PART II




# THE COMMON PLACES

## CHRIST, OUR REDEEMER, UNDER THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL

PETER MARTYR VERMIGLI

PART II




# THE COMMON PLACES

## CHRIST, OUR REDEEMER, UNDER THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL

PETER MARTYR VERMIGLI

# The Common Places

## Part II. – Christ, our Redeemer, under the Law and in the Gospel

Peter Martyr Vermigli

Monergism Books

This text has been initially updated from EEBO-TCP by Project Puritas.

Further revision and editing done by Monergism.

Copyright Monergism via universal text usage permission from the above.

Copyright © 2024

Published by Monergism Books

P.O. Box 491

West Linn Oregon 97068

www.monergism.com

All rights reserved.

No portion of this book may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the publisher or author, except as permitted by U.S. copyright law.

Editor’s Note – During the EEBO-TCP Transcription Process, all the text was hand transcribed according to visual representation; and as such, sometimes the letters s, l, f & t are misconstrued with each other, these letters regularly being almost illegibly similar in the original facsimile script. Though it is rare for these errors to remain post-edit, unfortunately they may remain if uncaught. My sincere apologies in advance where such errors occur. As the Puritan Edward Leigh once said "If thou findest faults and Errata in the book, let love cover them, for to err (as the Satirist saith) is the sad privilege of mortality, and he (of all men) erreth most, who challengeth a privilege from error." Also, the symbol <H&G>, when included, signifies omitted Hebrew & Greek. Lastly, some archaic words may be updated to more contemporary terminology; but changes have been kept to a bare minimum.

# Contents

1. CHAP. I. Of Sin, especially original sin; and of the universal corrupting of man’s nature.

2. CHAP. II. Of Free will.

3. CHAP. III. Of the Law.

4. CHAP. IV. Of Idolatry, forbidden by the first Commandment.

5. CHAP. V. The second Precept, which concerneth Images.

6. CHAP. VI. The third Precept; of the sanctification of the name of God.

7. CHAP. VII. The fourth Precept; of sanctifying the sabbath day.

8. CHAP. VIII. The fifth Precept; of the honoring of Superiors.

9. CHAP. IX. Wherein is treated upon the sixth Precept; and first of Friendship.

10. CHAP. X. The seventh Precept; Thou shalt not commit adultery: and first of Matrimony, and having of concubines.

11. CHAP. XI. Of Whoredom, fornication, adultery, and other noisome things, which are contrary to the seventh commandment.

12. CHAP. XII. The eighth commandment; Thou shalt not steal. And first of theft, sacrilege, and the stealing away of men's servants and children.

13. CHAP. XIII. The ninth Precept; Thou shalt not bear false witness. And first of Contumely.

14. CHAP. XIV. The last Precept; Thou shalt not lust. Wherein is treated of the comparison and connection of sins one with another.

15. CHAP. XV. Whether the commandment of God be so set forth, that it may be kept in this life: moreover, of the use and abrogating of the law.

16. CHAP. XVI. Of the likeness and unlikeness of the Old and New league or covenant.

17. CHAP. XVII. Of Christ, and his manifestation in the flesh; and by what means he performed all the parts of our salvation.

18. CHAP. XVIII. A plain exposition of Peter Martyr, upon the twelve articles of the Christian faith.

19. APPENDIX. Scripture References.

# CHAP. I. Of Sin, especially original sin; and of the universal corrupting of man's nature.

First, we will see, whether there be any original sin or no: for there be some, which utterly deny the same to be: then we will declare, what it is; lastly, what properties it hath, and how by succession it is conveyed to the posterity, and by what means it is released. As touching the first, we must remember, that both in the holy scriptures, and also among the fathers, it hath diverse names; for in the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans, it is called sin, and the law of the members, and concupiscence. Elsewhere, it is called the want of original righteousness, a corruption of nature, a lump of wickedness, a froth, a weakness natural, the law of the flesh, and such other like. The Pelagians in old time denied this sin; at this day, the Anabaptists deny it. These in a manner may be accounted their arguments. First they say, that the fall of Adam was sufficiently punished in himself, and that there is no cause why God will revenge it in his posterity; especially seeing it is written in the prophet Nahum, that God doth not twice punish one and the self-same thing: for it sufficeth him that he had once punished. Moreover, it is also written, that The son shall not bear the

fathers iniquity, but the soul that sinneth, the same shall die. Further, that the body, when it is formed in the womb, is the workmanship of God, and hath nothing that ought to be blamed; nay rather, which is not worthy of great admiration: that the soul also is either created or infused by God: and that the means of propagation cannot be accounted evil; because marriage in the holy scriptures is commended, and that from the beginning God commanded man to beget children. Wherefore among so many defenses of innocence, they demand by what entrances sin could insinuate itself.

They add also, that Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians, when he exhorteth the believing wife to abide with her unbelieving husband, if he will abide with her, among other things saith; Your children are holy. But they say, that they cannot be holy, if they be born in sin; and that therefore they which be born of faithful parents, cannot draw with them original sin. They affirm withal, that it is commonly said, that sin is a thing spoken, done, or lusted against the law of God; and that it is not sin, unless it be voluntary. And (as John saith in his first epistle the fourth chapter) Sin is iniquity, contrary whereunto is equity or right; and that this can be no other thing, than is contained in the law, and so that sin is a transgression of the law. All which things cannot fall into infants, when they be born. And they say further, that it seemeth not convenient which is spoken of some; namely, that this sin is by the flesh or body poured out from one to another: for that the flesh and the body are in their own nature senseless things, neither can they seem to be a meet subject for sin. And to establish their feigned devise, they said besides, that those things which are spoken by Paul, in the fifth to the Romans, must be extended unto the sins, which be called actual. But they say, that it is therefore said, that sin entered by one

man into the world, because of the imitation and example which the posterity followed.

2. By these and such other like arguments they being led, deny that there is any original sin. But as for death, and the afflictions of this life, which are commonly brought as tokens whereby original sin is confirmed, they say that those consist of natural causes, such as in the temperature of the elements and of the humors. And therefore they say, it is a vain fable, that we refer them to the fall of Adam. And they think it to be a thing most absurd, to affirm, that to be sin, which by no manner of means can be avoided. Lastly they say, that if by that means we shall be said to sin in Adam, because we were in his loins, according as it is said of Levi in the epistle to the Hebrews, that He paid tithes in the loins of Abraham: by the like and self-same reason we may say, that we were in the loins of other our forefathers, from whom we have descended by procreation; and that therefore there is no cause why the sin of Adam hath been derived unto us, rather than the sin of our grandfather, great grandfather, his father, or of any other our progenitors. And that by this means the state of them, which shall be born in the latter days, would seem to be most unhappy; for that they must bear the offenses of all their forefathers. These things allege they, to prove that there is no original sin.

3. But we, on the contrary part, will prove by many testimonies of the holy scriptures, that there is such a sin. Thus God saith in the sixth of Genesis; My spirit shall not always strive with man, because he is flesh. And again; All the imagination of their hearts is only evil every day. And in the eighth chapter; The imagination of their heart is evil, even from their very childhood. These things declare, that there sticketh some vice in our nature, when we be born. Also David saith; Behold, I was conceived in

iniquity, and in sins my mother hath conceived me. Nothing can be plainer than this testimony. Also Jeremiah in the 17th chapter saith, that The heart of man is wicked, perverse, and stubborn. Yea the same Jeremiah and Job also do curse the day wherein they were born into the world, because they perceived that the very original and fountain of vices sprang up together with them. But Job hath a most manifest testimony of the uncleanness of our nativity, for thus he saith; Who can make that clean, which is conceived of unclean seed? And our savior saith; Except a man be born again of water, and of the holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. And even as the potter doth not make any vessel anew, unless he perceive the same to be ill fashioned before: even so Christ would not us to be regenerated again, unless he saw that we were first unhappily begotten. Which he also testifieth in another place, saying; That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit, is spirit. By which words he would signify unto us, that therefore regeneration by the spirit is necessary, because we had before but only a carnal generation.

Paul in the sixth chapter to the Romans saith; that We must not abide in sin, because we are dead unto it. Which thing he proveth by baptism, for he saith; that All we which have been baptized into Christ Jesus, have been baptized into his death, to the end we should die unto sin, and that our old man should be crucified, and the body of sin abolished. And forsomuch as young children be baptized, even thereby we have a testimony, that sin is in them: for otherwise, the nature of baptism, as it is there described by Paul, should not consist. Also he followeth the same reason in the epistle to the Colossians, where he saith, that; We be circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, by putting off the sinful body of the flesh, being buried together with Christ in baptism. He compareth baptism with

circumcision, and faith, that those which are baptized, have put off the body of sin. Neither is it to be doubted of, but that those which be baptized, are baptized into the remission of sins. And assuredly, the circumcision, which in the old law was given unto children, was correspondent unto our baptism. And as touching circumcision, it is written; The soul, whose flesh of the foreskin shall not be circumcised the eighth day, shall die the death. Wherefore, seeing children have need of the sacrament of regeneration, it followeth necessarily, that they be born under the power of sin. Paul unto the Ephesians the 2nd chapter saith; that We are by nature the children of wrath. But our nature could not be hateful unto God, unless it were defiled with sin. And in the same place, Paul with most weighty words describeth the fierceness of this wrath; how that We walk according to the prince of this world, which is of strength in our hearts, by reason of our disobedience, and therefore we do the will of the flesh, and of our mind. Augustine also citeth a place out of the first epistle to the Corinthians, that Christ died for all men: wherefore it followeth, that all men were dead, and had need of his death. But it is a wicked thing, to exclude children out of the number of them, for whom Christ died. But if you shall demand what kind of persons they were, for whom Christ suffered; this did the apostle sufficiently declare, in the epistle to the Romans, when he said, that they were weak, God's enemies, ungodly, and sinners. Among whom, we must reckon young children, if we will grant that Christ died for them.

Besides this, it seemeth that original sin is most manifestly taught out of the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans: for thus it is written; The law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin. Whereunto is added; The good which I would do, that do I not; but the evil which I would not do, that do I: it is not I then that do it, but it is sin that dwelleth in me. He also

maketh mention of the law of the members, lamenting that he was thereby drawn captive and against his will. And in the eighth chapter he saith, that The wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God, and that it is not subject to the law of God, nor yet can it be. Yea, the death, which young children have, doth sufficiently bear record, that sin sticketh in them; unless we will say, that God punisheth them undeservedly. Moreover, the place in the fifth to the Romans, containeth a most evident testimony of original sin: for thus it is written; that By one man sin entered into the world, and that all men without exception have sinned, and that the sin of one man spread over all men, and that for the disobedience of one man many are made sinners. Further, they which are grafted in Christ, are towards the end of the same epistle, called wild olive trees: by which metaphor is signified, that man degenerated from the good institution of his own nature. But if we have departed from our own nature, undoubtedly we have gotten original sin. And Paul before, so accused all mankind, as he said; There is none just, there is none that understandeth or seeketh after God: all have declined, and are altogether become unprofitable, there is none that doth good, no not one, &c. All which things sufficiently declare the depravation of man's nature. By these testimonies of the scriptures it sufficiently appeareth (as I think) that there is original sin.

4. Next of all I should confute the arguments of the adversaries: but first I thought it good to show the definition of original sin; for the same being diligently weighed and known, many things will in the meantime be known, which serve for the confutation of their reasons. First, we will recite the opinions of other men, then we will declare what we think thereof. The Pelagians affirmed, that the sin of Adam did not spread abroad into the posterity; but by imitation only. Against these Augustine disputed

vehemently, and by many arguments showed, that original sin is not only by the imitation of Adams sin. For if Paul would have said, that the first sin had been spread abroad after this manner, he would not have said that it came from Adam, but rather from the devil; for he was the first that gave a form and example of sinning. Wherefore Christ in the Gospel of John said, that the Jews, which boasted that they came of their father Abraham, were rather the sons of the devil, because they did his works. For the devil was a man-killer, even from the beginning; and they sought to kill him, which had not deserved evil at their hands. And here withal Augustine citeth that, which is in the second chapter of the book of Wisdom; that Through the envy of the devil, sin entered into the world, and that they which are of his part do imitate him.

Unto which saying nevertheless I do not attribute much, partly because that book is not of the canonical scriptures; and partly because in the Greek text there is some ambiguity. For this verb Do imitate, is not there written, but πειράζουσι, that is, Have experience of that death. Howbeit the reason is firm, that of the devil came the first example of sinning. Further, this opinion is hereby confuted, in that Paul maketh an Antithesis between Christ and Adam. But the righteousness of Christ is not only set forth unto us to be imitated; but also that they, which believe in him, should be changed in mind, corrected in spirit, and amended in all their strength. Wherefore on the other side, it is required by the nature of contraries, that besides the ill example, which Adam gave unto his posterity, he hath also infected their nature: and (as Augustine writeth in his book *De peccatorum meritis & remission*) hath with a certain corruption depraved. Thirdly, this also maketh against the Pelagians, that even the very infants do die. For as Paul saith unto the Romans, the sixth chapter; The reward of sin is death,

but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. And in the 15th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians; The weapons (saith he) of death is sin. Lastly, the baptism, which is given to young children, cannot blot out of them the sin of imitation. Wherefore we ought of necessity to affirm some other kind of sin to be in them, unless we will that they be baptized in vain.

5. Another opinion was that, which the Master of the sentences citeth in the 2nd book the 33rd, distinction of them which thought, that original sin is only a guilt, or trespass, or bond, whereunto we are tied by the sin of Adam. So they acknowledge not, that there is truly, and in very deed any fault or sin in those which are born, but only a certain offense, and obligation; the which might cause them to die, and be condemned for the sin of Adam. This opinion Pighius seemeth in a manner to have revived; for he denieth, that original sin is sin indeed, because it is neither a transgressing of the law, nor yet voluntary; and therefore he affirmed the same to be nothing else, but the sin of Adam, for the which we that be his posterity are made subject unto damnation and death, and are become exiles from the kingdom of heaven. But as for death and afflictions of this life, and lusts of the flesh, and other such like affections, he saith that they come of the well-springs of nature. All which things, so far is he from calling sins, as he pronounceth them to be the works of God; for he saith, that God is the author of nature, and that these things follow the humors and temperature of the body; and that which we see happeneth in brute beasts, happeneth also in men, as touching the flesh and grosser powers of the mind, For they do desire such things as are preservative, pleasant, and profitable, whether they be agreeable to reason, or against it; and to avoid those things that be contrary. Wherefore he affirmed original sin to be the only transgression of Adam, in the danger of

which one transgression, he would have us all to be born: not for any sin, or fault, or corruption that we have in ourselves.

And he saith moreover, that those which die only in the danger of that sin of Adam, shall not be afflicted in another life with sensible pain; for he imagineth (although he dare not boldly affirm it) that they shall either in this world, or else in some other pleasant place be happy, with a certain natural blessedness, wherein they shall live, praising of God, and giving of thanks, although they be banished from the kingdom of heaven. Of which discommodity nevertheless (as he dreameth) they shall nothing complain, or be sorrowful for it: for this were to strive against the will of God, which a man cannot do without sin. But forsomuch as while they lived here, they had no naughty will, it is not to be thought, that they shall have it in another life. And that they shall not be pressed with sensible pain, it seemeth to himself, that he very well proveth, and that by two reasons; first, because they committed no evil, nor yet contaminated themselves with any naughtiness; secondly, because there is required in this life no repentance or contrition for original sin. And for this feigned devise, he hath this color, to wit, that sin should not be understood, but after the true proper manner: that is, that it be a thing, spoken, done, or lusted against the law of God, and that it be voluntary; because it is not forced upon any against their will, but may be avoided: but forsomuch as these things take no place in young infants, therefore sin cannot be in them. Howbeit, he saith, that he denieth not original sin; for he saith that it is the sin of Adam, for the which all we are condemned, and do die. But therefore I said, that this man seeketh pretenses; because I see in very deed, that he was moved to speak these things for some other cause. For whereas he attributeth so much unto free will, and hath written so many things touching that matter against us: and

he seeing that the same might not consist, if he should plainly grant original sin, in such sort as it is taught of all the godly; therefore he found out for himself this new devised doctrine, the which (as I said) is not altogether so new: for it is both touched and rejected by the Master of the sentences.

But to give a more colorable show to this his devise, he bringeth a similitude of a most liberal prince, who not only giveth freedom to a servant of his; but also indueth him with lordship, and heaps of riches, the which also should come to his posterity. And he only chargeth him faithfully to observe certain commandments of his, the which he transgressing, knoweth that all those riches and preferments shall be taken from him, and he to return to his old bondage again. This servant, as an indiscreet and ungrateful person, breaketh the prince's commandment; whereby not only himself is become a servant, as before he was, but also his seed born unto him become bond-slaves. He saith, that those children have nothing wherefore they should complain of bondage to their prince; but rather to give thanks, that he had so liberally showed himself to their fathers: but that as concerning their father, they may grievously sorrow, because he lost those benefits, as well from himself, as from his posterity. Yea, and what if this also be added; namely, that the prince's liberality was so great, as he invited the posterity of that ungrateful servant, to the very same, and much greater preferments; and so invited them, as frankly he sent his own son to provoke them? Even so (saith he) standeth our matter. Adam was so created of God, that he was capable of that supernatural felicity; who nevertheless setting light by the commandments of God, was despoiled of all those supernatural gifts, and was left to the first state of his own nature. And in the same state we also are procreated, and so for his sin are we damned, do die, and are banished out of the kingdom of heaven, suffering many discommodities, which are

derived from the originals of our nature. Wherefore we may complain of our first parents, but not of God; for he was most liberal unto him: and especially, seeing he calleth us again unto himself (which is the highest felicity) by his only son, and him would have to suffer death for our salvation.

6. But that which I have now twice spoken of, doth make very much against this opinion; to wit, that infants do die. For death hath no right where there is no sin; unless we will say, that God punisheth the innocent: and this reason is confirmed by the argument of saint Paul, whereby he proved sin to be before the law; For death (saith he) reigned from Adam even unto Moses. But according to Pighius opinion, this reason might seem to be very blunt. For some might say; Though they died, yet it followeth not thereby, that they had sin: for sin happened unto them by reason of Adam, for whose sin sake they became mortal. Moreover, doth not Paul grant corruption to be in nature, when he declareth that sin doth dwell in him, and confesseth that the law of his members doth draw him away captive, and such other like things? But let not Pighius object against me, that these things come to the originals of nature; for these originals be not of nature that is perfect, but of nature corrupt and depraved. Neither ought he in this matter to bring a similitude of brute beasts; for man is created to be far more excellent than brute beasts, and to be the ruler over them. Indeed man had in himself originals, whereby he might desire things pleasant and commodious, but not against reason and the word of God: for, to have such forceable and violent affects, is not the property of men, but of beasts. Over this, seeing our soul was immortal, and given from God, it requireth a body meet for the same; namely, such as might be preserved forever, least the soul should at any time be constrained to be without the same. So as we

must not fly to the first grounds of nature; for it was not so ordained at the first, as we now have it.

But if that Pighius will imagine, that God created these wicked lusts and affections in us, he shall deal both blasphemously and reproachfully against him; the which faults he goeth about to lay to our charge without a cause. For seeing God is both the best, the wisest, and the most just, and hath created man unto the chiefest felicity; he would not have endued him with those things, whereby he should be drawn back from that felicity, which would induce him to that which is contrary unto him commandments: which things of themselves would be vile, and would lead us captive under the law of sin and death. For if these affections should be mortified and crucified in us (as indeed they ought to be) we must confess, that they be vices, and be hateful unto God. Neither maketh it so great matter that he saith, that those things properly be not sins; unless, even as cold is called slow, because it maketh men slothful; so these things, because they stir up men to sin, that therefore after a sort they may be called sins. Or else in like manner as the scripture is named a hand, because it is written with the hand; or that the speech is called a tongue, because it is uttered by the ministry thereof: so these may be called sins, because they have proceeded from sin. These similitudes do nothing at all further Pighius cause; for although Augustine used now and then to speak after that sort, yet his will was to be understood, concerning those defects and imperfections, which are remaining in man after baptism.

7. But Augustine saith, that in any wise they be sin before baptism; yea, the holy Ghost also by Paul calleth them sins: and the nature of sin is agreeable unto them. For we have defined sin in such sort, as it appertaineth unto all things, whatsoever do strive against the law of God: for as John

saith; Sin is unrighteousness, and who perceiveth it not to be a thing unjust, that the flesh should make the spirit subject unto it, and that our soul will not repose itself in the word of God? Seeing therefore all these things do stir us up, to transgress and rebel against the word of God, both they are unrighteous, and must be called sins. Beside this, the words of David are against Pighius; Behold, I am conceived in iniquity, and in sins my mother hath conceived me. If naughty desire, and these vices were the works of nature, surly the man of God would not complain of them. And what did Paul the apostle otherwise mean, when he wrote these words unto the Ephesians; We are by nature the children of wrath, but that sin is in every one of us? But Pighius goeth about by a perverse interpretation, to wrest this testimony from us, saying; that To be the children of wrath by nature, is no other thing, than To be the children of wrath by a certain condition of our birth, because we are so brought forth into the world. And he alledgeth, that some be called servants by nature, which is no other thing, but that they be born unto such a state as they do serve. But we neither can nor ought to rest upon this feigned devise; for the wrath of God is not stirred up but upon just cause: for it is no such thing, as can be kindled either rashly or by chance. So as it behooveth, that in our nature there be something amiss, whereby God's wrath is provoked to revenge. And that similitude of his serveth not to his purpose; for those which are said to be born bond-men by nature, have even by nature something in them apt for bondage; for if we give credit to Aristotle in his Politics; they are bond-men by nature, which exceed in strength of the body, but in reason be slow and dull. And thereby it comes to pass, that they are more meet to serve, than to command others, or to live at liberty.

Also the apostle doth sufficiently declare, wherefore he calleth us by nature the children of wrath: even because we by nature, seem to be prone to stir up God's wrath, and do walk according to the prince of this world; and also for that the devil can do much in our hearts, by reason of incredulity; and that we fulfill the will of our flesh, and of our mind. These be the things which make us the children of wrath. And how can it be denied, that sin is in our nature, seeing Christ would have us to be regenerate; for unless we are framed amiss, what need were it for us to be fashioned anew? Besides this, in the eighth chapter of the book of Genesis, it is plainly spoken; that The imagination of man's heart is evil, even from his childhood. And how dare Pighius be so bold, to call that a good thing, and the work of God, which the holy Ghost in plain terms hath called evil? But least he should seem to say nothing, he imagineth that the same was spoken by God of his mercy; as though he would so excuse men, and testify that he would not destroy the world anymore by water; because that men were made on that sort, and that the cogitations of them did tend unto evil, yea, even from their childhood. But while he judgeth this to be an excuse, he is far deceived; for this is thought to be the better and more natural sense of this place; namely, that God would enter into a covenant with Noah, that he would never destroy the world again with water; though otherwise men were such as they deserved the same, and the imagination of their hearts was evil even from their childhood. These things do not clear man's nature from sin, but rather signify the same to be more vicious and corrupt: which nevertheless God will spare for his mercy sake.

8. Lastly, we read in Paul, that By the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners: which showeth, that there is sin in them, which be born of Adam; for the which they may be called sinners. But Pighius thinketh

himself able by shifts to avoid this, because that sinners are sometime so called, by reason of the gilt or fault, although the act of sinning be past, and show itself no more. Notwithstanding it be so, yet is he never able to show out of the scriptures, that any man is called a sinner; but that either he hath sin in him, or else hath surly committed sin before: unless he will say that God maketh men guilty without any sin [committed] by them. Moreover, Pighius considereth not that by this his feigning is brought in a middle opinion, touching the state of them which die only in the guiltiness of Adam; whereas the scriptures do plainly teach us, that in the last judgment there shall be no mean, but that men shall either be committed to everlasting fire, or else shall enjoy eternal felicity. And it is a rash part to proceed further in such things, than is revealed in the holy scriptures: wherefore they deal with more moderation, and greater wisdom, which refer all this whole matter to God's divine providence. But it is a goodly matter, to see by what reasons our Pighius is moved; They shall not be grieved (saith he) with any sensible pain, because they did not contaminate themselves in this life with any lewd purpose. What matter maketh this? It sufficeth that they had a naughty nature; for they were prone unto sin, although in respect of their age they could not sin. The wolfs whelp is slain, which nevertheless might excuse itself, that it had not as yet wearied any sheep, or done any damage to the flock; yet the reason wherefore he is killed, is good: because he hath a wolfs nature, and would do those things, if he were suffered to live.

Hereunto Pighius addeth another argument; namely, that sorrow and contrition is not required for original sin. But how is he able to prove this? For all godly men have grievously lamented for being oppressed with this vice. David, at what time as he occupied himself in repentance, brake out

into these words; Behold how I am conceived in iniquity. Paul doth so bewail for this offense, as he crieth out; O unhappy man that I am! Who shall deliver me from this body subject unto death? And whereas Pighius saith, that these will be content with their state, he useth no other reason, than because if they should strive against the will of God, and should be sorrowful for the judgment done upon them, they should sin: which thing is not needful to surmise of them, because they committed no sin in this life. But here Pighius must be demanded, Whether infants have had that right will in this life? He must of necessity deny it, seeing by reason of their age they could not have it. Which being so, how dare he assign the same to them in another life? It is much more probable, that they shall there have an evil will, whereof there was a beginning in them, while they were here, than any good will, whereof they possessed no token in this life. But that similitude, which he brought of a liberal prince, who not only freed his servant, but also advanced him to great honors, is none of his own proper invention: for it is borrowed out of Aegidius Romanus, the School-divine, who nevertheless acknowledgeth with us the corruption of nature, and naughtiness naturally engrafted in us from the beginning.

But yet this [similitude] must be examined, least, as tapestry hangings cover the blemishes of bare walls; so the same, with the show and color cast upon it, may cloak some error, and dangerously deceive and abuse us. He setteth forth unto us Adam as a bond-man, which from the beginning, was both set at liberty by God, and also endued with excellent gifts; and so furnished, as those things should also have been extended unto his posterity, so that he had obeyed the commandment and law of God: but if he neglected to do the same, then he with all his posterity should return to the former state of bondage. Herein lieth hid the error of Pighius; for he

feigneth to himself a man, which from the very beginning had a nature that was subject to corruption, and bound fast unto the servitude of unreasonable affections. Which thing is not true; for he was made perfect by God, not that he should be like unto a brute beast. Indeed he had desires unto things, which were both pleasant, and might preserve; but yet unto no such things, as should stir him up against the word of God, and right reason. And there was a body given unto him, which might have endured forever. Therefore when he sinned, he fell not into his first state, but procured to himself a new infelicity. These things shall suffice at this present concerning that second opinion.

9. The third is, that lust or concupiscence dispersed in the flesh and members is original sin. Of which opinion was Augustine, as appeareth by his book *De peccatorum meritis & remission*, and by many other places. Whom she School-men do interpret, that he meant not all-only of the concupiscence of the grosser parts of the mind, but also of the naughtiness of the will. But Pighius repugneth, saying; that Augustine affirmed, that only concupiscence of the flesh and members is original sin: as though Augustine meant not, that by the wickedness of the affections, both the mind is blinded, and the will corrupted. For seeing these vices are joined one with another, he would under one name comprehend them all: and he used the name of concupiscence, because in it the force of this disease doth more plainly and manifestly appear. Where Hugo *De sacramentis*, wrote, that Original sin is that, which we from our nativity draw into our mind through ignorance, and into our flesh through concupiscence. Lastly, whereas Christ said, that None can be saved, except he be regenerated; he meant, not only as touching the flesh, or lusting part of the mind: for it chiefly behooveth, that our reason and will be born anew; then followeth

regeneration of the affects and of the body, whereby (as meet it is) all things are subdued to the spirit and word of God. Neither did Augustine by concupiscence understand the very act of lusting; but the ableness, proneness, and ready disposition unto ill doing: which vices are not always known in children, but so far forth, as they descry themselves by their age. For so in deep darkness, there is no difference between a blind man, and him that seeth; but so soon as light cometh, or the day is present, the impediment of the blind man is easily perceived. Before that the wolf be past the age of a whelp, he showeth not his nature and ravening. The scorpion doth not always prick, yet doth he always carry a sting. The serpent, while he is numb through cold in the winter, is safely handled, not because he hath no venom, but for that he is not able to pour it out.

And he saith, that this concupiscence is brought unto us by generation, because all we have sinned with Adam; for he judgeth, that all mankind was in Adam, as in one lump: and that, because nature was corrupted in him thorough sin, we cannot from thence draw other than a corrupt nature; for Grapes are not gathered of thistles, nor figs of thorns. But he saith, that this concupiscence is specially derived unto the posterity, through the heat of lust which happeneth in procreation. Yet some of the wiser sort of School-men have judged, that although there should happen no wantonness of lust in the conjunction of the parents, yet that the child should not be without original sin; because the same was in the first man, as it were in *Seminali ratio* (as they speak) that is, the nature of the seed. But if so be thou demand of Augustine, whether he thinketh that this concupiscence, which he saith is original sin, be voluntary? He will answer, that it may be called voluntary; because the sin committed by our first parents was voluntary: but in us, it cannot be said voluntary; because we have not taken it upon us by our own

choice, unless perhaps it may be so called, for that it is not by violence put into us. Against this opinion Pighius inveigheth, for thus he saith; If so be that the sin of Adam corrupted man's nature, it behooved such a natural effect to be in sin; for there was not anything at all in that first transgression, that had a property to corrupt nature more than other sins have. Wherefore it shall be necessary to confess, that our nature is corrupted; not only by the fault of our first parents, but also by the sins of all our progenitors. Which thing seemeth very absurd unto Pighius, that we should be so much more corrupt than others, as we are later born than they.

10. But this chief point, to wit, whether the sins of all parents be derived from one to another unto the posterity, I will for this time omit; and will speak thereof toward the end, so much as shall be thought meet. In the mean while I deny, that which this man taketh for a ground; namely, that corruption is the natural effect of sin. For the reason thereof proceedeth rather of divine justice, by which the grace of the spirit, and heavenly gifts, wherewithal man was endued before his fall, was removed from him, when he had sinned. And this withdrawing of grace proceeded of God's justice, although the blame must be ascribed to the transgression of the first man, least thou shouldest straightway say; that God is the cause of sin. For when he had once withdrawn his gifts, wherewith he beautified man, forthwith ensued vices and corruptions of their own accord, the which before were strange from the state and condition of man. This man demandeth, how sin can have the power to corrupt man's nature? Whether by means of privation? Or by reason of the matter or subject of privation? But by means of privation, he thinketh it impossible to be; for that, being nothing, can work nothing: neither that it can be by reason of that action, which is subject unto privation, as was the wicked choice, through the will of the

first man. For he saith that Adam, when he did eat the forbidden fruit, desired not this; neither was it his will to corrupt his own nature, and the nature of his posterity. This is a very weak argument; for oftentimes we see that many things do follow men against their wills, and unawares, which things, though they would not, yet are they joined together with their actions. They which load themselves immoderately with meat and drink, do it not upon any such cause, as to procure unto themselves the gout; but the gout followeth of its own accord. Even so, although Adam would not have had these things happen, yet when he had sinned, they happened of themselves.

But he saith, that seeing this concupiscence happeneth of a certain necessity of birth, and not by choice or election, it cannot have the nature either of a fault or sin. But this cometh to pass, by reason that he maketh a less and lighter matter of sin, than he ought to do: for he would sin to be voluntary, and a thing spoken, done, or lusted against the law of God. But if he take the same to be iniquity, as John hath described it; he shall perceive that the nature of sin is to be found in concupiscence. For it is an unjust thing, that the body should not obey the mind in honest things; and that the lusts should be at variance with the mind, and seek to have dominion over it; that reason should strive against God, and despise his commandments. These things being unjust, come they willingly, or come they necessarily, doubtless they be sins. But doth not this Pighius, which objecteth these things, perceive that it is necessary also for him, to appoint that the posterity of Adam is guilty of his sin, and that whether they will or no; which thing is specially against the word of God? For it is written in the prophet Ezekiel; The son shall not bear the fathers iniquity; And; The soul that sinneth, the same shall die. Which doubtless will be false, if we believe Pighius; seeing

children do die, and are guilty of eternal damnation, although they have sinned nothing at all. Unto which absurdity we be not driven, which we do put, in every man that is born, the fault and the cause wherefore he dieth and is condemned.

Also unto Pighius it seemeth a reproachful and blasphemous thing against God, that he suffereth sin to be sown in new born babes; seeing they cannot do withal, but be born and affected in such sort as we see all other men to be born and affected. But let Paul make answer to this objection, which saith in his epistle to the Romans; O man, who art thou that makest answer unto God? Hath not the potter power of the clay, to make of one lump one vessel to honor, and another to dishonor. Let Isaiah also answer, which saith; that It is not convenient for one potsherd to dispute with another touching the workmanship of their maker. God is not such a one, as ought to be brought into order by our reason; which would come to pass, if we should measure his justice by the rule of our judgment. Seeing there is no day passeth over, wherein there happeneth not somewhat in the government or worldly things, that we blame, and that doth not content and satisfy our own wisdom; when I pray shall we count God to be just? For who is able to declare the cause, why grace is not so much given unto him which perisheth everlastingly, as to another which is saved?

11. I know that these men have been accustomed to say, that God doth nothing there unjustly; because he is not bound to any law; and that he distributeth one and the like grace unto all men. But here certainly human wisdom will not stay itself; for it will complain and say, that he ought to deal alike towards all, though not by the precept of man’s law, yet by the law of his own goodness. Moreover, what human wisdom can see, what the justice of God is, that some are taken away, while they be yet infants or

children, least afterward their hearts should be perverted with lewdness; and by this means do attain unto salvation: whereas others be preserved safe unto their ripe years, at which time they deserve their own destruction; where otherwise they might have been saved, if they had died in their infancy? Here ought we to have in honor and estimation the secrets of God's judgment, and not to be of the mind to correct and amend them, according to the prescript of our law.

Cato, an ethnic man, taking part with Pompei, because he judged that part to be juster than Caesar's part; at the last, when victory inclined [unto Caesar] and that Pompei's side was discomfited and fled; he looked up to heaven, and cried out, that There is great obscureness in divine things: for he thought it a thing unworthy of God's providence, that Caesar should have the victory. And surly, when I think upon these things, I am much delighted with the answer of Augustine, which he used against the Pelagians, when he entreated of the very same matter that we have now in hand. For two arguments somewhat subtle and difficult, were objected unto him by the Pelagians. One was; how it might be, that God, which for his goodness sake, doth forgive us our own sins, will impute other men's sins unto us? Another was, If so be that Adam, by original sin, condemneth those which sin unadvisedly, and against their wills, why doth not Christ also, (least he should give place to Adam in anything) save the unbelievers? To these Augustine maketh answer. What if I were somewhat dull, and could not confute these reasons upon the sudden; should I therefore give the less credit unto the scriptures? Nay rather, it is much more meet that I should acknowledge mine own simplicity, than to lay any falsehood unto the scripture. But afterward he dissolveth both the arguments: for unto the first he answereth, that God is exceeding good, and doth not impute the sins

of others unto us (as these affirm [that he doth] in original sin;) but the iniquity of our own selves, which cleaveth to our own nature, even from the first beginning of all. Unto the other he saith, that Christ saveth even them that be unwilling, for that he expecteth not them till they be willing; but of his own accord cometh unto sinners, when they be both unwilling and resisting, and also the he bringeth many infants unto felicity, before they as yet believe; neither by reason of their age can have faith, whereby they should believe.

These things I thought good to bring in, to show that it is lawful for me, if I will, to use the answer, which this father first used, and to say unto Pighius; Let us leave unto God the defense of his own cause, he hath no need of us to defend him, that he should not be counted unjust or cruel. Let us believe the scriptures, which cry out every-where; that We be born in sin and corruption. Which thing also both death, and an infinite heap of calamities do show; which in very deed should not be laid upon the children of Adam, unless there were some sin in them to be punished. But they which descend not into themselves, nor look into their own nature, how prone it is unto all naughtiness, do not know what this concupiscence meaneth. Yet no small number of the ethnic philosophers perceived the same; for they marvel how, in so excellent a nature, so great lewdness, and self-love, and desire of voluptuousness can be: and they so acknowledged these evils, that they also adjudged it most needful for their children, to have chastisement and discipline. And for the redressing of this engendered naughtiness, they counseled us to take in hand labors, and exercises, and other weighty and hard enterprises: but indeed they perceived not the cause and fountain of these evils; for that is only to be perceived by the word of God.

12. Furthermore, Pighius disputeth, that this lusting, which Augustine calleth concupiscence, is the work of nature and of God, and therefore cannot seem to be sin. But it is answered before, that it proceedeth not from the originals of nature, as the same was instituted by God; but from it being corrupted; for when man was created, he was made just, and (as the scripture speaketh) Unto the image of God. And therefore that same appetite in Adam, of things pleasant and preservative, when he was first created, was not raging and vehement, that he should do against right reason and the word of God; for that followed afterward. Wherefore the same must not (as Pighius saith) be called the work of God, but the naughtiness of sin, and corrupting of affections. And therefore Augustine calleth Julian the Pelagian, A shameless praiser of concupiscence; for he commended it, even as Pighius doth, to be a notable work of God. Moreover, Pighius is against Augustine, for the same very cause, that he saith concupiscence is sin before baptism, and denieth it [so to be] after baptism; whereas (saith he) concupiscence is all one, God all one, and his law all one: wherefore he concludeth; that either sin must be in both, or else in neither of them. But here Pighius greatly erreth in two respects; first, because he thinketh that in regeneration, there is become no change: especially seeing he cannot deny, but that Christ's remedy is added, his righteousness applied, and our guiltiness taken away; for God doth not impute that concupiscence, which remaineth after regeneration.

Moreover, the spirit is given, wherewith the strength of concupiscence may be broken; that although it do stick within us, yet that it shall not reign [over us;] for to this end Paul exhorteth us, when he saith; Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies. Again on the other part he is deceived, in that he thinketh Augustine to judge, that the concupiscence which remaineth after

baptism is no sin at all; but most especially, if the sin be considered alone, [as it is] by itself: for in most plain words he declareth it in his own nature to be sin; because it is disobedience, against the which we must continually wrestle. And where he denieth the same to be sin, it must be understood as concerning guiltiness; for that out of all doubt, is taken away in regeneration. For by that means it coms to pass, that although it be very sin indeed; yet God doth not impute it for sin. Moreover, Augustine doth compare concupiscence with those sins, which are called actual; by the comparison whereof, it may be said, to be no sin: for it is far from the grievousness of them. But I marvel how Pighius dare say, that Augustine determineth without testimony of the scriptures, that concupiscence is original sin; seeing he, in his disputations against the Pelagians, defendeth his opinion chiefly out of the holy scriptures. And the cause why he calleth original sin concupiscence, is, for that original corruption doth chiefly declare itself, through the unpurer desires of the mind, and of the flesh.

13. Now it is expedient to see, what others have said concerning this matter: for, besides this, there is also another opinion of them, which say that original sin is a lack of original righteousness. Which thing Anshelmus affirmed in his book *De partu virginis*; and he drew many other scholastical authors into his opinion. And these men mean no other thing by original justice, or righteousness, but the right institution of man, when as the body obeyeth the mind, and the inferior parts of the mind are subject to the superior; and [when] the mind is subject unto God, and to his law. In this righteousness was Adam created; and if he had so continued, all we should have lived in it: but seeing he fell, all we were deprived thereof. And they would have the lack of this righteousness to be original sin. But that they may show their opinion the better, they say that every defect is not evil; for

although a stone do lack righteousness, yet it shall not be said that a stone is unrighteous or evil; but when as a thing shall be fit and meet to possess that whereof it is destitute; then such a defect is said to be evil: as it happeneth in the eye, when it is bereft of ability to see well; we do not say therefore, that there is a fault or blame in the eye. For then sin cometh, when by reason of such a lack, there followeth a contending and wrestling against the law of God. And this opinion is also condemned by Pighius; for he saith, that It is no sin, if one keep not the gift which he hath received. For it may be, that one which is born in perfect health, and in a good state of the body, may fall into a disease, or be maimed in some member, or else become lame; yet there is none that will call those defects offenses or sins. But this similitude is not agreeable to the purpose; for a disease or maim of the body, doth not make either to the performing or violating of God's law: but that which they call a want of original righteousness, doth of necessity bring with it the breach of God's law. Moreover, he laboreth to prove, that the loss of original righteousness in young children is not sin; because the same was not foregone by their fault: but this again is to call God to an account. But God is not registered among the decrees of men, he is not to be brought into the order of man's laws.

Let Pighius confer that opinion with this, which he reasoneth against. This affirms he, that God doth condemn the faultiness and uncleanness, which he appointed and showed to be in new born babes: Pighius maketh guilty and condemns children of that vice and sin which is not in them; but only is that which Adam the first parent of all committed in himself: for otherwise he taketh those children to be most innocent. But whether of these is the further from reason, and doth dissent from the laws of men? To punish an innocent for the sin of another? Or else, to condemn him, which hath cause

in himself why he should be condemned? Undoubtedly, unto them which shall diligently consider of the thing itself, the saying of Anshelme is better in many respects, than this opinion of Pighius. We know it to be true, which Ecclesiastes saith, that God made man upright: but when he had once sinned, he fell by and by into wickedness. He doth not now behold God and heavenly things anymore, but he bendeth himself continually down to earthly and to carnal things, and is subject to the necessity of concupiscence: and this is to want original righteousness. For actions be not plucked away from man, but the power of well using them is taken away: as we see happen by experience, in such as be taken with the palsy; verily they move their hand, but because the power is hurt, whereby they might rule that motion, they move the same faintly, and deformedly. This also happeneth in us; for seeing divine righteousness is wanting, the ground is corrupted, whereby our works should be rightly ordered and performed. But (saith Pighius) it cannot be sin in young children, to be destitute of this gift; for they are not bound by any duty or obligation to have it. But if (saith he) our adversaries shall say otherwise, let them show a law, whereby we that are born be bound; which (saith he) because they cannot do, let them cease to say, that this want of original righteousness is sin. But we not only will show one, but three laws. The first is the institution of man; God made man according to his own image and likeness, wherefore such it behooveth us to be: for God doth justly require that which he made in our nature. And the image of God doth herein chiefly consist, that we be adorned with divine properties; namely, justice, wisdom, goodness, and patience. But contrariwise Pighius crieth out, that this is not the nature of the image of God; for that (he saith) consisteth in understanding, memory, and will: as Augustine is his books *De trinitate*, and in many other places hath taught.

These things indeed are said of the School-men. But we will prove the matter to be far otherwise, both by the scriptures, and sayings of the fathers.

14. First, it is thus written in the epistle to the Ephesians; Put ye off the old man, according to the conversation in times past, which is corrupt, according to the deceivable lusts: and be ye renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put ye on the new man, which according to God is created in righteousness and true holiness. And in the third chapter to the Colossians; Ye have put on the new man, which is renewed to the knowledge and image of him that created him. And a little after he showeth the properties of this image; Put ye on the bowels of mercies, goodness, modesty, meekness, gentleness, forbearing one another, and forgiving one another. And in the eighth chapter to the Romans; Whom he before knew, he also predestinated, to be made like unto the image of his son. All these things do sufficiently declare, what manner of image of God the holy scriptures set forth unto us in the creation and instauration of man: neither did the fathers mislike of this opinion. Irenaeus in his fifth book saith, that by the infusion of the holy Ghost, man is made spiritual, even in such sort as he was created by God. And Tertullian against Marcion saith, that that is the image of God, which hath the self-same motions and senses with God: and the reason which persuadeth us hereunto, is, that man was therefore made at the beginning like unto the image of God, because he should be the governor of all things created, as if he had been a certain deputy of God. And no man can doubt, but that God will have his creatures to be well governed; for he continually biddeth us, that we should not abuse them. And we are bound by a law, to ascribe unto God all those things, whereby we are holpen, as from whom all things do flow. But a good use, and right administration of things cannot appear, unless we be furnished with those conditions, which (we have said)

do belong to the image of God. And whereas Augustine assigned the image of God to be in the understanding, memory, and will; we say he did it, to the intent he might set forth unto us some form or example of the divine persons, how one of them do respect another. But he must not be so understood, as though he would make these faculties of the mind to be the image of God; they being naked, and despoiled of those virtues, which we have declared.

Wherefore we have a law given unto us, either by the institution, or by the restitution of man; which Paul commandeth: and by this bond we are bound, to have the original righteousness, which we have lost. We have also the law of nature, and to live agreeable unto it (as Cicero saith in his third book *De finibus*) is the principal and last end of man's estate: and this law dependeth of that other, which we before spake of. For of no other thing doth it come, that we in cogitations have our mind, which accuse and defend one another; but that they are taken from the worthiness of nature, as it was first instituted by God. For whatsoever either the philosophers, or law-givers have commanded, as touching the duties of man's life; the same doth wholly depend of the fountains of our creation. For those precepts cannot come out of a corrupt nature, out of self-love, and out of malice; whereof it comes, that we are prone unto evils: but they come from that kind of most upright nature, which they feign to be done by the worthiness of man, and which we know out of the holy scriptures to be instituted by God, and commanded to be renewed by us. And hereunto (as some will have it) doth appertain that law of the mind, which the law of the members doth resist. There is also a third law, which God would have to be put in writing, namely; Thou shalt not lust: which commandment, although our adversaries do wrest unto actual sins, yet we have showed that the same

belongeth also unto original sin: and that God, by his commandment, would have all kind of naughty concupiscence to be utterly cut off from men.

15. Now therefore we have laws, which so long as they be extant, shall perpetually bind us, and make us debtors to perform that righteousness which they require. True indeed it is that infants feel not those laws; and therefore sin lieth asleep in them; as Augustine saith in his second book *De peccatorum meritis & remission*, following that which Paul saith; I sometimes lived without a law: not that there was at any time no law prescribed unto Paul, but because in his childhood he felt not the same, by reason of young age. Wherefore Paul saith; that Sin was dead, which Augustine interpreteth, was on sleep: but when the commandment was come, that is, when the law began to be known of me, sin did revive. No doubt, but it was in him before sin; but when he felt it not, it seemed dead. Now it appeareth, how those things with we have spoke, agree with the holy scriptures. But Pighius urgeth yet further, that these do pertain nothing unto infants, for that a law ought not to be made as touching those things which cannot be avoided. But when he speaketh thus, he followeth not the sense of the holy scriptures; for their sufficiently teach, that those things which be commanded in the law, cannot be perfectly fulfilled, when nevertheless they be straitly commanded. Paul saith in the epistle to the Romans, that Look what was impossible to the law, forasmuch as it was made weak by the flesh, God sending his only son, &c. By these words it appeareth most plainly, that the law, as it is commanded, cannot be performed; for if it could, we should be justified by works. Neither had it been needful, that Christ should suffer death for us. There be also other offices of the law, for which it is written. For assuredly, the same is profitable to direct the actions of godly men, but most profitable of all to discover sin: for By the law

(saith Paul) cometh the knowledge of sin. Again; I had not known lust, unless the law had said unto me, Thou shalt not lust. Besides, by the law, sin is also increased, and doth burden us the more, and doth the more grievously press us; for The law entered in, that sin might abound. And to the Corinthians; The power of sin is the law.

All these things tend to this end, that man, as by a schoolmaster should be brought unto Christ, and should crave his help, and pray that strength may be given unto him: that at the least-wise in part, and with an obedience begun, he may execute those things which are commanded; and that such things as he faileth in, may not be imputed unto him, but may be supplied by the righteousness of Christ. Augustine, in his first book against Julian, reprehendeth the Pelagians; because they thought, that they knew some great matter, when they vaunted that God commandeth not those things, which be unpossible: and he showeth, that these, which we have now declared, are the ends of the law. Yea, and the same Augustine, in his book of Confessions, maketh mention also of those sins, which young children, while they be yet sucking, do commit: yet none will say that they could resist them. But they should be no sins, unless they might be referred to some law violated by them. Neither doth it anything help Pighius, or yet take away their sins, because they are not felt by them: for a thing that is dishonest, although it seem not so to us, yet in his own nature it is dishonest. That (saith he) which is dishonest, is dishonest, whether it seem so or no. This opinion of Anshelme, as touching the lack and want of original righteousness, differeth in very deed nothing from the saying of Augustine, wherein he calleth original sin concupiscence; but that it is there spoken somewhat more expressly, which in the word concupiscence is wrapped up more obscurely. But because this want of original

righteousness, might so be taken, although we understand only the privation of the gifts of God, without any fault of nature; therefore it shall be very well to set down a more full definition.

16. Original sin therefore, is a corrupting of the whole nature of man, derived by generation from the fall of our first parent into his posterity; which (were it not for the benefit of Christ) adjudgeth all that are born therein in a manner to infinite miseries, and eternal damnation. In this definition all the kinds of causes are contained. For the matter or subject, we have all the parts and powers of man; the form is, the corrupting of them all; the efficient cause is the sinful will of Adam; the instrument, is the spreading of derivation, which is done through the flesh; the end and effect, is eternal damnation, together with all the discommodities belonging to this life. And hereof have risen diverse names of his sin; so that sometime it is called a defect, sometime perverseness, sometime vice, sometime a disease, sometime a contagion; and by Augustine, an affected quality, and a rude lump. And that the whole man is corrupted, herein it appeareth; because he was created, to the end he should cleave unto God, as unto the chief good thing. But now he understandeth not divine things, he patiently waiteth for the promises of the scripture, he heareth with grief the commandments of God, and he contemneth punishments and rewards: his seditious affects do impudently deride right reason and the word of God; the body refuseth to obey the mind.

Although all these things be experiments of natural corruption, yet they be also confirmed by testimonies of the scriptures. As touching the impediments of the understanding, Paul saith; that The carnal man perceiveth not those things which be of the spirit of God: no verily, nor cannot, because they be foolishness unto him. In which words we note by

the way, against Pighius, that the law was made concerning that which could not be done: for first of all the law willeth us to know divine things; which nevertheless Paul affirmeth plainly, that a carnal man cannot perceive. And as touching our purpose, we see that Paul affirmeth, that this blindness or ignorance is engrafted in men; and that by nature: for it cannot be imagined, that the same hath come unto us by reason either of time or age. For the older that every man waxeth, the more and more he is instructed as concerning God: wherefore in that he is a carnal man, and unapt to perceive heavenly things, that hath he gotten by nature corrupted.

17. This corrupting also is of so great importance, (as Augustine saith in the third book against Julianus the twelfth chapter;) that by the same, the image of God is become a stranger unto the life of man, through the blindness of the heart; which blindness (saith he) is sin, and doth not sufficiently agree with man's nature. The same father, in his first book *De peccatorum meritis & remission*, the 36th chapter, where he alledgeth that those words of David; Remember not the sins and ignorance's of my youth, maketh mention of most thick darkness of ignorance, that is in the minds of young children, while as yet they be in their mothers wombs: which know not wherefore, from whence, or when they were there enclosed. For there lieth the poor infant unlearned, unapt to be taught, unable to conceive what a commandment is, being ignorant where he is, what he is, of whom he was created, and of whom he was begotten: all which things did nothing agree with the nature of man, as it was first created, but be rather corruptions of nature. For Adam was not so created, but he was able doth to understand the commandment of God, and to give names to his wife, and to all living creatures: but in infants, a long time must be expected, whereby they may by little and little pass over this kind of dizziness. Moreover, that this kind

of ignorance is to be accounted sin, Reticius the most ancient bishop of Auston beareth record, as Augustine testifieth in his first book against Julianus. For when he speaketh of baptism, thus he writeth; It is a principal indulgence in the church, wherein we cast away all the burden of the old crime, and do blot out the old wicked acts of our ignorance, and do put off the old man with his natural ungraciousness. By these words we understand, that wickedness is natural unto us; and that the sins of ignorance are taken away in baptism. Wherefore, seeing infants are baptized; they by the authority of this father are proved to have sins, and that their old ignorance is abolished in baptism.

Now as concerning the will, let us see whether that also be corrupted or no. Thereof the apostle gave an excellent testimony, to wit, that The sense and wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God: and under this sentence he comprehendeth all the affections of men not yet regenerate. But I marvel at the impudency of Pighius, who to wind himself out by some means or other, saith that this place must be understood as touching the sense of the letter, which he affirmeth to be against God, and cannot be subdued unto him. For, as well that which goeth before, as that which followeth, doth manifestly reprove him; for Paul forthwith addeth the difference between men that be in the flesh, and those which be in the spirit. Wherefore it appeareth sufficiently, that he treateth not of the diversity of the sense of the scripture; but of the diversity of men themselves. And the next words before that sentence are; That which was impossible to the law, inasmuch as it was weak, because of the flesh, God sending his own son in the similitude of sinful flesh, by sin condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us. These words also do testify, that Paul spake of us; not of the spirit, or the letter of the scriptures. For in us is the infirmity,

whereby the law is weakened, that it could not bring us to salvation; and by Christ the righteousness of the law beginneth to be fulfilled in us.

18. Neither must we hearken unto them, which both in this place, and in many other, will that by flesh should be understood the grosser parts of the mind. For when Paul to the Galatians reckoneth up the works of the flesh, he putteth in that number, not only adulteries, fornications and wantonness; but also idolatry: which no man can deny, but that it doth appertain to the mind, not unto the flesh. And Christ, when he saith; That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit, is spirit, exhorteth to regeneration: which in very deed appertaineth not only to the substance of the body, or grosser parts of the mind; but especially also unto the will and mind. And when he said unto Peter; Blessed art thou Simon, the son of Jonah, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee: he meant, that he had not learned those things by natural knowledge, but by the spirit of God. For under the name of flesh, he comprehendeth those things which appertaineth to the mind and reason. But yet we say not (as Pighius fondly cavilleth) that in the nobler part of the mind there is nothing but flesh: for we know, although Pighius had not told us, that the soul is a spirit, which nevertheless in the scriptures is called flesh, before it be regenerated; because whereas it ought to make the flesh, that is to say, the grosser part of itself spiritual, and ought to reduce the same to the obedience of a mind instructed by the word of God, it will rather bend unto the pleasures thereof, and so is made carnal.

But they object against us, that [saying] unto the Galatians; The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: as though this may not be, if in the minds of men, we leave nothing that is sound. But we will easily answer to this objection; for first, those words are pronounced by

Paul, as touching believers, which be already regenerated: which thing those words that follow, do sufficiently declare; That ye do not those things which ye would. By which words he declareth, that they obtained a right will by the spirit of Christ; which nevertheless they could not accomplish, by reason of the continual conflicts of the mind, and their great infirmities. And therefore the apostle meant no other thing in that place, than that whatsoever is in us not perfectly regenerated, all that doth strive against the spirit of God. Nor do we deny, but that some such conflict is otherwhile in men, which be not yet regenerated: not that their mind is not carnal, and prone unto naughtiness, but because the laws of nature are as yet engraven therein, and that also there is some illumination of God's spirit in the same, although it be not such as either can justify, or bring in any change to salvation.

19. Moreover, that reason is corrupted in us, Paul's words do sufficiently declare, wherein he exhorteth To put on the new man, which must be continually renewed in us. Seeing he willeth that man be so wholly changed; and that man consisteth not only of the body and affections of the flesh, but also, and that much more, of the mind, will, and reason; it is necessarily gathered, that these things were also corrupted in him. For otherwise, what need have they to be renewed? And it maketh no great matter, if thou say, that these things must be understood of such as be come to ripe years, who of their own choice, and voluntary sins, have corrupted these things in themselves. For I will ask, wherefore all in general, which be not regenerated, did so contaminate themselves, as there was not one innocent to be found among them all? Truly there can be nothing else answered to this question, but that the very fountains were corrupted and defiled in them, even from the beginning. Augustine teacheth also, that we

be so far forth only regenerated, in how much we are become like unto Christ: for in that we be unlike unto him, therein we are not born anew, but retain still the old man in us. Wherefore let us see, whether from the beginning we have a mind, will, and reason like unto Christ; for if they be found unlike, we must needs conclude, that they be corrupt, and do appertain unto the old man: and as touching the corruption of the baser parts of the mind, daily experience sufficiently teacheth us.

Again, this property belongeth unto the baser parts of the mind, that they be sprinkled abroad in the members, and do spread themselves abroad over all the parts of the flesh; which cannot be agreeable unto the mind and reasonable part, being things spiritual and invisible. That the body also and parts thereof have fallen from their duty, to become rebellious and repugnant to the mind, Paul teacheth, when he crieth out; O unhappy man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? And again, when he saith; I feel another law in my members. Finally, that the whole man, how much soever he be, is corrupted, the commandment of Christ doth sufficiently prove, wherein he biddeth us to deny ourselves. But if that our nature were innocent and perfect, there would be no need why we should renounce the same; for things that be good should be retained, and not abandoned from us. With this definition, which we have made of original sin, agreeth the want of original justice: so likewise agreeth Augustine's definition, wherein he saith, that the same is concupiscence of the flesh; so that both the one and the other be rightly understood.

Those which were chief among the School-men, acknowledged this doctrine; as Thomas, Scotus, and especially Bonaventura: these affirm the material part in this sin, to be the corruption of nature or concupiscence; the formal part to be the want of righteousness; and so of those two opinions,

which I now spake of, they make one. But there be some of our men, which would have the formal part to be guiltiness, or the imputation of God; but seeing that this is an outward thing from sin, I had rather incline to that sentence, which maketh those formal parts to be the fight and wrestling against the law of God; for that is the principal reason, why the corruptions of nature must be called sins.

20. And there must be no credit given unto them, which cry out, that our nature is good. Indeed I would grant it to be true, as concerning our first creation of nature; but not as the same is fallen; for good it is indeed, but yet so good, as it hath some corruption joined therewith. But whereas these men say, that lusting is good; they must give me leave, if I give more credit unto Paul, than unto them. But he saith; I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, there dwelleth no good thing: and a little after; I find by the law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me. In this place he saith, that concupiscence is evil. To the Galatians also he sufficiently proveth it to be evil, when as he willeth the same to be crucified. It is also false, which they say, that it doth always desire things which be profitable, and which tend to preservation; for we find by experience, that the same is continually prone to offenses, and to those things which be enemies unto life. Moreover, if nature were as innocent and good, as they imagine it to be; wherefore should it be so grievously punished by God? Among all the kinds of living creatures, we see in a manner none more miserable than man. If we respect either his birth, infancy, childhood, education, and discipline; all things are replenished with tears, with sorrow, with lamentation, with infirmity, and with pains taking. The body must labor to get his living; the mind is continually disquieted with troublesome affections, the heart is stirred up with perturbations, the whole body is tormented with diseases: all which

things some considering with themselves, have said, that nature is not a mother, but a step-mother.

I pass over, that the body and souls also of children and infants, are some delivered unto the devil to be vexed; so we read in the Gospel, that a young man was in such sort tormented by the devil, that he cast himself sometime into the fire, and sometime into the water: so as the severity of God doth so account of the innocence of man's nature, as he grievously punisheth the same. And it should appear, that the very Ethnic men perceived more concerning this thing, than these divines; for Plato in his second book *De republica* saith, that Men by nature are evil, as those which cannot be led by their own accord to embrace righteousness, but only to be discontent with injury. And Socrates showeth, that unless men be inspired; as it is said the poets were, with some divine power, virtues cannot be had. And Cicero in his third book *De republica* (as Augustine alledgeth in his 4th book against Julian) saith, that Man is brought into light by nature his stepmother, with a naked, frail, and weak body; having a mind vexed with grief, subject to fears, feeble unto labors, prone unto lusts, in whom is hidden the fervent love of God, and also his mind and his wit. Also the ecclesiastical writers have condescended to this opinion, many of whose consents Augustine hath gathered together in his book against Julian.

21. Touching Irenaeus and Tertullian, I have already spoken. Cyprian also saith, that Christ healed the wounds which Adam made, and the venom wherewith the devil infected our nature. Cyprian acknowledgeth infirmity to be derived from the sin of our first parent, wherewith we be so provoked unto sin, as no man can flatter himself in his own innocence: for who can boast that he hath a clean heart? For as John saith, If we shall say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and there is no truth in us. Again,

Cyprian in his epistle unto Fidus teacheth, that Children must be baptized, least they perish everlastingly. Also Augustine citeth Reticius, the bishop, whose words we recited before: he citeth also Olympius a bishop of Spain, who saith, that The sin of Adam the first framed man was so sprinkled among the young plants, that sin is born together with man. He also citeth Hilarius, which thus wrote concerning the flesh of Christ; Therefore he being sent in the similitude of sinful flesh; even so he had sin. But because all flesh is of sin, namely of the sin derived from Adam the first parent, he was sent in the similitude of sinful flesh; so that there was no sin in him, but the similitude of sinful flesh. The same father in another place expounding the 18th Psalm, urgeth this sentence of David; Behold how I was shapen in wickedness, and in sin my mother hath conceived me. The same father in a homily upon the book of Job saith; that The body is a matter of naughtiness, which could not so be said to be at the first creation. And Ambrose upon Luke saith, that The body is a fowl puddle, and harborow of sins; but by the benefit of Christ it is changed into the temple of God, and a holy place of virtues.

The same father writing against the Novatians saith, that Our beginning was in sin: again, in his apology; David saith that afore we be born, we are spotted with contagion; and before we have the use of light, we receive original unrighteousness, and be conceived in iniquity. And he saith of Christ, It was not requisite for him, in whose body no sin should be, to feel any natural contagiousness of generation. Justly therefore did David bewail in himself the fowl filthiness of his nature, and that infections began to be in a manner before he had life. The same Ambrose, in his book De arca Noah; Whom then hath he now called just, but him that is free from these bonds, whom the common bonds of nature cannot hold? Also upon the gospel of

Luke; Through the washing of the healthful ministry, those infants, which have been baptized, are now cleansed from wickedness. Jerome upon the prophet Jonah saith, that Yoong children are subject to the sin of Adam. And least thou shouldest think he only spake of the guiltiness of Adams fault, upon the 18th and 41st chapters of Ezekiel, he saith; Not so much as the child of a day old is without sin, urging also that sentence; Who can make that clean, which was conceived of an unclean seed? Gregory Nazianzen saith, The image of God shall cleanse the blemishes of bodily inundation. And afterward; Reverence the birth, by which thou art delivered from the chains of earthly nativity. And entreating of baptism he saith; By this man the spots of our nativity are taken away, by the which we were conceived in iniquity, and in sins our parents begat us.

22. Basilius Magnus is defended by Augustine: for the Pelagians would have had him seem to be of their parts. He writeth against the Manichees, that evil is not a substance; but a conversation, which cometh only of the will. Which saying he meant of those, which procured the infection of conversation by their own proper will; which conversation (saith he) may easily be severed from the will of them that be diseased: for if it could not be severed from the same, evil should be a substantial part thereof. All these things Augustine affirmeth to be rightly spoken; for the Manichees decreed, that evil is a certain substance, and that the same is the beginning of worldly affairs. But contrariwise Basil saith, that that evil is in a good thing, and that it happened through the will of the man and of the woman that sinned. And whereas he saith, that it may easily be severed from the will, he ascribeth not that unto our strength, but unto the mercy of God. And in that he saith, there shall be no token thereof left, we also do hope the same; though not in this life, yet in the life to come. But that he acknowledged original sin, his

own sermon of fasting doth sufficiently bear witness: for thus he saith; If Eve had abstained from the tree, we should not have had any need of this fasting: for Sound men have no need of the physician, but sick men. We became sick, through that sin, let us be healed by repentance: but repentance without fasting is vain. By these words Basil determined, that we by reason of the sin of Adam are not sound.

Moreover, he citeth the twelve bishops of the east, which condemned Pelagius. To whom we should add Origin, who interpreting that sentence of Paul, which we have spoken of; Death came upon all men; he said, that Abel, Enoch, Methusala, and Noah sinned: other fathers he saith he will not recite, because they sinned all everyone, and that none is clean from corruption, though he have lived but one day. But upon the sixth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, he speaketh more plainly, when he saith, that Baptism was appointed by tradition from the apostles, to be given unto infants; because the apostles knew, that the natural corruption of sin is in all men, which ought to be washed away by water and the spirit. And Chrysostom upon Genesis, entreating of the question; Wherefore men now a days be afraid of beasts, and be hurt by them, seeing they be created lords over them? This saith he happens by reason of sin, and because we depart from our confidence and honor. And thereby Augustine proveth, that the natural gift of young children is fallen away, in that the beasts do not spare them. The same Chrysostom, expounding that place of the sixth to the Romans, saith how that sin, which remaineth through the disobedience of Adam, hath polluted all things. He hath also many other places to the same effect.

23. But yet the Pelagians, and especially Julianus, were not ashamed to cite this father for a witness, as though he had made for him; because in his

sermon *De baptisatis*, he reciting many gifts of baptism, saith; that They which be baptized, do not only receive forgiveness of their sins, but also are made the children and heirs of God, the brethren of Christ, and joint-heirs with him, the members and temple of God, and instruments of the holy Ghost. He addeth at the end; Doest thou see what a sort of liberalities there be of baptism? And some do think, that heavenly grace consisteth in remission of sins; and for that cause we do baptize young children, when as nevertheless they be not polluted with sin, that unto them should be given or added, righteousness, holiness, adoption, inheritance, brotherhood of Christ, that they may be his members. By these words Julian thought, that Chrysostom giveth not his consent, that there is original sin. But Augustine saith, that his words must be understood concerning sin committed upon their own advisement, from which sin assuredly they be exempt; and by this reason they may be called innocent. According to which meaning, Paul writeth of those two brethren; Before they had done either good or evil: when nevertheless there is none altogether exempted from that which the apostle said; By the sin of one, condemnation came upon all men. And; By one man's disobedience, many are made sinners. Hereof it appeareth, how warily it behooveth us to be in reading of the fathers; for sometimes we read in them, that young children have no sin proper of their own, when nevertheless they especially acknowledge the corruption of nature; that is, original sin to be in them.

But to have sins proper, may be two ways understood; either concerning things which they have done of their own will and free election, and in this respect that sentence of Chrysostom concerning infants, is allowed; or else sins are called proper corruptions of nature, whereby we are both defiled and condemned: which cannot be removed from young children, seeing

they be born in them, as David plainly proveth. Whereunto Augustine noted in Chrysostom's words, which be extant in Greek, that There is set down sins, in the plural number; and not sin, in the singular; in such wise as Julian had cited them: for thus it is read in the Greek, Διά τούτο και τά παιδία βαπτίζομεν, και τά ἀμαρτήματα οὐκ ἔχοντα. Which word ἀμαρτήματα, in the plural number, (as Augustine thinketh) is most properly applied unto sins, which they name actual. And he addeth, that the more ancient fathers did not so copiously dispute of original sin; because the Pelagians were not yet sprung up to impugn the same. These so many sayings of the fathers, Pighius should have weighed; especially seeing he accounts them for eagles, which see most sharply, and always fly unto the carcass. But it seems to me that he esteems them as counters to reckon with, which being set in sundry places, may sometimes signify a talent, and at another time but a dandiprat as it pleaseth him that casts the account: so Pighius will sometimes have the fathers authority to be exceeding large, sometimes (if they content him not sufficiently) to be none at all; and thus at one time he extols them as eagles, and another time despiseth them as jays.

And herein he seemeth not to regard the judgment of his Roman church, which otherwise in every place he maketh equal with God himself; for that church so acknowledgeth original sin, as it doth not vouchsafe so much as the churchyard for burying of those infants, which die without baptism; and requireth, that the devil be by exorcisms expelled from young infants when that they be brought to baptism, because it saith they be bondslaves of the devil. Which I do not therefore speak, because I would either allow those exorcisms, or would have them to be retained still: for this must be obtained of God by prayers, and we must not deal as if we would seem by miracles to heal a man possessed with the devil: and seeing at this day there is no

such gift extant in the church, there is no cause why we should imitate the same. Neither do we grant, that the infants not yet baptized, are assaulted of the devil. Also Innocentius the bishop of Roome, who lived in the time of Augustine, condemning Pelagius, was of the very same mind that we be of, concerning original sin. We ought not to extenuate this evil, otherwise we shall extenuate the benefit of Christ: and they which will not acknowledge this sin, they be neither sorrowful for it nor yet seek remedy of Christ. Truly Pighius herein went further also than the Pelagians; for they only denied the propagation of sin by Adam. But Pighius crieth out, that that opinion is wicked and blasphemous, and reproachful against God. Again, they thought this enough, to say that infants, dying without baptism, shall both be excluded from the kingdom of heaven, and also be placed in the pains of hell. But this man dreameth, that they shall be happy through a certain natural blessedness; and so happy, as they shall bless, praise, and love the Lord with all their mind, with all their heart, and with all their strength.

24. But now let us see how obscure he endeavoreth to make the definition alleged. First he saith by these darknesses and corruptions of nature, ye understand either mere privations of God's gifts, or else certain positive things. If you appoint them to be privations, I understand what you say. But your cavillations are nothing else, but tragical names, and vain terms. But if you will have these things to be positive: seeing in the infant new born, there is not anything but the soul and the body, which be clean, and have God and nature to be their author, from whence or by what means did these mischiefs break in, which you do make mention of? First we answer, that the privations, which I here set down, be not as though they were mere negatives, which take away the whole: as when we say there is no *Centaure* nor *Scylla*; but we say, they be such names of things as leave their subject

maimed, unprofitable, and deformed; as appeareth in the eye destitute of sight, and in the trembling hand of him that is taken with the palsy: even so fareth original sin with us. Indeed the powers of the mind and actions do remain, but yet destitute of their right government, and therefore evil and corrupted. But Pighius erreth still, because he feigneth the nature of man to have a certain natural integrity of itself, whereto have come these supernatural gifts, which were planted in the first parent: but that after sin committed, those gifts being taken away, man fell into his old state.

But this is a mere dream, for such a nature of man was instituted by God, as was convenient for him; therefore his gifts being taken away, it is corrupted, and very much marred: and seeing he swerved from his creation, he is in sin. Moreover, we do not only say, that original sin is this privation, but also that it doth comprehend things positive; as is proneness unto evil, a violence of nature against the word of God, and such other like: and therefore Barnard saith, that In the conjunction of the soul with the body, it is even as if it should fall upon a heap of most hard potsherds and hurting stones. And among the School-men Gulielmus Parisiensis, in his book called *Summa de vitijs & virtutibus*, bringeth this similitude; namely, that a soul is so let down into the body, as if a man should fall into a miry, deep, and stony place; and so should both sink in, be defiled, and hurt. In like manner (saith he) we through original sin are plunged in the darkness of ignorance, we are defiled with lusts, and as touching the powers and faculties of the mind we are wounded.

25. And whereas Pighius saith, that Both the body and the soul are good things, and have God for their author; I grant it. And when he afterward demandeth, how they be then corrupted? I answer with Paul; By one man, which fell; and that by procreation, as a little after shall be showed. But in

that he saith, that they can by no means be corrupted, because God is the author of them; it is no firm reason. For even they which be of ripe years, have both a body and a soul, which be the works of God, and are continually preserved by his power, and yet may they be defiled and corrupted. But if he shall say, that this cometh of man's will and free choice; so will we answer, that the same may come of other causes; to wit, through propagation and seed. And so Pighius reasoneth from that which is not the cause, as though it were the cause: for his meaning is, that if men be corrupted, it cannot otherwise be than by the will and free choice; which is not true. All the arguments, which he objecteth against us, arise hereof; that he saith, he understands not how this corruption can be derived to the posterity; and how it is possible that infants should be bound by any law; and how a law can be made of that, which we are not able to avoid. But seeing the holy scriptures declare, teach, and testify these things, it maketh no matter how much Pighius either understandeth, or not understandeth: for we believe many things, which we perceive not, nor know not by any certain reason. Which nevertheless ought not to be of any such force, as every man should obtrude unto us to believe what things soever they shall think good; under this pretense, that although they cannot be perceived by reason, yet they ought to be comprehended by faith; seeing God is also able, to make things which be far greater. For first, that which we would have to be believed, ought to be showed out of the holy scriptures: then afterward, if we cannot attain unto it, let us clean unto faith, and set reason aside.

But it followeth not by our definition, that there is no good thing lest either in nature or in Ethnic men. Only this we affirm, that this sin would destroy all, if God (through Christ) brought not a remedy unto the regenerate. Also God is present sometime in them which be not regenerate,

and adorneth them with excellent and noble virtues, whereby original sin is restrained, and Common-wealth's and empires are kept at the least-wise in some civil order. Socrates would not go forth of prison, when he might. Aristides, being driven into banishment, wished unto his citizens that they might never be in so ill case, as they should call him to their remembrance. Phocion, being demanded a little before his death, whether he would have any message to be done unto his son; Let him never (saith he) remember the injury done unto me. The Common-wealth of Rome had his Curtios, Scipios, and Catos, men of civil honesty, and very great lovers of upright dealing. Which duties, albeit, as they were in men which knew not God, were sins; yet were they bridles of original sin, and of nature corrupted, least all things should be confounded, and good laws fall to ruin, and the light of nature be in a manner extinguished.

26. Now, seeing we have confirmed original sin, by the testimony of the scriptures, and have confuted the opinion of Pighius; and have rejected the opinion of them, which think original sin to be a guiltiness and bond, procured through the sin of Adam; and have alleged the definition of Augustine, that Original sin is concupiscence of the flesh; and of Anshelme, that It is a want of original righteousness; and last of all, seeing we have largely, and by many testimonies proved our own definition: now it remaineth, that we prosecute those things, which we purposed to entreat of in the third place; namely, of the conditions and properties of original sin, how it is spread abroad, how it is abolished, how the remnants thereof are in men renewed, and also what punishment is due thereunto. Indeed, as touching the manner how it is poured thorough into the posterity, many opinions are recited. The first of them is, of the propagation of souls, which we will show, by the judgment of Augustine, to be a more ready way than

the rest, although it be not received of all men. Another opinion is, which Augustine followeth, to wit, that original sin is conveyed from one to another, by the lust and inordinate delight of the parents. This reason hath two errors; first, because it saith, that this evil is in procreation, as a matter of necessity, which nevertheless may be separated from the same. And the School-men themselves confess, that he which should be begotten, without a vicious desire of the parents; yet shall he draw original sin: for they say that it is sufficient thereunto that it was in Adam, as in the first principal seed. Another absurdity is, that then original sin should only consist in the fowl affection of the lust, where, in very deed, it comprehendeth (as hath been said) the whole corrupting of nature.

Others have thought, that the soul was created evil by God; because it should be a part of man, execrated and put under the curse. But because this seemeth to be against the nature of creation, that it should be called a depravation; therefore that opinion is also rejected. The last opinion is commonly received; namely, that The soul gathereth original sin, through conjunction with the body, that is already infected and corrupted by the parents. Whereupon if it be demanded, what is the seat thereof, or (as they commonly speak) what is the subject? We answer, that it hath place in the flesh, as in the root and beginning: then out of that fountain, it also possesseth the soul, and so is extended throughout the whole man: so as the seed is the instrument, whereby this sin is conveyed from the parents unto their children. Pighius objecteth, that Vices cannot be derived by seed unto the posterity, unless perhaps those vices, which cleave and stick in the body of the parents; as we see happeneth in the leprosy, in the falling sickness, and other diseases of the body: neither doth nature suffer, that sin should take place in the very substance of the seed, so as it can be conveyed by it

unto the children. Here we answer; first, that it is not true, that only the diseases of the body of the parents are derived unto the children. For we also see, that many conditions of the mind are derived from the parents unto their children; as wit, fury, ambition, gentleness, pride, and such other like. As to the other, we grant indeed, that the ill quality or corruption, which is brought by the seed, as it is in the seed, is not sin. But yet this letteth not, but that the corruption brought into the children by seed, as by an instrument, may have in it a respect of sin; even as the qualities, which I have now recited, do not make the seed to be witty, docible, or covetous; but yet those qualities, derived unto the child, do make him such a one.

27. Howbeit, whether it may be affirmed that God is author thereof; they commonly say, that the deformity and unrighteousness that is in this sin, is drawn out of nature already corrupted; the which, as it was created by God, was not so depraved. And so they affirm, that whatsoever is in the nature of goodness, the same is of God: but whatsoever is evil therein, forsomuch as it is nothing else but a defect or want, there needs to be no efficient cause in it. For that which is but a want, is not of necessity that it should be made; for if it should be made, it should be also in it. Howbeit, this is not enough; indeed we agree with them, that God is the author of the subject, or of the substance, wherein the defect is: but in that they say that the defect itself hath no efficient cause, therein we agree not with them. For somewhat there must be to remove or prohibit that perfection which is requisite, and to withdraw the grace and gifts wherewith our nature was endued at the beginning. So as we must of necessity refer this privation or defect unto God, which giveth not perfection utterly without a defect: which is always done of him by his just judgment, although it be not always manifest unto us. And by the scriptures it is most certain, and cannot be denied, that God

punisheth sins by sins; but yet they are not so laid upon us by God, as they should be sins, in respect that they depend upon him: for whatsoever God doth, is without all controversy both right and just.

And punishments themselves, so far forth as they be punishments, do pertain to the nature of goodness; howbeit, as they proceed from us, they are sins. For we affirm not, that God himself doth by himself pollute the soul, when he createth it; for it draweth the filthiness of sin from the corrupted body, whereunto it is adjoined. But man's wisdom in this thing is very much offended; for it thinketh that in no wise there ought to be made such a conjunction: for it seemeth to be like, as if a man should cast a precious thing into an unclean vessel. Also it appeareth an unjust thing, that the soul, which hath done neither good nor ill, should be joined with a body; and to draw from it original sin: yea rather, that if it be so, men should abstain from procreation. As those also, which have the leprosy, are persuaded to refrain (if it be possible) from procreation, least they might proceed thereby to infect mankind. And because the end, whereunto man is instituted, is eternal felicity; it seemeth not convenient, that the soul should be placed in that body, whereby it should be called back from the end prescribed. And as it is unjust, that that soul, which hath not sinned, should be punished in hell fire; even so it seemeth unjust, that the same should be cast into that body, wherein it incurreth not pain, as in hell, but sin, and the hatred of God, which be more grievous; and doth so incur, as it can by no means avoid it.

28. These things be so difficult and obscure, as they cannot fully be satisfied by man's judgment. Indeed there be certain consolations gathered out of the ecclesiastical writers, which do so mitigate and quality these objections, as may suffice godly minds; but not so much as man's reason

would require. For the soul is joined with an infected and unclean body, that consideration may be had of the whole world; least that mankind, which is the principal, should be wanting therein. God falleth not of his office, he hindereth not the course of nature; but the body being made, he createth the soul according to his order prefixed; and rather will, that a man shall be, although he be not born without sin, than that he should not be at all. And although he do not bountifully give all things, which he gave at the beginning; yet of his mercy he giveth many things. Further, he hath set forth the remedy, which is Christ our mediator; by whom the sin, which we have drawn, shall be cleansed. Which sin, before conversion, driveth the elect unto Christ; that they feeling the force of their disease, may receive the medicine of him: and then, after that they be once grafted into Christ, they have this sin remaining still, that they having battle and wrestling may at the last bear away victories and triumphs.

But thou wilt say; God might by some other kind of means have saved mankind from destruction; namely, if he had created another man pure and perfect: so as Adam dying without kindred, all the posterity might have been procreated of that other man uncorrupted. There is no doubt, but God could so have done, if he would: but this had not been to raise up him that was fallen, to save him that was lost, and to redeem him that was utterly perished. This form of goodness God would show, that (notwithstanding the corruption of nature) he might preserve from destruction, as many as he had chosen. A shaken reed he would not bruise, and smoking flax he would not quench. For he would bring forth Christ, as another Adam, which should so preserve his, as the other had destroyed them. These, and such other things, persuaded Gregory to cry out; O happy offense, that deserved to have such a redeemer! Which words I would not be hasty to speak, forsomuch as I see

nothing in that cause, which is not miserable, and meet so great lamented. For, in that there followed so great a salvation, that must be wholly imputed to the goodness of God, and not unto the offense committed by Adam: for so great a good thing hath not proceeded otherwise, then by accident.

29. These things, although they cannot so fully answer to those objections, which we have put, as human reason would require; yet by them we have, what after a sort we may answer. The conjunction of the soul with the corrupt body, maketh nothing to the destruction of the chosen; for in Christ, as well the body as the soul is renewed. And as the soul is infected by the body; so by the faith of Christ, which is in the soul, the same, together with the body, is repaired. And whereas the innocent soul, which hath done nothing, either good or evil, is joined with a body corrupted; this the order of nature doth require; unless the body should be left without life, and to be forsaken, as destitute of all mankind. But if we shall stand in disputation with God, there will be no measure nor end. Innumerable souls would complain, because they were created, not predestinated [to salvation;] who nevertheless deserved not the same. A great many would complain, that they have been born of wicked infidels, and barbarous parents, and that they died in their tender age, by means whereof they could not come by the knowledge: and a thousand complaints more they might imagine.

And as concerning procreation, we say that it is commendable, when it consisteth of lawful matrimony: therein must be considered man that is begotten: that is, (as the School-men term it) the effect proper and of itself. But man is the good creature of God, vice and corruption is added by accidental means. And this evil hath a remedy; which thing happeneth not in leprosy, and other incurable diseases. Also we do grant, that man is made, to the end he should attain unto eternal felicity. And whereas it is objected,

that he is revoked from this end, through the corruption of the body: we contrariwise do say, that he by the very same means is invited unto Christ. Lastly, we grant, that it may seem to be a thing unworthy, that the innocent soul should be placed in hell; seeing no hope of redemption is there to be looked for: but being set in a body, although it be a corrupt body, yet it may obtain salvation and redemption.

30. Now must the reasons be brought, which firmly and soundly prove, that original corruption is spread in men by seed and generation: and this we will show by the holy scriptures, because that many do repugn it openly, and think that all the matter is feigned. First Paul saith, that Sin by one man came into the world: therefore we must see how men do depend of Adam, in such sort, as they can be partakers of his sin. But other way can there be none found, than [by means of] seed and generation. Moreover, when the apostle saith unto the Ephesians, that We by nature are the children of wrath; and nature (as the natural philosophers affirm) is the original of motion; we must have recourse unto seed and generation: for they are the foundation of our motion and beginning. But David doth more evidently show this, when he saith; Behold how I am conceived in wickedness, and in sin my mother hath conceived me: in which words he plainly teacheth, that this sin is derived by generation: but most manifest of all is that saying of Job; Who can make that clean, which is born of unclean seed? By this place the infected seed of our forefathers is proved to be unclean, though Pighius deny it never so much.

31. But now on the contrary part, let us examine by what means this sin is taken away. Even as by one man it was brought in; even so by one man it is removed away: and even as sin is from Adam spread over all, through seed and generation; so on the other side, in that multitude, which appertain unto

Christ, there are some things which may have the respect of seed: as be election, predestination, grace, the spirit, the word of God, and baptism. These two latter instruments, God useth for to regenerate such as be his. But if any demand, Whether the outward word or visible sign of baptism be altogether necessary? We answer, that indeed the inward word, whereby men be moved unto Christ, and reformed, is wholly required, if we speak of such as be of perfect age: but in young infants, neither the inward word, nor yet the outward, hath any place. But undoubtedly the outward word is the ordinary instrument, whereby God doth call them of ripe years unto salvation; although in some he useth only the inward word, after an extraordinary sort. For so he called Abraham out of his own native country, and instructed Adam immediately (as the School-divines term it) without any outward ministry. The sacrament also of baptism must not for any cause be contemned: for they which despise that, when they may attain unto it, shall not obtain regeneration. But if there be no opportunity to come unto it, it shall be no danger unto the godly man, which is converted unto Christ, although he be not baptized. And upon this occasion among the fathers, there was mention made of baptism, of blood, and of the spirit. And Ambrose writing of the death of Valentinian the Emperor, saith that he was not without the grace of baptism (seeing he burned in the desire thereof) although he were not baptized.

32. Howbeit, if I should be asked concerning the infants of Christians, which depart without this sacrament: mine answer should be, that we must have a good hope of them, and stick fast unto the word of God; namely, to the covenant made with Abraham, wherein God promiseth himself, not only that he would be a God unto him, but also unto his seed. Which promise, seeing it is not so general, as it comprehendeth all; therefore I dare not

promise certain salvation particularly unto any that departeth hence. For there be some children of the saints, which belong not unto predestination; such we read to be Esau, Ishmael, and others more, whose salvation is not hindered, in respect that they were not baptized. But yet, whilst we live here, the relics of this sin remain even in them that be regenerate: for original sin is not utterly rid away, no not by regeneration; indeed the guiltiness is taken away, and those things which remain, are not imputed unto us to our eternal destruction. But everything ought to be considered, by that which it is of itself: wherefore, if it be demanded of us, whether it be sin, that remaineth in the persons regenerate? We will answer it is sin. But and if thou shalt at any time read, that it is not sin: that thou must understand to be spoken of the guiltiness of sin: but of this matter we will speak more at large in another place. But at the time of death, this kind of sin shall altogether be abolished; for in the blessed resurrection we shall have a new made body, and a body made fit for eternal felicity. And in the meantime, while we live here, our old man and natural corruption doth continually pine away, that finally at the time of death it ceaseth to be at all. Now have we seen these three things; how original sin is derived, whereby it is taken away, and what we are to determine touching the remnant of the same.

33. Now let us speak of the punishment. Some of the School-divines think the same shall be without feeling. The Pelagians judged, that such should only be banished out of the kingdom of heaven; and appointed nothing else but that. But Pighius addeth this also, that those should be blessed with a certain natural happiness, which die having but this sin only; and that they shall love the Lord, with all their heart, with all their mind, and with all their strength, and shall set forth his name and praise. And although he dare

not teach these things for any certainty, yet he alloweth them as very likely. But Augustine *De fide ad Petrum*, and else-where, not once adjudgeth young infants to hell-fire, if they so die not regenerated. And the holy scriptures do seem to favor his part; for in the last judgment, there shall be but only a double sentence pronounced. There is no third place appointed between the saved and condemned. The Papists also, notwithstanding that they think there shall be a purgatory, until the day of judgment; yet do not appoint any mean place between both, after that day. And it is written evidently, that they which believe not in Christ, not only shall not have eternal life, but also that the wrath of God resteth upon them. And while we be enemies unto Christ, we be called the children of wrath: and there is no doubt, but God doth punish those, with whom he is angry. We will therefore say with Augustine, and with the holy scriptures, that they must be punished. But of the kind and manner of [punishment] we be able to define nothing; but that whereas there be diverse sorts of punishments in hell, (for so the scriptures affirm that it shall be easier for some than for other-some) it is credible concerning these, that seeing unto original corruption they joined not actual sin, they shall be the easilier punished. I always except the children of the elect; for we doubt not to number them among the company of believers, although they as yet believed not by reason of their age: even as they which be born of infidels, are reckoned among the unbelievers, although of themselves they withstand not the faith. So as the children of the godly, departing without baptism, by reason of the covenant that God hath made with their parents, may be saved; if they appertain to the number of such as be predestinate. Also I do except all others, if any there be, which by the secret counsel of God belong unto predestination.

34. Now these things thus ordered, we will come to the arguments of the Pelagians, whereby they thought themselves able to prove, that there is no original sin. The first of their arguments is, that it is not likely, that God will still persecute the sin of Adam, seeing he punished the same sufficiently long ago; especially for that the prophet Nahum saith, saith, that God will not twice judge for one and the self-same thing. I know some do answer, that God did not twice give judgment upon that sin, but once only; for that under one judgment, he comprehended Adam, and all his posterity. But that the matter may be the more plainly declared, I say, that in every one of us, so often as we be punished, there is a cause why we ought to be punished; and that therefore in every person is condemned not the fault of another, but his own proper fault. But and if we read that God doth revenge Adams fault in us, that must be so understood, because our corruption had the original from him. Even as if one being sick of the plague, doth infect others and they die: but if a man will say that they perished through the contagion of him, from whom they did draw their infection: that must be so understood, because he was the first which brought the plague, and infected others with the same. But that sentence of the prophet Nahum maketh nothing unto this purpose. Indeed Jerome, when he interpreteth that place, saith, that by those words Martion [the heretic] was confuted; for he falsely accused God, that he seemed in the Old Testament to be cruel, and a revenger; because he did bring most cruel punishments upon men. That thing Jerome saith must not be ascribed unto cruelty, but unto benignity: for it was not for any other cause, that God did so grievously punish men, among the Sodomites, in the general flood, and at other times, but to the end they should not perish everlastingly; for he was once [for all] revenged upon them, least afterward he should punish them again. But the same Jerome, because perhaps he saw

that these things were not very firm, objected against himself; By these words it may seem, that it is well with adulterers, if they be taken tardy: for so it shall come to pass, that while they receive temporal punishment, they escape the everlasting pains of hell. Wherefore he answereth, that the judge of this world cannot prevent the judgment of God; neither that it must be thought, that sins be blotted out by an easy punishment, which do deserve a grievous and long continued pain.

In these words of Jerome, two things are to be noted; one is, that in those days adultery was punished with death; another is, that that first interpretation seemed not to satisfy him. Whereupon he bringeth another exposition of the Jews; that God would signify unto us by these words, that the Assyrians should not bring to pass, that after the leading away of ten tribes, they should also enjoy the kingdom of Judah, as they had attempted to do under Hezekiah. God (saith he) will not permit, that a double trouble should arise; he is satisfied that he hath destroyed ten tribes, he will have the kingdom of Judah to be saved. Although this exposition be nothing against piety, yet it seemeth not to agree with the mind of the prophet; for he prophesied against Nineveh, the threatening's of God, and the subversion that should ensue. And when he was minded to exaggerate the punishment that was at hand, he saith, that such should be the violence of destruction to be brought by the Chaldeans, that there should be no need for the Lord to revenge the same again; for that he, by the first vengeance, would take sufficient punishment: for the empire of the Assyrians was utterly overthrown by the Chaldeans. And we be commonly wont to say of a man that is beaten even unto death, that he was so stricken dead with one blow, as he needed not the second blow. This is the scope, which the prophet taketh, and the proper sense of this place.

But touching the matter, we deny not, but that afflictions in godly men do tend unto that end, that (as Paul saith) They may not be condemned with this world; for they be fatherly corrections, whereby men be called to repentance. But here-hence must not be drawn a general rule, to the intent a measure should be prescribed unto God, that when he hath begun to punish men in this life, he cannot also punish them in time to come, if they depart from hence without faith and repentance. If they return unto God, they shall suffer nothing in another life: howbeit, not for that they have satisfied God by their punishments in this life; but because Christ paid for them the price of their redemption. Wherefore even as certain good things be given to the godly men in this life, which be pledges and entrances into another life; even so in the wicked, everlasting punishment is begun by the preparatives of afflictions in this life. Which also Christ doth seem to grant, when he saith; Fear him which can both destroy the body, and send the soul into hell-fire. By these things I suppose it evident enough, that the oracle of the prophet, which we have plainly expounded, appertaineth nothing unto that matter, which we have in hand.

35. Another of their arguments is taken out of the prophet Ezekiel; The son shall not bear the iniquity of his father, &c. To this we might answer at a word, as a little before we said; namely, that children do not bear the iniquity of their parents, but their own and proper iniquity, which cleaveth to everyone from his nativity. But seeing that place is wont to be one way expounded by some, and another way by others; we will briefly declare what we think fit concerning the same. This was a common proverb among the Jews; The fathers did eat sour grapes, and the children’s teeth be on edge. This proverb was not only remembered by Ezekiel, but also by Jeremiah in his 31st chapter. The meaning of which saying is this; Our

fathers have sinned, and we for them are punished. And as the Rabbins say; They which were of the kingdom of the ten tribes, seemed to ascribe these things unto Jeroboam the son of Nabat, which first made the golden calves. But they which were of the kingdom of Judah, referred those things unto Manasseh; for whose ungodliness they thought that the captivity was to light upon them, which the prophets had denounced. This proverb doth God reprove, and saith, that it should not be so hereafter; The souls (saith he) be mine: the son shall not bear the iniquity of his father, but everyone shall die in his own sin. Many would have these things to be understood concerning temporal punishment, because God in the 24th of Deuteronomy commanded, that parents should not be slain for the children's offense, nor yet the children for their parents. Which also Amazias the king of Judah observed, as it is written in the 14th chapter of the second book of Kings; for he executed the murderers of his father: but he spared the children of them, according to the commandment of the law. Which nevertheless was not always observed by the Israelites; for we read in the seventh chapter of the book of Joshua, that not only Achan was slain, by reason of the cursed things which he had retained [against God's commandment;] but also together with him, both his sons, and daughters, and cattle. But this was done by the special commandment of God, neither is it prejudicial to the law given in general.

36. Nevertheless, this exposition concerning the law civil, doth not concur with the prophets words: for the Jews did not complain of judicial punishment, or of that, which the prince laid upon them; but of those calamities, which God himself brought unto them; namely, of the spoil of their goods, of the destruction of the Jewish kingdom, and of the captivity of Babylon. Here they accused the judgments of the Lord, and made a

muttering that his ways were not right; wherefore some did interpret that place [to be meant] of eternal punishments, of the loss of grace, and of the spirit: the which things they say do happen to everyone for his own proper sins, and not for the sins of other. Yet in the mean time they affirm, that both children, for their parents; and people, for their prince's sake, do suffer temporal punishments: for God (say they) will punish the fathers in their children; for children are a certain part of their parents. And they say, that it is no absurd thing, if the children, by their afflictions do profit their parents; seeing they also by this means are called home to repentance, and that no injury is done unto them, if they die, seeing they be mortal. For that God doth wisely dispose the times either of living, or of dying; and that he doth pluck the children from their life, least either they should be corrupted with naughtiness, or else if they be already in sins, and in the state of damnation, they should not be more and more burdened: and that they may at one time or other make an end of naughty living. And unto this opinion Augustine seemeth not a little to incline, in his questions upon the book of Joshua, question the eighth and ninth. And they which would not have these remnants of original sin remaining after regeneration, are compelled so to say; for they cannot show, that in infants their own sins be punished, seeing they affirm them to have no sins. But we which say that they are altogether sins, do teach, that indeed they be not imputed unto eternal death; but yet that they be charged sometimes with certain punishments, to the intent it may be perceived that they displease God. But neither doth that exposition of Augustine sufficiently concur with the meaning of Ezekiel; for the prophet saith, that It shall not so come to pass afterward, that the children should say that they suffer temporal punishments (such as was exile and captivity) for their parents sakes. For the Lord saith; The son shall not bear

the iniquity of his father. Wherefore it availeth these men nothing at all, when they say, that this is true, concerning spiritual punishments, and in eternal damnation: for the prophet speaketh most plainly of bodily punishments of this life. There was another interpretation of Augustine, In *Enchiridio ad Laurentium* chapter 46, that this sentence was a prophesy concerning the benefit, which Christ would bestow upon us; for seeing that by his death, satisfaction is made even for original sin, the prophet saith: Hereafter the son shall not bear the sin of his father, but of his own. And it seemeth that Augustine was led to this opinion, because, when as Jeremiah in the 31st chapter doth write in a manner the same thing, there is straightway added a promise of the New Testament; Behold (saith he) the days shall come, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Judah. But it may seem, that this sense neither agreeth with the prophets meaning, which we recited before. Moreover, notwithstanding that Christ suffered at a certain time, yet by the virtue and grace of his death, the children also in the Old Testament were saved. What need was it therefore to say, Hereafter it shall not so be, seeing undoubtedly it was not so before?

Besides this, they also which be strangers unto Christ, do bear their own iniquity; neither do they suffer punishment for the offenses of others, but for their own. We say therefore that the sentence of the prophet is generally true; and that all, whether they be children, or of ripe age, as well of the Old Testament, as of the new, do everyone bear their own iniquity. For all those, which be born, have sin and corruption in themselves, for which they should be punished: so then, this sentence confirmeth our opinion; so far is it off, that the same can be alleged against us. But it maketh very much against Pighius; for he decreed, that the children do bear the sins of the parents, when as otherwise he saith, that they be clean, and are born without

sin. The Jews vaunted, that they were innocents, and that the torments which they abode, were for their parent's sakes; for they sinned, and not themselves. But God saith, that there should from thence forth be no place for that proverb; for he would declare by the prophet, a plentiful illumination, which should be of the holy spirit, in the New Testament: for that his judgments be not such, as he will punish any innocent person for the sin of another. And so he saith not, that it should henceforth not be so, as though it had been so at any time before: but this he saith, that it should not afterward happen for them to frequent such a proverb in their mouth, when they had once knowledge of the truth.

37. But the law seemeth to be against this exposition; for therein God saith, that He will visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation. These things appear to have but small concord, both that God doth avenge the iniquity of the fathers upon the children; and also that the children do not bear the sins of their parents. To satisfy this objection; first I will expound the words of the law: for so we shall understand, that between the prophet and the law, there is no contrariety. Some there be, which refer this sentence of the law unto the mercy of God, and some unto his severity and justice. They which think that the mercy of God is commended by these words, say, that God is so good and gracious, as he will not straightway destroy man, when he sinneth; but he will rather expect his repentance. And so sometimes, when he spareth the father which offendeth, yet he punisheth the son: sometime when he forbeareth both the father and the son, yet he punisheth the son's child; and sometime he deferreth the punishment unto the fourth generation. Which we see was done in Jehu the king of Samaria; for whereas he had grievously sinned, yet God did not bereave his posterity of the kingdom, until the fourth

generation was past. Wherefore by these words seemeth to be declared the goodness of God, which so long restraineth his wrath; neither doth he immediately pour out the same.

But others there be, which think, that the goodness of God is declared; seeing it is said, that He will do well unto those that love him, unto a thousand generations. But contrariwise, that his severity and justice may be known it is added; that he will persecute sins, not only against those which have sinned; but upon their children, and children's children also, even unto the fourth generation. Which they suppose may be declared by examples; for Amaleke did infest and vex the children of Israel with many evils, while they wandered through the wilderness: and a long space after his posterity was afflicted by the Israelites; and so afflicted, as at the last, God commanded Saul to destroy them utterly, even unto the last man. Also Jehezi the servant of Elisha, because he had received money in his masters name, of Naaman the Syrian; both he himself was stricken with a leprosy, and all his posterity ever after him. Both of these two opinions be godly, and may be confirmed by examples; yet the latter doth rather seem to agree with the text. But in what sort God doth persecute the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation, the law itself doth sufficiently declare: for it is added, Of them that hate me. Whereby it appeareth, that no other children shall bear the offenses of their forefathers, but such as shall be like unto them. And it is to be noted, that To hate God, is two manner of ways taken; either in act, as they speak; which is only proper to them of ripe age: or else by an inclination and corruption already conceived by nature, and this taketh place in infants.

38. But some man will object; If we understand that God doth only punish such as do imitate the vices of their forefathers, what need was there to add;

Unto the third and fourth [generation,] seeing punishment is to be done always against all sinners, whatsoever they shall be? With this objection Augustine was so troubled, as he said, that By this form of speaking; Unto the third and fourth generation, must be understood all posterity in general, and that a number definite is used for a number infinite: for if thou join four unto three, it maketh the number of seven; which is accustomed to be put for any other number. In the like manner he saith, it is written in the prophet Amos; For there wickedness's and for four I will not spare him: and he saith, this is the meaning of that place. If one shall once or twice offend, God may forgive him; but if he shall heap sin upon sin, and so shall proceed to immeasurable sinfulness, now God cannot forgive him. In this place three or four wickedness's are set down for the continuance of sins: and so God may be said to punish to the third and fourth generation, of them which hate him; when as he will use punishment against all such whatsoever they be. But it might be otherwise answered; namely, that God did therefore prescribe the third and fourth generation, to declare his wrath to be tempered and joined with benignity, that he may once stay his torments, and proceed no further forward in punishing. Albeit others there be, which think, that the third and fourth generation is particularly set down; because the posterity, so far forth are led to sin by the evil example of their progenitors: for none of the ancestors doth live past that time; for most commonly they die, when they have seen the fourth descent. Thus we see, that the words of the prophet are nothing at all repugnant unto the law, but do rather interpret the same. For therefore he saith, that the son shall not bear the fathers iniquity, because the law saith, that he doth persecute the sin of the fathers upon the children, if they also do follow the sins of their

parents: to the intent, that when they be punished, they may understand that they suffer for their own sins, and not for their parents.

And it is said, that God doth therefore punish the sins of the fathers upon them; because those sins had their beginning from them, and were continued unto the children. But and if that the children had not had fathers or grandfathers, which so had sinned; peradventure God would as yet have forborne his wrath: and even as through his patience he forbear their progenitors; so perhaps he would also have borne with them. But seeing that both their progenitors sinned, and they also do not avoid the example of them; God will no longer defer punishment, least he might seem to cast away the care of man's matters, and so others to sin the more securely. Yet nevertheless, they which be so punished, cannot be called innocent, seeing they likewise do hate God. Neither is that repugnant to these things, which Christ speaketh in John, concerning the man which was blind from his nativity; Neither did this man sin, neither his parents. For the meaning of that place is not, that the same blind man was punished without a cause: but this only is noted, that the providence of God directed that fault of the eyes unto another end, then for the punishment of the blind man: for he would take that occasion to celebrate the divinity of Christ. God doth so order his punishments, as he not only may punish by them; but also may compass other ends, which he to himself hath appointed. And thus far concerning the place of the prophet, whereby it may be understood, that the same place is not contrary unto the definition, which we have alleged: nay rather, the same sentence is to be reversed upon our adversaries, which affirm, that children are guilty of other men's faults.

39. The next reason was, that seeing as well the soul, as the body, are the works of God; and progenitors oftentimes may be pure and godly, and are

commended in the holy scriptures, and that marriage, and the act of procreation are praised; how hath sin crept in among so many fortresses of innocence? First of all we answer with Paul; By one man. And whereas they affirm, that the ancestors were clean and holy, that is false: for although that they were endued with godliness, and that original sin is to be forgiven them, so far forth as belongeth unto the guiltiness; yet nevertheless there remaineth still a corrupt nature, and an impure state in them. So that such a nature, as they themselves have, such do they yield unto their posterity: and that (as hath been said) by seed and generation. Neither doth that hinder anything, which some do imagine, that the body cannot work upon the spirit: for we say not, that the soul is corrupted by the body, thorough a natural action; but seeing the body is corrupted, it doth resist the soul. For the same, being not strengthened with those endowments, which it had at the beginning, is subject to the inclination of the body; and doth not rule, as meet it should; but is ruled by it. Moreover, natural reasons do also teach us, that there is a natural agreement between the body and the soul; for the soul is accustomed to be diversely affected, according to the temperature of the body: for they that abound with choler or melancholy, are wont to be angry or sad. So that, seeing this manner of reasoning proceedeth of false principles, it can conclude nothing.

Furthermore, there was brought a place out of the first to the Corinthians; Your children be holy. Then it is not probable, that they drew unto them original sin: for that holiness hath no agreement with sin. Some thus expound [the same,] to wit, that the children of Christians be holy, as touching civil action; that is to say, that they are to be taken as lawfully begotten, and not as bastards. But this doth not hold; for so the marriage of Christians should have no preeminence above the marriage of infidels: for

even the children of them, begotten through lawful matrimony, are legitimate, and become heirs. Others do interpret holiness to be godly education; for if a godly husband should depart from an ungodly wife perhaps the children would remain with the ungodly, and so they should be led from Christ. But if man and wife do live both together, the godly parent will always pour some godliness into the children. But neither in very deed doth this make with Paul's purpose; for godly education may also happen unto them which are begotten in adultery and fornication: which we perceive was done in Adeodatus the son of Augustine. Wherefore the apostle seemeth rather to mean, that some holiness doth redound unto the children from their parents, which nevertheless cannot depend of the flesh, but of the promise made in the covenant. For God promised unto Abraham, that he would not only be his God, but also the God of his seed. So as in the prophets, God doth name the young children of the prophets to be his own, and complaineth, that they did sacrifice his sons and daughters unto Moloch. And we sticking to the hope of this promise, do offer our young infants to be baptized in the church, because they belong unto God, and unto Christ; that the promise, which we have now spoken of, may be confirmed with some outward seal.

40. But thou wilt say, thou mayest be deceived; because perhaps thy child shall not appertain to the number of the elect. I answer, that the same difficulty may happen, even to them of ripe years: for it may be, that one professeth faith with a feigned heart, or may be led only by the persuasion of man, or may have faith but for a time; so that in very deed he appertaineth not to the elect. But the minister hath not respect unto these things, but only regardeth the confession which the party to be baptized doth profess: and he will say, that God's election is hidden unto him, and

that therefore he doth not much trouble himself thereabout: that concerning particular things, he is able to determine nothing, but waiteth upon the general promise; from the which, although many be excluded, yet that it is none of his part to define which they be. So Paul speaketh of the Jews; If the root be holy, the branches also shall be holy; If the first fruits be holy, so is the whole batch or lump. By which words he showeth, that God's favor was inclined unto the Jews, by reason of the promise, and for their fathers; and that for the same cause salvation was due unto them. Although therefore this promise be indefinite, and that many be excluded from the same; yet nevertheless it remaineth stable: for there be always some of them converted unto Christ, and shall be converted even unto the end. Which appeareth in Isaac, unto whose seed, although God promised that he would be gracious; yet the same promise took place in Jacob only, not in Esau: and yet was that no cause why Esau should not be circumcised.

Even so, we confess that the children of the Christians, which appertain unto the election of God, be holy; but yet they be infected with original sin, because they are by nature the children of wrath, even as others be. But if so be God do not put away the guiltiness, and impute it not unto them against their salvation; that have they by the grace and free mercy of God, not of the pureness of their own nature. Seeing then they be born of a corrupted lump, and belong unto the election; we affirm both that they be holy, and are also by nature the children of wrath. Wherefore it appeareth in what sort this argument must now be discussed. But they add, that in infants there is nothing spoken, done, or thought against the law of God, and so they have no sin. How shamefully they err in this place, it appeareth by those things, which we have already spoken. This is even as much as if they should say; They have no actual sin, Therefore they have no sin: for to argue from the

particular to the general by a negative, is the worst kind of reasoning. But they be deceived, because they follow not the general nature of sin, which I have before described, in such sort as it comprehendeth all things, which are by any means repugnant to the law of God.

41. They object likewise, that it is not rightly said, that original sin is spread abroad by means of the seed and flesh; because those things have a senseless and dull nature, and therefore be not capable of sin. But I have already said, that sin is not in them, but by original as in the root: and then the nature of sin is perfected, when the soul is once joined thereunto. We have declared also, how we are to answer the Pelagians, seeing they affirm, that those things, which are spoken by Paul to the Romans, should be understood of imitation. For first of all, that cannot agree with all the sayings of the apostle; for he saith, that All men have sinned, and by the disobedience of one, many are become sinners: And that which is the more firm, he hath proved; that Therefore sin was in the world, before the law, because death reigned from Adam unto Moses. There were reasons which Augustine used against the Pelagians, which now we need not to repeat. Beside these, they add, that men's afflictions, and death itself are natural; for that we have those fountains in us, even of nature, from whence they flow. But we answer, that these fountains were not so ordained, when man's nature was first instituted; but were afterward defiled and corrupted, in such sort as we now perceive them to be. The philosophers resolve those effects which they see, into those principles which be now extant: but that Christians do rather refer them unto the word of God.

Seeing therefore the scripture teacheth, that death came by sin, and that man, as he was created, might always have lived; let Pighius, and those which follow him, see how truly and godly they affirm, that death comes

unto man by nature. And they add, that that ought not to be accounted sin, which cannot be avoided. But this is found false, for that the law is proposed to us, which no man is able perfectly to perform, or to avoid all offenses against it. In considering of sins, we must not inquire whether anything be done casually, or necessarily; but alonely whether it be repugnant, or else agreeable with the law of God: and by this balance sin must be weighed. Wherefore it is vain and trifling, which they do bring against us, concerning necessity. Last of all they object, that if the sin of our first parents be derived unto the posterity, there can be no reason found, why the sins also of the next parents should not in like manner be conveyed unto the posterity: which if we do grant, they think, that would follow, which is most absurd; namely, that the state of us, which are born in this latter time, would be most miserable: for that there should be laid to our charge, not only the sins of our first parents, but also the sins of all our progenitors.

42. The School-men have thought, that it cannot possible be, that the sins of the next parents can pass into the children: and they seem to be induced so to say, for two causes specially. The first is, that the next parents do only communicate nature to their children, and such other things as of themselves do accompany nature: but that they do not communicate special properties, and things accidental, unless the same things perhaps appertain unto the body. For oftentimes the diseases that come by kind, as the leprosy, or the gout, do pass unto the children; but the qualities of the mind be not derived, neither do appertain unto procreation: for a Grammarian begetteth not a Grammarian, nor one Musician begets not another; and so they say, that seeing sins appertain unto the mind, those cannot be derived from the parents. Another reason is; The first parents had original righteousness, the

which was not only planted in the mind, but also in the body and members. And therefore in procreation they might infuse into their children, the want of this righteousness; seeing the same did stick in the body and the flesh. But the actual sins, which afterward followed, seeing they do appertain unto the mind, cannot be derived unto the children; yet Augustine in his *Enchiridion ad Luarentium*, and in the 46th chapter, saith; It is probable, that the sins, even of the next parents, are communicated with the children: for the proof whereof he compareth together the two places of the scripture before handled by us.

In so much as God saith, that He will persecute the sins of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation: whereas he saith in another place, that The son shall not bear the fathers offense; If the child (saith he) doth not bear the fathers iniquity, (but his own) and yet God visiteth the sin of the father in him, it must needs be, that the son hath in himself that sin: otherwise these places would not agree together. Wherefore sin was so made in the nature thereof, that it not only destroyeth the mind of man, but also corrupteth both the body, the flesh, and the members. Therefore Paul saith unto the Corinthians, that Our bodies be the temples of the holy Ghost; and doth heavily threaten the man, which destroyeth the temple of God. Now then, if God punish the sins of the parents upon the children, and the child beareth not the iniquity of another, but only his own; it followeth, that the infants of wicked men, when they be afflicted, should have in themselves some of their father's naughtiness; to the end that the fathers may be punished in them. Neither ought any here to complain of God's justice; for if God, by his most sincere justice, can deliver those which do sin, into a reprobate sense, and punish sins with sins: what let is there, that he will not (and that justly) have the corruption of sin,

not only to destroy the soul, but that the impurity thereof doth also flow into the body; so as they, which be begotten of sinners, do draw such a nature from them, as they find in them? And by this doctrine men be admonished to live purely, lest they pollute both their minds and their bodies, and by the same means do also infect their children.

43. If this be determined, which we have said, some will demand; What the difference is between original sin, and that which is drawn from the next parents? We answer, that the propagation of original sin is continual, even as the holy scriptures do teach; but the continuation of other sins is not of necessity: for sometimes there is no sin poured from the next parents into their children; original sin excepted. For it seemeth that God hath prefixed a measure, lest evil should abound beyond all; and that he doth temper this propagation of evil. And this doth experience teach; for Hezekiah, a most godly prince, had king Achaz for his father, a most wicked man: and again, the same Hezekiah begat Amon a most wicked child, who also begat Manasseh well worse than himself. Or else, if the beginnings and entrances of sin be poured from the parents into the children; yet God will sometimes minister such grace, favor, and strength unto them, as they may be able to overcome them. But this way these sins differ not from original sin: for grace is granted unto the godly, that they may also have the victory thereof. Further, when God doth of ill parents give good children; he showeth the power of his goodness, wherewith he represseth the corruption and infection of the parents, that it should not pass into the children. And again, forsomuch as he bringeth to pass, that of good parents there be begotten evil children; he hath regard least the godliness of the children should be judged to come for the merits of their parents. For they cannot pour out grace from them to their children, by the procreation of their body, seeing it is a thing

altogether spiritual; neither hath it any natural intercourse or acquaintance with the flesh.

Wherefore, seeing honesty and godliness is a mere and pure gift of God; God doth verily promise, that he will be beneficial unto the posterity of godly men, even to a thousand generations. But that must not be understood, as though some deserts were meant to be in the ancestors: for God is led to make this promise only of his mercy, and not through man's merits. But that he may declare what liberty he himself hath, he sometimes suffereth it to happen otherwise; and by that means he teacheth, that holy parents are not so holy, but that they have as yet much naughtiness and corruption in them, which they may perceive to be engendered in their children. Through this we may acknowledge the corruption of our nature, seeing it waiteth upon the godly sort, even to their grave. Yet for the further establishing of this opinion, some do allege out of the Psalm, the prayer of the church against the children of the wicked; That they may be fatherless; that none may have compassion of them; that they may beg their bread. If the children of the wicked be innocents, this prayer is not just; whereby it seemeth necessarily to be gathered by these words, that they be partakers of their parents wickedness: but forsomuch as they be infants, this can come to pass by no other means than by propagation. I know there be diverse, which would have these words of David to be prophesies of things to come, whereby the holy Ghost did foreshow, that these evils should fall upon them. But let us grant that they be prophesies; yet it cannot be denied, but in them is both the form and inclination of prayer: but it is meet that prayer be just, for otherwise it were no prayer.

44. But whereas they say, that that is most absurd, which may arise of this doctrine; namely, that the last men also should be more miserable than all

other, in so much as they should bear the sins, as well of Adam, as of all their forefathers; that is two ways to be answered. For first, not all things which seem absurd unto us, are absurd also with God. For let us go no further than this very matter; Christ threateneth the Jews, that all the blood of the godly, even from Abel, unto Zechariah the son of Barachie, should be laid unto their charge. And who seeth not, that the state of those children of Israel was more miserable, which were led into captivity, than many generations of their forefathers, which had defiled themselves with the same sins? Again, we answer; Indeed that would be absurd, if the forefathers sins should continually pass from them to their children. But seeing we have declared, that the same cometh not always to pass, but that God's providence hath limited and measured this evil, and that he hath expressly pronounced thereof touching only the third and fourth generation; there is nothing which should seem absurd unto any man. But the reasons of the School-men, wherewith they wrestle against this propagation, are very feeble. First, they presume, that the properties of the mind are not communicated by the parents unto their children: which experience teacheth to be false. For we oftentimes see, that of testy or angry persons, there be angry children born; and sad of sullen parents. Neither doth this similitude serve them to any purpose, in that they say, that one Grammarian is not born of another; or one Musician of another: for these be arts, which be attained by precepts and exercise; and not affections, which be bred in men. And yet sometimes we see by experience, that in what art the father doth chiefly excel, he hath children of apt inclination to the same: be it husbandry, be it warfare, or be it liberal science. Moreover, we chiefly entreat in this place of those affections, which be the springs and beginnings of actions.

In another argument they say, that sin in parents doth only corrupt the mind; which is not true: for as we have taught before, their body is also polluted; so as it is no marvel if fathers do communicate such bodies unto their children. As touching this therefore I do willingly agree with Augustine, that it is a thing probable and agreeable to the scriptures. And this doctrine is allowed of Martin Bucer, a very godly and no less learned man, the private sins are derived from the parents unto the children. But it must be considered, that this is contingent, and not of necessity: for God sometime suspendeth the sin of the parents, and for his goodness sake, doth not suffer man's nature to be utterly destroyed. But when he will either repress this derivation of sin, or else suffer it to take place, he himself only knoweth. Howbeit, unto us it is enough to consider of these two things; first, that sin is poured out from the fathers into the children; secondly, that the same is sometimes prohibited by the benefit of God, which nevertheless cannot any ways be said of original sin: for we be all born infected therewith. And thus far out of the epistle unto the Romans, the fifth chapter, upon these words; Even as by the disobedience of one, &c.

*Look the like place In Gen. 8.*

**These things I thought good to add out of the fifth to the Romans upon these words; Even as by one man, &c.**

45. To the end that these words of the apostle may be plainly understood, let us examine three things, which are set forth by him; first, what the apostle meaneth by sin; secondly, what that one man is, by whom sin entered into the world; thirdly, by what means sin is spread abroad. As concerning the first, the apostle doth use this word sin generally and largely, that he may signify all that is against the law of God, and against his will. For by this sin, man depareth from the creation of nature, and from the

image whereunto he was created: for God so made him at the beginning, that in him should shine forth his image; but that happeneth not, when we contend against the law of God. And this is the only and true cause, why man is not permitted to delight himself with every kind of pleasure; for if he should do so, he should draw near unto the nature of brute beasts, and not unto the similitude of God his creator: and God would have him to be his deputy in this world, and therefore to be most like unto him. Surely, if sin be understood thus at large, it doth not comprehend only original sin, that is, our depraved nature, and the corrupt powers both of our body and soul; but also all those evils which do ensue upon the same: namely, the first motions of the mind unto things forbidden, wicked deliberations, naughty endeavors, and corrupt customs. Wherefore the apostle, under the name of sin, comprehendeth both the root itself, and also all the fruit of the same.

Neither must they be hearkened unto, which babble that these things be no sins; for seeing the holy Ghost calleth them by this name, I see no cause why we also ought not so to speak and stand unto his doctrine. And moreover the very etymology of the word itself doth show, that the first motions of the mind, and corruption of nature be sins: for this word ἁμαρτία, that is, Sin, cometh of this verb ἁμαρτάνειν, which signifieth, To err from the right scope appointed, by what means soever the same cometh to pass. And seeing it is the rule of our nature, and of all our actions, that we should be very conformable to God in all things: surly we being then prone unto those things which be forbidden us by the law of God, and even at the first push are carry straight headlong unto them; without all controversy we must be said to sin, that is, to err from the scope, and from the end appointed unto us. The like signification there is of the Hebrew word; for that which is in that tongue called *Chataa*, is derived from the word *Chata*,

which thou shalt find in the book of Judges, the 20th chapter used in the self-same sense, wherein I declared the Greek word ἁμαρτάνειν to be taken: that is, To miss the mark. For it is there written of the seven hundred children of Benjamin, that they were wont so to throw stones out of a sling, as they could hit even a hear, and would not miss one whit. Besides this, experience itself teacheth, how grievous these evils are, even in us, which be regenerate: for we be so hindered by them, as we cannot fulfill the law; the which nevertheless we are bound to observe in every point. We are also commanded not to lust, to the which precept everyone giveth his secret consent, and is witness to himself how much he doth withstand, by reason of our proneness unto sins, and first motions unto vices.

But if the Fathers do seem to write sometime, that the law may be fulfilled by men regenerated in Christ, they spake of an obedience begun, and of such a kind of fulfilling, as hath much imperfection joined therewith. For they pronounce them to be perfect, and to perform the law of God, which can perceive their own imperfection, that they may daily say with others; Lord forgive us our trespasses: and acknowledge with Paul, that they have a great way further to go. Also the same Fathers do confess, that there is found none, no not the holiest, that hath most perfectly loved all virtues. For as Jerome saith; He that excelleth other in one virtue, doth oftentimes fail in another. And he citeth Cicero, who said, that There cannot easily be found one, which is most excellent, either in the knowledge of the law, or in the art of Rhetoric: but to find one that excelled in both kinds together, it was never heard of. Wherefore, that the apostle may make famous and renowned the entire benefit of God, through Christ bestowed upon us; he not only toucheth original sin, but also comprehendeth under one name of sin, all kinds of vices, which do flow from thence.

46. Now we must see, by which one man it is, that Paul saith, sin had such an entrance into the world. The same undoubtedly was the first Adam, who was as a certain common lump or mass, wherein was contained all mankind: which lump being corrupted, we cannot be brought forth into the world, but corrupted and defiled. And although Eve transgressed before the man, yet is the original of sinning ascribed unto Adam; because the succession is accounted in men, and not in women. Howbeit Ambrose; by One man, understood it to be Eve. But seeing that word One [in that place] is the masculine gender, the signification thereof cannot but hardly, and with much wrestling be applied to the woman. Others do think, that under the common name of man, both of them, as well Adam as Eve, are understood: so that this speech may not differ much from that, which is in the first chapter of the book of Genesis; Male and female created he them. Neither do they much regard this adjective, One, because the scriptures testify, that Adam and Eve were all one flesh. The first interpretation is the more sincere and easy; therefore I willingly follow the same. But we must remember, what Paul writeth unto Timothy, that although both those two first parents sinned, yet there was not one manner of transgression in them both: for he saith that Adam was not deceived. Which is gathered by that, which they answered God, when he reproved them: for the woman being asked wherefore she did it, she accused the serpent; The Serpent (saith she) deceived me. But Adam, when he was demanded the same question, said not, that he was deceived: but he said, The woman, whom thou hast given me, delivered me an apple, and I did eat. These things must not so be understood, as though we affirmed, that no error did happen unto man, when he transgressed: for as it is plainly taught in the Ethics; In every kind of sin there always happeneth some error.

This only we be taught, that man was not seduced by so gross a guile, as the women was. And this did very much further Paul's reason; for in the same place, he willed the woman to keep silence in the church, because she was an instrument fit to deceive. And this he confirmed by the example of the first parents; for she that persuaded man to sin, it is not likely that she can rightly instruct him: and she that could be seduced by the devil, and deceived by the serpent, it is not meet for her to bear office in the church. Yet the book of Ecclesiasticus saith that sin had his first beginning from the woman; which is not to be denied, if we consider the history of the book of Genesis. But Paul, (as we have already said) doth keep the usual manner of the scriptures, which ascribeth succession and procreation unto men, and not unto women. For his purpose was, not to teach at that time, whether of them did first sin, Adam or Eve: but his meaning was to show the root, out of which sin was spread in the world. And so is that likewise answered, which might be objected out of the book of wisdom; that Through the envy of the devil, sin came into the world. Also John writeth, that The devil did sin from the beginning. For here is not treated of the imitation of the sin of another, or of the persuasion to sinning; otherwise it is true, that the first example of sin came from the devil, and he was the very persuaded and author of transgressions. But this is now the scope of the apostle, to teach out of what thing, as from the beginning, sin was conveyed by propagation to mankind. And that this is the meaning of the apostle, it may be proved by that Antithesis [or contrary comparison] which he maketh between Christ and the first Adam. For the Lord did not restore us, or make us just, only by laying an example before us of following him, or by showing himself to be a most faithful admonisher; but by altogether changing us, and making us new by the spirit and grace. Whereupon Augustine doth seem to have

rightly expressed the discommodity brought by Adam, when he saith, that He brought mankind into a consumption; by which word he signifieth, that he by a certain contagion infected us all.

47. But against this doctrine the Pelagians are wont to use this argument; That which hath no being, cannot hurt; But original sin (if any be) is already wiped away by faith in Christ, and by baptism, and doth not remain; Therefore it cannot hurt the children which are baptized. But that which these men take, as granted; namely, that original sin is abolished in the believers, and in them which be baptized, that is not perfectly true. For in every sin, two things must be weighed; the action, or lewd affection, which is as it were the matter and offense or bond unto punishment, which they call guiltiness. But original sin herein differeth from those sins, which they call actual; because in them, the matter continueth not still: for so soon as one hath committed either adultery, or hath spoken blasphemy, the thing being done, those actions do forthwith cease, and are no more extant: only the offense against God, and the guiltiness remaineth. Wherefore, seeing by faith and repentance the bond unto punishment, or the offense against God is remitted; we may easily grant, that the whole sin is abolished. But in original sin, the consideration is otherwise; because the matter thereof passeth not away: for every one of us hath experience in himself, that the corruption of nature remaineth; seeing as yet also we run headlong continually into sin: but unto divine things, we be unapt both in body and in mind, which sins notwithstanding are not imputed unto the faithful. For the guiltiness and offense against God is forgiven in baptism, through faith in Christ, although the matter of sin be still remaining; which matter, though it be broken, and made of slender force in the godly; yet we shall not attain to the perfect abolishing of the same, until such time as we die.

And seeing men which be regenerate, do procreate children; not in respect that they be regenerate, but by nature and flesh; thereof it comes to pass, that the children also of believers are born subject unto original sin. For into them is poured the same defiled and corrupt nature that is in the parents; when as yet on the other side, forgiveness or imputation, which are apprehended by faith, cannot be poured into them. For the explicating of this matter, Augustine useth two similitudes. One is of the grains of corn, which although they be sown into the ground, being purged of their small leaves, chaff, straw, and ears; yet they grow up again with all those things: which hereof cometh to pass, because that cleansing cometh not unto those grains by nature, but by the art and industry of men: and forsomuch as the corn springeth not of these principles of art and industry, but of nature; it must needs be, that when they are sprung up, they follow the order of their own nature, and not of human industry. The other similitude is, of a man circumcised, who nevertheless begetteth a child with his foreskin; which cometh to pass, because circumcision was not in the father by nature, but by violence used outwardly: and seeing that children are not begotten by that outward power, but by the inward strength of nature; it is of necessity, that when they are begotten, they do follow the order of nature: and therefore we bring forth no other children, but such as we ourselves are. Seeing then we have in us the infection of original sin, they cannot be without the same: but we cannot impart unto our children, the remission and forgiveness of that sin; for that must be hoped for at the hand of God only.

The very same thing we see happeneth in sciences and virtues, which although they be in the parents; yet they are not derived unto their issue; whereby it appeareth sufficiently, wherein the Pelagians were deceived. Neither can any man justly accuse us for these things, as though we pluck

anything away, either from faith, or baptism. For unto baptism we grant plentifully, that it sealeth unto us the remission of the guiltiness, and of the offense; and also grace, and the holy Ghost, and engrafting into Christ, and that it sealeth unto us the right to eternal life. Yet it followeth not thereof, that by it is abolished the corruption of nature, or the continual nourishment of sin. Wherefore Paul rightly saith, that By hope we are saved. But it is a great marvel, how the Pelagians can deny, that there is original sin in infants; seeing they perceive them to die every day. For the scripture manifestly teacheth, that The reward of sin is death, and the sting of death is sin. Therefore, whom so ever thou shalt seclude from sin, him also thou must of necessity seclude from death: for by the testimony of the scripture, these are compared together, as the cause and the effect. But here we must except Christ only, who notwithstanding he knew not sin, yet for our sakes he died: but death had no dominion over him; for he of his own accord suffered it for our salvation. But to affirm, that there be some without sin, although all men do die, is even to join together things which be repugnant and contrary one with another. But besides this place, there be a great many of others also, which may prove, that infants be not without sin: for David saith; Behold I am conceived in iniquity, and in sin hath my mother conceived me. And Paul to the Ephesians calleth us The children of wrath by nature. And in Genesis it is written; The heart of man is prone to evil even from his infancy. Also there be many other places, which serve for this purpose, besides these which are brought forth by us.

48. Now, seeing it hath been declared of me, what the apostle meaneth by Sin; and by what One man the same is entered into the world: there remaineth to consider, by what means the same hath been spread abroad. The matter indeed is obscure and very hard, and therefore I purpose the less

to stand upon it. For seeing the word of God doth plainly teach us, that there is original sin, and that it is conveyed over unto the posterity; although we understand not the manner and way how it is poured [into them,] yet we must yield unto truth, and not to be too careful, or to trouble ourselves in reasoning more than is necessary, as touching the way and manner, which is hard to be known, and may without damage be left unknown. Howbeit, I will not think much to rehearse those means, which I have observed amongst the Ecclesiastical writers; whose opinions, touching this matter, are four in number. The first is of them, which supposed that we receive of the parents the soul, together with the body; that even as God, by human seed, doth frame the body; so of the same, he createth the soul. This opinion Augustine mentioneth, in his tenth book upon *Genesis ad literam*, and in many other places; and did never (so far as I can remember) disallow the same: yea rather he saith, that by this doctrine may be dissolved this knot of original sin. Tertullian, and many of the ancient writers, favored this opinion; whose arguments when I examine diligently, I judge them probable, but yet not necessary: for that which they allege out of the 46th chapter of the book of Genesis, touching the 66 souls, which came forth of Jacob's thigh; it may be expounded not unfitly by the figure Synecdoche: so that by the soul, which is the chief part of man, is understood the body, which without controversy is begotten of the seed of parents. Also by the soul we may understand the grosser parts of the soul; such be the vegetative part, and the sensitive part, which doubtless are procreated of the seed. And that the holy scriptures sometime use this word Soul in that sense, Christ testifieth in the Gospel, where he saith; He that loseth his soul for my sake, shall find it.

Another of their reckons (as Augustine writeth in his tenth book upon Genesis) is this; In the creation of the woman, it is not written that God breathed into her a living soul: whereupon they gather, that she had not only her body from Adam, but her soul also. But this reason Augustine judgeth weak: for it might be replied upon, that it had been once already said, that God breathed a soul into Adam, and that therefore there needed no repetition thereof. For if there had been a new manner of procreation of souls brought in, the scripture would not have passed it over with silence: but seeing the scripture maketh no mention at all of a new manner, we ought to use that which it had before expressed; especially, seeing we see that Adam said of his wife; This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: but did not add, And soul of my soul; the which had been more sweeter, and had rather served to express the knitting of matrimony. But Augustine confesseth, that the doubt is not therefore dissolved: for if we affirm that there be souls created every day, and so created, as in the bodies of them there goeth before no means of seed, which he calleth [*Ratio seminalis*,] then God shall not seem to have perfectly ceased from all his works the seventh day; seeing he still every day createth souls of nothing. But unto this argument it may peradventure be answered; that in the body derived from parents, it is sufficient if there be found qualities and conditions, whereby it is able to receive a reasonable soul, and this is that *Seminalis ratio* here spoken of.

49. But whatsoever is to be said as touching these arguments and answers, so it is, that Augustine altogether inclineth this way, that at the lest wise he thinketh, that the soul of Christ proceeded not from the blessed virgins by propagation. Which he saith that others also did judge besides himself, and that they did affirm that the same might be proved by the epistle to the

Hebrews: for there it is thus said, that The priesthood of Christ did excel the priesthood of Aaron, because Christ is a priest according to the order of Melchizedek. And the priesthood of Melchizedek was more excellent than the priesthood of Aaron, because Levi gave tenths unto Melchizedek: for he was in the loins of Abraham, who paid tithes unto Melchizedek. But Christ also should have been no less in the loins of Abraham, than was Levi, if he had received both his soul and his body from him. And so in this respect the dignity of each priesthood had been alike, seeing either of them in Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek. But here they, which favor that opinion, might answer; that there was besides, some other manner of difference between Christ and Levi: because, albeit both of them were in the loins of Abraham, as well concerning the body, as touching the soul; yet did not both of them after one manner derive their nature from him. For Christ was born of the virgins, by the means of the holy Ghost; but Levi was begotten and born, after the ordinary manner that other men be procreated. Wherefore Augustine passeth over this reason, and bringeth another out of the book of Wisdom, wherein is written, as he thinketh, under the person of Christ; I have by lot obtained a good soul. For he thinketh, that this phrase of speech can have no place, if the soul of Christ had been derived by way of propagation, through the law of nature from his forefathers; unless we shall affirm, that nature doth work by chance. And he thinketh, that this word [Lot] did therefore take place in the soul of Christ, to the intent we should understand, that those ornaments, which we know were most abundant and plentiful in it, were not bestowed thereupon for any merits going before, but thorough the mere mercy of God: and that this was a very great ornament of the soul of Christ, to be joined to one and the self-same substance, and person with the word of God. But this testimony, forsomuch as it is not had

out of the holy scriptures, which are reckoned canonical, it hath no great force.

Last of all, he leaveth indifferent the question as touching the derivation of souls [from parents] as a thing each way probable. And because they, which are against it, are wont to cite this place out of the 33rd Psalm; Which fashioned the hearts of them severally: this (saith he) is also weak, because even they which defend the derivation of the soul [from parents] deny not, but that the souls be created by God, although they affirm that the same is done by a mean. For so we read in the book of Genesis, that the birds were not created of nothing, but at the commandment of God they issued forth out of the waters. And every one of us is said to be dissolved into the earth, from whence we were taken; when as nevertheless we have not bodies immediately out of the earth, but of the bodies of our parents. Thus this opinion cannot be confuted, and overthrown by the scriptures. Although I know, this is the opinion received in the church, that the souls are in creating, infused, and in infusing are created. Neither have I recited these things, to the intent that I would have any alteration concerning this doctrine; but that it may only be understood, what manner of propagation of original sin seemed most easy unto some of the ecclesiastical writers. And surly the School-men, when they refuse this doctrine, they only use natural reasons; to wit, that forsomuch as the reasonable soul in nature is altogether spiritual and indivisible, it cannot be sundered: which thing is required in derivation of the souls [from parents.] And for that they hold it to be the understanding part, and a thing of more worthiness, than that it can be drawn out of the matter or substance itself; they earnestly affirm, that it must not have his being by generation, but by creation.

50. Augustine assigneth another way in his book *De nuptijs & concupiscentia*, and in many other places, where he disputeth against the Pelagians touching this kind of sin: and this he saith; that This vice is supposed to pass into the children, through the pleasure, which the parents take in the fellowship of nature. But this reason of propagation leaneth to a suspected ground, and in my judgment an untrue: for that pleasure, which is taken of procreation, is not evil in his own nature, unless a naughty desire come unto it. For if that action should of necessity have sin joined therewith, the holy Ghost would not exhort any man thereunto; which yet he doth, when he persuadeth us unto matrimony: and when as by Paul he admonisheth them, which be coupled in wedlock, to yield mutual benevolence one towards another. Howbeit, admit it were so; grant we that through man's infirmity there be some fault therein: it would follow thereof, that only this kind of lust is derived unto the children. But the infection of original sin, consisteth not only in those things, which appertain unto carnal desires; but also in other lusting's, after riches, honors, revengements, and finally in the whole corruption of our nature.

The third way is, that God doth therefore create the soul, with such an imperfection or defect; because it must become the soul of man now damned, and appointed to be under the curse. Such a soul (say they) God createth, as unto such a man is required: even as we see, unto the body of a dog is given such a life, as is meet for a dog; and unto the body of an asse, such a life as is requisite for an asse. But this seemeth to be a very hard opinion; namely, that God should contaminate with sin, a soul which as yet appertained not to Adam; especially, seeing they cannot say, that this kind of sin is the punishment of another sin, which went before. Wherefore, this devise is rejected among all men, least we make God to be absolutely the

author of sin. The fourth manner is embraced by the consent of a great many, and it seemeth very like to be true; namely, that the soul is not created sinful, but straightway draweth sin unto it, so soon as ever it is joined to the body derived from Adam. For seeing it wanteth those graces and virtues, wherewith the soul of the first man was endued, and also hath obtained a body subject unto the curse, and hath instruments unapt and little meet to spiritual works: therefore, when it should rule the body, it is grieved, and oppressed by the same, and is drawn unto such lusts as are agreeable to the body. For it is weakened on each side, both with the unpureness of the body, and the imbecility of itself: because it is destitute of that power, wherewith it should vanquish nature. Upon which two principal points, the corruption and naughtiness of the whole nature doth depend. I have now spoken so much as I thought should be meet for this present purpose, what the apostle meaneth by this word Sin; by whom he saith it is spread abroad over mankind; and what the ecclesiastical writers have taught, concerning the manner how it hath been conveyed from one to another.

**That sin is the cause of death.**

51. But against the Pelagian errors, Augustine disputeth earnestly in his book *De peccatorum meritis & remission*, where he declareth, that The body of the first man was not of necessity subject unto death: yet was he mortal, because, if he did sin, he was to die. But he would not that it should be lawfully said; This is mortal, Therefore it shall utterly die. Even as we grant, that our flesh is in such case, as it may be wounded; and yet it may come to pass that it shall not be wounded. The body also of man (as I may say) is in case to be sick, whereas nevertheless it chanceth many times, that some do die before they be sick. Therefore he saith, that the state of Adams

body was such, as although he might die; yet unless sin did happen, he should be preserved from death by God: even as the garments and shoos of the Hebrews by the power of God were not consumed or worn by the space of forty years in the wilderness, as we read in the 19th chapter of Deuteronomy. And he thinketh, that as concerning this condition, Enoch and Elias have now the state of Adams body; because they be preserved from death: yea, whether they be sustained without meat, or else do use such sustenance as God prepareth for them. For the first man had meats, wherewith he might be nourished; and he did eat other fruits to withstand the defects of nature. But the tree of life [was against old age;] for by the same tree it came to pass, that the decayed matter, which was amended, should be of no less goodness and perfection, than that which was lost. But seeing the same cometh not to pass in us, we both are troubled with old age, and at last death catcheth hold of us. In Adam therefore there was a state of mortality, but yet such, as was to be swallowed up by the benefit of God, when he should at his due time be translated unto the chief felicity.

Whereby Augustine judged, that we may perceive the greatness of the benefit of Christ, seeing he hath restored us unto more than Adam took from us: because that through Christ, not only life is restored unto us, and death chased away; but mortality also at the resurrection shall he taken away. For we shall not be able to die; which thing Paul teacheth when he writeth, that This mortal shall put on immortality. And [that saying] unto the Romans seemeth to make with this doctrine, when he saith; But if Christ do dwell in us, verily the body is dead by reason of sin. In which place he saith not, that our body is mortal through sin; but is dead, that is to say, subject unto death. Afterward he addeth; His spirit which hath raised Christ from the dead, shall quicken your mortal bodies. This he spake of the

resurrection, wherein our bodies must be quickened, which he called mortal, but not dead; that thou mayest understand, that not only death shall be taken from them, but also that they shall be mortal no more. And whereas the Pelagians think, that death is allegorically to be taken for the fall of souls; it can in no wise be allowed, seeing it is written in the fifth to the Romans; By one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death. But if that only the death of souls he brought by Adam, why did Paul express twain; who not only said, Sin, but he also added Death? Moreover, the testimony of the book of Genesis doth most plainly convince them, wherein man's punishment is thus recited; Earth thou art, and into earth thou shalt return. Which saying these men are constrained, whether they will or no, to ascribe unto the death of the body; unless they dare affirm, that our souls be fashioned of earth, and into earth shall be dissolved. And whereas they objected, that we have a body by nature compact of contraries; if forceth not much, because the same preservation doth not depend of nature, but of God: as the scriptures declare to be done, as touching the garments and shoes of the Hebrews.

But of what thing he meaneth death, it cannot better be perceived, than by an Antithesis, or comparing of it with the contrary, which is with life. But life is of two sorts; the one wherewith we be moved to spiritual, to divine, and to heavenly good things; and the same cometh to pass, so long as we be joined together with God: for unless we be set on by the spirit of God, we cannot proceed unto those things, which do surpass our own nature. Another life is, wherewith we be moved to pursue those good things, which make to the preservation of nature, and maintenance of our bodily state. Both of these lives, did death, which was laid upon us for sin, take away. For death is nothing else but a depriving of life: for so soon as ever man

sinned, he was turned away from God, and so was forsaken of his grace, and destitute of his favor; so that he was not able to aspire again unto eternal felicity. This bodily life also may be said to be taken away through sin; for immediately after sin, the beginnings and ministers of death invaded man: such be hunger, thirst, sickness, consumption of moisture and heat, and the daily quenching of life: for all these things do lead a man away to death. And Chrysostom upon Genesis, treating at large of this matter, saith; that The first parents, so soon as they had sinned, were dead forthwith: for the Lord forthwith pronounced the sentence of death against them. And even as they which be condemned to die, although they be retained somewhile alive in prison; yet are reputed for dead: even so the first parents, albeit through the benignity of God they lived longer, yet in very truth, they were dead by and by after that God denounced sentence against them. Ambrose saith, that they were suddenly oppressed with death; because afterward they had no day, nor hour, nor moment, wherein they were not subject unto death. Neither is there any mortal man, that can assure himself to live the space of one hour. Whereby it appeareth, that both sorts of death was brought in by sin.

So then we must beware, that we consent not unto them, which are wont to say, that death is natural unto man; and as it were a certain rest, whereby the motion of life is interrupted. These sort of opinions must be left unto the Ethnics; for all the godly do affirm, that in death there is a feel of God's wrath. Therefore by nature itself it bringeth in grief, and quaking fear; which thing both Christ himself, when he prayed in the garden, and also many other holy men have declared. But if there be any, unto whom it is pleasant and delectable to die, and to be loosed from life; this have they by some other means, and not thorough the nature of death. And Paul unto the

Corinthians saith, that Death is the sting of sin: for death should not be able otherwise to do anything in us, unless it did consume us by sin. Wherefore they which vaunt, that original sin is only a certain feebleness, which cannot condemn a man; those do neither understand the nature of sin, nor yet this sentence of the apostle. Besides this; if that death flow out of sin, all sins in their own nature must be called mortal: for in that God imputeth not some sins unto us, that comes not to pass through a lightness of sins, but through his mercy; for there cannot be so light a sin, which bringeth not destruction, unless the mercy of God put itself among. Howbeit, we do not therefore say with the Stoics, that all sins are alike: for we know that Paul describeth certain sins unto us, which be so grievous, that they exclude men out of the kingdom of heaven.

**How by Sin all things are subject unto vanity.**

52. But the revelation of us is waited for of all creatures; because in the meantime, while the same is deferred, every creature is subject unto vanity. Indeed this place of Paul is somewhat hard, howbeit, I think this sense to be plain enough; that generally every creature is in a grievous state, and unto the time of our full redemption is toiled with troublesome labors. For the earth is for our sake subjected unto the curse, and bringeth forth thorns and briers; and to nourish us repaireth fruits, which ever among are falling to decay, and is compelled for our sins to suffer ruins and destructions. The air is become unwholesome, sometimes it is frozen with colds, sometimes inflamed with heats, sometimes it is covered over with clouds, sometime with rain. Living creatures of all sorts are brought forth, and die for our relief. The celestial spheres are continually moved, they go down, they rise, they suffer eclipses; the moon waneth, and increaseth. At the death of Christ, the light of the sun was darkened; and when Christ shall come to

judge (as the evangelists declare) the powers of heaven shall travel. Further, every creature is constrained to serve the wicked, and to become subject to their abuses: which the prophet Ose in his second chapter declareth. The Israelites ascribed the good things of this world, which they abused, not unto the true God, as they should have done, but unto Baal; to him they gave thanks, and him only they called upon. Wherefore God being angry, said; I will take away my wine, and mine oil, and I will set at liberty my wool and my flax, that they should not cover thy shame. By which words the prophet showeth, that when creatures are taken away from the ungodly, they are set at liberty, that they should not be compelled to serve the wicked anymore.

Augustine in his 83rd book of questions, and 67th question, doth otherwise interpret this place: for by Every creature, he understandeth men, even as it is also taken in the Gospel; for so Christ saith; Preach ye the Gospel unto every creature. And this therefore is convenient unto man, because in him, as in a certain little world, are comprehended all kinds of things. Although the same Augustine denieth not, but that these words may be otherwise also expounded. But this he warneth us to beware, that we do not foolishly think, that the sun, moon, and stars, and the angels above, do sigh and groan: which some have not been ashamed to imagine. We must confess (saith he) that the holy angels do service unto us at the commandment of God: but seeing they be now in blessed state, and do behold the face of the father; doubtless mourning and sorrowing for our sakes, is not convenient for them, lest peradventure they might seem to be in worse state than Lazarus in the bosom of Abraham. Hereunto add, that Paul saith; Every creature is subject unto vanity, and doth not only sigh and groan, but also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption: all which

things cannot fall upon the nature of angels. But saith Augustine, We must not rashly pronounce anything: it sufficeth, if we beware of the absurd and the fond opinions of heretics, which have falsely and unadvisedly uttered many things touching the groaning and mourning of creatures: in which words I think that the Manichees among others are noted.

53. But to speak somewhat touching the opinion of Augustine, whereby he thought, that by Every creature, are to be understood, Men: I consider that all mankind is to be divided into two parts; so that of men, some be godly, and some ungodly. Then it must be sought, whether of these do with so great a desire wait for the revelation of the sons of God. I think it will not be said, that the ungodly do wait for it; for they be nothing careful for that which shall happen in the world to come. Wherefore there remaineth only the godly; who seeing they be such, out of doubt they must be called the sons of God. And so it will follow, that those only be the sons of God, which do wait for the revelation of the sons of God: and so they shall be all one, which both desire, and be also desired. But it seemeth that Augustine was not hereof ignorant; for he saith, The sons of God, seeing they be now oppressed with sundry cares and troubles, do covet earnestly for a better state, which they hope shall be one day revealed. The which happeneth often times, that they which be in heaviness, and hard state, do earnestly desire, that a quieter state may once be granted unto them. But if we consider those things, which Paul a little after addeth; And not only it, but we also, which have the first fruits of the spirit, &c: we shall perceive, that godly men, and such as are endued with the spirit of God, are distinguished from the multitude of other creatures; for so meaneth this particle Not only.

Although I know there be some, that by those which are said to have the first fruits of the spirit, do not understand all Christians in general, but only

those which at that time did abound in great plenty of spirit; such as were the apostles, and Paul himself, and a few certain others, which were endued with the apostolical spirit. As if it had been said; The revelation of the glory of the children of God is waited for, not only of all the godly, but of us likewise, which are endued most plentifully with the spirit of Christ: so that the argument is taken from the judgment of most excellent and wise men; which is of great force either to confirm or amplify. But the apostle seemeth not in this place to use that distinction: for before he pronounced universally, that we which be of Christ, have his spirit dwelling in us. Neither doth he (in that he maketh mention of the first fruits of the spirit) mean to put a difference between the common sort of Christians, and the apostles: but he called the first fruits of the spirit, that spirit, which we now have; because we shall reap in another life, the full fruits, and plentiful commodities thereof. And Ambrose, when he interpreteth that place; Not only it, but we ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the spirit, addeth straightway; When he had now spoken of the universal creature, then he speaketh of men themselves.

The arguments also, wherewith Augustine was led to fly the common interpretation of other men, be not so weighty and firm, as there should be much attributed unto them. For in that Paul maketh insensible things to desire our salvation, and for the cause thereof to groan and be in travel, he used the figure Prosopopoeia, or Anthropopathia. They which are of this opinion, are not far off from the fondness of heretics, to believe things absurd concerning the sun, the moon, and the stars. Here we are in a doubt between two figures; for Augustine followeth this figure, in that he thinketh every creature doth signify a man: we rather think it to be the figure Prosopopoeia. The controversy is here, whether of these two figures is

rather to be used. That must be allowed (as I think) which best agreeth with the words of the apostle, and which maketh his argument of more weight and force. And seeing the sense, that we take it in, may bring both to pass; I have thought that the same is rather to be admitted. First indeed the apostle added, as we did note, that Not only it, but also we which have the first fruits of the spirit, &c. Which words do sufficiently declare, that he before entreated not of men, but of other creatures. Further, this reason is of great force to advance our redemption, which we wait for, if we know the same to be expected of all sorts of creatures.

54. Touching the angels only, this exposition seemeth not so plain: for they might seem to be miserable, if they should for our sakes either groan or travel, whom yet we must believe to be in blessed state. But their felicity doth not prove, that they should be utterly rid of all kinds of affections. Peter in his first epistle, and first chapter saith, that They desire to look upon the promises of the prophets, which appertain unto the Gospel. For that place is not so to be read, as our interpreter hath turned it, to wit; *In quem desiderant angeli prospicere*, that is, Upon whom the angels desire to look; but *In quae*, ἅ, that is, Upon which the angels desire to look: wherefor they be holden with a desire to see those promises fulfilled. In Zechariah we read, that they, among the myrtle trees, like a troop of horsemen, prayed with great affection for the holy city, that it might be built again. I pass over that which we read in the gospel, that they be in great joy, when they perceive sinners to be converted to repentance: wherefore it followeth by an argument of the contrary, that of necessity they be grieved at the stubbornness and obstinacy of the wicked. Concerning the souls of godly men departed, no man doubteth, but that they be endued with singular felicity: and yet we read in the Apocalypse, that they cry and pray unto

God, that he will revenge the blood which hath been shed, and labor with great affection, that the clothing of the body now corrupted may one day be restored.

So as both unto angels and blessed souls, such a felicity is to be ascribed, as excludeth not these kind of affections, which the scripture doth show to be convenient for them. Which ought so much the less to be marveled at, seeing we read in the scriptures, that God, the very fountain and head of all felicity, is touched with repentance, changeth his mind, and suffereth many other things, which seem not to be agreeable unto his divine nature. But how those things are to be understood, neither intend we now to declare, neither doth this place require the same of us. But it shall be sufficient to say, in a word, that such an affection may fall even into the angels, as Paul doth make mention of in this place. And although we cannot as yet understand, how the same should be no let unto their happiness; yet there is no cause why we should deny, that the same can be so: but at the last, when we shall be come to that felicity, then it shall be manifest unto us. In the meantime let us believe the holy scriptures, which bear witness that the holy angels have such affections in them.

55. But how shall we understand, that they be subject unto vanity? Easily enough; indeed not according to the substance (as they term it) of their own nature, but as touching those works, which God hath appointed to be done by them. They be set over cities, kingdoms, and provinces, as Daniel plainly writeth: yea also, they are present with every private man, for Christ saith; Their angels shall always behold the face of my heavenly father. And disciples in the acts of the apostles answered concerning Peter, when he knocked at the door; It is his angel. Howbeit there be some, which endeavor to expound the same to be Peters messenger. And in the 48th chapter of

Genesis; His angel hath delivered me from all evil. These things prove, that angels, by the commandment of God, do service even to private men. But if we shall inquire, unto what end angels do govern kingdoms, provinces, and cities, and also every particular man; and what their meaning is by so great a care and diligence; we shall find, that their diligence is to no other end, but to bring all men to obey their God and King, and to acknowledge, to worship, and to reverence him as their God. Which when it doth not take place, and that many leaving the true service of God, do give themselves unto superstition and idolatry, and dishonest themselves with sundry crimes; the labor of the angels is disappointed of that end [whereunto it was a mean] and so they after a sort are subject unto vanity; which shall cease notwithstanding, when they shall be discharged of these their governments. But now we must see, how the angels at that time shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption. Albeit their nature, or (as the School-men say) their substance be uncorrupt and immortal; yet are their affairs continually amongst matters transitory and mortal; those things they do continually uphold and sustain, or else endeavor that by the commandment of God they may be taken away, and destroyed. Further, that the benefit of Christ appertaineth also unto the angels, Paul declareth unto the Ephesians and Colossians. In the first chapter to the Ephesians he saith; According to the good pleasure, which he had purposed in himself, even unto the dispensation of the fullness of times, to make all things anew through Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are in earth. And in the first chapter to the Colossians; It hath well pleased the father, that in him should dwell all fullness, and by him to reconcile all things to himself: and to set at peace, through the blood of his cross, both the things in heaven, and the things in earth.

This Chrysostom interpreting, saith; that Without Christ the angels had been offended with us: so that these two natures, namely, of angels, and of men, were severed and alienated the one from the other. For the celestial spirits could not otherwise do, but hate the enemies of their God; but when Christ was become the mediator, men were now gathered together again, so that they have one and the self-same head with the angels, and are become members of the same body with them: wherefore Christ is rightly said to be he, by whom is made our gathering together. Also it may be, that other commodities have likewise redounded to the angels, through the death of Christ; which notwithstanding we do not easily perceive by the scriptures: neither doth the search of the same belong to that which we have in hand. We say therefore that Paul with great weight, and vehemency of speech, applieth sense unto all creatures; as if so be they felt grief and sorrow, because they are made so common to the abuses of wicked men. For the confusion of things in this state, is not so obscure; since the godly are in trouble, and are ill entreated every-where: but the ungodly do abound with all prosperity, and all things happen to them as they would have it. In this turmoil of things, the godly ought to be of a valiant courage, and patiently wait for the end of these matters. The Epicures and Atheists, when they see all things done so confusedly, they reason by and by, that God hath no care of mortal affairs, as he that is not moved with favor, nor with hatred, and doth to no man either good or evil: but contrariwise, the godly do assure themselves, that seeing God, by his providence ruleth and governeth all things; it will one day come to pass, that things shall not go in such sort, and that the world shall after a better manner be reformed, even like as it was ordained for the honor of God; and shall be brought to that form, whereby God shall more and more be magnified. And hereof riseth an

incredible consolation, that seeing we see all the creatures of God to be subject to so many discommodities, we also (by the example of them) may confirm our selves in patience. Forsomuch as the whole world is vexed with so many calamities, it is very meet that we should also bear, with a patient mind, such afflictions as fall upon us.

56. And there may be four reasons alleged, why we think creatures to be vexed and mourn. The first is, for that they be wearied with continual labors, insomuch as they serve for our daily uses; hereof it cometh oftentimes to pass, that when we sin grievously, as often we do, they suffer punishment together with us, as may plainly be perceived by the flood, by Sodom, and by the plagues of Egypt. Moreover, there is a certain Sympathy, or mutual compassion between man and other creatures; by means whereof, in adversity they sigh and mourn together with him. Last of all, there is great injury done unto them, in that they are compelled to serve wicked and unclean men; whereunto the prophet Ose had respect, as we have above declared, when he said in the person of God; I will take away my wheat, my wine, and mine oil, and I will send away my wool, and my flax, that they shall not cover thy filthiness. Ambrose maketh for me in many places; in his epistle to Horantianus, handling this place of Paul, by an induction showeth, that Every creature sorroweth, and waiteth for the appearing of the sons of God. And he beginneth at the soul; The same (saith he) cannot but be afflicted and mourn, when it seeth itself to be enclosed in the body, as in a certain vile cottage, and that not willingly, but for his sake, which hath made it subject. For it was the counsel of God, that the same should be joined with the body, that through the use of it, it might one day attain unto some fruits, whereof it should not repent. For Paul saith in the second to the Corinthians, that We shall all be set before the judgment seat of Christ, that

every man may yield account of those things that he hath done in the body, be it good, or be it evil. But he saith also in the same epistle; that We do sigh, so long as we be in this earthly mansion: not for that we would be clean spoiled of it, but rather to have it overclothed.

And Ambrose citeth out of the Psalms; that Man is made like unto vanity; and that Man is altogether vanity. Whereunto I think this is to be added, to let us understand, that this heaviness of the body, and these griefs, which David complaineth of, do come unto the soul by reason of the body. We may perceive, that they came not by the institution of God; but rather crept in by the means of sin: for otherwise, the body was not given to the soul, as a grave or prison, as some do fable; but as a most fit instrument, to accomplish most singular acts, and most excellent enterprises. Ambrose goeth on, and in his induction saith, that The sun, the moon, and the rest of the stars, are wearied with continual course; and that the inferior creatures also do take pains for our sakes. But he saith, that this is not done by them with an unwilling mind; for that they understand, that the very son of God took upon him for our sakes the form of a servant, and by his death procured their life and safeguard. Further, he saith, that they in this respect comfort themselves; because one day they shall be delivered, and that their labors shall once have an end. Whereof if I should declare my judgment, first of all I might doubt, whether the sun and moon, and other the stars, do labor in their courses. Moreover, I think it to be spoken figuratively by Ambrose, that all creatures with a quiet mind bear those their molestations; because they know that Christ, the son of God, hath suffered for our salvation the ignominy and death of the cross. Neither do I think this to be without a figure, when he saith, that they be comforted in this respect; because they understand that their labors shall once be at an end, and that

they shall be repaired. Last of all he maketh mention of angels, and saith, that they are not glad to be occupied in punishing of wicked men; for that they be touched with mercy, and had rather adorn them with benefits, than afflict them with punishments, especially seeing Christ saith in Luke, that The angels do greatly rejoice of one sinner that repenteth. The same Ambrose expounding this place, saith; that The sorrowfulness of the creatures shall so long endure, until the number of them be full which shall be saved. And To be subject unto vanity, he interpreteth, To be mortal and transitory. Vanity therefore in this place (after his opinion) is mortality, where under all creatures universally do labor, as we see: and therefore are compelled to wrestle continually with the same; so as Solomon upon just cause said; Vanity of vanities, and all things are vanity.

57. The commentaries, which are ascribed unto Jerome, seem not much to disagree with the saying of Augustine: so that they, by every creature, understand the whole number, even from the very time of Adam; which number of saints, together with the same Adam, do (as they say) sorrowfully wait for the revelation of the sons of God, that they also, as we be taught in the epistle to the Hebrews, may be perfect with us. Origin maketh mention of certain things concerning the soul, which is the chiefest part of our mind; which he saith laments and sorrows heavily, because it is continually compelled to humble itself, to serve the manifold and sundry necessities of the body. But Chrysostom is plainly on our side, and confesseth, that Paul useth here the figure Prosopopoeia, which figure is greatly frequented in the holy scriptures: for the Prophets and Psalms do many times command the floods and the woods to clap their hands. Sometimes they show, that the mountains do dance, and that the hills do leap for joy: not that they in very deed do ascribe motion and sense unto

things without life; but to signify, that the same good thing, which they so commend, is so great, that it ought to appertain unto creatures utterly without sense and feeling. The Prophets also are wont sometimes to bring in the woods, vines, earth itself, and other elements lamenting and howling; and also the roofs of houses and temples crying: that they may with more vehemency of words amplify that evil, which they have in hand. Neither should it seem strange, if Paul do imitate these phrases of the Prophets, seeing one and the same spirit of God was in both of them.

58. Neither is it a hard matter to declare, how our calamities do redound also unto creatures: for when man was adjudged unto the curse, the earth was also condemned to be accursed, and constrained to bring forth thorns and briers. And after what sort it is become desert and unpleasant, by reason of sin, both the holy scriptures in every place teach us, and experience (if we consider it) would show us. Isaiah saith in the 24th chapter; The sun shall be confounded, and the moon shall be ashamed. And in the destruction of Babylon, the same prophet writeth; That the moon and the stars shall give no light, and that the sun shall be clothed with darkness. Concerning heaven David pronounceth; The heavens from the beginning are the works of thy hands, they shall perish, but thou doest endure: as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed. Moses saith in the law; I will give a heaven of brass, and an earth of iron: which we understand came to pass in the time of Elias, wherein the heaven was so shut up, as for the space of three years and a half, it yielded no rain. Wherefore that is an excellent saying, which the prophet Ose said on the contrary part; I will hear heaven, and heaven shall hear the earth, and the earth shall hear the wheat, wine, and oil, and they shall hear Israel. Finally, in what manner every creature doth service unto godly men, the scripture in every place declareth. The sea

made way for the Israelites; the stony rock gushed out water; the heaven gave a cloud and Manna; the sun stood still for Joshua, and went back for Hezekiah. All which things we may plainly discern in Christ alone, in whom all things be after a wonderful sort reiterated. At his birth the heaven rejoiced, and did shine by night, the angels were present and sang, a star conducted the wise men; at his death the sun was darkened, and all things were environed with darkness, the stones dashed together, the veil was rent in sunder, the graves were opened; at his resurrection the earth quaked, and the angels were ready at hand; at his ascending into heaven, a cloud embraced him; and when he shall return again, the whole world shall be shaken, and the powers of heaven shall be moved; and again after his judgment there shall be so great a renewing of all things, as Isaiah in the thirty chapter saith; It will come to pass, that the moon shall shine like the sun: and the light of the sun being compared with that it now hath, shall be seven fold greater than it is.

59. But is there any injury done unto creatures, when without their fault they be so vexed for the sins of men? Chrysostom answereth, that they have no injury done unto them: for if (saith he) they were made for my sake, there is no injustice showed, if for my sake they suffer. Further, he addeth, that the consideration of right and wrong, is not to be transferred unto things without life, and things void of reason. Last of all, if for our sakes they be afflicted, they shall be also restored with us, when our felicity shall appear. The same Chrysostom, in his second homily upon Genesis, doth plainly declare; that It is neither unjust nor absurd, if so be the creature be constrained to suffer some calamities for men’s sake. For if a man (saith he) happen to incur the displeasure of a king, not only he himself is punished, but also all his family is oppressed. Man, by reason of sin, is become

subject unto the curse, and wrath of God: wherefore it is no marvel, if all creatures, which are the household or family of man, do lament and sorrow together with him. Moreover, he alledgeth out of the scriptures, that every creature was drowned in the flood; that in Sodom all things together were burned with the ungodly men; that in Egypt, by reason of Pharaoh's obstinacy, all creatures were destroyed. And in his book *De reparandis lapsis* unto Theodorus, he showeth, that After the judgment day, all things shall be renewed; that the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and made manifest, so as the same shall fill and occupy all things. The Greek Schoolies do acknowledge here, as we do, the figure Prosopopoeia; and therefore affirm, that the creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, because for our sakes it was made subject to corruption. And they declare, that the adoption of the sons of God shall be revealed, for that the sons of God are now conversant with the children of the devil, and cannot easily be delivered from them. Hereunto may be added, that we be pressed with afflictions, compassed about with infirmities, and defiled with many falls: all which things, notwithstanding they do not frustrate the adoption, which we have by faith; yet they so shadow and dim the same, as without the inward testimony of the spirit, it cannot be known. But our glory shall be revealed in due time, and it shall not only appear, but also be given unto us: for we have the same even now presently, but not as yet full and perfect; but then it shall be fully perfected, and shall obtain whatsoever is now wanting.

# CHAP. II. Of Free will.

Now it shall be good to entreat somewhat of the liberty of our will. And at this present we will inquire how much freewill the natural corruption, which came by original sin, hath left unto us: specially, seeing whatsoever we do well, all that is said to be attributed unto the grace of God. And although this word Free will be not read in the holy scriptures; yet the thing it self must not seem to be either imagined or devised. The Greeks call it αὐτεξούσιον, which is, Of his own power, or, Of his own right: the which same thing the Latins signify, when they call it *Libertatem arbitrij*, that is; The liberty or the choice of will. For that is free, which followeth not the will of another, but his own will. But the choice seemeth herein to consist, that we follow, as we think good, those things which be decreed by reason. Then doubtless the will is free when as it embraceth those things, which be allowed of the considering part of the mind. Wherefore the nature of free choice, although it do most of all declare itself in the will, yet doth the root thereof consist in reason. But they, which will use this power aright, must have a special regard, that there fall no error

into reason. Which error commonly is wont to come two manner of ways: for either it is unknown to us what is just, and what is unjust in the doings of things; or else if we do know it, yet we fail in giving judgment of the reasons, which are wont to be alleged on both parts. Forever, in a manner, our lust joineth itself unto the weaker argument. Whereof it comes to pass oftentimes, that the stronger and the better reason is neglected and forsaken.

And this we see doth oftentimes happen in disputations: for they which take upon them to defend the weaker part, are wont to set a show upon the same, with all the ornaments and colors that they can; to the intent the hearers being allured with eloquence and counterfeit speech, may not thoroughly weigh wherein the strength and weight of the argument doth consist. Moreover, it is to be understood, that men do not commonly deliberate concerning all manner of things; but of those only, which of the Greeks be called πρακτικαί, that is; Which are to be done of us. And in very deed, all the things, which either we prosecute or refuse, have not need of deliberation: for there be some things so manifest and undoubtedly good, [or evil] as it sufficeth that they be named; for they be forthwith either chosen or refused: such are felicity, infelicity, life, death, and whatsoever is of the like sort. But there be certain other more obscure or indifferent, upon which things men are wont to deliberate. That God is to be worshipped, all men confess, without any doubting; but after what manner, and with what rites and ceremonies he must be worshipped; therein is great doubt. That it is profitable for men to be together in cities, and to maintain fellowship, all men do know: but by what laws they must be ruled, or what kind of Common-wealth ought to be used; there men many times do doubt very much. In these, and such other like things is free will occupied.

2. I define free will after this sort; Free will is a faculty or power, whereby we either take or refuse, as we lust ourselves, those things, which be judged by reason. But whether such a kind of power be in men or no, or how it is in them, cannot with one answer be defined. First we must of necessity distinguish the state and condition of man. There be verily found in man four differences of state at the least: for the state of Adam, when he was created in the beginning, was far differing from the state after his fall; such as is now also the state of all his posterity. Moreover, they which be regenerated in Christ, be in far better state, than they which live without Christ; for we shall become most happy, and most free, when we have put off this mortal body: wherefore we will make answer unto the proposed question, according to these four states. We must believe, that Adam in his first creation, had free will: which thing, before I shall declare, three kinds of works, that be in us, are to be noted. Of the which some do appertain unto nature; as to be sick, to be in health, to be nourished, to digest our meat, and such other like: in the which things, albeit the first man was a great deal more happy, than we be at this present; yet he was subject unto some necessity: for it behooved him both to eat, to be nourished, and to take meat. Nevertheless, he was free from all calamities, which might bring death. There are other works also, which after a civil or moral consideration, be either just or unjust. The third kind is of those works, which be liking and acceptable to God. As concerning all these, man was free from the beginning: for He was created unto the image of God, unto whom nothing doth better agree, than true and perfect liberty. And of him it is thus written; God hath crowned him with glory and honor: and again; When he was in honor, he knew it not. And what honor can there be, where liberty wanteth? Lastly, God made subject unto him all things which he had

created: the which out of doubt he could not truly, and according to right reason have governed, if he himself had been created a slave unto affections and lusts. But in what sort that state was, seeing there wanteth scripture to show us; there can nothing be defined for certainty.

Augustine in his book *De correptione & gratia*, saith; that The help of the grace of God was bestowed upon Adam: and such an help it was, as both he might forsake it when he would, and therein might remain, if he would; but not that it should be as he would. And as touching this thing, Augustine dareth prefer the grace which we enjoy by Christ, above that grace, which Adam had in paradise: for now by the grace of Christ, not only we abide, if we will, but also (as Paul saith) We have both to will, and to perform: for the heart of believers is changed, so as of not willing, they be made willing. And this same, To will, was in the very choice of the first man, neither was it the grace of God that wrought this in him. But why God gave free will unto Adam, in his first creation; Augustine bringeth this reason, in his second book *De libero arbitrio*; for that God had decreed to declare unto him both his goodness and his justice. And he would have declared towards him his goodness, if he had done well; which thing undoubtedly he could not have done, if he had not been free. But if so be he should behave himself dishonestly and naughtily, God was to use towards him the severity of his justice. But he, when he was free, fell miserably. And even as Christ describeth the man coming down from Jerusalem to Jericho, to have fallen among thieves, to be ill entreated of them: so he [to wit Adam] not only having his garment taken away, lost all his ornaments; but also having received many wounds, was left for half dead, and destitute of hope.

3. Wherefore we say, as concerning this second state [of man,] when we are strangers from Christ, there is but a little freedom remaining unto us: for

both we be subject to the necessities of nature, and are afflicted with diseases, will we or no; and last of all, we are stricken with death. Howbeit, there is some freedom left, as concerning works that be civil and moral: for these things are both subject unto our natural knowledge, and also they exceed not the powers of our will; and yet in them also men have experience of great difficulty, because licentious lusts do resist moral honesty. Enticements and pleasures do always hurt our senses, and these are set forward by wicked persuaders; Satan also doth continually urge us, and drive us forward. For he envying man's commodity, and perceiving that civil discipline, by such kind of works, is still retained; he coveteth by all means to overthrow them. But that man's power may do much in these civil matters, at the leastwise, in respect of judgment; many good laws set forth by Lycurgus, Solon, Numa, and by diverse other, do sufficiently declare. And Paul to the Romans; Doest thou think (saith he) O man, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God, when thou dost the self-same things, that thou judgest?

Moreover, in these things there be two points, which must not be passed over. The first is, that God useth the will of man to those ends, which he hath appointed. The second is (which dependeth also of the first) that those events follow not, which they appoint that apply themselves to civil works: for oftentimes things do far otherwise happen, then they did ever imagine could be. And hereof it cometh to pass, that Ethnic men are wont very often to be troubled. Pompei, Cato, and Cicero thought to themselves, that they had intended excellent counsel: but when the same was come to naught, there remained nothing but desperation unto the authors; for they being disappointed of their purposes, did attribute all unto fortune and chance. But Jeremiah declareth, that the success and event of things is in the hands of

God; The way of man (saith he) is not in his own power, neither lieth it in man to direct his own steps. Which place the Hebrews expound of Nebuchadnezzar, who (they say) went forth of his house, not against the Jews; but to make war upon the Ammonits, as we read in the 21st chapter of Ezekiel: but when he came into a way that had two turnings, he began to deliberate, and to take counsel of the entrails of beasts, of idols, and of lots by the brightness of a sword: and having advertisement, he set upon Jury, and leaving the Ammonites, he besieged Jerusalem. These two things are not hidden unto the godly; namely, that God is the author of counsel, and giveth such a success to things as he will. And therefore they determine nothing with themselves, but they add this condition; If God will: which thing James warned us to do. And Paul in his epistle to the Romans saith, that He desireth to have a prosperous journey unto them, but yet by the will of God. Wherefore, if the thing happen otherwise than they looked for, they are comforted in themselves; because they know, that God their most loving father, better provideth both for his own kingdom, and their salvation, than they could have provided for themselves. And they have always in their mouth that which David sang; Unless the Lord build the house, in vain do they labor which build it. Therefore it is their care, that they may frame and apply their counsels unto the word of God; and the event they commit unto God: and so they work surly on every part.

4. But in those works, which be acceptable and grateful unto God, such men as are strangers from God, have no freedom at all: whereupon came that saying of Augustine in his Enchiridion; that Man abusing his freewill, hath lost both himself, and also the liberty of his will: for when sin gat the upper hand in battle, it brought man into bondage. I know there be some, which thus interpret this sentence of Augustine: that Adam lost freewill, as

touching grace and glory, wherewith he was adorned; but not as touching nature. Verily I will not much labor here, to deny that the reason and will, which belong unto nature, were left unto man after his fall: but that the same nature is imperfect and wounded, they themselves cannot deny. For this the Master of the sentences also affirmeth in his second book and 25th distinction: for he saith, that A man now after his fall is in such a case as he may sin; and that it so fareth with him, as he cannot but sin. And although Augustine, and others, did not so affirm; yet most sound reason might teach it us: for holy works depend upon two principles; namely of knowledge, and of appetite. Concerning knowledge, Paul saith; The natural man doth not understand those things which be of the spirit of God, yea verily no more he cannot; for they be foolishness unto him. But now, if we know not what is to be done, and what is pleasing unto God; by what means may we show the same in our work?

Moreover, in what sort our appetite and cogitations are toward those holy works, it appeareth by the sixth chapter of Genesis; My spirit (saith God) shall not strive in man forever, because he is flesh. And a little after; God saw that the malice of man was great, and all the imagination of the thought of his heart was only unto evil every day. And in the eighth chapter; The imagination of man's heart is evil even from his infancy. And those things doth God himself speak; and there is none to be believed better than him that made us, when he giveth a testimony of his own work. In the 18th chapter of Jeremiah, the people said; We will follow our own imaginations. Which place Jerome expounding, writeth thus; Where is therefore the power of freewill, and the judgment of man's own will, without the grace of God; seeing it is a great offense unto God for a man is follow his own thoughts, and to do the will of his wicked heart? That we be subject unto

servitude, Christ teacheth us in John, saying; He that doth sin, is the servant of sin. Wherefore, seeing we commit many things, and have sins cleaving unto us from our mother's womb; we must of necessity grant that we be servants: But then we shall be free indeed, if the son shall set us at liberty; otherwise we serve in a most bitter bondage. Whereupon Paul said, that he was sold under sin, and so sold, as in his flesh, he confessed that there dwelt no good thing; and that he did the things which he would not, and which he hated; and that he felt another law in his members, resisting the law of the mind, and leading him away captive to the law of sin. And unto the Galatians he saith; that The flesh doth strive against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, so that we cannot do what we would.

Which things being true, touching so worthy an apostle, and touching holy men regenerated by Christ; what shall be thought of the wicked, which belong not unto Christ? And unto him they cannot come, unless they be drawn: for Christ saith; None can come unto me, unless my father shall draw him. He which would go before of his own accord, is not drawn, as Augustine saith; but is led. If therefore we must be drawn unto Christ, in that we would not before, the same is a most grievous sin: and therefore we will not, because The wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject unto the law of God, no verily, nor cannot be. And as many as are not set at liberty by Christ, do live under the law, and (as Paul addeth to the Galatians) are under the curse. Which thing should not be true, if they could fulfill the law of God: for they incur not the danger of the curse, unless they transgress the law. Further, Paul expressly saith; It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy. For our salvation is his work, and not the work of our strength; It is he that worketh in us, both to will, and to perform. Before he do that, whatsoever he doth

with us, either by the law, or by the instruction of his word; he dealeth with stones: for our hearts be stony, unless God do change them into fleshy hearts; which he promiseth in Ezekiel that he would do, and would bring to pass, that we should walk in his ways.

And surly, if we might live well and rightly without grace, we might also be justified by our own works: which doctrine is utterly condemned, both by Paul, and all the holy scripture. Jeremiah saith; Convert me, O Lord, and I shall be converted. And David saith; A pure heart create in me, O God. The which thing that it cometh not to pass in all men, we perceive by the 29th chapter of Deuteronomy, where it is thus written; The Lord hath not given unto you eyes to see, nor an ear to hear, nor a heart to understand. And in the thirtieth chapter, God promised, that he would circumcise their hearts, and the hearts of their seed, that they should walk in his commandments. For he both beginneth and finisheth our salvation: for this Paul saith to the Philippians; I hope that he who hath begun in you, will perform it even unto the day of Christ. This thing the holy men right well understanding, do pray with David; Incline my heart unto thy testimonies: and with Solomon; The Lord shall incline our hearts, that we may walk in his ways; and with Paul unto the Thessalonians; The Lord direct your hearts in patience, and in the expectation of Christ. And Solomon in his proverbs saith; The heart of the king is in the hand of God, and he inclineth it to what end he will. These testimonies do sufficiently declare, that it is God's work, and not ours, to be converted unto him, and to do uprightly.

