schismatics. The Nazarenes or some of them communicated with the Christian Gentiles & continued in that communion till about the end of the second century as has been explained above. And so did the Christian gentiles afterwards called Alogi. These held that Christ was a mere man & received not the writings of Iohn in which he is called the λόγος. For it was long before all the writings of the new Testament were generally received. Iustin Martyr gives us this account of the communion of the Alogi in his days. Verum enim vero, Trypho, dixi sententia sunt, dixerunt. After the death of Iustin arose the Encratites & Montanists & after them the Tessaescædecates & after them the Alogi according to Epiphanius. When the Tessaescædecates & Alogi began to be accounted hereticks then their heresies are said to begin that is, the heresy of the Tessaescædecates in the days of Pope Victor who condemned it & the heresy of the Alogi in the latter end of his days or in the days of his successor Zepharine. But I do not find that the Alogi were condemned in any Councils or that they were distinguished from other Christians by any particular name before Epiphanius gave them the name of Alogi. When Theodotus the currier of Byzantium was condemned by Pope Victor for holding Christ to be a mere man & soon after (I think in the days of Pope Zepherine) Artemon the master of Theodotus was condemned by the Greeks for the like error: their disciples alledged that their opinion was taught by the Apostles & ancient Christians & the truth of the doctrine conserved to the days of Pope Victor but from the days of his successor Zepherine [inclusively] was adulterated. About this time therefore the Nazarenes & Alogi were excluded communion by the condemnation of Theodotus & Artemon. But yet Artemon held Christ to be a mere man in a different sense from that of the Nazarenes & Alogi, teaching with Paul of Samosat, Marcellus & Photinus that Christ was a man inhabited by the λόγος

For the Gnosticks & such like hereticks thinking it below the dignity of their principal Gods &c.

The opinions of the Tesseracædecates & Alogi were much older, but its to be understood that when they were first condemned; then Epiphanius reckons that their heresies began. The Tesseracædecates were first condemned by Pope Victor & therefore the heresy of the Alogi was reckoned to begin in the latter end of the days of Victor or in the days of his successor Zepherine.

These senses he rejects & tells them that the father & son were two like & equal substances of one nature & kind from all eternity; two in number & one in nature & kind, & that the son was notwithstanding obedient to the father as his author. He did not by rapine equalize himself to the father but was obedient to him even unto death. And hitherto the doctrine remained in the Churches that the father was the supreme Monarch of the univers & reigned over the Son, notwithstanding the disputes about the time & the manner of the sons nativity & the nature of his substance. And in this sense Hilary preached the Nicene faith to the western Churches for the future, in opposition to the heretical senses which had hitherto been spread amongst them.

<176v>

the λόγος might be. Before the days of Alexander some might say that the Word was always with the father but I do not meet with any before Alexander who said that he was always begotten. And I am the more inclined to beleive Alexander the author of this opinion because his enemies objected that according to this opinion the son was ἀγέννητος unbegotten & that they never heard of two unbegotten principles before. They looked upon Alexander therefore as the first author of this opinion: & if the opinion had been older the objection would also have been older. According to Iohn the Word was in the beginning with God, & the Son was begotten & born when the Word became flesh. According to he was born of a Virgin & at the age of 30 years baptized & declared to be the son of God. According to the Christian Philosophers of the second & third century the son of God was begotten a little before the beginning of the World in order to its creation. According to Alexander he was begotten from all eternity. And according to Arius he was begotten of nothing before all ages.

Hosius who presided in the Council of Nice & published the Nicene Creed, & by consequence — — — — —
— et filius est filius Patris. From whence it is manifest that the opinion of one hypostasis of the father son & holy Ghost was now much spread in the west. And since Hosius was at the head of this Council it may be concluded that he was of this opinion & therefore in publishing the Nicene creed translated ὁμοούσιος by unius substantiæ & unius hypostaseos.

About twelve years after the meeting of this Council Hilary being then in the east & sending to the bishops of Gallia & Britain an account of the condemnation of Photinus by the Council of Sirmium & of the faith & decrees of the Council against him with his expositions upon them as was mentioned above & doing this to set them right in the faith, he tells them that many of them understood the language of una substantia in the sense of the hereticks Multi ex nobis fratres Charissimi, saith he, ita unam substantiam Patris et filij prædicant — — — — — & that more fully then in the Creed.

The Greeks therefore for checking & abolishing the 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 endeavoured in several Councils A.C. 357, 358, 359 & 360 to abolish that language & revive the decree of the Council of Antioch against Paul. And particularly in the Council of Constantinople A.C. 360 they decreed that the word hypostasis or (as Theoderet writes) one hypostasis should not be named of the father son & holy ghost.

The Greeks therefore used the language of three hypostases but many of the Latines continued to use the language of one & accused the Greeks of Arianism & were mutually accused of Sabellianism by the Greeks. And this was the state of things in the end of the reign of the Emperor Constantius, A.C. 361.

The next year Athanasius — — — — cannot be disputed.

Yet it was some years before the language of one hypostasis fully ceased among the Latines — — — — —
— tres substantias prædicabit? However, the Latines in a little time for avoiding the imputation of Sabellianism quitted this language & came into the opinion of Athanasius & Hilary that the father son & holy Ghost were three substances in number & one in nature & species

< insertion from the left margin of f 176v >

And further to free themselves from the imputation of Sabellianism & Paulinianism of which they had been accused, they anathematized those heresies. And now the language of una substantia & una usia being no

longer Sabellian nor contrary to the Nicene faith became defensible as if it had been erroneously abolished by the late Councils, & the language of three hypostases

< text from f 176v resumes >
<177r>

And hence forward the language of one hypostasis began to cease. for in the reign of Iulian A.C.. 362. Athanasius & about 14 or 16 other Bishops most of Egypt {returned from} banishment & meeting in Council at Alexandria declared that the language of one usia one hypostasis & one substance not in number but in nature & 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 the language of una usia & una substantia being freed from the imputation of Sabellianism & Paulinianism {&} the language of three hypostases being cleared from Arianism was readily received by the party of Athanasius, & the language of una usia & una substantia being easily relinquished. And yet it was some years before the language of one hypostasis fully ceased especially in the west where the language of three hypostases was accounted contrary to that of una substantia. For in the letter prædicabit.

The Council of Nice took hypostasis in the same sense with usia: for in the anathemas annexed to their Creed they say

During this controversy the Latines began to use the language of three persons to that of one substance & Instead of calling the father son & holy Ghost three hypostases the Latines called three persons.

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 & 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 person being of an ambiguous signification, The Greeks to make it signify a substance & not only a 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.

Before the times of this Council of Alexandria I do not find that the holy Ghost began to be called God or to be worshipped as God in conjunction with the father & the Son. In the primitive Creed we are taught to beleive in one God the father & in one Lord Iesus Christ the son & in the holy Ghost & this we are taught in order to be baptized in their names, & therefore the primitive Christians were baptized in the name of one God the father & of one Lord Iesus Christ the son & of one holy Ghost: but now men began to be baptized in the name of the father son & holy ghost one God. And this faith & baptism was set on foot at the same time with Saint-worship & by the same men. For Athanasius & the other bishops in the aforesaid Council of Alexandria declared one Deity of the father son & h. Ghost & about two years after (viz^t AC. 364) Athanasius published this doctrine to the Emperor Iovian.

<177v>

And the Council of Serdica composed of about 200 Western & Egyptian bishops A.C. 347, in their general epistle as it is recited by Sozomen say: Confitemur filium esse virtutem Patris. Confitemur illum esse τὸν λόγον Verbum Dei Patris præter quod nullum est aliud et Verbum verum Deum et sapientiam ac virtutem esse. Venem autem filium esse tradimus non sicut alij filij appellantur: nam hi quidem aut regenerationis causa Dij dicuntur, aut eo quod digni habiti fuerint Filij noncipantur non autem ob unam hypostasim quæ est Patris et Filij. And this Epistle was handed about in the Churches till the reign of Iulian the Apostate as composed by the Council of Serdica & therefore the profession of faith contained therein had many followers in those days.

So then the opinion that the Word of God was the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος of the father tho it had its rise among the Gnosticks & sprang from the philosophy of the heathens & Cabalists yet after it was refined by the Montanists & Patripassians & was taught by some other Christians of good note who had been educated in the philosophy of the heathens & backt by the text of Solomon Dominus creavit me initio viarum suarum ad opera sua: it spread in the Churches in the second & third centuries & got ground very much in the fourth century untill it was condemned in Photinus by the Council of Sirmium A.C. 351 [& the sentences of the Council against him were made known in all the churches] from which time it decreased & in a few years vanished, the faith & sentences of that Council against Photinus meeting with an universal reception & approbation. And so far as I can find even Athanasius himself rejected that opinion. ffor in the Creed which is extant in his works & called his exposition of faith, he affirms that the father son & holy Ghost are three hypostases & declares against the sons being the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος ἢ προφορικὸς.

For it is to be understood that those Christians who held the Word to be the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, generally held that this λόγος which had been seated inwardly in the substance & heart of the father from all eternity was a little before the creation of the world emitted outwardly & became the λόγος προφορικὸς & some explained this emission by a projection or dilatation of some part of the fathers substance with an inherent power, as light from the sun as a branch from the root, a river from the fountain, an ofspring from the parents, & breath with a sound from a man. And this emission projection or dilatation they called the generation of the λόγος into a son, & made the λόγος προφορικὸς to be the son of God generated a little before the creation & in order to it, & others (as Marcellus & perhaps Paul of Samosat) did not make the λόγος προφορικὸς to be the Son of God before Iesus Christ was born of the Virgin. But these opinions that the Word of God was either the λογος προφορικὸς or the λογος ἐνδιάθετος being condemned in Photinus by the Council of Sirmium were soon relinquished & came to an end.

In the three first centuries I do not meet with the opinion that the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος was the son of God begotten from all eternity. Alexander bishop of Alexandria so far as I can find was the first author of this opinion. Before his days the antemundane nativity of the λόγος προφορικὸς was the growing opinion. But it being objected that this opinion made the father mutable, it was rejected by both Alexander & Arius, & instead thereof Alexander taught that the son was the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος begotten of the father from all eternity & Arius that he was not the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος nor begotten of the fathers substance but another λόγος produced out of nothing before the world began. And henceforward the doctrine of eternal generation being received by Athanasius & the Moncks got grownd in the Churches. And having once taken root remained & spread even after the fundamental doctrine that the Word was the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος ἢ προφορικὸς was exploded; those that beleived the antemundane generation of the λόγος προφορικὸς easily changing their opinion for that of the æternal generation of the λόγος

<178r>

– wrote also to the Churches in his own defense. One of the crimes of which the Meletians accused him was that he had killed one of their Bishops called Arsenius. He made the Emperor beleive that Arsenius was alive, but the Meletians persisting in the accusation & Arsenius not appearing, the Emperor ordered Athanasius to give an account of this matter before the Council of Athanasius came not & therefore the Emperor ordered him to appeare the next year before the Council of Tyre & threatned that if he came not he would send those for him that should carry him thither. Then Athanasius went with a great multitude & pretended that Arsenius was alive as he knew by a letter which when the Council had heard the cause between him & his accusers they sent for their further satisfaction six of their numbers to the places in Egypt where the facts were done to examin persons upon the spot, & upon their report Athanasius fled from the Council to the Emperor.

The opinion of his being consubstantial to the father & what worship may be due to him on that account I do not here consider. For The heathens beleived that the souls of all men were consubstantial to the supreme deity & yet worshipped only some of them & those only according to their supposed dominion over man acquired by their merits in this life.

<178v>

The Goths & other Scythian nations beyond the Danube had hitherto lived without letters & the Christian religion had been hitherto propagated among them only by oral tradi{tion.} But now Vlphilas the patriarch of Dacia invented the Gothic letters & translat{ed} the scriptures into their tongue. & propagated the Christian religion among them very much so that Fridigern king of the Visigoths became a Christian & Athanaric fea{ring} that the Christian religion should also prevail in his kingdom (for Vlphilas instructed the people of both kingdoms) raised a vehement persecution against the Christians & put many of them to death & made others fly.

They were seated on the eastern side of the River Teys upon the rivers Maresh & Kares{h}

⊙ to Alexander the great Among the conquered nations I reckon the Burgeones whom Ptolemy places in Poland between the Vistula & Borythenes & whom I take to be the Burgundians who had war with {Suilda} king of the Gepides in the reign of Philip the Emperor & in the reign of Valentinian fled from their seats to the side of the Rhene ffor these Burgundians are usually reckoned a Gothic nation.