5. Here some object unto us the commandments, which are set forth unto us in the holy scriptures: for they seem to signify, that it lieth in ourselves to observe those things, which we be commanded. For Isaiah saith; If ye will, and will hearken unto me, ye shall eat the good things of the land. And the

Lord oftentimes commandeth us, that we should convert ourselves unto him; Be ye converted (saith he) unto me, I will not the death of a sinner, I had rather that he converted and live. And when he had published the law, he said; that He had set before them life and death, blessing and cursing. And an infinite sort of other such like testimonies might be brought. But here it must be considered, that these things in very deed are commanded unto men: but we are nowhere taught; that a man is able to perform them of his own proper strength. Neither is it meet, that we measure the greatness of our own strength by the precepts of God's law; as though so much can be done of our own accord, as God's law hath commanded: nay rather our infirmity is to be measured hereby; that when we see the excellency and worthiness of God's commandments to excel our strength by innumerable degrees, we may remember, that the law hath a certain other end, than that it should be performed of us.

Paul showeth that end to be manifold; By the law (saith he) cometh the knowledge of sin: which he saith was therefore made, that the number of transgressions might be increased. For by this means, The law is become a school-master to lead men unto Christ; that when they see themselves overcharged with the heavy burden of the commandments, and the greatness of their sins, they may perceive their salvation to consist only in the mercy of God, and redemption of Christ. For the weakness and unworthiness of ourselves being considered, we forthwith begin to pray unto God; that both he will for Christ's sake pardon our sins, and give us sufficiency of his spirit, that we may endeavor to follow his will. Give what thou commandest (saith Augustine) and command what thou wilt. Further, another use of the law is, that we should see whereunto we must apply our selves. Also it may be, that if through the grace of God there be an access of

obedience begun, men may apply themselves unto the law. Lastly, though in this life it be not given unto us, that men can in every condition satisfy the law; yet we shall fully obtain the same in another life, when we shall cast away all this corruption. Yet God ought not to be accused of injustice by reason hereof: for he is not in fault, that men be not able to keep his commandments. Neither can any of us be excused, because that willingly and greedily we do break the law, that is appointed unto us. The same was given in such sort, as it might best agree with our nature, when the same was first instituted: for the image of God could not by any other means more plainly and effectually be expressed. But and if by reason of sin we be not able to accomplish the law; yet this at the least-wise we see, namely, what manner of persons we ought to be.

6. But that sentence, which is commonly objected; that Nothing is to be counted sin, which dependeth not of election, must be understood (as Augustine doth interpret it) of that kind of sin, which is not the punishment of sin: for otherwise, original sin is neither voluntary, nor received by election. But thou wilt say; Seeing the matter standeth thus, we shall seem of necessity to stick fast in sin: which thing indeed I deny not; although such is this necessity, as it hath no compulsion joined therewith. God is of necessity good, and cannot sin by any means: and yet is he not driven by force to be good. Which thing Augustine, in his 22nd book *De civitate Dei*, and thirty chapter, doth very well declare; Because God himself (saith he) cannot sin, therefore shall we deny that he hath free will? Ambrose, in his second book, and third chapter, *De fide*, unto Gratian the Emperor, testifieth, that God is free, when he saith; that One and the same spirit worketh all things, dividing unto all as pleaseth him, according to the choice of his free will, and not for to obey necessity. In these sentences of

these fathers, free will is so taken, that it is contrary unto violence and compulsion; not that it is equally bent to either part. Whereupon Jerome in his homily of the prodigal son, which he wrote unto Damasus, because he took free will in another sense, therefore he wrote otherwise; It is only God (saith he) on whom sin falleth not, nor can fall: but others, forsomuch as they have free will, may be bowed every way. Also it is agreeable unto blessed spirits and angels, that they cannot sin; seeing their felicity is already confirmed.

Wherefore Augustine in his 22nd book *De civitate Dei*, and thirty chapter, saith; Even as the first immortality, which Adam through sin lost, was, that it was possible he should not die: even so the first free will was, that it was possible he should not sin; but the last free will shall be, that he shall not possibly sin. Yet nevertheless, there is granted a certain kind of liberty unto them: not whereby they can be bowed to either part; but such, as (although that which they do is of necessity) yet thereby they be not compelled, or violently driven. For even as there be certain true things so manifest, as the mind cannot but consent unto them; so the presence of God now revealed and made manifest, is so good a thing, as the saints cannot fail or forsake the same. So likewise, although we of necessity do sin, before we be regenerated in Christ; yet are not therefore the powers of the will violated: for whatsoever we do, both we do it willingly; and also we are led to do it upon some hope.

And yet we must not be therefore accounted to differ nothing from brute beasts: for they, notwithstanding they be moved with a certain kind of judgment; yet it is not by a free judgment. But in men, although they be not yet renewed, there is (as we have said) much liberty remaining, as touching civil and moral works. Further, among the very sins, wherein they be of

necessity conversant, they have a choice to choose one, and refuse another; though they cannot attain unto those things which please God. These things do not accord with brute beasts: for they be rather driven by the force of nature, than that they can do anything by any liberty or free choice. Men may be said to be free, either in respect of compulsion, or in respect of sin, or in respect of misery. The first liberty from compulsion, is given unto all men; howbeit, unto sin and misery all men, which have not attained unto Christ, are altogether subject. But after what sort men, which be regenerate, be subject either to sin, or to misery, while they live here, I will afterward declare. In the mean time we ought to be sure, that the will is not constrained to sin, through this necessity which we speak of.

7. But that we may with the more perspicuity and plainness, declare all this whole matter, it must be first determined what these words Free, Violent, and Willing do signify. We call that Free, which having two, or more things set before it, can choose, as it lusteth, what it will. And therefore we deny, that the will of men not regenerate is universally free: for it cannot choose those things which do belong to salvation. Violent is that, which is so moved of an outward beginning, that it of itself nothing helpeth unto that motion, but rather resisteth it: as when a stone is cast on high. That is said to work of his own accord, or willingly, which hath an inward beginning inclining to that motion, whereby it is driven. By these things it is manifest, that to do of his own accord, and to do of necessity, are not contrary one to another: for they may be joined together, as it is plain in our will, which of necessity embraceth felicity; yet it embraceth it not against his will, or by compulsion; but of his own accord, and gladly. Neither is it possible, that the will should be compelled, to will that which it will not.

Yea, Augustine thinketh it to be so absurd, that a man should will that which he will not; as if one should say, that anything can be hot without heat.

But yet that necessity, whereby the wicked are said to sin, is not absolute and perfect; so as it cannot be otherwise: for so soon as the grace and spirit of Christ cometh, that necessity is straightway loosed. Wherefore Augustine saith, that it is of nature to be able to have faith, hope, and charity; but to have them indeed, is altogether the gift of grace: for that power or ability breaketh not forth into act, unless grace be given from God. Herein Augustine agreed with the Pelagians; that To be able, is of nature. But this Augustine added, which Pelagius did not allow; that To will well, and to live uprightly, is to be attributed unto grace only. But I think, that as touching this power of nature, there must be made a distinction: for if they mean this, that our nature is so made of God, as neither faith, nor hope, nor charity do strive with the same, if they be given of God, but rather accomplish it, make it perfect, and adorn it; I confess it to be true that they say: but if they will have the power of nature to signify some strength of the same, whereby it can challenge to itself these things; I yield not to them in any wise; for it is a wicked and damnable opinion.

We say therefore, that the will of man hath respect both unto good, and unto evil; but after a sundry fashion: for it may embrace evil of his own accord; but it cannot embrace good, unless it be restored by the grace of God. For we have need of a certain divine inspiration, to perform those things which are good; which thing indeed the very Ethnic writers also, being forced by the truth, have sometimes declared. For Aristotle, in his first book of Ethics saith; If there be any gift of God, we must verily think, that it is felicity. And Felicity he defineth to be nothing else, but a most excellent action, proceeding from the chiefest power of the mind, by a most

notable virtue. And Plato confesseth in a certain place, that virtues are engendered in men by divine inspiration. The School-men also, if there were any somewhat sounder than the rest, confessed, that the grace of God is necessary to assist man's strength unto every good work. Howbeit, afterward they forgetting themselves, I wot not how, decreed; that a man, not being renewed, may do some good deeds, which may please God, and which may merit the grace of Christ, of congruity (as they term it.)

8. That they call congruity, which we may call meet and good; which is, when the rigor and sharpness of the law is remitted: but condignity they call that, which is of right due. But they which first invented these terms, considered not, that those goodly civil works, though in show they seem good unto men, yet before God they be sin; as Augustine by most certain reasons proveth. For before we be converted unto God, we be the children of wrath. And John saith; He that believeth not in the son of God, hath not life everlasting, but the wrath of God abideth upon him. And what can be offered unto God by his enemies, and by such as hate him, that may be acceptable unto him? Paul to the Ephesians saith, that We, before we did come unto Christ, were dead in our offenses and sins. But the dead, as they feel nothing, so can they bring nothing to pass, whereby they should be called back unto life. Paul unto the Philippians counted all things, whatsoever he did before he was converted unto Christ, but loss and dung; so far off was he from placing any merit in them. God in the first chapter of Isaiah testifieth, that he did abhor, detest, and counted abominable those oblations, which the Jews offered without faith and godliness. The same prophet compareth all our righteousness unto most vile and filthy rags. And our savior Christ saith; I am the vine, and ye are the branches. And even as the branch cannot bear fruit, unless it abideth in the vine; so ye can bring

forth no fruit, unless ye abide in me. And straightway he addeth; Without me ye can do nothing. And in another place he saith, that An evil tree cannot bear good fruit; for the root must first be good, before any good fruit can be hoped to come from it; but good trees we cannot be, before we be grafted in Christ. This engrafting in the holy scriptures is called regeneration. And even as no man helpeth anything to the generation of himself; so no man can help anything to the regeneration of himself. Paul also saith, that Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin. Seeing therefore the wicked be without faith, whatsoever they do, is to be reckoned for sin. If so be thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be single; but if thy light be darkness, how great shall that darkness be? Unless faith be present, we be conversant in darkness; and of necessity do cleave unto sin.

Moreover, if we follow the opinion of these men, we utterly overthrow the nature of grace: For grace, if it should be of works (as Paul saith) it now ceaseth to be grace. Paul also addeth, That the Israelites following after the law of righteousness, attained not unto righteousness: for that they sought it by works, and not by faith. Also unto the Colossians he teacheth plainly, what we be before we are justified; We be alienated (saith he) from God, enemies in mind, and conversant in evil works. And in the epistle to the Romans; men not yet engrafted in Christ, he calleth wild olive trees: and we know, that wild olive trees be barren, neither can bear any fruit. Besides this, works cannot be good, unless they either satisfy the law; or else if they stray anything from the law, it is not imputed unto them, because of Christ. But men, that be not renewed, cannot satisfy the law: for even the regenerate cannot do it. For seeing they be not joined unto Christ by faith, they cannot attain unto the benefit of Christ, whereby these imperfections be made whole and sound.

And he that teacheth, that a man is able, without the grace of God, to do works which be acceptable unto God; must also of necessity teach, that Christ is not the redeemer of the whole man. For he which teacheth that we, without the grace of Christ, do work well, and live uprightly; the same ascribeth unto our nature no small part of salvation without Christ. Paul also in the epistle to the Romans saith; When we were servants unto sin, we were free unto righteousness; which is nothing else, but that we had no trade nor acquaintance with righteousness. Furthermore, he exhorteth us, that Even as we have served sin, so we will be now servants unto righteousness. And he also teacheth, that we should now altogether serve righteousness without any sin; forsomuch as we served sin before altogether without righteousness. Lastly, he hath left no mean at all between the servitude of sin and righteousness. But these men contrariwise fain a sort (I know not who) which although they be not yet justified; yet notwithstanding do good and just works, which may be acceptable unto God. All these things sufficiently teach, how absurd and fond these men's opinion is.

9. Yet in the mean time they cry out, that we be blasphemous, which avouch the whole nature of man to be evil. But (as Augustine doth prudently write;) Under the praises of nature, be hidden the enemies of grace. It were meet, that they should consider, unto what ground we refer that evil, whereof we complain: for we ascribe not the same either to nature, as it was created; or unto God: but unto sin, whereunto there was an entrance laid open by the first man. For we, by all manner of means, do disagree from the Manichees: for they dreamed, that both our nature is evil, and that it was created evil by God. But we confess and acknowledge; that man was created free: and in that he hath now lost his freedom, we ascribe

not God to be the author thereof, but man's own fault. They which deny freewill, have been called heretics by the church. But this must be understood concerning the first creation of our nature; for otherwise there is not one of the fathers, which (if the truth be well weighed) bewaileth not the calamity of man, whereinto he fell through sin.

Our adversaries rather come near unto the Manichees, which affirm, that Our corrupt affects, as they are now, were so created by God: for so they affirm, that he created them evil. But we, forsomuch as we perceive that these troublesome affections be not void of sin, deny that they were so created by God; but that through our own default they are become unbridled, and be repugnant to the word of God. Certain it is, that man at the beginning was made unto the image of God; and there is nothing more beseeming unto it, than liberty. But seeing that image was in a manner blotted out in us, so as there was need to have the same restored by Christ; what marvel is it, if our liberty be also for the most part taken away from it? When they reason that man is free, they do even as if they should say, that man is a two-footed creature, and therefore he is able to go upright. But if they would so conclude of a lame man, it should easily appear how much they be deceived: for the properties of man, which would be agreeable unto his nature, being perfect, when they be applied unto the same nature being corrupt, do not agree.

Neither be the opinions of our adversaries much dissenting from the Pelagians: for they taught, that nature being holpen by the grace of creation, and doctrine of the law, may live uprightly. And these men say, that nature being holpen by grace preventing and knocking, is able to do good works, which may please God. The catholic church resisted the Pelagians, neither did it contend about the grace of creation, or of the law, neither about the

grace preventing: but it taught, that without the grace of Christ, wherewith we be justified, none is able to work aright. And by the judgment of Augustine, who vehemently contended against these men, there is no difference between doing rightly without grace, and doing rightly without the faith of Christ. He, upon the 31st Psalm, to show that there is no good work without faith, writeth thus; A good intent maketh the work good, but faith guideth that intent: wherefore consider not what a man doth, but what he hath respect unto while he is doing.

10. And whereas in all the holy scriptures, there is not one sentence repugnant to our doctrine; yet they continually object unto us the example of Cornelius, who being not yet (as they think) regenerate, neither believing in Christ, yet did such works as were acceptable unto God. Indeed we grant, that both the alms and prayers of Cornelius were pleasing unto God: for the angel affirmed the same. But these men add of their own; that Cornelius, when he did these things, was not yet justified, nor yet believed in Christ. But they mark not that the scripture in that place called him religious, and one that feared God: wherefore Cornelius believed, and in Messias believed he, being instructed in the Jews learning; but whether Jesus of Nazareth were that Messias, he knew not for a certainty, and therefore Peter was sent to instruct him more fully. But here, to blear our eyes, they say, that Paul, in the 17th of the Acts, attributeth some godliness unto the people of Athens, when as notwithstanding they were idolaters: for thus he saith; Ye men of Athens, I show unto you, that God, whom you ignorantly worship. But even as if a man that can handsomely draw someone letter, shall not therefore be straightway counted a good writer; neither he that can sing one or two verses, shall for that cause be taken for a singing man; (for these names require consideration and art, and it may come to pass by chance, that a

man may draw well, or sing well once or twice:) even so none is to be counted verily and out of doubt good, which setteth forth one good work or two, that have some show of godliness. But Paul called not the Atheniens godly, without adding some terms of speech, which should diminish godliness; Whom ye ignorantly (saith he) worship. But what piety can that be, which is joined with the ignorance of the true God? Moreover, a little before he had called them δεισιδαιμωνεστέρους, that is, Very superstitious: by these two words he much diminished their piety.

But Luke absolutely calleth Cornelius religious, and addeth; that He feared God: which addition is of so great force, that in the book of Job, a man fearing God, is translated of the seventy interpreters, ἀληθινός και θεοσεβής, that is, A true and religious man. And David saith; Blessed is the man that feareth the Lord. And if so be he be blessed which feareth God, how is not the same man also justified? But besides these things, which after a sort, by the causes, declare the justification of Cornelius; we have also another testimony of the effects: for that he gave alms, which were acceptable unto God. But we have already, by many reasons proved, that none can do works acceptable unto God, but he which is justified and regenerate. Further, he distributed these alms upon the people of the Jews, as of whom he having been instructed in the skill of godliness, would impart unto them in like manner some of his temporal goods. For It is meet (as Paul saith unto the Galatians) that he which is instructed, should communicate unto him, which doth instruct him in all good things. Moreover, that soldier, which was sent unto Peter, declareth, that he had a good testimony of all the Jews. All which things do sufficiently show, that although we read not, that he was circumcised; yet he came so near unto the doctrine of the people of God, as that all men commended his piety. It is

written besides, that he prayed, and that continually. And if so be we diligently weigh the whole history, we shall find, that he observed the same hour, which the Jews had appointed for common prayer: for it saith, that At the ninth hour he saw an angel standing by him, which gave him to understand, that his prayer was heard. But out of the first chapter of Isaiah, and 15th of Proverbs, and many other places, we be taught; that The ungodly and sinful sort be not heard of God. Which nevertheless must be understood, so long as they would be sinners, and retain with them a will to sin.

11. Neither is that, which Augustine writeth against the Donatists, repugnant to this doctrine; namely, that The prayers of wicked priests be heard of God: for he addeth, that it so cometh to pass, by reason of the people's devotion. But Cornelius, when he prayed, was holpen by his own faith, and not through the faith of others which stood by. And Augustine in his epistle unto Sixtus, saith; that God in justifying of a man, is wont to give his spirit, whereby he may pray for those things which be profitable for salvation. And seeing Cornelius prayed for those things, there can be no doubt, but he was justified. Hereunto add, that no man can rightly pray unto God, unless he have faith. And that we be justified by faith, it hath been sufficiently testified and declared already. Peter also, before he began to preach unto him, saith; that He perceived in very truth that God is no accepter of persons, but that he is accepted by him, of what nation so ever he be, which worketh righteousness: which words teach us plainly enough, that Cornelius was even already accepted of God, before Peter came unto him. But I marvel, that there be any, which dare affirm, that he had not the faith of Christ; when as Christ himself, in the eighth chapter of John saith, that He knoweth not God, which believeth not in the son of God. And in the

14th chapter he admonisheth his disciples; If ye believe in God, believe also in me: and if so be ye believed Moses, ye would also believe in me.

These things assure us, that Cornelius believed verily in God, and therefore did also believe in the Messias which should come; even as he had been instructed by the Jews: although he knew not that he was already come, and that Jesus of Nazareth, whom the Jews had crucified, was the same Messias. He had the same faith, wherewith the fathers believed that Christ should come; wherefore seeing they were justified by the same faith, how dare we be so bold as deny the very same unto Cornelius? Nathaniel, which believed that Messias should come, and thought that he was not yet come, is by Christ pronounced to be a true Israelite, in whom there was no guile: which two things cannot concur in a man not yet justified. But Peter was therefore sent to Cornelius, that he might more plainly and expressly know that thing, which he had before intricately believed of Christ. Of this mind was Gregory in his 19th homily upon Ezekiel: for he saith, that Faith is the entry whereby we come to good works; but not contrariwise, that by good works we can come unto faith. And so he concludeth, that Cornelius did first believe, before he could bring forth any laudable works. And he citeth that place unto the Hebrews; It is impossible without faith to please God. Which sentence, as it appeareth by the self-same place, cannot be otherwise understood, then of faith justifying. Beda, expounding the third chapter of the acts, is of the same mind; and citeth the words of Gregory. Neither is the Master of the sentences of any other judgment, in his second book, and 25th distinction.

But our adversaries object unto us Augustine, in his 7th chapter *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, where he reasoneth against those, which taught, that faith is of our selves; when yet in the mean time they confessed,

that the works which follow, be of God; but yet obtained by faith. Indeed Augustine confesseth, that the works, which follow faith, be of God; but denieth that faith is of our selves. For he saith, that Paul writeth to the Ephesians; By grace ye are saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves: for it is the gift of God. But that is a hard saying, which he addeth; namely, that the prayers and alms of Cornelius were accepted of God, before he believed in Christ. But we must here weigh the things which follow: for he addeth; And yet prayed he not, neither gave he alms without some faith: for how did he call upon him, in whom he believed not? These words do plainly declare, that Augustine took not away from Cornelius all manner of faith in Christ; but only a unfolden and distinct faith. Which thing that place chiefly declareth, which is cited out of the epistle to the Romans; How shall they call upon him, in whom they have not believed? For those words be written of the faith and invocation of men regenerate, as the next sentence following plainly declareth; Everyone which calleth upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved: for we cannot attribute salvation, but to them which be justified. But Peter was sent unto Cornelius, to build up, and not to lay the foundation: for the foundations of faith were laid in him before.

12. But those things, which Augustine addeth, seem to bring a greater difficulty: for he saith; But if he could, without the faith, namely of Christ be saved, that singular workman the apostle should not have been sent to edify him. But seeing he already before attributed unto him faith and invocation, after which of necessity followeth salvation, whereof the apostle speaketh in the epistle to the Romans; how can he take salvation from him: unless we peradventure understand, that faith and salvation in men justified is not perfect, while they live here? For our salvation cometh not in this life to that degree, nor to that quantity, which Christ requireth in his elect: for

no man may doubt, but that we shall not attain to perfect salvation, before the resurrection and eternal salvation; although we have begun to enjoy the same already after a sort. Paul to the Ephesians affirmeth, that We be now saved by faith. And yet unto the Philippians he exhorteth us, With fear and trembling to work our own salvation. Which places cannot be brought to one consent, unless we say, that the salvation begun in us, through justification, is daily to be made perfect in us: for we are always more and more renewed, and faith is made more full, more expressed, and of more efficacy. These words of Augustine, unless we interpret them on this sort; either of necessity they must be none of his, or else he is repugnant to himself. That the book is Augustine's, we cannot deny: but that he is repugnant unto himself, that is not likely.

But if thou say that these things may agree well enough together, if we grant that Cornelius was not yet justified; when as nevertheless he did some works well pleasing and acceptable unto God: I answer, that this can by no means agree with Augustine's meaning. For he, in his 801st treatise upon John, and in his fourth book, and third chapter against Julian, and upon the 31st Psalm, doth prove by most sure reasons, that all works, done before we be justified, be sin. But that faith is more expressly set forth, and made perfect in them that are justified; we may easily perceive, by that which Christ said unto his apostles; Many kings and prophets desired to see the things, which ye see, and saw them not. Yet notwithstanding, those kings and prophets were men godly and justified; although they knew not so expressly all the mysteries of Christ, as the apostles did. And Christ, when he prayed, thus spake concerning the apostles themselves; The words which thou gavest me, have I given unto them: those have they received, and have known that I came forth from thee, and that thou hast sent me. These things

do show, that the apostles believed in Christ; and therefore were justified. Yet the very history of the Gospel sufficiently declareth, that they were ignorant of many things: for it is showed oftentimes, that either they had their eyes closed, that they should not see; or else, that they understood not those things which were spoken. Wherefore Augustine denieth, that Cornelius had salvation before Peter was sent unto him: yet not altogether, but that he had no perfect and absolute salvation.

13. But they further object the same Augustine in his questions unto Simplicianus, in the second book, and second question: where he plainly teacheth, that faith goeth before works. After that he putteth a certain mean between grace, and the celebration of the sacraments: for he saith, that it may be, that *Catechumenus* [or one newly converted unto Christian religion,] and that he which is conversant among the Catechumen, may believe, and have grace; and yet the same man is not yet washed by baptism. Moreover he saith, that grace is more plentifully poured in after the sacraments. By which words he signifieth, that it is one and the self-same grace; but is afterward made more abundant. And that thou mayest know he entreateth of a justifying faith, he citeth a place out of the epistle to the Ephesians; By grace ye are saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; for it is the gift of God. But our adversaries will say, that they also teach, that grace goeth before good works; and that by this grace, some faith is bestowed upon men. But this at the beginning is so weak, as it cannot have the power to justify: howbeit, there may some works be done, which may be acceptable to God.

But we will call to mind what Augustine writeth of Pelagius, in his hundred and fifth epistle unto Innocentius bishop of Rome: he saith, that Pelagius, in the council of Palestine, to the end he would not be accursed

[himself;] did curse all those, which should say, that they could live uprightly without grace. But he, by grace, meant no other thing, than the gift bestowed upon us in our creation; as free choice, reason, will, and the doctrine of the law. The Palestine bishops, being beguiled by this colorable craft, did absolve him. Augustine excuseth them, because they dealt plainly and simply: for when they heard that Pelagius confessed the grace of God; they could not understand it to be other, than that grace; which the holy scriptures do set forth; namely, the same, whereby we are regenerate and engrafted in Christ. Wherefore it appeareth, that they, which feign unto themselves another grace, then that whereby we are justified, and engrafted in Christ, do thrust upon us a thing imagined by man; or rather a Pelagian refuge, which the holy scriptures acknowledge not.

Moreover, Augustine in the same place, which we now spake of, doth affirm; that the Catechumen, and such as believe, though they be not baptized; yet nevertheless be conceived: but they which are now conceived to be the sons of God, cannot be strangers from him, or enemies unto him; wherefore it followeth, that they also be already justified, though not in such perfect sort. And this also is manifest, in that Augustine calleth the grace following, a more full grace: as that which differeth not from the first in kind and nature, but only in degree and quantity: and seeing it is of the self-same kind, that the other is, the same shall also justify.

***14 & 15. ---- There are 2pgs missing from source text. This English translation being a very rare text to obtain has made it impossible to find other copies. Sections 14 & 15 are omitted as a result. This is the only text missing from this book.***

16. But many suspect, that by this doctrine is opened a window unto many vices: for if all the doings of civil men, while they seem to work upon

virtue, be sins; they may easily be pulled away from those goodly works. I answer, that we teach not, that civil discipline is to be let go; for the same by God's providence is as it were a bond, wherewith civil society is preserved. God can suffer cities and Common-wealth's, so long as in them flourisheth integrity of manners and honesty; but when those things be altogether vitiate and corrupt, then God is so provoked unto wrath, as he will punish those things, which long before he had winked at. So long as men be without Christ, they sin, even when they show forth notable works: but yet they sin far less, than if by setting aside all civil duties, they should utterly abandon themselves to all manner of sins: for we are not Stoics, to think that all sins are alike.

Further, if these men omit the doing of those things, which by the very light of reason they acknowledge to be honest; they wrestle against their own conscience. And if so be we will more manifestly see whether doctrine, ours, or our adversaries, doth open the greater window unto vices; let us compare them one with another. They verily, when they teach, that the wicked can do good works, such as may please God, and through them can deserve grace (as they speak) of congruity; what thing do they else, than foster and nourish the miserable souls in that their damnable state? For they cause them to like of themselves for works of theirs, I know not what; and to hope it will come to pass (at least-wise in the end of their life) that they shall for those works sake obtain of God to be truly and earnestly converted: but in the meantime, they live securely; neither do they with a just and true repentance turn away from their wicked facts. But we contrariwise, when we admonish them daily to come unto Christ, and to be reconciled by true repentance (for otherwise good works shall profit them nothing at all, when as, although they be goodly to the show, yet they be

sins before God;) do we not earnestly set them on, that leaving impiety and corrupt kind of life, they should convert themselves unto the righteousness of God?

These things if thou prudently consider, thou shalt easily perceive, whether of us doth make the way more open unto lusts. This thing doubtless all they may judge, which are touched with the desire of truth and godliness; for besides that, which I have said, they shall easily perceive; that all the good works, which are attributed unto men not regenerate, be a derogation and a robbery unto the grace of God. For if we be able to do many things without the grace of God, which may be grateful and acceptable to him; then are we not wholly redeemed and restored by him: which is a thing so impious and strange from the catholic truth, as nothing can be imagined more impudent and more wicked. For what godliness doth there remain, when Christ is deprived of his own honor? Or what honor is left unto Christ, if we teach, that he hath not brought unto us all the power we have to live uprightly?

Some boast, that other whiles many things happen to be done before regeneration, the which be as certain means to the obtainment thereof: and seeing it oftentimes cometh to pass, that by them we be justified, they cannot seem to be sins. Indeed we grant, that these are sometime certain means, whereby God doth lead us unto justification; but thereby it is not proved, that those be no sins unto them, by whom they be done. And doubtless, as concerning the nature of their works, unto some they be occasions of greater destruction: for there be many, which by reason of such works of theirs, do wonderfully puff up themselves, and please their own fancy, and prefer themselves before others; and when they be full, and have enough of their own opinion, although they be persuaded and set on [to

continue therein,] yet they refuse to proceed any further. In such kind of men works be preparations unto everlasting death. But as touching the elect, God doth govern and temperate their works, and findeth the means that they work together unto salvation; although they be sins in their own nature, and must be esteemed as things corrupt, so long as the light of justification shineth not upon them. Wherefore we confess, that works are certain preparatives unto healthful conversion: but yet to none, but such as be predestinate and elect, whom God doth sometimes lead unto justification; not that they have this strength of their own nature, to prepare unto justification: for unto the reprobate and cast-aways, they serve unto condemnation.

17. But let us see what works those be, which our adversaries so highly praise in men not regenerate. In them (they say) there is a certain acknowledging of sins thereof springeth a terror, wherewith they be vehemently pierced; afterward there is stirred up a sorrow for the loss of the kingdom of heaven; and then they be moved with a less desire of wicked acts; and they take less pleasure in sins and allurements of this world: they seem also with some endeavor to hear the word of God. And how (say they) can these things seem to be sins? Yet they say that they be of no such efficacy, as a man thereby may be converted, and leave his old naughty life. Here I would demand of these men, what manner of knowledge of sin that is, which is so had; that in the mean time we do prefer the same before the righteousness of God? Surely, for so much as it wanteth the end, which is proper unto it, and whereunto it belongeth; it cannot be any other, but sin: for to this end knowledge is given unto us, that knowing sin, we should forsake it; and that we should embrace God's justice: which end, unless it be present, the work is corrupted, and is made sin. This thing all the Ethnic

writers do confess, that that action is sin, which is deprived of the end due unto it.

Moreover, what manner of fear of hell-fire is that, when as they proceed every day in casting themselves headlong into it? Or what sorrow is there for the loss of the celestial kingdom, when as they continually refuse the same, being offered them by the holy scriptures, and by the preachers? If they be moved with less desire to sin, and take less pleasure of their sins; yet do they take so much delight in them, as they cannot be plucked away from them. If they hear the word of God with any diligence, yet having heard it, they have it in derision; for so much as they hope, that those things promised therein shall happen unto them, although they live in such sort as they do. Wherefore we see, that all these things do wander from the mark and end which is appointed. And seeing that all these motions be of small efficacy, and do leave men under the wrath of God; there can nothing that is sound be hoped for at their hands.

But let us hear what Isaiah, in the 58th chapter pronounceth concerning this same kind of works; Every day (saith he) do they seek me, and will know my ways, as it were a nation that wrought righteousness, and had not forsaken the statutes of their God. They ask of me the ordinances of justice, and they will draw near unto God. Wherefore do we fast (say they) and thou seest it not? We have afflicted our souls, and thou regardest it not. Behold, in the day wherein ye fast, ye find out that which ye desire; and ye all seek and require your debts. Behold ye fast to strife and debate, and to smite with the fist. Is this such a fast as I have chosen? These words of the prophet do teach most plainly, that it is sin before God, to seek after his ways, to fast, and for a man to afflict himself; seeing such works may be done without the true worshipping of God, and without piety. It cannot be

denied, but that these are indeed goodly and plausible works; but yet God the just judge doth refuse them.

Augustine, in his book of confessions, doth lay before us a plain example of himself, concerning this matter: for he showeth the motions which he suffered in his mind, before he was converted unto Christ. For thus he writeth in the eight book, and eleventh chapter; I lived in my bond, till the whole was broken in sunder, wherewith I was holden being now little: but yet was I holden. Thou O Lord by thy severe mercy didest double in mine eyes the scourges of fear and of shame. I said inwardly with myself; Behold now let it be done. Now in a manner I know it, and did it not. It wanted very little, but I even now touched it, and held it; and yet touched it not, nor held it not. And the worst that was grown in use, more prevailed with me than the better out of use. And that very instant, wherein I was to become a new man, the nearer it approached to me, the greater horror it drove into me. I was held back by trifles of trifles, and by the vanities of vanities, and by mine old wanton lovers, which privily whispered; Doest thou now forsake us? And shall we never anymore after this time be with thee? Doest thou? And from this time forward wilt thou never use this or that? And I now began to hearken unto them a great deal less than half. These things he declareth, and accuseth them before God to be sins; which nevertheless are so greatly commended by these men. These indeed were means, whereby God brought Augustine to salvation; yet in the meanwhile, they were sins in him: for he obeyed them not, but corrupted them with many abuses; so that he could not with efficacy be changed thereby. But whatsoever wanteth his due perfection, is sin.

18. But these Sophisters are like a kind of serpents called Hydrae: for when one argument is cut off, as it were a head, another ariseth. They object

to us the Publican, thus praying in the temple; God be merciful to me a sinner. And it is said, that he went home to his house justified: wherefore (say they) he was a sinner, when he prayed; for we read that he was afterwards justified. But his prayer pleased God; wherefore (say they) we may do works acceptable to God before we be renewed. But these men should have remembered, that this man prayed; the which thing could not be done without faith, as we declared touching Cornelius; For how shall they call upon him, upon whom they have not believed? Wherefore he was justified, even at the same time that he prayed. Neither must thou so understand those words, as though he was then first justified, when he had finished his prayer: for although it is said to be afterward done, yet doth it not follow thereof, that the same was after no sort done before. He obtained a more perfect justification, a more ample spirit, and a more near feeling of God's mercy. He calleth himself a sinner, and that justly; partly because he felt still in himself that which he misliked, (for always how just soever we be, we be commanded to pray; Forgive us our trespasses;) and partly, for that he pondered in his mind how grievous sins he had committed before he was justified.

And godly men ought chiefly to consider, while they be praying, how great the burden of their sins is: for when they come unto God with their prayers, they be moved with true repentance to say with David; My bones are consumed away in my crying out; continually day and night thy hand is laid heavy upon me; my juice is dried up, as the moisture of the earth is dried up in the summer. Innumerable evils have compassed me about; mine iniquities have closed me in on every side, so as I cannot see, they be more increased than the hairs of my head; my heart hath failed within me. I acknowledge my wickedness, and my sin is always against me; against

thee, against thee have I sinned, and done evil before thee. And to the end godly men should the better beware of sins afterward, God doth stir up in them the sharp feel of his wrath; that they may know what they have deserved, unless God had holpen them by his son. Also he openeth the eyes of them, that they may perceive what his fatherly chastisement is towards them: and that the same may be the better felt, he oftentimes deferreth from them the taste and feel of his mercy. Therefore they cry; Make me to hear thy joy and gladness, that my bruised bones may rejoice; hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all my wickedness; a clean heart create in me, O God, and a perfect spirit renew within me; cast me not away from thy face; take not thy holy spirit from me.

Wherefore, they also that be justified do pray, that what infirmity is yet left, may not be imputed unto them. They call to mind those things, wherein they grievously sinned before; and they crave with tears to have some taste of God's mercy, and of the righteousness which is bestowed on them. And this is the very natural meaning of such godly prayers. Neither must we think, that the same Publican prayed otherwise: for he was not so minded, that he would still retain his old purpose to sin: but he truly and from his heart converted unto God. But our adversaries imagine, that they, which still persevere in their sins, and have not determined to change their life; yet that they do some good thing which pleaseth God. But we be taught, out of the holy scriptures, that He which believeth in God, hath eternal life, and therefore is justified: but as for other things, neither be they good, nor yet do please God. Wherefore, seeing the Publican prayed, and that faithfully; it is certain that he had eternal life, and was not destitute of justification.

19. But that all these things may be the perfectlier understood, it shall not be from the purpose; to know what things are required unto a good work, to

make it acceptable unto God. First of all, he that doth any good thing, it behooveth him to be moved by the spirit of God: for otherwise, in us, that is, in our flesh dwelleth nothing that is good; and they which be led by the spirit of God, those be the children of God. Secondly, it behooveth, that faith be present; by which it is understood for a certainty, that the work which we take in hand, is of those kind of things, which God willeth, and by his law hath commanded to be done; For whatsoever is not of faith, the same is sin. Neither ought we so to handle the matter, that our own heart should accuse us in that thing which we do. Thirdly, whatsoever we do, the same must be wholly directed to the glory of God: that hereunto chiefly and above all things we have regard, that the praise and glory of God may be set forth by our works; Whether (saith Paul) ye eat, or whether ye drink, or what other thing soever ye do, do it to the glory of God. Fourthly, forsomuch as, by reason of the infirmity, which is grafted in us, there is always some want in our works; yea even in those works, which seem to be done well, it is necessary that the grace and mercy of God, through Christ, be present with us, whereby that defect or want may be supplied.

For this cause David saith; Blessed are they whose iniquities be forgiven; blessed is the man unto whom the Lord hath not imputed sin. And Paul saith; There is now no condemnation to them which be in Christ Jesus. Again; That which was impossible to the law, insomuch as it was made weak through the flesh, God sending his own son, &c. These testimonies sufficiently declare, both that our works do fail of their perfection and just end: and that also it cometh through Christ, and the mercy of God, that that blame mingled with our works is not imputed unto us. Lastly, this also is required, that no man glory of that which he uprightly doth; but that he glory in God only; and acknowledge that what he doth, he doth by his

goodness; and not of his own strength: for Who hath separated thee (saith Paul to the Corinthians?) What hast thou that thou hast not received? But if thou hast received it, why doest thou glory, as though thou hadst not received it? When all these things, which I have here recited, shall take place: the work without all controversy will be good and acceptable unto God.

Here may the diligent reader, out of these conditions of a good work, gather the definition thereof. On the contrary part, if we have respect unto the nature of man, not regenerate: we shall easily perceive, that these conditions which we have said to be necessary unto a good work, cannot be found in him, For he is altogether void of the spirit of God, and of faith; and is so infected with the love of himself, that whatsoever he doth, he referreth it not unto God, but unto his own profit. Moreover, forsomuch as he is a stranger from Christ, it must needs be, that he is left under the law: so that, what defect or fault soever there be in his works, (as of necessity there must be much) the same cannot by any other means be recompensed. To conclude, if perhaps he have done any notable and goodly work; he doth not glory in God, but in himself: for he is ignorant of Christ, and of grace. By these two descriptions of a work, good and acceptable unto God; and of a man that liveth without Christ: I think it is now manifest, that those works cannot be good and acceptable unto God, which proceed from a man that is out of the faith.

20. But our adversaries endeavor to wrest from us two very strong places, which we use for the confirmation of this matter. The first is, that we say; An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit; the other is; Everything that is not of faith, is sin: of which things somewhat must be said in this place. That metaphor of an evil tree, which cannot bring forth good fruit, Christ

used not only in the seventh chapter of Matthew; but also in the twelfth chapter of the same Gospel: and thereof he inferred; Ye generation of vipers, how can you speak good things, when ye yourselves be evil? But before I make open this cavillation, I think it good to declare, how Augustine, in the fourth book, and third chapter against Julian the Pelagian contended for this self-same place. He setteth forth a goodly work of a man being an infidel; namely, to cloth a naked man: and he demandeth, whether this work may be called a sin? Surely, unless this work be of that kind that pleaseth God, I perceive not, that any other work of an infidel can be acceptable to him. And Augustine affirmeth, and proveth, that the same is sin: and least that he might seem to speak this without reason, he saith; It is therefore sin, because he that did that goodly work, glorieth in his work: for he doth not by faith acknowledge either God or Christ, to whom he should ascribe the doing thereof. Moreover, he saith, that To avoid the nature of sin, it is not enough that a good thing be done; but also that it be well and uprightly done.

Shall we their say, that an infidel hath done a good work, and wrought uprightly? If we grant not this, then we confess that he sinned. But if we do grant it, then we confess the fruit to be good; whereas the infidel without Christ, is an evil tree. By this means we shall grant, that an evil tree doth bring forth good fruit: which thing nevertheless Christ doth expressly deny. Our adversaries therefore are driven to such a pass, that now they do not fight against us only, but even against Christ himself also: unless peradventure they will say, that a man being faithless, an infidel, and a stranger from God, is a good tree. But if they affirm this, how do they deny, that he pleaseth God; seeing that which is good, cannot be but acceptable unto our good God? But he which pleaseth God, must out of all doubt have

faith: for unto the Hebrews it is written; Without faith it is impossible to please God. But these men, by this their heresy, will obtrude unto us, that which the same epistle denieth can be done. But a man (say they) in that he is a man, is no evil tree. But Augustine saith; If we consider the natures only, then shall there be nowhere any evil tree: for both angel and man were created by God, and received good natures. But these natures must not be measured by us, according to that which they were made by God; but according to the state which came unto them afterward. A man endued with a good will, shall be called a good tree: but an evil tree shall be the man, which is endued with an evil will. And we say, that after the fall of Adam, and the first ruin of our kind, men be such, as they are not moved with a good will; but with an evil.

But to return to the alms of an infidel, whereof we began to speak; we may demand, whether this mercy, which is showed, be of faith, or be faithless? And forsomuch as it is done without faith, it must needs be faithless: wherefore it cannot be without vice and sin. It is not sufficient to have mercy of our neighbor, unless the same be also done faithfully and rightly: for mercy is not of itself alone good. For God hath disallowed many benefits bestowed upon our neighbors; as when the king of Israel spared the king of Syria; and Saul, Agag the king of Amalek. But faith which worketh by love, is always good, and can never be evil. But forsomuch as mercy is not of that kind, therefore it is necessary, that there be used an uprightness, whereby it may be done faithfully to receive commendation. They cry out, that this natural affection of showing mercy is good; which thing peradventure we will not deny. But they should have considered, that men not regenerate, abuse the good thing, when as they direct it not to God, who

is the only end of all our actions: neither surly doth he commit a slight sin, which perversely abuseth so great a gift of God.

21. Furthermore, the same Augustine affirmeth, that Whatsoever good thing can be perceived to be in the work of an infidel, the same is wholly of God. Wherefore, in that our neighbor is holpen, and some ordinance of reason observed, and some civil honesty retained; that cometh not any otherwise, then of God: but so far forth as it proceedeth from an infidel, and a man corrupt, it is sin, and displeaseth God. By these, and such other reasons, Pelagius was led to confess, that these men, which so by nature behave themselves aright, are good indeed, but yet without fruit. Augustine again replieth against them, saying; that Such is the nature of barren trees, that either they bring forth no fruit at all, or else evil fruit. But Pelagius still endevoreth to clear himself, and therefore he saith, that these men are to be called barren: for that, although those things, which they do, be good; yet help they nothing to the atteinement of the kingdom of heaven. But in saying thus, he saith nothing; nay rather, he hindereth his own self. Truly the Schoolmen of our time have even the very same opinion; the which thing Augustine withstandeth by all the might he can: for he saith; By this means the Lord, which is good, shall cut down and cast into the fire a good tree bringing forth (as ye say) good fruit. What manner of justice is this, which ye so severely defend everywhere? Upon this opinion of yours there follow many vain and absurd things. Thus much hitherto out of Augustine.

But our men boast, that they differ much from Pelagius: for we put (say they) a certain grace preventing and knocking, whereby in the hearts of men may be enclosed some good treasure, by which they may work some good thing: wherefore they are not plants utterly dead; for after a sort they bring forth fruit. And although that which they do bring forth, cannot bud forth

into flowers, and into tried fruit; yet are there boughs, which may and do come forth of some sap of the grace of God; whereof, even they, which be strangers unto the grace of God, be altogether destitute. But Pelagius confessed even the very same things: for he misliked not the name of grace, when as nevertheless, by the same name (as Augustine doth prudently discover him) he understood what he listed, rather than what he ought: and a far other matter, than that word signifieth among the catholic writers, or in the church of Christ, or in the holy scriptures. But these men, in their similitude, have small consideration: for they remember not, that the Lord in the gospel did curse the tree which only bare leaves without fruit, and also commanded, that the same should be cut off, and cast into the fire.

But there is nothing in the danger of God's curse, and of hell-fire; but sin. But they have yet another color, whereby they would avoid this place: for they say, that these trees indeed be evil, but yet not utterly dead; for in them there is found out sap of grace. For they affirm; that there is in man a certain grace, which knocketh and preventeth; whereby in the hearts of men not regenerate, some good treasure may be enclosed, out of which may spring some blossoms from a man not penitent. For although they be not able to make that (which they bring forth) prosper unto a perfect and ripe fruit, or to bear flowers; yet at the least wise they bring forth boughs and leaves, which doubtless be a token of secret grace and life. It is a wonder to see, how these men stand in their own conceit, concerning this knocking and preventing grace: whereof we have declared before what is to be thought. But they, which speak and judge after this sort, are too much without consideration: for they mark not, that this grace of theirs, is no other, but a certain inviting unto Christ, but yet not of efficacy; for men therewithal are left under the wrath of God, neither are their hearts changed.

What good treasure then can be in them, from whence may bud forth works acceptable unto God?

But because we will not fly from their similitude: Whereas they say, that there be plants, which bring forth boughs and leaves, although they have no fruit; yet they should have remembered, that Christ (as we before have said) cursed those sort of trees: and when as he had sought for fruit upon the fig tree, and found nothing but leaves; he smote the same with so effectual a curse, as it dried up. We deny not, but that by men may be done some civil and moral good thing, which proceedeth through that power of God, wherewith all things be preserved: for as the Ethnics also confessed; In him we live, we move, and have our being. But that power, wherewith God governeth and moveth all things, doth nothing at all further men unto eternal life, which be not regenerate. But the state of our cause is; whether they, which be as yet aliens from Christ, can do anything, which may be allowed and acceptable unto God: that is it which we deny, and they affirm. But how much the place maketh for us, which is brought concerning the evil tree, which cannot make good fruit, there hath been sufficiently spoken.

22. Now let us examine the other place, which these men go about to wrest from us; Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin. This place did Augustine in a manner always object against Pelagius. Pelagius made answer, that this is no other, than a particular reason, which was spoken only of meats; and for that cause ought not to be extended unto other works, especially of infidels. Indeed we confess, that that question sprang first by reason of meats. But after what sort the reason thereof is alleged, let us consider by the words of Paul; He which judgeth (saith he) that is, [he which putteth doubt in each part, and eateth] is condemned: this was to be proved. The reason which he gave, was; For that it is not of faith. But seeing this saying is but particular,

neither could that, which he had spoken, be reduced to a Syllogism, unless there should be added a universal proposition, therefore he added; that Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin. By which sentence Paul's meaning is, that so often as we attempt anything, he would have us to be thoroughly assured, that the same shall be acceptable unto God, and is of him required by some commandment of the law: which certainty if it want, he saith, that whatsoever we do, it is sin.

And Paul's firm argument may thus be knit together; Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin; To eat meats prohibited in the law with a doubting, whether the same be lawful or no, is not of faith; Therefore it is sin. Although the apostle proveth a particular proposition, yet he useth an universal reason: the which as it is applied unto meats; even so it may be applied unto all other actions, so as all things whatsoever do want this faith, be sins. Wherefore, neither we, nor Augustine do abuse that sentence, when we apply the same to the works of misbelievers. But in these days many cry out, that Faith in this place signifieth the persuasion of the conscience, and that Paul respected not that faith, which we say doth justify. But these men take too much upon them, which bring in a new signification of faith, without any testimony of the scriptures: wherefore we might well deny this unto them. But forsomuch as, if we grant them that which they would, yet are they still compelled to return to our opinion; therefore we will not much contend with them about the same.

Admit it be as they would have it; grant we that faith be the conscience. But what persuasion should there be of conscience, concerning works, that the same may understand, which be good, and which be evil? Doubtless other rule can we not have (if we be godly) than the law of God: for that is the rule, wherewith the good and the evil must be judged. From thence must

appear the persuasion of our conscience, that by faith it may understand that work to be good, which it taketh in hand: and contrariwise to be evil, if it strive against the law of God. And this is nothing else, but that which we before spake concerning faith. Wherefore, let us leave these men, who, when they would be seen to speak things differing from us, do fall before they be aware into one and the self-same opinion with us.

But we be here taught, that whatsoever we take in hand, a special regard must be had, that we be assured of the will of God. And the same thing taught Paul, when he said; Let us try what is the good will of God. And as the same apostle writeth unto the Ephesians; Let us not walk as unskillful, which understand not what the will of God is. And that it be not thought, that this interpretation is of our own devise; I desire the reader to look upon Origin, upon Primatius the disciple of Augustine, and upon those Commentaries, which be ascribed to Jerome: whom thou shalt find to be of the same judgment, when they expound even that place, which we have now alleged; for they acknowledge no other faith than that, which all men acknowledge.

23. But now to come to the principal point of this controversy: I think, that it is plentifully confirmed out of the holy scriptures, that all the works of infidels be sins. Of which mind not only is Augustine against Julian, but also Ambrose in his book *De vocatione Gentium*, the third chapter, for he saith, that Without the true worshipping of God, those things, which seem to be virtues, are sins. Basil, in his second book *De baptismo*, and seventh chapter, of purpose moveth this question, and maketh on our side. And he citeth places out of the scriptures: as out of Isaiah; A sinner, when he sacrificeth, doth all one, as if he should offer up a dog: and when he offereth sweet cakes, it is all one, as if he offered up swine's flesh. And he

added; He which committeth sin, is the servant of sin, and serveth it only. Again; No man can serve two masters, God and mammon. What agreement is there between light and darkness, between God and Belial? Finally, he citeth that testimony, whereof we entreated before at large; An ill tree cannot bring forth good fruit: upon all these testimonies he concludeth the very same thing, which we teach. By these things I think it is now plain, what we are to judge of the state of men not yet regenerate; first, they are free from the servitude of compulsion; secondly, in moral and civil works they be able to do many things by their free will; lastly, among sins, they have some choice, and sometimes embrace this sin, and sometimes that sin, as their will serveth them: but yet they be not so free, as to do those things, which may please God: also they be bound to the miseries and calamities of this life, will they or no.

Now must we speak of the liberty of men regenerate, which, besides that it is not less than the same, which we have declared to be in the wicked; yet in this point it goeth beyond it, that it can attain unto good works, which be acceptable unto God. For who is ignorant, that the work of Abraham, wherein he was prepared to sacrifice his own son, was most acceptable unto God? For he was therefore highly commended by God himself. Paul unto the Philippians calleth their alms, sacrifices having a good savor. And unto the Hebrews we be taught, that God is marvelously delighted with such sacrifices. And hereof it cometh, that Paul warneth the Philippians, that with fear and trembling they should work their own salvation. But what need is there of any other testimonies, when as the Judge himself, in the latter day, shall reckon up the good works which godly men have bestowed upon the members of Christ? Seeing therefore that men regenerate be good trees, it is agreeable, that they both can and do bring forth good fruits. Howbeit, they

which be thus regenerate, must never forget, that they obtained not this freedom by their own merits; but by the benefit of God: for he fashioned them anew, and instead of stony hearts hath put into them a heart of flesh. Finally, it came not of themselves, but of the heavenly father, that they should be drawn to Christ: for, unless they had been with great efficacy persuaded inwardly in their minds by God the father, they had no less fled away from Christ, than other men. Wherefore, in that first change of impression of the holy Ghost, our mind only suffereth, as they use to speak: but after that we be once persuaded and changed, we are so restored, that we be able to work together with the holy Ghost, and with grace.

24. And in what sort this restoring of free will is, it must be considered by two principal points; out of which we at the beginning (when we described the nature of will) declared that every sin, and every error that is in election or choice, doth come; because that when we deliberate touching any matter, either we are utterly ignorant what is just or unjust; or else, for that though we see what is just and unjust, yet lust and perturbation intermingleth itself, which by their great force cause us to prefer the weaker reasons before sure and strong reasons. Wherefore, the knowledge of that which is right cannot take place. For the violence of the affections, and the whole attention of the mind, is fastened upon those reasons, which serve for pleasure and lust; and the honester arguments are not considered, and therefore do not break forth to effect. But by the benefit of regeneration, both these discommodities are holpen: for as touching the first, the light of faith is present, which by adding the rule of the law of God, manifestly understandeth in the practicing of things, what things are just and unjust.

Furthermore, by the power of the holy Ghost, although all corruption of the affections be not taken away; yet is it so broken and made feeble, that it

is not able, as before, to hinder the making of a right choice. Howbeit, for that this lust, so long as we live here, cannot utterly be consumed; therefore it comes to pass, that this liberty, which is given unto the godly, to do things which may please God, is not perfect and absolute; but weak and maimed: and in this sort it is set forth in the holy scriptures. For touching those works, which be acceptable to God, many men are greatly letted many ways, that they cannot do them as they would, and as the law requireth: for they always feel a law in their members, which fighteth against the law of the mind; that whether they will or no, they be led captive unto the law of sin. For even as we read to the Galatians; The flesh so lusteth against the spirit, as they do not the things which they would. And Paul complaineth, that he did not the good, which he earnestly desired, but rather the evil, which he hated. Godly men no doubt do in mind Serve the law of God, but in their flesh the law of sin: in whom yet this is a notable gift of God, that they exceedingly bewail and lament these impediments; that although they doubt not, but that they have the first fruits of the spirit; yet they groan, and fervently wish for the perfect restitution.

Moreover, there happeneth fallings unto them every day, which do admonish us how weak this our liberty is. For this cause John saith; If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and there is no truth in us. Also James saith; We all offend in many things. And the Lord hath taught us in our daily prayer, to cry unto the father; Forgive us our trespasses. But nevertheless, we are not hindered by this imperfection of liberty; but that we may work together with God, and to frame ourselves as apt instruments unto the holy Ghost. Wherefore Paul warned Timothy to stir up the grace that he had in him. And in the first epistle to the Corinthians, he admonished them to apply themselves to the free gifts of God, and to gifts

more excellent; as though their diligence were required to be able to use rather this gift of the spirit than that.

But those which are said to have these things, are not simple and bare men; but when they be endued with the grace and the spirit of God, they be called the men of God: and because they be the men of God, they be also called perfect, and instructed to every good work. Wherefore we grant, that men born anew in Christ, have all that freedom which we grant unto the ungodly: and moreover, that they be also able to do works which be acceptable unto God, although they be not free, neither from sin, nor yet from the calamities and miseries of this life. Now should we also speak of the fourth state of man; but we may answer in one word touching the same; That seeing in our heavenly habitation we shall enjoy the chief felicity, no kind of liberty can there be found wanting: unless a man will call that a liberty, to be able to sin, and to fall away from God, that is, from the chief good thing [which there cannot be.] But because that is a chief liberty, therefore we hope well, that in that country we shall be most free.

25. But now there is another question to be entreated of; to wit whether this concupiscence, and those corrupt motions, which remain in the regenerate, be sins, and so ought to be called? These things are called by Paul, The law of sin; and the law of the members. And by an example of himself he taught, that they remain in godly men after regeneration. But whether these be sins or no, cannot rightly be defined, unless we first understand what sin is. Augustine saith, that Sin is whatsoever is spoken, done, or coveted against the law of God. But whether this definition belong unto all sins, or to those sins only, which be commonly called actual; it is uncertain, by the ambiguity of this word, Coveted or Lusted. For if the same be referred unto the full assent of the will, whereby we assent to corrupt

desires, then is the definition stretched unto actual sins: but if this word Coveted, be so largely taken, as is the last precept; Thou shalt not covet, the definition may be universal, and may comprehend all sins. The Master of the sentences, in his second book, and 35th distinction, cited that definition, when he had now largely entreated of original sin, and had disposed himself to the searching forth of other natural sins: wherefore it seemeth, that he thought the same definition to pertain only unto actual sins. But howsoever it be, touching this matter I will not much contend. Ambrose, in his book *De paradiso*, and eighth chapter, setteth forth indeed a most large definition of sin; Sin (saith he) is nothing else than a transgression of the law of God, and a disobedience of the heavenly commandments. But to pass over the sentences of the Fathers, the matter must be brought to the trial of the scriptures, that by them we may certainly know and understand what sin is.

John, in the first epistle, and third chapter; Sin (saith he) is ἀνομία, that is, Iniquity. That Greek word is compounded of the particle privative ἄ, and of this word νόμος, that is, A law. Here the nature of sin is very well declared; for it is said to be a privation or want, whereby is taken from it the good thing which it ought to have. If thou inquire what that good thing is, which by sin is removed; this Greek word νόμος expresseth it: for that good thing is taken away, which is expressed by the law of God. Wherefore we may say, that it is sin, whatsoever withstandeth the law of God. Now we are to see, whether this definition, which is taken out of the holy scriptures, be correspondent or answerable unto that corruption, which remaineth in the godly, after regeneration. This do we affirm, but our adversaries deny. Howbeit the scripture, without all controversy is of our side: for Paul saith expressly, that The law of the members warreth against the law of God, and of the mind, and that the wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God, so as

neither it is, nor can be subdued unto the law of God. And it wholly striveth against the first and greatest commandment; Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind, with all thy heart, and with all thy strength. For if all our strength and ability, as meet it were, would yield unto God; this coveting would never be resident in us. Furthermore, the very same coveting or lusting doth also wrestle against the last precept; Thou shalt not cover. And Augustine testifieth, that these two precepts cannot fully be observed: and what the cause is, why they be given, seeing they cannot be kept, he alledgeth goodly reasons, which shall not here be needful to recite.

26. We have declared by the definition of sin, that this coveting, whereof we speak, is sin. Now let us consider of other arguments. One is taken of the institution of man; for Man is made to the image and likeness of God: and; We be predestinated, that we might be made conformable unto the image of the son of God. And we are commanded To put on the new man, which (as Paul saith in the third to the Colossians) is renewed to the knowledge and image of him, which hath created him: and which new man (as it is written in the epistle to the Ephesians) doth consist in righteousness and holiness of truth. And the image of God, which we are commanded to put on (as Tertullian saith) herein consisteth, that we have one and the self-same motions with God. And Paul, to the Philippians, exhorteth us To be of one and the same mind with Christ. But these motions and lusts do most shamefully corrupt and blot the image of God in us. Furthermore, that which we ought to crucify, mortify, and put off; the same of necessity must be sin: for if they were good things, the holy Ghost would rather have admonished us to nourish and maintain them. But Paul to the Colossians saith; Mortify your members, which be upon the earth. And unto the Galatians; They which be of Christ, have crucified the flesh, with the

concupiscence's thereof. And in another place; Put off (saith he) the old man. But and if so be these motions do so displease God, it is in no other respect, than because they be sins: for God is so very good, that there is nothing displeaseth him, unless it be sin.

Lastly, unto sin death is due as a reward: wherefore, where no sin is, there death can have no place. For this only appertaineth unto the son of God, to die an innocent; For he died for our sins: but we therefore die, because we be not without sin. And if it be so, then let us see what our adversaries can allege; why infants, which be now born anew in Christ, do die. For actual sins they have not, and the guiltiness or blame of original sin is taken away: there remaineth only lust and corruption of nature, not wholly amended: and corrupt motions, which Augustine in his eleventh book of Confessions saith, are found in infants; and he both confesseth, and accuseth them as sins: and therefore, seeing these be sins, they do not unjustly die for them.

Forsomuch then as it appeareth, by most substantial reasons, that the corrupt lusts, which remain in us after baptism, are sins; now it resteth, that we see, unto what kind or part of sins they belong. Sin may seem thus to be divided; that There is one thing, which may be forgiven; and another thing, which cannot. Transgression against the law of God, which is never forgiven, is sin against the holy Ghost. But if sin may be forgiven, that may be two manner of ways: for either it is so forgiven, as we must of necessity altogether depart from it; which we see come to pass in sore and grievous sins, which Paul saith, Do separate us from the kingdom of God, and commonly be called mortal: or else be so forgiven, as we depart not from them; partly, through ignorance engrafted in us, and partly, by reason of the infirmity, wherewith we be infected.

And those be called small or venial sins, without the which man's life cannot here be led. Paul hath put a notable difference between these sins, when he exhorteth us, that we should not suffer sin to reign in us. And of this third kind of sins the apostle complained, when he said; O unhappy man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? And of these sins do we mean, when we teach, that the works of men, notwithstanding they be godly men, be not without deadly sins; for that we do nothing without this kind of defects. And such kind of defects be deadly, because in their own nature they deserve death: for The reward of sin, is death. Further also, for that so long as we carry about with us these blemishes of corruption, we cannot enjoy the life eternal: for so long are we excluded from it, until by death we have put off all corruption. Moreover, it is written; Cursed be everyone, which abideth not in all the things, which are written in the words of this law. And he which complaineth with Paul, that he doth not the good which he would, doth not perform all the things, which the law requireth, nor is not utterly without curse: though the same, through the mercy of God, be not imputed unto him unto eternal destruction.

27. And so do the men of our part speak of the good works of godly persons; not that either we deny good works, or that we think not that the good works, which are done by the men regenerate, are pleasing unto God: but that our uncleanness and impurity may be acknowledged, to the perceiving whereof we are blockish, and more than blind. Wherefore, setting aside sin against the holy Ghost; other sins are divided into three degrees. In the first is coveting or lust, which is engrafted in us; secondly, out of it doth spring continually the first motions and impulsions unto diverse sorts of wickedness; thirdly, cometh a consent of the will, and

breaketh forth into act. Paul assigned these three degrees, when he said; Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies, that ye should obey the lusts thereof. Sin, which ought not to reign in us, is the engrafted lust and corruption of nature. The first motions are the lusts of concupiscence, which spring from thence, the which we are admonished not to obey. Then is added obedience, which doth consummate and make perfect the sin, which is commonly called actual sin.

It is not to be doubted, but that the corruption of nature appertaineth to original sin. Again, that sin, unto the which cometh the consent of the will, they call actual. But there is a doubt touching those first motions, by means whereof we, through the benefit of Christ, be not tied to a new blame and bond of the judgment of God) whether they be to be referred unto original sin, or unto actual sin. Surely they are between both, and they take somewhat of each part: for, so far forth as by them we do work, covet, or desire anything; they have some consideration of actual sin. And Paul useth the words, ποιεῖν και πράττειν; which out of all doubt signify some action. But on the other part, because we suffer this kind of motion against our wills; therefore therein they communicate with original sin: for that sin is not taken by choice, and of our own accord.

Jerome upon the seventh chapter of Matthew, maketh a distinction between πάθος καί προπαθεία. πάθος (saith he) doth signify the first motions, after that the consent of will is come unto them: and προπαθεία, when they do move and stir up from the beginning. And he addeth, that although they have a fault in them; yet are they not held for great faults: but the passion is to be counted for a sin. Here thou must note, that Jerome confesseth, that the first motions have the blame of sin; although they be not counted for crimes, that is, although by the benefit of Christ they are not

imputed unto death: or else, although in man's judgment they be not counted for a crime. And sin is again divided into that which is only sin, and into that which is both sin, and also the punishment of sin. Of which distinction Augustine maketh mention, upon 57th Psalm: for he saith, that The first falling away from God is sin only; but those sins which follow, are both sins, and the punishments of sins, until the time that men come unto hell fire. Wherefore, what evils soever are committed between the first apostasy, or falling away, and [the time of] hell fire; the same as well be sins, as also the punishment taken for other sins. That hath Paul unto the Romans very well declared: for first he saith; that The Ethnics (no doubt) knew God, but they glorified him not as God. And for that cause he addeth, that They were delivered up unto wicked desires, being filled with all corruption and covetousness, &c. And at last he maketh mention of the condemnation of hell fire, saying: But thou, according to thy hardness and unrepentant heart, heapest up to thyself wrath, against the day of wrath, and of the revelation of the just judgment of God, wherein he shall render to every man according to his works.

But there be many which think not that these sins be the punishments of sin; because, of them men take no small pleasure. Howbeit, unless they were blind, they might easily understand by the apostle, that they are punishments, and such indeed as are most grievous. For he saith, that Their heart was blinded, and that they were made fools, although they boasted that they were wise men, and were given over by God unto a reprobate sense, to defile their bodies with shamefulness. And what are all these, but most grievous punishments? If when one hath committed theft, his hands should straightway be cut off, or his eyes plucked out; we would say that he were grievously punished by God. Paul saith, that These men were deprived

of their mind, that their heart was made foolish, and that their bodies were most shamefully defiled. And shall not these seem to be punishments?

How can we esteem our mind to be safe, sound, and uncorrupt, if sin do reign therein? Solomon saith; Can any man nourish fire in his bosom, and not burn his garments? Or can a man go upon hot burning coals, and yet not burn his own feet? And therefore sin is called a punishment; because it hurteth and corrupteth nature: for the unhappiness of original sin hath so marred the same, as it can scarcely seem to be half on live. And the corrupt motions, and violent rages, which often times spring out of that unhappiness; unless they be kept short, and mortified, do make it the more raging. Finally, if thou yield or give thy consent to them, they evermore become stronger and stronger; and so nature runneth evermore headlong to the worse.

28. All these things have respect hereunto, that we may understand, that lust grafted in us, and corrupt motions, which still remain in our minds, belong to this kind of sins; but yet so, as they are punishments of another sin going before; namely, of original sin; if it be not of some other sin that is more grievous. Yet nevertheless this is to be noted, that the first falling away also is in such sort sin, as it is also a punishment: for as we have said, there is no sin, which doth not most grievously hurt the nature of man; and so at the least wise it hath a punishment of itself joined with it. But every sin is not the punishment of another sin going before it: but those, whereof we now entreat, we affirm to be punishments of sin going before; yea, and we abide by it, that they be sins. But it seemeth a wonder unto many, that seeing these be of necessity, how they can be sins.

But touching this matter, let us hear what Augustine saith in his third book *De libero arbitrio*, and 18th chapter; Some things also (saith he) done of

necessity, are not to be allowed: as when a man would do well and cannot. For otherwise, why were these words spoken; The good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. To will is ready with me, but to perform the good, I find no ability. And this; The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh. For these words are one repugnant to the other, that the things which ye would not do, those ye do. But all these things belong unto men, and proceed from that condemnation of death: for if they be not a punishment of man, but nature in man; then are they no sins. For if we depart not from that state wherein man was naturally made, so that he could not be better; then, when he doth these things, he doth what he ought to do. But if a man were good, it should be otherwise: but now, since it is thus, he is not good, nor yet is it in his power to be good; either for that he seeth not what manner of one he ought to be, or else in that he seeth the same, and is not able to be such a one as he perceiveth he should be. Thus much Augustine.

In which words many things are most worthy the noting. First of all he confesseth, that there be many things which necessarily happening, are to be disallowed. Secondly, he alledgeth a reason why they are called sins; because we depart from that state wherein we are naturally made. Thirdly he saith, that a man is not good, neither hath it in his power to be good. Fourthly, he bringeth two reasons why he cannot be good; either because he seeth not what is to be done; or else for that he seeth it, but by reason of infirmity is not able to perform it. Lastly, this is to be noted, that he meaneth these things of men which be regenerate. For he citeth the words of Paul to the Galatians, and those places which we have now alleged; which things we have declared, cannot be understood otherwise than of the regenerate. But against this saying of Augustine, that seemeth to be, which

Jerome writeth in his interpretation of faith; We say, that they do err, which say with Manichaeus that a man cannot eschew evil.

29. But these things may be reconciled easily enough: for Jerome speaketh of nature, as it was instituted by God. For he writeth against the Manichees, which taught, that we therefore cannot resist sin; for that we were by nature created evil, by an evil god. Yet there is none of us which doubteth, but that man, when he was created at the beginning, was most free. But that Augustine speaketh of nature after the fall, it sufficiently appeareth, in that he saith; All these things pertain to men, and came from the condemnation of death. Besides, he confesseth, that this is the punishment of man being fallen. Moreover, if these things be referred unto the regenerate, we may say, that the saying of Jerome hath a respect only to the grosser kinds of sins, which do separate us from the kingdom of God; from which sins we doubt not, but men born anew in Christ may abstain. But Augustine speaketh most largely, and by sins understandeth those also, the which we are presently in hand with; without the which we cannot here lead our life. And this latter solution is cited by the Master of the sentences, in his second book, and 36th distinction.

But they will object unto us, that we do injury against baptism, if we say that sin is not taken away thereby. But we cannot justly be accused of this crime: for we affirm, that the guiltiness or imputation of fault is taken away by regeneration. For although these vices remain, as both the scripture declareth, and experience teacheth; yet their bond [of punishment] and guiltiness is discharged. Wherefore Augustine sundry times saith; that Concupiscence indeed remaineth, but the blame thereof is taken away by Christ. And he addeth, that sometime it cometh to pass, that the act and work of sin passeth away, as we see it is in theft, and in adultery; but the

guiltiness nevertheless abideth. And sometime it cometh to pass, that the blame is taken away, but the fault remaineth: which is plain to be seen touching this lust, whereof we speak. In deed the same remaineth, but yet we cannot there-thorough be accused as guilty of eternal destruction. If thou demand wherefore it is called sin, seeing the blame is taken away; I answer, because that in so much as it is not imputed unto us, it hath not that of his own nature: for touching his own nature, (as we have before taught) it deserveth death and damnation; but this cometh by another means, namely, by the mercy of God through Christ.

But everything ought to be judged of, as it is in itself, and according to his own nature. Wherefore, seeing the proper nature of sin is to strive against the law of God; which thing we see cometh to pass in lust, and in these first motions, therefore they are to be called sins. Neither do we by this our declaration, fall into that foolishness, wherewith the Pelagians reproached Augustine and other Catholics; as though they should say, that by regeneration is not blotted out sin; but only raced. For when as hairs be shaven, yet there remain still under the skin, the roots, whereby they grow up again. For although we affirm that in men regenerate remain still lust, and corrupt motions; yet do we not deny, but that God is perfectly reconciled unto us. Wherefore, although these in their own nature be sins; yet by the mercy of God they be so wiped out, as they cease to be imputed to us at all. So then, if we have respect to imputation, there remaineth nothing of them.

30. Last of all, they object unto us, that we do injury unto Augustine, in that we say he affirmeth, that these be sins; seeing he interpreteth himself, that they be called sins improperly. For as a scripture or writing is called a hand, because it is done with the hand: so these things are called sins,

because they come from original sin. And as cold is called slothful, because it maketh us slothful; so these motions are called sins, because they stir us up to sins: but yet properly they are not sins. So (say they) Augustine doth not only interpret himself, why he called these, sins; but also hath given us a way how we ought to understand Paul, when he calleth them sins. Hereunto we answer, that if Augustine, or any other of the fathers, deny that these be sins; the same must be understood by way of comparison, if they be conferred with actual sins: but not that the nature of sin can wholly be taken away from them. Which thing Augustine in another place most plainly declareth: for against Julianus, in his sixth book, and eighth chapter; For neither is it (saith he) any equity, when in one man either the superior parts, are after a vile sort servants unto the inferior parts; or the inferior parts after a vile manner resist the superior parts: although they be not suffered to get the upper hand. Seeing he calleth this sin, iniquity; he plainly teacheth, that unto it is agreeable the nature of sin, which we before described.

And in his fifth book, and third chapter against the same Julianus, he thus writeth; The concupiscence of the flesh, against which the good spirit lusteth, is sin: because in it is a disobedience against the government of the mind, and it is a punishment of sin; for that it is rendered unto the merits of the disobedient person; and it is a cause of sin, through the falling away of him that sinneth. Here we see, that concupiscence or lust, is by Augustine three manner of ways called sin. Neither can it be said, that he writeth these things of a man not regenerate: for he saith expressly; Against whom the good spirit lusteth: for the spirit of God is not in the wicked, with whom he might strive. Wherefore we have out of Augustine three places; one, which we cited before, out of his fifth book *De libero arbitrio*, and two against

Julianus, wherein he expressly confesseth, that concupiscence is sin: and he bringeth a reason why he so thinketh. Neither ought our adversaries, as concerning the interpretation of Paul, to run unto a figure, to say, that this is not properly to be called sin: for both out of Paul, and out of other places of the scripture is brought good reason, why concupiscence, or lust, is truly and properly called sin. And it is to be wondered at, that these men, which are so ready else-where in every place with their figures, when as in this one proposition; This is my body, they so much contemn all kind of figures, where nevertheless a figure is most convenient for that sentence. And if thou desire other testimonies of the fathers, to prove that lust is sin; we have before cited Jerome upon Matthew: and in Augustine against Julianus, there are found cited many other sentences of the ancient fathers; all which do make with us.

**These things which follow are taken out of the like place upon the first to the Corinthians, at the end of the second Chapter.**

31. Now must we search out, whether the liberty of the will be taken quite away, by means of those things which we have rehearsed. But because Paul affirmeth, that A natural man cannot know those things which be of God: it seemeth a while to be against free will. For if we be not able, through our natural power to comprehend spiritual things; how can it come to pass, that we express them in our actions: seeing we see by experience, that there is much more business and labor in doing, than in understanding? And not only this, but also the predestination, or prescience, seemeth to be a hindrance to it. For it seemeth that this may be inferred; If God hath known all things, before they be brought to pass, and cannot be deceived, the liberty of our will is quite gone, and all things happen of necessity. Also, the power of God, wherewith all things be wrought, causeth no small difficulty

of this matter: for of such efficacy is the will of God, as Paul to the Romans said; Who is able to resist his will?

Moreover, the scriptures affirm sin to be of so great force, as by the same all things in a manner are corrupted and despoiled in us: wherefor the strength which is left unto will, is very feeble, the which is not able to do as reason hath appointed. Again, so much is attributed to the grace of Christ by divine oracles, as without the same it is said, that we are able to do nothing, which either may be acceptable or grateful unto God. And seeing the same is not equally given unto all men, it is thought that their liberty is destroyed; for so much as they have not this grace in their own power. The Mathematicians also extol the powers celestial, and in a manner persuade, that of them do depend those things which happen; so as there might not seem to be left unto us the perfect liberty of such things as are to come. Finally, there have been such also, who would affirm, that there be definite causes of things to be done; the which being joined one with another, and tied with a sure knot, there is brought to them a certain necessity and destiny, which cannot be withstood.

32. But we need not stand much upon that argument, which was taken from the force of knowledge; because it expressly appeareth by those things, which we have already spoken, that this liberty is not judged to be in men not yet regenerate, as concerning works, which be in very deed good, and do please God: wherefor that kind of reasoning is not to be weakened, seeing it surly confirmeth the doctrine of the apostle. In the next reason there is a more difficulty and trouble: for there be few, which can perceive how the providence of God, or (as they term it) his prescience can suffer any free choice to remain in our will. And the place is so difficult and dangerous to be dealt in, as many of the old writers, in reasoning about this

matter, were brought to such a pass, as they judged altogether, that of those things, which be done, there ariseth a necessity: yea, and they supposed, that God himself is held with this necessity. Whereof came a proverb, that God also might not withstand necessity, so as he durst not attempt anything against the same.

Through this liberty of theirs, the poets went further, and said, that many things be done, even whether the gods will or no. And Homer brought in Jupiter to be sad, and to lament the necessity, or destiny, by the force whereof he was let from removing death, which approached unto his sweet son Sarpedones. And he maketh Neptunus to take very grievously the chance of his son Cyclops; of whom he being stirred up with a lust to revenge, would have driven Ulysses altogether from home, and complaineth, that this was not granted to him by destiny. And in Virgil, Juno doth no less outrageously bewail; because she had kept wars so long together with one nation, and yet could not remove (as she desired) from the coast of Italy the Trojan navy. But we Christians do not in such sort speak of God: for we have most certainly learned out of the holy scriptures, that there is nothing impossible to God; and we are taught by Christ himself, that all things are possible unto God. And our faith, after the example of Abraham, doth chiefly cleave to this persuasion; that God can do whatsoever he hath promised. Neither must we conceive in our mind, that Christ was either condemned unto the death, or forced to the cross against his will, or his father not willing. God would these things to be done, not being led thereto by an inevitable necessity; but by a superabundant and exceeding charity towards men. So the scripture teacheth us, which saith; So God loveth the world, as he gave his only son, &c. And unto the Romans it is written; Which spared not his own son, but

gave him for us all. Christ himself by the same love, was moved to die for us; and he taught us, that A greater love than this can none have, that one putteth his life for his friends. And thereby he showed himself to have exceeded the measure of man's love; because he would suffer death for his enemies. And that he willingly, and of his own accord took death upon him, he sufficiently declared; when in the last banquet (which, according to the Paschal custom, he kept with his apostles) he said; I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you.

33. By these places we perceive, that the Lord's death was thoroughly foreknown, and understood, and did in no respect infringe the liberty, either of Christ, or of the father. Therefore Cicero, otherwise a very learned man, is greatly to be wondered at: against whom Augustine, in his fifth book *De civitate Dei*, especially in the ninth and tenth chapters, earnestly disputeth concerning this question. The controversy dependeth upon this, that in the latter book *De divinatione*, all things are refelled, which were brought by Quintus, Ciceros brother, in the former book. And Cicero endeavoreth by all means, to overthrow all predictions of things to come, and of the prescience of God. Therefore Augustine affirmeth, that the Astrologians had reasons, which were better to be borne withal, than his: because, though they attribute overmuch unto the stars, yet they take not away all divination and prescience. And a certain Physician (as the same Augustine declareth in his book of confessions) being a grave man, and one that detested Astrology; when he was demanded, how it came to pass that Mathematicians did prophesy so many truths, he durst not (contrary unto all histories and experience) deny every divination; but he answered, that a certain destiny was spread over things: and he affirmed, that it was not incredible, but that reasonable souls did after a sort feel it. Surely there is nothing to be found

more repugnant, than of the one side to affirm God to be; and on the other side to take from him the prescience of things to come. The prophet Isaiah would these things to be so firmly knit together, as he said; Show us what things shall come to pass, and we will declare you to be gods. But that Cicero had small knowledge, and no good judgment of God; it appeareth by his book, which he entitled *De natura deorum*: wherein, disputing under the person of Cotta, he striveth utterly to take away the nature of God.

And surly, it is to be lamented, that so notable a man is to be charged with that, which the psalm of David ascribeth unto fools: for there it is written; that The foolish man hath said in his heart, There is no God. Upon what occasion he appointed those parts in the dialogue unto Cotta, which was a bishop; I do not well understand: unless perhaps he considered, that none in a manner are to be found, which both more freely speak, and worse do esteem of God, than they do, to whose trust are committed ceremonies and holy things. And because it was not hidden to Tullius Cicero, that it is a very odious thing to profess an opinion, whereby God should be denied: therefore, when he had disputed as much as he thought good; in the end of his book he showed his opinion, yet in the behalf of Lucius Balbus; and so, as he saith to Velleius, that the opinion of Cotta is to be allowed. Cicero was a man very studious, as well of all kind of learning, as specially of the civil law. And whereas he thought, that the state of man's doings should be overthrown, if free will were denied: and he not knowing by what means this liberty might be retained, with a prescience of things to come; he rather yielded, that God's wisdom should be taken from him, than that we should be deprived of the freedom of our will.

Whereupon it may be gathered, into what darkness and obscurity of things the sin of the first man hath driven mankind: for what a madness is it to go

about to throw God, the creator of all things, out of the fortress of his wisdom, that thou mayest preserve man? This is that over self-love, which every-where in the scriptures is condemned: we would that all things should perish, rather than our selves. This doth not godliness require. Wherefore we, which be taught by the spirit of God, declare that both must be confessed; namely, that both God doth foreknow all things, and also that the freedom of our mind (as we have showed before) must be retained. So do the holy scriptures instruct us, wherein we read; Whom he foreknew, them hath he predestinate to be made conformable to the image of his son: and that We were chosen by God before the foundations of the world were laid. In them do we learn, that The hears of our head everyone are numbered: that The little sparrows light not without the will of our heavenly father. And seeing we judge, that God doth all things rightly and justly; we cannot think that he dealeth without reason and understanding.

34. But go to, let us more nearly consider the manner of Ciceros reasoning. If (saith he) things to come are certainly known before, things among themselves shall have some certain order: and forsomuch as nothing is done without a cause, of necessity also it shall be granted, that there is an order and knitting together of causes. Whereby will come to pass, that all things, which be done, be done of necessity; by which means just and wholesome laws shall perish: and no admonitions or rebuking's will be left, neither can there be any place for religion or prayers. Wherefore thou must choose, whether of these two evils thou wilt: either that there is divination, and prescience of God; or else to maintain the free power of man's will. Both together cannot be had, they be repugnant one with another, as he thinketh. Wherefore unto him it seemeth altogether necessary, that one of these be maintained and defended; and that the other be refused, as false

and unprofitable. Which deliberation being taken, as Augustine no less wittily, than godly said; Cicero, otherwise a very prudent man, while he coveteth to make us free, maketh us impious and wicked persons, who should rob God of the knowledge, which he hath of things to come.

And we must diligently mark, that his arguments make no less against the foretelling's of our prophets; than they impugn the divinations of the Ethnics, whereof he at that time disputed. Wherefore thus I think best to answer his curious reasons. Let us grant him what he would; to wit, that for the establishing of God's prescience, we agree that there is a certain and determinate order before God, as well of things, as of causes. But that which he bringeth in at last; namely, that all things will therefore come to pass of necessity; that will we deny. For though there be an order of causes appointed, yet doth it not follow thereof, that there cannot be some causes found among them, which may keep their liberty, or (as they call it) their contingence. And in this point Cicero seemeth to err more than the Stoics: for he, to save the liberty of man, would that all order of causes, and foreshowing of things to come, should be utterly taken away; which things take so sure hold of the nature of God, that the same being spoiled of them, it cannot seem to consist. But the Stoics, because they would take nothing from the nature of God, do bring in their destiny: and that our entire and perfect will may have a place, they altogether remove the same from the order of causes joined together.

35. But here let us join issue with him, that we may steadfastly deny, that the knowledge of God doth nothing at all hinder our will; although it comprehend the things which are to come: for never shall the will of man bring anything to effect, unless God have both foreknown it, and wild it to be brought to effect. When he shall know before hand, that tomorrow I will

either run or read; indeed I shall run and read, yet not driven thereto of any necessity, but (as they speak) contingently: for as far as belongeth to myself, I might do neither one nor other. But if thou urge further, and say; Yet nevertheless thou shalt do it, in such sort as God knew that thou shouldst do it. I grant: but thereof it followeth not, that I could not otherwise do; because we do not always that which we can do: nay rather, many things might be done, which in no wise be done. And in that I shall read or run, it proceedeth altogether of my own choice: for of all things it is most in our power, to will, or not to will. Wherefore when they say; Because God knew before, that thou wouldest read or run; Therefore of necessity thou shalt read: we must demand of them again, whether under the name of necessity, they mean a compelled and a repugnant will.

For if this be their mind, that we utterly deny: because it may be, that God foreknew that I would do something, and that neither unwillingly, nor with a constrained mind; but that I would do it willingly. But if by necessity, they mean that this should in any wise be done of me, we will not deny it: for so much as the controversy now is, not of the thing which is done, or is not done; but the disputation between us is only of the manner and form of doing. Neither (as he thought) are admonitions, laws, rebuking's, or religious prayers taken away: these things doubtless will be of force, and that more frequently than he could persuade himself; because God not only hath man's safety in his foreknowledge, but also he comprehendeth in his understanding, the ways and means, whereby he will help them. Wherefore if we shall perceive our brother to have need of the remedies, which we have here mentioned, we must boldly use them: for they have so far forth appeared, as God before hand knew, and would, that they should be profitable. Neither must we desist from our duty, although it may be, that all

mortal men would affirm that we labor in vain. For we must follow the law prescribed unto us, and not the secret prescience of God, whereof we have no surety what he hath decreed of things to come.

And seeing the prescience of God is not the nature, or (as they term it) the essence or being of our mind; we must give judgment of the actions which proceed from the same, according as they ought to be esteemed by the nature of the mind and will; and not by that which is placed out of the same. Wherefore, seeing the nature of will is, that it is moved, neither unwillingly nor by constraint; it cannot be excluded from it by any outward means. It may sooner be abolished not to be at all, than that the violent action can be taken there from: even as thou mayest easilier rid any of us from being men, than when we be men to make us that we shall not be furnished with a reasonable soul; for it followeth immediately, that the soul being abandoned of reason, he cannot any longer be a man.

36. But if thou demand yet further, whether it be a matter of necessity, that I shall read tomorrow; seeing God hath this foreknowen: we answer, that upon condition, or supposition, some necessity may be granted; but not perfect and absolute. Wherefore with that necessity, which we grant, the choice of free will may very well agree. Moreover, Aristotle in his Ethics, disputeth, and that learnedly (as he doth all other things) whether the casting forth, which is done in the sea, when shipwreck is at hand, is to be appointed among things voluntary. And although he there confesseth a certain action, that is mixed with willingness and unwillingness: yet nevertheless he concludeth, that those kind of actions belong unto the voluntary sense; seeing for that time, wherein the shipmen be in danger, they will them, and altogether make choice of them. And if so be that notable Philosopher doubted not to place willingness in this kind of action,

whereas men by a certain force are tried to constrain themselves, to choose that thing, which otherwise (if that chance had not been) they would never have done; then how much rather shall not we take willingness from our usual and common actions, when we perceive ourselves, of our own accord, and with a mind most willing, to do and endeavor those things, which we think good; although we doubt not, but God did long before understand of the same?

And that the necessity of this kind which we have taught to be by supposition, doth not overthrow the free power of our will; Chrysostom doth plainly show, while he writing upon the first epistle to the Corinthians, and interpreting these words; It behooveth that heresies be, that they which be tried among us, may be made manifest, saith: Not unlike this form of speech Christ used, when he said; It is necessary that offenses do come, but woe be unto that man by whom they shall happen. Also he said to his apostles, that It behooved Christ to have suffered, and so to enter into his glory. All these things in holy matters are so to be expounded, as when they be called things of necessity; yet nothing must be taken away from the nature of man's will. And this among the School-men is wont to be called, A necessity not of the consequent, but of consequence.

37. There be some which commonly say, that doubtless these distinctions help us nothing at all; if God have known before hand of things, those shall in any wise come to pass. Yes verily, they are profitable unto us, and that not meanly: for because thereby we understand, that man's will is not compelled; but that willingly and without compulsion it desireth whatsoever it will. For otherwise I will ask thee again, whether thou wouldest be saved against the will and consent of God? I suppose not. But if thou wouldest be saved according to his will, he of necessity is not ignorant of thy salvation:

for so it is ordained, that none willeth that which he is ignorant of. It happeneth unto us very often, that we together behold players; yet dare we not say, that the sight and knowledge which we have, bringeth any necessity to them which play: and yet, while we see them in play, it is of necessity, that they do play. Wherefore, as that necessity infringeth not the nature of their will; even so the excellency of God compelleth not the will of man.

Some brawl at us, and say, that this similitude is far from the question proposed; because none at any time do behold players, which be not, and play not indeed. Whereas it is ascribed to God, that he hath had a knowledge beforehand, of all our doings even from the beginning: when as yet, neither we, nor any of our actions appeared to be. To these men I might answer, that unto God all things are no otherwise present, then they which do play are conversant in the fight of them which behold. Let everyone therefore take heed to himself, that he cast not the causes of his sins upon God; and when such a kind of cogitation entereth into his mind, let him have respect unto lust, voluptuousness, wrath, hatred, and other perturbations of the mind, wherewith he is sore diseased; and out of these fountains let him seek for the causes of his sins. Neither must there be much credit given unto the Peripatetiks in this matter, which deny, that God hath understanding of particular affairs; least they should seem to think, that the mind of God were abject and vile, if he should draw his knowledge from frail and transitory things. This thing is not agreeable unto our documents: for we do believe, that God of himself hath a perfect knowledge of all things; neither that he hath any need to challenge knowledge else-where to himself.

38. And whereas touching the third point, it was judged, that the power of God is a hindrance to our will: the argument is neither perfect nor strong.

For, although that God by his infinite power, wherewith he is endued, doth what his pleasure is; yet doth he suffer the state and nature of things to stand whole: neither doth he violate them, or wrest them any other way, than the condition of them doth bear. Wherefore it is said in the book of Wisdom; that God doth mightily reach even from one end to another, and doth pleasantly dispose all things: or (as the Greek text saith) χρηστός, that is, Profitably. Which might not be said, if by the high power of God the natures of things were disturbed. The sum is, that God doth here moderate his power in ruling of the world, that he may fitly apply his action unto all manner of things. In the fourth place sin seemed to be a hindrance to the liberty of the will; as if it so weakened the powers of man, that after a sort they might be able to do nothing anymore. But there needeth not now many words about this matter; because there hath been plenty enough spoken in those things which we have declared, how much our liberty hath been diminished by reason of sin; and that specially as touching very perfect and good actions, which might be acceptable and well pleasing unto God. Besides, it hath been declared, that our liberty is not by this means utterly taken away; but rather, that there is as yet a great deal of it remaining.

39. Moreover, concerning the powers celestial, there shall be no great need to entreat; seeing the Astronomers do glory in their own books, that The wise shall bear rule among the stars. But and if so be that these things, which they pronounce, might not be escaped, all their gains would fall away: for no man would bestow cost upon the skill of those things, which he thought he should not be able, neither to avoid, nor change, either by endeavor or study. Which thing without controversy would ensue, if so be they should ascribe a mere necessity unto their foreshowing's. By this means all prayers, piety, and worshipping of God would be taken away: for

who would pray to God for obtaining of anything, if he were already persuaded, that the same should not be granted unto him? Wherefore Augustine said; They which thus think, do great wrong unto heaven: for there they believe is a court appointed, wherein are notable acts decreed, which cannot be avoided: the which if it were in the earth, it should needs be taken away. How much less must we think, that the same is done by God in the celestial parts? I beseech you what judgment would be left, if so be we did all things upon constraint?

This matter some excuse, saying, that from heaven is only signified what shall come to pass: yet that we be not thereby driven by any necessity. And they bring forth a place out of the book of Genesis, wherein it seemeth to be spoken; that The stars be put as signs. But that place is to be understood concerning seasons, winds, rains, tempests, and such like sort. But how can they affirm, that in heaven they see certain signs of things to come? They shall hardly prove it, especially touching man's affairs. For what answer can they make of twins, which being conceived at one time, and have all one aspect of the heavens; yet (as experience teacheth) the chance and success of them is altogether differing?

Augustine, in his fifth book *De civitate Dei*, and second chapter, is worth the reading; where he writeth, that sometime there happened two brothers to be like affectioned, that when one sickened, the other also was diseased: and when the one recovered, the other was also eased. Concerning which thing Hippocrates being demanded of his opinion, made answer, that he thought them to be twins; and that therefore they had the temperature or complexion of their body all of one nature. But Possidonius the Mathematician did ascribe the whole cause unto the stars; because in their nativity they occupied all one aspect of the heavens. But what (saith

Augustine) will these men say of twins, and innumerable living creatures, which are born in hours and moments alike; and yet attain to such diversity of fortunes? And Augustine witnesseth, that this example was taken out of Cicero; the which nevertheless we read not in his books at this day extant, unless perhaps he found the same in his book *De fato*, which remaineth amongst us all torn, mangled, and diminished.

40. Moreover, destiny, which the Stoics appoint to have mere necessity, hindereth not our matter; forsomuch as we admit not the same to be. They severed it from the wills of men, because they thought that all things would go to naught, if together with other causes they comprehended will under destiny. Howbeit, it seemed not good to them, utterly to sever man's will from destiny; saving in respect of the first choice, which they would have to be wholly in our will. But whiles we shall choose any cause that might be under destiny, they would have it follow of necessity; that what things soever they were, they should be joined unto it. Even as Euripides said unto Laius, that It was free for him not to procreate; but when he had procreated, then of necessity he should suffer even those things, which Apollo prophesied to be contained under destiny.

But we, as we declared at the first, deny not, but that things are knit together, as God ordained, and knew before hand; yet so, as the nature and condition of them remaineth whole and sound. For unto whom soever a thing contingent (as the School-divines speak) is due, they have the same: and to whom soever necessity belongeth, with necessity they be constrained. But in very deed, grace, which finally seemeth to resist free will, doth not take the same away; but rather helpeth and restoreth it. But now we will cease from these matters, least we dispute more curiously of them than beseemeth Christians. Let everyone follow their own vocation;

and let us leave inquiring, more than is requisite, about the secret and hidden will of God, touching prescience and predestination: and let us follow that doctrine of God, which is plainly laid out before us in the holy scriptures.

Look another place of the same argument in the addition at the end of this book. Now we think it convenient to join unto this disputation certain other discourses; namely, of Voluntary and Not voluntary, and also of man's choice, and such like.

**Of Voluntary and Not Voluntary.**

41. Aristotle in his first book of Ethics treateth at large of that which is voluntary, and of that which is not voluntary: the reason whereof is, because praise, dispraise, pardon, and sometimes mercy be voluntary. The argument is taken from the consequents. Praises and dispraises serve unto moral knowledge; for as commendable manners and actions are to be desired, so those which are blame-worthy are to be avoided. Howbeit, such praises and dispraises cannot be judged of, unless we know whether they be done with a willing or unwilling mind. Further, he added another cause; to wit, that this doctrine is a part of the civil faculty, whereto belongeth the making of laws. And laws set forth rewards and punishments to the observers and transgressors of them: it is needful therefore that they know which be voluntary things, and which be not voluntary. For men that be unwilling, do not obtain rewards; and they which sin by compulsion, should not suffer punishments. Some wrest this reason of law-makers hereunto, as though they ought to regard this, that they command not those things, which of necessity must be done, nor those things, which are impossible to be done; but only those, which be in our own power: and that therefore it behooveth them to know what is the nature of voluntary and not voluntary. I know in

very deed, that this is the definition of law; that It is a reason commanding honest things, and calling back from things that be dishonest. But that which these men avouch, to wit, that it commandeth things which be possible, I would only grant it as touching civil laws, but not of divine laws: for those require things that be impossible, especially in respect of the state of nature, corrupt and defiled. Howbeit, Aristotle used not this reason; he only touched these things which I have mentioned of punishments and rewards. But why did he speak of the affects, since those be not voluntary, but are naturally planted in our minds? The Greek scholies answer; that, albeit as touching substance and root they be of nature, yet may they some kind of way be called voluntary, insomuch as by use and exercise they may be enlarged or repressed. Or else we will answer, that Aristotle made mention of both, of affects I mean and of actions; but voluntary must only be referred to the actions. The which thing being done, it will also belong unto the virtues, which are conversant in the affections: for those also are gotten by actions, which when they be right and commendable, must be accounted voluntary. Moreover, why doth Aristotle say, that sometime pardon, sometime mercy must be showed? Because we do not always take mercy on them whom we pardon; for a man in defending himself, killed him which set upon him; he did it not willingly, he is forgiven, but we take not pity on him.

42. But how the knowledge of that which is Voluntary and Not voluntary, may help to moderate the punishments which laws appoint, it may many ways be showed. They which have committed anything against their wills, or of compulsion, are not punished: And in the civil laws there be very many titles, which provide remedy in the case of ignorance or compulsion: even as they do likewise concerning those things which be done for fear,

and by crafty collusion, and touching them which be under 25 years of age, &c. Also he that is taken with madness or frenzy is forgiven; yea and a mad man, although he kill his father; shall not be punished. The laws of God quit the hewer of wood, which by chance and not willingly shall kill another, because perhaps the axe might fly out of the helve, and certain cities were appointed for refuge. Also Plato in his ninth book of laws, showeth that many things are to be forgiven, where the will did not consent. So as it greatly availeth law-makers and judges of the law, because of giving punishments and rewards, to know what is done voluntary, and what is not done voluntary. We will speak first of Not voluntary: for in this matter the privation seemeth to be better known, than the thing itself. By darkness is the light better known, and sickness doth make the goodness of health the more manifest. This definition of Not voluntary appeareth by the reckoning up of the parts thereof, so that it is rather a division than a definition; albeit that just and full divisions have sometime the place of a definition. And we then chiefly use them, when that which is common to the parts, cannot be expressed by any one certain point thereof. Howbeit we must understand, that it is called Not voluntary, of these two forms or kinds, which be of one signification: for even that which is done violently and unwittingly, is not voluntary. And we prove, that the division of these two parts is rightly made: for Voluntary, which is contrary to Not voluntary, standeth of two things; of knowledge, and desire. First we must know that which we must desire, then are we stirred up thereunto by a motion of the desire. But either of these two may be hindered: ignorance taketh away knowledge, and violence letteth the desire. For good cause therefore be these two put contrary to that which is voluntary. Violence is defined what it is after this manner; It is a vehement enforcing, which either not at all, or very

difficultly can be abidden. But some man will marvel, how two things may be set against one: for against Voluntary is set that which is done by violence, and also that which is done unwittingly. Hereunto we answer, that there is but one set against one: constraint or Not voluntary, is set against willingness or voluntary. But this unwillingness or not voluntary, is afterward distributed into two parts: for it is one thing that is done by violence, and another which is done by unskillfulness.

43. And as touching violence, Aristotle saith that the beginning of the motion thereof must be outward: for those things which be moved by an inward beginning, are moved naturally, not violently. But some cut off the latter particle which Aristotle hath in that place, so as that which suffereth or doth, bringeth not any help to that beginning. Howbeit, those which so say are deceived: for as we perceive of a wrack that is made in a great tempest, the beginning thereof is outward; namely, there be winds, waves, and storms: but the wrack would not be, unless that the shipmen themselves would take out of the ship those things which are to be cast away. And they which under a tyrant, are forced to do things that be shameful, they have the beginning of their actions from without; namely, the commandment of the tyrant: but yet those things would not be done, if they themselves would not yield to the doing of them. Wherefore it appeareth, that these things have their beginning outwardly; yet nevertheless that they bring some help thereunto. Others think, that [Doing] is there added in vain: for if the beginning be an outward motion, then should it be enough if he were named a sufferer: for that which is moved, suffereth, but doth not. We answer; It may well be, that the self-same things which are moved violently, may also have a doing, as instruments: for a staff moved by us, doth also move a stone. And in some thick throng, where men be pressed, when a man is

there choked, he is crushed by those which stand about him; so as they are said to thrust against him, although they thrust not of their own accord, but are driven by others, and enforced by the rest of the company. The examples brought by Aristotle are such, as one of them is of a living creature, when against our wills we be carried away by men, in whose power we are. Another is of things which have no life, as when we be carried with the wind whither we would not, which oftentimes happeneth to them that be sailors. If any shall demand, whether voluntary and without constraint, be all one: we will answer, that without constraint extendeth further than voluntary. For without constraint, agreeth even to things that be without life, but so doth not voluntary. Neither is it required, that the first beginning should be a motion in us: for our knowledge cometh of an outward object, albeit that the same motion, wherewith the sense is brought to pass by the object, is of another order. The beginning whereof Aristotle spake, is the cause; yet not any cause ye will, but only the efficient cause. And that is understood to be the same, which is enough to move by itself.

44. There is moved a question, as touching certain actions, which seem to be as it were mean, and it is doubted whether they be voluntary or not voluntary. And the question propounded may either be simple, or of two parts. It is simple, if thou shalt say; Whether be those things voluntary, which are done for the fear of greater evils, rather than the obtaining of some good and honest thing? And they declare that such a thing happened unto Socrates, who would not obey the thirty tyrants, which required of him to kill a certain citizen of Athens: which he would not do, when nevertheless they threatened him, that they would kill his father and children. And this they sought, to the intent they might make him to be a companion and partaker of their most cruel purposes. The question also

(which liketh me better) might be of two parts; namely, whether those things be voluntary things, which are done for fear of greater evils; or for the obtaining of some honest thing, which otherwise would not be done. As if a lie be spoken, which in his own nature is filthy; it is doubtful whether it be voluntary or not voluntary, when it is made for the defense either of his own life, or the life of another man. Also adultery is a shameful thing, which no man of himself should choose: but if one, for the slaying of a tyrant, should, to win favor with the tyrants wife, have carnal copulation with her, that by her he might have a ready way to kill the tyrant; the question is, whether that adultery should be called voluntary. And all we know what great pains merchant men do take, what things the ambitious sort, and those which delight in pleasure, do endure, that they may enjoy their ends. And they would not abide those things which they do, unless it were for their commodity. Wherefore it is doubted, whether those things be voluntary. But if any man do doubt which be called great evils, let him look on those things which be their contraries, and he shall see that there be greater good things; namely, life, chastity, liberty, and godliness: and he shall perceive that death, breach of chastity, bondage, ungodliness, and such like, are the great evils: which things be so grievous, as many times some shameful things are committed for the avoiding of them.

How detestable things are oftentimes done for the scaping of death, may easily be known. Cato slew himself, because he would not come in subjection. Regulus, least he should break his faith, returned unto his death to Carthage. Virginius rather slew his daughter, than he would suffer her to live violated and a bondwoman. And many such like things have the holy scriptures. Lot rather offered his daughters to be deflowered; than he would suffer his guests to have injury done unto them; on the other side, his

daughters rather defiled themselves by incest with their father, than that the world should want [posterity.] Abraham to shun death commanded Sara to say that he was her brother, and put her chastity in open danger. In like manner Judith, with the danger of her chastity, went to Holophernes for the deliverance of her people. We dispute not here whether these things were well or wickedly done, but we only seek whether they ought to be called voluntary, or not voluntary. And there is a great difference between wicked men, which either to flatter tyrants, or else because they be delighted in shameful and evil works, offer themselves of their own accord to do these things: and between others which for honesty sake cannot be induced to commit these things, unless there be laid before their eyes great and most grievous calamities, or else great rewards. And thou mayest hear of some, which having proposed some great good unto themselves, will say, that for the obtaining thereof, they are constrained to attempt anything. And on the other part it is also said of many (that whereas they cruelly oppress the people, and bear rule for their own sakes only) they are constrained by tyrants to do that which is wicked. And at this day there be a great sort which fall away from the Christian truth, being constrained by the most cruel persecution of tyrants. There is also brought a similitude of the casting forth of things from a ship, which is done when the tempest of weather constraineth; not that this serveth anything at all unto manners, but that by the evidence of the matter, that which is now in question, may the better appear.

45. These actions, which we have rehearsed, are mixed actions: for in respect that they may be omitted, and are not of such necessity as they must in any wise be done, they seem to be Voluntary; but in respect no man could choose them for themselves, they seem, Not voluntary; but rather draw near

to the nature of those things that be voluntary, because in them is a certain comparison of evil things. Two evils are proposed; to wit, either poverty with the loss of goods, or else with those goods a present death: the will chooseth the less evil, and coveteth to avoid the greater. Therefore when the will doth his part in those actions, these things cannot choose but be called voluntary. Besides this, Aristotle in his Rhetoric's admonished, that the less evil hath the consideration of the good, and is greatly to be wished for, since that which is desired, is good: and there is no doubt, but it is the will that chooseth the end. But the end of these actions whereof we dispute, is applied to the consideration of the time. For since the safety which the mariners wish, cannot be had, except by casting their goods into the sea, the will doth choose that casting of them away. Wherefore the time in all this matter must be considered, I mean not that time which is past, or to come, (for before that chance, no man would choose these doings; and afterward when the mariners have escaped, they are sorry and discontented in their mind for those things which were cast away:) but the matter must be judged of, according to the present time, while it is done. And therefore, since there is then made a choice, and that the matter is called into deliberation, and that the original of the doing is in the doer of it, who either may do it, or may not do it; those things are said to be voluntary. As touching the action, we cannot judge in general, but we must have a respect to the circumstance of the time. And yet simply these things are called, Not voluntary, because for themselves no man would desire them: but nevertheless, since they be not considered simply, but are to be desired in this respect, and he that desireth them, is not without knowledge (for he knoweth what he doth) and his will or desire whereby he chooseth these things is present) therefore be they actions Voluntary. For all things must be judged of according as they

be done; and done they cannot be, but at a certain time, and therefore they must be judged according to that time, and not as they are apprehended by reason, for so are they, Not voluntary. For while they be considered of simply, they are set aside from the consideration of time. Neither is it to be doubted, but that herein cometh the consent of the will: for those things would not be done, unless the will would give her assent. True indeed it is, that no man would those things for their own sakes, but for some other thing: but yet this causeth not, but that they be Voluntary. If they were violent, the doer would not infer any enforcement thereunto: but the original of the doing and of the assenting thereunto is in him that is the doer, and therefore may choose whither he will do it or no. Seeing therefore these be called relatives and are referred unto the will; they must not be judged of simply, but according to the respect they have unto the will. Wherefore since the will (as hath been declared) hath place in those things, they must be called, Voluntary.

46. By two reasons have these mingled actions been proved hitherto to be voluntary. First, because they must be esteemed according to the nature of the time present, wherein they be done; secondly, for that they be in the power of the doer. For unless the will should move the instrumental parts, in very deed they would not be done. There is a third reason taken from praise and dispraise; Because men are sometime praised, and sometime dispraised in the suffering of these vile and shameful things; Therefore doth this appear to be voluntary: for praise and dispraise speaketh not but of things voluntary. And Aristotle saith; that Men are sometime praised or dispraised herein, because they are not so always, as we shall perceive: for otherwhile praise is not given to these men, but pardon is granted them; but on the other side (saith he) they be dispraised. That same particle [On the other

side] signifieth two things: either men will not abide reproachful things, for the love of great and excellent things; or else they suffer indeed such things, but yet for light and unworthy causes: in which causes they are reprehended. Aristotle only mentioned one of these, the other he kept in silence. These great good and honest things, for the which men must endure grievous and hard haps, are judged to be our country, our parents, children, wife, justice, and such like. Zopyrus the Persian, as Herodotus reporteth, mangled his own nose, his ears, and his lips, that he might betray the city of Babylon unto his king Darius. Ulysses (as it is said of Homer) suffered his body to be beaten, and to be deformed with stripes, and appareled himself in vile clothes, and in that habit, as if he had been a runagate servant, went unto the Trojans, and entering into the city, thoroughly spied out the same. But on the other side, all men dispraise Dolo, because he revealed the secrets of his own country, that he might not be constrained to abide any torments. But it is to be considered, that when it is said, we must sometime suffer shameful things, that must not be referred unto wickedness, or unto horrible crimes; for those things must not be committed for any manner of utility or honor: but it is only said, that those things should sometime be suffered, which have some grief and reproach. As if a magistrate should be bidden to run like a servant through the common streets, or to wear openly a woman's garment: if great preferment, and lawful commodity be laid before him, he will not refuse these things. So then, they must be very great matters, for the which the like should be done, if a man will be praised for the same. I do not allow the examples of the Scholies: for when they show, that these vile things must be suffered, they teach that a lie must be made, or else that there must be carnal company with a tyrant's wife, to the intent her husband may be slain. For these be sinful things, neither (as I have said)

doth Aristotle speak of them: neither yet can such things be commended, since that praises do agree with virtues, and dispraises with vices. There be some found of so abject and vile a mind, as they ought for just cause to be dispraised; since for a just and honest matter they will not suffer anything at all. So are soldiers dispraised, which forsake their station, and they that without constraint do yield up castles and strong holds. And in like manner are they dispraised, which are ready to do anything, rather than they will be compelled to pay any sum of money.

47. And it appeareth evidently enough, why Aristotle said; that Sometime praise doth follow the suffering of grievous things, because this cometh not to pass continually. For sometimes, neither praise nor dispraise do in that respect happen unto them which suffer reproachful things, but they are pardoned. And this happeneth, when [by reason of these things] a man doth that which becometh him not: as when tyrants do threaten those things, or else they shall light upon us, unless we suffer such reproaches, as are beyond the power of man's nature: there Aristotle saith, that we pardon him. It is offered unto men, that they shall be burned, or be cut in sunder: there, if they yield, either in disclosing of secrets, or in suffering of any vile thing, they are pardoned. And some think, that in those cases it is lawful to make a lie. Aristotle addeth, that nevertheless there be certain things, whereunto no man ought to suffer himself to be compelled: he ought rather to abide anything, and when he yieldeth, he shall not be pardoned nor excused. Wherefore our martyrs be in the right opinion, who have determined rather to endure anything, than to depart from godliness. Aristotle bringeth an example out of the tragedy of Euripides; for Alcmaeon was not pardoned, in that he killed his mother; because she was lead unto so great a wickedness upon a very light or rather ridiculous cause. Since these actions, whereof we

treat, be mixed (as we have said) of Not voluntary and Voluntary: when Voluntary beareth rule, either praise or dispraise followeth them; but if Not voluntary have the overhand, and that a man may seem to have done the thing against his will, he is forgiven. For those actions which be mixed, are so composed of two things; as either the one or the other of those things, whereof they be compounded, may surmount or overcome. And rightly doth Aristotle make exception of grievous crimes, which shall not be pardoned: for who will forgive him which condemneth an innocent, which committeth adultery, which betrayeth his country, which for the sharpness of torments denieth godliness? These things can or ought by no means to be excused. Anaxarchus, because he would not pleasure the tyrant, when he was beaten in a mortar with iron pestles, said: Beat on hardly Anaxarchus bag. So far was it off that he would change his will, or yield unto torments. And Zeno in his torments bit off his own tongue, least through the force of grief he should be constrained to bewray the conspirators. Wherefore there be four kinds of men, which Aristotle speaketh of; the first is, of them which are commended in their suffering of grievous things; the second, of them which are dispraised; the third, of them which obtain pardon; the fourth is, of them which obtain no pardon.

48. Aristotle showeth of two difficult and hard things which happen, in suffering or in not suffering of grievous and cruel things for an honest cause. The first belongeth to the faculty of judging; because we are oftentimes ignorant what things ought to be suffered for any cause: whether anything must be suffered in the goods of the mind; whether in the body, or in the goods of fortune; and again, what manner of things they ought to be that we should suffer, or that we should not suffer. And rightly doth Aristotle say, that this is sometime hard to be judged: for otherwhile, this

difficulty doth not happen. For all men know, that wickedness is not for any cause to be suffered. But Achilles doubted, whether he should rather have wished for long life (but yet without glory) by lurking at home; or else for famous glory, together with short life, by warfaring at Troy. Also a son will doubt, whether he ought to hold his peace; or to betray his father, whom he knoweth to rob his country, to enter into the treasury by secret passages in the earth, and from thence to steal away the common treasure. In like manner David will doubt, whether he ought to counterfeit himself to be a fool; or rather suffer himself to be slain of a barbarous king. The cause is hard to be judged: for sorrowful things are to be compared with dishonest things; neither is it easy for all men to discern between these things. And virtue consisteth in matters difficult. Therefore from hence come praises; or else, if we fly from virtue to vices, dispraises. Here doth variety of the circumstances increase the difficulty, which causeth that we cannot have certain rules in those things. The other kind of difficulty ariseth of the weakness of strength, not of judgment; for when we be out of danger or sorrow, we see what is to be chosen, and oftentimes we discern that which is right. But when we come to the feeling and experience of grief, pains and torments; we are then of another mind. Whereof also it cometh to pass, that when we be in health, we give good counsel unto them that be sick; but yet we do not rightly advise our own selves, when we are sick. And they are very much to be commended, which stand fast in their sound determination, and in their good purpose. And on the other part, they which shall fall from their sound determination, are to be dispraised. Themistocles is marvelously commended, who would rather die, than bear arms against his country. But they on the contrary side are most worthy of dispraise, which would rather deny godliness, than to suffer torments or death.

49. When Aristotle had set down two kinds of the things which be Not voluntary, then he confuted their opinion, which made a third kind of the same. For they said, that the wicked actions, which we commit for attaining of pleasure and profit, are violent: and they made only those to be voluntary actions, which be rightly consenting unto reason. By these reasons they are confuted. [ 1] The first is, because then all our actions would be violent: for whatsoever we do, we do for these causes; namely, for delectation and commodity. [ 2] The second reason is, because that which is violent, is joined with sadness: but they which deal for pleasure sake, are glad, not sad; so as it appeareth that those actions are not violent. [ 3] The third reason is; that then every evil man would excuse his evil actions, transferring his fault unto outward things; that is to wit, such as are pleasant and profitable; and he would say, that he were constrained by these things: which is a matter to be laughed at. [ 4] The fourth reason; There is no greater cause why these men should make themselves authors of honest actions, than pleasant and profitable things to be the cause of shameful actions; because they have in themselves the original as well of these as of those. Briefly, if these men's opinion were true, there would be no sins nor wickedness's of men, which might not be excused under pretense that the same is done against their will, or violently. The reason is alleged; because all men deal for these causes, namely for delight and profit. Which in very deed is true, if also under the word, καλά, thou comprehend honest things: for there be many, which for honesty sake do many things.

But thou wilt say, that the adversaries do not so use that word, as thereby they have noted only delightful and profitable things. I know it. But thus doth Aristotle argue, and saith, that They, which will rather blame delightful and profitable things, than themselves, which yield themselves so readily to

be allured thereby, deserve to be laughed at. This is it that they are justly to be blamed for, that they suffer themselves so soon to be caught by these things, and to be called away from just actions. Why should they attribute unto themselves honest things, and ascribe that which is dishonest unto outward things; seeing that those also are in our power? Even as it appeareth in men that be temperate and continent, which do soon temper themselves from these things. And furthermore it may be wondered at, why they do not in like manner say, that they are constrained by honest things; seeing that they choose them, and since those be no less outward, than be pleasures and commodities. Undoubtedly, if we of good right ascribe to ourselves honest things, the dishonest also shall belong unto us: for contraries do both belong to the self-same general kind, and are to be measured by the self-same rule. Aristotle seemeth to speak those things against Plato: for Plato said, that Good men are not made good by nature; as if he should say, they are good by will, and by their own election. And on the other side, of evil men (in his ninth book of laws) he said, that they are all and in all respects evil; but yet unwillingly. But Aristotle affirmed, that as well good men as evil are led by their own accord, and with voluntary actions. For as well of goodness as of naughtiness there be originals, which do move outwardly; to wit, things which do offer themselves to our understanding: but since they be both in the one and the other, there is a help and aid given thereunto by us, which do choose and discern the same.

50. Now that we have spoken of Not voluntary, which is done by violence; let us see what can be said of Not voluntary, proceeding from them that be ignorant. And first Aristotle taketh away Voluntary, from that which is done by ignorance; for nothing, done by him that is ignorant, can be called Voluntary; seeing this requireth a knowledge of that which is

done. But Aristotle noteth a certain difference of those men, which do anything of ignorance: for some of them, when they have afterward perceived what they have done; it repenteth them: and there be others, which repent them not, but rather confirm that which hath been done. These two kind of ignorant men, because they differ much one from another, do make diverse forms and kinds of ignorance: and because they differ one from another in matter, it is meet also that they be called by sundry names. Wherefore he that repenteth him, after he hath perceived his error, shall be called ἄκων, that is, One that doth against his will. And he which repenteth him not, shall be said to have done it being not willing: for he retaineth still the name of the general word; to wit, of Not voluntary. At the beginning our actions were divided, that some of them are Voluntary, and some Not voluntary. We began the discourse of the parts of this division, with that which is Not voluntary; and that, Not voluntary, we distinguished again into that which is against the will, or violent which is done by force; and into that which is done by ignorance. Violent was defined to be that, whose beginning is from without us, and wherein that, which is the doer or sufferer, giveth no help thereunto. Now is showed the other part of Not voluntary, whereby a thing is done thorough ignorance: and this is showed to be of two sorts; namely, with repentance, or without repentance. That which is with repentance, is simply against the will; but that which is without repentance, is at the beginning Not voluntary; but after the acknowledging of the fact, because he doth not repent him, he seemeth to be somewhat, yea to be very far from doing of it against his will; nay rather, that he hath somewhat Voluntary therein. These things therefore in name must be thus distinguished. The first shall be called he that doth against his will, and the other shall be called, he that doth not with his will. Oedipus is

said in the fables to have slain his father, and to have married his mother against his will: for understanding what he had done, he so repented him, as he put out both his eyes. And on the other side, Tiberius racked his host of Rhodes ignorantly, whom afterward when he knew, he put him to death. Wherefore at the beginning, when he racked him ignorantly, he did it not with his will; but because afterward he did not repent him, he could not he said to have done it against his will. And there may be brought another example. He that killeth a man, thinking he had been a wild beast, if he be afterward sorry, he did it against his will. But if any man, to whom brazen money was owing, receiveth gold, and doth not repent him of his error, but rather rejoiceth; he is said to have done it not willing, but yet not against his will. Thus may the reason be made; Whatsoever is done violently, or against the will, it hath sorrow or repentance joined therewith; But not all things that are done by him, which is ignorant, have repentance or sorrow joined therewith; Therefore all such kind of things are not violent or against the will.

51. There is used also another distinction. It is one thing to do through ignorance, and another thing for the doer to be ignorant. They are said to do a thing through ignorance or unwittingly, unto whom ignorance is after a sort the cause that they do. On the other side, many do things being ignorant, who by reason of some grievous perturbation, whereof themselves are the cause, do as it were bring an error unto themselves. These things differ as the general and the special kind, as a thing spread forth, and a thing drawn together. For whosoever doth a thing through ignorance, is ignorant; but not so on the contrary part, whosoever is ignorant, doth a thing through ignorance. Hereof Aristotle bringeth examples, first of drunkenness. Many things are done by drunken men, wherein they know not what they do; yet

are they not properly said to do anything unwittingly, because they might have abstained from too much wine: and they which drink more than is requisite, did bring ignorance unto themselves. Wherefore such a vice causeth not that they should be said to have done against their will. Another similitude is of anger: for they which shall be moved with a great fury of wrath, do oftentimes not know what they do, but yet they deal not against their will: for they ought to have tempered their wrath, and to have attained unto virtue, whereby they might have moderated that perturbation. Which, since they would not do, they are not excused of those things, which they through anger did amiss. And briefly it is said, that ignorance of that kind is the cause not of constraining the will, but of naughtiness; otherwise every wicked man is ignorant, yet is he not therefore to be excused. That evil men be ignorant, this doth prove it; namely, that they know not what to follow, or what to avoid. For they are beguiled of their own lusts, for whose sake they are so deceived, as they perceive not what things are truly pleasant, and truly profitable; and contrariwise, which be truly grievous, and which be truly damnable. Wherefore they are corrupt in their judgment, and know not the nature of the end for the which they work.

52. The reason may be framed thus; Not every evil man worketh through ignorance; But every evil man worketh being ignorant; Therefore to work being ignorant, and to work through ignorance, are things different. The Major proposition is manifest; because evil men (as is said) if they wrought through ignorance, might be excused. And that, as is contained in the Minor proposition, they be ignorant, we have declared a little before. A general ignorance (saith Aristotle) excuseth not. That is called general, which is not of the circumstances; but of the whole thing itself. As if one would say, that he is ignorant that fornication or adultery be sins; he is not excused, because

he ought to have known these things: nay rather, he shall be the more grievously accused for this ignorance. But a particular ignorance, that is to wit, of circumstances, excuseth and deserveth pardon; because the circumstances could not be known. Otherwhile such chances fall out, as no man can for certainty know such circumstances. But contrariwise, the general ignorance obtaineth not mercy; because it was in the power of them that are ignorant, to have learned it. Wherefore if they be ignorant, they themselves are in the fault, that they know not; and they seem to have had a desire to be ignorant. Again, if the excuse of universal ignorance were available, then should no wicked men be accused. The cause of their error is; that they only seek for pleasure and profit, but neglect virtues and honesty: which nevertheless they do unadvisedly.

Whereupon Plato in his treatise Memnon, doth very well expound this. First he taketh this as granted, that there is no man which would be a miserable and unhappy man. Which being granted, he addeth, that then there is no man which desireth evil things; since to be miserable, and to be unhappy, is nothing else, then to be conversant in evil things, and to be delighted in them. So then it appeareth, that evil men do choose to themselves those things that be evil, unwittingly. And this error (as saith Cicero) we have sucked together even with our nurse's milk. But the reason why this general ignorance maketh not a man to do against his will, is, for that it hindereth not his choosing of things, nay rather it is joined therewith: for ill men choose rather to steal than to labor, rather to be idle than to exercise any art, rather surfeiting than abstinence. It may be, that otherwhile the whole matter may be generally unknown, and sometime generally known, but unknown privately and particularly. As if any man shall say, he knoweth adultery to be sin; but that he is ignorant particularly, that this

adultery is forbidden: neither of these ignorance's is worthy of pardon. But if any man do not know the circumstances in general, and think that there is no consideration to be had of the end, nor of the place, nor of the time, nor of the matter that he is about to do; whether shall this man be worthy of mercy or pardon? No verily: for he ought to have known this. And this common kind of perceiving belongeth to the universal knowledge, which must in any wise be had: but the ignorance of this or that circumstance particularly may be excused, since no man either may or is able perfectly to know all those circumstances in every particular. Wherefore only the ignorance of them maketh the action to be an action done against the will.

53. And because such circumstances be of great weight (for they obtain pardon and mercy when they are not known,) therefore Aristotle reckoneth them up, that they may be thoroughly tried out and known. They are in number seven or eight: and there is a common verse of them in the schools;

Who, what, where, whereby:

Wherefore, how, and when.

These are seven, but yet one wanteth, that is, Whereabout; under which word is signified the matter or subject of action. And when it is said of Aristotle, Wherein, there be signified two things; namely, place and time. So that, if we will have the just number, there be eight; of which number this reason may be alleged. Because either we respect the causes of the action, or else we consider the nature or substance of the action. The cause, if it be efficient, then is it named of this circumstance, Who. If it be the end, then we account it of the circumstance, Wherefore. Or if it be the matter, then we add to it the circumstance, Whereabout. Or if it be as touching instruments, or the organs, we refer it to the efficient cause [which before we called, Who.] But if so be we consider the action itself, the nature

thereof is expressed by the circumstance, Whereby. But when we consider the measure thereof, then have we the circumstance of time and place, which we call, When and Where. And last of all, we regard the proportion of the manner, which is a thing belonging to quality, and is the circumstance that we named, How. No man (saith Aristotle) is ignorant of all these circumstances (he meaneth) of them all at once. A man may be ignorant of one or other of them particularly, but none can be ignorant of them altogether, unless he be a very fool: for how shall a man have no knowledge of himself? This is not generally true, because a man may easily be ignorant of the cause efficient. If himself be that efficient, I confess it is the harder, not to know himself. But even this also may haply come to pass, that one, sometimes minding another matter, may stir a ship; and yet marketh not that which he doth. But that we now speak of, is to be understood for the most part. Howbeit, this subtle point falleth not out in things that are moral. The matter is made plain by examples.

What did the circumstances excuse Aeschylus the tragical Poet? He in a tragedy did seem to reveal certain sacred mysteries of Ceres, which thing raised so great a tumult in the theater, as he was well near slain. He fled unto the altar of Bacchus, from thence he was brought to the judgment of the Areopagits: he pleaded his cause, he excused himself, that he knew not those things to be mysteries; and because he knew not what he did, he was quit. Also another man made a certain engine or instrument of war, which did cast stones: the effect whereof when he was minded to show, he discharged the piece, and by a stroke killed a certain man: he excused himself that he knew not what he did. The circumstance, Whereabout, which is the matter or subject of action, appeareth by the example of Merope. She lay in wait for her son, and killed him, thinking that he had

been her enemy, when he was her son. Heer the error was in the circumstance, Whereabout. And this example is said to be in Euripides, in the tragedy of Crespontes, which is not extant. Sometimes we know not: and that is called the circumstance, Wherewith; as if a man think he runneth with a blunt spear, and the same shall be armed with a sharp head. Or a man thinking that he doth throw a pumice, when he hath thrown a stone, whereby somebody is hit, or wounded, or slain. Otherwise we are ignorant of the end. A man for health, or for recovery from sickness, letteth blood, giveth a medicine, or lanceth the flesh, and there followeth a contrary effect; for either the party dieth, or he is hurt: the ignorance of the end doth excuse him.

Also the manner of the action: as when a man doth a thing and would not, it holds him excused. They which contend one with another, with all the strength of their hands or fingers, (which is a kind of wrestling) and one mindeth to teach the other, and thinking to strike but lightly, striketh grievously: he is excused. Since that there is an ignorance in those things, that which is done shall be counted against his will, especially, if those circumstances, which are the more principal, be hidden from us. And these circumstances be, Wherefore, Whereabout, or Wherein. But Aristotle in his example seemeth to have omitted the circumstance of place, and time, [that is, Where and When.] Which is no marvel, since they might seem to be known well enough, as those which needed no examples. Neither is it required, that when many things of one sort be expounded, examples should be brought of all things. For it sufficeth, that some things be showed so to be: for the examples, which make plain some of those things, do serve also for the declaring of other things. But least there should be found a lack of them, we say it may be, that some man knoweth not that the place wherein

he committeth any evil is holy: and otherwhile also the circumstance of the time; namely of a festival day, or of a holy day, or of a birth day, may be unknown.

54. If that which is done against the will, ought to be ascribed to the actions which are done unwittingly, while we be ignorant of these particular circumstances, there is required moreover, that the error being known and discovered, the action should be grievous, and we should be sorry for that which happened to us unawares. For if this grief should not ensue upon it, the action may be called, not voluntary, yet shall it not be against the will. But here it is worth the seeing, how ignorance can be called the cause of a thing done against the will. This is therefore, because it depriveth us of knowledge, which if it had been present, that which is now done, had not been committed; or if it had been committed, it had made the action voluntary. Wherefore, either it depriveth us of the knowledge, whereon voluntary doth depend, or else it depriveth us of that knowledge; which, if it had been present, the action had not followed. And it may be, that he which doth unwittingly, hath ignorance joined together with the act which he doth; and yet he is not unwilling to that which is done, but rather desireth it: whereupon there followeth no sorrow afterward, when the thing is known.

And this kind of ignorance doth not excuse him, nor yet maketh him to have done it against his will. As when a man, thinking to kill a heart, killeth his enemy, whom he before wished to have been slain; and now being slain, rejoiceth, notwithstanding he then knew not what he did. There is moreover, a certain ignorance, which some of set purpose would have: for they desire and choose, that they may be ignorant, least by knowledge they should be withdrawn from sinning, or from pleasures. And this kind of ignorance is greatly to be accused, much less excused. There is another ignorance, which

is so done, as a man knowing what is right and meet, when he cometh to the action, neglecteth that cogitation of honesty and right; and rather considereth his profit and pleasure. And this cometh to pass, either of a vehement perturbation of the mind, or else of some ill habit. Neither also doth this ignorance excuse, for he that so is ignorant for lack of consideration, he doth not that which he might and ought to have done. Now and then, ignorance cometh hereof, that a man will neglect to learn, or else for that he shunneth labor, or because he useth no study and diligence. For every man ought to know the general laws. Since therefore even this man doth not that which he can and ought, he is not to be excused. Howbeit, in these actions there is something that is Not voluntary, for this ignorance preventeth actions, or the motion of the will, which motion if it were present, knowledge would not follow. The last ignorance is that, whereof we treat: this excuseth, it obtaineth pardon and mercy; because the circumstances are not known, and for that after the action, sorrow and grief do follow.

**Of that which is Voluntary.**

55. As touching Voluntary, the definition standeth of two parts. First (saith Aristotle) the beginning thereof must be inward. Secondly, the circumstances must be known: for if voluntary be contrary to that, which is against the will; and that which is against the will, consist of two parts: then is it necessary, that the contraries to them must be placed in the definition of voluntary. Hereupon we see the excellent method of Aristotle: for except he had before hand showed the nature of violence and ignorance, he could not so easily have defined what voluntary was. Moreover, Aristotle was the rather moved to write of these things, because that those things, which are done of angry men, or men that are moved with desire, are comprehended

in the definition of voluntary. For both the original of the doing is in the man himself, which is the doer, and they do understand and very well know the particulars: for they use deliberations, and sharp judgment, either to revenge or to compass that which they desire: which would not be done if they were ignorant of the circumstances. Whereupon it is concluded, that those things are voluntary; and that those do err, which have thought such things to be done against the will. And what moved them to think, that those things are against the will, it may easily be perceived. They saw that it was altogether difficult, to resist those two affections; namely, anger and desire, as those which are more violent than the residue; and therefore they thought that men are constrained by them. Wherefore Heraclitus said, χαλεπόν θυμῷ μάχεσθαι, that is, It is hard wrestling against anger. And Plato in his second book *De republica*, saith; ἅμαχόν τε καί ἀνίκητον θυμός, that is; Anger is neither to be striven with, nor to be subdued. But if there can be no striving against the same, nor that it can be conquered, it seemeth to compel, and to make that the actions be done against the will. For which cause the same Plato in his ninth book *De legibus* saith, that An angry man, ὅμοιος τῷ ἀνουσίῳ, that is to say, Is like to one that doth against his will. He saith not that he doth altogether against his will, but like unto him. And Cato the Censor said, that he which is angry, differeth from a mad man only in time. Yea and other men, as Euenus, have been bold to say, that Wrath is much worse than madness. But Plato in his treatise of Cratylus, writing of desire, compared the same to a very strong bond. Wherefore we also doubt not, but that these two affections are vehement, and of great force; but yet that they are not so strong, as they cannot be bridled by reason. Which we see come to pass in temperate men, and those which be endued with meekness, and other virtues. But yet would I not deny, that those actions are

more voluntary, which be done without the enforcement of such affects: which nevertheless is no cause, that these should be excluded from the number of them.

56. Aristotle saith, that none of the rest of the living creatures do anything against their wills, no not children. The proposition is to be confirmed; Those things that are done by enforcement or by desire, be voluntary. That was declared before by the definition. Now are other reasons added hereunto, whereof the first is this; If they were actions against the will, neither brute beasts nor children should do anything of their own accord; But those do many things of their own accord; Therefore those things are done against the will. The argument is conditional of the consequent, taken to overthrow the antecedent. The conclusion is proved; Because brute beasts and children, since they be without reason, whatsoever they do, they do it through those affects. But how absurd the consequent is, hereby it appeareth; insomuch as we see, that these living creatures and children do certain things against their wills. As when they be overcome and shut up in any place: but on the other side, when they be loosed and set at liberty, they do many things willingly and of their own accord. They choose themselves meat, when they will they enter into chambers and dens, and from thence, when it seemeth good, they go forth. They defend their young ones, they fly to their nests; and infinite such other things they do willingly and of their own accord. They rejoice in liberty, and on the other side, when they be constrained to anything, it grieveth them, and they are not a little disquieted. Alexanders horse Bucephalus admitted no man to sit upon him but Alexander, which without doubt he did not by constraint. The elephants do love their masters, they obey them, yea they kneel down when they be commanded. But what should we speak of elephants? Dogs in a house do

fawn upon their masters, but do bark at strangers; they hunt cheerfully, they follow those which feed them: and all these things certainly they do of their own accord. Many things belonging to this matter might be rehearsed of birds, fishes, and other brute creatures, which are so wonderful things, and are done of them with so great an inclination; that sometimes many have thought, that in brute beasts there is a will, whereby they choose those things which like them most, refusing other things, which do displease them. Yea and some men have ascribed some reason unto them, because they see that those things which they do, they do them with great industry. Which we would not grant, albeit as we have said, we must affirm, that they do those things of their own accord. But and if thou wilt say, that they be called wild beasts, because they be led after a certain violent sort, we will not deny it; and yet will we affirm, that they are not without an inward appetite, whereby they are moved: wherefore the actions which spring from them, must be said to be of their own accord. And it is no marvel, if Aristotle in this matter joined children together with brute beasts: for those also, by reason of the infirmity of age, have not the use of reason, but are only moved with the affects, especially with anger and desire. And yet who will deny, that they do those things willingly? They run abroad, they play, they skip, they make sport, and they fawn on their parents. But if they did not things of their own accord, they should have great injury done them, when they be beaten of their school-masters. For what other thing do they seek, but that they should abstain from those things, from which they know they are able to refrain? And as concerning the appetite, we must understand that the same is of two sorts: for one followeth the sense, and another the reason. Brute beasts and children are moved with that appetite, which followeth the sense; howbeit such appetite is not all one in both of

them. Hereupon ariseth the difference; because brute beasts are altogether destitute of reason, and therefore their desire is never obedient unto reason: but children have reason, yet not in act, although in power. Therefore, when through age, reason breaketh out into act, their desire may be obedient unto reason. We must also consider, that this Greek word τό ἐκούσιον is more large than Voluntary: for it is extended both unto brute beasts, and to children, unto whom Voluntary doth not properly appertain, seeing (if we shall speak properly) they have no will.

57. Moreover, whereas some which were against Aristotle, affirm that those things which are done by anger or lust, are done against the will; then it would follow, that either all such things should be done against the will; or else that good things are with the will, and evil things against the will. Howbeit, neither of these things may be granted. But this did Aristotle overthrow, and saith; Is it not a ridiculous thing to affirm, that these things are done with the will, and those by constraint and against the will; seeing that shameful acts, which are done through anger or lust, have no less the self-same beginning that honest acts have, which proceed of the self-same affects? No doubt but those things, which have all one beginning, must be accounted of the self-same order. And further he saith, as touching anger, that this, by the law of honesty and justice is required at our hands, that we should be angry against some; namely, against vices, and against wicked men, whom unless that private men should rebuke, and magistrates should punish, they were to be blamed. Also there be many things, which if a man do not desire, and by great endeavor procure to himself, it is a great offense; as for example: health and doctrine. Shall we therefore say, that the law of honesty and justice doth require of us, things to be done against our will and by constraint, and such things as we are not able to perform; or from the

which we are not able to abstain? This would be absurd as touching civil laws. And again, whatsoever things are done against the will, they bring grief and sorrow with them. But those things that are done through anger and lust are delightful, so far is it off, that they bring trouble and heaviness with them. As concerning lust, there is no doubt thereof. But as for anger, it may be doubted, because Aristotle in his Rhetoric's entreating of those things which bring pleasure, in describing the affection of wrath, bringeth in the verse of Homer, which saith, that Anger unto Achilles was even as honey that melted under his tongue. Neither indeed is anger any other thing than a desire of revenge. Moreover (saith Aristotle) what difference is there between those things to be done against the will, which are according unto reason, or which be wickedly done according to wrath, since either of them are things that may be avoided? This reason seemeth to stand on the nature of sin: for seeing that sin consisteth in those things, which ought or can be avoided; and that this estate is found as well in those things, which are done amiss by reason, as in those, which are naughtily done of anger with a desire; they ought to be both called voluntary. Why then are these things, rather than those other, accounted of the adversaries to be done against the will?

58. And as concerning human affections, Aristotle doth thus argue; Because the unreasonable affections, which we have, be human, and those be human affections, which do arise of anger or desire, therefore are they also voluntary, and are done without constraint. For whatsoever is human, is voluntary. But there is no man will say, that desires and angers be not affections in the minds of men, even as reason is in the self-same men. Wherefore, if actions, which flow from reason be human, because reason is a part of our mind; so likewise shall those be human, which proceed from

anger or desire. For the powers of anger, and of desire, be in the minds of men. It may happen that this will be objected; to wit, that The actions which be of anger or desire, proceed from the part unreasonable. True it is (saith Aristotle) but yet these be powers of a human mind, and therefore shall the acts proceeding from thence be human. And these powers, although by essence they have no reason, yet are they partakers thereof, and may be ruled by the same: which thing cometh not to pass in brute beasts. Again, these affections and actions are the first beginnings done with the will; for they may be restrained by the will. And it standeth not with them, as it doth with the power that nourisheth and increaseth, which worketh even whether we will or no. And therefore we conclude, that it is absurd to affirm, that these things are done against the will, or by constraint.

59. Now let us see, how these things, which we have here treated of, do agree with the holy scriptures. Aristotle said, that he would treat of Voluntary, and Not voluntary; because praises and dispraises, rewards, punishments, and mercy, do accompany those things which be voluntary. Even so, in the 111th Psalm, the faithful are praised, because they be a willing people. Also Eunuchs are commended, not those Eunuchs which are so become through violence, or be so born; but they which shall willingly chasten themselves for the kingdom of heaven sake. A hewer of wood, which by chance killeth his fellow, is forgiven; because that action was not voluntary. The devil is constrained to speak a truth, is compelled to depart from them which were possessed; but yet he deserveth no praise or rewards at all. Balaam is of the angel compelled by the sword, that he should not curse the people of God; he hath no praise at all, because he did it not willingly. The definition of violent, as it hath an outward beginning, so doth it not give any help, as a thing that worketh or that suffereth. And it

declareth, that original sin is no violent thing, because it is an inward corruption in us: and we further it by that naughtiness, which daily we add thereunto. But and if any man will say, that we are without knowledge and understanding, when the same is gotten; and that it cometh by occasion of the first naughty motions of our mind wherein is given no choice or deliberation: we answer, that those things which Aristotle saith, must be understood as touching moral and actual doings: for these sins did not he know. Howbeit, this sufficeth us, that such things cannot be called violent, seeing they have their beginning from within. Also we grant, that there be mingled actions; and we affirm that they ought to be reckoned among those which be voluntary: and therefore the holy scriptures do exhort us unto them, persuading us, that we must endure anything, rather than to run into sin. Paul saith; We must never do evil, that good may come of it. We must rather obey God than men. And we are called To take our cross and to follow the Lord. And he is said, to have found his soul, which hath lost the same. Neither hath the denial of a man's own self any other respect. These actions be of the mingled sort, because no man would choose these things, except by chance: but these things we will and we do, partly to avoid sins, and partly to be joined unto the Lord.

Howbeit thou wilt say, that these things have an outward beginning; wherefor they be rather violent. For unless the Lord did these things in us, none of us would do them. We grant, that the beginning, whereby our wills are changed, is from without: but our wills being changed by the spirit of God, are inward unto us, and at their commandment we are moved unto these actions, and therefore they ought to be called voluntary, for they are not done of God without us. Yea and we be praised and dispraised for these mingled actions: for Christ saith, that He will deny before his father, those

which shall deny him before men. Neither (saith he) will I be ashamed of him, which is not ashamed of me before men. And they in very deed are commended, which for Christ his sake do suffer grievous vexations; Blessed (saith he) are they, which suffer persecution, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. In such things as these (saith Aristotle) is pardon given. As when David, that he might not be slain, feigneth himself before king Achish, to be mad. But there be certain things, which we should never be led to commit. And what be those? They be sins. And it is an old saying; *Usque ad aras*; that is to wit, Saving a man's conscience and religion. Job is an example unto us, who in adversities could never be driven, either by the reproachful speaking, or bragging of his wife, to blaspheme God. And they which are driven unto these things, so far is it off, that they find mercy, as they rather fall from the hope thereof: as in the epistle to the Hebrews, it is said of them which departed from the known truth. So did it happen to Spiera the Italian, and to those which slew themselves, when they had abjured the Gospel. Aristotle propoundeth two things very hard. The one is, what a man should suffer for anything. The answer is easy; We must suffer anything, rather than we should depart from Christ and his holy commandments. What availeth it a man if he gain all the world, and suffer loss of his own soul? Fear ye not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, (saith the Lord.) Of the other difficulty we have experience in our own selves: and we often see followers which only believe for a time. Again, The spirit is ready, but the flesh is weak. But on the other side, we comfort ourselves, because All things are possible to him that believeth. And Paul said, that He was able to do all things through Christ, which strengthened him. Justly moreover did Aristotle reprove them, which thought that honest and just things are voluntary; but affirmed, that

dishonest things are not voluntary: for we must not think so in any wise. Paul said; I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing. Yea, and if we have anything that is good, that must be altogether transferred unto God. For unto the Philippians we read, that It is God which worketh in us both to will, and to perform.

60. Now let us see what is to be said touching ignorance. There is a certain ignorance, after which repentance doth forthwith follow, upon the perceiving of the error; and sometime no repentance at all doth follow. As touching the latter member, the Lord saith; Forgive them, for they know not what they do. The same thing did Stephan pray. Among those nevertheless, for whom prayer was made, some did otherwhile repent, and some did never repent. Also Jonathan tasted honey, being ignorant what his father decreed; and knowing his father's decree, he sorrowed not, but rather was angry with him. But Paul, when he perceived his error, sorowed. In like manner sorowed they, of whom Peter said in the Acts; I know that they did it of ignorance. And that they sorowed, those words which they speak, do declare; Men and brethren, what behooveth us to do? The sorrow which followeth, doth not always show that there happened no sin; for both they, which crucified the Lord, sinned; and also Paul sinned: for these men were ignorant of that which they ought to have known. But if there had happened to have come a certain ignorance of the circumstance, which could not have been known; as in Noah, when he was drunken, who had not seen the wine before, neither knew the strength and property thereof. And as it happened unto Jacob, when he lay with Lea in the place of Rachel: for both of them were ignorant what to do, and were excused. But he that knoweth not the general and principal points of the laws, is not excused. Therefore is it said of Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians; He that is ignorant, let him be

ignorant. And this ignorance, which doth not excuse, is sometime laid upon men by God as a punishment, while he punisheth sins with sins. Unto the Thessalonians, the second epistle it is written; Because they have not received the love of the truth, that they might be saved, therefore will God send upon them strong delusion, that they should believe lies. And in Ezekiel; If the prophet be deceived, I have deceived him. Also Ahab was seduced by the evil spirit, God being willing thereunto. Thus then we see what ignorance doth excuse, and what ignorance doth not excuse. Aristotle addeth, that Those things, which be done by drunkenness and anger, are voluntary; the which also we do affirm: For as touching those things we have received a law; Be angry, but sin not. Let not the sun go down upon your wrath. And we forbid to say unto any man; Thou fool. And as touching drunkenness, it is said of the Lord, Beware that your bodies be not oppressed with surfeiting and drunkenness. Also Paul; Be ye not drunken with wine, wherein is excess. These things therefore, which are done by anger and drunkenness, do not excuse; seeing these things might either not be admitted or be bridled. But that all the wicked and ungodly sort are ignorant, though they be not excused, the scriptures do everywhere plainly declare; The foolish man hath said in his heart, that there is no God. In the seventh chapter of the Proverbs, as touching them which are lead with lust, and with pleasures; He is led as an ox unto the slaughter, and like as it were a fool, which in fetters is led to his punishment. In the epistle to the Romans; They which called themselves wise, became fools, and the foolish heart of them was blinded. Unto the Ephesians; Ye shall not walk as other gentiles walk, in vanity of their mind, being strangers from the life of God, thorough the ignorance that is in them, and the darkness of their heart. Yea and as Isaiah saith, and all the Evangelists testify; They seeing shall not see,

and hearing shall not hear; seeing they be in the darkness, they know not whither they may go.

But among the circumstances, which being unknown do excuse, Aristotle doth specially reckon up the end, and Whereabout. And this in very deed is true. David sent away Absalom to go into Hebron, but to what end, or to what purpose he did it, he could not know: he is excused. Also Abimelech had another man's wife, but he knew not what she was, with whom he was conversant: therefore might he say unto God, that he did it in the simplicity of his heart, and that it was unknown unto him. Also, that Simon Magus was baptized, the church is excused; because it knew not of his ill and fraudulent counsel. Howbeit, in those ignorance's which do excuse us, if there follow no sorrow, we are guilty: we allow not that which is done. He which shot an arrow, and by thence slew king Ahab, if he had been witting of the deed, he would not have sorrowed, neither would it have been perceived, that that which was done, was done against his will. Again, David sorrowed for the death which followed of Absalom; also of the death of Abner and Amazias: whereupon it appeareth, that such things happened unto him against his will and mind. Voluntariness comprehendeth two things; both, that the beginning be from within, and that there be not an ignorance of that which is done. Original sin hath his beginning from within, and we know, that such a corruption is against God and righteousness, although that of our own choice we call not for the same: and therefore it is voluntary. Yet is it in young children, where there is a want of knowledge. But this maketh no matter, because we mean here, of actual sins. Neither can Aristotle, or moral faculty attain unto that kind of sin. That those moreover be voluntary sins, which are done through lust and wrath, it hath been showed by diverse reasons. The which thing we do admit: for we

have received laws concerning either of both vices; Thou shalt not lust. Again, we are commanded, that we should not be angry with our brother without a cause. Aristotle in his arguments affirmed, that brute beasts do things of their own accord Isaiah likewise said; The ox hath known his owner, and the asse his master's crib. And Jeremiah said, that The stork knoweth his appointed time: chapter eight. And the same opinion are we of touching children: for in the time of Elisha, they were punished by bears. Also Isaac, while he was oppressed by Ishmael, was commanded to be cast forth by Sara. And further, Aristotle affirmeth, that it is required and otherwhile exacted of us, that we should be angry. The zeal of thy house hath even eaten me. And Phinehas is commended by God, because he was revenged upon the impure fornicators. And where it is said, that those things, which be done against the will, have sorrow joined with them, Paul to the Romans testifieth the same; Unhappy man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? But whereas Aristotle saith, that those things, which are committed through wrath and lust, and also those things, which are done by the reason and will, are to be avoided: this we correct, on this wise; That avoided indeed they may be, if God's grace be applied thereunto: for without the same, who can beware of the motions of anger and lust? No doubt but we may temper ourselves from outward actions, but these motions of the heart are not in our power. Also we agree that they be men's actions, which proceed from lust and wrath: for even of them also we shall yield an account.

**Of man's Election, or making of choice.**

61. Aristotle saith; that making of choice is most proper to virtue. For in the definition, which he made of virtue, first was placed the general kind, namely the habit; then he added the difference, to wit, mediocrity; after that

were joined together the two properties; namely, that through virtue we do things of our own accord; and then, that we do them by making of choice. Howbeit, of these two properties, making of choice is the more proper: neither only, if it be compared with that, which is of our own accord, but also if it be compared with the other properties of virtue, which no doubt are many. For this cause are the actions proceeding from virtue commended, because they come from the making of choice. Manners (saith Aristotle) are more judged by making of choice, than by actions. True indeed it is, that manners are known by actions, as a tree is by the fruit: but yet that judgment is deceivable; for hypocrites do very oftentimes make a counterfeit show, and otherwhile we see things done of a far other purpose, than it is meet they should be. The Manichees abstained from wives; also from the eating of flesh: not because they were given to chastity or sobriety; but because of their erroneous and blasphemous opinions. Tyrants do sometimes deal courteously with their subjects, but to beguile them. And wicked men do sometimes abstain from wickedness, but that is for fear of punishments, not for the love of justice. Evil men forbear to sin for the fear of punishment. Wherefore in judgments, when the fact is apparent, there is oftentimes inquiry made of the will, mind, and purpose of him that doth it. Neither at any time is the making of choice subject to fortune, as is action. Yea rather, they, which are found in any crime, are oftentimes accustomed to say, that they meant to have done otherwise, and that they purposed not in their mind, that such things should happen. And we easily grant, that the actions are more apparent, since they are laid open to every man's eyes; but yet they make not the judgment either surer, or more certain. Men do judge of manners, by that which followeth, namely by the work: but the judgment of choosing proceedeth from the cause, and (as they use to speak) from that

which went before. And sometimes it happeneth, that a man doth no action; so as it cannot be judged by his actions, whether he be good or evil: but immediately, so soon as he showeth what choice he hath made, although he do no action, yet men give a judgment of him, either as touching his naughtiness, or his goodness. But how can it be said, that young children, and also brute beasts want the making of choice, when as they choose one meat before another; play before discipline; and shun some things more than other things? We must answer, that making of choice is of two sorts. One is common, whereby one thing is either preferred before another, or else is more eschewed than another: and this kind of choice neither brute beasts nor children do want. The other is the very proper choice, which hath counsel going before, and is directed by the judgment of reason. And this kind of making choice can neither brute beasts nor children have: for when they pursue one thing before another, or avoid one thing rather than another, they are not led by reason; but by sense. Also those things, which we do in hast, and upon the sudden, are without making of choice, not that we want reason while we commit those things, but because we admit no space of time to deliberate on them. Also the counsel, and the judgment, and deliberation of reason is hindered by the vehemency of the perturbation.

Wherefore there be reckoned up three things, that want the making of choice. First, brute beasts, because they are not capable of reason. Secondly, young children; which although they be endued with reason, yet can they not use the same, because of their tender age: in the third place are counted sudden and hasty motions of the mind: wherein, although men have reason enough and also years, yet do they want time of deliberation. Wherefore they, which do anything by the force of any affection, are wont to say, that they did it not of purpose, or advisedly. Since that making of choice doth

belong unto the mind, it is either of the power of knowing, or the power of appetite. All appetite is divided into three parts. Either it is of the more noble part of the mind, and is joined with reason, and is called the will; or else it is of the grosser part, and then it is divided into the desiring power, and into the angry power. Hereupon Aristotle said, that some thought choice to be the will, others thought it to be anger, others thought it to be desire: but if it belong unto the knowledge, then come they which affirm choice to be an opinion, who perhaps were the Stoics. But first Aristotle treateth of desire and anger, and reasoneth that their opinion is fond, because that then we should yield, that brute beasts have choice: for they are moved both with desire and anger, which he rejecteth, as an absurd and unworthy thing. Wherefore it plainly appeareth, that Aristotle did utterly remove desire from choice, because we may not by any means say, that desire is choice: which cannot so be judged of, as touching willingness. Indeed willingness differeth from choice, but it cannot be sundered from the same; seeing every choice is according to the will. And the argument which he used is this; If desire were choice, whatsoever thing worketh by desire, should (no doubt) work by choice; But not everything that worketh by desire, doth work by choice. The overthrow of the consequent appeareth in this, because an incontinent man worketh by desire, but not by choice; for that he followeth it not. He determined to do well, but he stood not to his determination; therefore he dealt not according to the choice, which he had conceived in his mind. Choice is an appetite, which is a counselor; but the incontinent man, while he is carried away by desire, heareth no counsel. And on the other side, the continent man giveth no ear to desire, but followeth his right choice. And this reason may be applied unto anger; for he also that doth anything by anger, doth it not by choice: and this we may

see in angry men. And herein it shall suffice to have said, that an incontinent man is not altogether without choice; but yet he followeth not that which he hath in his mind.

He is compared to a man that sleepeth, to him that is drunken, and to a city wherein good laws are not regarded. Here Aristotle reasoneth; Choice is contrary to desire; But desire is not contrary to desire; Ergo desire is not choice. This argument is in the second figure. The reason is this; Those things that agree in one third, they also agree in themselves: Even so those things that do not oppose themselves against one third, do not agree together at once themselves. But there ariseth a doubt: because desire seemeth to be against desire. Some man desireth fame, and to have his name renowned, and the same man is much desirous of money; one of these desires is repugnant to another. Augustus desired sovereignty, and yet was desirous to imitate Silla, in giving up of sovereignty. These things seem to be repugnant. Pamphilus longed to be with his lover Glycerie, and yet was desirous not to offend his father. These things declare, that desires be contrary. The answer is many ways to be made. Contraries must always be contrary: but these things are not always contrary, as appeareth in the Sophister, which at one time hath both these desires; namely, the desire of glory, and the desire of money. Moreover, it behooveth that contraries have respect to one and the self-same thing: but the one of these desires respecteth fame, the other money. Those things that respect one thing, after a quite contrary manner, are very contraries, and cannot be both at once together. As, to desire to have fame, and to desire not to have fame; to be noble, and not to be noble; to be maintained, and not to be maintained: these be contrary desires, and cannot be both at once together. Aristotle was not of the mind, that among desires there is no contrariety, but that contrary

desires cannot be together at once in one man. But evil desire is always an enemy to sound choice in one and the self-same man, and at one and the self-same time. Neither is every choice always an adversary to every desire: for the desire of theft is not against the choice, whereby a man determineth to become rich, though it be by unjust means. And the desire of slaughter is not against the choice, which a tyrant hath made. But a sound choice (as it hath been said) is evermore against an evil desire. But what manner of contrariety is this of desire and choice? No proper contrariety, but such as is of contrary winds, or of two enemies. For it behooveth that these contrarieties, which be proper contrarieties, be in one and the self-same subject, and that from thence they drive away one another; as white and black, cold and heat: which thing agreeth not with choice and ill desire, for they be placed in diverse parts of the mind. For choice is placed in the mind or reason, but desire in the grosser part of the soul.

Another argument is gathered from the objects, the which being contraries, do cause that the powers themselves are not the very same. Desire is carried unto those things which be pleasant, and which be unpleasant; namely, to obtain the one sort, and to avoid the other. But choice hath not respect unto these things, but regardeth only that which is shameful and honest, profitable and hurtful. Howbeit, here there is a doubt; because the choice seemeth to be of things pleasant, and of things grievous. Before young men there is set virtue and pleasure, and they are said to be set as it were in the point of two ways; that when they shall be come unto the years of man's state, they may bend either to the right hand, or to the left. Whereupon they are at their choice, to choose whether way they will. Thus have Pythagoras scholars and the Poets described the matter. And to Paris there was a choice given; Pallas offered him learning and good arts;

Juno offered him civil honors, and a happy government of the common-wealth; finally, Venus offered him the grosser sort of pleasures: wherefore the choice was in Paris, and he rather chose that which was pleasant. Yea, and our savior Christ setteth before us a broad and a narrow way, a wide and a strait gate: so as it seemeth, that the choice is both of that which is grievous, and that which is pleasant. We answer: If by choice, thou understand the action of the mind, whereby one thing is preferred before another; we cannot deny, but that choice is both of that which is pleasant, and that which is grievous, seeing we prefer pleasantness before grief. But deliberation concerneth not properly pleasant and gross delights: for to those we are not born. Wherefore those which prefer such pleasures before severe honesty, or sometimes before a grievous sense, are not said to choose, but rather to be led and violently carried by the desire. Yet is it not to be denied, but that it may sometimes be, that the honest and profitable things, which we choose, may be pleasant: howbeit, that happeneth at all adventures, (or as the common sort speak) accidentally. Wherefore choice is exercised about that which is good, and about that which is evil: for this by our choice we seek, even to obtain good things, and to avoid evil. But if a man demand, whether there can be a choosing of evil? We will answer, that this cannot be, because we never make choice of that which is evil: for it behooveth, that that which is chosen, either be good, or at the least wise have in itself a show and resemblance of goodness. But thou wilt say; Are not the less evils oftentimes chosen before the greater? I grant they are: but Aristotle in his Rhetoric's saith, that the less evil in that case, hath a consideration of good. Finally, Aristotle said, that anger pertaineth much less to choice; because those things seem not to be done deliberately, which be done in anger.

Neither is the choice, saith Aristotle, our will, although it have an affinity thereunto. In which words he propoundeth two things; the one, that will hath an affinity with choice: for both of them are placed in the chiefest part of the mind. And moreover, the common people say, that they will those things which they choose. And yet nevertheless, how near so ever they be, they differ one from another: for the will is more at liberty, and stretcheth further than choice and election doth. For will extendeth unto many things, whereunto the choice doth not attain: as unto the end, unto things impossible, and to those things which by us cannot be performed. By common sense it is manifest, that choice pertaineth not to things impossible: for he should be counted a mad man, that would choose such things, as can by no means be compassed. That the will extendeth to such things, it appeareth, because that thou mayest find many men, which would not die: which in nature is impossible. Also there be, which would be monarchs of all the world, and bear rule over all men: which also is a thing impossible. Moreover, the will is the end, but the choice is rather of those things which belong unto the end, and therefore they differ. Because the end, especially the chiefest end is of that nature, that forthwith, so soon as it is set before us, it cannot be refused. Therefore since it is not in our power to slip from the same, it belongeth not to the choice: for that concerneth those things which are in our power. But yet we must understand, that there is a choice of such ends as consist between two extremes: for many times is set before a young man the choice of good learning, or of chivalry, or of ecclesiastical function, or of the administration of the common-wealth. First, they choose to themselves one of these things which liketh them best; then also they choose the means, whereby they may excel them. But we answer, that choice in those ends hath no place, as they be ends, but as they

be certain means unto felicity. For an end, so far forth as it is an end, is (as Aristotle saith) no choice.

Finally, to prove that choice is not opinion, which was set down in the fourth place, the reason is drawn from the objects. Opinion is of all things; But choice is not of all things; Therefore choice is not opinion. The argument is in the second figure, taken from the nature of relatives: for the power is referred unto his object. Now let us see what is opinion; It is an assent of the mind, whereby we take upon us to maintain the one part of a thing that is gainsaid: yet we avow it not without all fear, but somewhat doubting, least perhaps the other part of the contradiction should be found true. And herein opinion differeth from knowledge: for knowledge is a most sure and immovable assent. Therefore let no man go about to persuade one that hath knowledge, or is a professor of the Mathematical sciences, that a thing is otherwise than he knoweth it to be: for it is impossible to persuade him thereunto. But chiefly do Orators endeavor to root opinions out of the minds of men, when they see that judges, or hearers do otherwise judge, than they themselves would have them. Aristotle proveth, that opinion is of all manner of things; because men hold opinion even of things eternal. For men have opinion of many things concerning God, concerning angels, concerning heaven, and such like things, which of the philosophers are holden for eternal. Also men have an opinion of those things, which cannot be; to wit, that there be Chimeras, Centaurs, and such like monsters: and that the diameter is equal to the side lines of the quadrangle, which cannot possibly be. Also things necessary be otherwhile subject unto opinion: for it may be, that what one hath perceived by knowledge, another believeth by opinion. But when it is said, that opinion is as touching all things, this must not be understood as concerning simple motions, or single words; but as

touching propositions, which consist of many motions or words, and do show, that either a thing is, or is not. Neither yet is there opinion of all these things: for there be certain things, which even of themselves are known either to the sense, or to the mind. As, that fire is hot, we certainly know by experiment of the sense, we have not an opinion thereof; and that the whole is greater than the part thereof; or that we pronounce of everything, either that it is, or is not (which things be called principles) we are not led by opinion, since of themselves they are known to our understanding. Opinion therefore is of all things; that is to wit, of all propositions, which of themselves are not known unto us. Also opinion is distinguished from divine faith: for faith signifieth a firm assent given unto the word of God, by the persuasion of the holy Ghost; so that it neither staggereth nor wavereth as doth opinion. The Minor proposition of the argument aforesaid is thus proved; Because choice is only of those things, which may be done of us, wherefore it is not of all things, as opinion is.

Aristotle hath another argument drawn from the parts. These two whole things, choice and opinion, have not the same parts, whereinto they might be divided; Ergo they are not all one. For the parts of choice are evil and good; but the parts of opinion are false and true opinion. And yet this argument may seem to be weak; for we commonly say, that there be many evil opinions; as if a man think that our souls are mortal, or that God doth not by his providence care for men's actions. Whosoever think these things, are said to have ill opinions, First we answer hereunto, that ill is here understood as it belongeth to manners: and therefore Aristotle saith, that opinion is neither evil nor good, because it is not reckoned among manners. But the common sort do call opinions, evil; because that which is false, is evil; even as that which is true, is good. For those things, which are

commonly called transcendent, are so joined one with another, that true, is good; and false, is evil. Also these opinions may sometimes be called good or evil in a moral sense; because thorough those false or true opinions, men are stirred up either to good or unto evil manners. The next argument is taken from the effects, to prove that it cannot be particularly said, that any kind of opinion is all one with choice. Here we have to deal with the particular part, because it hath been already declared in the whole, that opinion and choice do differ. Wherefore, least any man might say; They differ generally, and yet it may be, that some opinion is a particular choice; Aristotle proveth, that this cannot be: because (saith he) this is the effect of choice, that through a just cause we shall become men denominated of that quality; to wit, just men. But this happeneth not in opinion; and therefore they are by no means all one. Those things, which be here spoken, are most evident in an incontinent man: for he, because he maketh an ill choice, is said to be an evil man, whereas in other matters he may hold an opinion right enough. For as touching virtues, he judgeth rightly; and thinketh, that it is good to temper himself from unchastity and drunkenness, and yet doth not choose this: he is not called a good man. But yet none can deny, but that even by conceiving an opinion, we are become endued with some certain kind of quality, since opinion itself is a quality, and even of opinions do arise some affects of the mind. But Aristotle is to be understood as touching that quality, whereby we conceive an opinion, and do make our choice: for in choosing of chaste things, we become chaste; by choosing of strong things, we become strong; by choosing of just things, we become just. But it is not likewise true in general, as touching opinion: for in conceiving an opinion of eternal things, we are not made eternal; nor yet in conceiving an opinion of anything touching justice, are we made just. Howbeit this is true,

that by true opinions we become more apt unto virtues; and through false opinions, more prone unto vices. But opinion itself doth straightway of itself, so soon as it is present, communicate unto us such forms or denominations; but yet it behooveth that there be a choice had therein. Moreover, choice is occupied in pursuing or flying, but so is not opinion: for when anything is offered unto us, we begin to conceive an opinion what it is, what commodity may be gotten thereby, and how it must be used. But we do not so much conceive in our opinion, whether the thing should be shunned or followed: for that rather appertaineth to choice. Yea rather, between these things there seemeth, that there should be a certain order set: for first (as I said) we conceive in opinion what it is, what profit it bringeth, and how it will serve our turn. Which things being conceived in opinion, then we proceed either to pursue, or to eschew the matter.

# CHAP. III. Of the Law.

Here I thought it good to speak somewhat concerning the nature of the law, and therewithal to show, how the Manichees and Pelagians understood it not: and what the same worketh in us, either before regeneration, or after we be justified. First, as touching the form thereof, the same must be affirmed, which Paul saith in his epistle to the Romans, when he writeth, that it is spiritual. But the universal end thereof, and which appertaineth unto all men, is to bring men unto the knowledge of sin. Which thing Paul signified, saying; that By the law cometh the knowledge of sin. Here if thou demand wherefore the apostle said not rather; By the law cometh the knowledge of righteousness? I answer, because a man not yet regenerate, so long as he is without Christ, cannot have in himself the feel of good works, or of true righteousness, which may satisfy the law of God. Wherefore, when he compareth his doings with the law, he perceiveth them to be only falls and transgressions. But if we do speak of the end of the law, as touching the elect; that is Christ. And this doth also Paul teach, saying; The end of the law is Christ unto salvation: which yet he speaketh not

universally, but Unto everyone that believeth. For the law itself, by itself doth not bring a man to this end. The Ethnics said, that The end of the law is a knowledge, which it breedeth as touching things to be done. Whereupon Chrysippus (as he is cited in the Digests) saith; that The law is the knowledge of things divine and human. Howbeit, this end, and this definition be to largely extended: for all wisdom, and all good arts, do teach some knowledge of divine and heavenly things.

Now there remaineth, that we diligently consider what is the matter and efficient cause of the law. And to comprehend these things briefly, I say, that The law is the commandment of God, wherein both his will, and also his disposition or nature is expressed. When I say, A commandment; I note the general word: for there be commandments of the people, of the senate, of kings, of emperors. But when I say, Of God; I make a difference, which betokeneth the efficient cause. Whereas I say, that in the law is expressed the will of God, that is more evident than needeth exposition. But perhaps it may seem more obscure, that I said, we be taught in the law concerning the disposition of God, and be stirred up to the knowledge of his nature: wherefore we will make the same plain by examples. When God commandeth us, that we should love him; he teacheth us thereby, that he is of a nature to be beloved: for things cannot rightly be loved, unless the very same are worthy to be loved. And unless he were well affected towards us, he would not set forth unto us that chief good, which we should love: wherefor he chiefly persuadeth us unto this, because he desireth to have us partakers of himself. We perceive therefore, that he is such a one towards us, as he also desireth us to be. And when he forbiddeth that we should not kill, first he showeth his own will. Further, he declareth himself to be a God, which detesteth violence and injuries, and he had rather do good unto

men, than hurt them. After the same sort these two things might be showed in the rest of the precepts.

And out of this definition those things may be also gathered, the which we spake above, touching the form and end of the law: because it is of necessity, that such a doctrine be spiritual, and that it breed an excellent knowledge. And we be taught, that it is no small benefit, that God hath thereby given unto men: for he bringeth to pass, that both we know our selves, and understand the properties of God. Plato in his books of the law of a public wealth, and in Minoe, seemeth thus to define a law; namely, that It is a right way of governing, which by profitable means directeth unto the best end; by setting forth punishments unto the transgressors, and rewards unto the obedient. This definition may very well be applied unto the law of God: yea verily, there can be no such law, unless it be of God. It is no marvel then, if the old Law-makers, when they would have their laws commended, did feign some god to be the author of them: for Minos ascribed his laws to Jupiter; Lycurgus, his to Apollo; Solon and Draco, theirs to Minerva; Numa Pompilius, his to Aegeria. And we are assured out of the holy scriptures, that our law was given of God by Moses in mount Sina.

2. And these things thus ordered, concerning the nature and definition of a law; we may easily understand, how foully the Manichees have erred, which blasphemed the same, and cursed it as evil. For seeing the law commandeth nothing, but things to be commanded; and forbiddeth nothing, but things to be forbidden; how can it justly be accused? For there can be no just or honest duty found out, but that by the law of God it is commended; and nothing fowl or dishonest, but it is forbidden in the same: nor only wicked doings are prohibited by the law, but also wicked lusts are

condemned. Wherefore that showeth, that not only the outward works, but the mind and will must be corrected. And since a great part of felicity standeth in the acknowledging of God, and that philosophers do so greatly commend the knowledge of our selves; both which things, the law of God doth appoint: the same cannot (without grievous offense) be blamed as evil and pernicious. Yet the place wherein it is said; that The law entered in, that sin should abound, might seem to make somewhat for the Manichees. As also that to the Galatians; that The law was given because of transgressions. And that in the 7th chapter of the epistle to the Romans; that Sin through the commandment killeth. And that which is said in the second epistle to the Corinthians; that The law is the ministry of death. All these seem to confirm the error of the Manichees.

But there must a choice diligently be made of those things, which of themselves belong to the law; from those which follow it by reason of another thing, and by accidental means: for sin, death, damnation, and other things of this sort, do spring out of the law, by reason of the corruption of our nature. But if thou compare not the law with our nature, but consider the same by itself; or if thou refer it to a sound and uncorrupt nature: thou canst not otherwise pronounce of it, then that which Paul saith; that It is spiritual, holy, good, and that it was ordained for life; and that rather it must be said to declare, than to work sin. Wherefore, if deformed men lying hidden in the dark, should say unto one, which by chance bringeth a light; Get thee away hence, least thou make us deformed by this thy light: certainly, we would not gather by their words, that the power and nature of the light is such, as it can make men deformed; but this rather, that those things, which of themselves be deformed, are by the light discovered and showed what they be. Even so fareth it altogether with the law: for after a

sort it bringeth in light, and bringeth forth to our knowledge the sins which before lay hidden.

But some man will say; If the law be good and holy, why are men so discontented therewith, and have it in hatred? Even because it calleth men back from those things, whereunto by nature they are inclined: for it grieveth them to be forbidden those things. And when we look in the law, we see the things which we ought to do; and by reason of the pride, which is naturally planted and engrafted in us, we would not be restrained by any rules. Moreover, we perceive that our actions be wrested from that uprightness, which is set forth in the law; and that (which is more grievous) we feel our selves to be so weak, that we cannot correct them, and revoke them to the rule prescribed. But in the mean time we look upon the punishments, and upon the wrath of God, which for sin we do incur. All these things so offend our mind, as we be angry, not with ourselves and our sins, as meet it were; but with the law that is given by God: whereas otherwise the same is most perfect and most holy. Howbeit, this discommodity may be remedied; and it may be brought to pass, that that which before displeased, may please us afterward: and this will come to pass, if we join the law together with Christ.

For as the waters of Marath were most bitter to the children of Israel in the wilderness; and yet the very same, by casting in the wood, which God had appointed, were made sweet: even so, although the law of itself be bitter; yet if Christ (whom God hath set forth unto us to be an only savior, and the very just end of the law) be added thereunto, then shall we feel it to be sweet. The which thing that it happened unto David, it is manifestly perceived by the 19th Psalm, wherein the praises of God's law are wonderfully set forth: for it is called pleasant and sweet, above honey and

the honey comb. And this is it, which is promised us in the prophet, that God would write a law in our hearts: which is nothing else, than that he would give unto us the spirit of Christ, by whom we should be inclined to those things, which the law hath commanded to be done; that at the least-wise the commandments of God may be pleasant unto our hearts. Which thing the apostle also teacheth, when he saith; I serve the law of God in my mind. Whereof the regenerate have experience, who though they be not able to perform a perfect obedience unto the commandments of God; yet do they love them, and exceedingly desire them, and embrace them as the chief God; and do continually pray unto God, that they may draw most near to the perfection of them. By these things it appeareth, how the commodity and righteousness of the law is defended against the Manichees.

3. But on the other side, the Pelagians are no less to be shunned, which attribute more unto the law, than is convenient; for they judge the same to be sufficient unto salvation: and say, that men, if they have once understood what is to be done, may be able (by the very strength of nature) easily to perform the same. Wherefore Pelagius, for fear least he should have been condemned by the bishops of Palestine, as one which utterly denied the grace of God, confessed the same grace in word: for he affirmed, that it is needful to have the grace of God unto salvation. But by grace he meant no other thing, but nature itself freely granted unto us by God; insomuch as God hath made us reasonable, and endued us with free will. Moreover, he called grace a law, or a doctrine: because of our selves we be ignorant what is to be done, or what to be believed; unless God do reveal those things unto us. Whereupon Augustine, in his book *De gratia Christi*, against Caelestinus, writeth; that They affirm the possibility of nature to be holpen by grace. But he addeth; that If their meanings be examined, and thoroughly

sifted, we shall perceive, that by grace, doctrine, and law, they mean nothing else; but that a man, having only received the knowledge of the law, hath power enough of himself to do the commandments.

Unto which error the School-divines draw very near, when they teach; that A man, by the very power of nature, is able to keep the commandments of God, as touching the substance of the work; although not according to the intent of him that commandeth. By which words this they signify, that we be able to perform the very works, although not in such sort as God hath commanded them to be done; namely, in charity, and in the spirit: which latter part I suppose they added, that they might be seen in some point to disagree from the Pelagians. But Augustine so far disagreed from these kind of opinions; as unto those, which be regenerate, while they live in this flesh, he granteth not a perfect observation of the commandments of God: which evidently appeareth by his retractations. And that his judgment therein is most true, Paul declareth in the epistle to the Romans.

Doubtless, if the matter were so, as the Pelagians taught; there was no need of Christ's coming, and of the sacrifice of the cross: for these things were therefore given, because by our own strength we could not attain to the righteousness of works. Which Paul plainly testifieth, saying; That which was impossible to the law, forsomuch as it was made weak by the flesh, &c. These things do manifestly teach, that man, by reason of the infirmity of the flesh, might not fulfill the law. Further, he saith; The wisdom of the flesh is enmity towards God, for it is not subject unto the law of God, neither can it be. For although the law hath power to teach, and to give light unto the mind; yet doth it not therefore minister strength, or change the will. Wherefore Ambrose in his book *De fuga saeculi*, saith; that The law can stop the mouth of all men, but yet cannot convert the mind.

And a little after; The law in deed maketh the fault evident, but taketh not away the naughtiness. Wherefore grace must be added thereunto; the which, because the Pelagians contemned, they wandered from salvation, and were justly condemned of the church.

4. As concerning then the office of the law, these few things must be observed; first, that the same is not altogether unprofitable, even without regeneration: for it may be available to some civil discipline. For, if men do the outward works of the law, in such sort as they may: although they be sins unto them, which do them; yet through them, civil order may be preserved. For where there is no observation of these things, all things are confounded; wrongs be done, naughty lust rageth out of measure, the wrath of God is kindled; so as he suffereth those common-wealth's, which be thus corrupted, not long to continue. Also there is another work of the law, which is inward, appertaining to the conscience, that it should perpetually accuse, vex, whip and condemn the same. And by this mean, as we have said, God doth at the length bring men to justification: which justification being obtained, the law doth not yet lie idle; but is like unto a glass, wherein the regenerate behold what fruits of faith they ought to bring forth, how much they ought every day to profit, what they have to give thanks for, and how much they want of the just restitution, whereby they may the more earnestly pray unto God therefore. Also, the law setteth a mark before our eyes, whereunto they ought to level in all their actions: unto the which, although they cannot attain in this life; yet they must apply their endeavor to depart but a little from it. By these things it appeareth, how much the law doth avail in outward works; what it worketh in the conscience, and how much it helpeth them which be regenerate.

**Of Philosophy, and of the comparison hereof, especially moral, with Divinity; taken out of the beginning of the Commentaries upon Aristotle's Ethics.**

5. All the knowledge that we have, is either revealed, or gotten by endeavor: in the former part is divinity, and in the latter is philosophy. The name of philosophy is compounded. Wisdom of some is called a knowledge of all the things that be extant. But since that wisdom comprehendeth nothing but a certain and undoubted knowledge, it cannot be as concerning all things; for some certain things are unknown: things that come by chance and casually, cannot be known, because of their uncertainty. Others say, that the same is a knowledge of divine and human things: howbeit, between divine and human, there are found many things; namely, the circles of heaven, stars, elements, meteors, stones, mines, plants, herbs, and brute beasts. But they refer heaven unto God; because it is a thing immortal: but inferior things, they say, belong unto men, forsomuch as they be corruptible. But in what place will they account the science Mathematical? Howbeit it seemeth meet that it be defined; to wit, that It is an habit given to men's minds by God, increased by diligence and exercise, whereby all things that be, are comprehended, so far forth as they can certainly and by firm reason be comprehended, that man may attain unto felicity. And here be all the kinds of causes. The form, which is the habit. The matter, wherein it cleaveth; that is to wit, the mind and reason of man, and those things about which (as about objects) the same is occupied; namely, about all things that be extant, yet not simply and absolutely, but so far forth as they can be certainly known. The worker is specified; namely, in that God is appointed to be the author: for he hath planted light in our minds, and hath sown in us the seeds, which are the originals of all sciences. Whereupon

Cicero in the first book of his Tusculane questions, saith, that Philosophy is the gift and invention of the gods. And this doth Lucretius also grant, although he were an Epicure. And forsomuch as an assured knowledge of all things may rather be desired than hoped for, and is sooner loved than possessed; and that the more we give ourselves to the same, so much the more are we stirred up towards it: therefore it is called philosophy. The author of this name was Pythagoras: he, when he was come to Philonta, and had spoken with Leontes, which in this place was a tyrant; marveling at the wit and eloquence of the man, demanded of him what art or science he would profess: who would not say, that he was a wise man, but one that desired wisdom, that is, a philosopher.

6. And this being defined on this wise, it is divided into the part active and contemplative: both which Aristotle entreated of, according as the subject required. These do so differ, as contemplative alonely beholdeth, and active practiseth those things that be known. So as they differ in their ends: for contemplative reposeth itself in the very contemplation of things; for it is not able to exercise them. But active doth therefore behold, that it may in work express the thing which it knoweth. And we see undoubtedly, that in man there be two works: for he understandeth, and afterward he worketh. And even as God not only understandeth himself, and is happy and perfect to himself; but also by his providence doth create, and things being brought forth, governeth them: so likewise is there two sorts of man's felicity; the one, which we may call active, and thereof doth Aristotle write in his first book of Ethics; and the other, which is far more perfect and exquisite, is contemplative, and of that he disputed in the tenth book. Whereby it appeareth, that man, if he become perfect in this double felicity, draweth very near unto the similitude of God. Wherefore Plato, in his book of the

immortality of the soul, said: that Philosophy is the imitating of God, according to man's ability. Neither is this distinction of practice and speculation given (as some think) by the works of our own understanding and will: for it ought not thus to be; because knowledges are distinguished by their objects. But if a man will somewhat more diligently consider of the matter, he shall see, that it must be taken according as those things be which are understood: for those either have God and nature for their causes, and then they belong to the kind speculative; because such things we cannot do by our own choice. But there be other things, which have us for their causes, in respect that we do will and choose: and these be of the active faculty.

But let us see whether of these is the more excellent. By the common and received opinion, the speculative is preferred before the active: for action is ordained unto contemplation; but not so on the other part. And no man doubteth, but that which is ordained to another thing, is of less worthiness than that thing. But they again object, that the general word of contemplation belongeth unto action: for therefore do we behold nature, that we may love the author thereof; and therefore do we seek to know God, to the intent we may honor him: and for this cause is our divinity of some, called active. Howbeit, these men, in reasoning after this manner, are very much deceived: for there is no science therefore called active, because there followeth a work of that knowledge, unless the self-same thing be performed which was first known. When we behold nature, and the heaven, albeit of the same there follow a worshipping and loving of God; yet must not such a knowledge be called active, forsomuch as that is not brought to pass which we do behold: for there is no man that can make nature and heaven, and other works that follow thereof. Accidentally they are said to

be done: for not all they which do behold these things, do love and honor God; nay rather, they be oftentimes furthest of all from him. And further, the works following that knowledge, and also our divinity, have respect unto this; that we may know God more and more, until we behold him face to face in the kingdom of heaven.

And our savior Christ confirmed this opinion, when he said; This is eternal life, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. And not only do these two points divide philosophy, but they also divide our understanding: whereupon the one is called active, and the other speculative; not as though there can be two powers or faculties of the mind; but because the understanding, according as it is conversant about such and such other things, so is it called either speculative or active. That philosophy which is speculative, is divided into three parts. For there be some things even utterly sundered and severed from the matter; so is God, and so are the intelligences, and they are called supernatural: or else they are things so inherent in the matter, as without it they cannot so much as be defined, and in that sort they are natural: or else they are after a middle sort; for that they cannot be without a matter, either of iron, or wood, or such like, and yet may be defined or understood without those things; as are the Mathematics.

7. These things may be yet further distinguished; but I cease, and I will so divide active philosophy, as therein may be taught precepts touching the life and instruction either of one or of many. If it be of one, it is a book of moral philosophy: if of many, they are either more in number, or fewer. If they be fewer, they concern household government: if they be more, they belong to the common weal. But in what place shall we leave arts? They are comprehended under the third active kind, and belong unto politic

government; neither must they be excluded from the nature of wisdom. For art is σύστημα εγκαταλήψεων ἐγγεγυμνασμένων πρός τί τέλος εὔχρηστον τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ. In this definition there appear two things. First, that art is a habit belonging to knowledge, whereby some things are certainly comprehended; namely, through exercise and experience, so as it cannot be excluded from wisdom. And it is not to be doubted, that the ancients called them, Wise men, which found out these arts, or else did excel in them. Whereupon Bezeleel and Aholiab in the holy scriptures are called wise men. The other thing that we speak of is, that this knowledge is active; for these things are known by exercise: and by these habits somewhat is done and brought to pass, which helpeth to maintain the life. Wherefore the walkers upon ropes, and jugglers, and such other like, which do nothing profitable unto man's life, must not be called artificers; but deceivers and triflers.

But arts may be divided into those, which bring forth some work; and into those, which in the very action are consumed. Now doth it appear by these things, what we are to judge concerning Logic: for even the same also must be reckoned among the arts, and it worketh most profitable things in the life; so as it ought not to be divided from wisdom, especially seeing it is a ready mean, instrument, and way to procure wisdom unto us. Neither must the way be cut off from his scope appointed. Yea moreover, Cicero distinguished the parts of philosophy; so that it is partly touching life and manners, partly touching nature and things hidden; or else it concerneth the art of disputing: in the first of his Academ. which he rehearseth out of Plato. Neither doth Galen disagree from this opinion. But as concerning the authors of philosophy, we must understand, that they brought more profit to the world, than did Ceres, that invented the increase of corn and grain; than

did Bacchus, that found out the wines; or than Hercules, that rid the world of monsters: for these things belong to the maintenance of bodily life; but philosophy nourisheth and instructeth the soul itself.

8. Now must we remove a certain small impediment: and it is that which Paul saith in the second chapter to the Colossians; Beware least there be any man that spoil you through philosophy. By which words in very deed he seemeth to terrify Christian men from the study of philosophy: howbeit, if ye mark well the apostles meaning, I am sure that ye will be nothing troubled. True philosophy, since it is gathered by the knowledge of the creatures, and by those propositions concludeth many things as touching the justice and goodness, which God planted naturally in the minds of men, it cannot be justly accused. For it is the work of God, and without his special gift it cannot be had of men. But Paul reproveth that philosophy, which is corrupted through the inventions of men, and ambitious contentions of philosophers. For if they had kept themselves within certain bounds, and had only pronounced those things, which the knowledge of the creatures did by most assured reasons declare, as touching God and nature; they should not have erred from the truth. Wherefore the apostle saith; Through philosophy and vain deceit: and he addeth; Which are according to the traditions of men, and rudiments of the world. Not the creatures, but men did teach, that the world should be everlasting.

It was not nature that showed, but it was vain cogitations that devised the world to be compact of the concourse of such small and indivisible motes as we see in the sun-shine, and to consist as it were of no ground. And who doubteth, but that the fate and impassibility of the Stoics, the perpetual doubting of the Academics, and the idle and unoccupied deity of the Epicures, was this vain deceit? Men dreamt of a community of things, of

the intermingling of wives one with another in Common-wealth's, of pleasure to be the chiefest good, and of gods to be worshipped after the manner of common people; but they took no knowledge by a natural light, and by usual propositions known of themselves by assured reasons. These in very deed are the venoms and corruptions, wherewith the devil by naughty men corrupteth philosophy, being the gift of God; and this being so defiled and corrupted, Paul would have to be eschewed.

9. Howbeit, now must we see how these things that we have hitherto spoken, will agree with the holy scriptures; for there also have we philosophy active and contemplative. Those things that we believe, and are comprehended in the articles of the faith, do belong unto contemplation; for those we perceive by knowledge, but we do them not: and albeit they are not comprehended in science, yet nevertheless are they understood. Unto the active kind are those referred, which are contained in laws, counsels, and exhortations. Thus far do these agree: yet do they differ, because in philosophy, that which is active goeth before that which is speculative. For (as it hath been said) we cannot with human strength behold either God or nature, till first our affections be at quiet. But in the holy scriptures, speculation taketh the first place; insomuch as we must first believe and be justified by faith: and then afterward do follow good works, and that the more and more abundantly, as we be daily renewed by the holy Ghost. Thus doth Paul set it forth in his epistles: for he first handleth doctrine, and afterward he descendeth to the instruction of manners, and framing of the life. And so were the children of Israel first gathered in Egypt under the faith of one God the savior; and afterward in the desert they received laws, which serve unto the knowledge, which consisteth in practice. Again, in the table of the ten commandments is observed the same order, for it saith first;

I am the Lord thy God: the which thing belongeth to faith, or speculative knowledge: afterward do follow precepts, which belong to the works required of God. The cause of this difference is, that human contemplations are gotten by searching out, and by the endeavor of meditation; and therefore moderate affects are necessary. But those things that we believe, are received by the inspiration of God; so that there is no need of those preparations. And in man's reason, it behooveth men first to do just things, before they be justified. But the order of divine sanctification, is far otherwise appointed: for we first believe, and afterward be justified; then by the spirit and by grace are our minds renewed; finally, there follow just and honest deeds.

10. Moreover, the end of philosophy is, that we should obtain that blessedness or felicity, which may be gotten here by man's strength: but the end of Christian godliness is to have repaired in us that image, whereunto we are made in righteousness and holiness of truth, that we may daily grow up in the knowledge of God, until we be brought to see him even as he is, with face discovered. Besides this, in the moral philosophy of Aristotle, we shall not hear of the remission of sins; nor of the fear and confidence towards God, nor of justification by faith, nor of Christ, or such other like things: for these things are opened by the will of God, being such as cannot be gathered by a natural knowledge from the creatures. And we deny not, but it oftentimes happeneth, that the self-same things are commended in Aristotle's Ethics, which are commanded by God in the holy scriptures; but then are those all one in matter, but not inform, properties, and principles: for in them there is a sundry respect, a difference of properties, and their originals not all one.

Even in like manner as the rain water, and any fountain water is all one in matter; but the strength, property, and originals be of great diversity: for the one cometh by a heat of the heavens, and by the clouds and coldness of the middle region of the air; but this other is either gathered from the sea, out of the hollow places of the earth, and is so strained as it becometh sweet; or else it cometh by converting the air into water, through the coldness of the place where the spring ariseth. Even so, those things that a Christian doth, he doth them by the drift of the holy Ghost: for they which be driven by the holy Ghost, be the children of God; but they which deal by philosophy, according to moral rules, do work by the guide of human reason. Such be stirred to do these things, because they so judge it to be honest and right; but the Christians, because God hath so decreed it. Those think, that if they so do, they profit and make perfect themselves; but these, because they may obey the majesty of God. Those do believe their own selves; but these do believe God, and the words of the law which he hath made. Those be carried with a love of themselves; but these with the love of God alone. Doubtless, of this manifold diversity it cometh to pass, that one and the same thing, as concerning the matter, both pleaseth God, and by his judgment is condemned of him. And thus much of these differences, and of the consent that is between the holy scripture and human philosophy.

11. But to return to that whence we digressed; namely, whether this faculty be repugnant unto godliness: I affirm, that it is no more against the same, than is Astrology, than is the art of mariners or soldiers, than is fishing, hunting, and finally, than is the knowledge of the law of man, which all men know how necessary it is for the government of common-wealth's. Verily the same picketh out her laws and institutions, which be engrafted in our minds, concerning justice and goodness; the very which

notwithstanding, moral philosophers do discuss and turn most exquisitely, in such sort as they not only know these things very manifestly, but also can with great perspicuity teach them unto others. Hereof it cometh, that in Greek σοφία, which is, wisdom; is called as it were σάφεια, that is, perspicuity: and σοφός, wise, as it were σαφής, manifest or perspicuous; because it declareth and maketh very plain, those things which it handleth. And so, by this means, the lawyers might easily defend their science to be a part of philosophy: albeit they by their laws do not so gravely decree touching virtue, goodness, and justice, as the philosophers dispute of them. For example sake; Philosophy detesteth ingratitude towards all states of men, but the laws do not punish the same, unless it be committed by children towards their parents; or of late servants towards their patrons. Human laws compel no man to give their goods to the poor; but philosophy commendeth bountifulness and liberality towards all men. And what shall I say more?

Cicero, in the commendation of this kind of philosophy pronounceth thus, in his fifth book of Tusculane questions; O philosophy, the guide of life! O thou that art the searcher out of virtue and expeller of vice! What could not only we, but altogether even the life of men have been without thee? Thou broughtest forth cities, thou gatheredst together the dispersed men into society of life, thou first of all joinedst them together in houses, afterward in marriages, and after that, in the unity of letters and words; thou wast the mistress of manners and discipline, &c. All men know what an excellent thing is the strength of herbs, stones, metals, and medicines; and this do not we also deny: but for all that, doth it not follow, that this is a worthy faculty, whereby the acts, the choices, the arts, the methods, the wits, virtues and vices of men be perceived? What can be accounted more excellent, than for

a man to know himself? And this do we singularly well know hereby. And moreover, we must call to mind that which Plato said; to wit, that It may easily come to pass, that earnest loves toward virtue, may be stirred up in us, if otherwhile some image thereof might be set before our eyes. And on the other side, we are a great deal to blame, that we do nowhere behold the same near at hand. There ariseth no small pleasure by this science, to know within what bounds the light of nature ought to keep it self, and how far in his own right it may extend. And Christian religion is exceedingly kindled, by considering the manners of the Ethnics: since by a comparison we perceive, how greatly those things, which be taught in the holy scriptures, do excel the philosophical precepts. For it is a common saying; that Contraries, when they are compared together, do shine with the greater light. And errors cannot conveniently be shunned, except they be first known. Wherefore, he that hath known both of these faculties, shall the easilier avoid the faults of the one; namely, of human philosophy, especially, when they shall be showed plainly in their own proper places.

**Necessary rules as well for the expounding, as for obeying of the law.**

12. First, we are to mark the order of the tables, which we see set forth in the ten commandments. For the first table is that, which treateth concerning God, without any mean: but the other is directed unto our neighbor. And we must judge, that the dignity of the first table is the greater, because it containeth the other, and as a principal architecture hath the same under it; and further, that the end thereof is more noble, because the end of the latter table is ruled and governed by the former. Wherefore Luther in his catechism, very prudently in everyone precept of the latter table, rehearsed the end of the first table. For example sake; Because God must be loved with all the heart, and with all the soul; therefore thou shalt not kill. Again;

Because God must be loved with all the heart, and with all the soul, therefore thou must not commit adultery. In the ten commandments only, the sum of the law is set forth, and that after the plainer and homelier sort; wherein we ought to understand all the parts thereof. The head and sum of all deceitful things is πλεονεξία, which signifieth, Immoderate coveting of more, or, To carve himself a greater part than is just. Even as against all foul voluptuous pleasures, only adultery is expressly named, under which is comprehended all kinds of uncleanness. And touching the commandment of idolatry, therein is forbidden all kind of false worshipping, whereas that only is expressed which is most gross. Where two laws are made one contrary to another; the obedience must be done unto the latter. God commanded that the first fruits should be offered unto him, and sacrifices to be made unto his name: but he himself afterward commanded, that all the goods of the Amalechites should be utterly destroyed. Unto this latter commandment Saul should have obeyed.

13. This is to be observed in all precepts, as well ceremonial, as judicial, and moral. When two precepts of God seem one to be repugnant to another, so as the one is a hindrance to the other, that they cannot both at one time be observed; yea rather, it is necessary that the one of them for the time being be omitted: then, that which shall be judged weightiest and greatest, must be retained. But yet in the meantime, that other, which is reckoned to be less and lighter, is not violated; because in the same there is nothing done against the will of God. The law commandeth, that everyone should have respect to the safety of his neighbor: and if one be a magistrate, that he by arms defend his city. The same law commandeth, that We must not labor on the sabbath day: the enemy besiegeth the city, and that on the sabbath day; because he knoweth that that law was laid upon the citizens. Here seemeth a

contrariety of the precepts: for on the one part, safety must be maintained; and on the other part, the sabbath must be observed. The Machabeis judged it best to fight, because the safety of the common-wealth seemed greater and better than the ceremony of the sabbath.

Also the law is, that we should feed the hungry: and another law commandeth, that the show-bread should be eaten of none, but of the priests. David came hungry unto the priest, nothing he had but the show-bread: wherefore here cometh together two contrary precepts. The wise priest followeth and observeth that, which is the worthier; namely, to feed the hungry: he brought out the show-bread, and helped David. There is also another law, that we must furnish the prince with armor; for he is to be holpen by his subjects: and contrariwise, it is commanded, that things consecrated unto God must not be translated unto other uses. David the king's son in law, which warred for him as his general lieutenant, was then unarmed: the priest had no weapon at hand, but the sword of Goliath. Here be two precepts, which seem contrary; the priest followeth the one, and delivereth the sword unto the magistrate: because he judged it better, to arm the magistrate, than to observe the ceremony.

Also there is a law, that the church must not be deprived of ministers, so as it should be destitute of them: and Paul hath another law, that a novice or man newly entered into religion, should not be a bishop. The church of Milane was much troubled, because it could not find a meet bishop, that as well was free from the heresy of Arius, as also that had great authority and learning given him of God: only there was Ambrose; but yet a novice, and newly come to the faith. Here are two laws met, in show contrary one to another; but it was meet for the lesser law to give place to the greater: for Christ so taught, when by the sentence of the prophet he saith; I will have

mercy, and not sacrifice. Howbeit, he meaneth not, that he will not have sacrifice: but that, if two commandments meet together, whereof the one belongeth unto mercy, and the other unto sacrifice; he testifieth, that he had rather have mercy, than sacrifice.

14. Hitherto also may be referred, that Augustine unto Publicola discreetly and largely disputeth, whether it be lawful for a Christian man to receive of an Ethnic an oath by false gods: and at the end he concludeth that it is lawful. For when as the Romans had on every side neighbors that were idolaters, it was of necessity, that they should keep with them some civil faith and covenants. Indeed it behooved, that they should have sworn by the true God; but when that might not be brought to pass, it remained, that the Roman Christians should abuse their naughtiness, and receive that oath which was offered by the names of the idols. For so Jacob received an oath of Laban, when he doubted not, but that he worshipped the gods of Nachor his father. There is an excellent history extant in the 41st chapter of Jeremiah, when Ishmael had slain Godolias, he encountered with certain men going to worship at Jerusalem; those also he led out of the way, and slew. Of these men there were ten that said; Slay us not, we have honey, oil, and grain; if thou wilt pardon us our life, we will show thee where those things be. Those men may seem not to have done rightly, in showing of their goods unto thieves: for that was to be willing to help manifest robbery. For they could not have found nor taken away those goods, unless they had been showed unto them; howbeit, they in very deed used the wickedness of other to save their own life.

So may he be excused, which taketh up money upon interest; for that would he not do, except he were constrained through want and necessity: and when he is compelled to be at another man’s devotion, he suffereth

injury, but doth it not. So Paul unto the Philippians saith; that There be some, which teach the Gospel through evil will: and yet (he saith) that Therein he rejoiceth, yea and will rejoice; for that they, if they do anything of an ill will, shall render account unto the Lord: not that he would warrant their offense. And here it must chiefly be considered, whether the thing itself in his own nature be evil. For if it be, then must we not in any wise allow the same by our consent: if it be not, there is no let, but that being forced by necessity, we may assent thereunto, so as the same may be undertaken without any fault of ours. But yet in the meantime must he, with whom we in such wise do compact or consent, be admonished of his fault.

15. Yet there cometh a question, whether that old man, which is spoken of in the 19th of Judges, and 14th verse, did right; when he promised his daughter, and the Levites wife unto the Gabionits, to the intent they should not do violence unto his guest. All the writers answer it not after one manner. Some say, that he had respect unto the greatness and grievousness of the crime, and preferred the lesser evil before the greater; and that he would not break the faith which he had given to his guest, and they think that by such reasons he was to be excused. None otherwise judge they as concerning Lot. And among the rest, Chrysostom greatly commendeth Lot in that matter. Which Ambrose also doth in his book of Abraham the Patriarch; for that he made less account of the injury of his house, than of so great a villainy. But Augustine in his questions upon Genesis, doth weigh these things more diligently and narrowly; and denieth altogether, that the recompensing of one fault with another is to be suffered. In his judgment it was not lawful for him, to yield his daughters to the lewd lust of the Sodomites, thereby to keep them from a more grievous sin. Neither is it lawful, that we in our own selves, should commit a less fault, to avoid a

greater: for the apostle doth plainly teach, that We must not do evil, that good may come of it. Wherefore, when the matter cometh to sin, although it seem to be but light; yet it must be wholly forborne. And if any matter more heinous might seem to ensue by the delay of sin, the care thereof must be committed unto God: but, we under that pretense must not commit any sin. This was Augustine's opinion, which I do very well allow.

And least we go from the history which we have in hand: although this old man was to keep his faith with his ghost; yet should he also have used faithfulness and protection towards his daughter, and the Levites wife. Neither was it lawful for him to show a more faithfulness unto his guest, than the word of God permitted. Wherefore, he could not in right, humble unto them either his daughter, or the wife of his guest: for the father hath not so much power over his daughter, as he may set her forth to be abused by other men; neither ought the daughter herself to obey in anything that is sin, although her father would will her, and command her. But they say, that the lesser evil must be preferred before the greater. I know, that so it hath been customably spoken. But it must be rightly understood; namely, that it taketh place in outward affections, and in the troubles of the body, and of the life: because in such manner of discommodities, as often as we are to take deliberation what we should prefer, the lesser loss must be preferred before the greater; because it hath a respect of good. But in sin there is no consideration of good; and surly whatsoever is sin, the same must straightway be rejected, let there afterward follow what will. But Augustine after a sort excuseth Lot, and that old man; because they offended by reason of a sorrowful and troubled mind.

It oftentimes happeneth unto wise men, that when their mind is disquieted, they do those things, which afterward, when they come to

themselves, they do not allow. But this excuse doth not utterly discharge men of sin, although it somewhat relieveth them. Howbeit, if a man will say, that Paul did prefer the less sin before the greater, when he said; that He would be accursed from Christ for his brethren, rather than they should continue in that blindness and obstinacy wherein they were holden: he that objecteth this against us, let him consider that he doth not rightly understand the place of Paul. Doubtless the apostle desired to redeem the Jews with the peril of his own self: not undoubtedly with sin, but with his loss and hurt; namely to be accursed of Christ: not that he meant to be an Apostate, or to forsake his belief in Christ; but only to be without the fruition of eternal and happy life. Augustine hath also many things against this redeeming of sins: and among other things saith; What if a man require either of a maiden fornication, or of a married woman adultery; and threateneth to kill himself, unless he may obtain his desire; shall the pure and chaste woman give any care unto him? No forsooth: neither if he shall afterward kill himself, must the chaste woman seem to be guilty of his death. They ought indeed to be sorrowful for his mishap, and to bewail his fact; but they shall not think themselves to have done amiss: because they consented not unto him in unlawful things.

The same Augustine, upon the 146th Psalm, writeth; that If a man shall deny unto his wife due benevolence, to the end he may live continently, and in the meantime, his wife fall into adultery; he committeth sin, and his devise is not to be allowed: for that vice is not to be permitted in the wife, for exercising of his continency. God (saith he) doth not redeem so great a loss, with such a gain. Wherefore the sentence of Leo the first, in distinction 46, chapter *Non suo*, is to be liked, which said; that It is an unmeet thing, that any should direct their crime to other men's commodities. Augustine

*De mendacio ad Consentium* saith; that We must do what we can for the safety of others: but if the case so stand, that it cannot be holpen without committing of sin, there resteth nothing else for us to do. And he addeth that none must be brought unto heaven by making a lie. The same father saith in another place; If the poor see a rich man cruel and covetous, and would privily steal something from him, to help either themselves, or some other poor; they diminish not sin, but increase it. And Gregory bishop of Rome, in an epistle unto Siagrius, saith; that To commit a less sin, for to avoid a greater; is to offer sacrifice to God of a wicked act: as we read in the 21st chapter of the Proverbs. But where as Chrysostom and Ambrose, in this respect do commend Lot, they must be thus understood; namely, that they allowed of his faith and charity towards strangers; and that they had a consideration of the horribleness of that sin, which the citizens were ready to commit: not, that they allow the making of their women common.

16. Over this, we must observe, that all the commandments of God, either command, or forbid something. And they command not, to the intent only that anything should be slightly done; but that it should be also done with all the heart, with all the mind, and with all the strength, and that most exactly; so as there be not one jot in us, but is obedient unto the will of God. And what they forbid, that do they not only so forbid, that it shall not be in us; but also, that there be not left in us so much as any motion or inclination thereunto. And therefore God pronounced; Thou shalt not lust: to the intent, that those things which God hath forbidden, we should abhor in mind, in will, and wholly in all the parts, as well of the mind as of the body. And after this manner these two commandments answer one unto another; Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy soul, and with all thy heart, &c. which is to be repeated in all the precepts that do command anything: and

the latter; Thou shalt not lust: which in like manner must be understood touching all things which be forbidden. Wherefore in these two commandments, the efficacy, and (as I may say) the very soul of the law is understood; as without which the rest of the commandments of God cannot be full and perfect.

# CHAP. IV. Of Idolatry, forbidden by the first Commandment.

The word Idolatry is a Greek word, and a compound of λατρεύειν and εἴδωλον, and is nothing else, but The worshipping of idols. And εἴδωλον is derived of this word εἶδος, which signifieth, A form, or (as if ye did say) A shape. But an idol (as we now speak of) is every form or figure, which men have invented unto themselves, to resemble and express God. And as there be found out sundry and manifold matters of these forms; so be there also diverse kinds of idols. Whereupon, if the matter be stones, wood, or metal, whereby God is outwardly counterfeited, to the intent he should be there worshipped; those be gross and most manifold idols. There may be used also a spiritual matter, which then happeneth, when those forms and images are nothing else, but conceits of the heart and mind; which men do frame to themselves to represent God himself; not as the scripture declareth him, but according to their own opinion and rashness. Wherefore, according to the properties of the matter, an idol is divided into two kinds; the one is outward or visible, and hath recourse to the outward senses of men; but the other is inward, that is, wrought in the inward parts

of the mind. There be also two parts of religious worshipping. The one is inward, whereby we believe in God himself, trust in him, give him thanks, submit ourselves and all that we have unto him, and devoutly call upon him in our prayers: in these actions (no doubt) consisteth the inward worshipping. But the other part hath outward tokens, wherein we give a testimony of this mind of ours, by prostrating the body, and bowing the knee, by uncovering the head, by speaking, and by exercising rites and ceremonies by God appointed. And this is an outward worshipping or adoration.

2. But we must note, that such outward kind of signs of bowing the body, or knees, and such other like, are done also unto creatures: I mean unto princes and kings, which in earth do represent unto men the authority of God, and do supply his place in the administration of things. And verily, then they are nothing else to be esteemed, but certain sure testimonies, whereby, as many as are subjects, do truly and from the heart confess, that they in the name of God will be subject and obedient unto such powers, so far as piety and the word of God shall permit. But we must beware, lest in our inward judgment we attribute more unto them than is meet; or expect more of them than their power and might is able to perform: for otherwise we should not scape idolatry. Wherefore, if any, by bowing himself to his prince, would signify that he cannot err; and that it is lawful for him to do whatsoever him listeth, to command anything whatsoever his pleasure is: doubtless such a one should be counted an idolater, and should commit the crime as well inwardly as outwardly.

And whether the Popes hirelings do use this trade, we may hereby easily gather; in that they so cast themselves at his feet, to testify, that they will be subject unto him; as to the only vicar of Christ upon earth, as to the

universal bishop of the church, as to him that cannot err in decrees of doctrines concerning faith; and finally, as to whom only it is lawful, as he list himself, to determine of religion and Christian discipline. Let this then be everywhere a sure and firm rule; that these outward submissions of the body do then appertain to idolatry, when they shall be testimonies, that the mind attributeth more unto the creature than is meet; or which are only proper unto God. For they be not referred unto God himself, or to the obedience of his commandments; but to vain forms and similitudes, which we ourselves have imagined to ourselves, and conceived in our mind.

3. Hereby we may also gather, that the invocations of saints, which are used by the Papists, are idolatrous. For they attribute unto saints, those things which belong only unto God; namely, that they being absent, hear our prayers; or that they can be present at one time, either everywhere, or else in many places at once: thereby to be able to succor those, which call upon their names in diverse parts of the world. Augustine in his epistle to Dardanus, durst not thus affirm, no not of the soul of Christ; to wit, that it might at one time be in many places. Wherefore, that which Christ spake unto the thief; This day shalt thou be with me in paradise, the same he expoundeth should be understood as touching his divine nature: seeing the body of Christ should the same day be in the sepulcher, and his soul in hell: neither could that soul be both in hell and in paradise all at one time. Basilius *De spiritu sancto*, and also Didymus would not grant this unto the angels, that they may be in diverse places at one time; affirming, that that thing ought only to be granted to the sole nature of God. But they, which call upon saints, believe that they hear them, and that they are present with them: which (without doubt) is to attribute more unto them than the power and course of a nature created can suffer.

4. But here they trifle, and say, that they do not so think; but that God himself, which heareth their prayers, doth open unto the saints what is required of them. But thus I answer; They deceive as well themselves, as others: for they know not, whether God will show unto the saints their petitions; wherefore the prayers, which they pour out, cannot be grounded upon faith, which ought to be sure and undoubted. They bring also a feigned lie of the glass (as they call it) of the divine essence, wherein the saints behold all things: but their feigned devise hath no ground at all in the holy scriptures. Over this, seeing they will needs have it so: admit it were so, as they feign it to be; yet must they be compelled to grant, that the same their glass hath not a natural, but a voluntary representation; so as there is only so much seen of the saints, as God will have to be known. For else, without all exception, the saints should behold all things therein. Which is both false, and manifestly repugnant to the holy scriptures: for; Of that day (saith the Lord) the very angels shall not know, which nevertheless do behold the face of the father, which is in heaven. Moreover; the Papists do not after this manner call upon saints: for by this reckoning they should thus say; Cause, O God, that this or that saint may know those things, which I require of him; and that he may be with me, and grant me that which I desire. But they deal far otherwise; O holy Peter (say they) O holy Paul, pray for me; bring this or that thing to pass for me. So as they think, that the saints do altogether hear and understand their prayers: which if they thought not, then were their doings utterly foolish.

5. They declare also by their titles and additions, which they ascribe unto the blessed virgin, unto the cross, and other creatures, how far more worthy they esteem and repute of them than their condition can bear. Neither are they afraid, to set up lights, wax candles, and lamps, to cense, and do other

things unto them; which the Ethnics, and also the Jews in the old law were wont to perform unto God alone. What shall I say more? Do they not build up altars unto the images of saints? But to whom altars are built, those are confirmed by a sure testimony to be gods. Augustine in his tenth Tome, and sixth sermon, writeth thus; It is an altar, which testifieth that to be counted for god, to whom it is erected. For the altar doth testify, that they; namely, the Ethnics have a god, and do take that image for a god. What should an altar do there, if that were not taken for a god? Let no man tell me it is not a power divine, it is not a god. But I would to God they knew this so well as all we know it. But what they account of it, for what purpose they have it, about what they be there occupied; that altar doth testify.

6. Howbeit our adversaries say; We therefore do these things, because we have tried by experience, that they do please God: for there he worketh miracles. Indeed I know, that God hath sometime done miracles by saints, even by such as were dead: for the bones of Elisha, by the touching of them, restored a dead man to life. And the same Elisha used the cloak of Elias to divide the waters of the rivers, that he might make the more expedition in his journey. But God doth therefore work these things sometimes, that the doctrine of the prophets and apostles, which was the very word of God, might be confirmed. And yet the scripture declareth not, that there was any invocation, either of Elias, or of Elisha, when those miracles were done. But seeing the Papists do not, by these their invocations, seek the confirmation of the evangelical doctrine, but rather are busily occupied to establish their superstitions; those miracles, which they boast of, must rather be referred to the devil, than to God.

For Satan seeketh nothing more, than to lead men away from the sincere service of God. This doubtless he attempted by the enchanters of Pharaoh:

and that such things must sometimes happen unto us by Antichrist, Paul hath faithfully admonished the Thessalonians. But thou wilt say, that the devil hath no power to do these things, unless God will, and give license. I grant it. And why he will so have it, there be two causes set forth in the scriptures; whereof, the one is gathered out of Deuteronomy; namely, to try us, to the end it may plainly appear, in what estimation we have his word; and whether, by such illusions, we will suffer ourselves to be drawn from him. The second cause is, to punish the unbelievers: for so Paul teacheth us unto the Thessalonians; Because (saith he) they have not received the love of the truth, therefore they are delivered up to be beguiled with strong illusions, and devilish miracles.

7. But we meet with two places in the scriptures, which must be examined, whereby our doctrine now in hand may be the more confirmed. The first is in the Acts of the apostles, the tenth chapter, touching Cornelius the Centurion; to whom when Peter came, he threw himself at his feet: but Peter would not suffer it; yea rather he reproved him, and said; Do not so, rise up, I also am a man. It is read likewise in the Apocalypse, that John prostrated himself before the angel: but he admonished him, that he should not so do; I am (saith he) thy fellow servant. These two places might thus be understood; that Peter and the angel condemned these actions, as in a manner idolatrous: as though the Centurion and John should attribute any divine nature, the one to Peter, and the other to the angel, and should give them more honor than was due unto creatures. But it seemeth, that this must not easily be believed as touching any of both these. The scripture testifieth with the Centurion, that he did fear and worship God. How can we then think, that he could be brought to believe, that Peter was a god; or that he would attribute divine honors unto a creature? And it is very likely, that

John, which was either an apostle, or else (as some will have it) a notable Divine, did put no difference between an angel and God.

But if so be that neither of these would worship the creature, instead of the Creator; it may seem to remain, that it is not lawful to give unto creatures this kind of outward reverence. Wherefore we shall seem, not to have said well before, in affirming, that these things may be done to princes and kings. Unto this I answer, that there must be a difference observed between civil and worldly honor, and a divine or religious worshipping; as we have before declared. Further, we must understand, that these two men, Cornelius (I mean) and John, intended not by this their worshipping, to transfer the honor of God unto creatures. Howbeit, it may easily be, that they fell into an immeasurable show of reverence, and so somewhat offended in excess.

8. But as touching kings and princes, we are in much less danger of offending, than towards angels, or ministers of Christ: for they, insomuch as they execute the spiritual function, the honor, which is given unto them, draweth nigher unto religious worship. Wherefore, in those places, either the bowing of the knee, or of the body, are not of themselves to be condemned; but in respect that they be done for religion sake. Moderate honors therefore must be used, especially when they be done for religion. And thus much shall be sufficient for this time concerning this matter. But let us remember that, which we have admonished before, that this also doth belong unto idolatry; when as we worship the true God by other means and rites than he hath willed and prescribed unto us. For if we otherwise do, we shall worship an idol, according to that second form before described, by feigning to ourselves in our mind or heart any god, which is delighted with the worship invented by men: and such a god is there none. Wherefore we

shall not honor and worship the true God, but an idol, the which in our mind we have fancied. And verily to this effect we ought to understand Paul, where he saith in the first epistle to the Corinthians; We know that an idol is nothing in the world. Paul teacheth not, that an idol is nothing, as touching the shape and outward form: for no man doubteth, but that the idols themselves have place either in the outward matter, or else inwardly in our minds. By an idol then he meant, not the very sign, but the thing whereunto the same hath relation. And he understood, that the thing itself, which is signified in the idols, is nothing at all: seeing there is nowhere a god, which is either represented, or delighted with such images.

**Whether it be lawful for Christians to dwell among Infidels.**

9. Seeing the Israelites fell, because they dwelt together among the unbelieving nations; and rather exacted tributes of them, than according to the commandment of God, weeded them out: I think it good to entreat, whether it be lawful for godly men to dwell and have conversation with the ungodly. And surly there be many reasons, whereby the same might seem to be indifferent. The first is, because Christ did not shun the feasts of the Publicans, Pharisees, and sinners. Secondly, Paul in the first epistle to the Corinthians admitteth not, that the believing wife should depart from her unbelieving husband, if so be that he be content to live and dwell together with her. Moreover, the same apostle writeth, that If any infidel bid you to a feast, and ye be willing to go, then eat such things as are set before you. By these his words therefore, he maketh it free. Furthermore, the same apostle in the same epistle saith, that he warned the Corinthians, that they should avoid whoremongers, raveners, and evil speakers, and such like: but not all (saith he,) for so must ye go out of the world; but if any be called a brother, &c. Wherefore it is not forbidden us to avoid the fellowship of all the

ungodly. Besides this, Abraham was called out of Chaldea, and was commanded to dwell as a stranger among nations, which were strange from true religion: and so he dwelt in the land of Canaan, and in Egypt, which places were fraught with idolatries. Yea and Lot separated himself from the conversation and household of Abraham his kinsman, and went to dwell at Sodom. Also Naaman the Syrian, returned to the idolaters his countrymen. In like manner, Christ did not retain all those with him, which he had healed from diseases, but sometime he sent them home again, that they might show there what was done unto them. Finally, by civil laws certain heretics have had places appointed unto them: as the Novatians in the city of Constantinople. And it is granted at this day to the Jews, to have everywhere liberty to dwell among Christians.

10. Now this question as it is weighty, so hath it also very many difficulties. Wherefore it seemeth that we should first make a distinction what may be lawful unto magistrates, or what unto private men. Then must we understand, that the conversation with infidels is of two sorts; one is, whereby men are compelled unto idolatrous and impure worshipping's; and another is whereby they remain at liberty. Moreover, it must be considered, that they which dwell together with the ungodly, be sometimes, as concerning religion, skillful and constant; and sometimes both weak and also unlearned. It seemeth good therefore, that we declare (as touching private men,) that if they be learned, and have steadfastness joined with learning, so they be not compelled to communicate with ungodly ceremonies, may lawfully have their conversation with infidels: yet so, as there be used certain cautions. The first caution is, that they do it with this mind, to instruct those which be strangers from godliness, and to induce them to true religion. And therefore, while they be conversant among them,

they must not cease, but ever busy themselves about those things, for the which they dwell in those places. And that their instruction and doctrine may be fruitful, it is a singular point of wisdom, that they be familiar, gentle, and courteous toward those whom they mean to win unto Christ. For unless they fully persuade themselves, that they are beloved and greatly esteemed of those, which teach and admonish them; the thing well purposed shall but unhappily proceed.

Furthermore, there must be heed taken, that they live godly, justly, and honestly: for if so be that the infidels should be offended at their behavior, their ministry would utterly become unprofitable: for so much as it nothing availeth to build that with one hand, which thou destroyest with the other. Moreover, this must especially be regarded, that under the cloak of courtesy and friendship, they mingle not themselves with ungodly usages: no not although they were persuaded, that by such means they could with more ease allure them unto Christ. For the rule of the apostle ought to remain inviolate; that Evil things must not be committed, that good things may come thereof. Let them also beware, that they seek not their own commodity, while they be conversant with them. For some there be, which although they make a pretense to have the Gospel published abroad, yet in very deed, do hunt after their own pleasures, gain, or advantages. Wherefore, if it be past hope of the salvation of these infidels (which thing nevertheless can seldom justly happen) we must no longer deal with them; but so far, as either their necessity or ours doth require. That is, if peradventure they should be very sore sick, and could not otherwise be holpen than by our travel: or else, if we ourselves should not be able to get such things as be necessary for our sustentation, by any other means than among them. Also it may be lawful to be in the company of them, so much

as natural and civil courtesies require; or if they shall be our princes, parents, our wives, our masters, and such like.

11. There remaineth, that we confirm this doctrine, either by testimonies, or by examples of the holy scriptures. So indeed Christ did, which for this cause kept company with Publicans, sinners, Pharisees, and Scribes; that he might instruct them concerning salvation, and convert them from sins unto godliness and virtues. Wherefore Jerome upon the sixth chapter of Matthew hath this saying; Christ indeed went to the feasts of sinners, but to the end he might have an occasion of teaching, and to recompense their inviting's with spiritual banquets. Neither is there any mention made there, but of such things as Christ himself either spake or did; or else what was the power of his doctrine? &c. The very same way did the prophets in old time use, when they were conversant with idolatrous people. Nor otherwise did the apostles, when they were sent by Christ to be conversant among the Ethnics. Neither did Paul, when he came to Athens, disdain to haunt up and down those idol temples, and there very diligently and exactly to view the titles and inscriptions of the altars. By means whereof, he found that inscription, *Ignoto Deo*, that is, Unto the unknown God; and thereof he gathered matter for an excellent sermon, which he there made; that he might after a sort reprove the Atheniens out of their own proper tables. These things I think are sufficient to confirm the doctrine before alleged. But before I remove from this matter, I thought good thus much to advertise; namely, that these cautions being used, it is lawful for godly men to be conversant with them, which be excommunicate; namely, to call them into the right way, so that they be not partakers with them in the offense, or have dealing with them for affection sake.

12. But let us proceed, and declare what is to be thought touching men which be weak and unlearned. They, although they be not compelled to pollute themselves with idolatrous customs, yet ought they not to dwell together with infidels. For seeing they be unlearned, they have no pretense of teaching: for if they should go about to instruct others, they might easily, thorough their unskillfulness, cause the doctrine of Christ to be had in derision. And surly the ignorance of such men is sharply to be reproved: forsomuch as among Christians there is none found so unlearned, but he is bound to be able to yield an account of his faith, and in some sort to instruct strangers. And doubtless, they shall be all able to do that, if they would suffer themselves to be even meanly informed in the Catechism. Nevertheless, such as are infected with this ignorance, ought to separate themselves from the familiar conversation of infidels; so far as the need of the body and other inevitable necessities will suffer. But what shall we say of school-masters? They be oftentimes enemies unto piety; who nevertheless are appointed to that end, that they should teach good arts and philosophy. I say that it is dangerous to use such: for oftentimes they instill perverse things into the minds of the hearers.

And seeing the scholars are accustomed to have a marvelous opinion of a learned school-master, it cometh easily to pass afterward, that they begin to have them, and that highly in admiration; and so finding them eloquent, pregnant in liberal sciences, and well traveled in philosophy, they can hardly persuade themselves, that such do err, or be miserably deceived in true religion. For on the contrary part we see, that Origin Adamantius (being, besides the religion of Christ wherein he was instructed, wonderfully endued with good arts and philosophy) in teaching heathen arts, brought very many of his hearers unto Christ. We know also, that

Augustine when he willingly gave ear unto Ambrose for his eloquence sake, of a Manichie became a Catholic: so it may oftentimes happen (and that more easily, in so much as we be more inclined to evil than to good) that they which are weak and unlearned in religion, may in ungodliness overmuch increase under ungodly schoolmasters. And undoubtedly, by this means fell Julianus the Apostate from Christ, in using Libanius, Iamblicus, and Maximus, for his school-masters. Wherefore, forsomuch as such teachers cannot be had without great peril; my judgment is, that we should altogether leave them.

13. Thou wilt peradventure say, that the apostle Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, hath not delivered these cautions or exceptions concerning the weak and unlearned, seeing he writeth absolutely; If any that is an infidel shall call you, and you will go, &c. By these words he seemeth to affirm, that the matter is wholly committed to our own disposition. I reply that the apostle permitteth not this to the liberty of every man's will; but only to such a will, as is well and rightly instructed. For if a man go unto those feasts to be drunk, to pamper his belly, or to gorge, and solace himself with filthy talk; without doubt, he should not be excused by the permission of Paul, but ought to be earnestly reproved for his wanton will and naughty purpose. Likewise, if a man being conversant with an infidel, should doubt of his own constancy, and should perceive that he could nothing profit them which be in his company; undoubtedly, that man cannot go thither with a sound conscience, or with a just will. But if he do go, he cannot direct that which he doth, to the glory of God, as he is commanded. Therefore, although Paul hath not in the same place by express words put this caution alleged; yet it followeth not thereby, that the same is not to be given, seeing

as well by strength of reason it is manifest, as also by many other places of the holy scriptures proved, that it is not lawful.

And to hold me to this apostle, he saith in the seventh chapter of the same epistle, that He doth well, which surly purposeth in his heart that he will keep his virgin. Howbeit, he addeth this condition; So that he have no need, and have power over his own will. For if he should otherwise determine than his daughter either would or had need, then out of doubt he should not do well. Whereby it appeareth, that to the goodness and uprightness of the work itself, it is not enough to foresee that the work itself, in respect of the nature thereof be not evil, or repugnant to the word of God: but this moreover is required, that we take the same in hand with a right, sincere, and sound intention. Wherefore, everyone that is unskillful and weak, ought to separate himself from the fellowship and familiarity of the unfaithful; so far as civil and natural necessity will permit. For, seeing he perceiveth, that thereby will come some danger upon his soul, he cannot with a good mind and sound intent be conversant with them. Howbeit, he may show such duties, as are commanded by the law of God; lest he be guilty of the sentence of Paul, where he saith; He that hath not a care of his own, and especially of his family, hath renounced his faith, and is worse than an infidel. Yea, and the same apostle hath commanded, that Servants should of necessity obey their masters.

14. Now there resteth, that we show reasons out of the holy scriptures for the disallowing of this conversation. First, our Savior doubted not to say in Matthew, the fifth, and the 18th chapters; If thy hand, foot, or eye, offend, or hinder thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee. The which words notwithstanding, as the sounder sort of interpreters have showed, he spake not concerning the members of the body; but meant them by such as be our

familiar acquaintance, and most nigh of kindred. They all are to be separated from our company, although they seem to bring us profit and commodity, when either they sever us from God (who is our eternal salvation) or put lets and hinderances, whereby we be withdrawn from him. Chrysostom entreating in a manner of this argument, in the 56th homily upon John, saith; If we cut off a corrupt member from the body, least it should corrupt other parts of the same, (which undoubtedly we do not, because we despise that member; for Who ever hated his own flesh?) How much rather should we do the same in those, which be wickedly joined unto us; not despising of them, but providing that our salvation be not hazarded by them, when as we see, that we be not anything able to profit them? Wherefore in this case there ariseth no profit by desiring and maintaining of familiarity and concord. To this also tendeth the law of Christ, which he gave in the 18th chapter of Matthew; that They which be in a manner past all hope of salvation, and do not hear their brethren justly admonishing them, yea and which despise the voice of the church correcting them; let them be accounted as Ethnics and Publican's. Which thing Paul also taught, who in the first to the Corinthians, the sixth chapter, commanded the incestuous person to be excommunicated; least a little leaven might pollute the whole dough of the saints.

15. Moreover, the same apostle taught, and that in the same epistle, the 15th chapter, out of a verse of Menander the poet, that Good manners be corrupted by naughty communication. And thereby he showed, that the right faith of the resurrection was sore impaired among the Corinthians, which were new come unto Christ: and that by reason they were over ready to give ear unto the arguments and profane reasons of philosophers, or rather heretics. No man can sufficiently conceive, how the words of

enchantment do corrupt the tender faith of the weak. Wherefore the Corinthians were profitably and seasonably warned, and with them all other weak in faith are warned to refrain the conversation of infidels. The physicians also do counsel, that when a contagious disease infecteth either a family, or a near neighborhood, they while they be yet in health, should not come to the sick. For in the bodies and complexions of men, there is a certain like affection, whereby a contagion issueth easily from them which be sick, unto others that be whole and sound: the poison whereof, although it be not presently felt of them which were not wary of themselves, yet within a while after it infecteth deadly. Wherefore, seeing we be willed to take such heed of the diseases of the body; much more we ought to prevent the vices of the mind, that we draw them not unto us.

16. Moreover, our nature is so framed, by reason of natural or original sin, as we be subject on every side to corruption; as both the holy scriptures, and many experiences do daily teach us: so as there is no doubt, but that we shall easily drink of the poison of other men's sins, if we do not very diligently avoid the same. And those sins, as they do without any labor cleave unto us before we be aware; so, being once conceived, they cannot be plucked from us, but with very great pains. Wherefore Chrysostom in his 56th homily upon John, the which I cited a little before, seemeth wisely to say; If we could make them the better, and not hurt ourselves (he speaketh here of infidels) we should do all things. But seeing we be not able to further them, because they be past amendment, and that we may grievously hurt ourselves; they are utterly to be cut off. Further, to confirm his saying the more strongly, he bringeth in that which Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians and 5th chapter, writeth; Take away evil from among you. Which words of the apostle cannot certainly be understood of sin: for the

Greek word is τον πονηρόν, that is, Evil; by which kind of speech a wicked man is meant.

Wherefore I shall not err at all, if I somewhat bend the apostles words unto the commodity of them which be weak, saying; Depart ye from among them that be wicked. For if when ye be weak and unskillful, you be among them you must as well hear as see very many things against godliness and religion, which you profess. But those things, seeing you be neither able to refell nor reprove, ye shall seem to be cited as witnesses of blasphemies and reproaches against the truth. And perhaps a sting will remain in your minds, wherewith ye shall be disquieted in conscience longer than ye think for. Let us give care to the Wise man, which rightly and faithfully admonisheth us; He that toucheth pitch, shall be defiled therewith; and he that hath fellowship with a proud man, will become like unto him. Take no greater burden upon thee, than thou art able to bear; nor join not thyself with one that is mightier than thee: Ecclesiasticus the 13th chapter. These things do two manner of ways appertain to the matter present. First, in that the vices of other men are likened unto pitch, the which sticketh wonderful fast to the fingers and garments of them which touch it. Secondly, we be faithfully admonished, that we should have a consideration of our own proper strength.

17. Let (I beseech you) the examples of the holy scripture teach us. The Israelites were seventy years captives in Babylon, and were so infected with the conversation of the unbelieving nations, as when leave was afterward given them, first by Cyrus, then by Darius, most mighty kings to return home; many of them would not return, but being delighted with the commodity of houses, lands, and trade of merchandize, they remained still among the Chaldeans, Medes, and Persians: so great was the love,

godliness, and study of religion cooled among them. Indeed they were reproved by Esdras, Nehemiah's, and Zechariah; but they were little the better thereby. And how much the Hebrews were corrupted through the long conversation, which they had with the Egyptians, the things which by and by they committed in the wilderness, do manifestly declare. For when as yet they had before their eyes, the singular benefits of God towards them, they departed from him unto idolatry. And because in Egypt they had seen an ox superstitiously worshipped, they provoked Aaron to make them a calf to worship: which being given unto them, with great rejoicing they began to cry; These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee out of Egypt. Moreover, traveling through the wilderness, when they came to the borders of the Moabites, and accompanied with that nation more familiarly than became them; they were brought to this point, that they did not only with the shameless harlots of Moab abominably commit fornication; but also offered sacrifice unto that most fowl idol Baal-Peor, and suffered themselves to be trained up in the most impure services thereof.

Peter a chief apostle, when he had entered into the wicked hall of the high priest, and there had been in the company of the maidens and ungodly servants, did forswear his master Jesus Christ our savior: which fault afterward, being departed from thence, he most bitterly lamented. When Isaiah beheld God sitting in the temple like a judge, and angels standing about him, which most purely celebrated praises unto him, although he seemed not to himself to be guilty of his own fault, yet he cried out; Woe is me that I dwell amidst a people of unclean lips! For (no doubt) that man of God felt, that he had gotten no small infection, by reason he had dwelt so long with an unclean people. Alexander of Macedonia, which by wars and notable victories had subdued to himself a great part of the world, became

so delicate and effeminate by the manners of the Persians, whom he should have drawn to his own manners and qualities; as he himself took of their garments, daintiness, haughtiness, and pride: so far was he from bringing them to the ordinances of the Macedonians, that he incurred great hatred of his own soldiers. Nor is this to be passed over, that the long conversation of the godly with the infidels (unless the fruit of their conversion be manifest, and be by all means endeavored) doth breed a let or hindrance to their salvation. For when they perceive that our men live so familiarly with them, they think not that their superstitions and idolatries, wherewith they be corrupted, can be so very evil, or much to be detested. And peradventure they be come to that pass, that persevering in these points, they distrust not, but that they may hope to obtain salvation. For unless it were so, they could not persuade themselves that our men would dissemble it.

Besides these things, there be very many of our men, that by the example of this mingled conversation, think, that they also may do the same, which they see others do: whereby it cometh to pass, that by the deed or example of some, evil hath a larger scope, and our faith and godliness is counted but a jest among the infidels and Papists. And oftentimes it chanceth (which we know happened in the time of Paul as we have in the first to the Corinthians) that they which otherwise were faithful, do through this conversation, communicate with ungodliness, and with polluted customs. For by overmuch familiarity with the infidels, there is a step made by little and little to follow their superstition and idolatry. Wherefore the apostle did not proclaim without a cause; Fly from idolatry. I will not say also, it is impossible, but that among our men, being weak, and without learning and knowledge, and being conversant among the infidels, sometimes speech of religion may happen, wherein they slip not: yet when they cannot

overthrow the sophistical and crafty subtle arguments of the adversaries, there ariseth many times brawling and strife, and from that they fall into hatred, cursing, and reproaches, which have no edification, but rather hinder it: so far is it off from stepping forward unto the same. To this purpose serveth that which Paul wrote in the second epistle to the Corinthians; Drawe not the yoke with the unbelievers. What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? Or what participation is there between light and darkness? What agreement between Christ and Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever? Or how agreeth the temple of God with idols? These words are so manifest, as they need no interpretation. Neither must they be understood only for contracting of matrimonies, seeing they are extended largely and generally, and appertain to all kind of conversation, which for our own sake we have with the ungodly.

18. I know verily, that the shadows of the old law are now removed from us by the benefit of Christ: yet nevertheless, we are not to doubt, but that those things abide, whereof the people of God was by them at that time admonished. Wherefore, I demand what God meant when he commanded the Jews to sow borders to their garments which they ware. This surely was the meaning, that they being taught by that sign, should perceive themselves to be severed from the Ethnics: neither that it was lawful for them to join themselves with them; but so much as necessity constrained. God more than once forbad them, that they should not return into Egypt, nor yet desire the aid of strange nations: for he would have cut off from his people, all occasions of superstitions and idolatry. Yea and the history of the Judges testifieth, that the Israelites grievously sinned, because they brought those idolatrous nations under tribute, and had made a league with them, and

dwelled together in the same cities and country with them. And surly, to what evil it turned them, the history itself doth show: for they brought not the Chanaanits unto the true worshipping of God, but they themselves rather forsaking their God, became idolaters together with them. I speak not how the conversation between the Hebrews and Samaritans was so hateful, even until the coming of Christ; that the silly Samaritan woman, of whom John maketh mention, said unto Christ, that the Jews used no familiarity with the Samaritans. Besides this, it is not very convenient for Christians, to take away from themselves the boldness and liberty of the free talking of Christ: which they must do of necessity, if they dwell among infidels. For if in living familiarly among the unfaithful, they should confer of Christ; either they should be scorned, or not tolerated.

Undoubtedly, the holy fathers of old time, both sorrowed and mourned, when they were driven by any necessity to dwell from the people of God. Whereof David is a witness, who sighed when he was (by reason of the unjust violence of Saul) forced to live among the desert places. And it appeareth in the Psalms, with how grievous lamentation he complained, that he was compelled to have conversation among such as were strangers and enemies unto God. Daniel, with his fellows, might have enjoyed the pleasure of the kings table and delicate fare; but he refused those pleasures and commodities, least he should contaminate himself with the delicate meats of the Ethnics, and with the impure banquets of the unbelievers. Moses also (as it is written in the 9th chapter to the Hebrews) when he might have been reputed the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and thereby attain to great honors, contemned all this, and went unto his brethren, which were pressed with miserable servitude in working of clay and bricks. They which follow not these examples, surely declare themselves to have but small

heart to the glory of God, and that they will not redeem the same with any loss of theirs be it never so small. Do we (saith Paul unto the Corinthians the first epistle) provoke God? Or be we stronger than he? Wherefore they which be weak and unlearned, whilst they be so hardy to have conversation among the infidels; without controversy they tempt God, and in a manner provoke him, as though they would be stronger than he. Surely, there might be many other reasons gathered to this purpose; but those which I have brought, shall suffice at this time.

19. Now let us come to those, which do so dwell among the infidels, as they are enforced to be present at their unlawful rites; whether they be learned or unlearned, constant or wavering. What they be in this case, it is no matter now: for I take them one with another. I say, that to none of them such a habitation or acquaintance is to be borne withal, but either they must fly from thence, or rather suffer death, than to commit idolatry. Paul (as we have mentioned before) said; Fly from idolatry. The law and the prophets, the Old and New testament, are full of edicts, commandments, laws, admonitions, and rebukes; whereby strange worship is forbidden. Daniel's fellows chose rather to be cast into the furnace, than to worship the image set up by a most mighty king. Machabaea the mother, with her children, would rather be martyred, than eat of swine's flesh against the law of God. There be infinite martyrs reckoned up, which most constantly suffered death, because they would not forsake their professed religion, having always this before their eyes; Fear you not them which can kill the bodies, &c. Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians affirmeth the same; Because we be the temple of God, the members of Christ, and partakers of the Lord's table; unto whom nothing may be common with the table of devils.

20. All these things are to be applied unto our times; forsomuch as in the Papacy, the godly dwelling with the ungodly, be compelled to be present at their Masses, and their polluted sacrifices, which is in no wise lawful for them. But some take these probations of me now alleged, to be understood concerning the sacrifices done unto idols, and not touching superstitions which are now grown into use in the Papacy. But they ought to consider with themselves, that there is no outward work to be accounted for the worship of God; unless by the word of God it be ordained. Which if it be not, it can be nothing else but an invention of man; for we cannot without faith worship God: and faith can have no place, if the word of God be withdrawn. Wherefore, in human actions, be they never so gorgeous, unless God by his word allow them, there can be no worship of him. Surely, if we be minded to honor men, we are first accustomed to mark wherewithal they be delighted: and this being known unto us, then we think we have bestowed our labor very well, when we have done those things wherein they are wont to take delight and pleasure. Whie then deal we not in like sort with God, that we may serve him with that worship, which he by his scriptures hath allowed?

We do hear in Isaiah, that he was rather wearied with oblations, sacrifices, incense, and burnt offerings, which without faith were brought to the temple, than that he rejoiced at them. He abhorreth and detesteth these kinds of sacrifices, as the prophets have taught us. But if so be that those things were spoken concerning the sacrifices, which had the word of God, and that only because they were done without faith; what are we then to think of man's inventions, and feigned worshipping's, which seeing they be destitute of the word of God, they cannot be done with faith? We may verily say, that they appertain unto idolatry. And this may sufficiently be gathered

hereby, because there is no true God, that will be worshipped with those things. Wherefore it resteth, that the ungodly, while they adjoin such rites unto their holy services, do worship, not the true God, but him whom they have feigned to themselves to delight in the same. And for so much as in the whole cause of things, there is no such God, they worship an idol of their own fancy, and therefore justly and worthily may be called idolaters.

21. But they say, that those things, which be done and said in the Mass, had their beginning from the institution of Christ; although they were afterward corrupted by man's default. Surely that availeth them nothing, forsomuch as in these matters we may not have a regard or consideration to their beginning, but to their nature and form: and there must be diligent heed taken, whether they agree with the word of God. The brazen serpent had his beginning by the commandment of God, and it was also commended by miracles. For the Israelites, by looking upon it, were delivered from the venomous biting; yet nevertheless, when the Jews did worship it, and offered incense to it, the godly men did so detest it, as the most holy king Hezekiah brake it in pieces, and utterly put away the worshipping thereof. Wherefore the beginning must not be regarded, but the use must be considered; and whether it be agreeable to the first institution. The Hebrews, when they compelled Aaron to make them a calf to worship, were not minded to fall from the true God Jehovah; seeing they confessed him to be their guide out of the land of Egypt. Only this was their intent, to worship him under some sign or visible form: and they chose that form, wherein they had seen the Egyptians worship their God.

So the Ethnics testified, that they worshipped one God, the chief author of all things, whom they fashioned to themselves in diverse and sundry shapes. For in Pallas, they said was signified his wisdom; in Mars, his strength and

power; and in Jupiter, his justice and goodness. Wherefore rites and ceremonies are not to be esteemed, according to the counsel and will of men. No otherwise must we think to have happened of Jeroboam the son of Nabat; for he professed, that he would not lead the people from worshiping of the true God: but because he stood in fear of his kingdom, and saw, that it might soon come to pass, that if his people should often go to the temple of Jerusalem, they would fall from him, and return to the family of David: he said therefore, that to worship the true God, they needed neither the temple of Jerusalem nor yet the ark of the covenant. Forsomuch as the same God Jehovah, as he was represented to the Jews in the wooden ark, and temple of Solomon; in like manner might he be expressed in the signs of golden calves; so as the worshiping, which they should perform at Jerusalem, they might commodiously celebrate to Jehovah in Bethel and Dan. No other thing therefore did this man, but that he obtruded an outward work, which he invented altogether without the word of God, as if it had been a worship of God: but this word being wanting, all that he did was mere superstition and idolatry. Tyrants therefore and princes, when they compel men to corrupted customs, although they profess they do it upon a good intent, (as they term it) and howsoever they pretend some certain beginning of anciency, are not to be hard. Paul in this manner admonisheth the Ephesians; Have no fellowship with their unfruitful works, but reprove them. He called them their works; for they could not be called the works of God, in so much as they disagree very much from his word.

22. But what is then to be done, when they are thrust upon us? We ought to reprove them, and with great liberty (when need requireth) to reprehend them. But that is dangerous (say they) we shall lose our goods and dignities; we shall be put to death. I grant that. But none of us hath upon this

condition received Christianity, that his life, goods, and dignities should remain safe unto himself. Yea Christ hath by express words testified unto every one of us; Except you renounce all that ye have, and take up your cross, and follow me, ye cannot be my disciples. And unless you lose your souls, ye cannot possess them. After this sort must we frame ourselves. Cyprian (as Augustine reporteth) when he was led to execution, the president being desirous that he might escape, said unto him; Now I give thee space to deliberate, to choose which thou wilt, whether thou wilt be thus miserably executed, or obey, and so be dismissed. The man of God answered; In a thing so holy, deliberation hath no place. They which are not affected with this mind, but are over careful, least their life and goods should perish; such do easily defile themselves with Masses and impure superstitions: and for the same cause suffer most grievous punishments. First truly their conscience doth miserably wrest them; secondly, the light of the truth, which before was kindled in their minds, is by little and little extinguished. Further, they exceedingly delight themselves oftentimes in that dissimulation; so far off are they from repentance thereof. Yea, and they go about to persuade the same unto others; and those which will not obey their admonitions, they begin to hate. And lastly, as much as in them lieth, they stir up against them the wrath, forces, and power of tyrants and worldly potentates. Such a most unhappy end of many of them myself have seen.

23. But while they dissemble on this sort, thus they use to defend themselves; We do not this (say they) from the heart, we only behave ourselves so in body and outward gesture. But why consider they not, that outward actions be a certain show of confession? And as it is not lawful for the tongue to disagree with the heart, in profession of faith and religion; so

whatsoever is outwardly done in divine ceremonies, ought to agree with the same profession. Add thereunto this saying of Paul; With the heart we believe unto righteousness, and with the mouth is confession made unto salvation. Christ also said; Whosoever shall be ashamed of me before men, I will also be ashamed of him before my Father. Furthermore, I would have these men to know, that the same is no perfect and true faith, which breaketh not out into actions agreeable unto it. Moreover, our Savior, who most earnestly sought the glory of his Father, after he had purged the temple of buyers and sellers, said; The zeal of thy house hath eaten me up. But these fellows show forth no following of that godliness and faith, which they crake that they have enclosed up in their heart. Neither do they remember, that even as the inward worshipping of God, is found to be that, whereby we rightly and reverently judge of him; so the outward worshipping of him, is that, wherein we honor him aright, and as he hath prescribed. And that idolatry likewise is of two sorts: for one is, whereby in our heart we fain by evil opinion, such a god as we list ourselves: another is, whereby we transfer the outward worship, not only unto creatures and idols, but also we pollute the same with our own lies and inventions.

We retain in our heart (say they) the right opinion. Grant it be so, but yet the body is abandoned to idols, and to the devil. But Paul showeth, that Your body is the member of Christ, why do you then take it, and give it unto a harlot? But they affirm, that Paul wrote that touching fornication. I know that. But the prophets in the meantime teach us, that idolatry is the foulest fornication of all other: for Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and other holy prophets, so inueth against the Jews and their church, as they resemble the same to a harlot, which under every green tree, hath laid open herself unto idols, and profane worshipping's. Furthermore, how vain this excuse of

theirs is, that divine oracle sufficiently declareth: wherein God thus answered Elias the prophet; I have left unto me seven thousand persons, which have not bowed their knee unto Baal. He said not; Which have rightly judged in their hearts, and which have believed uprightly in their minds: but contrariwise mentioneth a sign of outward worshipping; namely, of bowing the knee. And he that hath made the whole man, is not content with the half of him: neither will he have his creature parted with the devil. To me (saith he) to me alone shall every knee bow. Moreover, if this their reason had been of any value, the Corinthians also might thereby have excused their doing: for they might have said unto Paul; Whie art thou so vehement against us? We ourselves also know, that an idol is nothing, we in our hearts keep the right opinion. Therewith let God be content; it is lawful for us in the meantime with the body and outward presence to serve our own commodity.

24. Yet further they say; We pollute not these things at all, but rather we would have them to be uncorrupt and perfect. Wherefore, what sin soever is here committed, it ought not to be ascribed unto us. I answer, that truth indeed it is, that another man's sin is imputed to no man; but yet, whilst ye are present at profane rites, this blame is ascribed and rightly imputed unto you, in that you communicate with another man's ungodliness. The apostle, in the first to the Corinthians said; Do ye not know, that they which eat of the sacrifice, are made also partakers of the temple? What say I then, that the image is anything? Or that which is offered unto idols is anything? Nay, but this I say, that the things, which the Gentiles offer, they offer unto devils: but I would not that ye should be partakers of devils. Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and of the cup of devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils. &c. So as,

although the corruption of the sacrifices be not to be imputed to the communicants; yet the communicating itself, from which they ought to have kept themselves, maketh them blame-worthy. And unless the matter were so, why would not the holy martyrs communicate with the rites of the Ethnics? Wherefore did Paul so rebuke the Corinthians? But here again they reply and say; that The Mass is not to be compared to the idolatries of the Ethnics: for howsoever it hath somewhat strayed from the institution of Christ, yet must it not be accounted a profane and idolatrous thing. But I affirm it to be so much perverted, as in a manner it agreeth nothing at all with the institution of Christ; yea it is altogether contrary unto it: which is very easy for me to prove.

25. [ 1] First of all, The supper of the Lord, as it was instituted by Christ, was a common or public work. But now cometh forth the sacrificer, appareled in monstrous vestments, and doth all things alone. Others are only present to see and hear. Wherefore, if Paul justly and upon good cause said to the Corinthians, which tarried not one for another, that they were not now to eat the Lord's supper; how can they worthily call the papistical Mass by the name of the Lord's supper, where only one sacrificer doth eat and drink? Surely by no means. They may rather give any name unto it, than the supper of the Lord. [ 2] Besides this, they say, that they offer the son of God unto the eternal father. And that is expressly denied in the epistle to the Hebrews: for it teacheth, that all things were finished by the only oblation of Christ; which being perfect, we may not renew it. They will, that Christ be offered up every day: the word of God affirmeth, that he was to be offered up but once.

I grant indeed that the fathers sometime so spake, as if the body and blood of Christ, are to be offered or sacrificed in the celebration of the sacraments.

But they not seldom interpreted themselves, that those oblations or sacrifices were only giving's of thanks, or else a memory and figure of that oblation and sacrifice, which Christ made, when he died upon the cross. Moreover, they affirm, that the bread and wine is converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, when as the holy scriptures do teach far otherwise. Over this, when they lift up the bread and wine, they set forth the very creatures of God to be worshipped in the stead of God. For what is more shameful, than religiously to worship a piece of bread, and a cup of wine? It is true indeed, that they be made partakers of the body and blood of the Lord; namely, in heart and mind, which with a sincere faith do eat and drink the elements of the Eucharist, and in such sort, as God hath instituted the same. But if a man only behold and worship them, they are unto him nothing but a piece of bread, and a cup of wine. Further, the ministers of the church, when as their duty is to study with all their power, to ravish the minds of the people unto heaven; to the intent they should not seek for Christ in the world, and that they should not receive any carnal or earthly thing in the holy supper, do miserably attend the visible signs.

The apostle in the first to the Corinthians giveth charge, that in holy assemblies they should not use a strange tongue; because that all men might answer, Amen: and because the edifying of the hearers is above all things to be sought for. But in the Mass all things be done in Latin. And those words, which should bring great consolation unto the standers by, when as to them the participation of the body and blood of the Lord is promised, they do speak them so softly, yea they mutter them so darkly, that albeit a man know the Latin; yet is he not able to understand them. They therefore whisper them so softly, as though the members of Christ were unworthy to hear them: when as nevertheless the Lord himself spake them openly. And

the Greek church, even to this day, pronounceth them with a loud voice. Yea and in times past it was a custom received (as Ambrose and Augustine among others testify) that unto those words the people answered, Amen. But in my judgment these men do therefore mumble up those words; because they be wary, least their lies should be perceived. For there they say; Take ye and eat: and also; As often as ye shall do these things, ye shall do them in remembrance of me: when as nevertheless they have appointed to eat and drink it alone. And doubtless many other things speak they secretly and openly in the Mass, as though many did communicate, or should communicate, when as the sacrificer meaneth to do the same alone by himself. Indeed a lie is shameful always, but then most shameful of all, when it is committed in holy things, and before the Lord.

26. But what shall we speak of their applications? They protest, that they may at their own pleasure apply to the quick and dead, those sacrifices which they make. But the scripture testifieth, that every man is justified by his own faith: and that all persons in their own righteousness or unrighteousness, shall either die or live. But they say otherwise; namely, that they be able to help with their Masses both quick and dead. If they would attribute this unto prayers; to wit, that they would teach it to be lawful for them by their prayers to help the necessity of others, they might have been borne with: but when they affirm, that the work itself; namely, of the Mass, hath such virtue and strength in it, as it may be a help to all kind of men: that may not in any wise be done. Add also, that Masses be many times celebrated to the honor of some saints: which thing undoubtedly is most strange from the truth. For Christ instituted his supper, to the end it should be a remembrance of his own death, and not a commemoration of other saints. I speak not how it commonly cometh to pass, that there is

nothing found certain of those saints, whom there they worship. The lives of them are obscure; and oftentimes full of fables, and faining's of poets. Also, therein are placed certain, yea very many strange rites, ridiculous signs, and garments not used: the signification of which things are utterly unknown, not only to the standers by; but even the sacrificers themselves, if they should be demanded what the matter meant, could not tell what answer to make. Wherefore, either they answer nothing at all, or else, if they would fain say somewhat, they allege not the same things, but diversely disagree one from another. Whereby thou mayest easily gather, that there is no truth in their words. So as faith hath no place in those things, which they do in their Mass; seeing it hath place there only, where God's word offereth itself to us.

27. And that they cannot clear themselves, but that they offend in the crime of idolatry; the images testify, whereunto they turning themselves, do celebrate their most impure services. For in their Masses they are not satisfied by looking upon images, but they cense them, and kneel before them; and finally, do unto them all manner of honor, which should be showed unto God alone. And because (as I have declared before) they dare affirm, that the Mass hath (I know not what) affinity, with the institution of Christ, it shall not be from the purpose, and it may easily be done (if we consider the tokens) to show that the old Ethnics may with much better probability excuse and plead for their sacrifices, than these men may defend their Masses. For the sacrifices of nations did less differ from the manner of sacrificing which the fathers had before the law, and which God allowed in his law, than these do differ in their Mass from that supper which Christ appointed, and the evangelists, and Paul the apostle taught. There, on both sides was invocation of God, a temple, an altar, sacrifices, priests, killing,

shedding of blood, salt, wine, oil, meal, a holy banquet, religious garments, washings, fumigations, continual fire, singing, oracles, and such like, which would be too long to rehearse.

Let the popish sacrificers show us, if they can, in their Mass, as many things that can agree with those, which Christ did in his holy supper. But if so be they cannot, let them then think, that their Mass doth no more agree with the celebration of the Lord's supper, than the rites of the idolaters accorded with the legal sacrifices. Let them cease therefore from dandling that little daughter of theirs, and say no more that it ought to be taken for the institution of Christ, and of his apostles. I will speak little of the yearly obits, and funerals of the dead, which be so often frequented: whereof God gave no commandment. By it they establish purgatory, whereof the holy scriptures have made no mention. Furthermore, this is most of all from piety, that in their Mass they pour out their prayers unto saints already departed out of this life. Finally, all the things, wherewith they there busy themselves, they make a market of; yea, they sell them, they bargain and set them out to most shameful gain. Wherefore we had need to take very great heed, least while we do desire to worship God, and have him merciful unto us, we by hearing of Masses provoke him not exceedingly unto wrath.

28. The superstitious sort proceed, and by the example of Naaman the Syrian would prove, that it is permitted them to be present at most corrupt Masses. Naaman prayed Elisha the prophet, that if he bowed his knee in the temple of the idol, when the king, who leaned his hand on his shoulder should so do, he would earnestly crave of God mercy and forgiveness for him. To whom Elisha only answered; Go in peace. These fellows ought to consider with themselves, whether they only and alone have read and seen the discourse of this history: I think not. For the holy martyrs in the old

church were studious day and night in the holy scriptures: so as these examples were not hidden from them. And what cause was there then, that they would not follow such an example, and that with the loss of their life? Those ancient champions, and pillars of our faith, saw no doubt that which our adversaries make no account of among themselves; namely, that the same Naaman, which is objected against us, was newly converted unto the true God, and was yet a novice: who also was not yet provided to renounce both his substance and himself also; but after a sort desired to retain his old place and dignity about the king. The which if he should obtain, he saw that it might easily be, that he should fall into that sin which he declared unto the holy prophet. But when he had very well understood, that it was not agreeable to true godliness, he required prayers and intercession of the true God: whereby he falling through weakness, might have his fault forgiven him. Otherwise there is none, which need to ask pardon of that which he thinketh lawful for him to do. We make intercessions for sins, and not for things permitted us. Wherefore this place maketh much against our adversaries. And that the same is sin, it is manifestly proved by this history: but this do they earnestly endeavor to excuse. I would to God they would diligently mark in that action, that which there Naaman felt. And if they shall fall, as he feared to fall, let them not cloak it with a vain defense, but let them crave the mercy of God, and the prayers of godly men; whereby, that which they have done amiss, may be freely forgiven them. Neither did Elisha, (as they persuade themselves) give Naaman the Syrian, liberty to go unto the idols: only he said; Go in peace, which also was an accustomed kind of salutation in those days. Neither is it lawful to gather any other thing by those words, than that the prophet promised to do that which was desired of him; namely, to pray unto God for the salvation of that man.

First, to strengthen him, that he should not fall; secondly, that if he sinned, his fault might be forgiven him.

29. Also they use to object certain words out of the epistle of the prophet Jeremiah, the which is written at the end of a little book entitled, Baruch. The words be these; In Babylon you see gods of gold and silver, borne upon men's shoulders, forcing a fear out of the heathen; beware that ye follow not the Gentiles, when ye shall see a heap of people worshipping as well before as behind. But say in your heart's; O Lord it is thou only that ought to be worshipped. By these words do our Nicodemites think it to be sufficient, that they which be present at idolatrous worshipping's, do say in their hearts; O Lord, it is thou only that ought to be worshipped. But they should more attentively ponder, that the prophet, if he were a prophet, that spake those words (which I therefore speak, because the little book of Baruch is not canonical, nor found in the Hebrew) gave not the Jews liberty to go into the temples of the idols, and so to be present at profane and idolatrous rites, that they should then talk secretly within themselves unto the true God. But he speaketh of those images, which were carried about the city: for that was the manner among the Babylonians, as the history of Daniel declareth, which testifieth, that the image of Nabuchad-nezar was openly carried about in great pomp, with instruments of music, and with songs: at the hearing whereof, all men were commanded to worship the image that they beheld; which the companions of Daniel would not do. Of those images (I say) it is written in that epistle. And the godly are faithfully admonished, that they should not worship or adore those things, which the Ethnics did both behind and before them. Nay rather, in detestation of their wicked worship, let them say at the leastwise in their heart; O Lord, it is thou only, which ought to be worshipped. These same meetings happening

by chance in the city, could not be avoided. The godly therefore were to be admonished, how they should behave themselves in such meetings.

30. But these men being shameless, do proceed forward importunately, and demand; how chance Daniel was not cast into the burning furnace with his fellows, when as like punishment was provided for all, which would not worship the image of Nabuchad-nezar? Wherefore these men imagine, that Daniel made a show, as though he did worship it: and for that cause the Chaldeans meddled not with him. And they say also, that they may lawfully do that which they think this holy prophet of God did. They consider not, that they fall into a false kind of reason, which commonly is called *Non causa ut causa*; which is, when that which is not a cause, is put for a cause. For there might be very many other causes, why Daniel was not then punished. Peradventure he met not the image, which was carried about; or if at any time he met it, the Chaldeans marked not what he did; or else, being apprehended and kept, was not accused, because the king bare him incredible good will. But we must not believe, that the man for fear of punishment or death, would dissemble the worshipping of the image, against the law, and against piety; since it is afterward declared, that for godliness sake he was thrown among the lions. Seeing now there were many causes to let, that he was not delivered to be burnt in the flames of fire with his fellows; why do these men then lay hold only of one cause, and that such a cause, as was unworthy and full of reproach for such a holy man; because in the holy scriptures there is not so much as a suspicion once offered us in any respect of such a matter?

31. They think with themselves, that they speak handsomely to the purpose; and that they cunningly defend their doing: when they allege that which is written in the Acts of the apostles, the 21st chapter, where it is

declared, that Paul, by the counsel of the elders of the church of Jerusalem, took upon him a vow, and four other men with him, and purified themselves after the manner of the Jews. If the apostle of God (say they) would use the ceremonies of the law already abolished; we also may be suffered sometimes to admit rites and ceremonies, so long time received, and to be present at them. But to make this matter more plain, we must understand, that this was the effect of Paul's preaching; We think that a man is justified by faith without works. As many as be under the law be under the curse. The just man shall live by his faith. Wherefore the apostle in that first time of preaching the Gospel, condemned not the ceremonies and laws appertaining to the Hebrews, unless they were retained with such a faith and mind, as if justification should come by them. And this doctrine of his, hath he very manifestly set forth in his epistle to the Galatians, where he saith; Ye which be circumcised, have fallen both from Christ, and from grace: for Christ is made of none effect unto you, if ye should be justified by the law. As though he would say; These things of Moses do not alienate you from Christ, except ye exercise them with this mind and purpose, that thereby ye might be justified. Take away this opinion, and the apostle commended good works.

And as for civil and accustomed ordinances, so they were just, and not idolatrous; he suffered still in their own place. Neither did he let, but that the legal ceremonies might still be used. Wherefore he writeth: In the Lord there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free man: and that circumcision also, and uncircumcision are nothing, but only the observing of the commandments of God, and a new creature, Again; He that is circumcised, let him not desire to have uncircumcision: if thou be called in uncircumcision, be not then circumcised. Let every man abide in that

wherein he is called. And that such things, as were civil and indifferent, might sometime be observed, and sometime discontinued, as best should serve for edification, he declareth by that which he spake of himself; I am made all things to all men, that I might win some. To the Jews I am made a Jew, and to those which are without a law, I am as without a law. Neither did he any less confirm his saying by examples, than by doctrine: for when he was required to circumcise Timothy according to the manner [of circumcision] he granted unto it. But when they would have compelled him for the overthrowing of Christian liberty, to circumcise Titus likewise, he judged that it was not to give place, no not for one hour; For (saith he) false brethren are privily crept in among us, to search out our liberty. He observed therefore the ceremonies of Moses, when the same might be done without ill purpose and hurt of the church: and by this means avoided the offense of the Jews, least they should be alienated from the Christian religion, which they had received.

Neither ought the Nicodemites to compare the ceremonies of the old law with the inventions of men. For those ceremonies were brought in by the word of God, but these were thrust into the church by the subtlety of the devil and deceitful men. They were not forbidden by and by after the ascension of Christ into heaven, but might be so long observed as the temple and public wealth of Israel remained, and until the Gospel of the son of God were revealed and preached, and until the church were well conjoined both of Jews and Gentiles. Neither was it meet (as Augustine godly and learnedly writeth unto Jerome) that those ceremonies of the ancient synagogue should straightway without honor be rejected: but idolatrous and superstitious things have always been, are, and shall be forbidden. Now then it was lawful to observe them for a time, so that from

them true righteousness were not looked for. Wherefore Paul the apostle (albeit thou shouldst look upon the actions themselves, which he by the law observed) cannot be justly reprehended; and much less can be blamed, when thou shalt thoroughly perceive his mind, purpose, and (as they term it) his intent. But to the favorers of the Mass, both these things be wanting. First, they defend that which is contrary unto the word of God, and (as I have declared) is wonderfully against it. Moreover, by means of that their dissimulation, they travel only for themselves; namely, to keep their riches, degree, place, dignity, estimation: whereas Paul sometime kept the legal ceremonies, only because the Jews should not start back from Christ; and to the end he might the better and more easily allure them unto the Gospel.

32. They object also, that by their dissimulation they would avoid offenses. For they say; If we shall utterly be enemies unto the Mass, we shall be accounted wicked and ungodly men, and in our own countries we shall procure great offense. I believe indeed that these men do avoid offenses; to wit, offenses of the world; that they would not be any offense unto tyrants, and antichrists: as who saith, they would not provoke their weapons, anger, and rage against them. But these be not the offenses which Christ taught to be avoided, when he saith of the Scribes and Pharisees; Let them alone, they are blind, and leaders of the blind. What offenses then be disallowed? Even those verily, which hinder the spreading abroad of the Gospel of the son of God, which stay men from coming to the pure doctrine, and call them back which already believe in the religion of Christ. Now let them consider (I pray you) whether by their dissimulation, they offend not the superstitious and idolaters. Yes undoubtedly: for they say with themselves; Behold, these men that know the truth of the Gospel, do come to our Masses. Sure, if they were so very wicked, as they are said to

be, these men would also abhor them. Wherefore they being confirmed by the example of them, do very oftentimes determine to stand firm in their purpose.

Yea, and the weaker brethren newly converted unto the Gospel, perceiving this learneder sort, as ring-leaders to dissemble, dare also do the like, and suspect themselves to have been deceived: and they which ought to have gone profitably forward in religion, do go backward. But we ought (say they) to bear with the weak ones, and sometimes to frame ourselves unto them. For there be many which are not yet persuaded that the Mass is evil: and they perceiving us not to come unto the same, would not give ear unto other points of religion. Wherefore somewhat must be done for their weakness sake: as Paul in his epistle to the Romans faithfully gave advise. We grant, that somewhat must be consented to for their sakes, that be so weak: howbeit, with Paul we may not abide the same to be done otherwise, then in things indifferent. But things which of themselves be evil, and forbidden by God; we counsel that they be not done for any man's sake. For this is a most firm and sure rule (as I have often before said) that No man is permitted to do evil things, that thereby good may ensue. Yea, we must not always bear with the weak ones in those indifferent things, except in the meantime, while they may be the better and more perfectly taught. But when they once understand the thing, and yet nevertheless stick fast in their opinion, their weakness is not to be nourished. Moreover, we must not so much bear with them, as by our example we should hurt other, and also many members of Christ.

33. Again, they object unto us; If we should so do, as you would have us, either we must escape away, or else strait way be put to death. Which things if they should happen, our churches would be utterly forsaken: there would

be none to teach us anymore. I answer; That also doth every one of us see, and (which is more to be reckoned of) it is not hidden from God himself, whom yet commanding, we must obey. Let us commit the end unto him, unto whom the church belongeth: he no doubt will very well and in good time provide for his spouse. Christ said to Peter, when he called him, and he prolonged, and demanded what should become of John; If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. We be taught therefore to follow the word of God, whither so ever it call us; and let us commit the care of other things (which seem to hinder us) to him that calleth us. Furthermore, this is not to be overpassed, that that doctrine oftentimes is more worth, and doth greater edify, which is sealed by flying away, and by death; than that which is only set forth by words. Let us not be afraid, though one of us fall or fly: but let us hope, that God in his place will raise up many more. But if we continue, and that our dissembling endure long; the light of the truth, and fire of charity, which is kindled in our hearts, will by little and little be extinguished.

34. They allege examples of the prophets, of Zechariah, of John Baptist, of Marie the virgin, and of Joseph, who in those corrupt and impure times came unto the public service, and unto the temple of the Jews; and therefore think that it is permitted unto them to do the like. But they ought to consider with themselves, that in that age there were many pernicious doctrines, and evil opinions among the Scribes and Pharisees. Howbeit, the custom of sacrificing was changed: for as yet the same sort of beasts and oblations were offered, which the law commanded; the same days and ceremonies were observed. Wherefore it was lawful for holy men to use them, for so much as they had the word of God joined with them. But as for the corrupt opinions, conceits, and manners of certain priests, bishops, and Scribes,

they were no let unto holy men; especially, seeing they were pure and clean from them, and both judged and lived in all things according to the word of God. But the corruptions and faults of doctrine, when opportunity served, they did reprehend and sharply reprove. This doth Augustine testify, as it is in the 23rd cause, qu. 1. cap. *Recedite*, and in certain other chapters, which be there read.

Let the papists do so in these days with us, let them so set forth the Lord's supper, and other rites, as they be appointed by the word of God; and we will not refuse to use them: so that they compel us not to the confession of wicked opinions, and preach not heresies unto us, but deliver to us the pure and uncorrupt word of God. But and if so be they themselves think evil, if they live shamefully; we will be sorry for them, we will admonish, rebuke, and blame them, and (if we may) we will drive them from the holy administration: and when they be past amendment, we will deprive them of their office, although we abstain not from the sacraments. This no doubt was the will of the Lord, when he said; The Scribes and Pharisees sit on the chair of Moses, and what they say, do ye; but what they do, do ye not. It was lawful therefore for the blessed virgin, after she was delivered of our savior, to offer a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons; because it was so commanded in the law. Wherefore, let them show unto us, that their Mass by them corrupted, is commanded by the word of God, and not forbidden: and then we will not contend with them about that matter.

35. Last of all, being confuted in these objections, they be brought to that pass, as they say; Although it be sin to be present at Mass, yet it is but a light offense, and should not by us be so severely reproved. But when they say thus, why do they not remember, that all sins have their weight, not of the nature itself of works prohibited, but of the word of God and the law,

whereby they were forbidden? Hereby sins do procure all their burden and weight. Whereunto James the apostle had respect, when he saith in his second chapter; He that shall observe the whole law, and offendeth in one thing, is guilty of all. Neither do I speak, as though I would have all sins by all means alike: for this, Augustine, in his nine and twenty epistle to Jerome aptly and manifestly denieth. Indeed he confesseth, that the philosophers went about to prove it, when they affirm, that all virtues are so knit together; that he which hath one virtue, hath all; and he which doth want one, doth want them all. For wisdom is not fearful, neither intemperate, nor yet unjust: wherefore it hath all the other virtues with it. And again, justice, fortitude, temperance, and the other virtues be not without wisdom; and therefore they be knit all together. These things (say they) do not agree with the holy scriptures: for there it is written; In many things we sin all. And if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and there is no truth in us. Seeing then we sin in many things, doubtless in sinning we cannot have virtue, which is opposite unto the sin, which we commit.

And nevertheless it often chanceth, that he which falleth in one thing, may be constant in other things. Peradventure he which is angry, or that eateth and drinketh excessively, yet yieldeth to every man his own, and is ready with a good courage to give his life for God: and therefore, notwithstanding he be somewhat testy or intemperate, he may for all that be called just, bountiful, and valiant. Moreover, the same father confuteth the similitude of the Stoics, wherein they say; that He is as well drowned in water, above whose head the water is but one hand breadth, as he over whom it floweth ten or twenty cubits. The similitude (saith he) is not aptly brought: but we must bring in another more fit to the purpose; namely, a similitude of light and darkness. Undoubtedly, while a man departeth from darkness, and

cometh nearer the light, he beginneth then somewhat to see: so that it cometh to pass, that although he be covered with darkness, yet for all that, after a sort he is somewhat partaker of the light. But he that is desirous to understand more hereof, let him peruse the same 29th epistle. And these things have I to this end brought, to confirm, that all sins are not equal; as the Stoics judged.

36. Now let us return to the place of James, which I cited; He that offendeth in one, is therefore guilty of all: because the observation of the law is not to be admitted with an exception, as if we might choose any certain part thereof to be kept, and lay aside and neglect another part for a time, as we will and list ourselves. God hath joined together the commandments of the law, and it is not our part to separate the same at our pleasure. We must consider the authority of God the law-giver, which ought to take place as well in one; as in all. This interpretation James himself seemeth to confirm, when he saith; He that said, Thou shalt not commit adultery, the same saith, Thou shalt not kill. As though he would say; God is as much resisted in breaking one of these commandments, as in another. But it may be proved also, by another reason, that he which sinneth in one, is guilty of all. For even as we being driven by temptation, lust, or other occasion, are stirred up to some certain transgression of the law: even so, if the same or like motion should urge us to any other transgression, we should as well break the one as the other. Also Augustine, in the place now alleged, teacheth, that the saying of James is true for another cause: for sin, which is committed, is contrary unto charity, whereon the observation of the whole law dependeth. Briefly, to this end have I rehearsed all these things; to declare that sins, which be committed, are not in that respect to be diminished and extenuated, because they be counted light: forsomuch as the

transgressions of the law are not to be esteemed only by the weight and worthiness of their actions, but rather by the strength of God's word, and authority of the law of God, who hath forbidden to sin. But least I should seem over-rough, I am content to have some consideration even of the act, wherein the sin is committed. And surly, as concerning this, I cannot see how it can be accounted a light fault, to sin against the sacraments; when as that kind of sin pertaineth to the first table, wherein (without all controversy) is entreated of the worshipping of God. Which worship alone being kept inviolate, other things be easily corrected: and contrariwise, the same being corrupted or abused, all other things whatsoever we do, become most unacceptable unto God.

37. Further, they think that the crime, whereof we entreat, may therefore be extenuated; because they affirm themselves to err, not willfully, but by compulsion only. Of whom if thou demand, what manner of compulsion that is, which they pretend; they cannot undoubtedly give any other answer, but because they would not incur the loss of their goods, their fame, and their life. Yet these things make not, but that the action is voluntary: even (as Aristotle taught in his Ethics) as when passengers in danger, that throw their goods into the sea, to avoid the peril of shipwreck, are said commonly to be compelled, when as they nevertheless do throw them in willingly. (For they take deliberation, and judge it better to suffer loss of goods than of life.) And as they in that work do wisely, so do our men for the love of life and body, and covetousness of the goods of this world, unwisely choose the loss of eternal life; when with wicked dissimulation they repair unto detestable Masses. Wherefore, the excuse, which they bring, cannot be received as just. The Corinthians also might by this reason have defended themselves, when they were reproved by Paul; If we go unto the feasts

dedicated unto idols, we go not thither of our own affection, as though we would allow such sacrifices; but by just reason we be compelled to go thither. For if we should fly such feasts, we should be accounted seditious, evil citizens, and without humanity: we should loose pleasant friendships, and profitable favors; yea and peradventure possessions and country too.

If they had said these things to Paul, would he have given care unto them? No truly: for he was not ignorant, but that they might have said so: and yet nevertheless (as it is written in his epistle) he vehemently and most sharply reproved them. Aaron also (if these men's judgments were true) might justly and rightfully have defended himself for making a molten calf unto the Israelites: for he might have said; I did it not from my heart, but I was compelled so to do, because the people would have stoned me, if I had not obeyed them. So indeed he made answer. But Moses, which knew right well that the same necessity or compulsion was not just, but came of a naughty condition or ground, which neither justice would have suffered him to have enterprised, nor God would by any means have admitted; therefore Moses did sharply reprove him. Moreover, these men must assure themselves, that Mass is a pledge, an earnest penny, a token, and a sign, whereby Papists know their companions from others. For whether a man give alms or no, whether he pray or pray not, live chastely or unpurely, and such other like, they lightly regard; but whether they hear Mass or no, that is it which they have respect unto: and if they perceive he do, they account him straightway for one of their own. And again, to detest Mass, and not to hear it, they take it for a certain token of falling away from Antichrist.

Wherefore we may well call Mass a public profession of popery. With what color therefore, or with what countenance may so great a crime be extenuated? They be grievous evils (say they) which hang over us, and we

put ourselves in most great dangers, unless we communicate with the Papists in hearing of Masses. I grant it: but let us remember, that God both foresaw all these things, and also forshowed that they would come to pass: who nevertheless would not therefore suffer his laws to be changed. Wherefore, as touching these events, let us cast the care upon him, who hath commanded these things, and is not ignorant that these evils are joined with the observing of his commandments. So as the nature and force of troubles and dangers is not such, as they can abrogate the laws of God. Those do abide, and everlastingly shall abide: and therefore let us not covet to have them new made for our dangers and calamities. But there is good and wholesome counsel given unto men, that they should not part that which they have, between God and the devil; so as they should give their heart and affection unto God, and grant their body and outward parts unto the devil.

38. Forsomuch as by the parts of the distinctions before put, we have spoken sufficiently as concerning the dwelling together of private men with infidels: now remaineth to treat of princes and magistrates; and they are either principal, as they which depend of no other, nor have superior powers above them: or else they be inferior officers, which lawfully and of right are subject unto superior potentates, as it were by fealty; or for because they are their deputies, or ministers, that is, officials, or vicars, as commonly they be called. Let us first therefore speak of such as be absolute and mere higher powers, searching whether they in their dominions may suffer the faithful to be conversant with infidels. I think it be lawful, so that there be certain conditions or cautions put. For when as the Roman Empire received Christianity, everyone which lived under the same Empire did not straightway believe; who yet were suffered to live and dwell peaceably.

Yea, in the time of Ambrose, Symmachus, who was a stranger from Christ, was so hardy to crave of the emperors, that the rites of the Ethnics might be restored: which was not granted unto him. And now, when as kingdoms and dominions have admitted the preaching of the Gospel, there be still many suffered, which are wonderfully affected toward the Pope, and his wickedness; because they cannot, without great perturbation of the state, be separated from them which are of the Gospel. So that the princes are forced to suffer such conversation.

Neither is that to be ascribed a fault in them, if that they depart not from these just cautions. The first whereof is, that they constrain not the faithful to any ungodly worshipping's; for then should they not execute the office of the ministers of God, but rather of the devil, and of antichrist: they should be a terror to good works, and not unto evil: neither should they set forward the work of God, but the tyranny of Satan. Secondly, let them beware, that they permit not unto the infidels, wicked rites, and ungodly ceremonies, in their dominions. Of this crime was Solomon guilty: not that he compelled the Jews to worship idols, but because to his wives and concubines, which were strangers, he permitted temples in Jury, wherein they might worship Astaroth, and Chamos, and other strange gods. But how grievously God was offended with him, the holy history declareth. He was justly punished by the law of like for like: that even as he had made division of the service of God, giving part thereof unto God, and part unto idols, so was his kingdom divided, whereof a part was granted unto his son, and a part was given to Jeroboam the son of Nebat. And his fault spread abroad unto his posterity: for Ahaz, Manasseh, and many other ungodly kings, had wicked and detestable worshipping's at Jerusalem; for the which they were by the prophets grievously and sharply reproved. And undoubtedly, a magistrate

cannot but be blamed, when he worshippeth idolatry, seeing he beareth the sword to revenge wicked acts. Wherefore we must determine, either that idolatry is no sin; or else, that it ought to be punished by the magistrate, as well as other sins be.

39. Augustine many times doth very well entreat of that place of David; Be wise now therefore, O ye kings, be learned ye that be judges of the earth, serve the Lord in fear, &c. It is meet (saith he) that even kings do serve the Lord. Neither speaketh David of them, in that respect, that they be men: for so are they bound, as well as others, to observe common laws. In that therefore that they be kings, (surly) they be warned to use the power and sword given them by God, to defend the verity of the true faith, and to repress the ungodly, that the Catholic truth and church of God, so far as their dominions extend, be not assailed. So that it is not lawful for princes to grant impure worshipping's unto the ungodly: nay rather, it is their part specially, to be earnest in setting forth of sound doctrine, ceremonies, and rites, which agree with the word of God. And yet nevertheless (to speak thereof by the way) I think not, that we should too much contend, that rites and ceremonies may be all alike, and observed everywhere after one manner. But this must be regarded, that they be not repugnant unto the word of God; but that they approach thereunto as nigh as is possible, that they tend as much as may be to edifying, and to the promoting of decency and order. For otherwise it maketh no matter, whether we receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper standing, or sitting, or kneeling; so that the institution of the Lord be kept, and occasion of superstition be cut off. Neither is it any matter, when the brethren be communicating, whether one certain place of the holy scripture be recited, or whether psalms and thanks-giving be son of the people.

Yea, and I think that this variety of rites, doth not a little further to the obtaining of a true opinion concerning ceremonies; namely, that all men may understand, that those ceremonies, which are not set forth in the holy scriptures, are not necessary to salvation, but may be changed for edification sake, as time shall serve. And Augustine to Ianuarius and Cassulanus was of this opinion. The third condition or caution that must be regarded, is, that princes take heed, that those infidels, whom they suffer in their dominions, be continually with diligence instructed; and not neglect them (as commonly the manner is) in things pertaining unto godliness. Otherwise we are not to look, that the patience, wherewith the prince suffereth them, can set forth the glory of God; if they may be suffered continually, without teaching to abide in their ungodly opinion: for in process of time they become not the better on whit, but a great deal the worse. Furthermore, princes must beware, that those sort infect not the people committed to their charge, with the corruption of infidelity and errors, by means of the mutual conversation between them. And finally, when they be well instructed and taught, they must compel them to the sound and pure worshipping, which the holy scripture hath appointed. For the magistrate may not suffer his subjects to live without the exercises of godliness: for the end of civil government is, that the citizens should live virtuously and happily. And who seeth not, that godliness and worshipping of God is of all other virtues the principal?

40. But some man perhaps will say; that If the prince should compel those unto the right using of the sacraments, which are not yet persuaded of the truth, he should drive them headlong unto sin; so far is he from furthering of their salvation. For there they shall do against their conscience, and whatsoever they do in such wise, is sin, as the apostle testifieth. And here I

think it good to make a distinction, between that which is of, or by itself; and that which is by adventure and by hap, or (as they speak in the schools) that cometh by accident. The magistrate in this matter, which we have now in hand, setteth forth to his subjects, that which is right, good, and just: but whereas sin is committed in the meantime, that happeneth nothing at all by his default, but rather by the incredulity and misbelief of them; whereof he is not to be accused, when he hath diligently labored to have his subjects well instructed. Neither are the Papists (which at this day be suffered by Christian magistrates) ignorant, that we ought to have in use the sacraments instituted by the Lord. So as they cannot justly complain of their magistrates, if they would have them to be uprightly and in due order ministered unto them. Besides, they which object these things unto us, must note diligently, that by the same way we may cavil against God: for he hath set forth unto men his law (which is most perfect) to be kept of them. Shall we then say unto him; We be weak, corrupt, vicious of nature, and not able to perform thy commandments, as thou hast willed us: and so, whether we do against that which thou hast commanded, or perform that which thou hast willed, we shall ever sin, because we shall fail; neither can we obey as we should do: wherefore, whatsoever we do, we shall not avoid sin. Thus whosoever shall contumeliously speak against God, will not he of good right answer him again? The things which I have declared unto you to be kept, be just and right: but in that ye be weak and feeble, it ought not to be imputed unto my default; for I have especially holpen your weakness, having given mine only son unto death for your sakes. If ye will believe in him only, whatsoever ye shall not accomplish in performing my precepts, it shall not be imputed to you to everlasting death. So may a good prince answer; I require of you those things which are contained in the word of

God, and the things which are decent, and do edify; now if your opinion or conscience be against it, that must not be ascribed unto me, which have diligently employed my travel, that ye might not be ignorant of the truth, and miserably perish. For I have very carefully studied, that ye might be taught and instructed in the truth; and so will I still proceed in exhorting, admonishing, and commanding you, that ye read the holy scriptures, and that ye pray unto God to open the eyes of your mind. These things if the prince shall say, I see not by what right, or by what reason he may be reproved.

41. And I think it not meet to be omitted, which Augustine said, that he was once of the opinion, that nothing should be done to heretics by compulsion; but they to be instructed by admonitions and doctrine. But he confesseth, that he was warned by certain bishops of more experience, which showed him of certain cities, which before were in a manner utterly destroyed by the error of the Donatists, and were by violence and laws of emperors compelled to come unto the catholic church: which cities being thus at the length sincerely converted unto the truth, rendered thanks unto God; neither would they, if by any means they might, return unto such pernicious opinions. Wherefore the godly prince shall nothing at all hurt such men; nay rather, he shall profit them very much, if (when instruction hath been given) he compel them to receive the sacraments duly, as they be delivered by the word of God. But this I would have to be understood concerning his own subjects, his native countrymen and denizens, which enjoy the right of the city or province. Otherwise I do not think, that he ought to use any violence towards strangers that pass to and fro, and which occupy the trade of merchandize, either inward or outward. And yet I judge also, that he must take diligent heed touching these, least they infect the

people with wicked doctrine. So as I suppose, that the steppes of the Israelites are to be followed; who made none a Jew or a Proselyte, neither enfranchised any among their nation, unless they had been first circumcised, received the law of Moses, and communicated with their sacrifices. Which thing being so diligently observed by them, there is no cause why our princes should not do the like unto any; namely, to suffer no citizen of theirs either native or stranger born; but that they might compel or constrain him unto the ceremonies and services consonant or agreeing to the word of God.

42. But now let us proceed, and speak of those lords or magistrates, which are subject unto the power of superiors. These seem on this manner to be divided: some to have jurisdiction, either proper, or by inheritance; or else committed unto them by emperors, kings, and public-wealth's. Or else they be without jurisdiction, and are reputed noble men only for the nobility of their blood, or by reason of notable riches gotten together. And surly, seeing this latter sort differ in a manner nothing at all from private men, we must (in my opinion) so judge of them, as of those other private persons, of whom I have before spoken. But the first, which be rulers of provinces, cities, and places, either by inheritance, or by office committed unto them; they ought not otherwise to do in the thing (whereof we now discourse) than we have before prescribed for those, which are mere and absolute magistrates. For by the commandment of the superior princes, it is not lawful for them to compel the subjects, whom they govern, unto ungodly religion: neither to permit the same to those infidels, which inhabit their territories. But if thou shalt say; We must obey the higher powers: I grant it, but yet *Usque ad aras*, that is, So far as religion shall permit.

When they, which overcame the Lacedaemonians, commanded such things as were against their laws and institutions: they said; If ye shall command us things more harder than death, we will rather die. Then, such kind of magistrates must in all other things be subject to the superior power: but in those things, which are against the word of God, they must not in any wise follow their mind. What time as the Macedonians, Antiochus, Demetrius, and Alexander, withdrew the Jews, which then lived under them, from the true worshipping of God; the Machabeis would not be obedient unto them. And whereas that house of priesthood was chief, next unto the kings family; it revolted from those kings, least that the sincere and ancient religion should be destroyed. And here, in alleging of these things, I count not the books of the Machabeis to be such, as that I judge from thence should be taken firm arguments of doctrine; but because I reckon that history to be true, as the which is not only contained in those books, but also hath been written by other authors.

43. I will also add the act of king Hezekiah, as it is written in the second book of Kings, the 18th chapter. For (as it is written in the 16th chapter of the same book) Ahaz had yielded himself unto the king of Assyria, to whom he did not only pay tribute, but for his sake he changed the worshipping of the true God. For he going to meet the king at Damascus, commanded an altar to be made at Jerusalem, according to the pattern of that, which he had seen at Damascus; and he followed the service and religion, which the Assyrians used. But Hezekiah his son (being very godly) perceiving that those things, which his father had done, were repugnant to the word of God, fell utterly from the king of the Assyrians, who then ruled over him, as a superior power. But first he assayed to pacify him with gifts and money; but when he saw that would take no place, he then defended himself, and his

people, against him with all his power. Nevertheless, in these things so much as is possible we must avoid seditions, and most warily provide, that under the pretense of religion, princes seek not their own. These things if they observe, and resist their superior magistrates only for godliness sake; let them not mistrust, that they commit any injustice. Moreover, the holy scriptures command, that Every soul should be subject to the higher powers. But that must be understood; as much as shall be lawful by the word of God. For in the same scriptures it is written, that the magistrate is a terror, not unto good works, but unto evil. So as, if the inferiors promote not evil things, but good, they do not then resist their powers. Wilt thou not fear the higher power (saith the apostle?) Do good, and for that thou shalt be praised.

Then, if they defend godliness, they shall deserve rather praise than blame: but if thou do evil, fear the superior power, for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, and a revenger unto anger, against him that doth evil. All these sentences do confirm the minds of the inferior powers, that they should be nothing afraid of the superior power, when they in defense of religion obey him not. Howbeit, if thou wilt say; By what law do inferior princes resist either emperors, or kings, or Common-wealth's, when as they defend the sincere religion and true faith? I answer; By the law of the emperor, or by the law of the king, or by the law of the Common-wealth: for they be chosen of emperors, of kings, and of Common-wealth's, as supporters to govern, whereby justice may more and more flourish. To the end therefore that they should rightly, justly, and godly govern the Common-wealth, according to the charge committed unto them, they were appointed: wherefore they do according to their duty, when in cause of religion they withstand the superior power. Neither can that

superior power justly complain, if in this case, the inferior power fall from it. The emperor testifieth in the Code, that his mind is not, that any of his decrees should take place in judgments against right; but that they should be made frustrate, if happily they be perceived to vary from justice. Whereupon Trajan is not without cause commended, who delivering the sword and the girdle unto the governor, said; If I rule justly, use it on my side; but if I rule unjustly, use it against me.

44. Gregory the bishop of Rome cannot be excused, who perceiving that the law made by Mauricius was unjust, (for he had decreed that none, which was encumbered with affairs of the Common-wealth, or appointed to the wars, should be made a clarke or monk) wrote indeed to the emperor, that when he had seen his law, he was wonderfully afraid; and therefore desired him either to remit somewhat of the rigor thereof, or else utterly to alter it. Howbeit, he added; Now that he had done his duty in admonishing him, (according to the obedience and service which he ought unto him) he would publish the law at Rome, as he was commanded. Doubtless this act of Gregory cannot but be reproved; because he ought not to have obeyed the superior power, in that thing, which he judged to be unjust and wicked. When we write of these things in this manner, we do not open any way at all unto seditions; but only our care is, that those things may be given to God, which are due unto God, and unto Caesar the things which be due unto Caesar. If the higher power would require either the goods or things of this world, for the use of the public weal, my counsel is, that they should be given; but not when those things be required, to be overthrown and subverted, which have respect to the worship of God. And by this means surly, we may excuse just Naboth, which would not grant to the king his vineyard: for he did not that of covetousness and pride; but because he saw

the law of God thereby to be violated, whereby it was ordained, that lands and possessions, among the people of Israel, should remain distributed by just division. This law of God the king went about to violate, and to the performance thereof he sought the consent of that man, which he with a good conscience could not have done.

Some think, that when the superior powers go about to constrain their inferiors to do wicked things, it were good and meet that they which exercise the inferior office, should resign and depart from their office; but I think not so. For this were to fall from his vocation, which he ought not to do; especially, when we see that his surrender must be made to the ungodly, which either resist, or oppress the kingdom of God. I judge therefore, that they ought to continue, until by force they be deposed by the superior powers; that they, through abiding may courageously defend the glory of God. But alas, we see very many dukes, earls and princes, which if the king or emperor would take from them their dominions, they would not leave a stone unmoved to defend and keep their own. There would they with all their force resist their higher powers, for this cause, and under this title; that they would unjustly deprive them of their own. But when the kingdom of God, godliness, and true religion are assailed by them; and that these inferior powers are required as ministers to prepare themselves to be present, and help to the overthrow of these things: they dare not speak or resist anything at all. Whereby we can think nothing else, but that they have but small love to the kingdom of Christ, and true religion.

45. Now remaineth, that we answer unto those arguments, which were objected at the beginning: where it seemed to be proved, that conversation together with the infidels is lawful. Christ was alleged, which kept company with Pharisees, sinners, and Publicans. Howbeit, he was not only constant,

and wise, but was the head of all wise and constant persons: and was in such sort able to profit evil men, as their naughtiness could nothing at all hurt him. Wherefore they, which are constant and learned, may lawfully (as we have taught) be conversant with infidels, to the end they may thereby further them to salvation. Secondly, Paul was brought forth; who forbad that a faithful husband or wife should not depart from an unbelieving husband or wife, so that he or she were content to dwell together. We also showed, that natural and civil friendships, especially such as are instituted by God, should be kept still. And yet must not that, which the apostle hath there said, be understood absolutely, as it seemeth there to be spoken. For if the unfaithful husband should entice his wife, being a Christian, unto ungodliness; or would not cease to blaspheme Christ: such a matrimony ought not to continue. Further, there was rehearsed the sentence of the same apostle to the Corinthians; namely, that all covetous persons, drunkards, and whoremongers, are not to be avoided; for then we should be gone out of the world: but he said, that those only were to be eschewed, which were accounted brethren. And touching this purpose of Paul, we must diligently note, that he perceived very well, that the necessities of life could not suffer, that all those, which believed not in Christ at that time, should be shunned: for the greatest part of men, at the beginning, were far from Christ. Neither could the infidels have become better, if our men had separated themselves altogether from them.

But according to the mind of the apostle, the corrupt brethren would be stricken with sorrow and shame, when they should perceive themselves for their sins sake, to be abandoned of those, to whom before they had been so familiar and deer, that they were joined to them, as members of one body. Besides, when this discipline flourished, the church was not ill spoken of,

for the offenses of brethren; which would otherwise have been, if they had winked at wicked acts. Wherefore these sayings are nothing at all against that case, which we before determined. And much less that which was alleged of Abraham, how he journeyed as a stranger among Ethnics and idolaters; first, because he did it by the calling of God; secondly, for that he was of so great staidness and wisdom, so as he could be conversant among the ungodly, without any hurt to himself, and with great fruit to them. For whither so ever he went, he carried about with him the religion and worship of God. We may answer the same also of Lot. If he went unto the five cities with a good mind; namely to teach the Sodomites godliness, and the right way [he did well:] but if he went thither, being moved only with the commodity of the place, he did not well. And assuredly, his going thither had but ill success: for he was led away captive; and Abraham was fain to redeem him. And when afterward those places were set on fire by the power of God, he was compelled to remove from thence, whether he would or no. I need not speak much at this time concerning Naaman the Syrian, for I have before treated of him, and will again. And I think it is manifest enough withal, what was the cause, why some of them, which were healed by Christ, were sent home to their own families; namely, to the intent they should preach, and faithfully declare unto them, what had happened unto themselves.

**Of the Jews.**

46. Now there remaineth to speak somewhat particularly of Jews and Heretics: for this kind of men are suffered almost in all cities, provinces, and kingdoms; and they dwell together with Christians. Why the Jews should be suffered, Augustine among others bringeth certain reasons. He *De civitate Dei*, the fourth book, the 18th chapter, as also upon the 58th Psalm,

and in other places, writeth; that Therefore they be suffered, because they before other men had the promise of salvation; neither are they past all hope, seeing that some of them many times, although few in number, do return unto Christ. Blindness (saith Paul unto the Romans) fell partly upon Israel: as though he would say; Not upon all. And to this the same apostle addeth; When the fullness of the Gentiles is come in, then all Israel shall be saved. And least peradventure thou shouldest think, that these words are spoken allegorically; Paul writeth them as a mystery. And to prove his saying, he bringeth the prophesy of Isaiah the prophet; to wit, that The iniquity shall be then taken away from Jacob. Furthermore, they be now called enemies unto God for our sakes, but friends in respect of their fathers. The same Augustine, in his questions upon the gospel, the second book, and 33rd question (if those be Augustine's books) when he interpreteth the parable of the prodigal son, he saith; that That son doth betoken the Gentiles. For it is written, that he departed into a far country; because the Ethnics were so far departed from God, as they worshipped idols publicly, and in open profession. But the elder son, under whom is shadowed the Hebrew people, went not so far off. And although he were not within his father's house, which is the church; yet nevertheless he abode in the field. For the Jews are occupied in the holy scriptures, which they understand not rightly, nor with such spiritual sense as the church of Christ doth know them; but take them in an earthly and carnal manner, whereby not unaptly they be said to have their abode in the field. This elder son doth not at the beginning enter into his father's house, but in the latter days he shall also be called and come.

47. The same father also, for the proof of this doctrine, bringeth that which is written in the 59th Psalm, as he readeth it; Do not kill them, least

they forget thy law, but scatter them in thy power. The son of God (saith he) prayeth unto the father, that the same nation might not be destroyed, but that it might wander everywhere in the world. Other provinces, when they were overcome of the Romans, followed the laws and rites of the Romans; so that at length they became Romans: but the Hebrews, notwithstanding they were overcome by the Romans, yet would they never yield unto their laws, rites, and ceremonies. They still observe their own, as much as they may; and being dispersed, they wander abroad. Neither have they utterly forgotten the law of God; not that the godly apply themselves to observe it, but do only read it, and keep certain rites and ceremonies, whereby they are discerned from other nations. Verily it seemeth, that God hath put a sign upon them, as he did upon Cain, for killing his brother Abel; namely, that every man should not kill them.

Neither is this scattering of them abroad in the world unprofitable unto the Christians, because (as it is written to the Romans) they are showed unto us as broken bows. And for so much as we were grafted in their place, when as we see that they were so miserably cut off, we acknowledge the grace of God towards us: and by beholding of them, be taught to take heed, that for our infidelity sake, for the which they were broken off, we also be not cut off in like manner. Moreover, there is another commodity, which cometh unto us by the dispersing of them. Because our books are saved by them; I mean the holy bible, which they carry every-where about them, and read it. And although, because they be blinded, they believe not; yet they confess, that those writings are most true. Indeed they be in heart our deadly enemies; but yet by these books, which they have and reverence, they are a testimony to our religion. Wherefore I cannot marvel sufficiently at those, which do so much hate the Jewish tongue, and bibles in Hebrew, as they

desire to have them destroyed and burnt; seeing Augustine *De doctrina christiana* thinketh, that wheresoever we doubt of the Greek or Latin translation, we must fly unto the truth of the Hebrew. And Jerome in many places writeth the same.

48. But they say, that the holy books were abused and corrupted by the Hebrews. To this Jerome upon Isaiah the sixth chapter, towards the end, answereth thus; Either they did this before the coming of Christ, and the preaching of the apostles, or else afterward. If a man will say, that it was done of them before; then, seeing Christ and his apostles reprehended the most grievous wicked acts of the Jews, I marvel why they would say nothing of that sacrilege, and so detestable a wicked act. Undoubtedly, they would have reproved them for marring and corrupting of the scriptures. But if thou wilt affirm, that the faults were brought in by them afterward: then will I say, that it had behooved them to corrupt those places chiefly, which do testify of Christ, and of his religion; and which were alleged by the Lord himself and his apostles in the New Testament. But those places remain sound; and the very same sentences, which they cited, do remain still in the Hebrew bibles: for they were not so greatly careful for the words, and it is not likely, that they in other places have corrupted the holy scriptures. Yea, if a man diligently read over their books, he shall find in them a great many more testimonies, and those more plain and manifest, than our common translation hath. Do they not read in the second psalm; Kiss the son: which our men have translated; Take ye hold of discipline? Which words undoubtedly are referred unto Christ. But I do not mean at this present, to bring all such like testimonies: it is sufficient, if I prove with Jerome, that the books of holy scriptures are not corrupted by the Hebrews. The which surly, if they would have done, yet had they missed of their purpose. For

many of the most ancient books are found, and that in written hand, which have been kept a very long time by the Christians, which never came in their hands to abuse.

49. But let us return to discourse of that commodity, which Augustine hath declared; There be very many (saith he) which would peradventure think, that the things, which we affirm to be done of the ancient people, and of the prophets, were but vain, and imagined by us; unless they saw the Jews yet alive, who with their books maintain that, which we profess, whether they will or no. For although the Hebrews be blinded in their heart, and be against us with as much power as they can; yet we have themselves, together with their books, most evident testimonies of our religion. And doubtless, among all testimonies, that testimony is of greatest account, which is testified by the enemies. And of this kind of witnesses God hath provided great store for his church: for we not only have the Hebrew books, to make on our side; but also the verses of the Sibyls, which were born in sundry countries. Neither must it be thought, that those verses were invented by our forefathers themselves: for in the time of Lactantius, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Augustine, which alleged those verses, the books of the Sibyls were rife in every man's hand. So as, if they had added any counterfeit verses unto them; the Ethnics, which were then many in number, and were full of eloquence, and deadly enemies unto our religion, would have reproved them as vain and lying. What then remaineth, but that God would wonderfully defend his church, even by the testimonies of his adversaries? Now then, the Jews are tolerated among the Christians; partly for the promise sake, which they have of salvation to be given to their kindred; and partly because of the commodities, which I have now recited out of Augustine. Wherefore they be not only borne withal, but they have

also synagogues, where they openly read the books of the holy scripture; and one with another do call upon the God of their fathers.

In which thing nevertheless, the diligence of magistrates and bishops is to be required, who ought to provide, that they do nothing else there; and by all means to beware, that in their public prayers, exhortations, and sermons, they do not curse nor rail upon Christ our God. And this if our magistrates and bishops do not look unto, they cannot escape a just accusation. But it is not lawful to grant unto the Turks any religious assemblies; for that they have not any particular promise of their salvation: neither would they read there, either the Old Testament or the New, but only their most detestable Alcoran. Over this, the Jews should be prohibited to exercise false bargaining and usury among Christians; thereby to vex and afflict the poor Christians before our face: the which cannot be done without great indignity. But our princes exact a good great tribute of them; and of those gains, which come by usury and naughty bargaining, they obtain great pray: so far are they from forbidding them these evil arts. Furthermore, (a thing no less hurtful) they provide not to have them taught; when as they ought to compel them to come often to godly Christian sermons: otherwise, while they be so negligently left, they become daily worse and worse. Whereby, either naughty fruit, or in a manner none at all can be looked for, by the conversation which they have among Christians. It must also be looked diligently to, that they corrupt not Christians, in seducing them to their Jewish religion. By reason of neglecting hereof, the heresy of the Marrans hath much increased, specially in Spain. Moreover, it is meet, that they may by some apparel, or certain token be known from Christians; least any unwittingly should be familiar with them, no less than with the Christians. And these things shall suffice concerning this sort of infidels.

**Of Heresies.**

50. Now let us speak of heretics. The word is αἵρεσις; it is derived of this verb αἵρειν, which is, To elect, or choose: for those kind of men choose unto themselves, some certain opinions, which are against the holy scriptures, and do stubbornly defend the same. But the causes of this their choice for the most part, are either, for that they be ignorant of the holy scriptures, or else if they know them, they despise them: and being driven of a certain desire, they apply themselves to the inventions of some errors. Wherefore Augustine in his book *De utilitate credendi*, writeth; An heretic is he, which for the love of gain, or bearing of rule, either breedeth or else followeth new opinions. So that the definition of heresy is a choice, and stubborn defending of opinions, which are against the holy scriptures, proceeding through the ignorance or contempt of them, that they may the easilier obtain their pleasures and commodities. Choice and stubborn defending in this definition, are instead of the form. But the opinions disagreeing with the holy scriptures, serve for the matter. Pride and covetousness make heresy. And the obtaining of dignities, gain, and pleasures, are appointed as ends of so great a mischief. By this definition is manifest enough (as I think) who be heretics. I mean not now to descend unto the kinds and particulars of heresies; I hope I shall have another occasion, and place more convenient. This will I briefly say as concerning this question, that we are to deal with heretics in none otherwise than with infidels and Jews.

51. But to draw to an end of these things, which I have spoken, let us hear what Augustine writeth of this matter, in his 154th epistle unto Publicola where he saith; If so be an idolater shall offer unto idols any portion of the fruits, or of the wine lately strained in the press, that maketh not, but we

may freely use that which remaineth, as well in the press, as in the barn. For we be not afraid to draw waters out of those fountains and wells, from whence they took for the service of their idols. But he judgeth, that he which hath the public power, (the magistrate I mean) by his authority must withstand, that no part of the profits should be defalked [and employed to] wicked worshipping's: but if this cannot be hindered, those things which are remaining, he maketh free. He answereth also touching the common bains, wherein idolaters were wont to bath themselves; the which in like manner he maketh common unto Christians; For (saith he) we likewise take breath, and breath out air, which we know to be infected with the evil stink of the sacrifices of infidels. Hereunto I would willingly also add, that albeit I confess the place of the bath for the faithful to be free also for the use of the believers; yet that we must not wash together with unbelievers: because in that kind of action, there may be noted some familiarity, assent, and participation together. And this we read in the ecclesiastical history, that John the evangelist did avoid, who would not enter into a bain, when he heard that Cerynthus the heretic did wash therein.

52. Augustine added, that we must use nothing that we understand doth tend to the honor and worshipping of idols; Neither doth it avail (saith he) if thou say that thy conscience is clear: for thy neighbor doth not see into thy heart, but beholdeth thy fact. Therefore if we shall hear anything, which is either superstitious, or idolatrous, we must abhor and detest it, and not convert it to our own use. The which was expressly commanded in Deuteronomy, when God forbad men, that they should not take such things unto themselves. Of which opinion Augustine alledgeth two reasons; Least thou taking anything away, which served to the superstitious worshipping, they suspect, that thou art moved to abolish wicked worshipping, not for

religion, but for covetousness sake; namely, that thou mayest wax rich, and to fulfill thy covetousness. Another reason there is, that if thou shalt lay-up at home these things among thy treasure, it might easily come to pass, that either they should be had in honor of thy posterity; or of the unwiser sort, which be in thy household: and so, that the idolatrous worshipping by little and little should be restored. Howbeit, he confesseth, that those superstitious things may be converted into public uses, and to the services of the true and right religion; even as we have known godly emperors to have done, who have taken money given to the theater, and to the temple of idols, and have consecrated them to the church of Christ, and to the good uses of the Common-wealth.

And there is a place cited out of the sixth chapter of the book of Judges, where the Lord willeth the wood of the grove dedicated to Baal, the which Gideon did cut down, to be transferred to the sacrifice which he was to offer. And in the sixth chapter of Joshua we read, that the substance of Hierico became accursed, and yet whatsoever was there, brass, iron, silver, or gold, all that, were they to bring to the treasury of the Lord. If a field, by any hap should be consecrated unto idols, the same Augustine judgeth, that those things which grew therein, are lawful for the believers: for The earth (saith he) is the Lord's and all the fullness thereof. And unto Timothy it is said; Every creature of God is good, so it be received of us with thanks-giving and prayers. Else should we blame Paul, who was many days in Athens, and undoubtedly fed of the fruits and commodities of the Athenien field; which field nevertheless was consecrated unto Minerva. But if there should now be fruits, and those consecrated and appointed to the special use or service of idols, the Christians ought to refrain, least they might seem to communicate with impiety. But because men in old time were accustomed

sometimes to sacrifice unto fountains and rivers; for that they attributed unto them a certain kind of divinity, I know not what: and therefore they threw into them sometimes, either the sacrificed flesh, or the inwards of the same; it is doubted, whether Christians might use those waters afterward. Augustine answereth; Yes indeed, it is lawful: for we know, (saith he) that there be very many, which do sacrifice unto the sun, yet fear we not to use the light of the same, and to enjoy the beams thereof; yea and there be found infidels, which do offer sacrifice unto the winds, and yet nevertheless we use the winds in our sailing.

53. Last of all, Publicola putteth him in mind of a case concerning a certain man, which passing through a desert, and the same man being very hungry, happening upon a church or chapel of idols, where, by chance, finding certain flesh set ready, he demandeth whether it were lawful for him to eat, if he profess Christian religion? Augustine answereth, because it may be, that that same is not sacrificed flesh, but is left there of strangers by chance, which turned in thither, either to dine or sup: therefore, seeing it is not apparent, that those are sacrificed things, he that is hungry may use them. Further, as if he had not satisfied himself, he maketh this distinction. Either he knoweth for a certainty, that the flesh was offered in sacrifice; or he knoweth for a certainty, that it was not: or else he doubteth. And he addeth, If he doubt, or else know for a certainty, that it is no sacrificed flesh, he may eat lawfully. But if it shall certainly appear, that the flesh was offered in sacrifice, let him abstain in respect of Christian piety. Here would I not willingly subscribe to the judgment of Augustine, for I see no cause why he may bid a Christian man that is hungry, to refrain from this kind of meat: for being in the wilderness, he hath not there any weak brethren, whom he may offend: neither yet doth he communicate with devils, seeing

no sacrifice is there in hand: neither doth he set forth unto the infidels his liberty to be condemned or blasphemed. Which things were the just and only causes, why the apostle forbad the eating of things offered unto idols. Therefore I would judge, that in such a case it is free, to use that kind of meat: for, The earth is the Lord's, and all that is therein.

**What is, to tempt God.**

54. To tempt, is nothing else, but to make proof. Wherefore they tempt God, which will have trial of his power and will. And this is done two ways: because otherwhile there is no lack of such things as we have need of, but we disdain to use those accustomed and familiar things: and we would be holpen by means exquisite and unheard of. As if one that would not put on a garment, which he hath, and in the meantime should pray, that God by some strange means, would drive away the cold from him: as there be everywhere to be found, who not content with the miracles rehearsed in the holy scripture, would now have some other to confirm the truth of the faith. According to this sense Christ answered Satan, when he persuaded him to throw himself down headlong from the top of the temple; It is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. As if he should say; The way to go down is manifestly known unto me, I have steps, to what purpose should I cast myself down headlong? If I do it, I shall tempt God.

55. Another kind there is of this temptation, when we lack necessary things, but yet nevertheless have a promise; and godliness doth persuade us to attend patiently. But many refuse to tarry the Lord's help, yea they dare prescribe a time unto God, and a mean also, whereby they would be holpen of him. This riseth through the unpatientness of adversities, which happeneth oftentimes with our great destruction. Wherefore the scriptures not without cause exhort us everywhere to patience. Tertullian also and

Cyprian have very notably written, concerning patience. None of us ought to prescribe unto God, either the means, or the time of help: he best knoweth the just causes, and he for good considerations deferreth his gifts. The first is, for that our sin should not lurk in the mind: for unless we were deferred, unpatience would not bewray itself, wherewith otherwise the heart is infected. Which being not understood of us, we would live more careless; neither would we pray to have it taken from us. Further, if things necessary should forthwith come unto us, perhaps we would not attribute the same unto God; but either unto chance, or else unto our own strength and endeavor. Wherefore God hath appointed, that when he deferreth his help, which he afterward giveth at the time prescribed, we may acknowledge him to be the author of our deliverance. For by this means we understand, that help is come unto us, not by our own appointment, but by his.

And affliction is recompensed with the pleasantness of delaying: for most pleasant are those things, which be longest looked for. Neither doth God demand anything else, but that we should weigh his gifts with a right consideration; lest they should become vile. And thus we must beware of this heinous crime, that we through unpatience do not tempt God: for by such means men either believe him not, to be the author of all things; or else they be in doubt whether he take care of them. And when help is deferred, at length they spew out their anger, and pour forth their hatred, which they miserable wretches always keep close and nourish within themselves against God, and never show it; but when they come to misfortune. Then break they out into blasphemies, wherewith they either slander God as cruel; or else the evils, which they suffer, they impute unto the stars, and unto evil men, whom they blame and curse without end. And as a mad dog biteth the stones which be thrown at him, and letteth them

alone unhurt which threw the stones: so these men neither look into their own sins, neither yet consider they the just causes, whereby God doth prolong his help: but most unwisely tempt God. The remedy must be so applied, that we set before our eyes the promises of God, and the steadfast faithfulness, which he hath hitherto used towards all the godly, and towards us. Which if we shall repeat in our mind, we shall not be provoked to tempt him, but rather we will turn ourselves to most earnest prayer, whereby we shall obtain, that those things, which are profitable to salvation, shall be given us in due time.

56. Besides these two kinds of tempting God, there is a certain other most wicked of all, which proceedeth only of impudency and contempt. For there be some, which of set purpose do go on in provoking and stirring up God by their sins, of which wickedness the apostle maketh mention in his 1st epistle to the Corinthians, when he saith; Be we stronger than Christ? Neither did Peter, though he dealt more mildly than we have declared, much disagree from this signification, when in the Acts of the apostles he said; Wherefore do ye tempt God, that ye would lay a yoke upon the faithful, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear? As if he had said; This is to provoke God unto battle. As though they challenged greater strength unto themselves, than God would grant unto their fathers in the observation of ceremonies. As concerning the first of these three temptations, the Israelites tempted God; for when as they had sufficiently wherewithal to sustain their living, they would have had God to prepare flesh and fish for them from heaven. Also they tempted God in the second manner: for when they had need of help, they expected not the opportunities appointed by God. Neither abstained they from the third manner, when as by accustoming themselves to sin, they provoked the wrath of God.

**Of Curiosity.**

57. Curiosity, is too much endeavor to know things forbidden, and such things as are nothing to the purpose. As touching the ark, God forbad that no man should see it, only the priests did fold the same in clothes: afterward, being covered and folden up, they delivered it to the sons of Caath to be carried. For if the Levites had seen the same, they had died. So God forbad that the people should approach to the mount, or to behold what was done near unto it: it was enough for them to be afraid at the lightening and thunder. Yea, and now it was not lawful to search over-curiously even of things besides the purpose: for when Peter had demanded as touching John; What shall this man do? Christ answered; What is that unto thee? Follow thou me. For while we have our mind occupied in these things, the time for better cogitations is lost. But on the other part also we must take heed, that we do not over-lightly receive whatsoever is laid before us: for that cometh of a certain foolish inconstancy. But we must be steadfast and constant, and not be moved with every wind of new doctrine. Prudently did the Thessalonians, who would confer with the scriptures, and see whether those things were true, which were spoken of S. Paul: for upon another occasion Christ said; Search the scriptures. When the Papists perceive, that their strange wonders are not believed of us; to wit, that the body of Christ and his blood do lie hidden under the shows of bread and wine, they cry out, that we be over-curious, and that of us is renewed that Jewish saying; How? But fools as they are, they might have remembered, that in the holy scriptures, even the godly men have oftentimes asked; How?

Moses desired by prayer to be rid of his ambassage, and alleged the stammering of his speech; And how (saith he) shall Pharaoh hear me? And Gideon; How can I deliver Israel, seeing I am the least of all my tribe? And

Abraham; O that Ishmael might live in thy sight! And how should I know that I shall possess the land of Canaan? And Sara laughed at the promise of God concerning the seed. And the blessed virgin; How (saith she) shall this be? And Jeremiah saith; That he was a child, and could not speak. I know indeed that of these, some were reproved, and some praised: for Abraham by that faith was justified. And the blessed virgins heard; Blessed art thou, which hast believed. But Moses was blamed, and that in such sort, as at the last God was angry with him. Then this is the difference, that they, which through unbelief, ask the question, How? Do offend and sin. But they which desire, that by this means their infirmity may be strengthened; or they which only inquire of the way and manner, because they see, that they themselves must have to do in the matter, they sin not at all. The virgins demanded by what means she should bring forth a son, whether naturally, or above nature. Neither was she for this cause unfaithful, neither is she reproved. But when a man sinneth in this matter, it cannot be perceived by the words themselves: for all men after one manner say, How? But God is chiefly the knower of the heart, and he understandeth with what mind every word is spoken. We also through things going afore, and following after, may meetly well understand a man's meaning. But now, if these men were not to be reproved, which demanded, How, in the words of the Lord; how much less shall we be blamed, if, in their lies and vain devises we do ask, How? And undoubtedly, Peter commandeth us to be ready to render an account of all our doctrine: but these men can make no manner of reckoning of their mysteries. They say it is a tradition, we ought not to ask. If so the case stand, we must yield: but (as I have said) this easiness of giving credit, is no less a fault, than that curiosity, whereof I began to speak.

# CHAP. V. The second Precept, which concerneth Images.

In treating upon this place, it seemeth good to use this method, that first we consider as touching the original and beginning of images; afterward of the use of them, whether it be lawful; last of all, if they have any use, whether they ought to be suffered in temples and holy assemblies. As concerning the name, among the Hebrews, an image is called *Temuna*, *Tselem*, and (as some will) *Teraphim*; of the Greeks, εἰκόνες; of the Latins *Imagines & signa*, that is, Images and pictures. Thus much of the words. But as touching the thing, we must understand, that the thing signified by the image, is no absolute thing; but must be placed in those things, which have relation to another. For every image is the image of something, even as the likeness is called the likeness of another thing. And those things, which be compared either in quantity or quality, have relation one to another. And the things, which be compared together in quantity, be either equal, or greater, or lesser: and in quality they are reckoned like, unlike, and diverse. Seeing therefore that an image is counted (as I have said) among those things, which have relation one to another; it is among the number of those,

which appertain unto quality: for it expresseth the lineaments, figures, and colors, and such other like of a living creature. And therefore we may thus define the same; An image is a certain similitude, whereby something is represented unto us, which may be discerned with the eyes. And this I therefore say, because we may as well read, as hear many things alike, which properly be not called images. The matter of images is not all one: for sometimes they be made of stone, of wood, metal, plaster, clay, and such other like. And sundry artificers do make them of that matter, which they have in hand: the potter, of clay; the carpenter, of timber; the mason, of stone; the founders, of metal, brass, silver, and gold; the painters also, of their colors.

And we must not pass it over, that idols also are images, whereof Tertullian wrote an elegant book, which he entitled *De idololatria*; and he examining the word [idol,] derived it from εἶδος, and εἶδος is a likeness, image, or form: whereupon cometh εἴδωλον, which may be called, a little form. The form of images, is the view of a similitude, wherein something is expressed, so as it may be perceived of the beholders. The end whereto images are, seemeth to be delight: for Aristotle in his Rhetoric's, among other things which breed pleasure, reckoneth imitation, where an image seemeth to be a certain emulation of God. For God created all things; wherefor men being unable to create the things themselves, do imitate the production of God, when they make images of those things, which he himself hath brought forth in nature. Images also are made for adorning sake: for they beautify the places where they be put. Furthermore, they have invented them, to the intent they might not suffer the remembrance of them which be absent, or dead, or of things done, to be extinguished. Also they have been devised for honor sake: for if a man had well deserved of the

Common-wealth, images were erected to him. So did Cicero counsel, that there should be an image set up unto Servius Sulpitius, which died in his embassage. And there have been some among them in old time, which would not only have others, but also themselves to be worshipped with images. For Nabuchad-nezar king of the Chaldeans commanded, that within his own kingdom himself should be honored by an image of gold. And among the princes of the Romans, Gaius Caligula would be expressed by images, with this inscription being added; Gaius Caligula Caesar, a god. And such an image he endeavored to bring into the temple of Jerusalem; whereupon there arose very great troubles, seditions, and tumults in Judea. The which thing Nero afterward would have to be done, and for that cause the Hebrews revolted from the people of Rome, whereof appeareth, that images were also translated to the service of God. Neither did there want some, which erected images to the affects or appetites wherewith they were corrupted. The drunkards carried about, the banners of Bacchus; the lascivious people, of Venus; the greedy and covetous, of Pluto; the mankillers, of Mars: and to prosecute everyone, it would be too long. Let the reader search for this in Tertullian, in his book *De idololatria*. But the honester sort of men did frame images of virtue and honor: sometimes also they erected the images of the elders, to the intent that men might be stirred up to imitate their forefathers: of which matter Salust wrote in the prolog of his history of Jugurth.

2. Seeing we have said enough touching the end, it remaineth that we examine the efficient cause of images. Artificers indeed were authors of them, and surly cunning workmen. Wherefore, from them they received their estimation: for the honor of images consisteth not of the matter, seeing they may be made unhandsomely even of gold. Certainly, all their honor is

of the form, that in very deed they may in perfect similitude finely represent that thing, which they betoken. Jupiter Olympius obtained honor and estimation of Phydias, and the picture of Alexander the great by Apelles, even as the well graven pots of Alcimedontes, and the instruments of Solomon's house by Iramus that notable artificer. To these things let us ad, that our forefathers, to bring the more estimation unto their images, feigned them to have fallen from heaven. Wherefore, the image of Pallas of old time was called διοπετές, that is to say, Fallen from Jupiter. Wherefore we read in the 19th of the Acts, that the town clarke of Ephesus said to the people; Who knoweth not that ye be worshippers of the great goddess Diana, whose image came down from heaven? And it must not be omitted, that seeing the ages in times past were very rude, the images at first were not orderly and perfectly wrought, as afterward they were. For of a long time men had unwrought stones, stocks, and pillars, instead of images. Yea and in Rome, at the first, a spear was the ensign of Mars: afterward, by little and little, there succeeded more cunning artificers, who so greatly prevailed in the perfecting of art, that as the poet wrote, they drew lively countenances out of the marble stone. Wherefore their images in old time were called βρότες, ἀπό τοῦ βροτοῦ, that is, Earthly men; because they seemed to be like unto men. Images were made so fair and beautiful, that there were found, which doted in love towards them, and as it were coupled with them most filthily.

3. Moreover, there might be somewhat spoken of the antiquity of images: but that thing is very obscure, and all be not of one mind touching the same. Some do call back the beginning of them unto Prometheus, which first shaped a man of clay, and afterward gave life thereunto. The Hebrews ascribe the original of images, unto the nephew of Adam, which was called Enoch: for it is said, that then began the name of God to be called upon.

Which they interpret, that men of that age began falsely to give the name of God unto images. Tertullian in his book against idolatry, bringeth the testimony of Enoch against images. Whereupon it appeareth, that the same book of Enoch, which is reckoned among the Apocryphal books of scripture, was yet extant, when Tertullian lived. Thence also Jude in his epistle brought a testimony. And this we do easily prove by the holy scriptures, that in the time of Jacob, there were images, or idols: for we do not only read, that Rahel carried away the idols of her father Laban; but that Jacob also warned his family, that they should bring them all unto him, to the end he might bury them in the ground. Yea it is gathered by very probable reasons, that there was worshipping of idols in Chaldea, in the time of Abraham. But if the matter be revoked to Christendom, there were Gnostics, and Capocratians, which are said to have had the images of Christ with them, which they privily worshipped among themselves, burning incense unto them, whereunto they added the images of Paul, and also of Homer and Pythagoras, and of certain others: as Irenaeus testifieth in his first book, and 24th chapter.

And among the Gnostics, one Marcellina is much celebrated by Epiphanius, who had such manner of images. The very same thing doth Augustine touch in his book *De haeresibus, ad quod vult Deum*. Eusebius in the seventh book, and 18th chapter writeth, that there was kept among some, the images of the apostles and martyrs, which they had private at home with them; and he addeth, that he himself saw them: and it is not to be omitted, that he confesseth this custom to be derived from the Ethnics. Damascene, where he purposely entreateth of this matter, saith, that Christ sent unto Abgarus the picture of his phisnomy, printed in a cloth, to the intent he might comfort himself therewith, when he could not see him

present. They feign also, that Christ going to suffer, delivered the print of his face in a handkerchief, to Veronica, the which they say is kept at Rome: and under that name they honor and reverence a certain picture at this day, with great superstition. Also Eusebius writeth, (and the same is reported by Sozomenus) that in the city of Caesarea, which was afterward called Apamea, there was an image of Haemoroussa, together with the image of Christ, the which afterward was removed, and thrown down by Julianus the apostate. And there want not some rash men, which affirm, that Luke was a painter, and that he drew very many pictures of the blessed virgins, the which being dispersed abroad among the cities and provinces, they worship at this day with great superstition. Surely, if we shall believe Jerome, Luke did exercise the science of physic. And indeed Paul in his epistle to the Colossians, maketh plain mention of Luke the physician. But whether the same were he that wrote the history of the Gospel, and of the Acts of the apostles; I know not: but that he was a painter, or a drawer of pictures, none of the ancient writers do tell. And thus much touching the beginning of images. Now it resteth that we show some distinction of them.

4. The partition of them must be taken from those things that are represented by them: for such things as are referred to another thing, are wont to be distinguished by their correlatives. Wherefore, images do either represent God the Creator of all things, or else, things created, which be the sundry workmanships of God. And among those things, which be created, we place even Christ himself as touching his humanity. This being set down, it seemeth meet to be determined, that all creatures may be represented by images: yea the very angels themselves, I mean not in respect of their spiritual nature, but in such sort as they have exhibited themselves to be seen of men. Wherefore the godly men, which either be

dead, or yet living, kings, stars, plants, stones, earth, sea, and such like may be represented by pictures. Also we make a distinction of images, that some of them be true, and some of them false. Among the true, those be reckoned, which do represent those things, which either be, or have been, or hereafter shall be. But those are called false, which represent those things, that neither be, have been, nor yet ever shall be: as are the Chymaeras and Centaurs. There be also some images filthy, and some honest, according as those things be, which are expressed by them. Also they may be distinguished, according to the circumstance of the place; because some be set in a holy place, and some in places profane. Again, others there be, which are appointed in respect of worship and religion: but others are erected as ornaments, and only for the remembrance of a thing. Now are we to examine, according to the distinctions set forth, what images be lawful, and what be unlawful.

5. And first I think good to speak of those, which represent God. But before all things, I study with myself, for what cause such images were invented; and I suppose, that men thought, that by a certain law it was laid upon them, that they should worship God, and that they should have him present in their minds. But they saw themselves distracted with many cares, and that they could not do the same continually. Whereupon they gathered, that it should be needful to have admonishers; that they being distracted, might call themselves home again to the worshiping of God: and they judged images fit things, whereby they might be often put in remembrance. In deed they supposed that which was very true; namely, that men partly through infirmity, and partly by reason of sundry and manifold cares, should have need of admonishers: but therein they erred, because they would procure to themselves such admonishers as were dumb. God of his

own goodness hath abundantly helped this necessity, who hath set forth all his works for men to behold; to the intent that they having thoroughly considered of them, might be admonished of him that wrought them. Wherefore David very wisely said; The heavens declare the glory of God.

The Patriarchs, when they would sacrifice, went unto high places, where they might behold the tall trees, the heaven, the floods, and the earth lying round about; and thereby lifted themselves up to the knowledge of God the creator. But contrariwise, foolish men would devise images to themselves, and at length fell to that, that they called stocks and stones, gods. Wherefore Jeremiah, in his second chapter, earnestly reproveth them, which feared not to say unto a stock; Thou art my father; and unto a stone; Thou hast begotten me. And thus, while these men would have such kind of admonishers, they were drawn far away from the true worshiping of God; and finally, they attributed unto images, the purging of sins. They held them also for gods, which did guard the quick and the dead, and every particular man, and likewise the whole city. From thence also they endeavor to wrest oracles, and they make vaunt, that their prayers poured out unto them, are heard: and going yet further, they sacrifice daily before them. This boldness or rashness of men, did exceedingly displease God, and not without cause. For a prince would take it in ill part, if the honor, which is only due unto himself, should be given unto his servants: wherefore God himself in the prophet Isaiah saith; I will not give mine own honor unto another.

6. But some man will say, that this invention had no ill meaning; but rather a good and right intent (as they call it,) but the same right intent doth oft times mar all. Neither doth it suffice to make men’s works righteous, unless those things be added or put to, which we have else-where sufficiently spoken of. Athanasius wrote against idols, and among other

things, he saith; They which lived in times past, made images, to the intent that out of them oracles might be uttered: and for so much as God might not be known, but by visible signs, and therefore they judged that God was to be called upon in images; because they thought heavenly powers were present with them. And Arnobius in his sixth book against the Gentiles reporteth, that the nations said, that they did not worship stones, but the presence of God exhibited about these images. For they thought, that images through certain dedications, were so adorned and purged, that the power of God came fully unto them. And in dedicating of them, they thorough a certain perverse imitation of the old fathers, applied holy unction's (as they called them.) For Jacob also anointed a stone, and Moses was commanded to anoint in a manner all the necessary implements about the Tabernacle. Eusebius also, in his ninth book, the third and 11th chapters, writeth, that thereto did come the enchantments of devils, and incredible sorcery: for so much as there were daily wonders wrought at the images, whereby the silly people were in sundry wise seduced, to the great detriment of the church. He declareth the history of Theotechnus, which was punished for his wickedness. Yea furthermore, Theodoretus in the fifth book, 22nd chapter, saith, that the craftiness of enchanters came hereunto, who erected images against walls, and gave answer through holes bored in them. Wherefore the people were marvelously amazed, when they supposed that the images spake. It can hardly be credited, with how great labor and difficulty men could be brought from the worshipping of images. Eusebius in his third book of Constantine life, saith; When images were subverted, in them there was found the bones of dead men, dry skulls, loathsome clothes, and small bundles of sticks: which things our men in showing to the people said; Behold (I beseech ye) what ye have hitherto worshipped. And he

affirmeth, that by those same shows, very much was brought to pass with the people.

7. Now that the causes be set forth, why men endeavored to express God by images; it seemeth good to dispute, whether it be lawful to represent God by them. And it must be determined, and that freely without exception, that the same is not lawful. For God commanded the children of Israel, that they should remember they saw no image upon mount Horeb, and therefore forbad, that they should make any such. Howbeit, the place is more large, if it be more diligently examined. For there he commanded that they should not make any images at all, to do any worship unto them. And in the forty chapter of Isaiah he saith; To whom will ye resemble God, or by what similitude will ye express him? And in the 44th chapter he confirmeth the same, saying; Who shall be so hardy to fashion out God, or to make a molten or graven image that is profitable for nothing? I marvel that among the Papists, Dominicus Azotus, upon the epistle to the Romans, the first chapter, durst write, that by that commandment it is not forbidden unto the Christians, to make images resembling the shape of man; seeing the law hath only made mention there, of creeping things, of birds and fishes: whereas nevertheless it is there by express words forbidden, that no images should be made, either of the male, or of the female.

Moreover, it is thus written in the Psalm; Mouths they have, and speak not; feet they have, and walk not; ears they have, and yet hear not; noses they have, and smell not. And although the rest of the members may be understood touching brute beasts, yet that saying, that They have mouths, and cannot speak, belongeth peculiarly unto men, forsomuch as speech was not given unto brute beasts. Wherefore Lucretius called them beasts without mouths. Which interpretation, Augustine brought in the same place.

Furthermore, Isaiah in the 44th chapter, laugheth the Carpenter to scorn, who of the one part of a tree being cut down, maketh an image, of the other part kindleth fire, and therewith dresseth bread and meat. He carveth it (saith he) and marvelously worketh it, that he may express the similitude of a man. By all these things it appeareth, that even the images of men (which be ordained for divine service) are forbidden. It is proved therefore, that images, which represent God himself, be forbidden by testimonies of the holy scriptures. Whereunto we must add, that by the testimony of them we be taught, that God is a spirit: whereof it followeth, that by lineaments and colors he cannot be expressed.

Further, it is there written; that None hath seen God at any time. Wherefore, if he be seen of none, and Dwelleth in the light that cannot be attained unto, how can he be set forth in a picture or graven image to be seen? Moreover, he is infinite: but those things, which be painted, graven, or molten, be drawn together and limited; yea rather, they be circumscribed by the workmanship itself. Besides this, images for the most part be made by men, to the intent that they, which be absent, may after a sort be present with us. But God is everywhere, nether is he absent from anything. Wherefore it is written in the Psalm; If I go up into heaven, thou art there; If I go down into hell, thou art there also. We must not therefore make him present by images, seeing he is present always, and in all things. Hereunto add, that we must in an image express with apt likeness, the thing which should be represented. But when God by any image is represented, things which rather be unlike and contrary, than like and agreeable, are likened unto him. Moreover, God (as all men must of necessity grant) hath no beginning; but all images are invented by crafts-men. Whereunto may be added, that God, what and how great a one soever he be, is continually

moving or doing, and is never idle: whereas images be senseless, and do no manner of thing at all.

Over this, God himself is all wholly knowledge and understanding: but images perceive nothing, and do understand nothing at all. Besides, God not only consisteth of himself, but also maketh all things to consist, and stand by his word: but images are not able to consist of themselves, for they are stayed up of artificers, by props and great posts. Yea and further, God himself hath no end of his nature and life; whereas images wax old, and in the end come to naught. And seeing God is of nature invisible (as hath been confirmed before:) crafts-men, in picturing and painting him out, do follow their own imaginations, and not the divine nature, which they cannot see. And they be not afraid to ascribe those imaginations and conceits of their minds unto the name of God: but this is altogether wicked and ungodly. So it came to pass, when the Israelites said unto Aaron; Make us gods, which may go before us. And he made them a molten calf, and called it by the name of Jehovah; For tomorrow (saith he) it is the feast of Jehovah. Jeroboam also, when he made the golden calves, commanded them to be worshipped by the name of Jehovah. Wherefore, it is written in the 14th chapter of the book of Wisdom, that they applied the holy and immutable name of God unto idols. And in the 17th of the Acts, Paul saith; We ought not to think that the Godhead is like to gold, or silver, graven by art and invention of crafts-men. If so be then that the similitude of God be not in images; those which be of this kind must be utterly rejected.

The complaint of Seneca is commonly known, whereof Augustine maketh mention in the sixth book *De civitate Dei*, and forty chapter, out of the book named *De superstitione*, which is lost, and is not anywhere to be found at this day. Augustine's words be these: for when he entreated concerning

images; They dedicate (saith he) the holy, immortal, and inviolable gods, in a matter most vile and immovable, giving unto them the habits of men, wild beasts, and fishes: and some indue them with diverse bodies of a mingled kind. They call them gods, which if they should receive life, and suddenly meet one, they would be taken for monsters. But the holy scriptures have laughed to scorn this presumption and foolishness of men; especially Isaiah, in the 44th chapter, as we have already heard before. To these things let us add, that Aristotle in his second book *De physico auditu*, alledgeth the saying of the philosopher Protarchus, which said, that Those stones be fortunate, whereof images be made: for they be laid upon the altars, and have honor and reverence done unto them by men; whereas others not unlike to them, lie upon the pavement, are trodden upon with their feet, and spit upon. Besides this, let it come to mind, that the very works of God, which be extant in the nature of things, cannot perfectly show him. Wherefore seeing the workmanships of men be a great deal more imperfect, because art always faileth in comparison of nature: how should we hope that God himself can be expressed by the industry of crafts-men? Neither must it be omitted, that the scripture, when it speaketh of images (to the intent it may drive men from them) it calleth them filthiness, lies, things of nothing, abomination, and affliction. Howbeit, we must grant, that God would have some signs, whereby he would open himself unto men. Such were the ark of the covenant, the tabernacle of Moses, the temple of Solomon, and also the pillar of fire, and of the cloud: but it must be considered, that he devised and ordained these signs for himself. Neither is it lawful for men, to do so much as it is for God.

Augustine *De fide & Symbolo*, when he expounded the article, wherein is said, that Christ sitteth on the right hand of his father, he saith; We must not

imagine, that God is endued with the shape of a man, that Christ doth bow his knees, and sitteth on the right side of him: it is a wicked thing to have such manner of images. But in the fourth book, the ninth and 31st chapter *De civitate Dei*, he hath more manifestly expressed the same, where he commendeth Varro, which wrote in his Theology, that they which first of all others made images unto God, first took away the fear of them from men; namely, because of the vile matter whereof they were formed, and because they moved not of themselves: and they did err more, for so much as in making of images, they did not reform their error, but rather increased the same. Also he praiseth Varro, who alloweth of the ancient people of Rome, because they, for the space of 70 years, worshipped God without images: neither did Varro fear to bring the people of the Jews to be a witness of that thing. And he added also, that whiles the people of Rome worshipped God without images, they honored him more purely, than afterward they did. And these things be not only recited by Augustine, and Varro; but they be also written by Plutarch in the life of Numa Pompilius, by Dionysius Halicarnassus, by Clemens Alexandrinus, and also Tertullian, as it is recited by Eusebius. Besides this, Herodotus in his first book, and Strabo in his 15th book, do show, that the Persians in old time made no images. When Tarquinius Priscus, who was endued with the learning of the Greeks and Hetruscans, reigned at Rome, there were images brought into the city. Which act Augustine doth marvelously mislike of, who most evidently showeth, that it is not lawful to counterfeit God by images. And in his eight book *De civitate Dei*, 23rd and 24th chapters he sharply reproveth Hermes Trismegistus, who presumed to say, that Men do well in making of images, that even as God made heavenly gods, so he gave power unto men to make earthly gods.

8. But at this day in Christendom, there be such kind of images suffered, whereby God himself may be represented. For, to express the blessed Trinity, thou mayest see every-where in the churches, a man painted with three heads. In another place they put a tall old man for God the father; who hath standing before him a young man, that is to say, the son; and between both they place the picture of a dove, and that is instead of the holy Ghost. Neither do the rulers of the churches take away these things, but allow of them: howbeit, with such fond arguments, as be necessary to repeat, least we should seem to dissemble anything. The seventh Synod, which was held at Nice, in the reign of Constantine and Iren, thus concluded; For it is God, which the image teacheth, but itself is not God; look upon this, but worship with thy mind, that which thou beholdest in the same image. But what is to be judged of this Synod, we shall see in due place. In the meantime, let us hear the objections of the adversaries.

First of all they say, that the holy scriptures have given occasion to form images: for seeing they have attributed unto God the parts of a man; namely, eyes, ears, head, nostrils, feet, &c. There seemeth no cause why, but that the painters and gravers may form the very same unto him. Also it is written in Ose; I am likened by hands of the prophets. And in the seventh of Daniel; The ancient of days was showed unto the prophets, which had the hears of his head white like wool. Also there was showed unto Ezekiel the similitude of a man. Yea and Isaiah saith, that He saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, &c. And Moses also with the elders saw God sitting upon a throne, and upon the mountain he beheld his hinder parts like unto a man going away. Wherefore they say, that seeing those things have been showed, and have been seen by the prophets, why shall it be thought a wicked part, to plant out the self-same things in colors and engravings?

[ 1] Of some it is answered, that the diversity of members, which is attributed unto God in the holy scriptures, did show by a certain mystery, that the divine nature should in time to come take upon it a human nature. [ 2] But I let pass this answer for this time; affirming, that we ought here to have regard to the goodness of God, whereby it did so humble itself unto our infirmity, that seeing we cannot understand his nature, he would under the name of members or parts, open, or rather shadow unto us certain of his properties. For by the eye he describeth his providence, by the arm his might, by hands his workmanship, by nostrils his wrath, and the rest of like sort. [ 3] Where it is afterward said, that it is lawful for us to use the same lineaments, colors, and engravings, it followeth not: for there is no law given unto God. All things which he doth rightly and justly, are not lawful for men to do: for God taketh revenge of his enemies; he commanded the father to kill his son, and willed the Hebrews, to take away the goods of the Egyptians, the which nevertheless is wicked for men, either to do, or command: for he appointed laws for men, and not for himself. And for so much as he is the author of the law, he may other whiles except some things from it. Wherefore we must assure our selves, that what he did, he did not without consideration.

[ 4] In deed he expressed himself sometimes by certain apparitions; but in them there was no danger of idolatry: for who is there that worshippeth words either spoken or written; else offereth sacrifices unto them? For words pass away, knowledge also and conceits of the mind are put out of remembrance: but if so be things themselves be painted or engraven outwardly, men will readily adore them, burn incense to them, and pray unto them. [ 5] Further, let us consider, that the prophets, which had such kind of forms in their mind, did never picture them, nor yet made images of

them: for they did know, that God forbad such things to be done. Neither did they dispute with themselves in this manner; God hath thus declared himself unto us, therefore it is lawful so to express him out in images. [ 6] Besides this, God commanded that there should be a propitiatory upon the ark, as though his seat should be there: but the same was an empty seat, neither was there any image of God therein. [ 7] Moreover, the scriptures which do shadow God many ways, if they be attentively read, will teach us, that God is a spirit, and without a body: and so do they meet with that error, which might arise in our minds. But a picture or image, although we behold the same a thousand times, doth signify none other thing, than that which was showed at the first sight. Wherefore there is neither way the like reason. And it is truly proved, that God is not to be expressed by images. But they make their moan, and say; What shall we then do? Shall not God be some manner of ways counterfeited, that our minds thereby may be carried or lifted up to the consideration of heavenly things?

We answer, [ 1] that of his images there be enow already extant: for Christ is the lively image of him, let us therefore behold him and his acts, and in him we shall know God abundantly. [ 2] Furthermore, we have in the holy scripture, which most perfectly painteth out God to us, so much as is requisite to the painting out of him. What need have we either of wood, brass, gold, silver, or other sensible matter? [ 3] Again, if it delight us to behold the lively images of him, let us look upon godly men, which now be, and sometime have been in the church: for they undoubtedly were from the beginning created, and afterward were restored to the image of God. [ 4] We have moreover, as it is above declared, all the works of nature, wherein the printed steps of God’s power do appear. [ 5] Further, we have the visible sacraments, wherewith the word of God is joined. Surely these things may

suffice, and ought to be enough to lift up men's minds to the beholding of God and his properties. [ 6] But curious and importunate men, besides these things which I have recited, bring yet into the church, marble, brass, and wood; but they which do these things, be reprehended in the holy scriptures, and are most weightily reproved of whoredom, because they be not content with God, to whom all the faithful are married. But call unto themselves other husbands, that is, images and idols, and with them commit most abominable adultery. [ 7] Damascenus, which otherwise defended images many ways, yet in the 4th book and 8th chapter, he writeth, that to endeavor to fashion out God, is both a fond and also a wicked part. Neither doth he allow of the images of God.

9. But seeing the papistical church receiveth in a manner all kind of images, neither excludeth images of the trinity, and of God; it hath flattering sophisters, which wonderfully defend all those things. Cardinal Caietanus writeth, All such images may sometimes be made of purpose; to declare, and affirm, that God hath the form or figure of a body. And they which be of this mind, both do foolishly, and also contend against the holy scriptures, which most plainly teach, that God is a spirit. But if so be that either painters, or image-workers believe not, that God is not endued with a body, and yet paint out those images, whereby God hath declared himself in the scriptures; they are not to be disallowed or hindered, that they should not go through with their works. And again, if they devise unto God a similitude or figure; not because they judge that he is such a one, but because they will by that manner of means stir up men to contemplate higher matters than be expressed in the image of God, they are to be allowed. Wherefore, in the distinctions, which he bringeth in; the first member he disalloweth, and the other he admitteth. But God reasoneth not so sophistically, but he speaketh

plainly and roundly, and commanded that they should make no images for to worship them religiously. Yea and the prophets, being the interpreters of God's law, defied them in every place. And they which will be wiser than God and his prophets, must not be received. The same author added, that those two sorts of images, which he allowed of, must not absolutely and barely be received; but appareled with some certain circumstances. The first is, that we be sure there be no danger like to ensue, by reason of errors, and that we have sufficient trial, that the church being well instructed, doth believe no such things of God. The second is, that such things be not done after the fancies of men, but that they be as it were expressing's of the doctrine and traditions received by the church.

But I would gladly demand of him, as concerning the church; what church that was, of whom these things were delivered and ordered? Doubtless not the primitive church: for the apostles taught no such matter, nor yet the church that followed; because the good fathers received no such pictures and images of God; as we have proved out of Augustine. It remaineth that the same was the latter church, wherein antichrist, and the devil do now exercise their tyranny. Moreover, how shall they be sure of the right instruction of the simple sort, which be in the church? How can they undoubtedly known, that when they see such images, they will not fall into error? Surely these feigned matters are invented by Sophisters, not for the furthering of the truth, but for the maintenance of abuses. And Thomas Aquinas is also to be wondered at, who saith, that God forbad the Jews, that they should not make images; because at that time the word had not taken upon it the nature of man. What is this to the purpose; seeing we speak at this present of the images and pictures of the very nature of God, which by art, colors, and lineaments cannot be described? Wherefore there is all one

reason, as well of the old Hebrews, as of the Christians; because that God, by the course and alterations of times, hath not changed his nature, that now at length he should have such a nature, as may be expressed, and then had far otherwise.

But there be others, which use a more subtler kind of sophistication; and say, that God unto his commandment added this reason; Because in the mount ye saw no image. If this be a true and just cause, why should he not afterward be drawn and expressed, when he showed himself by so many shapes? And they prove, (as they think) that he may be pictured and graven by such similitudes, as he in process of time revealed himself. I would that those men should understand, that the commandment was simply and absolutely set forth; namely, that they should not counterfeit God by images. Neither is that, which after is added, the whole cause of the commandment; but as some probable thing added, to persuade that which was commanded. But we find in the prophets, that the chief cause is, for that the divine nature cannot be expressed, but falsely and wickedly: and also, because God forbad it. Justly therefore we must determine, that such images ought not to be suffered.

10. Now, as touching those images, which resemble things created; let us see how they may be suffered, or not suffered. And first of all, Christ cometh very well to remembrance, in that he is man: for in that respect he may be resembled, and painted out. For that is not against the nature of the thing; seeing he was very man; neither against the art of painting, which may imitate bodies. True in deed it is, that in the 7th Synod, which the papists allow not, (being held by Constantine and his son) it was decreed, that Christ should not be painted or fashioned out, no not as touching his human nature. And the reason is set down; because nothing but his

humanity can be expressed by art. Wherefore they, which make such things, seem to embrace the Nestorian heresy, which separated the human nature from the divine. But to say truly, I do not much allow of this reason; which if it were true, it should not be lawful to picture any man, because the soul, which is a spirit, cannot be expressed. And they which describe the human nature of the Lord, do not exclude the divine nature from the understanding; neither do they show or allow, that the humanity of Christ, either was, or is destitute of his godhead. Although Theodosius and Valentinianus seem to have commanded, that Christ's picture should not be set forth in metal, nor in flint stones, nor yet in tables of wood. As we have in the first book and eighth title of the Code. The law standeth in ambiguity, which seemeth to signify, that he should not be expressed in the pavement; least (forsooth) it should be trodden under feet, or spat upon. But Petrus Crinitus saith, that he saw that law written absolutely, whereby is commanded, that the image of Christ should not be made of any matter. But that he cannot be counterfeited, as touching his human nature, there are no firm reasons brought.

11. The angels, as touching their substance and nature, seeing they be spirits, cannot be expressed; yet is it lawful sometimes to picture them in such wise, as they have showed themselves unto men: for they be not, as God is, infinite; but are bounded and limited. Neither doth the commandment of God forbid this, unless their pictures were made, to the intent they should be religiously and devoutly worshipped. Also men may be pictured and counterfeited, seeing the same is not repugnant either to the thing, either to art, or else to the commandment of God. So is it lawful also, to form and picture forth the cross of the Lord, trees, fruits, and other sensible or visible bodies: for the arts of painting and counterfeiting be the

very gifts of God; wherefore they must serve to some use. [ 1] And by this I gather, that they be the gifts of God; because he endued the builders of Moses tabernacle, with his spirit; Bezeleel (I mean) and Aholiab. Neither is it lawful to say, that God doth inspire evil things with his spirit, and such things as be against his law. [ 2] Moreover, the power itself of imitating, seeing it is natural unto man, verily he had the same of God, and not of himself. And it followeth of right, that some use should be thereof: because God hath bestowed no gifts upon his creatures, especially upon men, which should not be lawful for them sometime to use.

[ 3] Neither doth he take away the use of those gifts; because many do abuse them: and this is easily confirmed by many similitudes. The power of procreation is given unto men, although some do shamefully abuse the same unto lusts. So the sight is granted, which they do perversely use, who for lust sake do behold women, which be none of their own. And so it might be said of the rest. [ 4] Again, we know that Solomon would have images to be made for his royal throne, which should have the forms of young lions: neither was he for that matter reprehended by any prophet. Wherefore in a profane thing it is lawful to have pictures and graven images. [ 5] I am not ignorant, that the ancient fathers, and especially Clement and Tertullian detested the acts of painters and image-makers. But I understand this, in respect that these workmen did profess Christ: and yet they made images and pictures, which might easily be worshipped, and peradventure they divided them among the idolaters, thinking it sufficient to their own salvation, if they themselves did not worship them. But the Turks be of the opinion, that there should be no images made at all: whereupon in their coins they only have letters, which be written in the Arabian tongue: and upon their tapestry they also use to weave certain knots.

The use of images may be good, for the keeping of things in memory, for the garnishing of houses, especially of kings and noble personages, and also to serve for some honest pleasure, wherewith men sometime may both delight and recreate themselves. Howbeit, in such light commodities, there are oftentimes many faults; for false images are sundry times thrust in, instead of true. As if so be a nation or people be described to be overcome by their enemies, which nevertheless was the vanquisher: that must needs be reproved, seeing it doth injury unto others. Also if one be pictured to have done some heinous act, which in very deed he did not. Neither must they be borne with, which do paint false miracles, whereby idolatry may win credit. And doubtless in our time, there have not wanted such, as have endeavored to paint the miracles of Christ's infancy: which things are nowhere found written, and seem to be altogether fabulous. So, some likewise do paint out in many places, Christopher and George rather monstrously than truly. We must therefore take heed, least men be perniciously seduced by false images: I have added, perniciously; because the Gentaures, and other things of like sort, may, for garnishing sake, be expressed without any harm unto them, which are beholders. Others attempt to paint out virtues, which have no bodies, but do belong unto the mind, which is a spirit. Also they painted or fashioned them like to virgins and matrons: and therein I think is no deceit, whereby the beholders can be deceived. Howbeit, this seemeth the safest way of all other, that if things should be painted, the profitable and holy histories should chiefly be painted; whereby the beholders may receive some edifying.

Further, we must beware of lavishing out of money: for there be some, which in procuring of pictures and images, are stark mad. These costs must not be preferred before the necessities of the poor. How greatly herein it

hath been offended, the temples from our forefathers, which be yet extant, do evidently declare. Besides this, we must take very diligent heed, that there be no filthy things painted: for we are otherwise, of our own vileness and corruption of nature, sufficiently kindled unto lust. If it be truly said; that Evil speaking corrupteth good manners: no less do filthy images corrupt the beholders. Tertullian writeth, that the Ethnics painted the image of Christ with asses ears, in despite of our Savior Christ. Wherefore, such an image ought to be accounted blasphemous. Lastly, from them must be removed all religious worship, the which that it be not given them, it must be always provided, that they be not placed in the churches.

12. Seeing therefore it is now declared, what things it is lawful to picture, after this we must diligently examine, whether it may be lawful to use any adoration or worshipping in images. In the disputation whereof, we will first recite what our adversaries have thought, and what kind of worship shall be spoken of. Holy worshipping the Greeks call εὐσεβεία, and the Latins *Pietas*, that is, Godliness: which nevertheless is extended both unto the parents, and unto the country. But we now talk only of religious worshipping, and inquire, whether the same may be attributed unto images. Divine worship or honor is expressed of the Hebrew in two words; of the verb *Jare*, which is, To fear; and *Avad*, which is, To serve. And undoubtedly, under the name of fear, is comprehended all religion, which is placed in the mind. By *Avad*, is declared an outward service, which is contained in ceremonies, besides an inward worshipping. Wherefore it is rightly said; Fear the Lord thy God, and serve him. Moreover, Christ did fight with this place against the devil, saying; Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only thou shalt serve. Whereupon Augustine devised a difference between religious worshipping's, calling that which is only due unto God,

λατρεία, and that which is lawful to do unto creatures, he called δουλεία. In his 49th epistle *Ad Deo gratias*, and against Faustus, the 20th book, and 21st chapter, he calleth λατρεία, that service which is only done unto the Godhead; and he addeth, that the same cannot in one word be expressed of the Latins. Also in the 20th book *De civitate Dei*, and first chapter, he wrote very much of this matter. Surely, for my part I have not read of any such distinction in the fathers, before Augustine's time.

And certainly Laurentius Valla upon Matthew, the 4th chapter, affirmeth; that There is no difference, as concerning the words; because the verb λατρεύειν, signifieth as well To serve God as men. And he alledgeth a place out of Xenophon, where a husband saith, that he was ready with his soul, that is, his life; to redeem that his wife should not serve any man: in which place he useth the verb λατρεύειν. And again, the wife saith, that she would redeem with her life, that her husband might not serve: where the verb δουλεύειν is written. And Soudas saith, that λατρεύειν is to serve for reward. And undoubtedly, according to this sense, the holy scriptures do interpret λατρεύειν. For where it is commanded, that there should be no manner of servile work done on the sabbath day; it is written in the Greek text, λάτρην τον. And λάτρις, among the Greeks, signifieth a Handmaid; and λάτρης a Manservant, but λάτρον a Reward. Whereupon in times past, Latrones were called Mercenary soldiers. Whom some (I know not how well) have thought so to be called, as if one should say *Laterones*, as they that should guard the persons of kings and princes. In Luke it is written; Ye cannot serve God and Mammon: where, for serving, the verb δουλεύειν is written, as common unto both the services. Paul also calleth himself in many places δοῦλον Christi, The servant of Christ. And in the Acts he saith, that he continued among the Ephesians, δουλεύοντα τῷ θεῷ, Serving God.

And unto the Colossians he saith, δούλευε τῷ θεῷ, that is, Serve God. But Augustine himself seemeth not constantly to have retained that difference: for in the 94th question upon Exodus, he handling these words in the 23rd chapter; If thou serve other gods, they will make thee fall to sin. In this place (saith he) is δουλεύσει, and not λατρεύσει: for δουλεία is due unto God himself, in respect that he is our Lord, and λατρεία in respect that he is our God.

13. But passing over the words, let us rather deal with the matter itself. It cannot be denied, but that the honor which we attribute unto God, is not that which we give unto men: for that is the highest honor, which is given to one only God: and it chiefly consisteth in these things. First, that we repose in him all the hope of our salvation, that we account him for our chief happiness, by submitting ourselves unto him, without adding of any condition, but even simply and absolutely. But unto princes we must submit ourselves, and all that is ours: yet so, as they command us not to do things repugnant unto the word of God. But unto God we are subject, without any manner of condition or exception. Furthermore, it is necessary, that we believe in him simply and absolutely; and that we declare him to be as the fountain of all good things, in giving him thanks for all the benefits which daily do happen unto us: and we must declare his honor by outward calling upon him. Also, some honor is due unto the excellent creatures, such as be princes, prophets and godly men. Wherefore Augustine *De civitate Dei*, the 22nd book, and 10th chapter, writeth; that Those are to be honored in the right of charity and society. For we hold them for our fellows and brethren, and therefore we love them; we wish well unto them, and we joy with them in their good hap. Moreover, in his book of true religion 25th chapter, he saith; that We must honor excellent men in respect of imitation, by

following the steps of their good life; when as yet in respect of religion, they must not be worshipped. And of this kind of honor, Paul wrote, saying; In giving honor, go one before another. Again, as brethren they are to be holpen with mutual good turns.

Further, in the churches the saints are only commended, and the noble gifts, which God bestowed upon them, be celebrated after such a manner, as Christ alloweth of the faithful and diligent servant, which rightly and prudently behaved himself, in ordering of the money which he had received. But and if so be they will use the word δουλεία, in this kind of worshipping; we will, that they may retain it, so that they know, the same distinction to be contained in the holy scriptures. They have invented also the word ὑπερδουλεία, which they would have to be attributed unto the most excellent creatures; namely, unto Marie, and to the human nature of Christ. A difference of honors we disallow not: but those things which appertain only to the high God, we cannot suffer to be attributed unto creatures. Which thing out of doubt they do: for they prostrate themselves before images, they light wax candles to them; and at them they invocate those dead men, which are represented by them. Augustine in many places taketh away from all creatures, churches, priesthoods, sacrifices, and altars. But that prayers be the sacrifices of Christians, no man doubteth. Yet the Papists have communicated all these things, not only unto men departed this life, but also unto images and pictures: and for the defense of their doing, they use many sophistications, when as God notwithstanding plainly speaketh and forbiddeth, that images should in any wise be made unto religious worshipping. And that, which he hath absolutely spoken, and commanded, must not be cunningly shifted off by man’s craftiness.