& grandson of {Athanipas} or {Wulpha} the brother of Hermaneric, reigned

The Gepides & Vandals were Gothic nations & spake the same language with the Goths & agreed with them also in manners, & the Vandals are reckoned a branch of the Gepides but when they separated from them is uncertain. For since the Gothic nations had no letters before the days of Vlphilas, we can have no certain account of their earlier actions but from the works of the Greeks & Latines who recorded only what they themselves were concerned in. Iornandes tells us that the {illeg} {family} of the Vandals was of the stock of the Astidirgi & Dio that the Alans under the conduct of {Rhaus} & {Rhaptus} entred Dacia in the reign of the Emperor Marcus & had seats tranted them there by that Emperor. ffrom that time therefore the Astingi Adingi or Vandals were members of the Empire till the revolt of Dacia They were seated upon the {illeg} And in the reign of Constantine the great they were conquered by the Gepides & left their seats in Dacia to the conquerors & had seats granted them in Pannonia by that Emperor. Iornandes calls the war between the Goths & Gepides a civil war which imports that they had been formerly one kingdom. They lived quietly in Pannonia as subjects of the Empire till they invaded Gallia, that is for the space of above 70 years. Iornandes represents that they lived quietly in Pannonia 40 years & long after that invaded Gallia And a little after he says that when Atathenes & Saprach invaded Pannonia Gratian was gone from Rome into Gallia by reason of an incursion of the Vandals. He reckons therefore that the Vandals lived quietly in Pannonia 40 years & then made this incursion. But he seems to be mistaken in ascribing this incursion to the Vandals. It was against the Alemans a German nation seated upon the upper Rhene that Gratian went at this time into Gallia, & the Vandals staid in Pannonia thirty years longer, in all 70 years . And by their long stay in the Roman Empire first in Dacia & then in Pannonia, the Christian religion prevailed amongst them. They lived in Pannonia without a king, [& at length rising from their seats made Godegisilus a Christian their king, & taking along with them the Alans & some other nations in their way to the Rhene they invaded Gallia while Alaric invaded Italy & the Hunns Pannonia & by these invasions & the revolt of the Sabian Franks & the British Soldia the western Empire at once broke into ten kingdoms, The history of which is as follows.]

After the death of the Emperor Theodosius the Visigoths rose from their seats — — — orare. Then Radagaisus a heathen, calling to his assistance many barbarians from beyond the Danube invaded Italy with an army of above 200000 men which were all of them either slain or taken pr. & was shut up in the mountains by Stilico & his whole army famished & taken prisoners. In the mean time Stilico desiring to gain the Empire by means of the barbarous nations favoured the Goths underhand & at length procured a military prefecture for Alaric — — — — — And For facilitating this designe he invited the Vandals with other barbarous nations to invade the western Empire. And those nations — —

<179v>

& may be understood of the kingdom of Macedon standing up &c. in {conjunction} of the Romans & growing mighty in their power by the successive additions of the kingdoms of Pergamus Syria & Egypt. In the prophesy of the he Goat this kingdom is derived from the kingdom of Pergamus represented by the little horn of that Beast in this of the scripture of truth it is derived from the kingdom of Macedon standing up in the power of the Romans. ffor it arose from them both growing into one by the Legacy of Attalus, & it was fit that both its originals should be represented in these prophesies. And whilst the little horn became mighty but

not in his own power; the Arms which stood up after Antiochus Epiphanes & became one with this horn, was also to be mighty but not in his own power.

The Greek Empire being founded by the conquests of the kingdom of Macedon, lasted while this kingdom stood unconquered; & therefore the holy spirit in describing the affairs of Alexander the great & his successors the kings of the North & South bordering upon the holy land, is very particular untill he comes to the conquest of the kingdom of Macedon by the Romans. For he carries on that description of the single kings until the profanation of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes which was on Novemb 1 in the year of Philip 156 as above, & Perseus the last king of Macedon was conquered by Æmilius the Roman Consul on September 10 in the same year. By this means the prophesy points out the period of time in which the king of fierce countenance began to stand up & the fourth Empire began to reign. And henceforward the holy spirit describes the affairs of the Greeks under the power of the Romans & makes no more mention of particular kings (for the Romans were governed by a senate) nor insists upon particular wars & actions; but touches only upon the greatest & most general turns of affairs & passes on by large periods of time to the day of judgment. The first period contains the reign of the Greeks under the Romans or Latines, the second contains the reign of the Greeks alone after separation from the Latines, the third is called the time of the end & contains the reign of the kings of the south & north over the Greeks or some part of them. For this whole prophesy relates to the nations of the Greek Empire represented by the he Goat. The first interval of time is ushered in with these words: but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed, that is the conspiracy of the kings of Syria & Egypt against the holy covenant for taking away the daily worship of the Jews & setting up the worship of the heathen Gods in all the land of Iudea shall not prosper because the time of the end in which the transgression of desolation is to prosper is not yet arrived the end in which the setting up of the abomination of desolation was to prosper is not yet, but there is still a time appointed before the time of the end begins. The second interval of time is ushered in with these words, And of those of understanding there shall fall to try them & to purge & make white to the time of the end, For a king shall do according to his will – & shall prosper till the indignation shall be accomplished, that is a king shall do according to his will in making laws about religion & in setting up the abomination represented by the worship of the Mahuzzims, & shall prosper till the indignation against the holy covenant shall be accomplished, & by the setting up this abomination those of understanding who oppose it shall fall in the reign & by the persecution of this king till the time of the end. And the second part of the second interval begins with these words. And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him. In all this time of the end therefore the worship of fals Gods set up by the king who doth according to his will was to prosper & reign & make <180r> desolate the people of God, & therefore it is called the transgression of desolation & the indignation against the holy covenant. But let us go over the particulars.

And after him arms shall stand up that is after the reign of Antiochus carried on to his second expedition into Egypt & return into Syria, a power shall rise up, the power of the kingdom of Macedon by the access of the power of the Romans & of the kingdom of Pergamus & by the conquest of Syria Palestine & Egypt shall stand up with mighty dominion. Now when these arms were thus risen up they made war upon the Jews in the reigns of Nero Vespasian Trajan & Hadrian, burnt their Temple destroyed their city set up the heathen Gods in all Iudea & dispersed the people into all nations forbidding them to enter Iudea upon pain of death. And all this is described by Daniel in the next words: And they shall pollute Mountains Mat XXIV.15. This first setting up of

After

In setting up the abomination of the Mahuzzims & casting down those of understanding & desolating the saints this king of Greece shall do according to his will till the time of the end, & shall prosper not only in setting up the transgression of desolation before the time of the end, but also in continuing it during all the time of the end untill the indignation against the holy covenant be accomplished & the sanctuary be cleansed . For the last end of the indignation is the time of the end.

that {communal} worship of this people the Christians. ffor the Prince of the host is Iesus Christ When the Roman Empire became Christian & its Emperors began to act as Princes of the Church of Christ & to take upon them the authority of Christ himself in giving laws to his Church by their edicts then this horn is said to magnify himself to the Prince of the host, that is, to usurp his throne & legislative authority & by doing so took away the daily worship of the Prince & cast down the place of his sanctuary & set up the transgression

of desolation to {illeg} the sanctuary & the host [viz^t as it were upon the throne between the Cherubims] shewing himself as a God , or as exprest in the prophesy of the scripture of truth to do [by his Edicts] according to his will & exalt magnify himself above every God, & speak marvellous things against the God of Gods, [that is by his edicts & imperial laws. to do according to his will as if he were above every God & abrogate the laws & supremacy of the God of the Iews.] But for understanding these things, its necessary to compare this vision of the Ram & Goat with the prophesy of the scripture of truth. For they both concern the nations of the Greek Empire or third Monarchy reigning sometimes by their own power & sometimes by the power of others, till the end of the four empires & the latter prophesy is a commentary upon the former.

– & by doing so took away the daily worship of the Prince & cast down his sanctuary & the truth to the ground & set up the transgression of desolation. And by reason of this transgression the Apostle Paul in commenting upon this Prophesy calls him the man of sin & because he stands up against the Prince & (as is exprest in the Prophesy of the scripture of truth) exalts & magnifies himself above every God, the Apostle saith that he opposeth & exalteth himself above every thing that is called God or that is worshipped so that he as a God (by his usurped legislature) sitteth in the Temple of God (as it were on the ark between the Cherubims) shewing himself that he is a God

– & by doing so took away the daily worship of the Messiah the Prince & cast down his sanctuary & the truth to the ground & set up the transgression of desolation, & destroyed the mighty & the holy people & practised & prospered. But for understanding this prophesy of the he Goat it must be compared with the prophesy of the scripture of truth which is a commentary upon it. For both these prophesies concern the nations of the Greek Empire or third Monarchy reigning sometimes by their own power & sometimes by the power of others, till the end of the four Empires & day of judgment.

<180v>

But the words are shut up & the book is sealed to the time of the end & the seals are opened in the Apocalyps then begins the latter time. Then many shall run to & fro & knowledge in these things shall be increased untill the gospel be preached in all nations. And many shall be purified & made white & tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly. And none of the wicked shall understand these things but the wise shall understand. [This sealed book is opened in the Apocalyps & as the seven seals are gradually opened the time of the end approaches. In a large sence the latter times commence with the taking away of the daily worship of the Iews & opening of the first seal. In a strickter sence the latter times commence with the opening of the last seal & reign of the king who doth according to his will, & takes away the daily worship of the Christians. But the time of the end commences with the first Wo-trumpet].

The Goat in the reign of his last horn is called by the Apostle the man of sin from the transgression of desolation & the Antichrist from his standing up against the Prince of Princes & because he magnifies & exalts himself above every God & speaks marvellous things against the God of Gods & reigns till the last end of the indignation therefore the Man of sin is said to oppose & exalt himself above every thing that is called God or that is worshipped. & to sit in the Temple of God & continue till Christ destroys him with the brightness of his coming. He is also represented by the Dragon in the Apocalypse & from his idolatry called the Devil & Satan & his Church is called the synagogue of Satan, & because the kingdom of Pergamus was the little horn this Satan is said to have his seat or throne in Pergamus.

Sir Is. Newton P.R.S. ✓ 1

M^r Bembdy.

Hill ✓ 2

D^r Halley.

Lowtharp x

Roberts ✓ 3

Sloan Secr. ✓ 4

D^r

M^r Pitfield Tr ✓ 5

Derham x

D^r Cockburn x

Sir Iohn Percival x

D^r Arbothnot

D^r Harris x

M^r Wren

M^r Clavel x

M^r Isted ✓ 7

D^r Mead

D^r Woodward x

M^r Waller Secr ✓ 6

D^r M^r

M^r Pettiver x

M^r Foley

Sir Chr. Wren

M^r Aston

D^r Hutton

D^r Master of Pembr.

M^r Pettiver

Sir Is. Newton

M^r Pitfield

D^r Sloan

M^r Waller

M^r Roberts

M^r Hill

M^r Isted

D^r Halley

D^r Mead

M^r Bembody

D^r Arbothnot} or M^r Wren

Sir Chr Wrenn

D^r Hutton

M^r Aston

M^r Foley

D^r

<181r>

[42] There being 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 hypostasis from usia: They therefor 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. There was Sabellianism imputed to the language of three persons & Arianism to that of three hypostases: both which names were feigned by the study | zeale of contending. And what followed? When something was ever added to the troubles (the troubles I say made by the desire of contending:) at length the ends of the earth were in danger of being broken together with the syllables. Therefore that blessed man that man of God truly so called that great dispenser of souls, seeing & 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, & accurately considering the sense & meaning of their words, after he found them agreeing & not at all differing in opinion, he indulged them their use of words & bound them only by the things. Thus far Gregory. And henceforward the two contending parties allowed one anothers language, & the Latines to exclude the Sabellian signification of three persons invented the language of three substances & began also to use language of three hypostases. So then the language of the two united parties was henceforward μία Ουσία, una substantia, & τρεις ὑποστάσεις tres personæ tres substantiæ : that is one substance in nature & kind & three intelligent substances in number. For this was the sense which Athanasius taught the two contending parties, as you may see in his epistle to those of Antioch.

So Epiphanius testifies that they did not hold the father & son to be μονοούσιοι or ταυτοούσιοι but ὁμοούσιοι & Basil that for clearing our selves from Sabellianism it is not enough to name three persons if we do not confess every person to subsist in a true hypostasis or substance & the second general Council decreed the son consubstantial to the father in the same sense with the C. of Nice & the word it self implies two substances & the third general Council decreed that Christ is consubstantial to the father as touching his Godhead & consubstantial to us as touching his manhood & the fourth general Council confirmed the faith of the third. And in short, Curcellæus, D^r Cudworth, D^r Bull, Petavius & Huetius have proved beyond exception that the Churches of the fourth & fifth & following centuries held the father son & holy Ghost to be three substances in number & one in nature: Yet in the dark ages by the language of una substantia the opinion of a single substance silently revived among the Latines & made persons subsistences & hypostases to be taken for something else then substances by the Schoolmen who understood not Greek, & the Sabellians who denied three hypostases, to deny three persons not substantial.

– And the same Athanasius in his exposition of faith condemns the Sabellians for making the Son μονοούσιος not ὁμοούσιος to the father. And Epiphanius^[43] 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 for clearing our selves from Sabellianism it is not enough to name three persons (which Sabellius himself would

not refuse to do) if we do not confess every person to subsist in a true hypostasis or substance Epist. 64. And that because the Son is the image of the father he is consubstantial to him Adv. Eunom. lib. IV sub initio. & that there is one ὁσία of Peter & Paul Adv. Eunom I I. initio. And that ὁμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν like according to substance with an invariable likeness is the same with ὁμοούσιος in the sense of the Nicene Council. Epist 41. ad Maximum. And in his 340th Epistle [he saith, What relation a common name hath to a proper one that relation hath οὐσία to ὑπόστασις] disputing against the {language} of those who called the father son & holy ghost one hypostasis <181av> he saith Quænam vero calumnia hac ipsa gravior esse queat aut quænam violentius multitudinem concutere quam si invenirentur alicui a partibus nostris unam patris filij et spiritus sancti hypostasim affirmantes, qui utcunque personarum differentiam aperte docerent, nihilominus cum hoc ipso dogmam Sabellio præoccupatum posuerint ut hoc idem dicente; unum scilicet in hypostasi Deum esse, diversimodis personis tamen in s. scriptura nominari secundum idioma & exigentiam subjecti: et nunc quidem illum patris sibi nomina inducere cum illa ei persona sit adhibenda; nunc autem ea quæ filio congruunt cum scilicet vel ad nostri curam agendam aut dispensatorias quasvis operationes sit descendendum; nunc vero spiritus induere personam cum tempus huic personæ congrua expetatur nomina. # < insertion from lower down f 181v > # And a little after: ὃν ἔχει λόγον τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον, τοῦτο ἔχει ἡ οὐσία πρὸς τὴν ὑπόστασιν. That relation which a common name has to a proper one, that same the name οὐσία has to the name ὑπόστασις And in his 43^d Epistle directed to his brother Greogry Nyssen, writing against those who took the names ὁσία & ὑπόστασις in the same sense & contended that they must either say one usia & one hypostasis or three hypostases & three usias he teaches his brother the difference of the names & tells him that some names are common & denote the nature common to many as homo & some are peculiar & proper as Peter Andrew Iohn or Iames & that Paul Silvanus & Timothy having the same common mode of οὐσία are called ὁμοούσιοι but particularly are several hypostases, & that if you know any word which expresses the difference of οὐσία & ὑπόστασις among men, & shall transfer the same to the divine dogmata, you will not err. < text from f 181av resumes > Sabellius therefore taught that in the deity there was but one substance which the Greeks had hitherto called οὐσία & ὑπόστασις, & that this substance or some part of it by dilatation emission emanation projection or otherwise according to various occasions exerting various powers or putting on various forms acted sometimes in the person of the father sometimes in the person of the son & sometimes in the person of the h. ghost & therefore the language of τρία πρόσωπα & tres personæ was not thought sufficient to exclude Sabellianism unless the language of three hypostases was added to make the πρόσωπα or personæ three intelligent substances in singular existence tho but one in nature & kind. And this was the argument which then prevailed in the world for changing the language of one hypostasis into that of three.

<182v>

The right method of computation as is conceived by the Auditors, is to find the ratio of the Queens duty to the gross price in any one case, & then in all cases to multiply the gross price by that ratio.

Let the net value of the goods be 100^{li}, & in this case the Queens duty will be 52^{li}. 2. 6 as above, & the summ of this value & duty augmented by the seventh part thereof (the allowances for prompt payment & warehouse room,) namely 173^{li}. 17. 1⁵/₇ will be the gross value by the candle: and as this value is to the Queens duty in this case, so is 1 to ,299815, & so is the gross value to the Queens duty in all cases.

Therefore multiply the gross value by the ratio ;299815 & you will have the Queens Duty.

As if the gross value be 100^{li}, this multiplied by ,299815 will produce the Queens Duty 29^{li},9815 or 29^{li}. 19. 7¹/₂.

For	100 ^{li}	=	=	The gross price
	29.	19.	7 ¹ / ₂	The Queens dutys.
	12.	10.	=	The allowance to the Company of 6 & 6 ¹ / ₂ per cent
	42.	9.	7 ¹ / ₂	The total of the deductions

57. 10. $4\frac{1}{2}$ The net value to be taxed.
4. 1. $11\frac{1}{4}$ Old subsidy.
4. 1. $11\frac{1}{4}$ New D^o
4. 1. $11\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ & $\frac{2}{3}$ D^o
10. 15. $9\frac{1}{2}$ Impost 1690.
6. 18. $-\frac{1}{4}$ 12 per cent on China ware.
29. 19. $7\frac{1}{2}$ The summ of the Duties composing the Queens Duty.

So that in every 18^{li} 8. $9\frac{1}{2}$ received as on the other side, there is lost 11^{li} 10. 10.

Sabellius often confounding the understanding undertook to distinguish the persons saying that the same hypostasis or substance was transformed upon every occasion which was offered. Basil. Epist 392. If the word person be taken in the same sense with hypostasis, that is for an intelligent substance, Sabellius held but one person: if for a power forme or mode of appearance he allowed a variety of persons much after the manner of Simon Magus who said that one & the same God appeared sometimes as the father sometimes as the son & sometimes as the h. ghost. ffo it was in various respects that Sabellius called God by the names of the father son & h. Ghost. But he did not make himself that God, as Simon did ffor Simon taught that he himself was the supreme God who appeared among the Iews as the son & descended in Samaria as the Father & came to other nations as the h. Ghost. Iren. l. 1 c 20. If this difference between the opinions of Simon & Sabellius be excepted the heresy of Sabellius descended from Simon.

You have heard that Athanasius interpreted the Nicene Creed of the consubstantial substances of the father & son. He doth it in several parts of his works. According to that Council the son was begotten of the substance of the father & in his likeness & therefore had a substance of his own & he was God of God light of light & therefore in the sense of the C. was consubstantial to the father as one light is consubstantial to another. All parties allowed <182r> that the son was like the father as being the image of the invisible God; & the homousians contended for a perfect likeness, such a likeness as amounted to an equality & taught that such a likeness amounted to a consubstantiality, & that ἀπαράλλατος ὁμοιος signified the same thing with ὁμοούσιος, ③ They taught that ὁυσία & substantia were common names or names which denoted the common nature of the three persons as homo is a common name & denotes the common nature of men & that the hypostases or subsistences of the father son & holy ghost were proper names or names which signified the single subsisting properties or proper subsistensies of the individuals as Peter is a proper name & signifies not that which is common to Peter & Iohn but all that which is proper to Peter & subsists in him alone, that is, the proper substance of Peter with all the proper habits powers forms & qualities actually subsisting in that substance & sometimes they said that there was one ουσία of the three persons as there was one usia of three men † < insertion from f 181v > † but with this difference, that three men were divided from one another, but the three divine persons were undivided, like a root & its branches, a fountain & its streams, or three cohering Suns which intermix their light; so that singly they were three whole substances. & yet jointly but one undivided whole. < text from f 182r resumes > ② They taught that if the son or Word of God was like any of the creatures he would be consubstantial to those creatures but if he was like the father he must be consubstantial to the father & that as every natural son is consubstantial to his father so the natural son of God must be consubstantial to his father, & that he was consubstantial to the father as touching his Godhead & consubstantial to us as touching his manhood. ‡ < insertion from f 181v > ‡ And these notions of the Trinity are almost every where in the writings of Athanasius, Hilary, Epiphanius, Basil, Greg. Naz. Greg. Nyss. Chrysostom, Maximus the Martyr, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Ambrose, Ierome, Austen, Leontius Byzantinus, Iohn Damascene, Theodorus Abucara, Euthymius Zygadenus Theorianus &c. either plainly described or in degree or other touched upon where there is occasion to explain these mysteries.

And Agapius a heathen that the souls of men are consubstantial to God & so are the sun Moon & starrs. And Porphyry that the souls of brutes are consubstantial to those of men, namely by being all of them derived

from the substance of God. And in the same sense Aristotle, that all the stars are consubstantial, < text from f 182r resumes > The homousians taught also that the son was not μονοούσιος or ταυτοούσιος to the father but ὁμοούσιος, & that to make them μονοούσιοι or ταυτοούσιοι or to take the three person for any thing else then personal substances tended to sabellianism So Basil tells us that because the son is the image of the father he is consubstantial to him & that ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν like according to substance with an invariable likeness is the same with ομοούσιος in the sense of the Nicene Council & that there is one usia of Peter & Paul, & ὃν ἔχει λόγον you will not err. Basil tells us also that for clearing our selves from Sabellianism it is not ----- And in his 349 epistle disputing against the language of those of Antioch who called the three persons one hypostasis ----- congrua expetant nomina. And upon this account Athanasius in his exposition of faith condemns the Sabellians for making the son μονοούσιος not ὁμοούσιος to the father – And Epiphanius saith that the son was not ταυτοούσιος to the father but ὁμοούσιος & that the word ταυτοούσιος being used by some, draws to sabellianism. Sabellius therefore taught ----- hypostasis into that of three: the language of three persons & τρία πρόσωπα being found insufficient to clear the Monousian faith from Sabellianism.

It would be tedious to run over the writings of all that have explained the doctrine of thre consubstantial hypostases: but they that have leasure will find that Athanasius, Hilary, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostome Ambrose Ierome Austin, Theodoret, Cyrill of Alexandria Leontius Byzantinus, Iohn Damascene, Theodorus Abucara, Euthymius Zygabenus, Theorianus &c wherever they have had occasion to explain this doctrine have take one usia & three hypostases, one substance & thre subsistences for one in nature & kind & three in number. And several Councils have done the like as the Councils of Antioch A.C. 363 who say that the Council of Nice cautiously explained the Consubstantiality of the Son by his likeness to the father, the Council of Rome under Damasus A.C. 379 who declared that the Son was begotten of the substance of the father & equal to him & that the divinity of the father son & holy ghost was una & æqualis. The second general Council who ratified the Nicene faith. The fourth general Council who say that Christ was consubstantial to the father as touching his Godhead & consubstantial to us as touching his manhood. And the third general Council who decreed that the two hypostases of God & man were united & became one. If the hypostasis of the man Iesus was a substance composed of body & soul the two hypostases of God & man must be two substances & neither of them must be the substance of the father least the father should be incarnate & suffer ffor this Council decreed that God the word did not inhabit the man Iesus, as the spirit of God dwells in holy men, but became flesh & communicated with flesh & blood like one of us (that is as the spirit of a man communicates with his soul & body & is united with them into one man) & that the Word suffered died & rose again in the flesh. In short, that the Greeks & Latines of the fourth & following ages, as many as used the language of three hypostases tooke these hypostases for three substances of one nature & species has been so fully proved by Petavius <181v-b> Curcelleius, D^r Cudworth, D^r Bull & Huetius that it cannot be disputed. And since Euthymius Zygabenus & Theorianus lived in the 12th century this doctrine seems to have continued in the Greek Empire while that Empire stood. But in the Latine Churches when the dark ages came on & the significations of the Greek words ὁμοούσιος & were no longer understood in the west the language of una substantia restored the opinion of a single substance & made persons subsistences & hypostases be taken by the Schoolmen for something else then substances & the single hypostasis of the Sabellians for something else then a single substance. Yet the word essentia which answers to the word οὐσία & seems derived from it continues to this day among the Latines to signify one common essence or nature of all the individual substances of one species or kind.