14. But it is good to hear a little while, with what leaves and green branches they can cover this shame of theirs. First, they affirm, that the cogitation, whereby we are carried to the image, and the thing expressed thereby, is the self-same, and not diverse. Wherefore, that honor, which is given unto an image, is done unto the thing represented by it. And so they conclude, that such and so much honor is due unto the image, as is due unto the thing, which is represented by the image. Whereupon they teach, that the sign of the cross is to be adored with the service of λατρεία, or of divine worshipping; because Christ himself suffered upon the cross. And they say, that if the marble stone, gold, or silver, be considered apart, there is no religious honor due unto them; insomuch as they attain not to the dignity of a reasonable creature. But if they be taken as signs, the same honor is due unto them that is done unto the thing signified. Further, they allege Basil in the 27th chapter *De spiritu sancto*, who saith, that the honor done unto the sign, is referred to the example itself. To these things, I will repeat that which once or twice I have already said; namely, that God is not satisfied with these kind of distinctions, who said absolutely, that images and pictures must not be worshipped. Also by a new division they make a difference between crosses; that of them, one is true, whereto Christ was fastened. And they contend, that the same must be adored with high kind of reverence; because Christ did sanctify it by his touching; and again, for that it representeth the Lord him-self crucified. But if there be so great consideration had of touching; why do they not judge, that the blessed virgins should be worshipped with divine worship, who bare Christ in her womb nine months, and gave him suck a long time? Especially, seeing that same touching was natural, and the other was violent. But for such touching sake, we should worship the thorns and the spear with divine worship.

Again, these men would also have a cross to be worshipped in other matter; because it representeth the true cross. But that is most absurd: for by that means we ought to worship all hedges, and all thorns, nails, ships, and asses; because they resemble those things which Christ touched. Surely, this argument Claudius the bishop of Tarent used, against the worshipping of images. Wherefore it appeareth, that there have been always some, which have detested images adorned with sacred honors. But the superstitious sort have been superior, both in number, power, and arms; and they not only defend perverse worshipping, but in very deed they attribute unto the cross divine honor. Neither are they ashamed on this manner to sing in the churches; All hail O Cross, our only hope; in this time of passion increase righteousness to the godly; and give pardon unto the offenders. They also sing; Behold the tree of the cross, come let us worship it. Again they say; O Lord, thy cross do we worship; thy holy resurrection we do glorify. Wherein they attribute much more unto the cross, than to the resurrection.

Also Gregorius of Rome, the patron of superstitions, saith in his prayers; Grant unto us Lord, that they which come to the adoring of thy holy cross, may be delivered from the bonds of their sins. Howbeit, Durand, among the School-divines, allowed not of this opinion; namely, that the cross of the Lord should be worshipped with high adoration: but he is reproved by other sophisters, and that for this reason, that he had attributed too little to the ecclesiastical traditions. Also Peresius seemeth to follow Durand, attributing to the cross, for many reasons another kind of adoration, I know not what. [ 1] First, for that it is falsely said, that the cogitation or knowledge is all one, both of the sign, and of the thing signified; for so much as they be two things, which are distinguished one from another. For first this or that thing is perceived to be a sign; afterward, we behold the

thing which is signified. Indeed, they be together at one time; but yet in nature and reason one of them goeth before another. Further, although a stone, a marble, or metal be made a sign, yet doth it not therefore change his own proper nature; neither doth it pass the bounds of insensible things, neither attaineth it to the dignity of a reasonable creature, nor hath joined with it the thing which it signifieth. Doubtless, we worship a king in his purple robe, the which being severed from an emperor, we would not yield unto it the honor of a king.

Augustine writeth, in his 58th homily, *De verbis Domini*, that The humanity of Christ must be worshipped with divine honor, because it hath the Godhead joined therewith: which, if it should be sundered from him, as it cannot be, he should not be worshipped with divine honor. How much less therefore must not the cross, (which in very deed is severed from Christ) be worshipped with divine honor? Therefore he rejecteth that doctrine, whereby it is taught, that both the sign, and the thing signified, should be honored with the same manner of worship. And thus he affirmeth, that the highest adoration is due unto the thing signified, that is, unto Christ himself; but to the cross, that honor (howsoever it be called) which is attributed unto such notable things. Peresius saith somewhat well; but yet in this point he erreth, that he attributeth some manner of adoration to the cross. But I marvel at him, that he also used this argument. All men agree that the holy Ghost is present in baptism, and yet is there none, which doth worship baptism with divine honor. Wherefore, much less is that kind of honor to be given unto the cross: for it seemeth, that it cannot be avoided, but that they do evil, which adore the Eucharist, although they perceive Christ to be present, even as touching his divine nature. [ 2] He addeth further; If so be the very same honor should be due unto images, which is

given unto the thing signified; now should it be lawful to give them churches, sacrifices, and altars; when as Augustine (as it hath been declared) hath taken from them these things. It seemeth, that Peresius had some light: but herein he was entangled in the dark, that he attributed any kind of worshipping at all unto such kind of signs. Erasmus (me thinketh) among other things, hath very wisely written this; namely, that Images may more easily be removed, than a reason and mean of worshipping them can be prescribed. So now, when Peresius endeavored to prescribe a measure, otherwise than had been appointed by the Schoolmen, his labor was vain and fruitless.

15. Wherefore, we confirm by the sentence of the holy scriptures, that there must be no religious honor done unto idols, images, and signs. For (as we have declared) the law of God saith; Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only thou shalt serve. Neither helpeth it our adversaries, that in the sixth chapter of Deuteronomy, there is not that particle [Onely;] seeing Christ (as we read in Matthew) being the just and true interpreter of his own law, added the same. And in the same book of Deuteronomy it is written; Thou shalt make no images, nor worship them. And what is to worship images? Even to put a confidence in them, to love them, to call upon them, to crouch and kneel to them, to offer them incense, and to burn candles to them: all which things we see at this day are done unto images. God, to the intent he might turn men away from so perverse a worshipping, declared himself to be a jealous God, that is, one who will revenge so great wickedness with earnest endeavor. Let these men (if they can) show out of the Old Testament, where the images of patriarchs, prophets, or of godly princes were worshipped and adored by godly men. Yea and Gregory himself the father of superstitions wrote thus to Serenus the bishop of

Massilia, which threw down images; In that thou forbiddest them to be worshipped, we allow it; but whereas thou takest them away, we disallow it. Wherefore even he would not have images worshipped and adored.

Also Jonah the bishop of Aurelia, writing against Claudius the bishop of Taurinum, of whom I made mention before, saith; that Images must be had, but yet must not be worshipped. Howbeit, at this day they do as well worship them, as adore them. Also for another cause the worshipping of images is to be rejected; to wit, since thereby the charity towards the poor is diminished. For the worshippers of them do deck them most sumptuously with rich ouches, with precious stones, with coverings for the head, vestments and garlands; and they do heap and hang upon them infinite offerings: all which things might with singular piety be bestowed upon the need of Christians. Doubtless, holy and godly men, while they were in the flesh, did live modestly and frugally, and commended that kind of life, as well by their doctrine, as by their example. But now, they which honor their signs, and images, fear not to devise in them superfluity and vain ornaments: which things they did evermore mislike. But they say, that pomp's, and such kind of ornaments, do show unto us the glory, gorgeousness, and dignity, which they now enjoy in heaven. As though the scripture did not sufficiently instruct us in these things. Add here unto, that through these men, the greediness of thieves and church-robbers is stirred up: for the richer that the ornaments be, which are put about them, the more be they inflamed to embezzle them.

Moreover, I would demand of them, wherefore they, leaving their idols at home in their own country, do travel so great journeys to worship others? If they will worship God in his images, why rather do they it not in living men; which (as the holy scriptures put us in mind) be created unto his

image? They answer, that in living men it is not done; least peradventure the minds of the worshippers should be settled upon them, and should not lift up themselves higher, that they might think upon God and Christ. As who should say, their cogitations cannot also be carried unto images; either for the excellency of the workmanship, or else for the richness of their attire, which men have been accustomed with great pleasure to behold. Verily I have seen, especially at Rome, diverse images, so artificially wrought, that many men, which were skillful of those arts, spent many hours in the diligent beholding of them. God hath set all creatures before men, that they might be certain tokens and signs of his goodness and excellency: neither did he fear, least men would stand still in the beholding of them. Further, he commanded, that everyone should love his neighbor, and be beneficial unto him: neither did he mistrust, least any man, forsaking him, would employ his only endeavor towards his neighbor.

16. Moreover, when we object against them the testimony of John, in the first epistle, and fifth chapter; Keep yourselves from idols, these men say, that their images be not the images of strange gods, but the images of holy men; namely, of the faithful, and of the members of Christ. But they perceive not, no not they, which seem wisest of all men in their own conceit, that if they be the images of men, they ought not to be worshipped nor adored: for men themselves cannot be worshipped with religious worship. If then it be taken from themselves, much less can it be granted unto their images. Augustine *Ad Deo gratias* saith; that No man, although he be a saint, must be adored. Besides this, they have not always been wicked men, whom these men think to have been strange gods. For excellent men, which well-deserved as touching human things, were oftentimes reputed among the gods. Moreover, do they know, that all those

were in very deed good and godly men, whom they judge to be saints, and do worship them in their images? The sentence of Augustine is well known, that The bodies of many are worshipped upon the earth, whose souls are tormented in hell. The word of God, when it detesteth and forbiddeth the idols of nations, it showeth not of what things the idols were: only it saith; They be the works of men's hands, they have eyes and see not, &c.

Now let us consider, whether the images of Papists be such. Are not they wrought by the hands of men? Do they not altogether want sense and moving? Seeing therefore all these things be like unto those, they be images condemned by the scriptures. Also Paul, in the first to the Corinthians, the tenth chapter, saith; Fly from idols. And Peter, in the first epistle, the fourth chapter, calleth The worshipping of idols abominable. But here our adversaries trifle fondly again, and endeavor to put a difference between *Idolum* and *simulachrum* [both signifying an image] saying, that Idols are forbidden, but not images. Neither perceive they, that there is no other difference between these, but that the one is a Latin word, and the other a Greek. Whereupon Lactantius writeth, that *Simulachrum* is written of *Simulando*, which signifieth, Resembling or Counterfeiting. With whose testimony or authority, if they be not satisfied, let them read Pliny, in the 43rd book, and fourth chapter, where he saith; The first image of brass was made unto Ceres, at the proper costs and charges of Spurius Cassius. Here we see, that this writer calleth the idol of Ceres, *Simulachrum*. Vitruuius, in his second book, and eleventh chapter, where he entreateth of the hewing of stuff, calleth the image of Diana, *Simulachrum*. The seventy interpreters, where it is in Hebrew *Atsabbim*, there they translate it in Greek, εἴδωλα: but the Latin text hath *Simulachra*.

Yea and John, in the place a little before alleged, saith; Defend yourselves from images. We read it in the Latin translation; *Fugite simulachra*. Jerome upon the eleventh chapter of Isaiah declareth, that Idols be the images of them which be dead. Wherefore it appeareth, that these men devise distinctions, which be fond and ridiculous. Again, it must be considered, that this worshipping of images, which is outwardly of them used, hath been fetched as well from the Hebrews, as also from the Gentiles. For in the tabernacle of Moses, there was the candlestick and the altar, and also the incense; such as these men do set before their images. Albeit Christ is now come, and hath abrogated the ceremonies of Moses. Cicero, in his third book of offices saith; that Perfumes and wax candles were set before images. Wherefore, such rites or ceremonies were derived, as well from the Gentiles, as from the Hebrews. But at the last, the matter came to such pass (which is more intolerable) as it is now thought of them, which be called Christians, that some divine power is in those images. In which point I see not what they differ from Ethnics.

They undoubtedly did think, that such as used the image of Alexander, were more fortunate than other men. Wherefore Augustus, which had before used the image of the Sphynx, did afterward use the image of Alexander. Marius was delighted with a silver eagle, the which came afterward to the hands of Cateline, who also worshipped the same himself, and prayed victory of it. Even so do they at this day attribute sundry virtues unto images: they make sacrifice unto them, and do ask many things of them. Jerome upon the 57th chapter of Isaiah declareth, that in his time at Rome, the image of Tutela was worshipped in the entries of houses, with tapers and lights. But for us (if we be true Christians) it is no decent thing to take rites and ceremonies, either from the Jews, or from other nations: but we

must only use those things, which are commanded us in the word of God. Whereupon Paul, being desirous to commend the use of the Lord's supper, saith; that He delivered unto the Corinthians, that which he had received of the Lord.

17. Wherefore, seeing we have it manifest out of the word of God, that we must not worship images, we ought to obey, suffering ourselves to be governed by the law of God, and not by the inventions of men. Moreover, we know, that God must be worshipped in spirit and in truth: but no man is ignorant, that images be not spirit and truth, for so much as they be things which may be seen. And Paul saith, that We know Christ no more after the flesh: therefore much less after an image. I beseech you, let us confer the state of the primitive church (where, unto the service of God, images were not used at all) with the latter state, wherein they be allowed; and it will most manifestly appear, that all things are become more corrupt. Moreover, Augustine in his book *De quantitate animae*, most wisely wrote; that It behooveth him that is worshipped, to be much better, than he that doth yield the worship: but all men understand that images be not better than men. Further, if they might be endued with life and reason, they would honor their makers, by whose hands they were made. When men sin in this kind of worshipping, they do nothing else, but (as S. Paul taught the Romans) They change the glory of God into the similitude of a mortal man, of birds, of four-footed beasts, and of serpents. Those which defend and maintain such worshipping's, do draw away men from the true worshipping of God. For, when as Jeroboam went about to draw away the children of Israel from the worshipping of the true God; he erected two images of calves, one in Bethel, and the other in Dan.

Furthermore, in this matter we know the forwardness of men: for whereas Christ hath commanded, that we should bear his cross, we had rather worship the same, and all to becross our head and forehead therewith: which thing he commanded us not. Neither can we but grant, that the Christians (as we may learn by Tertullian) began even at the first to fortify themselves with the sign of the cross. For the devil began forthwith to sow cockle upon the good seed of the church. Also Paul putteth the Corinthians in remembrance, that they were sometime carried away unto dumb images: the which very thing we see done at this day in every place. We read not anywhere in the time of the primitive church, that faithful and godly men did direct their prayers unto pictures and images. But now this is used everywhere, and it is come to that pass, that men give more honor unto images, than they do unto the word of God. For there is not a man found at this day, that doth worship and honor the holy scriptures. Christ, when he was upon the earth, because he was now ready to depart, comforted his apostles, saying, that Unless he departed, the spirit of the Comforter should not be sent unto them. Which the interpreters expound to be said, because that the presence of Christ, as concerning his flesh, would hinder them, that they should not be fit to receive the spirit. Which thing if it be truly said, as touching the flesh of the Lord, how much rather shall it be affirmed of his images and pictures? Neither do we doubt, that Peter would not be worshipped of Cornelius the Centurion, who was not to be thought that he would do divine honor unto him. With what mind, think we, doth he bear, that his images and pictures should now be worshipped among men? But if they will say; We do not honor them with the chiefest honor: let them understand, that neither Cornelius minded so to worship Peter.

18. Neither must we be ignorant, that the angel in the Apocalypse, did twice reprove John, for that he would have worshipped him. Then, if so be that neither angels nor men must be worshipped, much less their images and pictures. And it was not without consideration, that the angel forbad it: for I am (saith he) like unto thee, and unto thy brethren which have the testimony of Jesus Christ: that is, which believe in him. Seeing therefore we be all of one degree, neither that one is more excellent than another, adoration cannot have any place among us. Although the argument be plain, yet is it not void of all difficulty. Because, if the worshipping of angels were not lawful, why were they worshipped in the Old Testament, which revealed themselves unto the saints? Neither do we read, that the fathers of old time were reproved for that cause. To this objection many things may be answered. [ 1] For some say, that as then the son of God had not taken upon him the nature of man; wherefore men were placed much lower than angels, and therefore it was lawful, that they should worship and honor them. But now, by reason of a new conjunction of the word with the flesh, there is made a certain equality between men and angels. Wherefore, it is not lawful to interpose an adoring between these natures. The reason that is brought is very weak: for, although Christ be now incarnate, yet are other men much inferior unto angels.

[ 2] But others say, that angels were then worshipped; because the son of God, under the name and title of them, appeared to the fathers. But this reason is not altogether true: for the son of God, under the name of an angel appeared unto the Patriarchs; but not always, nor yet so, but that other angels also did make manifest themselves. For certain it is, that the ancient of days was showed unto Daniel, under the person of God the father, and likewise the son of man, when also there was present an angel, whom

Daniel worshipped. But it may more easily be answered, that the fathers of old time, when they did yield any honor to angels themselves, they kept themselves within the bounds of civil honor; and that they did not give any religious honor unto them. But yet, because that might seem to belong unto religion, therefore were men at the length to be kept under, least they should worship angels with a kind of divine worship. [ 3] And it ought to be sufficient for us, that the matter was at any time found fault withal. But why God would find fault therewith more at this time, than at that, it is not our part to inquire. Neither must we say, that it is now lawful; which then was borne withal after a sort. The very which reason might be brought of the marriage of many wives, of divorce, and such like; which things were afterward taken away by Christ, when as before that time they were suffered after a sort. Neither are we bound of necessity, to clear the fathers always of all fault.

[ 4] Furthermore, it might be said, that the same worshipping was then borne withal; because, albeit the Hebrews did oftentimes fall into idolatry, yet did they know by the law of God, that the thing, whereto they inclined, was unlawful. But when as the Gospel was to be spread abroad amongst the Gentiles, it behooved, that idolatry, and every kind thereof, wherein the nations were trained up, should be repressed, lest they should think it a thing permitted, and so it might take deeper root. For the like cause Paul did more earnestly labor to persuade the Corinthians, that fornication is sin, than is endeavored in the Old Testament; because the Ethnics did not think it to be sin, but reckoned it for a thing tolerable and lawful. Wherefore it was needful to restrain that mischief with many reasons. Seeing therefore our adversaries say, that the fathers, in worshipping of angels after that sort, either sinned, or else sinned not. If they sinned, why were they not

reproved? If they sinned not, why was John so restrained? I might grant as well the one as the other: first, that they committed some fault; or else, that they offended not: because they did keep themselves within the bounds of civil reverence. But that, because it was a dangerous thing, therefore God would at the length have that custom to be amended; least perhaps they, which were not so well instructed, might be hurt by that example, and be easily led to idolatry.

19. Moreover, in the first epistle, and second chapter of John, it is written; If we sin, we have an advocate with the father, even Jesus Christ. In which place Augustine said; The apostle doth not say, Ye have me to be an advocate; but he putteth himself into the number of them, which have need of an advocate. If then it be not lawful to use the apostles for advocates, how much less the images of them? And we must not pass it over, that Paul reckoneth the worshipping of images among the works of the flesh; and numbereth it among those things, which exclude us from the kingdom of heaven. Wherefore, when the Hebrews began to honor the image of the serpent, the godly king Hezekiah brake it in pieces. But at this day, they fight even to the fire and faggot, for the worshipping of those images, which they themselves have made; not by the commandment of God, as in times past that serpent was made. And undoubtedly, look how many kings were commended for their godliness sake, those did rid away images: but contrariwise, they which be dispraised, did increase the number and worshipping of images. Certainly, if some woman, which having her husband absent, would choose another unto her, and him would embrace; she might not escape the crime of unchastity. And Paul affirmeth, that we (as a chaste spouse) are joined unto our Christ. Why then do we make pictures and images instead of him, the which we embrace, worship, and

honor instead of him? But they say, that they do this, because these signs and images, by a certain similitude do represent Christ. The very same also might that woman allege for herself, saying, that the man, which she had taken in the place of her husband, did resemble her husband, both in age, in favor of countenance, in manners, and in condition.

They feign also, that they do no sacrifices unto images; as though prayers are not a meet sacrifice of Christians. Doubtless, they be a sacrifice, which is left unto us, now that the old ceremonies be abrogated. Tertullian and Jerome, interpreting the words of Malachi, that The sacrifice of prayer, immediately upon the coming of Christ, is offered unto God, from the rising up of the sun unto the going down of the same. Also, in the epistle to the Colossians, free will worship is condemned, although it be offered unto angels. And I will not omit that, which was spoken by Claudius bishop of Thurine, against those, which did prostrate themselves before the image of the lamb, whom John Baptist showed with his finger; These men (saith he) do worship painted lambs, but devour living lambs. Again; They honor painted lambs, but they do flea and spoil the true lambs of Christ. Furthermore, the godly, which be departed, are blessed; yet are they not become gods, that they should be worshipped and adored: much less the images of them. But God (say they) adorneth his saints; and therefore so it becometh us to do. True indeed it is, that God indueth his saints with honor, and with incorruptible reward; seeing he giveth them eternal life. Let us do the same in like manner, by speaking well of them, and by setting them forthunto the church to be followed. Let us consider beside, that God doth make his saints honorable, yet doth he not either adore them, or put them forth to be adored. But it is said by Christ; that Whatsoever ye did to the least of mine, that ye have done unto me. But these words must be

understood; as touching the duties of charity; and not as touching worship and adoration. And certainly, what Christ meant, he himself very well expounded, when he said; I was hungry, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink.

Origin, in the eighth book against Celsus, showeth a reason why the Christians should abhor the worshipping of images, and he saith; Images we have indeed, not outward images, which have been made by most vile carpenters; but the minds of the faithful and holy men, from whence proceedeth (as from the altar of God) most sweet savor of prayers, which do reach up even unto heaven. Wherefore, in the revelation of John, the prayers of godly men are called sweet odors. And David sang; Let my prayer be in thy sight as the incense. Afterward he addeth; We abhor the worshipping of images, because they have no sense. This also is wont to be objected; that If upon the death of one emperor, there succeeded another, the images of the first were destroyed throughout all the provinces of the empire, unto which images, honor was done, as unto the emperor, who was not present. This I grant: but that was only a civil honor, whereby they testified themselves to be subject unto him; and they received their new emperor with joyful voices. Also, this must be well considered; that there have been always some men, in every age, which have freely cried out against the worshipping of images. And undoubtedly for that cause many of the Graecian emperors; as namely, the Philippicans, the Constantine's, and the Leos, resisted the Roman bishops; against whom, on the other side, the Roman bishops opposed themselves, of a certain hatred: because they desired earnestly to be rid of their subjection. For which cause, they joined themselves with the French men, and by that means rent in sunder the

Roman empire. Wherefore it is no marvel, if at this day also for images sake, they stir up vain contentions.

Further, they object wonders and marvels, which are wrought before images. And did not Peter (say they) while he was upon the earth, work things of great wonder and admiration? This cannot be denied: and yet did he not suffer himself to be adored. Wherefore, the argument is most feeble, namely; Some miracles be done at signs and images; Ergo they must be worshipped and adored. Antichrist also shall come with many wonders, and yet to follow and honor him, is a heinous wickedness. Also the brazen serpent did heal them, which were hurt in the wilderness; which nevertheless, when it was worshipped, it was abolished by Hezekiah. In like manner the Ethnics showed many signs and miracles, for the establishing of their idols; as we may read in Valerius Maximus, Livius, and other old writers. At the last (when they have nothing else) they say; that This worshipping is the tradition of the church, and therefore must be still retained. Verily, we reject not all the traditions of the church; but those without controversy we retain, which agree with the word of God; and those also, which be not superfluous, nor bring in a new service or worshipping. But if there be any, which be repugnant to the word of God, or burdensome to the church of God, or do import some new kind of service, we (upon just cause) reject them. Moreover, how is the worshipping of images an apostolical tradition, when as the primitive church used no such things? Nay rather (as we have before declared) some of the ancient fathers, not only condemned images, but also the makers of them. And most vain is that, which these men have always in their mouth; It is a tradition, inquire not of it. But I on the other part say; It is a tradition, therefore inquire diligently of it, whether it be agreeable to the word of God; or whether it

were in times past allowed of all the ancient fathers. But as concerning miracles, which be objected unto us; we must understand, that the devil doth many times put himself among, who is accustomed to nothing more, than to establish superstitions and idolatry. Again, the miracles which are of that sort, be done by the just judgment of God; because men do cast away from them the love of the truth: as it is in the epistle to the Thessalonians.

20. The devil seeing the sign of the cross, feigneth himself to fly: when nevertheless, by such counterfeiting, he creepeth more and more into us. The strength and power of the cross consisteth not in the sign, but in the true and sound faith of Christ crucified. The sacrificing priests also do report, that they sanctify in a manner all things with the sign of the cross. But the scriptures speak far otherwise, which testify, that meats are sanctified by faith, prayers, and by the word of God. Whereunto while we assent, and do pray for the use of things, to the clean all things are made clean. I deny not, but that certain miracles have sometimes been wrought by the sign of the cross, as Augustine reporteth in his 22nd book *De civitate Dei*, and eighth chapter. But I have already declared the cause thereof, which seemeth not needful to be repeated: only this I will report, that the devil is marvelously fed and delighted with man's errors. And withal it is to be added, that many of those miracles were forged: for the sacrificing priests and monks seeking after gain, do spread abroad many things altogether false, which were never anywhere done or spoken. But why the elders (as we have above said) signed their forehead with a cross, it is no easy matter to allege the certain cause. But I think that there were two respects: [ 1] first, to testify themselves to be Christians; as though they were not ashamed of the cross of Christ. And this I gather by Augustine *De verbis apostoli*, the eighth sermon: for the Ethnics triumphed over the

Christians, casting their folly in their teeth, because they worshipped Christ that was nailed on the cross. To whom that father maketh answer; A heart in deed we have, but yet no such as ye have: neither are we ashamed of him that was crucified; but in that part, where the sign of shamefastness is, there have we the sign of his cross.

[ 2] Another cause is, that they would of a certain evil and preposterous zeal, imitate the legal ceremonies: and because it might not be lawful, after the coming of Christ, to sacrifice after the manner of the Hebrews, who were bidden to besprinkle the door-posts of their houses with the blood of the pascal lamb: our Christians in semblance thereof, signed their foreheads with the cross. As Augustine doth testify in the 20th chapter *De catechizandis rudibus*. [ 3] Moreover, they persuaded themselves (as it is already showed) that the evil spirits were by such a sign chased away. Yea, and Gregorius Romanus also, in his third book of Dialogs writeth; that A Jew entering by night into a temple of an idol, there to take his rest, and being greatly astonished with the sight of very many wicked spirits, which were in that place, armed himself by the sign of the cross. And when the prince of the evil spirits understood that a man was present, he commanded one of the devils, that he should go unto him, and try him what he was. Who, after he had beheld him, returned and said; Truly I found an empty vessel, but it was marked: and he left the Jew quite and clean without any harm. Which thing he considering with himself, came to the religion of Christ. But Gregory in that book heaped up together many vain and fabulous things, the which not only may move the readers of them unto laughter; but also they are very much against the religion of Christ.

The sign of the cross is worn by princes upon their crowns, without superstition: because by that sign they only testify and profess, that they

honor and maintain the religion of Christ. Further, if it be lawful for a man to bear in arms the badge of his own family; it is also lawful for him, by the sign of the cross, to profess Christian religion. And in times past there appeared in heaven the sign of the cross unto Constantine the great, and an inscription was added; In this sign shalt thou overcome. For God was minded by a miracle to confirm him in the religion of Christ, which he had lately received. Neither may he be condemned, for that he caused that sign to be expressed in the banner which he meant to use. But that he afterward made such a manner of sign in gold, that I allow not; because by the doing thereof he opened no small gap to superstition. Concerning the finding of the Lord's own cross by Helen, wise men marvel that Eusebius Caesariensis, who was very familiar with Constantine, and set forth his life, wrote nothing of it. But Theodoretus and Sozomenus, indeed write somewhat of that matter. Howbeit, rather of the report of others, than by the certainty of their own knowledge. Yet, in the reading of that history, there is found no mention of worshipping: nevertheless, it is said, that it was placed in the temple. Moreover, what great estimation Helen made of the nails, which the report is that she found, it appeareth; in that it is written, that she put one of them in the bridle of that horse, which her son used, another into his helmet, and the third she cast into the sea, for appeasing of tempests. At this day also they worship and honor at Rome, (with singular adoration) the spear, wherewithal they say the Lord's side was pierced upon the cross. This is the wiliness of the devil, that he may perpetually drive men forward, till at length they be thrown down headlong into the bottomless gulf of impiety.

21. Our adversaries blame us, as being over hard and bitter: and they say; If one walking by chance, shall espy a fair plant, not only green, but loden

with fruit; and he being inflamed with an earnest affection towards the most bountiful goodness of God, and feeling his mind stirred to worship God the author of so beautiful a work; what should let, but that he may prostrate himself near unto that pleasant tree, and there worship God, and render thanks unto him for his singular benefits bestowed on men? Nothing, as I think. So in like manner, if one shall behold the image of Christ, and is earnestly affected to the benefit of Christ his death; wherefore may he not worship Christ the author of his life near unto the same? Hereunto I answer, that the word of God must always be before our eyes, whereby it is forbidden (for religion sake) to prostrate before a creature. This ought to remain always firm and sure, and to be in force; that neither we prostrate ourselves unto a tree, nor yet unto an image. Neither is it lawful to excuse these things, by saying; that they do not worship the outward matter, neither the figure, nor the lineaments. What then [do they honor?] They say they honor the thing signified. So might the Ethnics likewise have excused their idolatry; that they did not worship stones, wood, and metal, but only the properties which were represented by those signs. Verily Symmachus wrote an epistle to the emperors, that they would at length restore the images of the Romans, and there he useth such and such like arguments very Rhetorically: but Ambrose most strongly hath confuted them all. The writings on both parts are yet at this day to be seen, in the epistles of Ambrose. God commanded absolutely, that images should not be worshipped; wherefore we must rather obey his words, than the subtle sophistications of men.

Augustine upon the 113th psalm, wrote this argument; By the judgment of Paul it is said; They turned the glory and truth of God into a lie, and they desired rather to worship the creature than the creator. The first part of

Paul's saying condemneth images; because they be lies, which are repugnant unto the truth and glory of God: and the other part taketh away all excuse, that there they worship not God; but creatures. And Claudius the bishop of Thurine said; If thou have pictured upon the wall, Mars, Venus, and Mercury, thou hast no true gods; and when thou hast there, Paul, Peter, and John, thou hast not very men: wherefore the error is not quite taken away, but altered. Paul also said unto the Corinthians; We know that an idol is nothing, but that which the Gentiles do offer, they offer unto devils. Undoubtedly, if the excuse brought now by our adversaries, were of any weight, the Ethnics would easily have said unto the apostle; Thou hast done us a manifest injury, for our purpose is to offer the sacrifices, which we slay, unto God, and not unto devils. Also we meet with others more foolish, which say, that this precept was given unto the Hebrews, and that it ought to be reckoned among the ceremonical precepts; but that now the ceremonies being abrogated, we are no longer bound by it. [ 1] They consider not, that in the table of the ten commandments, there was nothing commanded, which did appertain unto the ceremonies, only the keeping of the Sabbath day excepted, wherein nevertheless some moral thing presenteth itself unto them, which diligently do behold the same. [ 2] Augustine, in his 119th epistle unto Ianuarius, doth acknowledge the same. I beseech you let these wise men consider, that if this thing should have been reckoned among the ceremonies, the Ethnics had not sinned in the honoring and worshipping of images; because they were not bound unto the ceremonies of the Jews. Moreover, it is evident, that that ceremonies of the Old Testament were not revoked by the apostle, nor yet the yoke of them laid upon the Gentiles; who nevertheless, in express words commanded, that idols and images should be avoided.

22. Seeing therefore it is plentifully enough confirmed, that images must not be worshipped nor adored; now it resteth, that we examine this, whether it be lawful to set them in holy places, where the congregations of the faithful resort. Some affirm that it is lawful, so the worshipping of them be forbidden. But (in my judgment) it must not be allowed, that they should be had in churches: first, because it is a very dangerous thing. And experience hath taught, whither men at the length, thorough beholding of them, fell, when they saw them placed in the temples: for they worshipped them. The way therefore that leadeth unto idolatry, must be cut off from the faithful. Augustine writeth very well and religiously of this matter, upon the 113th Psalm; When images (saith he) be set in a high place, or else in some tabernacle, a naughty affection is bred in men's minds, whereby the devil is invited to intermeddle himself. Also in his 49th epistle *Ad Deo gratias*, he was of the same mind. And surly we perceive, that this thing hath happened. [ 2] Neither will I pass over the same father, in his sixth sermon upon the Lord's sermon made in the mount; They declare (saith he) in what place and estimation they account the image, when they appoint to erect an altar unto it: for unless they thought, that either it were god, or had some divine power in it, they would not erect an altar thereunto. Wherefore, by this saying of Augustine, almost all the temples of the Papists are condemned, wherein always (in a manner) altars are joined with idols.

[ 3] Besides, it may be proved by the example of Epiphanius, that they ought not to be had in churches. He being in his journey, and happening into a certain town that was called Anablatha, did see (as he passed by) a certain candle burning; and demanding what place the same was, he understood that it was a church, or a place of prayer for the faithful, wherefore he entered in, that he might pray unto God. And he saw a curtain

hang, wherein was painted the image of a man, as if it had been of Christ, or of a holy man; insomuch that when he saw the picture of a man hanged in the church, contrary to the authority of the scriptures, he both plucked down and rent the curtain, and counseled the sextons of the church, that they should carry it forth, and wrap a poor dead man in it. Moreover, he wrote unto John bishop of Jerusalem (unto whom the cure of that place belonged) that from thence forward he should take heed, that such hangings, otherwise than religion would permit, should not be suffered in the church of Christ. And that epistle seemed unto Jerome to be of such weight, as that he vouchsafed to turn it into Latin: which he would not have done, if he had not been of our mind. [ 4] Also the latter synod of Ephesus condemned images: howbeit, the same synod is not allowed, and that upon just cause; insomuch as it favored the heretics Nestor and Eutyches. Such is the hap not only of human affairs, but many times also of ecclesiastical; that evil things are mingled with good. Whereupon it cometh afterward to pass, that not only evil things, but good things also together are therewithal rejected.

[ 5] So we see it happened unto some of the Graecian emperors, which abolished images: for Philippicus the first, Leo the third, Constantine, and Leo the fourth: because they were Monothelites, that, which on the other side they judged aright of images, was rejected. Which also cometh to pass at this day, when, by reason of the corrupt conversation of them, which profess the Gospel, their sincere doctrine is cast out. [ 6] Also the synod of Eliberinum condemned images; wherein was decreed, that within the walls of the churches there should no image be painted, least such a thing should be pictured out, as might be worshiped. [ 7] Peresius, when he perceived himself to be hardly beset with the sayings of these fathers, he said unadvisedly; that Their mind was not to have all images to be taken away,

but only those, which were made deformedly upon the walls; and not likewise those that were done upon clothes and tables. But afterward, when he perceived that this also was but a vain shift, he calleth to remembrance, that this sort of pictures ought well to be taken away for a time, because men, in those days, worshipped them with the honor due unto God. And in this opinion he is against Gregory, which decreed, that they should not for that cause be taken away; but rather, that men should be warned not to worship them. Peresius also determined, that after the same reason and sort Epiphanius was to be excused.

23. Whereas afterward our adversaries demand of us, what worthy men we have seen to be destroyers of images? We answer: Hezekiah a most godly king, which brake in pieces the brazen serpent. Moses also, which brake in sunder the molten calf. Other good princes also: and Serenus the bishop of Massilia. Neither have we ever perceived, that the scripture condemned overthrowers of images, but the workers of images. The first perhaps, which painted the church, was Paulinus the bishop of Nola, which yielded this reason for the fact. When the faithful sort met together upon the holy day, to celebrate the memory of Felix the martyr, they were entertained with a religious banquet; and when they were more given to feeding of their body, than reason would, that father devised to paint upon the wall, the histories of the Old Testament and of the New, to the end that the people, by beholding of them, might the more soberly behave themselves in their banquet. But howsoever that holy and godly father meant in other matters, yet in this matter he offended double. For first he should not have banqueted the people in the church, seeing we know, that in the church of the Corinthians there were many things found fault withal by the apostle, concerning those feasts. Moreover he did amiss, in that he thought men

were more instructed by dumb pictures, than by the lively word of God. Wherefore did he not rather teach them by a lively voice, that they should temperately and soberly spend out the time of the holy feast? This had been the ordinary way and means, and most void of all danger. Prudentius also, which lived in the time of Honorius and Theodosius, singing the passion of Cassianus the martyr, said that The history of him was pictured in the church.

And in the seventh Synod, which was holden under Constantius and Hiren, one Nile a bishop is brought in, which counselleth him that should build a new church, to garnish the walls on every side with images and pictures. But what bishop this was, it is not known: a martyr indeed he is called, in this respect, that he so became for Christ, in the time of Dioclesian. But it cannot be he, because it was not then permitted unto the Christians, to build churches publicly. Further, in that second Synod of Nice, we read many feigned things: and those things which were cited by those fathers, for the most part are not extant in the book of those men, which were of sound judgment. There also it is reported, that Gregorius Nissenus wept, at such time as he passed by the image of Abraham: but whether that image were in the way, or in the temple, it appeareth not. There also it is read, that the martyrdom of Euphemia the virgins, was painted out in the temple of the city of Calcedonia: howbeit, so far as I can gather, these pictures were in the church-porch. But that Augustine had no images in his temple, it appeareth hereby, that he expounding those words of the 113th Psalm; The images of the Gentiles be silver and gold, even the works of men's hands, he writeth: The works of men's hands; for they worship that, which they themselves made of gold and of silver. Doubtless, we also have many instruments, and vessels, of such kind of matter or

metal, for the use of celebrating the sacraments: the which vessels being consecrated to the ministry itself, are called holy; in the honor of him, whom hereby we serve for our salvation. And these vessels (I beseech you) are they any other thing, than the works of men's hands? Yet notwithstanding have they a mouth, and speak not? Have they eyes, and yet will not see? Do we pray to them, because through them we make supplications unto God? That is a very mad cause of impiety. Wherefore it is manifest, that images were not there: for otherwise he would have confessed himself inexcusable.

24. Moreover, in the same Synod they cite Basil, in his oration of the forty martyrs. But that which they allege maketh nothing to the matter now in hand. For Basil affirmeth not, that the acts of these martyrs were described in the temple: but in the commending of them, in his oration, he saith, that he would do rightly and orderly, whereby others might again and again be strengthened in faith. For painters, while they paint forth the acts of valiant men, they stir up others unto laudable enterprises. Men began, even at the first, upon a ready good will borne unto Christ, and to his apostles, to have some of their images at home with them. Afterward, being not satisfied with the private use of them, they set them not within the temples, but in the porches. Again, they considered with themselves; What if they should be put in churches, would they not bring such and such things unto our memory? And finally there ensued an adoration. Constantine, with his son Justinian, at the temple of Sophia, made pictures; the which afterward Philippicus took away: for which cause there followed afterward very fierce contentions. And seeing Paul saith; How agreeth the temple of God with idols? Is it not a shame at this day, that churches should be fraught with images? How the ancient Christians ordered themselves in prayers,

Tertullian expresseth in his *Apologetico*, the 30th chapter; We (saith he) honor God with our eyes lifted up to the heavens, and not unto pictures. Lactantius reproving the Ethnics, saith; If ye think that those whom the images do represent, be in heaven, why do you not lift up your eyes unto heaven? Wherefore it is lawful so to say unto our adversaries; If ye think that the saints be in heaven, why do ye not lift up your eyes unto them, which ye turn unto the images in the temples?

Also, we may prove by another argument, that Christians had no images in their temples. For Aelius Lampridius, describing the lives of the thirty tyrants, among other things, saith; that Adrianus the emperor had decreed to appoint churches unto the Christians, but that there was one, which did dissuade him that he should not do it. For he said; If thou do this, the temples and images will be forsaken, and all men will become Christians. For those churches, which the emperor was minded to give them, he built without images. Insomuch as those churches, which were afterward erected without images, were called the temples of Adrian. Moreover, it must be considered, that those things ought not to be had in the churches, which call men back from the religion of Christ. Undoubtedly, very many, as well of the Turks as Jews, would be content to become Christians, were it not that they be greatly offended at our images. Whereupon Paulus Ricius, a very learned Hebrew, which was christened at Pauia, said; It was very expedient, that images should be removed out of churches; because many of the Hebrews, by the means of them, be called away from the confessing of Christ. And Erasmus, in his catechism, wrote many things to this purpose; and finally determined, that those are not to be accounted heretics, which want images, and will not receive them. And in his book called Ecclesiastes, he alloweth not of those preachers, who, while they deal with the people in

the pulpit, do use pictures and images: for that (as he saith) is not decent for that place.

Paul undoubtedly, in the first to the Corinthians, exhorteth the faithful, and that with many words, that they should beware of offending the weak. Wherefore, although there be many, which say, that they know that images must not be worshipped; yet let them think this, that everyone doth not sufficiently know it. And surly, the consideration seemeth to be all one of images, and of things dedicated unto idols. Which the wise men of Corinth said they knew what they were. And yet nevertheless, Paul commanded, that they should not eat them: and he said, Buy ye meat in the market, eat at home, and not in places appointed for idols. Even so may we say; If ye will have images, have ye them at home, and not in the temples. Neither do images placed in the temples less harm unto the church, than did the dissembling of Peter. For he, in suffering the ceremonies of the Jews, nourished an evil opinion of them. In like manner is the fall of the weak, and perverse adoration confirmed, when images are suffered to be in churches. We have (say they) a right judgment of them. Why do ye not then remove them? A right faith must be testified by deeds. And when as they be at any time removed out of the temples, I think it good to beware, that they be not kept sound and whole: for if the state change, they may easily be restored again into their places. When Constantine the great was converted unto Christ, he shut up the temples of the idols; but he destroyed them not. Afterward came Julianus the Apostate, and opened them again. The which, if they had been subverted, they could not so easily have been made anew. Which thing afterward Theodosius and other Christian princes noting, they either destroyed them utterly, or else granted them to the use of Christians.

25. But we must understand, that it is not the part of private men, to cast down images: therefore it must be done by the public authority of a magistrate. Sozomenus in his fifth book writeth, that under the reign of Julian, when he had opened the temples of the idols, certain Christians threw down images: in so much that emperors officers apprehended some, who were suspected of that crime, and put them under torments, and examination; when they nevertheless were innocent. But when the authors of the fact repented themselves, and sorrowed for the torments of others, they confessed that they did it, and were burned. Of this matter Augustine, in his sixth homily *De sermon Domini in monte*, wrote very well, where he bringeth the place out of the seventh chapter of Deuteronomy; When the land shall be yours, ye shall subvert the altars and images of them. First (saith he) it behooved them to possess the land, and to have it in their power, before they could subvert the images thereof. And it is evident, that temples be public places, and not the possessions of private men. Wherefore it is not every man's part there, either to cast out or to destroy anything. They then, which bear rule, as well in civil as ecclesiastical causes, ought not to suffer those images in churches. Otherwise, the simpler sort, when they perceive them to be suffered, even for that cause they attribute the more unto them: for that they see the princes, bishops, and pastors do not cast them away. And it is very frivolous, that they have always in their mouth; that images are certain visible words of God, which help the faith of them that be ignorant. For Paul testifieth, that Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God: not by pictures or images. If any be desirous to have Christ pictured, let him read the holy scriptures; let him have in his hands the gospels, the apostolical epistles, and the Acts of the apostles: and let him be oftentimes present at godly sermons.

Wherefore Paul unto the Galatians saith, that Christ was painted before their eyes; namely, through the preaching of him and others, whereby they so faithfully cleaved unto Christ, as it seemed unto them, that they beheld him fastened unto the cross. Yet they are wont to say; that If these signs be removed, the minds of them, which be weak, are offended. But they see not, that while they study to shun the less evil, they fall into the greater. For while they suffer images in temples, the weak be offended; and both the ungodly are confirmed in their ungodliness, and the godly are damnified. Furthermore, it is to be considered, that our adversaries do importunately, and without ceasing, urge, that it is an ecclesiastical tradition, and that therefore it neither may nor ought to be changed. But it is far otherwise; seeing that ecclesiastical traditions may be changed and taken away, if edifying do so require. Wherefore, if they would suffer it to be an ecclesiastical tradition, it should be lawful to change the same. In times past children were baptized with thrice dipping: which custom or tradition (as Gregory writeth unto Leander) was taken away; because of certain heretics, which affirmed, that without those three dipping's, children were not baptized. By the same reason, why are not images cast out of the temples, least we should seem to consent with idolaters? But Peresius saith, that By taking away of images, we be against the sense of human nature, and also against God himself. But we have already answered, that all kinds of images are not taken away by us; but we would not have them worshipped, nor to be in the temples, where adoration might easily be done unto them. Moreover, if the reason of Peresius were firm, we might prove God to do against himself, who forbad by his law, that men should not prostrate themselves before images. There be others, which say, that the fathers in the primitive church suffered not images; because men were then prone unto

idolatry. But (who I beseech you) is able to know or affirm this? Is not now man's corruption the same that then it was? Are not images in this our age worshipped and honored everywhere?

26. At the last they come unto that, which was the cause that we took in hand this treatise. And they say, that in the time of Moses and Solomon, God would have Cherubim, and other images, in the tabernacle and temple. Hereunto some say, that those images were placed in the innermost holy place, where none might see them. It is a weak answer: for there were such also in the court of the priests, where they made the burnt offerings and sacrifices. Also in the engines, which sustained the lavatories, there were Cherubim, lions, and oxen. Moreover the sea of brass was set upon oxen of brass. Whereupon others answer, that those images were not there, to the intent they should be worshipped; but to be as it were a certain training, and that they might garnish the holy temple. But the Papists would, after the same manner, excuse their images. Wherefore it is more fitly answered, that God gave the law, not to himself, but unto us; so then we must follow the same: neither may we bring him into order, if he other whiles would anything of a special prerogative. He must be suffered to do after his own will; but we must obey the law that is made. Certainly those images had some figurative meaning, but they were not set forth as an example for us to follow. With them was joined the word of God, which the images placed in our churches do want. And seeing they were external things, and had the word added to them; they were (after a sort) sacraments of those times: and it is only God, and not men, which can make sacraments.

And it is to be noted, that Solomon and Moses, which made the Cherubim, durst not make any other: they only made that, which was commended unto them by God. They painted not upon the walls the acts of

Abraham, neither the doings of Adam or Moses, nor of the other fathers. They are also accustomed sometimes to say; We have the images of Christ, to the intent we may convince the Marcionites and Valentinians, which denied that Christ had a true body. Surely a very plausible and sharp argument! But I would have them answer, wherefore they have the images of other saints. Was there any man that admitted them to have no true bodies? Doubtless there be other reasons to be used for the convincing of heretics; who, if they be not moved by the testimonies of the scriptures, and by the acts which Christ did, surly they will not be confuted by images. And so those things, which be brought by our adversaries, be only pretenses, leaves of fig-trees, and branches; whereby nevertheless they cover not their shame. If they would be seen to fly from Marcion the heretic, why do they not in like manner show themselves to detest idolatry? Neither is this to be let pass, that the image itself of Christ, if it be had in the churches, is far more dangerous than others be; by reason of the worthiness and excellency of the person whom it betokeneth.

27. Also that is frivolous, which they report of Alexander Severus the emperor, that he had images in his privy closet: for he received them not of the Christians. He was an Ethnic, and therefore no marvel if he delighted himself with images. Such examples are not to be sought from him, and such as he was. After these things they object the brazen image, which in times past was placed in the city of Caesarea Philippi. But if they will somewhat more diligently read the history of Eusebius, they shall understand, that the same was not placed in the temple, but before the door of the same woman's house, which had received her health of Christ. Among the Ethnics there was a custom, that if one had received a great benefit of any man, he would set up an image of him, of whom he had

reaped so great a benefit: so did she behave herself toward Christ. Moreover, they defend the having of the image of Christ crucified upon the cross, in this respect, that unless those signs be seen in every place, our redemption, that is, the death of the son of God may be forgotten. Undoubtedly, if it be declared in sermons, and often called to remembrance, the faithful will not be forgetful of the same. For the primitive church had always before their eyes Christ crucified, although it used no idols nor images.

But the writing of Athanasius, concerning the image [of Christ] wounded by the Jews, seemeth to be both fabulous and fond. For there lived at that time many famous and learned bishops, whose works yet at this day are extant among us; who, if so notable a thing had happened at that time, they would surly have made mention thereof in their books and histories. Eusebius, Sozomenus, and Theodoretus, who wrote many things of Athanasius; yet did they utterly leave out this, which is vainly boasted of by these men. As touching the learning, which they say is to be gathered by these things, we need not stand upon it; seeing God, Christ, and the holy Ghost speak largely enough unto us in temples, in the holy scriptures, in sermons, and in sacraments: over and besides which, what need should there be to bring in images unto them, which rather call us from the perceiving of them, than help us? It is not the part of Christians, to repair unto the churches, to the intent they may feed their eyes with pictures and images; but to pray, to hear the word of God, to receive the sacraments, to give thanks unto God, and to celebrate the name of his majesty. The Lacedaemonians ordained, that in the Senate house there should be placed no image; to the intent the Senators there might be of ready wit, and most

attentively bend their cogitations upon those matters, which were in counsel among them.

28. Wherefore in vain do our adversaries clatter, that images be the books of lay men; that while they notify the acts of holy men, they teach the rude and unskillful sort. We indeed confess, that something is signified by pictures or images; howbeit very slenderly. But the minds of the unskillful be so rude, as that they have need of the ministry of the word. And it cometh oftentimes to pass, that by images they be rather led into error, than truly taught. Let the idiot or unlearned return as oft as he will unto a picture, it will always tell one thing: and if any doubt happen unto him, while he beholdeth the same, it will never answer anything for resolving thereof. But in the holy scriptures, and in godly sermons, whatsoever shall appear somewhat dark in one place, is plainly enough expounded in another. Verily a picture, if thou shalt once err, it will never amend thee. Howbeit, we grant that images may have a good use; namely, to renew the memory of things which have been done. Which thing, although not everywhere, yet in some places it happeneth conveniently: even as sometimes we speak some things by signs, and dumb men express many things by gestures. But whereas it is lawful to use this at sometime, and somewhere; do we therefore use it always, and in all places?

Shall he be accounted a wise Senator, that in the senate house showeth his judgment by pointing and nodding? And there is no doubt, but we use water for the quenching of thirst; yet if thou set the same before thy guests at a banquet, thou shalt be called a fool and a covetous man: so in like manner images, although elsewhere they have their commodity, yet they must not be suffered in churches, where we may deal with God by far better ways and means; especially seeing they cannot there be had without danger. For

Jeremiah in the tenth chapter saith, that Images do tell lies. And even this doth Abacuk show in the second chapter. And in the 13th and 14th chapters of the book of Wisdom it is written; that Men be deceived by them. And that the matter may appear more evident, we must understand, that then crept into the church a frequented use of images; when as bishops began to give themselves to idleness, when they ceased to teach the church that was committed unto them, and to feed the same with the word and sacraments; then (I say) they did substitute images, to be as it were vicegerents. I beseech you let experience teach us, and let us see since that time, (wherein temples were defiled with images) whether the rude and unlearned sort have been made the better learned by the use of them, and have become the more skillful in divine things by the use of them. Surely Christ, and God, was much less known than before. Was God ignorant of this commodity of images?

29. Assuredly, it could not be hidden from him, who with his eye beholdeth all things, and knoweth all things; if he saw it, and forbad it. He embraceth not us with fatherly good will, who may seem to deny men so great a good. Furthermore the apostles, who omitted nothing which might further the salvation of men, made no mention in any place of that so great a commodity. But by their actions they bewray themselves: for those images, unto the which the foolish people run on pilgrimage by heaps, be covered many times with great devotion, and hidden with great diligence; so that scarcely they be opened to noble men, cardinals, and princes. And the silly ignorant people, for whose sake they will that those images were devised, shall always have those books shut up before them. Neither are we to pass much upon the second Synod of Nice. For if a man do weigh but with mean diligence, the reasons of those bishops, whereby they established

images, he cannot refrain from laughing. Moreover, against that synod we will oppose the synod Eliberina, in the which (as I have before declared,) pictures and images be forbidden. Further it is strange, that these men be not ashamed to object against us the place of Paul, wherein he said; To the clean all things be clean: seeing in that place he entreateth only of mean and indifferent things, and not dangerous and forbidden things. And seeing now we have spoken of the nature and antiquity of images, and have distinguished them by the things which they signify, that some represent God, others the creatures of God; and have set forth what moved men to endeavor themselves to express God by images, and have showed that it is not lawful to represent God by pictures, partly in respect it cannot be, and partly because he himself hath forbidden it; and have also taught, that there is no let, but that things created may be resembled in images, so that no honor or worship be done unto them; and at the last have proved, that they ought not to be set in holy places: we think now, that we have sufficiently spoken of them.

**Of Cherubim.**

30. As concerning the name, Ibn-Ezra writeth, that some make the same a general word to all graven and carved things, and to images: yet so nevertheless, as those, which be written of in the law, are said to have had the shape of man. But in Ezekiel, the forms of them be described; namely of a lion, of an ox, and of an eagle; and not of a man's shape only. Yea further, in the same prophet, a king is called Cherub; because he aboundeth with great dignity, glory, and riches. Sometime that word is written at full; to wit, with the letter *Vau*: but sometime in the place thereof is put, *Kibbutz*. Howbeit, Solomon seemeth to have followed Moses: for he also in his tabernacle had two molten Cherubim. Yea and the very inward curtain,

which was instead of the wall of the tabernacle, had Cherubim of needle work. Wherefore it is no marvel, if both Solomon made two graven Cherubim, and also upon the walls made many set out finely in sealed work. I am not ignorant, that there were many of the ancient Hebrew interpreters, which thought, that the word Cherubim was compounded in such sort, as the first letter *Caph*, is a note of similitude. Then the verb *Rab* being added, which signifieth, To nourish, or To grow, whereof is made the noun *Rabum* and *Rabi*, which signifieth, Children and Yong men, because they grow and increase in stature. But this hath no likelihood of truth, that the etymology of a Hebrew name should be fetched from the Chaldean tongue. As touching the matter of them, it is evident enough, that those which were in the tabernacle of Moses, were of massy gold: for they stretched forth their wings from on high, on both sides of the mercy seat, with their faces one toward another. And the mercy seat was a table of the same length and breadth, that the ark of covenant was; which consisted of mass and pure gold, and out of that table (as is said) two Cherubim did rise up. The stuff whereof Solomon's Cherubim were made, was wood of the olive, which undoubtedly is very hard. Wherefore in carving or graving the same, artificers do take great pains: but it endureth very long.

31. In this place R. David Kimhi demandeth, how it was lawful for Solomon to cut down olive trees; because they bring forth fruit? And in Deuteronomy it is decreed, that those kind of trees should not be hewn down, no not upon the land of the enemies. By some it is answered, that he cut none down, but such as were withered with age, and were become so barren, as they would bear fruit no longer. But there be some, which think, that he used not the best olive, but the wild olive tree, whereof there is no fruit had. And there be some, which write, that these trees were not felled

within the country of Judea, but were sent thither by Hiram. Howbeit, it might more fitly be said, that these things were done otherwise than order was; and that by the instinct of God, some piece of the law was dispensed with; especially that which rather belonged unto war than unto peace. Also there were some, which denied that this was properly the wood of the olive tree: for (as they say) there be also other kinds of trees, which bring forth a certain oil; as the Cedar, the pine apple, and fir tree: the which, in so much as they bear fatness or gum, may be called trees of oil. They allege a place out of the eighth chap. of Nehemiah's, where it is written, that the feast of tabernacles was celebrated, wherein it was said to the people; Bring ye the leaves of the olive tree, and the leaves of the tree of oil. By which words these things are very manifestly distinguished one from another. Further also, the Schoolmaster of the law commanded not only to wear leaves of the olive tree, but also of the Cedar tree: and the Greek translation hath, the Cypress tree. And in the 41st chapter of Isaiah, (although the place be somewhat dark,) the wood of Cypress seemeth to be expressed under the name hereof. The height of the Cherubim was ten cubits; yet so, as they resembled young age in their face: which thing was sometime done by cunning artificers, in the great images called Colossi. Howbeit, Josephus described these images to be only of five cubits; and he testifieth, that the stuff of them was pure and massy gold. But credit must be given unto the holy scriptures.

32. As touching the site and habit of the Cherubim, this may be said; namely, that R. Solomo wrote, that with the soles of their feet, they stuck unto the floor, and had their countenance turned toward the east; as though they beheld them which went in and out. The one of them, with his wing touched the wall on the southside; the other the wall on the north side,

touching one another with the midst of their wings. They were therefore distant one from another ten cubits. The book of Paralip. affirmeth, that these images had the countenance of young men. On the contrary part Josephus writeth, that none is able to say what countenance they were of; but that their faces were bent toward the east, and to the holy place. The book of Paralipomenon doth testify, when they were with stretched out wings, the whole wideness of them consisted of ten cubits; and so they occupied the whole breadth of the sanctuary, even twenty cubits. Wherefore in them might be seen the just measure of a man's body, according to the quantity which they say it contains, seeing his height is so much as is equal with him, his hands being stretched out. But thou wilt say; If both the wings consisted of so many cubits, what place shall we allow for the trunk of his body? David Kimhi writeth, that their bodies were under the wings; because the tops of the wings were joined to the chine of the back. So that their bodies appeared in the fore part without the wings, and where they appeared most, the ark of the covenant was set either under or between these two Cherubim, the which was shadowed with their wings stretched out.

The length of the ark, as it is described in the 25th chapter of Exodus, was of two cubits, and a half: so much also was it in breadth, and the very height thereof was of one cubit and a half. There were bars of gold joined therewith, which were put through rings of gold, and neither from thence were they removed at any time: the length of those bars was four cubits. Above the ark in the propitiatory, there were two other Cherubim made by Moses. And by this means it came to pass, that in the holiest place of Solomon's temple, there were four Cherubim; to wit, two of Solomon's, and two lesser, made in the time of Moses. But the greater, which Solomon placed, did look toward the sanctuary, and toward the east part. But the

Cherubim of Moses, stood of each side of the propitiatory, and looked one upon the other, as if they had upholden the propitiatory with their hands. In the tabernacle of Moses, the opening of the two wings was of ten cubits, and with their wings they touched the wall; but after another manner than those of Solomon's did. For Moses Cherubim touched the east and the west part; and Solomon's, the north and the south part. But Moses Cherubim being placed in the temple of Solomon, touched not the walls with their wings; because the place was larger than it was in the tabernacle. Howbeit, in Isaiah we read of an order of Cherubim, somewhat differing: for to every one of them was six wings; for with the uppermost, they covered their countenance, and with the lowermost their feet, and sling with the middlemost, they cried; Holy, Holy, Holy.

33. We must not think that Solomon transgressed the law, by placing Cherubim in the innermost places of the temple, for he followed the example of Moses, who was commanded by God so to do. Moreover, when he showed unto David all the form and description of the holy building; there is no doubt, but he showed him also the images of the Cherubim. Wherefore idolaters must not be led with the example hereof, to have images in their churches. Last of all there remaineth, that I declare so much as shall be thought sufficient, for the signification of these images. Certainly, they did represent the administering spirits, whereof there is mention made in the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews: of which Daniel reckoneth so great a number, as he writeth, that there be ten hundred thousand, (meaning an innumerable multitude:) for he put a certain number for an infinite number. The ministries of them be of diverse sorts. Sometimes of severity: for when God had driven Adam out of paradise, he placed Cherubim before paradise, with a fiery two-edged sword, to drive

away wretched men from thence. The Egyptians were stricken by the ministry of angels. So was the host of Sennacherib. David also saw an angel approach near Jerusalem with a drawn sword. Also an angel withstood Balaam in his journey. Neither is there any doubt, but the five cities were destroyed with fire by the ministry of angels. But other whiles angels do serve God in the defending of men. For an angel set himself between the camps of the Egyptians and Israelites, in the same very night, when the Israelites should pass through the red sea. Lot also was preserved, and Peter brought out of prison by the diligence of angels. And angels were present with Christ, when he was tempted by the devil in the wilderness. Moreover, they defend kingdoms and provinces (as it is written in Daniel.) And it is declared, that by the hands of them, the spirit of Lazarus was brought to the bosom of Abraham. And in the Psalm it is sung; He hath given his angels charge of thee, and they shall keep thee in all thy ways. Also they were seen stand for the defense of Elisha against his enemies, as the holy history reporteth and testifieth. Furthermore, God useth them for instructing of men, as we read in Daniel and Zechariah. Marie was instructed by Gabriel, that she should bring forth the fruit of salvation. So was Joseph, concerning the taking of his wife unto him, from whom he was determined to depart: and so was he likewise as touching his flight into Egypt, and returning again. What shall I say more? They be messengers of God for to reveal his will.

34. Yea, and the ministers of the church be called angels, and are represented by them: for they advance the holy word of God amongst men. Wherefore Ezekiel saw an engine, wherein Cherubim were carried: whereby (as the wise and learned do interpret) are meant the prophets, apostles, and ministers of the church, of whom God, that is, Jesus Christ our

Savior, is carried by his word into all parts of the world: and wheresoever they come, they celebrate the praises of God amongst men, even as did the Seraphim's of Isaiah. Many things, besides these may be brought, whereby the allegory between ministers and angels might be amplified; but with these few we will content ourselves. I return therefore unto the angels themselves, by whole ministry also I affirm, that God governeth natural things. For there is no doubt, but that the celestial spheres, by their labor are turned about, and the marvelous things of nature are brought forth. For which cause it is very elegantly written, that God himself is carried upon the Cherubim. And the scriptures testify these divine spirits to be of such worthiness and excellency, that it setteth them out unto us; not only with wings, but also full of eyes; that is to say, that they execute the office committed to them by God, both wisely and speedily: which two things are most worthily commended in ministers and ambassadors. For then they rightly execute their office, if they join celerity with wisdom. And thus much shall suffice of Cherubim.

35. But now let us see somewhat concerning this word Teraphim. Some will have it, that they were instruments for marking out of times; or else of regions, stations, and degrees of stars, whereby afterward, by the science of Astrology, men might prognosticate of the events to come. But this is not much allowed: for they were rather images, as in the history of David is manifestly seen: when as Michal the daughter of Saul, placed a Teraphim in the bed, and feigned David to be there laid, whom notwithstanding she had privily sent away. But it had been no likely way for the devising of a lie, unless Teraphims had been of human shape. Wherefore it is said by others, that they be images, so made by the observation of the stars, as they be able to make answer, and give out oracles, when they are consulted withal. Of

which opinion, among others, is Ibn-Ezra. But against this opinion, it seemeth that that may be objected, which is pronounced in the psalm concerning idols; A mouth they have, and speak not. But if so be they answer; How shall this take place? In the very same Psalm the question is answered; They speak not in their throat: because in very deed men do speak by a natural power [of life] through an artery proceeding from the lights. But in these kind of images, not the life, but the devil speaketh. Wherefore the Jews, otherwise overwhelmed or drowned in these kind of superstitions, do show, that the witches did sacrifice some child, whom they knew to be a first born, whose head being cut off, they embalmed with salt and spices, that it may remain uncorrupt, under whose tongue they put a plate of gold, whereon they set the name of an unclean spirit, which they invocate; and setting up lights, they worship this mischievous head, and ask counsel of it, and from thence have answers, the devil moving the tongue thereof.

In Zechariah it is said, that the Teraphims did speak lies. And marvel not that it is written in Hosea, that the people seem to be left without Ephod and Teraphim; as thought it pertained unto God, that Teraphim should be worshipped, even as the Ephod was. For this is not true: for Teraphim, in the holy scriptures, is always taken in the worse part. But there the meaning is, that the people of God should be scattered and afflicted, so as neither they might retain the true worshipping of God, neither should they be at leisure to worship idols. Ephod in that place may be referred to good religion, and Teraphim unto wicked: neither of which two, those that be in captivity and affliction will retain. But I marvel, how some dare be so bold to say, that Laban did not worship such kind of Teraphim or images; when as he plainly saith, that they were his gods. I am of the mind, that he

worshipped together both God and idols. For it is very likely, that he had recourse to the idolatry of the inhabitants of Mesopotamia; and he retained somewhat of those things, which perhaps his father Nachor taught, as touching the true God. Although that Nachor also was an idolater, as it is thought of the Jews not unlike to be true: as was Balaam the soothsayer, which saith, that he was called by Balak out of the very same country. But this only will I say, as touching idolatry, and the endeavor about images and idols, whereby things to come might be known; that these things began of a curiosity. For when men were so immoderately careful to know things to come, they left nothing unattempted for the compassing of the same. And then the devil perceiveth himself most easily to be admitted, when we have such fervent desire of anything. Wherefore he both useth his cunning, and also bestoweth his labor willingly, that we may be deluded and drawn from our true and perfect salvation. But unto Christ are we beholding, that these things are not now so commonly received in the world, as they were before his coming. Although privately they be not altogether taken away; yet is there no city well-ordered with laws, but doth either punish severely, or else note with infamy, such mischievous arts and studies of enchantment. Let Plutarch and others say what they list, as touching the cause why oracles ceased to be given; seeing we know, that this must be ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ.

**Of human sacrifices.**

36. It appeareth manifestly out of the holy history, that men were brought to that madness, that they endeavored by human sacrifices and offering up of their children, to make God favorable unto them. And from whence this evil sprang, diverse men do diversely imagine. For there be some, which think, that that custom was brought in by a perverse imitation of Abraham.

For men hard, that God required such a sacrifice: and therefore concluded, that it is most acceptable to him: and they thought, that they should be happy, rich, and mighty, like unto Abraham, if they had given such an oblation. Howbeit, it hath no resemblance of truth, that the Ethnics made such account of Abraham, being a private man; that they would so grievously punish themselves by his example. Again, for the imitation of his fact, the preparation of the mind was sufficient; neither behooved it, to perform the thing itself. For God, which commanded that this should be done, did forbid it to be done. So then I cannot ascribe the invention thereof to a more certain author, than to Satan, which hath been a murderer from the beginning: neither delighteth he in anything more, than in slaughters and human blood. Wherefore it is notably said in the Psalm 106. They have offered up their sons unto devils. But this would they not have done, unless they had been certified by their oracles, that they were delighted with this kind of sacrifices. And not only in Palestine, or Syria, was that custom come in ure, but it came even unto foreign nations also.

37. Plutarch, in his parallels, the 66th chapter, writeth, that the Lacedaemonians, what time as they were afflicted with a plague, received answer of Apollo, that the plague should cease, if they would slay some virgins that should be chosen by lot, from among the chiefest nobility. And in the chapter following, he writeth, that the very same happened unto the Pheraei. Moreover, it is often reported of all the poets, that Polyxena, the daughter of Priamus, was offered up to the spirits of Achilles. And Iphigenia, or Iphianassa (for indeed she was called by both the names) being the daughter of Agamemnon, was sacrificed in Aulis: whereupon Virgil pronounced.

*Sanguine placâstis ventos, & virgins caesa*;

that is,

With blood and with a virgins slain,

Ye have appeased the winds [certain.]

Yea and Tertullian, in his book entitled *Scorpiacus*, against the Gnostics, mentioned; that the Scythians sacrificed men to Diana, namely in the region of Taurica; and that the Gauls did the same to their Mercurius; the Africans also unto Saturnus. And lest he should seem to report things out of knowledge, and most ancient, he testifieth, that the same most cruel custom did publicly endure until the proconsulship of Tiberius; who took from among them so great a mischief: and the priests which executed these things, he hung upon the trees, which shadowed the temple of Saturn. Howbeit he addeth, that from that time were finished those most cruel sacrifices, although not publicly, yet at the least wise privately. Yea and (saith he) in the city itself of the godly Aeneads, the same thing was accustomed to be done, so as human blood was sprinkled unto one [which was called] Jupiter. Neither maketh it any matter, that the same blood was of the *Bestiarij*, (that is, of those kind of men, which for diverse kinds of great crimes were condemned unto beasts) because, although they were hurtful men, yet nevertheless they were men. This writeth he in his *apollogie*, affirming that this kind of oblation did fitly agree with Saturn, who, as he spared not his own natural sons, so was he delighted in the slaughter of strangers. This divine power of Saturn (as the Hebrew interpreters affirm) was called among the Jews Moloch; unto whom the idolatrous parents did sacrifice their children. And it is not unknown, that the Romans, in old time, used every year to sacrifice two men, casting them down from the bridge Miluius, into the river Tiber: which ordinance they did afterward mitigate, by throwing out of a basket into the river, not the

men themselves, but the images of them. Livie in his fourth *Decad*, and fourth book, maketh mention of a holy sacrifice of the spring time, wherein the people of Rome vowed unto sacrifice, all the living creatures, which should be born from the kalends of March, unto the ides of May. And (as Festus hath taught) they therewithal vowed even their children. And in Cyprus they sacrificed a man unto Apollo. For Teucrus, who first did this, delivered the rite by hand unto the posterity; and that ceremony endured unto the time of Adrian the emperor. And Philo, who wrote the history of the Phoenices, wrote, that they in their greatest dangers, accustomed to sacrifice their children. Which thing agreeth well with the narration of the holy history. Moreover, it is known unto all men, that the *Decij* vowed their own selves for the safety of their own army; and that Curtius threw himself into a huge gap of the earth, that the city might be delivered from the plague, wherewith it was infected.

38. These men indeed are praised by the judgment of the world and the flesh; whereas by the judgment of God and the spirit, they are worthy to be dispraised. Whereupon Christ most prudently admonished us, that those things, which excel before men, are most vile in the sight of God. Therefore (as I have said) this most cruel kind of sacrifice proceeded of the devil. But let us see, by what reasons men have been allured thereunto. One (I think) was brought to pass by this means; Those things that be most precious, and which do please us most of all, should be offered unto God, especially, when we are afflicted with extreme dangers; But our children be far more excellent than cattle, neither account we anything more deer unto us, than they; Therefore, when we live in the greatest perils, they must be offered up unto God. This is a false argument, [taken] from that which is absolute, to that which is in some respect: because we also do confess, that parents

ought also to offer up their children unto God, by bringing up of them godly and religiously; but not in making a burnt sacrifice of them. Perhaps they are driven by another reason; namely, because they had heard of their ancestors, that is, of the holy Patriarchs, that it would come to pass, that one day God would be well pleased with a human sacrifice. Which as they did peculiarly understand concerning Messias; so the wicked, being taught by the instruction of the devil, understood it of some particular men. Undoubtedly it was a marvelous blindness of their minds, that they abhorred not to sacrifice their children unto devils: and it was more than a true pretense of religion, which consisted not of the word of the Lord, but of a human and devilish invention.

And certainly, the more fervent that men be in superstitions devised by themselves, the further are they carried headlong into things more absurd. And if so be that a good intent were at any time to be commended; here should it most of all have taken place. For they, which did sacrifice their own children, did not only seem to mortify human affections; but utterly to despoil them. On this wise do men, when they be carried away of their own will. What else, I beseech you, was this, then to be cruel against their own blood? Wild beasts, which be altogether destitute of reason, would commit no such thing; who do fight for their young ones, and offer themselves to die for the safety of them. Hereby we understand, what miserable gods the idolaters have worshipped; whom they would not have to be merciful unto them, except they had first done them much harm. Under the color of godliness, the earth was polluted with innocent blood, that a more unhappy destruction might come against it. And thus we see that idolatry exacteth more, and far more grievous things of men, than true godliness, and the word of God can obtain. It grieved not those men to kill their sons; but they

that profess the Gospel, will not abide to chasten them, no not lightly. The priests of Baal lanced their bodies so cruelly, as the blood ran on every side out of their bodies: and they which would be called Christians, withdraw not their bodies from hurtful pleasures.

39. But and if we should demand, whether God have at any time delighted in human sacrifice, that will we not deny: for through the death of Christ, God was well pleased with mankind. And that which in many places of the law is written as touching sacrifices; to wit, that God smelled those things as a sweet savor: that must be referred, not unto the cattle which was sacrificed, but unto the principal type that was shadowed by them, that is, unto Christ, whose death nevertheless did not barely and by itself please God, but so far forth as it proceeded of a true obedience, perfect mind, and singular charity. And if thou demand, whence that obedience and charity obtained their dignity and excellency? It shall be said, from the divine person, in which the human nature was sustained, while Christ, so far forth as he was man, should suffer the works of our salvation. Also the sacrifices of the holy martyrs, wherein they suffer themselves to be slain for the name of God, is also most deer unto God. Yet is not God cruel, as he that rejoiceth in the blood and death of men: for the deaths and slaughters of martyrs please not God of themselves, and in their own nature; except in that, that they are offered for the testifying of his truth. Again, he hath not so respect unto patient men, as they be mere men, and the children of Adam; but as they belong unto the body of Christ, and are now become his members by regeneration, and (according to the form of Paul's speaking) are called the men of God.

40. In very deed God might, in his own right, have required human sacrifices of men. For seeing he is the Creator of men, he may determine of

them at his own pleasure: which yet is the more lawful for him, when as all the posterity of Adam have been made subject unto death. That therefore, which every hour they owed to God, he might require of them, whensoever he had thought good. For truly, no justice was against it, but that he might use their death, for the fulfilling of his decrees. And in requiring of this kind of oblations, he should have done no injury unto them: for instead of the loss of this transitory and frail life, he would have requited them with a blessed and eternal life; the which should have been counted for an advantage, and that a most manifest advantage. Wherefore those men, that were to be offered in a burnt sacrifice, might have set their minds at quiet, by this sound consolation. But when it was lawful for God thus to do, he would not: nay rather, he forbad that it should be done. First, before the law was given, when as he stayed Abraham from killing of Isaac. Afterward in the very law itself, in two or three places he chargeth, that men should not offer up their sons, and sacrifice them as did the nations of the Chanaanites. And after the law was made, he oftentimes by the oracles of the prophets rebuked the Israelites, when they committed such things. And in the place of human sacrifice, he appointed the slaughters of beasts; that is, of bulls, of calves, of sheep, of goats, and of birds: which nevertheless he removed afterward, when Jesus Christ had been sacrificed. And why he for a time suffered those kind of sacrifices, Tertullian in his second book against Marcion declareth. First, because he saw the Hebrews incline to the ceremonies of the idolaters, where these beasts were used in sacrifices: wherefore he rather would, that those things should be done unto him, than unto the vain gods of the Gentiles, yea rather unto devils.

Furthermore, with singular diligence and perfect precepts he distinguished the kinds of the sacrifices: also he prescribed in a manner infinite things, as

touching the places, vessels, and rites, to the intent he might exercise those fathers very busily in his service, that they might be constrained to meditate day and night in his law; and that with a true faith: otherwise their sacrifices should have been hated of him, as he spake by the prophet Isaiah; To what end is this multitude of sacrifices offered unto me? Have I required this at your hands, &c? Also, that manner of worshipping was a certain schooling: for the fathers were taught, that the death, which they had procured unto themselves by their sins, was through the bountiful goodness of God translated from themselves unto the sacrifices. And Christ was evidently showed, who took upon himself all our sins and death; and therefore died, that we might be absolved. This was the schooling of the sacrifices of Moses. Howbeit, we must not say, that we are altogether without human sacrifices, which we may offer up to God. For every man may and ought to sacrifice himself, as Paul taught in the twelfth chapter to the Romans, writing; I beseech you, by the mercy of God, that ye give up your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, &c. And David pronounced; A sacrifice to God is a troubled spirit, a broken heart, &c. In like manner may we offer up our children unto God, if they be godly and sincerely instructed, to the honor of the true God: which may not be done according to the inventions of men, but according to the word of God. And this may now suffice as touching human sacrifices.

41. But no less doubt is offered unto us; to wit, that the horrible sacrifice of the king of Moab may seem to have been very profitable unto him: for immediately the siege was dissolved, and the host [of the Israelites] so departing away, there is an occasion given of exercising a perverse rite in time of adversity. What then? Shall we accuse God, which gave such a success? No, not in any wise: for no man may or ought to put a law upon

him. Who shall prescribe unto him, seeing he is the cause of all things? By that reason we will find fault with him, that the sorcerers of Pharaoh resisted Moses, and did show forth many signs and miracles against him. There also was an occasion given of refusing the word of God. We might also complain of Antichrist, because with miracles and wonders (as it is written to the Thessalonians) he shall drive men to fall from the truth. Also in these latter times, miracles and delusions are done unto images, relics, and sepulchers of saints; whereby superstitions, and idolatrous worshipping's are confirmed. But we are not for these causes to complain justly of God, seeing he is very justice itself, and doth all things justly. Those verily, which for such occasions are drawn to evil; those I say (as it is written unto the Thessalonians) have not received the love of the truth, and therefore are given up unto errors, and seducements of Antichrist. Wherefore we are hereby admonished, while we take anything in hand, that the successes and events should not be regarded; since we might be easily deceived. For we should oftentimes see, that godly men are pressed with troubles; and contrariwise, the wicked do flourish, and enjoy at their pleasure, riches and earthly felicity. The will of God is only to be regarded, which he hath revealed unto us in the holy scriptures; according to which we must examine what is to be followed, and what to be eschewed.

**The establishing of the second commandment; whether the child shall bear the iniquity of his father.**

42. But in this place there is a most weighty and very difficult question; because the child doth seem to bear the iniquity of his father. For it is written in the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, which also is in Exodus; I will visit the wickedness of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation. And the very same did God repeat to Moses, when he

went forth before him: for among others his titles, the same (Of recompensing the wickedness of fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation) is added. And it seemeth to be a marvel, how that could be rehearsed among the titles of mercy. The Heretics left not this unspoken of; namely, the Marcionits, the Valentinians, and the Carpocratians, which for this cause rejected the Old Testament; and God the author thereof, they affirmed to be evil, as he that would spare the parents which were sinners, and would punish the children being innocents. And that he is so far from mercy, as he cannot forget sin; but keepeth anger in store, even unto the third and fourth generation. Also the Jews took the same in ill part, who in the 18th chapter of Ezekiel said; that The fathers did eat sour grapes, and the children's teeth were set on edge. This was, as if they should say; Jeroboam erected calves; Manasseh set forward idolatry: were it meet that we should suffer punishment for them? But the Lord answereth by the prophet; All souls be mine. Like as the soul of the father is mine, so is the soul of the son mine also. The soul which sinneth, the same shall die: and the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father. These things seem not sufficiently to agree one with another.

43. Some have thought, that there must be used a distinction of evils, and punishments. For they say there be some punishments, which appertain to everlasting damnation, others which are but temporal. And they understand the said place of Ezekiel, to be spoken of the former kind of punishments. For as concerning everlasting salvation, or damnation; every man shall bear his own burden: and The soul which sinneth, the same shall die. Neither do they otherwise understand the place of Jeremiah, in the 31st chapter. But as touching temporal punishments, (of which sort are sickness, poverty, banishment, death, and such like) they affirm, that it is not contrary to the

justice of God; that the father, together with the son, and the people with the princes, should be wrapped in those punishments. And so they expound that which in the law is said; I will reward the sin of the fathers upon the children; unto the third and fourth generation. Augustine seemeth sometime to have allowed of this distinction: for in the questions upon Joshua, the eighth question; when he disputeth of Achan, which had hidden some of the accursed things, for whose sin all the Israelites were miserably afflicted: and for that, not only Achan was punished, but also his sons and daughters were put to death together. There (I say) Augustine writeth, that those punishments might as well profit, as hurt: the which thing God himself knew, and that therefore they were tempered by him, according to his righteousness. For God doth so moderate them, as both they may afflict the wicked, and not hurt the good. For such is his providence, that those things which seem to be evil he can make good. But as concerning the everlasting punishments, because those do hurt for evermore, every man doth justly suffer them according to his evil desert. No man (saith he) suffereth those punishments for another man's fault. And even this also he writeth in his first book, the 10th chapter, against the adversaries of the law and the prophets; There is no doubt (saith he) but in this life one is afflicted for another.

And against Julian the Pelagian, the sixth book and 12th chap. he distinguisheth the state of the people: and some (he saith) are regenerated in Christ, but that others are not yet regenerated. And of them which be not regenerated, their sins are visited upon the third and fourth generation, to wit, upon all the posterity. And he alludeth unto original sin, which from Adam is spread over all posterity. But thou wilt say; Whie then punisheth he to the third and fourth generation? The same father answereth in the 42nd

question upon Deuteronomy; Because three being joined with the number of four, make the number of seven; which is a complete number. So as by naming the third and fourth generation, it is all one, as if he had said; Unto every generation. Which kind of speech Amos used; For three wickedness's (saith he) and for four I will not be turned. Augustine therefore understandeth the words of the law (concerning the punishing of the father's iniquity upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation) of them which be not regenerate: for the law (saith he) spake of them, which were under the law. But Ezekiel and Jeremiah spake of men, which were born anew, and of the gift of regeneration, to be given by Christ. But men, which be regenerate, shall be judged everyone after his own merits, and not according to other men's sins. And so the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, but the soul which sinneth, the same shall die. But before regeneration, original sin infecteth, and destroyeth all posterity.

44. This distinction of Augustine I disallow not; yet doubt I, whether it be sufficiently applied unto the sense of Ezekiel and Jeremiah. Both those prophets wrote the self-same words; The fathers did eat sour grapes, and the children's teeth were set on edge: when as nevertheless the one was in Jewry, and the other was led away into Babylon: which is a good argument, that they spake both with one spirit. But Augustine saith, that the exposition of Ezekiel must be taken out of the 31st chapter of Jeremiah. For there it is added, after those words; Behold, the days will come, that I will make a new covenant, &c. Wherefore all that whole place is to be applied to regeneration: so that by these words of Jeremiah, the saying of Ezekiel must be interpreted concerning the regenerate. By this means, that father thinketh, that the question is answered. But I, when I more diligently consider of that chapter of Ezekiel, it seemeth to me, that it speaketh of the

pains and afflictions of this life. For wherefor did the people complain, saying; The fathers did eat sour grapes, and the children's teeth were set on edge? Did they complain of the pains of hell? No verily: but because they were carried away captive into Babylon, and there lived in bondage. They complained, that God did deal over hardly; that whereas their fathers had been idolaters, yet they which had not offended, should be punished. Concerning those punishments, the people lamented: so as it was needful that the prophet should answer for those things; The soul of the father is mine, and the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, the same shall die. Wherefore these things have respect to the punishments of this life. Albeit I deny not, but they may be transferred also unto spiritual punishments: but that is not but by the way of arguing *A minori ad maius*, that is, From the less to the greater; which is after this sort: God hath not altogether laid temporal punishments upon the innocents for others sins; Therefore much less the spiritual and everlasting pains.

45. Jerome, when he interpreteth Ezekiel, hath a solution, the which afterward Augustine also followed; as we will declare when the place serveth. But the interpreters do vary, because the matter is obscure; and thereof cometh a difficulty, because it cannot be denied, but that God afflicteth some for other men's cause. For whereas Cham had disclosed the shame of his father [Noah] yet was the curse transferred unto Chenaan his son. And when the Sodomites had grievously sinned, the children also together with the fathers were burned. Again, when David had committed adultery, God caused, that the child begotten in that adultery, should die. Wherefore, in a matter so obscure, Jerome indeed bringeth his own exposition; but yet he showeth what other men thought concerning this question. First he saith, that there were many, which understood that place

of the law; namely, (that God doth persecute the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation) to be allegorically spoken touching every particular soul, or man that sinneth. [ 1] For they be certain rash onsets, impulsions, and forcements unto evil, or (as other say) first motions; [ 2] afterward followeth deliberation, as when one hath determined with himself, that he will do naught; [ 3] thirdly, when this determination is performed; [ 4] fourthly, there followeth a glorying in wickedness, when one doth satisfy and well please himself in sins. So, after a sort, there be reckoned four generations. But God is so merciful, that in the first and second generation; that is, in rash onset and deliberation he is silent, and maketh as though he knew not: but the third and the fourth, (that is, the committing of sin, and the glorying therein) he punisheth: when as both a man doth evil, and glorieth in his sins, and will not repent. Wherefore they say, that God revengeth upon the branches, not upon the roots. For a man (as they think) if he neither do evil, nor yet boasteth of evil, may be saved; although otherwise, he as well lusteth, as deliberateth to do evil.

Neither do they otherwise interpret Paul to Timothy, when he saith, that A woman shall be saved by procreation of children, if so be she abide firm in the faith, &c. That is; her soul shall be saved, if she work well, although she have naughty motions and cogitations. This interpretation I allow not. First, because it is allegorical; seeing God (especially in the law) speaketh plainly and manifestly. Secondly, for that the words of the Lord, if they should be turned to allegories, will become altogether uncertain. Lastly, because it is not true that is spoken. For those forcements and first motions are sins; because they are against the law of God: and they be condemned by Christ, when he saith in the Gospel; He that looketh upon a woman, to lust after her, he hath already committed fornication with her in his heart. And; He

that is angry with his brother, is worthy of judgment. God doth not so look upon doings, but that he hath much more respect unto the mind. Moses sinned grievously at the waters of strife; and yet, if we examine that history, we shall find no evil act that he outwardly committed: but God saw the incredulity of his mind, and grievously punished him. Wherefore, these motions and deliberations of the mind, not only be sins, but they be also grievously punished by God. Let us then pass over this interpretation, which also Jerome brought as none of his own.

46. But now, to make the matter itself plain; none can be said to suffer that, which he hath not deserved as touching the punishments of this life: because there is none perfect, no not the child, which is but one day old. There is none but hath deserved, even death itself. Why then do men say; Our fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge: seeing everyone beareth his own burden, whether it be touching this life, or the life to come? But God doth not always bring these temporal evils, as pains and punishments; but oftentimes they have relation to other ends: as Christ in the Gospel of John answered concerning the blind man; Neither did this man sin, nor yet his parents, that he should be born blind, but that the glory of God might be made manifest. Also Peter and Paul, when they were put to death, could not complain that they had not deserved it: although God, when they were slain, did not respect this, to have them punished; but that by their blood, a testimony might be left of his sons Gospel. Wherefore, seeing the case so standeth, and that we be all guilty of sin, we must not complain, that God dealeth too sharply with us, if for the sins of our parents we be punished. For God can so direct those troubles, as they may belong not only to his own glory, but also to the salvation of the parents. Oftentimes he doth punish the fathers in the children, and the

prince in the people. For the punishment of children no less grieveth their parents, than if they themselves were afflicted. But if so be that the children die for their father's sake, they have no injury done unto them: for death is due unto them also, and otherwise it is certain, that they must die. Now then, if God will use their death in that sort, he may do it lawfully. Which also may be affirmed, as touching other calamities: for if that a child be vexed with sickness, he deserved sickness: if he have lost his money, he hath lost but frail and unstable things; and those he had upon condition, that he might easily forgo them. So then, if with these kind of calamities God will punish the parents in the children, he cannot be accused of injustice.

47. Whereupon Augustine in his questions upon Joshua, the eighth question; We are (saith he) by reason of original sin, debtors of many punishments, the which nevertheless God converteth into certain medicines, and findeth means, that they do very much profit, although they seem evil unto us. For if so be the son had lived, peradventure he would have trodden in his father's evil steps, or else have committed worse things. Wherefore, if God take him away out of this life, he cannot complain that he is ill dealt with: since death, by God's blessing, doth redound to his commodity. For he is suddenly taken away, least wickedness should change his heart. And certainly, we ought to suffer, and endure the less evils, for to obtain greater good things. For so doth the physician with a bitter medicine trouble the mouth, that the sick man may be restored to his former health. In like manner, when we have deserved punishments, yet God doth turn them unto good. And by this means (saith Augustine) a certain discipline is established in the world: for unless it were so, men would perpetually become worse. Also there is declared a certain conjunction and society of mankind, when as on this sort, one is punished for the fault of another. For they, which

belong all to one kingdom, or city, or province, be as it were one body among themselves: and in the body one member doth suffer for another member. Seeing therefore this is done in the body, it is no absurd thing, that the same do happen in the society of men.

Plutarch, in his little book *De sera Numinis vindicta*, did very well teach the same; The eye (saith he) is grieved, and the vein of the arm is lanced: even so the father did offend, and the son is punished. The prince behaved himself amiss, and the people are afflicted. And such a natural consent or agreement there is of human things. Justly doth this author accuse the rashness of men, which, so often as these things do happen, complain that God dealeth cruelly. For the father (saith he) is either good or evil. And if perhaps the son of a good father be punished, by and by they exclaim, that God dealeth unjustly; and that it is not meet, that the son should be so miserably handled, who had so good a father. But if so be the father be evil, and the son fall into calamity, there again they cry out, that herein also God is unequal, and that the son ought not to be punished, when the father hath sinned. Wherefore the vulgar sort think, that the son should not in any wise be afflicted. But what if the father be evil, and yet all things chance happily to the son? Here also (as he saith) they complain of the unjust dealing of God: for they deny it to be meet, that the son should live happily, which had so evil a father. These things he spake godly enough, although he were an Ethnic.

48. Moreover, it must be considered, that the children be as it were certain parts of their parents, and have somewhat of theirs in them: wherefore it is not absurd, if God punish that part of the parents in the children. But I come again to Augustine, who saith, that God by this means appointeth a discipline in the world, in a Common-wealth, in a church, and in a family.

Whose saying (in my judgment) cannot be disallowed: for if so be the children do suffer punishment for the sins of their parents, they have not whereof to complain. Undoubtedly they owe this duty unto their parents: for even this, that they are, they had it from them. Wherefore, if they leave their life for their sakes, they have no injury done unto them: for they yield that unto them, which they received of them. If God shall say unto them; I will use your punishment for the safety of your parents, they could by no right refuse the same. John teacheth, that Everyone so ought to love his brother, as he should be ready to yield his life for him. And if so be that life must be yielded for a brother, how much rather for a father? God useth diverse instruments, wherewith he draweth men unto him: why then may he not use either the sickness or the death of children for the chastisement or salvation of parents?

Augustine in his eighth question upon Joshua (which we have oftentimes alleged;) It is meet (saith he) that the lesser part should suffer punishment for the greater: as in that history it came to pass, for the sacrilege, which Achan had committed. A few were slain in the host, and the whole multitude was assoiled. Herby is understood, how great the wrath and vengeance of God had been, if the whole multitude had sinned; when as the sin of one alone was so costly. And Plutarch, in the same book, which I cited a little before, saith; that thus the emperors do in their camps. For if there be any fault generally committed by them all, they take the tenth of the multitude; to the intent that by the punishment of a few, the rest may be assoiled: and so one doth suffer for the fault of another. But (as it hath been said) God doth injury to no man: for he that dieth, was subject to death, and God directeth his death to a good end; namely, that he may help others, that is, that by this means he may call home, either parents, or princes to

repentance; or else to establish discipline. Those things, which we have said, must not be understood concerning spiritual and eternal punishments: for (as touching them) everyone shall be punished for his own fault.

49. Now are we to expound the very words of the law; I (saith he) am a jealous God, and visit the sin of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them, which hate me. These latter words, Jerome, upon the 18th chapter of Ezekiel noted diligently, and Augustine also in the question upon Joshua already alleged; Of them (saith God) which hate me: as if he had said; I will not touch the innocents; but I will be avenged upon the iniquity of them, which imitate evil parents, and hate me. After the like manner he promiseth, that he will do well unto the children, and children's children, even to a thousand generations. But to whom? Even to them (he saith) which love me. Wherefore, if the father were wicked, and the son good, his father's wickedness shall do him no harm. But if the father were good, and the son wicked, his father's godliness shall not avail him. And therefore (saith Jerome) God punisheth the iniquity of the fathers upon the children; not because they had evil parents, but because they did imitate their fathers. The words themselves do sufficiently declare, that the law must not be understood of original sin; but of that sin, which they call actual. For then the son shall bear the iniquity of his father, when he sinneth in like manner as his father did. Also the words of Ezekiel cannot be understood, as touching original sin, as the words, which follow do easily declare. Albeit that, which is said; to wit, The soul which sinneth, the same shall die, may be understood even of original sin; since every man hath in himself a nature corrupt and prone unto evil: wherefor everyone doth bear his own sin. For although that that sin be originally drawn from the parents, yet is it now become our own.

But thou wilt say: Seeing it is said in the law; Of them that hate me, surly since infants do not hate God, therefore it cannot pertain unto them. I answer: indeed they do not hate God in act, but by natural corruption and proneness unto evil. So the wolf that is grown devoureth the sheep, but the wolfs whelp doth not so; not because he hath not the disposition of his dam, but because he is not able to do it. And thus much concerning the words of the law. But for what cause it is said; Unto the third and fourth generation: and not; Unto the fifth and sixth, we have heard what Augustine hath answered. But in my judgment, we might much more fitly say, that the parents may live unto the third and fourth generation. God therefore would so punish the fathers in the third and fourth generation, as some feel of that punishment of the posterity might come to them, while they should be yet living; and that they might see the calamities of their children's children, and the children of them. And for this cause the holy scripture did not make mention beyond those generations. When their posterity is evil, and is punished by God; there is no doubt but the parents be punished in them. Chrysostom on Genesis, homily 29, interpreting these words; Cursed be Chenaan, &c. But it was not Chenaan (saith he) that sinned, but his father Cham. He answereth: true indeed it is, but Cham took that curse far more grievously, than if he himself had been afflicted. Such is the natural working and affection in fathers, that they be more disquieted with the afflictions of their children, than with their own. So Cham perceived, that not only his son should be evil, and subject to the curse; but also that he himself should be punished in him.

50. Now remaineth to be declared, why this also; namely, Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, was recited before Moses among the titles of God's mercy; seeing it seemeth to have respect unto the severity

of God. But it is not so: nay rather, if the place be more narrowly sifted, we shall see the same to be a part of his mercy. For so soon as sin is committed, God, in his own right, might by and by take vengeance: but so good is he, that he will defer it, until the third and fourth generation; in the meantime he calleth home the father to repentance, by the admonitions of the prophets, by preachings, by benefits, and many other means. Last of all, when it is come to the third and fourth generation, and the man nothing the better, he executeth punishment: and even then he useth not affliction, as the uttermost punishment, but rather as a medicine. Who seeth not that all this is a work of great mercy? Justly therefore, and upon good cause, are these words numbered among the titles of God's mercy. And it cannot be denied, but that the prophets, together with the people, were oftentimes afflicted. For Ezekiel and Daniel were led away into captivity, and Jeremiah was cast into prison, and turmoiled many and marvelous ways in time of the siege; and afterward going to Egypt with the Hebrews, was slain. For on this sort God will have the thing to be done; that good men may not only order their own conversation aright, but that also, by patient suffering of grievous things, they may warn and amend the wicked. For with them they live together in one common-wealth and church, and be after a sort, members of one body.

Wherefore good men ought thus to think with themselves; If God have afflicted them, we also shall be vexed together with them, we shall be all wrapped under one punishment. Therefore we must take heed, that we travel for them, by reproving and praying: for their salvation being neglected, it will bring evil also unto us. After this sort must Augustine be understood, when he saith, that God by this means establisheth discipline. For if the people be afflicted for their kings, and the son for the father; then

it behooveth, that all men labor and be diligent one for another. Yet do not good men in the meantime live without sin, in such sort as God cannot find cause to punish them. Howbeit, the painful things, which happen to the godly, as it hath been said, cannot properly be called punishments: but rather exercises of faith. For by that means God doth thoroughly make trial of their faith; and whatsoever he doth against them, it turneth to their good. Moreover, he would have them to express in themselves Jesus Christ, their first begotten brother, which bare the sins of others in himself. For even this is a certain portion of Christ his cross, though they be not so innocent as Christ was: neither doth their cross work anything to the redeeming of sins. Daniel being in captivity thus confessed his sins; We have sinned (saith he) and dealt unjustly, &c. He saith not; They have sinned; but, We. And Isaiah saith; All our righteousness is like unto filthy rags. Indeed in saints there is a certain righteousness, but no such, whereof they may boast before the tribunal seat of God. Wherefore, if they suffer some punishments, they have no just cause to complain.

51. But thou wilt say; Wherefore is God said to revenge on them the sins of other men, when as they themselves also do sin? He should rather be said to punish their sins, than the sins of their parents. I answer: because, when God had long and many days expected their father's repentance, and yet perceived no amendment; and in the meantime, the third and fourth generation was come, at the length he poureth out his wrath on the children. Now they are said to suffer for their parents, because, had it not been that the wickedness of their parents had gone before, their punishment might have been delayed longer: but now, since they happened to be in the third or fourth generation, the nature of God's justice suffereth not, that the punishment should be longer deferred. And although themselves deserved

those evils; yet, in that they are corrected in the third and fourth generation, they owe it to their parents. And so God doth terrify the parents, to the end they may stay themselves from wickedness: if not for God's cause, or their own sake; yet at the lest wise for their posterity sake. He maketh also the children afraid, least they should imitate the sins of their parents; that the punishment due unto the parents, might not be renewed upon them. And it is no injustice, that the children suffer somewhat for their parents: for even for their fathers sakes they receive inheritances, and are endued with honor and renown before others. For God not only gave good success unto David, but favored his posterity also for his sake: since the kingdom did continue in his family by the space of four hundred years.

But as touching eternal salvation, neither do the fathers suffer punishment for their children; nor yet the children for their fathers. But many spiritual gifts are by good parents obtained for their children: for Paul said, in the first to the Corinthians, the 7th chapter; Otherwise your children should be unclean, but now they are holy. Wherefore, of godly parents, the children have some holiness, and some spiritual gift; as that place teacheth. On the contrary part, by evil parents many such good things be hindered. Neither are they, being evil and impenitent, heard of God, when they desire spiritual gifts for their children. But it cometh oftentimes to pass, through the providence of God, that of good parents, are born evil children; and of ill parents, good children. As Hezekiah a good king, had the wicked king Ahaz to his father: and contrariwise, the same Hezekiah a very godly prince, begat Manasseh a most wicked and cruel king. The same also I might say of Josiah. This happeneth thus, least wickedness should grow out of measure; if continually evil children should be begotten of evil parents. God worketh therein, who maketh the child, born of an evil father, to become the member

of Christ. And he showeth therewithal, that his goodness cannot be hindered by the parents, though they be evil. Furthermore, evil children be born of good parents, that grace may be confirmed; and least that the good behavior of the children, should be attributed unto the nature which they took from their parents. For God will have it to be acknowledged his gift that we be saved.

52. One only thing is to be added to this question proposed; namely, that indeed it is lawful for God (as we have declared) to punish the sin of the fathers upon the children: but unto men this is not lawful. For in Deuteronomy, the 24th chapter, it is plainly said; Let not the fathers be punished for the children, nor yet the children for the parents. Which must be understood; so that the father consent not unto the son, nor the son unto the father. Wherefore, if Achan had been called into the place of judgment, and unto the tribunal seat, he alone should have perished, by the ordinary course of the law, and not his children together with him. But God hath this law peculiar unto himself, who would have it to be otherwise. Howbeit, he sometime also observeth this order: for in the 16th of *Numerie*, when Chore had conspired against Moses, he died an evil death: but the children together with their father were not destroyed; nay rather, they were preserved unto the holy ministry, and of their posterity came Samuel. King Amazias was commended, which put to death the murderers, of whom his father was slain; yet he put not the children of them to death: for he had a consideration unto the law of God. Augustine alledgeth the cause of this prohibition; God (saith he) may punish the son for the father: for though he do afflict him in this world, yet is he able in another world to save him, but this cannot man do. Further, God seeth, that the children be not innocent, but man seeth it not.

And though the civil laws deal in this point more sincerely, and do punish the son for the fathers fault, (as it is in the Digests, and in the Code *Ad legem Juliam Majestatis*) yet do they not put the son to death for the father, but they deprive him of all his fathers substance, dignities, and honors. Howbeit, some portion is assigned by them unto the daughters, by a law which was called *Falcidia*, to the intent they might marry. Otherwise the civil laws agree with the law of God: for in the Code *De poenis*, in the law *Sancimus*, it is commanded, that the punishment should not be laid upon others, which either be of affinity, or blood; but should only bind the author of the offense. And yet, both this law, and the other above, were made by the same emperors; namely, Archadius and Honorius. But why it was so sharply decreed, against such as be guilty of treason; it seemeth to be done, because men might be terrified from that kind of mischievous deed. Howbeit, the laws of God have decreed no such thing hereof: yet this they command in express words, that the son should not be slain for the father; howbeit concerning the goods, they decree nothing. But our adversaries have transferred this civil law concerning treason, unto heretics: for they do not only punish the father, being a heretic; but they also deprive the children of all his goods: how justly, I will not now declare.

# CHAP. VI. The third Precept; of the sanctification of the name of God.

The Hebrews call an oath by the name of *Nischba*, being a noun derived of *Schaba*, that is, seven; by which number is expressed the power of the holy Ghost, seeing whosoever sweareth, let him understand that he is bound and tied by that oath. The definition is, that the same is a confirmation of the will, by the testimony of God, or of divine things. Of his own nature it is good, yet the abuse thereof may do harm; as the Eucharist, as meat, and drink. Also by the end thereof, it is declared to be good: for it is ordained to the intent any man may justify and purge himself thereby, that there may be a faithfulness of speaking, which oftentimes doth much avail: yea even to the finishing of controversies: and this is written in the sixth chapter of the Hebrews. Furthermore, it hath his beginning from a right faith in God: for because we esteem all things to be thoroughly known unto him. Again, we judge that he is a lover of the truth, and a revenger of perjury: all which points of godliness are not to be despised. Also an oath serveth to the honor of God; because we extol the name of him. And therein we confess God to be the greater and more excellent, since that (as we read

in the sixth chapter to the Hebrews,) We always swear by the greater. An oath is a certain confessing of the excellency of God. Wherefore, not without cause it is said in the law, *Lo tisa*; Thou shalt not bring in the name of God for a lie.

*Nasa* signifieth, To advance; as though they that swear, do by their oath extol the name of God. Yet must we not hereof conclude, if it be good, if it make to the honor of God, that therefore it should be often times used. For although an oath be appertaining to the service of God; yet is the institution of the same to help the need of the brethren, if credit be not given unto us, or else, where one party is not believed of another. So that, where such a need shall not happen, neither shall an oath be used. Even in like manner, as a medicine is in very deed profitable; yet whereas a fit occasion of a sick person urgeth not, it must not be ministered. But whereas it is said in the Gospel, that an oath cometh of evil, it is not prejudicial to the goodness of an oath. For it nothing at all hindereth, that some things do spring of an ill occasion, which notwithstanding are good; as be medicines, virtues, meats, and drinks.

2. In the old law, an oath was oftentimes to be taken: the which, if it be kept true, sound, and inviolable; faith also between men continueth pure, and perfect: but this being violated, hardly can faith itself remain sound. Neither is it unknown, that for many causes men are provoked unto perjury. First, because they do exceedingly desire to hurt him, whom they hate; and on the other side, by all means possible to gratify their friends. Sometimes they be moved by covetousness and greedy desire, being unwilling to pay that which they owe, to restore that which is laid to keep, or to recompense the harms done. In the 22nd chapter of Exodus, God commanded, that in the case of laying to pledge, and also in the case of theft and robbery, an

oath should be taken. In the book of numbers cursing's are commanded to be used for jealousy. And the epistle to the Hebrews teacheth, that very many controversies be decided by an oath. For when a thing cannot otherwise be done, we must fly unto God himself, who is the searcher of the heart and reins; and unto his eyes all things are manifest, be they never so secret. But when judges can define causes otherwise, they must not minister an oath unto those, which be the adversaries in law. But oftentimes proofs be wanting, neither are witnesses ready present, or else there is only one found; or he that is pleaded guilty, is troubled only upon report and suspicions, which be not very certain: in deed in such cases, an oath must be taken.

But in this matter must not be omitted, that by the lawyers there be appointed three or four kinds of swearing. [ 1] The first is a voluntary oath, which is both given and taken among private men, and that in covenants, bargains, and particular agreements; which kind of oath it is free for everyone to take or refuse. [ 2] An other is called necessary; because it cannot be refused without most great and weighty causes: for it is given by the judge or the magistrate. [ 3] The third, they do call judicial, the which the adversaries in law do one owe unto the other, which when it is offered by the defendant, unto the plaintiff, it is of necessity; otherwise it may be oftentimes refused. [ 4] Also there is an affirming oath, which belongeth unto the time present and past: for things that are to come, cannot be affirmed, seeing they be not known; although an oath of promise hath respect unto the time to come: and then is it showed, when we bind ourselves, either to do, or not to do anything. And in every oath God is called to be a witness, which thing is sometimes done simply, and

absolutely; and sometimes he is appealed unto, as to a judge and revenger against a liar.

3. There remaineth, that we see whether it be lawful for a Christian man to use an oath. Some there be, which utterly deny it, and detest it, because of the words of the Lord; But I say unto you, ye shall not swear at all, let your communication be yea yea, nay nay. But the father is not repugnant to the son. The Lord, in the 22nd of Exodus, commandeth the magistrate of Israel, in some certain cases, to take and demand an oath: therefore it is lawful. Isaiah, in the 65th and Jeremiah in the fourth, do promise in the name of God to the holy people, that they should swear by the true God. God did swear. Christ added to his speech; Verily, verily. He being adjured or charged by oath of the high priest, did not reprove the fact, as an evil thing; but he obeyed it. Paul, in the first to the Corinthians, the 15th chap. sweareth. And in the second to the Corinthians, he calleth God a witness unto his soul. The angels do swear. Moreover, an oath oftentimes redoundeth to the profit of our neighbor, and hath joined therewith an honor towards God; therefore it is not to be detested.

4. And little doth it further these men, when they say, that the sentences of the law and of the prophets do prove nothing. Since that we be a new people, there ought to be performed far more excellent things than be there contained: for the coming of Christ brought no new thing as touching works; only it brought a more ample spirit, and more plentiful grace. Undoubtedly, whatsoever good and healthful thing we can do, is contained in the law and the prophets. And would to God that we were able to accomplish such, and so many godly works, as God hath there provided to be expressed unto us! Seeing therefore that no man is better able to order politic governments and Common-wealth’s, than God himself, and that he

would, that an oath should there be of force; let us also suffer it there to be. For Christ came not to abolish Common-wealth's in politic governments; no rather, he left them in their own estate. And now, seeing the magistrate hath oftentimes to do with disloyal men, why should he not use the due remedy appointed by God? The words of Christ in the fifth of Matthew; Swear not at all, must be expounded, and are not so strictly to be understood as they sound. The meaning of Christ's words is, to require the law of us, that we should live together so faithfully, and according to charity, as we might have no need of an oath. Let everyone therefore take heed to himself, that he be not called by his own default, and that as touching this matter, he satisfy the words of Christ; who for all this saying, decreed not, but that (if we happen to deal with men that be not so affected, or endued with so much godliness, whom nevertheless it is expedient for us somewhat to believe) it is lawful to swear; especially where the glory of the Lord may be advanced.

Neither let it trouble thee, that Christ in his words hath this phrase; Not at all. For his speech was specially spoken against the Scribes and Pharisees, who were bold to say, that those oaths were established and firm, which be exhibited by the name of God: but those, which are sworn by heaven, by the earth, by the altar, by the temple, and such like, are not of force; and that therefore it is not lawful to transgress them. These things Christ confuteth, and would that all these oaths should be of great importance; and therefore persuadeth, that so far as lieth in our power, we should so live, and in such sort behave ourselves, as that through our default we be not called to an oath. Neither are the oaths, which are sworn by creatures, to be lightly esteemed, as they accounted them; seeing they are not created, to the end we should abuse them, as witnesses of our untruth: they ought to be

instruments of virtues, not of vices. And if we abuse them in this sort, the injury that is done is great, yea and that very great: for when they be called as witnesses in an oath, our mind telleth us of them, that they belong unto God, and that the power of God doth shine in them. For an oath (as it is in the epistle to the Hebrews) is always made by something greater than he that sweareth. But creatures be inferiors unto men, unless they be considered as they be the host of God, and do service unto him: and so to swear by creatures is not forbidden. Wherefore, when we swear, we use the holy Evangelists, the body of Christ, faith, and other like words.

Joseph sware by the life of Pharaoh. And Moses, and the prophets do call the heavens and the earth to witness of those words, which they were to speak unto the people. Let those oaths therefore, contrary unto the opinion of the Scribes and Pharisees, be firm and steadfast oaths: and as touching our own conversation, let us so live, that there be no need for us to sware; neither by God, nor yet by any other thing at all. And this is that same At all, which Christ spake of. There be also oaths made of cursing's: as Paul, who in the second to the Corinthians calleth God for a witness unto his soul. And in the holy scriptures of the Old Testament, they sware in a manner always by that particle If: and there wanteth the expressing of the curse, which must be always supplied of us. The doctrine of the Pharisees was so corrupt, as they judged themselves to fulfill the law thoroughly, if they performed the thing which they sware. But Christ declareth it to be otherwise; namely, that we ought to be of so great integrity of life, as oaths might be superfluous, and to be abolished. And by this self-same way we must interpret the words of James, in the which he saith; Let us not swear any oath, neither by heaven, nor by earth. By which means it is denied, that

the swearing by God should be in use of the godly, and so in like manner of swearing by creatures.

5. The Anabaptists use another argument; Things to come are not in our power to be done, and God may let the thing which we promise to do; Therefore it is better not to swear, than to promise doubtful things. For this is wittingly, to cast himself into the peril of perjury. But if this reason of theirs be of force, it will together take away all bargains, all promises, covenants, vows, yea and baptism itself; wherein we offer our name unto Christ, and bind ourselves, that we will live unto him, to renounce the devil and our sins: all which things nevertheless are approved by the oracles of God: those things (I say) which I have mentioned. Neither put we forth ourselves (as they think) into the danger of perjury: for when we swear, it sufficeth that we have this will, of performing that which we promise. But if so be God shall show, that we ought to do otherwise, and it shall be declared that our promise is against God's will; now ought not he, to whom we have sworn, to exact the same of us: which if perhaps he shall do, his right shall be accounted no right. For no servant can bind himself unto any man, without the will of his lord. And who knoweth not, that God is our Lord, and that we be bound to love him with all our strength, with all our heart, and with all our mind? Wherefore, so often as we swear, our desire is, that his will, and the obeying of him be evermore inviolate. Whereby appeareth the making frustrate of monastical vows: for there men do swear that, which is repugnant to the will of God; for which cause it must be abrogated and abolished. But concerning these vows, we shall speak larger hereafter: it sufficeth now, that we have made answer to this argument of the Anabaptists.

6. But now let us come to the describing of that, which is to be blamed in oaths. And let this be the first. If we swear anything, which is repugnant to the will of God, there sin is committed two ways; first, by swearing rashly; secondly, if we perform that which we have wickedly sworn: as Herod did, when he delivered the head of John Baptist, unto a most wicked dancing damsel. A great deal more wisely did David, in breaking his oath: for he had sworn, that he would kill Nabal the Carmelite; yet being thoroughly instructed, and pacified by the words of Abigael, he revoked that which he had sworn amiss. For he had said; So let God do unto the enemies of David, if of all that pertain unto Nabal, I leave one, &c. In which place it is to be noted, that we must not will anything; that we must not promise nor swear to do anything, that is not allowed by God. This have the words of God's law declared to us, wherein we be commanded to love God with all our heart, with all our strength, and with all our soul: and this have we undertaken to do in baptism. Therefore, whether we be sworn, or not sworn, we are never bound by any law, to do anything that is against the will of God. But and if we have sworn to do any such thing, the same must not be performed.

Neither ought any man to think, that he hath then broken his oath, seeing the same is not to be imputed as an oath: for the license of swearing extendeth no further, than God hath given scope unto the same. It is not convenient therefore, that we take an oath for anything, which is repugnant to the good pleasure of God. Howbeit, let everyone take heed, that he think not himself at any time discharged of his oath; unless that, for the which he hath sworn, be made impossible; or else perceiveth for a certainty, that the same is repugnant to the word of God, no not although the Pope would dispense with him never so often. Antichrist is not able to make frustrate the

word of God. But those oaths, which be void and of none effect, because they be against the law of God, be dispensed with even of themselves: neither is there need of [such] apostolical (yea rather diabolical) power, to make them frustrate and of none effect.

But if thou shalt object unto me the oath of the Gabaonites, wherein the children of Israel promised that which was against the decree of God; namely, that they would enter into league with the men of that province, and yet God would the same to be established, for that he minded that the stock of Saul should be punished for that oath. We answer, that the oath or covenant in his own nature was void, and of none effect: but that God held the same established, because he would bring punishment upon the Jews; namely, when they had over-rashly sworn unto them, without consideration of God's word. Wherefore it was necessary afterward, that they should suffer them among them. And forsomuch as God allowed of the oath, therefore by his decree it was afterward of strength, although immediately upon the making thereof it was void. And at the last this thing redounded to the honor and commodity of the people, so as in very deed they had these strangers to be the hewers of wood, and which always drew water unto the ministers of God.

8. [ 2] Another thing that is to be blamed in an oath, is, if a man do not swear, but forswear. Which sin is so grievous, as of that only, among the ten commandments, you find written, Lo linke, He will not forgive him, He will not hold him guiltless. For God is highly offended, when we abuse his name to confirm our lies. But if so be the basest sort of men many times cannot abide, that they should be accounted witnesses of a lie; how much less will God suffer a lie? Besides, our neighbor taketh very great hurt, not of the body, substance, or name; but of the mind, that is to wit, of reason: for he

that is a forswearer, doth always beguile and deceive; which is to seduce the reason of man. Politic governments, and common-wealth's also are overthrown, unless we stand unto our oaths and covenants. And this the Hebrews, in a certain Apology of theirs do declare; who write, that when the tables were given upon mount Sina, so soon as the law was made concerning perjury, the whole world was shaken. Let everyone therefore beware of it, and let him keep faith even with his enemies, with thieves and murderers, though it be with the loss of his goods or life. For this cause Regulus is commended, who returned to the Carthaginians, although he knew, that at his return he should suffer most grievous punishments: for he minded to satisfy his oath. Augustine in his book *De civitate Dei*, not without just cause, setteth forth his praises; albeit his counsel, whereby he hindered the peace, cannot be praised or allowed. But in that he would in any wise keep his oath inviolate, even to the hazard of his own life, doth not that deserve very great admiration? Neither is it any let, which some men say; that by returning unto thieves, murderers, and cruel men, if a man know for a certainty that he should be slain, is to cast himself into danger, and to tempt God. For this man was now already, by the will of God, delivered into the hands of his enemies; neither did he escape thence, without using the testimony of the name of God. Wherefore it behooved him to return, least God should be had in derision; unless it had been revealed unto him, that the same should be against the word of God.

9. [ 3] Moreover, we offend in an oath, if a man use crafty and deceitful words, purposing to take them according as he himself understandeth them, and not as it seemeth to the ears of them which stand by: such a man is not exempted from perjury. For an oath was devised to finish controversies, Hebrews 6. not to sow them, and to stir them up more. Neither ought we to

use this remedy, to the deceiving and beguiling of minds, which serveth to the establishing of them. Far be it, that deceit should arise from thence; where truth ought most of all to show itself. [ 4] Also let us take heed of another defect in swearing; namely, that we swear not often for light causes, and rashly, being urged thereunto by no necessity, whereby the word of God might be of the less estimation. Seldom therefore must any swearing be used, and that for weighty causes: and so shall we the better avoid perjury. Yea and Augustine in the 28th sermon *De verbis apostoli*, writeth, that Christ and James the apostle forbad an oath; not to the end they would utterly take away the same from the affairs of men; but because we might beware of perjury, in not swearing upon light occasion.

10. [ 5] Lastly, in an oath let us avoid this; that we swear it not by the name of idols: for that is forbidden in the 23rd chapter of Exodus, and in the 23rd chapter of Joshua. And God will have us to swear by his own name: for herein the worshipping of God is intermingled, which should not be attributed unto idols. Howbeit Augustine, in his epistle *Ad Publicolam*, granteth unto the faithful, that when need shall require, they may take an oath of the infidels, in the name of their idols; for otherwise, there could be no peace nor truce confirmed with them. In an oath there is chiefly this confirmation of the will, which is a certain good thing, that we may use when we have need. And whereas they offer not the same, but under the name of idols, it grieveth us: and if it lay in us to amend it, we would willingly do it. Once (saith he) we read in the scriptures, that it was done by Jacob, when he took an oath of Laban: Laban sware by the God of Abraham, and by the God of Nachor his father, and by the God of their fathers. But whereas they were idolaters in Babel and in Mesopotamia, it is manifest that that oath was celebrated in the name of strange gods: as Ibn-

Ezra doth testify upon that place. But if so be thou wilt say, that there the name of faithful Abraham is mingled with the other: it maketh no matter at all, because he joineth unto him Nachor, and the fathers of them; that thou may understand, Abraham to be there comprehended under the name of that worshipping, under the which he lived in his own country with his parents, which were idolaters: as we read in last of Joshua. But Jacob sware by the true God, whom he calleth the fear of Isaac: wherefore everyone sware there, according to his own religion. These things be spoken probably; howbeit, I know that some of the fathers were of the mind, that Laban sware there by the true God. But Augustine in the place, which I have now alleged, maketh for me.

11. But it appeareth, that Abigael seemeth to swear by a creature: and hereof the Papists gather, that it is lawful to swear by saints. But that we may understand, with how great reason they affirm it, we must call to mind what is an oath. An oath therefore is a calling to record of the name of God, to the confirmation of those things, which either we have spoken, or promised. When God is called to be a witness, there is given unto him, even that worship, which is most high and singular. For so we testify, that God is present every-where, and seeth all things, and will punish, if a man do offend. And this is fit for none, but for God only: for saints neither be in every place, nor yet see all things. And it is requisite, that all worshipping should proceed of faith; which faith of necessity is none, insomuch as touching the presence of the saints, we can learn nothing out of the holy scripture. Why then do we call them to witness, of whom we know not whether we be heard? Further, they cannot punish whom they would: wherefore these things appertain unto God only. Thus it is written in the sixth of Deuteronomy; Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and him only thou

shalt worship, and thou shalt swear by his name. Here, there is an oath joined unto the worshipping of God. Foolishly therefore and ungodly did Socrates, when he sware by a dog and a goose: and the Manichees also, when they sware by the light.

Jerome upon these words of Christ in Matthew; Thou shalt not swear, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, saith, that he doth not forbid us to swear, but that we should not swear by creatures. And in the fourth Council of Carthage (which place is also cited in the 22nd cause, question 1. in the title Clericus) it is forbidden, that any should swear by creatures: and it is added; that If a clerk shall so swear, he should be excommunicated and deposed. But we must note, that God is sometime called to record, not absolutely; but either with vows and prayers, or else with cursing's and execrations. With prayers, as when we say; As I would live; As God shall help me. Thus sware Joseph; By the life of Pharaoh: as if he should say; So let Pharaoh live, as that which I say is true. And in times past they were wont to swear by the angel of Caesar, and by the safety of his children. Howbeit, such form of oaths was taken away in the Code. But the curses are on this sort; I'll come unto me: or; Let me be confounded. So David in the psalm; If I have done this (saith he) and if there be any wickedness in mine hands, then let mine enemy take away mine honor from me, and tread my life in the dust. In these two forms, there is nothing to hinder, but that the name of any creature, unto whom we will either good or evil, may be mingled with them. But that name of the creature is only there set down indirectly: for it is no direct and full oath. On this wise it may be expounded; As I would live: that is, So God give me life; or else, So let me be confounded: that is, So let God confound me. Here the name of God is held in silence, whereas in very deed the whole efficacy and taking record

in the oath, is referred unto him only. As on the contrary part, when we say; Thus and thus God do by me: the name of God is expressed, but the things themselves be kept under silence. Wherefore these things do not further the Papists at all, for to prove it lawful hereby, to call saints which be dead unto an oath.

12. But let us see how rightly David sware unto Semei, that he should not die; when as afterward, being at the point of death, he instructed Solomon concerning his affairs, and charged him, among other things, that he should put Semei to death. He seemeth not to stand to his oath, or else he sware not that well, which he would not have kept. If he sware, he ought to have stood to his oath: if he minded not to keep his oath, he should not have sworn. Some say it ought thus to be meant; that he should not be killed, while David himself lived: if he took order, that he should be killed after his death, that then he brake not his oath. But this exception was not expressed in the form of the oath; That which a man doth by another man, he seemeth to do it himself. He which promiseth anything, must not alonely perform the same; but he must apply his endeavor, that the promise which he hath made, may be performed. So as David ought not to have stirred up his son Solomon against Semei; but he should have given charge, that the promise made by him might not have been violated. If a man will say, that although the condition were not expressed; yet the same was in his mind, when he did swear: we must consider how an oath is to be interpreted, whether according to the mind of him that sweareth, or of him to whom the oath is made. Touching this point, there seemeth to be contrary opinions. Isidorus in the decrees, the 22nd cause, question the fifth, the chapter *Quacunque art*, writeth; In every art let men weigh the words of the oath. God, who is the witness of consciences, taketh those words, as he, to whom they be

sworn, understandeth them. He judgeth that the oath must be understood, according to the meaning of him, to whom it is made.

Gregory in his Morals, the 26th book, was of another mind; The ears of men judge our words to be such, as they sound outwardly: but the judgments of God do hear such things spoken outwardly, as they be uttered from within. And so he would have it to appear, that the words of them which swear, should be understood according to the mind of him that maketh the oath. These two opinions are reconciled even by the School-men, and among others by Thomas Aquinas. Oaths be made, either as concerning the conscience, or else in respect of outward pleadings. If we speak of the conscience, he which sweareth, either dealeth simply and sincerely, or else craftily and by fraud. If sincerely, then is he bound to keep no more but that which he meant to do: but if fraudulently, then let him be sure, that he is bound to the meaning of him, whom he would have beguiled. But if an oath be made in civil pleadings, the words of them which be sworn, must be taken according to the common meaning. If there happen a doubt, the magistrate shall be the judge thereof. But return we to David: if he dealt sincerely, and had the foresaid condition in his mind; he was not bound to Semei, in respect of his conscience. If he meant to apply himself to the time, and by any means to beguile him, he sware not in truth. Wherefore let us use this invincible argument; Either he meant to keep his promise, or he meant it not; If he meant it not, he should not have sworn; If he meant it, he should have performed it, if it were lawful. If an oath do confirm an unjust thing, it must not be kept. Now to promise impunity to a wicked man, which hath broken the law of the Lord (for the law saith, Thou shalt not curse the prince of thy people) is not just: wherefore he was not to perform the oath which he made.

The oaths which be made unadvisedly, ought not to be performed. These be of those sort of things, which always have an evil end, turn which way thou wilt. If so be thou perform them not, thou hast sworn naughtily: if thou do perform them, thou makest a double offense. Neither here availeth the instance of the Israelites fact with the Gabaonites. They seem to have sworn that, which was not lawful; and yet they thought themselves bound unto their oath. In very deed we say, that they were not bound: for the Gabaonites dissembled with them. When he that sweareth, is deceived, he is not bound. But the Israelites thought that they should blemish the name of God, if they did not stand to their agreement; and that the oath which they made, was not contrary unto the word of God. God would not have had them to make peace with the Canaanites, of their own accord: but it is added; Unless they had demanded peace: but they alone desired it. This therefore is not against the commandment of God; especially seeing they not only did receive the religion of the Israelites, but also were appointed for perpetual service unto the tabernacle. Also the Israelites thought themselves to be deceived by their own fault, because they had not taken counsel from the mouth of the Lord. The promise, which David made, was not lawful; namely, that a wicked man should be spared. Therefore it is no marvel, if afterward he warned Solomon, that this evil might be amended.

13. But very many do doubt, whether it be lawful to offer an oath unto him, which is suspected of perjury; and by great conjectures is thought that he will be forsworn. For not only sins must be avoided, but also there must be no occasions of sinning offered unto our neighbors. To this I answer: It is necessary for us to ponder, that they, which offer an oath, be not all of one sort. Wherefore, if they be judges that do it, and that the order of law require, that an oath should be offered; in obeying of the law, they sin not.

Let them commit the matter unto God, and diligently warn him of his duty, unto whom they offer the oath. For (as it hath been said) the law of God in Exodus commanded, that in certain cases an oath should be taken. This if the judge observe, it cannot rightly be said, that he giveth a true occasion of perjury. But if so be the oath shall be voluntary; to wit, between private persons, it must not be offered to such a man, as upon just cause is suspected of perjury. For it is not lawful to any man, for his own advantage sake, to provoke another man unto sin. As touching private conclusions, bargains, and covenants, let them be omitted, rather than for our sakes the name of God should be made a jesting stock. Wherefore that which Solomon desireth, is holy and just; namely, that evil may be taken away from the people, and that men may be terrified from taking of the name of the Lord in vain; either by denying of a truth, or affirming a falsehood by the testimony of his name. King Solomon desired nothing, but that he knew God himself did like of. For in the ten commandments it is written; Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for God will not account him innocent that so doth, but will grievously punish him, as one that is guilty. That this might come to pass, Solomon desired, and especially unto them that forswear themselves in that house, which he had lately built.

The oaths, which (as I said) were taken, were accustomed to be done over against the altar of sacrifice, that is, in the court of those men that were clean. But the oath of profane persons, which commonly they call the laity, was done at the wall, whereby the court of the priests was severed from the same. Certainly, an oath was invented for the honor and glory of the name of God, and was commanded in the law. So then it is the part of a good prince, to be very circumspect, that it fall not out otherwise; namely, to the contumely and injury of God. And therefore Solomon is to be commended,

when he prayeth, that the honor due unto the name of God might remain entire; and that every man's own, so far forth as is possible, might be rendered unto him; and that the law of laying to pledge, or of stealing, or of doing harm might be kept inviolate. But at the first show it seemeth, that Solomon did not the office of a godly king; because he desireth justice and damnation unto sinners. To this may be answered, that he likewise, on the other side, desireth good things unto those that were innocent; namely, that right judgment might be ministered unto them, and that God would defend their cause. Further, it must be considered, that the glory of God, and public safety, is to be preferred before the commodities of private men. But God hath dealt much more severely against perjury, as it is in the sixth chapter of Leviticus: for there he not only condemned the perjured man: but also all those, which being privy of the perjury, held their peace. For the law commanded, that they, which for a certainty knew, that an oath was falsely taken, should in stepping forth reveal the same, that the name of God might not be had in derision. Wherefore Solomon prayeth God, that he will hear it out of heaven.

# CHAP. VII. The fourth Precept; of sanctifying the sabbath day.

In the seventh day God finished his work, which he had made; not that he created anything the seventh day, but that so far forth, as our understanding reacheth, it might be known, that he finished all things the seventh day; when as we know that there was nothing made by him upon that day. Some think that the letter Caph which is added unto Yod doth signify, Before: and they cite the place out of the 25th chapter of Deuteronomy; Thou shalt not muzzle the ox, before the treading out of the corn. But it proveth it not; because here we may also understand it, in the treading out. Howbeit here in very deed there is no question: for the same consummation, perfection, or finishing of creatures is not any work added to things created the sixth day; but that on this seventh day, the things are noted to have been finished and made perfect. In that he rested the seventh day, understand it not, from labor, but from the work of creating. For, Rest, may betoken two things; either the end and termination of that which is done, and so it is taken in this place; or else as a refreshing after labor, which thing must not be ascribed unto God (for without any manner of

labor did he create the world.) But as the Hebrews say, in the letter *He*, which is uttered with a breath only; By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them, with the breath of his mouth: Psalm 33. Let us here pass over the mysteries of the number of seven, wherewith undoubtedly God is delighted; seeing he hath comprised in that number, the great and noble things, which he made and commanded. And this only let us note, that of every seven days, one must be reserved unto God. How did God cease from working, seeing he now also worketh? Yea and he is a pure and mere act: neither is that most blessed action of his staid at any time. We say that this must be understood of other new creatures, whereof God created none afterward: yet he always worketh, in governing and preserving of them: for; In him we live, move, and have our being, and while he enjoyeth himself, who is the eternal felicity.

Wherefore let them go, which look for more worlds after this world of ours. One only world there is, and the self-same end of creatures, according as it is here described. Neither is there cause, why man need to fear, least any creature should be made above him. And this is not the least glory of man, that God did rest after the creation of him, and that in him he finished the work of the whole world. It is said, that God blessed the seventh day. But To bless, is, To give and bestow something. What hath God given unto us by this seventh day? Very much: even this world filled and fraught with all good things. What marvel is it if afterward it were most acceptable unto him, to be worshipped upon the very same day; seeing it is written, Give him of that wherewith he hath blessed thee? He blessed the seventh day. This did he chiefly give unto it, that therein men should rest, and apply themselves to the service of God. Rabbi Agnon saith, that this blessing doth light upon those, which observe and sanctify the same sabbath. Neither did

the observation hereof begin, when the law was given in Sina; but it was celebrated before that time: as appeareth in the raining down of Manna, Exodus the 16th.

2. To sanctify (as it is taken in this place) is, To appoint something to the worshipping of God: for, else-where it signifieth diverse things. And God sanctified the sabbath, by the very deed itself, when he rested from his work. The which sanctification, he not only rehearsed afterward in the law, but also observed it in act: seeing upon that day he gave no Manna to the people in the wilderness. But whether shall the people, either in that day, or in any other day be idle? No truly. But even as God ceased not from all action, but only from the bringing forth of natural things: even so we also must abstain from the deeds of our corrupted nature; yet not to be discouraged from obeying the motions of God: nay rather, we must the more persist in in this only work upon the holy days. And so doth Paul expound in the fourth chapter to the Hebrews; that we should refrain ourselves not from every kind of work, but from our own works: which a Christian man ought to do so long as he liveth. So then we in Christianity must not be accused, because we keep not the sabbath day [of the Jews] seeing we have consecrated all the time of our life into a sabbath. And therefore understand ye it allegorically, that this seventh day is named to have neither morning nor evening, for because this is in very deed a perpetual rest unto the children of God.

Here consider thou the order of things. Some things are created for man, therefore man was made after them. But man was made for the service of God; therefore straightway after his creation, was brought in the blessing and sanctification of the sabbath. Hereby men are admonished, that if the church give them commandment to employ themselves in the service of

God upon any day in the week; this is not altogether the devise of man: and that it doth not appertain only to the law of Moses, but that it had also a beginning from hence, and that it serveth to the imitation of God. But if thou demand, why the day of observation of the sabbath, is not retained here in our church? I answer, that we have most of all retained the same; so that we ought to have all days to be such, as we should rest from our own works. But that one day, rather than another, should be chosen for the outward worshipping of God, it was free for the church, through Christ, to appoint that, which it should judge most fit for the purpose. Neither did it judge amiss, if in observing of the Lord's Day, it preferred the memory of our present restoring; that is, the resurrection of Christ, before this finishing of the workmanship of the world.

3. But Paul, by the one of the sabbaths, meant the day of the holy assembly. God might indeed have assigned all, or many days, for the worshipping of him; but seeing he knew that we were commanded to eat our bread in the sweat of our face, he requireth of us one day in the week, wherein leaving off from other works, we should apply our selves only unto him. And even as in other ceremonies, there is something perpetual and eternal; and something changeable and temporal (Even as in circumcision and baptism it is a perpetual thing, that they which belong unto the covenant of God, and are joined to the people of God, should be marked with some outward sign; yet nevertheless, the kind of sign was mutable and temporal. For God, at his own will, appointed the same to be done, either by cutting away of the foreskin, or else by the washing of water. Perpetual also and eternal it is, that so long as the church is here conversant upon the earth, a maintenance of living is due unto the ministers thereof. But whether the same should arise by tenths, or by certain lands, or by money paid out of the

common treasury, it may diverse ways be done, according as is most fit for the regions and times:) Even so is it assured and firm, that there is one day in the week reserved for the service of God: whether of the days be appointed, that is temporal, and may be changed. In old time, by order of the law, the sabbath was observed, for to revive the memory of making of the world: but now the Lord's Day is used in the remembrance of the resurrection of Christ, and therefore to confirm the hope of our resurrection to come. But when this alteration was made, we have it not expressed in the holy scriptures: yet in the Revelation of John, we have express mention of the Lord's Day. And it is very likely, that the first Christians, for a certain time, retained the Jewish custom of meeting together upon the sabbath day. But the thing (as we see) was afterward changed.

4. And why I should think, that in that place is understood the Lord's Day, I am led by the Hebrew phrase, wherein one signifieth the first: as in the book of Genesis; And the evening and morning were one day, that is, The first day. Also in another place, when it is written; In one of the month, it is meant, The first day of the month. And when it is written; One month, it must be understood, The first month. Also we read in the Gospel of Mark, the 16th chapter; And early in the morning in one of the sabbaths, they came unto the sepulcher, the sun being now risen: where manifestly by one of the sabbaths, is understood the Lord's Day. Matt. the 28th: In the evening of the sabbath, when the first day of the week began to dawn. So it is also written in the 24th chapter of Luke, and in the 20th of John. And to inflame our minds to give alms unto the poor, Paul did very fitly choose the day of the holy congregation; because of the word of God, public prayers, and godly lessons, which be used upon that day: through all which things we be put in remembrance of the benefits, which God for his mercy sake hath

bestowed upon us. Also we receive the sacraments, whereby is renewed the memory of that most excellent benefit: I mean the death of our Lord Jesus Christ.

And what Christian mind is not persuaded to benefit his neighbor, by the godly remembrance of so great a good turn? Who is it that will not, when he revolveth in himself with a godly mind, that the son of God gave himself unto death, even to the death of the cross for his sake, that will not (I say) alonely impart some of that earthly riches, which is bestowed upon him; but rather give himself for his brethren? We confess also the communion of saints, which will be either very slender, or none at all; unless it be confirmed by liberality towards the poor. But there is no token of godliness, or communion of Christians more excellent, than is charity. Neither are we for this cause to be accused as observers of days, and of times, as were the Galatians; as though we attribute more holiness to one day, than to another. We only for order sake, and a certain civil custom of the church, do meet together upon that day, rather than upon another. But in the epistle to the Galatians, either they are reprehended by Paul, which renewed the Jewish feast days; or else the Ethnics, which superstitiously observed the days of the Egyptians, or of those that professed the Mathematical sciences.

5. Moreover, there may be many causes reckoned, why God would have the people yearly, besides the sabbath day, to ascend to the place which he had chosen for religion sake. First he appointed the same, because the remembrance of his benefits should not be forgotten, but should be revived by yearly peregrinations. For in the feast of Passover was celebrated the memory of their deliverance out of Egypt; and in the Pentecost, the remembrance of the law given by Moses. Further, in both the solemnities, there was thanks given for the new fruits received. For in the feast of Easter,

they offered the first fruits of barley; and at Pentecost they offered bread made of new wheat. Lastly, in the feast of Tabernacles was remembered the benefit, whereby God sustained the fathers by the space of forty years in the wilderness; and thanks were given, because they had now gathered in all the sorts of fruits. And rightly were these three principal parts of the gifts of God called to remembrance, in these three peregrinations: for they be special good things, wherein consisteth the society of man. For the first felicity of any nation is, that there be a common-wealth, and that it be free: and this the Jews obtained, when they were delivered out of the hard bondage of Egypt. The second felicity is, to have laws and religion proper to themselves: for no common-wealth consisteth without laws and religion. The third is, that there be no want of things necessary for life. Wherefore, the remembrance of these benefits was yearly renewed by the commandment of God.

Further, another cause of this ascending to the feasts at Jerusalem, was, that the mutual concord of the people in divine service and religion might be preserved. For when the Jews were once gathered together, and did their sacrifices, all after one and the self-same order; it was most prudently provided, that sundry religions should not arise. The first cause was, that the priests and Levites might openly teach them concerning the law and holy service, whereby the people returned home much better instructed, than when they came thither. There is also a sixth cause alleged, that in such an assembly, and mutual beholding of one another, charity might the more grow and increase among the tribes. For they saw and talked one with another, they kept their feasts together; and that which was most of all, they joined in public and solemn prayers together. Furthermore, by these peregrinations, there ensued a necessary sustentation of the holy ministry.

For the oblations and sacrifices were multiplied, the greatest part whereof came to the priests and Levites. Besides this, the minds of them that prayed, was confirmed, that God would hear their prayers: for he promised, that in that place he would fulfill the prayers of the people. Which cause undoubtedly should move us, to celebrate holy congregations: for notwithstanding that we may pray at home; yet seeing he promised that he will allow of our prayers, where two or three shall be gathered together in his name; therefore the appointed celebrations of the meeting together in the church must not be neglected.

Moreover, God would, that by such godly peregrinations, they should testify their obedience; especially, in that they did not choose the place, whereunto they had access; but it was appointed by the will of God. And it must not be omitted, that that place did represent Messias unto the fathers, without whom no works of men, though they be trim and goodly in show, can please God. Lastly, that work was a notable exercise of faith: for, so often as they were to go up unto the place, which was assigned for divine service, the Hebrews were compelled to leave all vacant and without guard at home. For the enemies were at liberty in the meantime, to break forth, to waste, and destroy all things. Howbeit, they obeyed the word of God, and little regarded whatsoever should happen; committing all that ever they had to the safeguard of God. And so great a confidence had they towards God, as they doubted not, but he would defend their borders, although they were desolate. Three times every year it behooved everyone of mankind to show himself before the Lord; and that at those certain and determinate feasts, which I have before mentioned. But the women, forsomuch as either they were great with child, or else might easily be hindered upon other just

causes, were not bound so to do. Howbeit, when they had no other impediment, they came of their own accord.

6. But to celebrate solemnly the day of a man's birth, it hath been a custom of all nations: and in my judgment, it is not done amiss, so that there be used a godly modesty. Surely it is a notable gift, that we may be reckoned among the number of God's creatures. And who doubteth, but that it is well done, to give thanks unto God for it, and in thanks-giving to testify the joyfulness of mind, by an outward token of some modest banquet? The use of honest pleasures is such, as they have always godliness joined with them. But in the meantime, let us remember that, which we see happened in the banquet of Herod, when he celebrated his birth day. For he used things, which were not decent; namely, the dancing's of young women, and rash swearing's: whereof followed that cruel example, so as he struck off the head of John. This is not to give God thanks for his great benefit, but to serve the belly and greedy desires. Further, it must not be allowed in Christians, that they should keep in solemn remembrance the original of their flesh; and yet be forgetful of their regeneration in Christ. This benefit ought chiefly to stick in our minds, that we be planted and engrafted into Christ.

# CHAP. VIII. The fifth Precept; of the honoring of Superiors.

Honor is here taken, not only for a certain outward reverence, wherewith we reverence the estate of our neighbor; but also for the outward help, sustentation, and aid, wherewith we relieve them which have need. But it hath also other significations. So therefore parents must be honored: for which act, rewards are not only promised, but are also given. Contrarywise, we know that Cham suffered punishment, who had his father in derision. Wherefore, in them must honor be done unto the image of God. For this cause Solomon, so soon as he heard that his mother was present, he rose up, and went to meet her, and received her reverently, having regard to the commandment of God; Honor thy father and thy mother. But some man will say; Was it seemly for him, being a king, to reverence her? Aulus Gellius, in his second book, entitled *Noctium Atticarum*, the second chapter, disputing of this matter saith, that Once the president of Creta came with his father to Athens, and went to Taurus the philosopher, and that there was brought a seat. Which being prepared, the philosopher bad the father of the president to sit down: who answered; Let rather this man sit, pointing to his

son: for (saith he) he is a magistrate of the people of Rome. But Taurus said; Sit thou down in the meantime, till we shall discuss among ourselves, whether it becometh rather thee or him to sit; seeing thou art his father, and he a magistrate of the Roman Common-wealth. Wherefore the father sat down: and the son also sat, having another stool brought for him. Then, after much talk, the opinion of Taurus was, that in public places and offices, the jurisdiction of parents, being compared with their children, placed in authority, ceaseth for a while, and for a time giveth place; but that out of public actions, and public places, public honors cease between them, and that the son must give place unto his parent.

Further, the same author addeth an example of Quintus Fabius Maximus, who being made Consul, and his father coming on horseback to meet him, commanded him by an officer to light down: which thing he not only took not in ill part, but he rejoiced in his son, which knew how to exercise with authority and manfully, the office committed unto him by the people of Rome. Wherefore, if Solomon, doing the part of a private man, honored his mother; he committed nothing, but that which was meet for him, giving a due honor unto his mother. He sat down in his throne, and commanded that his mother should sit down in a most honorable place by him. But as touching those things, which were declared by her, he referred them not to her judgment; but he himself gave sentence, not expecting the consent of his mother. So as, when children that be in office of authority, are compared together with their parents, the comparison is of two kinds of paternity. For in very deed, the son, as he is a prince, is made the father even of his own father; when notwithstanding, as touching nature, he is a son. Wherefore he ought to judge of those things, which be either spoken or propounded by his faither.

2. Furthermore, let not parents be over mild towards their children. Indeed children are the bowels of their parents; wherefore they cannot be corrected of them without great sorrow to themselves: which nevertheless must be lightly passed over, in respect of the honor of God, and the safety of their children. But this did not Helie, who over favorably rebuked his children; for he should have set every one of their faults effectually before their eyes: since it is a lighter matter unto them, and of small force to their hearing, when their faults be reckoned up generally; than when every particular crime is with authority objected against them. And when they are sharply reckoned up one by one, they move them after a more vehement sort. Moreover, he did not reprove them, by avouching anything, but only under condition; So (saith he) the talk goeth; So it is reported unto me: as if he had said; If the things be true, which I hear, ye do grievously offend. But he should have said; This is your wickedness; These be your faults; Thus heinously do ye offend. Undoubtedly, they which coldly and mildly do admonish, seek nothing but to avoid ill will.

That Helie used not severity and correction enough, hereby it appeareth; in that he was for the same cause reproved afterward, both by the man of God, and by Samuel. Which would not have happened, if he, in reproving his children, had used the authority of the high priest, and not the tenderness of a father. The man was old, and at that time men are wont to be more inclined unto mercy. Josephus said, that he, from that time forward, did weep in a manner always; for that he expected a most certain punishment to be done upon his children by God. Chrysostom, against the dispraisers of monastical life, writeth; that He ought not only to have punished his children with words, but to have chastened them with stripes, to have cast them off, to have disgraded them of priesthood, and not to have suffered

such wicked caitiffs to remain in the ministry. Ambrose the bishop of Millen compelled unto open repentance, not his children (I say) but Theodosius himself, being the emperor. Also Marcion, when he had defiled a maiden, was expelled the church by his father, being a bishop: after which he coming to Rome, and there could not be accepted to the peace and communion [of the church] devised a wicked heresy.

Peradventure this old man Helie was somewhat ambitious, and endeavored to retain still the priesthood in his family: in the mean while he by such means did that which was very ill, both for himself, his children, and his family. Further, it is to be considered, that Helie blamed not his children of his own accord, and free motion; but was after a sort constrained thereto, at the complaints and cries of the people. Verily, we be all so disposed, through our naughty and corrupt nature, as we reprove others against our wills; for our mind is to please all men, and to displease none. Also, man is a creature that desireth fellowship: therefore he feareth in a manner always, least if he should rebuke others, and more frankly admonish them, he should be accounted unworthy of society, and be called a furious and stern man. For such be they esteemed to be, which are wont to speak freely and truly. And this most of all happened unto the prophets, that while they reproved men's faults, they were of many reputed for mad men. For so the princes of the army demanded of Jehu, as touching the disciple of Elisha; To what end cometh this mad man unto thee? Again, it is most truly said of the Comical poet; that Truth breedeth hatred. So likewise Paul unto the Galatians said; Am I become an enemy to you for speaking the truth? Wherefore Helie thought it not meet, to take such a thing in hand, as might breed him displeasure: but did like a good Mitio in correcting of his children. Fair speech pleaseth all men, and soft words are heard quietly, and

without grudge. Also there be some, which mislike the admonishing and correcting of men; because they have an evil conscience of their own, and consider that they themselves also may be justly reproved: these do fear, least that saying should be objected against them; Thou hypocrite, first take the beam out of thine own eye. Cicero against Verres writeth, that He which is ready to pronounce against another man, doth bind himself to live uprightly.

3. Moreover, Ambrose hath well noted: first, that the father ought to take heed, that if he have more children than one, he show not himself more loving to one of them than to another; for so may he easily mar that child, which he favoreth above the rest: since by reason of his father's good will, he will soon take a liberty of sinning. Further, the rest of the brethren will easily be inflamed with hatred or envy against him: which thou must provide that it happen not. At the least wise he himself, which perceiveth that he is more made of by his father, than the rest, while thereby he swelleth with insolency, and advanceth himself with pride, is pulled away from his brethren, with whom he ought to have been most nearly joined. But if so be that the father do love his son, let him win unto him the good-will of the other brethren; and those, whom nature hath knit together, let not fathers affection divide in sunder. For, to the keeping of household peace among brethren, an equal tribution is required. Thou seest in the patriarch Jacob, how great evil happened thereby. And if so be that brethren be so offended, for a special garment given to one, and not to the rest; what thinkest thou they will do, if possessions and lands be bequeathed by the father or mother, to one above the rest? But if the father will at any time excuse this his love, more bent to one than to another, saying; I have respect unto virtue, I love him most that attaineth to more virtue and industry than

the rest: I allow of it, that thou love more; but yet thou must beware, that thou do not lightly show forth evident tokens of this love: there must be a respect had unto their age. Yoong men are much affected unto anger and hatred; which affections ought rather of the wise father to be repressed and kept under, than to be stirred up.

4. As touching the man and woman, Chrysostom doubted, whether before they sinned, one were of more dignity than the other; so as while things were yet perfect, the woman were subject to the man. Which thing he denieth, and seemeth to lean unto the holy scriptures. For when God had fashioned Eve, thus it is written of her; She is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: and the rest that followeth. Neither in very deed is there any mention made of subjection. But after sin, this saying was added; Thy desire shall be subject to thy husband, and he shall bear rule over thee. Nevertheless I think, that even when nature was uncorrupted, seeing woman was more imperfect than man, she should after a sort have been ruled by him: for she was made for him, and to be a help unto him. But when sin had now corrupted our nature, the imperfection of woman was grievously increased; and therefore she had need to be more severely ruled by man. Wherefore, as things now be, Aristotle, otherwise an Ethnic, seemed not to think amiss, who saith; that It is not convenient, that a wife should not differ from a servant, because this is barbarous. The barbarous sort, in so much as they have that part of their mind rude, which ought to rule (for they be not instructed in good science and virtue) therefore they seem to be made to serve: neither do they account of their wives otherwise than of bondslaves. But this is contrary unto nature, who is not accustomed to apply one instrument to two or more kind of works: one fitly serveth for one work.

Therefore it is not meet, that one woman should both be a wife and a servant to any man.

And in the ninth book of his Ethics, he appointeth the dominion of *Aristocratia* to be between man and wife; in the which kind of government, he is the chief, which excelleth in virtue and worthiness. Whereby it appeareth, that the husband is the head of his wife; because in virtue and wisdom he ought to excel her. And although this do not always come to pass; yet reason would, that for the most part it should so be. But Paul in the holy scriptures commandeth, that Men should love their wives, as Christ loved the church: but Christ so loved the church, as he both purged it, and made it safe. Even as in the government of excellent men, they which bear rule, do not only respect their own profit, but the public wealth; and the head doth not exercise tyranny against the members: even so, between man and wife there ought to be no need of violence. Which I speak, not to this end, as though men were not bound to reform and constrain their wives that offend; for Christ doth sometime both chasten and correct his church: but this he doth, to the intent he may make it the better. So, if men correct and chasten their wives at any time, it is meet for them to do it with that charity, wherewith Christ amendeth his church. But this they do not, who in a rage, and only to satisfy their own desire, do miserably handle them. And God doubtless, by the hands and industry of men, because of their estate and natural dignity, bestoweth many things upon women. But if it be otherwise done at any time, that men are either taught to be better, or else obtain any gifts of God by means of women; that happeneth but seldom, and it is nothing prejudicial to the order appointed by God.

5. Furthermore, we must take heed what is due to everyone. Unless the widow of Sarepta had certainly known it to be the special will of God, she

should not have done this; namely, to defraud herself and her son, to the intent she might sustain a man being a stranger. Neither ought prophets, or men of God, by the accustomed rule of piety, to require this of any men, that they should maintain them, without taking care for themselves and their children. For even the apostle to Timothy did plainly pronounce; that They which have not a care of their own, and especially of their family, have denied the faith, and are become worse than infidels: and therefore he would that widows should be maintained by them of their own kindred. But when the widow was now certified by the special will of God, it was not for her to have respect what was commanded by the law in general; neither might that take place, which is made a common proverb: Charity first beginneth at a man himself. Howbeit, as touching the common course, that we may perfectly discern, to whom we be more or less bound, and not to be deceived; we must consider, that there be diverse kinds of societies, kindreds, and friendships. One is spiritual; another is bodily, or of the same stock; another is civil, and such like. Wherefore, when we reason concerning love, and doing good towards our neighbors, there ought a comparison to be made of those things, which belong unto one degree: which being not made, an error will soon happen. That which I have now spoken, I will declare by examples, that it may the more plainly appear. If a man shall be instructed by a godly pastor and teacher of the word of God, and shall be brought to regeneration; and the same man have therewithal a father, of whom he was begotten, or have children: and the question be asked, whether he be more bound to his pastor, or else to his father and children? We must not answer absolutely; seeing with our answer, the matter would not be expressed. But we will say, that in those things, which concern spiritual friendship, we ought more to obey the minister of the

word that teacheth us rightly, and admonisheth us out of the holy scriptures, than either the children or the father, if they persuade things that be contrary and repugnant.

But if we demand as touching things of another sort; namely, of food and of maintenance, there is more due unto parents, and unto children, than is unto others; though they be ministers of the word of God. In which matter the Scribes, Pharisees, and high priests offended, when they taught children to say unto their parents; The gift which I offer shall avail thee: and so, by offering up of their goods in the holy ministry, they would defraud their parents of their due sustenance. Indeed the ministers of the word must be maintained, but yet not so, as any man should defraud either himself, or his family, of necessary livings. I will use another similitude. Admit that a man be in the camp, where just war is taken in hand. When the general captain chargeth him in something, concerning the affairs of the war, and the father being present commandeth him to the contrary: in this case the son shall rather offer himself to the general, than to his father. But if we shall determine of household business, and of things pertaining to living and sustenance, the parent shall be heard, and not the general captain. Hereunto respected that saying of Ambrose, when he said, in the first book of Offices; I do no less choose you (speaking unto his flock of Millen) whom I have regenerated by the Gospel, than if I had begotten you in wedlock. True in deed was that which he spake. For, as touching the employing of spiritual things, of doctrine, of amendment, and of sacraments, he was no less debtor to them, than to the children of the flesh: but if the business had been concerning the food and maintenance of bodies (although he might not forsake others) yet he should first have ministered those things to his own.

Moreover, we should call another matter to our remembrance; that we must prefer the Common-wealth before our private commodity. And this performed they, of whom Paul speaketh in the 16th to the Romans, who laid down their necks for the life of the apostle. Those men verily deserved well of the churches of Christ, and therefore they were very much praised by them. Hereunto also may be applied that which Paul testifieth of the Galatians, that If it had been possible, they would have plucked out their own eyes; and have given them to him. Also good subjects, if their good magistrates happen into danger, ought not to spare, no not their own life, to defend the public wealth and safety. And in very deed, both sorts of men (I mean magistrates and ministers of the church) must be maintained by the substance of private persons; but not so, as either parents or children should be forsaken. For the commandment of God above all things must stand in force, which he commanded by Moses; that We should honor our parents. And this honor consisteth not only in uncovering our heads unto them, or in giving them place; but he would, that they should be nourished and maintained by their children. And how much we are bound to the rest of our neighbors, in communicating of our goods, Paul declareth in the second to the Corinthians, the eighth chapter, where he wrote, that we must communicate our goods unto the poor; yet not so, as those which are poor should live at ease, and abound, and the givers themselves to want. Indeed we owe unto God both ourselves, and all that we have; but he dealeth with us according to right and equity: and as he is a mild father, so he showeth this equity or moderation. Wherefore the matter is so to be determined, as that which Elias demanded, and that which the widow granted unto him, we must understand to be a prerogative or privilege beside the common law, and ought not to be taken as an example for us.

6. But Christ in the 23rd of Matthew, forbad that we should call unto us many masters in earth, because we have one master Jesus Christ: so likewise he forbad us to procure any other fathers upon the earth, save only the heavenly father. Wherefore, that custom seemeth not to be allowable, wherein the servants of Naaman called their lord, Father. Hereunto we say, that the words of the Lord must not be absolutely understood, but his mind and meaning must be considered. For it ought not to be doubted, but that Christ himself appointed his apostles to teach and instruct, as well the Jews as the Gentiles. But it would be very ridiculous (and I may say a folly) to give the thing itself, and to take away the title and name. Neither may Paul be accused of sacrilege, when he saith, that he was appointed by God to be the teacher and master of the Gentiles. Yea moreover, he maketh himself the father of the Corinthians, and also the father of Timothy, in the second chapter to the Philippians. And although he was not ignorant, that Christ is the pastor of the flock of the faithful; [yet] he teacheth, that in the church there be pastors and doctors. Neither have men arrogantly challenged unto themselves the name of father, but have (as it were by inspiration) received such a title offered unto them. For the law doth earnestly command, that children should obey their parents; which if they shall do, it promiseth great benefits. But on the other side, if they will despise them, it pronounceth grievous curses and execrations against them.

That therefore, which Christ pronounced in Matthew, either represseth the ambition of men, which vainly and ambitiously sought after such trifles; or else forbiddeth them to be masters and fathers, who obscure the honor of God, and his honor, while they teach and preach other things, than God and Christ either taught or preached; and do sever the honor of parents and masters from the honor of God and of Christ. Otherwise they be fathers and

masters, but yet in God, and also in Christ. For even as of Christ dependeth all kindred and paternity, (as it is said in the epistle to the Ephesians, the third chapter) so all the doctrine of the masters of the church ought to depend of the dignity of Christ only. Howbeit, so far as I remember, Christ is not anywhere in the history of the Gospel called father. Wherefore he saith in the Gospel of John; Ye call me master and Lord, and rightly, for so I am. Also the apostles (as we read in the Acts) were not called fathers; only that Paul (as I warned before) named himself a father. But at this day, among them of the church, there is no measure or end of titles. They are not only called fathers; but, Most reverend, Most excellent, Right honorable, Most holy, and Most blessed. Howbeit, the greater titles that are given them by the doting world, the more abject they are in the sight of God; yea, and of all unhappy men most miserable.

**Of Ambition.**

7. Ambition is an overmuch desire of honor. And honor is that reverence, which is yielded unto any man, for a testimonial of his excellency. And a testimony is given to him even of right: for it is meet, that we somewhat recompense them, which help and maintain us, and are furnished with the gifts of God. And there is nothing that we hold more worthy, or better than honor. Moreover, [we give them honor] that they and their like may go forward, to exercise themselves the longer and more constantly in helping and preserving of others. Besides this, that we yielding such a reverence, may get them authority, whereby they may the more aptly and commodiously execute their office. Hereby it appeareth, that it is lawful also, even for holy men, sometime to embrace the honors, which are given unto them for virtue, learning, and godliness sake. For they both desire and allow of that, which is just; and do rejoice, that men perform that good,

which God would by his law have done. And his commandment is, that we honor our father, mother, magistrate, and such like. So as, if men obey his commandments, godly men cannot but take it with a thankful mind. Furthermore, if it should not thus be done, their ministry would be contemned: but that must by all manner of means be avoided. And forsomuch as we are prone to pride, haughtiness, and arrogancy; therefore it behooveth to take very wary heed, that through the desire of honor, how just soever it may be, we abuse it not. And thus I purposed to note those things, which I judge meet to be taken heed of in this matter.

First, that we repose not ourselves in this kind of good thing, as the chief end. Whatsoever we do, must be directed unto God: and specially that honor, which is given unto us, when we rightly and orderly do our duties; so that thereby, both we ourselves may know, and also may teach others to glorify God, and not men in their works. This moreover hath Christ commanded, that we should so order our works, as thereby those that see them may glorify God, the heavenly father. Neither ought it to move us, which is commonly spoken, that Honor is the reward of virtue. For that is not to be understood, neither as touching the virtues themselves, nor as touching the men, which be adorned with them. For it should be very ill with either of them, if they had no other end prescribed than honor. The end of good men, is life eternal, and the kingdom of heaven: and the end of virtues, is to prepare and renew us to the glory of God. But honor is said to be the reward of virtues, in respect of others, which do behold and wonder at the gifts of God, which are in good and godly men. And when they desire to present or recompense them with some good thing, and have nothing more excellent than honor, they give that unto them. After this manner therefore honor is accounted the reward of virtue.

Another caution is, that none be so inflamed with the desire of honor, as he seek to attain to the same after what sort he will; be it by right, or by wrong. Salust spake an excellent sentence as concerning this matter; The good man and the evil do both alike desire unto themselves, glory, honor, and rule: the one, by true means; but the other wanting good arts, striveth to compass the same by fraud and guile. Thirdly, we must beware, that a man seek not more honor, than his deserts and virtues require; nor that he seek to wrest unto him honors and dignities, when he rather deserveth blame: for this would be both absurd, and without all order of justice. Abimelech took no heed of those things, which I have recited: but ran into them all: for he proposed to himself a kingly power, or rather tyranny, as the chief end; for he directed thereunto all his acts and devises. And moreover, he endeavored to attain thereto by deceits and guiles, and not by a good way and just means: or rather he seemed to be of Euripedes judgment; That even right itself is to be violated for dominion sake. And for so much as he wanted deserts, he rather extorted honor (which is given as a testimony of virtues) than got it unto himself by honest means. He circumvented his citizens by no obscure kind of largesse: for he with fair words desired the kingdom, because he would bestow upon them most large and ample benefits, for so much as he was their kinsman.

The laws even of Ethnics condemn such ambition: for it is decreed *Ad legem Iuliam de ambitu*, that he which attaineth to honors by bribery, should be condemned, both in a fine of money; namely, in a hundred pieces of gold, and withal should be made infamous. And that ambition is wont to drive men to commit murders, without all respect of any kindred; the histories as well holy as profane do sufficiently teach us. Cain being afraid, least his brother should be preferred before him, did slay him. For the same

cause did Romulus kill Remus, Domitian lay in wait for Titus, and Antonius Caracalla slue his brother Geta. Also there have been children so desirous to reign, as they could not stay until their parents came to their fatal death. And again, fathers fearing least their children should attempt innovations, have put them to death: as Herod did, of whom Augustus said, he had rather be his hog, than his son; because he abstained from hogs, by reason of the Jewish religion; but he forbear not from murdering his children. I pass over the most cruel proscriptions of the Romans, wherein all regard of friendships was set aside. Also how the earnest endeavor of perverse religion or idolatry violently breaketh out and rageth, there is no need to repeat old histories; seeing our age hath over many examples of the same.

**Of desire of Praise.**

8. The godly have wherewithal to comfort themselves very well, by this sentence of the apostle; (When the Lord shall come, then shall everyone have praise of God) when they be back-bited, when their good name is impeached, and when the things that they have well done, are brought into slander by evil persons. For they be taught to expect praise from Christ, and with a noble courage to contemn the praise that cometh from men, which for the most part is vain. Indeed man, of his own nature, is greedy enough of praise. Wherefore Augustine, in his 13th book *De Trinitate*, doth cite a verse of Ennius; namely, that All mortal men do fervently desire that they may be praised. And no marvel; seeing man is according to the image of God: and God will have his praises to be most highly celebrated. But this desire must be reformed, least by our abuse it hinder salvation. This may be done, if we follow the counsel of Paul, in expecting praise to come from God; whereby it may be counted perfect and sincere. Augustine in his 13th book of confessions writeth, that concerning this matter he had much cause

to be greatly grieved, (for he was oftentimes commended, neither was it an easy thing to overcome the flattering motion of the mind:) but he saith that he used this comfort, that he knew it was most surely determined by God, that praise is a perpetual companion of pure and chaste life. And hereof were not the Ethnics ignorant, when as they made praise to be as a shadow following the body, to keep continual company with virtue. I ought not (saith one) for that cause, to live naughtily, that all men may hate me, so soon as they hear me spoken of.

But when we hear ourselves praised, there must be used a double remedy. First, let us rejoice on the behalf of our neighbors; because they be so appointed by God, and inspired by his spirit, as they will praise and allow of those things, which they shall judge worthy to be praised: which benefit of God is not common. Another remedy there is, that whatsoever praise is given unto us, let us turn all that upon God himself, who is author of all good things; taking special heed, that we be not desirous to be praised of men. For this desire is so pernicious, that sometime it driveth men to madness. Julian the apostate (as we read in the sixth book of the tripartite history) although otherwise a man wicked, yet in human philosophy and sciences of the Schools very well learned: what time as he moved war against the Persians, was so desirous of glory, that in pride of mind, he began now to dream and imagine unto himself a glory, whereby he might be equal with Alexander of Macedonia. Yea and he fell into so great a folly, as he said, that The soul of Alexander was translated, and dwelt in himself. We be taught in the epistle to the Romans, that True praise is to be expected from God: where the apostle speaking of Circumcision, which is in the spirit, not in the flesh, nor in the letter, straightway added; Whose praise is not of men, but of God. And in the second to the Corinthians, he saith; Not

he which commendeth himself is allowed, but whom God commendeth. If every man's praise shall come unto him from God, the same is also to be judged of dispraise. For in the judgment of God, as there shall be many praised; so on the other part, many according to their deserts shall be dispraised.

9. But insomuch as godly men do seem sometimes to be forgetful of themselves, when they speak honorably of their own virtues, we will declare in few words, how the same may be lawful. First, the godly make no show or brag of their own virtues: for they know them to be the gifts of God, and that they themselves be defiled and many ways corrupted. Secondly, they acknowledge those virtues to be given them, not only for their own sakes, but also for the people; that they may provide and care for such things as be necessary for others. Thirdly, they perceive that they have not fulfilled the law of God, but that they oftentimes offend and fall; and that they be not able to stand in judgment before God. But if they be compared with their adversaries, they doubt not, but even before God they shall be their superiors. Moreover, they would, that by their good life the glory of God should be set forth; and that others, by their example, should be stirred up to live well and godly. Furthermore, they call their own acts to remembrance; not for to make vaunt of themselves among others, but to give a weight unto their doctrine, since their speeches be neither false nor vain, nor full of wind. For, as when place serveth, they set forth their goodness; so else-where they dissemble not their evil. But here must be diligent heed taken, that we be not be guiled by our flesh. For as touching the thing itself, the very same is done by the godly, which is done by the wicked: howbeit, that which is done well of the one, is done wickedly of the other. Samuel, Hezekiah, and others, commend their own acts; the very

same doth the Pharisee: but not with the same mind. God is he that knoweth the heart, and seeth with what mind everything is done of every man. Again, the godly give thanks unto God for his gifts; and as often as they call this to remembrance, so many times do they begin to be of a most assured hope, that God will in this sort be with them perpetually. Lastly, they would not, that the same light, which they perceive is kindled in them, should be hidden under a bushel; or the city to be set in an obscure place, where it cannot be seen. It is probable, that Samuel had respect unto these things; but yet to nothing rather, than that the people should acknowledge their sin.

**Of Flattery.**

10. Flatterers be they, which for commodity sake do temper their words to win favor of him, whom they flatter for some commodity sake. For it is flattery, when we apply our selves both in words and deeds unto the will of another, and that feignedly, and not faithfully; to the intent we may reap some profit by him. They, which be of this sort, do dissemble all things, and altogether depend upon the will and countenance of another: and do not only sin in talking, but oftentimes in keeping silence. The etymology of the word is derived of δούλος, A servant: for it is altogether servile and dishonest. Chrysostom in his fifth homily upon the epistle to the Philippians; Flattery (saith he) is, when we honor any man, for that which he ought not to be honored, that we may get from him some temporal benefit. The same father, in his twentieth homily upon the first to the Thessalonians, saith; It is flattery, when for some evil purpose, we do anything that becometh not a man: but if we speak anything to please, howbeit not dissemblingly or falsely, to the intent we might win some man unto Christ, that is not flattery. For Paul himself, although he say that he doth not covet to please men, but God; and addeth, that his communication

was not in the enticement of words: yet unto the Corinthians he saith, that He was made all things to all men, to the Jews a Jew; to them which were under the law, as though he also had been under the law; finally, all things to all men, that he might win all. But this was no flattery: for that (as I have said) is, when we not truly but feignedly apply ourselves to the wills of others, to the intent we may reap some temporal commodity. And so is flattery distinguished from Christian humanity.

Wherefore David shamefully flattered Achish, and that with a most subtle kind of flattery. For Plutarch in a little book, how one may discern a flatterer from a friend, saith; that He is the closest flatterer, who, when he flattereth most, carrieth yet with him such a show of liberty, as he may seem not to flatter, but rather to gainsay. For that gross kind of flattery; namely, to hold up a man with yea and nay, every man can soon espy. Plato saith; that It is the most hurtful kind of injustice, if a man can so hide it, as he may seem to be just. David did so flatter, as it might seem in words, that he would withstand the king, and to heap kindness upon him whether he would or no. This is to make a show of justice, in a matter that is unjust: for he feigned, that he would employ his whole travel and endeavor towards the king, and to take it in evil part, that he should be so dismissed. At this day, in prince's courts, and especially in the court of Rome, there is no way more ready to attain honors, than if one so order himself, as he can sooth every man in everything.

David feigned himself to depart with grief, and that he was very desirous to tarry. He feigned (I say:) for his meaning was not so. For if he had fought, he had dealt ungodly towards his own countrymen: if he had not fought, he should have been ungrateful towards him, of whom he was entertained. R. Ben Gerson saith, that He would remain in the camp,

because he might make frustrate the counsels of the Philistines, and reveal the same unto his own people. And undoubtedly, when as afterward Absalom had made a commotion against him, he privily sent Chusa the Arachite, who might frustrate the counsel of Ahithophel. But whether David followed this counsel, let Ben Gerson see to it. But the more likelihood is, that David, when he saw himself now out of danger, did the more confidently profess there things of himself. For whereas he was ignorant, that Saul should so soon die; and saw that it might be, that the Philistines should be overcome, and that he should be constrained to remain longer in exile, thought it altogether convenient, that the favor of king Achish should be retained.

# CHAP. IX. Wherein is treated upon the sixth Precept; and first of Friendship.

This word *Amicitia*, that is, Friendship, is so called, of *Amor*, that is, Love: as saith Augustine against an epistle of Parmenianus, the first book and first chapter. And this is faithful and continual in Christ only. It behooveth, that the bond of friendship be steadfast and durable. But it behooveth that there be a reconciler of friends, to lead them unto felicity; and that an eternal and true felicity: for other felicities are uncertain and transitory. Howbeit, these things can no man perform, but Christ. Now let us see, what is properly, To love. Aristotle saith, that, To love, is, To will well, and (if thou canst) to do well unto any man for his sake, not for thine own. This definition, although it may seem probable, yet must it be amended: for we ought to will well to no man for his own sake, but for God's. But the philosophers stayed upon the second causes: as if so be that they saw a man godly and good, they said that he ought to be beloved for his own sake. But it behooveth us to ascend higher, and to place the causes of things in God. Cicero defineth friendship to be an agreement of divine and human things, through good will and charity. But Aristotle in his Ethics

speaketh somewhat more distinctly: for he saith, that friendship is a goodwill. But it happeneth oftentimes, that some man loveth an ungrateful person, and is not loved again: and for that cause, he addeth, Mutual. Howbeit, some men do mutually love one another, who nevertheless know not that they are mutually loved again. Wherefore it behooveth, that either of them do reveal their friendship one to another.

Furthermore it is requisite, that this goodwill be stirred up in respect of some good thing. For we do not love, without it be for some certain cause: and the good things are referred either unto profit, or unto pleasure, or unto honesty. But they which are induced to love, either of pleasure, or of profit; they love unadvisedly, and accidentally. For if the cause of pleasure, or of gain, should cease; the friendship would straightway be loosed. But the friendship, which virtue hath joined together, is steadfast, and never dissolved: for virtue is a habit gotten by long custom, which cannot be removed. Such a constant amity was between David and Jonathan. Seneca, in his ninth epistle unto Lucillus reproveth Epicurus; because he had said, that A friend must be sought, to the intent that if thou have need, thou mayest have one to help thee; if thou be sick, thou mayest have one to sit by thee. For a far more sweet friendship is it (saith Seneca) which doth help another, than that which is holpen of another. Wherefore (saith he) a friend must be sought, that thou mayest have whom to help, and whom to sit by, if thou be sick. For Apelles (saith he) and Praxiteles took greater pleasure of their own works, when they were working them, and had them in hand; than afterward, when they had them made and finished in their chamber: even so a true friend is more delighted, if he himself do any good turn to another, than if he receive a benefit of another. So did Jonathan not refuse any danger that was to be taken in hand for David’s sake. Saul also loved David,

but far otherwise than did Jonathan. Neither undoubtedly did Jonathan love David only in respect of that general commandment; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: but because of that notable endeavor, which he found in him towards the Common-wealth and godliness. Further, he saw that the kingdom should be plucked away from Saul, and be given to one better than he: and he suspected, that the same other man should be David, as we may gather by the history. Yet did he love him so fervently, as he did not for this cause hate him anything at all.

**Of Homicide, or Manslaughter.**

2. Here will I treat of two things; the first, what manner of man-slaughter is condemned by the word of God, and to be punished by the magistrates; secondly, who are guilty of this crime. As touching the first, we must understand, that not every slaughter of man is condemned. For if one kill a man by chance, in exercising of an honest and lawful thing, he incurreth not the punishment of man-slaughter. Wherefore, in the old law, there were granted cities of refuge. For in very deed, he killeth not: but as it is there written; God (without whose will nothing is done by chance) delivered him, that he should so be killed. A judge also and a magistrate, when he punisheth heinous offenders, is not to be accounted a man-slayer: for it is not he that killeth, but the law; yea rather God himself, who would have it so done, and so commanded it. Furthermore, he that in a desolate place, or where he cannot be holpen by others, is set upon by thieves or enemies: if, in defending himself, and according to the laws, by repelling violence by violence, he slay a robber or thief, which invadeth him; he is not guilty of man-slaughter, forsomuch as in that case, he is armed both by the laws and the magistrates. For the Common-wealth would not, that a subject should so perish: therefore it giveth him leave to defend himself by weapons. For this

cause Cicero defended Milo, because he had killed Clodius, who first by a secret lying in wait set upon him. Also the woman of Thecua obtained of David, that the magistrate should not kill her son, who had slain his brother being at variance with him in the field; They were alone (saith she) and therefore it is not known, which of them first invaded the other. Soldiers also, when in a just war they slay their enemy, commit no unjust thing.

Wherefore, that man-slaughter, which must be punished, and is condemned by laws, is then judged to be done, when a man of set purpose is killed by private men. And they, which are to be condemned of this crime by the Roman laws, are not called man-slayers, but murderers. In the law Cornelia, the title is *De sicarijs*; and not *De homicidis*: and they are so called, which do wear about them a short skein to kill a man. And by the figure Synecdoche, under the name of a short skein, is understood every kind of weapon. And not only they which kill, are guilty of this crime; but also they which either by deed, or by counsel do help, and in their sayings and assistance have respect hereunto, that some man should be killed: yea, the will is to be punished, though it had not this purpose. But this in civil judgment is not used, except in three kinds of crimes only; to wit, of murderers, of ravishers, and of traitors. Wherefore, that murderer is to be punished, which throweth a weapon at any man, to the intent he would kill him; or having that mind, woundeth him, though the party die not thereof: as we have it in the Digests, in the same title, in the law *Diuus*; where Adrian the emperor maketh answer, that we must have respect to the will, and not to the event. But that is understood, when the will manifesteth itself by any apparent token. Yet I did not without cause say, that these things are thus concerning civil judgment: because otherwise, before God, the desire and determination of the mind, as touching all kind of sins, is condemned

for sin. Christ saith; He that beholdeth a woman, and lusteth after her, hath already committed adultery in his heart.

And that the will, in those crimes, is esteemed as the fact, even the holy fathers, and the canons do decree. Jerome upon Isaiah, as it is in the title Poenitentia, distinction the first chap. *Omnis habet*; Thou hast not killed with the sword, but thou hast killed with the will. Yea and Cyprian in his sermon *De mortalitate*, writeth; He that desireth martyrdom, is a martyr before God. It is one thing (saith he) for the will to want martyrdom, and another thing for martyrdom to want the will. These things are found in the same distinction, in the chapter *Nunquid*. And in the same place, in the chapter *Periculose*, Augustine is cited, who saith; that the Jews no less killed Christ, than the Romans did; although they laid not hands upon him. By this distinction he accordeth the two evangelist's, who seem to disagree touching the hour of the Lord's death. The one saith, that he was nailed in the third hour; the other saith, in the sixth hour. Augustine affirmeth both to be true: for the Jews, at the third hour cried; Crucify, crucify. Wherefore as concerning them, they then killed the Lord, who nevertheless was crucified afterward in the sixth hour, by the soldiers of Pilate.

**Of the fact of Elias, and that a perverse imitating of him must be avoided.**

3. The king was very angry against Elias; partly because he hindered his ambassage, and partly because he threatened him with extremities, that is, with death. And it is likely to be true, that he was provoked by his mother Jezebel. Wherefore he sent a captain over fifty with his soldiers, that should take him, and bring him unto him, that at length he might put him to death. Howbeit the singular goodness of God did not only defend Elias, but also took most heavy revenge upon his enemies, and that justly no doubt: for it

is not meet that a prophet, being the minister of the word of God, should be violated by a soldier or guarder of the king. God is present, and oftentimes suffereth not these things to be done. Also although he sometime give leave that his ministers be afflicted by the wicked, yet this he doth not as being weakened by their power, as who would say he were so feeble that he cannot revenge; but he hath other ends, whereunto he directeth the afflictions of the godly. Wherefore to disquiet prophets, cometh not of the power of man, but of the patience of God; who assuredly is able to deliver them, seeing his power is no whit lessened. But he useth their adversities for the performance of his counsels: and therefore Christ said; Could not I ask my father, and he would give me twelve legions of angels, that I should not be delivered to the Jews? The same Christ also, when he should have been apprehended, asked of the company; For whom they sought? And when he had said: I am he, immediately they fell backward. And many times did the Scribes, Pharisees, and princes send soldiers to apprehend him, while he preached, who could not lay hands upon him, but returning again, said; that There was never man spake like this man. Wherefore they, which preach the word of God, have hereby a most sweet consolation, considering themselves to have God to be their defender; than whom, nothing can be found more strong, nor more mighty.

4. But now let us consider, what God did respect in burning of the captains over the fifties, and their soldiers. Certainly, he would show himself to be a revenger of the prophesy being contemned, and of the holy ministry that was despised. In old time he revenged the Mosaical priesthood, because it was scorned by the seditious. Also he revenged the ark of the covenant, because it was unworthily handled both by the Philistines, and also by the Bethsamites. Furthermore, he restored to liberty

the temple in the time of Nicanor and Heliodorus. These things did he therefore not permit to be unrevenged, because they should be instruments of godliness. But a great deal more doth prophesy, and the holy ministry belong thereunto. We ought not then to marvel, if he were so angry for the defense of his word, and of his prophet: for he doth not easily suffer his ordinances to be contemned: since he that repugneth them, repugneth God himself. And that should no less be spoken, touching the holy ministry, than touching the civil magistrate; He that heareth you (saith the Lord) heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth mine own self. But these offices are joined together, and so ordained by God, as he being not hurt, they cannot be despised. Wherefore justly doth God revenge both prophesy, and the holy ministry, when they be contemned and overtrodden by the wicked. Howbeit, this is sometime done upon the sudden, and even while the contempt is; as it happened in those bands of fifties, and as it came to pass in Jeroboam, when his hand dried up, which he had stretched out against the man of God in Bethel. Suddenly also were Chore, Dathan, and Abiram sunk, who made a commotion against Moses, because of the high priesthood of Aaron. But sometime the punishment is deferred for a certain space; as in Ahab, who long time afflicted the prophets, and yet was not straightway killed. Also Christ endured cruel injuries all his life long: he was beaten, and finally was crucified like an evil doer. Neither did the punishment fall upon the murderers and rebels, till after certain years. These things doth God diversely, according as the counsels of his providence do permit.

5. There remaineth to see, wherefore it was admitted to Elias, that he should destroy with fire from heaven, those princes and their soldiers: and yet it was denied to the apostles, which in like manner desired, that the

same might be lawful for them against the Samaritans, who most cruelly excluded Christ from harboring among them, when he journeyed from Galilee to Jerusalem: for James and John desired this of Christ. Some say, that hereof cometh the difference, that the spirits of the law, and of the Gospel, be very contrary. For the property of the law is to condemn, punish, and slay; but the property of the Gospel is to forgive, preserve, and quicken. So that Elias was to kill them, which did openly violate the law of God: but the duty of the apostles was to help and to heal men, and not to destroy them. Wherefore the Lord added; Ye know not of what spirit ye be. I do not think, that these words are so to be understood, as though Elias was so much addicted to the law, that he had nothing common with the Gospel; for he himself was sometime a help to men. For in a very great dearth he fed the widow of Sarepta, together with her son and family; yea, and when her son was dead, he restored him unto life again: and heaven being opened, he gave rain most plentifully.

Also the apostles of Jesus Christ were not so addicted unto goodness, as that they never hurt any: for Peter by his word destroyed Ananias and Sapphira, Paul made blind Elimas the sorcerer, and delivered very many unto Satan to be tormented according to the flesh. Howbeit, I grant that the spirit of clemency and gentleness flourished more in the apostles of Christ, than in the ancient prophets: and again, that the spirit of severity and revenge was more uttered in Elias and his fellows, than in the evangelical disciples. And I think good to add, that the apostles were therefore warned of the Lord; because they were moved against the Samaritans by a human anger, and not by a divine persuasion, to wish evil unto them. But it is very likely, that they were urged to ask that thing, through the site of the place: because in the same place Elias procured fire from heaven unto those

princes. For king Ahaziahu was in Samaria, when he commanded that Elias should be brought unto him. Wherefore there was a certain fond zeal in the apostles, wherewith they endeavored to imitate Elias. Nor in the meantime did they make any difference between the nature of their vocations. For thereto was Elias called, that he should execute the judgments of God's severity: neither did he so sharply behave himself, of his own accord, but by the warning of God, and of his angel. Indeed in outward show he might seem to be a man-killer: yet must he not so be reputed, seeing he was only the minister of God.

And so we must beware, that we do not by any example of our forefathers, assure our selves of those things, which we earnestly and extraordinarily desire. Thus undoubtedly did the silly woman of Samaria, who reasoning with Christ at the well side, labored to prove, that God should be worshipped in that mountain, because Jacob had worshipped him there. Indeed he did that, which was lawful for him to do in that age, wherein he lived: but afterward, when the law was given, the worshipping was to be done at the tabernacle, and after that, in the temple of Solomon. Neither must the examples of the forefathers, done against the law of God, be taken as rules to imitate and follow. The which if we shall do, we shall not be counted as followers of the fathers, but as mockers of them. Wherefore, when we will take unaccustomed things in hand, against the ordinary commandment of God; it is not enough to allege an example of the forefathers: but we must descend into our selves, in examining by what spirit we be led; least under a certain glorious pretense, we follow the wisdom and affection of the flesh. For this cause Jesus said to his apostles; Ye know not of whose spirit ye be: Ye purpose with yourselves to follow Elias, but ye be not led with his spirit.

6. Two ways we see there is offense committed in this age of ours. The Christian princes have diverse times taken in hand wars against the Turks, pretending a just cause, for that they thought meet to recover those lands, which the barbarous nations and wicked tyrants had taken away from the Christians. But whether they were stirred up by a good spirit, it is very doubtful. Peradventure they were moved by a greedy desire of bearing rule, or for worldly glory sake, or else by other inventions of man's wisdom; and therefore had seldom any good success. Again, there have been some, which endeavored by arms and human power, to spread abroad the Gospel and propagation of churches. These perhaps did not well try, with what spirit they did it. This is it, whereof Christ warned his apostles, that they should descend into themselves, and examine with what spirit they were led; namely, whether they could be like unto Elias. And when they had desired of their master, that it might be lawful for them, by his leave, to undertake and do it, he denied that request; because he was not sent, to the end he should afflict or destroy men, but rather to help them; and that therefore he would not pass the limits of his vocation. Whereby he also warned them, that they should not rashly endeavor, to arrogate such things unto themselves.

But that Christ was not sent to punish, and take revenge of wicked deeds; his life and acts do testify. For he was a succor unto all men, and he helped them that were in misery, so often as occasion was offered. And when he was with most bitter taunts reviled, he did not revile again. And being fastened to the cross, he prayed most patiently for his enemies. Wherefore the places, which at the first sight seemed to vary, are reconciled. And we be all warned, that when we are to take in hand anything against order and custom, we must first discern with what spirit and instigation we be moved.

Neither let us be of the mind, to imitate Helias in revenging; unless we understand for a certainty, that we be led with the spirit of Helias. Yet is not therefore the power, which the magistrate hath, of just revenging, taken from him: for he hath laws prescribed unto him by God, which he ought to follow. But those things, which we have spoken, belong unto private persons.

**Whether Helias did well, in killing of the Baalits.**

7. While the people was hot and fervent in confession of the true faith, Helias used an occasion, and prevented the kings commandment, and provided that the prophets of Baal should be taken and slain. They must not (saith he) be better instructed and provoked to repentance, but he would have them forthwith to be slain. For he was assured by the spirit of God, that they would not convert or be changed. And seeing they had now led away many from the true God, and would still have deceived many, if they had remained alive; he accounted it a just thing, that their ungodliness should be ended with their life. God undoubtedly might by another occasion, means, and way, have confounded and destroyed the Baalits: yet seeing he thought best to deal after that sort, we ought to think that this was the best way. But some man will say, that Helias in the meantime seemeth to be guilty of murder: for he slew, and caused to be slain, four hundred and forty men. Chrysostom treateth of this matter upon the epistle to the Galatians, when he expoundeth that place, wherein he said; I went not unto them, which were apostles before me: At the first sight (saith he) he seemeth to diminish the authority of the other apostles, and to extol his own self: which thing could not be without fault.

But unto this he answereth, that the sayings and deeds of the saints must not be barely and simply weighed. For otherwise, Samuel might have

seemed to be a murderer; who killed Agag the king. In like manner might Phinehas and also Helias. It behooveth (saith he) to look upon the causes, and to consider why, and to what end those things shall be either said or done. Paul (saith he) was not so arrogant, as he would contemn other apostles, in comparison of himself; only he would win authority unto the Gospel, which was preached by him. For he had to do with false prophets, who said; that unto Paul, which forbad the ceremonies of Moses, credit should not be given; but to the greater apostles, who suffered them. Briefly, he would prove, that as touching things manifestly revealed unto us by God, nothing should be withdrawn, or changed, by the authority of men.

Moreover, he seemeth to affirm, that the intent or end is chiefly to be regarded; as though a work (which seemeth absurd) can be made good and holy, by an intent (as they call it.) This (under correction of so excellent a man) do not I easily allow; because there be many works so wicked and corrupt, that how good an intent so ever come unto them, yet are they not thereby so amended as they be made good. Let no man, (under this pretense) say, that we must steal, to the intent that alms may be given to the poor. Neither let any man be absolved, if he have committed adultery, by saying that he did it with an upright mind, or to a good end. For (as saith the apostle) We must not commit evil, that good may come thereof. Further, in things that be indifferent, which may sometime be done well, and sometime ill, an intent may be of some force. In which kind of things, slaying is easily placed. For sometime men are justly slain, and sometime unjustly. For the magistrate hath the sword, and it is prescribed him by God, that he should punish offenders. And if he do it with a good mind, and a right purpose, his work is counted both good and holy: but if he shall do it to satisfy his malice, and to prosecute his quarrels, or to yield to his rage and cruelty, he

doth not well. Also a private man, who hath not the right of the sword, if he kill any man, he doth amiss: unless he be moved unto it by God, through a certain prerogative or privilege, whereby the common law is debarred. But then must he, which is stirred up by God, be very certain of his impulsion. And therefore men must not deal rashly herein; but a firm and perfect certainty must be expected.

Now then I would affirm, that those things; which at the first sight seem to be absurd, are by faith made honest and right. For they be allowed by God, because they be done by the prescript of his word; when as men cleave effectually unto him by faith: neither maketh it any matter, whether that word be of the common law, or of peculiar inspiration. Wherefore the goodness of works dependeth of faith. So that, even as it is said; Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin: so on the other side may be inferred; That which is of faith, is just: for faith itself justifieth, as the apostles writings do testify. Also the goodness of works dependeth of the spirit that moveth: for if any man be moved by the spirit of the flesh, he doth unjustly; but if it be by the impulsion of the spirit of God, he worketh justly. And unto this had the Lord regard, when in forbidding the apostles, that they should not call down fire against the Samaritans, he saith; Ye know not of what spirit ye be. And Helias shall be excused, not only through his intent, faith, and spirit; but for because that God delivered unto him his judgments to be executed, and appointed him to be a judge of the Baalits. So that he shall not be accounted a private man, but a man of God; who even as by an ordinary way in the earth he would have magistrates to be his deputies, so likewise can he promote to that place of dignity, whom soever he shall think good.

8. But passing over these excuses, I say, that it is decided by the law. For in Deuteronomy the 18th chapter it is decreed, that the prophet should be

slain, which speaketh lies in the name of God, or which prophesieth in the name of other gods. And in the 17th chapter is the very same thing, even as touching private men and women, which worshipped idols. But in the 13th chapter of that book, not only death is assigned to the prophet which seduceth; but there is also a commandment added, that none should spare his own brother, or the son of his mother, neither son, nor daughter, nor servants, nor those which were most deer and nearest friends unto him. Thirdly, it is commanded, that the whole city, when it is infected with idolatry, should be destroyed with fire and sword. Further, in the 24th chapter of Leviticus it is decreed, that the blasphemous man should not be suffered to live. Herewithal add the justice of rendering like for like: for the prophets of Baal had caused the ministers of the true God to be slain, as well by Jezebel, as by king Ahab. But, will some man say; By these laws and reasons it is proved, that these Baalites had indeed deserved death, but perhaps they should not have been slain by the prophet, for avoiding suspicion of man-slaughter. Howbeit this I answer, that the king was also present, and consented unto the slaughter. Helias indeed prevented the king's judgment; yet it appeareth not, that he did against it, because the king being present, did not withstand it.

But wherefore he held his peace, many reasons may be brought. First, it might not be, but that by seeing so great a wonder, he also was astonished, and exceedingly amazed: wherefore he could not but spurn against the prick. Add also, that the king durst not stand against so great a consent of the people. Also it might be, that he was very desirous of rain, and that therefore, least he should be disappointed, he gave some manner of consent unto this slaughter. He caused the false prophets to be brought to the brook Kison; to wit, that their dead bodies should be cast into it: a brook otherwise

noble, for the victory gotten of Jabin and Sisara, by the leading and conduct of Barach and Deborah, as it is written in the book of Judges, and mentioned by David in the Psalms. But to some it seemeth an unworthy and cruel thing, that the prophet himself, with his own hand, as the history reporteth, slue some of them. As though it were not read, that Samuel smote Agag the king of Amalech. Moses also with the Levites destroyed many thousands of idolaters.

But and if thou wilt say; that Moses was prince of the people, and as a lawful magistrate used the Levites instead of soldiers: I grant. But what should we say of Phinehas, who being a private man, slue Zimbri and Cozbi, which were taken in whoredom? Did not Moses also, before he received the principality, slay an Egyptian man? It is not lawful to blame that fact, seeing Stephen in the Acts of the apostles alloweth and commendeth it. We know in deed, that it is the part of prophets and ministers to deal by the word, not by violence, and by the sword. Wherefore Peter and Paul, if they punished or put any to death, they did it by the word, not by the sword. But we say, that these things, which Moses and Helias did, were not ordinary, but certain acts out of use, and common order. Yea and whereas Helias exercised the office of a priest, and sacrificed out of the place chosen by God: Augustine upon Leviticus, question 56. excuseth it, by the same reason, by which was excused the deed of Abraham, who meant to slay his own son. All these things were done by the private instinct of God, against the common law set forth. The law-giver himself, when he commandeth anything to be done against his laws, his commandment must be counted for a law.

**Of Parricide or slaying of parents.**

9. Of the wicked crime of parricide, there are many things written in the civil laws *Ad L. Corneliam De parricidijs*. And (as far as may be gathered out of the laws and histories) in old time, the name of that crime was given unto those, which murdered their parents, grandfathers, and great grandfathers, &c: to those also which murdered their children, and children's children, &c. But afterward by Pompeius the signification thereof was further extended. And they were also called parricides, which killed their brothers, their sons in law, their daughters in law, their fathers or mothers in law, and such other. Although there be an old law, and given by Numa Pompilius; If any man wittingly bringeth a free man to death, let him be taken for a parricide. And Augustine, in his third book *De civitate Dei*, the sixth chapter, counted Romulus guilty of parricide, because he slew his brother. And there he derideth the Ethnics, which affirmed, that their gods suffered Troy to be destroyed; because they would take vengeance of the adultery of Paris. But how (saith he) were they favorable unto Rome, when as the builder thereof committed parricide, straightway at the beginning? Howbeit, the same Augustine in his book *De patientia* (which nevertheless is counted none of his) in the 13th chapter, appointed a certain latitude or degrees between parricides: for (as he saith) he sinneth more heinously, which killeth his parents or children, than he which murdereth his brethren. And he which slayeth his brethren, offendeth more than he, which destroyeth those, that be further of kin.

And the wicked crime of slaying parents or superiors, seemed to be so horrible, that at Rome, for the space of six hundred years after the building of the city, it was not committed. Yea and Romulus, that made no mention of it in his laws, being demanded why he left it out, answered; that he could not be persuaded, that any such thing can happen unto men. Solon also

being asked why he likewise, by his laws, did not restrain parricide; answered, that he would not by any occasion of his laws, give men knowledge of so horrible a wickedness, and by his admonishment, to stir them up after a sort unto it. For it oftentimes happeneth, that they, which forbid certain vices, provoke men to fall into them; who very often will endeavor to do such things as they are forbidden. The murder of brethren and kinsfolk, hath undoubtedly been from the beginning; as all histories do testify. And the punishment of those parricides, which slue their parents or children, was by laws (as it is perceived *Ad legem Corneliam de parricidijs*) that they should be sowed in Culeo, that is, in a leather sack, and with them also were put an ape, a cock, and a viper, and were thrown into the depth of the sea, or else in the next river adjoining. But they, which slew of their kinsfolk or cousins, were punished with the sword only.

These punishments if at any time they were either passed over, or winked at, by the magistrates, God himself punished them; as the history of Samuel declareth of Absalom, which killed his brother, and most cruelly set upon his father. He also striketh them with rage and madness, which commit such horrible wicked acts: as both the poets, and also historiographers write of Nero and of Orestes. For both of them having killed their mothers, became mad. And it is a common saying, that they, which commit so great wickedness, cannot be quiet in mind. Wherefore Cicero in his oration for Roscius, saith, that certain young men of Terracina, which were accused of murdering their father, were by this means quit; because in the morning they were found asleep. For the judges thought, that they could not sleep, which had committed so heinous a crime. Domitian also, which slue his brother Titus, was killed by the vengeance of God. And in like manner Bassianus Caracalla, when he had destroyed his brother Geta. And that we

overpass not Abimelech, God sent an evil spirit between him and the princes of the Sichemits: and either party was taken with a certain fury, so that in the end, one of them destroyed another.

**Of Sword-play.**

10. Whereas God by most weighty words pronounced, that man's blood should not be shed; this in the sword-play, among the ancient Romans, was held for a game: which devise of theirs cannot by any means be excused. L. Florus saith, that D. Junius Brutus, at the funeral of his father, exhibited for a show, 22 couple of sword-players. This (forsooth) was to purge his father's soul by sacrifice, or rather to appease the devil. But very excellent was that saying of Theodosius the emperor. For when the people in the Theatre made petition to him to have sword-players; he answered, that A godly prince not only ought to reign with clemency, but ought also to behold games, which be without cruelty. And at Athens, when the people had determined to have a public show of sword-players, because the same was a custom among the barbarous: Demonax answered, that the altar of mercy was first to be subverted, before so great a cruelty should be openly received. Augustine in his sixth book of confessions, the ninth chapter saith, that his friend Alypius, otherwise a good man, being at Rome, had his mind wonderfully delighted with sword-players, and did gladly feed his eyes with human blood. But what pleasure could be therein? Was it to see men die valiantly? No, this was not true fortitude: for that hath consideration of the place and time. But this was to be utterly mad, and lavish of their life.

Seneca in his first book *De tranquillitate*, and tenth chapter saith; that Cicero writeth, that those sword-players were hated of the people, which would desire life of him, of whom they were overcome; and that the people liked them, which make a show that they can contemn death. Howbeit, this

was not the part of men, but rather of beasts. Therefore, both Abner and Joab were to be reproved, which so caused their soldiers to kill one another. But there is yet another kind of sword-play far more wicked. For there be some, which provoke learned men to contention, about the weightiest points of our religion; not for the truth sake, but for the desire of contention. There is exclaiming, contending, and breaking of charity. And the common multitude doth so often change, as it cannot tell now what it ought to believe. This of all other, is the worst kind of sword-play. Indeed I diswallow not moderate conference of religion; but I reprehend chiding and clamors about hidden and secret matters.

**Whether it be lawful for any man to kill himself.**

11. Now must I discuss a question, which I hope will not be unprofitable: whether it he lawful for any man to kill himself. And least I should be over long, first I say, that death of its own nature is evil: for God threateneth the same, and doth cast it upon us as a punishment. Moreover, it is put as contrary unto life, which we doubt not but is good. And Paul, in the first to the Corinthians, the 15th chapter, calleth it the enemy of God; The last enemy (saith he) that shall be destroyed, is death. The same thing, if need were, I might prove by other reasons. But now I only ask this; If death be evil, why is it sometime wished for: for nothing can be desired but hath some consideration of good? But thou wilt say, that even this hath then some consideration of good, when men are thereby delivered from the grievous evils, which they think, that either they be not able to bear, or that in abiding of them they shall be grievously troubled: or else, when by the same they obtain some notable good thing. Wherefore, though it sometime appear lawful to wish death for any of these; yet is it a doubt, whether one may kill himself for those things. Now will I entreat of that matter.

But I speak nothing here of them, which slay themselves through frenzy and madness. For albeit, that those men may be condemned for other sins, which they committed when they were whole; yet it may rather seem here, that they should be pitied. For they have no free choice of things; as it is written in the 15th cause, question 2. in the chapter *Insanientes*. Neither will I dispute of them, which by chance being otherwise occupied, happen into their death against their will. And we will use this proposition; It is not lawful for one to kill himself, for any of those things which I have showed. This I prove by the law of God: by that law I mean, which was made long before Moses was born. For in the ninth chapter of Genesis, thus God spake after the flood? Your blood will I require at your hands, at the hand of man, at the hand of his neighbor, and at the hand of beasts. At your hands he saith; that is, if one shall kill himself. In the law of Moses, thus it is written; Thou shalt not kill. And that is spoken in general, not only against killing of another, but that undoubtedly thou shouldest not kill thine own self. Moreover, there is engrafted in every man a certain loving affection by nature, that every man desireth to have his own life preserved and defended. He that procureth death to himself, fighteth against God the author of nature. Besides this, life is the gift of God; therefore it cannot be spilled without heinous offense. And he that slayeth himself, doth injury to mankind, and to the common society of men: for he taketh away a citizen from the Common-wealth.

Add withal, that neither the prophets, nor the apostles, nor patriarchs, would at any time kill themselves. Job, when he was miserably afflicted; My Soul (saith he) hath wished to perish and die: yet did he never slay himself. Christ sent out his apostles, as sheep among wolves; yet he had them fly out of one city into another but not to kill themselves. And Christ

himself, although by his death he was to deliver mankind; yet did he never offer to kill himself, but tarried to be slain by others. And when the Amalechit had said, that he stood upon the body of Saul, while he was dying, and did press him down, that he might die the more easily: David answered; Thou art the son of death. But if it had been lawful for Saul, to have killed himself; how could the young man, which hastened his death, be worthy of death? For it is lawful for one to help another in an honest matter, and especially his prince. And if the law forbid thee to kill another man, it much rather forbiddeth thee to kill thyself: since that which is not lawful for thee to do to another, is unlawful for thee to do to thyself. For the rule of charity must be taken from that charity, wherewith we love our selves. Furthermore, thou killest either an offender, or an innocent. If innocent, thou doest injury to the law; if an offender, yet art thou injurious against the law: for thou bereavest thyself of time to repent. And if so be God would suffer thee, that thou mightest repent; surly thou that art not a magistrate, oughtest to suffer thyself. Thus much out of the holy scriptures.

12. Augustine in his first book *De civitate Dei*, from the sixth chapter unto the 20th disputeth hereof at large. And the cause why he wrote these things in so many words, was; for that when the barbarous nations, after the sacking of Rome, did injury unto young maidens and matrons, many rather killed themselves, than they would abide such things. But Augustine counseled, that they should not so do. And in the 17th chapter he saith, that It is not lawful for any to kill themselves, either for obtaining of good things, or for avoiding of evil: for it is murder, which is forbidden by the law of God. And Judas, when he killed himself, undoubtedly did slay a wicked man: yet is he guilty (saith he) not only of the death of Christ, but of his own also. The same father, in the second book, and 19th chapter against

Petilianus; Thou sayest (saith he) that a traitor hath perished by a halter, and for such hath left the halter. As if Petilianus would say, that it is lawful for a Christian man to revenge his own sin upon himself; and they, which would so do, should be accounted for martyrs. But we (saith Augustine) account not such to be martyrs. The same father, in his 60th epistle, and in the 204th doth much more plentifully dispute of this matter. Jerome in his epistle to Marcella, concerning the death of Blesilla, under the person of God, saith; I receive not such souls, which against my will went forth of their bodies. And those philosophers, which so did, he calleth the martyrs of foolish philosophy. The same father upon Jonah saith; that It is not our part to pluck death to us violently, but when the same is offered, to take it patiently: except (saith he) it be where chastity is in danger. Chrysostom upon these words of the first chapter to the Galatians; He hath delivered us out of this wicked world: If so it were (saith he) that this life were evil, they should not do evil, which kill themselves; but we say, that they be wicked, and worse than murderers. The canons condemn those also, which geld themselves. And those canons, which be called The canons of the apostles, do call such men murderers of themselves. But and if it be not lawful for one to geld himself, much less is it lawful to kill himself. But yet it must be noted, that it is not there meant of them, which for disease are cut by the Physician.

13. Hereunto also agree the better sort of the philosophers. The better I say, because I know that there were many (as Cleanthes, Empedocles, Zeno, and others) which slew themselves. Plato in Phaedone saith, that This thing for two causes is not lawful. First, because it is not lawful to slay the servant of another; and that all we be the servants of God. Secondly, for that soldiers be condemned, if they forsake their station without their emperors commandment. He saith that God hath set us as it were in a station:

wherefore he that without his commandment shall leave his place, is a traitor. Aristotle in the fifth of his Ethics saith, that It is not lawful to kill a citizen, without commandment of the law and magistrate: and therefore they which kill themselves, ought to be grievously punished; for they are noted with infamy. These things he said, although it be reported, that afterward, for the avoiding of danger, he did willfully kill himself. Virgil placeth these kinds of men in great torments in hell, saying:

Then lowering next in place been they, that fell with willful death,
And guiltless slue themselves, with hasty hands abhorring breath,
And shook from them their souls. How gladly now in skies again,
Would they full poor estate and hardness of their life sustain?
The destinies them resist, and lake unlovely them detains,
And belly fen that nine times flows, among them fast restrains.

And one that wrote Epigrams, saith;

Death to contemn in poor estate, an easy thing it is:
In thrall to live who can abide, doth valiantly certainly.

14. In the Digests, *De bonis illorum, qui ante sententiam sibi manus attulerunt, aut corruperunt accusators. L. Qui rei*. It is decreed, that they, who shall kill themselves, their goods shall be confiscate: and the reason is, that they must be taken for such, as have confessed themselves guilty. Yet is the sharpness of that law mitigated by Antonius the emperor: for he decreed, that that law should be of force, if the crime be worthy either of death or of banishment. Wherefore they, which for theft kill themselves, are excepted. They also be excepted, which being weary of life, or impatient of sorrow, do slay themselves. Also Adrian excepteth the father, who being suspected of killing his son, killeth himself: for it should seem (saith he) that he did it rather for the love of his son, than for guiltiness of the crime.

And if so be that one going about to kill himself, and others coming in the meantime do let him of his enterprise (so he do this through an unpatiency of sorrow, or weariness of life) him also Adrian doth except: but if he shall do it for any other cause, he appointeth him to be punished. For he that will not spare himself (saith he) how will he spare others? In the Digests *De jure fisci*, in the law, *In fraud*, in the Paraph, *Si quis*; If any through shame of debt shall kill himself, he also is pardoned.

And in the Code, *De illis, qui possunt facere testamentum*; If one shall lawfully make his testament, and afterward killeth himself, it is a doubt whether that testament ought to be of force. And it is answered in like manner. But if he be taken in the crime, or made guilty, it shall not stand. And, as we have in the Digests, *De re militari*, in the chapter *Omne delictum*; If a soldier would kill himself, and cannot; if he do the same, either through irksomeness of life, or impatientness of sorrow, or else for shame, he also is pardoned; yet so, as he be discharged from the war, and let go with shame: but if he be not able to excuse himself, he is punished by death. In the Digests *De injusto & fracto testamento*, in the law *Si exhaeredato filio*, in the Paraph, *Irritum*. All these have seen, that it is sin for a man to kill himself. But the Atheniens decreed more sharply as touching this matter. For they ordained, that he which so died, should not be buried in the territory of Athens. They did not only confiscate his goods, but also they would have his body carried forth of their bounds. And why the Romans dealt more mildly, I perceive not; unless perhaps they remembered, that they had in their city, such as were Lucretia, Caro, and Curtius, whom they would not number among the wicked. By these so many arguments, I think it is evident enough, that it is not lawful for any man to kill himself,

neither for the escaping of tyranny, nor yet for obtaining of immortality, which thing Cleombrotus Ambraciota did.

15. But there be objected unto us the examples of Cato, of Curtius, of Lucretia, and of Jonah, which willed himself to be cast into the sea, and of Razis out of the books of Macchabeis, and of certain holy women, whose memory is celebrated in the church, who for defense of their chastity and religion, slue themselves. Cato killed himself, least he should come into the power of a tyrant. But if examples ought to take place, we also may object examples of patriarchs, apostles, and martyrs, who suffering patiently all manner of most grievous torments, yet did they never kill themselves. And these, insomuch as they be our own citizens, they should more move us by their example, than do strangers and foreigners: especially seeing the acts of these men are grounded upon the eternal law, and express will of God. And as touching Cato particularly, Augustine answereth in his first book *De civitate Dei*, that that was not fortitude, but weakness of courage: for that he could not endure adversity. The same Augustine, in the 19th book, and fourth chapter, marveleth at the Stoics, who do place the blessed state in virtue, and reckon not misfortunes among evil things: and yet think, that they are to be shunned even by death. For what reason (saith he) is this, that calamities be not evil, and yet must be avoided even by death? O goodly felicity (saith he) which must be performed by the help of death! And if so be that life be blessed, we ought to abide therein: but if we will finish and perform the same by death, it is not happy. For what felicity is this, that can be overcome by those things, which ye will deny to be evil? Cato (saith he) killed himself, did he it patiently, or unpatiently? Surely unpatiently, and in bitterness of mind. For his patience was vanquished, through the authority of Caesar.

Others thus excuse him, as though by his example he would teach how mischievous a thing tyranny should be in a free Common-wealth: and that the public freedom of our native country ought to be more deer unto us, than life itself. Indeed our life must be spent for the liberty of citizens; yet that must be in battle and conflict. But it is not lawful for any man to kill himself by his own hand. And it is lawful to warn the people of their duty, by all just means; but it is not lawful to teach them by naughty examples. And if so be that Cato were so careful of his country, what profit did he to it, by dying? By his life he might peradventure have profited the same, but being dead, he could by no means do it. A thousand ways better did our Paul: for he, when he was in prison, and had suffered many most bitter punishments, and would have accounted it great advantage, if he might have died; yet, because he saw that he might profit others, he rejected his own commodities, and for other men's sakes desired to remain alive. This undoubtedly is the part of a good citizen, to think upon the public utility of his own citizens. But Cato, before he should die, warned his son, that he should hope well of Caesar, and join himself unto him. If this were dishonest, by what reason persuaded he his son? If it were honest, why did not he himself take the counsel that he gave his son? But it seemeth, that Caesar sufficiently perceived, with what mind Cato did this. For when he heard, that he was dead; He envied (saith he) my glory, he would not have me to be the author of his safety. But he was ashamed to live in that city, which should be held with the rule of a tyrant. Howbeit, he should have considered, that that sin was none of his own, but another man's. And we ought to be ashamed of our own sins, and not of other men's; unless they be such sins as are gathered by our own default. Seeing Cato procured not that tyranny unto Caesar; but ever as Caesar grew in honor, so he put himself

against him, there was no cause why he should be ashamed of another man's fault.

But it is a very great matter (say they) that a man can kill himself. I grant: yet sins also are very great. Greatness may be no less considered in vices, than in virtues. But these men, forsomuch as they be Ethnics, if they cannot be persuaded by our examples, yet at the least wise let them acknowledge their own examples: [whereof there be many found in the ancient histories.] Marcus Artilius Regulus would not slay himself, but chose rather to return unto Carthage, when he knew he should go to most extreme punishments. Whether of these two seem to be of the greater courage? Undoubtedly Regulus; since Cato was overcome with impatience. Also Lucretia is objected. But Augustine saith, that she could not abide the note of unchastity, and for that cause she killed herself. For Sextus Tarquinius entering into her chamber, in the night, with his sword drawn, threatened that he would slay her, unless she would yield to him; and that he would place a servant slain in one bed with her, as if he had been taken in adultery with her. Here did she first begin to deliberate with herself, and afterward she obeyed. Hereby (saith Augustine) there is offered a great scope of matter unto Rhetoricians, for so much as some would praise that fact of Lucretia, and others would reprove it. As for her praisers, they were wont to say, that two indeed committed the wicked fact; but that only one was the adulterer. But (saith Augustine) the chastity of Lucretia cannot be praised, unless her murder be condemned. For if she were an adulteress, why is she praised? But if she were chaste, why did she kill herself? And so he concludeth, that the same in Lucretia, was no valiant courage, but a faint heart, because she could not abide the people's ill suspicion of her.

But this fault was peculiar unto the Romans, that they were infected beyond measure with the desire of praise. Wherefore very well wrote Virgil; that The love of country, and immeasurable desire of praise, had the overhand. But if thou demand, whether Lucretia were an adulteress, or no? I answer that she was. For Aristotle, in his third book of Ethics, when he disputeth of certain actions, whether they be voluntary or not voluntary, demandeth; that If one in a tempest throw out his merchandize, rather than the whole ship should perish, what manner of action that is to be reckoned? And he answereth, that the same is a mingled action: for that it hath some part that is voluntary, and a part also that is not voluntary. But to make a more exquisite answer, he saith, that the action is voluntary: for the merchant had rather it were so for that time. And that an action must be weighed, according to that time, wherein it is taken in hand. And he addeth another reason; that such a kind of action falleth out under the free choice of man: for the merchant deliberated with himself, afterward he made choice, and fully determined that this should be done. Seeing then Lucretia chose rather to commit that adultery, than to be stained with infamy after her death, of necessity the action was voluntary. For she would rather be an adulteress, being alive; then so to be accounted being dead. I grant indeed that the action had some mixture but yet (as I have said) we must measure the fame by that time, wherein it was taken in hand.

But we on the other side, against this example, will object the example of Susanna. I know, that that story is not canonical; yet, howsoever it be, the example must not be contemned. When those elders stood about her in the garden, and threatened that they would accuse her of adultery, unless she would yield unto them; she answered, that She had rather fall into the hands of men, than into the hands of God. Even so ought we also in such

distresses, not to cleave unto our own good intents, and to imagine what may happen on each part; but to make ourselves conformable unto the will of God, and to leave unto his judgment whatsoever shall happen. Also Curtius is objected, who, at such time as the earth opened wide in the midst of the market place, and that the gap could not by any means be filled up; and that an answer was made by the sooth-sayers, that our mother the earth desired that thing, which in the city was most excellent: he came armed on horseback into the market place, saying; Think ye that the city of Rome hath anything in the city more excellent than armor and men? And spurring his horse, he lept down into the gap, and forthwith the earth returned to her own estate. What can here be said, but that these things were done by the deceit and fraud of devils? Nevertheless, if we will compare this Curtius with Cato, we shall perceive, that he was of a far greater courage. For he did not kill himself through impatience, but thorough a care and love of his country: for he was led by some feel of religion. But this was evil, in that he gave credit to the devil, whom he thought to be God. Neither was that otherwise, which Plutarch showeth of the virgins of Lemnos: for they hanged themselves, without any certain cause. And when there could be no end made of this their fury, those which had so come to their death, were, by public consent of the city, drawn naked by a hook, with great ignominy among the people: and after that, they ceased to hang themselves.

16. But to set aside profane examples, they say, that Jonah also willed himself to be cast into the sea: and that this was no other thing than to kill himself. But we must remember, that Jonah was a prophet, and perceived the will of God, and by his instinct commanded these things to be done. Furthermore also, God would that in him should be a figure of Christ: that even as he had been three days in the belly of the fish; so Christ should be

three days in the heart of the earth. Razis also in the history of the Macchabeis killed himself: for when he saw that he was enclosed on every side by Nicanor, and that he could not escape, he struck himself with his own sword; afterward, when he saw his wound was not mortal, he cast himself down headlong. Here Augustine taketh very much pains. For the Donatists were wont to take hold on this example. Nevertheless, he first answereth thus; that Some things perhaps were lawful unto them, which in our time may not be lawful. Howbeit, this is but a weak argument: for the law of God, especially the moral law, is everlasting. But he addeth, that certain acts doubtless are mentioned in the holy scriptures, but not allowed of. Such are the drunkenness of Noah, the incest of Loth, the selling of Joseph, the adultery of David, and other such like. But against this answer it is objected, that in the 14th chapter, this act is commended by the author: for thus he writeth; He would rather die honorably, than suffer anything unworthy of his progeny. Howbeit, this doth not much trouble me: for perhaps the author speaketh these things according to the opinion of Razis; who thought, that if he should live in such sort, it would be a great shame, both to his stock, and his name. Howbeit, another answer is much better; namely, that those books are not among the canonical scriptures, neither may any opinion be confirmed by them. But thou wilt say, that they were read in the church. I grant they were. Augustine saith, that those books were accustomed to be read; because of that noble virtue of the martyrs, to the intent, that godly men might be encouraged against tyrants. But it is incredible, how desirous those Donatists were of voluntary death. This they did, to bring our bishops in hatred, who had obtained against them the assistance of the emperors. And now, to the end they should deal more mildly, they threatened that they would kill themselves. And when it was

objected by our men, that it was not lawful; they used to fly to that example, which we have mentioned of Razis, and unto the place in the epistle to the Corinthians; If I shall give my body, that I be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. Wherefore, it is lawful (say they) so it be done in charity: for Paul reproveth not the same, save where charity faileth. But they fondly and unlearnedly depraved the words of Paul: for they (as Augustine said) are thus to be meant; If of necessity we must either die, or else admit some mischievous act, it is much better for a godly man to die; yet not so, as any man ought to be the author of his own death, but to be ready to abide anything done by the tyrant and executioner. So may it seem, that those fellows of Daniel delivered themselves, when they said, that they would rather die, than worship the image of Nabuchad-nezar. And Christ is said to have given himself for our salvation. Yet saith Paul, if a man even so give himself, that he be burned of a tyrant, if it be not in charity, it shall profit him nothing. Yet this, also did the Donatists vaunt, that man hath free will in his own matters; and therefore it is lawful for any man to kill himself, if he will. But this is ridiculous and vain; since our will must evermore be drawn back from sin. For this both the holy scriptures exhort, and good magistrates, and godly parents, in their subjects and children, do the same.

17. But Jerome upon Jonah saith, that It is our part, not violently to pluck death unto us; but with a good courage to suffer it, when it is offered; unless perhaps it be, where chastity is put in danger. As if he had said; It is lawful for one to kill himself, for preserving of chastity. Of the same opinion Ambrose seemeth to be, in his third book *De virginibus*: for so he writeth of Pelagia the virgins, that the tormentors threatened her, that unless she would worship idols, they would ravish her; and that she, to avoid as well the one

as the other, cast herself down headlong. This act did Ambrose commend: and he addeth, that her mother did escape away with other two daughters; and that when in flying away, they were hindered by a river, they of their own accord rushed headlong into the same, and by that means they were drowned. Eusebius also, in his eighth book, and 15th chapter, when he reckoneth up the lewd lusts of Maxentius, saith, that he, bearing inordinate love unto a certain matron of Rome of singular beauty, privily sent ministers of his lewdness, to bring her unto him. Who having bound her husband, and used all threatening's towards him, lastly obtained of him, that he yielded his wife unto the lust of the tyrant. But she, as though she would seem to obey, when she had obtained a time to make herself ready, being retired into a parlor, did thrust herself through with a sword. And that fact is not blamed, but rather allowed. Here Augustine somewhat doubteth, what answer to make. First he saith, that on the one part he seeth that law of God; Thou shalt not kill: and on the other part, that they be celebrated in the church as martyrs. As touching the word of God, he is resolved: and concerning the judgment of the church, it might be, that God by some revelation made it be known, that their doings pleased him, and that they were stirred by the motion and instinct of the spirit, and by the special counsel of God. And like to this is that which we read to be done by Samson, in the book of Judges.

But by Augustine's leave, this comparison doth not sufficiently agree: for as touching Samson, that he was set on by the spirit of God, it is certain: also God restored his strength unto him, which he before had taken away. And Samson, when he died, did call upon the Lord. And the epistle to the Hebrews giveth him a testimony of faith and godliness, and reckoneth him in the number of the saints. Which cannot be said of these virgins: for they

have no testimony out of the word of God. Augustine addeth; that that law (Thou shalt not kill) is certain and well known. But no man must be persuaded to kill himself, through a divine motion; unless he know and have a certain trial, that it is the motion of God. Indeed I confess, that God sometimes doth certain things by extraordinary means. For he commanded the Hebrews to rob the Egyptians, and Abraham to kill his son: yet may we not hereby pronounce anything, more than we see is evident by the holy scriptures. Verily, I for my part cannot allow of the facts of these virgins: for whether they were done by the motion of God, I know not; neither do I think, that the same can certainly enough be known of any. Yet may it be, that they acknowledged their sins, before they departed out of their life, and that God forgave them. Undoubtedly, the endeavor of defending chastity and religion is very laudable: yet must we take heed, that we defend the same by good means, and right considerations. Those virgins, which did these things, be praised. Admit they be so. But sometimes things, which be done amiss, be praised also. The word of God is such, as in commending thereof, we cannot be deceived.

18. I know there be some of the latter writers, which thus decree; that If any man, for his own sake, because he cannot endure either sharpness of punishment, or reproach, doth kill himself, he sinneth very grievously: but that if he only lay before his eyes, the glory of God, because he perceiveth that those things, which he shall suffer, will redound to his dishonor, he may so be excused. For so Samson killed himself, because he saw that his misery was a dishonor unto God. And that same Razis also, and those other women, which we now spake of, did so likewise. But this distinction doth not weaken the truth, which we defend: for it is a steadfast and everlasting rule; that We must not commit evil, that good may come thereof. Yea and

the martyrs also could easily perceive, that their death would redound to the glory of God's name; yet was there none of them that killed himself. Even so might that Amalechite have excused himself, which furthered Saul's death: for the Philistines, if they could have taken Saul alive, would not only have reproached him, but God also. Nevertheless, David commanded him to be slain. Yea and Augustine himself answereth this reason; What sin (saith he) did they fear? Surely the sin, which seemed to be at hand, was none of theirs, but of wicked men. But if it be lawful for us, to kill ourselves, for the escaping of our sin, then should everyone slay himself immediately after baptism. By all these reasons it is concluded, that Saul, in that he killed himself, cannot be excused. But the Hebrews defend him on this sort; That when he knew he should die, yet he manfully returned to his camp, and failed not anything at all of his duty, but submitted himself to the judgment of God, which was declared by Samuel. Nay rather, he sinned two times grievously in one and the self-same matter; first, in that he took counsel of a witch; secondly, in that he gave credit unto her, or rather unto the devil. For both those deeds of his were against the law of God. These things have I reasoned at large, but (as I hope) not unprofitably. For these days of ours be very dangerous, and the life of godly people is open unto prisons, unto banishments, unto torments, unto burnings, and finally unto all kind of evils. Howbeit, although we should enter into all kind of adversities, yet must none lay violent hands upon himself. Also, doubtful and intricate cogitations are oftentimes suggested unto us by the devil, touching some sin of ours, as of offense towards God, our shame or infamy. But these assaults we must valiantly resist, and not suffer ourselves by any persuasion of the devil, to be carried away from God.

**Of resisting of violence.**

19. A Christian man is not forbidden, but that he may repel violence by violence; when either he is suddenly set upon in a desolate place, or cannot otherwise call for aid and help of the magistrate. For seeing the laws made by a just magistrate, do give this leave unto him; he doth not this act as a private man, but as a public minister, armed by just and public laws. Christ said, If a man give to the a blow on thy right cheek, turn unto him the other. But this must be done, when thou seest, that by this means thou mayest profit thy brother, or that it furthereth the advancement of God's glory. And out of these cases, it is not necessary so to do, as both Christ and Paul by their example have taught. But while we repel violence by violence, we must use a moderation of a just defense of ourselves, (as the lawyers speak,) that we seek not to hurt or to kill him, that doth us violence. And this must be diligently regarded, that with as little harm to him as thou canst, thou repel from thee his force or violence. Undoubtedly, if it had not been lawful to repel violence by violence; the apostles following Christ would not have borne swords with them. But they had swords: for they said unto Christ, at his last supper; Behold here be two swords. And Peter, when Christ should be taken; Shall we smite (saith he) with the sword? Hereby it is manifest enough, that the apostles to this use wear swords. If this had been repugnant to the law of God, Christ would never have permitted it: for he was a most earnest maintainer of the commandments of his father.

**Of cursing's, imprecations, or banning's.**

20. It shall now be very convenient for us, to entreat somewhat of imprecations, and of banning's, or cursing's. The use of malediction and cursing is very ancient in the holy scriptures. Noah cursed his nephew Canaan; Cursed be Canaan, let him be a servant to his brethren. Baalak also the son of Zippor, called Balaam to curse Israel. In Deuteronomy we read;

Cursed shalt thou be in the town, and in the field, in the barn, and in the store. Cursed be the fruit of the womb. These execrations were to be recited upon mount Hebal. The law of jealousy hath also, in the book of Numbers, proper imprecations; namely, that The belly should swell and break, and the thighs rot. All which things could not hurt the woman, if she were innocent: but unto an adulteress they were recited, not without force and effect. Joshua cursed him, which would re-edify Jericho, with the death of his children. And this happened under Ahab, as the history of the Kings mentioneth. And Nehemiah's saith; that he not only rebuked those, which had married strange wives, but also cursed them. In the New Testament also, there want not examples, the which shall be afterward alleged.

Yea and the Ethnics likewise used cursing's. Acteius a Tribune of the people of Rome, (as Plutarch declareth in the life of M. Crassus) when he could by no other means dissuade him from his expedition into Parthia, at the length, in the way, by the which Crassus should pass out of the city, he set a chafing dish of coals, in the midst of the street. And when Crassus came against it, he cast in certain perfumes, and with most horrible and bitter curses, cursed the general, and all his host. Which curses were not in vain, as the event over well declared. Oedipus also (as the Poets tell) with banning's cursed his two sons Adrastes and Polynices; namely, that they should be without city and house, that they should be beggars and wanderers abroad, and so at variance in themselves, that the one should kill the other. Which effects, according to his wish, came to pass. And Horace saith; I will utterly curse you, and this bitter curse can no sacrifice appease. Neither is that to be passed in silence, which Augustine mentioneth concerning Paul and Palladia. For they being cursed of their mother,

miserably wandered about from country to country; until at the last they were delivered at the tomb of S. Stephen.

21. Seeing therefore so great plenty of cursing's and banning's hath always been, as well among the Jews, as also among the Gentiles; is it possible, that it should altogether be unjust, or be sin, to curse, or to wish evil unto any man, so that it should be lawful at no time? Augustine undoubtedly was of this mind, that it is not lawful: and he entreateth of this matter, towards the end of his first book *De sermon Domini in monte*. He also writeth, that those imprecations, which are read in the prophets, pertain only unto prophesies; so that, under that form of prayer, they only foretold the things, which they saw should come to pass. And whereas they use the Optative mood, instead of the Indicative, that (he saith) is not to be wondered at among the Hebrews: seeing they often times use such figures in their speeches. For many times they use one Tense for another, putting the time past for the time to come: as; Wherefore have the Gentiles raged, and the people imagined vain things? Again; They divided my garments among them. These things were for to come, and were forespoken concerning Christ; when as nevertheless they were written, as things already past. Howbeit, he confesseth, that otherwhile we pray, that some may be punished and chastised for their amendment: which is not (saith he) to pray against them, but for them. And he citeth a place out of the Apocalypse, the sixth chapter, where the martyrs cry under the altar; Take vengeance upon the earth for our blood, which is shed.

And it seemeth unto him, that thereby is meant, that these martyrs prayed against the kingdom of sin. And sin may be destroyed two manner of ways. First, if a contrary disposition be induced: so that sin being excluded, there succeedeth mortification of lusts, righteousness, honesty, and all kind of

virtues. Again, sin is subdued unto God, when punishment is applied unto the same; for while it is unpunished, it hath nothing in it that is good: but so soon as it is punished, forsomuch as that punishment is a part of justice, sin is at the least wise somewhat restrained and bridled thereby, from ranging any further abroad. And this also is profitable unto wretched sinners. Wherefore, if we will judge uprightly; the martyrs, in so praying, prayed rather for them, than against them. Neither also were it absurd, if they should pray for the end of the world, wherein they have suffered so grievous things, that ungodliness may once have an end. Although I think not, that all the elder fathers are of this mind, that we should pray for the end of the world; seeing rather on the contrary part, Tertullian in his apology saith, that the Christians in their congregations, pray for prolonging of the end of the world. And in the same place he writeth, that our men, by the determinate rule of the holy scriptures, prayed not only for emperors, but also for the long preservation of the world. For after this monarchy of the Romans, as Paul writeth to the Thessalonians, shall come Antichrist, and the end. Wherefore some of the godly sort prayed, that the time might be prolonged; partly, that the tribulation which should come through Antichrist, might be deferred; and partly, that the children of the election might be gathered together.

The Greek Scholies write, that those holy martyrs prayed against the devil, that his power might be bridled and brought to an end. And thus much of Augustine's opinion, who was also of the same mind against Faustus, who saith; These words of execration, which we read in the prophets, seem to be the words of those, which fore-speak, not desires of them that accurse. But as touching this matter, I would think it should thus be determined; to wit, that when there is an enemy, which both wisheth evil

unto us, and also to the uttermost of his power worketh evil against us; we first of all should make a distinction of the cause, for the which he hateth us. For either it is our own proper cause, human and civil; or else it is, because he hateth God and his truth. Next that, we make a distinction as touching men: for some are led by an accustomed affection of their own; and other some are moved by God, who revealeth to them, both what he will do, or what is the state of the wicked, and stirreth them up to speak the things, which they do speak. Neither is this in the meantime to be passed over, that the evils, which we pray for, are either temporal, or eternal. After these distinctions, I think we ought thus to say; That if our own cause only be in hand, therein we ought to be patient, long suffering, and gentle. Bless, and curse not: thus the scripture commandeth. We must also pray for them that persecute us. We are by God created men, let us not spit out the venom of serpents: and forsomuch as we are men, let us not suffer ourselves to be changed into brute beasts. They which hurt us, are mad, and are forced by fury; and therefore are rather worthy of compassion, than of revenge or cursing's. A mouth is given unto us, by it to help and remedy; and not that we should curse and ban with the same. Otherwise God saith of such execrations; I commanded thee, that thou shouldest pray for thine enemies, why doest thou provoke me now against them? Wilt thou have me to be a helper of thee to transgress my laws, and to be thine executioner?

A certain priest of Athens could not be induced to curse Alcibiades: for he said, that he was made a priest to pray for men, and not to curse them. And among the Romans it was not lawful for the high priest of Jupiter to swear; for that oftentimes, the end and conclusion of an oath is execration. For they say; Let these or those things fall upon me, unless I perform this or that. And seeing it was not lawful for the priest to curse himself, much less was

it lawful for him to curse others. Wherefore, if our own cause be in hand, we ought not to use cursing's, but rather prayers, compassions, and blessings. But when God's cause is in hand, and that this indignation cometh on us, by reason of sins and wicked acts; there is nothing to let, but that we may sometime use imprecations, in such manner as we shall express. And it oftentimes happeneth, that our own cause is joined with the glory of God; and is so joined, as it cannot be distinctly judged of, but only by a diligent and attentive consideration. As if a minister of the church see himself contemned and derided, although he often times regard not his own dignity: yet notwithstanding, neither can he, nor ought he, quietly suffer the word of God (which he ministereth) to be contemned. For this cause, the prophets seemed many times to be very angry, for that their messages and prophesies were derided. Wherefore I grant, that in this case, both imprecations and cursing's were justly admitted.

22. Howbeit, this I think necessary to admonish you of, that we deal very warily. For our flesh is wont, under the pretense of God's glory and honor, to fight and brawl for our own honor and estimation. Moreover, it must not be neglected, that we diligently sever sins from nature, and that in any wise we wish well unto nature itself, that is, unto men: but let us curse and hate sins. And for so much as it happeneth oftentimes, that men, when they have been corrected by some afflictions and punishments, do repent: so, if unto wicked men, being strangers from God, and transgressors of his laws, we sometimes wish some discommodities and adversities of the flesh, to the end they may feel the wrath of God, I see nothing to the contrary. And this without controversy we may wish unto ourselves, and that justly; that God will rather afflict and scourge us, than suffer us to fall into sins: or if we sin, that he will at the least wise, by this means, call us back to him. And if we

may wish these, and such like things unto ourselves; why should we not wish them unto others, seeing we are commanded to love our neighbors as ourselves? So Elias shut up heaven. So God drew home again unto himself some of his elect, which went astray: for there be some dispositions of men so blockish, that they cannot be brought home again, but by this means. Wherefore the psalm saith; Fill their faces with ignominy, and they will seek after thy name. So then, we may wish the cross of affliction, both unto ourselves, and also unto others, for amendment and correction. In which cause yet nothing ought over hastily to be done: for often times it happeneth, that some by afflictions are not amended, but rather made worse.

But the better way were to pray unto God, to correct them: and not to wish adversities unto them, except it be with this condition, to convert them, or that the glory of God may thereof ensue. And this way (saith Augustine) we should not pray against them, but for them. Howbeit we must understand, that among men there be some, which are the ambassadors of God, who deal not as private men; but they execute an extraordinary ministry. And these by the spirit of prophesying doubt nothing of the will of God: for in their prayers they talk together with God, and in that talk they see and understand many things, as concerning the mind, and are wonderfully affected. Seeing then, that God showeth unto them, that sinners shall be brought to amendment of some kind of punishments, and that he hath determined to punish them; or else that some are now past all hope of salvation, and shall without doubt be punished with eternal misery: seeing (I say) that such things are showed unto holy men, and that they in no wise doubt, but that they are decreed by the most excellent God (the which being chosen by him, must of necessity be good) how can it be but that they please them, how can it be chosen but that they are wished of

them, when as they continually pray; Thy will be done? Wherefore when they see those things, they pray, they make imprecations, they pour out such execrations and cursing's, as we read in the prophets and holy histories.

23. Hereof the godly do take consolation, who thereby understand, in what sort wicked men shall at the length be handled: and the weaker and wandering sort, which pertain unto the flock of God, are by these things corrected, and do take heed unto themselves, that they deserve not the like. For this cause Gregory, upon those words of Job, wherein he cursed the day of his birth, prudently wrote, that the execrations of the saints proceed not of malice; that is, from a fleshly desire and worldly hatred, but from a just consideration, namely, in that they do see the same to be allowed by the will of God. But (saith he) these things are not prayed for by wishing and desiring. Unto which last saying of his I assent not: for (as I have already said) the saints cannot but allow, and earnestly wish that, which they see God willeth; so that they be assured, that God hath thus firmly decreed. In this manner Paul made blind Elimas the sorcerer: Peter slue Ananias and Sapphira. So likewise the same Peter said unto Simon the sorcerer; Thy money and thou be destroyed together. Paul delivered unto Satan, him that committed incest, and said; I would to God they were cut off, which trouble you! Neither did Elias any other wise command the fire to come down from heaven, the which devoured the captains over fifty, with their fifty soldiers. Elisha also cursed the children which derided him, and they were torn in sunder of the bears. What difference is there, whether God execute by himself, or by others, whom he hath appointed to be his ministers? Wherefore, that which he doth by himself, he can do in like sort by his saints and prophets.

24. Furthermore, if any man have a great desire to curse other, and pretend the imitation of the prophets and apostles; let him fore-see, whether he have their spirit. For even as no man ought to use the sword, but a magistrate only; so let none use these execrations, but they which are most privy to the will of God, and which are moved by the spirit to give those curses. This place is alike, yea rather all one with that place, which concerneth revenge. Private revenge is forbidden; yet not public revenge, and that which is done by princes. So then, let them, which be of the common sort abstain from execrations: especially let them not wish any cross to any man, as touching eternal damnation, but upon condition, that it may do good. And let them know, that they are bound by this common rule; Bless and curse not; pray for them which persecute you. And they, which by God's motion use any execration or imprecation, let them always have before their eyes the amendment of sin: or at the least-way, the diminishing of the malice thereof, through pains and punishments, that the righteous may not be hindered from the worshipping of God, and also may not stretch forth their hands unto iniquities: and finally, let them only seek, that the will of God may have place; and let them not be desirous of their own commodities.

Neither ought it to seem a wonder to any man, that that common rule (which prescribeth to us To bless, and not to curse, and to wish well unto them which persecute us) admitteth any exceptions: for that happeneth also in other commandments. Is it not else-where ordained, that We should pray for all men? And unto Timothy the reason is added; for that God will have all men to be saved. And yet John saith; that Some do sin unto death, and for them (saith he) we ought not to pray. Which yet we ought to understand, when we plainly perceive, that they have sinned unto the death. Now then,

as touching that trope or figure of Augustine, wherein he saith, that these imprecations of the saints, were predictions or foretelling's (as we do not utterly reject it:) even so we say, that it is not necessary. Neither do we grant, that in the execrations of the prophets, and of the apostles, there were not earnest requests and desires. For how could they but desire that, which they saw God had willed and decreed; unless peradventure by request and desire he meant the sense of the flesh, or of reason, as it is led by men's counsels? Last of all, this is to be noted; that it is not absurd, that in one and the self-same will of godly men, are contrary motions: since they happen not in respect of one and the self-same thing, but in respect of diverse. For, in that they look upon the will and decree of God, and the destruction of sin, and such like; they cannot but rejoice in the punishments of the wicked: but as they look upon them being men joined unto them by nature, of one and the self-same flesh and lump, they are exceedingly sorry for their destruction. Thus Samuel mourned for Saul being rejected by God: as we have it in the 15th chapter of the first book of Kings.

**How far it may be lawful to rejoice in our enemy's overthrow.**

25. Wherefore, if it be demanded, whether it be lawful for a man to delight in the miserable state of an enemy: first I answer this in general, that for his ruin into sin, not only we should not rejoice, but also we ought earnestly to lament. As touching adversity some doubt there may be. Solomon saith in the Proverbs, the 24th chapter; Rejoice not thou at the fall of thine enemy, and let not thy heart be glad when he stumbleth, least the Lord see it, and it displease him, and he take away his wrath from him. How then (wilt thou say) did Moses (when Pharaoh was destroyed and dead) sing that triumphant song; Sing we unto the Lord: and not only rejoiced in mind, but also appointed timbrels and dances? Some men do

thus distinguish this question; That so long as the enemy is afflicted, we should not rejoice, because we are uncertain of the will of God: for that every man ought to remember, that he also is a man, and that the self-same may happen unto him [that happeneth to another;] for that no human thing is strange from him. But when God, by the slaughter and destruction of his enemy, hath declared his will and purpose, then we ought to rejoice. Thus have they said.

But I say, that when thou dost thus rejoice, we must see whether thou seek thine own, or not thine own. For there be some, which only have consideration to their own: and when the enemy is afflicted, they think that their injuries be revenged of God. But if thou withdraw thy mind from these cogitations, unto the glory of God; and considerest, that God doth therefore revenge his own cause; that thine enemy may be bettered, that sin may be hindered, that the Gospel be no more disturbed, or the word of God repressed: then are we to rejoice earnestly, and from the heart. And in very deed, we must not in this matter take examples from holy men, but from the law of God. For David wept at the death of Absalom, of Abner, and of Saul: but at the death of Nabal he rejoiced. Samuel mourned for Saul, but not for Agag. For so do sundry affections follow in godly men, according as they be diversely stirred up by the spirit of God. In these affections we must altogether seek, not what is for own profit, but what furthereth the salvation of our neighbor, and the glory of God. Yea and these two affections are oftentimes joined in one man. For so far forth, as we see our enemy is a man, humanity itself causeth, that we bewail his calamity: but if, on the other part, we cast our eyes upon the will of God, godliness requireth that we should rejoice in his judgments.

26. But there is none to be found of so evil and lewd a nature, but a man having due consideration, may see some gifts of God in him, for he is either active, or strong, or learned, or noble, or eloquent, or witty. These things, though we be provoked by injuries, we ought not to deface, or keep in silence; if any opportunity be offered to speak well of our enemies. Aeschines an Ethnic neither dissembled, nor diminished before the Rhodians, the eloquence of Demosthenes his most professed enemy; but rather amplified it, as much as he could, and recited unto them that most venomous oration, which Demosthenes had written against him: and he added, that it was nothing without the action and pronunciation of that Orator. David both in words and deeds reverenced Saul being his enemy, for that he was the anointed of the Lord. And the apostle therefore commandeth the same, because the world judgeth that man should deal far otherwise. For either it delighteth in cursed speakers, and enemies of the truth; or it thinketh it an honesty to requite injuries. Wherefore Vespasian (when as there arose a contention between a certain Senator and a knight of Rome) did with this sentence appease the strife; Doubtless, to revile a Senator, it is not lawful; but to revile again when a man is reviled, that is both lawful and civil: for that he, which first provoked, did deprive himself of the prerogative of his honor. But Paul commandeth us far otherwise: for we must not consider what our adversary deserveth, but what becometh our own selves.

Neither doth the apostle require only, that we should speak well of our enemies, but also wish well unto them: for so think I, that εὐλογεῖτε, (Bless ye) is to be taken in the second place, as an Antithesis to that which followeth; (And curse not.) Some think it is only a repetition for the greater vehemency. But I think it better agreeth, that we are first commanded to

speak well of our enemies, and then to wish them good, and in no wise to curse them as men commonly use to do. And if this seem a hard matter to be done, let us remember, that We are the children of him, who maketh his sun to shine upon the good and upon the evil: and that we are his disciples, who answered his apostles, when they required fire from heaven to burn the Samaritans; Ye know not of whose spirit ye be; namely his, which came not to destroy, but to save; his, who healed them that railed upon him; his, who restored unto Malchus his ear, who came with the other soldiers of the chief rulers, to take Christ; his, which both saluted the traitor Judas as a friend, and received him with a kiss; finally, his, which forgave the wicked thief, and promised him eternal felicity, which prayed for them that crucified him, and which of his own accord died for his enemies. It shall nothing profit thee, to recompense injuries with injuries, and taunts with taunts. Thou oughtest rather to commit the matter unto God, who will be a most just judge, and by no perturbation can be led away from justice.

27. Furthermore, thou shouldest hereby gather, that it is not lawful to speak ill of any man; nor yet to curse any man. For if it be forbidden to do these things against our enemies, (which otherwise might seem tolerable in man's judgment) much less may we suffer ourselves to do it unto others. Chrysostom, to the intent he might persuade us to follow these words of Paul, reckoneth up the commodities which the cursing's and persecutions of adversaries commonly bring to the godly. First (saith he) they very well help us to the obtainment of the kingdom of heaven: for Christ saith; Blessed are they, which suffer persecution for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. And he addeth; Blessed are ye, when they revile you, and persecute you, speaking all manner of evil, and lying against you for my sake. Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is great in heaven, &c.

Besides this, they are an occasion or matter of most excellent virtues: for as Paul teacheth; Tribulation, worketh patience; patience, experience: and experience, hope. But where is the patience of the saints, where is their experience, where is their hope; if thou take away the wicked enterprises of our enemies against us?

Moreover, the glory of God can by no other means be highly advanced, than if we valiantly and courageously behave ourselves in those things, which are to be suffered for his name sake. For it is no hard matter, to cleave unto God, so long as all things go prosperously and quietly with us, and as we would desire. But when all manner of adversities happen, and yet we constantly abide in his obedience; this doubtless cometh of a manly and stout faith. And therefore I think James said, that Patience hath a perfect work. Unless peradventure a man will thus understand it, that perfection is not in any work, unless we persevere in the same. For when we leave off, we accomplish not the work, and so without patience it is left imperfect. Add moreover, that by this means chiefly our enemies are terrified, that they proceed not to persecute us. For when they see, that we are not moved by their injuries, they think, that they lose their labor: and therefore they take not so great pleasure of the reproaches, wherewith they have exercised us. But if they shall perceive us to be vexed, and to take it in ill part; they will think, that their injuries have taken good success, and will be afterward more bold in their wicked endeavor. By this we may see, why the Lord said; Blessed are ye, when men revile you, and persecute you, and speak all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake: rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven. This commandment of Christ the apostles executed; for they returned from the presence of the Council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to be reviled for his name's sake. And Paul, in

the first to the Corinthians, saith; We are evil spoken of, and we bless. In Greek it is λοιδορούμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν.

28. But this persuasion Paul did not always observe: for to the Galatians he saith; I would to God they were cut off, which trouble you! And David saith; Let their table be made a snare before them, let their eyes be made dim, that they may not see, and bow down their backs always. All other books of the prophets are every-where full of curses and imprecations, wherewith they curse the enemies of the people of God. Here doubtless (in my judgment) it must be said, that we ought so to deal, as Paul now admonisheth, so long as we have a respect unto our own injuries; and that we walk the ordinary way, and common course, whereby we are bound by love to wish well unto our neighbors. But if so be God open unto us his secret will, and declare what shall without doubt come to pass, concerning our enemies, and those which persecute us; then, if we sincerely and truly love him, we ought undoubtedly to stay ourselves upon his will and counsel. Howbeit, this caution is added: first, to be fully assured, whether those things, which God hath opened unto us, pertain only to a threatening; or else wholly to declare his determinate and assured will. For where we suspect, that God only threateneth, to bring us to repentance, we ought not to cease praying even for the wicked. So did Moses, when he made supplication to God for his nation: so did Abraham for the Sodomites, so did Samuel for Saul, and so did Jeremiah for the people.

But when they be out of doubt, that it is the certain and fixed will of God, they do not only pray against the wicked by prophesying as thinketh Augustine against Faustus, in his 16th book, and 22nd chapter (where he thus writeth; But curses, when they are uttered by the way of prophesy, proceed not of an ill desire of him that curseth, but of the foreknowing spirit

of him that denounceth them:) but also from the heart, God now consenting thereunto, and wishing the same with it. David, when as otherwise he was so merciful to Semei, to Absalom, and to Saul, and to other enemies; yet sometimes he so curseth and banneth the wicked, as he driveth a horror into them that read them. Christ also first bewailed the infelicity of the city of Jerusalem, for that she knew not the time of her visitation: and he saith; How often would I have gathered together thy children, as a hen doth her chickens under her wings, and thou wouldest not? Howbeit, even he, knowing the assured and immovable will of God, burst forth into these words; I give thanks unto thee, O father of heaven and of earth, for that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to the little ones: even so Lord, for that it hath so pleased in thy sight.

Moreover, men of God, when they come to this point, they have not a respect to their own cause, neither do regard their own injuries; but consider, that by the wicked works of the ungodly, the church of God is harmed, the spiritual proceedings thereof are hindered, and the course of the Gospel is letted. And they most ardently desire, that the name of God might be sanctified, and his kingdom most amply spread abroad. And hereof it cometh, that when the godly pray against wicked men, they persecute not their own enemies, but the enemies of God, whom they wish to be most purely worshipped. David saw that he was called by God to the kingdom; and understood that the enterprises of the wicked were not so much repugnant to his own dignity, as to the will of God. Wherefore, worthily in his prayers, he wisheth rather, that they should perish, and that most vilely; than that any jot of the most just will of God should be hindered. So that both in this place, and in such other like, we are forbidden, not only to curse, but also to speak evil when we be overcome with the spites and

injuries of the wicked; by whom it is not meet that we should suffer our courage to be quailed, or to be led from the rule of charity. Herein doubtless consisteth the magnanimity of Christians, and their incredible valiantness of courage; not only not to curse them that persecute them, but also to speak well of them, and to pray unto God for them.

29. Howbeit, I cannot wonder enough, that Thomas Aquinas should say, that by the words of Paul, Christians are not compelled; by force of the precept to show particularly unto their enemies the affect of charity, or (as they use to speak) to show signs of benevolence unto them, except it be in case of necessity. For it is enough, if they exclude them not from the general bond of love, wherewith we ought to love our neighbors. Neither (saith he) is it of necessity, that we should pray peculiarly for them. But this is sufficient, if we exclude them not from the common prayers, which we make for all men. And if any man (saith he) besides the case of necessity, do show unto an enemy tokens of special love, or do specially make intercession for him; that man followeth counsel, but obeyeth not the commandment. Yet Christ and Paul, when they spake of these things, taught not this distinction. This doctrine doubtless cutteth in sunder the sinews of Christian religion, it presseth down the vehemence of God's spirit, and taketh away the force and sharpness of the law of God. Let these men go now and cry out, that we be they, which dissolve the endeavor of good works, and open a window to licentious life; when as they cannot deny, but that themselves are those, which at their own pleasure change the certain and severe commandments of God into counsels. Doubtless Christ and Paul commanded those things, and do not give them only as counsels. But this is exceedingly to be lamented, that these commandments in this iron age of ours, are made like the laws of Athens. For they, although they were wisely

invented and published abroad; yet notwithstanding lay neglected, and were everywhere of all men violated. And we must think, that this came of no other cause, but that the whole juice and blood of Christian religion is in a manner dried up.

**Of a curse.**

30. The Hebrews did not utterly overthrow and destroy certain cities, which they had taken into their hands; but did inhabit them. Howbeit, some they cursed, and utterly rooted out. And their vow of the thing that was promised, was called *Cherem*, of the verb *Charam*, which is, To waste, To destroy, To kill, To deface, and To accurse. The Grecians called that word *Cherem*, ἀνάθεμα: and they also called ἀναθέματα, ἀποκείμενα, καί ἀφειρώμενα, as things consecrate and put apart. And it may be, that they were so called, because they were hanged up in temples, and were sequestered from the use of men, and might not be removed from off that place. Yea, men were sometimes called by that word. Paul in very deed used that word many times: for he saith to the Galatians; Let him be accursed, whosoever shall preach any other Gospel. And to the Romans, he wished himself to be accursed for the brethren. And to the Corinthians the first epistle, he saith; He that loveth nor the Lord Jesus, let him be accursed, *Maranatha*: where he taketh this word ἀνάθεμα, for this word *Cherem*, that is, A thing separated and disjoined altogether from the company and use of man: so as it was unlawful to touch it, or use it. A testimony whereof we have in the book of Joshua the sixth chapter, as touching the city of Ierico. And it seemeth that it was so accursed, because it was after a sort the first fruits of the cities which were taken. For, after that they were passed over Jordan, it was the first that was conquered of all the cities, and that by no help of man; for that the walls thereof fell down of their own accord, and by

the will of God. Wherefore it was meet, that the spoils thereof should altogether be consecrated unto God.

31. But it seemeth to be utterly strange from the service of God, to destroy both cities and men: and these things have rather a show of cruelty, than of religion. I answer, that destructions indeed of their own proper nature, appertain neither to religion, nor to godliness: but so far forth as they be referred to the glory of God. And this may happen two manner of ways; as when that destruction is counted for a certain token of the severity and justice of God, against those people, whom he, for their wickedness, would have to be destroyed: or else, as a certain testimony of God's goodness and mercy towards the Israelites, whom in that expedition he mercifully helped. Wherefore, the overthrowing of the city, houses, men, and beasts, did show the justice and severity of God: and the consecration declared the goodness, help, and mercy uttered to that people. Moreover, God would by that means prove the obedience of his people, in abstaining from the spoils which were consecrated to God. For we know, that soldiers, when they have gotten the victory, are hardly restrained from the prey. But they which obeyed not the curse, when if was published, were most grievously punished. Which the holy history of Joshua declareth to have happened unto Achan, because he usurped unto himself some of the spoils of Ierico. We know also, that Saul was for this cause bereft of his kingdom, in that he had reserved Agag the king, and certain oxen and fat cattle of the prey, which were already bound by the vow of the curse.

32. But touching the form and end of the curse, we have spoken enough. For the form is the destruction of cities, men, and beasts: and the consecration of gold, silver, iron, brass, pearls, precious stones, and costly things, which were appointed only to the use of the tabernacle. But the end

was, that they might be monuments of God's goodness and justice; and also an exercise and trial of the Israelites. Now resteth to speak somewhat of the matter, and efficient cause thereof. Certainly, the matter was, whatsoever was to be found alive in those cities: for all that ought to be killed. And the buildings, and other garnishing's of the city to be clean destroyed: but as for the riches and ornaments, they (as it is said) were consecrated unto the worshipping of God. But there was to be noted, that none were vowed unto so horrible a destruction, except such as were already declared and openly vowed to be enemies of God. For it is not lawful to kill innocents. Wherefore, they sinned most grievously, which so vowed Paul's death, as they would neither eat nor drink, till they had killed him. And at this day, they behave themselves more than wickedly, which confess themselves to have made a vow, most cruelly to kill all the professors of the Gospel. Yea and Jephthah without doubt was deceived, who because of this kind of vowing, thought that his daughter ought either to be slain, or else forced to perpetual virginity.

Agamemnon also is to be condemned, who (as Cicero in his book of Offices reporteth) vowed unto Diana the fairest thing that should be born in his kingdom: which foolish vow to perform, he sacrificed his daughter Iphigenia. But the efficient cause of the vow Cherem, sometimes is God: as it is written in the seventh and tenth chapters of Deuteronomy. For there it is commanded, that places dedicated to idols, altars, images, groves and monuments, should utterly be destroyed: and that was a perpetual curse in the land of Canaan, and to be always observed. Sometimes the prince made such a vow, as we read of Joshua: and sometimes the people, as we find in the 21st chapter of Numbers. The prophet also sometime did this: and thus did Samuel charge Saul, that he should destroy all things which belonged to

the Amalechits. The name of this city, whereof there is mention in the first of Judges, was afterward called Horma; whereas before it was not so called. And it was so called, of the word Cherem: for such a name were they wont to give the places that were destroyed, by reason of a vow or curse. In the book of Numbers, a certain portion, which the Israelites kept by force, was (by reason of such a vow) called Horma.

33. But it would seem to be a question, whether these destructions were against charity? I say, they were not: for such enemies were chosen to be utterly destroyed of the Jews, by the judgment of God, and not at the pleasure of men. And as concerning the love or hatred of enemies, we must understand, that Augustine hath written toward the end of the former book of the sermon of the Lord upon the mount, that he doth ascend a certain step of righteousness, which loveth his neighbor, although he as yet hate his enemy. But he shall then perform goodwill and goodness, according to the commandment of him (which came to fulfill the law and not to break it) when he shall extend the same even to the love of his enemy. For the other degree, although it be somewhat, yet is it so small, that it may be common also with Publicans. Neither is that, which is said in the law; Thou shalt hate thine enemy, to be taken as a commandment unto the just, but as a permission unto the weak. Thus much writeth he. To whom if I shall say as the truth is, I do not agree, but am certainly persuaded, that to hate our enemies is not permitted by God; no not in them which be imperfect: for it is an everlasting precept, that we should love our neighbor as ourselves. And he is our neighbor, upon whom we light by any occasion: as Christ declared in the parable of the Jews and of the Samaritan. Those undoubtedly were compared as enemies one to another: wherefor the condition of enmity, when it happeneth, cannot let, but that such as are

enemies one to another, be neighbors notwithstanding. Moreover, forsomuch as we see, that David and other prophets did oftentimes curse their enemies: by what means can we call them weak, to whom God gave liberty to hate their enemies? For they were holy men, and very perfect.

Neither doth that seem to make much to the purpose, which the same Augustine saith; namely, that The sayings of these holy men were no vows and desires, but rather forespeaking's, and prophesies of them, who living under the old testament, did oftentimes prophesy the event of things to come. For the apostles are also found in the New Testament, not only to have spoken words of cursing's (as Paul, when he saith; I would to God they were cut off that trouble you!) but also to have imposed most grievous punishments. For so much as it is written in the Acts of the apostles, that the same Paul deprived Elimas the magician of his sight; and Peter slue Ananias and Sapphira. Wherefore it were better to say, that these great men did not such things of hatred granted to them against imperfect men; but forced thereunto by some other manner of means. And so me thinketh we must make this distinction: that they sometimes had to do for their own causes, and sometimes for God's cause. When they had to do for their own matters, they seasoned all their doings with all modesty and gentleness: as we see David did, who sundry times spared Saul his deadly enemy. Moses also, and other holy men, did very oftentimes sustain grievous things, both constantly and valiantly: but when God's business was to be handled, they behaved themselves severely and nobly. But this if they had done, while they tendered their own matters, they might have seemed to wrest the sword out of the hand of God, and of the magistrate: as they do, which revenge their own injuries.

33. This also is to be added, that men appointed to take in hand, and to defend God's cause, though they may then do things sharply and severely; ought notwithstanding precisely and diligently to beware, least under that pretense, they follow their own affections. The apostles when they desired Christ to send fire from heaven upon the Samaritans (as they knew had been done in the old time, at the petition of Elias) were rebuked of the Lord; because they knew not of whose spirit they were: which without doubt was a most fit answer. For they, whom God sendeth to execute these offices, ought not now to be counted private or mere men, but such as were prepared and instructed by him to supply his room upon the earth. But whether is it lawful for private men to pray against ungodly and cruel tyrants, by whom the true worshipping of God is hindered, and to curse them? Augustine answereth, that it is always lawful for godly men to pray against the kingdom of sin; and that may be taken away, when the ungodly forsake their wickedness: for whose unfeigned repentance we must always pray unto God. But if they seem past all hope, it is lawful to pray, that their sins may once at the length come to an end; namely, that they, being taken away, might cease both to hinder the worshipping of God, and also to trouble the saints. For it is not convenient, that their sin should range abroad unpunished; since when it is left unpunished, it is mere injustice: but when the punishment of God is joined to it, then it hath in itself less deformity.

Wherefore, by the same Augustine, God is very well called, not a cruel punisher, but a just corrector. Moreover, seeing that holy men be very familiar with God, and therefore, so soon as by any heavenly revelation they be certified of his will, they having an earnest love unto him, cannot but allow his judgment: yea, they faithfully pray, that the same may be accomplished. Howbeit, insomuch as they be men, they be both sorry, and

also take it grievously, to have their neighbors so vexed. For which cause Samuel mourned for Saul, although he were not ignorant, that he was rejected of God. Jeremiah also wept for the captivity, which was at hand. And Christ wept for the city of Jerusalem, that should be destroyed. For they, which be men indeed, cannot choose but be sorry for their neighbors, and for their own flesh, when it is afflicted. Neither doth God require of us a Stoical lack of compassion. But of this matter, if the reader desire to see more, let him peruse my Commentaries upon the Corinthians. And as concerning this present matter, I say, that the people of Israel, in destroying or cursing of these nations, followed not their own hatred; but the instinction of God. For they were his lieutenants, and might be called his workmen; seeing they destroyed those, whom God himself had declared to be his enemies, and commanded, that they should be destroyed by them.

**Of Affects, or affections in general; out of the Commentaries upon Aristotle's Ethics.**

34. An affect is a certain power or faculty, whereby we either seek or shun the objects laid before us. And in living creatures, in that they be living, and have sense, it doth ensue knowledge. And some affects do ensue touching; but some do accompany the cogitation and opinion. Those which follow of touching, forthwith, as the sense lighteth into an object, either agreeable or unagreeable, do either pursue it, or fly from it. For when the sense and the object do agree the one with the other, then it is pleasure: but when it happeneth otherwise, it is counted grief. And while the sinews are hurt, there ariseth a great grief; which grief undoubtedly is not an opinion or a cogitation, as many have fondly conceived: for, besides the cogitation or opinion, the body itself is ill affected. And it is not in the power of our opinion or imagination, to change such manner of objects: for those, which

do cause grief, will always hurt the sinews; which sinews do appertain to the feeling, and will vex the body. And on the other side, those objects, which of their own nature are pleasant, will always delight; so that the body be not ill affected with some ill quality. But those affects, which do not ensue in touching, spring and arise from the cogitation or imagination; although there be no outward object present. And they be the motions of the heart, whereby we pursue or shun objects; according as the cogitation, either truly or falsely showeth those things to be either profitable or unprofitable. Those affects are called πάθη, and therefore they be not cogitations, but are derived of them. Of these affects there be diverse sorts: for some of them be simple, and others compounded. Of the simple we reckon four; Gladness, Sadness, Hope, and Fear: for the object, which is presented unto us, is either good or evil. And the same is showed by the cogitation, either as present, or by and by to come.

If good be showed to be present, there ariseth gladness, which is a motion of the heart, whereby it openeth and spreadeth forth itself, sweetly embracing the present good. But if the good be not present, but is looked for; hope ariseth, being a motion of the heart, whereby it enlargeth and prepareth itself to embrace that good, when it shall come. But the evil, when it is presently showed, the heart doth shun it: for sadness is a motion of the heart, whereby it draweth itself together, that it might avoid the present evil. But if the evil that is to come be showed, then we fear. And that affect is a motion of the heart, whereby it draweth itself together, lest it should be oppressed by the evil to come. These are the simple affects, which are given unto living creatures, that they might not only use a knowledge for their own safety; but also, that if that knowledge should be but a weak help, such kind of spurs might be joined withal, as might stir us

up to our safety, and call us back from things that are hurtful unto us. They be as it were winds, whereby the ship is driven: and they are placed in the third kind of quality. And albeit that the first and second kind are of very great force, to the governing and ruling of living creatures; yet are those of more force to rule, and do work with a greater vehemence, than the habits or natural powers do. Howbeit, there are other affects of this sort, which are not simple, but are compounded of many things; as is anger, which comprehendeth grief and gladness together; and such other like there be.

35. Now it remaineth, that we see what be the organs or places of these affects. Plato did place anger in the heart; desire and gladness in the liver. But Aristotle was of another mind, who placed as well anger as grief, gladness, and such like, in the heart: albeit that Aristotle placed also the natural affects; to wit, those which belong to the vegetative or growing power, in the organs, which be proper unto that faculty: and such are hunger, thirst, and the stirring up unto procreation. Neither would he deny, but that the liver is the chief among these inward parts; because therein is the principal storehouse of the blood; and that humor is both nourishment, and also is the proper matter of the seed. But setting aside these natural affects, which are not joined unto knowledge; let us deal with those, which are joined either to the apprehension of the senses, or else unto the cogitation. And since, according to the opinion of Aristotle, we place them in the heart; let us prove this opinion of ours by arguments. Certainly, this must be done, wheresoever they are to be placed, either in the brain, or in the heart, or in the liver. They shall not be placed in the brain, since there the actions and powers, which be repugnant to these affects; namely, judgment, and reason, have their abiding. But one and the self-same power bringeth not forth at one very time, actions which be repugnant. And that

the actions of the affects, and those of judgment and reason be one repugnant to another; even Medea herself in Ovid testified, who said;

*Video meliora, probóque; deteriora sequor*:

The better I allow, and view;

But yet the worst I do ensue.

And by this very reason it appeareth, that these affects are not (as the Stoics thought) cogitations or opinions; since these actions consist in the brain. And therefore it remaineth, that if they be not in the brain, they must be placed either in the heart, or in the liver. And verily they cannot be ascribed unto the liver; because those affects, which belong thereunto, cannot be governed by judgment and reason, as hunger, thirst, and moving unto procreation may be. No doubt but judgment or reason may over-rule the power that moveth; to wit, that it shall not eat nor drink, nor procreate children: but it cannot let, that it should disclose itself, that it should provoke, disquiet, and stir up. But those affects, which follow perceiving or knowledge, may be stayed by reason and judgment: and so they be not of the self-same nature that those be, which are placed in the liver. Wherefore, they shall not belong unto that part of the body, but unto the heart. And with this opinion, which we think is Aristotle's, the holy scriptures do agree, which say; Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and thou shalt fear to offend him.

36. But we must note, that hunger and thirst are sometime understood for the defect itself, when we be quite empty; and in this respect they cannot be governed by judgment and reason, nor yet have their original from thence: but that grief, which doth follow, belongeth to the heart; since the first emptiness is in the organs, which do belong unto the vegetative power. And as touching the affects also, which follow the sense of feeling, there must be

two things considered; to wit, the dissolutions of the whole, the rending in pieces, and burnings: which things are done in the flesh and sinews. But the griefs, which follow them, be motions of the heart. Neither must we pass over this, that the heart hath two other motions, beside affects; namely, the pulses. But we are not now at this present to speak of them, and therefore I come again to the affects: which, since we have called them motions of the heart, we must not think them to be violent: because they have their original from nature itself, for they arise from the powers of the heart. But yet must we understand, that such is the course of nature, that those things which be over vehement, do hurt; yea they mar and corrupt. As for example: if the light be too great, it destroyeth the eyes; over-much heat, or over-much cold do destroy living creatures: but whatsoever is moderate; doth profit and preserve. Which self-same thing must be judged of the affects. Vehement grief, fear or gladness be hurtful; but when there is used a mean, they bring very many helps and commodities. Now have we spoken enough of the formal cause: for we have proved, that they be motions of the heart, which do follow the knowledge of the senses; or else follow cogitation or opinion, which nevertheless are natural and not violent. And we have also showed what we must determine as concerning the matter or subject.

Now it remaineth, that we speak of the efficient cause. As for this, it is the object, whereby the sense or cogitation is moved; namely, that good thing or evil thing, which offereth itself, either present or to come. And moreover, the efficient cause is a power of the heart, which forthwith moveth the same to pursue or to shun that which is offered. Howbeit, between the object and power stirred up of the heart, there cometh between a middle knowledge: for the power of the heart is not stirred up by the object, unless it be through knowledge. For immediately, so soon as the objects are apprehended, either

by the sense, or by the knowledge; the spirits faculties, which do attend upon the knowledge, do strike the heart itself, and the power of the heart is awakened, whereby it is moved either to fly from, or to pursue. But yet it must be noted, that according to the diverse temperature of the body, so is this motion of the heart, either slowly or speedily stirred up; and by reason of the affects, do become more vehement in some, and in other some more feeble. Hot and dry humors do easily and vehemently stir up; but those which be cold and moist, be somewhat slower: from which the affects must of necessity proceed somewhat slackly. And further, the humors are moved, according to the nature or condition of the affects. In grief or fear is raised melancholy; in gladness, blood; and in anger, yellow choler. Over this, the motions be either of the property of drawing together, or of spreading abroad. When the object, which is offered, shall be good; the heart spreadeth itself abroad to receive it: but if the object shall be evil, then the humors withdraw themselves to the inward parts. And hence proceedeth paleness of the face; and from hence arise blushing's, according as the blood either retireth unto the inward parts, or else poureth out itself into the outward parts. And thus much shall suffice as touching the cause.

37. Now remaineth, that we consider of two things. First, that these affects be not either cogitations, or opinions; as the Stoics thought them to be. Secondly, that they must not be all condemned as vicious and evil. First it may evidently be proved in those affects that be called natural, as are hunger and thirst: which affects invade us without any cogitation. Also, who will call it a cogitation or opinion, when we be afflicted with a dissolution of the whole, with a breaking of the sinews, or burning by flame or fire? They may as well persuade us, as touching the natural affections of parents towards their children, which are not only vehement in men, but in brute

beasts also. Howbeit, since the matter is plain; I think it needles to stand much thereupon. Now, as concerning the second; I will not deny, but some affects have their faults joined with them. But I will show, that many of them are good; and that those, which are evil, are evil through man's fault, not in their own nature. And first may we speak of the error of judgment, for we do not always judge aright of the objects which are before us. That which is evil, is otherwhile taken for that which is good; and that which is good, is esteemed to be evil. But the affects, as we have declared, do accompany the judgments of the mind; and so the fault passeth from the judgment unto the affect. The apostles judged the contumelies, which they suffered for the name of Christ, to be honorable unto them, and therefore departed with joy and gladness from the Council.

But contrariwise, when David was driven out of his kingdom by his son, he sorrowed; because he saw, that his casting forth would be an offense unto men, which knew what God promised unto David by the prophets. He saw moreover, that these things did happen through his own fault: and since that these were evils, he could not choose but sorrow. Either of these both David as the apostles judged rightly of the things objected, albeit in diverse manners they judged of the things that happened. Vain men do esteem flatteries to be good things indeed, and therefore are delighted with them. Others judge more rightly of them; for they perceive them to be but mockeries, and for that cause do dislike of them. Those that are good men, do rejoice in mere virtues; for they judge rightly of them. Again, thou shalt see others, which do hate them; because they be infected with a corrupt judgment: so as the naughtiness and goodness of the affects, proceedeth of the true or false judgment, concerning the things which are objected. Howbeit, it is not requisite to say, that all the affects are evil; because many

men being seduced by error, do light upon those ill motions of the mind: for they which err not, are not hurt by the affects of error.

38. Another evil there is in the affects, which in very deed proceedeth not of error; but for that there be some, which are adversaries unto right reason: such is the desire of other men's goods, of murder, of adultery, and such like. These affects must of good right be condemned; but yet for these sakes must not sentence be given generally; since there be other affects, which are agreeable to right reason and sound judgment; namely, love towards virtue, and hatred and anger against sins. Which affects, being agreeable to reason, are not only honest and laudable, but also very profitable: for they are given as certain spurs to godly life. For it is not sufficient to know those things that are good, but we must be earnestly stirred up unto them. For the affects be as it were sinews, by whose stretching forth, or shrinking in, we are the earnestlier, or the lightlier stirred up. Who seeth not, that this is most true, that anger is as it were a whetstone unto fortitude? We should be very dull even unto honest actions, if we had not these provocations: we should be even as a ship in the sea destitute of wind. Wherefore, the nature itself of affects is not evil, since many of them be very profitable and honest. Undoubtedly, God gave the organs of these affects, and he appointed humors to attend on them, and knowledges to accompany them: so as it cannot be denied, but that they are the works of God; and especially since he in his law requireth such affects. For he willeth us to love and to fear God, to love our neighbors, and servants to fear their masters: and full of such precepts are the holy scriptures.

That same impassibility then of affects, which the Stoics would have (albeit that Basil, Nazianzen, and certain other of the fathers, otherwhile seem greatly to commend) must utterly be refused. Christ wept, was sad

unto death, was moved with mercy: so then he was not without affects. And therefore affects are not repugnant even to the perfection of our human nature. True it is, there happen evils many times, through the fault of our corrupt nature: but we must endeavor ourselves to correct our vicious affects, and to confirm and restore those that be good and agreeable to reason. And this we read, that the holy and godly heroical men did, both in the old, and in the New Testament. These fathers did not follow their affections, as guided by them; but used them unto those virtues and noble acts, which God commanded. And it is apparent in the holy scriptures, that those heroical men were stirred up of God, with certain more vehement affections, than other men are. But it may be doubted of, from whence the exceeding corruptions of affects, or else so great a disagreement from reason in some of them (such as is the greedy desire of other men's goods, of murder, rape, and adultery, which cannot any manner of way be allowed) had their original. Unto which question an answer may easily be made out of the holy scriptures; because that By one man, that is by Adams fall, sin entered into the world. But the philosophers, which understand not this, do fly unto temperatures of the body; and unto aspects and motions of the stars: howbeit, as the thing it self declareth, they cannot by those causes yield a perfect reason.

39. Now let us see, how those affects may be ruled and corrected. The first way is civil; to wit, through moral virtues. For those do reduce them to a mediocrity; and those would suffice; if we should only have respect unto the present life. But in truth, before God they are not sufficient; neither doth this civil justice suffice before his tribunal seat. And therefore another rule is yet necessary; namely, the rule of the divine scriptures, the which do profit nothing at all, unless they be apprehended by faith. This rule bringeth

two manner of commodities with it. The first is, that that which is wanting unto true righteousness (considering the moral state wherein we be) is not imputed to us, and that the whole fulfilling is ascribed to us out of Christ his fullness. Besides this, there is given unto us greater strength to withstand lusts. And finally by faith, the very actions of virtues, and good affects, are altogether referred to God: which without faith cannot be done. And therefore, in men, which are estranged from Christ, those moderate affects, how gorgeous soever they were, are sins; not that they be so in their own nature, but they so become through our natural corruption. For we be even as fusty vessels, the which do corrupt the wine, though it be good that is poured into us. And therefore, since God is the author of all creatures, and that he made nothing but is good, and made no bare substances, and such as are furnished with no kind of helps, but gave unto everyone a proneness and inclination unto those things which be wholesome and profitable: it followeth, that not only natures and substances be good; but also the affects, which are by God engrafted in them. Albeit, that in those which be wicked men, they draw unto them these two evils, which otherwise of themselves are good. First, by reason of original sin, nature is so corrupted and weakened, that good affects are not of such efficacy as they ought to be. Secondly, they are not directed unto God, as it behooveth that they should be; but rather to the embracing of pleasures and earthly delectations.

Whereby we may perceive, there are four degrees of men. [ 1] The first are the basest, who be neither endued with moral virtues, nor yet with godliness: in these we may perceive all things to be fraught with perturbations and disorder. [ 2] Secondly, there be others as yet aliens from godliness; howbeit, civil men, who by a certain kind of habit, have after a sort revoked their affections to a mediocrity. [ 3] The third sort are believers

in Christ; who notwithstanding they are not without sin, no more than are other mortal men, yet is not their sin imputed unto them. [ 4] In the fourth and last place must those be put, which either were made by God at the beginning, or else are loosed from hence, and be now with Christ. They indeed have no corrupt affections, neither on the second, nor yet on the third cause; but they have them altogether good, absolute, and perfect. Howbeit, in nature there be not any affects so corrupt, and so vicious, but in them may be seen somewhat that is good. For in all of them there doth appear some part of the institution of God. For that same first beginning, or (as I may so say) the faculty and strength of these qualities had his original from God; but the confusedness either of imperfection, or of deformedness, which cometh by reason of sin, hath corrupted the same. Neither do those evil affects hurt alone the grosser parts of the soul, but they also hurt the will and reason. For so did God fasten and bind together those powers of the mind, as they might serve one another; namely, that the affects should obey reason, and that reason should rule and govern the affects, and temper the motions of the heart. Howbeit, it fareth otherwise; and so great a feebleness there is of the will, as being compared with the affects, it may seem to be even a fearful child, sitting upon a very fierce horse. Wherefore, the moral philosophers have prefixed to themselves this end; namely, to qualify the affections by virtues, and to strengthen reason being weak.

40. But which be the parts of the mind, that being instructed by vehement affects, do disturb reason, and make it feeble; Plato declared, who in the chief place appointed ἡγεμονικόν, and in the inferior place, ἐπιθυμητικόν, and θυμοειδές. So that in these latter parts of the mind are placed the affects. And these powers of the mind, as it was said before, he judged to be in the head, in the liver, and in the heart. But Aristotle, for the general word,

took ὀρεκτικόν, which he divided into three parts; to wit, ἐπιθυμία, that is, Greedy desire, Affectation, or Covetousness: θυμός, that is, Anger, or Vehemency of the mind: and βούλησις, that is, Will. Which parts, because they are apparent of themselves, there is no need to expound them any further. Yet this nevertheless will I add, that according to right order, the inferior appetites ought to be moved, governed, and ruled by that same superior, which is βούλησις; to wit, Will: even as the uppermost sphere doth guide the lower, as Aristotle writeth in his 3rd book *De anima*. And thus doubtless the case standeth: the inferior powers, when they be stirred up, and compel us to the doing of anything, are governed by the cogitation; and the cogitation by reason.

Yea, and every man hath experience in himself, that when any natural reason is applied, the disturbed affections are set in quiet: even as the winds are feigned to be suppressed by Aeolus. Wherefore, in man, the affects are obedient unto the will itself; whereas in brute beasts, action immediately followeth upon the motion of the affects. But our affections do perpetually expect the commandment of the will, unless that some impediment do oppose itself: as in children, and in mad men we see it falleth out. Here perhaps thou wilt say; Do we not see, that in those, which are incontinent, the affects are moved even against the will? We answer, that indeed they rebel against the will; but that, as touching the motion and actions, they bring nothing to pass, unless that the will do command them. Indeed the affections do resist the will, and trouble it, and finally overcome it, and lead it away to their own opinion; which will, when it shall have given her assent, and shall have overruled the matter, actions do follow, not as it decreed at the beginning, but as it commandeth when it is overcome.

41. But some think, that the power of desiring, and of being angry, is all one; because contraries belong all unto one faculty: but things agreeable unto nature, and things hurtful to the same, are contrary; and therefore they be both objects of one part of the mind. As white and black, are objects of the sight; a right and crooked line, are objects of one and the same science; namely, of the science Mathematical; and a whole and a sick man, are objects of physic. Hereunto we answer, that the objects of the angry and of the desiring power, are not so to be distinguished, by that which is agreeable, and that which is hurtful, but that either of these parts hath respect unto good and evil; howbeit, not after the like manner. The power, which desireth, hath respect unto good and to evil absolutely; that is to wit, that it may attain the one, and avoid another. Nevertheless, otherwhile impediments and things that do corrupt it, do fall out between: so that it is a difficult thing to obtain this, or to avoid that. And there doth the power of anger show itself, for the overcoming of these difficulties; it wrestleth, and it earnestly resisteth the impediments, to the intent we may either apprehend the good, or avoid the evil, according as we do desire. So then the object of the angry power is good and evil, according as the thing difficult and hard offereth itself. Hope is chiefly an affection of the angry power: for it is carried unto that which is good, but yet a good that is absent, to the obtaining whereof must be devoured the impediment of expectation; yea, the power and the difficulty of the impediments must be overcome.

But in what order those faculties shall be placed among themselves, it hereby appeareth; in that the force of the angry power beginneth at the power of desire, and endeth also at the same. For when any man hath an injury done unto him, he is sad: but the affect of sadness pertaineth to the faculty of desire. Against this evil (whereby the offended party is made sad,

to the intent it may be avoided) doth anger interpose itself; which, by revenge, coveteth to repulse that evil. But revenge (as we all know) is a hard matter; which when it is performed, then succeedeth gladness, which belongeth to the power of desire, and there we cease to be angry. Wherefore the power of anger is a defender, and also a striver against, and doth resist the desiring part. For the angry part flieth from labors and griefs, but the part desiring overcometh them, endureth them, and entereth into them, whether it will or no: and when the one of them enforceth her action, the other contrariwise doth slacken it. They which lust very inordinately after women, are not angry with them: and they which be angry with them, are less inflamed with the desire of them. Wherefore the object of the angry part, offendeth the desiring part; because (as we said right now) it flieth from labors and difficulties, whereunto the angry part offereth itself, and maketh itself ready to get the victory. And it is a manifest thing, that of those two powers of the mind, the angry part cometh the nearer unto reason; for it is a helper of the same, to execute wholesome counsels: but the desiring part cometh nearer to the sense. And to deal by examples, in a matter which yet I think is plain enough. Boldness and fear, being parts of this mind, be affects: for boldness doth affect a good thing, which is difficult. But fear flieth an evil thing, which is hard to be avoided: for we fear not the evils, which urge us not, and may easily be avoided. And thus much of the affects in general; whereof not only the moral philosopher disputeth, but also the natural philosopher, and the Physician, and Rhetorician.

42. Now to set aside natural philosophers and Physicians, I will speak somewhat of Rhetoricians. They doubtless (as Aristotle testifieth in his second book of Rhetoric's) do first endeavor by arguments, to make men

believe, that those things be true, which they affirm. And then do they consider of the minds and affections of the judges, and of those which hear them: for that carrieth a great weight unto the cause. For they which favor him that is guilty, do believe, that either he sinned not, or else that he made a very small fault. But on the other side, if they shall hate him, they think with themselves, that either he is no innocent at all, or else that he is most guilty of all. These affections, unless that an Orator can change, qualify, or turn unto the contrary; he shall labor in vain. Wherefore Aristotle teacheth, that three things there must be considered. First, who they be that are prone to be affected, either this way or that. Secondly, towards whom they are wont to be so affected. And finally, for what causes their affections are moved, either one way or another; to the intent that these things being known, they may easily make them serve their purpose. But there be some, which think, that this is not just, or to be permitted; that in pleading of causes, affections should be moved, since that the minds of the judges, in discerning, ought to be at quiet: which cannot come to pass if the affects be troubled by an artificial speech of Orators.

Howbeit, they which speak this, seem to me, that they distinguish not the nature of affects, by the use of them; because in very deed, the nature of affections is good, albeit that the use of them be otherwhile good, and otherwhile evil. Also swords being made of iron, which is a good creature of God, do serve sometime to a just use; and sometime to an unjust. And wherein (I beseech you shall the Orator offend; if, when in a good and just cause, he shall see the judge ill affected towards the party accused, he do temper him with the art of eloquence, and do draw him unto a contrary mind, yea and stir up the motions of his heart to decree gravely and justly? Here undoubtedly there shall be no offense committed; but human

affections shall be directed unto the ends prescribed unto them. For otherwhile the auditory, and also the judges become cold; as unto whom it shall not suffice to have showed what is to be done, unless they be drawn thereunto, by stirring them up with a very vehement affect. But those Orators are to be reprehended, and restrained, which to this end direct eloquence for the moving of affections; that the minds of the judges may be disquieted, and that they may not see what is just. But yet, for these men's ill demeanor, must not that profitable cunning be banished from the affairs of men. For so ought the holy scriptures to be blamed, wherein the spirit of God, not only warneth what things are to be done, and what to be avoided; but also stirreth up the affections, that we may be the more compelled to obedience. And this will I have to suffice as touching this matter.

**Of some of the Affects severally.**

43. But now we think it good to speak somewhat of the affects severally. Affects, as it is manifest, do belong unto the general word of quality, and are contained in that kind, which commonly is called passion, and passable quality. But among these, there be two of a grosser sort, and very common; I mean delectation and grief. They chiefly have their place in the sinews, which be dispersed in a manner over all the body: unto which sinews, when things, either agreeable to nature, or else repugnant thereunto be applied, then we be either delighted, or else do sorrow. Moreover, there be other affects, which follow knowledge itself: whereby, as the nature of them is, so the heart doth change his motion, according as good or evil shall be laid hold upon in the knowledge; and that, either present or imminent. For when we feel that good is present, the heart is pleasantly delighted, and sweetly affected therewith: and this affect is called gladness. But if so be we perceive that the good is not present indeed, yet not far off, but ready; and

that within a while we shall obtain it, then are we stirred up with hope to pursue the same: and the heart in like manner is pleasantly moved. But when we perceive that evil is present, the heart starteth back with a grieved motion: for it shrinketh, it abhorreth, and it is vexed. And this affection is commonly called as well sorrow as grief of mind. In Greek it is λύπη; so called, as the Stoics think of λύσις, that is, A loosing. For even as the body of him that is sick, is loosed through sickness; so likewise the mind seemeth, after a sort to be consumed with sadness.

There remaineth another knowledge of evil, the which indeed is not present, but such as is now near at hand: that doth the heart eschew, and evidently enough starteth from it by his motion: and such an affect is called fear. According to these principal affects, we will now entreat of those, which have their original from sadness or grief. And those are likewise reckoned to be four; that is to wit, mercy, indignation, envy, and emulation; of the which Aristotle did singularly well write many things in his book of Rhetoric's. But before I deal particularly with these, we must demand one thing; to wit, whether affects are to be reckoned in the account of good or of evil things? The Stoics accounted them in the number of evil, and condemned them generally: being led by this reason; that by them the mind, the judgment, and sound counsel is greatly troubled. For they so hale and draw the mind and reason to and fro, as it cannot peaceably behold things natural and divine; neither yet determine of doing things orderly and rightly. And further, because with the heavy load of them, they drive men very often to commit dishonest and unjust things: yea, and when they be somewhat more vehement, they hurt the body itself. These in a manner were the reasons of the Stoics.

The Peripatetiks teach far otherwise; namely, that it is not true, which the Stoics declare, except when affections be not chastised by reason, but are suffered to have their immoderate scope. Because those affections, if they be comprised within certain bounds, are both good and profitable: as being the matter of virtues, and which by nature were given, as the whetstone of them. For fortitude is greatly furthered by the means of wrath: and compassion doth attend upon the virtue of clemency. And in the same sort it may be said as touching the most part of them. But among these philosophers, so disagreeing in themselves; sentence must be given according to the judgment of the holy scriptures. They declare, that man, in respect both of the body, and of the soul, was created by God: and they add; that All things, whatsoever God made, were good. Therefore, seeing he himself planted the affects in man (I mean not wicked nor corrupt, as now we have them, but perfect and sound, and which should obey and serve reason) they of necessity be good. Furthermore, the law of God doth in every place commend mercy unto us: it preacheth repentance, which cannot be without sorrow and grief of mind. David also wrote, and Paul repeated it; Be ye angry, and sin not. Yea and the matter hath stretched so far forth, that affects are attributed even to God himself; namely, wrath, mercy, sorrow, repentance, and such like: which although they be not properly spoken of him, yet this we must observe, that in man, whatsoever by itself is vice and sin in his own nature, is never by the holy scriptures attributed unto God.

**Of Shamefastness.**

44. Shamefastness, which is a mean thing, is commended; yet is it no virtue, because men do naturally run thereinto, and sometime against their wills: for it is a sorrow or fear for some evil that hangeth over our head, or into which we shall fall. But thou wilt say, that affects are neither praised or

dispraised, since they be natural; how then can shamefastness be commended, and the extremities thereof condemned? I answer, that a mere affect is neither praised nor dispraised, but the measure thereof is. It is praised, when it is in a mean; it is dispraised, if it be extreme. Here likewise in shamefastness there is found an excess: and he which so exceedeth, is said to be κατάπλεος, that is, Astonied, or abashed, who is ashamed at everything. And on the other side, he is impudent, who although he be not altogether ashamed, yet he lacketh shamefastness more than becometh him.

**Of Temperance.**

45. Between pleasures and griefs, temperance is the mean; and intemperance the excess. The defect hath no name. But because pleasure is of two kinds; some be of the mind, and those be commended of all men; as when a man rejoiceth in the contemplation of God, and of nature: or delighteth in the remembrance of his well doing, either else taketh pleasure in the helping and benefiting of others to his power. But the other kind of pleasure is more gross, and is perceived of the senses, not of the reason: and those are called corporal pleasures. Whereupon Aristotle saith, that this virtue is not conversant about the former virtues: for those things being most pure, have no need of moderation. It remaineth therefore, that temperance is placed in this latter kind. And yet hath it not place about all corporal things; but in those only, which belong unto the sense of touching. But with touching thou must also understand tasting: for those two senses (as it is written in the book De anima) are very near one to another. Wherefore, temperance shall be a mediocrity in pleasures of meat and drink, and fleshly desire. But wherefore doth it not also moderate the pleasures, which come by the sight and by the hearing? Because the desire of those pleasures is not so great and vehement, as it is of these: neither are

those so hurtful as these be. For by these, if they be immoderate, men do in a manner degenerate into brute beasts; but so do they not through sounds, smells, or colors.

But admit that in this kind of pleasures also, which belong unto the other senses, measure be exceeded; and that there is need of some virtue, that kind of excess is never accounted or called intemperance: but they, which so sin, are accused of a certain other sin, not of intemperance. Wherefore, seeing that the virtue of temperance hath place, as well in pleasures, as in displeasures; whether of these affections is the more frequented matter thereof? Aristotle saith, that those be pleasures: for in the suppressing of them, we have greater labor; and unto the excess of pleasure we seem to be driven by nature. Neither is it so hard a matter to resist displeasure, as it is to temper a man's self from pleasure. Virtue in very deed is chiefly conversant about those things that be difficult. Furthermore, the grief of the mind, which belongeth to this virtue, ariseth of the defect or absence of pleasure. But it is far more easy, to abide the desire of a pleasure that is absent, than not to enjoy a pleasure that is present. The defect or want in this matter had no name. A reason is brought; because there be not many, nay rather, there be very few, which do altogether shun pleasures. Those things, which do seldom happen, or be in a manner never seen, do easily want a name. But yet, saith Aristotle, they be ἀναίσθητοι, that is, Astonied. Nevertheless, we must think that they are properly so called: for that word doth also signify them, which being oppressed with the force of sickness, have no sense. And it may be, that some men, by reason of a sickness, or some dissolution of the sinews, feel no taste of pleasure and fleshly lust.

**Of Mercy, and the affect called Nemesis.**

46. But mercy is a grief of the mind, which we conceive for other men's adversities: or (as Cicero saith) It is a grief taken for another man's misery. Aristotle taught, that mercy is stirred up, if we see any that do suffer grievous things, which they have not deserved. For if that the wicked do suffer just punishments, thereof ariseth no mercy. And besides, he thinketh, that those mishaps, whereby we are moved with mercy, be cruel; otherwise, if they were but light, we would be moved but little or nothing: to conclude, that those are moved with mercy, which consider that such things may happen to themselves, or to some other of theirs. Whereupon it is thought, that they, which enjoy prosperity, and do judge themselves blessed, are not inclined to mercy: nay rather, that they have been accustomed to triumph over poor wretches, as of those, whom they think are not able to hurt them. In like manner, he removeth this affect from desperate and wretched men; because they fear, that nothing can happen unto them more miserable than they have: and thus, in that desperate fortune they seem to have become senseless. Howbeit, if this were true, some man might doubt how mercy can be ascribed unto God; since he without controversy is the most blessed, and that nothing is able to hurt him.

But hereunto we answer, that mercy is not properly attributed unto God; but by a metaphor taken of man; because he doth those things, which merciful men have been wont to do. For they doubtless do help the afflicted, the very which thing also the godly do. Howbeit, I would not herein subscribe unto Aristotle, that mercy is not to be showed to them, which do justly suffer punishment. For Samuel mourned a long time for Saul, who was rejected of God; not undeservedly, but most justly. And no less did Christ mourn for the destruction of Jerusalem, which without doubt hanged over the head of that city, not without desert, but for just cause.

Neither yet do we allow, that the sins, which are committed of some, do not stir up mercy; but that only calamities and adversities do the same. For godly men are no less aggrieved for other men's chances, when they fall into great wickedness, than when they be oppressed with unhappy fortune. Wherefore we must not deny, that mercy is a good affect, when it followeth the word of God, and reason; especially, since the Lord hath pronounced with his mouth; that Blessed are the merciful, because they also shall obtain mercy.

47. Another affect, which ariseth of sadness and grief, is that, which they call Nemesis. The same hath no Latin word, albeit of some it is called *Indignatio*, that is, Indignation: which yet, by that word doth not express all that affect. For indignation extendeth further than doth Nemesis. But omitting the word, we will thus define the thing; Nemesis is a sadness taken for the prosperity of wicked men, because they seem to be unworthy of that fortune. Just and godly men have sometimes this affect reigning in them. David, when he saw the ungodly flourish, said; My feet had well near slipped. Also Abacuk took it grievously, that the wicked were of so great power, that they oppressed the saints, and devoured the just. And Job seemeth in a manner to complain unto his friends for the same thing. Furthermore, Plutarch in the life of Homer praiseth this affect; and by reason thereof he far preferreth the Peripatetiks, in disputing of the affects, before the Stoics, and especially by the judgment of Homer: who affirmeth, that at the length God will angerly punish, after that the wicked have a certain while flourished. Howbeit, this is to be observed, that men in this respect are not grieved thorough this affect; for that they shall suffer any loss, by reason of the prosperity of the wicked, or because that they by their power can hurt them. For if they were by this means grieved, they should

not be troubled with Nemesis, but rather with fear. But Nemesis is then, when a man is moved of a stomach, and for that he hateth the unworthiness of the person.

48. This affect in two things communicateth with mercy; first, because that either of them both is a heaviness; secondly, for that each of them is stirred up through an unworthiness of the thing: Mercy, because good men are grieved and oppressed; Nemesis, because wicked men live fortunately. But herein afterward they differ, because Nemesis hath respect unto prosperous fortune; but mercy unto sharp fortune. So that Nemesis is, as it were a mean affect between envy and mercy; for of either it seemeth to take somewhat: of mercy it taketh unworthiness; of envy, prosperity, which it hath a respect unto. And moreover, Aristotle teacheth, that none are affected with Nemesis, for other men's virtues. For if otherwise of vicious and corrupt men, they become moderate, strong and temperate men; we disdain it not: because when they are adorned with virtues, they are no longer counted wicked men. But then at the last we are affected with Nemesis, when unto wicked men there come those good things, wherewith we think that good men ought to be rewarded; as are riches, honors, authority, favor, and such like. Nevertheless, godly men must deal prudently with this affect, that when their minds are affected therewith, because of the fortunate state of the ungodly, let us have a regard unto God, who is the true governor and distributor of all good things. Wherefore, if men should bestow those outward good things upon the unworthy, their injustice might be justly reproved. Howbeit, such a reprehension hath no place in God, because he doth all things most justly. This, when David did not diligently consider, he said; My feet had well near slipped. As though he should have said; By reason of this Nemesis, I had almost grievously fallen. Wherefore we must

seldom give place to this affect, least we seem to reprehend the providence of God.

49. Mercy is an affect profitably engrafted in our minds by God, whereby we are stirred up to help and defend others. But we must take heed, that thereby we be not made so nice and effeminate, as thorough the same we should commit anything against the commandments and will of God. The holy scriptures reprehend Ahab king of Samaria, because he spared Benhadad king of Syria, of whom he said; If he be alive he is my brother. Also they condemn Saul, by the mouth of the prophet Samuel; because he saved Agag king of Amalech alive. And even as it was said unto another by the messenger of God; Thy soul shall be for his soul: so Saul, being a little before placed by God in the kingdom, was deprived thereof. What shall we then do? Shall not sins be forgiven? Seneca, in his second book *De clementia*, the sixth chapter; Pardon (saith he) is a remission of punishment due, whereby he is forgiven, which ought to have been punished. And so he thinketh it is not a wise man's part to give pardon; because a wise man will never commit that, which ought not to be done; or leave anything undone, which ought to be done. This reason of his seemeth to be good and effectual enough, yet least we should be deceived thereby, we must here make a profitable distinction of persons; namely, of God, of princes, and of private men. No man ought to doubt, but that God may forgive whom he will, since that he is not bound to any other man's laws. Wherefore, in forgiving, he is not said to remit that, which ought to have been punished. Besides this, he hath not so forgiven men their faults, but that he hath punished them in his only begotten son Christ.

But we must otherwise think of the magistrate, to whom it is not lawful to forgive the punishments of sins, because he is commanded to give judgment

according to the laws: to whom nevertheless it is commanded, either to release, or to aggravate the punishments, according to the weight or manner of the crimes. So now, when he that is guilty is curable, and hath not grievously offended; the magistrate is sometime content with an easier punishment; and sometime he useth a more sharp reprehension or admonition: and so he never leaveth sins unpunished. And even he in punishing is not cruel, nay he rather correcteth, amendeth and healeth. Which work is both a just and merciful work: so far is it off that it should be ascribed to severity or cruelty. And this will I also add by the way, which is written by the same Seneca; that To have many executions, is no less dishonorable to magistrates, than many funerals to Physicians. But now, concerning private men, me thinketh it must be thus answered; It is their duty to forgive injuries done to themselves. Neither can Seneca his saying take place in them; namely, that a wise man will leave nothing undone that ought to be done, because revengement is forbidden them by the law of almighty God: and they are commanded after a sort to punish such as sin against them; I mean in reproving them. And they are willed to be content with that punishment, when those which have offended them, are amended and cured. But contrariwise, if they perceive them to be stubborn, they, by the commandment of God ought to complain to the church, by whom at the last they are excluded; unless they will be obedient thereunto. And when they are excluded out of the church, they may also be accused to the magistrate; wherein nevertheless there is not anything committed against clemency: for such is the mind and purpose of the accusers, that by all means possible, according to God's commandment, evil may be utterly taken away from among men.

**Of Cruelty.**

50. And as concerning cruelty, we may easily gather by the punishment done unto Adonibezeck, that too much cruelty displeaseth God: and thereof I think it came to pass, that as well by God's laws, as man's laws (of those I mean which are accounted just and honest) there have been certain punishments prescribed for crimes, according to the grievousness of them; to the intent that judges might have the less liberty to exercise cruelty. Yea and lawyers have added this rule, that punishments should rather be diminished by judges, than augmented: which nevertheless must be understood so far forth as the nature of the fault and utility of the Common-wealth will suffer. Which I therefore speak, because otherwhile those conditions, which commonly they call circumstances, do make the crime so odious and horrible, that the judges must there of necessity augment the punishment, which hath been prescribed by the laws; to the intent they may terrify others from so great and detestable offenses. And so David, when Nathan the prophet had set before him an execrable and horrible thing, decreed a more grievous punishment against him that was guilty, than the law had provided against common thieves, and stealers of cattle.

I have therefore made mention of these, because there were in the law three kinds of death appointed for evil doers; I mean, hanging, stoning, and burning: whereunto some of the Hebrews add a fourth; namely, the punishment of the sword. But because there is not (as far as I know) any mention thereof in the law, I have therefore passed it over. We read that Adonias, Joab, and Agag king of Amalech, were thrust thorough with swords; but we find it not prescribed by any law or precept, that the guilty should be put to death. Seeing therefore the matter is so, yet we perceive, that the children of Israel used in their tents a certain extraordinary kind of punishment against king Adonibezek. Neither will I believe, that they did

this without the instinct of God: for God would punish the cruelty of this tyrant, with an exquisite punishment, which nevertheless was a rendering like for like. Which kind of horrible doing, to the intent we may the easilier avoid, it shall not be grievous unto us to speak somewhat thereof.

51. This word cruelty, is derived either of this Latin word Cruor, which signifieth Blood, wherein cruel men like wild beasts do delight; or else of *Crudae carnes*, which signifieth Rawe flesh, which barbarous and beastly people do sometimes eat: and it may be defined to be an evil habit, by the which we are inclined unto sharp and hard things above reason. And sometimes it happeneth, that cruelty is counted for a pleasure: with which wicked affection or habit, how some wicked tyrants have sometime been infected, it is evidently to be perceived by many examples. For the holy history setteth before our eyes Adonibezek: and the evangelical history maketh mention of Herod. The Ethnic poets have made report of the cruelty of Atreus and Thiestes. And the most cruel fact of Xerxes king of the Persians is set forth by Seneca in his third book *De ira*, the 17th chapter. When a certain man named Pythius, who had well deserved at his hands, came unto him, and desired of him to spare him one of his five sons from the wars, he commanded him, as though he would grant him his request, to choose which of them he would have to tarry at home from the wars. And he did as he was bidden. But this most cruel tyrant commanded, that the young man, whom he had chosen, should be drawn one side of him one way, and the other side of him another way, until at the length he was torn in sunder: the one part whereof he commanded to be fastened in one corner of the way, by the which the soldiers should pass; and the other in another corner: saying, that by this means he purged his army. Howbeit, not long after, he being most shamefully overcome and beaten by the Grecians, was

constrained to fly away through the overthrows and dead carcasses of his own soldiers.

Sylla banished an innumerable company of the citizens of Rome: but at the length he was most horribly eaten up of lice. Even after the like sort died that most cruel Herod, as it is most manifestly declared by Josephus. Contrary to this exceeding great wickedness and most heinous mischief is clemency, which as a singular virtue doth very well become princes, and is an excellent ornament of Christian men. Augustine in his third book of Questions, question 31. defineth the same after this manner; It is a habit, whereby men being stirred up to hatred against any man, are through goodness kept back. This virtue is a mean between cruelty and foolish mercy. I call it foolish mercy, whereby our mind is so moved with other men's miseries, that it declineth from sound counsel and just reason. And for this cause are we overcome of this affect, because we would never suffer such things, as we see others justly and deservedly afflicted withal: and because we ourselves endeavor to avoid the same, therefore we cease to punish the wicked.

52. David, having overcome his enemies, did grievously punish them; he led the Ammonites forth of the city, and slue them, not after a vulgar manner, but he had saws, wherewith he sawed them in sunder. And this is also showed to have happened unto Isaiah. And in the eleventh chapter to the Hebrews, it is said of the saints, that they were hewn in sunder. This kind of punishment perhaps was usual in those parts. Moreover, he brought forth chariots and sleds, that they should be drawn upon them; and he also hewed them in sunder with axes and hatchets, he threw them into the kills of brick or tile: all which are cruel things. David perhaps in these punishments, might seem to have degenerated from his own nature: for he

was meek and gentle; but these seem to be parts of exceeding great cruelty. What did he become another Phalaris? No: but if we will judge by things, as they were done, many of them may seem in the holy scriptures to have been cruel. For the Jews so punished king Adonibesek, as they cut off the thumbs of his hands, and of his feet. Joshua brought forth the kings, which had hidden themselves in a cave; and they being prostrated upon the earth, he would have them to be trodden upon by the children of Israel, in such wise, that they should tread with their feet upon every one of their necks: and afterward he hanged them upon five trees. Gideon, in the eighth chapter of the book of Judges, slue the elders of Succoth with thorns and briers. Saul's sons, by the will and commandment of the Lord, were hanged up. These things seem at the first sight to be cruel; but they be not so. Which that it may appear, do but consider this; that about the executing of punishments, there be found in the minds of men, habits of virtue, and of vices.

Clemency causeth minds to be bent unto the mitigation of punishments, according unto right reason. The vice that is in defect, is a certain remissness and slackness in punishing: for we may see many, which do not once touch heinous crimes. And on the other part, there is a certain habit of fierceness and cruelty, that passeth measure. Those be called cruel (if we give credit to Seneca, in his second book *De clementia*) which exceed a measure in punishing offenders. And, as we briefly touched, cruel men are so called either of Cruor, that is, Blood: as who should say, they be delighted therewith; or else of *Cruditas*, that is, Rawness. For even as those things, which be sodden, have a pleasant taste; so have raw things an unpleasantness joined with them, together with a certain taste that is horrible. Those be savage and cruel, which do torment without a cause, as though they were delighted with the torments of other men; even as beasts

that know not goodness and honesty, but have only respect unto sweetness and commodity: either for that the sight of blood is delightful, or else because they will be fed with flesh. Now, since cruelty consisteth in this, that therein is a going beyond the measure of right reason; let us see, whether David and others have passed the bounds of reason. Certes, they followed a mediocrity; and those things, which they did, belonged unto punishing justice: for those were worthy of the greatest punishments. David followed reason, but yet a divine reason; the which reason alone is called good. God stirred him up unto these things, not without a cause. And it was necessary for him, since he was a grand captain, to follow that reason, which God had showed unto him.

53. That the Ammonites were most wicked men, we may know it by many causes. First of all, they against the law of nations, shamed the ambassadors of David, in cutting short their beards and garments. They gave an ill judgment of the most godly king David; namely, that he had sent that ambassage with a feigned heart, not to comfort the son of the king of the Ammonites, which was dead, but to destroy him. Again, when the head city was besieged, and that they had slain Uriah, and other valiant men, they also vaunted against God. This did Nathan declare; Because thou hast provoked mine enemies (saith he) to speak evil of me, the child, which is born of thee, shall be slain. If God slue the child of David, because David had given an occasion of blaspheming God; how much more grievously were they to be punished, which did this thing? And further, whereas they had done injuries unto David, yet did they first move war against him. And neither would they only hurt David, but they also solicited others of his subjects and tributaries to forsake him. They disquieted all those regions of Syria and Mesopotamia: and that (which is most of all) they burned their

sons and daughters for their idol sake, which they worshipped. And what marvel was it, if they were thrown into the same furnaces, wherein they threw their own children? This was a punishment of like for like.

And always in those punishments, which are not reproved in the scriptures, we must fly unto this; namely, that God governed those fathers. Some, to make these punishments the less, say that all were not so handled; but the seigniors and princes only, which were as the stay and succor of the people. But Josephus saith, that they were all rid out of the way. And the scriptures also seem to make it a general punishment. Howbeit, I would think that some were excepted: for in the 17th chapter of the second book of Samuel, we read, that Sobi the son of king Nahas, did help David, when he was driven out of the kingdom by Absalom. Whereupon it is gathered, that the one son of king Nahas was slain, and that the other was by David made ruler of the country. These things are not so much to be wondered at in him, seeing he was a figure of the true David, which at the last day shall say unto all men; Go ye cursed into everlasting fire, which is prepared for the devil and his angels. Those punishments which God shall lay upon the wicked in hell, are not cruel. They shall be as it were intolerable punishments, but yet they proceed of a right punishing justice. He saith in the Gospel; Bring ye unto me all them, which would not have me reign over them, and slay them in my sight. Here let magistrates learn to have a regard unto right reason, when the guilty are delivered to them to be punished. It must not grieve their mind to execute those punishments, which are just, and commanded to be done.

**Of Envy.**

54. Now come we to envy: the same did Cicero think should rather be called *Invidentia*, than *Invidia*: the which word *Invidentia* we may in

English call Envying, or Enviousness; because among the Latinists, those that are envied, are said to suffer envy. But envying belongeth to them, which pine away with this kind of grief. And therefore he thinketh, that envy or envying is so called, because they, which be envious, do look too narrowly to other men's prosperity. Wherefore, envy is a grief taken at the prosperity of other men; especially of them, which have been of like degree with us. For a poor man envieth not a king; nor yet beggars, noble men. Envy is of equals, and such as be like unto ourselves. And likeness is considered in kindred, riches, beauty, age, wit, dignity, and such like. The cause of envying is not in respect that we be afraid of harm to come unto us, by such men as we do envy; for that were fear: but that men of a certain hatred and stomach cannot abide the prosperity of others, especially of their like and equals: this worketh envy.

Envy is always had in evil things; and it is grievously reprehended in the holy scriptures; because it is most plainly repugnant unto charity itself. For in the first epistle to the Corinthians, the 13th chapter, the apostle said; Charity envieth not. For Paul in that place did not take this Greek word ζηλοῦν, in his proper signification. But unto the Galatians he hath more plainly forbidden envy, saying; Be not desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, and envying one another. In which place, not only envy is reproved, but also the mother thereof is showed, that is to wit, the desire of glory. And this may we also note in the history of the Judges: for the Ephraits envied Gideon, because the glory of so great a victory seemed to have come unto him.

And this affect beareth rule in all those things, wherein we desire to excel. Neither yet doth it forbear virtues: for he that is envious would not have his equals, and such as be like unto him, to excel in any ornament of virtue.

And the reason why envy is conversant among such as be alike, is, that although the prosperous fortune of our equals, and them that be like us, doth not pluck any of our goods from us, nor maketh us less than we be; yet the envious man doth so conceive of other men's goods, as if by them his honor and dignity, his gain and other ornaments should be diminished. Neither must we omit, that every envious man is a rejoicer in evil things: for he delighteth in the adversity of his equals. Yet must not both these be accounted for one and the self-same vice; seeing they appertain to contrary motions of the mind. For envy is a grief or sadness; whereas he that rejoiceth in evil things, is affected with delight. Otherwise these vices, although they be diverse, yet are they so linked together, as there can be no envious man, which is not moved with a gladness of other men's harms. And hereby it evidently appeareth, that envy is mere repugnant unto mercy, seeing mercy sorroweth for another man's misery, but an envious man rejoiceth for the same, by reason of the delight, wherewith he is affected to other men's harm. This motion of the mind is in him also, that is vexed or angered at the prosperity of the wicked: for he that becometh sad for the prosperity of the wicked, the very same man taketh pleasure, when he perceiveth them to be suppressed and in trouble.

**Of Emulation.**

55. After this, we are to speak of Emulation; that is to wit, the grief of mind, which we run into for other men's goods, which we ourselves want, when as those things may become us, and we be able to obtain them. We desire not by this motion of the mind, to have other despoiled of those ornaments that they have; but it grieveth us that we ourselves be destitute of them: and it cometh of a good nature thus to be affected. Wherefore emulation is reckoned among commendable affections. Cicero in his

Tusculane questions defineth, that hereof cometh a grief of mind; when another man enjoyeth the good, which we ourselves desire. The same author observed, that emulation is otherwhile so taken, as it differeth nothing from envying; and therefore is sometimes reproved. But if we understand it in such sort, as we have said, it is a commendable affect; because it maketh men the better: for it is accustomed to engender the imitation of good things. But we must take heed of that, which indeed we are prone unto; namely, that it degenerate not into hatred, and that emulation have no such scope, as we should desire to despoil men, which be fortunate, honorable, and honest, of their ornaments and good things.

And for this cause Cicero said, that that emulation is praise-worthy, which is not like unto the emulation that is in wooing; seeing this is the property of wooers, that they would so enjoy their pleasures, as they may utterly exclude others. These cautions being had, emulation is both good and godly. Wherefore Paul exhorted the Corinthians, that they should strive to excel one another in charity, and in the better sort of graces. This affection is most occupied about virtues, and about all such things as are had in honor and admiration: for whatsoever thing a man contemneth and despiseth, he doth not emulate. Emulation hath joined with it a perpetual hope of obtaining that which it desireth: for if a man despair, it is not possible for him to emulate. And so much of these affects.

**Of Revenge.**

56. Revenge is of two sorts; one public, and another private. And as for public, which ought to be exercised by the magistrate; so far is it off from prohibiting thereof, as God commandeth the same; warning always the magistrates, that they should execute justice and judgment, and not suffer wickedness to escape unpunished. But it is not lawful for private men to

revenge, unless it be, according to the proverb, To repel violence by violence. This is not prohibited them, when the magistrate cannot help them. For sometime the case happeneth so upon the sudden, as a man cannot straightway fly to the help of the public power. Wherefore we may then defend ourselves, using nevertheless great moderation; to wit, that we only endeavor to defend ourselves, and them that be committed unto us, not wishing with a mind of revenge to hurt our adversaries; in such sort as that action may proceed, not of hatred, but of charity. Yet nevertheless, public revenge (as we have said) is commanded by God. By the which precept, not only magistrates are bound, but the guilty also are bound, that they should with a patient mind bear the correction and punishment, that is laid upon them by the superior power, for the crime which they have committed. Which if they do, let them understand, that it belongeth unto the commendation of justice.

But do not thou object unto me the saying of Aristotle, in his Rhetoric's, that according to other virtues, it is honest and laudable, not only to do, but also to suffer. And he only excepteth justice: for he saith; They which are punished, and do suffer justly, must rather be dispraised than praised. For that, which he here saith, is true; if thou respect the cause, for the which they be punished: that without doubt is not praise-worthy; since they are punished for offenses. Yet on the other side, if thou respect his mind in suffering, which for a public commodity, and for other men's instruction, because of the commandment of God, that he may obey him, and in detestation of the wickedness committed, doth willingly submit himself to the laws which are decreed; it must not be denied, but that such a one doth justly, and is to be praised in such a steadfastness, and just determination of his mind. But yet the prayer of Samson may seem at the first sight not to be

very godly: for he prayeth, that it might be granted him to take revenge upon his enemies; because they put out both his eyes. In very truth, if he had meant to fulfill his wrath, we might not justly allow of his prayer: for he should no more have been allowed of God, than if he had said expressly; I beseech thee Lord to prosper either my theft or my adultery.

Augustine saith, that Samson did these things, not of his own accord; but by the drift and counsel of the holy Ghost. Besides, we must not think of Samson, as of a private man; but as of a magistrate, whom God himself had appointed. And surly, it was not lawful for him, as a private man, to revenge injuries; but as a magistrate, both he might, and should do it. If we speak of a private cause, that must be of force, which Paul said; Give place unto wrath; vengeance is mine, and I will repay, saith the Lord. But in a public cause, the magistrate, by the commandment and authority of God, must revenge the injury done unto him: for he is God's deputy upon the earth. And God himself, although that oftentimes he revengeth sins immediately, as they say, by himself; yet doth he for the most part punish by magistrates. Wherefore those words; Vengeance is mine, and I will repay, do nothing at all hinder the severity of magistrates, whereby they punish offenders. For they be the ministers of God; and that which they do, God himself doth it by them.

# CHAP. X. The seventh Precept; Thou shalt not commit adultery: and first of Matrimony, and having of concubines.

Matrimony, wedlock, marriages, and wedding, do signify all one thing, and matrimony (as it is in the first book of the institutes of Justinian, when mention is made of the power of the father, and in the Digests, *De ritu nuptiarum*) is defined to be a conjunction of man and woman, an inseparable conversation of life, and a communicating of the law of God and man. But this definition must be made perfect by the holy scriptures. Wherefore we must say, that this conjunction of man and woman, was instituted by God, for the increasing of children, for the taking away of whoredom, and that thereby the life of man might have helps and commodities. In this definition, no doubt but the conjunction of man and woman are instead of the matter. Unto the form appertaineth the inseparable conversation of life; seeing with this mind and purpose man and wife must marry together. For although that copulation be separated by adultery; yet, when the matrimony is contract, both man and wife ought to have this in their mind: that being once joined, they must abide and live together. This also belongeth unto the form, that between them two there be a

communicating of the law of God, and of the law of man; since it behooveth that they should he both of one religion, and that they communicate human things one with another. For the wife passeth into the family of her husband, and is accounted one flesh with her husband. Yea and the goods of both the wedded persons, in all respects, be made common to the one and the other. Howbeit, the efficient cause of this ordinance was God himself, even from the beginning, who made a helper unto Adam. And the end (as we have said) is the procreation of children: for God said; Increase and multiply. But as touching the other end; namely, for the avoiding of whoredom, Paul hath very well and plainly written, in the first to the Corinthians.

If thou wilt demand, whether bonds or writings are required for contracting of matrimony, we may answer, They be not required: because the consent of either parties is sufficient, as may be perceived in the Authentiks, and in the Code, where it is entreated of marriages. But that, which Jerome writeth unto Oceanus, that thereby a wife is discerned from a concubine; because a wife must have bonds, and a dowry (which concubines had not) this I say is not universally to be received; for his saying is to be extended unto that wife, which before was a concubine. As touching her it was needful to have bonds, that she might no more be counted a concubine, and that the children, which she already had, or afterward should have, might be legitimate. But a dowry is not required of necessity; because (as it is a common saying) a dowry hath not place without matrimony: but matrimony may consist without a dowry. For a dowry is given for the easier sustaining of the burden of matrimony. The canons have added, and that profitably, that matrimonies should not be contracted privily. For if the assent of the man and wife be secret, and

without witnesses, judges can pronounce nothing of such a matrimony contracted. Wherefore, if their wills should be changed, and after those secret matrimonies, they should contract solemn and public marriages; the first marriages give place unto them, and the conscience is kept both doubtful, and also wounded.

2. But to speak of having of concubines, two things are to be considered; first, what the Roman laws ordained concerning the same; secondly, in what sort it was used among the Hebrews, or what is to be understood, when we read that the fathers had concubines. As concerning the first, the having of concubines was by the civil law a certain kind of matrimony: for a concubine was not a harlot prostituted unto many men; nor yet a harlot, which was kept together with a lawful wife. And how much she differeth from a wife, it shall appear by the definition of a concubine. For a concubine is she, that hath the use of marriage with one that liveth sole. But for that she is not inseparable (insomuch as they that are so joined may easily be separated) therefore a concubine differeth far from a very wife. Moreover, the rites of the law are not communicated with her: for a concubine passeth not into the family of him, with whom she is conversant; yea and their goods and faculties are not common together. Neither are the children, born of that conjunction, counted lawful and just heirs; unless they be made legitimate by the benefit of the prince. Howbeit, it is by the Roman law forbidden that a man should have many concubines at once. And it is prohibited to have a concubine, together with a wife. Moreover, by the Roman laws, such cannot be counted as concubines, with whom rape may be committed; namely, a free born virgins; and a widow under 25 years of age. For if a man have carnal company with them, either it shall be matrimony, or else judged whoredom. Yet nevertheless, a widow may be a

concubine, if before witnesses it be declared, that she is taken, not for a wife, but for a concubine. And lastly, there can be no concubine, which may not become a wife: although not in that place where she dwelleth, yet at the leastwise in another place. Which I therefore say: because by the Roman law, it was not lawful for the president to marry a wife of that province where he governed: which nevertheless he might have as a concubine.

And if thou wilt demand, whether the Roman law allowed concubines? I will answer, that they did absolutely allow of them, because they did not condemn the having of concubines, as a thing unlawful; so that it were used in such sort as I have said. Yet indirectly it reproveth that conjunction, when as it suffereth not the children born of concubines, to be lawful and just heirs, unless she at the length of a concubine should become his wife; or unless it be by the authority of the prince. Howbeit, we must understand, that the children of a concubine were admitted unto a certain small portion of inheritance; but yet, not to a like and equal portion with the legitimate: yea and the children born of a concubine, were not in the jurisdiction of the father. But when of a concubine she was made a wife, then it was necessary, that there should be tables of matrimony. If we will retain the Roman law, a handmaiden cannot be made a concubine; seeing by that law a handmaiden could not be made a wife. For the conjunction of a free man with a handmaiden, the Roman laws called *Contubernium*, a kind of fellowship: neither did they account it for a just matrimony. Howbeit, by handmaidens the Romans understood not hired servants, but such as they had bought. Which I therefore speak, because our hired handmaidens be free persons: so as it is lawful to contract just matrimony with them.

3. But now let us consider the law of the Hebrews, and what is to be thought of the concubines of the fathers. In very deed they were wives,

although oftentimes they were handmaidens: as Agar, Bala, Zilpa, and the concubines of Gideon. In the plea of court, and as touching the civil affairs of the places, in the which those fathers dwelt, it seemeth that free men might not enter matrimony with them: and therefore perhaps in the holy scriptures they were called concubines. But yet before God, that is, by the law of matrimony instituted by him, they were wives. Wherefore in the book of Genesis, Agar, which is called a concubine, is called a wife also. So then there were two differences between the Hebrew laws, and the Roman laws; because with them, the having of concubines was no matrimony, but with the Jews it was matrimony before God: although perhaps in the court of plea, and in civil reason, because of the servile condition of the woman, she was not acknowledged for a wife. Further, herein they differ; because the Jews had handmaidens to their concubines: and the same was not lawful to the Romans, if we follow that law, that she should be a concubine, which may be made a wife; seeing the Roman laws counted not that for matrimony, which was contracted with a handmaiden.

Nevertheless, this civil law was not in Jerome's time retained in the empire of Rome; either because the ecclesiastical laws had mitigated it, or else for some other cause. For in an epistle unto Oceanus, he speaketh of certain, which had their handmaidens instead of wives, and forbear the name of a wife, because they would avoid burdens and charges: who notwithstanding, if they became rich, made their handmaidens wives. But we must further consider, that where concubines seem to be allowed and permitted in the decrees, the same should be understood of those, which are in very deed wives: although by the Roman laws, and in place of pleading, they were counted concubines; because that woman was not solemnly married, notwithstanding that there was between them a mutual consent of

matrimony. This, which I have alleged, is read in the 34th distinction, in the chapter *Is qui & Christiano*. Whereof the first is the decree of the Council of Toledo: the other is the testimony of Isidorus, in his book *De distantia noui & veteris testamenti*. But when in the decrees there is mention made of concubines, which in very deed are not wives; they are generally prohibited: and that is, when either party will not always dwell together, nor yet acknowledge one another as man and wife.

**Of Polygamy, or the having of more wives than one.**

4. Here have I matter somewhat hard to be explained touching polygamy. This place cometh oftentimes to hand in the holy scriptures; therefore it shall be very well once to understand what we are to judge of the same. I undoubtedly will declare (as in a matter obscure) what may seem good unto me; not prescribing anything in the meantime to any man, that can allege any better. Polygamy is two manner of ways to be considered of. The first is, that when the first wife is dead, a second or a third is married: as touching this, because there is at this day no doubt, I will say nothing. The other is, when two, or more wives be kept in matrimony. But whether it be lawful for one woman to have two husbands at once, I think it needless to inquire: for certain it is, that it was never lawful by any good laws. This matter may be considered, either simply and absolutely, or else according to the nature of the time and place. First therefore we will inquire, whether polygamy may be simply and absolutely proved. Secondly, by what right the same was used among the fathers in the old law of Moses. Lastly, whether the same liberty may be also transferred unto us.

5. As concerning the first, there seem to be arguments strong enough for the proof of either part. First I will bring forth their arguments, which would have polygamy to be lawful. Secondly, I will show what may be said on the

other part. After that, I will confute the former arguments. [ 1] First therefore they say, that they have examples, not of the common sort of men, but of the most holy men, Abraham, Jacob, Helcana, and David: them (say they) we follow in other things; and why should it not be lawful in this matter also? [ 2] Further, if they sinned herein, it is not likely that God would have dissembled that sin: for he sent Nathan unto David, to reprehend him of adultery; and Gad, that should blame him for numbering the people. And other offenses of the people were ever reproved by the prophets. [ 3] Moreover it is not read, that the fathers did repent for such kind of polygamy: wherefore, if it were a sin, they died without repentance. [ 4] Besides this, when Nathan reproved David, he thus used his speech to him, under the person of God; I have anointed thee king, and given thee the house of thy lord, and the wives of thy lord, into thy bosom. He meant Egla and Rispha, the wives of Saul; and more were promised him, if these might not seem sufficient. [ 5] Besides this, when God in Exodus gave express warning of a goring ox, of a tooth smitten out, and of every small matter, he never forbad polygamy; nay contrariwise, by supposition it may be perceived, that he did permit polygamy. For in the 21st chapter of Deut. he made this law; If any man have two wives, the one that he loveth, the other that he hateth, let him not prefer the son of the beloved, before the son of her that he hateth. Howbeit, this place proveth not greatly; for it might be, that the one wife was divorced.

[ 6] Furthermore, if a man die without children, God commandeth, that the brother of him should marry his wife: neither is there any exception added; namely, that unless the same brother have his own wife before. Wherefore, God not only permitteth, but also commandeth, that there should be polygamy. [ 7] If polygamy were permitted, so often

divorcements would not be used: for husbands do therefore refuse their first wives, because they may marry others. [ 8] Also, the fruitfulness, which is chiefly regarded in matrimony, would be greater by many wives, than by one. And by this reason the Turks at this day do defend polygamy; because they have a singular respect unto propagation and issue of children. [ 9] Again, what account shall we make of those ancient patriarchs, unto whom the Jews have always attributed so much? Surely, unless we accept of polygamy, they were begotten either in whoredom, or in adultery; since lawful matrimony it cannot appear to be. And by that means should the fathers and authors of the stock and name of the Jews be bastards. [ 10] Where shall then become that nobility so often boasted of? For only Rachel was the lawful wife of Jacob; and of her only two were brought forth, Joseph and Benjamin. And of Joseph were Ephraim and Manasseh born. For indeed Lea was a wife, but yet a supposed wife; that is, a concubine: or rather a harlot than a wife. Wherefore, all the other patriarchs were bastards.

[ 11] Besides this, Valentinian the elder, a godly emperor, and a Christian, had two wives together, as Socrates affirmeth in his fourth book. For when as Severa his wife had very much commended unto him the favor and beauty of the young maid Justina, whom she had in her train: the emperor therewith inflamed, was wholly determined to take her to wife. Yet did he not put away Severa from him, seeing of her he begat Gratianus, which afterward did reign. [ 12] Howbeit, none of the fathers, which lived in that time (although they were frank of speech, and excellent men) reprehend him for so doing. Yea, and of this second matrimony was Valentinian the second born; and Galla, who afterward married Theodosius the emperor. [ 13] And this also is affirmed by some, touching Charles the great; although others write, that he put away the daughter of Desiderius, king of the

Lombards, without publication of the cause; and that after the same he took to wife a maiden of Suevia a damsel of a noble house. Howsoever the matter be, yet all men grant, that he, besides his wives, had four concubines. [ 14] Chrysostom upon that place of Paul (The husband of one wife) saith, that Paul added this for their sakes, which came from Judaism unto Christ. For to them it was lawful to have many wives. Yet (saith he) Paul gave warning that a bishop should not be chosen from among the number of such. And Jerome likewise followed the same opinion. Wherefore, in those days, they that had more wives than one, were suffered among the Christians.

[ 15] And at this day, if a Turk or a Jew should come unto Christ with his two wives, what should be done as touching them? To pluck either the one or the other away, against her will, were cruelty. But should we permit them both? [ 16] Moreover, seeing barrenness is a curse of God: if a man cannot by his first wife have issue, shall he so remain cursed, or not rather marry another? [ 17] Augustine, in his 22nd book against Faustus the Manichei, when as he dealt in this matter, he so divided sin, as he said one is against nature, another against custom, and another against law. He saith that polygamy is not against nature, for it is a furtherance unto fruitfulness; neither against custom, because it was now openly received; neither against the law, seeing there was no caution made by the laws concerning the same: wherefor he concludeth, that polygamy was lawful. [ 18] The law also of marrying another wife was granted, if any man’s wife became a leper. [ 19] Likewise, there is license granted unto those wives, whose husbands are wandered into far countries, or be fled, touching whom it cannot be known or heard, either by letters, or yet by messengers, for a certain space of time what was become of them. And yet the bond of matrimony rested in both:

for if the first husband that was far absent return home, he is compelled to take his own wife, although she be married to another. And after this sort polygamy is permitted. Howbeit, this doth not much make for the matter; seeing we speak here of those, which use two wives both together.

[ 20] Furthermore, if a woman for any cause shall be refused by her husband, the bond of matrimony remaineth undissolved: but she cannot return to her husband, from whom she is compelled to depart; for she is now become profane unto him, yet may she be married to another. In this sort a wife may have two husbands. Men are wont to refer the original of polygamy unto Lamech: but touching him, whatsoever others do think, Chrysostom saith, he was a good man and a godly. [ 21] It seemeth also to agree with reason, that whosoever will, may yield as concerning his right. Why then should not this be lawful in matrimony, if the wife be willing to permit it unto her husband, seeing by that means there is no injury done unto any? For so Sara permitted Agar unto Abraham: and not only she took not that fact of her husband in ill part, but also she did of her own accord provoke him thereunto. Also Caietane upon Genesis saith; [ 22] Let the godly reader consider, that in express words there is no law written as touching polygamy.

6. But on the contrary part, to speak plainly of the thing itself, I say, that polygamy is not lawful. And to prove this, I will reason first from the very institution of matrimony. [ 1] For if we will know the form or reason of anything, we must have recourse unto the beginnings. God at the very beginning created not three or four; but two, and by the mouth of Adam himself pronounced the law of marriage; This is now bone of my bones, for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh; that is, They shall be so united together,

as they may be one flesh. If we perceive anything hath happened [otherwise] in matrimony, the same must be revoked to this original form. But if thou wilt say, that the latter laws (as the lawyers term it) do over-rule the former: I answer, that if any things were brought in, or usurped afterward, the same be human inventions; and that the first institution is the law of God. And if thou wilt likewise contend about the time, the same is also in time the latter: for Christ, in the 19th of Matthew, and in the tenth of Mark, called home the same as it were by a kind of recovery; Knowe ye not (saith he) that he, who from the beginning made them, said unto them: For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh? Whom God therefore hath joined together, let not man separate. By these words the former law of God is repeated, and newly established.

[ 2] And if so be that Christ would not suffer, that the first wife, being put away, another should be married; how less credible is it, that he would suffer any man to have many wives at one time? Nay rather, he speaketh more sharply, that He, which marrieth another, committeth adultery. Neither is the matter, which some here object, of any great force, that Mark saith; He committeth adultery against her: as though he were not an absolute adulterer, but only that he doth injury to his first wife. [ 3] Yes truly, he committeth double sin; first, because he is an adulterer; secondly, for that he doth injury to his wife. Jerome in many places doth ponder these words; They shall be two in one flesh. Against Jovinian he saith; It is written, In one flesh, not in two or three. And he addeth, that Lamech was a naughty man, which divided one rib into two: but (saith he) he suffered the punishment of his naughtiness in the flood. The same thing he saith in an epistle unto Salvina. Although I must needs grant this, that these reasons

prove not Jerome's purpose: for unto Salvina and Geruntia, he inveigheth against second marriages. Into the which error Tertullian also fell, when as he erred with the Montanists. Nevertheless, these reasons do very well serve us in this place.

But Jerome addeth; And he shall cleave unto his wife: Not, unto wives (saith he.) I verily, when I ponder with myself these words, In one flesh, I perceive a great emphasis or force in them. For One flesh, is either by colligation, as when all the members be knit one with another, or else by continuation. Both the ways make, that all the parts of the body do serve one another. So the hand doth his endeavor unto the mouth, the mouth unto the belly, the belly unto the whole body: as it is more at large described by Galen, *De usu partium*. Such kind of flesh is not possible to be communicated, so as it cannot pass from one living creature to another living creature. We see therefore, that by the force of these words, both adultery, and polygamy are taken away. But thou wilt object; Whie then in a divorce, by reason of adultery, is it permitted to have another marriage? I answer: for that the cause of the unity is taken away, and that is the fastening together. Wherefore it is said; And he shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. But he which committeth adultery, cleaveth not unto his wife; and so he is not one flesh with her. The very same is to be judged, if a faithful wife, for her faith sake, be cast off, her husband being an infidel: for there also is their cleaving together taken away; that is to wit, the cause of unity. Wherefore Paul saith; The Lord hath not called us to bondage. Neither must it be any let unto us, that the name of Two, is not expressed in Genesis: it is sufficient, that Christ hath added that word. And the same must be fully supplied in Genesis, since when those things were spoken, there were only two; Adam and Eve.

But here is a great doubt put: for if that reason, concerning unity of flesh, should be of force, it will also be of force in fornication and adultery; so as it should not be lawful for a lewd man to be plucked from her, with whom he hath committed fornication. In so much as Paul, when he disputed against fornication, saith; Shall I take the member of Christ, and make it the member of a harlot? For it is written (saith he) They shall be two in one flesh. Now is that reason either firm, or not firm: if it be firm, it shall also be of force in fornication: if it be not of force, neither shall it be firm in matrimony. Some answer, that Paul saith, that indeed the flesh of them, which commit fornication together, is all one; yet not perpetually, but for a time only. Howbeit this is nothing: for Paul citeth the same place out of Genesis. Neither doth he speak of one hour, or another, but absolutely.

It seemeth that a better answer may be made on this wise; that so far as belongeth to the nature of the thing itself, the flesh is altogether one: but seeing that whoremongers come not together according to the Lord's institution, that conjunction is not firm, but may be dissolved. Indeed they are made one and the same flesh, as concerning the fact (as they use to say;) howbeit, by stealth, not lawfully. But in matrimony both are good: as well the conjunction, as the prescript of the Lord. That did Paul lay hold of, because he saw it made to the purpose: for this hath whoredom common with matrimony. Which hereby appeareth, for that through such a conversation with harlots, there ariseth an affinity: so as it may not be lawful afterward to contract matrimony with the parents, or children, or brethren of such a one, as thou hast before unlawfully kept company with. This is evident by the scriptures: for when Absalom had kept unlawful company with the wives of his father; David, when he was afterward restored, would not receive them unto him, because he did perceive, that by

reason of that ill company, there was now some affinity contracted. Howbeit, no law is by that means procured, whereby the whoremonger may compel the harlot to remain with him.

7. [ 4] Paul unto the Corinthians writeth very well of this matter. For first he saith; Let every man, for avoiding fornication, have his own wife; and every woman have her own husband. But, her own, is contrary unto Him that is common to another. Again, if the husband have many wives, the wife of necessity must have a husband common to others, and not proper to herself. [ 5] The Logicians have very well defined that to be proper, which always and only agreeth unto one alone. Paul addeth; I would not have you to defraud one another. But in polygamy, one or other must of necessity be defrauded: for the husband cannot keep company with them all at once. Wherefore Jacob was constrained so to decide the matter, as he by turns was sometime with Rachel, and sometime with Lea: seeing hereof there arise perpetual contentions and brawls betwixt women. For we see no living creature that is so void of courage, but both in feeding and propagation, would be free from impediment: and had rather fight, than to be kept from these things.

And in the state of polygamy, although women come not to the field, yet they be at war together, sometime with chiding and brawling, and oftentimes with their fists and nails. [ 6] He that marrieth a wife, giveth his body unto his wife: how can he then deliver the same afterward to another? It is a great injustice, when one will not abide by his promise. Nevertheless, thou wilt say; He delivereth his body indeed, yet not altogether. I hear thee: but why then will he have his wife to give her body altogether unto him? In contracts, consideration must be had to both alike. [ 7] Besides this, the principal point of matrimony is friendship; and friendship doth chiefly

consist in justice: if justice halt, matrimony must needs be lame. Paul addeth; that The husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife; nor the wife of her own body, but the husband. Wherefore, the husband cannot marry a second wife, without injury done unto the first. He affirmeth also, that the troubles in matrimony are very great: For such shall have tribulation of the flesh. And it is not the part of a wise man, to increase his own troubles, where no need is: for there be very few, which be able well to sustain one such kind of cross as this is.

8. [ 8] Another reason is derived from the signification or sacrament. Paul saith unto the Ephesians; Husbands love your wives, as Christ hath loved his church, &c. And; They shall be two in one flesh. Great (saith he) is this sacrament or mystery in Christ, I say, and his church. But Christ hath one only church; wherefore, if our actions ought to be correspondent unto the original form, it shall not be lawful for us to marry more wives than one. This reason Jerome used against Jovinian: in which place he earnestly inveigheth against Lamech, who (as he saith) divided one rib into two. And so he affirmeth, that the heretics divide the church into sundry conventicles. This doth not much trouble me, seeing this reason might serve for polygamy. For Solomon had seven hundred Queens, and three hundred concubines. And in the Canticles it is read, that he had three score Queens, and four score concubines: howbeit, one of them was his dove, one was his perfect one. That doth Augustine in his treatise *De bono coniugali*, the 18th chapter, thus interpret; that Christ of all his particular churches, throughout the world, hath collected one church unto himself. I pass over, how others do interpret Rachel to be the church; and Lea the synagogue. In very deed, there was one only dove, that is to say, one perfect church.

[ 9] The School-divines say, that three things specially are requisite in matrimony; fruitfulness; dwelling together, that the man and woman may one help another; and the sacrament (as they term it) that is, the signification. That first good thing touching fruitfulness, polygamy nothing hindereth: nay rather, it is an increase to the same. Yet that they can dwell together in that state, and the husband help all his wives alike, it can hardly be. [ 10] In matrimony there must be a singular charity. But, both reason it self, and Aristotle in the eighth book of his Ethics, do teach, that special friendship cannot abide among many: for among the more in number that friendship is spread, the slacker it must be toward everyone in particular. [ 11] There ought also to be a singular unity in wedlock: for They be two in one flesh. And Paul saith; Bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh. But no one man can be one and the same towards many. Further, in polygamy, all the rest are oftentimes contemned in comparison of one, and they are counted in the place of handmaids, and that same one doth bear rule, and command the rest. Neither doth malice there stay itself: since oftentimes, for that one woman's sake, the residue are miserably afflicted. And this appeareth out of the second chapter of Malachi: for there the wives that were waxed old, when they were despised and wronged by their husbands, by reason they had married other wives, came into the court of the temple, and complained unto the Lord. And herein the husbands committed double sin, both in that they married others wives, and because they afflicted their former wives.

[ 12] It seemeth also, that the having of many wives, maketh against good manners: since enmities are not only sprung up among their wives, but also are bred and increased among their children. For Agar, when she saw herself to have conceived, she despised her mistress, then she fled;

afterward, when she was returned, and could not agree with Sara, Abraham was constrained to cast her forth. Touching Jacob, the history is well known. Of Helcan and his wives, we have spoken in our Commentaries upon the first book of Samuel. Epiphanius against the Massalians saith; that The ancient fathers, when they had many wives, never sustained them together in one house. Whence he took that, I know not: yet from thence I suppose he had the same; for that Laban, when he pursued Jacob, and sought his idols, it is written, that he first entered into the tent of Rachel, afterward of Lea: whereby it appeareth that they dwelt asunder.

[ 13] Solomon, although he gave no good counsel to himself, yet by the inspiration of the holy Ghost he gave good warning to others. For in the Proverbs he saith; Delight thyself with the wife of thy youth, let her be thy hind, let her be thy fawn, satisfy thyself always with her paps. But this cannot he do, which hath many wives. [ 14] And not only Solomon did see this, but Laban also. For he, although he had forced Jacob to take the two sisters: yet when he overtook him flying into Gilead, and had made a covenant with him, he added this; Molest not my daughters, nor yet bring in other wives unto them. For this he saw could not be done, but that those should be greatly disquieted. Lamech had two wives, Ada and Sela: and Sela signifieth in Latin, *Umbra eius*, that is, His shadow. For she seemed rather to be the shadow of a wife, than a wife indeed.

9. [ 15] Yea and the Comedy also teacheth, that polygamy is a great corrupting of matrimony: since in the Comedy Phormio, the old man Chremes, when he had a wife at Athens that was rich, and would marry another in Lemnos, was constrained to change his name, and to call himself Stilpho. Which unless he had done, perhaps that second woman of Lemnos would not have been married unto him. Yea, Chremes by the Parasite

Phormio is accused of polygamy, as of a grievous crime and offense. [ 16] The Roman laws could never abide, that a man should have more wives than one. For in the Code, concerning incest's, and unprofitable marriages, Dioclesian and Maximian decreed, that none should have many wives: and who that did contrary, should be punished. And they add, that the same was received before the Praetorian edicts. In the Digests *Deijs, qui notantur infamia*, law the first, in the Paraph, at the end; They be noted of infamy, which have two wives together, or be trothed to two at once. The same we find in the Code, *Ad legem Julian*, *de adulterijs*, in the law, *Eum qui*. The which also is the more to be marveled at, in the Code *De Judaeis*, in the law Nemo; Theodosius, Arcadius, and Honorius decreed, that it should not be lawful for the Jews, which lived under the Roman empire, to marry more. So the godly emperors, though they did bear with many other things in that nation, yet would they not suffer this. In the Eliberine Council (which is also cited in the 31st question, chapter *De ijs*) it is decreed, that the ministers should not bless such kind of marriages. This place hath naughtily and perversely been wrested unto second marriages; for the Council speaketh plainly of polygamy: which also the Glosser perceived. The reason is alleged, because the priest ought rather to persuade them unto repentance, than to bless them. The same is in the *Extrauagant De secundis nuptijs*, law the first. By these reasons I am moved to think, that polygamy is not absolutely lawful. And much less do I allow of them, which think, that marriages ought to be common. Such were the Gnostics, the Valentinians, and the Secundians: of the which opinion some write that Plato also was.

10. Now I come to the second point. What wilt thou then say, shall we think of the fathers? Even thus, that they may two manner of ways be defended. For first I say, that God, according to the state of those times,

dispensed with them, for the law which he had made at the beginning. Moreover, some add a signification. As touching the first, God could have raised men out of the sin of the earth; but seeing he had decreed, that mankind should be spread by procreation, polygamy was necessary. And this reason doth the Master of the sentences follow. For propagation of the flesh was the increase of godliness: seeing God would, that the people, in whom true religion was planted, should continue even unto Christ. So then it was lawful for them to have many wives, to the intent that that people might be more in number: neither can it appear that they sinned, when they so did. But here sin must be distinguished: for if, to sin, be to stray from most perfect reason, surly they sinned. Howbeit, if we determine that to be sin, wherewith God is offended, and is provoked to revenge, they sinned not: since God dispensed with his law, to the end that the people, of whom he would be worshipped, might be of the greater number. For although among other nations, some perhaps were good men; yet the public worshipping of God was nowhere else but in Judea. Further, there seemed to be no new thing brought in by them; for the whole East part used polygamy. Wherefore, God provided, that even that, which others used sinfully, the Jews should use without committing sin.

But thou wilt object; Seeing we confess, that herein there is some imperfection, why did God suffer it to be in his church, which ought to be most perfect? I answer, that in very deed that church was perfect; but that was according as those times did permit: because as yet they killed beasts, and had gross sacrifices. For they which so defend the fathers, are wont to say, that the age of the whole world must be so considered of, as the age of one man, in whom is childhood, youth, man’s state, and old age. And there be many things lawful to children, which would not become an elder age.

Augustine noteth, that to wear garments with sleeves, and down to the ground, among the ancients was a token of niceness: but now (saith he) it would be noted, if one should use a short garment, and without sleeves. Howbeit, thou wilt say, that those fathers were most perfect, as Abraham and Jacob, as David and others. I grant it. Nevertheless, it is one thing to consider a man in himself; and another thing, as the time serveth. Those fathers were perfect in themselves; yet, by reason of the time they had much imperfection. For they say, that those times were full of darkness, if they should be compared with our light. Indeed the Jews of that time, being compared with the Gentiles, were in a manner the light of the whole world: but they were nothing in comparison of our state, after that the holy Ghost was given, and the Gospel spread abroad. And there be many things well done in the dark, which would not be abidden in the light.

11. Nevertheless, thou wilt yet inquire, by what scriptures it may be showed, that God did dispense with his law. I answer, that the same may sufficiently appear, by the examples of Abraham, Jacob, David, Helcana, and other godly fathers. But those (thou wilt say) might err; and that their fact is not sufficient to confirm the consciences of others. Yes verily, it ought to seem sufficient unto us, for that we perceive not, that anywhere, they were reproved by the prophets for this cause. Moreover, God, when he made the law, if anything were before done amiss by the fathers, he amended it. For before that time it was lawful for Jacob to have two sisters in wedlock. But this did God forbid by the law, and distinguished the degrees: yet did he not revoke polygamy, although the place may seem most of all to require it. And this the rather also he alloweth, in that God saith, that he gave the wives of Saul unto David into his bosom. Wherefore, the fathers sinned not in that matter; for they did it without lust: which we

doubt not but many did. And they kept the faith of wedlock very religiously: for they had access unto none, but unto their own wives. And by this means the issue was provided for. Howbeit, thou wilt object, that if the law of God were dispensed with, in consideration of bringing forth children, the same should chiefly have been done unto Adam. *Augustine De nuptijs & concupiscentijs*, the first book, and ninth chapter answereth, that God would set forth in Adam the form of perfect matrimony. Moreover, he addeth, that at that time there was no idolatry: but afterward, when idolaters were increased, it was necessary that the godly should also increase; and for that cause God dispensed with his law.

Yea (thou wilt say) but it is the perverseness of nature, and therefore not to be ascribed unto God. Philip Melancthon (whom I name for honor sake) in his Epitome of the Ethics distinguisheth natural honesty, and saith, that one is eternal; to wit, that God must be worshipped: that thou oughtest to do to others, as thou wouldest be done unto: for these things be eternal, and cannot be changed without great trouble. The other is that, which somewhat declineth from a perfection: yet not so, as any great naughtiness or confusion doth follow. And of this sort he reckoneth polygamy, which (he saith) God did allow among the Israelites. Even so was it, for a man to marry the wife of his brother: which for that time God not only allowed, but also commanded. Some of the fathers add, that God did dispense with his law, not only for propagation sake; but also, that he might by some means shadow that, which should afterward come to pass. Ambrose in his first book, and fourth chapter of Abraham the patriarch, because he first had a child by Agar, and afterward by Sara, saith, that therein lay hidden a great mystery. The very which thing Jerome also said to Geruntia; to wit, that Sara represented the church, and Agar the synagogue. The same they judge

of Rachel and Lea. The same of Anna and Phenenna. Of this mind was Justinus Martyr, in his conference that he hath with Tryphon; namely, that it was not lawful unto the fathers to have many wives at once, unless it be to describe a mystery.

But what the fathers themselves have held concerning the polygamy of those of old time, it may easily appear by their own testimonies. Clemens Alexandrinus, in his στρώματα, the fourth book, saith; that God, in those first times did exact polygamy of them. Chrysostom saith, that God granted polygamy unto them. Jerome to Geruntia saith, that the same was done according to the variety of times. Augustine *De doctrina christiana*, in the third book, and 12th chapter, saith; that that fact of the fathers must not be regarded, according to the outward action, but after the manner of their lusting. Wherefore he saith, that they sinned not, if they did it only for issue sake; but if there were any, that therein sought after lust, they could not be excused. Indeed Augustine in that place treated of meats: but this he added in the end as touching polygamy, and saith, that the same was blameless, because of replenishing the world with sufficient issue. The same father against Faustus the Manichei; Seeing saith he, it was then the manner, it was no sin. And in the same book *De doctrina christiana*, the 18th chapter, he saith; They might have even many wives in chastity, and one with lust. And he addeth, that they, which had many for another cause, that is, for propagation sake, are to be preferred above them, which had but only one for lust sake. Ambrose of Abraham the patriarch saith, that he did nothing for fulfilling of lust; therefore he may be excused. Finally, the same thing doth the Master of sentences affirm, in the fourth book, distinction 33.

12. Thus therefore may the doings of the fathers be defended. First, because those most ancients understood by the spirit of God, wherewith

they were endued, that God did dispense with his law. Secondly, because the posterity followed the example of their ancestors, especially when they perceived, that the doing thereof was neither reproved anywhere by God, nor yet afterward by any law. Others there be, which think, that the same was sin, though not very heinous, and that it was remitted them by reason of their faith. And they think, that the same sin might be eased in them, by reason of probable ignorance: since probable ignorance may in some part excuse sin. For he that knoweth the will of his Lord, and doth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes. Perhaps in those times of darkness, either they thought not of the law, or else they understood it not. Moreover, they saw that polygamy was received now usually over all the East part, so as they thought, that there was no other matter in it, than a civil ordinance. And whatsoever sin was therein, God made as though he knew not, both for propagation sake, because he meant of that stock to raise up a great number of people; and also by reason of the ignorance of the same people, (for as yet they were not otherwise instructed;) and lastly for the figure and mystery sake. This is another reason made by the latter men, whereby the polygamy of the fathers may be defended. Both reasons seem unto me probable, and so probable, as I see there be both learned and godly men, which sometime do follow the one, and sometime the other.

For Philip Melancthon, (unto whose manifold learning and godliness I do attribute very much) though in his Ethics (which place I cited before) he saith that God allowed polygamy in the Israelites; yet in his book *De coniugio*, he writeth manifestly, that matrimony ought to be a conjunction of one unto one. And he saith, that God did bear with that imperfection in the fathers; because they, although otherwise they were perfect, yet were not without their blemishes. Howbeit, this Melancthon of the tree of

consanguinity more plainly saith, that the same sin proceeded of ignorance: yet he addeth, probable; because as yet no law was extant concerning the same. But what law he speaketh of, I do not perceive: for the law given to Adam went long before. Unless perhaps he mean the law manifested by Christ; or else that Moses, which put that law into writing, was not yet born: seeing before that time, it was only kept by tradition. Or else peradventure he meant, that that custom was politic; and that in such civil ordinances, always something is suffered to be amiss. Howbeit this he saith, that God pardoned their faith, because it was not done against the express law. But whereas that great learned man inclined to this other reason, it was not of inconstancy; but because he perceived them both to be probable. Unless peradventure he were always of this mind; and that when in his Ethics he saith, that God allowed it, he meant, that he forgave it. The choice shall be in thee (gentle reader) which reason thou haddest rather to follow: both of them be probable; neither of them ungodly.

Indeed for my part the first liketh me best: for I see that God altogether would that his people should be increased. Further, albeit I doubt not, but that those fathers were not void of sin; yet where they may be well defended, I would not charge them over-much. Yet Ambrose writeth somewhat of this matter, which I see not how it may be allowed. For he excuseth Abraham; first, for issue sake; secondly, for the shadowing [of things to come;] lastly, because he coming out of Chaldea, retained some gentilism. This latter reason is not of any great force: for Abraham had abstained a great while, neither did he join Agar to himself of his own accord, but was provoked thereunto by his wife Sara. Yet doth Jerome unto Geruntia report the same of Jacob. He saith it is objected, that Jacob had two wives. Indeed (saith he) he had; but that was in Mesopotamia, and

under Laban. But what answer will he make of Abraham? For he undoubtedly was not in Mesopotamia. What will he say of David? Since he had his wives in the midst of Jewry.

13. And as touching the third part of that we purposed to speak of; namely, whether that liberty may be also transferred unto us? I answer, that it is in no wise lawful. For now hath Christ made manifest that law of God, and hath called it back to the first institution. Wherefore, he that now transgresseth the same, doth against the plain word of God. Moreover, the cause being taken away, the effect must needs be taken away. And the cause was, the increase of posterity: whereof there is now no need, seeing God hath now those that worship him over all the world. But before it behooved that the worshipping of God should be retained among one people, until the coming of Christ. And it was very profitable, that the same law should be expounded by Christ: for when as Adam was the first man that had one wife, it was meet that Christ the second Adam, of whom the same first was a figure, should ordain the marriage of one alone. But thou wilt say, that Christ came not to make laws, but to preach the Gospel, and to redeem mankind, and that therefore it behooved him to leave matrimony in the state it was in, as well as the sun, the stars, and other outward things.

I answer, that Christ made no new law, but only revoked the old. For he only declared the will of his father, and taught nothing anew. Further he took away sacrifices, so that now he is a wicked man that will kill any beast for sacrifice. He also brake the strength of the judicial laws, so as no man, that is of sound judgment, will urge magistrates to execute those laws against their wills. Neither only did Christ this by himself, but also by his apostle Paul. Also he revoked wholly that matter concerning divorcement: so that if any man depart from his wife, and marry another, he committeth

adultery. But thou wilt object; By this means the forefathers may seem to be adulterers. I answer, as I have said before, that God dispensed with his law, and that therefore they sinned not: nevertheless, the matter being now expounded and declared, he that shall do otherwise doth grievously sin. And revoking hath a respect always to the time to come, and not to that which is past; seeing such is the condition of all laws: otherwise, as concerning the nature of the fact, the same undoubtedly did appertain unto adultery. For the ten commandments have the same respect to virtues and vices, as the ten predicaments have towards all kind of things: insomuch as there is nothing, but may be reduced to some predicament or other; so there is not any virtue nor any vice, which may not be reduced to some precept.

Now then, if we stand unto that second opinion, which we have expounded, that there was some vice in polygamy; the same must needs be adultery. And although in plain reason it were not sin, as in the former opinion I declared; yet was it some revolting from perfection. Panormitanus (in the title of divorcements, in the chapter Gaudemus) saith, that The forefathers, when they had given a bill of divorcement, and had married another, were sufficiently excused of adultery: because adultery cannot be committed but by collusion or by covine. And this he declareth by two laws: the one ecclesiastical, and the other civil. The ecclesiastical is out of the Triburien Council, as we read it in the 34th cause, question the second, in the chapter *In lectum*. A man had a wife, and she a sister, all in one house. When the wife was absent, that same sister went to his bed. Afterward came the husband, and thinking it had been his wife, had the company of her. The Council absolved the man, upon condition, that he did it not fraudulently: but he was constrained to swear, that he did that wicked act ignorantly and unwittingly. And it is called a wicked act, not because it was so in very

deed, but because the matter pertained to wickedness. Thus the fathers are excused, because they married not their second wife by collusion: for they perceived, that the same was accustomed and usual among all.

The other law civil, is in the Digests *Ad legem Juliam, de adulterio*, in the last law but one. A certain man put his wife from him, but gave her not a just bill of divorcement. Another man married her that was put away; he was accused of adultery: but he was excused, because he knew not that there was anything lacking unto a just divorce. This I speak, least it should seem unto any man, that Christ accused the fathers, of adultery. But if God, for propagation sake, dispensed with the forefathers, as touching his law; why (wilt thou say) may not the same be done at this time to them which profess the Gospel; seeing, if they be compared with the Papists and Atheists, they be but few in number? Howbeit, the reason is not all alike: because it behooved the religion of God, until the coming of Christ, to be retained in one nation only. Now the succession of godliness is not sought for out of one stock or line, but is spread over the whole world.