<183r>

For the hereticks thinking it below the dignity of their principal Gods to be really incarnate & to suffer really on the cross, eluded the truth of Christs being come in the flesh by various opinions. Some of them, as Simon magus, Basilides Manes, said that Christ had not a body of real flesh & bones but only appeared to men in shew: & others as Cerinthus Carpocrates Marcus Colarbasus Montanus, Proclus, Sabllius Paul of Samosat, Photinus & I think Artemas, Theodotus, Marcellus, Eustathius & the rest of the Cataphrygians Paulinists & Sabellians said that Iesus was a mere man born after the manner of other men & that a vertue or spirit called the λόγος or Word dwelt in him as the holy spirit doth in good men & performed the divine operations. And this composition the Montanists called one person & said that it was made without confusion of substance. And Praxeas & Noetus said that this spirit was the father or some part of him & were thence called patripassians. But Iohn the Apostle tells us: Every spirit that confesseth not that Iesus Christ is come in the

flesh is not of God & this is the spirit of Antichrist, whereof you have heard that it should come, & even now, already it is in the world. This was one character of Antichrist & another was to deny the father & the son, as all those did who made the son to be either the Idea or λόγος ἐνδιάθετος or προφορικὸς of the father or any part or power of the fathers substance, & in this sense worshipped them both with divine worship. For this was the theology of the heathens. They made the parts & powers of God to be his sons & explained the generation of such sons by emission prolotion or projection of those parts or powers but the Christian religion is a stranger to such generations.

Yet the opinion that the Word was from all eternity the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος of God & a little before the world began was emitted outwardly & by such emission became the λόγος προφορικὸς & the son of God, was a growing opinion in the second & third centuries & the first half of the fourth & infected some <183v> of note in the Church whom I forbear to mention. But {by degrees} this heresy being condemned in Photinus by the Council of Sirmium A.C. 351, as was related above it began from that time to cease & in a few years was extirpated {illeg} in a few years the sentence of the Council being universally accepted & was succeeded by the opinion that the father son & holy ghost were three like & equal substances

For Hilary, eight years after this Council writing to the bishops of Gallia & Britain {illeg} & for setting them right in the faith {illeg} he {made} definitions of this {illeg}: Multi ex nobis — — — — — {illeg} or that the father & son were two equal substances in number & one in {gender} nature & likeness, or two like & equal substances. And this is the first instance that I meet with of this doctrine.

The next year Hilary returning into Gallia, made it his business to {propagate} this doctrine in those parts & for establishing it got the bishops to meet in several small councils & being favoured by the bishop of Rome went into {Italy} on the same account. And after this faith by the authority of the bishop of Rome & the endeavours of Hilary & others was received by the major part of the bishops of Gallia & Italy the Bishop of Rome A.C. 373 called a Council at Rome to establish it & sent the establishment to a numerous council called at the same time in Illyricum. who also established it, & the Emperor Valentinian commanded at the same time that it should {be received every where}. Thus it became the religion of the western Empire & about six or {eight} years after upon the death of the eastern Emperor Valens, it was established also in the eastern empire by the edicts of the Emperors Gratian & Theodosius.

<183Ar>

but presently after the death of Iulian the Apostate they added the deity of the H.G & made him coequal to the father & the son . For Gregory Nazianzen who lived in those times gives this account of the beginning of this new controversy.

But tho the consubstantiality made

The opinion that the son of God was the λογος προφορικὸς emitted by the father not from all eternity but a little before the world began was warily embraced by some men of note in the Church in the second & third centuries, as by Theophilus bishop of Antioch, Athenagoras, Clemens master of the school of Alexandria, Tertullian, Hippolytus martyr, Lactantius

The opinion that the son of God was the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος of the father seated in him from all eternity, crept into the Church very early

Besides the heresiarchs who were openly condemned & exploded, there were some very early in the Church who imbibed the heathen philosophy without being censured for it. Such were they whom Iustin Martyr mentions in this manner.

The opinion which most prevailed with the Christians was that the λόγος of the Apostle Iohn was the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος the inherent Word & wisdom of the father & that this word was inherent in the father from all eternity, & a little before the world began was emitted outwardly as a voice from a man or as a ray of light from ☉ or water from the fountain or a branch from the root. And this emission they called the generation of the son. Of this opinion I reckon those Christians mentioned by Iustin as above, & Tatian & Theophilus of Antioch & {Athenagoras} & Clemens master of the school at Alexandria & perhaps his successor Origen &

Hippolytus the martyr & Lactantius & Constantine the great. ffor Constantine in an Epistle which he sent – – – & caused to be published in all the cities of the Roman Empire just before the meeting of the Council of Nice, spake thus to Arius – which were made by him. Hitherto the said antemundane generation of the λογος had been a growing opinion in the Churches, But Alexander bishop of Alexandria & Athanasius in the disputes which they had wih Arius dropt this antemundane generation & declared the λογος ενδιάθετος to be the son of God by an eternal generation received And at length the opinion that the son of God was the λόγος ένδιάθετος being condemned in Photinus by the Council of Sirmium was totaly exploded & ceased in a few years, the faith & definitions of that Council being universally approved & received: But the opinion of eternal generation still continued & got ground. I reccon Alexander the author of this opinion becaus his adversaries said that by his opinion the Son was άγενετος unbegotten, & they never before heard of two that were unbegotten

Hitherto the Son had been accounted subordinate to the father by all parties, those who held the antemundane generation teaching that the father emitted or begot the son by the {force} & power of his will in order to create the world. But soon after the condemnation of Photinus they began to equal the son to the father equal substances & one of the first who did so was Hilary.

By creation here is meant not formation (as in scripture) but production out of nothing, & by traduction – – – – the breathings of God. He seems to have had his opinion from his master Montanus: but I do not – – – – resurrection.

<183Av>

By continual creation they meant continual production out of nothing & by traduction a propagation of the souls of the chil{dren} from the souls of the parents, & of the soul of the first man either from the substance of God or from nothing For Tertullian traduced them originally from the substance of God. ffor he said – – – – Platonist for I do not find that the Monanists allowed the Pythagorick transmigrations or denied the resurrection They held either the traduction of souls from one another or their continual production out of nothing.

Whilst the primitive hereticks were of opinion that Angels & the souls of men were of one substance with the supreme God the opinion that the Word or son of God was of one substance with him could give the Word no preeminence above that of an angel or a humane soule excepting so far as he was the first or one of the first emissions. But the opinion that he was the λόγος ένδιάθετος the inherent word & wisdom of the father might give him a great preeminence. And after the words creation & generation were taken to signify the production of something out of something & the production of something out of nothing, & the opinion prevailed in the Churches that God created all things out of nothing & did it by Iesus Christ & in order to do it begat Iesus Christ of his own substance before the world began: this opinion made the son of God still greater. Yet I do not find that it equalled him to the father amongst either the Christians or hereticks before the middle of the fourth century.

The opinion that the Word was the λόγος ένδιάθετος the inherent word & wisdom of the father & before the world began was emitted outwards & became the λόγος προφορικòς & the son of God infected some men of great note in the Church as Theophilus bishop of Antioch, Clemens Doctor of the school at Alexandria Tertullian & the Emperor Constantine the great & by the influence of such men it spread in the Church in the second third & fourth centuries untill it was condemned in Photinus by the Council of Sirmium as above. After which time it decreased & in a few years vanished, the Definitions of that Council being universally received & approved. And on the other hand the opinions of Arius that the son of God was produced out of nothing & that there was a time when he was not, were anathematized not only by the Council of Nice but also by seven other Greek Councils & particularly by the Council of Sirmium which condemned Photinus, & by these anathemas the language & doctrine of Arius also ceased. And hitherto the Church catholick prevailed against all heresies.

Eight years after the meeting of this Council Hilary writing from Asia to the bishops of Gallia & Britain & for setting them right in the faith sending to them the Creed & Definitions of this Council as above, he subjoins this admonition in his letter: Multi ex nobis

The next year (A.C. 360) Hilary returned into Gallia & it may be presumed that he set himself to propagate the doctrine of the equality of the two substances of the father & Son. For hitherto the disputes which commenced in the reign of Constantine the great concerned only the father & the son,

<184r>

– into all nations.

Seventy weeks, saith Daniel, are determined upon thy people & upon thy holy city [from the time of their incorporation] to finish transgression & to seal {up or hide} or blot out] sins & to make reconciliation for iniquity & to bring in everlasting righteousness & seal up [or accomplish] the vision & prophesy & to anoint the most holy. 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. And seventy weeks of years counted from that time end in the year of the vulgar æra 33 or 34 & then was Iesus the Messiah slain & by his death blotted out sins & made reconciliation for iniquity & brought in everlasting righteousness & accomplished the vision & prophesy & ☉ & by his death & resurrection the most holy was annointed to be a king of the Jews ffor he {has} obtained a name above every name & shall come to judge the quick & the dead at his appearing & his kingdom < insertion from lower down f 184r > ☉ & by his death & resurrection the most holy was annointed. ffor by the suffering of death he was crowned with glory & honour Because he humbled himself to death therefore God exalted him & gave him a name above every name that at the name of Iesus every knee should bow of things in heaven & earth & under the earth & that every tongue should confess that Iesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the father. Because he loved righteousness & hated iniquity God annointed him with the oile of gladness above his fellows & set him at his own right hand. He was annointed, that is became the Messiah the Christ ffor the Messiah the Christ & the Annointed are words of the same signification in several languages. At his birth he was named Iesus, & at his resurrection he commanded his disciples to preach that he was the Christ, that is the Messiah predicted by Daniel. And thenceforward his disciples called him Iesus Christ, & for doing so were soon after called Christians. He was annointed to be Lord or Prince or king of the Jews ffor in the next words the Prophet calls him the Messiah the Prince: & in our Creed we call him Christ the Lord & the Lord Iesus Christ. At his death he owned that he was born for this end that he should be a king & this title was given him upon the cross: but his kingdom was not of this world. He compares himself to a noble man going into his country to receive a kingdom & return & who at his return called his servants <185v-a> to account & reward them according to their works making one a ruler over ten cities with a rod of iron & another a ruler over five & casting a third into utter darkness. He is gone to prepare a place or mansion for the blessed & will come again & receive them to himself. For he shall judge the quick & the dead at his appearing & his kingdom & must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet the last of which is death & when all the dead are raised & sentenced to their several places he is to deliver up the kingdom to the father that God may be all in all, & to go with the blessed to the place which he is now preparing for them. For in Gods house which is the universe there are many mansions. As David was annointed long before he began to reign so Christ was annointed king of the Jews at his first coming but was not to reign over them before his second coming, & in respect of that reign he is in the next words called the Messiah the Prince.

And know & understand, saith the Prophet, that from the going forth of the commandment to cause [the captivity] to return & to build Ierusalem [the city of the great king] unto the Messiah the Prince [or unto his coming as Prince after his being annointed thereunto shall be seven weeks. The 1290 prophetick days or years end when God shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people & if this comes to pass three or four years after the going forth of the commandment to cause them to return there will be seven weeks unto the arrivall of the blessedness of them that wait & to the resurrection of Daniel at the end of the 1335 days. For all Daniels propheties concerning the affairs of Gods people reach to the end of the four monarchies.

Also threscore & two weeks it shall return & the street shall be built & the wall, and [this shall be not in a flourishing state like the seven weeks but] in a difficulty of times. And after [the coming at the end of] the threscore & two weeks the Messiah shall [not reign as Prince but] be cut off, & it [the city or people or kingdom or dominion] shall not be his but the people of a Prince that shall come [the Romans] shall destroy the city & the sanctuary & the end thereof shall be with a flood & unto the end of the war desolations are

determined. The death of the Messiah was predicted before & the Prophet is here predicting his two comings. From the 28th year of Artaxerxes in which the street & the wall of Ierusalem were finished & the gates of the city set up, as above, count 62 weeks of years & they will end two or three years before the vulgar Æra: at which time Iesus was born.

< text from higher up f 184r resumes >

And Know & understand that from the going forth of the commandment to cause [the captivity] to return & to build Ierusalem [the royal city of the kingdom] untill [the coming of] the annointed Prince [to reign as Prince in the city of the great king] shall be seven weeks. The 1290 years end when God shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, & if this comes to pass three or four years after the going forth of the commandment to cause them to return, there will be seven weeks to the arrival of the blessedness of them that wait & the resurrection of Daniel at the end of the 1335 days. For all Daniels prophesies reach to the end of the four Monarchies.

Also threescore & two weeks the street shall be rebuilt & the wall [unto the coming of the Messiah] but this [not in flourishing times like the seven weeks but] in troublesome times. And after [the coming at the end of] the threescore & two weeks the Messiah shall [not reign as Prince but] be cut off & it [the City or people or kingdom or dominion] shall not be his, but the people of a Prince that shall come [the Romans] shall destroy the city & the sanctuary & the end thereof shall be with a flood: & unto the end of the war desolations are determined. The death of the Messiah was predicted before: & the Prophet is here predicting his two comings. ffrom the 28th year of Atarxerxes in which the street & the wall of Ierusalem were finished & the gates set up as above, count 62 weeks of years & they will end two or three years before the vulgar æra, at which time Christ was born.

Yet he shall keep the covenant with many [or with the multitude] for one week. The covenant between him & his people that they should be his people & he would be their God or King, he kept seven years after his death untill the calling of the Gentiles in Cornelius.

But in half a week [of years] the desolator shall cause the sacrifice & oblation to cease & upon a wing of abominations overspread the land, & 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 war of half a week by which the sacrifice & oblation ceased began in spring A.C. 67 & ended with the taking of Ierusalem in autumn A.C. 70. And by other wars in the reign of Trajan & Adrian the Iews

Herod was made king by the senate in the end of October or beginning of November — — — — — would be in reckoning by weeks of days.

The law of the Iews & Christians except the ceremonial part &c The western Churches at the first joynd with the Macedonian & declared only for the consubstantiality of the son. But Athanasius

<185v-b>

The death & annointing of the Messiah & his coming to reign having been predicted before, the Prophet is here not predicting the time of his death again but stating the time & circumstances of his first coming to distinguish it from his coming to reign as Prince. From the 28th year born.

And at the same time at the request of the Council of Rome above mentioned which Pope Damasus called for establishing the Roman faith & condemning the Macedonians & all others who differed in faith from the Church of Rome,] the Emperors Gratian & Valentinian restored to the Bishop of Rome the universal bishopric over the west in matters judicial by this edict. — Volumus ut year 378.

And about a year & six months after the death of Valens the new eastern Emperor by the following Edict dated Feb 28 A.C. 380 commanded all to be of the religion of the Church of Rome — — — — — & their followers.

And the next year the Emperor Theodosius for establishing the Roman faith in the minds of the people called a general Council of the Bishops of his own party to meet at Constantinople. And this Council established the Nicene Creed with some alterations & additions & particularly after the article I beleive in the holy Ghost added these words, the Lord & giver of life who proceedeth from the father who with the ffather & the son together is worshipped & glorified, who spake by the Prophets. And I beleive one Catholick & Apostolick Church, I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead & the life of the world to come. Which last articles were taken from th Creeds of the Latines.

<185v>

received a name above every name [that every tongue should confess that Iesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the father, And this name is the ^{a[44]} τὸ εἶναι ἰσα θεῷ & was given him because he humbled himself. He did ^{b[45]} not take it by force but on the contrary laid aside the μορφή θεοῦ the state of glory & dominion which he had before his incarnation & took upon him ἡν δούλου μορφήν the condition of a servant & humbled himself to death even the death of the cross & therefore God highly exalted him & gave him the τὸ εἶναι ἰσα θεῷ the name above every name that at the name of Iesus every knee should bow & every tongue confess that Iesus Christ is Lord to the glory of god the father.

NB. ^{b[46]} Μορφή θεοῦ & μορφή δούλου, sibi invicem opponuntur, ut et ἄρπαγμα ἡγήσατο & ἑαυτὸν ἐκένοσε, & οὐκ ἄρπαγμα ἡγήσατο idem hic significat quod οὐκ ἤρπασε non rapuit. Vide Hilar. de Trin. l. 8 p 182 & contra Constantium p. 330 & de synodis p 384 Edit Paris 1652 et Theophylact & Oecumen in h. l. et Chrysostom de Christi praeibis Sermon. 51 p. 698, 699 Tom 5 Edit Paris & Hom. 7 in 2 Phil. 2. ^{a[47]} Nota etiam quod vox ἰσα cum dativo sequente, semper adverbium est similitudinis ut in his exemplis.

Because he humbled himself therefore God gave him this name

This name God gave him because he humbled him self. He did not ^{a[48]} take this name, [this τὸ εἶναι ^{b[49]} ἰσα θεῷ] by force but on the contrary ^{c[50]} laid aside the μορφή θεοῦ the state of glory & dominion which he had before his incarnation & took upon him τὴν δούλου μορφήν the form or state & condition of a servant & humbled himself to death even the death of the cross & because he humbled himself God highly exalted him & gave him τὸ εἶναι ἰσα θεῷ a name above every name that at the name of Iesus every knee should bow & every tongue confess that Iesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the father.

to God his father. ffor worthy is the Lamb which was slain to receive power & riches & wisdom & strength & honour & glory & blessing. And let every creature, which is in heaven & on earth & in the sea & all that are in them, say blessing & honour & glory & power unto him that sitteth upon the throne & unto the Lamb for ever & ever. Amen.

And thus much concerning the humane nature of Iesus called in scripture the Christ, the Messiah, the Lord the Prince of the host the King of Kings & Lord of Lords & by many other names & concerning the worship which is due to him as our Lord & King the mediator between God & man the man Christ Iesus & which cannot be refused him without denying the Lord that bought us. To worship one God as the creator of — — — — sufficient to salvation.

Nor does the opinion of the consubstantiality demonstratively require any other sort of worship. ffor the heathens beleived that the souls of all men were consubstantial to the supreme God, & yet worshipped only some of them, & those only according to their supposed merits in this life; [We are to ground our worship not upon disputable consequences of scripture but upon express commands & the practise of the primitive Church in the days of the Apostles.] What further worship may be due to him on account of the consubstantiality I consider not here, because the heathen] How far his worship may be founded on his consubstantiality I do not here consider. The heathens beleived — — — — in this life. But their Gods had no dominion/ vel cum diametro foraminis &

Either come, say they, & purge your selves of what you are accused of & of the calumnies which ye have wrought, or know that ye shall be condemned by the Council as offenders, & Athanasius & those with him shall be declared free & pure from all crimes.

And in all these proceedings I do not find that the producing of Arsenius alive at the Council of Tyre was [once alledged, as it would have been upon all occasions had it been true.] so much as mentioned. Had it been true, the Councils of Alexandria Rome & Serdica would not have been silent about it: The five eastern Bishops at Serdica would not have proposed a reexamination of the matter. The western Bishops would not have declined the proposal, nor have offered unanimously in the following Councils of Millian Arles Bithynia & Aquileia to subscribe the condemnation of Athanas provided the Nicene faith might be first confirmed. And therefore the story was of a later invention. A pretended letter of Arsenius was produced in the Council at Tyre to prove that he was alive & at length the story was told by the Moncks as if it was not a letter but Arsenius himself which was there produced.

<186r>

Christ & therefore no other Articles of faith are requisite to this incorporation nor are men to be deprived of this incorporation for not believing more then was required of them at their admission into it. And to excommunicate any man for not believing more is to leave the love of the primitive Christians, to be uncharitable to the members of Christs mystical body, to rend that body asunder & to become guilty of schism, a crime as much greater then heresy it self, as Charity is a greater grace then vertue. Nor can the crime be diminished by any humane sanction, establishment censure or judgment whatsoever for God has not given to Emperors Kings or Bishops, senates or Councils any authority to change times & laws in matters of religion & condemn the charity of the first Christians as heretical & impious. The world may call men latitudinarians for not admitting their humane impositions but in doing so they rail at charity. The world may call men hereticks for not receiving their definitions, but are not all new articles of communion another Gospel & doth not the preaching them as necessary to salvation make void the faith in Christ The Gospel which was preached by the Apostles was not after man for they neither received it of man neither were taught it but by the Revelation of Iesus Christ. And if any man or even an Angel from heaven, saith the Apostle, preach any other Gospel then that which they had preached Let him be accursed, Gal. 1. If the new impositions be pretended to be holy just & good so was the Law; If they are in scripture so was the Law: & yet to impose it upon the Gentiles without a divine command is called preaching another Gospel, & the imposers are declared accursed.

The scriptures are the rule of truth & the primitive Creed the rule of faith requisite to communion. For There are many truths in scripture which a man may be ignorant of without deserving to be excommunicated for his ignorance, And in the primitive ages few men had all the scriptures & some nations into which the Christian religion was propagated had not so much as the use of letters: But all men were to learn all the articles of their Creed before they were admitted into communion by baptism; And a systeme of these Articles we have given you above by rejecting out of the Creeds of the Greeks & Latines such articles as have been inserted since the beginning. And as the Christians of all nations were in the primitive times united into one mystical body by one Rule of faith & communion & by departing from this Rule brake into many factions & parties so it is not to be expected that all the parties of Christians should ever reunite into one mystical body of Christ untill they shall return to the primitive rule of communion.

Yet considering that the Creed usually called the Apostles Creed is generally received by the Churches of the Latines, I do not see but that it may be still allowed them for the sake of peace provided the Articles which have been inserted since the beginning be understood in such a sense as is consonant to scripture [& not imposed upon the Churches of the Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, Coptites, Ethiopians or any other Churches as primitive articles necessary to baptism & communion.

<187r>

For By the descent into hell may be understood that Christ died really & truly & in all respects underwent the state of the dead; without entring into particular opinions about that state. By the resurrection of the body may be understood that every man shall revive with his own spiritual immortal body; without entring into particular opinions & controversies about the nature of that body. By the remission of sins may be understood the remission of sins at the day of judgment of all such as heartily & sincerely repent in this life; without entring into disputes about the power of the By the communion of Saints may be understood the duty of all Christians to live in communion & charity & to love one another; without meddling with the doctrine of ghosts or dæmons. And by the holy Catholick Church may be understood a body of all those who live in such

communion, serving one God & one Lord & being united in one faith the faith which was once delivered to the saints, & avoiding quarrels about other opinions as contrary to the indispensable duty of charity. [And with such interpretations of these articles I conceive it better to indulge the use of this Creed to the Latines then to create disputes & prejudices by rejecting what has been added to it] for in such a sense these articles are nothing more then explications of the primitive articles of the Creed & of the Charity by which & one faith men are to continue united in the Church into which they are admitted by baptism

<187v>

By the last words he means that when the Bishops in their communicatory letters explained their faith (as they did very frequently), they did not tie themselves to a set form of words, but expressed themselves in words more or less copious & eloquent according to every mans ability, & yet all of them from one end of the earth to the other end thereof agreed in the number & sense of the articles of their communicatory faith, without adding diminishing or altering any thing, as if the whole Christian world had but one soul & one mind.

By what has been said it may seem that the Creeds now in use have all of them been altered, & yet considering that the Creed usually called the Apostles Creed

<188r>

& imports that the controversy about the h. g. was set on foot by Ath. in the reign of Iovian which was about 10 years before & from Egypt & Syria spread into the west, that after the death of Iovian which happened A.C. 364 it was restrained in the Greek Empire under the dominion of Valens being only whispered in Asia & Syria & muttered in Egypt, but in the western Empire under the dominion of Valentinian it was preached openly with all freedom of speech. For the Emperor Valentinian left religion to the bishops, & gave them leave to meet in Councils about it as they thought fit amongst themselves but Valens prohibited the deifying of the holy Ghost as polytheistical.

The foundation of the sermon about the deity & worship of the holy Ghost was laid by by the Council of Serdica in their assertion that there was but one hypostasis of the father son & holy Ghost & that the hypostasis of the son was that which alone was acknowledged to be the hypostasis of the father. But this did not yet create any controversy about the holy Ghost. The controversy at this time was only about the Son. About two years after, viz^t A.C. 349, Athanasius in his return from the west into Egypt making some stay at Antioch avoided the communion of Leontius the bishop of that city & communicated with the disciples of Eustathius who had been desposed for Sabellianism And at that time they began to sing the verses of the Psalms alternately & to add the doxology to the end of them, & some said Glory be to the father & the son to denote an equality & others Glory be to the father in the Son or Glory be to the father by the Son in the h. G. to denote a subordination. But the holy Ghost was not yet worshipped: the disputes hitherto were only about the son.

In all the writings of Hilary (his Epistle to the bishops of Gallia & Britain A.C. 358, his books against the Emperor Constantius A.C. 359 360 361, his book aga

Hilary in all his works contends only about the deity of the son. I do not remember that he gives the name of God to the holy Ghost or contends for his worship in all his works. The Council of Paris convened A.C. 361 in a large profession of faith disputes only for the deity of the son. Auxentius bishop of Millain ten years after the Councils of Sirmium & Ariminum that is A.C. 366 or 367 being vehemently accused by Hilary of heresy defended himself only about the deity of the Son without acknowledging the deity of the holy Ghost or being accused by Hilary of denying it & was acquitted as you may see in Hilaries book against him. And therefore the controversy about the deity & worship of the holy G. was not yet begun in the west. It seems the western bishops were willing to let the deity of the holy Ghost alone till that of the son was established.

But after the consubstantiality & coequal Deity of the Son was by the influence of the bishop of Rome & industry of Hilary & Eusebius sufficiently established Pope Damasus A.C. 373 called a council of 93 bishops at Rome –

Their meaning in these words was that they hoped for an Emperor in a short time who should turn out all the bishops in the eastern Empire who received not this faith as they were beginning to turn out all in the western. ffor Auxentius bishop of Millain had hitherto remained quiet, but now this Council deposed him with some others in the west.