14. To this opinion of mine do all the fathers agree. For Chrysostom in his 56th homily on Matth. saith; We must not judge of the fathers according to our own reason; for at that time it was lawful, now it is not lawful. And he addeth, that Christ came, to the end he might bring us to the state of angels. For now he granteth us one, till we come to that place, where they are neither married, nor yet marry wives. The same father, in his oration *De libello repudij*, saith, that Christ was therefore come, to lead us unto a higher philosophy. The true religion he calleth philosophy, to take away the pride of the Grecians, who attributed so much unto their philosophy. Jerome writeth hereof in diverse places to Geruntia, to Eustochius, and against Jovinianus. And among other things, he writeth, that Christ was Alpha and

Omega, that is, The first and the last. And when the matter was now come to Omega, that is, Unto the last, the same was revoked by Christ to Alpha, that is, Unto the beginning: for that it pleased God (as Paul saith to the Ephesians) to bring all things into one, and restore them in Christ; that such things, as yet were imperfect, might be brought to perfection. Unto Eustochius he saith; that the world before time was unreplenished, but when the harvest was ripe, God put to his scythe, that is to say, he cut off such liberty.

The Valentinians and Martionits, by reason of this fact of the old fathers, accused the God of the Old Testament; but Christ (they said) the son of the good God, revoked this sufferance of the evil god. Jerome answereth; We divide not the law and the Gospel, neither do we set Christ against his Father: but we worship one God, who would have it for that time, but now hath decreed against it. For that then was the time to scatter stones abroad, now is the time to gather them up: then was the time of embracing, now is the time to abstain from embracing's. Briefly he saith, that the fathers served their times. And that that saying, Increase and multiply, is not in the same force at this day; for in old time, virginity was reproachful: that now Paul writeth; The time is but short, and therefore they which have wives, let them be as though they had none. And he addeth, that Christ doth allow of them, which have made themselves chaste for the kingdom of heavens sake. Also Augustine *De doctrina christiana*, in the third book and 13th chapter, saith, that Those forefathers were so chaste, as if they had happened to be in our days, they would have made themselves chaste, for the kingdom of heaven.

These things among the fathers must be read with judgment: for their mind was by all means to extol virginity, and single life. In very deed Paul

praiseth virginity; yet so, as if a man perceive, that by that means the kingdom of heaven may be enlarged; or if by doing otherwise, it may be hindered. He praiseth it I say, not as a thing, which of his own force, and of itself, pleaseth God; but as a state, wherein we may the more commodiously and readily spread the Gospel. Augustine saith, that now we cannot have many wives, but with lust, because it would be against laws and customs, which cannot be violated without unlawful lust. Also against Faustus he saith; Because it was then the manner, it was no sin; but now because it is not the manner, it is sin. Clemens in his Stromata, which place I cited before; when he had said, that God in the law required polygamy, added afterward, that the same is not now lawful.

And Justin against Tryphon saith, that now everyone doth rejoice under his vine, that is, Everyone hath his own wife, and that is but one only. And he reproveth the Rabbins, who as yet gave leave to themselves to have more than one. Out of Origin we cannot learn anything for a certainty, he so playeth in his allegories; and many wives he maketh many virtues: and he saith, that he is most happy that hath many. By all these things it appeareth, that polygamy is at this day forbidden. And to all these, I also add this, that the Roman laws did never permit polygamy: and it is the part of a good citizen to obey good laws. Yea and Plutarch saith, that There followed a most grievous disturbance of the public wealth, and of the whole world, when that law was broken. For after that Antony (who already had in marriage Octavia the sister of Octavius Caesar) had also married Cleopatra; the people took it in ill part, and Augustus most of all: so as they put themselves in arms one against another, with all their endeavor and power.

15. Now must I confute those arguments, which we brought at the beginning for polygamy, Abraham (say they) and other fathers were holy

men, and had many wives. Here might I make answer at a word: that we must live by laws, and not by examples. But I add moreover, that God either willed it, or bare with it. It is therefore a paralogism, or false argument, A secundum quid ad simpliciter, that is, when that which is but in some respect, is put for that which is absolute. God dispensed with them: will he therefore with us also? Or else it was a good thing in them: is it therefore good of itself? But the prophets reproved not that fact. What marvel is it? For they saw it was either licensed by God, or else doubtless permitted. Howbeit, here there is a false argument, when that which is not the cause, is put for the cause: seeing it was permitted them for propagation, or for figure sake. Now there is no need, either of so populous a propagation, or else of such a figure. They repented not. It is no marvel: because no man can repent him of the fact, which he is ignorant of. For it was a tolerable ignorance, or else (that which I rather believe) they saw it was lawful for them. God gave the wives of Saul into the bosom of David. It was lawful; insomuch as he had dispensed with his law. Or if any man will say, that God permitted that unto David only: this is the meaning; namely, that God gave the kingdom unto David: then it followed, that he might marry the wives of Saul if he would; since no man could then let him. But the first answer pleaseth me better. God made no law against polygamy. And no marvel; for his will was, that that people should mightily increase. Afterward by Christ he revoked it to the first institution. So, that which was wanting in Moses is supplied by Christ.

A brother, although he had a wife, yet he was compelled to marry the wife of his brother that was dead. The case is particular, and prerogatives must not be drawn unto examples. God would have that to be done for certain causes, not only in the law, but also before the law: as appeareth by the

children of Judah, and [his daughter in law] Tamar. Moreover, the Rabbins say, that that woman was not counted for the wife of that brother, which remained alive; but of the husband which was dead, and that the name of the first husband was given to the children which were born of her. So as the brother, which remained alive, was not properly her husband; but only had access unto her, that he might raise up issue unto her. We should have fewer divorcements and whoredoms. Neither of them is true: for they which hate their wives, will shut them out of their house; as they which cannot once abide the sight of them. Nor yet was that the cause, why God permitted a man to have more wives than one. And as touching whoredom, certainly David, when he had many, yet he could not temper himself from Bersabe.

Greater would the fruitfulness be. I grant it: and therefore God dispensed with his law. Howbeit now, when as religion is not tied to one nation only, but is dispersed over all the world, there is no need of such fruitfulness; seeing now the church hath her resting places of receipt: although not always in one place, yet wheresoever God hath offered occasion. But the marriages of the fathers might seem to be adulteries. No forsooth; seeing God either gave license, or bare with it. For (as we said out of Panormitane) adultery is not committed, but with collusion. And that he proved by two laws; the one civil, and the other ecclesiastical. Undoubtedly marriages they were, although not so perfect, as that of one man to one woman. But what shall become of that nobility of the Jews? It shall firmly abide in his own state; insomuch as those old patriarchs were born of lawful wedlock. For Zilpha and Bilha, although they were but in the state of servants, and might be called concubines; yet in very deed they were wives: howbeit, they were

not mistresses of the house, nor yet were handfasted with Jacob. Neither did that nobility depend of the mothers, but of the blessing and promise of God.

Valentinian had two wives. Admit he had: nevertheless, we must see whether he had them rightly or no: for although he were a good emperor, yet was he not such a one as could not sin. Claudius Caesar, when he perceived that by the laws it was not lawful for him to marry his brothers daughter, made a law, that it might be lawful: but scarcely was there any one claw-back to be found, which would follow that fact. Now both these laws are utterly extinct and forgotten; seeing they be neither in the Pandect, in the Digests, nor yet in the Code. Nevertheless, the fathers reproved not this in Valentinian. How canst thou tell that? Surely (as I have declared) they have sufficiently set forth in their writings what their meaning was. But let us consider the event. Justina that second wife became an Arian, and did grievously vex Ambrose. The younger Valentinian, which was born of Galla, the daughter of Justina, followed the religion of his grandmother, and did vehemently oppress the churches: and he lay miserably slain in his litter. Chrysostom saith, that Paul added [The husband] of one wife, because of them, which having many wives, were converted from Judaism unto Christ. And thereof it appeareth, that polygamy also was borne withal even in the church. I answer, that the same was therefore borne with; because that declaration of the law of Christ, was of force, for the time to come, and not for the time past. Howbeit, it was borne with, as a certain infirmity, because with a good conscience they agreed among themselves.

Yet do I otherwise understand that place of Paul: for him do I think that Paul called the husband of one wife, who liveth chastely with his own, and followeth not the wives of other men but is altogether of perfect and good fame. And I am led so to think, because the same Paul saith, that Widows

should be chosen, which had been the wives of one husband. But it was never lawful for a woman, by any laws, to have two husbands: Paul would have her to be a widow, which should be chaste, and well reported of. If the Turk at this day, with his two wives, should be converted unto Christ; might that polygamy be suffered in Christian religion? Surely it might be suffered for a time, for they with a good conscience agreed between themselves. Neither must injury be done unto those wives: for every of them hath right in her husband. And that law, which Christ made, must be of force (as we have said) for the time to come. That which now is done with a good conscience and in probable ignorance, cannot be undone. Howbeit, another kind of answer is made hereof, in the Decrees of divorcements, in the last law. If the first wife will dwell together with her husband, she shall be counted for the wife, and the rest to be dismissed; if the first will not, the next must be had in that place: and so of the rest.

I do not here contend. But yet I wonder at these men: for in the same title, the said Innocentius, being asked his counsel of a Jew, which in matrimony had his brothers wife? Answereth, that she may be kept still, after that they be contracted in good faith. If this be lawful, why is not that other lawful, seeing Christ took away both? But they might peradventure answer, that the Jews had an express law for marrying of the brothers wife; but none at all for polygamy. Or else, that the Roman laws would not suffer more wives than one; but one they would suffer, although she did not so rightly marry. Fruitfulness is the blessing of God. Be it so, but now (as I have often said) the same is not so needful. Indeed it is a blessing, but yet not so, that he is cursed which hath not children. Augustine saith, that it was neither against the custom, nor against the law, nor yet against nature; and yet it is now against the law, and against custom. Those things, which were alleged

concerning lepers, and them which be far distant, make nothing to this purpose. For neither do we speak here of him, which at one time dwelleth and is conversant together with many wives.

A wife dismissed was married to another, when as in the meantime the bond of matrimony was not undone. I answer, that a bill of divorcement did sufficiently excuse her from adultery, especially when she did it of probable ignorance. Lamech is commended by Chrysostom. Doubtless it is not for polygamy, but for repentance. Yet for what cause so ever it were, others do not so praise him. A wife, if she will, may yield of her own right. Howbeit, this is not to depart from her own right, but from that which is God's right: for we must not have respect what the wife would, but what God will. And as concerning that, which Sara did, she did it by the setting on and persuasion of the holy Ghost: wherewith, there is no doubt, but she, and other godly women were endued. The Schoolmen, among the number of whom we cited Caietanus, say, that There is not any law extant, which expressly forbiddeth polygamy; which although they affirm, yet certainly others say not so. In deed the very form thereof in plain terms is not found and expressed; yet is the same necessarily gathered by the words both of Christ and Paul. And thus much of this question.

**Of Barrenness.**

16. Among the Jews barrenness was reproachful, and was accounted a very grievous infamy, and that for many causes. First, because it seemeth to be repugnant unto that precept, wherein God commanded, both immediately after the making of the world, and straightway after the flood: saying, Increase and multiply. Further, because those that be barren, attain not to that blessing of God, which he promised unto Abraham; to wit, that his seed should be as the stars of heaven, and as the sand of the sea. Again, they

which wanted children, seemed after a sort to be hated of God, in that he would not have their generation and stock to be spread any further abroad. But others thought, that barrenness was therefore infamous among the Jews; because Messias should proceed from their posterity. And so everyone endeavored to have many children, that out of his progeny Messias might one day be born. Howbeit, he was promised only unto the tribe of Judah, and family of David: so as it behooved only these to be careful of that matter. Howbeit, of that desire there may be brought another reason much more true. For the true religion and pure worshipping of God, before the coming of Christ, was in public profession retained only among the Jews. Wherefore the more that the Jews increased in number, the greater multitude should be of the worshippers of God. For this cause therefore did holy men study to have a large posterity, that the true God might be worshipped of a great many. But if to any man there happened no children, he was noted with a kind of infamy and rebuke. Therefore, when Rachel at the length became great with child; The Lord (saith she) hath taken away my rebuke. And Isaiah saith; In that day shall seven women take hold of one man, and they shall say; We will find ourselves bread and apparel, only take from us our rebuke.

Moreover, among Ethnics it was reproachful to be without children. And among the Romans those, which had begotten many children, were excused by the civil law from charge and public offices: as it is manifestly set forth in the title *De ijs, qui numero liberorum se excusant*. At Rome doubtless, three were sufficient for an excuse. In Italy were required four. In the provinces five, so they were not adopted, nor yet were taken of the enemies, nor died out of the wars. Howbeit, this number of children excused only from personal offices, not from offices of inheritance: but sixteen children

in number excused from both kinds of offices, as it is in the Digests *De jure immunitatis*, in the law Semper: which was made by Pertinax. Afterward also twelve did excuse, as appeareth in the Code *De decurionibus*, in the law *Si quis decurio*. Briefly, the bearing of children hath always been an honorable thing among all nations. A certain Lacedaemonian being an old man and unmarried, as he passed by the high way, saw a man that did not rise up to give him honor, and he asked of him why he did so? Who answered him; Because thou hast left none unto the Common-wealth, that may rise up unto me when I am old.

And albeit that among the Christians, this kind of rebuke may seem to be taken away: yet must we endeavor to our power, that we may leave very many children unto the church. But by the example of Anna we are warned, that the lack of children, and fruitfulness, are not to depend only of the second causes; seeing they proceed chiefly from God himself. For in the family of king Abimelech, God shut up the wombs of the women, that they might not bring forth. Afterward, at the prayers of Abraham they were delivered, that they might bear children. So as Rachel, when she grievously afflicted herself, and said to her husband; Give me children, for else I shall die. Jacob being angry said; Am I unto thee in God's stead? If God keep from thee the fruit of thy womb, why doest thou cry unto me? So on the other side, fruitfulness is the gift of God. Therefore in Isaiah the 66th chapter he saith; Am I he that maketh other to bear, and bear not myself? And David in the psalm pronounced; It is God that maketh the barren woman to keep house, and to abound with children.

**Whether it be lawful for children to marry without the consent of their parents.**

17. Now shall it be very well to see, whether it be lawful for children to contract matrimony without consent of their parents. Certainly Samson would not. And it is a matter of much honesty, and of thankfulness towards the parents, if matrimony be not contracted without their knowledge and consent. At the beginning, Adam did not choose himself a wife: God was his father, and brought Eve unto him. Abraham, when Isaac was a man, sent his servants to his kindred, to seek out a wife there for his son. Isaac also sent Jacob into Mesopotamia to his uncle, to the end he might get him a wife there. Afterward followed the law that was given of God by Moses, that children should honor their parents. But the honor, which must be given unto them, is not only to uncover the head, to give the upper hand, and to rise up (yet these things must also be done, though they be not sufficient;) but they must also sustain their progenitors, if need shall require, and show themselves dutiful towards them. Wherefore, the power of a father is defined to be a bond of piety, whereby children are bound to their parents, to perform the duties of humanity and thankfulness.

If so be children in other things ought to obey their parents, doubtless they ought chiefly to do it in contracting of matrimony. Hereof there is a peculiar law in the 22nd chapter of Exodus; If a maiden, which is not betrothed, shall be deceived, he that hath seduced her, ought to give her a dowry, and to take her to wife. But it is added; If the father will. Otherwise he shall only give a dowry; neither shall he have the maiden to wife against the fathers will. And in the book of Numbers, the thirty chapter; If a maiden vow a vow, and the father hear it, and letteth it not, the vow shall be firm; but if he gainsay it, it shall be in vain. And what is a vow? A promise made unto God. Howbeit, matrimony is a promise, which is made unto man. If God permit a vow made unto him, to the judgment of the father; much more

will he permit matrimony unto him, seeing it is a promise made between men. In the second book of Samuel, Tamar answered unto her brother Ammon; If thou desire me at my father's hand, he will not deny me unto thee. The custom was then, that the daughters were desired of the parents. Here I dispute not, whether it were lawful for David to give to Ammon his sister to wife.

Further, Paul saith to the Ephesians; Children obey your parents in all things. He excepteth nothing, when he writeth so: but saith, In all things; namely, which they command not against the word of God. And in his first epistle to the Corinthians the seventh chapter, is most manifestly declared, that it belongeth to the parents to give their daughters in marriage to husbands. And that was known, not only by the law of God, but also by the light of nature. Which, even the Comedies of Terence and Plautus manifestly declare. And in Euripides a maiden answereth; Of my marriages my father will have care, seeing these things are not in me to determine. Which verse certainly so liked Ambrose, as he placed it in his book of the patriarchs. Further, it serveth very well for domestical peace: for the daughter in law ought to be to the father in law instead of a daughter. Contrariwise, of rash marriages rise great discords at home. And for so much as the father ought to help his son with his goods; it is meet again, that the son should obey his father in contracting of matrimony. In other civil contracts, the son can do nothing, without the consent of his father; as appeareth in the Digests, *De mutuo, ad senatusconsultum Macedonianum*. Wherefore it is meet, that the judgment of the father should be tarried for in so weighty a matter.

The self-same thing have the civil laws decreed. Justinian in his institutions, in the title *De nuptijs*, will not that marriages should be firm,

without the consent of the parents. And in the Digests *De statu hominum*, in the law *Paulus*; If a son marry a wife against the will of his parents, the child, which shall be born of those parents, shall not be legitimate. And in the Code *De nuptijs*, in the law *Si proponis*, the case is diligently to be marked. The daughter marrieth by consent of her father; she afterward being aggrieved at her husband, departeth from him: after that, he returneth into favor, and she marrieth him again against her fathers will. It is answered, that that matrimony is not lawful. Hereby it appeareth, how much those laws esteemed the authority of a father. Again, in the law *Si furiosi*, children (if perhaps their parents be mad, or bereft of their wits) seeing they cannot use the consent of them in contracting of matrimony, they shall use the consent of their tutors.

18. So then it seemeth marvelous, that Christians at this day determine, that marriages are lawful, without consent of the parents. And to cover this, they allege the Canons: of the which I think it good briefly to declare some. And first I will make mention of the better Canons, which were the more ancient: for the later they were decreed, the more corrupt they were. In the Decrees, cause 30. question 5. chapter *Aliter*; Matrimonies are then lawful, when the maidens are desired at the parent's hands, and delivered openly: otherwise they are not matrimonies, but whoredoms, dishonest companying's, adulteries, and fornications. Thus decreed Evaristus. Nicolaus also at the consultation of the Bulgars, cause 30. question 5. chapter *Nostrates*; Those matrimonies are firm, which be knit by the consent of them which contract them, and of those in whose power they are. Leo also the first, in the 30. cause, question 5. chapter *Qualis*; Then it is to be counted matrimony, when the maiden is by her parents delivered unto her husband. And in the 31st cause, question 2. chapter *Non omnis*; A

woman, which marrieth by the consent of her father, is without blame, if any man shall afterward find fault withal. And thus Gratianus concludeth that place; that he saith, In contracting of matrimony, the consent of the parents is always to be required.

Further, Ambrose entreating of the place in Genesis, where it is written, that the servant of Abraham came into Mesopotamia, and found a wife for his master's son; the parents of the maid, when they endeavored to retain him longer, and he would not tarry, they called the maid, and asked her, whether she would go with him. After this manner he saith (as also it is declared in the 23rd cause, question 2. chapter *Honorandum*;) They asked not her of the wedding, but only of the journeying with him. For it pertaineth not (saith he) to maidenly shamefastness, to choose unto herself a husband. And the same he affirmed of widows, which be young. Although (to say the truth) I cannot herein agree unto Ambrose, that the maiden was not demanded the question; whether she would marry him. Neither do I doubt, but she was demanded as touching both maters. For in the 30th cause, question 2. chapter *Ubi non est*, we read, that There can be no matrimony, where is not the consent of those, which contract: yea even in the marriages of the children, which are but seven years of age. And seeing at that age they are thought to understand somewhat of matrimony, necessary is the consent of them which contract. And because there is mention made of spousages, we think good to note this by the way; that children so contracting, ought to be seven years of age: for otherwise the parents can promise nothing for them. Those children, if they afterward, being of more years, shall contract another matrimony, the same is of effect, and not the [former] espousals: which yet must be understood, if the parents consent to the second matrimony. Moreover, in the 31st cause, question the

second, chapter *Tua*; Hormisdas answereth, that children, when they contract after this manner, ought to stand to the will of their parents. And in the *Extravagants De sponsatione impuberum*, in the chapter *Tua*, it is ordained, that children, when they come to ripe age, ought to obey their parents, forsomuch as they also gave their faith, and consented.

19. I thought it good also to bring forth somewhat of the Councils. The Council of Toledo, the fourth cause, question 21. chapter *Hoc sanctum*, decreeth; If widows will not profess chastity, let them marry to whom they will. And the same it decreeth of a maiden: but it addeth; So that it be not against the will of the parents, or her own. Such an addition we see that Nicolaus the second added, as we find in the 27th cause, question second, chapter *Sufficiat*, where he writeth after this manner; To join matrimony, the consent of those which contract is sufficient: and it followeth, According to the laws. Which is added, because the matrimonies of children be not acknowledged, if they be made without the consent of the parents. Yet the gloss referreth not those words unto the civil laws, but to the canons: because as the Canonists say, the civil laws are sometimes corrected by the canons. But oftentimes it happeneth, that those canons are in very deed ἀκάνονες, that is, Rules without rule: as in the *Extravagants, De coniugijs servorum*, chapter the first; If bond-men contract, yea against the will of their lords, such matrimonies shall be ratified. Behold (saith the gloss) the canons amend the civil laws: for in them it is forbidden, that a bond-man should marry a wife against the will of his lord. Yea, if a free man have very often recourse unto another man's bondwoman, he is made a bond-man. And a free woman, if she have much access unto another man's bond-man, she also loseth her freedom. The gloss saith moreover, that more is attributed unto matrimony, than unto holy orders; because it is not lawful to

bring a strange bond-man into orders, but it is lawful to contract matrimony with him. Wherefore, it manifestly appeareth, that the latter canons were corrupted and depraved, which took away from marriages the consent of parents, as a thing not necessary.

But now let us see what reasons they pretend. In the *Extravagants De sponsalibus*, in the chapter *Cùm locum*, it is said, that in contracting of matrimony, there ought to be a full liberty. And in the same place, in the chapter *Veniens*; If any fear happen therein, the matrimony should be void. And there is given a reason: because she cannot long please him, of whom she is hated; and because such contracts have oftentimes unhappy success; and that thing is easily contemned, which is not beloved. Yea it seemeth, that the canons have so loved liberty in contracting of matrimony, that the Council of Paris (as we find in the 30th cause, question the second) decreed, that it is not lawful to desire a wife, by the rescript of the king: although the same be also ordained in the Code *De nuptijs*; law the first; chapter *Si nuptias ex rescripto*. The reason is, because the rescripts of princes are in a manner imperious commandments. Neither do I disallow that: although I do not a little marvel, that the canons have proceeded so far, that matrimony may be contracted between him that stealeth away a maid, and her that is stolen. In the *Extravagants De raptoribus & incendiarijs*, in the chapter *Cùm causa*: A maiden that was stolen away out of the house of her father, and contracted matrimony with him that did steal her; the father withstood the marriage.

Here the good Pope answereth; Forsomuch as the maiden consenteth, she cannot seem to be stolen. Wherefore, he decreed that matrimony to be good. And in the next chapter *Accedens*; If any man had stolen away a maiden, not only against the will of her parents, but also against her own will (which

maiden nevertheless if she afterward agreed with him that stole her) he decreed, that firm matrimony might be contracted between them. The same seemeth to be decreed in the 36th cause, question the second, chapter *In summa*: where is entreated of the stealer, and her that is stolen. And it is decreed; If she that is stolen, shall consent with him that stealeth, matrimony may be contracted between them: but yet in such sort, that first they do some penance. But because some canons do make against this decree, therefore they moderate the matter thus; That wheresoever they read, that matrimony cannot be contracted between such persons, that, they understand to be said for someone of these three causes: either because she that is stolen, did not consent; or else, because she was betrothed before to another by words (as they use to speak it) of the present tense (for I say not of the future tense, because the husband was not bound to marry one defiled;) either else for that she was not marriable.

20. But in the Code it is far otherwise decreed, touching the stealing of virgins; namely, that matrimony between these persons may by no manner of means be contracted: no not although the father give his consent unto her that is stolen. And Justinian also in his Authentiks, collation the ninth, in the title *Quae raptoribus nubunt*, decreeth the same to the detestation of so great a crime. But our Canonists (forsooth) think matrimonies to be lawful, even against the fathers will. Wherefore in the 32nd cause, question 2. chapter *Mulier*, the gloss saith, that the authority of the father is undone as touching an oath and matrimony, when ripe age cometh: which saying the School-men have also followed. Of this matter they dispute, in the fourth chapter of sentences, distinction 28. where they define, that a man, even the son of the goodman of the house, hath a certain dominion over his own

body: neither is so bound to his parents, but that he may, at his own liberty, dispose it as touching matrimony.

And when they read in the Canons, that the consent of the parents is required for the contracting of matrimony, they, by their interpretation corrupt them, and say; that Evaristus Nicolaus, and Leo, when they so decreed, did judge that the consent of the parents is required touching the honesty of matrimony, but not in respect of the necessity. Which peradventure they drew out of the gloss in the *Extravagants De sponsalibus impuberum*, in the law *Tua*: which is after this sort; that The good will of the parents must be required, yet rather for the honesty of marriage than for necessity sake. So that, if the parents will not assent; yet are the children free, and may contract matrimony at their own liberty. Yea and the Master of sentences, in the 28th distinction, saith, that The consent of parents serveth for the comeliness and honesty of marriages, and not for necessity. And he bringeth the words of Evaristus. But he saith; There is a difference between those things, which are required to the substance of marriages, and those things, which serve for honesty and comeliness. And the good will of the parents (as he saith) pertaineth not to the substance of marriages. He thinketh, that without it, children may lawfully contract. And for so much as he maketh matrimony a sacrament, he would have in such marriages the strength of matrimony, but not the honesty.

21. But because they very much urge the words of Evaristus, when he writeth that marriages, contracted without the good will of the parents, are whoredoms, fornications, and adulteries. The Master of the sentences answereth, that that is true, not because such marriages be so indeed; but for that, they coming secretly together among themselves, and privily without the parent's knowledge, are wont to be counted whoremongers and

adulterers: but yet that the matrimony abideth ratified, and is firm, by reason of the words of the present tense which were used therein. Also Thomas Aquinas, in the same place, is of the same mind. And unto that, which is alleged out of Paul to the Ephesians (where he saith; Children obey your parents in all things) he answereth, that it must be understood of those things, wherein the children have not any liberty; namely, as touching familiar and domestical things. And this reason he addeth: Because matrimony is a certain kind of servitude, which the child is not compelled to take upon him against his will. And in that it is written of Abraham, that he sought his son a wife out of his own kindred; he answereth, that the same happened, because he knew that land to be promised unto his posterity: and that God had decreed to take it away from the Chanaanits: so as he would not have his son to contract matrimony with them. These fellows indeed speak much, but they bring not so much as one word out of the holy scriptures. They still affirm, that children ought to have most full liberty left them as touching marriages: but that is a mere invention of their own, which by no means hath his foundation upon the word of God.

22. The ancient fathers were of our mind. But it happened of them, as of the Canons: for the more ancient they were, the better they were and the more new, the more corrupt. Tertullian in his second book to his wife, as touching the marriages of Christians with Ethnics, writeth very well: neither alloweth he of marriages, between persons of a contrary religion. God (saith he) giveth thee to a husband. And he addeth, Doubtless upon the earth daughters cannot rightly and justly marry, without the consent of the parents. How therefore wilt thou marry, without the consent of thy heavenly father? Chrysostom upon Genesis, and upon Matthew, when he entreateth of marriages, remitteth the matter unto the examples of the fathers in the

Old Testament. Neither is it of great necessity to recite his words, when as the same father upon the first epistle to Timothy, in his 9th homily, treateth manifestly of that matter. There he exhorteth parents, because of the slippery age of their children, to give them in marriage: but he exhorteth not the children, that they should choose unto themselves husbands or wives. Yet he converteth his speech unto the parents, that they should provide marriages for them. And he addeth a very notable sentence; If (saith he) they begin to play the harlots before they be married, they will never regard their faith in matrimony.

I will note also by the way, what he writeth in that place of wedding crowns. For even at that time, they used crowns or garlands in weddings. What (saith he) signifieth the crown or garland? Forsooth, that the husband and the wife should declare, that even unto that time, they had conquered their lusts. If thou hast been an adulterer or whoremonger, how bearest thou a crown or garland? Augustine in his 133rd epistle being desired to make a marriage between a young man and a maid; I would do it (saith he) but that the mother of the child is not present; and thou knowest, that in making of marriages, the mothers good will is necessary. In this place Augustine writeth more severely than the civil laws: for they will not have the child to be in the power of his mother. Of Ambrose I will speak nothing at this time: I spake enough of him before. Seeing then the law of God, and the law of nature, the laws of cities, and the laws of families, the fathers, and sincere canons affirm, that the consent of the parents is necessary, and the examples of the godly declare the same; what should let us to be of that mind?

Neither ought this to seem grievous unto children: since it was by the laws of God so appointed for their commodity. For young persons, in such things, and specially women, ofttimes provide very ill for themselves.

Wherefore, it is written in the Code *De sponsalibus*; in the law *Si pater*: When the father hath betrothed his daughter, if he afterward die, the governor or tutor cannot undo the covenant of the father. And a reason is added; Because tutors sometimes are won with money, and women are carried to their own discommodities. Also the example of Christ ought to move us, which was given of his father, to be the husband of the church: and he always said, that He did not his own will, but the will of his father, by whom he was sent. Further, how great a disorder ariseth in the Common-wealth, through this corruption? How great a window is opened to filthy lusts? In some places, he that can first lie with a maiden, hopeth to obtain her to wife, even against her parents good will.

23. But now we must answer the reasons, which the contrary part allege for themselves. [ 1] First, as we before said, they cry, that in contracting of matrimony, there ought to be a full liberty. But (I pray you) what liberty? Of the flesh, or of the spirit? Undoubtedly that liberty of the spirit is the greatest, when we obey the commandments of God: who, if he would have us obedient unto our parents in other things, why not in contracting of matrimony also? So then they break the law of God, which even in this thing obey not the parents. Further, if they will have the liberty of contracting of matrimony; why do they themselves forbid so many degrees of kindred? Once the Popes would not suffer matrimony to be contracted, even unto the seventh degree: but now they contain themselves within the fourth. Moreover, why do they forbid marriages unto the ministers of the church? Again, why did God himself forbid matrimonies between persons of contrary religion, if there ought to be so great a liberty in marriage as they feign to be? [ 2] But they add; Children, for fear of their parents, will say, that that matrimony pleaseth them, which pleaseth them not.

Nevertheless, the son is not compelled so to say: nothing letteth but that he may answer, that the same wife pleaseth him not; and that such a matrimony will not be agreeable to his mind. And indeed unless his consent be had, matrimony may in no wise be contracted.

In the Digests *De ritu nuptiarum*, in the law *Non cogitur*, we read, that the son cannot be compelled to marry a wife. And *De sponsalibus*, in the law *Sed ea*: If a daughter hold her peace, she seemeth to consent unto the father. And there are two causes alleged, wherefore the daughter may gainsay her father; if either the father offer her a husband that is wicked, or that is deformed. Otherwise, if none of these causes be, it is required of her, that she love him, whom the father hath chosen. But if she will not assent, when the husband is neither deformed nor evil manered, she incurreth the crime of ingratitude; which is so great, as the father may disherit her for it. And in the title *De ritu nuptiarum*, in the law *Si cogente patre*; Although the son have assented for fear of the father, yet because he had rather assent than offend the father, such a matrimony ought to be firm and ratified. Unto the former causes I would add a third; If the father offer a husband, which is of a contrary religion. And I would ever counsel the parents to do that, which should be agreeable to their children; unless they should perceive them to be very obstinate and unjust. But when the parents behave themselves tyrannously towards their children, and force them to marry wives, which they cannot abide; the matter must be brought before the magistrate. It is his part to hear the cause, and to deliver the son from injury, if he be over sharply oppressed. Then, if the son marry a wife by the authority of the magistrate, although it be against the will of the father, it cannot seem, that he hath married utterly without the parents consent. For the magistrate is the father of the country.

The same seemeth to be decreed *De ritu nuptiarum*, in the law *Qui liberos*. And me thinketh, the School-men have not well said, that the children of the household have power over their own body; forsomuch as they owe unto their parents, even for the very being, which they have. They ought not to be compelled unto marriages against their will; but that they should marry without the consent of the parents, it cannot be allowed them. And whereas liberty is so many times obtruded unto us, and the power of the body vaunted of; let us again reply upon them with the answer of God, as touching the daughters of Zalphead, who saith of them: Let them have heritage among their brethren, but let them marry in their own tribe. These women are compelled to marry the nighest of their kin, neither hated they that liberty which these men imagine. And the brother sometimes was compelled to marry the wife of his brother being dead: neither could she marry otherwise. Therefore, so great liberty is not necessary in marriages, as these men pretend. And by the civil law, so great is the authority of the father over his son, that he may sell him, if he fall into grievous necessity. And least it seem to any man to be a barbarous point; it is permitted by the law of God, in Exodus the 21st chapter: but yet adding certain cautions, which I think not good here to repeat. Wherefore, they did not rightly argue; when they said, that matrimony is a kind of servitude: which the son ought not to take upon him at the appointment of his father.

24. And whereas they say, that the consent of parents is required for the honesty of matrimony, and not upon necessity; it is vain and frivolous. For what greater necessity can there be, than that, which the law and commandment of God doth import? Children are commanded to honor father and mother. Also Paul the apostle prescribeth them to obey their parents in all things. And the same thing writeth he unto the Philippians, the

fourth chapter; That which remaineth brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever are honest, whatsoever just, whatsoever pure, whatsoever profitable, whatsoever things are of good report, do ye. By these words appeareth, that the things which be honest, must not be separated from the commandments of God. So then, look how necessary it is to obey God's commandments, so necessary it is, not to marry without the consent of the parents. And whereas they add, that the consent of the parents is indeed required; but yet if they will not consent, the matrimony may be firm: that is nothing else but to deride the parents. For what reproach is it for the son, so to desire the consent of his father, as though he be against it, and gainsay it; yet nevertheless he will abide in his purpose, and go through with the same? It were much better not to desire it, than to desire it with that mind. This also seemeth a wonder to me, that the Master so perverteth the words of Evaristus, that when he saith, that matrimonies, contracted without the consent of the parents, are whoredoms and fornications, and not matrimony; he dare expound, that the matter is not so indeed: but because they so come together, as whoremongers and adulterers use to do. But the saying of Evaristus is manifest; They are not (saith he) matrimonies. And indeed he addeth what they are; namely, fornications, adulteries, and whoredoms. And he saith not that they seem to be these things, but that they are so.

25. There be others, which object the book of Genesis, where it is written, that Esau married the wives of the Chanaanits, which his parents took in very ill part: for he had married them contrary to their commandment; and yet the scripture calleth them wives. Wherefore it seemeth, that matrimony may be contracted, even against the parents will. I grant indeed, that in the holy scriptures they be called wives; but yet therefore, because he so counted them, and because the nations, among whom they dwelt, so reputed

them. Notwithstanding, it is not gathered hereby, that the scriptures do confirm such a matrimony. The same form of speaking used Paul in the first to the Corinthians, the eighth chapter; Even as there be many gods, and many lords. He saith that there be many gods: not that there are so indeed (for there is but one God) but because the most part so believed, and common persuasion conceived that there was an infinite number of gods. Therefore he saith, Many gods. But to us, which judge aright, there is but one God, and one Lord Jesus Christ. It is no unaccustomed or strange thing in the scriptures, so to call things, as men use commonly to speak: yet elsewhere, when they speak properly, they call everything by his own name. Howbeit thou wilt say; We never read, that the children of Esau were not legitimate. I answer, that Esau had indeed a great posterity; but whether it were lawful or no, the scripture showeth not. Whereunto add, that by those nations, among whom he lived, they were counted legitimate; for those had not the word of God, wherein it is commanded, that this should not be done: and they had wonderfully corrupted the law of nature.

26. Others cry; What shall we think of our forefathers? What also of many, which live at this day, and have contracted matrimonies without the consent of their parents? Shall we call them matrimonies, or else adulteries? And shall we count their children so born, for legitimate, or for bastards? I answer: that when as such marriages were had in that time of darkness, before the new light of the Gospel; those men in very deed were not excused from sin (for it was not lawful for them to be ignorant of the law of God:) but yet, because they were done publicly, and by the permission of the magistrate; I am persuaded, that such matrimonies are firm and ratified. If they object, that in such marriages the consent of the parents wanted: I answer, that it was therein, and it was not therein. For the magistrates had

made the civil laws subject to the canons: which undoubtedly they ought not to have done. Now in this, all men agree. And forsomuch as the magistrate hath the authority of the people, if he consent unto anything, there, after a sort, is the public consent of the people. As at this day in Parliaments, when they assemble for the payment of some sum of money: although some private men of the people be not contented with it; yet, because it is agreed upon by the magistrate, they also should seem to have given their consent.

So indeed, the father would not that the matrimony of his son should be firm without his consent. Howbeit, seeing he submitted his will to the judgment of the magistrate, he should seem after a sort to have given his consent. But now the truth of the thing being known, the magistrate ought to revoke the error. So as the matrimonies, which hitherto (that is, in darkness) have been contracted against the will of the parents, ought to be firm, and the children born of them ought to be legitimate. Nevertheless, if the law should afterward be repealed, then should they be no matrimonies, but only presupposed; and in very deed whoredoms, fornications, and adulteries: even as Evaristus rightly judgeth. Howbeit, while the laws, which are now in force, are not abrogated, I dissolve not the matrimonies which in the meantime are so contracted. Neither do I say, that the children born of these marriages are bastards; but I declare what doth seem most agreeable to the word of God, and to honesty. But Evaristus might justly write so; because in his time the Roman laws were of force, which accounted not such conjunctions to be matrimonies. Further, I add, that fathers are not to be obeyed, when they let the marriages of their children only for religion sake; because in that cause, God must be obeyed in all

things, who is the head father of all things. Look the first to the Corinthians, the seventh chapter, verse 37.

**Of Ravine, or violent taking away.**

27. This word *Raptus*, Ravine, in the Hebrew cometh of *Chatath*. The Greeks say, ἁρπάζειν; the Latins *Rapere*, which is, To take away by violence; not after every manner of sort, but as it were by a certain fury and great violence. Wherefore ravine differeth from theft; because theft may be committed secretly and without violence. For which cause, in the Digests *De jureiurando*, in the law *Duobuireis*, it is written; If a man swear he hath not taken anything away violently, yet is he not straightway quit of theft. For although that thing, which a man doth, be not ravine; yet it may be theft. So the civil law putteth a difference between theft and ravine. But to what things ravine pertaineth, it is mentioned in the Digests, *De conditione triticiaria*, in the law the first. Things immoveable, as houses, lands, and farms are entered upon: but those, which be moveable, as things not having life, beasts and men are violently taken away. Howbeit, we treat here of the violent taking away of things moveable: yet nevertheless, not of all, but of men's bodies, that are by violence taken away for lusts sake. This is another kind of ravine, but not proper, which Augustine toucheth in the 19th sermon *De verbis apostoli*: and it is mentioned in the Decrees, 14th cause, question the fifth, in the chapter *Si quid inuenisti*, where he saith, that things, which be found, must be restored. Which if thou do not, thou hast taken them away forcibly; forsomuch as thou hast done what thou couldest: so that if thou haddest found more, thou wouldest have taken away more.

There the Glosser very well declareth, what is to be done with things that be found. Either (saith he) the same are counted for things cast away: as if the owner have cast away anything, the same, if a man retain, when he hath

found it, he committeth not theft; but if that thing, which is found be not forsaken, neither thought to be cast away willingly by the owner (as when a ring is found, or a purse, or any such thing, which is not wont to be cast away) if thou detain it, it is theft, unless thou keep it by thee with a mind and will to restore it again. So then, thou must openly tell that thou hast found these things, whereby the owner may come to his own again; as it is decreed in the Digests *De furtis*, in the law *Falsus*, in the Paraph, *Qui alienum*. But if thou keep it by thee, with a mind not to restore it, it is theft. And this doth Augustine in the place now alleged reprove. The very same is decreed in the Code *De thesauro*, in the law *Nemo*, and in the institutions *De rerum divisione*, where it is ordained; that If a man find treasure in his house or ground, it shall be his that findeth it. Howbeit, if he find it in another man's soil, either he hath gotten it by chance, or else he sought for it. If he have gotten it by chance, let it be divided between the finder and the owner; but if he sought for it, the whole must be yielded to the owner. If the place were holy, and the treasure found by chance, the finder shall have it. It is added, that if a man do seek for treasure in his own ground, and thereunto use Magic, and arts forbidden; the thing found, ought to be yielded unto the common treasury. For he, which by evil means hath sought anything, seemeth unworthy to be possessor thereof. But to return to Augustine, I affirm that which before I said, that it is not properly ravine, if a man hold back that which he hath found of another man's.

And this doth Origin plainly declare in his fourth homily upon Leviticus; Some (saith he) will not restore that, which they have found: for they say, that God hath given it them. Howbeit, whatsoever they say, it is a crime like unto ravine. He saith not, that it is ravine, but a certain thing like unto it. Although we have out of the civil law distinguished theft from ravine, yet

may ravine be called theft; but yet so, that there be added a violence. In the Digests *De Furtis*, in the law *Si vendidero*, it is thus written; He that taketh away by violence, every way committeth theft, and is an open thief. But omitting these things, let us return to that kind whereof we now entreat. Some have said, that this Latin word *Rapere*, is nothing else, but Violently to lead away a maiden from the house of her father, to the end that he dishonesting her, may afterward have her for his wife. But this definition is not full and absolute, although it be used of the Canonists in the 36th cause, question 1 chap. *Lex illa*, in the Paraph *Cùm ergo*. For in the history of judges, the maidens were violently caught away, yet were they not taken away from their father's house, but out of the field or vineyards. Neither is that true, which is added: namely, To marry her, or to have her to his wife, when he hath dishonested her: for the mind of him that taketh her away by violence, may be to have her for his concubine, or to abuse her at his pleasure, though he take her not to wife. Further, this foresaid definition only maketh mention of maidens, when as yet nevertheless, both married women and widows, free-maid-servants and bond-maid-servants, and also young children may be violently taken away. Wherefore the crime extendeth further than that definition doth import. Only harlots seem to be exempted; for they are not said to be carried away violently, although they be taken away by force. And certainly, it is then no action of violent taking away, but of injuries only. But it is meant, that such persons are violently caught away from the custody either of their parents, or of their tutor, guardian, patron, or lord; to the end there may be used an unlawful copulation, whether matrimony follow or no.

28. Now must we declare what punishments be ordained for such violent takers. In the Code *De Raptu virginum, & viduarum*, in the law *Unica*,

Justinian entreateth at large of that matter, and maketh the taking away of the persons, which I have before rehearsed, guilty of death: so that the companions also, and they which assisted the raptor, are comprehended in the same punishment. Neither was that thought to be sufficient, but there were other punishments invented more grievous than death. For it is decreed, that not only the judges and magistrates shall put him to death; but also, if the raptor be taken with the wicked deed doing, either by the parents, brethren, kinsfolk, tutor, governor, lord, patron, or finally by him, in whose power she is that is taken away, they may kill him, and that without any punishment. It is also ordained, that they, which are present with the raptor, and defend him in his dishonest act, may also be slain without any danger. He addeth likewise, that violent taking away is sometime committed against a man's own spouse: as if one by violence take away her, whom he hath not yet married. And if a man take away another man's wife, he doth not only commit adultery, but also ravine. If the raptor be not slain (as they say) in the very heat of the crime, he ought afterward to be put to death by the judges or magistrates: and so, that if he appeal unto a superior magistrate, he shall not be heard. And that (saith Justinian) was ordained by a law made by Constantine.

Undoubtedly it is grievous, not to be heard if thou appeal. And that is here decreed. So great a matter did the civil laws make of ravine. In free-maid-servants and bond-maid-servants, the punishment is ended with death: but if a free-woman be taken away by violence, the goods of the raptor, and of those which be present with him, do turn to her use that is taken away. Neither can the raptor give away his goods, or bequeath them by his will, but they fall to her that is so taken away: and that not only for a time, but also forever; in such sort, that she may either sub them, alienate them, or

give them for a dowry. One thing only is excepted; to wit, Unless she that is taken away, be afterward married to the raptor. The goods of the raptor were given her upon that condition, that she should not marry him: and the reason of the law is added; because in our public weal, we suffer not, that a man should marry a wife, after the manner of an enemy. For citizens are wont to marry their wives, and not to take them violently away. But what was done with them, which although they were not present at such taking away; yet were of counsel thereof: or being witting thereof, uttered it not; or else afterward received the raptor into their house? Justinian decreed, that they indeed should not lose their goods; but only be put to death. Nevertheless, if a bond-man, or bondwoman were taken, either in committing or aiding this crime, it was commanded that they should be burnt with fire.

29. But what if a maid will, by her own consent, be taken away; yet must no part of the punishment (saith Justinian) be diminished: it is even all one, whether the woman will or will not. And the reason is added; Because, if the raptor would abstain from the wrapped, it is not very likely, that any woman will offer herself, of her own accord, to be taken away. Wherefore it seemeth probable, that she was won by flatteries and deceits. Yea and the parents of the maiden, if they consent to the taking away, are commanded to be banished. These things Justinian decreeth in the Code: who nevertheless afterward in the Authentiks (where it is entreated of women taken away, which marry the raptor) was compelled to make the law anew; because there were some, which caviled, that if she that was taken away did consent to be married, she might possess the goods of the raptor. For so they interpreted the first law, that the goods of the raptor ought to come unto her that was taken away, if she married him, or if he in his will made her his

heir. But we (saith Justinian) meant no such thing: for our laws do not appoint rewards for a wicked crime. Besides, neither can he make any will, forsomuch as he is now condemned to die. Neither do any of our laws suffer any such matrimonies to be in force. And if it be no matrimony, how then can she possess the goods of the raptor, in the name of the dowry? And so he decreed, that such matrimonies should not be ratified.

What then shall become of the goods of the raptor? If the maid (saith he) have parents, which have not thereunto consented, those goods shall come unto them; but if they have consented (as I have already said) they were banished, without any propriety of goods or lands. Which kind of punishment was much more grievous, than plain exile. But if the maiden had no parents, or had those which consented, the goods of the raptor were confiscate to the common treasury. By these things it appeareth, that in those times ravine was counted detestable. Whereunto I will also add this; If any daughter had married against the will of her parents, or otherwise behaved her self wantonly and unchastely, it was lawful for the parents to disherit her: as appeareth in the Code *De inofficioso testamento*, in the law *Si filiam*. This one thing is excepted: If the father knew that the just time of matrimony was past, and would not bestow his daughter, then hath he nothing to deal against her, if she marry without his knowledge, or against his will; nay rather, he is compelled to give her a dowry, as appeareth in the Code, in the same place, in the law *Si post viginti quinque annos*. Whereby it appeareth, that 25 years was the furthest time that matrimony should be driven off. The same is mentioned in the Digests, *De ritu nuptiarum*, in the law *Qui liberos*. Other lawyers determine the same thing, if a woman take away a man by violence: although they say that happeneth but seldom.

30. Now must be added the opinion of the Canonists, and what they bring out of the scriptures. In the 36th cause, question the first, Gratian bringeth that definition of wrapped, which we have before confuted. But this he addeth: that in ravine, injury is sometime done to the maiden, and not to the parents; and sometime to the parents, and not to the maiden: and sometime to them both. For if the maiden will be taken away of her own free will, there is no injury done unto her, but unto her parents: howbeit, if the parents give the man power to take away their daughter, because she will not consent to marry him; then there is no injury done unto them, but unto the daughter. Yet there is injury done to both of them, when the daughter is led away from her parents against their will. And in the same place he bringeth the Council of Orleans, in the chapter *De raptoribus*, where also he confesseth, that ravine was wont to be punished with death. But it is further said; that If the raptor take the church, he escapeth the punishment of death. How then? If the maiden (saith he) consented unto the raptor, first she shall be taken from him, and restored to her parents. Nevertheless, she being excused; to wit, a caution being accepted, let her not be slain or disherited: but if she consented not, she is by herself sufficiently purged: yet shall the raptor be compelled to public penance; as it appeareth in the 36th cause, question the second, chapter Raptores. But what if he will not do penance? He shall be excommunicated, according to the Cabylon and Chalcedon Council.

Notwithstanding, if he do penance, he shall be punished by the purse. And herein they say that they follow the word of God, which is written in Deuteronomy the 22nd chapter; If a man dishonest a maiden, he shall give unto her father fifty sickles, and shall take her to wife. And so they condemn the raptor to pay a certain sum of money unto the parents of the

maiden: the which sum if he will not pay, or hath not wherewithal, he is driven to serve the father of the maiden for certain years (which the Glosser contriveth into five:) upon this condition, that in the meantime he may redeem himself if he will. It is added also; If they consent together, the matrimony is firm, so that the father agree thereunto. And that these matrimonies may be firm betwixt the raptor, and her that is taken away. It also appeareth by the Decretals *De raptoribus & incendiarijs*, in the chapter *Cùm causa*, and in the chapter following: which without doubt is against the civil laws, and against the Canons of the better sort. But the Council Meldenum decreed far otherwise: for first, it ordained, that the raptor, and she that is taken away, should do public penance; afterward it permitteth matrimony, but yet not between themselves, but with other. And it is added; that If the husband or wife of either of them die, he which hath committed the ravine, or consented unto the raptor, cannot contract new matrimony, except the bishop release him. Besides this it is decreed, that by no means, any such matrimony should be firm, no not although the parents consent thereunto. Yea and the same Gratian confesseth, that the same thing was decreed in the Council which was held at Aquisgrane; yet afterward, both he himself otherwise defineth, and also the Decretals of the Popes.

What then make they of those Councils? They answer that those Councils meant this, that it should not be lawful to contract matrimony in that case, unless open penance be first done, and the consent of the parents had. And to prove that sentence, Gratian in the 36th cause, question 2. chapter *Tria*, citeth Jerome, who seemeth to acknowledge three kinds of matrimony to be lawful. One, when a maiden is given in matrimony to a husband by her parents, or tutors. Another, if a maiden be oppressed of a man, and her father afterward consent to give her to him in matrimony. The third is, if the

father consent not to such marriages, but give her unto another man. These three matrimonies he saith are lawful in the holy scriptures. But in the 27th cause, question 2. chapter *Additur*, by the testimony of Jerome, there is added another lawful kind of matrimony; namely, when a widow, which is not under the authority of the parents, marrieth in the Lord. Here Gratian gathereth, that Jerome acknowledgeth matrimony between the raptor, and her that is taken away. But I perceive, that in the 22nd chapter of Exodus, there is nothing entreated of violent taking away; only mention is made there of whoredom committed, and not of violent taking away. For it is said; If he by flatteries shall allure her to lie with him, then hath he liberty given him that he may take her to his wife, having the consent of the parents. But if a man had taken away a maiden, or man-child by violence, then he was judged by the law *Plagium*, that is, stealing of men: which is in Deuteronomy, and this it testifieth, that Whosoever stealeth a woman or man in Israel, should be punished with death. Wherefore there is nothing contained in the holy scriptures (so far as I see) touching the firmness or establishment of such a matrimony.

31. But here some man will object, that Jacob and his sons did consent, that Shechem the son of Hemor should have in matrimony Dinah, Jacob's daughter, being violently taken away by him, upon condition, that his subjects would suffer themselves to be circumcised. I grant this: howbeit, that was done before the law of Moses was given. Neither do we read, that the Patriarchs had any word of God concerning this matter. Neither can it be denied, that before the law was published, very many things were committed against it. Jacob, of whom we now speak, had at one time two sisters in matrimony. Amram had to wife his aunt, of whom he begat Moses, Aaron, and Marie. Which matrimonies, after the law was given,

were not lawful. So as the example, now brought, proveth nothing. But if raptors should have any hope of matrimony, there would be opened a wide window for wild young men to take women violently away: for they will make no doubt to take women away violently, if they shall have any hope to marry her, whom they have taken away. But all occasions of evil must be removed out of the Common-wealth, and the Church. Moreover, seeing parents must have great honor done unto them, they should sustain a great reproach, if matrimonies should be contracted between the raptor, and her that is taken away against their will.

This also seemeth to be added, that Lucius the Pope writeth unto the bishop of Burgis, as appeareth in the *Extravagants De raptoribus & incendiarijs*, in the chapter *Cùm causa*, that he decreeth, that If a maiden say, that before she was taken away, there were words passed between them touching marriage, it cannot properly be called ravine. What shall then be done? May she against her parents will marry the raptor? Innocentius the third, in the chapter following, decreeth; If a maiden be taken away against her will, and afterward consent to marry the raptor, that marriage is also firm, yea although it be against the will of her parents. And he addeth that this is done, in the honor of matrimony; when as indeed it openly appeareth to the contumely thereof, if a man with deeper judgment weigh the whole matter. In the 27th cause, question 2. chapter Raptor, it appeareth; If a maiden that is taken away, be betrothed unto another by the words of the future tense, she must be restored unto him, if he will receive her: and if he will not, it is free for the maiden, which was taken away, to marry another. But if she were betrothed by the words of the present tense, and that she can prove, that she was taken away against her will: the spouse, if he will not receive her, ought to be compelled.

32. The School-divines write not much disagreeing from this. Thomas in the 22nd question toucheth this matter, when he writeth, that violent taking away springeth of a vehement lust; whereby the raptor is so troubled, that he neglecteth all dangers. And he will have her that is taken away, to be rendered to her spouse, if she have any; and if she have none, unto her parents; or if she be without parents, to them in whose power she was. And then, if they will agree, she may marry the raptor; but yet so, that there be first made a restitution: because in all theft and robbery, restitution is chiefly required. Yet (saith he) ravine before restitution be made, is a hindrance to the contracting of matrimony; that is, that they sin, if they contract matrimony: nevertheless, if it be contracted, it breaketh not the contract. But to the canons, which determine against it, he answereth, that they were made in detestation of the crime: but that the Pope afterward considered the matter better. Howbeit, this was not the part of a godly man, to worship the Pope for God, and so to flatter him like a bondslave. And to the end he might seem to speak rightly, he bringeth the words of Jerome, which are in Gratian, concerning the three kinds of matrimony. But how that place serveth to this matter we have in hand, I have showed before. Lastly, he objecteth unto himself the Meldensian Council. Howbeit, that place (he saith) must be understood, as if a man will take away her that was married unto another: as though that were obscure or doubtful. We need no canons to understand this.

Against Thomas, a certain Divine (none of the simpler sort) earnestly opposeth himself in this matter. And where Thomas saith, that the violent taking away hindereth not the matrimony already contracted; he answereth that many decrees make against that doctrine. Further, he bringeth a reason; namely, that he, which is excommunicated, cannot receive the sacraments.

Then afterward he addeth, that the raptor is excommunicated: wherefore, unless he do penance, and reconcile himself unto the church, he cannot contract matrimony. There Caietane would altogether defend his Thomas; and denieth that he, which is excommunicate, can be partaker of the sacraments. Howbeit, this he confesseth: that he, which is excommunicate, sinneth, if he receive the sacraments. And he saith further; If an excommunicate be admitted to confirmation, or to holy orders, it cannot be denied, but that he hath received the sacraments: neither is it lawful for him to begin them again, if he afterward do penance. Besides he saith, that the Master of the sentences in the fourth book, where he reckoneth the impediments, which take away matrimony contracted, maketh no mention at all of wrapped.

Moreover, he teacheth that the raptor, and she that is taken away, are not excommunicated Ipso facto, but are to be excommunicated. But because he seeth that it is in the canons of the Council of Chalcedon and Cabylon; Let the raptor, and her that is taken away, be accursed: he answereth, that the gloss interpreteth that saying to be of the same force, as if it had been said; Let them be accursed. And again he answereth to the other two things, touching restitution and penance; and saith, that she, which is taken away, ought not to be restored: but it is sufficient, if he satisfy the father by some means, although she be not delivered into his hands; even as in theft, it is not always of necessity, that things taken away should be restored, but sometimes it is sufficient, that the wrong be recompensed, either by a price, or by a bond. But concerning penance, he saith; The raptor, if he contract without it, he sinneth indeed; but yet after he hath contracted, the matrimony is firm. Lastly he saith, that the canons, which decree to the contrary, either be abrogated, or else speak of spouses. After this sort

Thomas, Caietanus, the Divines, Ecclesiastic's, and Canonists trifle among themselves, and play the parasites with the Pope their god.

33. Now I will declare what the holy scriptures do determine hereof, or what they will have us to judge of the same. The first place is out of Genesis, the sixth chapter, where it is written; The sons of God seeing the daughters of men, that they were fair, took them to wives, such as they liked. I know there are brought sundry expositions of this place. Some interpret The sons of God to be angels, which being inflamed with the beauty of fair women, had fellowship with them. This exposition cannot agree: for seeing that angels have no bodies, they cannot burn in such lusts. Others understand by The sons of God those, which came of Seth, and were brought up in the true worshipping of God; who being overcome with beauty and fairness, contracted matrimony with the daughters of Cain; that is, with idolaters and infidels. Whereby there now remained nothing sound and perfect: and therefore God sending a flood, destroyed the whole world. The Chaldee interpreter saith, that the children of God were mighty men, and magistrates; who when they had taken to wives the daughters of base men, all things were fraughted with vices. Here do I see that wrapped was committed, which thing the Chaldee paraphrast hath signified, whose authority among the Hebrews is incredible.

And certainly, Moses saith not, that they desired these wives of their parents, but only took them whom they liked best. By that place may easily be noted the course, and as it were the degree of man's wickedness. For first they saw, and then they desired, and at the last they violently took away. Neither were they won by their manners, but only by the beauty of the body: wherefore God punished that sin by a flood. And although there were many other sins in men, yet this one is expressed with an emphasis.

Besides, in the 34th chapter of the same book, Shechem the son of Hemor did violently take away Dinah the daughter of Jacob: but what end came of that violent taking away, it is not now needful to declare. But the cause why Dinah was violently taken away, was her curiosity. The maiden would go forth, and understand the manners of other women. Curiosity was a hurt to her then, and also will be a hurt always unto women. For if it were hurtful unto the family of Jacob, being so great a patriarch, for a maiden to wander abroad; how much more dangerous is it for other families, which are not so holy nor acceptable unto God? But the nature of women is greatly infected with this vice. And therefore Paul to Titus admonisheth women to love their husbands, to bring up their children, and to be abiders at home. And to Timothy, when he entreateth of wanton and young widows; They wander abroad (saith he,) and run from house to house, and at the last go after Satan.

Yea and these virgins, of whom there is mention made in the 21st chapter of Judges, when they wandered abroad through the vineyards, and gave themselves idly unto dancing's, were intercepted by the Benjamits. Some will say, that the brethren of Dinah oppressed the Hemorhits by guile. It is true indeed, but when they were reproved of their father, they said; Ought they to have done, *nebata*, that is, a foolish and wicked thing in Israel? And that Dinah was taken away not willingly, but against her will, hereby appeareth: because it is written, that Shechem, after he had oppressed her, spake unto her heart. Which signifieth no other thing, than that he would by flattery have comforted her. But it may seem to be a marvel, that these Benjamits were not punished for their ravine. And yet we must consider, that they did not properly commit ravine, because they led away the maidens, not only by their own counsel, but also by the will of the elders.

Otherwise, true and proper ravine hath always had an unlucky end. Io was led away by the Phoenicians, Europa by the men of Creta, Medea by Jason, and Helen by Paris. All which violent takings away stirred up discords and wars, and also the overthrows of public-wealth's and kingdoms. Also the Sabine women, while they would be curious beholders of public games, were caught by the Romans. Whereof followed such wars, as both nations were in a manner destroyed; as Titus Livius, and Augustine *De civitate Dei*, do write. Seeing then God will not have such wicked acts unpunished, it is meet that from hence forth we avoid such matrimonies. I am not of the mind, to deny that matrimonies, which have been hitherto after that sort contracted, are no matrimonies at all. For it is not my meaning to bring a confusion of things. But these two points I affirm; first, that in contracting, there is sin, especially, if it be done against the will of the parents: further, that those laws, whereby such matrimonies are permitted, must be corrected, that hereafter it may not be lawful to do the like. For we see that the order, which God hath set, is perverted; when as the parents are neglected, by whose counsel's matrimonies should be contracted. And by this means young men are encouraged to violent taking away, seeing they hope that they shall marry the wives, whom they violently take away. Besides, that which I speak, is agreeable with the laws of God, with the law of nature, and with the civil laws. Wherefore let the Canonists and School-men take heed, how they judge the contrary.

**Whether marriages be lawful between persons of diverse religions.**

34. There be which defend this kind of marriages, and affirm, that they be lawful. [ 1] For although God, in the 23rd of Exodus, in the seventh of Deuteronomy, and in many other places forbad the contracting of them, that (say they) must be understood only concerning the seven nations, which

were inhabitants of the land of Canaan. Neither think they, that God did forbid, but that the Hebrews might marry with other nations. [ 2] They add also, that as touching the Chanaanits, that law might sometime be dispensed with: for Rahab the Chanaanite, because she was godly and favored the Israelites, became the wife of Salmon, who not only was a Hebrew, but a prince of the tribe of Judah. [ 3] I omit Judah, that went in to a wife of the Chanaanits, because he was otherwise unclean: so then it is not lawful to ground an argument upon his example. [ 4] More probable is that, which is written in the 21st chapter of Deuteronomy; where God gave leave unto the Israelites (if themselves would) to marry the strange women, which were captives among them. But first he would, that the head of her that should be married, should be shaven, her nails not pared, her garment changed, and that she should mourn for her parents by the space of thirty days. Hereby they gather, that such marriages were not by all means forbidden.

[ 5] Yea and Boaz married Ruth a Moabite: and David took Maacha the daughter of Thalma the king of Gessur. [ 6] Solomon also had the daughter of Pharaoh. [ 7] Neither for this cause was he reproved of any: nay rather, he seemeth to be commended, because he loved Jehovah. [ 8] I pass over Samson, of whose matrimony with a stranger it is evidently written in the book of Judges. [ 9] Moreover, there is a place brought out of Paul, in the first to the Corinthians, wherein is decreed; that It is lawful for the believer to abide with a wife that is an unbeliever. Hereby they gather, that the diversity of religion maketh not, but that marriages may be firm. [ 10] Yea and Augustine *De adulterinis conjugijs ad Pollentium*, in the 23rd chapter: and also *De fide & operibus*, the 19th chapter, affirmeth, that there is no evident place extant in the new testament, that such kind of marriages should not be contracted. Nevertheless, Jerome in his first book against

Jovinian, sharply inveigheth against this kind of matrimony; and doth openly witness and complain, that such marriages in his time were not eschewed. Also the same Augustine, in the place now alleged *De fide & operibus*, is sorry, that men did not think it to be sin, to contract marriage with them that be of a sundry religion. But there is a doubt put as touching Solomon; because he seemeth not to be altogether clear of sin, by reason of these marriages: since in the 23rd chapter of Deuteronomy, there is mention made, that some nations were altogether to be excluded from the conversation of the Israelites. For the Ammonites, and the Moabits were perpetually to be excluded from the church of the Jews: but the Idumeans and Egyptians only unto the third generation. And yet did Solomon immediately, in the first generation, admit an Egyptian woman into the church of the Hebrews.

35. Now on the contrary part, let us bring forth the reasons, which condemn and forbid this kind of matrimony. And it is proved not to be lawful, unless that party, which was of the condemned religion, shall depart from the same. [ 1] For, when as God so oftentimes forbad these kind of matrimonies, he added the cause: lest the unbelieving party should allure the faithful party unto idolatry. Because, if the unbelieving party abide in his or her religion, the other party doth put forth itself into great hazard: which the heavenly father would have utterly to be turned away from his children. Wherefore, if the believer think that he shall abide steadfast in this kind of wedlock, he undoubtedly seemeth to tempt God. [ 2] Further, we learn by the example of Solomon (who at length made idols and churches for his outlandish wives) what success such matrimonies had. And Jehoshaphat on this behalf sinned grievously. [ 3] Ahab also, though he were an evil prince, yet became he much worse by reason of Jezebel. [ 4]

Moreover, what happened unto the Israelites, when they shamefully kept company with the daughters of Moab; [ 5] in the book of Numbers it is manifest. [ 6] Jacob and Rebecca took it in very ill part, that Esau married strange wives. [ 7] And Esdras, after his return out of Babylon, when he perceived that the Israelites had coupled themselves with the Moabites, and with foreigners of a diverse religion, he undid those matrimonies: the which if they had been stable by the law of God, it had not been lawful to have severed those persons.

[ 8] Again, Paul in the second epistle to the Corinthians, the sixth chapter, when he writeth (Do not ye bear the yoke with the unbelievers) it may seem, that he forbad this: and it is thought that he alluded it unto the law of Moses, which forbad that they should not till the ground with an ox and an asse together. For when a yoke is put upon beasts, which be of diverse natures or forms, the work goeth not well forward. Herewithal the apostle added; For what fellowship hath unrighteousness with righteousness, or what partaking hath light with darkness? Some man will say, that this place seemeth not to be extended unto matrimony; seeing Paul doth there reprove the Corinthians, because they persuaded themselves, that it was lawful to keep company with the Ethnics in outward things without committing of sin. Therefore Paul would, that so much as is possible, they should sever themselves from them: and he brought forth a sentence, which is universal, and not particular touching matrimonies. But if the sentence were general, and that he pronounced the same of other affairs; how much rather shall it be of force in the contracting of marriages together with them? Erasmus also in his annotations saith, that the same apostle doth not only forbid outward dealings together, but marriage also. And undoubtedly reason persuadeth the same: because the property of marriage is to be a

participation of heavenly and human things. For if this be attributed unto friendship, much more it shall be proper unto matrimony, seeing the same is a friendship most nearly knit.

36. [ 9] Cyprian, who is brought forth by Augustine in the places now cited, in his epistle *De lapsis*, doth lament, that the church in those days was troubled with that detestable vice; even in like manner as it was about the time of Augustine, and Jerome; They prostitute (saith he) the members of God unto the Gentiles. [ 10] And Jerome, in his first book against Jovinian writeth, that the Christian parents do prostitute their members unto the idols. And he further saith, that Christian women, which are so married, become the ribs of the devil. [ 11] Yea and Ambrose in his 70th epistle to Vigilius, writeth very largely of this matter; where, besides the decrees of the old law, he bringeth two other arguments. First, that man and wife ought to receive blessing under the veil of the priest. But and if they shall be of sundry religions, how shall they be covered in the church of Christ under one veil? By those words we understand, that it was then the manner to have matrimonies solemnized in temples; and that the husband and wife were covered both with one veil by the minister: to the intent that they, which stood by, might see they were joined then together. Which custom is very much against secret matrimony.

Possidonius, upon the life of Augustine, writeth, that he did very well like the counsel of Ambrose, who judged; that If man and wife did consent together in matrimony, the minister of the church should be sent for, by whom the covenants of marriage should be established, and the matrimony should be confirmed. And what the veil was, wherewith the new married folk should be covered, I have nothing else to affirm, but that (as I think) it was an outward sign received from the Jews, who also at this day retain the

same. And perhaps Ruth had a respect thereunto, when she desired of Boaz that he would cover her with his cloak; to wit, that he would acknowledge her for his lawful wife. Another argument of Ambrose was, that man and wife ought otherwhile to pray together. And peradventure he meaneth those kind of prayers, which publicly are uttered sometime in churches. But if man and wife do not cleave both unto one God, how can they both pray together? Nay rather, it will easily happen, that when the one of them hath determined to pray, the other will be minded to feast and make cheer. [ 12] The same father, in his book of the Patriarch Abraham, the ninth chapter, warneth the faithful, that they should diligently beware, least they bestow their daughters upon Jews and infidels; or to take wives among them. And his words are alleged in the decrees, 28th cause, question 1. in the chapter *Non oportet*.

[ 13] And in the same question, Paraph *Exijs*, Ambrose is cited, who saith; It is no marriage, which is done without the decree of God, and therefore must be amended, Gratian interpreteth those words, and saith, that It is not decreed, that there is no matrimony at all among the infidels; but that the marriage between them is not lawful, seeing it is contracted contrary to the commandment of God: that is, between such persons, as God would not have to be coupled together; namely, them which be of kindred one to another, within certain degrees prohibited in the law; or else, when the one party shall be an infidel. Further Ambrose commendeth the old Patriarchs, which sought out wives of their own stock. [ 14] Tertullian also, in his book *De corona militis*, saith; We marry not unto Ethnics, least they should compel their wives to idolatry, whereat they begin their marriages. [ 15] And while he endeavoreth to prove, that God hath forbidden those marriages, he bringeth the place of Paul in the first to the Corinthians,

wherein he saith; If she will marry, let her marry in the Lord. Which saying nevertheless of his, some do understand to be spoken generally: as if the apostle had said; Let her marry religiously, observing godliness, in the fear of the Lord: as though by these few words he forbad not this kind of matrimony. And it might be, that Augustine was of the same mind. But I think, that the speech of the apostle, being pronounced generally, is so to be understood, as thereby marriages also with infidels be forbidden. For how can it be, that a faithful person should be coupled religiously, and in the fear of the Lord, with the enemies of Christ? And certainly Tertullian, Jerome, and Ambrose, understood that place after this sort.

[ 16] Moreover, Tertullian himself wrote unto his wife, that such marriages cannot be allowed by any of the holy scriptures. And he added, that therein were many dangers, and also wounds of faith: dangers, lest the faithful should fall into idolatry; and wounds of faith, because, in so much as otherwise we be weak, we have the more need to be supported. But the other party, being an infidel, will not help: and the faithful party shall be compelled many times to hear that will displease him. [ 17] Moreover, he speaketh more boldly and freely, saying; that such marriages make men guilty of adultery, and that we must not communicate with them in brotherly fellowship. Wherefore it easily appeareth, that they, which so had contracted matrimony in those days, were excommunicated. And why they were guilty of adultery, he declareth on this wise: God by his law forbad such matrimonies; Therefore an infidel, which is given in matrimony, is not fit for that marriage. Then, seeing they be no marriages, there shall be whoredom committed. A strange person is brought in, by whom the temple of God is defiled. Moreover, this sin is therefore made the more grievous, because it is not hard for Christians to find out other matches.

[ 18] Moreover, he addeth, that if it be true, that Menander and the apostle declared; that Naughty talk corrupteth good manners: how much more will so unmeet matches make them naught? Undoubtedly, he that is a stranger from Christ, will speak no good of him. Besides this, the worst of all is, to have the servant of the devil so near at hand. [ 19] Verily, the servants of princes, which would be counted faithful, can by no means abide to have fellowship with their enemies, or with their enemies servants. And it cannot be denied, but that they, which joined themselves to such wives, passed not to be among the enemies of Christ. [ 20] Further, it is to be considered, that in those days, the assemblies of the godly were had in the night season. And therefore, how could that husband, which was an infidel, suffer his wife to be absent in the night? [ 21] Again, it is evident enough, that God is the maker of godly marriages: but such [as those other be] are procured of naughtiness, that is, by the devil. [ 22] Besides, Tertullian bringeth an example taken from things civil. For the law was very ancient; that If any woman kept unlawful company with a bond-man, and being warned did not amend, she should at the length be made the handmaid of the master of that bond-man, which she shamefully loved. Neither did the Roman laws suffer, that servants should marry without the consent of their lords. What account then shall we make of Christ, which is the true Lord of us all?

[ 23] Moreover, if we come unto strange women, we shall at length fall into the hands of their master, which is the devil. Indeed the reasons, which this writer maketh, be very strong: the which nevertheless persuaded not the women of that time, especially the richer sort, because they were not willing to join themselves in matrimony to poor Christian men; but contrariwise, they sought after large houses, which might receive their substance. [ 24] Afterward he added a notable sentence, and saith; that

Faithful men must desire marriages of the church, that there may be one desire, one faith, hope, and discipline between man and wife. The which when Christ seeth, he will rejoice, and will send his peace among them. And contrariwise, without this, they shall never live peaceably. [ 25] At the last, he concludeth with his own judgment, affirming, that such marriages are not lawful. And he addeth; that Although they were lawful, yet that they be not expedient. Certainly in other matters and proprieties, that sentence is very greatly regarded; Take thou thine equal. How much rather in matrimony ought there to be a consent, as touching religion?

37. There might be other of the fathers also brought; but passing over them, I affirm, that the Councils have judged the very same thing. [ 26] For the Council Agathense, not only forbiddeth marriages with infidels, but also inditeth them with heretics. Also the Council of Urbin, as it is brought in the 28th cause, question the first, in the chapter *Si Judaicae*, &c. hath ordained the very same. [ 27] In like manner hath the Council of Laodicea, Canon the 10th and 21st. But I marvel that many of the Canonists dare write, that the Pope can dispense with this law: because it is (as they term it) positive, that is, evil. Certainly they be deceived: for (as it is proved) this is a divine institution, neither is it lawful for men to dispense with it, because God himself commanded it. Yet must we add, that with Ethnics matrimonies are lawful, so that they be converted unto Christ, and to the worship of the true God. So I think, that Moses married his Ethiopian wife, and Jacob the daughter of Laban. But because there is mention made of matrimony with heretics, what shall we say is to be done at this day, when as Papists are sometime joined to the professors of the Gospel, and professors of the Gospel contract themselves with Papists? Hostiensis said, that this ought

not to be done; but yet, that if such be joined together in matrimony, they be man and wife, and the marriages of force.

Yea and Thomas, in the fourth book of the sentences, seemeth not to mislike this opinion. But these fellows do soon utter what they think: yet they prove not that, which they speak. While they thus affirm, they cast themselves into a very great absurdity. For if that party, which is a heretic, provoke to heresy the faithful and sincere party: if the faithful will not assent, nor yet dwell with the other party; or if he will dwell together, he doth it not without perpetual contumely to Christ, what shall be done? They answer; If the matter come to that point, let them be separated; howbeit, from the bed, but not from the bond of matrimony. And so they imagine a kind of divorcement, utterly unknown unto the holy scriptures. Wherefore I lean to the contrary part, and am led by these reasons. In the history of Kings, and in the latter book of Paralipomenon, the 18th chapter, Jehoshaphat (otherwise a most commendable prince) is accused by the word of God; because he entered into affinity with Ahab, an idolatrous king. [ 28] For he coupled Athaliah the daughter of Ahab unto his son [Joram:] whereupon he was afterward sharply reproved by Jehu the son of Ananie, as it appeareth there in the 19th chapter.

38. [ 29] Let us consider moreover, how great mischief followed thereof. Joram the son of a good father (namely of Jehoshaphat) casting aside the worshipping of the true God, did imitate the kings of Israel: [ 30] Athaliah his wife urging him thereunto. Now let us compare together the Israelites and the Jews, between whom there is the same consideration to be had, that is between the heretics and the Christians. For the Israelites did profess the law of Moses, they had circumcision: neither were they by all means strange from the faith of the Jews, and yet notwithstanding was the amity,

which the kings of Judah had with them, reproved; and by the will of God their ships were broken, while they joined together in friendship. What shall we then say concerning heretics? [ 31] In the third to Titus it is written; Shun thou a heretic, after the first and second admonition. Doest thou give ear unto the apostle, if thou marry such a one? Such were the Israelites in times past, being compared with the Jews; such are the Papists and Anabaptists; if thou compare them with the professors of the Gospel. [ 32] Add hereunto, that in John the fourth chapter, it is written, that the Samaritans had no conversation with the Jews.

These reasons do very much move me: howbeit, I would that the matter should be so mitigated, as we might not be more careful than reason would, about the easier sort of controversies and disagreements. But let us chiefly examine, whether the parties, which are to be joined in matrimony, do agree together in the chiefest points of religion; namely, Whether they believe in one very God, as touching the essence, and three persons together in one substance; Whether they believe, that for our sins we have need of Christ to be an only mediator; in whom be two perfect natures, divine and human, the properties of them being preserved; Whether they believe that we be justified by faith without works; That there shall be as well a resurrection, as a general judgment: and other things of like sort? Which I add herein, because it were an infinite thing to descend unto more particularities. But admit, that when the marriage is made; the husband and the wife do agree in religion; what must afterward be done, if the one of them shall fall into heresy? The Papists answer: They must be separated from the bed, as we said before, but not from the bond of matrimony.

But Coelestinus judged, that those matrimonies should utterly be undone, and a license of new marriage granted them. Innocentius, which followed

after, abolished this decree: saying; It may be, that they, coveting to be at liberty from the marriage which they mislike, would accuse their wives as heretics, or would fain themselves to be heretics: as appeareth in the *Extravagants De diuortijs*, in the chapter *Quando te*, &c. But I acknowledge no divorce, but that which is free, wherein liberty to marry again may be at the least wise granted to the party offended. Neither do the holy scriptures show of any other kind of divorce. Howbeit I would answer Innocentius, that the one married party must not be believed, that accuseth the other of heresy, unless the mater be proved by just and lawful examination. Moreover, I think it best, that such punishments be laid upon heretics, as none may lightly be led to profess heresy. Wherefore we must determine, that the surest way is, to take heed of such marriages at the beginning. And if it happen afterward, that there arise any heresy of great importance among them, which is tried out by lawful examination, let there be ways and means attempted, whereby the infected party may repent. Which if it take no place, and that the infected party will not dwell with the faithful: or else is not ready to do this, without committing blasphemies and contumelies against Christ: they must be separated with a free divorce. Now remaineth, that we answer to the arguments, which seemed to make against our opinion.

39. [ 1] First it was said; that God meant such matrimonies [of unlike religion] only as touching the seven nations of the land of Canaan. I answer, that the cause, which is afterward added, is general; namely: least men should turn from the true God, and from the right worshipping of him. But here we will demand, that if turning unto the true God had happened among them; whether it were lawful for the Hebrews to contract with those nations? I think it had not been lawful, without some special dispensation of

God; because God had wholly cast out those nations. [ 2] And as for that, which was brought touching matrimony licensed with a captive woman, I first say, that if a man will more narrowly behold that law, he shall easily perceive, that such matrimony was not allowed by God: the which nevertheless he granted to the Hebrews, by reason of their incredible folly. Which I hereby gather, because he willed, that the head of a strange captive woman should be shaven: that if perhaps she pleased a Hebrew, by reason of her beautiful hair, now being shaven, he might begin to mislike of her. He also ordained that her garments should be changed; because even those (as often it cometh to pass) might procure that love. He also commanded that they should let their nails grow, to make them the more deformed. And he willed, that there should be a morning for thirty days; that if she were loved before for her mirth and amiableness, now she should less please for her morning and unhandsomeness. With these conditions God endeavored to make a medicine for raging love. Over this, there is added a great burden, that if she began to be misliked, he ought not to have her for a bondslave, or else sell her to another: but he was commanded after a divorce was made to let her go free. Those conditions being observed, at the last he condescended, that she should be a wife: which must be understood (although it be not expressed) that she should be first well instructed in religion, and should be converted unto the true God.

[ 3] But touching those examples brought of them, which in old time married such women; I confess, that some such were married, who nevertheless did first admit the true and sound religion. But I judge, that Solomon had perhaps done better, if he had refrained from the daughter of the Egyptian; because I do not think that Pharaoh was much better than Ahab, with whom the matrimony being made was reproved by God. And

whereas it is written in the history, that Solomon loved Jehovah; that I do understand was meant by the love, which he had at the first, before he was yet corrupted. For afterward, when he was grown to old age, his heart, through strange women, was alienated from God. And as concerning Augustine, which said, that in the New Testament there is no express commandment extant, whereby such kind of marriages are forbidden; I set against him Tertullian, Jerome, and other fathers, who refer to this place the words of Paul to the Corinthians, the second epistle, and sixth chapter, which I alleged before. And that which he wrote in the former epistle (Let him marry in the Lord) they refer unto this place, and show, that they were spoken against this kind of matrimony. And where it is alleged, that many in old time did not abstain from the marriages, neither did think that they sinned thereby: that have not we to do with. For while Paul lived, there were many, which had recourse to idolatry, and thought not that they did ill therein; even as many thought that whoredom was not to be reckoned a fault: which nevertheless, the apostle doth earnestly reprove, and showeth it to be sin.

And that, which to the Corinthians is decreed by the same apostle, that The believing husband may dwell with the unbelieving wife, if he will, and be contented therewith: [ 4] we answer, that we in this place do reason of marriages to be made, and not of such as be already made. So as the apostle saith there; He or she that hath an unbelieving spouse. Whereby it appeareth, that he speaketh of matrimony that was contracted before. [ 5] But touching Solomon, whether he brake the law, which is in Deuteronomy, of the not bringing in of nations into the church of the Jews, either never, or else till many generations were past: I say, that that law must be more diligently weighed, and more narrowly scanned, what is, To enter into the

church. For (as I think) we must not believe, that a man being a proselyte, and converted unto the true God, and circumcised, should wait so long after he were justified, to be admitted unto offering of sacrifices and common prayers. Wherefore it is very likely, that in the law was meant their enfranchising into the city, whereby they might be in possibility to execute offices, and to be in the state of marrying wives of the tribes of Israel. And so, as concerning this, Solomon should not be accused for breaking the law, seeing the same provideth it for men and not for women. I think therefore, that matrimonies of this kind are not to be made, because they be rather snares than marriages.

**Of Degrees forbidden to make contract in marriage.**

40. This seemeth first to be agreed upon, that in the 18th and 20th chapters of Leviticus, are not rehearsed all persons or degrees, in whom marriages are forbidden. For there is no mention made of grandmother: when as nevertheless all men will confess it to be most shameful, if any man should take his grandmother to wife who is so far above him in years. The wise also of the grandfather is not mentioned. And though the wife of the uncle, by the father's side, be spoken of; yet is there nothing spoken concerning the wife of the uncle by the mothers side. Yea and (that we more marvel at) there is no prohibition for the father to marry his daughter: when as all men confess, that those marriages be most incestuous. So as it is to be thought, that in that place are set forth by the holy Ghost certain degrees prohibited: and those not many but yet such, that by them (as by certain exquisite and manifest rules) we may judge of the like. Wherefore we must think, that whatsoever is spoken as touching the mother, is also commanded as touching the grandfather, or grandmother: seeing that all these are reckoned to be parents. Those things also, which are spoken as touching the

wife of the uncle by the father's side, do manifestly show what is to be done as concerning the wife of the uncle by the mother's side: forsomuch as these affinities or degrees have by the same space or distance, relation one to another. So that I am of this mind, that I think the prohibitions mentioned in the law, are therefore set forth, that by them we might evidently understand, what is meet to do in the like degrees.

I grant nevertheless, concerning Paulus Burgensis reason, that they much more break the law, which do contract matrimonies with persons forbidden: and that they also pervert the order of kindreds. For unto me he seemeth to do far worse, which marrieth his grandmother, than he which marrieth his niece of his brother's side: although I think, that both these matrimonies are unlawful. What the Hebrews of our time do, I pass not much; yea, I much doubt of that, which Paulus Burgensis assureth himself, as a thing plain and manifest; namely, that the Jews at this day are most diligent in observing of their outward laws. For me thinketh I should do well, in not giving to them more dignity or religion than to Christians. Wherefore, as it is manifest enough, that we have for men's traditions, strayed very much from the right observation of the commandments of God, and also from the right knowledge of the scriptures: so is it also likely that the same hath happened to the Jews, especially in this our age. So as I am not injurious against them, when I will not yield more unto them, than unto ourselves.

Nevertheless, I will not let to declare, that their Rabbins have added to the degrees forbidden in the law, many more as well in descending as ascending: which thing I understand the great learned man Paulus Phagius hath declared in his annotations on Leviticus. Neither can I be persuaded, that they were added by them for any other cause; but only for that they thought that those degrees were comprehended in the degrees expressed by

God. Wherefore that (as I think) will not be sufficient for judging of lawful marriages, if the degree, wherein they are contracted, shall not by manifest and proper words in the law be forbidden, nor yet the order of kindred perverted: for it may be, that the like degree, and of the same distance, is forbidden by authority of the law. Neither doth the scripture (so far as I can see) allege in any place such a reason, as belongeth to the perverting of order, although (as I have said before) I will not utterly reject the same.

41. Some man peradventure will say; What matter is it for us of this age, either to know or to mark those precepts, which are contained in the 18th and 20th chapters of Leviticus; seeing that we, after the coming of Christ, are no more bound to the civil laws of the Jews? I grant that the Christians are not bound to the civil precepts of the law: but yet I ascribe those precepts, which are there given for marriages, not to civil laws, but rather to moral. And I think, that I may bring a reason out of the same place to confirm my saying. For God when he gave those laws, added these words thereunto; Take heed therefore that ye defile not yourselves with whoredoms, and such incest's, as the Gentiles have done, whom I have driven out of those lands, which I have now given unto you: for seeing those nations have been polluted with so grievous wicked acts, I have therefore so destroyed them, and will do the like unto you, except you shall diligently shun those things, which I command you, as touching these evils. I think no man will doubt, but that the Chanaanits, which received not the law by Moses, neither were citizens of the public wealth of the Israelites, could not by that law be condemned; because they obeyed not the laws of the Hebrews. They were subject only to the law, which is called moral. Seeing then God reproveth them for that cause, that they were so defiled with such filthy lusts and incest's, and affirmeth, that for the same cause he

deprived them both of their land and life: it is manifest, that these laws must be joined, not to civil precepts, but to moral, which all men are bound to observe.

Nevertheless, it seemeth at the first sight to be against this doctrine, in that Abraham (a man otherwise most holy) is thought to have married his brother's daughter; namely, Sara. Amram had also Jochabed his aunt to wife, of whom he begat Moses, Aaron, and Marie. And it seemeth, that so godly and holy men would not have done this, if the moral law (as we have said) had been against it. To this we answer: first, that the law of nature was much blotted by corruption and wickedness, which overwhelmed all mankind soon after sin: and for that cause they, which contracted such matrimonies, thought peradventure that the same was lawful. And therefore, although they cannot altogether be excused by that ignorance; yet it is to be thought that they committed less sin than those, which durst do such things, after the law was given. I add moreover, that among the facts of the fathers, certain things are now and then spoken of, by which other men must not take example, seeing they are sometimes to be interpreted as prerogatives, or certain privileges given them. But how so ever it be, we must not (as I think) much labor to excuse the fathers in all things. Although I know there be, which say, that Sara was not the daughter of Abraham's brother, but of kin some other way. And therefore she might be called his sister, after the ancient manner of speaking; as though she were of some kindred unto him, but yet not so near of kin, but that they might marry together. And in like manner they say of the kindred of Amram and Jochabed. Howbeit, I will omit these things, seeing the whole matter may be made plain by these two kind of answers before alleged.

42. It might also be demanded, that if the precepts of matrimonies be moral, and do appertain to the law of nature, why God would also establish them in his laws? Because the light of nature was come to that point, that it was not sufficient. The brightness thereof was daily more and more defaced in the hearts of men. Which doth manifestly appear, not only in these, but also in the ten commandments: where it is commanded, that men should abstain from theft and murder. And yet we read in the histories, that robbing on the sea, and also on the land prevailed in such sort, as they might seem to be full of honor and dignity. Plato, in his first book of laws, thought, that concerning procreation of children, we should abstain from mothers, grandmothers, and the degrees above them; again, from daughters, nieces, and degrees beneath them: but as for other persons he made free. Jerome against Jovinian, in his second book testifieth, that the Scots in his time had no certain marriages: but accompanied with their women, as they lusted themselves, even with such as came first to hand. He saith moreover, that the Meds, Indians, Ethiopians, and Persians, confusedly contracted matrimonies with their mothers, sisters, daughters, and nieces.

Which seemeth nevertheless to disagree with that, which Herodotus writeth of the Persians. For Cambyses (as he testifieth) desired to marry his sister, for the which he asked counsel of the lawyers and wise men: and demanded of them, whether that matrimony were lawful or no. To whom they answered, that they indeed had no law for the brother to marry his sister: but yet they had another law among them, whereby it was lawful for the king of the Persians to do whatsoever himself lusted. Surely they answered well in the first part of their answer, but in the latter part they most shamefully flattered the tyrant. Howbeit, the things, which be written by this historiographer (though sometimes fabulous) and those that Jerome

bringeth, vary not. For the common sort, being now corrupted with shameful and wicked custom, contracted such matrimonies: howbeit, the wiser sort, in whom the law of nature did shine, perceived that those matrimonies were not lawful; although, being overcome with covetousness, they would not forbear them. Whom Paul to the Romans hath sharply reproved, saying; Which men, notwithstanding that they know the righteousness of God, they not only do such things, but also they consent unto those which do them. And these matrimonies are known as it were in their own nature to be so unlawful, as they, which hear relation made of such things, be stricken with an exceeding great horror. Yea and they themselves, which have committed such things in the heat of their lust, seem to detest those whom they have defiled.

The poets make mention of Cynara and Myrrha his daughter, with whom her father perceiving that he had unawares kept unlawful company, he so hated her, that he persecuted her, all that ever he might. Amnon began so to hate his sister, whom he had dishonested, that he commanded her to be violently thrust out of his sight. Thou shalt also never in a manner find (if thou look into histories) that incestuous marriages, or carnal copulations came to good end. Ptolemy king of Egypt took to wife, by fraud and guile, his sister Euridice. What ill success came thereof, the histories, and (specially Justin) have plainly set forth. Antonius Caracalla, who married his stepmother; and Nero, that committed abomination with his mother, not only came to a most unhappy end, but (according to their deserts) were wonderfully hated of the people, and were openly called monsters of mankind. Wherefore we grant, both that these commandments, which do prohibit those sins, pertain to the law of nature; and also, that they were for just cause renewed by God in his moral laws.

43. It may also be plainly enough declared by another reason, that incestuous marriages are forbidden by the light of nature; seeing that they were earnestly forbidden by the Roman laws, which were counted among the most excellent and honest laws: and those marriages were specially named, wherein any man had married his niece by the brother's side. Although Claudius Caesar, when he would marry his brother's daughter Agrippina, caused the first law to be abrogated; and to be decreed, that it might be lawful for every man to have his brother's daughter to wife: but there was none at Rome, except it were one or two, that would follow his example. But the first law, which was the best, was observed among the Romans. Howbeit, we must understand, that there were certain persons prohibited by the laws of the Romans, whereof God's laws made no mention; and yet their prohibition was not without reason. So as the citizens of Rome were bound to observe them, although by the light of nature they could see no cause why they should so do. Which kind of laws was wont to be called peculiar, because it seemeth to be a thing private unto certain persons. I will make the thing more plain by examples.

The Romans (as may be seen in the Code) would not that matrimonies should be made between the guardian and the pupil; because they saw it would easily come to pass thereby, that the guardian, which had consumed the goods of his pupil, least he should be constrained after the time of his tutorship, to render an account of those goods, would solicit the maiden to marriage: which being obtained, he should be free from rendering an account of her goods. Surely the law was good, but yet it was not perfectly observed. Cicero (otherwise a grave man) was ill reported of for the same cause: for being far in other men's debt, when he had forsaken his wife Terentia, he married his pupil, of whose goods and affairs he had the charge

as guardian. Also the Romans decreed, that no president of any province should take to wife, either to himself, or to any of his, any woman within the same province, wherein he governed. For they knew right well, that it might so happen, that the Pretor, Proconsul, or President in a province, having affiance in the families and kinsfolk coming to him by his wife, might conspire new matters, and at last alienate themselves from the Common-wealth. They also saw a great danger to hang thereupon, lest he should not be just and severe in giving of judgment; because he would gratify his kinsfolk more than others. Lastly, it should not be free for them to have marriages within the provinces; because magistrates might in a manner compel them of the provinces, to contract matrimonies either with themselves, or with their friends.

We see also this excellent law violated. For Felix, which governed Jury under Nero, (as it is written in the 24th chapter of the Acts of the apostles) had Drusilla a Jew to wife. But what need is it to rehearse, that these laws of less weight were not observed, when as that people had shaken off even those laws, which we called moral, and are known by the law of nature? Cicero declareth in his Oration for Cluentius, that Sassia, a certain wicked woman, was so inflamed with wicked lust, that she instigated her son in law Aurius Melinus, (to whom she had before married her daughter) to refuse his wife, that he might take her to wife instead of her daughter: which at the length she brought to pass. And whereas that deed was accounted full of dishonesty, yet was it not punished by the laws. Neither do we read that the matrimony (which Cicero affirmeth was unluckily contracted without order or authority) was dissolved by the power and commandment of the magistrates. Wherefore, there is here also offered a good reason, why God would again inculcate by a new law, those things, which by the light of

nature were judged to be honest: for the bounds, bars, and closures of nature were broken, by the impotent lust of men; and therefore they were to be made surer by another bond. For the Israelites were no more shamefast in keeping of natural honesty, than the Romans were.

44. Neither is this to be forgotten, that God had certain proper things in his law, which may be called peculiar: seeing all men were not bound unto them by the law of nature, but the Hebrews only. For he would not have them to contract matrimony with the Chanaanits, Ammorhites, Jebusits, &c. for other people seem not to have been bound to that law. Neither should we at this day (if there were such nations still) be letted, but that we might join ourselves in matrimony with them. Although the cause of that law ought at this day to be holden: which cause is, that matrimonies should not be contracted with them that be of a contrary religion; for we must beware, that the godly be not joined with the wicked. I know that Augustine, concerning unlawful marriages, writeth to Pollentius, in the second book, and *De sermon Domini in monte*; that There is not a place in the New Testament, wherein by express words, matrimonies with infidels are forbidden. But of this matter I will not write much at this present, seeing I have largely entreated thereof upon the epistle to the Corinthians. This will I say moreover, that a good man, in contracting of matrimonies, ought to follow chiefly that which is honest; and not lightly to depart from commendable orders, and usual customs, which are not against the word of God. And if there happen peradventure any doubt, let him not think it much to ask his magistrate: otherwise he shall rashly put forth himself, his wife, and his children into danger.

For if he be married in any of the degrees prohibited, he shall not be counted a husband, but a whoremonger; and his wife shall be called a

harlot; and the children, in that marriage begotten, shall be taken for bastards. Howbeit, the magistrate, although he may not, concerning matrimony, forbid certain other contracts, besides those which God hath forbidden: yet can he not, neither ought he to remit any of those, which God hath commanded, and which he hath forbidden by his law. Yea, he must most diligently take heed, that he burden not the people too much, or without an earnest cause; as we see that the Pope hath done, who hath two ways sinned therein. First, in that he durst usurp the office of making laws in a Common wealth; which undoubtedly pertaineth not unto him. Secondly, because in his laws he followed not the word of God; but without reason forbad first all degrees, even to the seventh, which he perceiving afterward not to be observed, and that all things were full of confusion, he restrained his prohibitious to the fourth degree. Wherein he is constant and obstinate, if there come no money in: but if money be offered (whereof he must have much brought him to fill his greedy desire) he dispenseth as pleaseth him, both with his own laws, and the word of God.

45. This also must be known, that God hath in his laws another decree, which we may call peculiar; because it should not extend to other nations: neither ought it to be in force at all times. And that was, that when any husband did die without children, the brother that remained alive, or some other next of kin, should marry her that was left: so that the first, which should be procreated of that marriage, should be counted the son of him that was dead, and as in the inheritance should fully succeed him. For God would not in that Common-wealth, that men should altogether be extinguished. And he provided, that this division of lands should be kept as much as might be. And seeing the same is not used in our public-wealth's, neither that God hath commanded it; therefore it doth nothing appertain

unto us. Wherefore we must keep our selves under the general and common law; namely, that no man presume to marry the wife of his brother being dead, although he died without children.

And be it known unto us, that in the beginning, when only the family of Adam lived on the earth, brethren were not forbidden, as they were afterward: for brethren were driven of necessity to marry their sisters. Howbeit, afterward, when as men were increased in number, they began to be ashamed, and by the instinction of God, or nature, either to abstain from prohibited persons, or at the least-wise to know that such conjunctions were full of ignominy. But what time they began first to abstain, it appeareth not by the history. The heathen poets perhaps showed that necessity of them in old time, which urged the family of the first parents to match the brother and sister together, when they feign, that their gods had their sisters to wives. For the chief of them; namely, Jupiter had Juno, who in Virgil thus speaketh of herself;

But I, which walk the Queen of gods, both sister and wife to Jove.

46. And though the word of God, and the instinct of nature, should be sufficient of itself to make us abstain from the foresaid conjunctions; yet are there brought by diverse writers, causes fit enough to forbid the same. Augustine, in his 15th book *De civitate Dei*, and 16th chapter, writeth; that That abstinence doth very much help to enlarge the bonds of human society. For if marriages should be concluded between the parents of one family, there would be no kindreds between others. Furthermore, it is not convenient, that one and the same man should sustain the persons of sundry kindreds; to wit, that one man should both be the uncle and husband of any one woman; and that one woman should both be the aunt and also the wife of any one man. Which reason also Cicero made in his fifth book *De*

*finibus*; and Plutarch in his 108th problem. And seeing both these men were Ethnics, they could not perceive this, unless they had been illuminated with the light of nature. Also the third reason is added; because these persons, from whom we must abstain, do for the most part dwell together in one house. So if they should have leave to join in matrimony together, they would not so gravely and modestly be conversant one with another, as domestical civility requireth.

Plutarch, in the place now alleged, hath showed two other reasons, besides these, which we have brought. One is, that between near cousins, dissensions were to be feared: for they would soon complain, that the right of kindred were taken away. Which saying I thus understand: If either she that were to be married, or he that would marry, should overskip the nearer of kin, for to marry one of further alliance: then that party, which were nearer of kin, would take it to be an injury received; as if by overskipping, it had been purposely done, to put the other party to shame. Even as it cometh to pass in making of wills, wherein they, which be the nearer of kin, neither may nor ought to be forgotten. And in the law, touching the raising of seed unto the brother already dead, the first place was to be granted unto him that was nearest of kin; who, if he would not use his own right, was made ashamed: as that law more at large doth declare. Wherefore, seeing that disorders between all sorts are to be hated, then those between kindreds must be detested. Also Plutarch bringeth another reason; namely, that women be weak, and therefore have need of many and sundry upholders. So that in marrying with strangers, if they be afflicted by them as it cometh to pass, they have all their own kinsmen to be their patrons and defenders: but if they should be wives unto their own kindred, and be ill entreated of them, they should have a very few to defend their cause; since other

kinsfolk would not be very ready for their sakes, to fall at controversy with their own kin: which would not grieve them to do against strangers.

47. But seeing now I am in hand with Plutarch, I remember that, which he hath written in the sixth problem: and I think it not unprofitable to rehearse the same, seeing it appeareth to be against that, which Augustine hath in his 15th book *De civitate Dei*, and 16th chapter, touching the marriage of cousins germane. For he affirmeth there, that the same was lawful before his time; although such kind of matrimonies seemed very rare, because men did in a manner forbear to contract with persons so near of blood. But he saith, that afterward that liberty was taken away. Which in very deed I cannot perceive in the Roman laws, which were publicly received and allowed: and yet nevertheless, those laws were in force throughout Africa. So as it may seem obscure to some, of which laws Augustine speaketh: unto whom he saith, that matrimonies of this kind were forbidden in his time. But it must be understood, that when Augustine lived, the law of Theodosius the elder was in force, who first among the Caesar's (so far as I know) forbad this sort of matrimony. Which also Aurelius Victor, and Paulus Diaconus do testify. And the same we find at this day in the Code of Theodosius, concerning incestuous marriages, the sentence as touching these persons remaining in these words; He that shall violate himself with the marriage of his cousin germane, either of his sisters or brothers daughter, or of his wives daughter; lastly, of any the marriages of whom is forbidden and condemned.

Howbeit, at this day the law is not extant in the Digests, nor in the Code, nor yet in the Authentiks. Which nevertheless king Clotherius followed, as it is read in the Almane laws, in the title *De illicitis nuptijs*: yea and it is confirmed by the ecclesiastical Canons and Decrees, by Gratian 35th

question 2 and 3: out of the Agathen Council, the 61st Canon. And Gregory the first, in that place, is found to be of the very same opinion: in the chapter *Quaedam lex Romana*, &c. These things he answereth unto the sixth interrogative of Augustine the bishop of Canterbury. And he affirmeth, that they which join together in the degree of cousins germane, ought to refrain from contracting of matrimony between themselves. And Ambrose also long before Gregory, in his 66th epistle to Paternus, condemned marriage between brothers and sisters children; and witnesseth, that the same was forbidden by Theodosius law: which I also have already alleged. And if it be lawful to use conjecture, I think that Theodosius did it at the request of Ambrose, who had a marvelous respect to public honesty. Yet nevertheless was not that law so severe in those days, but that the same might sometime be dispensed with; as the epistle to Paternus doth show. And in that Ambrose affirmeth there, that such kind of marriage was forbidden by the law of God; it cannot be proved unto any, which thoroughly consider the words of the law, and the acts of the fathers.

How the Romans ordered themselves in ancient time, as touching the marriage of cousins germane, this I have observed. In the second book, and fifth Decade of Livie: Ligustinus saith, that his father gave him to wife his uncle's daughter. Cicero also, in an oration for Cluentius, writeth, that Cluentia was lawfully married to M. Aurius her cousin germane. And M. Antonius the philosopher married Faustine his cousin germane; as Julius Capitolinus writeth. And before the building of Rome, there is mention made of the marriage between Turnus and Lavinia, who descended of two sisters. Yet Plutarch, in the place before cited, saith, that in the former times at Rome it was provided by law, that they which were near of kin should not be joined in marriage: but that the same law was afterward released

upon this occasion. For a certain man, which both was honest, and of good reputation among the people of Rome, being very much pressed with penury, married a cousin germane of his, which was very rich and wealthy: for which cause he was accused of incest. But his cause being heard, he (by the judgment of the people of Rome) was absolved. For favor bare a great stroke in the city. By means whereof, there was a law made by the people, that from thence forward it should be lawful for cousin germanes to marry. These things I thought good to declare of this kind of marriage, both out of the laws of God, out of the laws of the Romans both ancient and later, and also out of the fathers and ecclesiastical Canons.

Whereunto I will add, that there be many cities acknowledging the Gospel, which do not allow the marriage of brothers and sisters children; namely, Zurich, Berna, Basil, Schaphusium, Sangal, Bienna, &c. Also in the kingdom of England (where I was) there this degree was excluded from marriage. So as in places, where the magistrate doth forbid these marriages, the faithful sort must forbear them; for those reasons, which I have before declared. But Othniel, if he were the cousin germane to Achsa, he might marry her by the law of God: but if he were her uncle, he might not do it by the common law; howbeit, he married her. Wherefore one of these two things we must say; either that there was a fault in him (for the fathers, as we have already said, were not always free from sin) or else, that God, by a certain privilege or prerogative, would have these things to be done: which nevertheless must not be challenged for an example. Neither must we forget, that by a custom very usual in the scriptures, they which by any means were joined in blood were called brethren. Even as Lot is called the brother of Abraham; and the kinsmen of Jesus Christ the son of God, in the evangelical history, be called his brethren. So likewise in this place it may

be, that Othniel is called the brother of Caleb, when he was only joined unto him by some near kindred. And this exposition the interpreters, for the most part, do use: the which I would not mislike, unless I saw added in the text this particle (The younger) which is not accustomed to be added, but when brethren or sisters are in very deed compared together.

**Whether any dispensation may be made in degrees of kindred prohibited by God.**

48. Now let us declare, whether any dispensing may be in the degrees forbidden by the law of God. For at this day, those which would be counted Christians, being matched in the degrees forbidden, do say; Let us go to the Pope, let us talk with him, he will dispense with us, so we reward him with money. Neither do the common sort only say this, but our masters, which be the School-divines, in the fourth book of sentences, the 34th distinction, concerning matrimony write, that the Pope can dispense. And they endeavor to prove that this he may do. For they say, that those precepts, which be in the 18th and 20th chapter of Leviticus, touching degrees forbidden, partly be moral, and partly judicial. The moral and natural are, that the father may not marry his daughter, nor the son his mother. Here they say is such an indecency, as by no means it can be taken away; but that it should be a perpetual impediment. For they say, that the father and the daughter, the mother and her son be one flesh. Notwithstanding, in matrimony it behooveth, that one flesh become another than it was: howbeit, those are not severed.

But if the reason were firm, Adam might not have married Eve: she was his flesh, for he saith; This is now flesh of my flesh. They answer, that Eve was the flesh of Adam; not by way of nature, but by miracle; since God so framed Adams rib, as it was made a woman. Howbeit, when kindred is

defined, we have no recourse to miracles: but it is said to be a bond of those persons, which be derived from one beginning by procreation; so Eve might not be called a kinswoman of Adam. Wherefore they say, that in those precepts, which be in Leviticus, the indecency between father and daughter, mother and son, is natural, moral, and perpetual: and that the rest of the degrees do appertain to the judicial laws. Some indecency they would have to be there, but yet not so much as hath been always forbidden. For brethren and sisters did at the first time marry one to another: yea and the sister of the brother departed, was married in the law, for the raising up of seed. Jacob had two sisters in wedlock; Amram had his aunt; Abraham had Sara, whom he called sister. Wherefore (say they) these degrees; namely, the father and the daughter, the mother and the son, are after a sort perpetually forbidden by the law of nature, and by the moral law: but other persons, which be forbidden by God, were kept back from marriages; howbeit, that was by the judicial laws.

But those laws endured so long, as the civil regiment of the Jews continued: which being decayed, we are not tied to those laws any further, than the church hath allowed of them; so as unto us they be laws of the church, and not moral laws: neither are they laid upon us by the laws of God, but by the laws ecclesiastical and positive. And whereas they make the Pope to be president over the whole church, they say it is in his power, for certain just causes, to release these impediments. They so flatter the Pope, that *Caietane Secunda secundae Thomae*, question 154. article the ninth, saith, that the Pope doth for just causes dispense in all those degrees (except for marriage between the father and the daughter, and between the mother and her son;) not by a common law already ordained, but by the Popes license. This he assigneth to be the cause, for that they be judicials.

Experience teacheth, that these things have sometimes happened. Immanuel the king of Portugal married two sisters, Catharine Queen of England two brethren, Ferdinandus the king of Naples married his aunt: Pope Alexander the sixth allowing the same. I have read, that Martin the fifth gave license to marry with a natural sister: whereof many of the Canonists say, that it is to be doubted, whether it were lawful or no. This license is horrible. Ye see how great matters these men challenge unto themselves.

I am of another mind: and those things, which be contained in Leviticus, touching degrees forbidden, I esteem them to be moral. Such marriages seem rather beastly than human. And that the same [prohibition of degrees] is rather natural and moral, I prove by the very words of those laws. When God made those laws, he spake on this wise; Observe ye these things, and defile not yourselves with these abominations, as the Chanaanites, which were before you, and I did cast them out. If ye shall imitate them, and shall defile yourselves, the earth also shall cast you out. Thus I reason; The Chanaanites were not the people of Israel, God did not give laws unto them by Moses, yet were they punished for such kind of marriages; wherefore they were bound to these precepts. If they were bound, they were bound by the light of nature; and the precepts did also pertain to other nations. A nature being well instituted, might perceive that shamefulness. The Lord said, that he for that cause hated the Chanaanites. So then it should not be convenient for us, that those precepts were but of small value, perishing together with the civil administration of the people of Israel.

What do they speak of the children of Adam? Our cause and theirs is not all one. Their cause stood upon great necessity. Moreover, God dispensed, saying; Increase and multiply, and fill the earth. And God can dispense when he will. It was not his pleasure to bring forth other women. That this

should be done without such a necessity as that was, we have not a word to show it. In that it was once done, men must not imitate the same. True it is, that Jacob married two sisters: but public honesty was after a sort defaced in Mesopotamia, and elsewhere. Neither were all things well done, which the fathers did: unless we can say; that the spirit of God would this to be done peculiarly. We speak of the common law, and usual course. Jacob had two sisters against his will: his will was to have had but only one: but through the wiles of Laban, the one was put to him against his will, and the other died by the way, before he entered into the holy land. The Hebrews say, that God would not that so great wickedness should be in the land of promise.

Against that example we allege the law of God. We must not live by examples, but by laws. There were such things in other nations also, but not to be allowed therefore. Eusebius Caesariensis, in *Praeparatione euangelica*, writeth, that the Persians had marriages between the father and the daughter, and between the mother and the son. Berosus writeth, that giants before the flood did not refrain from such marriages. Caracalla said to his stepmother; If it were lawful. The unchaste woman answered; If it like thee it is lawful; An Emperor giveth laws, he taketh none. Among the Atheniens it was lawful to marry sisters. These things be shameful. Against those shameful things, let us oppose the good laws of the Romans. As touching this matter we see things very repugnant in the Popes licenses. By a common and forbidden law, they abridge the liberty of marriage, and forbid more degrees than God did appoint. For once they forbad the seventh degree, within a while the fourth degree; afterward they so license at their own pleasure, as they except only the first degree.

So will I, so do I command,

Let will for reason stand.

I deny not, but that in these contracts, the incest is greater in one degree than in another: but what things soever God hath forbidden, be dishonest. If they say that they do this by a fullness of power: let them say (saith Baldus) by a fullness of tempest, wherewith the church is troubled and corrupted. Do not think that any man (God I will except) can give license, that the brother should marry his sister.

**Of Dowries; In the Commentaries upon Judges, the first chapter, and the 14th verse.**

49. But whether husbands received dowries of their wives, before the law, it is uncertain. The servant of Abraham rather gave gifts unto Rebecca, than received; for so much as he brought with him golden and silver vessels, in the name of Abraham and Isaac, which were to be given to the spouse. But there is no mention made of the maiden's dowry. Also Jacob served for his wives, so far was he from receiving anything of them in the name of a dowry. Shechem also, the son of Hemor, inordinately loving Dinah the daughter of Jacob, with whom he had committed fornication, said unto the sons of Jacob; Increase her dowry as ye list, I will refuse no condition, so I may have your sister to be my wife. Howbeit, I cannot tell how the custom of the ancient fathers, in not taking but giving dowries to wives, which they should marry, ought to be commended: yet I thought good to recite those things, which I have read hereof by the way. And to begin with Megadorus in Plautus Comedy Aulularia, when he should take to wife the daughter of a poor man, being also without dowry, commended his counsel by those words; If (saith he) other men would do after my example, the city would then be in better concord, and envy should not be so rife among us as it is. They (namely the wives) will fear us the more, and we shall keep them with much less cost, &c.

When I consider these things, they seem to be very wisely spoken. For now and then it happeneth, that one city is after a sort divided into two parts; when as the daughters of poor men are without hope to marry with them that be of the richer sort, either for the slenderness of their dowry, or else because they have no dowry at all: for they attain not thereto, except it be by chance, or else very seldom. Wherefore the richer and mightier sort are much envied, and grievously hated of the poorer. Besides this, wives, which have good dowries, stand in the less awe of their husbands: yea rather, they despise and set naught by them, counting them as unworthy to be matched with them. Lastly, their decking and lusts cannot be satisfied, but with extreme charges. Plutarch in his Apophthegs of Lycurgus, when he was asked wherefore he had commanded that virgins should marry without dowry, answered; To the intent that some should not be left unmarried for poverty sake, or other some should be over-much desired or wooed for their wealth; but that every man diligently considering the maidens conditions, might choose him a wife for virtue sake. He showeth also, in the thirty problem, that the bride brought to the bridegroom's house only a distaff and a spindle. The *Decemuiri* of Rome decreed also, by the laws of Solon, that a woman should be without a dowry, and should bring from her father's house only three garments, and also certain vessels of small price; because they would declare, that the fellowship of marriage is not confirmed by riches, but through the love of children.

Certainly these things do very well agree with that, which is written by Paulus and Ulpianus, in the Pandects, as concerning the free gift between the husband and wife. It is written also of the Egyptians, that if they received dowry of their wives, they should then be counted as their wives bond-men. Which custom did sufficiently teach, that it seemeth both

infamous and unprofitable to seek a dowry of our wives; when as nothing is more noble than liberty. And nature hath ordained, that the husband should rule the wife. And it is written, that the Spaniards had a custom, that the wives should bring to their husbands a distaff wound with flare, instead of a dowry. I might rehearse a great many besides, to signify, that all the men in old time allowed not, that husbands should have dowries given them, when they married their wives. But in very deed the laws of God make mention very often of dowry. And yet I am assured, that the same was some-where used before the law. In Exodus, he which had defiled a virgins, was bound to marry her, so that her father were content; but if he would not marry her, then he was forced to give her a dowry, even as the law appointeth the dowry of virgins to be. Moreover, in the first book of Kings, the ninth chapter; Pharaoh gave for a dowry unto Solomon, who had married his daughter, the city Gazar, which he had taken from the Chanaanites. Beside this, the Roman laws, which otherwise be most indifferent of all other, do make very much mention of dowries; and have many whole titles, wherein this matter only is treated.

50. But seeing we are now come thus far, it seemeth meet to define a dowry, that thereby we may the easilier know, how much must be attributed thereto by godly men, in the contracting of matrimonies. A dowry is a right to use things, which are given to the husband by his wife; or by others in her name, to sustain the burdens of matrimony. And although a dowry be properly said a right of using; yet notwithstanding, those things, which are given unto the man, are oftentimes called by this name dowry. Howbeit, the end is chiefly to be noted in this definition; namely, to sustain the burdens of matrimony. It seemeth also, that seeing the husband bestoweth very much in nourishing of his wife, and in the honest maintenance of her,

justice and equity would, that somewhat in like manner be yielded unto him. Then, seeing a dowry hath this foundation of justice, there is no doubt, but that it is a thing lawful. Nevertheless, therein is an error not to be suffered; because some are not ashamed to say, that by a dowry, concord between man and wife is easily obtained. This, both reason and experience teacheth to be most false. Who is ignorant, that that kind of friendship (which hath respect only unto profit, and which is grounded only upon pleasure) is very frail and transitory?

Moreover, experience teacheth, that marriages which be so contracted, as there is no other consideration had therein, but only the wives beauty and her dowry, have very ill success. Wherefore these are reproved by the common proverb; *Qui vxores oculis & digitis ducunt*, Such as marry wives with their eyes and fingers, that is, which are moved only with beauty and money. So then it behooveth just laws not altogether to take dowries away, but rather strictly to provide, that they be not over-much increased, nor done without right or reason. And for this cause the Roman laws commanded those dowries to be cut off, which were greater than the ability of the giver might bear: as we read in the Digests *De jure dotium*. And contrariwise, we must take heed, that neither parents nor tutors, being overcome with covetousness, give less than honesty requireth: as it is written in the title *De dote inofficiosa*. And because dowries be given, to sustain the charges of matrimony; those cannot be excused, which having received them of their wives, afterward dare use their wives miserably. Besides that, they be unjust, because they violate the law of God, whereby they ought to love their wives as themselves, and as their own proper body; when as they will not conveniently help them with their own goods.

Yea there be some, which if they were not let by public laws, would consume, sell, and utterly alienate their wives dowries. And that this might not be, the laws, especially of the Romans, have carefully provided. For they decree, that the state or title of the dowry should remain with the wives, although the husbands had the fruit and use thereof, so long as the marriage should last. But what (I pray you) shall we say of them, which suffer so grievous and intolerable burdens of matrimony to be daily augmented, while they too much flatter and cocker their wives? Surely they sin very grievously: forsomuch as now, neither their own patrimony, neither their wives dowries can be sufficient; because they exceed so much in sumptuous attire. Certainly, among godly husbands and good wives, all things ought to be used with moderation and temperance. But wherefore (think we) have the laws ordained so many things, and by so many ways concerning dowries? Even because they would keep the citizens without hurt or damage, when as they marry and are joined together in matrimony. For it is expedient for the public wealth that if the husband die, the dowry should remain whole unto the wife; wherewith if she will, she may marry again: or if the wife die first, that the dowry should serve to nourish, apparel, and bring up the children, which are begotten in matrimony.

51. Notwithstanding, thou wilt demand; Whie are dowries said to be given under this title, of sustaining the burdens of matrimony? Even least the same dowry should be counted a price: as though wives and marriages were things to be sold. For the which cause, in the Digests, gifts between husband and wife are prohibited; to wit, that in matrimonies and contracts, gifts between man and wife be neither given nor received. Furthermore, when as divorcements were given in many places by that civil law, if gifts between man and wife had been lawful, marriages would very easily have

been dissolved. Seeing if one of the married parties would not give unto the other, so much as he demanded; that party should forthwith have been refused. The men in deed might give certain gifts unto their wives, before the marriages, which were called jointures, as some certify recompensing's of the dowry. Yet nevertheless, when they were once married together, the Roman laws permitted not, that they should give gifts one to another.

Whereof Plutarch also hath made mention; out of whom nevertheless is brought another reason than that, which I declared to be taken of the very laws. These be the words, in the 35th and 36th precept of matrimony: Certain bodies are said to consist of severed things, as an army, and a navy; other bodies, of things joined together, as a house and a ship; and other some are united and compact together, as all living creatures are. Wherefore matrimony, which consisteth of living creatures, is united and compact: but the matrimony, which is made either for dowry sake, or for children, belongeth to bodies joined together. And that which consisteth for pleasure or carnal copulation, thou mayest number among the severed bodies: for there man and wife may be said to dwell together, but not to live together. And as in living creatures, the temperatures of humors run through all parts: so marriage must mingle bodies, money, friends and kinsfolk together. And the maker of the Roman laws forbad persons coupled in matrimony, to take or to give gifts one to another: not to the intent they should not be partakers of any one thing; but that they should think all things to be common.

Howbeit, these things are to be understood of free gifts, and not of dowries: which otherwise were both lawful and much used in the Roman public well. For the daughters of Scipio, Curius, and Cincinnatus had dowries out of the treasury; because of the poverty of their parents, to the intent they should not be married without dowries. Yea and the general

Council of Arls, as it is rehearsed in the thirty question, the fifth chapter *Nullum sine*, decreed, that no matrimony should be contracted without a dowry. Let the dowry (saith it) be according to the ability, neither let any woman presume to take a husband, or any husband a wife, without public marriage. This canon I willingly allow, in that it condemneth secret marriages: but where it decreeth, that marriages cannot be contracted without a dowry, seeing that is not confirmed by the testimony of God's word, I cannot admit. For there are and have been very many, which have married wives altogether without dowry; yea and these men of so great honesty and authority (as it should seem) a rash part to condemn their doing, seeing the holy scriptures are not against it. Neither do I judge, that matrimony should by any means be denied to those women, which are without a dowry, if marriage be necessary for them.

Moreover, Paul testifieth, that matrimony doth shadow the conjunction that Christ hath with his church. Wherefore, if the truth of the matter be well considered, the church had nothing to offer unto Christ in the name of a dowry: nay rather (as Ezekiel teacheth) the same was found wrapped in blood and mire. Also the fathers in the old testament seem sometimes to have had wives without dowries. So then it seemeth meet to be decreed, that men may, and that it is lawful to receive dowries, when they are given, and that the same custom is honest, so that a just measure be not exceeded, and that he which marrieth, be not allured thereunto through the name of the dowry, as being the principal cause. The manners and godliness of the wife ought chiefly to be regarded. Neither ought any man forthwith to persuade himself; If I shall marry a wife without a dowry, I shall therefore have her the better, and the more at quiet, since (as Jerome declareth in his first book against Jovinian) Cato Censorius had Actoria Paula to wife, born of a base

kindred, who was poor also and without a dowry; and yet nevertheless she was a drunkard, impotent, and behaved herself proudly toward Cato.

**Of Divorcements, and putting away of wives.**

52. Unto the Hebrews and Ethnics it was but a light matter to put away their wives, and it was lawful upon every occasion: but unto the Christians it ought not so to be. This hath Christ declared in the 5th and 19th of Matthew. There (when he saith) Moses gave you a bill of divorcement) it ought not so to be understood, as though Moses did this of himself, without the commandment of God: for he was most faithful, as God beareth record of him. And that which is decreed in the law, touching divorcement, afterward is commanded in Malachi; to wit, If thou hate thy wife, put her away. For the Lord would not, that hatred and enmity should be retained in so near friendship. Wherefore, in the New Testament, Christ calleth us home unto the first institution. For insomuch as now, the spirit is more plentiful, and grace more abundant; men ought to use greater patience and charity towards their wives, and not so to deal against them, as they should reject them for every cause. In like manner there is required of the wives a greater obedience and modesty.

53. Here thou wilt say unto me; What if thou shalt find at this day, among Christians, such as be so hard-hearted, and so obstinate in retaining of hatred and enmity in wedlock, as they be not only equal to the Jews, but also go beyond them therein? Seeing then the disease is all one, why is not the same remedy left? Unto whom we answer, that they, which be of such sort, be strangers from Christ: wherefor we commit them to the Common-wealth, to determine of them as it shall seem most expedient. For when they cannot be amended by the church, let us count them for Ethnics and Publicans: let us deal with them by the civil laws. We have it plainly enough

declared by the word of Christ, that a divorce ought not to be done, unless it be for the cause of adultery. The which exception, if it be intermitted by Paul, it is no marvel: for when Paul saith; that he speaketh not these things, but the Lord, he sendeth us to the Lord's own words: neither doth he pluck anything away from his commandment. And when he saith, that he commandeth not, but the Lord; he maketh not those things of small force, which he taught before, when they are not read to be [expressly] spoken of Christ, since even those things are of the Lord: for he saith; And I think, that I also have the spirit of God.

But he therefore speaketh of the commandment of Christ to mitigate the sharpness of his speech; for it seemeth intolerable to the flesh, that matrimony cannot be dissolved. It is even as much, as if Paul had said; I set not before you strange or new things, and such as have not been heard of before my time; this the Lord hath commanded. Else, both this and those things, which the apostle wrote before, are firm, and full of authority. But this is the difference, that these things the Lord spake by his own self, and repeateth them by Paul; but those other he would to be uttered by the apostle only. And touching his sentence, that matrimony should not be dissolved, Christ allowed it by a testimony out of the book of Genesis, where it is said; For this cause a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife. Two near friendships are laid together in these words; the one is between parents and their children; the other between the husband and the wife. And seeing the bond of the father, or of the children is such, as it cannot be sundered and shaken off by any means, much less this bond between man and wife. And as the bond of amity between the child and the parents endureth perpetually, so doth the conjunction between the husband and the wife. This is Christ's interpretation of that place, and

the reason that he bringeth thereof: but yet he will have the cause of adultery to be excepted. And Paul (by whom Christ speaketh) excepteth another thing; namely, if one of the married persons, in that he is an infidel, will not dwell with the other being faithful, as it shall be declared in place convenient.

54. But as touching the cause of adultery, which Christ excepted, some doubt whether that be the only cause; and they are bold to say, that Christ's meaning was to comprehend therein all other wickedness, which is either equal, or more heinous than adultery: and they say, that the manner of the holy scriptures is, that in one cause rehearsed, they include others like unto it. Even as we read in Deuteronomy, of man-slaughter, which is committed by chance, and against a man's will: where one only reason is described; namely, when the hatchet flieth off the helm. But what? Shall we not judge the very same, if in building or carrying of anything, one man shall kill another unwillingly? Even so (say they) there are presently many faults equal, and perhaps more grievous than adultery: so as they judge, that those offenses do also make a cause of divorcement. Which meaning perhaps caused many emperors, otherwise godly and studious of *Christianitis*, to express many crimes in their laws, for the which it should be lawful to make a divorce; because they judged them to be no less than adultery. And that other causes also, besides the crime of adultery, are to be admitted; hereby it may appear, for that Paul added, as touching the unfaithful spouse, which will not dwell with the other being faithful: which case Christ spake not of. Yea, and at this day, if a coldness (as they term it) or other like impediment be perceived in the parties, which be already married, a just divorce is permitted. And yet nevertheless Christ excepted only the cause of adultery.

Yea, and if we will thoroughly consider what license the bishops of Rome have given to themselves herein, we shall perceive, that they have openly arrogated unto themselves the power to dissolve matrimony already contracted; so that there followed not copulation (as they call it.) Yea moreover it is reported, that there hath been a Popes dispensation seen, which hath taken away matrimony; not only contracted, but (as they say) finished. And Pope Zechariah, (as it is written in the fourth book of sentences) when a certain man had committed adultery with his wives sister, wrote thus unto him; Seeing thou hast committed this horrible act, thou shalt have neither of them to wife; both thou and she, whom thou hast defiled with adultery, shall remain without hope of marriage, and thine own wife shall marry in the Lord, with whom she will. In which case, thou seest it manifestly judged by this bishop, that a divorcement made for the cause of adultery, doth admit a marriage afterward. They will moreover have matrimony dissolved, if there be an error or a mistaking of the person or condition: as if a woman shall think that she hath a certain husband, and shall [afterward] prove the same to be another than she meant to have; or else, if she had taken him to be a free man, and of an honest stock, whom she findeth to be a bondman.

There is added also the cause of the degree of kindred, even of the degree not forbidden by the law of God, when they would have the matrimony that is contracted to be cut off. So it appeareth, that it was not so straitly judged, that the same only cause, which Christ doth express, maketh a divorce. Otherwise, seeing Christ expressed one only cause; how cometh it to pass that emperors being Christians, and men also which be of the church, have added so many other causes? Certainly it was even this, that they thought, that in that one only cause, Christ meant to be contained both the offenses

which be equal, and those which be more grievous. Erasmus (who treated hereof at large) added; When the Lord commandeth that thou swear not, that thou be not angry, that thou say not Racha, if a man shall strike thee upon the one cheek, turn unto him the other, if one will take away thy cloak, give him also thy cote, and such like; we admit interpretations, that we may understand these things to be spoken oftentimes of the preparation of the mind; to wit, that it be not done rashly or lightly, nor without a just cause: and shall we be here so hard and precise, that we cannot admit any interpretation or exposition?

55. And the reason why Christ did express but one only cause of adultery, seemeth to be, for that there is nothing so great an enemy unto matrimony as this mischief is. They shall (saith the scripture) be one flesh. But he that committeth whoredom, doth so join himself to other flesh, as he is plucked away from his own wife: for; Shall I (saith Paul) take the member of Christ, and make it the member of a harlot? This (as I have declared) is the opinion of some, which although it be not wicked, and perhaps it cannot easily be confuted: yet for my part, as I with all my heart embrace those causes, which be expressed in the scriptures; so can I hardly endure, that divorcement should stretch beyond these bonds. And in very deed, as touching such crimes as the scripture speaketh of; if a magistrate, being a Christian, should use the severity, which both the divine laws, and the Roman laws have decreed to be most just, we should not be troubled with these discommodities. I speak not now of the impediments of nature, which may happen so to be, and be sent in such sort by God, as matrimony cannot any longer consist. That which I have declared, I would have it to be understood only as touching wicked acts, which of many are thought to

make matrimony void. Those things I say cannot (in my judgment) be easily known, otherwise than by the holy scriptures.

56. Yea moreover, and in those things which the scripture hath expressed, I think that nothing ought to be adventured, except the magistrate do ratify the same. For matrimony, although it be ordained by God; yet, as touching the circumstances, it hath many things belonging unto the civil laws and customs. Wherefore they, which contrary unto the magistrate's mind, and against the common laws, do contract new matrimonies, the first wife being dismissed, do incur exceeding great dangers. They give the children, which be born of the latter matrimony such a blemish of infamy, as they be commonly taken for bastards: and unto such a shame do they deliver the wife, whom they have married, as she is accounted an adulteress and a harlot; and do cause that they themselves also are noted with the same dishonesty. We must pray therefore, and by all means entreat the magistrate, that he being faithful, will determine hereof; and that he will apply his laws to the word of God. And it must be foreseen, that it be so determined, as a window be not set open to horrible offenses, whereby matrimonies are in many places rashly dissolved. And on the other part they must take heed, least while they will defend a divorcement so made, whereof the holy scriptures never give any testimony, that the bond of wedlock still remaineth (the husband and the wife being severed, and so severed, as they cannot dwell together;) I say heed must be taken, that no occasion be given unto frail lusts, and company of harlots.

And if so be that any, for fornication sake, or because that he will not by any means that his wife should dwell with him (as Paul writeth of the infidel) is constrained to abide sole, and live continually without a wife, he remaining in a doubt, and not knowing what he ought to do, when the laws

will give him no liberty to marry a second person; certainly there are but two remedies, which he must have recourse unto; that either, when he is driven to this strait, he may now think that he is called unto this single life by God, whom by continual prayers he ought to move and solicit, that he will be present with him, whereby he may live chastely and purely; and when he perceiveth that injury is done unto him by the laws, let him commend his cause unto God, for that he did not willfully, and of his own accord, cast himself into this state, but being urged of necessity, is constrained to retain this lot. But and if he shall altogether perceive, that he is not able to live a chaste and continent life, and that he cannot be persuaded in his mind to live single and without a wife; and thinketh it expedient for him to use the liberty, which God hath appointed, least he should do it against the will of his own magistrate, and against the common laws; let him depart, and get himself into other countries, where this may be lawful: there let him marry, and addict himself unto that Common-wealth, by whose laws it is permitted him. These things are in such sort taught by me, as I am ready always to hear and admit that counsel, which shall be better, and more perfect.

57. But of this I marvel oftentimes with myself, how it came to pass, that Valentinian, Theodosius, and Justinian, otherwise most Christian princes, partly made laws themselves of divorcements, and partly by their authority confirmed them which were made of old; and that such laws were not openly withstood by the most godly bishops, which lived in those days: seeing otherwise, Ambrose procured Theodosius to make a law of deferring the punishment of death for certain days, and found means by his authority, that the decrees, which Symmachus would have established, took no place. Seeing therefore that those princes, which were very godly, durst ordain

such things by their laws, and that the church withstood not the same; how cometh it to pass, that magistrates at this day do stand in doubt to determine hereof? Peradventure they would say, that there would then be great store of divorcements. Which is not very likely, seeing among the Hebrews, Grecians, and Romans, where divorcements were lawful, we read not that there was any great number. But and if so be they think, that our men be worse in these days, than either the Hebrews or Ethnics were in old time; both they do injury unto the name of Christianity, and by this means are brought, that they the rather condescend unto divorcement; because it was permitted as a remedy of wickedness. For who will have a medicine to be taken away, while he perceiveth the disease still to reign?

58. This moreover ought to be certain, that Christ, when he excepted the cause of adultery, meant not a divorce, wherewith the wife and the husband should be separated only (as they say) from the bed and board, and that the bond of wedlock should still remain. The Lord spake unto the Hebrews, wherefore his words are to be understood of the usual divorce amongst that people. Also the Ethnics, as well Romans as Grecians, had only this sort of divorce known among them; that the one married person was so loosed from the other, as new marriages might be lawful. And if so be that Christ had otherwise meant it, he should have seemed not to have answered unto the question propounded unto him: for they reasoned then of that kind of divorce, for the which a bill of putting away a man’s wife was granted by the law. The disputation was of that, wherefore the words of Christ ought so to be understood. For whether is it more likely, that the Jews inquired of the divorce, which they were ignorant of; or rather of that, which Moses had granted to them in the law? I think that no man is doubtful, whether they asked of the thing, which was usual among them.

59. What also the ancient fathers in the church have judged hereof, it is no difficult thing to perceive. Origin granteth, that some bishops gave leave unto wives (being separated from their husbands) to marry others: which fact of theirs he saith, was against the scriptures, and yet he excuseth the bishops, that they did it not without consideration. Of the same mind shalt thou find Jerome to be, in the Epitaph of Fabiola, which was married to another, while her former husband yet lived. Jerome there confesseth, that she did not well therein; but yet in the meantime he excuseth her fact, by sundry and manifold reasons. And it appeareth manifestly, that the other marriage of this woman was not quite cut off. The bishops therefore of those times did not give counsel to have new marriages; but it seemeth that they did bear with those, which happened in the meantime. Albeit (as we have recited out of Origin) some of them gave license to marry again. But we are to believe, that the greater part did rather suffer than persuade.

Wherefore I understand the Canon of the council of Neocaesaria (wherein ministers of the church are forbidden to be present to bless the second marriages) to be meant as touching this sort, and not of those which are renewed after the death of the other spouse; forsomuch as these marriages are good and godly, and are commanded by Paul, unto whom so ever they shall be needful, seeing he saith unto Timothy, that he would have The younger widows to marry, and to bring forth children. But those other marriages (in so much as the other married party was living) were taken for suspected; although they were borne withal: and therefore the ecclesiastical blessing was not given to them. And this doth the reason show, which is added to the Canon: for it is said; For how can they enjoin repentance for these marriages? Whereas it is not read, that ever any repentance was enjoined for second marriages, after the death of the husband or wife, as

though they had been sin. But for matrimony, which hath been done, the husband being yet alive, it is manifestly showed in the epistle of Jerome, which we even now spake of. There was repentance enjoined to Fabiola, although (as I have said) we read, that that matrimony was neither dissolved, neither yet counted unlawful; for that woman was with the latter husband so long as he lived.

60. And as concerning Ambrose, how little he misliked second marriages, the one party being alive, his exposition upon the second to the Corinthians, the seventh chapter, doth plainly testify: where he understandeth, that the wife may depart from her husband for three causes. The one, if he be an adulterer; another, if he be a back-slider from the [true] religion; the third, if he would abuse his wife through lust, contrary unto the just use and custom of nature: for these causes (saith he) let a woman depart, but let her remain unmarried; since that is not lawful to her, which is lawful to the husband. For if the husband put away his wife for fornication sake, he may marry another. And he saith very plainly, that the man's cause in this respect is better than the woman's, and the reason he allegeth; because Man is the woman's head: and that therefore it is not meet he should be tied by such strict laws. Peradventure, besides this reason, which he brought, he had respect unto the law of the Old Testament, where it seemeth to have been lawful only unto the men, to give a bill of divorcement. Which hereby is proved; because at no time in the scriptures, there is any mention made of women, that they should give a bill of divorcement unto their husbands. And in the prophet Malachi, when God doth complain of the cruelty of husbands towards their wives, (which daily lamented in the temple, and wept in their prayers, making relation what they endured at their husbands

hands) he commandeth, that he which hateth his wife, should give her license to depart.

But and if so be it had been permitted unto women, to give unto their husbands a bill of divorcement; they would not have endured such cruelty, and so hard a state of life. They would have departed of themselves, and would not have waited for an admonition from the Lord, which should say by his prophet; If thou hate thy wife, put her away. And undoubtedly, God seemeth in the Old Testament, for sins sake, to have subjected the woman unto the man, by a certain kind of servitude; so as her state in many things should be worse than the state of man. It was lawful unto the husband (if he had been jealous) to make trial of her by public and solemn ceremony: which was not lawful for women against their husbands. Polygamy, or to have more wives than one, was sometime granted unto men: which was not permitted unto women. And we might reckon up many such like things, which notwithstanding were not without consideration appointed by the law of God, which would be now overlong to rehearse. Yea and among the Romans, there was no such punishment of lusts used against men, as was against women. The woman was condemned of adultery, with what man so ever she had kept unlawful company; but there was no punishment used against the man, except when he had plaid the harlot in a strange bed, or had ravished those which were honest and free born; but if he had done wickedly in harlots houses, or against his own handmaids, there was no punishment for him.

61. But Jerome in the epistle to Oceanus hath otherwise, and he saith; that That which the holy scripture commandeth the man, the same doth also redound to the woman: and he will have the like decree of both. Further, as touching the Roman laws he saith; In one sort speaketh Caesar, and in

another sort Christ; one way Paul, and another way Papinianus. For my part, although I cannot deny, but in the law of Moses the condition of women and men was unlike in respect of many things; yet in this cause, as the state of our time standeth, I would not subscribe unto Ambrose: against whom also Augustine is, is, who, in the second book and eighth chapter to *Pollentius De adulterinis coniugijs*, maketh both their states alike. Notwithstanding that, which the Master of the sentences bringeth, is most vain; whose judgment is, that these things are packed into Ambrose his books by heretics. But so might all controversies be easily dissolved, and we might say, that those things, which make against us in the fathers, were thrust in by heretics. Howbeit, the same Ambrose afterward giveth the scope of new marriages unto women also, if the unbeliever will not dwell together with her. Which in very deed standeth me instead of a reason to prove, that the liberty of both is alike. For if the cause, which the apostle showeth, extend it self unto both the man and wife; it shall no less be granted in the cause of fornication, which Christ expressed.

Moreover, that which is permitted unto the man, shall no otherwise be, but that matrimony is dissolved, because of fornication. But if so be it be dissolved, and the woman loosed from the same; why shall it not also be lawful for her to be married unto another? Last of all we see, that the laws of the bishops do grant unto a woman her divorce, if she prove that her husband is very cruel unto her. Which seeing they do as touching her divorce, how dare they deny that it may not be done in a man? In the old law it was not lawful for wives to give a bill of divorcement; because it was given for every cause. And seeing women be inconstant, it is not meet that they should depart from men for every cause. But now if the certain causes were limited, we might easily be rid of that inconvenience. I will also add,

that the time is not easy to be known, wherein it began among the Romans to be lawful for women to put away their husbands, unless it be in those questions mixed together of the old and New Testament, which are entitled to Augustine. In the question 115. it is written, that under Julian this began to be lawful for them. For then leave was given unto women; that they might put away their husbands. Notwithstanding, who this Julian was, it appeareth not; seeing we read of two emperors of that name.

62. But these were wont to be counted the causes, why the fathers would, that new marriages should not be lawful, after a divorce was made for fornication sake. First, for that it might seem that the husband lusting after a new wife, would invent a feigned crime of adultery against the first. Further, for that it might seem no wise man's part, that when it happened ill with him before, he would try the same luck again, and after a sort seek the same infelicity. Besides these, there are brought in the places, as well to the Romans as to the Corinthians, where the apostle seemeth to be of that mind; that a wife, so long as her husband shall live, is bound to his law. The latter writers also do cavil, that matrimony is a sacrament, and that therefore it cannot be made void. And Innocentius, when he decreed that it is not lawful for the one party married, to enter into new matrimony, if the other shall be fallen into heresy, addeth this reason; that There would be a door open unto great inconvenience: for any man would soon feign himself to be a heretic, that he might be delivered of his wife, and obtain another. Further, they be wont to urge this saying; That which God hath coupled together, let no man separate.

These reasons Erasmus doth plainly confute. Touching the first; If a severe judgment be appointed by bishops and magistrates, false reports might easily be prevented, neither will there be any leave given of divorce,

unless that fornication shall plainly and evidently be proved. Of the other reason it is said; That which is objected, is very ridiculous, seeing we oftentimes see, that those which have sailed once without good success, and have abidden shipwreck, do return again to shipping. And the party, which is innocent, while he endureth pricking's and burnings, and cannot easily keep himself chaste; what marvel is it, if he cast in his mind to marry again? Touching the place to the Romans it may easily be answered; The apostle did not there dispute, whether divorcements might be by any means admitted; but it sufficed him, that he showed unto the believing Jews, and to them which were converted to our religion, that it was now lawful to marry again in Christ, after that death was come, which is the certain and undoubted cause of dissolving matrimony: wherein, although there were a singular conjunction and peace between man and wife, yet by death the same is dissolved. Very wisely therefore did Paul in that place put only that cause of dissolving matrimony, which of necessity he was to grant; although no other cause had happened in the mean while. So unto the Corinthians he would show, that it was lawful for a widow to contract new marriages, if she would; because her first husband was dead. He reasoneth not there, whether a divorce may be made for any other cause; but only showeth, that there is no cause why second marriages be not lawful, when either the husband or the wife happen to die.

63. But whether matrimony be a sacrament or no, it is not hard to be answered. If thou understand the name of a sacrament generally, and at large, for every such thing as signifieth some holy thing, we will not deny, but that matrimony may be a sacrament; seeing it resembleth unto us, the conjunction of Christ with his church: whereof we have a testimony in the epistle to the Ephesians. But after this manner thou art forced to appoint,

not only seven, but an infinite number of sacraments: such as are the washing of feet, the shaking of dust from the feet, the embracings of young children in arms, and in a manner all the actions of Christ. But if thou wilt draw the name of a sacrament to those things, which not only betoken spiritual things, but also are used to be done by certain words, and of which there is a commandment extant, that they should be done: in this sense thou canst not appoint matrimony [to be a sacrament.] I pass over, that Dionysius in his treatise *De ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, reckoneth it not among the rest of the sacraments. Neither would Jovinian have escaped this argument, which left not any small thing untouched, whereby he might extol matrimony. Further, what sort of sacrament soever this be, the reason furthereth not the purpose of our adversaries. For Christ, whom they would signify to be joined unto the church, hath made a divorce from the synagogue, and hath coupled our church unto him. But if peradventure they shall say, that this is not done but by his death: I will answer, that the divine nature in Christ, for the which this matrimony is especially agreeable unto him, neither died, nor yet possibly can die. And yet (as Isaiah writeth) God gave a bill of divorcement unto the people of Israel, and by reason of their sins he rejected them from his company.

64. A slender reason also is it that Innocentius brought: for by the like and the same reason might any man fain himself to be a servant, when otherwise he were free; to the intent he might undo the matrimony contracted, and procure himself another wife. And if that the error of their state were so great a matter to them, that it dissolved matrimony; why should not that be of more force, which Christ himself and the apostle did except? Neither doth that greatly trouble us, which they uttered in the last place; namely, that it is not man’s part, to separate them whom God hath put

together. For when such causes, as these be, do happen; it is God which divideth, and not men: forsomuch as he, by his word, hath given this power. Undoubtedly men should then separate, if for every cause not expressed by God, they should attempt to undo matrimony. And Paul, when he said; Let her remain unmarried, speaketh of them, which being led by light causes, departed from their husbands. It was a custom among the Hebrews, to give a bill of divorcement upon any cause. And divorcements were so common and usual unto the Ethnics, as Juvenal said; So are there eight husbands made, five for the harvest time, &c. Wherefore, not without cause the apostle writeth these things unto the Corinthians. The Romans were not so ready to put away their wives. For the first, which made a divorce, was Spurius Servilius, and that because of barrenness of the wife; in the two hundred and thirty year after the building of the city: as Plutarch mentioneth in the life of Romulus.

Paul therefore speaketh not of the cause of fornication: for as touching that, he disagreeth not from Christ, who (as we have proved) did grant there a just divorce. Neither must the apostle be understood, as though he allowed those departing's of married folks one from another: verily he condemneth them, and would not have them so rashly, and upon such trifling causes to depart one from another. But as a good minister he provideth, least perhaps, if they fall into this vice, they may commit another more grievous; namely, to be married unto another. Let her (saith he) remain unmarried, or else let her be reconciled unto her husband. And he seemeth in this place, not so greatly to reprove and blame the crime of departing one from another, as it deserveth. For he saw, that sometimes it happeneth that women be not separated of their own accord; but cast forth by their husbands, in such sort, as if they would return, yet is there no present means for them to do it.

Howbeit the magistrate ought to provide for such afflicted souls by approved and good laws.

65. But now I thought good to weigh and examine certain things, which be spoken by Augustine, in his two little books *De adulterinis coniugijs* unto Pollentius, according as I shall judge them to serve unto the purpose of this place. He thought in very deed, that it was not lawful for him, that should put away his wife for the cause of adultery, to marry another. But whereas in Matthew that cause is excepted, he answereth, that either of them both is an adulterer; as well he which for adultery sake, as he that without that cause, putteth his wife from him, and marrieth another. And he saith, that Matthew expresseth only one of them, to note him which committeth the greater sin. Both of them do commit adultery, by putting away their wife, and marrying of another; but he more grievously, that shall do this without cause of fornication. And so he would, that the same exception should only be of force to moderate the crime of adultery: but not to this effect, that it should be quite taken away. And this he thinketh that he can show by the word of God: for Luke and Mark uttered the same sentence absolutely, and without any exception. They say; Every man, which shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery: therefore he concludeth generally, that the saying of Christ must be understood as Luke and Mark wrote. But Matthew (saith he) noteth him, that shall do it for fornication sake, that it may be understood he sinneth the less.

But certainly I would judge this kind of argument to be most weak: for it seemeth we should rather say, that Luke and Mark wrote not the perfect or complete sentence of the Lord, which we ought to gather out of Matthew, and to understand it definitely. Which rule he himself useth, and that not once, in his book *De consensu evangelistarum*, where he plainly saith; that

Very oftentimes in the other evangelist's, some things are spoken not very plainly and perfectly. The which ought more perfectly to be gathered out of Matthew. And it is to be wondered at, how he can always seem to understand that departure, whereof the apostle speaketh, for that which may be lawful, seeing the apostle plainly said; Let not the wife be separated from her husband. So as it is manifest, that the apostle speaketh of that departing, which is not lawful; seeing he forbiddeth the same. Whereby it easily appeareth, that here is no speech touching the cause of fornication. But in that case the apostle would not command, that the wife should not depart from her husband: for that were to nourish brothelry, if adultery should be suffered, the wife being present and abiding with her husband.

Wherefore Paul commandeth, that she should not depart for these small causes, seeing that is not lawful. And if perhaps she do depart, he commandeth that she should remain unmarried; or else that she be reconciled unto her husband. Everyone is bound to put away evil from among his own family. How should a husband but exclude his wife, when he findeth her in adultery? And yet the apostle saith; Let not a man put away his wife. Ought he therefore to harbor her adultery? Hereby is sufficiently showed, of what manner of departing and ejection these things be meant. And in this place thou hast Chrysostom, who is of our opinion: for he saith; Sometimes they depart one from another by reason of contentions, or faint courage, or else for continency, or for other pretenses: neither doth he make any mention of adultery. Tertullian, in his fourth book against Martion, saith; that Justice hath the Lord to be a defender of divorce. By which words he showeth, that Christ did confirm divorce, and that he took it not utterly away. For by this reason the heretics went about to prove, that Christ was contrary to God in the Old Testament, for

condemning of those things, which he ordained. Which sentence of Tertullian should not be true, if just divorcements (as the Hebrews used) should not be admitted among the Christians.

66. Neither ought this to trouble us much, that in the Old Testament, a bill of divorcement was permitted for every cause; seeing now Christ draweth the matter into so strict a room: this is no cause, why thou shouldest think him to be against the decrees and laws of his father. But this thou must consider, that in those days, the same law of giving a bill of divorcement, which was ordained in the 24th of Deuteronomy, was civil: and Christ dealt not as touching the civil affairs. They, which govern a Common-wealth, appoint themselves such a scope, as if two evils or discommodities be offered, the less must be permitted, lest they should fall into the greater. Which may easily be showed in harlots, whom they suffer to live in cities, least more heinous crimes should be committed. Which nevertheless, the law of the Lord in his Common-wealth did not permit. But now I bring this as an example, which although it be not done according to Christianity; yet is it to be seen here and there in many Common-wealth's. Even so, as concerning the affairs of matrimony, when the matches be untoward, one of the two discommodities seemed necessary; that they, which hated their wives, either they would perpetually afflict them, and at length kill them; or else a license of divorcement was to be given them.

This latter evil seemed more tolerable, wherefor God granted the same to be in his Common-wealth: but yet he so granted it, as a bill of divorcement should be written. Wherewith a sharp and intractable man, even in writing of it, might some ways be moved, and might more deeply ponder how dishonest a part it should be, to drive her away from him, with whom even from the beginning he had lived most familiarly. For we be wont more

attentively to ponder those things, which we write, than those things which we speak. Moreover, he commanded, that when she should be cast out by a bill of divorcement; she might never be received again into matrimony by her first husband. So as in these political laws, let a Christian and godly man so behave himself, that he use not this leave, which he seeth is granted him, least we fall into more heinous evils: since he may perceive that it hath some evil also joined with it, although it be the lesser. Wherefore our redeemer hath appointed decrees unto his people, both of piety and religion. In the meantime he condemned not the counsel of God, which he used in the Common-wealth of the Hebrews, for restraining of more grievous sins.

67. Thou shalt not find in the Old Testament any men of praise or renown (so far as the holy histories make mention) that used a divorce Do not object Abraham, which put away Agar, and Ishmael her child from him: for this he did not of his own accord, but at the suit of his wife, and commandment of God. Also Augustine, in the place above recited, did write; that It is unbeseeming for Christian husbands, to take the matter so grievously, that they should not be reconciled to their wives (which fall into adultery) when they be penitent, and show hope of amendment of their life. They must (saith he) consider with themselves, that they be Christians whose part is to incline to mercy, and not to be hard-hearted. David (he saith) took Michal to him again, who nevertheless was coupled to another man. But this example of his seemeth not very effectual, because Michal committed not a full and complete adultery: for the young woman was compelled by her father, who was king, to match herself with another man. So that she was driven unto that latter matrimony, not only by the law of the country, but also by the commandment of the king. In the second place he bringeth in the example of Christ, who seemeth to have pardoned the

adulteress: which (no doubt) is of force to persuade the minds of husbands unto mercy towards their penitent wives. Yet doth it not prove, that adulterers should not be punished by laws and magistrates with death. For Christ, by that action, did not take anything away from the civil laws, or from the severity of public judgments. Bitter men (saith Augustine) did so hate that chapter of John, as they blotted it out of his place. By which words he seemeth to note (as the thing itself declareth) that the same chapter was not found in all the copies. Certainly these men ought to have remembered their own frailness, and to mark how oftentimes they themselves fell into sundry mischiefs; and sometime perchance into the very same kind of sin, of violating the faith of marriage.

68. They moreover, which so obstinately hate their wives, say it is not meet, that husbands who be the heads, and wives, should be both under one law. Nay rather (saith Augustine) seeing the man is the woman's head, her ruler and guide; therefore it had been meet he should excel her in virtue. And he citeth the law of Antonius the emperor, which he saith, he read in Gregory's book, which is on this wise; I judge it to be very unjust, that a man should require chastity of his wife, which he himself performeth not to her. Where upon he decreed, that she should not be condemned of adultery, which proved her husband either guilty of that crime, or else that he gave her an occasion of falling. By these and such other means, Augustine exhorteth men to pardon their wives, when they have offended. Which I very well allow, when there is hope of true repentance, and change of life. So then, if the magistrate once apply his mind to take away these evils, and to reform the faults that be in matrimony; let him provide, that husbands, which complain of their wives naughtiness, being proved in the same fault

themselves, escape not unpunished: and let him provide by good laws, that husbands give unto their wives no occasion of sinning.

69. But when the apostle saith; Unto the remnant speak I, not the Lord. If any brother have a wife that is an infidel, and she is content to dwell with him, let him not put her away, &c. thou shalt note, that dwelling together is required to a just matrimony. Wherefore the Lord said, that he would appoint man a wife to be a helper unto him. Which I speak not, to the intent it should never be lawful for man and wife to be one from another, either by occasion of sickness, or else for other great and urgent necessities: but that married folks may understand, that there should be no let in them to dwell together, and that they should not shun to live one with another. Thou wilt demand perhaps; If the unbelieving party be proved altogether an Atheist, an Epicure, and which hath no regard of religion, so as there is despair of his salvation; whether in that case the party that believeth, ought to remain in wedlock? We answer: Certainly, when the party married is past all hope of salvation, a separation may be made; for the effect being removed, there is left no place for the cause. All the reason of abiding together, was for charity sake; that the faithful man might win his wife unto Christ.

But because it is not lawful to despair of any man, while he liveth; and he that this day is an Atheist, an Epicure, and contemner of religion, tomorrow perhaps will not be so; seeing God hath the hearts of men in his hands: therefore, unless there happen to be a manifest and special revelation of the condemnation of such a one, there ought not to be a departing. But if the same party in the meantime shall be a blasphemer, and a curser of Christ; so as the believer cannot remain in matrimony, without the contumely of Christ (for perhaps the husband cannot abide to be reprehended of blasphemy;) or else that the truth of Christ must be defended by confession:

is it lawful then to depart? Yea verily; for he, which honoreth Christ, if he do not deliver his name from contumely, if he may; or at the least-wise passeth not whether he seem to consent unto the injury done unto him, he sinneth grievously, and in vain taketh himself to be a Christian. Wherefore prudently doth the apostle write; (If the unbeliever will dwell together with the believer:) because he is not judged to be willing, which doth detest the religion of his spouse; who doth revile his God with blasphemies, and suffereth not that his conscience may rest in tranquility and quietness. This is not to dwell together, but to torment the other party, to raise up strife, and utterly to overthrow all domestical peace.

70. Also, if it happen, that the faithful party be weak, and perceiveth himself, by means of that matrimony, to fall away by little and little from Christian religion; so that he is almost led away from the faith, and ready to fall headlong into idolatry, by being with idolaters, what shall he then do? He ought not to abide: for that sentence must stand sure and unshaken; We must not do evil, that good may come thereof. Neither is there any hope then remaining, that the unbelieving party can be converted, which was the cause of retaining matrimony: nay rather it now happened contrariwise, that the believing party should be put in jeopardy of inclining to infidelity. And this was the reason why God, in the Old Testament, appointed matrimony, which was contracted with infidels, to be dissolved by Esdras: because men were by that means stirred up unto such worshipping's, as were forbidden; so far off were they from winning their wives unto the Jews religion. Augustine, in the place now cited, reasoneth on this wise; For this cause Paul wrote these things, for that it was to be feared, that if through the Gospel begun, the matrimonies contracted should be made void, Christian

religion would be condemned; as though it troubled the Common-wealth's, and did cut in sunder honest and lawful contracts.

And there was added another discommodity; namely, that the unbelieving party, suffering a repulse of her husband for religion sake, entangled herself with new marriages, whereby her mind might be the more vehemently hardened in infidelity, and more and more become strange unto Christian religion. Which would not have happened, if the faithful wife had tarried with him. So as it seemeth good, that all means be attempted, before a departure be had. Hereby therefore we see, that Paul doth give leave to depart, not for religion sake only; but in case that the unbelieving party will not dwell together [with the believer.] So as he maketh the obstinate will, to be the cause of departing, rather than unlikeness of religion: seeing he teacheth, that the same after a sort might be abidden. And it appeareth, that the sentence of Christ, wherein he only excepteth whoredom, was not complete: seeing the apostle here added another.

71. Here arise three great doubts. [ 1] First it seemeth, that Paul layeth open the party that believeth unto great peril: for he persuadeth him to remain with an infidel, whereby he perhaps might fall into idolatry; for it is an easy matter to be seduced of the unbelieving party. But it is answered, that it is not so: for, God being then moved by prayers, will help the faithful party, when he perceiveth him to follow his vocation, and that he did not willingly, and of his own accord, procure those dangers. Which had been as much as to tempt God, who seeth, that he abideth not in this kind of marriage by his own will, or for his own commodity sake; but that he may obey the commandment of God, and therefore will help him. Moreover, if it happen that the believer, being weak, perceiveth himself to be led from Christ, he hath leave to depart; as we have instructed before.

[ 2] The second doubt is, for that in committing of whoredom, we therefore sin; because we take the member of Christ, and make the same the member of a harlot. How happeneth it here, that sin is not committed, when as we make the member of Christ (I mean the party that believeth) to be a member of idolatry? It is soon answered; that we do it not: he was the member of his wife before. Only this must be holden, that there should be no parting for the Gospel sake. There is no leave given to him, which already is the member of Christ, that he should become the member of an idolatrous woman, to marry with one that is an infidel: but it is only said, that he should not rashly depart. But in committing of fornication, we which already be the members of Christ, are pulled from him; and make ourselves the members of a harlot. Thou seest that the reason is unlike. Furthermore, it cometh to pass, that in coupling with a harlot, either party is impure; as well the harlot, as he which hath the company of her. So is it not in marriage of persons of unsemblable religion, where the one party; namely, the believer is pure. For he, which committeth whoredom, is not only mingled in body with a harlot, but also he consenteth with her in the wicked desire of fornication. So that both of them, as well touching the mind, as the body, are defiled. But here, in marriages of contrary religion, they are not coupled together in respect of faith; but in bodies only: and Paul testifieth, that from the body of the infidel, uncleanness is taken away, that the other party may not be contaminated. In the meantime, faith remaineth sound, and the mind pure, in the party sanctified: which faith hath no place in committing of whoredom.

The last doubt is; if a Christian husband dwell with an idolatrous and an unbelieving wife, and that he ought not rashly to depart, and yet may depart from an adulteress; it seemeth to follow, that adultery is a more grievous

sin, and more intolerable than idolatry is. Chrysostom answereth, that God is so very good, as sometime he preferreth our commodities before his own: for he willeth, that the sacrifice be left at the altar, and before we do offer sacrifice, a reconciliation is to be made with our neighbors. He sometime forbeareth to have a debt paid unto him, and forgiveth the same: but us he will not absolve, unless we satisfy our neighbor. Wherefore the argument is but feeble, wherein thou didest gather, that idolatry is a lesser sin than adultery; because the spouse is permitted [to tarry] with the idolatrous wife, and from adultery he may depart. But it appeareth, that we may make a more perfect answer; that in very deed idolatry, in his own nature, is a more grievous sin than adultery: but that adultery is more repugnant to wedlock than idolatry, wherein man and wife should be one flesh, and by adultery be drawn one from another. It is true indeed, that idolatry is more repugnant unto God than adultery is; but adultery is a greater enemy to marriage than idolatry. Which doth hereby appear, for that marriages are had between idolaters and Mahumets.

72. But whether David did well, in taking of the Synamite to wife, it appeareth doubtful unto some. For those that are cold [of nature] when they marry wives, they seem not to do the part of a married man, because according to human laws, such marriages be not firm: for cold persons do enforce themselves to perform that which they are not able. Certainly, there have been many things decreed touching this matter, as well by the Civil as by the Canon laws. First they decree, that if there be a continual defect; those which be contracted, ought to be separated; so that the party, which sueth for separation, had no foreknowledge of that disease. For if the woman, contracting with a man in ill state, did know thereof before, she cannot for that cause step back from her husband. There is a law had

concerning spousages, in the law *Mulier*, which ordained in this wise; If before matrimony contracted, the wife knew of the infamy or the impotency of the man, let her impute it to her own self, she cannot seek for divorce. In the Digests *Ad legem Iuliam de adulterijs*, in the law *Si vxor*, about the end it is said; If any man know that a woman hath committed adultery, and shall afterward marry her, he cannot accuse her of adultery: for seeing he took her to wife, and had knowledge of it, he seemed to allow of her conditions.

The same hath the Canon law determined, as in the 33rd cause, question 1. in the chapter *Requisisti*, the Gloss saith; If the woman knew the impediment of the man, and contract with him, she cannot step back. But admit she knew it not, shall the matrimony be firm? Gregory, in the Canon alleged, did counsel, that they should dwell together; to the intent the woman, if she cannot be a wife, may be a sister. But this he speaketh by counsel, not by commandment. For if she deny with loud voice, and say, that she would be a mother, and bear children; she is heard. Howbeit, they make a condition; namely, that she shall gain-say it within the space of two months (as appeareth in the *Extravagants De frigidis and maleficiatis*, in the first Canon;) seeing if she abide long, she seemeth by her own consent to have confirmed the marriage. But the rigor of this law is not observed at this day, but a longer space of time is appointed, and that justly: for he perhaps may seem cold at the beginning, which will not be so afterward. What shall be done then, if she gainsay it, and yet allow it? If the husband will stand at denial, he must be credited: but if he confess it, they shall be separated, and leave is given unto the woman, to provide another marriage.

Which nevertheless ought not to be done over hastily: for they will have the space of three years to be expected; to the end a longer, and a more sure experience may be had. The same have the civil laws judged. *Justinian De*

*repudijs*, in the law *In causis*, first assigneth two years; but there in the Paraph *Sed body*, he assigneth three years, and it doth very well agree with the Popes Canons. The same he hath in the Authentikes, in *Collatione* 4. in the Paraph *Per occasionem*; namely, that three years be given. Howbeit, this must be understood on this wise; Unless a plain proof thereof can be had before, because it ought not then to be deferred. But some men say; that It is possible, that judges may be deceived, that the disease may sometime be cured, and that the space of three years seemeth not to be sufficient, that he might marry with another, and have children, and that in conversation they might both of them sometimes confess their coldness, because they might find the means to be separated. If this should happen, they would that the man, being afterward found fit for procreation, should renew his former marriage. But this is not observed. The same do they affirm of them, which be hindered by devilish practices. But because the devil doth sometimes hinder, so as a man is able to use the company of one woman, and not of another; therefore matrimony is assigned to be with her, from whom he is not let. These things are said touching women.

73. But if the man do either know, or be ignorant that he is cold, what then shall be done? If he be ignorant of it, he is after a sort excused; and it is lawful for him to ask a divorce, whereby he may be eased of the charges of marriage. But if he know before, that he had the disease of coldness, he is compelled to find and maintain his wife, whom he deceived. The Popes canons decree, that he should marry no more: as it is read in the place a little before alleged, *De frigidis & maleficiatis*. Howbeit, there be some, which say; If he can find any that will have him to her husband, so he make known this imperfection, he may contract matrimony with her. But what manner of marriage will that be, when it is done neither for procreation of

children, neither for avoiding of whoredom? Unto this they answer, according to the saying of Augustine, which we read in the 27th cause, question the first, in the chapter *Nuptiarum*: and it is written in the eighth chapter *De bono conjugali*. In the old time, marriage was an obedience of the law; now it is for the redress of our infirmity, and for the comfort of mankind. But the place is ambiguous, for the comfort of mankind may have a respect unto procreation of children; since thereby the parents conceive no small pleasure, wherein they delight themselves. Howbeit, at this day, they admit this kind of marriage: and there be many found, which do peaceably live together.

They, which entreat of these things, have considered, that there is a great difference between coldness and old age. And they define, that old age must never be driven from marriage. In ancient time was made the law called *Papia*, or *Papaea*, under Tiberius Caesar (whereof Tranquillus in Claudio maketh mention, and so doth Lactantius;) whereby it was provided, that they which were past three score years of age, should not marry wives; and that the women should not be married, which did exceed the age of fifty years. But these laws were abolished by Justinian: as is to be found in the Code *De nuptijs*, in the law *Sancimus*. For this coldness is not in all persons alike. Howbeit, neither the laws of emperors, nor of bishops gave liberty to them, which were gelded men indeed, to marry. Yet it behooveth, that that coldness or devilish practices, which may dissolve matrimony, should be perpetual. For skillful men do sometime make a remedy for things, which hurt but for a time. Besides this, it is necessary, that the impediment be before the contracting of matrimony: for if they once become one flesh, marriage is not undone. Of this matter also wrote the Master of the sentences, in the fourth book, the 34th distinction.

74. Now remaineth that we entreat particularly of the matrimony of David. And this will we first note, that he was not moved unto that marriage, of his own accord, neither of lust, or of naughty desire; but by the advise of his noble men, and by the prudent counsel of physicians. Nevertheless, thou wilt say, that a naughty advise and a wicked, must not be admitted. This in very deed is true: but in this matter (so far as may appear) neither lewdness of mind, nor naughty desire can be proved. First, old age nothing hindered, but that the king might contract matrimony: who perhaps also was thought, that as touching coldness, he might be restored; although not to the strength; which he was wont to have, yet so, as should be fit for his old body. Certainly Abraham was restored, when he was an hundred years of age: so that after the death of Sara he married another, and by her he did beget children. Neither was there wanting natural helps to David, wherewith the physicians thought they might restore him. Moreover, if they declared unto the damsel the old man's impediment, and the same being known, she gave her consent, she sustained no injury. It might be added, that her mind was persuaded by God, that she should consent for the benefit of the whole kingdom. Notwithstanding, if she were moved thereto by ambition; the counsel had not been good. But to judge rashly of these points, it standeth neither with our godliness, nor yet with our authority. Seeing these things might be done of a sincere mind, and by the will of God; I think they ought rather to be taken in good part. This doth the history teach, that this damsel was not long with the king; because within a while after he died: howbeit, his life, which was very necessary for the Common-wealth, was prolonged for a while. Yet thus much I will admonish, that we need not labor so much to excuse the fathers of blame; who also ought not to be charged, unless the history compel thereunto. Neither will we pass it

over, that God used the occasion of this damsel to oppress Adonias, and to establish the kingdom of Solomon.

# CHAP. XI. Of Whoredom, fornication, adultery, and other noisome things, which are contrary to the seventh commandment.

Now I think it good to speak somewhat of whoredom or fornication. For as there were many in old time, so now there are not a few, which affirm, that it is no sin. But I will prove by the scriptures, and by most certain reasons, that it is a grievous sin. They which extenuate this wicked crime, do ground upon diverse arguments. First, in the Acts of the apostles, the 15th chapter, when in those first times there arose a dissention among the Jews and the Grecians, it was by common assent decreed, that the Ethnics should abstain from blood, from strangled, from things offered unto idols, and from fornication. Here (say they) whoredom is reckoned among those things, which in their own nature are not sins: wherefore it appeareth, that of itself it is not sin. For these things were then for a time decreed by the apostles, that Christians might live peaceably together. For No creature of God is evil: as Paul unto Timothy saith. Furthermore, they say, God would not command that, which of itself is sin: but he bad Oseas the prophet, to take unto him a harlot, and to beget children of fornication; so that of its own nature it seemeth not to be evil. Moreover, every sin is

against charity: either against that charity, which we owe unto God; or else that, which we owe unto our neighbor. But in whoredom or fornication, there seemeth to be nothing committed against God; for his honor and religion is not hurt: neither also against our neighbor, for there is no violence used against his wife; neither is there any wrongful oppression committed.

Moreover, Augustine in his book *De bono coniugali*, writeth, that as meat is unto the body, so is the bed for procreation. But if a man eat and drink a little more than he ought, he is not accused of sin: so likewise, if a man do stray a little in the company of women, he is not to be judged guilty of sin. Lastly, those things, which God hath forbidden as sins, are so plain and manifest, that even by the light of nature, everyone may understand them to be sins: but fornication, in man's judgment, is not so accounted; and many think that it is no sin. Mitio in the Comedy in Terence saith; Believe me it is no wicked act for a young man to commit fornication. And there wanted not some in the church of Corinth, which were of that opinion. So as by these reasons, the filthiness of whoredom is so extenuated, that either it is not counted for sin; or else thought that it should be reckoned among the least sins.

2. We must not have a respect unto the reasons of men, but unto the word of God; not what men think or judge, but what the holy Ghost speaketh in the holy scriptures. In the prophets, and in Solomon there is detesting of fornication in every place: but in the law they say there is nothing decreed against it. Seeing they will reason by the law, I also will bring testimonies out of it; whereby it may easily be understood, that fornication is forbidden. In Leviticus, in the book of Numbers, and in Deuteronomy, the Jews are forbidden to link themselves unto strange women. Again, in Deuteronomy

the 25th chapter, it is commanded, that there should be no harlot nor common woman in Israel. Let these places be compared together. It was not lawful to have any harlots, neither strange women, nor yet women of Israel: Therefore they were all forbidden. But some will say, How then had Samson fellowship with an harlot? Some of the Hebrews answer, that she was not an harlot, with whom Samson had fellowship; but one that kept a vitling house. But forsomuch as that is but a weak answer, me thinketh that another answer must be made. The public-wealth of the Hebrews was at that time corrupted: for they lived then under the Philistines. Neither is it any marvel, if they had then received some of their vices and corrupt manners. Wherefore, some harlots they had; howbeit, not by reason of their own laws, but through the use and conversation of the Philistines.

3. But in the New Testament, whoredom is openly and manifestly forbidden. To the Hebrews it is thus written; Adulterers and fornicators the Lord will judge. The Lord is not said to judge and to avenge, except it be for grievous sins. And to the Ephesians, not only covetous men and idolaters, but also fornicators are excluded from the kingdom of God. To the Corinthians also, where Paul writeth of excommunication; I speak not (saith he) of all sorts of fornicators, but if any brother be named a fornicator, with such ye shall not so much as eat. But he treateth much more manifestly of all this matter, in the sixth chapter of the same epistle, and that of very purpose. For many (as it is said) were of an evil opinion as touching this kind of wickedness. First (he saith;) Meat is ordained for the belly, and the belly for meat, but God shall destroy both this and that; now the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord. Moreover, all meat of his own nature is pure; but for the offense of our neighbor, we ought sometimes to abstain. Howbeit, some man might say; Meat is necessary to live by. It is (saith

Paul) in this life, but in the blessed resurrection God shall destroy both the meat and the belly. Wherefore, thou must not so much esteem it, that for such a cause thou shouldest offend thy brother. It is not commanded, that thou shouldest abstain from all meat generally, but from that only, whereby thy weak brother is offended. But as touching fornications (saith he) of which ye make small account, there is a far other respect; Your body is not appointed for fornication, but for the Lord.

And this must not be passed over, that Paul with great wisdom saith not, that the body is not given for procreation, but that it is not given for fornication; since the body is also given for procreation sake. Oftentimes men are wont to excuse their faults, and to impute them unto nature. The nature of the body (saith he) is that it may be given unto the Lord: so then the rule of life must be taken thereby, and not by evil examples. This is the nature of relatives, not only of those relatives, which in the self-same thing that they be, belong to other; but also of those, which by any means are referred to another thing: as the head unto the body, and likewise the body unto the head. For when we see the head, we straightway require the body: and again, when we see the body, we require the head. Such relatives, as the Logicians say, are called *Secundum dici*. The Lord is the head of the body of the church, and the church is the body of his head. Wherefore Paul, both wisely and pithily disputeth, when he saith; The body is not made to this end, that it should pollute itself with lusts, but to be correspondent unto the head, and to be conformable unto it. And he addeth; God, which hath raised up Christ, shall raise us up also by his power. The first argument was taken from relatives, the second from God himself. For if he shall raise up our bodies, as he hath raised up Christ, why then do we shamefully use them? He proceedeth further, and saith; But do you not know, that your bodies are

the members of Christ? Shall I then take the member of Christ, and make it the member of a harlot? Undoubtedly a weighty argument, which he concludeth; Shall I take (saith he) the member of Christ? As though he should have said; No without doubt: for this were to rent in pieces the body of Christ. And it is a most cruel thing to pluck away the members from a lively body, and to join them to a rotten or dead body. But herein the strength of the reason doth consist; Christ cannot commit fornication; wherefore, if thou wilt commit fornication, thou must be first plucked from Christ. Here is showed, that fornication is not only a sin; but also a deadly and most grievous sin, because it plucketh us away from Christ.

4. Afterward he addeth; He which coupleth himself unto a harlot, is become one body [with her:] for they shall be two in one flesh. And he, which is joined with God, is one spirit. This place is very full of consolation: forsomuch as it declareth, that we are joined most nigh unto Christ, from whom we must needs be plucked away, before we be made the members of a harlot. He, which cleaveth unto a harlot, is become one body with her: for they shall be two in one flesh. The apostle seemeth at the first sight to abuse the words of Genesis, in transferring them to whoredom, which be spoken of matrimony. For these words were first spoken of Adam and Eve: because the flesh of Eve was before in the flesh of Adam, from whom God took a rib, and made thereof a woman, which he again joined unto Adam, to be with him one flesh. But in very deed the apostle abuseth not this sentence, forsomuch as whoredom is a certain corrupting of matrimony: seeing one matter; namely, the conjunction of the flesh, is common to both. For bodies are communicated as well here as there. So as Paul had a respect to that, which is common to them both, when as yet there is this difference between them; that in whoredom the conjunction is against

the law of God: and therefore fornicators must be pulled one from another, otherwise there is left no hope of salvation for them. But in matrimony the knitting together is brought to pass by God, and therefore it is become an indissoluble knot. Seeing then the coupling together is all one, and the self-same in either of them; Paul did rightly apply that sentence to whoredom. He that cleaveth unto God, is one spirit. These words serve much for this present matter: for if we be with God one spirit, we must with earnest labor fly from those things, which he hath forbidden. Wherefore aptly hath the apostle added; Fly from whoredom. He saith moreover; Every sin, which a man committeth, is without the body; but he, which committeth whoredom, sinneth against his own body. If the arguments, which I have brought before, do not move you; at the leastwise have a regard to your own body, the which you seem to hate and contemn, when ye commit whoredom.

But it may be demanded, how other sins be without the body; and how by fornication we sin against our own body? For we doubt not, but he which is very angry, nourisheth and augmenteth choler: whereby the body is not a little hurt. Sickness also doth very much weaken the body: wherefore Solomon saith; A sorrowful spirit drieth up the bones. Again, drunkenness and gluttony do hinder health, and do in a manner utterly destroy the body. Yea and envious persons do seem also to sin against their own body: for thou mayest perceive them to be dried, withered, and in a manner dead with leanness. How can it then be, that other sins are without the body? Some say that fornicators do sin against their own body; because very many times, through the company, which they have with whores, they are infected with the pocks, and with leprosy. But let others say what they will: I had rather think, that the apostle had respect unto those things that went before; in so much as he had said, that the fornicator is made one body with a

harlot. And he seemeth to sin very grievously against the worthy state of his body, who maketh it all one with the most vile and filthy body of a harlot. For if any king or prince should marry a wife of a simple and base degree, it will be said, that he hath stained his kindred. I know there be some, which think that these words are spoken hyperbolically: because there be found other sins also, which hurt the body; but this sin doth most grievously and most of all hurt it.

5. The same Paul doth yet further argue; Do ye not know that your bodies are the temple of the holy Ghost? And assuredly, he which destroyeth the temple of God, him will God destroy. As if he had said; Ye have not your bodies of yourselves, but of God; God hath made them his temple, and the holy Ghost dwelleth in them; ye are not your own: wherefore ye do not a little violate justice, in defiling the thing that belongeth to another. Ye are bought with a great price, glorify therefore God in your body. These arguments of Paul are excellent, and of very great weight: wherewith if any man be not well satisfied, let him look upon Samson. He was no idolater, no murderer, no thief; and yet was he taken, bound, his eyes put out, cast into prison, and compelled there to grind, as if he had been a four-footed beast. Paul by many arguments laboreth to prove whoredom to be sin. And no marvel, seeing he then wrote to the Corinthians, who at that time exceeded others in fornications: whereof came the proverb; *Non cuiuis Corinthum*; that is, It is not meet for every man to go to Corinth. And generally, all the Ethnics were in an ill opinion touching this vice. For which cause, when the church was yet in growing (as Eusebius testifieth in the 3rd book of his history, the 29th chapter,) The Nicolaits did openly and manifestly commit fornication and fathered the custom of their naughtiness upon Nicolas the deacon.

Howbeit Clemens, bishop of Alexandria, in his Stromata, doth excuse Nicolas; for he saith, that he neither thought nor taught any such thing. But having a very fair woman to his wife, and was thought to be jealous over her, he brought her forth before the people, and said; This is my wife. And that ye might understand that I am not jealous over her, I am content for my part, that any man take her to wife. Which also he meant, so far as the law of God would suffer. Howbeit, they which were afterward called Nicolaites, understanding his words perversely, supposed him to think, that wives among Christians ought to be common. Of this sect it is written in the Apocalypse; But this thou hast, because thou hast hated the doings of the Nicolaites, which I also hate. So that it is no marvel, if Paul took so great pains, to teach that whoredom is sin.

6. This mischief is an enemy unto matrimony, seeing they which follow wanton lusts, and harlots, are enemies unto marriage. Whereupon Terence saith; They which love, can ill abide to take a wife. For which cause Clemens saith, that Whoredom leadeth from one matrimony unto many; that is, from one lawful conjunction, to many unlawful and wicked. The epistle to the Hebrews joineth fornicators with adulterers, and testifieth, that God will judge them. And these two vices are so joined together, that they are comprehended in the self-same precept, wherein it is said; Thou shalt not commit adultery. Also this pestilent vice is repugnant both unto charity, and to the public wealth. Unto charity (I say;) because the fornicators do injury unto their children, who not being lawfully procreated, are scarcely at any time brought up honestly and virtuously. And they hurt the Common-wealth; because they defraud it of good citizens. For Manzer, a bastard I mean, and one born in fornication, is forbidden to be received into the church: not that he is restrained from the holy communion, or from the

mysteries of salvation; but because it is not lawful for him to rule the public wealth, and to be numbered among citizens. Some think, that this evil would be remedied, if a man might keep a concubine at home: so (say they) the issue shall be certain. Certain perhaps it might be, but lawful it shall not be. Seeing therefore that this mischief is both against matrimony, and charity, and also the public-wealth; it cannot be denied, but that it is a sin most grievous.

And for so much as it is so; why are the stews at this day openly suffered in cities? I speak not of the Ethnics, I speak of the Christians; and of those Christians, which will alone seem to be the successors of Christ, and to be called by that name. Within their dominion whoredom is most shamefully maintained, they not only being willing unto it, but also taking advantage and revenues for the same. That which is against the word of God, against matrimony, against charity, and against the public wealth; either it is no sin at all, or else it is a notable sin. If it be a sin, why is it not taken away, and weeded out? Howbeit, I know what they will babble. They bring forth Augustine, who in his book *De ordine*, writeth thus; Take away brothel houses, and all places will be filled with filthy lusts. But let us consider at what time Augustine wrote this book. Doubtless, while he was yet *Catechumenus*, that is, unbaptized, and not sufficiently instructed in religion. And although he had not been *Catechumenus*, yet this saying of his doth not agree with the word of God, neither with very Augustine himself: who in another place affirmeth, that the good, which cometh of evil, as a recompense, must not be admitted. Which also Paul unto the Romans taught, even as they were wont to say of us; Let us do evil, that good may come thereof, whose damnation is just. We must never have regard to the end and event, when we be urged by the commandment of God. Sometimes

men say unto us; Unless thou commit sin, this or that evil will succeed. But we must answer what God hath commanded; the care of the success shall rest upon him. Neither is it meet, that one only sentence of Augustine should be of greater authority, than so many reasons, which we have brought, and so many plain places of the word of God.

7. God commanded absolutely, and by express words, that there should be no harlot in Israel. But some go about to wrest this place from us, in saying that these Hebrew words, *Kedescha* and *Kedeschim*, signify not Whores or Harlots; but rather the priests of Priapus, which were vowed and consecrated to things most filthy. But contrariwise, I think, that *Kedescha* signifieth an Harlot; and *Kedeschim*, Buggerers and effeminate persons. God would have neither of those suffered among the people. And that, which they object of the holy services of Priapus, it is nothing. For it was sufficiently before decreed touching idolatry: and what need it to be repeated again? Yet that we may the more manifestly understand, that *Kedescha* signifieth an Harlot; let us read the history of Judah and Tamar in the book of Genesis; and there we shall see, that Zonah and *Kedescha*, are taken both for one and the self-same thing. For which cause we must note, that there are certain words, which may be taken both in the good and evil part. Of which sort among the Hebrews, is this word *Kedescha*, which signifieth, both Holy, and also a Harlot: even as is this word *Sacrum* among the Latins, and it signifieth cursed. And thereupon Virgil saith; *Auri sacra fames*, that is; The cursed hunger of gold. This Hebrew word *Kedes*, is To prepare, or To be prepared: whereof is derived that word, which signifieth an Harlot; because such women are prepared and set ready for all men: or else, because they are wont to go trimly decked and painted. Wherefore Clemens saith, that The Lacedaemonians suffered harlots to wear wrought

garments, fine apparel, and gold: which things were not lawful for matrons to use.

Now let us see what followeth in Deuteronomy; And the hire of a harlot shall not be brought into the sanctuary. Here again the law calleth that *Zonah*, which it had before called *Kedescha*. But thou wilt say; If the law would not have harlots to be suffered, what needed it to have forbidden their oblations? What needed this law? They which speak on this wise, do seem indeed to speak wittily; but yet they speak not sufficiently. For foreign nations also sent gifts for the furniture and use of the temple. The Eunuch of the Queen of Ethiopia came to Jerusalem, to offer in the temple. The Macedonians and Romans gave yearly oblations and sacrifices in the temple. Wherefore the law forbiddeth, that if anything be offered by strangers that is gotten by the gain of a harlot, the same should not be admitted into the sanctuary. Besides this, God had given a charge, that there should be no harlot in Israel: but he knew that they would not observe that law. And when the Philistines, Macedonians, and Romans reigned over them, they had harlots. Yea and Christ maketh mention of harlots and publicans together. Then right well doth God first forbid, that there should be no harlots among the Hebrews: and afterward he decreeth, that if in case they were had, the gain coming of them, should not be admitted into the sanctuary. Which undoubtedly he commanded, because of the vileness and filthiness of the gain. In the same place he added; The price also of a dog shall not be brought into the sanctuary: because that beast is fowl and unclean.

8. Caligula, otherwise a detestable monster, decreed (as we have in Suetonius) that they, which should commit whoredom or brothelry, should be openly punished. Hereof Hostiensis writeth ridiculously; Harlots indeed

(saith he) are bound to pay and to offer, but the church cannot nor ought not to receive the same. Yet the gloss doth much better decree in the Decretals, distinction the 90th in the chapter *Oblationis*; namely, that Nothing at all, which cometh of the gain of a harlot, should be offered in the church. But priests and monks, when they feared that some of their profit should be gone, have devised another reason. For although (say they) the gain of harlots cannot be received for an oblation; yet nothing letteth, but that it may be received for alms. But after what sort doth the Pope receive the money of harlots? Surely, not as an oblation, because he cannot; nor as alms, because he is not poor: it resteth therefore, that he receiveth the same as a prince. The Lord would not have this kind of money in his sanctuary; but the Pope will have it in his treasury, and he hath it, and getteth a wonderful great gain by it. Whose vicar then is the Pope? God's vicar? Nay, God refused such a gain. What? Is he the vicar of Christ? But Christ never departed from the will of his father. Then must it consequently follow, that he is antichrist; when as he both teacheth and doth those things, which are expressly and purposely against the word of God and of Christ. But he will say, that he exacteth this money as a prince. Let him then be a prince. But I demand, whether he be an evil prince, or a good prince? It is not lawful for a good prince to depart from the laws of God. Let him then be an evil prince: let him be even a Caligula.

Peradventure he will answer, that in respect he is a prince, he doth according to the civil laws, which do not take away harlots out of the Romans dominion: yea rather, they disdain not to decree somewhat touching their price or reward. In the Digests *De condictione ob turpem causam*, in the law *Idem etsi*, it is decreed; that They cannot demand again, that which they have given to a harlot. And there is a reason added; For

though it be a shame for a harlot to be a harlot, yet it is no shame to take her hire being a harlot. These words are obscure, so that they may seem to be a riddle. Further in the Digests, in the title *De donationibus*, in the law *Affectionis gratia*, it is decreed; that It is lawful to give as well unhonestly as honestly. It is lawful honestly to give, as to parents, kinsfolk, friends, &c: unhonestly, as to harlots. But I would know, by what license that is lawful? Hath God given goods unto men, to cast them away on harlots? Howbeit, they confess here, that some shamefulness there is: for though it be lawful to give, yet if thou hast promised anything unto a harlot, thy obligation bindeth thee not; neither can the harlot challenge thy promise: as it may be seen in the Glose, in the title *De donationibus*, in the law *Ea quae*.

But it is a doubt, that if she do not receive it shamefully, why it may not be lawful for her to ask it without shame. They answer, that this followeth not: because many things are taken honestly, which are not honestly demanded. And for that matter he citeth the law 1. *De varijs & extraordinarijs cognationibus*. Wherefore the Pope will not, by the civil laws, take away harlots; but receive money of them: which he seeth cannot be suffered by the laws of God. But here I will reason with him a little. Certainly he professeth himself to be a ruler over the civil laws, and in very deed he hath altered many of them, as though he would amend them; when as yet he hath taken away the good, and sometime, in the stead of them, hath put such as be evil. Whie hath he not amended those laws for the suffering of harlots; seeing they be repugnant to the law of God? Undoubtedly, the true cause why he hath not taken away the laws of harlots, is this: because it should be over hurtful unto the Popes treasury. For at Rome they measure their laws by profit, and not by honesty.

9. Howbeit, by what civil right do they receive money of harlots? They answer; for tribute. But why do not they rather say; for brothelry? Doubtless, if we will speak truly, Popes in this respect are not altogether free from brothelry. Let them diligently mark the civil laws, whereby they now go about to defend themselves, and over which they boast themselves to be rulers; and let them look what those judge of brothelry. In the Digests *De ritu nuptiarum*, in the law *Palàm*, it is thus written; He which hath bondwomen for gain, the same committeth brothelry. Now I demand of these men, in what condition they count the harlots in Rome? For citizens? Nothing less. They count them therefore in a manner for bond-women, and of them they make gain: so as in a manner they are brothelers or bawds. As much might be said of usury. In their dominions they suffer Jews, which are usurers; and they take gain of their usury, every year a certain part, the twentieth part at the least. Wherefore the Pope is not only a bawd, but also a usurer. And that which I affirm of the Pope, let profane princes also take heed, least the same should be also said of them, which exercise this kind of gain of the Jews. To them undoubtedly agreeth that saying of David; If thou sawest a thief, thou rannest with him, and laidst thy portion with adulterers.

But they say that these be tributes. But in the Code, in the title *De pectigalibus & commissis*, in the law *Ex praestatione*, and in the law *Allegatis*; Tribute is defined to be that, which is paid for those things, which are brought into the public wealth from foreign nations: for they are called in Latin, *Vectigalia*, of the verb *Vebere*, which signifieth To carry. And the eight part of everything was paid, in the name of a tribute, or custom. Wherefore customers were called *Octauarij*, of *Octaua parte*, that is, The eighth part, which they gathered. But what (I pray you) do harlots bring unto the public wealth? Even filthiness and lusts; of the which the Courtiers

and Popish priests do gather not the eight part, but the whole. These *Vectigalia* are also called tributes and customs, which are taken of fields and lands. But what fields have harlots? What lands? None forsooth: then let them leave to excuse a most shameful thing by so honest a title. I know they will say; If harlots were suffered to be free and at liberty, they would sin more licentiously. O goodly kind of correction!

Can harlots be restrained by no other means, but so? They ought rather to decree, that they should not remain in the city, that they should have ill-favored and dark houses, that they should cast away all the ornaments of the body, that they should not come abroad openly; and they should be shamed by some notes of dishonesty, that thereby they might be mocking stocks to the world. By this means they might peradventure be called home into the right way. But now (good God!) how are they kept under? Their houses be most gorgeous, they ride openly in chariots, appareled like princes, they ride upon their fine foot-cloths. They have in their company men wearing chains, and disguised persons, yea and sometimes Cardinals, especially in the night, and a most sumptuous train of waiting women. Will they deny that these things are true? Then let grave and faithful men, which have at any time been in Rome, show whether the thing be so or no. If they will not believe me, I can bring for witness both Cardinals and Prelates of Rome.

10. Paulus the third of that name declared once, that he minded some reformation of the church: he committed the matter to certain Cardinals and Bishops, which were counted more pure than the rest. And what they judged, it is extant in the third volume of Councils. And they complain, that the power of harlots is so great at Rome, as it was in no other place the like. But hath Paulus the third amended this? Also in the synod of Trent, the clergy of Rome promised some great reformation: but they did it not;

neither did they endeavor it at all. Why do they not rather imitate and follow the laws of Justinian? He, in his Authentiks, in the title *De Jenonibus*, willeth, that Harlots should be utterly thrust out of the city; and that, if they promised anything unto bawds, they should not be bound to pay and accomplish the same. Nay rather, if they have sworn to be harlots for a time, the Pope absolveth them of their oath. These things do these men dissemble, and do suffer and maintain harlots. Which nevertheless we are not to wonder at: for seeing they so diligently retain and increase spiritual fornication of minds; namely, superstition and idolatry, how can they but join therewith the fornication of the body? But seeing they took away wives from their massing priests, it was a hard thing, yea and impossible, to be without brothel houses.

Justinian sorrowed, because he saw brothel houses so nigh unto the churches of God: but now they dwell in the midst of cities, not far from the houses of divine service; and it grieveth not the Pope one whit. But let the owners, in whose houses these harlots dwell, plead their own cause. But such houses, for the most part, appertain to Bishops and churches: and they will say; We do not take part of the gain of a harlot, but (as meet is) we receive rents of our houses. Which is not prohibited by the civil laws: for in the *Digests De petitione baereditatis*, in the law *Ancillarum*, it is said; that Brothel houses are used in the city rents of honest men. And in the same title, in the law *Si possessor*, it is ordained; that If a man have dishonest gains, he should be compelled to restore them, least an honest meaning might bring profit unto him that is an owner, by a dishonest gain. Howbeit, seeing they will maintain it by laws, why have they not a respect unto the interpretation of those laws? Namely, if this kind of gain be once exacted of harlots, that ought to be restored unto the heir: otherwise it is not lawful to

require them. Neither can contrariety of laws be avoided by any other means: for these laws should not agree with those of Justinian, which are to be read in the Authentiks. *De Jenonibus & scenicis mulicribus*.

But let them (I beseech you) mark the words which are read in the title *De ritu nuptiarum*, in the law *Palàm*: and in the title *De ijs, qui notantur infamia*, in the law *Athletas*; that That woman is infamous, which professeth herself a harlot, and he also that is partaker of the gain; and generally, that all bawds are infamous. Let us also (which is of much more weight) have a regard to the word of God, who commandeth; Be ye holy, for I am holy. What do we gather by these words? Even that that is not to be suffered among Christians, whereby men are made infamous. So then let bawds and harlots be removed away, forsomuch as these kind of persons are noted infamous by the civil law. But they will say; Men oftentimes fall, and sometimes commit those things, whereby they are made infamous. I grant it: yet is not this to be borne withal, whereby they are made infamous, whether they will or no. But though they had a thousand civil laws on their side, yet ought we more to esteem the word of God. Jerome, speaking hereof, writeth very well in his epitaph of Fabiola; Civil laws (saith he) ought not so carefully to be cited; Papinianus writeth one thing, and Paul another. And before Jerome, Tertullian De anima; Brothel houses (saith he) are detestable before God.

11. But if harlots (say they) should be suffered, there is some hope of their conversion. For Christ saith; The harlots and publicans shall go before you into the kingdom of heaven. But let them show me, whether they can by no other means be called home into the kingdom of God, but by sufferance. But he meaneth not harlots, so long as they be harlots, and be not converted. For what cause then is it said, that they shall go before the Pharisees and

Scribes into the kingdom of God? Because they, being converted, do acknowledge and bewail their sins: but the Pharisees and Scribes regarded not their wicked acts, but would seem to be most holy. If harlots should be suffered, because they may be converted; then shall there be no sin so grievous, which ought to be punished. For there is none so far past grace, but that some hope remaineth, that he may be called home into the right way. And so by this means, all laws shall be silent. They say moreover, that God did forbid harlots, as we read in Deuteronomy; and yet they were afterward permitted: for Solomon gave judgment between two harlots. First I answer, that it is not certain that they were harlots: in so much as this word Zonah, signifieth her also that keepeth a vitling house, and one that getteth her living by sundry sort of gain. Further, though they were harlots; it is yet but a weak and frivolous argument. For we must not reason from that which is done, unto that which ought to be done. God undoubtedly forbad harlots, but afterward discipline quailed, and many things were committed against the law. Howbeit, we must have a regard, not unto that which is done; but unto that, which God hath commanded to be done: otherwise, if we will live according to examples, there are ill examples enow everywhere.

For Popes and Cardinals do not only suffer harlots; but also they themselves keep them as things most dainty. Neither can they abide the Canons, which decree, that a priest for whoredom should be deprived; in the distinct 82nd chapter Presbyter: when nevertheless the Gloss saith there; Now a days no man is deposed for whoredom. The same we have in the 2nd cause, question 7. chapter *Lator*. The apostle excludeth whoremongers from the kingdom of God, but these exclude them not from the church: neither think they that they ought to be deposed. But it is no marvel, seeing they say that the bishop may dispense with adulteries, and other light crimes: as

may be perceived in the *Extravagants De iudicijs*, in the law *At clerici*. They be the words of Alexander the third: whereby it appeareth, that these men account adulteries for very small crimes. Whie should we then depend upon their examples? Philo a Jew saith; that In the public wealth of the Jews, harlots might not be suffered: for of necessity it behooved all, when they came to ripe years, to be either husbands or wives. Some widows indeed there were, but those were ancient in years, and of a tried chastity. This example should we follow; namely, of such a holy public wealth: and not the example of the Popes court.

At a certain time I being in Rome, remembered a witty saying of Crates. He; when he came to Delphi, and saw in the temple of Apollo, a golden image of Phryne a very notable harlot, cried out; Behold a triumphant token of the wantonness of the Grecians! So I considering there the sumptuousness and magnificence of harlots, said; Behold a token of the wantonness of the bishops of Rome's prelates! But let us leave them, and proceed with the words of God, and the reasons brought from thence. Basil, in his first book upon the Psalms, expounding these words; And hath not sit in the chair of pestilence, writeth very well: Whoredom (saith he) stayeth not itself in one man, but invadeth a whole city. For someone young man coming unto a harlot, taketh unto himself a fellow; and the same fellow also taketh another fellow. Wherefore, even as fire, being kindled in a city, if the wind blow vehemently, stayeth not in the burning of one house or two, but spreadeth far and wide, and draweth a great destruction with it: even so this mischief, being once kindled, rangeth over all the city. Ambrose also prudently writeth upon the 119th Psalm, alleging the words of the 16th chapter of the Proverbs; Who can nourish burning coals in his bosom, and not be burnt with them? Who (saith he) can think that harlots may be

nourished in a city, and young men not be corrupted with whoredom? And so may we aptly invert that sentence of Augustine; If thou take away harlots, all places shall be filled with filthy lust. We rather say the contrary; Nourish harlots, and all places shall be filled with filthy lusts.

They object again a recompense of sins, and will have brothel houses to be suffered, lest violence should be offered unto honest matrons. I have answered before, that Evil things must not be done, that good may come thereof. Yea, but God himself (say they) hath ordained a recompense to be made for sins; seeing he for the hardness of the Hebrews hearts, to the intent they might not fall into greater inconvenience, appointed them a bill of divorcement. But these men ought to remember, that we must not call God unto answer; neither is it lawful to require of him a reason of his laws. Wherefore it is no sound conclusion: God did so; Therefore it is lawful for us to do the like. We must not look what God hath done, but what he hath commanded us to do. But God saw that hatred happeneth oftentimes between man and wife, and danger of committing of murder: rather than the same should happen, he appointed that a bill of divorcement should be made. But it is a false argument: God appointed a bill of divorcement; Therefore it is lawful for us to keep brothel houses.

12. Now remaineth to confute the objections of the adversaries. First they said; Whoredom in the Acts of the apostles, is numbered among those things, which of their own nature are not evil: as blood, things strangled, and things dedicated unto idols. For No creature of God is evil, that is received with thanks-giving. Wherefore, seeing fornication is reckoned among these, it is no sin. Howbeit, this is a weak reason: for these things are not reckoned up of the apostles, because the nature of the fault should be alike every one of them; but because all these, if they should have been

used, would at that time have disturbed the church. The Jews, by the custom of the law, abstained from blood, and from that which was strangled: and the Ethnics made no account of whoredom. So, to the intent that peace might grow between them all, they decreed, that they should all abstain from those things. Whereby it followeth not, that all these things be alike faulty: but this rather we may infer, that all these things were an occasion of disturbing the church. Further, they objected, that God commandeth not sins: but he commanded Hosea the prophet to have fellowship with a harlot. I answer: Every sin, in that respect is sin, because it is against the word of God: but if God particularly command anything to be done, which otherwise dissenteth from the word written, that verily is no sin. Sin it is to take other men's goods away; yet God commanded the Hebrews, when they should go out of Egypt, that they should borrow stuff and silver vessels of the Egyptians, and take them away with them: which they did without sin.

Also, no man doubteth, but that murder is sin: and yet Abraham, if he had sacrificed his son at the commandment of God, which he was ready to do, he had not sinned. So may we say of Hosea the prophet, if he committed whoredom at the commandment of God, his whoredom was no sin. I know there be some, which think, that Hosea was not bidden to commit whoredom, but to take a harlot to his wife: but that agreeth not. For it followeth; And thou shalt beget of her children of fornication. Children gotten after that manner; namely, of a lawful wife, should not have been children of fornication. Jerome doth better interpret these things hyperbolically, and saith; that By this image was expressed the wickedness of the Jews, which had forsaken God a husband to them all, and had committed fornication with the idols of the Gentiles, and had begotten unlawful and bastard children, as touching the service and religion of God.

Moreover, that is false, which they alleged; namely, that whoredom is neither against charity, nor religion. For we have before declared, that it is otherwise: neither is it here needful to repeat that, which we have said. Augustine was brought, which saith; What meat is unto the body, that is the bed for procreation; But to eat or drink a little more than needeth, is not a grievous sin; No more therefore is whoredom.

The similitude agreeth not in every point, but serveth only for that part, for which it is taken. And undoubtedly, he which eateth or drinketh more than he ought, doth not straightway forgo the health of his body; but he, which strayeth in carnal fellowship, and playeth the harlot, may easily forthwith procreate a child, unto whom he doth injury, because through his fault he is born a bastard. Moreover, there followeth evil education, and by that means charity is hurt. I might also say, that even as evil and noisome meat destroyeth the body (yea Adam, by eating of the forbidden fruit, corrupted his posterity:) so whoredom killeth the soul. Lastly, whereas they alleged, that fornication is therefore no sin; because this cannot be perceived by the light of nature, that I say is nothing. For the precepts of God may be known even by nature, that they are just: howbeit, by such a nature as is sound and uncorrupt; seeing a corrupt nature doth oftentimes allow vices instead of virtues. For among the Lacedaemonians, theft was commended: and (as Thucydides writeth) among the ancient Greeks piracy was counted a virtue. Furthermore, it followeth, that the precepts of God may by nature be known to be just and honest; but yet by a nature instructed and framed with the word and spirit of God. Otherwise (as Paul witnesseth) A carnal man knoweth not the things, which are of God.

**Of Bastards, and children unlawfully born.**

13. Whereas Jephthah had a noble man to his father, yet it did profit him nothing; because he was base born, and not born in lawful marriage. Wherefore by the civil law of the Hebrews, it was not lawful for him to have place in the congregation of Israel. For in Deuteronomy it is written, Manzer shall not enter into the congregation or assembly. Zur, is in Hebrew A stranger; and a bastard is so called, because he pertaineth not unto the family of the father. She that bare Jephthah was no wife but a harlot. This Hebrew word Zonah, signifieth two things. First A vitler, that is, such a one as selleth things pertaining to victuals: for Zon signifieth To feed or nourish. It signifieth also A harlot, perhaps for this cause; namely, for that vitlers are sometimes ill spoken of for chastity, as appeareth by a certain law of Constantine, which is extant in the Code *Ad legem Iuliam de adulterijs*. And undoubtedly, either signification may be aptly applied to this place. Some of the Hebrews think, that Jephthah was not the son of a harlot; but only the son of a concubine, which was not espoused with a lawful contract, and dowry. But that seemeth not very well to agree: for the Hebrews called not a concubine *Zonah*. Neither had it been lawful for Jepthas brethren to have expelled him as a stranger, if he had been the son of a concubine: for the having of concubines, of that sort, was with the Jews true matrimony. Further we must know that the Hebrews had another word. But why would not God have a bastard to come into the congregation? Not because he had been the worse man, so that he had lived well; but that the people might know, that God detesteth whoredom.

And not to enter into the congregation, was nothing else, but to be made unfit for the executing of an office, either civil or sacred: although otherwise he had to his father either a priest or a ruler. So then it was not lawful for bastards to execute the office, either of a tribune, or pretor, or

magistrate, or priest. Whie therefore doth God now make a bastard ruler over his people? Because he prescribed the law unto men, and not unto himself. Another cause is, least they, which are so born, should therefore straightway be discouraged. Further, to the intent they might remember, that they be not excluded for their own fault, but for their father's fault. And now, to return unto Jephthah: his brethren could not have thrust him out, except he had been born of a harlot. Otherwise, a concubine was a lawful wife. And the children of Jacob, which were born of his concubines, abode with their other brethren, and were inheritors together with them. But thou wilt say, that Abraham cast out Ishmael. That was done before the law, and by the special will of God; to the intent the whole and perfect inheritance might come to Isaac. Otherwise, by the ordinary law of the Hebrews the children of concubines were not utterly excluded from all inheritance.

14. And that the matter may be made more plain, it seemeth good thus to distinguish children. Some be legitimate and not natural, as those be, which are adopted and chosen. Othersome there be, which are natural, and not legitimate, as they which are born of concubines. But I speak here of concubines after the Roman manner: for as touching the Hebrews, they which were born of them were legitimate. And there be other, which be both legitimate and natural; as they, which are born in just matrimony. Lastly, there be some, which are neither legitimate, nor yet natural; as bastards be. And a bastard is he, which cannot tell who is his father: or else, if he can tell, it is one, whom it is not lawful for him to have for his father. As it is written in the Digests *Destatu personarum*, in the law *Vulgo concepti*. There is a great difference in the state of children. But we (as concerning this matter, which we have in hand) will neither entreat of children adopted, nor yet of children naturally legitimate: but only of natural children and

bastards, who seem to be more obscure than the rest. The children, which are natural, and not legitimate, may be made legitimate: as it is in the Code, *De naturalibus filijs*, in the law *Anastatij*. And the ways how they might be made, are described in the same Code, in the law *Si quis*. But bastards could not be made legitimate.

If we shall speak of the children of concubines, after the manner of the Jews, they were legitimate; as we have taught before. But the Romans counted them not as legitimate: only this they ordained; that they might be made legitimate. Moreover, bastards be not in the fathers power, neither yet can they be. This I say, to the intent that we may see in how great a misery bastards are. So Jephthah could not attain to the inheritance of his father. And these laws were made, that men might be withdrawn from whoredom, if it were but only for the ignominy of their children: for when they beget bastards, they hurt them without hope of recovery. Whereupon Chrysostom, upon the epistle to the Romans, when he interpreteth these words (Now is the hour for us to rise from sleep) earnestly inveigheth against whoremongers: Whie dost thou sow (saith he) that which is not lawful for thee to reap; or if thou dost gather it, it is reproachful unto thee? For infamy will arise thereof, both to him which shall be born, and to thee also. For he, so long as he liveth, shall be full of ignominy; and thou, as well when thou art living, as when thou art dead, shalt always be noted of shameful lust, &c. Therefore it hath been ordained by laws, that bastards should not be admitted to the inheritance of their fathers.

15. The father, when he dieth, may give somewhat unto natural children; yea, they inherit, though the father die intestate, when there are no other children: yet they succeed not in the whole, but only in two twelve parts; as appeareth in the Code *De naturalibus liberis*, in the law *Licet patri*. But the

bastard was so far from inheriting to his father, as he might not so much as demand food of him: as it is in the Code *De incestis nuptijs*, in the law *Ex complexu*. Howbeit, the Ecclesiastical canons deal somewhat more gently: for they permit, that a bastard should have somewhat given him to find him withal: as may be seen in the Extravagants, of him that married her, whom before he had polluted with adultery; in the chapter *Cùm haberet*. And thus both the laws of God and man do agree. Neither (as I have said before) were those laws made for hatred or cruelty against bastards; but that at the least, by this means, the shameful lusts of men should be restrained. Notwithstanding, I will not overpass this, that by the laws of Rome a bastard might succeed his mother: as we have in the Digests *Ad senatusconsultum*, Tertullian lib. 1. He may also complain of his mother, if she leave him out of her will; as we have in the Digests *De moffícioso testamento*, in the law 29. where this is to be understood; Except the mother be a noble woman.

And why bastards are not reputed in the place of children, and are deprived of their father's inheritance; Augustine, besides these reasons, which I have brought, bringeth also another reason out of the holy scripture. In the 22nd of Leviticus it is written; He that cometh to the wife of his uncle, shall die without children. But (saith he) many are born also of incest, whose parents are not childless. He answereth, that the Lord so speaketh in the law, because such are not counted for children: wherefore their fathers are justly said to be without children, although they have children; because it is all one, as if they had none. And because such children are contemned of their father, neither are they rightly brought up nor chastised; oftentimes they prove worse than the other. Chrysostom, upon the epistle to the Hebrews, the twelfth chapter, in his 29th homily,

exhorteth the people to think, that God doth like a father, when he chastiseth us. For the father neglecteth unlawful begotten children and bastards: therefore God, when he chastiseth, doth the part of a true and lawful father. Plutarch, in his Problems, the 130th Problem, saith; that The Romans had four surnames; so that some were called *Cnaei*, and other some *Caij*: and those names they noted by two letters only, or by three. Wherefore he demandeth, why Spurius, that is A bastard, was written by these two letters Sp. Because (saith he) the first letter S. signifieth *Sine*, that is, Without, and P. *Patre*, that is, A father; because he was born of an unknown father: although the same may also be applied unto those that are born after their father is dead. But to them it was no reproach to be called bastards: for Sp. Melius, Sp. Cassius, and other of that name, were noble citizens. We have heard the law of God, and also the civil law: now it remaineth that we search the canons.

16. In the Decrees, the distinction 56. in the chapter *Presbyterorum*: they suffer not bastards to be admitted to holy orders, unless they have been first brought up in Monasteries; as though by this means they might be amended. But the canons which afterward follow, be somewhat milder. Chrysostom, upon Matthew, in his 4th homily (as it is in the same place recited, in the chapter *Nunquam*) teacheth that such manner of births ought not to be hurtful unto the children. For if a man have been a thief, a whoremonger, or a murderer, and then be repentant; his former life shall not be hurtful unto him. Much less ought the sin of the father to be hurtful unto the child: nay rather, if the child behave himself well, he shall be so much the more notable, and worthy of more praise; in that he hath not followed the steps of his father. Jerome, in his epistle unto Pammachius, against John bishop of Jerusalem, as in the same decrees appeareth, in the chapter *Nascitur*:

Bastards (saith he) are not to be contemned; for they had God the worker of them, neither did God disdain to make them, and to give them a soul, &c. Gregory also in the same place, in the chapter *Satis perversum*, saith; that It would be an unmeet thing, that the child should so be punished for the pleasure of his father, as he might not be preferred to the holy ministry. Jerome in the same place, in the chapter Dominus; If Christ vouchsafed that bastards be reckoned in his genealogy, why shall not we then admit them to the ministry, &c?

After these canons, which be more favorable unto bastards, is brought a strong argument on the contrary part. Whoremongers (say they) do seem to pour in a certain force into the seed, which passeth also into the children; whereof follow evil inclinations: and thereby are they judged to be worse than other, especially when they be not corrected in their childhood. Wherefore, if they be promoted unto the holy ministry, the church shall be indamaged. Yet at the last it is added in the chapter *Cenomanensis*: If there be any that are notable, they may be admitted unto holy orders; but yet not that it should be a general rule for all, but a privilege only. And these things be written in the Decrees. But in the Decretals, *De filijs presbyterorum*, we read; that Bastards, if they be made monks, may come into orders; yet so nevertheless, as they may not be promoted unto dignities, nor be made either abbots or priors. Howbeit, if they live without the monastery, the bishop may give them orders, and bestow small benefices upon them: but that is by interposing his own authority, and (as they commonly call it) by dispensation. But the ecclesiastical dignities shall not be given them, of any other than of the Pope; for that power he keepeth to himself alone: albeit such dispensations of Popes and bishops have respect to gain only. The judgment of these things should have been left unto the church, which

herein ought to have regard unto two things; namely, to the necessity of the church, and to the excellent virtues of him whom it would promote. If the church shall have a great need, and he excel in virtues, the manner of his birth shall be no let unto him. For Paul, in his epistles to Timothy and to Titus, when he diligently writeth of the election of bishops and priests, did forbid none of this kind of men.

But thou wilt say, that in the old law bastards were excluded from the ministry. I grant it: nevertheless, we are not now bound to that law; and it was made only for the detestation of adultery. Yet now, if they be able to profit the church greatly, their election must not be forbidden. And it is vain, which is written in the Decretals, that legitimates may be chosen, but bastards ought to be rejected; except with dispensation, as we have in the title *De electionibus*. For these counterfeit colors and deceits, the Roman bishops have invented, to amplify their dominion. But the judgment, which I have allowed, agreeth with charity; and we may gather the like of it out of the civil law; where it treateth *De decurionibus*, that is, of captains over ten soldiers; since these were civil judges for private cities and towns. Wherefore it is decreed, that bastards might be made *Decuriones*, if necessity so required. In the Digests *De decurionibus*, in the law *Generaliter*, in Paraph *Debet enim*. The law therefore would have that order; namely of *Decuriones*, to be full. Howbeit, if another born legitimate, were a suitor together for the same, he should be preferred before the bastard. So think I that we must do in the church; that if any man be as good, and as apt for the ministry, being a legitimate born; let consideration be had to him, before the bastard, who must give place in that case unto him that is legitimate. It is added in the law; If they be honest and good, the blemish of birth shall nothing hinder them: in the same title, in the law

*Spurios*, and in the law following. These things have I therefore mentioned, that we might understand, by what right Jephthah was by his brethren thrust out, and that the agreement of the civil laws with the law of God might be perceived.

**Of Adultery.**

17. Doubtless, adultery is a grievous sin, and how grievous it is (as Tertullian gathereth in his book *De monogamia*) we may perceive by the contrary, in comparing the same unto matrimony. Let us consider wherein matrimony consisteth. God made man and woman, he joined them together in one flesh: wherein matrimony doth stand. And if so be that one flesh be rent and pulled away, so as another is mingled and set in place, adultery is committed. This heinous crime hath been forbidden, ever since the first original of mankind, as many of the fathers have proved. God made man and woman, not men and women; to the intent that every man should be content with his own wife, and every wife with her own husband: if now then a man be not content with his own wife, he shall not have one wife; but many. Man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife: if he be pulled away, doubtless he cleaveth not to her. Chrysostom, upon the 51st Psalm, in the first homily, saith; that The fruit of adultery is murder and poisoning. In his 42nd homily upon Matthew, he saith; that Adulterous women very oftentimes practice murder, and that not of one man only, but of all them also, unto whom they think that their infamy may come; as did Herodia. Jerome against Jovinian, toward the end of the first book; Whatsoever tumults (saith he) are in tragedies, is the spite that is between married wives, and their husbands harlots. Moreover, Agamemnon was slain by the adulterer Aegistus. Atreus and Thiestes, by reason of adultery,

took in hand those cruel enterprises. The ravishing of Helen stirred up the most cruel war of Troy. In this is a certain sink of all evil.

Cyprian, in the second epistle of his fourth book to Antonius, writeth; that In the first times there were such bishops, as would never let adulterers to rest in the church: but there were other bishops, that after a good space of time, if they showed forth any fruit of penance, would reconcile them after a sort. Augustine, in his 42nd epistle to Vincentius the Donatist, alledgeth this epistle, and saith; that This diversity of custom the bishops had, and yet they kept the unity of the church. Christ willeth, that matrimonies should not be broken off; and yet he so accounted of adultery, as he made it the cause why matrimony should be undone. By adultery the household is disquieted, the bed itself is dishonored, great injury is done unto the children: for either they be bastards, or else taken for bastards. Bartholus *Ad legem Iuliam de adulterijs*, in the Pandects writeth, about the title [of the same book] that Adultery is the most grievous crime of all other, except treason: to wit, as concerning civil regiment. Thales Milesius judged, that perjury is not a more grievous sin than adultery. For a certain adulterer was ready to take his oath, that he committed not adultery; and perjury (saith he) is not worse than adultery.

Chrysostom, in his 62nd homily upon John, was bold to write, that adultery is a more grievous sin than idolatry. And he alloweth two reasons, both which nevertheless are derived from matrimony, and the nature thereof. Which is written by Paul in the first to the Corinthians, where he decreed, that A believing husband may dwell with his unbelieving wife: but he granteth not that an adulterer may dwell together with an adulteress: wherefore, that the same is a more grievous fault. Another reason is: The believing wife is not defiled with the company of her idolatrous husband;

but an adulteress is always polluted, if she be joined with an adulterer: therefore he concludeth, that adultery is a thing more grievous than idolatry. But under correction of so notable a man, I may say, that the arguments be weak. We must not compare matrimony with idolatry: but matrimony and adultery must be compared between themselves. These two are in such sort, as the one of them in his own nature, and by the appointment of God is good, and the other is sin.

And whereas in matrimony, the one part is sometime an unbeliever; that happeneth by accident. But the greatness of sin must not be judged by those things, which come by chance, or (as they speak in the Schools) which happen by accident. A believing wife may dwell with an unbelieving husband, so he be willing thereunto. For matrimony is a good thing: it is not so polluted with the idolatry of the other party, as it cannot be good unto the believer in Christ. But adultery is always an evil thing, none can well and rightly use the same. And though the reason of that father be not firm, and that it is not true, that idolatry is a lighter sin than adultery (for idolatry is the greatest sin of all:) yet the sin of adultery draweth so near unto idolatry, as in the holy scriptures it is compared with idolatry. Idolaters be called whoremongers and adulterers: for the wedlock of God with men is violated.

18. But we might stand in doubt, whether it he lawful for any man to take her to wife, whom he hath before polluted with adultery. If the civil laws, or the Jewish laws were in use, this case would not so oft happen to be. Adultery was an offense, whereunto death was due. If the adulterers, both man and woman, should be put to death; how might they contract matrimony? Certainly not in another world, where no marriages shall be. But sometime perhaps a man escapeth unpunished, or else adulteries committed are not openly known; what then ought to be done? In the 18th

and 20th chapters of Leviticus, there be appointed many impediments, and many degrees, wherein matrimonies be forbidden; yet is not this named in that place. Perhaps for the cause which I have now spoken of; namely, for that adultery deserved death; or else, because it was a secret crime. In that case there seemeth to be no laws of God, which prohibit. Howbeit, the Popes laws did afterward ordain this much; that if one of the married persons did seek the death of the other, whereby such a one might enjoy the desired matrimony, such marriage should be void. The same we find in many places of the Extravagants, in the title where disputation is had of him, that marrieth his wife, whom he had first polluted by adultery.

And in the title *De conversione infidelium*, in the canon, which beginneth *Laudabilem*; If a husband, while his former wife liveth, committeth adultery with another woman, and they contract matrimony together, or plight faith one to another, such a matrimony is of none effect. Which also *In concilio Triburiense*, in the forty chapter, was decreed. Augustine in his first book *De nuptijs & concupiscentia*, the tenth chapter, seemeth to disallow matrimony between adulterers. In the Authentiks, there is nothing extant of this matter: indeed they deny that marriage that is made between the ravisher, and her that is ravished. As for David he cannot properly be called a ravisher: indeed he committed adultery, &c. This matter is treated of by the Master of the sentences, in the fourth book, and 35th distinction. These things may be gathered even by human laws. Howbeit, God separated not David and Bethsabe; he suffered them to remain married, but yet in great affliction. It seemeth that the bishops were led to make these laws, least men should be inclined to the murdering of husbands, to the end they might enjoy their wives.

**Of Idleness, and other enticements unto wickedness.**

19. But now that we may the easilier avoid the causes of this wickedness, let us see by what steps David was carried into adultery. The circumstances of place and time must be observed. In the afternoon he slept quietly in his withdrawing place. This was an argument of a careless and idle man. Isboseth, when he on that wise slept in an afternoon, was slain. David, when he lived idle after the same manner, was well near overthrown. But if he had earnestly meditated of God's law, and of God's benefits, which he had abundantly bestowed upon him; of the war which then he made, and of the danger of the Common-wealth, he should never have fallen into these mischiefs. So great a matter was it to be idle. And assuredly, idleness is condemned by the judgment of all wise men. Seneca, when he passed by the manor house of one Vacia a citizen of Rome, that was an idle and slothful man; Here (saith he) is placed Vacia. He did mean, that a man idle and unprofitable for the Common-wealth, was in a manner buried there. But this I also add, that such manner of dead carcasses, both have a very foul savor, and do also bring forth rottenness and worms. I know indeed that there is a certain honest kind of idleness, whereby good men being become the better prepared, are wont to return to execute their offices, either private or public. After this manner Christ did oftentimes spend the whole night in prayers alone upon the mount; but so, as he returned in the morning to preach. Many times was he in secret places, but yet so, as he instructed his disciples. There is also another idleness that is holy and commendable, whereby we keep the sabbath holy from sin: that must we always have in estimation.

But we condemn a dull and slothful idleness, whereby men's minds and wits are dulled. Cato, in his originals, very well wrote; that It behooveth an excellent man to yield no less account of his idleness, than of his business.

And Christians must consider, that they be those excellent men, and that they shall one day be called to that account. Ezekiel, in the 16th chapter; This (saith he) was the iniquity of Sodom thy sister, pride, fullness of bread, abundance, and idleness. And albeit that idleness do nourish otherwise many evils; yet doth it not nourish anything either more, or more easily than lust. This also did the Poets see, and Ovid among others, who saith;

Demand is made wherefore and why,
Aegistus waxed an adulterer;
The reason followeth by and by,
He was an idle loiterer,
And in another place;
If thou fly idleness, Cupid hath no might,
His bow lieth broken, his fire hath no light.

Ambrose hath an excellent similitude of the crab and the oyster: The crab (saith he) most willingly eateth the meat of oysters: but for so much as those be well fortified with most strong shells on both sides, so as they cannot be broken by force, he craftily watcheth, while they open themselves to the sun. Then, while they open themselves, and take the air, the crab putteth a stone into the mouths of them that gape, so as they cannot bring together again their shells: afterward he safely enough thrusteth in his claws, and feedeth of the meat. So (saith he) when men be given to idleness, and open their minds to pleasures, the devil cometh and putteth in filthy cogitations: so that, when they are not able to draw back their shell, wherewith they were armed before, they are devoured.

20. David walked careless and at hearts ease. But princes are not created, to lead their life in idleness: for they are subject to that law, which in old time was said unto Adam; In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat thy bread.

In deed they do not plough nor delve, yet ought they to be vigilant, and to study for the Common-well, to examine causes, to give sentence, to write good laws. And not alonely kings would be idle, but bishops also, and monks especially of all men. Those at the beginning lived of their labors: afterward, they being weary (as I think) of good works, found the means (as idle men) to be maintained with stipends of the church. But when, by godly men, they were set on work; Surely (say they) it is not lawful, since this is not according to the gospel. For Christ warned that We should not be careful for the morrow, but should consider the lilies of the field, and the birds of the air. But against them Augustine disputed, in his book *De opere monachorum*; If ye will (saith he) imitate the birds and the lilies, why do ye not also imitate them in this point? The lilies do not eat or drink, the birds do not lay up till tomorrow; but ye do eat and drink, and do carefully lay up in store. And he rightly expounded that saying of the Lord; Be not careful for the morrow: for he saith, that the Lord forbiddeth only a pensive carefulness joined with infidelity; as though we are not maintained by the providence of God, but by our own proper industry.

David, when he was idle, fell into adultery. Nebuchadnezzar also, when in peace he gave himself to idleness, he became proud; Is not this (saith he) that great Babylon? As though he had gotten that so great a power of his own self, not of God. Many evils (saith Ecclesiasticus) hath idleness taught. So then we must specially beware of this evil: For our enemy the devil goeth about roaring and seeking whom he may devour. If he always lie in privy watch, ready bent and prepared to our destruction; it is meet that we also should perpetually watch, and be ever ready to resist. D. Latimer, sometime bishop of Worcester in England, and afterward a most constant witness and martyr of Christ, when he would exhort bishops to do their

duty, among other things said; that There was not a diligenter bishop in England than the devil: for that he did always teach, admonish, instruct, and adorn his church. Wherefore he exhorted them, that if they would not follow God, they should at the least-wise imitate the devil. Howbeit, he cried to them that were deaf: for many bishops at that time were so set, as they would neither follow the devil, nor yet God. Wisely did Jerome admonish, in his treatise to the husbandman; Be thou always doing somewhat, that the devil, when he cometh, may always find thee occupied.

21. David, walking upon the house top, saw a fair woman bathing of herself. But what needed David, with such curious eyes, to behold what was done out of his house? Or why did that silly woman bath herself abroad without covert, where she might be seen naked of men? In that she washed herself, she was not to be blamed: for there were many legal impurities, which it behooved at that time to wash away, by such purifications. Howbeit, she should have washed herself within, and under covert. David saw, and was caught. To see (they say) is the first entry of lovers. Howbeit, I may more truly say, that To see is the first entry of them that perish. For David looked not upon this woman with a single eye, but with an unclean and evil eye. He straightways cast from him the wholesome word of God; Thou shalt not commit adultery. Than the which word, there is not a more present or better remedy, if at any time we feel ourselves tickled with carnal pleasures. This wicked act of David will seem the more heinous, if we compare it with that most chaste young man Joseph. He was a young man, David was old: he was a bachelor, David a husband; yea and that of many wives, that there might be no want to fulfill pleasures: he was provoked, and that of his mistress, who might after a sort have commanded him; David of his own accord provoked, and that his own subject, whose chastity

he should by all means have defended. The woman was beautiful, and well favored.

But yet we must not thereby gather, that beauty is an evil thing. For a fit joining together of the parts, with a pleasantness of color, which they define to be beauty, is the cunning workmanship of the Creator, and the image of God; neither can it do any harm, except it light upon unchaste eyes. Even as the light of the sun, although otherwise it be pleasant and grateful, yet is it grievous unto bleared eyes. But we are corrupted, not only by the corruption of original sin; but also by other sins drawn unto us by use and custom. Chrysostom; in his first homily upon the 51st psalm; By this example (saith he) all men ought to be moved, that they approach not unto dishonest sights, where harlots are showed, and all gestures of vile lust expressed. For that is ridiculous, which some men do answer; that they are not moved by those sights. For what (saith he) are they made of iron, of stone, or of adamant? Be they wiser, or stronger, or holier than David? If a spark be cast into hay, will it not take fire? Our flesh (saith the prophet) is hay, and may easily be set on fire: and for that cause the holy Ghost setteth forth unto us the fall of David, that we by his example might beware of the like contagion.

The physicians, if by chance they light upon a man that is grievously and dangerously diseased, are wont to bring their disciples; that they may the more easily understand both the force of the disease, and the way how to cure the same. King David was to be cut, so as we ought attentively to consider, by what art he is cured of the Lord. First let us see by what means he was driven to fall. He refrained not his eyes: wherefore he having forgotten himself, was easily carried headlong into mischief. So in the book of Genesis, the sons of God, which were descended of Seth, when they saw

the daughters of men, born in very deed of the posterity of Cain, they began to love them beyond measure; and so being blinded, began to degenerate from their former godliness, which they had retained even from their great grandfather Seth. Paul, unto the Corinthians, commandeth women to have their head covered in the holy congregation, at the least-wise because of the angels. And even as women ought to shadow their face, that they be not seen: so on the other side, men ought to temper themselves, that they do not over-curiously behold them. Of which matter Tertullian wrote many things very well, in a little book entitled *De virginibus velandis*. And Solomon thus wisely admonished; Lust not after her beauty. Also Gregory the first; They (saith he) which abuse the outward eye, be worthy to have the inward eye shadowed. I have made a covenant (saith Job) with mine eye, that I will not think upon a virgins. He saith not only, that I would not look upon, but that I would not admit into my mind an imagination of her. This seeing David did not, he cast himself into the danger, which all godly men ought to take heed of.

**Of the punishments of Adultery.**

22. Somewhat we will declare in this place of the punishments of adultery. And this I think to be necessary for me: for by the grievousness of punishments, we know the weightiness of sins. By rewards and punishments Common-wealth's are preserved. But punishments must be applied, according to the heaviness of offenses. It is very well written in the 24th cause, question 1. in the chapter *Non afferamus* (which words be ascribed unto Jerome, but rather they are the words of Augustine;) How grievous a sin is Schism, or to be divided from the church, it is perceived by the punishments laid upon men for other grievous sins. The idolatry done unto the molten calf, God punished by a kind of death. Because Zedekiah

burned the book of the prophet, God did revenge it with captivity. But the rebellion done against Moses and Aaron he punished more grievously: he sent a fire, wherewith those, which conspired with Chore, were consumed, and the earth swallowed up the seditious persons. We will first then consider the punishments of adultery, that we may understand how heinous a sin it is. Secondly we will see, whether the adulterer and the adulteress, should have equal punishments; and whether they be bound to like punishments, and whether of them is the greater sinner. Thirdly, what evils may come by reason that these punishments are either neglected or utterly taken away. As touching the first; we must search in the holy scriptures, what may be found touching the punishments of adultery; after that we will descend to the reckoning up of punishments of diverse nations; then will we come to the Roman laws; and last of all unto the ecclesiastical and Canon laws.

Of the first we must understand, that the divine scriptures teach us, that The wages of sin is death. Seeing therefore that death is due unto sins; forthwith, after a man hath transgressed, he might be put to death by the justice of the law. But God is not so strict an exactor, he granteth as yet some space unto life: the which nevertheless is sometime broken off by the sword of magistrates; if grievous crimes be committed, which can by no means be suffered. But there are other sins of less weight, for which it is not lawful to put men to death. Further, we will see whether adultery may be reckoned among those sins, whereunto death is due. Certainly it was a sin, whereunto death belonged: as the holy scriptures declare unto us, and that for good cause. For by this wickedness is hurt that society, from whence is derived the fountain of all friendship among men. In the book of Genesis, when Abimelech the king of Gerar had seen Isaac playing somewhat

familiarly with Rebecca, he perceived him to be her husband and not her brother. So then he charged, that none upon the pain of death should touch that woman. Therefore we see, that before the law of Moses, adultery was by the Ethnics punished with death. Joseph after that it had been laid to his charge in Egypt, that he committed adultery with his mistress, was delivered to the head officer of capital crimes; and was cast into prison. Tamar, when she had buried two husbands, and waited for the third, unto whom she was betrothed, did commit adultery, and was judged to be burnt. And undoubtedly, when a woman that is betrothed, doth abuse herself, she committeth adultery. For although it be not a full marriage, yet is there such hope of marriage, as it ought not to be polluted.

This did the emperor Severus perceive. The law may be read *Ad legem Iuliam de adulterio*, in the Digests, the law *Sivxor*, in the Paraph *Dinus*. In the 22nd chapter of Deuteronomy, and in the 20th of Leviticus: by the law that is there given, the adulterer and adulteress are commanded to be put to death. Which sentence, God in the 16th chapter of Ezekiel confirmeth, where he saith, that he would bring punishment upon the adulterous Israelites. The same law is confirmed in the eighth chapter of John. When the Scribes and Pharisees had brought unto Christ a woman, which was taken in adultery, they said; Moses commanded us in the law, that such a woman should be stoned, &c. So greatly did God esteem chastity, and unspotted wedlock; as he would not have so much as a suspicion to remain between them, which were man and wife. For in the book of Numbers, there is ordained a law touching jealousy. She which was suspected of adultery, was brought unto the priest; curses were denounced, a drink was given her, and straightway it was known whether she was an adulteress or no. And if a man had married a wife, and had been able to gather and prove

by certain signs, that she was not a virgins; she was punished. If a maiden betrothed to a husband, had been forced by any abroad in the field, the ravisher should have been punished with death: if in the city, the damsel should also have had the same punishment. Deuteronomy 22. So then great severity was used herein. Howbeit the revenge was not committed to private persons: the husband killed not his wife, nor the father his daughter; but the matter was brought before a judge. So read we to be done in Susanna, although that history be Apocryphal. In the prophet Jeremiah, we read that Nebuchadnezzar roasted Zedekiah and Achabus, two unchaste priests. These things we have in the holy scriptures, especially of the Old Testament.

23. The laws of the Gentiles also suffered not this mischief to escape unpunished. If we give credit to Strabo, in the 16th book of his Geography, the Arabians made it death. In Arabia, where spices grow, the same punishment was provided for adulterers; as Eusebius saith in his sixth book, and eighth chapter, *De praeparatione evangelica*. The Egyptians (as Diodorus Siculus reporteth in the first book of his *Bibliotheca*) did cut off the nose of an adulteress; that the face of her, which was so pleasing, might be deformed. The adulterer was beaten with a thousand stripes, even well near unto death. Aelianus in his history of Variety, the 13th book, writeth, that Zeleucus the law-maker of Locris ordained, that an adulterer should have both his eyes put out. The same was thought to be a hard law. Within a while after it happened, that his own son was taken in adultery: the people would have released him from punishment, but the father would not. And to the intent the same law might after some sort be kept; he willed, that one of his son’s eyes, and another of his own should be pulled out. There were a people, which Soudas calleth Laciadae, and others Placiadae, among whom

adulterers were tormented with punishments and ignominies about the secret parts.

Also the Germans (if we believe Cornelius Tacitus) were most severe punishers of adulteries. For the adulteress, being taken with the manner, was set naked in the sight of her kindred: the hair of her head was cut off, and after that she was by her husband beaten through the town with a cudgel. Plutarch in his Problems writeth, that the Gortinaei, when they had apprehended an adulterer; they brought him forth openly, and crowned him with wool: whereby they might show him to be a wanton and effeminate person. After which time he lived in perpetual infamy among them. The people called Cumaei set an adulteress in the market place, upon an infamous stone, and there of the people was put to shame: then being set upon an asse, she was carried through the city. Afterward in way of ignominy, it was said unto her, ὀνοβάτις. Saletus a citizen of Croton (as Lucianus writeth of them, which being hired serve for reward) made a law, that adulterers should be burned alive. Within a while after, he himself was taken in adultery with his brother's wife: he being accused, made an oration, wherein he so defended himself, that all men bent their minds to pardon him. But he, considering with himself how shameful an offense he had committed, leapt of his own accord into the fire. And among the philosophers, Plato, in his eighth book *De legibus*, saith; that Adultery is a great and horrible offense, when the husband goeth to another than his own wife, and the wife unto another than her own husband. Further, that we ought to keep our bodies chaste, and not to bestow them upon strumpets and harlots. They (saith he) that shall do that, are in perpetual infamy.

Aristotle, in his seventh book of Politics, in the last chapter save one, writeth thus; If any man shall have carnal copulation with her that is not his

own, or any woman with him that is not her own; let that be counted among most shameful things. So as they noted adulterers, both men and women, to be infamous. Diogenes the Cynic was of another mind. For it happened that a certain man, called Didymus, was taken in adultery: and Diogenes being demanded what should become of him, answered; that according to his own name, he ought to be hanged. For δίδυμοι with the Grecians be the stones of a man or of a beast. In old time among the Atheniens, adultery was a capital crime: as Pausanias in his *Boetiks* showeth. He citeth the law of Draco. And it was lawful among the Atheniens to slay an adulterer, that was taken with the deed doing.

And even this doth the oration of Lysias testify, wherein it is spoken of the death of Eratosthenes the adulterer. The adulteress was not strait way put to death, but it was not lawful for her to come into holy assemblies. Otherwise she might have all manner of ignominy done unto her by any person, only the punishment of death excepted: not for that they did take pity of her, but that they might give her the longer torment. Which may be gathered by the oration of Demosthenes against Neaera, if the same be his. Polybius in the second book of his history; If an adulterer be slain (saith he) let the executioner go free. He seemeth to speak this by the laws of the Grecians: for he was a Graecian born. How greatly the Grecians were moved for the adultery and violent taking away of Helene, all men know, which have any small skill of the poets. Muhammad (as appeareth by his own laws) would have adulterers to be whipped in a manner to death. The Goths made a law of death against adulterers, as it is read in the first book of *Procopius De bello Gothico*. Many things of sundry nations might be recited; but these for this time shall suffice.

24. I come now to the Roman laws. Dionysius Halicarnassaeus commendeth Romulus the first king of the Romans; for that he would have, by his laws, matrimony to be inviolate; and yet (so far as we can find) he made not adultery to be punishable by death. Divorce was permitted for the cause of adultery. Yea and afterward, for the suspicion of adultery, a putting away of the adulteress was admitted. And so did Caesar: for he put away his wife Pompeia, finding her with Clodius in the house of the head bishop. But he being afterward bidden to declare against her some witness of adultery, he would not: and being demanded wherefor he had then put her away, he answered; that his house should not only be free from the filthiness of adultery, but also from the very suspicion thereof. By the laws of the twelve tables, an adulterer was put to death. But in so much as belongeth to public punishments, it seemeth that in those former ages, they were more easy. Tacitus in his second book declareth, that a certain man was accused of treason and of adultery, in the time of Tiberius Caesar. And touching adultery, it seemed that it was warily enough provided for, by the law *Julia*. But Tiberius, who about the beginning of his reign was gentle, did by entreaty put away those great punishments, and said; After the manner of our ancestors, let the adulteress be removed two hundred miles from the city, and the adulterer be banished both out of Italy and Africa.

We read in the tenth book of Titus Livius, that one Fabius Gurges, which was Censor, had condemned many matrons of adultery. The amercement that they paid was money, of the which money he afterward built a temple unto Venus. Out of the oration of M. Cato, which is rehearsed by Aulus Gellius in the tenth book, and the title is *De dote*; we may perceive, that before the law Julia was made, it was lawful to slay both the adulterer and the adulteress. Augustine, in the third book and fifth chapter *De civitate Dei*

saith; that The ancient Romans used to bury the vestal virgins alive, if they had committed whoredom; but that they did not deal so severely in punishing of adulterers. He saith, that they rather protected the temples of their idols, than their own wedlock. And no marvel it is: for they worshipped adulterous gods; Jupiter, Mars, and Venus. After that time was the law Julia made, whereof there is mention in the Digests, and in the Code. Many did falsely imagine that the same law had been made by Julius Caesar.

It was made by Augustus, who was also called Julius; for so much as he was the adopted son and heir of Julius Caesar. Suetonius saith, that he made this law, and he made it upon just cause; for his daughter Julia, and a niece that he had, were most licentious monsters. The emperor used to call them, his rotten impostems. When he had made the law, there was brought unto him a young man taken in adultery with his daughter Julia. The which the emperor took in so evil part, as he flew at him with his fists. The young man with a loud voice cried out; Thou Caesar only hast set down this law. Caesar, for that he was blamed, as if he had been an inconstant man, would not eat his supper for sorrow. By this Julian law, where first, in the time of Cato, it had been lawful to thrust through both the adulterer and the adulteress; then was this power taken from the husband: and it was lawful to kill the adulterer only. In the Digests *Ad legem Juliam*, in the law *Marito*; and in the Code, in the same title, in the law *Gracchus*.

Yet I read in Suetonius, that Claudius Caesar killed Messalina, under the name of adultery: but for so much as he was an emperor, he did what he would. It was lawful for a husband to kill the adulterer, although not absolutely; but when he should be taken with the manner, and in his own house. Neither might he do it to everyone, but to one of the common sort:

for if it had been a noble man, unto whom he ought a reverence, it was not lawful: yet might he keep him shut up in his house 24 hours, until he did bring witnesses. We see, that there was some exception of persons. Why leave was taken away from the husband to kill his wife, a reason may be given. Husbands do sometime bear hatred unto their wives, when they be contentious or deformed. They might covet to gain a dowry and to marry another woman: therefore the law would not condescend, that the wife should be slain. Howbeit, it was lawful for the father of the adulteress, to slay both; as well in his own house, as in the house of his son in law: as may be seen in the Digests *Ad legem Juliam*. But it was not lawful for him to kill the adulterer, unless he also killed his daughter; the reason was this, that Nature teacheth the parents to love their children heartily: whereby it is probable, that he would not slay his daughter, unless she were taken in adultery.

25. Seneca, in his first Declamation, seemeth to affirm, that it should be lawful to kill them both. For he put this case. A certain soldier, which had lost his hands in war, found his wife to have fellowship with an adulterer: even while the act was committed, he called his son to slay them. The son refused to obey, wherefore the father rejected his son: it is demanded, whether he did this justly or no? But perhaps Seneca had respect unto the time of Cato. But if so be the husband, when he was in a fury, had killed his wife being an adulteress; he, by the Roman laws, should have easier punishment, than if he had been an absolute murderer. For he fell not into the danger of the law Cornelia of murderers: his punishment was exile. Which is to be seen in the Pandects, *Ad legem Corneliam de sicarijs*, in the first and third laws. Whereupon, when it is said by the Canonists, the 33rd cause, question the second, in the chapter Inter haec; that Sometime it was

lawful by the Roman laws to kill a wife, being taken in adultery, and not by the Ecclesiastical laws; ye must understand, that the matter is not altogether so; but because the punishment was light, after a sort it was said to be lawful. Or else perhaps, they which made those canons, had respect unto the laws of Lombardie, in the which that was lawful.

Let us also add, that the husband might, by the Roman laws, slay the adulterer; not only when he took him at home with the manner, so as he could not deny it; but also out of the house, when the case were so, that he was suspected, and that the husband could bring testimony, that he had given him warning once, twice, and thrice, that he should not have communication with his wife. Howbeit, if he had found them talking familiarly together in the temple or place of prayer, then it was not lawful so to do: but they were delivered unto the bishop or defender of the church. But the bishops were many ways against the putting of them to death: neither would they give license to kill them. It seemeth, that those first Canonists were led with a desire of saving souls; that they should not die upon the sudden, without repentance. The latter Canonists favored this matter, perhaps because they, more than others, lay in wait for the chastity of other men's wives. Wherefore there were many punishments for adultery provided by this law Julia. First, the crime was brought before public assembly: the accusation was admitted, not rashly (forsooth) but by a certain order. The wife, if she accused her husband of adultery, was not heard; but she herself was accused. The first place was given to the husband, the second to the father; brethren and uncles also might accuse: and afterward, at certain times, place was given unto strangers. Divorcement was ordained between them, they lest the dowry and donation, which came by marriage. Both the adulterer and adulteress became

infamous, but after sundry fashions: the adulterer, not, unless he were condemned; the adulteress, so soon as she was attached.

And there was some certain peculiar thing in the crime itself, which could not be accorded with the accuser: as it appeareth in the Code *De transactionibus*, in the law *Transigere*. It is the law of Dioclesian and Maximinian: they would not have it agreed upon, that money, being given to the accuser, he should cease from [pursuing] this wicked fact. Which yet was lawful in other crimes of death; namely, to redeem the soul for money, or for anything else. Moreover, the husband might not retain the adulteress, nor yet call her home, after he had put her away: otherwise, he should have incurred the crime of brothelry. Besides this, when a woman was thus convicted, no other man might take her to wife. In detestation of this crime, this also was added; that not only they, which had committed adultery, were punished; but they also, which had enticed any woman, though they could not attain to their purpose. In the Digests *De criminibus extraordinarijs*, in the first law, we read; that the enticer ought to be punished without order of law. Moreover, if soldiers had been convicted of adultery, they were dismissed from the oath of war, they were put out of pay with shame; whereof the lawyers bear record, in the Digests *Dere militari*. Plinius secundus, in his sixth book of epistles, in his epistle unto Cornelianus, writeth; that Traianus did straightway for adultery discharge a soldier of his oath, and dismissed him with shame.

But these punishments otherwhile were mitigated, and it came to pass, that it was commonly said (as Juvenal writeth) Thou law Julia, what art thou asleep? They made but a scorn of it. Sometimes they were contented with this shame, that the adulteress should be brought forth openly in the garment of a man. Whereupon the poet Martial saith; When Numa saw the

adulterous laid afar off in her gown, then he said that she was a condemned adulteress. At Rome, in the days of Theodosius, there was a more shameful custom. An adulteress being taken and condemned, was brought to the brothel house: as Socrates in the fifth book of histories, and third chapter writeth. Theodosius coming to Rome, took away this most shameful custom; least sins should be added unto sins. Constantine Magnus (as we read in the law *Julia de adulterijs*, in the Code, in the law *Quamuis adulterij*) appointed a very severe punishment of adultery. He calleth adulterers, sacrilegers, or robbers of matrimony; and therefore thinketh them to be unworthy of this life. Then was that law received, which did endure unto the time of Jerome: as we read in the epistle to Innocentius *De muliere septies icta Vercellis*. There be some also, which affirm, that adultery, even before Constantine, was punished with death by the Roman laws: and they allege a law worthy to be known, which was made by Alexander Severus the son of Mammea, in the Code *Ad legem Iuliam de adulterijs*. Thus it beginneth; It is agreeable to the chastite of our times, that adulterers be punished. If any woman did by any means escape capital punishment, he ordained, that none should marry her. And yet the same Alexander was long before the time of Constantine.

26. Some seek for this shift, and say; that by capital punishment, according to the ancient laws, is meant banishment. But that maketh no matter: for there is another law of Dioclesian and Maximinian (who were before Constantine, though not long) where it is thus read in the Code, in the title *De transactionibus*, in the law *Transigere*; There is no let, but there may be composition made for capital crimes, except it be for adultery. In capital crimes, the laws do permit, that a man might redeem blood for money, if need should be, and might compound with the accuser, to cease

his accusation. If by this word Caput, thou say is meant banishment; the words that follow do forbid it. In the residue he saith; In those faults, which cause not the punishment of death, it is not lawful to make composition. Howbeit, the common opinion of the lawyers is, that by the law of the Digests, it is no crime of death: but by the law of the Code it is, by reason of that law of Constantine. Which opinion if we should follow, and say, that the law Julia ordained grievous punishments, and yet not the punishment of death: I will show in histories the contrary. Julius Caesar had a franchised man, whom he loved dearly; this man being known to have committed adultery with a matron belonging to a certain gentleman, he put to death.

Opilius Macrinus (as writeth Julius Capitolinus) was accustomed to burn in the fire the adulterer and the adulteress, both their bodies being joined together. Aurelianus (as testifieth Vopiscus) having a soldier, which ravished the wife of his host, tied him fast unto the top of two trees, which he had bended down: the same being let slip again with great violence, plucked the body in sunder in two parts. Augustus, for adultery, put to death Proclus his franchised servant. If therefore the law Julia did not condemn adulterers to death, it appeareth hereby, that emperors (as the circumstances required) might increase the punishments. That law of Constantine, which decreed death against adulterers (as we have it in the Authentiks) is rehearsed in the Code *Ad legem Iuliam de adulterijs*: it beginneth; Sed body. Justinian somewhat mitigated that severity, who suffered the punishment to continue, as touching the adulterer; but he dealt somewhat more favorably towards the adulteress. He permitted them to have their life, but yet after such a sort, as they should be beaten with cudgels, and driven to a monastery, from whence the woman might be demanded again of her husband within the space of two years. If the husband did not demand her

again, but were dead in the meantime, she was constrained to live there during her life.

After this, adultery was so smally regarded, as they made a mock thereof, and would do it in a manner of set purpose. In some place they made it to be a penalty of money; whereby the poorer sort (in deed) might be restrained, but the richer had a greater occasion to sin. Even in like manner as it happened of a law, which Gellius speaketh of; that for paying a certain sum of money, one man might strike another. Whereupon a certain man giving a blow to a citizen, whom he met by the way, commanded his servant that followed him, to go pay the judge that sum of money which he had forfeited. By this means it came to pass, that men said; He is a vile man that seeketh for law at the chief justices hand against adultery: as if he might say; He hath small courage, that thrusteth not through both the adulterer and the adulteress. But although the laws are silent, yet the justice of God showeth itself: for it punisheth adulterers with madness, with fury, and with other most grievous punishments; even as we see in David. These things had I to declare of civil punishments, which if they were distributed into a certain method, were either punishable by death; so as the magistrate himself punished them: or it was appointed to be done by private persons; as by the husband, and the father of the adulteress; or else, if they escaped the punishment of death, they were noted with some infamy. The infamy was sometime, naked [without outward tokens] sometime it had certain outward tokens [of shame] otherwhile the adulteress was set upon an asse, and crowned with wool. Sometime there was added a chastising of the body. The wives were beaten with cudgels, their noses were cut off. Or else the punishment was of another kind: they were banished, they forfeited a

sum of money, they lost their dowry, they were divorced, and might no more be married.

27. Now we will speak of ecclesiastical punishments. And whereas many things be showed by the fathers and the councils, we will use this method: that first we will declare what they have disallowed in the civil laws; secondly, what ecclesiastical punishments they themselves have laid upon adulterers. [ 1] First, the punishment of death liked them not. In the Council of Tribure, chapter 46. it is ordained; that If an adulteress shall fly unto the church, she may not be delivered unto her husband, or to the judge, or president. The first council of Orleans, which was held under Clodouaeus, in the 3rd canon, hath in a manner decreed the same; namely, that Adulterers may be safe, if they fly to the church, and shall not be delivered; or else, if they be delivered, they shall take an oath that they will not hurt them; and if so be they had not stood to their oath, but violated the same, they were excommunicated. At the length it came to that pass, that the bishops, to save them from death, would have the judgment of that crime to pertain unto their Court. And this they will have to be the cause thereof. If this examination be permitted to lay men, they would be too negligent therein: as who should say, that they themselves are most severe. And what I beseech you do they by their episcopal examinations? They set a fine upon their heads, and separate them from the marriage bed. Hereof arise innumerable whoredoms; yea and the naughty men themselves sometimes abuse these wives being separated.

[ 2] Moreover, they allow not, that the adulterer or the adulteress should be slain, either by the husband or father. Of this mind was Augustine in his treatise *De adulterinis coniugijs ad Pollentium*, in many places of the second book. He would, that those private men should forgive adulteries

committed. These reasons he bringeth; We be all infected with sin, we have need of mercy; Therefore unto sinners we must show mercy. And he useth the saying of Christ in the eighth of John; He which among you is free from sin, let him cast the first stone against the adulteress. He that is thus urged, let him think with himself, whether he be guilty of sin. Forgive ye (saith our Savior) and it shall be forgiven unto you. We pray; Forgive us our trespasses, even as we forgive them that trespass against us. With what face can we speak these things, if we be so cruel in revenge? God will not the death of a sinner, but that he should turn and live. Why then wouldest thou his death?

These reasons be not firm in all respects. For if they should be understood concerning civil magistrates, no malefactor should be punished; and to what end should magistrates then bear the sword? As touching private men, I agree with Augustine; that they ought not to take such power upon them, as to slay the adulteress and the adulterer. If any man will say; The public laws do there give authority unto the husband, he is no private person: even as when they command the soldiers to fight, or the executioner to put a man to death, who be private men. But if by the commandment of the magistrate, they do that, which they are commanded, they be not private persons anymore. It is lawful for a traveler, by the way, to defend himself against thieves, if they assail him: if he slay them, he is discharged. For the magistrate, at such a time, armeth him; he cannot be sued at the common law: the prince would not that his subject should perish.

I answer: that the civil laws have given no such authority to the husband and the father of the adulteress; but only hath pardoned their grief conceived: they command not that this should be done, but they command the soldiers and executioners [to do their duties.] Wherefore the similitude

is not alike. So also it may be answered of the traveling man, which is set upon by thieves: if he defend himself with a mind to kill the thief, he is not absolved; but if he kill him by chance, or (as they say) by accident, then he is absolved. The case is not all one: for he hath no time to call upon the magistrate, he cannot sue him at the law. But the husband might shut up the adulterer in his house, he might call for witnesses, and deal with him by the law. [ 3] Also the Ecclesiastical writers, and the Canonists do not allow, that when accusation is had, the adulterous husbands should be heard, and not the adulterous wives. [ 4] Neither would they allow accepting of persons; to wit, that only the common persons, and not the nobler sort should be put to death.

28. [ 5] Also they are against that rigor, that if the adulterer or adulteress escape, there should be no reconciliation had. Augustine, in his book a little before alleged, will have it to be otherwise; If the woman (saith he) repent, let there be a reconciliation. He alledgeth reasons thereof; God must be followed, his church doth oftentimes commit fornication, as we know was done in the time of the Judges and Kings: yet he saith by Jeremiah; Ye will not receive your adulterous wives, I do otherwise. The same doth Hosea affirm in the name of God. If examples shall bear stroke, David did so. Michal the daughter of Saul was given unto another: that, which was committed, was adultery; for in that mean while there was no divorce: David required to have her again. Also Justinian did moderate that austerity: for when the adulteress had been thrust into a monastery, the husband might demand her again within the space of two years. But thou wilt tell me: Augustine saith; She is not worthy to be my wife, she is impure and polluted. Why dost thou cast her impure, which hath repented herself? She

is restored unto the kingdom of heaven by the keys; and may she not be restored to thy bed? Wouldest thou have thyself to be so served?

On this wise did the Council of Arles determine: which we read in the *Extravagants De adulterijs*, in the chapter *Si vir sciens*. The words of the Council be these; If an adulteress be penitent, the man ought to take her again. The gloss saith; Is it the part of honesty, or of necessity? He saith: of honesty. I infer; If it be of honesty, in respect of godliness, it is also of necessity. For we must do all things, which appertain to honesty: as we have in the fourth chapter to the Philippians; Whatsoever things be true, whatsoever things be honest, whatsoever things be just, think upon them. He saith, that it is not of necessity, because he cannot be compelled thereto by an outward law. It is added; But not often. That seemeth (saith the Gloss) to be repugnant to the Gospel, when it saith; Seventy times seven. He answereth, that he may forgive her so often as he will; but the church will not often put itself to be a mean for the obtaining of this reconciliation, least it should seem to open a window unto wickedness. Moreover, the church thinketh that it should be but feigned repentance, if this should be often done. He addeth; Peradventure these things are spoken for terror sake. But if so be she do not repent her, she ought not to continue in matrimony: for then the husband might seem to be the maintainer of adultery. And in the Council of Arles, it is said; he should seem to be a partaker of iniquity.

Jerome, upon the 19th chapter of Matthew, writeth; She that hath divided one flesh into another, ought not to be kept; least the husband should be under the curse. For he that retaineth an adulteress with him, wanteth wisdom. If he be unjust, which accuseth an innocent, he seemeth unwise that retaineth an offender. But these things must be understood [with this exception;] that unless repentance be had. Moreover, it is demanded;

whether the husband shall accuse his wife of adultery, when she is dismissed? Some think, that of charity she ought not to be accused; if she repent. But others say, that the crime is not to be forborne; and that private magistrates should put to their helping hand, to the rooting out of wickedness; and that public-wealth's cannot stand, unless that great offenses be punished; also that the law of God would have evil to be rid from amongst men. It is certain in deed, that if adultery should continue still, the adulterer ought to be accused; that at the least wise, by that means, he might be made the better, if other convenient remedies were used before: as if he had warning given him by his friends. But admit, that the party which sinned do repent, ought he notwithstanding to be accused? Surely, if the crime were openly known, and the party innocent receive the adulteress into favor by reason of repentance, he shall seem to maintain sin. Men know of the adultery, but of the repentance they know not; they will think that he useth brothelry. If he accuse her, he shall at the least wise purge himself, and avoid the blame of infamy.

Admit that the crime be not so commonly known, and that the party in fault be repentant: but she hath conceived, and is to be delivered of a child: if the husband accuse her not, the issue shall be his supposed heir; it shall not be lawful for him to disherit him: there will be an injury done unto his lawful begotten children. What shall be done in this case? In these two latter cases; namely, if the crime be openly known, and the child conceived; counsel is given of the more learned sort, that the husband shall not go unto the magistrate, to desire the punishment to be executed on her, which is penitent; but that, for the avoiding of his own infamy, he shall repair to the church, and signify the cause: whereby they may understand, that the party doth repent. Also, if the case be showed to certain persons; not for

punishment sake, but to the intent they may know that the fruit is conceived by an adulterer, which afterward also he might disherit, there is found a remedy for these evils. Joseph, when he saw his wife Marie to be great with child, not by him, was troubled, he would not defame her, and yet was he a just man. On the one part he saw it belonged unto justice to accuse her; on the other part, he was troubled in himself, not without the special providence of God. While he was in a perplexity, which way to take; God was at hand with him. So will he likewise do unto the godly in these cases, he will be present with them, and will comfort them. These questions we fall into, by reason that adultery is not punished by death.

29. Thus have we seen what the fathers have disallowed in the civil laws. Now, hereafter let us see, what manner of ecclesiastical punishments they have been accustomed to lay upon adulterous persons. Cyprian, in the fourth book, and second epistle unto Antonianus, writeth; that There were certain bishops, which gave no peace unto adulterers; that is, they admitted them not to the communion, but would have them perpetually to be excluded. Others gave them peace, but yet after a certain time. Cyprian thinketh, that a moderation must be used; least they be utterly excluded from Christ, and cast away all love of religion. He saith also, that there must be a trial made of their repentance for a certain time: the space of time he appointeth not. The Synod of Ancyra, in the 19th chapter, appointed seven years: which space of time the Eliberine Council abridged unto five years. Whereby it may appear, that it was in the choice of the prelates of the church. The Council of Neocaesaria decreed, concerning Clergy men; that If the wife of a Clergy man fall into adultery, he is at his choice, whether he will straightway refuse her, or else depart from the ministry. They seem to admit no reconciliation in the clergy. I think the cause seemeth to be, for

that the family of the minister ought to be of good report. Moreover, they added; that a lay-man, whose wife was fallen into adultery, should not be admitted into the ministry. I think the cause to be this; for that he first ought to have governed well in his own house. But there was a suspicion of negligence, seeing his wife did fall into adultery. If a clergy man had not rejected his wife, when she fell into adultery, the Eliberine Council gave him no peace or fellowship with others, during his life.

The Council of Toledo decreed otherwise (as we have it in the Decrees, 32nd cause, question the sixth, in the chapter *Placuit*,) to wit, that A clergy man, whose wife did fall into adultery, might keep her at home; howbeit tied for certain years, with a fasting that should serve to keep her in health, but not that should make her to die. In the Decrees, the 81. distinction, in the chapter Romanus, the chapter Presbyter, and the chapter Diaconus; Adulterous ministers be utterly removed from the ministry. And the Eliberine Council did give no peace unto bishops, priests, or deacons (being fallen into adultery) no not when they should die: no more also did they to the common sort of men, which had committed adultery more than once or twice. They found also another kind of remedy, but that was in cases of suspicion. In the *Extravagants De judicijs*, in the chapter *Significasti*; If a minister were suspected of adultery, and the crime could not be proved, they used the canonical purgation; namely, that he should find out other five ministers, which would affirm by oath, that they could not believe this of him. But such it behooved these ministers to be, as they might be sure would not forswear themselves. They used also another thing; namely, that an adulterer should not contract matrimony with the adulteress, if her first husband had been dead. But this they understood [conditionally] if so be

they had contracted while the other spouse were alive; or had conspired the death of the husband.

There resteth to declare what we are to think of the decree of Justinian. As touching that, that a woman, after she were beaten, should be driven into a monastery, and not be punished with death as an adulterer: I perceive not by what reason that might be proved. The crime belongeth unto both, as well to the man as to the woman: why then is the punishment unlike? The sin of the woman doth no less stain the family, than the sin of the man; yea and that more. Perhaps it will be said, that she is weak: but if that reason should take place, no woman ought to be punished with death. Wherefore under correction of so notable a man, the inequality of the punishment can hardly be allowed: but I think he did this in favor of the bishops. Moreover, he is blamed, insomuch as he ordained; that If a husband shall not demand his wife again within two years; or else that he die, she should be constrained to live continually in the monastery without marriage. Undoubtedly that is against the holy scriptures. What if she be incontinent, as she gave a token thereof by reason of the crime of adultery? If so be that the magistrate grant life unto a malefactor, he ought also to grant those things, which pertain to a godly life. Otherwise, what profit cometh by putting her away; unless it be to make her worse? I have declared what I think concerning the decree of Justinian.

30. Now let us come unto the other question; namely, whether a man and a woman do sin, the one as grievously as the other, in the case of adultery; and whether they both are to be driven unto one punishment, so that in all respects they should be in all things equal. Unto very many it hath not so seemed good; and that verily for diverse causes. They would have the case to be more grievous touching women than touching men: and the causes,

which lead them thereto, are these. [ 1] [First] because they perceived that the civil laws do admit no accusation of the husband against his wife, or of the father against his daughter; but not so of the woman, although she take her husband with the shameful act, and have witnesses of the same: as we have in the Code, within the title *Ad legem Iuliam de adulterijs*, in the first law. Wherefore they in old time accounted the fault to be more grievous [in the woman.] [ 2] Also they weigh this, that a woman being taken, is straightway infamous: but a man must be first accused and condemned, before that he be stained with infamy. [ 3] Thirdly, it was sometime lawful, before the law Julia, for husbands to kill their wives: as Cato testifieth in the place above recited; The law (saith he) is to slay her that is taken. But it is not lawful for her to touch thee once with her finger, if she perceive thee to commit adultery. Hereunto Plautus pleasantly alluded in the comedy Mercator. In very deed women are here bound to over-strict a law: [ 4] as Plutarch (upon the life of Romulus) reporteth, that it was lawful for the husband to put away his wife for adultery; but not so on the contrary part. Which law seemed also to like Constantine: as we read in the Theodosian Code, *De adulterijs*, in the chapter *Placuit*; Let the husband (saith he) put away his wife for adultery, but let not her do the same unto her husband, though he be an effeminate person, or a *muliercularian*. For this term he useth.

[ 5] Also they hereby consider of an inequality; for that the woman, if she kept ill company with another man's bond-man, she was made a bondwoman; but it is not taught that it was so done unto men, if they sinned against bond-women. [ 6] Moreover, they say, that lust is always counted to be more shameful in women, and that therefore the crime should be more grievous in them. [ 7] Further, they suppose that a man, although he live in

matrimony, if he keep ill company with others, being loose or single women (as they call them) he committeth not adultery: when as on the contrary part, a woman being married, may have fellowship with no man, but she falleth into adultery. And they allege that which Suetonius writeth upon the life of Vespasian; that he caused the Senate to decree, that a free-woman, which joined herself with bond-men, should be constrained to bondage: but decreed not so, touching men. Howbeit, this and the fifth argument is all one. [ 8] There is another argument taken *Ex Orificiano*, out of the Code, in the law *Illustris*; that It is a far more shameful thing for a woman to have bastards, that is, by one which is not a lawful husband, than it is for a man to have bastards. [ 9] Ecclesiasticus is alleged, which in the 7th, 24th, and 26th chapters, speaketh many things of the custody, which the father ought to have of his daughters, for the conservation of their chastity; but speaketh nothing of his men children. [ 10] They also consider this; that A woman, being taken in adultery, loseth her dowry and donation, granted in respect of marriage, [ 11] whereas the adulterer sustaineth no loss. In the *Extravagants De donationibus inter virum & vxorem*, in the chapter *Plerúnque*, in the end; Adam and Eve, being found to be in one kind of sin, have not both one punishment: Eve is punished more grievously.

31. [ 1] On the other side, the causes seem to be very great, which persuade otherwise. The first is, that a woman is more weak and imperfect [than a man;] she wanteth understanding and judgment. These things seem to serve for diminishing the fault. And many laws persuade us, that in punishing, we should have a consideration of the sex. [ 2] Some of the laws I will recite. In the Digests *Ad legem Juliam peculatus*, it is said; that In punishment, there must be consideration had of the sex: the law beginneth, *Sacrilegij poenam*. Also *Ad legem Juliam de adulterijs*, in the law *Si*

*adulterum*, in the Paraph *Fratres*, and in the Paraph *Iacestam*, they would have a difference to be considered of in the sex, because women are not forced to be skillful in the laws, sometimes they be deceived: they think that to be lawful, which is not lawful. Also the Ecclesiastical laws teach, that there ought to be a consideration had of the sex. In the *Extravagants, De homicidio*, in the chapter *Si dignum*, in the Code, *Ad legem Juliam maiestatis*, in the law *Quisquis*, in the Paraph Filias; There is more favor showed to the daughters of conspirators, than unto their sons. In the Decrees, cause 32. question 6, the chapter *Indignatur*, there is consideration had of women, even in the self-same cause of adultery.

[ 3] There be sayings also of most excellent men, which be agreeable to this sentence. Augustine, in his treatise *De adulterinis coniugijs ad Pollentium*, citeth the letters written by Antonius Pius which we may read in the Gregorian Code; that It is very unjust, that men should require that faith of women, which themselves will not show. [ 4] In the Digests *De adulterio*, in the law *Si vxor*, in the Paraph *Si judex*; It is commanded, that if the judge have knowledge of the adultery, let him look whether the husband have lived chastely. [ 5] And so the fault of the woman is mitigated, because the men themselves by their ill living be causes of their unclean life. [ 6] Whereupon Seneca, in his 94th epistle unto Lucillus, saith; that It is a most unjust thing for men to exact faithfulness of women, when as they themselves be the corrupters of other men's wives. [ 7] Neither did Augustine put this matter in silence, who saith, that Vir; that is to say, Man, hath his name of Virtus, that is, Virtue; and that therefore he ought to excel the wife in all virtues and chastity. In his little book *De decem chordis*, (and it is also read in the 32nd cause, question 5. in the chapter *Non moechaberis*,) saith, that The husband is the head of his wife; if the head

fall into adultery, and the wife be chaste, he is a man turned upside down, the head is under the feet.

[ 8] It happeneth ofttimes, that the adulteries of the wife, are revengements of an adulterous husband. It is said of Clytemnestra, that she gave the power of her body to Aegistus, because she heard that Agamemnon preferred Chrysis before her. That such a punishment is brought by the judgment of God, it appeareth that Job understood, who in the 31st chap. saith; If my heart hath been carried aside to a strange woman, and if I have lie in wait at my neighbor's door, then let my wife grind unto another man, and let her yield her body to other men. So then there be reasons to be made on both parts. What shall we say? If credit be given to the School-divines, the distinction must be made, which is mentioned in the fourth book of sentences, in the 35th distinction. If the faith of wedlock be considered, the sin is equal on both parts; either is bound unto other, whether the woman give herself to another, or else the man commit adultery. If the condition of the person be respected, seeing man is the more perfect, he hath the firmer judgment, and ought to excel his wife; his sin is more grievous than hers. Howbeit, if we note the confusion of things, the supposed heirs, and the shame of the family, the woman is more grievously charged.

But as touching the very law itself of wedlock, they say well; that the bond is all alike, that sin is committed as well by the one as by the other, they must be brought to an equality. Equality we prove out of the holy scriptures; Unto one Adam, the Lord gave one Eve; and to one Eve, he gave one Adam: and he said; They shall be two in one flesh. Paul, when he treateth of these things in the first to the Corinthians, the seventh chapter, saith; that The wife hath not power over her own body, but the husband. And on the other side, he maketh this law equal to the one and the other.

Neither doth he speak unto the one party, of rendering due benevolence; but unto them both. And if they shall think good to sever themselves for prayer sake, he willeth that the same be done by both their consents. In case of religion, if they will not dwell together, each party is set at liberty. The same is also spoken there concerning the unbelieving husband. The law of God commandeth, that both, as well the adulterer, as the adulteress, should be slain. Seeing therefore he maketh this equality, we also ought to follow the same.

32. Now it remaineth, that we answer to the arguments. It was said, that a woman must not be heard. This law is civil, and refused of the Ecclesiastical writers; and that justly. Jerome, in his epistle to Oceanus, upon the death of Fabiola, wrote a very excellent sentence; Those things, which in the holy scriptures are commanded unto men, do redound unto women. Wherefore, if it be lawful for a man to start from his wife, for the cause of adultery; it is also lawful unto the wife. Among us there is the same liberty, and the same bondage unto both parties: to correct after a sort the civil laws. Both parties must be heard. Touching infamy also, it is man's ordinance. Even as praise is called the celebration of other men's virtues; so infamy is to dispraise that, which is in another. And it may be, they will speak more of women than of men. But with God this fame is of no importance. There is more spoken of the women, by reason of the harm which they bring; and because they make a confusion in families. As concerning that it hath been lawful for men to kill their wives, and not for the wives, their husbands: I answer; If it were lawful, yet that law was not just, as the fathers thought. I add: It is no marvel if it were not lawful unto women; for they handle not weapons, but are subject unto men; and in this respect there is some inequality.

And in that there was used to be a putting away of the woman by the man: I say it was a decree of men, as Jerome citeth in the sentence now alleged. Assuredly, Theodosius (as we find in the Code *De repudijs*, in the law *Consensus*) giveth authority unto the wives, to put away their husbands: and he declareth many causes why. There is an excellent place of this matter in the Decrees, cause 32. question the fifth, in the chapter *Christiana religio*: where it is written, that Adultery is condemned in both sexes alike. And because some were offended, for that they saw men oftentimes put away their wives, and wives to be more often excommunicated for adultery than husbands: answer is made, that it is not, because sin is lesser in man than in woman; but for that men might have more free authority against the women. And therefore, forsomuch as the church doth not judge, unless it be in matters which be manifest, it cometh to pass, that women are more often taken than men, and are excommunicated, and suffer divorcement. Also we know, that in the old law, it was lawful for men to give a bill of divorcement unto women; but contrariwise, that the same was not lawful for women: therefore it seemeth, that God did attribute more unto men. I answer, that the case must be weighed, for the which God would have this bill of divorcement to be given. It had been an easy matter for men to kill their wives, when as they might not be rid of them: but this was less to be feared of women, because it doth seldomer happen.

Another argument was, that it was provided by the laws; that If a woman coupled herself with another man's bondman, or kept shameful company with him, she should be brought into bondage: but it was not so ordained against men, that they should become slaves; according as Vespasian persuaded the Senate of Rome, as Suetonius reporteth. But it is answered, that men made this decree. If it had been in women to have decreed the

same, they would have provided otherwise. Moreover, it appeareth, that Plato, in the second book of his laws, counted both alike; both the men, which kept unlawful company with bond women; and the women, which did the like with bondmen. Besides, they that would make a difference, are in the danger of that saying of Paul; In the same thing that thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself, for thou doest even the same things that thou judgest. But it was added; That lust hath always been counted a more shameful thing in women, than in men. Of whom hath it been so accounted? Of men. But, will we say, is it so, if we respect the will and commandment of God? Man and woman undoubtedly be all of one lump. Further, women be the unperfecter and of the less judgment: it is man's part to guide them, and to have charge of them. How can the lust be more filthy in woman than in man? Unless perhaps we will have this respect, that women's shame is more manifest, they become with child, the matter appeareth, the show is more evident in them: but if we consider the commandment and law of God, the case is all one with them both.

33. [ 7] But they say; that It is the common opinion of men, that if a man, joined in matrimony, have copulation with a woman, being free and at liberty, he committeth not adultery; but that whensoever a woman that is married, have copulation with another, she is counted an adulteress. So as there is a difference. To dissolve this reason, many things are to be said. First, if we seek the etymology of the word adultery; it signifieth, To go to the wedlock bed of another. Wherefore, in what sort so ever it be done, be it of man or woman, it is all one. Indeed I know, that the civil laws have judged and determined, that it is adultery; when there is wicked society with a married woman. For if the same be either widow, or virgins, they say it is whoredom: and that adultery is only to have fellowship with her that is

married. This is the opinion of the lawyers, as appeareth *Ad legem Iuliam de adulterijs*, in the law, which beginneth *Inter liberas personas*. Whereupon Azo, a famous lawyer, defined Adultery to be the lying with the wife or spouse of another man; and that, to speak properly, (which I add, because Jerome, in his 2nd treatise against Jovinian, towards the end, writeth the opinion of Xystus one of Pythagoras sect, that if the husband moderate not himself in concupiscence with his wife, he committeth adultery, but this is not proper adultery) the deflowering of concubines or handmaidens, which be joined in marriage with bond-men, is not taken for adultery.

Indeed it was sin, and there was an action commenced, either of the law Aquilia, or else of trespass; as against a servant corrupted, but not to appeach him of adultery. But we are to judge otherwise by the holy scripture. The lawyers by their leave have not well defined adultery. This did Chrysostom note, who in his epistle to the Thessalonians writeth thus; The Roman laws punish women, which be taken in adultery, but men they do not punish, yet God will punish them; for without all doubt, it is adultery. Augustine, in his book *De fide & operibus*, the 18th chapter, saith; that They be adulterers, which have other men's wives in place of their own; and adulteresses, which have other women's husbands. And so a woman, that is set at liberty, and useth a strange man instead of her own, committeth adultery. The same Augustine, *De bono conjugali contra Jovinianum*, the fourth chapter, writeth; that Adultery is a violating of the faith of wedlock. When a man therefore hath access to another man's wife, whether she be free, or knit in marriage, adultery is committed by him, that is the husband. And a little after he saith; It is adultery, when there is carnal fellowship with another man, or another woman, against the covenant of

marriage. How oft therefore so ever it be done against this covenant, by the testimony of Augustine it is adultery.

If I should define it, thus would I say; that Adultery is a venereous action, wherein there is carnal fellowship with that flesh, which is not bound to itself by the law of matrimony, but unto another. Now let us see the parts of the definition. Action is the genus, or general word: and because the actions of men be diverse, venereous is added for the difference. Again, there is another difference; in that the fellowship is with that flesh, which is bound unto another, by the faith of matrimony. Why is it said; Not unto itself, but, unto another? [ 8] To the intent we may understand, that in the polygamy, which was in old time, there was no plain adultery. For one of the wives, when she was joined with a husband, was joined with that flesh, which was also tied to another woman. Therefore it is said; Which is not joined unto itself, but unto another, by the faith of matrimony. Further, if we will more narrowly examine that piece of the sentence; To have carnal fellowship, may be understood, to be either in act, or cogitation. For Christ saith; He that shall look on another man's wife, to lust after her, hath already committed adultery in his heart. But here we speak of adultery, that breaketh out into act; not of that, which as yet is within the heart.

34. Moreover, it was said to be more shameful for women to have bastards, than it is for men. [ 9] This also hath proceeded of man's reason: a shame it is, both to the one and to the other; but perhaps it appeareth more in women than in men. Those places of Ecclesiasticus, which urge parents to keep their daughters, or the bodies of their daughters, have not respect unto this place. No rather, the wise man doth consider, that if daughters be corrupted, they are to bring great harm and ignominy to their fathers house; and the father is accused of negligence. But men children must also be well

brought up, howbeit, the foulness of this fact, in this crime, appeareth elsewhere, not in the father's house. Nevertheless, these things bring not to pass, but that they both commit sin. [ 10] Another argument; But wives lose their dowry, whereas adulterers be not so punished. That is false: for even as if matrimony be undone, by the fault of the woman, she loseth her dowry and donations given in respect of marriage; so, if it be done through the man's fault, he loseth the dowry itself and donations also, and must restore them unto her.

[ 11] Again, somewhat was said of Adam and Eve; that they were in the like fault, and yet Eve was more grievously punished than Adam. Here may either of both be said; either that the sin was not of like weight, or else that the punishment of Eve was not more grievous. It is excused by some, that the man's fault was the greater. For it is said; Cursed is the earth for thy sake, in sorrow shalt thou eat of it, thorn and thistle shall it bring forth unto thee, and thou shalt eat of the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread, &c. These evils were continual unto man: he should labor, he should eat in great sweat and travel, and the earth gave not unto him the fruit that he looked for. Women seem to be less punished; only the pains of child-birth and conceiving are laid upon them, the which be not perpetual: but the labors of men do always continue. Further, the man ought to provide, not only for himself, but also for his wife, children, and for his whole family. But if thou wilt say, that the wife is subject unto the husband, and must be under his government: this importeth not much; for by the very constitution itself, she is inferior unto man. Wherefore it might by this means be denied, that woman is more grievously punished than man.

But if we would grant unto this, we might also say on the other part, that the sin in woman was somewhat more grievous; namely, because she was

seduced by the devil, and so seduced, as she thought she should become equal unto God, and this she very much desired. Nevertheless, Adam believed it not; because he saw it was not possible to be: and therefore the apostle saith, that he was not seduced, but did only eat; to the intent he might obey his wives mind, and made more account of his wife than of God; therefore he was not deceived with the same kind of error. Moreover, the woman did not only sin, but she also induced her husband to sin. But on the other part, she is somewhat lightened; because she was the unperfecter, and was seduced. Howbeit, if any of their sins were more grievous than other, the woman's sin was to be weighed the greater. This is the opinion of the Master of the sentences, in the second book, distinction the 12: and he alledgeth many places out of Augustine. But I, for my part, would say; that the man's sin was more grievous, and that his punishment was the greater, by reason of his perfection and excellency. Wherefore this argument maketh nothing to the purpose; either the punishment was of equality, or else the circumstances were not alike grievous to be aggravated to them both. The circumstances were many, some were more grievous in Adam, and some in Eve.

35. Also it was alleged on the contrary part, that the sin is less in women: for a consideration should be had of the sex. Indeed this is to be granted: yet the cause must be searched out, why those laws be favorable unto the sex. And there is a cause brought by the laws themselves; namely, that women are not driven to have the knowledge of all laws and customs: and therefore may the more easily err; and the error doth somewhat mitigate the fault. But here this erring hath no place: for there is no woman so foolish, but she knoweth, that she ought to keep her faith and promise with her husband. But in incest, they rather forgave unto women than unto men; because they

knew not those degrees, wherein it was lawful or not lawful to be married: and therefore they were not so grievously punished. And whereas it was alleged, that the adulteries of the men are oftentimes punished by the adulteries of the women: as it hath been said of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra. We answer, that such revenges are not to be allowed; for that they are repugnant to the word of God: and therefore we allow no such forms of revenging.

True indeed it is, that sins are punished with sins; and he that keepeth not faith himself, must not look to have another keep the same with him: nevertheless, this is done by the order and providence of God. It is not lawful for any man to do ill, because another hath sinned: for by that means, evil would grow till it were infinite. In that women are somewhat forborne in the great offense of treason, it is no marvel: for, the cause why that the sons of conspirators, which have sinned against the prince, are punished in such sort as they be, is; least that if they should retain the authority and riches of their parents, they might imitate their sins; or else revenge their death: the which in daughters is not to be feared. But yet it must not therefore be concluded, that there is a difference as touching the crimes. Briefly, I allow well enough that distinction of the Schoolmen; that if the faith of matrimony be considered, the sin is of like equality, both in the adulterer and adulteress. If the state [of the parties] be considered, the man sinneth more grievously: but if we regard the harm that is done unto the family, it is to be laid to the woman's charge. And, that man sinneth more grievously, in respect of that which belongeth to his state and degree, it is manifest; not only by this, that he is of a greater judgment, but we may also perceive it, even by the holy history. Nathan was not sent unto Bethsabe, but unto David.

36. And thus much have we said concerning the second question. Now let us come to the third; namely, what we are to determine of these punishments intermitted. Verily, if I should speak freely what I think, it is not well ordered, that the punishment of death is not in use; seeing the same agreeth with the word of God, and with divine laws, which ought to be of great importance with us. [ 1] In Leviticus, and in Deuteronomy, God ordained, that both the adulterer and adulteress should be slain. [ 2] Secondly, I prove this by the very order itself of the commandment of God. Let us lay before our eyes the ten commandments. As touching the worshipping of the true God, it pertaineth to the first commandment: he that should do otherwise, was to suffer death. Of taking the name of the Lord in vain, it is said; If there be any blasphemer, let him die the death. Of keeping holy the sabbath day, we read; that he which did gather sticks on the sabbath day, was commanded to be slain. Of the fifth precept it is decreed, that if any man were rebellious against his parents, he should be brought to the judges, and slain. Of the sixth precept; He that hath slain another man, let him perish, and let him be plucked even from the altar. Then followeth the precept of adultery; there the sword stayeth his execution, and proceedeth no further. Unto stealing and false-witness-bearing, there is no punishment of death appointed. Neither hath concupiscence any punishment of blood belonging thereunto.

[ 3] Seeing the order is on this wise, I would know, why the men of our time invert the same? But they say that the Common-wealth is more disturbed by thieves, than by adulterers: for we must have a consideration unto the commodity of the Common-wealth. But I deny that thieves do more disturb the Common-wealth. If they rob and slay by the high way in the night, and lie in wait for men’s lives, I might easily grant it: but

absolutely of stealing I cannot say so. Doubtless, if our judgment be right, who had not rather loose somewhat of his goods and substance, than that his wife should be dishonested? Howbeit, such a covetousness there is at this day engrafted in men, that they make more accompt of their money, than of their wives honesty. Wherefore I say, that there is some injury done unto thieves, in so much as they be hanged; and adulterers, who sin more grievously, are suffered to live. [ 4] The fourth reason is, that in suffering adulterers to live, they intricate us with very hard questions. First there is brought in by the papists a divorce from the marriage bed, but not from the bond of matrimony. Moreover, there is disputation, whether the innocent party may contract matrimony, while the other party liveth. And there is a controversy, whether the adulteress, which surviveth, may marry again with another. Further, they dispute of reconciliation between adulterers, and by this easy means, cities are filled with uncleanness and adulteries; and men would after a sort be more pitiful than God himself.

37. It is objected, that Christ suffered not the adulterous woman to be stoned. The eighth of John. Whereby they gather, that the Lord would not have this to be done in the state of the Gospel; and therefore adulterers are to be spared in these days. They say also, that Joseph being accused of this crime, was not put to death. To these two examples we must answer. First, I am not ignorant, that the same story, in the eight chapter of John, hath been rejected by some; because it rather seemed to be put in of others, than to be written by John. Jerome, in his second book against Pelagius, writeth of this matter. The same doth Eusebius Caesariensis touch in his third book, who saith; that he did think it to be taken out of the gospel of the Nazarits. Augustine, in his second book *De adulterinis coniugijs ad Pollentium*, thinketh; that It was the very story of John in deed, but devised by cruel

husbands to be wiped out, to the intent that adulterous wives might be put to death. Hereby it cometh to pass, that in some copies it is found and in some not. How likely a thing this is, let other men judge. What so ever it be, whether it be of John's writing or no, the matter is not great; for it containeth nothing against the sentence which I have proposed: which thing I will somewhat more largely declare.

Ye must think with yourselves, that the Pharisees did not bring the adulteress unto Christ, as unto a judge or king; for they never acknowledged him to be such a one. Neither did Christ ever usurp such an office unto himself, he withdrew himself, when they would have made him a king; neither would he divide the heritage: and he pronounced his kingdom not to be of this world. Whie then do they bring her to him? Even to lay a bait for him, and as they say to take him in a trip. He was praised among the common sort for his clemency, he was loved of the people. Then did these Pharisees devise among themselves; If he shall say, that she must be put to death, this favor of the people will fall from him, as being one, that would bring in again the rigor of the law; but if he say, that she must be let go, he shall do against the law of Moses, yea and of God himself. But Christ very well repelled their wiliness. He did neither of both, which they hoped he would do: yet in the meantime, he did his part very worthily. He was no civil magistrate, but the minister of the church. It was his office to preach the Gospel and repentance; both which he did. Wherefore he said to the Pharisees; He that among you is free from sin, let him throw the first stone at her. He said not; Let her not be put to death: but, Take heed what ye yourselves do, and repent.

This also must Judges be warned of, that in the thing wherein they condemn others, they be not guilty themselves. But therefore it is not said;

If yourselves have sinned, spare ye others. For they should sin two ways; as well for that themselves were guilty of heinous offenses; as also because they punished not others, which were guilty in the same. This that belonged unto himself, he gave them warning of: and in the same sort he did afterward unto the woman; Go thy ways (saith he) and sin no more. Therefore he discharged her: for he said; Seeing no man hath condemned thee, neither do I condemn thee. He saw her penitent heart. After what sort did he acquit her? Not from the punishment of death; for that he left to the Common-wealth. But he accused her not. That might not Christ do, not in that respect that he was a minister of the church; but because he had not seen her, nor taken her with the manner, he could not be a witness; neither came he into this world for that purpose.

Notwithstanding, some man will say; She nevertheless scaped away, by reason of the words of Christ. This was indirectly [not in respect of Christ's judgment.] Christ's dealing was otherwise. This was the Scribes fault, who might not abide to hear Christ's preaching of repentance. They everyone departed one after another, and left her there alone. Neither is this a good consequent; Christ, at his first coming, condemned not an adulteress; Therefore he punisheth not adulteries. He punisheth them oftentimes, when the magistrates sword is still: he doth, and he will do his office. Neither is it a good reason, to say; The church hath not the sword, it doth not punish adultery with death; Therefore, neither ought the civil magistrate to do it. The church letteth not the civil magistrate, but that he may do his office. More slender is the argument taken of Joseph: for certainly he was delivered to the chief justice of capital crimes. The crime therefore was of death: they which were put in that prison, were appointed to be put to death; even as that Baker was. But the judgment of Joseph's cause was deferred:

besides this, he was not accused, that he had committed adultery; but that he would have done the same. And let these things suffice for those objections.

38. Now I conclude, that I speak not this, to the intent I would abolish the authority of magistrates. I know that crimes are to be punished, this is appointed by the law of God: but the manner of punishing is committed unto magistrates; neither ought those laws to be of force. I know also, that those civil laws, given by Moses, do no more bind us than the ceremonial do. The ceremonies took effect till the coming of Christ. The civil laws had their use so long as the Common-wealth did last; they were convenient for that people. But I dare take upon me to say, that it were convenient, that the justice, which is to be seen in those laws, should not be neglected, but should be embraced of magistrates as a profitable thing. As touching the ecclesiastical punishments, in my judgment, such regard ought to be had, that adulterers, which be convicted, and are not penitent, might in such sort be handled, as at the least-wise they ought not to scape so free in the church from punishment, as they should be partakers of the sacraments: for the crime is most grievous; they wound the conscience of the godly sort. And how grievous it is, it is set forth unto us to behold in the fall of David. But what is the cause, why David was not condemned? We answer, that there was not tribunal seat above his own; he had none above him but God, who pardoned him of life: but yet that the same should be full of many crosses; so as he seemed rather to be reserved unto miseries, than to live in happiness.

**Of the reconciliation of man and wife after adultery committed.**

39. The civil laws are very much against the reconciliation of the husband and the wife, after adultery is committed. For in the Code *Ad legem Juliam de adulterijs*, in the law that beginneth *Castitati nostrorum temporum*, it is

decreed; that If a man shall bring home again his wife, being condemned of adultery, he doth incur the crime of brothelry. And in the title of the law *Crimen*, we read, that he which shall retain in matrimony his wife being an adulteress, he may not accuse her of adultery. Notwithstanding, it was afterward, by a new law otherwise provided. Neither was it a light matter for one to be condemned of brothelry: but it was even as heinous, as if a man should be condemned of adultery. Yea, and if so be that a man retain with him a woman condemned of adultery, he himself without an accuser may be condemned of adultery. And if a man shall bring her home again, whom he hath put away, he cannot accuse her of the adultery, which she had before committed. But of another adultery he may; since in bringing of her home again, it seemeth that he allowed of her conditions. And if any woman be condemned of adultery, none may take her to his wife. Wherefore the civil laws do utterly mislike of reconciliation after adultery committed; so that it be convicted and condemned. For if there should be but only a suspicion thereof, it may be lawful for the husband to retain her with him, and to accuse her being suspected. And if he shall afterward perceive that he was led with vain suspicion to accuse her, he may desist from his purpose: so that he first obtain a discharge from the judge.

Jerome, upon the 19th chapter of Matthew, may seem to hold with the civil laws: for he writeth, that she, which hath divided one flesh to another man, or other men, must not be retained; least the husband become under the curse. For as it is written in the 28th chap. of the Proverbs; He that keepeth an adulteress with him, is ungodly and foolish. So indeed the 70 interpreters did expound it: but the truth of the Hebrew text hath it not. The same Jerome saith: If there happen any sin to be, it doth not stain matrimony; but if adultery happen, now is not the wife lawful. And in the

32nd cause, question the 1st, the words of Chrysostom are recited; If a man have the company of an adulterous wife let him repent. The same father, upon the 26nd chapter of Matthew: Even as he is unjust, which accuseth an innocent; so he is a fool, which retaineth an adulteress. And the very same saying we have in the Decretals *De adulterijs*, in the chapter *Si vir sciens*, and it is the Council of Arles; A man which retaineth an adulteress, is partaker of the crime. Also: If a woman, being put away, should be married to another, although her latter husband be dead; she may not return to the first, for she is now become unclean unto him; as we have it in the 24th chapter of Deuteronomy.

40. But now pass we over these things, and let us see the reasons, which make for reconciliation. That most mighty and excellent God of ours would be the spouse of his church, and that not only in this our age, but also in the days of the fathers. Howbeit, the church, especially in old time, did oftentimes decline unto idolatry, and plaid the harlot with the gods of the Gentiles; as we may read in sundry places, in the book of Judges, and in the history of the Kings, and in the Prophets. Yet nevertheless, Jeremiah, in the name of God called her home, that she might return again to her husband. And even so did the prophet Ose, and that with many speeches. And if God be ready to receive his adulterous wife, man ought also to be reconciled unto his wife; especially, if she fall from her error, and repent. For how many so ever be Christians, they profess the following of God. There is extant an example of David, which brought home again his wife Michal; although she had been bestowed by the father to another man. Justinian also in his Authentiks, when he commandeth an adulteress to be beaten, and closed up in a monastery; yet doth he give leave unto the husband to take

her unto him again, if he will, within the space of two years; and so doth most manifestly allow of reconciliation.

Augustine, in his second book unto Pollentius, laboreth very much in this, to have them reconciled. For in his time there were many, which would not take their adulterous wives, as they which were now spotted and polluted. Whereupon he wrote; But dost thou think her to be polluted, whom baptism and repentance hath purged, and whom God hath made clean? She ought not to seem polluted unto thee. And if that she be already reconciled by the keys of the church, and admitted into the kingdom of heaven; by what right mayest thou repel her from thee? In the 32nd cause, question 1. these words also are written; If she be fallen, thou mayest know, that to fall is common among men: and mercy ought to be showed to her, if she be risen again. For the same would we have done unto us. And extreme law is extreme injury. In the Decretals *De adulterijs & stupris*, in the chapter *Si vir sciens*, we read out of the Council of Arles; An adulteress, if she be penitent, ought to be received. The Gloss in that place asketh, by what law or right she should be received? It answereth: Not of necessity; because the man cannot be compelled whether he will or no to take her. Wherefore he ought by the law of honesty to bring her home again.

But I would ask the question; Ought he not to take her home, by the duty of godliness, and precept of God, when as Paul saith unto the Philippians; Do whatsoever things be honest and just? And so the necessity of the commandment taketh place therein. Howbeit, the Gloss meant there, of the outward law of pleading; whereby no man may be constrained to take an adulteress again. But in the Canon now cited, is added; Not often: for if she fall often into adultery, she should not be received. The Gloss there objecteth Christ against himself, who being demanded, How oft a man

should forgive his brother, when he sinneth against him, answereth; Not seven times only, but seventy times seven times. Unto this he saith, that the words of the canon must be understood; that when the adulteress doth so often stray, the church shall make no intercession for reconciliation; partly, because there would be a window opened unto wickedness; and partly, for that it is thought to be but a feigned and counterfeit kind of repentance. Also there is added another answer; namely, that it is spoken for terror sake, that the people might not sin too boldly and licentiously. Hereby it is gathered, that the church ought to make intercession for repentance, to the intent there might be a reconciliation. Wherefore, the adulteress either showeth tokens of repentance, or else showeth none: if she show any, the church ought to make intercession for her, that there may be a reconciliation; but if she show none, intercession of the church shall not be used: otherwise it might be thought to be a supporter of sins.

41. Now must we make answer unto the arguments, which seemed to be a let unto reconciliation. As concerning the civil laws, they must be amended by the word of God. Jerome and Chrysostom speak of the adulteress, which will not repent. And this is plainly perceived by the Council of Arles. For so it is there: A man, which retaineth an adulteress, is partaker of the crime; yet nevertheless, if she repent, let her be received. But why the law of Moses would not suffer, that a wife, being once put away, should return to her first husband after the death of the second, the cause may easily be showed. For if he had permitted this, divorcements would soon have been admitted; in hope that the wife should at one time or other recover her husband again. God would, that she, which was once put away, might not return anymore; least she should be put away upon small occasion. There might also have been lying in wait for the latter husband; that the wife, when the latter were

taken away, might return again to the first. Wherefore the law of God was most equal, which pertaineth not unto adulteresses, whom by the commandment of God, it behooved to stone unto death. By these things now it appeareth, that it is lawful for the husband to return again into favor with his wife, that hath been an adulteress; so that she be penitent: who nevertheless ought to accuse his wife of adultery, if the crime be openly known; or if she do persevere in wickedness, or else if the issue be born by adultery, least the lawful heirs should be defrauded. For unless that accusation should be a remedy, a man might not disherit his child born in adultery. Further, the church may make intercession, and deal with the husband, for to bring home his penitent wife again. So as our Levite must not be blamed, for receiving of his adulterous wife into favor; if so be that she did repent her of her adultery.

**Of Wine and Drunkenness.**

42. Now, because there be very many intemperate men, which being blamed for their drunkenness, are wont to excuse their sin, otherwise most shameful, saying; that They abuse not wine, forsomuch as they use it to that end, for the which it was appointed and ordained by God; to wit, that mortal men might thereby make themselves merry. For this cause I thought it good to reprove their impudency. Wherefore, I will first declare the true use of wine. Afterward I will show the abuse thereof, teaching it to be against the law of God. Then will I bring examples, manifestly to open, that the abuse of it is as well damnable, as fowl and detestable. After this I will rehearse the horrible effects of this evil. And lastly I will answer to those civillations and sophistical arguments, whereby drunkenness and abuse of wine is defended by the Epicures.

As touching the first, I deny not, but that wine hath excellent properties: [ 1] for it quencheth the thirst, which might also be done with water; howbeit, not so commodiously. Because wine, in quenching thirst, maketh a man strong, and quickeneth the spirits, whereby nature is very much refreshed. [ 2] Further, it is medicinal for cold and weakness, both of the stomach, and also of the powers, which serve for the life of man. Whereupon Paul writeth unto Timothy, that he should use wine for the stomach, and often diseases thereof. [ 3] It is occupied sometimes also, and not unprofitably for wounds. For which cause in the tenth of Luke it is written, that the Samaritan bound up the wounds of him, whom he found half dead, and poured wine and oil into them. [ 4] Moreover, wine maketh merry, and helpeth not a little to drive away sadness and heaviness of mind. And therefore Solomon, in his Proverbs, the 31st chapter, writeth; Give strong drink to them that are heavy, and wine to the sorrowful of heart, let them drink and forget their poverty, and remember their sorrow no more. And we read in the 104th Psalm; Wine rejoiceth the heart of man.

For so great hath been the goodness of God towards man, that he would give unto them, not only things necessary for their sustenance, but he also bestowed large dainties upon them. For properly and of himself he delighteth not in the languishing, sadness, and heaviness of men; but desireth to have them live in godly and honest merriness of the heart. Wherefore he hath granted unto them, not only the use of wine, but also of oil, and most fragrant smells; flesh likewise, and also diverse and manifold kinds of meats. Assuredly, the use of wine now and then is profitable for them, which are recovered from diseases, and must be restored to their former health; and (as a certain Philosopher showed) the heaviness and certain bitterness of old men is thereby mitigated and asswaged: as hops,

which otherwise are most bitter, become sweet being steeped in water. But we must take heed, that we keep a measure; otherwise, the rejoicing that is attained by wine, is soon turned into very great heaviness. For the untemperateness of wine, doth easily lose his utility; yea, and if men come to drunkenness, the use of wine is most lamentable and hurtful. So then it is necessary to put a difference between the use and abuse thereof.

43. Herewithal we say, that to have too much drink, or to be drunk, may two ways be taken; either properly, or metaphorically. This difference did Marsilius Ficinus plainly teach, in the argument of his second dialogue *De justo*; and he maketh one kind of drunkenness above the moon, or a celestial drunkenness, stirred up by drinking of heavenly drink; whereby the mind, being set without itself, and above itself, forgetteth all mortal diseases, and only considereth things divine: by the brightness whereof, first it waxeth dim, but after that it tasteth the savor of the same, it is by a new heat changed from his first habit or quality, whereby within a while it clearly beholdeth spiritual things; and while it savorly tasteth them, it is fruitfully nourished. Wherefore it is written in the psalm; We shall be made drunken with the fruitfulness of thy house. Yea and Musaeus an ancient Poet saith, that the reward of virtue is perpetual drunkenness. And Orpheus, before Musaeus, said, that the same was signified by the ceremonies and holy services of Dionysius.

The other kind of drunkenness he saith is under the moon, and is worldly; which is stirred up of drink, taken out of the fountain Lethes, that is, carnal drink, whereby the mind being set without itself, and under itself, forgetteth divine things, and doteth. Neither is it to be doubted, but that this kind of drunkenness is utterly to be avoided. Of the first kind of drunkenness, which is metaphorical, there is plain mention made in the Proverbs of

Solomon: where wisdom stirreth up men to drink wine, which she hath set forth upon her table plentifully and abundantly. Yea and Christ our savior, which is the true wisdom, promiseth us such wine in the kingdom of heaven. By translation also is described the wine of compunction and fury, which God will give unto the wicked to drink; whereby they shall become mad, and for their deserts be turned into stark fury. But setting aside these metaphors, let us return unto drunkenness, properly taken, whereof we now entreat.

And let us declare by testimonies of the holy scriptures, that such abuse of wine is forbidden, and the contrary enjoined us. To the Ephesians Paul saith; Be ye not made drunken with wine, wherein is intemperance; but be ye filled with the spirit, speaking to yourselves by psalms hymns, and spiritual songs. Upon which place Jerome saith; We cannot at one time be filled with wine, and with the holy Ghost. For the apostle placeth these things as contraries; even as we cannot serve two masters. He that is filled with the spirit, hath wisdom, meekness, shamefastness, and chastity: and he which is filled with wine, hath foolishness, furiousness, malapertness, and shameful lust. They which be not filled with wine, can easily sing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs: which they cannot do, that have filled their gorge with wine. The like also Paul writeth; Care ye not for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof. But Christ, by express words, said unto his disciples; Take heed that your heart's be not overcome with surfeiting and drunkenness. And in the Old Testament, in the Proverbs, the 31st chapter, it is written; Give not wine unto kings. And in the 23rd chapter; Look not upon the wine, when it is red, and when it showeth his color in the cup, and goeth down pleasantly.

And in the second chapter of Ecclesiastes, Solomon saith, that he thought to give his heart to wine and pleasant things, and at the length he found this study and purpose to be mere vanity; I took laughter (saith he) to be error, and I said unto joy; Why dost thou in vain deceive? This mirth of wine, and pleasant things, ought not to be often used by godly men: for so much as Christ hath taught, that They are blessed which mourn, they (saith he in Matthew) shall receive consolation. But in Luke, the sixth chapter it is added; that they shall laugh. And it is best for us, that we do want some joy in this present life, that we may perpetually laugh. In the fifth of Isaiah, it is written; Woe be unto you, which rise up early to follow drunkenness, and to drink even till night, to be inflamed with wine. The viol, timbrel, pipe, and wine, are in your feasts, &c. And again in the same chapter; Woe be to you that are mighty to drink wine, and are strong men to mingle drunkenness. Besides, Joel in the first chapter writeth; Awake ye up that are drunken with wine.

And this we must not pass over, that in Leviticus, Aaron and his sons are commanded not to drink wine, until they came to sacrifice before the Lord. And twice Paul commanded, that the ministers of the church should not be given to over-much wine. And when he counseled his Timothy to use wine for the stomach and diseases, he addeth, that it should be but a little; least he should give license unto drunkenness. In the old law also the use of wine was forbidden unto the Nazarites. And the Rechabites in Jeremiah are commended, because at their father's commandment, they abstained from wine: at which time nevertheless they knew that those things were written, which in the history of Judges we have concerning wine; namely, that with it, both God and men are made merry. And that also, which is written in the 104th Psalm; that Wine maketh merry the hearts of men. And so we may

gather, that these are not contrary; and that we may use wine temperately and moderately; and that it is given to us by God, to make us merry in due time by a right use thereof.

44. And we must not be ignorant, that some such times do chance, wherein it is not meet for Christians and godly men to give themselves to mirth. We must mourn, in the meantime, for sins committed. And sometimes we are troubled with very grievous miseries; and when we be under the rod of God's hand, we must pray the more earnestly: whereto fasting's and chastening's of the body do much help. And this doth Paul declare in his first epistle to the Corinthians, when he saith; that It is lawful sometimes for the husband and wife to depart one from another for a season. But yet with mutual consent to lie asunder for a time, that they may give themselves to fasting and prayer: although we must not for such abstinence appoint any certain memorial and year days; but leave the time to the wisdom of the spirit. Howbeit, this reason maketh much against those, which affirm, that they must be always bibbing, and that they must not be without mirth at any time. Yea and the same apostle said of himself; I chastise my body, and bring it into bondage. By which saying he admonished the Corinthians, through his example, to bridle their lusts.

There might be many more examples rehearsed out of the holy scriptures, manifestly to declare, that both drunkenness, and also too much use of wine are forbidden: but these shall be sufficient at this time. And this only I will add, that the Ethnics were also of the same mind. Plato, in his seventh book *De legibus*, toward the end, writeth, that Minos by his laws, forbad the Cretenses, that they should not drink together unto drunkenness. And Seneca saith in his 84th epistle, that Drunkenness is nothing else but a voluntary madness: and straightway after; The quality of drunkenness

continuing many days is furiousness. Moreover, they, which contend in drinking, although they have the victory of others in taking of much wine, yet will they, or nill they, the cup overcometh them. And it is shameful for a man to take in more, than he is able to receive, and not to know how to measure his stomach.

45. Hitherto we have sufficiently declared, that the abuse of wine is both against the word of God, and also against human reason. Now let us prove the same by examples, that they, which will not believe the sayings before alleged, may yet at the least-wise be taught by examples. Noah, a mighty man, just, and acceptable before God, who saw two states of the world (for he lived both before and after the flood) is set before us, as an example for the utter avoiding of drunkenness; seeing that he, having drunken more wine than was meet, lay in his tabernacle most shamefully naked; and the secret parts of his body, which were wont to be hidden, he left bare and uncovered. And he, which was wont to be a schoolmaster of virtues, became a great offense unto his children. Cham mocked him, his other two sons were of a better and more holy disposition, and were sorry and ashamed to see the shame of their father. By this act it is sufficiently declared, that shame, derision, and offense follow drunkenness.

But of this sin we have a notable example in Lot, who undoubtedly drunk not out of measure, to the end he would abuse his daughters, and commit incest; but to put away cares and griefs, which he had taken, for the overthrow of the five cities, for the loss of his deer wife, and also of his substance. He would also comfort his daughters, that they should not take too much thought; especially for the loss of their mother: but he should have devised another way of comforting. Howbeit, I speak this only, because none should think that he, of a purposed will, did drink too much;

to the intent he might pollute himself with most shameful lusts. Yet for all that, too great abundance of drink was the cause of his most vile incest, otherwise being a man in years, at a very unfit time; when the judgments of God were showed against the lewd lust of the slew cities. Yea and this is to be wondered at, that wine so alienated Lot from himself, that he understood not with what women he had kept unlawful company. Wherefore rightly (saith Seneca in his 84th epistle before alleged;) They which are drunk, do many things, which afterward, when they be sober, they be ashamed of. Lot sought to make himself merry by wine, and he incurred a perpetual sadness.

Let them therefore, which seek to be made merry with overmuch wine, remember, that they put themselves into a very present danger; and by that means may easily throw themselves headlong into most grievous sins. Neither is there any cause why any man should excuse, that such events be uncertain; so that a man cannot tell for a certainty, whether he, which drinketh too much, shall fall into these shameful matters; for so much as the thing is so certainly known, that even the daughters of Lot, being yet virgins, understood it; namely, that the old man by wine might be driven to naughty lusts, and be so deceived, as he might have ill company even with his own daughters. Who will therefore say, that he knoweth not that which they understood? Lot was deceived and snared by his own daughters. But they which love too much mirth; to wit, drunken men, do allure themselves, and do fight openly against themselves: neither think they or call to remembrance, that God, with most grievous punishments, taketh vengeance of drunkenness, and suffereth not the abuse of his most precious gift, to be long unpunished.

These bibbers are wont sometimes to bring forth Lot, as a patron of their intemperance. Neither do they mark, that the holy scripture setteth forth the

story of him, as a horrible, and almost a tragical example. God did not lightly punish the drunkenness of that man: for he being coupled with his daughters, they conceived by him, and the thing could not be dissembled. Incestuous children were born, Ammon and Moab; of whom came the nations of the Ammonits and Moabits, which were both hated of God, and enemies to the Israelites. Lot himself (as it is to be thought) was always in grievous sorrow for the crime which he had committed: he became a by-word among men. And seeing the testimony of the holy scriptures is extant, and shall remain unto the end of the world; how often so ever they be read, so often is his infamy noted, and spread abroad. If so be God spared not a man, otherwise holy, the nephew of Abraham, and harborer of angels; what will he do to those gluttons and swine, whom no virtue can persuade, either from sitting or lying drunken both day and night? That which we read happened once to Lot, these men have every day in exercise.

46. But look what our drunkards allege of Lot, the Romans in old time alleged of Cato; because he, being so very a grave man, sometimes in the night recreated his mind: doubtless not in bolling and bibbing immoderately, but in sipping and drinking a little, adding therewith much honest talk. Neither considered they, that the same man was sober all the whole day, and labored much in determining and judging of causes, in consulting with other Senators concerning the public-wealth, in having affairs with the people, in executing the office of a magistrate, in reading and in writing. Such good and honest endeavors ought these men to have imitated. But let us proceed in rehearsing of examples. Amnon, David's son was slain by Absalom: verily not in his sober mood, but when in a banquet he was more merry than was meet, by drinking of too much wine. And (as it is declared in the latter end of the first book of the Machabeis) Simon the

high priest was (with his two sons Mattathias and Judas slain by his son in law,) when in a feast they were in a manner drunken, by swilling in of much wine.

And the history of Judith (although it be not found in the Canon of the Jews) showeth, that Holofernes, otherwise a very fierce general of an army, was so overwhelmed with wine, that without much ado he was beheaded by a silly woman. I might add how Sisera, being drunken, was slain by Jahel; although his drink was milk, and not wine. And if beside these, we will read over the stories of the Ethnics, we shall find many and notable examples of them, which were most grievously hurt by drunkenness. Alexander of Macedonia, the conqueror of the world, was most shamefully overcome with wine, and being drunk, slue Clytus his most valiant and faithful friend, whose diligence, industry, labor, prudence, and strength, he had long time used in the wars, to his great commodity. So, when he had slept his fill, till he was sober again, and had remembered with himself the act which he had committed, he was so sorry and ashamed, that he wished himself dead. But yet he amended not his vice of drunkenness; nay rather, he drunk so much wine in one night, as he fell into a fever; and because he would not temper himself from wine, he (within a while after) died. Wherefore Seneca, in his 84th epistle already alleged, writeth, that Alexander, which had escaped so many dangers, and overcome the hardest enterprises, perished through intemperance of drinking, and by the fatal cup of Hercules.

Marcus Antonius, otherwise a stout and valiant grand captain, and a conqueror in many battles, so laded himself sometimes with wine; that even in a morning, in the tribunal seat, before the people of Rome, whilst he sat to give judgment, he was compelled to vomit. And in Egypt he used much drinking, by reason whereof he could do nothing honorably, but was most

shamefully put to flight by Octavius. What the Poets write of the feast of the Lapiths and Centaurs, it is better known, than should be needful for me to recite at this time. And I think I have now brought examples sufficient, which being diligently considered, serve much for the avoiding of drunkenness.

47. But they, which are not terrified from the filthiness thereof by the word of God, which we have first and foremost showed, and do not abhor the same, being persuaded by those examples now alleged; shall perhaps be won and led from it, by considering those evils, which do spring of the abuse of wine. It is expedient, that the tree be known by his fruits. And assuredly, drunkenness is to be counted such a thing, as the fruits, which spring thereof, be known to be. Howbeit, that we may speak orderly, we will divide the evils by their subjects: for it hurteth the body, vexeth also the mind, wasteth the goods, and is hateful to our neighbors. As touching the body, by drunkenness come oftentimes sudden deaths, the dissolution of the parts of men's body, the falling sickness; and sundry such miserable chances. For the smooth and plain ground unto drunkards is a pit; since they fall, break their legs, their arms, and sometime their necks, and are burnt when they fall into the fire. The liver is inflamed with too much drink, the head aketh, the members are made weak, and do tremble, the senses are corrupted, the natural heat is overcome by overmuch wine; the stomach is annoyed with crudities and intolerable griefs, whiles it is stuffed and farsed above measure: the whole body is in a manner inflamed, and the thirst is augmented. Drunkards lie groveling like blocks, and so are bereaved of their strength, that neither head nor foot can do their office.

Wherefore it is written in the 23rd chapter of the Proverbs; To whom is woe? To whom is sorrow? To whom is strife? To whom is sighing? And to

whom are wounds without cause? Or to whom is the bleariness of the eyes? Even to them that tarry long at the wine, and to them which go and seek mixed wine. Look not upon the wine, when it is red, and when it showeth his color in the cup, and goeth down pleasantly, in the end it will bite like a serpent, and put out his sting like a cockatrice. Thine eyes shall look upon strange women, and thine heart shall speak lewd things; and thou shalt be like one that sleepeth in the midst of the sea, and as he which sleepeth in the top of the mast of a ship. They have stricken me, and it pained me not; they have bruised me, and I felt it not. When I awake, I will seek it again, &c. And behold how many punishments God bringeth upon drunkards. Isaiah, in his fifth chapter, agreeth with Solomon. For he also saith; Woe unto those, which are mighty and strong to drink wine. And in the same chapter he saith; that Drunkards regard not the works of the Lord, neither consider the work of his hands. Moreover, to such men belongeth woe; because (as Jerome upon that place writeth) they are most unhappy, who being occupied in drunkenness, gluttony, and sundry pleasures, from morning to night, understand not the works of the Lord in themselves; neither considering wherefore they themselves are created, do in a manner sleep out their whole life. Wherefore Joel cried out unto them; Awake up ye drunkards, weep and howl all ye that drink wine. But drunkards are not wakened by these cries: for they do not only sleep, but seem to be in a manner buried. Wherefore Virgil aptly said of the city of Troy, that it was buried in wine and sleep.

48. But now must we see how much the soul itself or mind is hurt with drunkenness. Drunkards are ofttimes stricken with the spirit of astonishment, and after a sort are turned into madness: they become like brute beasts, so that there seemeth to remain in them no understanding. It is a grievous thing for a man to wound himself, or to deprive himself of any

member: but to take away his own mind from himself, without compulsion, it is an evil intolerable. In the fourth chapter of the prophet Ose it is justly written; that Wine and drunkenness take away the heart. And we read in the 19th chapter of Ecclesiasticus; that Wine and women make wise men to fly from their profession, so that they are no more their own men: for they be withdrawn from their office and virtue, and do also fall from the right trade of life. And in the same book, in the 31st chapter, it is written; that Wine drunken with excess engendereth bitterness of mind, with chidings and despites. Drunkenness increaseth the courage of a fool, till he offend, but it diminisheth his strength. In these words there is an elegant Antithesis, or contrary comparison; namely, that wine increaseth the courage and spirits, and causeth greater audacity; but it diminisheth and weakeneth the strength. Wherefore Plato, in his sixth dialogue *De justo*, at the beginning; A drunkard (saith he) hath a tyrannical heart, for he would rule all men as he list, and not by any reason and law.

Drunkenness also causeth men to forget both law and right. Wherefore Solomon saith in the Proverbs; that Wine must not be given unto kings, least peradventure they drink, and forget the law that is made, and alter the judgment of all the children of the poor. Plato also writeth in his third book *De Republica*; that Drunkenness may be suffered in any man, rather than in a magistrate. For a drunken man knoweth not the ground whereon he standeth. If the magistrate be drunken, then hath the keeper need of a keeper. This moreover is to be added, that nothing is kept secret, where drunkenness reigneth; because it discovereth, not only the secret parts of the body, but also of the mind. And in drinking, there be poured out words unshamefast, foolish, unapt, and wicked: so that Horace, describing the effects of drunkenness, saith; What is it that drunkenness committeth not? It

discloseth things secret, it establisheth hope, it thrusteth forward the unarmed man to battle, it taketh away the burden from careful minds, it teacheth arts. Whom have not full cups made eloquent? And whom have they not in extreme poverty made careless?

And Plato, in his first book *De legibus*, toward the end, saith thus; When a man drinketh wine, at the first it maketh him more cheerful; afterward, the more he drinketh, the greater and better hope he is in, and feeleth himself strong: then, as though he were wise, the man is filled with that confidence, liberty, and audacity, that without fear he both saith and doth whatsoever pleaseth him. The same Plato, in his sixth dialogue *De legibus*, saith; He which is filled with wine, is stirred up with a madness, as well of the mind as of the body; and both draweth others, and is drawn everywhere himself. And a drunkard is like a man out of his wit. Seneca, in his second book of natural questions, the 20th chapter, saith; that Drunkenness, till it be dried up, is madness; and by too much heaviness is brought asleep. And in his 60th epistle to Lucillus, toward the end; The drunkenness of one hour; doth recompense his dissolute madness with the tediousness of a long time after. And in the 84th epistle; Drunkenness draweth out all vice, and both kindleth it, and discovereth it; it putteth away all shamefastness, whose property is to resist evil endeavors. Where too much power of wine possesseth the mind, what evil so ever lay hidden, bursteth out. Drunkenness maketh not vices, but bringeth them to light.

In drunkenness, to the proud man, pride increaseth; to the cruel man, cruelty; to the envious man, malice; and all vices are discovered and show themselves. By it a man forgetteth himself, speaketh doubtful and stammering words. It causeth unconstant eyes, a reeling pace, dizziness in the head, and to seem that the house goeth round about, torments in the

stomach when the wine boileth; and it maketh the bowels to swell. Cruelty, for the most part, followeth drunkenness: for Marcus Antonius wonderfully rejoiced at the heads and members of the condemned men, which were brought him at a feast. Also, in the 20th chapter of the Proverbs, it is written; Wine maketh a mocker, and strong drink a troublesome fellow; whosoever erreth therein, shall never be wise. But because there be some, which boast, that they can drink a great deal of wine, and be still sober, and of a sound judgment; I desire them to hearken unto Seneca, in the epistle now alleged, who saith; Let such men also say, that by drinking of poison they shall not die; and by taking of poppy they shall not sleep, and that by drinking of helleborus, they shall not cast forth and purge out, what so ever is in the inward parts.

49. The discommodities of wine, when it is excessively drunken, the which we have hitherto declared, pertain both unto the body, and unto the mind. But now we must add, how it bringeth hurt to our substance and goods. In the Proverbs, the 21st chapter it is written; He which loveth wine, and fat things, waxeth not rich. And in the same book, the 23rd chapter, it is thus written; Be not thou among the wine-bibbers, and with them which devour flesh: for the bibber and the glutton shall be brought to poverty; and he, which giveth himself to much sleeping, shall wear a torn coat. And how troublesome drunkards are unto their neighbors, it may easily be perceived. They are injurious, and rail upon those whom they meet: and when in their fury they fall into shameful lusts, they be ready to pollute other men’s spouses and wives, and by horrible means they rage against the families of their neighbors. They be an evil example, yea and an offense unto other citizens. And whilst they consume their substance upon wine and drunkenness, they have no regard to provide things necessary for their own

house. Nay rather, while they be in their mad fury, they ill entreat their innocent wives and children, and defraud the poor of their alms; which, by living more thriftily, they might be able to bestow upon them. They make themselves unprofitable for the public-wealth: seeing that drunkards can neither execute the office of a magistrate, nor yet well show obedience to their elders. They trouble also and infame the church, wherefore they are separated from the same. For Paul, in the first to the Corinthians, the fifth chapter, numbereth drunkards among those, with whom we ought not so much as to eat. And there is scarce any evil remaining, to be added unto the pernicious effects of drunkenness.

50. But to conclude the matter, first we grant unto those, which do excuse the vice of drunkenness, by the excellency and use of wine, that it is lawful to use wine for necessity sake, for medicine, and also for mirth; yet so nevertheless, as it must be tempered with sobriety, and that it exceed not a mean: yea and it must agree with time, place, degree, age, and kind. After this manner let holy men rejoice before their God; namely, with giving of thanks, and celebrating with divine praises. And Solomon, in the 23rd of the Proverbs, saith not; Woe unto those that drink wine, but; Woe unto those, which consume their time therein, which give themselves unto nothing but to drinking, contending who can drink most, provoking one another, and compelling others to drink. These men be reproved, and not other, which modestly use the gifts of God. Let men so make themselves merry with wine, that afterward they may be more cheerful to obey God; and to suffer adversities, if need shall require: and let men beware, that they forget not themselves, that they overwhelm not their senses, and choke up their strength. Neither must the holy scripture be ungodly and violently drawn unto the license of the flesh: yea, we ought so to be prepared, that we obey

the apostle, which said; It is good, not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, if it should turn to the offending of the weak brethren. Let us also remember, that The kingdom of God is not meat and drink. Neither are they commended of God, which can drink more wine than the rest. The words of God defend not drunkenness, but detest the same.

We will therefore conclude against these men, with the doctrine of Ecclesiasticus, the 31st chapter, where it is said; Show not thyself a man in wine, that is; Show not thy strength in drinking. For there be some, which try themselves how strong and mighty they be in this intemperance; and also, which with over-much drinking of wine do oppress all the powers both of the body and of the mind. The Wise man goeth forward, and saith; For wine hath destroyed many a man. As the furnace trieth the hardness of the sword in tempering, so doth wine the hearts of the proud when they are drunk. Wine moderately drunken is profitable for the life of man. What life hath he that is overcome with wine? But it was created to make men merry. Wine, measurably drunken, bringeth gladness and cheerfulness of the mind, &c. These things may easily be taught and answered unto those men, which under the pretense to make themselves merry, labor to defend and maintain drunkenness. Let them consider with themselves, that the gifts of God ought never to be separated from the rule of moderation and temperance. Let them not forget, that the apostle, in his epistle to the Galatians, reckoned Drunkenness among the works of the flesh. He also admonished the Romans Not to be conversant in chambering, in gluttony, and drunkenness. And to the Thessalonians he showeth the shamefulness of this vice, when he said; It pertaineth unto the night: they which are drunk (saith he) are drunk in the night. As though he would affirm it, as a thing unworthy to be seen by the light of the day.

**Of Dances.**

52. *Chorea*, which signifieth a dance, is so called (as Plato saith) of this word χαρά, which signifieth joy: for that it is a certain testification of joy. And Servius (when he interpreteth this verse of Virgil, *Omnis quam chorus, & socij comitantur ouantes*; that is, Whom all the dance and fellows in triumph wise did follow) saith; that *Chorus* is the singing and dancing of such as be of like age. But from whence dances had their beginning, there be sundry opinions. Some think that men, when they beheld the sundry motions of wandering and fixed stars, invented dancing, whereby the variety of motions might be represented. Other think, that dances rather came of religion; because among the old Ethnics there were in a manner no holy services, wherein was not hopping and dancing. For they led their dances from the left part of the altar to the right, whereby they might resemble the motion of heaven from the east unto the west. Afterward they returned from the right to the left, to express the course of the wandering stars. Which perhaps Virgil signified, when he said, *Instaurántque choros, mixed ique altaria circum*; that is, And they being mixed together, renewed their dances, compassing about the altars. Yea and the dancing priests of Mars, were had in great honor among the Romans. Some there be also, which refer the beginning of dancing to Hiero, a tyrant of Sicilia. For they say, that he, to establish his tyranny, forbad the people to speak one to another. Wherefore men in Sicilia began to express their meanings and thoughts, by becks and gestures of the body. And that afterward did turn to a use and custom.

But whatsoever this thing was, dancing's in the old time were not against religion, although afterward they were applied to public mirth. Besides, there was another kind of dancing, whereby young men were trained in

warlike affairs. For they were commanded to make gestures, and to leap, having their armor upon them, that afterward they might be the more nimble to fight for the public-wealth, when need should require. This kind of dancing was called *Saltatio Pyrrhica*; and because it was exercised in armor, it was called ἐνόπλια. Of this dancing is mention in the civil laws; namely, in the Digests *De poenis*, in the law *Ad damnum*. And sometime young men, when they had offended, were not straightway put to death; but were condemned either to hunt upon a stage, or else to dance in armor: and they were called *Pyrrhicarij*. Also there was another kind of dancing, which was instituted only for pleasure and wantonness sake: and that was called of the Grecians κόρδαξ καί κορδακισμός. But of those dances, which by gestures of the body, expressed the senses of the mind, writeth Lucianus in his book περί ὀρχήσεως: and so doth Athenaeus.

In this kind, men so prevailed at the length, that when at Rome, Demetrius Cynicus derided the dance called Minnica saltatio, (calling it a thing vain and nothing worth) a noble dancer, which then was had in honor at Rome, desired him, that he would only once behold him, while he danced, and afterward to judge and speak his fancy whatsoever he would. He came unto the stage, the dancer called Saltator Mimicus began by gestures to resemble the common fable of Mars, taken in adultery with Venus; wherein he so expressed the Sun, showing the fact, and Vulcan knitting his nets, and Venus overcome with shame, and Mars humbly desiring pardon, that Demetrius being astonished, cried out; ἀκούω ὦ ἄνθρωπε ἃ ποιεῖς, οὐ γάρ ὀρῶ μόνον, αὐταῖς γάρ ταῖς χερσὶν δοκεῖς μοι λαλεῖν: that is; I here O man, the things that thou doest, I do not only see them, for by these thy hands thou seemest to me to speak. About the same time by chance came to Rome the king of Pontus, and when he had seen this dancer make his

gestures upon a stage, being afterward willed by Nero to ask what he most desired to have given him, he desired to have the same Mimus. Nero marveled, (seeing he might have asked other things of much greater price,) and asked him the cause of that his request? He answered; Because I have sundry nations subject unto me, which without an interpreter I cannot understand. And oftentimes it happeneth, that the interpreters do not faithfully enough tell them what I say; nor again, what they say unto me: but this fellow, with his gestures, will express all things very faithfully.

53. Plato, in his third book *De legibus*, maketh two kinds of dancing's; the one called πολεμικόν, that is, warlike, which before we have called *Pyrrhicum*, the other εἰρηνικόν, that is, peaceable, which he calleth εὐμέλειαν. I omit to speak of the shameful kind of dancing, because it is openly condemned by the laws. The pyrrhicall dancing, and that which is done by gestures, may serve to some uses in the public-wealth: but they pertain not to our purpose. Wherefore we must here speak of that which is called εὐμελείᾳ, how far it is lawful: for so much as it is exercised for mirth sake. I think assuredly, that this kind of dancing is not of his own nature vicious or forbidden; because nimbleness and agility of body is the gift of God: and if there be added any art; namely, that the body be moved in order, aptly, in number, with comeliness and decency, I do not see why it ought to be reproved, so that it be done in time, moderately, and without offense. For, even as it is lawful to sing, and we may use singing, to give thanks unto God, and to celebrate his praises: so likewise, by a moderate dancing, we may testify the joy and mirth of the mind. For David danced openly before the ark of the Lord, and the maidens with dances and songs celebrated his victory against Goliath. Marie also the sister of Moses, when Pharaoh was overthrown and slain, led dances with other women, and sung

a song of victory. Wherefore seeing godly men, and chaste women, have used dances; we cannot say, that of their own nature they be vicious.

But as it is used in these days, that men should dance mixed together among women, it ought not to be suffered; because these things are nourishments and provocations unto lusts and wantonness. Marie the sister of Moses danced not with young men, but apart by herself among women. Neither did David dance with women. And the maidens, which celebrated his victory, danced among themselves, and not with men. And now they which love God with all their heart, and with all their strength, ought not only to observe his commandments; but also to cut off all occasions, whereby the observing of them might be letten. But our dances are most evident occasions of transgressing the laws of God: they be snares and offenses, not only unto the dancers, but also to the beholders. For they stir up and inflame the hearts of men, which otherwise be evil enough even from their beginning; and that, which ought with great study and endeavor be kept under, is stirred up by the wanton enticements of dancing. Undoubtedly, if a man will examine his own self, or have an eye, either unto experience or reason; he shall perceive, that in such spectacles, the lusts of the mind are greatly kindled and inflamed: and he shall note, that men return home from those dances with less virtue; and the women with less chastity. Further, dangers must rather be avoided than nourished: for (as Solomon saith,) He which loveth danger, shall fall therein.

54. But some will object, that whereas dances be so against manners, and do kindle lust; that cometh rashly and by chance: but everything must be judged, not according to those things which happen by chance, but according to those things which be in them of their own nature. There be some so chaste, and uncorrupt, that they can behold these spectacles with a

perfect and chaste mind. I grant, that this may sometime happen. But I add, that all accidents are not of one and the self-same kind: for there be some, which happen very seldom; other some are called ὀπότερ' ἐτυχίω, that is, which by their nature may as well be present with, as absent from anything. And there be some, which are called ἐπί το πολύ, that is, such as are wont to happen oftentimes, and for the most part. These last accidents ought in everything to be considered, and most diligently weighed. Neither must we note what may be done, but what is wont to be done. Aristippus danced in purple, and being reproved, he made an excuse, that he was made never a whit the worse for that dancing; but might in that delicacy keep still his philosopher's mind. Howbeit, there must be no ear given to such words. For (as Demosthenes saith, and the same is cited by the lawyers;) We must not regard what someone man doth at one time, but what is wont to be done for the most part. Admit we, that there is someone man so chaste, as he is nothing at all moved with such enticements: how in the meantime is the people and multitude provided for? Shall we, for the perfectness and integrity of one or two, suffer all the rest to be in danger? But so (a man will say) take away hear the word of God, and many eat and drink the holy mysteries to their own condemnation.

Here must we understand, that certain things are profitable to the salvation of men, and are commanded by the word of God: and these ought by no means to be taken away. And certain things be indifferent, which if we perceive that they tend to destruction, they must not be suffered. We have the law of God for hearing of sermons, and receiving of the sacraments; but for dancing there is no commandment given. Wherefore, these things must not be compared together. But by means of dancing's and leaping's, some say, that very many honest matrimonies are brought to pass.

It may sometimes be so: but I was never of the opinion, that I would have matrimonies to be contracted by these arts, wherein a regard is only had to the agility and handsomeness of the body. There be other means much more honest, let us use them, and leave these, as being shameful and unchaste. Let us remember, that although honest matrimonies are sometimes brought to pass by dancing's; yet much more often are adulteries and fornications wont to follow of these spectacles. We ought to follow the example of the godly fathers, who now and then used dancing's: but yet such as were moderate and chaste; so that, the men danced by themselves, and the women apart by themselves. By such kind of dances, they showed forth the gladness of their minds, they sang praises unto God, and gave him thanks for some notable benefit, which they had received. But we read not in the holy scriptures, of mingled dances of men and women together.

But our men say; Who can dance after that sort? In saying so, they discover themselves what they seek for in dancing. Further, let us mark the effects of dancing. It is written in Matthew, that the daughter of Herodias danced at a banquet which the king made, and the king took a pleasure in her, whom without shame he could not openly behold: since she was a manifest testimony of his unlawful matrimony, and of his adultery. For Herod had married the mother of that maiden, being his brother's wife. Through that dancing it came to pass, that John's head was smitten off. Many be offended with us, because we cry against dancing's, as against things, which are of their own nature evil and forbidden. On the other side, we say; that things are not always to be weighed by their own nature; but by the disposition and abuse of our flesh. We cannot deny, but that wine of his own nature is good; which nevertheless is not given to one that is in an ague: not that the wine is evil, but because it agreeth not with a body, which

is in that wise affected. When the Jews had made themselves a calf to worship, they sat down, they did eat, they drank, and rose up to play. In which place it seemeth, that to play was nothing else but to dance.

55. But least I should seem to speak and to judge these things of myself, I will add certain testimonies of the fathers. Augustine against Petilianus, the sixth chapter, saith; that The bishops were wont always to restrain idle and wanton dancing's. But now a days there are some bishops, which be present at dances, and dance together with women: so far off are they from restraining this vice. The same Augustine, upon the 32nd Psalm (when he expoundeth these words; Upon an instrument of ten strings I will sing unto thee) maketh those ten strings, the ten commandments. And when he had spoken somewhat of every one of them, at the last he cometh to the sabbath, whereof it is written; Remember that thou keep holy the sabbath day. I say not (saith he) to live delicately, as the Jews were wont to do. For it is better to dig all the whole day, than to dance on the sabbath day. Chrysostom, in his 56th homily upon Genesis, when he entreateth of the marriage of Jacob; Ye have heard (saith he) of marriage, but not of dancing, which in that place he calleth devilish: and even there he hath many things which make for our purpose. And among other he writeth, that the bridegroom and bride are corrupted by dancing, and the whole family is defiled. Again, in the 48th homily; Thou seest (saith he) marriages, but thou seest not dances: for at that time, they were not so lascivious as now a days they be. And he hath many things more upon the 14th chapter of Matthew, where he spake to the people of the dancing of the daughter of Herodias. And among other things he saith; At this day the Christians deliver to destruction, not half their kingdom, not another man's head; but even their own souls. And he addeth; that Where wanton dancing is, there the devil danceth together with them.

In the council of Laodicea it is written; It is not meet for Christian men to dance at their marriage. Let them dine and sup gravely and moderately, giving thanks unto God for the benefit of marriage. We read also in the same Council; Let not the Clergy come unto shows, either upon the stage, or at weddings. They may indeed be present at marriages: but afterward, when there come in θυμελικοί, that is, singers or players upon instruments, which serve for dancing, let them rise and go their ways; least by their presence, they should seem to allow that wantonness.

In the Ilerden Council, which was held under the Popes Symmachus, and Hormisda, and under Theodoricus the king, the same is decreed; namely, that Christians should not dance at marriages. In the Alliciodoren Council which was held under Pope Deus dedit, this restraint seemeth to be made for the Clergy. For there it is forbidden, that any of the Clergy, should at a feast, either sing or dance; as though in a sort that might be lawful for others. Of the same opinion are certain School-divines, upon the third book of sentences, distinct 37. who refer these prohibitions only unto the holy days. Richardus *De media villa* saith; that To dance on the holy days, is a sin most grievous, as though on other days it might be permitted. But the opinion of the fathers and sound councils is far more severe than the opinion of these men; who perniciously leave those things at liberty, which should be restrained; seeing therewith is joined a danger unto souls, and not a danger only, but offenses grievously to be lamented. Howbeit, it seemeth, that these men borrowed this their doctrine (wherein they forbid dancing on the holy days) out of the civil laws. For in the Code, in the title *De ferijs*, in the law *Dies festos*; In deed we release idleness on the feast days, but we will not have men give themselves unto voluptuousness. Wherefore it shall

not be lawful on the feast days to use dancing's; whether they be done for lusts sake, or for pleasure.

56. But let us see what opinion the Ethnics had of this matter. Aemilius Probus, in the life of Epaminondas, saith; that To sing and dance was not very honorable among the Romans, when as the Grecians had it in estimation. Salust, in his oration against Catiline, wrote; that Sempronia, a certain lascivious and unchaste woman, was taught to sing and dance more delicately than became an honest matron. And there, he calleth those two things, the instruments of lechery. Cicero, in his third book of Offices, writeth; that An honest and good man will not dance in the market place, although by that means he might attain to great possessions. And in his oration, which he made after his return into the senate, he in reproach calleth Aulus Gabinius his enemy, *Saltatorem calamistratum*; that is, A dancing dizard. It was objected to L. Muraena for a fault; because he had danced in Asia. And even this also was objected against king Deiotarus. Cicero answereth for Muraena; No man being sober danceth either in the wilderness, or at an honest and moderate banquet, unless perhaps he be out of his wits. The same Cicero, in his Philippiks, among other vices, upbraideth Anthony with dancing. But it appeareth, that the nature and disposition of the men of the East and of the West parts, was not all one. They are cheerful of mind, and nimble of body, and for that cause delight in dancing's. For (to omit other examples) David the king danced publicly. And they, which come now unto us out of Syria, do affirm, that the Christians, which live in those regions, do upon the resurrection day, and also upon other famous feast days, come into the temple with harps and viols, and sing psalms among themselves, and dance together. For their spirits are very light, and ours more sad and heavy. Howbeit, they say, they

dance soberly and modestly, the men apart by themselves, and the women by themselves.

**Of Garments and Apparel.**

57. We see that the Lord did first give unto men, decent and thrifty garments; such as have respect unto a use, and not unto a delicateness, and prodigality. And seeing that in all men, justice, comeliness, and modesty ought to be observed; we be taught here to use the same in our garments, the end whereof is profit and honesty. This must be observed, that therein we pass not our bounds, either as touching the stuff, or as touching the manner and fashion. That these limits are appointed for garments, it appeareth, in that Adam first made himself breeches, for he was ashamed of his nakedness. Therefore, an honesty [must be regarded.] God for this cause appareled man; for that he would cast him out of the distemperature of the weather; therefore utility is to be respected. The Jews had their fringes, and the priests their proper kind of garments. Further, herein it is convenient, that there be a diligent consideration had, of the custom, age, and sex, that there be no rash alteration from the manner of the country. And what custom must be observed, the sundry garments, which were appointed unto priests, do declare: and in that the prophets were clothed after another manner, then the common people. The sex also must be considered: for a woman must not wear the apparel of a man, nor the man of a woman. Touching age, the youth must go after one sort, and the elder people after another. The use of the country must be regarded: for the Jews wear fringes on their garments.

How greatly men do sin by wearing of wanton apparel, we may guess by the apostles Peter and Paul, who forbad women to wear precious garments, and superfluous decking of their hair, that should be trimmed or braided

with gold or pearl, who nevertheless have a colorable excuse; namely, to please their husbands. Wherefore, how much more must these things be reproved in men? If then the use of garments was devised to withstand the provocation unto wantonness, whereof a shamefastness was given us by God; they are greatly to be blamed, which provoke the same evil by the curious fashion, fineness, and niceness, or vanity of apparel. Also, let all superstitiousness be avoided, neither let there be any virtue or holiness attributed unto garments. And let here the goodness of God be considered, who to help man (that by his own default was made subject unto the untemperateness of the air, to cold and to rain) hath clothed him with garments.

58. And where it is written; that She, which is married, doth care to please her husband: some refer the meaning thereof unto decking and appareling of themselves; the which, no doubt, being kept within the bounds, that it be not (as the apostles said) in curled hair, in golden jewels, or precious garments, is not against the word of God. And the thing in his own nature is neither good nor evil: for we may both use the same well and ill. It is very oftentimes good, and to be used, not for itself sake, but by the fault of the other married parties. Those husbands be somewhat inconstant, which will neither love their wife, if she be not trimly decked, nor yet will be content with her alone. Hester garnished herself, and is not reproved in the scriptures: she did not those things, through her own vanity, or vain desire of pleasing; but by reason of the unperfectness of her husband. So likewise a mother, when her child will not leave crying; oftentimes singeth, and otherwhile danceth; not because these things as they be in themselves do like her, but that she seeth they must be used by reason of the child’s fault.

But we must beware of the sins, which may happen by such kind of trimming; that in costs and charges a mean be not exceeded: least peradventure, by ill examples we might be led with vain affection, to cleave thereunto, and provoke the lusts of the beholders. And therefore Hester said, that such kind of appareling was unto her as it had been a defiled cloth. Even by these words; namely, To please her husband: husbands are noted to be very effeminate, because they dote too much on their wives, and for that cause do many times sin. Wherefore, by Augustine they be called no husbands, but ardent lovers. Howbeit, we must not think, that it should be imputed as a fault unto husbands; if they give some place unto their wives in honest things, seeing they be commanded in the epistle to the Ephesians; Ye husbands love your wives, as Christ loved his church, who gave himself for the same. In like manner it is the wives part, that she endeavor to do those things which her husband commandeth. After which sort, if she covet to please him, she ought not to be rebuked, but to be praised. All that I have spoken, may be noted in the words of the apostle; to wit, that in matrimony, the husband and wife must be careful to please one another. But again, I give warning, that these things, by themselves, and of their own nature, are not agreeable unto matrimony, when they shall be abused; but then are they joined thereunto rashly, or as they term it by accidents.

**Of Counterfeit, Fuke, or false coloring.**

59. Now it shall be very meet to dispute somewhat of fuke, or false coloring, whether the same be lawful or no. First, we will begin with the name; afterward we will treat of the matter itself; further, we will bring the reasons, whereby some endeavor to allow the use of this kind of medicine; shortly after, the contrary shall both be affirmed and proved; lastly shall be discussed the reasons at the first alleged. As concerning the first, *Fucus*

(among the Latins) is a *Dorre* or *Drone*, much like unto a be; yea and of some it is thought to be a be imperfect, and not fully absolute: it wanteth a sting, neither doth it work honey, but greedily eateth up the bees honey. And so by translation, they, which be idle and slothful men, be called *Fuci*, or such as have but the face and show of men: who, notwithstanding that they shun all labor themselves, yet do they eat and drink abundantly; in so much as some thought, that the word was deducted of this word φαγεῖν, which is, To eat and consume. For this harm sake, the bees drive them from their hive. Wherefore Virgil in his *Georgiks* saith,

*Ignauum fucos pecus à praesepibus arcent*;

that is,

The honey-making bees do drive,
The drones an idle beast from hive.

Also Fucus is taken for the color, wherewith cloth and wool is died. As we have it in the first law of the Code, *Quae res vendi non possunt*. In which law, Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius do decree, that upon pain of death, none should sell cloth or wool dyed in purple; because the emperor would be clothed therewith alone. But we here entreat of that kind of counterfeit color, which is a medicine or color, wherewith the face is painted, that it might seem the more beautiful. Of the Hebrews it is called *Puc*, of the verb *Haphac*, which is, To change or turn the right form. And certainly, it is a true and apt etymology; for by such manner of paintings, countenances and faces are turned and altered; seeing they appear to be far otherwise than nature hath appointed. By a general word they are called καλλωπίσματα, ornaments of the face; because they serve for the ornament and decking of women. They call it also φῦκον; whereof (as I think) the Latins derived *Fucum*; and not of φαγεῖν, as I alleged before out of other

men’s opinion. And they call *Cerussa*, or white lead, particularly by the name of ψιμμύθιον and στίμμι, the which we call *Stibium*. And *Purpurisse* they name ἀνδρείκελον, which is a red painting. These things also have another name, whereof Pliny maketh mention in his 23rd book, the 4th chapter: and Tertullian, in his book *De cultu foeminarum*; namely, *Calliblepharum*, so called, because they make the eye lids and brows more beautiful to behold. And thus much touching the names. Now let us come to the matter itself, which cannot be better known, than by the proper causes of the same.

60. The end of such curious trimming is, to procure beauty, and to alter the face; whereby one may appear the trimmer, and blemishes may be hidden; or else to bring in a better favor than nature hath wrought. And the chief colors, which the fine doers of these things do practice; is either whiteness, which is done with white lead; or redness, which is brought to pass by *Purpurisse*; or else blackness, used by the means of the stone Stibium. Also they color their hair, sometime with safforn, and so they beguile the beholders of them, and with marvelous craft deceive them. Hereof cometh that, which we have in common talk; namely, that A man casteth a color upon anything, when he deceiveth. And it is wont to be uttered in bargains, in covenants, and agreements; Without color or counterfeiting; that is, Freely, in good faith, absolutely, and plainly. These things of the end.

The efficient and proper cause is the naughty desire of pleasing, the which sometime is stirred up by pride, and sometime by lust. By pride, because they will not have any to surpass them in beauty, but will make a show to be far more beautiful than others. By lust, for that they would seem to be beautiful more and more, than the measure of their own natural favor hath

appointed, and so to allure men to satisfy their lust. I am not ignorant, that the most ancient fathers (especially Cyprian in his book *De velandis virginibus*) teach; that The devil was the inventor of such manner of trimming. For when (as he thinketh) the evil angels had burned in the desire of women, and had abused their bodies; they, for a reward of the licentious pleasures permitted unto them, made demonstration of these arts and shameful ornaments. Wherefore Cyprian writeth, that these be not the ornaments, which God made; but those which the devil devised. Touching the cause efficient we have spoken enough.

But the matter is nothing else in a manner, but filth; to wit, smoke, soot, foam, and spittle, and such things for the most part, as would loath a man to touch them. Yea, and sometimes poisons are mingled; so that they, with their counterfeit colors, do not only wound the minds of the beholders, but do also hurt their bodies. Of the form I have nothing to say; because these things be tempered an infinite number of ways. And look how many counterfeited women there are, almost so many kinds of false colors there be. They are said also to die their faces, and that is, both to color them, and to deform them. It is also said, that this vice is greater charge to women, than to men: because a woman, through her defiled and corrupt nature, is desirous of beauty, and (as the Greeks say) φιλόκοσμος, that is, desirous to be trim. Howbeit, Paulus the second of that name Pope of Rome, (as Platina writeth) at such time as he should come abroad, abstained not from false coloring; even to the intent he might seem of the more beautiful countenance, as he was very tall of stature. But how shameful a thing it was for the vicar of Christ, as he challenged himself to be, let other men judge. Certainly, the Ethnic poet pronounced; that It best becometh men to be careless of their beauty. And again; Far from us may such young men be,

which are curiously trimmed like women. For Julius Caesar was desirous to cover his baldness. Wherefore, because of the honors (which were very many that the city had bestowed upon him) he most willingly received the laurel crown, which for this cause he ware in a manner always. And Jerome writeth, that Maximilla the prophetess of Montanus used Stibium: which may note unto us, by what spirit she was led.

The general word of this vice is feigning, and also leasing: since they feign a countenance to themselves as they list, and they counterfeit beauty. Neither is wantonness far from it; for when by nature they have not the worthiness of beauty, they counterfeit the same as they can. And we will not omit, that there be diverse, which have sometime painted their faces: not to the intent they might appear the better favored and fairer; but because they would seem to be more cruel, fierce, and horrible to behold: as it is written of the Brittons, who died their faces with a kind of herb like unto plantine, as Caesar reporteth in his fifth book of his Commentaries. And in India, where is no small plenty of precious stones, they are wont to make hollow places in their own flesh, that in the hollowness thereof they may close in precious stones, and that as well in the forehead as in the cheeks. These things shall suffice for declaring the nature of false colors. Now remaineth to be said, whether it be lawful to use the same. Some affirm that it is lawful, of whom there be many School-men, who rather favor and make much of vices, than pursue them, and seek to weed them out. First they allege certain testimonies of the holy scriptures, which at the first view seem to be of their side. Secondly, they labor to prove the same by reasons.

61. [ 1] Out of the holy scriptures they allege that, which is written in the first to the Corinthians, the seventh chapter; He that is not married, careth for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that hath

married a wife, is careful for those things that be of the world, and how he may please his wife. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy, both in body and in spirit: but the married woman careth for those things that be of the world, and how she may please her husband, It is lawful therefore for women to endeavor to please their own husbands, whereby they may retain them still to be content with their own wife. For if they should despise them, they might easily incline to whoredom and adultery. Wherefore (say they) there is some good use even of counterfeit coloring. [ 2] And further, unto this purpose they draw that, which is written in the first of Timothy, the second chapter, ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ, that is, In trim and comely apparel. And they say, that the apostle spake this, when he gave precepts touching women. [ 3] Moreover, they declare, that in the first epistle unto the Corinthians, the twelfth chapter it is written; that Upon those parts of the body, which are less honorable, put we more honor on; and our uncomely parts have more comeliness on. And that therefore, if any deformity be either in the countenance, or in the eyes, it is convenient that we should deck them more costly. And because they be not so very blind and blockish, but that they see this to be a great stop unto them, that men by these paintings and counterfeit colors are provoked unto lust; they have invented certain crafty and subtle shifts, that with them they might shadow and color their error.

62. [ 1] First they say, that we fall into the false argument [which is called] *A secundum quid ad simpliciter*, that is to say, From that, which is in some respect, unto that which is absolute. For seeing all things that stir men unto lust are sin, we think that all things, which provoke men unto concupiscence, are to be condemned. [ 2] That the case doth not so stand, they also bring an instance of natural beauty, the which out of doubt

kindleth naughty concupiscence with the sight of the same: yet none will say, that the natural appearance of beauty is to be defamed as a sin. [ 3] Some grant, that sin may happen thereby; howbeit, not through the nature of the thing itself, but by the circumstances adjoined; that is, if they go about to paint their face, to the intent they would be unhonestly loved of those, which behold them. Or else, if they be so proud and haughty, as by such means they endeavor, and are desirous to excel other women in beauty: then (say they) that evil creepeth in by accidental means, and not by the nature of the counterfeited color. Wherefore they affirm, that there be two sorts of provocations unto wantonness; namely, that either it cometh according unto the natural condition, or else through a lewdness of the intent and lust. And in these they grant sin to be, in respect of the corrupt will and dishonest desire: but they admit not that there is sin, by the natural condition of the counterfeit color.

[ 4] And they say moreover, that the effect is to be considered all alike, whether it proceed from nature, or come by art. Whereby they endeavor to prove, that if the fault be not in the natural beauty, no more is it in the artificial beauty. They bring a similitude of the health, that it is all after one nature and manner, whether it grow by temperature, and natural equality of humors; or else, if the same, having been distempered, is restored by the art of physicians. [ 5] Moreover, they put a difference between cause and occasion. And they say, that colored faces be not causes of the ruin and offense taking of the beholders, but are only an occasion: and that things must not be judged by the occasion, but by their own proper nature; otherwise we should in a manner do nothing, but we might be accused of sin. For even the very best things may be occasions of falling unto sin: and that it should not be lawful for any man to show either gold, or silver, or

precious stones; because there would be an occasion given of coveting them. And that by this means it would follow, that a beautiful woman ought never to step out of her house, least she should be an occasion of wicked concupiscence. Wherefore let us reject (say they) the things that come by accidental means, and those things which be occasions; and let us only have respect unto them, which be causes both just and by themselves. And let us remove corrupt nature, and naughty concupiscence, as vice and sin, which be the true causes of dishonest loves, and raging lusts: and let us not blame either feigned colors, or else natural beauty. [ 6] Lastly they say, that we cannot deny, but that God hath made the nature of colors and painting: and that we cannot but grant every creature of God to be good, and that therefore it followeth, that Christian women may use them freely. These are the things which be alleged by these men. But we, on the other part, judge that they be not lawful; the which we will prove, as well by the scripture, as by very likely arguments.

63. [ 1] Paul, when he went about to teach, that the ceremonies of Moses were not necessary to salvation, was ill reported of by the Jews, and by the false apostles: the which they very oftentimes objected against him. But he answered; If I would please men, I should not be Christ’s servant. By the which saying he giveth us to understand, that we must not greatly strive to be well liked of men. But those women, which set a false color upon themselves, do labor all the ways they can, to please men. If it were not lawful for Paul to please men in the ceremonies, which were not men’s inventions, but had their beginning from the word of God; how much less must we yield to these men, in the thing which proceedeth from the folly of man, from naughty lust, and (as Cyprian saith) from the devil himself? [ 2] Further, it is chiefly commended to the Christians, that they should embrace

sincerity and truth: for we ought to banquet in the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, as Paul very well admonished us; but in feigned colors, neither sincerity nor truth can take place. And Christ saith in the fifth of Matthew, that Men cannot make, no not one hair of their head white or black. [ 3] But they, which practice feigned colors, endeavor by their art to impugn that sentence; when as they die their face and their hair with colors, at their own pleasure. [ 4] Also Paul, in his epistle to Timothy, forbad, that women should dress themselves with curled hair, with gold, and precious stones.

[ 5] And even thereof doth Peter, in his epistle, give warning. Wherefore the part of Christians is to obey so great masters of the church. And if so be thou wilt say, that they made no mention of counterfeiting or coloring: I answer, that there is less naughtiness in gold, silver, and precious stone, than in false colors. Which I alone do not speak, but I have Augustine for my warrant, in his epistle to Possidius. I have also Chrysostom, in the 31st homily upon Matthew. Now, for so much as the apostles forbad that which is the less evil, we must consider, that they also removed that which is counted for the more grievous fault. [ 6] Also it is read in Deuteronomy, the 22nd chapter, that God commanded that men should not be clothed in women's apparel, nor women in men's: for because that is to hide the sex given by nature, and to show themselves to be of another sort, then God did create them. Seeing therefore this dissimulation is forbidden to be done in garments, why shall it be granted, that we may feign and alter the form and favor of our countenance? [ 7] To these things add, that Paul did forbid Christian women to go with their heads uncovered, least in very deed by the comeliness of their long hair, they might be an occasion of offense unto men. Wherefore, seeing he forbad, that they should lay before men's eyes

the beauty of their hair, how much rather must we understand, that he forbad them to make that ostentation of beauty, whereof they be destitute by nature?

[ 8] And whereas we, by the divine Oracles, are commanded, not only to provide for our own salvation; but for other men's also, how may there be safely used any feigned colors, which be swords, poisons, and fiery flames unto young men, who are beholders thereof? Where is the observing of that commandment; Thou shalt love thy neighbors as thyself? [ 9] Paul, when he had in many words preached unto the Corinthians, touching fornication, in the end concluded; Magnify or glorify ye God in your bodies. And God is magnified in our bodies, not only through chastity, but even by the very habit or disposition of chastity. [ 10] Further than this, let us consider the manner of our creation. God at the beginning made men trimmed only in their natural attire, so as they went altogether naked: but after sin was committed, they put on coverings of leaves, whom afterward God covered, not with purple or silk, but with a most plain garment of skins. Whereby may be perceived, that superfluous ornaments did not proceed from God.