Thus they reestablished the language of the Council of Serdica

By these words it is manifest that the Bishop of Rome & the western Churches of his communion had not yet separated from the communion of the Churches of the Greek Empire. [But the churches of the whole Empire both Greeks & Latines whether they used the language of one usia & one hypostasis or that of one usia & three hypostases or rejected the language of one usia & homousios, continued hitherto in communion with one another in one general visible church catholick.] But now the Latines began to resolve to impose their faith upon the whole Empire & remove from their communion & deprive all the Bishops who think otherwise so soon as they should get an Emperor to put this designe in execution in the eastern Empire as well as in the western.

In September & october the Emperor Valentinian went first to Rome & then to Paris. What past between the Emperor & the Bishop of Rome about this matter is not recorded, but at Paris a Council of the bishops of Gallia met & [published a profession of faith wherein they declared their approbation of the faith of Hilary] Hilary communicated to them a letter which some eastern bishops (I suppose at Antioch) had written him & in answer thereunto they returned to them a large profession of their faith in which they approved the faith & communion of {them}: Ex literis vestris, say they, quas – unius, a nobis, vel usiæ vel [hypostaseos substantiæ cum Deo patre confessum, ne creatura potius aut adoptio aut appellatio videretur. And a little after: Auxentius {abjacimus}. By this I <188v> gather that Hilary upon publishing his book against Auxentius & directing it to all the bishops who detested the Arian heresy, had accordingly sent copies of it to the ea{stern} bishops of his party as well as to the western & received back their letter which he communicated to this Council of Paris against Auxentius.

Vpon his return into Gallia & the revolt of Iulian the apostate, A.C. 361 he wrote a very railing book against the Emperor Constantius, calling him persecutor, Antichrist tyrant, the most wicked of mortals, a ravening wolf, a man of a diabolical ingenuity & yet railing at him for his not persecuting but being mild, courteous charitable pious & religious. The book is usually supposed to have been written after the Emperors death, but was certainly writ before it because he constantly directs his speech to the Emperor as alive. From that time he set himself to sollicit the bishops of Gallia to return to the language of one substance & homousios. [& receive his doctrine of two like & equal substances in number & one in nature & species] And when he had made a considerable party in Gallia he went into Italy with Eusebius Vercellensis to sollicit the bishops of Italy & accused Auxentius bishop of Millain to the Emperor Valentinian of heresy. & Auxentius accused Hilary & Eusebius of being condemned persons & endeavouring every {white} to make schisms. This was in the year 365 ten years after the Councils of Millain Sirmium & Ariminum. ffor the Emperor resided that year at Millain till the month of September. The cause was heard between Auxentius & Hilary by the Emperors order & Auxentius sent his faith with the Acts of the Council of Ariminum to the Emperor in his defense & was acquitted & Hilary ordered to depart Millain whereupon he wrote his book against Auxentius. In all this contention the debate was only about the deity of the son. Auxentius neither acknowledged the deity of the holy Ghost nor was accused of denying it. And therefore the controversy about the deity – of the holy G. was not yet begun in the west. The whole story you have in Hilary's book written at that time against Auxentius & in the Epistle of Auxentius to the Emperor annexed to it. This book was directed to the bishops detesting the Arian Heresy & reflected upon Valens Vrsatius Auxentius Germichus & Caius as Arians.

The same year in September & October the Emperor Valentinian went first to Rome & then to Paris in Gallia. What past between the Emperor & Liberius bishop of Rome about this matter is not recorded. But that winter a Council of the bishops of Gallia met at Paris & Hilary communicated to them a letter which he had received from some eastern Bishops in which they desired that Auxentius Vrsatius Valens Gaius Megasius & Iustinus might be excommunicated. And this Council excommunicated them accordingly & sent back to those eastern bishops a large profession of their faith. Ex literis vestris, say they, unius, a nobis, idcirco vel usiæ vel substantiæ cum Deo patre confessum ne creatura potius aut adoptio aut appellatio videretur. This faith is the very same with that which Hilary had sent to them eight years before in his Epistle to the bishops of Gallia & britain & had ever since his return been preaching to them, namely that the father & son have no

common substance but are two like & equal substances in number & one in nature & species, the whole son being the son of the whole father. But about the deity of the holy ghost there is not one word in all this long profession of faith, & therefore the controversy about the deity of the holy Ghost was not yet set on foot in the west: but Gallia by the means of Hilary was now returned to the faith & profession of one usia & one substance of the father & son & of their being consubstantial. Cum plerisque videretur (saith Severus) non ineundam cum his communionem qui Arimenensem Synodum recepissent, [Hilarius] optimum factu arbitratus revocare cunctos ad emendationem & pœnitentiam, frequentibus intra Gallias concilijs, atque omnibus fere epsicopis de errore profitentibus, apud Ariminum gesta condemnant & in statum pristinum Ecclesiarum fidem reformant. — Illud apud omnes constitit unius Hilarij beneficio Gallias nostras piaculo hæresis libertatas. Sulp. Sever. hist. l. 2 sect. 60. Ita duo isti viri [Hilarius & Eusebius velut magnifica duo mundi lumina, Illyricum Italiam Galliasque suo splendore radiarunt ut omnes etiam de abditis angulis & abstrusis hæreticorum tenebræ fugarentur. Ruffin l 1. c 30, 31,

Italy was not yet ripe for excommunicating Auxentius, much less for entering upon a new controversy about the deity of the holy Ghost but after seven years more, A.C. 373, the Emperor Valentinian being then in Italy, a Council of 93 bishops met at Rome — — — — — By these words it is manifest — — — — — as in the western

Ten years after the Councils of Millain Sirmium & Ariminum, A.C. 365, the Emperor Valentinian being that year at Millain till September, Auxentius bishop of Millain was vehemently accused of p

The disciples of Eustathius who had been deposed for Sabellianism continued numerous at Antioch many years after & Paulinus was one of them & therefore Basil was not mistaken in blaming as Sabellians for using the language of one hypostasis & communicating with the disciples of Photinus. But notwithstanding what he wrote of them

<189r>

Hippolytus therefore took the Word of God to {be thi}s λόγος ἐνδιάθετος & the generation of the son of God to be the emission of this λόγος outwardly a little before the world began as light is emitted from the sun & water from the fountain.

Ruffin in translating the books of Origen περὶ ἀρχῶν has corrected them as Ierome affirms & he himself confesses & yet Origen in this translation speaks much of the Word of God as the λογος ενδιαθετος the inherent word & wisdom of God seated always in him by nature, & represents this Word emitted as light from the Sun or a vapour from the earth & applies to him the text of the Apostle Primogenitus omnis creaturæ & that of Solomon Dominus creavit me initium viarum suarum ad opera sua & adds, Ipsam per Solomonem dicit creatam esse sapientiam initium viarum Dei, continens scilicet in semetipsa universæ creaturæ vel initia vel formas vel species. Whence you may understand that Origen took the Word of God to be the Idea of Ideas or Platonic λογος exerted & emitted outwardly as light from the Sun in the beginning of Gods works in order to create the world & all things therein by the principles forms species & ideas of all things contained in himself, & that he was by this emission generated into a Son & that in respect of this antemundane emission & generation he is by Origen called a creature & the first begotten of every creature notwithstanding that he was latent in the father before this emission. For the Platonists taught that all things were latent in the internal inherent ideas of God from all eternity, & were at length exerted & produced outwardly by such acts of God as the heathens metaphysically represented by the humane acts of generation & manufactu{re}, & called generation in respect of things intellectual & manufacture work structure or creation in respect of things corporeal or compound. And hence you may understand in what sense Origen said that all things were of one substance. ② Origen held also an eternal generation of the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος if Ruffin has not misrepresented him. ① He represented that the Son was begotten of the mind of the father as the will proceeds from the mind, without any division or diminution of the fathers substance. By saying that the son or word was in the father before he came out of him, [he seems to be of the opinion of those who in those days placed the son in the father potentially as his λόγος ἐνδιάθετος from all eternity, untill this λόγος came out of him & was actually generated into a Son. Si homo tantummodo Christus, saith he, quomodo dicit Ego ex Deo prodij — — — omnia facit.] & was born in substantia prolata a Deo virtutis, he seems to make him a virtue or power seated in the father from all eternity & at lenth sent out with a substance the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος before he was born & the λόγος προφορικὸς afterwards.

Here Lactantius makes the Son subordinate in power & dominion to his father as the supreme God, notwithstanding their being of one substance And its probable that he had his opinions from his Master Arnobius.

Hitherto therefore — — — — — by one God the God of our Lord Iesus Christ. Platonism had hitherto — — — — effects.

Constantine the Great — — — — — were made by him.// And by all these instances you may understand that the opinion that the Son was the essential internal inherent wisdom & reason & λόγος ἐνδιάθετος of the father, & a little before the creation of the world was emitted outwardly as light from the sun & thereby became the λόγος προφορικὸς & the son of God, spread in the churches of both Greeks & Latines untill the times of the Council of Nice.// And to these opinions the Council of Nice had relation in their Creed in saying that the son was begotten of the substance of the father before <189v> all ages , not made [of nothing] & in calling him light of light. ffor this was the language of the philosophical Christians of the third century who composed this Creed & the faith of Constantine the Great who inserted into it the word ὁμοούσιος. And so far as I can observe, the faith of this Council was the same with that of Iustin Martyr described above.

In the Council of Nice Eusebius of Cæsarea produced the Creed of his Church which he had received from former Bishops & into which he had been baptized: & in this Creed the Son is called light of light the first begotten of every creature begotten of God the father before all ages, by whom all things were made: which language shews that the philosophical Christians who held the antemundane generation of the Son & compared it to the emission of a ray of light from ☉ had got their opinion into the Creeds of some Churches before the end of the third century.

Antony — — — — —

This Constantine wrote with relation to the Nicene faith & therefore by the words of the Creed begotten before all ages, understood that the son of God, who was always in the father as his inherent essential word & wisdom, came out of him in the beginning in order to create the world & by coming out was begotten into a Son. And it may be presumed that the Emperor who presided in the Council, approved the Creed of Eusebius, dictated the ὁμοούσιος, & moderated in the whole debate about the Nicene faith, understood the meaning of the Council.

And whilst Hosius was at the head of this Council & in the time of the Council of Nice influenced the Emperor Constantine the great & the opinion that the Son was the only λόγος of God was published to all the Empire by Constantine & confirmed by this Council of Serdica: you may thence know that Hosius, was of the same opinion. He beleived therefore with Constantine & Alexander & Eustathius & the Council of Serdica that the λόγος which was in the beginning & became flesh was the only word & wisdom of God the father, the word without which God would be ἄσοφος & ἄλογος.

The opinion that the son of God was the λόγος προφορικὸς emitted before all ages for creating the world & that before this word was emitted the Son was potentially in the father as his λόγος ἐνδιάθετος but not yet actually generated into a son, was the prevailing opinion among the learned untill the times of the Council of Nice. This opinion being introduced by the Gnosticks & Platonists & refined by the Cataphrygians & Patripassians, spread in the Churches about an hundred & fifty years together, & then was again refined by Alexander bishop of Alexandria. ffor it being objected that this opinion made the father mutable unless the son was generated out of nothing, Alexander rejected it & made the son the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος begotten of his father from all eternity. And so far as I can find, he was the first man of note of this opinion. ffor his adversaries replied that by this opinion he made the son ἀγένετον unbegotten & that they never before heard of two unbegotten principles . Henceforward therefore some continued of opinion that the son was the λόγος προφορικὸς others followed Alexander & became of opinion that the son was the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος. [The first taught that the Son was begotten before all ages in order to create the world; the second that he was begotten from all eternity the father being immutable & never without a son least he should have been at any time ἄσοφος & ἄλογος until the Council of Sirmium in censuring Photinus A.C. 351 condemned both these opinions with this anathema. Siquis ἐνδιάθετον ἢ προφορικὸν λόγον internum vel prolativum verbum dixerit Dei filium, anathema sit. And from that time forward these opinions decreased & in a few years vanished, the

faith & sentences of that Council meeting with an universal approbation as you have heard above. And so far as I can find — — — — ἡ προφορικός.

And by all these things it is manifest that the original meaning of the article of the Creed begotten before all ages was that the son was begotten in or a little before the beginning of the ages in order to create the world, which being but a philosophical opinion grounded chiefly upon a misinterpretation <189Ar> of the words of Solomon Dominus creavit m{e init}ium viarum suarum in ope{ra sua} must have got into the Creed long after the days of the Apostles & bei{ing only} of humane authority, may by the same authority be rejected

cataphrigians, seem to have given occasion to their tumults & to the letters of Pope Victor. For Tertullian represents that those letters were for bringing peace to the Cataphrygian Churches. And before they were disturbed excommunicated & separated the bishop of Rome could not write letters of peace to them separately from the Churches which excommunicated them. He seems therefore to have written these letters of peace for supporting the Cataphrygians & thereby strengthning himself against the Churches of Asia who had excommunicated them & whom he had excommunicated for keeping Easter on the Iewish day. And hence forward — — — — — hereticks

The like opinions were propagated by Tertullian in Afric Ante omnia, saith he, Deus erat solus appellamus. And a little after describing how God first created wisdom in the beginning of his ways & then generated the son he adds Nam ut primum Deus voluit — — — — — generatus ad effectum. Because the Son is called light, therefore Tertullian represented him generated in the beginning of the creation when God said, Let there be light.

<189Av>

{creation}.

Origen the successor of Clemens in the said school, in the first of his four books περί αρχων, as it was extant in the fourth century before the transcribers & translators corrected it, taught the same philosophical opinions & many others recited by Ierome in his Epistle to Avitus in these words Christum filium Dei non natum [lege natura] esse sed factum, Deum patrem per natura invisibilem, etiam a filio non videri. Filium, qui sit imago invisibilis patris comparatum patri non esse veritatem: apud nos autem qui dei omnipotentis non possumus recipere veritatem, imaginariam veritatem videri: ut majestas ac magnitudo — — — — — quæ sancta dicuntur. Ierome further describes how Origen held the transmigration of souls, that Arch-angels might become Angels & angels men & men devils & devils return into the state of Angels & all rational creatures be changed into one another — that there were many successive worlds, that æther might become gross bodies & gross bodies return into æther, that the Sun Moon & stars were animated, that angels & devils were of one & the same nature but differed only in will. But yet he said that he spake of many of these things not as ecclesiastical doctrines but philosophical Questions occasionally touched upon. And in his second third & fourth books he proposes the like opinions & in the end of the fourth book he teaches the consubstantiality of all rational beings. Et ne parvam putaremus, saith Ierome, impietatem esse eorum quæ præmiserat, in ejusdem voluminis fine conjungit omnes rationabiles — — — — — angelis hominibusque largitur. † < insertion from lower down f 189Av > † And in the end of the third book he seems to derive all corporeal nature also from the substance of God. Post disputationem longissimam, saith Ierome, qua omnem creaturam corpoream in spiritualia corpora et tenuia dicit esse mutandam cunctas substantiam in unum corpus mundissimum & omni splendore purius convertendum et talem qualem nunc humana mens non potest cogitare; ad extremum intulit: Et erit Deus omnia in omnibus ut universa natura corporea redigatur, in eam substantiam, quæ omnibus melior est: in divinam scilicet qua nulla est melior. < text from higher up f 189Av resumes > [Many of these opinions Origen most certainly had from the philosophy of the heathens] And when Ruffin had misrepresented the opinions of Origen, Ierom in reprehending him for it saith Probo ego inter multa Origenis mala, hæc maxime hæretica: Dei filium creaturam, spiritum sanctum ministrum, mundos innumberabiles æternis sibi sæculis succedentes, angelos versos in animas hominum, animam Salvatoris fuisse antequam nasceretur ex Maria, et hanc esse quæ cum in forma Dei esset ουκ ἄρπαγμον ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ non rapuit honores divinos, sed se exinanivit formam servi accipiens. Hieron adv. Ruffin. lib 2.

Origen who succeeded Clemens & whose opinions are recited by Ierome (for his works now extant have been corrected) taught the plurality of worlds & the transmigration of souls that the son was a creature & that all

rational creatures might be changed into one another that the sun Moon & stars were animated, that Angels were changed into the souls of men & that the soul of our saviour preexisted & was that being which was in the form of a God before he took upon him the form of a servant. And that all rational beings in some respect, of one substance tho in some other respect he said sometimes that the Son was not of one substance with the f.. And while Clemens & Origen taught these philosophical opinions in the School of Alexandria it could not be but that their disciples would spread the same in Egypt.

While Tertullian complains that Praxeas hindered this bishop of Rome from bringing peace to the churches of Asia & Phrygia, & implies that these Cataphrygian Churches were now in trouble, & & {illeg} had been newly condemned & excommunicated by the Councils of the Greeks

<190r>

This is enough to shew that as the Platonists {illeg} the Gnosticks derived from the supreme God certain emissions Ideas, Splendors, or {illeg} from the supreme God & called them by the names of his attributes, the Cataphrygians, Encratites, Paulinists & Sabellians had thence their notion that the Son of God was the Platonic λόγος, or the λόγός ἑνδιάθετος the inward reason & wisdom of the father without which he would be ἄλογος & ἄσοφος: so this notion began to creep into the very Church her self in the latter part of the second century spread in it all the third and in the fourth overspread it & was the ground upon which those Bishops proceeded who repealed the Decree of the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosat & made his condemned language an article of faith.

And tho they intended thereby to establish the eternal Deity of Christ [opinion that the Son of God was his internal essential λόγος without which he was ἄσοφος & ἄλογος, :] yet they did it unskilfully: For any man who with the old heathens & hereticks takes the souls of men for rays sparks or particles of the Deity, may subscribe their Creed without beleiving Christ to be more then a mere man. Had they interdicted the novel language of both parties, & only established & declared the language in which they received the faith from the beginning, & upon pain of excommunication commanded all men to acquiesce in that language without further disturbing the Churches about questions or opinions not proposed in the language of the scriptures they had quieted the Empire & the Churches. But by making this new language of Paul of Samosat an article of faith they fomented rather then quieted the divisions which were then commencing.

Hitherto the Christian religion arose & spread by the preaching of the Gospel to poor people without the power of the sword, & by its truth, evidence & vertue & the blood of the martyrs prevailed against the power of the Jewish nation & that of the heathen Roman Empire. But Now from the time that the Empire became Christian & Constantine called a Council to establish his own opinions & to influence the Bishops first published his opinion in all the cities of the Empire & then came in person into the Council, the Christian religion by the power of the sword, every Emperor calling Councils to establish his own opinions & the Councils establishing the opinions of the Emperors which convened them. Which change was so very great that if the state of the Church under the persecution of Dioclesian & his successors (wherein all disputes between the Christians & hereticks ceased for a time) be reckoned for her fift state, this under the first Christian Emperors may be reckoned for the sixt.// For the Emperors hence forward by their Councils made several new articles of faith in forms of words not received from the Apostles by tradition, & modelled the Christian religion so as suited best with the interest of their Empire, & with the inclinations of the people that all of them (heathens hereticks & Christians) might unite & become of one mind & one religion. For its notoriously evident that the Councils always established the opinions of the Emperors who convened them.

<190v>

The names given to Christ usually denote his offices & powers & have a relation to the prophesies of the old Testament concerning him to signify that he is the person in whom they were or shall be fulfilled. He is called the Son of man to signify that he is the person spoken of by that name in Daniels prophesy of the four Beasts: The Christ or Messiah to signify that he is the Messiah spoken of in the prophesy of Daniels weeks: the King of Kings & Lord of Lords to signify that he is the Prince of the host & the Prince of Princes spoken of in Daniels prophesy of the Ram & He Goat: & Michael the Prince of the host Apoc. 12, to signify that he is that Michael spoken of by Daniel in these words At that time shall Michael stand up the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people Dan. 12. He is called the Lamb of God to signify that he was

prefigured by the Paschal Lamb in the law of Moses: the son of David to signify that he is the seed of David whose throne shall be established for ever (Psal 89. Luc 1.32): & the son of God to signify that he is the person of whom God said Thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee: which prophesy Peter applies to Christs being begotten by his resurrection from the dead, & the Angel Gabriel & the primitive Creed to his being born of the Virgin by the power of the most High < insertion from the left margin of f 190v > < text from f 190v resumes > And so he is called the Word of God, the truth, the faithful & true witness & the Amen to signify that he is the Prophet predicted by Moses that the Word of God is in him & his sayings are to be regarded & obeyed as the word of God, & that he is the great Oracle of God by whom God not only reveals himself to us, & dictates all his laws, but also judges the quick & dead & by whose breath & voice as with a two edged sword God smites the nations, destroys the man of sin & commands the Beast & fals Prophet to be cast into the lake of fire (Apoc 19) ffor this Word of God is quick & powerful & sharper then a two edged sword (Hebr. 4.12) And lastly he is called Θεός God to signify that he was the invisible God whom no eye hath seen nor can see but the visible God who acts in the name of the invisible one, & moving from place to place appeared to Adam & Moses, the Angel of Gods presence who led the Israelites through the wilderness, & gave the law in mount Sina, & whose voice was to be obeyed because the name of God was in him. Exod. 23.20, 21. [These <191r> interpretations of the names of Christ are very easy to be understood & {very ma}terial to the Christian religion: but what all this has to do with Platon{ism } the λόγος ἐνδιόθετος of God or with the generation of or with any sort of metaphysicks I do not underst{and.} Because his voice was to be obeyed as the voice of God he is called the λόγος τει Θεου & because the name of God was in him he is called Θεός. & by his incarnation truly became a man like us, the mediator between God & man the man Christ Iesus This λόγος came in the flesh, & as the children are partakers of flesh & blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is the devil. For in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful & faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. ffor in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted. Seing then that we have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Iesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are yet without sin. Heb. 2.14 & 4.14. And as he was made like his brethren by his incarnation so they will be made like him by the resurrection. In this sence Iesus Christ came in the flesh & became the mediator between God & man the man Christ Iesus being in all things made like unto his brethren, & subject to the same infirmities except sin; & to deny this in the true proper sense of the words makes void our redemption by his sufferings. And this is the spirit of Antichrist. This Λόγος ascended up to heaven & is there glorified with the glory which he had with the father before the world began. For as this world was made by him so he is now gone into heaven to prepare another place or mansion for the blessed. ffor in Gods house are many mansions. And when he shall have prepared a place for the blessed, he shall return to judge the quick & the dead, & reward every man according to his works, receiving the saints to himself that they may be where he is & behold his glory, & sending the reprobate & the fallen Angels to places of misery suitable to their merits.

<191v>

a being emitted by dilatation of the fathers substance but not separated from it & therefore without any other substance then the fathers as a branch of a tree is emitted without any other substance then that of the tree. [And this Word he conceived to dwell in the man Iesus as the holy spirit did in the Prophets, making Iesus a mere man & calling him the son of God] For he said He argued that if Christ was not a Deified man but God the Word, he would be consubstantial to the ffather, & this consubst the council condemned, meaning saith Athanasius in a corporal sence as one substance is said to be consubstantial to another from whence it arose. He made a part of the fathers substance to be common to the father & the son: for

– & by their taking the opinion of a single substance common to the father & son for the heretical opinion of Paul of Samosat condemned by the Council of Antioch. For Hilary mentioning the homousion of Paul & its condemnation by that council calls it quæstio quæ communi omnium nostrum iudicio damnatur. Quis enim sanæ mentis saith he etiam substantiam quæ et patri et filio communis sit prædicabit? Vel quis secundum Samosatenum, in Christo venutus, et filium confessus ac patrem: quod Christus in se sibi et Pater & filius sit, confitebitur? Par itaque in condemnandis impietatibus hæreticorum nostra sententia est, & hanc homousij intelligentiam non modo respicit sed & odit. Hilar adv. Arianos p. 390 And a little after: Male intelligitur homousion? quid ad me bene intelligentem? Male homousion Samosatenus confessus est? Sed nunquid

melius Ariani negaverunt? Octoginta episcopi olim respuerunt sed trecenti et octo nuper receperunt. His meaning is that although the homousion of Paul relating to a common substance of the father & Son was justly condemned by the Council of Antioch, yet the homousion of the Council of Nice signifying two substances of the same kind might be justly received. ffor a little before he explains the Nicene homousios of two æqual substances of the same kind. which are una natura non personæ unitate sed generis, & finds fault with homœusios not because it denotes a similitude but because it doth not also denote an equality. He takes Persons for singular intelligent substances. And in the same sence the Greeks then took hypostases. And if the Latines now take hypostases for &c

– or, as Hilary tells us, that the father & Son had a common substance, not the whole substance of the ffather but a part thereof.

A year or two before the Council made this new article of faith, the heathen Empire by the victory of Constantine the great over Licinius & these changes in the affairs of the Church were great, that if Dio

doth in good men & performed the divine operations. And the Montanists calling the Man flesh said that by this conjunction without any mixture or confusion of substance, the word & the flesh became one person which was both God & Man the Word being God & the flesh man

– doth in good men & performed the divine operations. And the Montanists calling the man flesh said that the Word put on fflesh & by this conjunction (without any mixture or confusion of substance) the Word & the flesh became one person which was both God & Man, the Word being God & the flesh man & each performing their proper operations distinctly without

– that the word put on flesh without any mixture or confusion of substance & by this conjunction they became one person, which was

67554 30024

270216 10008

3335

<192r>

1 Paul of Samosat made the Son a part of the father & in that sense consubstantial to him, that is to his other part as a branch of a tree is said to be consubstantial to the tree, viz^t not to it self, but to the rest of the tree. In opposition to this opinion which was the general philosophy of the heathens Cabbalists Gnosticks & Cataphrygians, the Council of Antioch composed of 80 bishops declared that the λόγος was not consubstantial to the father. Their sentence was communicated by circulatory letters to all the Churches & the Churches acquiesced in it. And when Paul was being deposed & refused to quit the bishops house at Samosat & the Eastern bishops desired the Emperor Aurelian to remove him the Emperor suspended till he had the opinion also of the bishops of Rome & Italy, & upon their letter aginst Paul, removed him. The language of homousios was therefore at that time condemned by the Council of Antioch with the consent of the Church catholick. And yet the Bishops of the fourth century established it, & made it heresy to oppose it .

<192v> homousios was not in the scriptures nor received from the Apostles by unwritten tradition & therefore she rejected it. & all the Churches acquiesced in her judgment. And after such a sentence there was no room for any following Council to pretend tradition for it. But the Council of Nice received it by a legislative power And this usurpation of divine authority began a new state of the Church.

Hitherto the Christian religion arose & spread by the preaching of the Gospel to poor people without the power of the sword, & by its truth evidence & vertue & the blood of the martyrs prevailed against the power of the heathen Roman Empire. While this Empire continued heathen it was impossible for the Christian reigion to become an Empire. But now that which letted is taken out of the way, & is succeeded by a Christian Empire: & the Christian Emperors begin to Call Councils for establishing their own opinions & by consequence to set up a new religion by the power of the sword: these changes in religion are so very

considerable, that if the state of the Church under the lasting persecution of Dioclesian & his successors (wherein all disputes between the Christians & hereticks ceased for a time) be reckoned for a fift state, this under the first Christian Emperors may be reckoned for the sixt.

2 And yet the Bishops of the fourth century established it & made it heresy to oppose it. Nor did they only establish the new word homousios contrary to the rule of holding fast the form of sound words, & contrary to the tradition of the church declare against Paul of Samosat, but they established also a new doctrine by that word namely that the Deity comprehended two substances called the father & the son, one of which arose from the other & was consubstantial to it, being two substances in number & one in nature. The heathens derived all their Gods from one root & said that they were all of them but one Iupiter one God: the Christians began now to decree that the father & Son were two substances in the Deity, of the same essence or nature one of which arose from the other & both were but one God. The Cabbalists & Gnosticks refined the doctrine of the heathens & restrained it to certain numbers of Gods & called those Gods by the names of the powers & attributes of God, the Cataphrygians Paulinists & Sabellians refined the doctrine of the Gnosticks & restrained it to the Trinity. The Egyptians reined the doctrine of these hereticks & to avoid divisions & changes in the substance of the deity, said that the son was begotten of the father from all eternity. Had the Council of Nice condemned the new language of both parties & forbore making a new article of faith & adhered to the language of tradition & the scriptures they had composed the controversy & quieted ‡ < insertion from f 193r > ‡ 3 quieted the Empire & preserved the unity of the Church: but by assuming a legislative power in matters of faith innovating in language & {narrowing} religion they set the Empire in flames & rent the Church asunder. ffor whereas the sentence of the Council of Antioch was the voluntary act of the Bishops & being according to tradition was received universally by the Churches without any opposition: the contrary decree of the Bishops at Nice met with incredible opposition. For Tho the Emperor to influence the Bishops had proclaimed his opinion by his letter published in all the cities before the Council met, & had imployed the bishops of his opinion to get it stablished when the Council met: yet the designe succeeded not till the Emperor upon a day apointed came in person into the Council to get it decreed. And When it was decreed, the opposition which it met with in the Churches occasioned all that vehement lasting religious war which disturbed the whole Empire till the reign of Theodosius & could not then be composed but by turning out the bishops of the Greek Empire by force & delivering their bishopricks to those of the Nicene faith, & prohibiting the meeting of their Churches in the cities by severe edicts.

< text from f 192v resumes >

4 The Christian rel arose & spread by the preaching of the Gospel to poor people without the power of the sword & by its truth evidence & vertue & the blood of the martyrs prevailed against the power of the heathen Roman Empire: but ffrom the time that the Empire became Christian the Christian religion reigned by the power of the sword: Before the Empire became Christian the Church kept to the language of the scriptures & exercised only a judicial power according to the laws of God if some Acts of the Bishops opposed by the other Bishops be excepted. After the Empire became Christian the Emperors set up Councils to establish their own opinions by a legislative authority. ffor what ever was the mind of the Emperor who called the Council the same was put in execution by imperial edicts as established by the Council. And these changes in the Christian religion were so very <193r> considerable that if the state of the Church under the lasting persecution of Dioclesian & his successors (wherein all disputes between the Christians & hereticks ceased for a time) be reckoned for the fift state this under the first Christian Emperors during the homousian controversy may be reckoned for the sixt.

4 The Christian religion arose – – may be reckoned for the sixt For in the end of that controversy the prevailing party set up the invocation of saints & Popery, a religion which has ever since reigned & may be reckoned the seventh state of the Christian religion.

The homousian controversy lasted with various success till the death of the Emperor Valens & was managed between the Latine Churches & chiefly the Church of Rome on the one hand & the Greek Churches & chiefly the churches of Asia on the other. In the reign of Constantius the bishops of Asia & Greece prevailed to have the use of the words usia & homousios abolished, & the Greek & Latin Churches after some discord reunited. In the reign of Valentinian & Valens (which began A.C. 364 the churches of the Latines under Valentinian separated from those of the Greeks under Valens & revived the use of those words, & in their Councils decreed the persons of the father son & holy Ghost to be consubstantial or one in substance & one God by

three persons meaning three personal substances & by one God & one substance meaning one in nature & species, or three intelligent substances of one & the same nature & species. And to distinguish this metaphysical divinity from the Theology of those heathens who made all their Gods consubstantial parts of one & the same supreme Iupiter & so but one God: They made it unlawful to call the father son & holy Ghost three Gods. as if it was no breach of the first commandment for a heathen to worship Iupiter Neptune & Pluto & give the name of God to each of them apart, provided he affirmed that they were not three Gods because they were , only three parts of the substance of the supreme Iupiter, three consubstantial persons in one & the same Deity. . Or as if the polytheism of the heathens consisted not in invoking & worshipping the God Iupiter the God Neptune & the God Pluto the God Mercury the God Mars the God Baal the God Moloch but only in calling them Gods in the plural number.

This metaphysical divinity being by the influence of the bishop of <193v> Rome & of the western Emperor Valentinian & his son Gratian set up & established in the west while Valens an enemy to this Theology reigned in the east: upon the death of Valens A.C. 378 the whole Roman Empire came into the hands of Gratian And he thereupon Arians & Athanasians Eusebians & Iulians. Greeks & Latins. Orientals & Occidentals, Churches of Asia & Church of Rome Anaticks & Romanists. Homousians & Homoiusians

Father. For he said that the Word was ὁμοούσιος to the father: & this consubst — — — — — then that of the tree & so is called consubstantial to the tree, that is not to it self, but to the rest of the tree.

For the Council of Antioch

When Paul of Sam taught that the Logos was ὁμοούσιος to the ffather he used the word ὁμοούσιος in its proper signification the same sence Tertullian a Montanist said that the Logos was prolatione genitus & Deus dactus ex unitate substantiæ. But the Council of Antioch in condemning Paul declared that the Word was not ὁμοούσιος to the father

The sentence of the Council of Antioch against Paul was communicated to all the Churches & unanimously agreed unto & therefore the ομοουσιος was then freely rejected by the Church Catholick. That of the Council of Nice for the ὁμοούσιος was pressed upon the Council by the Emperor, disputed by the Bishops of the Greek Church both in & after the Council & repealed in following Councils & the Bishops of the Greek Church were charged with heresy by the Monologers & at length thrown out of their bishopricks for not receiving it. The G

The Greeks alledged that the word [was not in scripture that it was rejected by the Council of Antioch, & that it was a stumbling block to the people. ffor the people were apt to take it in its proper sense & it properly signified that the λογος was a substance taken out of a prior substance the substance of the father & that **{illeg}** by emission or emanation or dilatation or division . This was the opinion of the old hereticks & was allowed on all hands to be heresy. The Emperor put a new sense upon the word & the Greeks to restrain the word from being taken in the heretical sense proposed that it should be taken in the same sence with the word ὁμοιούσιος, similis substantiæ deriving it from ομος, similis & The Council allowed this interpretation but the Latines in turning the Nicene Creed into their own language translated it unius substantiæ. The Greeks alledged that the word was not in scripture, that it was rejected by the Council of Antioch & that it was a stumbling block to the people they being apt to understand it in its proper sense: but the Latines desisted not till they got their translation established by throwing the Greeks out of their Churches. / And the commencing of this controversy together / The Council of Nice transgressed in inserting into the Creed an article of faith in a form of words not to be found in scripture, not received by tradition, lately introduced by hereticks apt to be interpreted in favour of them & rejected above 50 years before by the Church Catholick in the case of P. of Sam. By this word they intended to establish only that the son was of like substance with the father but The Latines translated it of one substance with the father, & contended for this translation. And the admission of this word into the Creed together with the controversy which arose thereupon between the Greeks & Latines, & the change of the religion of the Empire from heathen to Christian made so great an alteration in the affairs of the Church.

[1] p. 33

[2] p. 34

[3] 35

[4] Epist. 10.

[5] 1 Tim. 4

[6] e Euseb. Hist. l. 5 c. ult.

[7] p. 267

[8] a Pars 3 p 151, 152

[9] p. 232.

[10] Part 4. p. 232

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

[12] g ib. l. 1. c. 6.

[13] a

[14] h cont. Marcell. l. 2. c. 9

[15] a De Hæres.

[16] a De Hæres.

[17] Περὶ Κοσμοπ. p. 3.

[18] a Baron an. 381. sect. 41.

[19] Apud Holstenium

[20] Epist 4 apud Holsten.

[21] Epist 5

[22] Epist 10 apud Holsten.

[23] p. 97, 98

[24] a See Basnag Annal. A.C. 579. sect. 6, 7.

[25] a Apud Gratianum de Mediolanensi et Aquileiensi Episcopis.

[26] Ambros. l. 3 de sacramentis c. 1

[27] † De Regno Italiae lib. 9.

[28] c. 15

[29] Epistola

[30] a Apollonius in Argonaut. l. 1. v. 101.

[31] b Plutarch in Theseo.

[32] f Athanas. Epist. ad Monachos prope medium.

[33] f Athanas. Epist. ad Monachos prope medium.

[34] g Socr. l. 1. c. 23. Sozom. l. 2. c. 18, 21.

[35] h Socr. ib. Sozom l. 2. c. 18

[36] i Vide Epist. Concil. Serdic. apud Theodorum l.

[37] Greg. Naz. Orat. 21.

[38] Hilar. de Synodis p. 382

[39] p. 381.

[40] Hæres. 47 sect. 1.

[41] c. Ammian l. 31.

[42] Gr Naz. Orat 21

[43] Hæres 65. sect. 8 & Hæres 76 sec. 7

[44] a Ουκ ἄρπαγμον ἡγήσατο idem hic significat quod ὅυκ ἥρπασε non rapuit.

[45] b Ισα cum dativo sequente semper est adverbium similitudinis, ut in his expemplis. Ισα — — — — flectat. Nam totius hic locus ad humanam Christi naturam spectat.

[46] b Ισα cum dativo sequente semper est adverbium similitudinis, ut in his expemplis. Ισα — — — — flectat. Nam totius hic locus ad humanam Christi naturam spectat.

[47] a Ουκ ἄρπαγμον ἡγήσατο idem hic significat quod ὅυκ ἥρπασε non rapuit.

[48] a Ουκ ἄρπαγμον ἡγήσατο idem hic significat quod ὅυκ ἥρπασε non rapuit.

[49] b Ισα cum dativo sequente semper est adverbium similitudinis, ut in his expemplis. Ισα — — — — flectat. Nam totius hic locus ad humanam Christi naturam spectat.

[50] c Μορφῇ θεου & μορφῇ δούλου are opposed to one another, & ἑαυτὸν ἐκένοσε relates to the μορφῇ θεου which he laid aside when he took on him the μορφῇ δούλου.