[ 11] Again, let us consider, that by false colorings, the picture of God is put away, and the picture of a harlot taken on. But Paul said; Shall I take the member of Christ, and make thereof the member of a harlot? And so we may infer; Shall I take the face, figure, and lineaments of God, and bring in the lineaments, colors, and show of an harlot? [ 12] So likewise Christ reproved the hypocrites, because they obscured their faces, and deformed their visages, to appear that they had fasted; when nevertheless the fasting, which they did feign, might in his kind be an honest and just thing. How much less can it be allowed, that these women should alter their faces; to the intent they may allure unto dishonesty? [ 13] Also in the third chapter of

Isaiah, God doth earnestly reprove the daughters of Zion, for their superfluous ornaments; and threateneth them, that they should be most grievously punished, in such sort, as all those things should be turned into their great reproach. [ 14] Lastly, it is not the part of Christians to glory in the flesh. But these, what do they else seek by painting of themselves, but the pleasure and glory of the flesh? I might allege very many other testimonies out of the holy scriptures; but these I take to be sufficient unto the minds that be godly, and not obstinate. Now will I bring in probable arguments, whereof least I should seem altogether to be the author, I will declare what the fathers have written touching this matter.

64. Tertullian wrote two little books, the one was of decking, the other of women's attire. And in the first he writeth, that men, by feigned colors, are allured to lust; and that a way to temptations is opened, the which should rather have been shut. Moreover, he reproveth painted women for their folly; because the more that foulness is hidden, the more it is discovered. And when he testifieth, that God did not at the first create men, either painted, or with feigned color; he demandeth, whether they shall at the latter day rise up from the dead with these counterfeit and painted colors? Which being a matter incredible, he adviseth them to refrain from the same; seeing such things are neither agreeable unto the resurrection, nor yet to the first creation. Were these kind of ornaments (saith he) forgotten by God, in that he gave them not at the time of creation? Certainly he might have seen these things, which ye have invented; but he gave them not, because they displeased him. Doubtless Tertullian persuadeth not, that a woman should go altogether unhandsomely trimmed, and to be uncleanly; but he teacheth, that the trimming up of women must consist in a plain and simple cleanliness. And assuredly (saith he) Christians do profess modesty and

humility: but these kind of ornaments have altogether respect unto pride. Also he saith; that There cannot be showed any godly woman, and which hath been commended in the holy scriptures, that hath decked herself on this manner: wherefor it followeth, that the same is a vice, which cannot be defended by any good example.

And as Paul said, that There is a difference between a married woman, and a virgins: so we may say, that there is a difference between the handmaidens of Christ, and the handmaidens of the devil. The handmaidens of the devil, seeing they be unchaste, do use these paintings. Wherefore the handmaidens of Christ ought to eschew those things; that they may show themselves the more unlike unto the other. Undoubtedly, if Christian women would so color and counterfeit themselves; wherein (I beseech you) should matrons differ from harlots? For even they do chiefly set forth their own beauty with these feigning's and lies. He teacheth moreover, that it doth not suffice unto Christian chastity, that the same be assuredly kept and had; but that it is also required, that it may appear and break forth in their attire and countenance: and that the power of faith ought to be so great, as the same may break out from the heart unto the habit or countenance of the body. And he saith, that Christian women are therefore fallen into colors, and counterfeit decking's; because faith is become weak and feeble in them. Origin, in his second Tome, and fourth homily of sundry places of the scriptures, among other things reproveth women, which have forged colors set upon them; especially alleging against them, that they paint their lively faces with dead colors: and he affirmeth, that they do these things in reproach of the Creator.

65. Cyprian also writeth of this matter in his fifth sermon *De lapsis*, and in his book *De habitu virginum*. He imitated Tertullian, from whence also

he took many things word for word: although it should appear, that he wrote upon another purpose; for he speaketh only of the holy virgins, but Tertullian spake generally; to wit, of women's attire, and of the habit of all women. This father, in reproving of this vice, brought a very elegant similitude deducted from a painter. A painter, if he shall earnestly draw any sign, and another man come after him, and add other colors and lines thereto, he perceiving this, will take it to be done in great disdain: even so (saith he) seeing God hath fashioned our bodies after his own mind, he detesteth and cannot abide counterfeit and strange colors, which are brought in by men, over and besides that which he hath done; since these things may seem to have a respect of mending his work, or rather an impugning of the same. With black powder (saith he) doest thou paint out the lineaments of thine eyes, whereas God made thee otherwise. And that which is more vehement, he addeth; Which women, if they on this wise paint themselves, cannot put on Christ: for he maketh them to be alienated from salvation, when he separateth them from the holy unction of Christ. And against those, which make a show of themselves, to have a continent and chaste mind, he writeth: And if thou knowest a drink or meat to be poisoned, and shouldest see any man endeavor to eat or drink of the same; couldest thou hold thy peace, and sin not? Nay verily, thou not only holdest thy peace; but thou drinkest unto them the poison and liquor of death, and layest it before men's eyes to be drunk. Further, there be other such like sayings in Cyprian, which for brevity sake I mind to pass over.

Ambrose, in his book *De virginibus*, when he reproveth this vice; saith, That through counterfeiting of the countenance, they devise how to corrupt their chastity. Also he reproveth their madness, when he addeth; While they stand in fear, how their husbands will judge of them, they bewray their own

judgment of themselves: and they, which endeavor to please others, first displease themselves. For unless they had displeased themselves, and had been desirous of something in themselves, they had not desired to better their faces with feigned colors. Afterward he added (me thinketh) a certain hyperbolical speech; since as the words sound, it is not true. For he saith, that outward adulteries; to wit, of the body, are more tolerable than adulteries of the countenance: because chastity is corrupted in this, but nature in the other. And in the sixth book he writeth; It is a painting of vice, not of comeliness; of fraud, not of simplicity; it beguileth and deceiveth. And she that garnisheth herself on this sort, contenteth not her husband, who knoweth that the same is counterfeit, and not his wives own.

66. And Chrysostom, in his 31st homily upon Matthew, exhorteth the husband to terrify his wife from this vice; by showing unto her, after a courteous manner, that colored faces please not him, but that he is an utter enemy to them: because the property of such kind of paintings, is rather to deface the well-favoredness of women, than to beautify them. And moreover he saith; that It is a great delight, to see the face to be such a one, as God hath created it; when as on the contrary part, a visage disordered from his own nature, with red chalk and white lead, is misliked. And he showeth, that that deformity cometh by this means; namely, when the lips be died with purple, they resemble the cruel grinning of a bear; if the overbrows be made black, they will seem as if they had been rubbed against a pot in the kitchen; the cheeks whited, will show like the wall of a whited sepulcher. But if so be a man will say, that some women be so foul, as without counterfeit colors, they have no audacity to come abroad; he answereth, that in vain they do use those things; because nature beareth rule over art. And if they be foul of favor, they cannot bring to pass by painting,

but that they will be known at length what they be. Furthermore, deformity itself is void of rebuke: but counterfeited coloring, being perceived, is continually noted with infamy.

It is written in the eleventh chapter of Ecclesiasticus; Despise thou not a man in his outward appearance, neither commend thou a man in his beauty. Wherefore a blemish or foulness of the face, is not so greatly to be abhorred. For (as he saith;) If that a fair and a foul woman were both weighed in a balance, and the discommodities weighed, as well of the one as of the other; we should not easily perceive, that the foul woman hath more discommodities than the fair woman. Moreover, if they can teach husbands to love women, which be in such wise counterfeited; they shall not allure them to themselves, but rather set them forward unto harlots, who are cunningly instructed in such arts. He writeth, that women, which paint their faces, do even as if they should sprinkle a gold image with mire and slime. Undoubtedly, the form, which is like unto God, cannot be expressed in counterfeit paintings, and outward colors: which colors assuredly are to be taken of no other thing, but of the stone called Stibium, or of white lead, or of the red painting called *Purpurisse*. Seeing it is not lawful to counterfeit the wares, which men buy and sell: how much less to counterfeit the visage [which God hath framed?] And if so be, that when fault is found [with ware] after it is bought; the bargain is broken, and the seller compelled by action at law to take his ware again: no doubt, but if any man buy a virgins, meaning, if she had been no virgins, he would not have bought her; if afterward he perceive she was deflowered, the bargain is void; and an action is granted against the seller, for the taking of her again. But do these women think to scape unpunished, for deceiving of men, who

being beguiled through counterfeit colors, think they marry beautiful women; when they take deformed wives?

67. Jerome against Heluid; writeth; This woman is painted out by a glass, and to the reproach of the Creator she endeavoreth to be fairer than she was by birth. And in his epistle to Laeta, touching the bringing up of her daughter, wherein he, reciting the history of a certain woman, that was sore stricken for anointing her daughter with painting colors, calleth them which use such things, Violators of the temple of Christ. And in his epistle to Furia, of the keeping of widowhood, he showeth; that Counterfeiting of the face with colors, is an enemy unto repentance, whereunto Christians ought to apply themselves all their life long. And he bringeth an example of the woman being a sinner, who with her tears flowing abundantly, washed the feet of the Lord, and wiped them with the hair of her head. She had them not (saith he) burnished with the stone called Stibium. Moreover, he calleth white lead, and the red painting called *Purpurissa*; The fires of young men, the nourishments of lusts, and the tokens of an unchaste mind.

But to Augustine I come, who purposely treated of this matter in his epistle to Possidius. He had propounded a question unto him; Whether all kind of ornaments should be forbidden unto women? He answereth, that he would not that he should have too forward a judgment, touching the ornaments of gold and of precious apparel; to wit, that he should forbid them unto all women. But he saith; To be colored with paintings, whereby a woman may appear either whiter or redder, is an adulterous and crafty deceit, whereby I doubt not, but that the husbands themselves will not be deceived. Herby we easily gather, that it is not lawful for to use such paintings, seeing they be counterfeit deceits; and not only counterfeit, but also pernicious: because they be set forth to deceive the beholders.

Moreover, it must needs be a vicious thing in a woman, that she would beguile a man. Thus much Augustine. Whereunto I add, by the judgment of Paul; that We must not only eschew evil, but also the very show of evil. But in false coloring, there is so manifest a show of evil, as it cannot be denied. Undoubtedly, in the holy scriptures, the coloring with Stibium is never taken in good part. In the fourth chapter of Jeremiah, and in the 23rd of Ezekiel, when God bringeth the idolatry of the Jews into hatred, he useth the metaphor of whoredom, and saith; that He will bring the enemies against that people, who for their sakes had before painted their faces with Stibium; to the intent they might commit shameful whoredom with them.

Seeing therefore the scriptures bear record, that these colors are procured for whoredom sake, we must not give ear unto fond painted women, which protest, that they have a chaste heart and mind. Now that we have brought testimonies enow out of the word of God, and plenty and sufficient reasons out of the fathers; what must we then conclude? Not that every ornament should be utterly taken away from women. Let them (in God's name) endeavor to please their own husbands honestly; let them not be altogether unhandsome, and foully attired; let them wash away uncleanliness; let them cleanse away filth: but let them not be painted with white lead, with *Purpurisse*, with Stibium, and finally with any counterfeit colors. For that is to put on vizards, and to play the maskers, to beguile, to deceive, and also to stir up lusts. But what my judgment is concerning gold, jewels, and sumptuous garments, I did not purpose at this time to have disputed; howbeit, because they are things near agreeing together, I will briefly entreat somewhat of them. By the saying of Augustine even now alleged, it appeareth, that those ornaments are not rashly to be condemned, and utterly to be taken away. For there be diverse degrees, and sundry states of men.

There be in the world not only common people, and such as are not in honor; but there be also Emperors, Caesar's, Kings, Queens, Princes, Lord's, and Ladies: unto whom after a sort those ornaments be necessary.

68. Howbeit, thou wilt say, that Peter and also Paul do seem to have forbidden these things: but what their meaning was, that are we to consider of. Their mind was to withdraw Christian women from vanity, pride, superfluity, and too much sumptuousness; and to lead them away from that opinion, wherein they judged these things to be the proper, true, and principal ornaments of women. So that they being adorned on this wise, thought that no other thing should be sought for: as though in these ornaments consisteth the whole sum and effect of all. Wherefore they forbid these things, not absolutely; but by way of comparison. In like manner, as when the same Paul saith; that Our striving is not against flesh and blood; denieth not, but that we must also strive against these things: but he showeth that these strivings are very small, in comparison of the powers of our adversaries, which continually assault us. And even as when Christ, in talking of John, said; that They which are clothed in soft garments, be in king's houses, took not soft and precious garments out of the world, but showed for whom they were meet. Moreover, we must consider unto whom the apostles wrote; namely, unto them of small estimation, to the common sort, to those which were obscure and abjects: seeing the church for the most part at that time consisted of such. Wherefore Paul said in the first epistle to the Corinthians; Brethren, have an eye unto your calling, not many noble men, &c. To the intent therefore that Christian women should avoid superfluity, and too much sumptuousness, and not use such ornaments for things indifferent, and think that they might use them as they list; they call them back from those things, that leaving their affection

towards them, they should seek for better: the which would be overlong now to recite. For they are easy to be found in the very writings of the apostles, and almost in the whole scripture besides. These things being on this wise ordered, we will answer the arguments brought out of the scriptures by our adversaries.

69. [ 1] First, out of the first epistle to the Corinthians, the first chapter, it was alleged; that married women do care for those things that be of the world, to the intent they may please their husbands. But this we deny not: let them have a care to please their husbands, so they do it without dissimulation and lying. And let them think of themselves, whether they would be so deceived and beguiled, as instead of a comely and well-favored man, they should marry him that were foul and deformed. [ 2] They said also, that if men should be alienated from their wives, for deformity sake, they might easily fall into adulteries. Hereunto I answer, that honest husbands, by false paintings, are rather alienated than won unto their wives. Moreover, if they abstain not from adulteries, for the fear that they have of God, and are urged by the authority of his word; neither yet be moved by the laws of men, and terrified with grievous perils: much less will they stay for such counterfeit painting. [ 3] And whereas it was alleged out of the epistle unto Timothy, that it is lawful for women to go in comely apparel, it is not rightly expounded by our adversaries: because κόσμιον in that place is modest and honest: which the word following doth declare, for it is afterward added; In shamefastness. But in feigned colors there is no shamefastness, nay rather, there is intolerable impudency.

[ 4] Furthermore, there was a place brought out of the first to the Corinthians; that Upon those parts, which be most dishonest, put we more honesty on: whereupon it was concluded, that if any blemish be in the body,

or in the countenance, it is lawful to adorn and to color the same. First let us consider what mind the apostle had, when he wrote these things. In very deed he meant nothing else, but that the weaker sort in the church, which seem to be the unworthier and obscure members of Christ, should not be rejected and trodden under feet; but rather cherished and adorned: the similitude being drawn from hence, to wit, that it hath been so used in the outward body. And whereas the apostle speaketh of honor to be put upon those parts which are less honest; it cannot appertain unto counterfeit colors: for they are no ornaments, but rather feigned devises and deceits. I pray you moreover, what honor is there given unto the parts that be less honest? Even to cover them: for we provide that they should not be seen or open unto others. So then let them cover their face, if they think it to be foul or less decent. But they will say, that it is not the custom in all countries, that women should go with their faces covered. If this may not be, let them abide the foulness and indecency laid upon them by God. What if so be they had been born lame, or with a crooked back? Certainly they might not have amended these things; but should have suffered them. Let them therefore, which be deformed by nature, endeavor to make themselves commendable and approved for their virtue and honest conditions. Thus much for answer unto the places of the scripture alleged by them. Now must we confute their subtleties.

70. [ 1] First they say, that we offend by a false argument, A secundum quid ad simpliciter, from that which is after a sort, to that which is absolute. For seeing there be many things found, which provoke lusts, which cannot be denied to be sin; therefore that we judge all things to be vicious, which move or stir our evil concupiscence's. [ 2] But this they affirm to be false, and bring an instance of natural beauty, which inflameth those that look

thereupon, and yet will none say that there is fault therein. To this false surmise we answer, that one and the like consideration is not to be had of beauty natural, and of that which is counterfeit. Because natural beauty cannot be accused of sin, seeing it is the work of God. Again, she that is beautiful by nature, endeavored not to obtain this gift: but they, which paint their faces, seek it as much as they can; that being not beautiful, yet at the least wise they may seem to be such, and therewithal discover their own corrupt mind, and show signs of a naughty concupiscence. [ 3] Furthermore, they said, that we use a false syllogism of the accident, in that we judge of the action, not according to the nature thereof, but according to the accident which followeth the same; that is, by the circumstances which are about the matter, and happen thereunto. Hereunto it is said, that whereas of accidences or circumstances there be two kinds; one common, (because either for the most part, or now and then it is separated from the thing) and others so fixed and constant, as they be not dissevered: by these of this second kind, men's actions are justly and upon good cause allowed or disallowed. Even as, for that it is a thing necessarily incident unto surfeiting, to overcharge the heart; therefore it is condemned as sin. Drunkenness also, because it taketh away the heart of man, provoketh him to lust; and otherwhile also stirreth up unto fury: therefore it is accounted sin.

This in like manner they have alleged, that sin is in things, either by a natural condition, or else by an affection of those persons, which use them: but that in counterfeit color, there is no evil by a natural condition; but that sin doth only happen, through the corrupt will of them that practice these things. Howbeit, if we should follow this as a continual and certain rule, we should defend many acts wickedly done, to be things indifferent: which

nevertheless, by the scriptures, and by the judgment of sound men, are condemned. For in adultery, if thou have respect unto the condition of nature; what else (I pray you) is there but a conjunction of man and woman? Shall we therefore say, that such a conjunction is not sin? Nay verily, it is a most grievous wickedness: because men are not there coupled with their own, but with other men's. The which condition is so annexed unto adultery, as without the same, it cannot be committed. Theft also, if thou look upon the natural action, is to carry away a thing from place to place, and to translate it from someone person unto another. But in these actions, theft is not committed; unless the goods belong to another man, and be taken away against the will of the owner. Wherefore the circumstances, or fixed accidents are of so great importance, as in them that which is done, is judged to be sin: yea and in them it resteth oftentimes, that the form of sin is changed. For if that, which belongeth to another man, be taken away from the owner, against his will, theft is committed; but if thou take away a holy thing, or remove it from a holy place; now it is not theft, but sacrilege.

71. [ 4] Moreover, they took it as granted, that a thing, whether it proceed of nature, or of art, is all of one sort: and therefore, when there is both a natural beauty given, and an artificial, seeing the one cannot be reproved as a sin, neither ought the other to be disallowed. And that the things natural and artificial have one and the self-same respect: hereby they prove, because the health, which is natural, and that which physicians restore by their art, be both of one condition and property. But in arguing in that sort they are deceived: for it is not true, that things natural and artificial are both of one condition. And the similitude brought doth prove nothing: for the health, which is restored by physicians, is not artificial, but natural. It is nature itself that bringeth forth the same, being aided by medicines and

physic. Wherefore the physician is called the minister of nature. And if so be that nature do so faint, and be utterly destitute of strength, the physician can bring nothing to pass. But because I will not seem to cavil, admit we them to be of one condition, then will I ask; Because natural beauty doth provoke unto lusts, therefore must we study to do it more vehemently by painting and coloring? Further, it is not true, that semblable effects are brought forth in them both: for natural temperature maketh true beauty; but counterfeit colors and painting do make it dissembled, feigned, and counterfeit.

[ 5] They contended, that the true cause ought to be distinguished and separated from the occasion. This will we easily grant, denying nevertheless that, which they affirm; to wit, that we should not judge of the actions, according to the occasions. For although it so happen sometime, yet is it not always true; forsomuch as occasions have a great force, and (according to their difference) many things are allowed, and also dispraised. So great respect had God unto occasions, as for them he made many laws. Wherefore would he have his people of Israel to meet together all in one place, to sacrifice and to worship? Assuredly, even because there should be no occasion given of schism in religion, if men had assembled together in diverse places at their own pleasure. For in sundry places, every man would have served God after his own mind, and not by the prescript law of God. Neither did he, for any other cause, permit a divorcement; but to take away the occasion from cruel husbands, of murdering their wives. He also forbad matrimony with idolaters and strangers, for fear of corrupting sound religion.

72. Hereby we may easily see, what account God made of occasions. And it appeareth not to be true, which these men suppose, that we must not

judge of men's actions according to the occasions. Also, how we are to esteem of occasions, the Roman laws do teach. For in the book of the Digests, in the title *Si quadrupes pauperiem fecisse dicatur*, it is decreed; that The owner of the four-footed beast shall either deliver the same beast that hath done the hurt, or else pay the value of the harm. And in the title *Ad legem Aquiliam*, many punishments are provided against occasions, and against those things, which are done by chance. If a master shall be over-cruel to his scholar, so as afterward he put him in peril of his life, he is in the danger of that law; although his mind was to teach, and not to hurt or wound. Also the physician standeth in danger, if he cut not a servant as he ought to do; when as there is no doubt made touching his will in the doing of it. Likewise, that man, which shall take mules to be handled and governed, and afterward, either for his unskillfulness, or for his weakness is not able to restrain their violence, whereby there is harm done, he is punished; when as yet his weakness and want of skill doth after a sort lighten his offense. But the laws have a consideration, that he, knowing his own infirmity and want of skill, should not have taken that charge upon him. And they that in throwing darts, or shooting of arrows in game, happen to kill a servant passing by the high way, they be in danger of the law *Aquilia*. Also they, which make pitfalls for to take wild harts or bears, if men or cattle fall therein by chance, those men be punished. In like manner, if he that is appointed to be the keeper of a burning furnace, fall asleep, and the fire breaking out setteth all on fire, he is punished; though he were the occasion, not the cause of the burning. Hereby it appeareth, that even the occasions of harms are judged to be offenses. Wherefore it is a common saying, that He that giveth the cause, seemeth to have done the harm.

But our adversaries will say; We reason not of the cause, but of the occasion. But (I beseech you) let these men tell me, what is occasion. The same undoubtedly is a cause also, although not so full and perfect. For, even as an offense is of two sorts (given I mean and taken) even so we say, that occasions is of two sorts; namely, taken and given. It shall be called an occasion taken, in respect that when a man endeavoreth to do well, and (according to the precept of the law) others take occasion of defaming and slandering his good purposes: in this case he that doth well, is not to be accused of sin; neither must he leave off from his good enterprise, because of them which speak evil. But he is said to give an occasion, which by doing of evil, or by not abstaining from such things as he might; either by his example, or by some other means, doth stir up some man to sin. Besides, in this degree are women that paint themselves to be reckoned; because they offend, and give offense by their dishonest doing; and by not desisting from that, from which they might easily temper themselves. For whereas it is not unknown unto them, that many of the beholders be inflamed and perish, through their counterfeit colors, yet will they not refrain from them; specially, seeing that in those things a small fault, yea sometimes no fault almost at all is condemned. Even as there is no doubt, but that a master, which seeth his servant strike or kill another, is in danger of the law *Aquilia*: as saith Ulpianus in *Lege Aquilia*, in the Digests, in the same title. For that the knowledge and sight is taken for the suffering, since he did not forbid it, when he might; as Paul the lawyer showeth, in the law following, in the Digests, in the same title. Therefore it is not true, that these men affirm; that we should never judge by occasions, seeing they ought to avoid all things, which may give occasion and offense: as I have declared.

73. [ 6] They said moreover, that in following of our opinion, it might not be lawful to make show either of gold or of jewels; least the beholders thereof should fall into naughty desires, and should wish them to be theirs; although it were by wrong means. Hereunto we answer, that there is great difference between counterfeit colors, and natural beauty; such as is in gold, silver, and precious stones, which sometimes are necessary to be showed forth to the eye: as in the crown of a king, in principal banquets, and upon certain other causes. [ 7] Further, it was objected, that if the matter should be thus, it might never be lawful for a woman, endued with natural beauty, to step out of her house; least she should give an occasion of naughty desires. Hereunto we answer, that it should be very well done of fair maidens, and comely matrons, to keep at home, so much as is possible. Whereupon the snail, among the Ethnics, was an honest matrons cognizance; because that creature doth continually hide itself in his shell. And Paul reproveth the widows, which wander from house to house. Let them remember the ill hap of Dinah, which gadded abroad to be acquainted with the manners and qualities of strange women. Solomon also saith; that The unchaste woman is a wanderer up and down, but the honest woman settleth herself at home.

But thou wilt say, that she must sometimes go abroad unto godly sermons, to comfort the afflicted, and them that be sick; specially if they be of her kindred. I grant that these be necessary duties; in the doing whereof, let women so wisely behave themselves, as they brag not of their beauty, but let them rather modestly dissemble it: that if there happen any evil afterward, they may be excused, because they gave not their endeavor to any lewd or forbidden thing. Lastly, it was objected, that these things be the creatures of God; and therefore indifferent: whereupon it was concluded,

that we may use them. But we reply, that we may use them rightly; but not abuse them. If this were a strong argument, gluttons and drunkards should be excused. For they would say, that bread, and other victuals, and also wine, be the works of God; and therefore we take our pleasure of them. Also the workers of idols would pretend, that the marble stone, ivory, gold, silver, and wood, are the creatures of God; and hereby would say, that it should be lawful for them to use them at their own pleasure. Paul said; All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient. For whatsoever we do, it ought to be a furtherance unto the glory of God's name, and to the edifying of our neighbors. Let these things suffice for answer, unto the arguments and sophistical reasons of our adversaries.

# CHAP. XII. The eighth commandment; Thou shalt not steal. And first of theft, sacrilege, and the stealing away of men's servants and children.

As touching theft; it is theft, when we withhold that, which is another man's, against the will of the owner; or else, when we by injury draw unto us other men's goods; or when we distribute not that which is our own, when need requireth. And there be many other kinds of thefts. But in the table of the ten commandments, the chief purpose is only to set forth a brief sum; and that after the plainer and homelier sort, in the which we may understand all the parts thereof. The head and sum of all theft, is covetousness. Even as in the unhonester sort of pleasures, only adultery is expressed, under which are comprehended all kinds of uncleanness: so under the name of idolatry, all kind of false worshipping is forbidden; whereas that only is expressed, which is most gross. For a strange god is forbidden us; so likewise are graven images, and sundry forms. Wherefore, when any of the ten commandments of God is set down unto us, it is our part to consider well, what things be comprehended under that sin. Further, the root must be sought out, and there against we must strive with all the might we have. Covetousness or theft hereof springeth, that we distrust

God, and are always afraid, least we should want anything. But adultery, and all uncleanness of the flesh, springeth from the desire of voluptuous pleasures: as Christ expressed, when he said; If a man look upon a woman, to lust after her, he hath already committed adultery in his heart. And against this concupiscence we ought to wrestle.

As touching murder, Christ hath likewise admonished us, that we should take clean away anger, as the root thereof. Sacrilege also is to catch, and rashly usurp to a man's self, holy things, which be dedicated unto God, or due unto him, either in respect of a vow, or a separation. The Jews were commanded in the law, not to spare idols: for they ought to have overthrown and destroyed them all. But they, being drawn by covetousness, reserved them unto themselves, and turned them to their own commodities. So sinned Achan, and also Saul, when he had overcome Amalech. Contrarywise, Moses gave an excellent example of courage, when he not only brake the golden calf; but also did beat it into powder, and threw it into the river. But if the relics of the idol had remained still, peradventure the Israelites, as they were mad upon them, would have worshipped them. Undoubtedly the Common-wealth, and our magistrates, may take away those things, which are superstitious, and convert the prices of them to good and godly uses: yet private men may not do so. But the Hebrews were generally forbidden, that they should not keep such things; especially such as they had cursed.

2. Theft was not a crime of death: but if there were found any stolen thing in the hand of the robber, the thing stolen was restored. Howbeit, if he had either slain it, or sold it; he restored four oxen for one, and five sheep for one. But David made it death; He deserveth death (saith he,) and willeth, that there should be restored eight-fold: if we follow the rules of grammar.

For *Arbathaim* is the dual number: albeit the Chaldean interpreter, and some of the Hebrews take it for four-fold. What shall we answer hereunto? We answer two manner of ways. The first is, that the law ought to be kept after the ordinary and equal manner; but it lay in the Judges hands to increase or diminish the punishments, according to the nature of the circumstances. What were the circumstances, for the which David augmented the punishment? He that stole, was a rich man; Further, he stole from one that was poor: which also doth aggravate the cause. To take somewhat, where great store is, is not so great a matter. Besides, he took from him that one, which of all other he held most dear unto him. Wherefore did he so? To give good entertainment to his ghost, who (perhaps was an ill man) and to make good cheer with him. Wherefore it must not seem any marvel, if David augmented the punishment. Yea but thou sayest, that this is to alter the law of God, whereof God said; Neither add thou unto it, neither take thou from it. They say: there be no words added, the law remaineth perfect; but forsomuch as the law-maker cannot express all cases, it cometh to pass, that it is put to the discretion of judges, either to aggravate, or to diminish the sentence. Notwithstanding, that is a great matter, when the sentence of the judge is so aggravated, as it maketh that to be death, which is no crime of death. He might have said; If it be not enough to restore home four, or eight-fold, let him pay ten, twenty, &c.

Another answer is, that they say; This manner of David's speaking, is not to be taken, as though he would have the party to be punished with death: but for the more vehement expressing of his mind, he used an excessive speech, as though he should have said; He might seem to be guilty of death: and not that he would have him to be put to death. When a judge heareth of any grievous crime, he saith, that such a one deserveth a thousand deaths;

when as only one death can be laid upon him by the law. This saying serveth to exaggerate the crime, and maketh not the words false: for all men know, what the meaning thereof is. This I speak the rather, because if we say, that in the sacrament of the Eucharist there is a figure; they say that we make the proposition, This is my body, to be false. But a figure doth not make the words false. So true is the figure which David here useth, as he bindeth it with an oath. Either of these answers is probable. I see that in that place, the holy Ghost used the tongue of David unproperly, according to the common proverb; A straying tongue telleth truth. He was the child of death, for they were capital faults which he had committed: and he should restore eight-fold, that is, he should pay much.

Truly, it seemeth very hard to punish theft with death. Nevertheless we must consider, that in that law of Exodus, this was ordained; that if a thief had come armed in the night, with intent to steal anything away, it should be lawful to kill him, and that without danger. In this case, when it is said, that the rich man doth take away from the poor man, his one only lamb; there seemeth to be a violence used, and not a fraud. It is no marvel therefore, if the punishment be augmented, and he judged worthy of death. And as for the restoring of four fold, we have not only a law, but also the example of Zachaeus, in the 19th of Luke; If I have taken ought from any man by deceit (he saith to Christ) I restore him four fold. He saith not, I restore him double; but to show his duty the more, he chose to himself the straighter punishment. Again, there is a place in the sixth of the Proverbs, where Solomon saith, that A thief which is taken, shall restore seven-fold. In which place it may be gathered (as it seemeth) that it was in the power of judges, to increase the punishment: for at this time thieves did restore seven-fold.

Some answer, that it was not there meant of any precise number, in the restitution of things taken away; but that a thief should be compelled to make a perfect restitution. In that place he compareth the sin of theft and adultery together, and would show and declare adultery to be the greater. If a thief have no other intent, but to satisfy hunger, it redoundeth not to his shame. If he be taken, he is compelled to yield again that which he hath taken away. If he be taken in adultery, he is punished with death. Touching the restitution of four-fold, it may seem that David was punished; not only to the proportion of four-fold, but of above eight-fold. For his ten concubines were defiled by Absalom. And although himself was not slain, yet was he reserved to great afflictions. For four of his sons were consumed: first, he whom he had by Bethsaba, then Amnon, afterward Absalom, lastly Adonias.

3. The crime of stealing away of servants, or children, and selling of them, was by the civil law punished with death: as it is in the 48th book of the Digests, and in Deuteronomy the 24th chapter. The punishment which God appointed for the same, doth yet declare the grievousness of the crime. For this fault the Hebrews confess, that they were many years together vexed by Pharaoh in Egypt. Assuredly, the selling of Christ drove Judas to hang himself, and in the end wrought confusion, both to those that bought him, and to the whole kingdom. In the book Zahor (wherein be prayers, which the Jews repeat in the day of Purification, when they fast for the satisfaction of their sins) there is mention made of ten Rabbins of great name, the which were slain by Caesar Adrianus. For Caesar demanded of them, what punishment their law took of such, as should be found guilty of stealing free men away, and selling them? Who wisely answered out of Deuteronomy, 24:7, that they were worthy of death. Whereupon the Emperor put them to

death, laying to their charge, that they were guilty of this crime. But what free man it was that he charged them to have sold, it is not there expressed. Yet in their Talmud, to the end to slander Christ, when they make a declaration of this fact, they say it was Joseph. And least they should seem to speak against all reason or likelihood; that after so many ages, these men should be punished for a wickedness so long before committed, they speak more absurdly, that souls remove from one to another; and therefore, that the souls of the ten brethren of Joseph did remove into these ten Rabbins, and that for this cause they were punished after such a manner.

**Of well doing, and Hospitality.**

4. There is a notable place in the first to the Corinthians, the 16th chapter; wherein we be taught beneficence and liberality. By the which, and by such like, the Anabaptists (which declare that among Christians all things ought to be common) be confuted. For if their opinion were true, there had been no need to exhort the faithful to distribute alms unto the poor: for everyone might take from whom he would. But forsomuch as the holy scriptures commend alms unto us; they show plainly, that everyone is a possessor of his own goods: although he be bound to communicate with his needy neighbor, of the fruit and profit which cometh of the same. We see also in the same place, that the church of Corinth resisted not Paul, in saying; What tellest thou us of the Jerusalemites? Have not we poor people of our own with us, whom we ought to find and relieve? Suffer us to distribute our own goods among our own poor. But when they had heard Paul determine, that it was not enough, that every church should find their own poor, but is also bound to relieve the brethren of other churches, if their ability serve; they were ready to give their consent. For although that charity ought to be done in due order, yet must it not be so strait laced, as it should have respect only

unto them that be her own. In deed we ought to begin with such as be our own, but we are not there to make a stay.

Furthermore, in distributing of alms, there must be a consideration had of the honesty of those that be in need. Wherefore Paul said unto the Galatians; Let us do well unto all men, especially unto those which be of the household of faith. Besides this, there must be a special consideration had of them, touching whom the word of God hath given express commandment: as are the father, the mother; the wife, the children; and the ministers of the church. Thirdly, necessity must be regarded: for otherwise there happen cases sometimes, wherein our help cannot be deferred with a safe conscience; in which time both father, mother, and the rest, unto whom we are bound by the word of God, and also godly men, should after a sort bear with us. But a stranger, which meets us, is so narrowly driven, and in such danger, as he may not be overpassed.

5. But out of such a case of necessity, order must be kept: so that first we must do well unto them, whom God hath joined unto us by any means of friendship. Wherefore Augustine in his first book *De doctrina christiana*, saith; If thou shouldest by chance meet by the way with two persons, of like honesty and necessity, and haddest only so much as would relieve one of them, thou thus musing with thyself, couldest do nothing better, than even to draw cuts, which of them to gratify. So shalt thou (saith he) gather by a certain aim, that either the one or the other was joined to thee by the will of God, in some degree of conjunction. Because, when we be born, none of us all chooseth to himself what associates, friends, enemies, parents or kindred he ought to have. These do happen unto every man by chance, and every man is bound to do good unto those, which he joined to him, and such be called his neighbors. Which word is not restrained only to the conjunction

that we have with our kindred, country, or particular places. For that, which the Greeks called πλησίον, the Hebrews *Rehe*, the Latins *Proximum*, in English, A neighbor; must be understood as touching them, which by the will of God through any occasion do meet, or be joined unto us, or be commended unto us: be it by means of kindred, of friendship, or of meeting by the way. We are accounted to be their neighbors, to whom God doth associate, and join us by any manner of means. Which appeareth in that man, who in the parable of the Lord is described to have gone down from Jerusalem unto Ierico. This man being ill entreated by thieves, and being an inhabitant of Jerusalem, yet was a Samaritan declared to be his neighbor; notwithstanding that he was of a contrary religion unto him, and pertained to another kingdom. He was neighbor to him; because the will of God was, that he should meet with him. In that case therefore he was the neighbor, which deferred not his help, when there was present necessity, that might not be deferred; and when there was no other help.

It is provided also, that the name of a neighbor doth not appertain only unto kindred and acquaintance: for Elias went unto Sarepta, a place of the Sidonites, and demanded bread and water of a widow. That widow would have used the ordinary way of charity; namely, to have reserved that little (that was remaining) unto herself and her son. But the prophet said; Go thy ways, and first give me of it. The woman therefore, when she would have followed the usual way of charity, the private admonition of the word of God did let her: which nevertheless was not unjust. For the widow knew him to be both a prophet, and a man of God. But if thou wilt demand, how she understood it being a stranger? We cannot otherwise say, but that this was done by the motion and persuasion of God: as appeareth in the same chapter. For God said unto Elias; I will command a widow to feed thee.

Wherefore, for the safety of our neighbor's life, we are bound to bestow, not only our goods, but also our souls; that is, our life: as John witnessed, when he said; that We ought to give our lives for our brethren, even as Christ did. But as concerning the sustentation of bodies, first it behooveth, that we set before our eyes the glory of God: the which according as we shall judge it to be promoted by any kind of work; so must we be the more inclined to liberality. So then we see, that this widow had a godly meaning; in that she would first have a regard unto herself and her child: but afterward, when she understood that this was a prophet, and that it did chiefly belong to the glory of God, to have him sustained, she first ministered unto him; when as nevertheless she had it promised her, that there should be no want of sustenance for her and her child. It now appeareth, by that we have spoken, that there is an order to be used in charity; and yet nevertheless, that the same must not be limited within any strict bounds.

6. But seeing we are in hand with alms, we must answer that common and gross error; wherein men think, although they be entangled in the greatest crimes, and do not repent, they may be able to attain to everlasting life: so that they give alms liberally. And they oftentimes obtrude unto us the saying, which we have in the eleventh chapter of Luke; Give alms, and all things be clean unto you. Which place requireth a diligent examination: for that same verb δότε, Give, may as well be the indicative mood as the imperative. If it be taken for the indicative, we may say; Ye give alms, and all things be clean unto you, that is to say; When you be full of wickedness, given unto ravine, and in the meantime give some alms to the poor, ye think that all things be clean unto you: as if this kind of speech were a fine quip. But if we read it after the common translation, in the imperative mode: Augustine in his Enchiridion to Laurence giveth us this manner of

interpretation, that when it is said; (Give ye alms,) it may be understood, that the doing thereof must first begin with our selves; to wit, that we ourselves convert first unto God, and then all things shall be clean unto us. For it is said; Have pity upon thine own soul, pleasing God. So as in giving of alms, let us first give ourselves bountifully unto God, and then all things shall be clean: according to that, which in another place he taught; Make ye the tree good, and his fruit good.

The third exposition, is to say, that Christ sowed the words among the Scribes and Pharisees, with whom he dined. But these men were careful, above other things, for the cleansing of their platters and cups. On the other side, Christ persuaded them to make small account of outward cleanliness: and he saith; Seeing ye be grievously loden with ravine and deceit, cleanse ye those things which be inward, make clean your hearts and conscience. Which cannot be done, unless there be faith: for it is written; Purifying their hearts by faith. And as touching outward actions, give ye alms, and then all things will be clean unto you. For concerning outward things, whether the platters be clean, or the cups washed, yea or no; the conscience is neither the better nor the worse. Wherefore your consciences must be washed by faith, and ye must be liberal towards your neighbors. Also there is objected out of the 13th chap. of the epistle to the Hebrews; that By such sacrifice God is pleased. But in the Greek we read εὐαρεστεῖται, which signifieth, He is merrily affected, or, He is pleased. And we are easy to be persuaded in this, that the works of mercy are accepted unto God, and that they please him well; so that he is willingly delighted with them, when they be wrought by godly men. Yet must it not be attributed unto these works, that either they please God; or else make us acceptable unto him. For this were to diminish and pluck from the sacrifice of the death and passion of Christ.

7. And these things now might suffice touching alms, but that we see the devotion of distributing to the poor waxeth very cold: and that doth the beggary of men that go from door to door most plainly declare; and this ought not to be suffered among Christians. It were meet, that in every church there should be men chosen, the which should have the names of all the poor people registered; and should diligently view both the poverty, wherewith they be oppressed, and what labors they would be fit for: and to distribute alms in such sort, as they maintain not them that be idle; and that they withdraw their alms from those which will not labor. And it would be very requisite, that in the churches there should be a common treasure chest for the poor, wherein to put the common alms: and that every man, of that little that he hath, not only offer whensoever there is any godly assembly; but also, thrice or four times in the year, prepare some honest offering. And so they, which have the custody of the poor men's box, not only ought to have the distributing thereof; but also to yield an account unto the church, both what they receive, and what they lay out. Neither should any man pretend, that he will distribute his own goods at his own pleasure; for it is hard for one man to know all: and things be more easily spied out by them, which are appointed for this purpose. And it is rather to be wished, that all things may be done in order, than rashly. Men heretofore could bestow much upon stocks and stones, and upon the outrageous buildings of temples, upon dead men's bones, and pilgrimages, upon stations and pardons: all which were superstitious things. And yet at this day, they (being delivered by the benefit of Christ's Gospel from those crafty devises) deal very miserly with the poor, being the lively temples of Christ.

8. But Paul maketh special mention of the saints, because they, among others, have most need, being those, whom the world doth hate. And he

rightly addeth (Strangers:) for in those days the saints were turned out of all their goods, and lived oftentimes in exile, like strayers and banished men. Paul therefore exhorteth the Romans, that they would entertain such men with loving minds, and liberal hospitality. The flesh is not bent to do good to this kind of men: for when it seeth them in misery, it judgeth that they cannot requite their courtesy; and therefore whatsoever is bestowed upon them, it thinketh the same to be lost. And they, which be affected on this wise, account nothing more happy than to receive: so that they give nothing willingly, except where they think they shall receive as much or more again. In the law, God doth oftentimes commend strangers. In the 22nd of Exodus, he commandeth the Israelites, that they should not vex strangers, but should courteously entreat them; because they themselves also had been strangers in Egypt. And whereas he called to their remembrance, the things that are past; it may also seem to be profitable unto us, if we think upon the things to come. For who is now so assured of his habitation, as he knoweth for certainty, that he shall never be a stranger?

And in the 19th chap. of Leviticus, commandment is given to the harvest-folks and grape-gatherers, that they should not gather all; but leave somewhat for the poor and strangers. And God commandeth his people to love them, even as themselves. And in the tenth chapter of Deuteronomy, God affirmeth that he is the protector, and avenger of orphans, widows, and strangers: for these kind of people are lest to his care. Unto all such kind of men we owe our benevolence; and chiefly, if they be of the household of faith. These things the apostles, Peter, James, and John, had so great care of; as when they had sent away Paul to the Gentiles, and they themselves were appointed to be ministers unto the circumcision: they commended unto his care, the poor which dwelt at Jerusalem. And this business he testifieth unto

the Galatians, that he with an earnest diligence accomplished. That which is in the Latin book, *Necessitatibus*, that is, Necessities, is not well translated. For the sophisters abuse this word, and teach, that a Christian man is not bound by the commandments of God to help the poor wretches; unless they be in very great, or (as they speak) in extreme necessity.

But Paul willeth us to communicate rather to their uses, than to their necessities. For, to do good unto thy neighbor, thou must not tarry till he be urged with extreme necessity, seeing that no man would gladly so be dealt with. Neither is this to be passed over with silence, that some books, instead of χρείαις; that is Uses or necessities, have μείναις; that is, Memories. And of the reading of it on this wise, Origin, or rather his interpreter maketh mention. And Ambrose both readeth it so, and so interpreteth it. And so the sense is, that we ought to do good, not only to the poor, which are present; but also to them which be absent. For Thales Milesius was wont to say; that We ought not only to remember our friends present, but those which be absent. And the apostle had a great care to provide, that the Gentiles should minister alms unto the saints, which dwelt at Jerusalem. Howbeit, we will follow the accustomed reading, χρείαις, and say, that we ought to communicate to the uses of the saints, (to their uses I say and not to their pleasures or delights: since by that means, men are oftentimes made worse. And besides that also, such superfluity might serve to relieve other poor folks also.

9. Neither (saith he) Giving or bestowing, but, Communicating; because in alms giving, there is a certain communicating. For if we speak of the poor, which were at Jerusalem; the Gentiles had received at their hand's spiritual things; For the word of the Lord came out of Zion, and the law of God out of Jerusalem, and salvation from the Hebrews. Seeing out of that

nation, were appointed preachers of the Gospel, to preach unto the whole world. Therefore Paul in the second to the Corinthians, the eighth chapter, saith; That your abundance may relieve their want, and that on the other side, their abundance may relieve your want. But if we speak of other poor folks, even when we help them with our alms, there redoundeth unto us no small commodity or profit. For Christ warned (as we read in Luke;) Make you friends of unrighteous mammon, that when you fail, they may receive you into everlasting tabernacles. But what if the poor be evil, and they also excluded from the kingdom of heaven? These things are to be understood; not of the men, but of the works. But by this means also followeth another absurdity; That by the virtue of our works, we should obtain the kingdom of God. I answer; As we deny, that works are the causes of eternal life; so likewise we deny not, that God rewardeth the good works of the faithful, which are now regenerate by Christ; since we know, that He will judge every man according to his works. For he will say; I was hungry, and ye fed me; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye harbored me.

The kingdom of God is given for election, and for she promises sake, which the saints receive by faith. But because those things, are hidden from man's eyes, therefore are good works brought forth: which are the proper and manifest effects both of our faith, and God's election. Διώκοντες, that is, Giving our selves (saith he) to hospitality. This is not spoken without a great emphasis: for it is a greater matter to pursue hospitality, than only to be hospital. For Abraham expected not, till strangers came home to him, to desire to be received, and to desire lodging: but going of his own accord out of his tent, he looked round about, to see if he could espy any stranger, whom he might receive into his house. And if he saw any, he ran unto him,

and prayed him not to pass by his house; If I have found favor (saith he) in your eyes, I beseech you turn in unto your servant. And the same diligence and mind was in Lot: and well-nigh in all the fathers. Paul in these words chargeth us not with any vile and indecent works, but with very honorable and excellent works.

For there was never any noble man or notable prince, but that he was desirous to do good unto others, and was careful over strangers. Titus Vespasian, when he called to remembrance at night, that he had done no good turn unto any man, would with heaviness say; Friends, we have lost this day. And Christ saith; that The kings of the nations bear dominion over them, and they which have power over them, are called gracious: in Greek it is εὐεργέται. The Ethnics also say that God hath a care over strangers; and therefore they worshipped Jupiter Xenius, who had a care and regard of strangers. This property of God, Homer describeth in the second book of his Odysses. And Virgil very aptly saith; Jupiter, *hospitibus nam te dare jura loquuntur*: that is, For men say, that thou O Jupiter givest right unto strangers. And the natural affection toward citizens commonly stirreth every man; that if he meet a stranger, and one that is needy, he will to his power help him, and provide harbor for him. Even so in like manner, if peradventure the saints (which as touching the eternal country, are our citizens,) do come unto us, we ought to help them, and gently to entertain them.

10. But because that Iahel seemed to have violated the laws and covenant of hospitality, it is a doubt, whether we should condemn her or quit her. Howbeit, because all controversy dependeth not a little of the circumstances of the persons, we will therefore set her before our eyes; and consider with our selves, what manner of men the Kenites in the fourth of Judges were.

They assuredly in blood were joined with the Israelites: for they were the posterity of Hobab the father in law of Moses. Moreover, they perfectly agreed with the Hebrews, in the exercise of godliness, and in the law of God. Neither was their faith idle, but effectual and working: for they, leaving their country, followed the Israelites through the desert; and God which was their guide through the wilderness. Wherefore at the length, when the lands were distributed, they obtained inheritance together with them in the land of Canaan. For these causes if Iahel went about to set the Jews at liberty, she did but her duty: neither did she take upon her any other man's office.

On the other part, let us consider of Sisara. He was an oppressor of the people of God, and now slain by the power of God, and utterly confounded: neither appeared there in him any token of repentance, but he would rather hide himself; to the intent that he, escaping this so present a danger, might again gather a new host against the Israelites. Indeed, after a sort he was in league with Heber the Kenite: yet (as it is to be thought) with no sincere heart, but only to pluck him away from the rest of the Jews; whereby he might have the fewer enemies, and not be compelled to fight with so many enemies at one time; or else to get of him a great tribute, or some other commodity which he looked for. Furthermore, in this his misfortune, he calleth upon no God, he desireth not the help of other men's prayers; but only seeketh lurking places, where he might hide himself, till such time, as the rage and heat of the conquerors were somewhat slaked, and only trusted unto the helps and alliance made with men. By these things it easily appeareth, that Jahel did her duty, and Sisara deserved to be slain.

11. But as touching the laws of hospitality, we also judge, that they by themselves, and of their own nature, ought to be kept sacred and inviolated.

This did Lot understand, when he would have put forth his daughters to the naughty lusts of the wanton Sodomites; to the end they should do no injury unto them, which were lodged with him. And this same example did the old man follow, which received the Levite with his wife as strangers: as it is more at large expounded in the history of the Judges. Whose counsel, in betraying his daughters, although I allow not; yet I do very much commend the defending of strangers. Yea and the Gentiles worshipped Jupiter, and gave unto him the name of keeping hospitality; knowing by the light of nature, that God had a singular care over strangers and guests. Pythagoras also for this cause discommendeth the swallows, for that they lodge under the covering of men's houses; and yet will never be made familiar or tame unto their hosts. Also there were sometimes certain mischievous houses, in the which none might any longer inhabit: as probable writers have declared, and that because the customs of hospitality had been broken in them. And contrariwise, where hospitality hath been well and faithfully kept, not only angels, but God himself also hath sometimes been a most profitable ghost.

Christ also in the end of the world will say; I was a stranger, and ye lodged me, commending his chosen in the sight of all the world, for the virtue of hospitality. And it is manifest, that men in the old time wished, that there should be great amity between the housekeeper and his ghost. Lastly, God commanded, that the Hebrews should not despise the Egyptians, or wholly drive them away from them: and that for this cause, that at the beginning they gave entertainment unto their ancestors. Wherefore we must conclude by a general and ordinary law, that the customs of hospitality ought to be kept inviolated. And this also ought to be firm, that no laws nor friendships, be they never so honest and just, but if God command otherwise, they ought to be broken. For so long must all these things be of

force, as they shall be allowed by the will of God. Then, seeing God had now cast out Sisara and the Chanaanits, and would have them to be destroyed, no covenants might justly be kept with them: for we must rather obey God, than give place to the reasons of men. And of this will of God, Deborah was both a prophesier, and an interpreter. She had declared that Sisara was now cast out by God; and foretold, that he should be sold into the hand of a woman.

12. After this manner the Levites obeyed Moses, in the killing of their friends, and kinsfolks. To whom Moses, in the name of God said; Ye have consecrated your hands: so far was it off, that they were reproved for breaking the bonds of friendship. Jeremiah also, when by the commandment of God, he had declared that the Moabits should be slain, cursed those which had withdrawn themselves from that mind; He is accursed (saith he) that doth the work of the Lord deceitfully. In the law it is also commanded, that none should be spared, which did entice any to idolatry; no not the father nor the mother, neither yet he which sleepeth in thy bosom. Who seeth not here, that the most nearest bonds of friendships must be contemned, if the will and word of God be thereunto joined. Abraham was commanded to kill his son, and that his only son; as touching whom he had received a most large promise. The promise of God, and the natural love of the father seemed to be against this commandment: notwithstanding, against both these, being urged by the word of God, he ought to have killed his son. So must we think, that all men, although they be of nigh kin unto us, are sacrifices to God, so many as he commandeth to be slain. Wherefore it is written in the 34th chapter of Isaiah; The Lord hath a sacrifice in Bozra. But they, which with a preposterous clemency, contrary unto the word of God, will be merciful; let them remember what happened

unto the king of Samaria. He, when he had spared Benhadad the king of Syria, contrary to the commandment of God, was in this manner reproved by the prophet in the name of God; Thy soul shall go for his.

**Of benefiting and unthankfulness.**

13. Forsomuch as justice and honesty require this, that we should give thanks unto them, which have bestowed benefits upon us; nature followeth this order, that we should convert the effects into their causes: forsomuch as they have their conservation and increase from thence, from whence they spring. This was due unto Jephthah, since he should have had either the highest place, or the next unto the highest, among those that had well deserved of the public-wealth. [ 1] For first, thou seest some, that when they bestow benefits, they have only a respect to themselves. So do shepherds, neatherds, and swineherds, when they provide pasture for their cattle, whereof they have charge; since therein they seek only for their own gain and commodity. [ 2] Otherwise, they have no love to oxen, sheep, and swine. There be others, which in doing of good, have regard both unto themselves, and also unto them whom they do help. For the poor do serve rich men and princes, partly because they love them, and partly to get some commodity at their hands. [ 3] In the third degree are those placed, which do in such sort bestow a benefit upon any man, as they look for no recompense of him. It oftentimes happeneth, that when we see one in misery, we are touched with mercy, and we help him: which without doubt proceedeth of humanity. Forsomuch as we are men, we think that nothing belonging to a man, but it appertaineth unto us. [ 4] They are counted in the last and chiefest place, which benefit others, even with their own grief, hurt, and loss. After this manner Christ dealt towards us, he redeemed mankind with the loss of his own life. Whom Jephthah (after a sort) resembleth, who

delivered the Israelites unto liberty, and that to his great danger. Which he declared by this form of speaking; I have put my life in my hands: that is, I have not refused to endanger my life. Wherefore the Ephraimites were most ungrateful for so great a benefit.

[ 1] The first sort of unthankful men is, when they requite not good to those that deserve it at their hands. [ 2] The second, when they praise not, nor allow well of those things, which good men bestow upon them. [ 3] The third is of them, which forget the benefits they have received. [ 4] The fourth and worst of all is, when for benefits, injury and hurt is recompensed. After this manner the Ephramits behaved themselves toward Jephthah; who, because he had gotten the victory, would have burnt him and all his. What else is this, then to contemn both the benefits, and him that bestoweth them? But this is most of all the point of unthankful men, when neither men nor other creatures are despised in their so doing, but God himself contemned. For whatsoever benefits we receive of men, we have them of God, which useth the help of men, to relieve the miserable and afflicted. Wherefore they, which are ungrateful, are void of charity; as well towards God as towards men.

14. But thou wilt say; When men that bestow benefits, do sometimes light upon ungrateful persons, what ought they to do? Shall they strait-way withdraw their well-doing from them? Undoubtedly they deserve this. Howbeit, we must not forthwith do it, because men, by reason that nature is corrupted, are slow, neither are they easily moved to do their duty. Therefore we must go forward in well-doing: for he, which is not moved to be thankful by the first benefit, will peradventure be stirred by the second, third, fourth, or fifth. But if he altogether continue in his ingratitude, we may justly withdraw from him our benefits; not moved thereunto by hatred

or desire of revenge, but that he may be corrected, and that he do not continually disdain the benefits, which are the gifts of God. This doth God also, who by Ose the prophet, saith unto the unthankful Hebrews; I will give unto you a heaven of brass, and an earth of iron; I will take away from you my wool and my flax, &c. because ye have bestowed them upon Baal.

Thou wilt ask perhaps; Why did Christ command us, that we should Be perfect as our heavenly father, which maketh his sun to arise, as well upon the evil as upon the good. And as it is written in Luke the sixth chapter; He is good towards them that be ungrateful? I answer, that this sentence of the Lord, is not against the definition now declared. For God hath two kinds of benefits. [ 1] There are certain, which are principal; as the revelation of the Gospel, faith, justification, and lastly, glorification, or eternal life: these he giveth only to his. [ 2] There be certain other temporal and common gifts, which yet are especially given for the elect sake. Howbeit, for that it is impossible, that without a miracle they should come unto the good, unless the wicked be also made partakers of them; therefore he giveth them as well to the one as to the other. How might a shower be let, that it should not water the fields of the wicked? Indeed God might do it, but yet not without a miracle. And forsomuch as he will not always work miracles, he will rather that the ungodly also should be partakers of these benefits; than that the good should be destitute of commodities necessary for life.

Also kings do not make every citizen a ruler, a president, or other officer belonging to a magistrate; but them only that are just and wise: which if they do not, they execute not their office. But when they give unto their people liberal gifts, or a banquet, or distribute corn; because without great labor and pain they cannot separate the good citizens from the bad: therefore they bestow such things, as are of this kind, upon all men one with

another; and choose rather to deserve well of evil citizens, than to defraud the good of their liberality, for whose sake they are chiefly moved to be bountiful towards the people. Let us also imitate this, that when we bestow private things, although we light upon one that is ungrateful, let us not straightway withdraw from him our liberality. But let us behave ourselves in such manner, as we have before declared; that if he stubbornly proceed to be ungrateful, let us at the length, for his correction sake, cease to bestow any benefit upon him. But such benefits, as are common and public, let us continually bestow them, yea even upon the ungrateful; as we are of God commanded. And let us rather choose, to have our good things distributed to godly and holy men, than to cease off from doing good; because the wicked should not be partakers of them.

**Of Plays or Pastimes.**

15. Some of the Fathers seem to mislike all kind of plays. Ambrose, in his first book of Offices, the 23rd chapter; Plays and pastimes (saith he) seem to be sweet and pleasant, yet are they contrary to the rule of a Christian, since it is not found in the holy scriptures, how they ought to be used. Chrysostom, in his sixth homily upon Matthew, saith; that God invented not gaming, but the devil; For the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play, in the honor of a most filthy idol. For when they had worshipped the calf, and incurred idolatry, they seemed to have obtained this reward of the devil; namely, to play. Perhaps Chrysostom alludeth to that, which Plato wrote in *Phaedro*, that Theut the devil of the Egyptians found out first, numbers, Geometry, Astrology, letters, and dice. But Augustine in his second book of music, saith; that It is the part of a wise man, sometime to revoke the mind from earnest matters; and that is specially done by pastime: wherefor it seemeth lawful. But whereof so great a delight in play cometh,

it is not hard to understand. Aristotle, in his second book of Rhetoric's, putteth victory, or the hope of victory among the causes of delight. But when we play, either we obtain the victory, or else we be in some hope thereof. So as they, which defend play, determine with themselves, that the mind ought sometimes to be no less refreshed, than the body: and as the body is revived by rest or quietness, so they say, that the mind is recreated by play. By which means they think to prove, that some place must be left for play; some cautions nevertheless being prescribed.

First, that there be no vile and dishonest words used in play: for it is commonly seen, that in gaming, both shameful and blasphemous talk is used. We must also take heed, that too much lightness, and lack of gravity and comeliness be not intermingled with play: for oftentimes it cometh to pass, that men do so wholly give themselves to play, that afterward they are able to think upon no weighty matter. Moreover, the circumstances are diligently to be marked: (I mean) of the person, the place, and the time. It is certain in deed, that in the holy scriptures, there is no rule or form prescribed, as touching plays; although there be read in them many kinds of play. In Genesis, the angel wrestled the whole night with Jacob. Sara saw Isaac play with Ishmael, which she took in evil part: not because he played, but for that he played with the son of a bondwoman. Also David danced and played before the ark of the Lord. And the maidens sang in their dances; Saul hath overcome his thousands, and David his ten thousands. And Christ complained, that the Jews were like unto children playing in the streets, and saying; We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have sorrowed, and ye have not mourned. And although of these things there be no certain rules manifestly written in the holy scriptures; yet they be set forth in the civil laws.

16. But before I speak of them, it shall be convenient to distribute plays or games into their forms and kinds. There be some, which be utterly referred unto chance: as he, which casteth most points, or throweth this chance or that, winneth the game. There be other, whereby the powers either of the body or mind are exercised. Such plays as depend upon chance, are understood by the name of dice-play, and are condemned both by the civil laws, and by the fathers. In the Digests *De aleatoribus*, the Pretor saith: If a dice-player be injured by his fellows, I will not give him judgment; but if one steal, or do violence to another, I will surly do right, although they be unworthy. And afterward: If a man compel another to play, let him be punished; either let him be cast into the quarries to dig stones, or else into the common prisons. By these things it appeareth, that to play at dice was judged, by the civil law, to be a very odious thing. Cicero, in his second *Philippike* against Anthony; His house (saith he) is full of dice-players and drunkards. Further, the laws add; If dice-players lay any wagers among themselves, let them be of no force. Howbeit, it is permitted to them that be of one household, to play among themselves, for a repast or banquet.

But in the Code *De religiosis sumptibus funerum*, it is more particularly ordained concerning the play at dice, and dice-players. In the old time, soldiers were permitted to play at dice, when their business was done. Nevertheless, the emperor found fault, that in those days all men played, and in trying of chances wasted all their patrimony; and lastly used blasphemy against God. Wherefore he decreed, that it should not be lawful for any man to play, nor to look upon him that playeth: and he warneth the bishops to look diligently, that these things be observed. The same Justinian the emperor, in his Authentikes, in the title *De sacrosanctis episcopis*, in the Paraph *Intercedimus*, prohibiteth by name, that no bishop, priest, or deacon,

should either play themselves, or look upon them that play. But if they should do otherwise, he commandeth that they should be put into a monastery for three years. Let now the Popes go, and say, that it is not lawful for emperors to decree touching ecclesiastical things. *De excessu praelatorum*, in the chapter *Inter dilectos*: because a certain Canon was found to be a dice-player, and in play had given his money upon usury, to receive for 10 pieces of money, 12; he was deposed.

Also *De vita & bonestate clericorum*, in the chapter Clerici; Let them not play at dice nor tables, neither let them be present at such games. The same is to be read in the 35th distinction, chapter the first; Either let them cease to play, or else be condemned. But they that maintain this kind of play, were wont to say; What if we list to bestow our money in that sort? Are not we masters of that which is our own? We do no wrong to our neighbor, we take not away other men's goods. These things they have continually in their mouth. But they ought to understand, that it is the magistrates office, to see, that every man use his own well. Further, we must consider more deeply, that God gave these men money, to nourish their family withal, and to help the poor; and not to lay it upon a chance, and hazard it upon the uncertainty of fortune. Moreover, it behooveth, and especially Christians, to represent the image of God, who governeth and ruleth all things by reason. But to consume money on that sort, is not to be a lord, but a tyrant over his own. Add hereunto, that if there be anything gotten by this means, the same is filthy lucre; and so is it called.

17. Now, forsomuch as it is counted filthy gain, it may justly be demanded, whether these things that be lost by dice-play, may justly be received? I answer, that if he, which loseth, be not in his own government, but under the tuition of another (as are children and servants of a

household) the laws do appoint a recovery, and that unto the age of fifty years. Howbeit, if they be under their own tuition, there is no recovery granted: and the cause is alleged, because it is a shame for them both. In which case the possessor hath the better cause. In the Digests, in the title *De conditione ob turpem causam*, in the law *Ubi autem*; When the shame is in either party, there is no condition given. What then shall be done with the money? They say it must be bestowed upon the poor, that he, which hath lost, may receive harm; and he likewise, which hath gained, may not enjoy that which he hath naughtily gotten. This must be done, when the property is translated. Of the same mind was Augustine, in his 54th epistle to Macedonius; Where the possession (saith he) is translated, let the money be given to the poor; but where it is not translated, (as if a man take away anything by theft, and lose it at dice) let it be restored.

Let us then conclude, that such plays, as are directed by chance and unadvisedness, so that in them, both goods and money are endangered, ought not to be abidden. For it belongeth to the public-wealth, to see that men's goods be rightly ordered. And God giveth substance, to bestow upon good uses: forsomuch as thereby do oftentimes spring horrible blasphemies, and robbing of houses; and covetous desire of other men's goods is stirred up, besides the great loss of time. These things did both the civil and ecclesiastical laws see. But at this day they are not regarded: since the canonical laws be condemned by the Clergy, and the civil laws despised by Princes. For there is in no place more shameful and continual play used, than among princes and ecclesiastical persons: who in times past, when they wrote those laws, were of a sound judgment; but [in our days] they both have lived, and do live shamefully.

18. But the other kind of play, wherein is exercise of the powers, either of the body or of the mind, is not utterly forbidden. Justinian, in the law before alleged, when he had forbidden plays, which depend of chance, ordained this other kind of plays in the stead of them: as the throwing of a round ball in the air, handling of the spear, running; and such like. Yea and Aristotle, in his Rhetoric's, commendeth those exercises of the body. And certainly, forsomuch as a man hath need of some refreshing and pleasure, to recreate himself withal, it is meet that he should have leave to use such things as be honest. So at this day, the public-wealth doth sometime promise rewards unto such, as can best handle their weapons; to the intent their citizens may be the better exercised. Howbeit, there must be heed taken, that the kinds of plays be not hurtful and pernicious; and that therein be no danger of killing, maiming, or miserable tearing them, which either exercise themselves, or be present, or be assembled to behold. And this kind of games is forbidden *Ad legem Aquiliam*, in the law *Nam ludus*, and in the decrees *De tormentis*. Those things, which of their own nature be not evil, but are evil oftentimes through that which ensueth, ought to be forbidden.

In the old time, rewards were appointed for singers, orators, poets, and readers: which are not altogether to be disallowed, if they be done well, and with moderation. Afterwards were added stage plays, whereof I will say nothing in this place. There were also dances, whereof we have spoken in their place. But men could not content themselves with these plays; because the mind of them also, which for diverse causes cannot exercise the powers of the body, must be refreshed with some pleasure. Wherefore, they invented another kind of play; namely, the play of chessmen, which we commonly call chess, and is not thought fit to be condemned. Again, there is a certain other kind of gaming, which standeth partly upon chance, and

partly upon industry; as is playing at tables, and such like, where in very deed they cast by chance, but the casts are governed by endeavor. Wherefore Plato affirmed the life of man to be like unto the playing at tables. For even as in table play, so also in the life of man, if anything chance amiss, the same by art must be corrected. Unto which sentence Terence in his Comedy Adelphorum alludeth. And in deed these kind of plays seem to be such, that sometime they may be permitted; so that they hurt not, so they recreate the spirits, and be joined with honesty; and that the time, which should be spent upon better things, be not consumed in these.

19. But what shall we answer unto Ambrose? This certainly may be said, that that place *De officijs*, pertaineth not unto plays; forsomuch as he there treateth of pleasant talks, taunts, and scoffs; specially such, as are joined with scurrility. Nevertheless, in the 118th Psalm, upon these words; Turn away mine eyes, that they behold not vanity, he calleth stage plays, vanity: as doth Augustine, Lactantius, Jerome, and other fathers; for they had in them much filthiness. And in the beginning they were instituted unto the honor of idols; and for that cause were odious unto the fathers and Christians. But the reason, which Ambrose first alleged, was; because there was nothing found in the holy scriptures, how these things ought to be used. Thereunto we answer, that they are found in the holy scriptures generally; Whether ye eat, or whether ye drink, or whether you do anything else, do all things to the glory of God. Wherefore the body and the mind must other whiles be so refreshed with plays, as afterward we may be cheerful and prompt to weightier matters. Furthermore, there is nothing found particularly in the scriptures touching bakers, cooks, or shipmen; and yet nevertheless, their exercises must not be altogether excluded.

Chrysostom said, that the devil found out play, alleging this; that The people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play. If a man look thoroughly into the place of this father, he shall perceive that he spake of those men, which would not repent: but were wont to say; I would to God I might never weep, but might always laugh and play! To whom, he saith; Christ preached; Blessed are they that mourn. And forsomuch as we sin so often, and do so grievously offend God; how should we have leisure to play? He also condemneth those plays, whereby we are made sluggish and unapt to good works. We do not (saith he) in play or laughing, imitate Christ or the apostles: for we never read, that they either played or laughed. Howbeit, he addeth a moderation, seeing he saith; I do not generally take away all laughter, but excessive and immoderate laughter. Lastly, he converteth his speech unto stage plays, and saith; that They were invented by the devil: for they contain the wicked acts and whoredoms of the gods, whereby the consciences of godly men are grievously wounded, and wicked lusts are many ways stirred up.

And whereas he saith, that these things were invented by the devil, he speaketh nothing contrary unto the truth: since (as I have declared) they were instituted unto the honor of false gods. Yea and he addeth moreover, that the devil built stages in cities. But now to conclude, me thinketh that those kind of plays, which serve for refreshing of men's strength, are not utterly to be forbidden. Neither ought we lightly to be offended, if we see men play at chess; with which play the powers of chance are nothing holpen, but only the industry of the mind exercised. For if strength fail through age, so that they cannot exercise themselves by any other means, or that their bodies be but weak; why should they not be permitted to delight themselves moderately with this kind of play? Neither also is he

straightways to be condemned, which being sick or weak, recreateth himself with that kind of play, which dependeth upon chance or fortune; so that therein be no hazarding of money. For we must chiefly consider, to what intent the laws forbad it: undoubtedly it was, because a man should not prodigally waste his goods. And therefore it was provided by the law, that a man should not hazard above a shilling: as we have in the Code, in the place before alleged. The meaning of the law was this, that money should not be ill spent.

20. But some say, that they take no pleasure in play, unless they play for money. But I may ask of them, to what use they mean to employ that money? Perhaps they will say upon a feast. And why not rather upon the poor? But I say, it is much safer and better not to play for any money at all. For although it may be, that thou thyself art not touched with covetousness; yet perhaps the other, with whom thou playest, is touched. Let the occasions be taken away, which otherwise be many enow that move unto evil. And if there were nothing else to fear us from plays, let us for God's sake weigh the scarcity that we have of time. The law of God requireth so many duties, that all our whole life is not able to perform them; and yet shall we bestow time in plays? We are sufficiently infected otherwise with covetousness of money, and with ambition to excel and overcome others: why do we stir up these infirmities with plays? Albeit thou wilt say; These things are never stirred up in me. But now, thou must remember, that they may easily be stirred up. And we must not only see to ourselves, but also have a regard, that we bring not other likewise unto this point. And thus much of the honest kind of plays and games.

If there be any, which do play, being enticed with covetousness; let them know, that they, like evil merchants, rather chop and change, than play: for

they seek no other thing but filthy gain. Neither seek they pleasure, which in honest plays is the chiefest: but they seek their own commodity, and that by vile means. And whereas they, which delight immoderately in plays, do say; There must be some pleasure in the life, whereby we may be recreated. Let us grant that it be so: but in the meantime they must be admonished, that there be other pleasures more honest. Paul to the Ephesians, the fifth chapter, saith; Speak unto yourselves in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your hearts. The very same writeth he unto the Colossians, the third chap. Tertullian in *Apologetico*, saith; that Christians used to assemble together, to their moderate short suppers, and when they were refreshed with meat, they sang divine praises unto God, and recited something out of the holy scriptures, exhorting one another thereby. And by this means they returned sober home.

There be also problems, wherewith the wits may be exercised and refreshed: which if they seem to be too hard, there are stories, which may with lesser labor be learned. Whie have they not remembrances to read them unto them? There is no history so slender, which is not very profitable for some part of man's life. There be histories also of plants, of herbs, and of stones. There are likewise communications of godly men one with another, wherewith minds are refreshed, and therewithal edified. I do not (as I have said) debar plays utterly; but I prefer these things, as much more honest and profitable. Although the play of Samson was honest and seemly, yet had it a deadly end. And if this play had such ill success; what is to be hoped of those, which are forbidden by the laws? They that made those laws, were wise men in governing of the common-wealth: to whom, seeing credit is given in other things, why is it not also given in this one?

**Of Gentleness and affability.**

21. The virtue which followeth things delightful in sports, is εὐτραπελία, to wit, Gentleness and Affability in speech. It is otherwhile a necessary thing: for as the body hath need of rest so the mind to be refreshed with some pleasure. Yet must we beware, that we be not too forward in those things, least we hurt, and least that we speak any unclean thing. Moreover, we must observe the circumstances; to wit, When, With whom, and How; and that it be done with such words and actions as be convenient. The excess is βωμολοχία, to wit; when men use a certain reproachful kind of scoffing, when they speak those things that be filthy and hurt others, and have no consideration of time, manner, or persons. βωμός, signifieth an altar, and in old time about altars there was meat: and then there sat jesters about the altars, that they by their much babbling (which oftentimes was very uncivil) might make men merry: these are said to be rude and rustical persons. Or else, as they which be pleasant, may be called civil; so these other may be called uncivil.

# CHAP. XIII. The ninth Precept; Thou shalt not bear false witness. And first of Contumely.

As touching this place, I judge that there be four things to be considered of; first, what is Contumely; secondly, from whence it springeth; thirdly, whether it be sin; lastly, whether it be tolerable. These principal points being examined, we will apply the matter unto David; to consider, whether he did rightly, in bearing therewith in Semei. What it is, we shall by this means know. First, we will note the etymology of the word; after that, we will set forth the definition. Contumely (if we give credit unto Ulpianus the lawyer, in the Digests, in the title *De iniurijs*, law the first) is so called, of *Contemnendo*, Contemning: and in very deed it hath his beginning of contempt. Those, whom we reproach, we despise. Touching the definition, we gather out of the second book of Aristotle's Rhetoric's, that this evil hath, for his general word, ὀλιγωρία, that is, Contempt. It is defined what it is; to wit, A certain action about the opinion; and concerneth that thing, which appeareth unto us to be of no value. We in our mind and conceit contemn those things, which seem to be of no value. Of this contempt he maketh three kinds. The first is, καταφρόνησις, that is,

Despising. The second is, ἐπηρεασμός, that is, A certain kind of disprofiting; as if we be so affected against others, that we take pleasure in the hindering of their commodities. There be some lofty minds, which in comparison of themselves, think men unworthy of any good thing. The third is, ὕβρις, that is, Contumely, whereof we now entreat.

The same consisteth in sayings and doings, when we use the bitterer sort of words and deeds, to the defacing of any man's honor, and do take pleasure therein. Wherefore Cicero, in his Oration for Marcus Coelius, said: that Shrewd speeches tend to no other end, but to contumely; which if it be boasted of, after any insolent manner, is named a reproach; but being done merrily, it is called jesting. To perceive it the better, thou must understand, that between reproaching and honoring there is a contrariety. They are under one kind, and yet, as contraries, are furthest off one from another. They appertain to the signification of honor. If we honor any man, we declare that we think well of him; if we reproach him, we show by some sign, words, or deeds, that we think evil of him. And therefore it behooveth, that if a man either use contumely, or have it used unto him, this manner of signification is always therein. For if we should do anything against the estimation of any man, and yet not signify the ill opinion we have of him, it would not be properly called contumely.

I will show it by examples. A man breaking open another man's door, to steal, to commit adultery, or to kill some man, that breaking in of the gate is heinous; but being not purposely done, to dishonest him, it is injury: if he break it open, to reproach him, he dealeth contumeliously against him. Absalom abused the wives of his father. If he had done it of lust, it had been incest only, and not contumely: but seeing he did these things without having delight in their love and beauty, only through the hatred he bare to

his father, meaning to dishonor him, it is now called contumely. When in these contumelies, taunts are used against any man; those sometimes are sins, and sometimes no sins. No sins, as if one upbraid another, that he hath the pox, that he is lame or blind: sin, as when Semei calleth David, A man of blood.

2. There is used another distinction. These mischiefs are sometimes true, and sometimes false. In David they were false; he did not covet the kingdom ambitiously, he did not commit wicked murders. Those sins are sometimes manifest, and sometimes hidden. Hereof cometh the grievousness of contumelies. Sometimes they be weighed according to the state of the person: as if he, to whom the contumely is done, be no private, but a public person; as a magistrate, or a preacher. And there is always required therein, an intent and purpose of discrediting the fame and estimation of another man. Which I speak; because, if taunts be not used to this end, but to the intent men may be amended, they be not properly contumelies. Wherefore, if any governors of a school, or ministers of the church, use sharp words to revoke men from their sins; they cannot be called contumelious. Sometimes it is lawful to handle men so for discipline sake. This is gathered by an argument from the greater; If it be lawful to use stripes, it is also lawful to use sharp speeches. So Paul called the Galatians, Fools. And Christ; O ye fools, and slow to believe. There was a respect unto amendment, and it was no contumely.

Also the prophets do so deal, sometimes they speak very bitterly against Israel, calling her harlot and Sodom; not to the intent they would defame the people of God, but to revoke them from idolatry and wickedness. Paul also, in the first chapter unto Titus, seemeth to inveigh sharply against the Cretans, when he bringeth a verse of Epimenides; The Cretans are always

liars, evil beasts, and slow bellies. It might seem to be hardly done, to note the whole nation of the Cretans with so great an infamy. Howbeit, the apostles speech was not to this end; but he gave admonition unto Titus, whereby he might understand, how earnestly he ought to urge that people. Nevertheless, pastors and schoolmasters must take heed, that they use not contumelies without judgment: for if they often use the sharper speeches, they which be reprehended, begin to hate them, whom they ought to love; and by this means, admonitions do but smally prevail. Or else another thing followeth; to wit, that they are not moved therewith, but are hardened, if they often hear bitter words. Wherefore Augustine, upon the sermon of the Lord in the mount, saith; that This must be done seldom, and with judgment. Like unto this is that, which is wont to be done with biting speeches, wherein is more bitterness than favor. They, which use them, be of the number of those, which had rather forgo their friend, than a fine saying. There must be heed taken, that men be not hurt rashly. Thus much of the nature, definition, property, and use of contumely.

3. Now in the second place let us speak a few words of the causes: they proceed for the most part of anger, and are a certain kind of revenge, which is ever at hand. For so men easily revenge themselves; especially they of the common sort, and also women: and generally those, which are not able to make their part good with strength and weapons, do use contumelies. In a certain anger, Semei cursed David; he would revenge the injuries, which he supposed that he had brought upon the family of Saul. They also proceed of a certain anger. Some there be, which in comparison of themselves, make no reckoning of other men, and therefore they be ready bent to contumelies. Therefore rightly said Solomon; Where pride is, there is reproach. The blasphemous speeches, which Rabsaches cast out against God, sprung from

no other fountain. Also they do grow of a certain foolishness. So Nabal the Carmelite cursed David. Solomon saith; It is a man's honor to keep himself from strife, but a fool meddleth with quarrels. Thirdly, we are to consider, whether it be sin. Herein there must be a distinction used. If it have respect unto correction, it is no sin. But if we do it only to defame the honor and dignity of our neighbor, we must confess it to be sin: for it is against the rule of charity. Solomon saith; Hatred stirreth up contentions, but charity covereth the multitude of sins. It taketh all things in good part, it studieth to amend by just means; it hath not recourse unto contumelies.

Charity is a virtue, therefore contumely must needs be a sin. Contumelies or reproaches bring sorrow unto our neighbor, and take away his good name: these be evil. So Christ said in the fifth chapter of Matthew; Whosoever shall say unto his brother (Racha) shall be guilty of a council; and whosoever shall say, Fool, shall be guilty of hell fire. Reproach is an evil, worse than theft itself: for the weightiness of sins is considered in respect of their objects. Theft is about the goods of fortune; but among these goods, a good name is the most excellent thing. Seeing therefore the contumelious persons take away the good name, they offend more grievously than thieves. Better is a good name (saith the wise man) than great riches. But honor standeth most of all in the excellency of virtue: wherefore they, which take away virtues, as much as in them lieth, (and in their room substitute vices, and oftentimes fain lies,) do sin. Hereunto add, that a good name is scarcely recompensed at any time, with full restitution, of so much as was taken away from it. Some, for the regard they have to a man's honor, may say, that the matter is not so: howbeit, there is evermore some blemish remaining.

4. The fourth point to be considered of, is, whether reproaches are to be suffered; or else presently to be repressed. This first of all I say, that the judgment of suffering contumelies and injuries is all one. That which we speak generally, we understand specially. In the Gospel, Christ commanded that we should suffer injuries; If any strike thee on the right cheek, turn thou also the other; and he that will sue thee at the law, and take thy coat from thee, let him also take thy cloak; and he that will compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain. These precepts other whiles have greatly offended some, which did not rightly understand them. Hereby it was objected to Augustine, that Christian religion did smally profit the common-wealth: that the common-wealth of Rome was by this means greatly diminished. Augustine answereth, that as concerning the preparation of the mind, godly men ought so to be affected, as that for the name of Christ, they be content to suffer all kind of injuries, so they perceive it to be expedient for the honor of God, and for the safety of their neighbors. But if it tend not to the glory of God, and is hurtful to him that doth the injury, there is no necessity that we bear with the act.

Hereof we have an example in Christ: when he was stricken by the servant of the high priest, he offered not immediately his other cheek, but put him back; because he saw it was not expedient for the glory of God, that he should seem to be ill spoken of. Further, it was not profitable for that servant to be maintained in his sin. They that in such wise suffer reproaches, give stomach unto the wicked, that they dare do greater things, and to persevere in their sins, which we must not commit; we ought rather to cut off sins. Wherefore Solomon saith; He that putteth a fool to silence, doth pacify wrath. Sin may be diminished by repressing thereof. According to which sentence, the same Solomon said; Answer thou a fool according to

his foolishness, least he should seem to be wise. This is for his benefit. But if thou say anything to him, he will persevere in his naughtiness. Furthermore, if we ought not to suffer contumelies to be done against our neighbor; no more ought we suffer them to be spoken against our selves: for we must love our neighbors even as our selves. And he that contemneth his own good name, is cruel.

So that reproaches must be repressed, for his sake that doth them; that he may acknowledge his fault, and do so no more. Further, for their sakes, which be injured, and for own cause; lest we should forgo that authority, which is profitable to the church and common-wealth. For he that holdeth his peace, seemeth to consent. They that stand by, will judge thee to be such a one. Thy function in the church and common-wealth after that, will be more contemptible. The estimation of public persons is profitable to be kept. In these cases therefore, it is lawful to repress contumelies. But sometimes we ought to suffer them, neither must we requite again with the like; namely, when we perceive that we can nothing prevail; and that perhaps that man is so evil, as by stopping him of his will, he becometh the worse; and when of a small sparkle will be kindled a great fire. For which cause Hezekiah willed, that nothing should be answered to Rabsaches: since he could have profited nothing by any answer.

Contumelies also are borne withal for our own sakes, if we feel our selves moved, and that by rebuking we shall pass our bounds. So must that be understood, which Solomon saith; Answer not a fool according to his foolishness, least thou also be like unto him. Some there be, that while they would repress the fury of another man, become more frantic themselves. If they see them prone hereunto, they ought to abstain, least they offend God. Which we also shall do, if we perceive that we be not therefore lead unto it,

because it grieveth us that the name of God should be dishonored; but only for that we seek to follow our own appetites. Also we must take heed, that we suffer not such kind of contumely in this respect, that we would aver our adversary the more. There be some, who think it a noble kind of revenge, if they utterly contemn those things that be spoken against them; to the intent he might see, that there is no account at all made of him. There be some, which keep silence and bear; because they think it will redound to their praise. Seneca said, that; To be despised of the wicked, is to be praised. And lastly, we must take heed, that the dissembling of reproach, proceed not of cowardliness. There be many, which make so much of quietness, as they will take nothing in hand, which may be troublesome and joined with danger. This also is to be added, that reproaches must be abidden, when we cannot otherwise choose.

5. But if we shall judge, that contumely is not to be borne withal, there is two ways to deal. Either it is private; namely, that we ourselves rebuke him; or else by suit in law. We may go to the judges (for this is lawful) and provide that our office be not in danger of suspicion. If we deal privately, it is meet to use courteous speech: which the apostle taught unto the Galatians; Brethren (saith he) if a man be suddenly taken with any offense, ye that be spiritual restore such a one with the spirit of meekness, &c. Not but that we may sometimes deal sharply, when we are in hand with opinions and doctrine, when the honor of God, and the true catholic faith is in hazard; or else, when men be so inflexible, as they cannot be reformed with courteous words, then more severe speech must be used. Howbeit, we must take heed, that we allege no false crime against him, which is the author of the contumelies: for then it were a lie. The thing, which is just, must justly be done. But thou sayest, that he himself doth lie: thou must not become

like unto him. If in those cases, which I have expressed, reproach be not repressed; at the least wise we shall declare by living well, and by the deeds themselves, which in words we cannot, that he hath made a lie. Many have been content to use a general reason; namely, that the spirit will teach us when injury is to be suffered, and when not: and that even at the very push, we should take counsel. The Ethnics would say, that we ought to follow wisdom and reason. Howbeit, I thought good to open these points somewhat more particularly.

6. Come we then unto David. He used three reasons, the which must only take place in those cases, wherein injury and reproach ought to be suffered, and not generally: for sometimes they are to be suffered. The first reason was; Hinder ye not the counsel of God, God hath commanded him to curse me, &c. To this we say, that in that case the reason is good; not that we should conclude generally: then there should be no wickedness punished. We would always say; It is the counsel of God, he will take it away, when it shall seem good unto him. The second reason is; I abide greater things at the hand of my son, and shall I not bear these things? This is a good reason to comfort ourselves in affliction, and to make us circumspect what we do: but generally it is not of force. If the magistrate say; I have borne this, by reason of the necessity of the time, therefore I can the easilier bear evils: he shall leave wickedness unpunished. The third reason also is not universal; God seeth this affliction, and layeth up good for me in store. This in very deed we ought to think, if we be compelled to suffer contumely; yet are we not always bound to suffer it.

These things have we spoken concerning the reasons of David. Now must we show wherefor he dissembled, and whether he did well therein. In my judgment he did well; and his purpose was allowed unto the soldiers, and

nobility, which he had with him. He was busied about other matters, he was scaping away, he then thought upon his sin, and imputed it to the revenge, which God had foreshowed by the prophet that he should suffer. Doubtless he did not utterly pardon the offense, but deferred the punishment. All things have their time. It was now needful for him to repent, he wept and lamented. Another cause, which might persuade him, was herein; least he should be suddenly drawn to fury, and over-much moved with cruelty: and it was then sufficient for him to keep within his bounds. A third reason: he saw in spirit (for he was a prophet) that God would have him, even at this instant, to suffer this reproach. Thus far have we spoken hereof.

7. Now let us consider, after what sort Paul forbiddeth judgment; seeing we must very oftentimes judge, while we be in this life. For it behooveth, that every man do judge and examine himself, yea and others also, when need shall be; to the intent they may be warned and amended. The church pronounceth sentence of judgment, against those, which are to be excommunicated. There be also political or civil judgments. And in household affairs, we choose unto us wives, maidens, and servants. And in the church there be chosen deacons, curates, and bishops; which kind of election cannot proceed without judgment. Wherefore we answer, that judgments are of two sorts; either private, or public. And those which be public, pertain either to policy, or else unto the church. Civil judgments are not taken away by the Gospel, but rather amended and corrected; as hereafter we shall perceive, when the place serveth. But ecclesiastical judgments cannot be removed by man's authority. For Christ, when he spake of brotherly correction, gave commandment thereof. Private judgments do either spring of charity, and right consideration; or else of ill affections, which are envy and pride: as Augustine hath in his second book

*De sermon Domini in monte*, while he entreated of those words, which are read in Matthew; Judge ye not, that ye be not judged. By which saying of Christ, the sentence of Paul must be measured.

And in these judgments, which we exercise by charity, we must take special heed, that the sins, which either we judge or reprove, be thoroughly known to us, that we do not rashly give credit to rumors or slanders. Further, we must not judge without compassion and pity. Away with triumphing, mocking, reproaches. The which shall best be done, if we remember that we ourselves be men, and prone by nature unto those vices: and not yet assured, but that we may at sometime fall into the very same offenses. Therefore Paul said unto the Galatians; Considering thyself, least thou also be tempted. And Augustine in his book of Confessions wrote, that we should not only give thanks unto God, for the sins that he hath forgiven; but also for those, which by the assistance of God we have not committed. Over and besides, in his 15th epistle to Jerome, when he had lamented for the contentions which had happened between him and Ruffinus, he saith; that he knew not what he himself would have done, if the same things that were written against Jerome, had been written against him. And moreover, in judging there must never be so firm a determination, as though he which is fallen, cannot be restored again.

8. And touching those things, which ought to withdraw us from a light, rash, and hasty judgment, Chrysostom doth make mention. First, seeing our own state is very much unknown to our own selves; we ought to know, that the state of other men is very hardly to be known. Furthermore, there be many circumstances, whereby men's actions are defined; which we cannot always perceive, although we have set before our eyes the thing which is done: so as it is not easy to give judgment of it. Again, the very things that

we see be other whiles so doubtful, as we may understand them, as well in the good part as in the ill. Then it is better to suspend our judgment in a thing that is doubtful. To conclude, he that judgeth, must be spiritual; seeing in the epistle to the Corinthians it is written; The spiritual man judgeth all things. Seeing then we be not led oftentimes by the spirit, but by our own naughty affections; we have more need to be judged, than to use judgment against others.

Augustine, in his tenth book of Confessions, the 23rd chapter, excepteth three things, whereof we ought not to judge, although we be spiritual, and so be accounted. [ 1] The first is; the hidden mystery of God's providence and predestination, together with the counsels of God, touching those same things which we see do happen daily, otherwise than either justice or reason might seem to suffer. Isaiah said; It is not convenient that a potter's vessel should dispute against the maker thereof, why it was made of this or that fashion. Also it is not meet that one pot should dispute with another, whether the potter have done wisely or unadvisedly. Out of which places Paul took that, which he hath to the Romans; Hath not the potter power over his clay, to make one vessel unto honor, and another to dishonor?

[ 2] Another thing that Augustine taketh away from our judgment, is the book of the holy scripture; the which we must not therefore read, to condemn anything therein, or to wrest it to our mind and desire; but rather to submit ourselves thereunto. Wherefore, he writing in the 19th epistle unto Jerome, saith; If there be anything in the scriptures that displease us, we impute that unto the volume of the book, as being slenderly corrected; or unto the interpreter that hath not so sincerely and profitably translated it, according to the proper form of speech; or else we ascribe it to our own ignorance. [ 3] Lastly, he excepteth from our judgment, those men which be

without, that we should not judge them to be so far past hope of salvation, as they may not return unto it. And least he should seem to be against that he had said; he in the 22nd chapter of the same book, expoundeth the saying of Paul; that A spiritual man judgeth all things: He judgeth all things (saith he) that ought to be judged. The which we have expounded generally to be such, as make for edifying; or else, which may be hurtful for our salvation.

Moreover, it must be considered, that great diligence and discreetness be used in giving of judgment, least we condemn those things, whereof as yet we have no perfect knowledge and trial. In the book of Genesis it is written; that God himself came down to look upon the city and tower which they had built. And it is declared, that he went unto Sodom, to see whether they behaved themselves, according to the report, which had been made unto him. And these things are in such wise showed, to the intent we may be instructed, what diligent examination ought to be there had of the matter, before that sentence be given upon the same.

9. Augustine also, in the second book *De sermon Domini in monte*, reduceth the kinds of actions into two parts. Some be of that nature, that they may be done as well with a good mind, as with a bad; and of these (saith he) it is commanded us, that we should not take them in the ill part. And there be others, which cannot be done with a good mind; as are whoredoms, adulteries, and such like. And in these things we must take heed, that we judge not ill of the author, by determining with our selves, that he cannot be changed. But he referreth the words of Christ, and of Paul, (wherein judgment is forbidden) unto the first kind of works, which may be done either of good purpose or of bad. And to prove his distinction, which he brought of two kind of actions, he alledgeth the place out of the epistle to Timothy, where it is said; that There be some sins manifest, and which go

before to judgment; but others, which follow after. For there be some so evident, as thou mayest perceive them without trial or examination: and some be therefore said to follow, because they be more secret, and are not tried out, unless it be in examination of judgment.

Albeit the Greek scholies would have the same to be referred to the ordaining of ministers: for the apostle had said; Lay not hands suddenly upon any man, neither be partakers of other men's sins. But if so be his disciple had said; Seeing there be many men's sins, which are hidden from me, how can I beware of them? Furthermore, I cannot shun those, which perhaps will be committed by them after they be ordained. The apostle answereth; Some sins go before, which unless thou weigh and consider with a just judgment, and committest nothing unworthy of the holy orders, thou shalt defile thyself with other men's sins. And there be other sins that follow: for if thou promote any man to orders, whom in thy judgment thou foundest fit; if afterward he happen to fall, that cannot be imputed by right unto thee.

10. Neither must we omit, that Christ, to the intent he might restrain us from rash judgment, added a commination; Judge not (saith he) least ye be judged, for with the same judgment that you judge, ye shall be judged. Which must not be so understood, as though we should be rashly judged by God, if we ourselves judge rashly. For (as Augustine, in the same place, saith;) The meaning of Christ's words is, that when a man shall judge another man by unjust judgment: he himself shall be condemned by God, and shall therefore suffer punishment, because he judged rashly, and unrighteously. But seeing there be some godly men, which altogether temper themselves in this kind of sin; and notwithstanding that they judge not rashly of others, yet men do very unjustly judge of them: the same

father answereth; that For the most part it doth not so happen; because men are wont to be sore provoked against them, whom they know have a sinister judgment of them, and do endeavor likewise to judge hardly, and to speak ill of them. Wherefore that is wont to be used against them, which is written of Ishmael; His hand against all men, and all men's hands against him. Howbeit, the answer is more firm, to say; that godly men, which do not rashly judge of others, though they obtain not like right and recompense of men, yet without doubt they obtain it of God, who not only judgeth rightly of them, but also correcteth the ill judgments, which are done unto him by men.

**Of suspicions.**

12. But here also we may for good cause demand, how far forth we are to favor suspicions. Suspicions do depend of conjectures, through which we inquire, either what is done, or what may come to pass. And suspicion is an obscure knowledge of some evil at hand, from whence springeth fear. And malicious men, and old men, and those which are often hurt, and enemies, are soon brought into suspicion. And sometimes the causes of suspicious are just: as in the Digests *De suspectis tutoribus, & curatoribus*; He is suspected, who is such in manners. And albeit that he be not such a one indeed, yet it sufficeth, if he seem to be such a one. For though that David were no traitor, yet by that report, which commonly went of him; to wit, that he was a traitor, and desired the kingdom, the Philistines did wisely; who thought good to beware of him. Indeed, we cannot avoid it, but that suspicions will sometimes arise in our minds; seeing they be not in our power: but we must not rashly assent unto them, or judge by them. Augustine, in the 54th epistle to Macedonius: Men (saith he) of a certain self-love, are easily lead to judge; insomuch as every man is a friend to his

own cogitations, and thinketh that he doth suspect wisely. Yet (saith he) nothing must herein be done rashly, though the cause may seem never so probable: for even many things are credible, and yet false; and again, many things are incredible, and yet true. But thou wilt say; What if a man be a governor of a church, or of the common-weal; shall he not provide in time, if he suspect any evil to be at hand? He ought no doubt: but yet without hatred or harm of another man. So judges must beware, that upon light suspicion they disturb no man: for poor wretches, being oftentimes overcome with grief in punishments, do confess those things, which they never thought. The suspicions of the Philistines arose not of weighty, but even of probable causes; therefore they commanded not David either to be troubled or put to death, but only to be sent away. And this David gained by fleeing unto Achish, that although he were had in honor, yet he came into suspicion of treason. Wherefore we must never depart to the enemies of the faith; since that had never good success. For admit thou canst persuade the prince, that thou art a good man; yet shalt thou never persuade the multitude. And thus much by the way.

**Of mocking and taunting.**

13. By the mocking, wherewith Elias mocked the worshippers of Baal, it appeareth, that godly and sincere men may use pleasant dissimulation, witty conceits, proper nips, and merry speeches; so they use them not to satisfy revenge and hatred against their enemies, but for the condemning and disallowing of wicked religion. The sense of these signs is perceived rather by pronunciation, than by words. The imitation of this kind did Paul use, when in the epistle to the Colossians, he saith under the person of the false prophets; Touch not, taste not, handle not. How pleasantly doth Isaiah, in the 44th chapter, deride the idol-maker; because of the one half of a tree he

maketh a fire to warm himself, and to seeth his meat; and with the rest of the block he frameth an image, before which he afterward falleth down, giveth honor unto it, worshippeth it, calleth upon it, and serveth it. The same did Baruch the scribe of Jeremiah, in the sixth chapter: he pleasantly mocked the idols. Elias, by that witty mirth of his, taught that Baal was no god, that he heard not, felt not, nor regarded any manner of thing. So then, scorning's and mocking's may sometimes serve, very fitly, for the prophets and ministers of the word of God. For how could men be more plainly taught, that they lost their labor in worshipping of Baal? Howbeit, Paul, in writing to the Ephestians, seemeth to forbid this kind of talk in Christians; Let there not be in you (saith he) αἰσχρότης; that is, filthy and fowl communication; μωρολογία, fond and foolish words; and εὐτραπελία, that is, Urbanity and pleasant jesting, which otherwise is counted a virtue, whereby those that he sad, and in sickness, are sometimes cheered up: because it must not be taken for sin, when it pertains to charity. But it must be understood, that Paul, in that place, by the word εὐτραπελία, doth note βωμολοχία; that is, scurrility, whereby scoffs and railing speeches be rashly cast out against others, rather with offense unto the godly hearers, than with any edifying. It is not lawful for Christians to trifle unadvisedly.

**Of Deceit or Guile.**

14. To speak first of the word. That which among the Latins is *Dolus*; that is Deceit, the Grecians call δόλος: so that their word and ours is almost all one: but the Hebrews call it *Mirmah*, or *Remijah*. Further, let us understand that guile is there forbidden, where anything lieth secret, which is hidden, least the fraud appear, or be easily seen. Wherefore Plautus said; Guiles, unless they be covered by craft, they be no guiles. Thus much as touching the name. Now let us come to the definition. In the Digests, *De dolo malo*,

in the first law, Servius the lawyer thus defined ill guile, or collusion; namely, to be a subtle invention or devise to deceive another, when as one thing is done, and another feigned. Wheresoever therefore there is guile, there is deceit by some dissimulation. It is true in deed, that Labeo, an interpreter of the law, reproved the definition brought by Servius, and that by two reasons. Whereof one is, that sometime it may happen, that a man shall be beguiled without dissimulation or collusion. Wherefore the definition should be more strict, than that which is defined. But this all men account as a fault. The other is; because other whiles some by dissimulation do save and defend their own, or other men's, and yet thereby do beguile no man; neither do they hurt any man. So then, the definition must be applied unto other things, besides that which is defined; which also is culpable. For which cause he thus defineth it; Ill guile, or collusion, is all manner of craft, deceit, or subtlety done to beguile, delude, and deceive others.

Ulpian, in the same place, alloweth the opinion of Labeo. But having the authority of so great a clarke, I would say that Labeo did not well, in removing dissimulation from the nature of fraud. And as touching the first argument, which he hath, I deny that which he affirmeth; namely, that men can be circumvented without dissimulation. For unless they were wholly without sense, they would not easily be led to take and receive that, which they manifestly see will be hurtful unto them. Wherefore it is necessary, that there be some show and color added; which can by no means be done without dissimulation. Then, whereas he saith, that there be many, which defend either their own, or else other men's, by dissimulation: I grant that; but yet I affirm, that the same is guile, although it be honest dealing: as afterward I will show more plainly. As touching the nature therefore of guile, it seemeth, that feigning or dissimulation is always joined with it: and

for that cause, the definition of Servius pleaseth me better. Which definition, I myself nevertheless would rather apply unto guile in general, and not to ill guile or collusion, as he did, perhaps being led by that reason; because he understood that deceit, which should be hurtful.

15. Cicero, in his first book of Offices, affirmeth; that Dissimulation or feigning pertaineth chiefly to the nature of guile. For he writeth that Aquilius, his familiar friend, being demanded what was guile, answered; Where one thing is done, and another thing feigned. Of this mind is Augustine, who in his seventh treatise upon John, expounding these words which Christ pronounced of Nathaniel, (Behold a true Israelite, in whom there is no guile) saith; It is then guile, when one thing is done, and another feigned, &c. And to speak this by the way, it is easily gathered by this place, that Augustine preached his sermon to the people in Latin; because the Aphricans used the Roman tongue, although it were not pure, but in some words corrupt. For there Augustine admonished the people, that *Dolus*, which is guile, signified not *Dolor*; that is, Pain: as many do corruptly speak, saying; *Dolus illum torquet*, that is (as they meant) Grief doth vex him: when as they should have said Dolor. To take away therefore the ambiguity of the word, he saith, that *Dolus*, which is guile, signifieth feigning, and dissimulation.

And in the same place, to express what guileful feigning signifieth; he addeth, that it cometh of a doubleness of the heart. He alledgeth the 12th Psalm, in the which place, when mention is made of guileful men; David saith, that they speak dissemblingly in their double heart: that is (as he interpreteth it;) In one part of their heart they do see the truth, and perceive the thing how it is; and in the other they work dissimulation, and deceit. But in those (saith he) is no guile, who perceiving themselves to be sinners, do

so repute themselves, and do not dissemble or boast of righteousness; as did the Pharisee, when he prayed near unto the Publican; and as other hypocrites also do. Nathaniel had no guile in him: but not generally. For every man is a liar, and (as Paul writeth) There dwelleth no good thing in our flesh; seeing it is altogether full of fraud and guile. It might only be said of Christ absolutely, that He alone was without guile. But (as David saith;) They are blessed, to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin, and in whose spirit there is no guile. For in as much as they be regenerate, (especially concerning the spirit) that which they do, they do it uprightly and simply: and such a one Christ affirmeth that Nathaniel was.

The same Augustine, in the tenth tome, in his book of fifty homilies, the first homily, expoundeth that which is written by David, in the 34th Psalm; What man is he that listeth to live, and loveth to see good days? Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips that they speak no guile: Then (saith he) it is guile, when one thing is close shut up in the breast, and another is expressed, either by word or by deed. As flatterers use to do, which commend some, contrary to that they think; thereby either to eat their meat, and drink their drink; or else, to get some other benefit at their hands. And that, which he speaketh of flatterers, may also be understood of enemies and backbiters. But that it becometh men to deal plainly and uprightly, the very Ethnics saw. Wherefore Achilles, in Homer, saith; that he hateth those men, as he hateth death, which speak one thing and think another. So then, we think, that for the general definition of guile, there ought to be put, and that not amiss, a devise to deceive a man (when one thing is done, and another dissembled.)

16. Now, after this definition, we must add a distinction. For some guile is good, and some is evil. That we call good, which is not harmful; and when

as it hurteth none, but sometime profiteth: but evil guile is harmful, and always hurteth one or other. These parts may easily be made plain by examples. Nurses do continually use good guile towards their little ones, thereby to please and still them: for with them they both fain and dissemble many things. Physicians also do after the same sort deceive them that be sick, because they would recover them. Yea and Chrysostom, in his first book *De sacerdotio*, writeth, that a certain Physician so beguiled one that was sick of an ague, as in drinking water, he thought he drunk wine. And the same Chrysostom, in the same place affirmeth, that he himself used a good guile, to deceive Basilius, for the taking of a bishopric upon him; when in no case he was minded that way. David by this kind of guile escaped the hands of the king of the Philistines: for he feigned himself to be a fool, whereby the king judged him unworthy to be punished.

But of ill guile there be very many examples in the holy scriptures: among which is the act of Ehud, which in the book of Judges we have interpreted. And that is another also, which the Hebrews did, who at their going forth of Egypt, desired to borrow, both of their neighbors, and also of their friends, precious garments, golden and silver vessels: and yet they minded altogether to rob them of the same. To this kind also belonged that, which Chusaie the Arachite did, in deceiving of Absalom. And among these may be reckoned that, which Simeon and Levi committed against Hemor, and against the Sichemits. I might bring a great many of examples more, if I would use needless labor in a manifest matter.

17. Touching the first kind of guile, which is called good and harmless, no man will contend, but that it is lawful to use the same. But of the other kind there is a doubt, whereof if my judgment should be asked, I would think it best to make this answer; that We may not use evil guile with our friends.

Notwithstanding, against our enemies it is not forbidden; because it may be in the stead of armor. Wherefore, if it be lawful to take arms against them justly, it is lawful also to use guile, according to the saying of the poet; What matter is it against an enemy, whether a man use fraud or force? Howbeit, this must be considered, that we speak only of those enemies, which either God himself, or the public-wealth, or a just magistrate declareth to be enemies; and not of those, which every private man hateth. Moreover, I doubt not, but seeing it is lawful to repel violence with violence, when there is no other way to escape; it is also lawful to set guile against guile. For he, which repelleth violence with violence, as the laws do permit, the same man is not to be counted a private person: forsomuch as he is armed by the magistrate. So as it is manifest, that he doth not against the laws; but with the law. Even so, he that is suddenly oppressed, may lawfully escape by evil guile, if he can.

Moreover, the scriptures teach, that this kind of guile is just. For Jerome saith; and it is written in the Decrees, the 22nd cause, the second question, the chapter *Utilem*, that Jehu did dissemble honestly with the priests of Baal; because he had not been able to have killed them all, if he had begun to put some of them to death. Wherefore, to the end that he might gather them all together, he feigned himself to be much more desirous to worship Baal, than Ahab was; and by that means he slue them all. But this we ought to regard, that they, which are so destroyed by guile, be worthy of punishment, and (as they be commonly called) are notorious offenders, and such as cannot be punished by ordinary means. For which cause the king of Denmark is by some commended, who through guile destroyed most pernicious thieves, which he could not take. For he feigned a war, and made a proclamation, that as many as would come, should receive wages of him;

and promised pardon unto the thieves, for the wicked acts which they had before committed. But I (for my part) as I shall afterward declare, would not so absolutely allow these kind of examples. Augustine (as may be read in the 14th cause, question the fifth, in the chapter Dixit, and it is a place in his questions upon Exodus) showeth, that the Israelites deceived the Egyptians, when they borrowed of them gold and silver vessels. And yet the same was not to be counted a fault in them, when as yet no man doubted, but that they did it by evil guile.

The same father, in the 23rd Cause, question second, in the chapter *Dominus*, which is taken out of his questions upon the book of Joshua, rehearseth the place, wherein it is said, that God commanded the Hebrews to fight against the city of Haie, by lying in wait: which without doubt belongeth to guile. Jerome, upon the 17th chapter of Ezekiel, alledgeth this sentence, as a worldly saying; namely, What matter is it against an enemy, whether a man use fraud or force? Howbeit, he agreeth thereunto, although he deny, that it can take any place where an oath is made before. But this I will anon discuss. Ambrose, in the 14th Cause, question the fourth, permitteth guile or gainful fraud against enemies. And after this manner he interpreteth the place of Deuteronomy, where God gave the Jews liberty, to put their money in usury to strangers; namely, that where the war is just, there also usury may take place. For the goods of the enemies are ours, and they may be lawfully taken from them: and whether it be by fraud, or by violence, it forceth not. There be some, which allege that which is written in the latter epistle to the Corinthians, the 12th chapter; When I was crafty, I took you with guile. But that maketh nothing to the purpose, seeing the apostle in that place doth very manifestly use the figure Ironia. For he was accused, as though he had received money of the Corinthians, by the hands

of other, which by himself he refused to receive. Which he straightway disproved.

But those examples, which we brought first, do manifestly prove, that it is lawful to use guile, yea and evil guile against enemies; namely, keeping close our counsels and actions, and using tolerable works and words. Neither do the civil laws teach otherwise. In the Code *De commercijs & mercatoribus*, in the law *Non solùm*: The emperor decreed, not only that no gold should be transported unto the barbarous nations, which were enemies unto the state; but also, that such gold, as they had, should be taken from them by subtle guile or policy. And in the Digests *De captiuis postliminio reversis*, in the law *Nihil interest*; It is decreed, that captives, howsoever they returned into their country again, should recover their own goods and old estate, whether they were sent home again, or whether they escaped by violence or by guile. Although afterward, in the law *Postliminij*, in the Paraph *Captinus*, it is restrained upon condition; that If they return with a mind to tarry at home. For if they should either promise, or swear unto their enemies to return, they should not enjoy the right of returning. Wherefore Attilius Regulus enjoyed not the benefit, because he was sent to Rome, to persuade the Senate about the exchange of prisoners. Then, forsomuch as he had promised, and was minded to return, he by the laws might not use evil guile.

18. Hereby also that appeareth to be true, which a little before was said; that we may not use evil guile against our enemy, if there be an oath made between us. And that this may be the more plainly understood, we must distinguish an oath, as the lawyers do; one avouching, another promising: or (as they term it) the one assertive, and the other promissory. For when we swear, either we do affirm, or else deny something to be, or to have been;

(which we never ought to do with evil guile, by adding an oath:) or else we promise to perform something. And forsomuch as faith is to be kept, even with our enemy, the same faith also is not to be broken by evil guile. So as, if those things, which we have sworn unto our enemy to keep and observe, be temporal goods (such as are money, honor, and life of the body) the name of God for these things ought not to be profaned. Wherefore, David, in his 15th Psalm, saith; He that sweareth to do evil, and changeth not. In the Hebrew it is thus written, *Nischhab leharah velo jamir*. Which place I know that D. Kimhi expoundeth of those, which vow unto God certain sharp and hard things, which serve to the subduing of the flesh, and change not that which they have promised. But the sentence (me thinketh) seemeth more plain, if it be largely taken; namely, of an oath that is hurtful unto us, which a good and godly man will not break or change.

Jerome also upon Ezekiel, the 17th chapter, is of this opinion. For there the Lord saith, that he was very angry with Zedekiah; because he brake the oath which he had made with Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. For though the Jews counted him as an enemy; yet (as Jerome declareth) he was now a friend, when he had by oath promised his faith unto Zedekiah. Seeing it belongeth unto friends, one to be faithful unto another: so as evil guile ought not there to have been used. And Augustine, in the 32nd cause, question the first, the chapter *Noli existimare*, writing unto Boniface, admonished him to keep faith even with his enemy. Ambrose also, in the 22nd cause, question the fourth, the chapter *Innocens*, doth so advise. And the same sentence he hath in his book *De officijs*, where he bringeth the example of Joshua, towards the Gabaonites; who, notwithstanding that he ought to have made the oath void, and of no force; yet, by the consent of God, he caused it to be kept and ratified. Neither suffered he the Gabaonites

to be slain, whom nevertheless he punished, because of the guile which they used.

But if an oath be given for fulfilling of an unjust or ungodly thing, it must wholly be made frustrate; because an oath ought not to be a bond of iniquity. Neither is it necessary thereunto, that any man should come before a judge, to be absolved of this kind of oath. Which I therefore speak, because the Pope claimeth this right to himself; namely, to release such kind of oaths, and (as they commonly say) to dispense with them. As it appeareth in the 15th cause, question the sixth, where Nicholas absolveth the bishop of Triers. And his pride and arrogancy hath now at length brought his law and power to that pass, that he not only breaketh unlawful oaths; but also abrogateth just and lawful oaths, when it seemeth good to himself. So Pope Zechariah loosed the French men from their oath, wherein they were bound unto their king; and he deposed the king from his kingdom, and placed Pipin in his stead. But this is not to be marveled at, seeing it is commonly said at this day in the Court of Rome; that It is not meet for kings and great personages, but for merchants, to keep their oaths.

19. So then, if there be an oath made, guile must not be used; unless perhaps the one party, to whom the oath is made, shall first depart from covenants and conditions: for then the common saying must take place; He that breaketh faith, let faith also be broken with him. Wherefore Jerome to Nepotianus, commendeth the saying of Domitius the Orator, unto Philip; Seeing thou accountest not me for a Senator, I also do not take thee for a Consul. But hereof we have testimonies also in holy scriptures. For Paul, in the first to the Corinthians, the seventh chapter (as touching faith given in matrimony) writeth; that If an infidel depart, let him depart, a brother or a sister is not in subjection unto such: but God hath called us in peace. And

those things, which are alleged of an oath, I understand them to be of like force in promises and covenants. In which promises and covenants I affirm, that just and godly men ought both to use simple and plain words, and also to live with a good conscience. The Thracians therefore are justly and worthily condemned, who (after truce had been made to continue for the space of thirty days) robbed and spoiled by night, excusing their act, in that, that their truce was made for the day, and not for the night. Neither did the legate of the Romans plainly, but subtly with Antiochus, who having decreed, that she one half of the ships should be given unto the Romans, and the other half unto the king, commanded them all in very deed to be divided and cut in sunder. But he did it, to the end the king might be utterly destitute of a navy for the wars. Therefore, whatsoever a godly man will promise, he ought deeply to weigh with himself before hand, whether he be able to stand to his words and promises. Wherefore Jerome hath written unto Celantia; Whatsoever thou speakest, think that thou hast sworn it.

20. As touching the end of the question, there remain certain doubts to be examined, that the thing may be the more manifest. First, if a man promise armor and succor to any man, for the space of three or four years, and in the meantime he becometh a traitor to his country, and maketh war against it; whether in this case he ought to perform his faith, or else by evil guile to break it? I answer, that neither in this case, nor in the like, is faith to be kept; seeing (as it is evident) a mischievous act happeneth in the meantime, which with a safe conscience we may not aid. And in very deed, neither evil guile or perjury is here committed. For he, which hath sworn, is not changed; but he is changed, to whom the oath was made. For oaths can pluck away or diminish nothing of those bonds, which went before. Seeing then every man is bound to the word of God, and to the preservation of his

country, before he take any oath; that which afterward is sworn, must be understood conditionally: that if the first bonds be kept unviolate. The same also must take place in vows, that be vowed. For although a man vow sole life; yet, forsomuch as he was before bound to the word of God, wherein it is said, that It is better to marry, than to burn: and, They which cannot keep themselves chaste, let them marry: he doth not take away the first bond for the vow, which followeth. Wherefore, if he cannot keep himself chaste, or if he burn, he ought (by the commandment of God) to marry. Neither can any oath or vow that happeneth herein, take away the power and force of the commandment of God.

21. Another doubt cometh to my remembrance, touching those princes, which have given their public faith and safe conduct unto heretics for their coming unto Council's, or to conferences, whether they ought to stand to their promises; or else violating their oath, to keep still the heretics, and to punish them. I answer, that they ought to keep entire and perfect the promise made unto them. But they say; We will easily grant it to be sin, when we give our faith for an evil thing: but if, after we have given it, we keep it, and stand to our promises, we fall into another grievous sin; seeing we do not the duty committed unto us, neither do we obey God. For it is our part (as God hath commanded) to punish and to correct heretics; least they should spoil the church, and proceed in maintaining of their pestiferous doctrine among the godly. Neither doth any man doubt, but that magistrates ought to defend the church. So then it seemeth, that heretics should not be let go, when we once have them in our power.

I answer, that this in deed is the office of kings; to repress and keep under heretics: but that is, when they have them in their power. But if they give them a safe conduct to come unto them, then can they not say, that they

have them in their power: for they came upon trust of the promise, and an oath, otherwise they would not have come. Wherefore, if there be a promise made, it is not lawful to break it. And this is the cause why I said before, that I cannot easily allow the act of the king of Denmark. Neither also would I judge Jehu to be without sin, when he promised that he would worship Baal, thereby to get all the Baalites together; unless peradventure he knew manifestly, that he was stirred up by God to do it. But hereof we will entreat a little after. Let them therefore, which defend the council of Constance, cease to lay for their pretense, that John Hus, with a safe conscience might not be let go; because it is heinous sin in all princes, if they suffer heretics to go free. For this, which they say, is so long true, as the time lasteth that they shall be in their power; but when they are come by a safe conduct, then are they at liberty: neither are they said to be in the power of those princes, which did call them.

22. Others doubt, whether it be lawful to use evil guile against thieves; so that, if a man happen into their hands, and by an oath made unto them, is suffered to go home, upon condition to gather money to redeem himself: whether I say he ought to return unto him with the money, or (if he cannot get it as he hoped to have done) to return without it; especially, in case he were almost assured, either to live in perpetual servitude, or else to be put to a most cruel death? I answer, that in my judgment he ought to return unto them; especially, seeing in this case there is no danger, but as touching goods of this world; namely, of money, of liberty, and of bodily life, which are not so greatly to be esteemed, as for their sakes, an oath, or the name of God should be violated. And the verse of David, before brought, serveth well for this purpose. And this sentence is so firm and true, that even an Ethnic (M. Attilius Regulus, I mean) did acknowledge it. For he returned to

Carthage, when he knew certainly, that either he should be in continual bondage, or else loose his life; and that most cruelly.

Tell me not, that he did foolishly herein. For the Roman laws (as we have before said) *De captiuis & postliminio reversis*, in the law *Postliminium*, in the Paraph *Captiuus*, do ordain, and religiously decree, that he should not be counted as returned by the law *Postliminium*, which had promised to return again. Besides, the nature of man persuadeth the self-same thing: for it is civil, and delighteth in society. Wherefore, next unto God, and godliness to him-ward, there is nothing, which men ought more to esteem than their faithfulness, which wonderfully furthereth the society of men. For without it, it is impossible for men to live together. Moreover, who will not say, that the money, liberty, and life of one man, is less to be regarded than it is of many? For if covenants and promises be not kept with those thieves, hence-forth they will give credit to no man, whom they apprehend. They would send home none to their own house, to fetch their ransom; but either they will kill as many as they take, or else retain them with them in miserable and perpetual bondage. Lastly, I think it good to give this advertisement; that in taking of oaths, no signs that be added of universality ought to trouble any man.

As if a man promise and swear to his friend, that he will be an helper to him in all things: or if a man promise and swear unto a school or church, that he will do and observe all things, that they shall decree. For all such kind of speeches (as it appeareth by that, which we have said) are to be understood with condition, that if the obedience unto the word of God be kept. And undoubtedly, although that clause, through the nature of an oath, be meant always to be added; yet nevertheless it is the duty of godly men to express it, when they be received into any University, college, office,

corporation, or fellowship: and (according to the custom) are compelled to swear to the observation of statutes, laws, and decrees. It is the sure way (I say) by express words to testify, that they will observe all those things; unless that they shall find, that any of the same be against the word of God. And of this matter (I think) I have now spoken sufficiently. Ehud practiced evil guile: I grant, but yet against his enemy. Neither doth the scripture make mention of any oath that was made between him and Eglon the king. And though there had been an oath; yet had he been quit of it, seeing the motion of God, whereby God opened his will unto him, had abrogated the same.

**Whether Guile be lawful for the rooting out of Idolatry and heresy; In 2 King. 10:17.**

23. Jehu by fraud minded to allure the worshippers of Baal, that he might bring them into the danger of death. He proclaimed among the people, that he would be a notable worshipper of Baal; and that he would, with all speed possible, offer a notable sacrifice thereunto. Wherefore he commanded all the Baalites to come together to the holy assembly, to the end they might be ready with their service, about that sumptuous sacrifice. Some are in doubt, whether Jehu sinned in lying after that sort. They that defend his cause say, that this kind of lie was an officious lie; and therefore not to be condemned. And an officious lie they define to be that, wherewith none are hurt, and some are holpen. But among other things, we must note, that this lie of Jehu, did not rashly escape from him; seeing in that journey, it was conceived in his mind, and fixed in his heart. And in my opinion, it cannot be called an officious lie, because it did hurt many, by giving an offense. For on the one part, the people thought that they had gotten a godly and holy king; but on the other side, beholding his proclamation, they suspected

that he had destroyed Ahab and his family; not for religion sake, but for the desire of the kingdom. Wherefore they justly condemned him of hypocrisy. Others defend the lie, which he uttered [in saying] that it was amended through the good intent of the speaker. But a good intent doth not make a good action, when the nature thereof is evil; and that Evil things, (according to the doctrine of the apostle) ought not to be committed, that good things may come thereof. They proceed further, and say, that it is enough, that God knoweth the heart of him that speaketh. No, neither is that sufficient; because it is not only needful that we approve ourselves unto God; but we must do it even to men also, so much as is possible; To the intent that they, seeing our good works, may praise and glorify the father.

Neither is that of any great weight, when they say, that this lie was to endure but a short time; seeing it should come to pass within a few days, that the mind of him that spake it, should be manifest: insomuch as Jehu was about to slay the Baalites, whereby the people should know how great an enemy he was unto that kind of idolatry. For these men be very much deceived, which imagine, that sins must be measured by a space of time; seeing in a very moment, a horrible crime may be committed. Neither is it to be doubted, but that the Baalites did for the time being, confirm themselves in their perverse idolatry, through that fact of Jehu. Further, they committed great sin, in preparing of themselves to sacrifice; and they were constrained thereunto by the authority of the king, who had called them together by setting forth his edict, who also had commanded the keeper of the vestry, to give unto them the accustomed garments: which they having received, did violate the law of God. By which place it evidently appeareth, that they, in their sacrifices, had garments, which were peculiar and differing from others that were usual and profane. For the devil indevoureth

in all the things he can, to imitate God; who ordained, that Aaron, in ministering before him, should have garments curiously wrought. He commanded also, that his children; to wit, the meaner priests, should wear certain apparel, which he had appointed for them. So likewise did the Baalites provide to be done in their idolatry.

24. Such kind of lying and fraud was used in times past, when Augustine lived, to discover the error of the Priscillianists. These wicked heretics did privily corrupt many, and in the meantime could scarcely be called to place of judgment, or there be condemned; because they dissembled their heresy, and being accused, they utterly detested and denied it by oath; notwithstanding that in their mind they retained still a pestiferous meaning; nor yet did they cease to seduce and beguile. Whereupon, many of the faithful sort taking it grievously, that they should keep themselves close; they, to the intent they might draw them out into the sight of the world, and discover them, would otherwhile have access to some of them, and feign, that they also were favorers of the Priscillianists. So then, they hearing this, showed unto them their secrets. Augustine reproved the Catholics, and persuaded them to abstain from this kind of lying; and for the same cause wrote an excellent book entitled *De mendacio to Consentius*. Again, they that defend Jehu, object Elias unto us, who seemeth to have provoked the Baalites upon mount Carmel, to do sacrifice unto the idol. But between these things there is no small difference: for Elias did not of himself, and absolutely stir them up unto sacrifice, but provoked them for the accomplishment of a miracle; namely, to put in proof, whether part should cause fire to come from heaven. Further, the Baalites at that time were prepared for their daily sacrifices; yea, and they made oblations unto their god every day, and after a sort called upon him continually. But this

happened not now among the Baalites; seeing they durst not, for fear of the new king Jehu, do sacrifice to their idol.

Wherefore, they which profess the Gospel, must not confirm themselves by these arguments; and in the meantime pollute themselves in popery, by abjurations and wicked masses. It sufficeth not to have a sincere heart only, but God doth also require our outward actions: for he, being the creator of the whole man, doth also challenge the whole unto himself. Wherefore (me thinketh) we should confess it to be very good indeed, that the Achabites and Baalites should be destroyed; but not that all the circumstances used therein should wholly be allowed. Neither should we be very careful to discharge Jehu of sin; since he was otherwise a worshipper of golden calves: neither did he (as the holy scriptures declare) walk perfectly in the law of the Lord. Indeed he was appointed to subvert the service of Baal, but not to promote and dissemble the same. Wherefore, I cannot see, how this kind of lying may be excused; unless perhaps it be said, that he did not lie in respect of his own mind and judgment, but by the motion of God, which stirred him up unto such a lie; even as in like manner he willed the people to borrow costly garments, and gold and silver vessels of the Egyptians; when as yet the Hebrews knew very well, that these things should not be lent, but quite taken away from the owners: but yet God commanded, that so it should be; as we read in Exodus. But of Jehu this cannot be affirmed. Indeed the Baalites deserved thus to be seduced by fraud, seeing they deceived the people, and that in a most weighty matter. And they, which had solicited and incensed kings and a queen against the prophets, and men of God; now they themselves also deserved to be circumvented by fraud and guile. Howbeit, Jehu in the meantime is not excused from pernicious lying. I am not ignorant, that there is both good guile, and ill guile, and that it is

lawful sometimes to use good guile. But this, whereof we now entreat, I affirm to be ill guile; and therefore unlawful. Indeed the law commanded, that the idolaters should be slain; but it willed not, that by this kind of lying and legerdemain it should be done.

25. Jehu setteth forth his service of Baal by a comparison. Ahab seemed in that religion to be most superstitious; but it is said, that in comparison of Jehu, he worshipped Baal but a little. This is even as if he should say; Those things were but sport and play, in comparison of those same, which I am minded to give. The holy scriptures testify, that he did these things fraudulently; to the intent he might gather all the Baalites into one, and slay them all together; because he might not otherwise have brought his purpose to pass. For very many of the Baalites, having intelligence of the slaughter of Ahab and Ochozias, and also the children of Ahab, and kindred of Ochozias, fled away for fear, and hid themselves in secret places. Wherefore, Jehu feigned these things, and made proclamation that he did marvelously favor the Baalites. Moreover, he perhaps feared, least if he should deal violently and openly, a sedition might be raised among the people, to take in hand new matters. But the Baalites, being invited by such fair and courteous endeavors, came in, and of their own accord cast themselves headlong into the danger of death; whereas otherwise they were both subtle and crafty. But after this manner God doth infatuate such men, and taketh them tarde in their own wiliness. Even as we also perceive, that it came to pass in Pharaoh; who willfully, and of his own accord entering into the red sea, was drowned, and all his whole host with him.

This kind of guile and lying, in times past Constantius, the father of Constantine the great used; who, having embraced Christ, set forth an edict, which was far contrary unto his will, as though he would not suffer any

Christian to live in his Court. So as he commanded by his edict, that they, which would profess Christian religion, should surrender the offices, which they had received, and should be discharged from the wars. They, which sincerely embraced Christ, despised courtly dignities, and departed from the Emperors train: on the other side, they, which only bare the name of Christians; because they would keep their former place and degree, departed from Christ. But the matter fell out otherwise: for the Emperor called home those that went their way, and commanded, that they should enjoy their former offices and commodities; and he put away those from him, which had forsaken Christ. And he used this reason; If they were not faithful to that power, that is Christ, whom they worshipped; neither will they be faithful to me: nor yet faithfully labor and endeavor for the defense of me and mine empire. But Julian, whom they call the Apostate, who revolted from Christ, made another manner of lie. For (as Ammianus Marcellinus reporteth) when he led his army against Constantius his brother by the fathers side, fearing least he should offend his soldiers, of whom the most part were Christians, feigned himself to worship Christ also; when as he was already revolted from him. Wherefore, upon a solemn feast day of Epiphany, he entered into the temple, together with the Christians. And there be very many dissimulations, as touching religion, to be found out in the histories.

**Of Dissimulation.**

26. But what shall we set down as touching dissimulation? I say, that the same is of two sorts. [ 1] One, which hath respect only to deceive; the which, seeing it differeth not much from a lie, undoubtedly it is sin. If one, being wicked, do fain himself to be honest and godly, the same man is a hypocrite; and in that he dissembleth, he sinneth grievously. Whosoever

also, having a malicious and envious heart against any man, flattereth him, and feigneth to be his friend, is not without sin; yea, he is infected with a detestable dissimulation. [ 2] But there is another kind of dissimulation, which tendeth not to the deceiving of any man; but serveth only to keep counsel secret, least they should be hindered: and this dissimulation is not to be refused, or condemned as sin, seeing (as we have already declared) it is not always required, that we should open whatsoever truth we do know. Socrates was praised, although he were a very great dissembler. Howbeit, he said he knew nothing, [meaning] in comparison of the knowledge of God. So doth Plato excuse him in his Apology. Also he compared those things, which he knew, with those things which he knew not; and being so compared, they might be accounted nothing. Besides this, his mind was not to deceive; but rather to show unto others, which boasted that they knew many things, how very little or nothing they knew.

So Christ, being most innocent, took upon him the flesh of sin, and hid his innocence and divine nature: the which he did, not to deceive mortal men, but that he might suffer for the salvation of men. For if he had been known to be the Lord of glory, they would never (as saith the apostle) have crucified him. Moreover, Christ feigned also before two of his disciples, that he would have gone further: this he did not, because he would deceive them; but he therefore opened not himself unto them for a time, because he would reprove them of their incredulity, and instruct them by testimonies of the scriptures. Therewithal also he signified, how far he was from their hearts: or (as Augustine interpreteth it) he shadowed unto them his departure into heaven. Wherefore it evidently appeareth, that in those dissimulations, there was no lie; seeing his words well agreed with the thing signified.

27. And David, when he fell into a most perilous danger, being with Achish the king of Geth, changed his countenance, and feigned himself a fool: and by means that he seemed to be such a one, he escaped. Here some say, that he dissembled not; but that God, to deliver him, strake such a fear into him: and that his senses being taken from him, he might do those things which be spoken of him in the first book of Samuel. Wherefore, in his psalm, which beginneth; I will always give thanks unto the Lord, he gave God thanks for so great a benefit. Togither also with this his act, he, by the inspiration of God, showed what Christ should suffer for our sakes; namely, to be counted as a fool and a mad man. Or else it may be answered, that David is not wholly to be excused of sin; if he, as being a man, more afraid than was meet, sought for this kind of help. But if he, by the motion of God, did it wittingly and with knowledge, we will not accuse him of sin, though we may not imitate his example.

Neither is it lawful, that any man should feign himself to have committed any crime, which he hath not done: though Gregory saith; that It is the part of good minds, there to acknowledge a fault, where none is. Of this matter, Augustine, in his 29th sermon *De verbis apostoli*, hath taught more soundly and truly. For he writeth; By feigning on this wise, if thou wast not a sinner before, thou shalt become a sinner; namely, in saying that thou hast committed that, which thou hast not committed. Indeed it is lawful for every man to confess himself generally to be a sinner, but this or that crime specially (having not committed the same) no man ought to take upon him. Moreover, we must note this to be true; to wit, that it is not required of us to open the truth at all times, and in all places to speak all that we know. Howbeit, in judgment, the case is otherwise: for there, while we be

examined as witnesses, we are bound to testify that, which we know to serve unto the thing, whereof we be at that time demanded.

**Of Truth, and of a Lie: which place is treated of In Judges 3, and also in 1. Sam. 21:12.**

28. Now let us treat of another question; namely, whether it be lawful for a good and godly man to lie. But before I speak of a lie, I think best to speak somewhat of truth; which doubtless is an excellent virtue. Truth (as saith Tully in his book *De inventione*) is that, whereby things which are, have been, and shall be, are spoken without alteration. Wherein we will first note, that it consisteth in words: for he saith, that they are spoken. Not that I am ignorant, but that dumb men, and others, do sometimes speak by signs. But because (as saith Augustine in his first book *De doctrina christiana*) among other signs, words are the principal and most plain. Further, we be taught hereby, that truth is not only to be considered as touching one difference of time; but as touching three differences. For he saith, that both those things which are, which have been, and which shall be. These things be then spoken truly, when they be set forth without alteration; that is, even as they are, and by speaking made neither more ample, nor less than they be. The very self-same thing in a manner hath Augustine said, in his book *De vera religione*, the 36th chapter, where he writeth; that Truth is, whereby that which is, is signified. And it is a virtue; because by it men are made prone and ready to speak that, which is true.

If thou demand what is the general word of truth; It is equality: whereunto is joined, for difference sake; namely, of words, about the things which are signified. And as it is well known to all men, all virtues do aim at the mean, and eschew extremities. Wherefore, in the kind of speaking, thou shalt perceive two faults; namely, if thou speak more than the thing will permit,

or less than the thing is. Neither is virtue content only with the mean: for we must add circumstances, which use commonly to follow it. So as the truth must not always be spoken to every man, neither at all times, nor yet of everything: and yet we must not lie. But it is wisdom sometime to keep secret those things, which for just cause we will not have known. He, which should vaunt abroad every-where, and to all men, the gifts of God given unto him; should be counted foolish and fond. As contrariwise, he which should boast of a crime, whereinto by man's infirmity he hath fallen, ought justly and worthily to be reproved. Wherefore, truth requireth, that what we have within us, as touching our sense and will, that should prudently be signified by us as it is. Further, the virtue, whereof we speak, hath simplicity most of all joined with it: and it is very contrary unto doubleness.

Besides this, it is a part of justice: for both unto things it giveth the proper words; and unto a neighbor the truth which is due unto him: without the which, man's fellowship cannot stand. For, if a man should continually suspect himself to be deceived by any man, he would never give any credit unto him: by means whereof, all trades and societies among men would decay. Aristotle, in his Ethics, affirmeth; that Truth declineth somewhat toward the defect; especially when any man speaketh of himself. For this wisdom requireth, that a man boast not of himself. Whereupon Paul, in his second epistle to the Corinthians and twelfth chapter, wrote; If I will boast of myself, I shall not be unwise, but I will forbear, lest any man should think of me more than that he seeth in me, or that he heareth of me. By these words he reproveth them as foolish and unwise, which do boast and glory, even of those good things, which they have: and he saith, that he will abstain from it. Neither (saith he) do I require, that any man should think more of me, than either he seeth in me, or heareth of me. And he, which

speaketh less of himself, than he is, is not straightway to be accused as a liar. For that, which is the more, comprehendeth and containeth in it the less. For whosoever hath fifty, he may truly say that he hath twenty; although he speaketh not of all that he hath. Howbeit, if the same man should affirm, that he hath but twenty only; or else should deny that he hath any at all, out of doubt he should lie: the which must not be committed, either for modesty sake, or (as they say) for humility.

29. Concerning testimonies out of the holy scriptures, which do stir us up to speak the truth; doubtless very many might be alleged: but a few shall suffice. In the ten commandments, it is written; Thou shalt not bear false witness. Which commandment must be observed, not only in judgment, but in all things, which in our talk we testify, to be either true or false. Moreover, God is set before our eyes to be followed; whom the scriptures in every place pronounce to be true. Wherefore we also ought to be most fervent lovers of the truth. And for that cause Jethro, in the 18th chapter of Exodus, counseled Moses to set such men to be rulers over the people, as did fear God, men of courage, lovers of the truth, and those, which hated covetousness. Also David saith; Behold, thou hast loved truth, and therefore thou hast made me to understand wisdom in the inward and secret parts of my mind. These things sufficiently declare, that we are taught of God both by inward inspiration, and also by outward doctrine; because he is a lover of the truth: neither doth he suffer, that his children should either err, or be deceived by lies. In Zechariah, the eighth chapter, it is written; Speak ye the truth every man to his neighbor. Which self-same sentence Paul useth to the Ephesians: and he commandeth the same to the Colossians. But in the latter epistle to the Corinthians, he saith of himself, and of the other apostles, that they can have nothing against the truth. Yea and the Scribes and Pharisees,

being joined with the Herodians, on this wise flattered Christ (whom they went about to entrap in his speech;) Master, we know that thou acceptest no persons, yea thou teachest the way of God in truth. Hereby they declared, that it is a singular virtue for a noble and notable man, to prefer the truth before all things. But let these testimonies of the holy scriptures be sufficient at this time.

30. It remaineth, that I now come to treat of a lie. Augustine, who wrote thereof to Consentius, affirmeth; that A lie is the false signification of the speech. And undoubtedly, of this vice may all those things be spoken by a contrary position, which are before declared of truth. And first, contrary to that, which Tully affirmed of truth; that that is true, whereby things which are, which have been, and which shall be, are said to be unaltered. And a lie is that, whereby is signified that, which is not: for Augustine defined truth by the contrary. This vice is so hurtful, that it maketh a man, which is infected therewith, to rejoice, and be glad in falsehood. The general word of truth, is equality; and the general of this vice, inequality. And as truth is very near joined with simplicity, so a lie belongeth to doubleness. Truth is a part of justice, but a lie is a part of injustice. By truth, the society of man is preserved; but by lying, it is hurt and overthrown. But return we to Augustine, who writeth; that He is said to lie, which with a will to deceive speaketh that, which is false: and that, To lie, is nothing else, but to go against the mind; for liars speak another thing than they have in their mind. But the desire to deceive is utterly against justice, love, and amity; which we mutually owe one towards another. So then there be three things in a lie; first, to speak that which is false; secondly, his will in speaking; and thirdly, a desire to deceive. The first part belongeth to the matter of a lie; the other two parts pertain unto the form.

31. A lie is distinguished into an officious lie, a sporting lie, and a pernicious lie. And this division cometh of no other thing, but of the effects, or of the ends. For this is evermore true, that the ends themselves may have the nature both of the cause, and of the effect: seeing lies do either profit, or delight, or else hurt. The end of a pernicious lie, is to hurt; the end of a sporting lie, is to delight; and the end of an officious lie, is to profit. But, forsomuch as in virtue, Aristotle hath respect chiefly unto the mean, if then in speaking thou exceed that mean, he calleth it boasting: but if thou come short, he nameth it dissimulation or mocking. And in this evil, that most of all hurteth; because an evil or false opinion is engendered in the mind of our neighbor. For which cause it seemeth, that the same Aristotle said well; that Lieng is a wicked thing, and must be avoided. Which we may prove by testimonies of the holy scriptures. For hereunto belong all those things, which we rehearsed before, for provoking of us to speak the truth. And there be many other places dispersed here and there, which detest lying. David saith; Thou shalt destroy all those which speak lies. There be reasons also, which persuade the same: whereof one is, that in a lie there is an abuse of signs. And for so much as it is not lawful to abuse the gifts of God: a lie also is understood to be forbidden.

Moreover, as it is before said; a lie is enemy unto the society of man. For in lying, the understanding of the mind is not communicated unto our brethren; but lies. Wherefore, seeing by nature man is made unto society and communication, when he speaketh that which is false, he striveth against his own nature. And (as Augustine saith;) Faith herein is harmed, because he which heareth, believeth those things which are spoken. Wherefore, that faith, which he giveth unto others words, is made void: and so notable a thing cannot be hurt without blame. And to conclude, every

man by lying loseth his own credit; for being taken in a lie, he shall be ever after suspected of it. Wherefore, though he would, he shall not be able, by admonition or correction, to help his neighbor. So the fault that is in a lie, not only respecteth the loss or hurt of our neighbor, but it is in it of his own kind: as manifestly appeareth by that, which we have already said. But among lies, that seemeth to be most heinous, which is in matter of religion, doctrine, and godliness: for in no other thing can guile be more hurtful and pernicious. For if we shall err therein, we be cast from everlasting felicity. Wherefore Augustine, in his Enchiridion, the 18th chapter, hath very well written; that They indeed sin grievously, which deceive traveling men, in showing them a contrary way. But they be much more detestable, which in lying about matters of religion, do bring men into error.

32. If the three kinds of lies should be compared together, I mean the pernicious lie, the sporting lie, and the officious lie; the pernicious lie should justly be counted the more detestable. Because in it are two evils: one is, the abuse of signs; another is, the hurt of our neighbor, and that both of the mind that is deceived (which is common to all lies,) and also of the thing which is lost. But as for other lies, although they be not without fault; yet is the same fault much diminished by the benefit either of delight, or of supply of the help. And indeed, a sporting lie hath in it but a small and slender nature of a lie: for so much as the falsehood is straightway found out, neither can it be long hidden from the hearers. Yea Augustine writeth, that such lies are not to be counted for lies. But as touching an officious lie, the judgment thereof is more hard and obscure; seeing some deny it to be sin: for they say it hath a respect unto helping of our neighbor, whom we ought in words and deeds to relieve as much as we can. So as they think that therein is no abuse of the signs: forsomuch as all our doings ought to

have respect to the commodity of our brethren. Neither do they think, that therein is offense committed against man's society: because through this kind of lie, men are made safe, and kept harmless.

Further, they say, that whereas it is written in the holy scriptures; that God will destroy all those that speak lies: the same is not to be understood of every kind of lie; but of a pernicious lie only. Which Augustine also, in his Enchiridion, the 18th chapter, seemeth to grant. They allege also the opinion of Plato, in his book *De Repub*. who, as he did fray the common people from lies; yet he gave magistrates liberty to lie: especially in making of laws. But in my judgment, the thing is far otherwise. Neither can I easily grant, that an officious lie is without the abuse of the signs. For Aristotle, in his book περί ἑρμηνείας, in defining of words, saith; that They are notes of those affections, which we have in our mind. Whereby it followeth, that all they abuse words, which signify things to be otherwise, then they think in their mind. Further, that reason, which they bring of love, is very weak. For we ought to help our neighbors; but that must be by just and honest means: otherwise we will suffer ourselves to steal, to the intent to bestow it in giving of alms. But the sentence of the apostle must stand fast, which is; that Evil must not be done, to the intent that good may come thereof. Neither do I think it to be true, that by those kind of lies, the society of man is not hurt: seeing that, if fidelity be taken away, there remaineth no dealing of one man with another.

33. But as touching that sentence of the holy scriptures, wherein it is said; Thou shalt destroy all them that speak lies: we grant with Augustine, that that sentence is not universally spoken. For, so long as the strength of our faith, and joining together with Christ endureth; so long those sins are not imputed: which otherwise of their own nature would be our destruction.

And this also I may easily grant touching officious and sporting lies: because they are not so much against charity, as pernicious lies be. But this no man can deny, but that in making of a lie, we deal against faith. And we must wholly grant, that he which lieth, doth loose his own credit thereby: so that afterward he cannot profitably admonish, reprove, or fruitfully give counsel, as he ought to do. For they, which hear him, will soon think that he lieth officiously; to call them again into the way, and not that the thing is so in very deed.

Certainly, this was the cause that Augustine was against Jerome, who in a manner fathered an officious lie upon the holy scriptures: If this (saith he) should be so, the authority of the holy scriptures would soon be impaired; for the readers thereof would soon say, that the thing is not so, but that it is so written for the keeping of men in their duty. Neither ought the authority of Plato to move us much; seeing in that place he erred greatly, granting, that in things pertaining to God, they might feign fables, which should serve to bring forth and keep a good opinion of them. Doubtless we must not least in divine matters. Further, the law of God is equal, and evermore one: and as it will not have the common people to lie; so doth it also forbid the same to magistrates. Howbeit, they cannot justly be accused of a lie, which in their talk be far from double meaning. For otherwhile it cometh to pass, that some speak that which is false; and yet they thought the same to be true. Among which men they also are to be excused, who have given a promise to do a thing; which afterward they be not able to perform: because at the beginning, when they promised it, they were fully minded to do that, which they had promised: and therefore they have not lied. If they afterward do not accomplish those things, which they spake, the same happeneth by some other occasion.

And otherwhile it cometh to pass, that he which delivereth his sword to a man to keep, falleth afterward mad: wherefore he that hath the custody of the sword, ought not to redeliver it unto him; because (as the lawyers say) a new case requireth a new help. After the very same sort is Paul excused, who said, that he would go into Spain; when as nevertheless he went not thither. Paul also promised to the Corinthians, that he would come unto them; which he performed not, but yet he lied not: because, when he spake those words, he was minded so to do: but God had otherwise appointed it, as Gelasius hath well written, as we find in the 22nd cause, question the second, in the chapter Beatus. Undoubtedly, the disposition of God breaketh and dissolveth all bonds: as it is written in the 19th cause, question the second, chapter *Duae sunt*.

34. But what shall we say touching the hyperbolical speeches, which are in the holy scriptures, which at the first sight seem to be lies? I answer, that although there in signification the sentence keep not a mean in respect of quantity; yet, as touching the manner, it doth. For those excessive speeches amplify a matter, because their nature is not only to set forth a thing, but also to lead men into an admiration, which by that manner of speech they most commodiously attain unto. Neither have lies any place there, forsomuch as they breed not in the minds of the readers and hearers any false or corrupt sense. A mean therefore must there be kept; undoubtedly, not of the thing, but of the manner. The evangelists also are not to be holden as liars, when as they, setting forth the acts of Christ, do not all use the self-same words. For it is sufficient unto the truth, that a thing be set forth as it was: but it is not required to be expressed by the self-same words. Yea, it is oftentimes done through the goodness of the holy Ghost, that the manner of

the narration should differ. For by such means, those things, which are not sufficiently expressed by one, are more plainly showed by another.

35. But they use to object the midwives of the Hebrews, which although they lied, yet God rewarded them. The same also happened to Rahab the harlot, or vitler. Augustine answereth, that it was not the lie which the midwives made, but the faith and fear that they had towards God, and the mercy showed unto the Israelites, that pleased the Lord: which the holy history by express words doth testify. And no otherwise must we think of Rahab. But I never like of the opinion of Gregory, who saith; that for the lie which they made, their eternal reward was turned to a temporal reward: because it is said, that God, for their everlasting blessedness, built them houses. But I judge, that by reason of the true faith, which was effectual in them, in such sort, as it brought forth in them both love and the fear of God, (which be lawful and just fruits of that faith) the lie, which they made through infirmity, bereaved them not of eternal felicity.

36. Abraham also is objected, who said, that Sara was his sister. Howbeit, therein (as Augustine teacheth) he lied not: he told that which was true, but yet he spake not all the truth. And that is of no man required, to utter all that he knoweth to be true. He did not say that she was his wife: yet, because she was his kinswoman, he might (according to the manner of the Hebrews) truly say that she was his sister. Notwithstanding, he seemeth not to be holden altogether excused: for although he lied not in calling of her sister; yet it appeareth that therein he fell, because, by not revealing that she was his wife, he put her in danger of losing her chastity; since he left her void of that help, whereby only she might have been defended from falling into the love of strangers. Neither is it needful, that I should endeavor to excuse Abraham altogether: for he was a man, and by too much fear might easily

do amiss. Howbeit, Augustine mentioneth; that Abraham was then in danger two manner of ways: the one, least he should be killed himself; the other, the adultery of his wife. The first he might shun, in calling her his sister: the other; namely, least she should be polluted, he was not able to repel. For although he had said that he was her husband, that would not have served, to deliver her from the shameful lusts of the Egyptians. Wherefore, that which he himself was not able to shun, he committed unto God: and in that, which was in his own power, he would not tempt him. This seemeth to be the judgment of Augustine. But what I judge, I have before declared.

37. But did not the same Abraham lie, when he said unto his servants; Tarry here, and we will return unto you: when nevertheless he was minded to sacrifice his son? Which if he had done, he might not have returned, having his son with him; but should have returned alone without him. Jacob also by express words lied, when he said unto his father; I am Esau thy son. Paul also (as it is written in the Acts) saith, that he knew him not to be the chief priest, which commanded him to be stricken; when for all that (as Augustine testifieth in his sermon of the Centurions son, and as it is written in the 23rd cause, question the first, chapter *Paratus*) he knew him well enough. Paul (saith he) was brought up among the Jews, he had learned the law at the feet of Gamaliel: wherefore he very well knew the chief priest from other men. Jehu also lied manifestly, when he said, that he would worship Baal. Augustine writeth, that there be two kinds of men mentioned in the holy scriptures. For that there were some so perfect, as although they were not without sin, yet we may not rashly judge evil of them; but rather seek how we may defend those things, which in their works have a show of sin. They oftentimes were so moved by the holy Ghost, that God by their words and acts might make certain secrets known. And so we must believe,

that oftentimes they both spake and did certain things by prophesy. So Abraham, when he said; We will return unto you, prophesied unawares, that which should come to pass: for he safely returned from the mountain with Isaac.

And Jacob, in saying; I am Esau, meant to declare nothing else, but that he was the man, to whom the degree, blessing, and dignity was due: which seemed to pertain unto Esau, who was the first born. Paul also prophesied, what should at the length become of the high priest; namely, that as a painted wall, and a thing altogether feigned and hypocritical, he should be taken away. Further (saith Augustine) there were other men, not so perfect, but were evil; which are spoken of in the Old Testament, either to have lied; or else to have done something, that might seem to be sin. But he thinketh, that we should not so greatly endeavor to defend the good name and opinion of those men. Of this sort of men was Jehu: for although that murder, which he executed upon Ahab, and his family, and also his weeding out of Baal, and the worshippers thereof, pleased God: yet nevertheless, he was a wicked king; neither forsook he the worshipping of golden calves. Wherefore it shall be lawful to confess, that in lying he committed sin. But in my judgment (and as I noted before) by this only distinction we may easily dissolve this doubt; namely, that those men were stirred up to lie, either by the spirit of man, or by the motion of God. When they did it as men, we will not deny, but that they sinned: but when they spake so by the inspiration of God, we marvel at their sayings and doings. But we will not take it as an example and president to follow.

**Whether it be lawful to lie, for preserving the life of our neighbor.**

38. But there ariseth a harder doubt; namely, whether it be lawful to make a lie, for the preservation of our neighbors life? Augustine, *De mendacio ad*

*Consentium*, saith; If a man should be in great peril of death, and the same man should also know, that his son were in extreme danger; who happening to die, thou having knowledge thereof, if the father ask thee; Doth my son live? And thou art sure that he also will die, if thou show him that his son is departed, what wouldest thou do in this case? Whether thou sayest, he liveth; or whether thou sayest, I cannot tell: thou liest. But if so be thou answer that he is dead, all men will cry out upon thee, as though thou haddest committed man-slaughter; and as though thou, by thy heavy news, haddest been the occasion of the death of this father, being sick, and lying at the point of death. Augustine granteth that the case is hard; neither denieth he, but that (as a man) he should be moved; and perhaps it might so chance, that affections would not suffer him to speak that, which is just and right. But at the length he concludeth, that he ought not to lie.

And he addeth moreover, that if thou know, that any unchaste woman loveth thee inordinately, which also threateneth to kill herself; yea and will do it indeed, except thou assent to her wicked lusts, whether herein thou oughtest to commit any shameful things against chastity? I think not. So likewise (saith he) thou oughtest not to offend against the truth, for saving of thy neighbor's life. And moreover, what a window should be opened unto lying, if we should determine to do otherwise? For that, which one should think to be lawful in respect of life, another would judge that he may do the same for money; another for estimation, or for defending of lands and possessions. And so it would come to pass, that there would be no measure nor end of lying. We may not suffer (saith Augustine) that any man should kill his own soul for the bodily life of another man. No, nor that it is lawful to lie for the salvation of any man's soul. Every lie (saith John) is not of God. But we ought not to speak those things, which are not of God.

39. What if a man were sought out of murderers to be killed, and that thou knewest that the man lieth there hidden, where thou presently art; and they demand of thee if thou knowest whether he be there or no? He answereth, that if thou be of a valiant courage, and as becometh a Christian, thou must say; Where he is I know, but I will not utter it, do you what ye will. Notwithstanding, when the matter cometh to this point, that for the defense of any man's life thou must make a lie: know thou, that thou oughtest to commit the matter unto God, and that thou hast no more there to do. Either thou must answer, that thou wilt not betray him, or else thou must hold thy peace. But by thy silence the murderer will suspect that he is in thy house, and then thou shalt seem to have given an occasion of his apprehension. But in very deed, thou hast not given it; for thou canst not let him to think what he will. Wherefore, the matter must rather be committed unto God, than to make a lie. Howbeit, thou must temper thy words with singular consideration; namely, that thou speak in such sort, as thou utter not all, and yet speak not falsely. For in these cases, I think it is not forbidden; nay, I rather think it most lawful to speak doubtfully. And, as touching this question, this is sufficient.

**Whether for modesty sake it be lawful to lie; upon 2 Samuel 9:8.**

40. There be some so importunate men, as although God have heaped his benefits upon them, yet are they always complaining; We have borne the burden and heat of the day, and yet doest thou make us equal unto them? Some also be so modest, as even in prosperity they humble themselves. Others be broken with misery, and are become more humble. But they, which in their losses and afflictions retain still the fierceness of nature, be too insolent and obstinate. Humility is like a bridle, wherewith the insolency of our nature must be held in his duty. And men be most of all

reclaimed unto modesty, when they begin to consider how very little they have of themselves. Howbeit, the same humbling of our selves ought to be joined with the acknowledging of God's benefits. For many, while they be either ignorant thereof, or else dissemble it, become like unto beasts; as they, which cannot one whit understand, with what benefits they be endued by God. But there must be a special regard had, that we do not counterfeit that modesty; and that the same consist not only in words, but in the mind also.

Yet to retain that virtue, it is not lawful for thee to make a lie upon thyself for modesty sake. For Aristotle himself, in his Ethics, reckoneth a lie among dishonest things. And (as Paul saith; We must not do evil, that good may come of it. Augustine, in his 8th epistle to Jerome, touching this matter, citeth the words of Paul to the Corinthians;) If Christ be not risen, in vain is our preaching, and your faith also is in vain. For we be found false witnesses of God, when we say, that God raised up Christ from the dead; whom he raised not up, if the dead do not rise again. But here (saith Augustine) a man might say unto Paul; Why doest thou so much detest lying, since the same tendeth to the setting forth of the glory of God? And he maketh Paul to answer, that he doth detest such lies, and that it is no less evil, to commend things that be not true concerning God, than not to believe things that be true of him. Hereby we gather this argument; If it be not lawful to lie for the honor of God, it is much less lawful to lie for the retaining of any virtue. Yea, and it is no less evil to ascribe to thyself evil, which thou hast not committed, than to arrogate unto thyself any good, which thou hast not done.

41. Contrariwise nevertheless, Paul unto Timothy seemeth somewhat to make a lie of himself; Christ (saith he) came to save sinners, of whom I am

the chief. For Paul was not the chief, or the greatest sinner. And in the 30th chapter of the Proverbs, the prophet Agur, whether he were Solomon himself, or some other man; I am (saith he) more foolish than all men, and the wisdom of man is not in me; I have learned no knowledge, neither have I the understanding of holy things. Yet was he both a prophet, and a wise man, and answered prudently unto questions. And Christ himself, of himself; I am (saith he) a worm and no man, a very scorn of men, and the outcast of the people. Some defend these speeches on this wise, saying; that They, which have thus amplified their sins, they only respected their own strength, which they themselves had by themselves, and a certain natural inclination of their own unto evil. For they themselves saw, that they should grievously have fallen, unless God had stayed them. These in very deed be no small provocations, to make us judge humbly and lowly of our own selves. But it is one thing for a man to say that he is prone and ready bent unto evil; and another thing to confess that he hath done some evil, which he hath not done. For there is as much difference between these, as there is between act and power. Certainly, we may every one of us slip, yet no man ought to say that he hath slipped, when he hath not. We ought all to confess ourselves to be sinners, but none ought to ascribe unto himself any sin by name, which he hath not committed.

I say therefore, that those speeches, which I have made mention of, if they be thoroughly weighed, they be true. For some be uttered after that sort, because absolutely they be so; some, for that they be extolled by an excessive speech; some, because they be compared with another thing by contention. Paul calleth himself the principal sinner, either because he was the first that came unto Christ, among those that persecuted the church of God; or because he judged himself in very deed to be chief and greatest of

the sinners. Not as if there had been no man that had sinned more heinously (for there were such as had sinned against the holy Ghost, there were those which had sinned without any repentance:) but because that among all them, which were redeemed by Christ, and had obtained the mercy of God, he thought himself to have sinned most grievously. For some had sinned of infirmity, some of plain error and incredulity; some had proceeded so far, as they crucified Christ, who nevertheless were afterward, by the preaching of the word of God, called home unto repentance. Therefore saith Peter in the Acts; I know brethren that ye did it by ignorance, even as did your rulers. But Paul had no recourse unto the sermons of the apostles: there was need of greater bonds for the drawing of him unto Christ. Whereupon Christ spake thus unto him from heaven; Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? With these men therefore he compareth himself: and of these he saith he is the principal.

And so Chrysostom, upon this place, saith; that These words be against other words of his in the epistle to the Philippians. For there he saith, that he was conversant in the Jewish religion, without crime, and without complaint. But these things (saith he) are nothing repugnant. For even they themselves, which had performed the righteousness of the law, yet were they sinners nevertheless. And although Paul spake those things modestly of himself, yet did he not ascribe an untruth unto himself. For, notwithstanding he granteth himself to have been a persecutor, and a blasphemer; yet he saith not, that he was an adulterer, or a fornicator, or a thief; seeing these things should not have been true. The things objected out of the Proverbs, touching Agur the prophet, were true by way of comparing them unto those things, whereof a demand was made. He saith that he had no wisdom; not in respect that the wisdom which he had, was no wisdom; but because the

same, being compared unto so great matters, might seem to be none. So Socrates was wont to say; This only I know, that I know nothing: because that knowledge, which he had, would be nothing, in comparison of the multitude of those things that he knew not. So Christ called himself a worm, and a reproach of the people; because men so accounted of him, by reason of his afflictions and cross. Also in speaking, there happeneth sometime an excessive or hyperbolical speech; such indeed as is not joined with a lie, but which may serve for the better setting forth of the matter.

**Whether faith must be kept toward him that breaketh his promise.**

42. In the beginning of the ninth chapter of the second book of Samuel, David demandeth; Is there any man left alive of the family of Saul, to whom I may do good for Jonathan's sake? When he speaketh of Jonathan, he excludeth not God; nay rather, that which he did for Jonathan's sake, he did chiefly for God and godliness sake. So God saith, that he would do well to the people of the Jews, for the covenant which he had made with Abraham; yet doth he not exclude his own goodness. Nay rather, he chiefly includeth the same therein; seeing that covenant proceeded of the mere goodness and mercy of God. But thou wilt demand, why David saith that he will do good unto any of the house of Saul, for Jonathan's sake; and not for Saul's own sake. For in the 24th chapter of the first book of Samuel, what time as he had cut off the skirt of Saul's cloak, he being enforced by Saul to swear, promised, that he would not root out his seed. Whereby he was bound, not only unto Jonathan, but also unto Saul. Some answer, that David was now discharged of his oath; because Saul kept not promise with him, but had done him exceeding great wrong. For he that breaketh his faith (say they) let faith be broken with him. And Cicero, in his third book of Offices, citeth a verse out of Accius an old Poet; Hast thou broken thy faith? Atreus,

whom he bringeth in to speak, answereth; Neither have I given neither do I give my faith to any faithless person.

But this is no sure rule at all times. For if one be wicked, and false of promise: yet oughtest not thou for that cause to shrink from thy promises; seeing God doth oftentimes keep promise even with us that do evil. He promised, that he would continue the kingdom, or else some great honor in the family of David, even unto Messias. He promised that he would give a son which should redeem mankind. Men undoubtedly were evil, unfaithful, and unworthy to have the promises kept with them: yet did he perform these things to them, according to his excellent faithfulness. Some answer on this wise, that faith in deed must be kept with an evil and unfaithful man, if he be unfaithful towards other, so he be no such towards us; or else, if he do hurt us, so it be not in the self-same thing, wherein it was agreed upon between us. Nay rather, if he fail even in the very same thing which is agreed upon, yet must we keep promise: if by that means, neither his naughtiness be increased; nor a greater power to do hurt be given unto him. We be therefore loosed of our promise, if the thing cannot be, which we have promised; or else, if it should fall out ill unto himself, to whom the promise is made: as if thou deliver a sword unto a furious man, which thou didst promise unto a man of sobriety; or if he wax worse and worse, as though, through thy patience, he meaneth to reap a benefit of his unfaithfulness: or else, if thou shalt promise such a thing, as is against the word of God, or the profit of the Church or Common-wealth. Therefore it is written in the 22nd cause, question second; In evil promises break thy faith.

But most of all, we be at liberty of our promise, if we being circumvented by any fraud, have promised anything that we ought not to have done; or else, if the things themselves be now changed. Some have added; If thou

being compelled either by force or fear, doest promise anything that thou wouldest not. But it can scarcely be perceived, how so great a fear and compulsion can happen unto a courageous and good man, that he should promise that, which might be against either his duty, or the word of God. Howbeit, if a man be fallen in such wise, he is at liberty. But above all, we must take heed, that we do not craftily color our promises, and seek by fraud and counterfeit means to unwind ourselves out: seeing fraud (as Cicero very rightly said) doth not undo perjury, but it tieth it fast. David, when as perhaps he might have invented many things to break his promises; yet would he do no such thing. For being a godly prince, he was rather minded to follow truth and faithfulness.

43. Certainly, the nature and consideration of these two virtues; [namely, truth and faith] is both alike, yet is it not altogether the self-same: wherein they do agree, and how they differ, I will in few words declare. Truth is a virtue, whereby we are ready to speak those things, which the meanings and cogitations of our mind do express: for hereby, because we speak those things which we think, are we called faithful and true of our word. And faith is a virtue, whereby is brought to pass, that our deeds be answerable to our promises. There is some conformity on both parts. In truth there is a conformity of words with the meaning of the mind, and in faith a conformity of deeds with promises. So as lying is contrary unto truth, and falsehood unto faith. For Cicero thinketh; that Faith is so called, because that is done which is spoken. And he defined the same after a sort on this manner; Faith is a constancy of words and of covenants. In another place he saith, that Faith is the truth of a man’s word.

But thus the definition will be more full; Faith is a good habit, according to right reason, whereby we are ready to do those things that we have

promised. This definition (as I have said) is more perfect, and it consisteth of a general word, and of a difference. For faith appertaineth unto justice, and it causeth us to yield unto every man, that which pertaineth to him; seeing what thou shalt promise to any man, that is now become his, to whom thou hast promised. And the same unless thou perform in time, thou withholdest that, which is another man's. And so great is the force of faith, as it comprehendeth in one all the parts of man's life: because neither matrimony, neither the bargains which citizens have among themselves, neither any part of the Common-wealth can consist without faith. It differeth (as I said) from truth, although with the same it hath many things that be like. The matter of truth is infinite: for all things that we speak, are either true or false; whether they be past, whether they be present, or whether they be to come. But faith hath to do only in promises: nevertheless, those promises must be of the thing that is good; and not of that, which is evil, or a hindrance to good: otherwise they ought not to be firm.

Wherefore, faith should have the very same companions joined therewith, that an oath hath; namely, truth, righteousness, and judgment. So as he, that breaketh his promise, doth not only sin in so doing; but he must also make amends for the hindrance, which through his unfaithfulness the other party receiveth, to whom the promise is made. David, being singularly adorned with these virtues, would not depart from the promises. For he made the promise of his own accord, being not forced thereto by any fear or violence: and that, which he promised, was neither repugnant to the word of God, nor yet hurtful to the Common-wealth. For is was a matter of good example, that so notable a king did fulfill his promise: neither was there any danger, least they, to whom he had promised, should become the worse by his

promise: for they were already dead. Wherefore, there was no cause, why he should shrink from it. And because he would perform his promise unto Saul, therefore he demanded, whether any of his family were remaining, whom he might do good unto. But he speaketh of Jonathan by name, because he was bound unto him; not only by the bond of promise, but also of friendship, and most near acquaintance. Undoubtedly, he that faileth of his faith, is unworthy to have faith kept with him. Howbeit, we must have a special regard unto these circumstances; least for the naughtiness of another, we also should become naught ourselves, and seek corners for perjury.

**Of a Fable and Apology.**

44. They say that an apology is a kind of fable: and a fable they define to be a narration of a false thing, devised for commodity or delight sake. Or (as Augustine, in his second book, and 11th chapter *De soliloquijs* saith;) A fable is a lie, made for delectation sake, although properly it cannot be called a lie. For the falsehood of it is straightway found out, and especially in apologies. For in them are brought in insensible and unreasonable creatures talking one with another, and entreating of very weighty matters. And so soon as the hearer perceiveth this, he straightway understandeth, that the matter is feigned, and not so done [as it is uttered.] And doubtless some fables are likely to be true, and some are far from probability. For it is very likely, that once there fell a contention between Ajax and Ulysses for the armor of Achilles, which at the length was judged unto Ulysses: and that Ajax took so great displeasure thereat, as becoming mad, he slue himself. But contrariwise, it is without all probability, that a woman was turned into a plant, or into a stone: so as an apology may be likened to a fable that is not likely to be true.

45. The kinds or sorts of a fable, are comedies, tragedies, satyrs, and narrations of harping and heroical poets, and also apologies. But which of these feigning's be lawful, and which be not lawful, may thus be defined. Those, which have unmannerliness and scurrility; that is, a mirth joined with dishonesty, ought not to be admitted. But those, which are written honestly, and with shamefastness, so that they can refresh the mind with some pleasure, and are also profitable to teach good manners, are not to be despised. That such, as be uncivil, must be put away, it is confirmed by two testimonies of the apostle. To the Corinthians he writeth; Evil talk corrupteth good manners. And unto the Ephesians, the fifth chapter, it is written; Let not whoredom, nor any uncleanness, nor covetousness be named among you, as it becometh saints. Then is added αἰσχρότης, filthiness; μωρολογία, foolish talking; and εὐτραπελία, jesting; which are not comely. By these words he reproveth all communications, which are defiled either with dishonesty or scurrility.

The very same saw Plato, in his third book *De Repub*. where he excludeth poets that spake of gods, as though they should speak of men: because they, in so writing, do both dishonorably treat of the nature of God, which is the best and most excellent; and also excuse the sins of common men, when as they testify, that both the gods, and also noble men, did things alike. Which certainly we may perceive in the comedy of Eunuchus in Terence, where Chaerea, a wicked young man, beholding a wanton table in the harlots house (wherein was painted Jupiter coming into Danae by a shower) began to have a pleasure in himself; seeing he, being but a silly man, did those things, which he perceived by that table, that the chief god in old time had committed; I did it (saith he,) yea I did it with good will. Also, Cicero saith,

that Homer feigned these things, and translated human things unto the gods. But I would rather they had transferred divine things unto us!

46. Augustine, in his second book of confessions, the 15th and 16th chapters, complaineth and soroweth, that he being a child and a young man, learned profitable words, but yet in vain things. I would to God (saith he) I had been instructed in profitable writings! I heard Jupiter thundering, and therewithal committing adultery. The minds and affections of men are prone enough unto vices. Wherefore it is wickedly done, that children and young men should in that age be stirred up to sin, by vile and filthy fables. But apologies are profitable, which consisting both of honest words and good arguments, do rightly instruct that first age. Aesop, the ancient writer, happily exercised himself in this kind: although some do ascribe his fables unto Hesiodus, who was before Aesop's time. But this one apollogie (whereof we now treat) was written long before the time of Aesope and Hesiodus. For the time of the Judges, and namely of Gideon, was a hundredth years and more, before the war of Troy. There is another apology also in the second book of kings, the 14th chapter, where Amasias obtaining victory of the Edomits, provoked the king of Israel to make war with him. Unto whom king Joash answered thus; The thistle of Libanon sent unto the cedar that is of Libanon, and said; Give thy daughter to my son to wife. And a wild beast went out of Libanon, and trod down the thistle. By which apology he showed, that he was so much greater than Amasias the king of Judah, as the cedar tree excelleth the thistle: and gave him warning, that he should, after that sort, be trodden down and oppressed by his host, as the thistle perisheth that is trodden down by wild beasts.

47. These things have I therefore rehearsed; because the Greek and Ethnic writers should not be thought to be the first inventers of these profitable

devises. All men agree, that the use of apologies is then to be added, when we have to deal with rude persons. [ 1] For they understand not what a perfect argument or an imperfect meaneth; neither are they able to perceive inductions: so that of particulars they might gather universals. And they pass not upon the examples of noble personages; because they themselves are abject and base. Wherefore, seeing they be smally instructed by those means, there remain feigned narrations: where they being allured with the strangeness of the matter, give great heed to the things that are spoken, and are other whiles at length persuaded. [ 2] Moreover, they are good to help memory: for things, that are so new and pleasant, do very much delight; and those things, that be so pleasant, be not easily forgotten. [ 3] Furthermore, men can sooner abide themselves to be reproved by apologies, than by evident speeches. For the plain truth engendereth hatred, but being covered with apologies or dark speeches, it may be abidden. At the beginning, the hearers know not whereunto the matter tendeth: therefore being ignorant what will be spoken, they tarry out the end, and perhaps be persuaded at the length. Christ finished the whole parable of the vine, and at the end, the Scribes and Pharisees perceived, that it was spoken against themselves. So also among the Romans, Menenius Agrippa, by an apology wan the common people, which had divided themselves from the Senators, to join themselves again with them. For these causes are the parables, dreams, and visions of the prophets very much used in the holy scriptures.

# CHAP. XIV. The last Precept; Thou shalt not lust. Wherein is treated of the comparison and connection of sins one with another.

Paul, in disputing of the knowledge, which we have of sin, among all others precepts, bringeth this only one precept, Thou shalt not lust; which undoubtedly the apostle did (as all other things) most prudently: seeing he meant specially to speak of that kind of naughtiness, which is most hidden from the judgment of men, and is not set forth in other laws. For the natural lust and corruption, which driveth us into all evils, is in this place touched and discovered, as the fountain and head of all evils. Wherefore it is very well said of Augustine, that there is no sin committed without lust. For this cause Paul would not speak of the grosser outward sins, because he saw, that they pertained unto discipline; and are not only set forth by the civil laws, but have also their punishment provided for them. Neither would he speak of wicked affections, and perturbations; because he perceived them to be condemned by the philosophers, in their moral discipline, and that they gave precepts for bringing of them to a mediocrity. He went rather unto the root of all sins, and showeth, that the same being unknown and hidden, is manifested and brought to light by the

law of God. And to express this more plainly, we must consider, that all the commandments of God, do either command or forbid something. And they not only command that a thing be done lightly; but also that it be done with all the heart, with all the soul, and with all the strength, and most exactly: so that there be nothing in us, which should not be obedient to the will of God. And what they forbid, they not only forbid that itself should not be in us, but also that there should be left in us no desire or inclination thereunto.

And therefore God gave his commandment; Thou shalt not lust: that we should both in mind, will, and wholly in all the parts, both of the soul and of the body, abhor those things which God hath forbidden. And on this wise, these two commandments are one answerable to another; Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, &c. (which is to be repeated in all the precepts that do command anything to be done) and this last precept, Thou shalt not lust: which again must be understood, in all things that be forbidden. And so in these two commandments is understood the pith, and (if I may so speak) the very soul of the law, as without which the rest of the commandments of God cannot be full and perfect. And all mortal men, be they never so holy, yet are they accused, convinced, and condemned for the breach of either of these two precepts. For, unless the grace of God, through Christ, should succor us; we have nothing before our eyes, but certain destruction. Because, how free we are from lust so long as we live here, Augustine most plainly declareth in many places, and especially in his 200th epistle to Asellicus the bishop. For thus he saith; that In mind he may do that which he loveth, and not consent unto the flesh, which doth that which he hateth; that is, Not that he should not lust at all, but that he should not follow after his lusts. And straightway, he saith; We shall one day come to the end thereof, when the lust of sin

shall not be restrained or bridled, but shall not be at all. For this hath the law set forth, saying; Thou shalt not lust. Not that we are here able to perform this, but that we may profit in endeavoring ourselves towards the same. And against Julian, in his sixth book and fifth chapter; And who doubteth, but that lust in this life may be diminished, though not taken away.

2. But there be some, which think, that this commandment (Thou shalt not lust) forbiddeth not the naughtiness and vice of nature, or the first motions, whereby we are affected towards those things which God hath forbidden: but by that commandment (say they) is only prohibited the consent of the will, and of the mind. And then at the length they confess, that we sin, when we give place unto those first motions, and suffer sin to reign in us. Howbeit, those things, which follow even in that same chapter, do most manifestly reprove them. For Paul showeth, that he entreateth of that lust, which is burdensome unto the mind that serveth the law of God. And he addeth, that by it, he doth that evil which he hateth. But these things have no place, where the consent of the mind is joined withal. And of this kind of lust he crieth out; Unhappy man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death! And he addeth, that he is thereby drawn captive, though he be unwilling, and do strive against the same. Wherefore, seeing this lust is of this nature; there is no cause why it should be wrested unto the consent of the mind. But herein our adversaries are exceedingly deceived: for that they think this precept is given in vain; if it prohibit that, which cannot be avoided in this life. And it is a ridiculous thing (say they) to command anything unto the brute and foolish flesh, and unto those parts of the mind, which be void of reason, and understand no such thing, and are of necessity moved to do that, whereunto they be ordained.

Notwithstanding, these men ought to have remembered, that this precept was given unto man endued with reason; and that not in vain, or without purpose. For God hath created man to his own image, and likeness: wherefore it was requisite, that he should have nothing in him, which should not agree with the will of God. Neither are the commandments, which cannot be performed in this life, given in vain, as these man fain. For the law of God hath a far other end, than that it should be absolutely performed of us; or that we should, by the observation of it, obtain righteousness. Wherefore lust is of two sorts. The one is a manifest consent of the mind, which pertaineth to every one of the commandments of God. For anger and hatred pertain to this commandment; Thou shalt not kill. Lust and filthy desire pertain unto this commandment; Thou shalt not commit adultery. The other is a general lust, which is a proneness or inclination against the will of God, and is with all the motions thereof expressed in the last precept; Thou shalt not lust. But there is yet a doubt remaining: for Moses setteth not forth that precept so nakedly as Paul doth: but (saith he) Thou shalt not lust after thy neighbor's house, his field, his servant, his maid, his ox, his wife. The cause of this diversity is, for that, when as Moses should give the law unto men being rude, he would more openly and more plainly describe lust, by the objects whereunto it is carried; that thereby they might the more easily understand it. But Paul, which saw that he had to do with them that knew the law, thought it enough precisely to say; Thou shalt not lust: supposing that it should need no further explication.

3. Neither also did Moses himself reckon up all things, whereunto we are led by lust. He thought it sufficient, to reckon a certain few things, which straightway, for their homeliness and plainness, should be ready for every

man to understand. And so we see, that God in like manner useth the figure Synecdoche well-near in all the rest of the commandments. And this hath Christ in Matthew plainly taught us, when against the traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees, he defended the true meaning of the law. For he taught, that in this commandment; Thou shalt not kill, is not only forbidden handy strokes, but also contumely, hatred, and wrath. And in that commandment; Thou shalt not commit adultery, is not only forbidden the unclean action, but also the lustful looking; and all manner of inflaming of the mind towards a woman, not being thy wife. After the same manner we might easily declare, that in all the rest of the commandments is used the figure Synecdoche.

Further, in every one of the commandments are commanded the virtues, which are contrary to that vice, which is there prohibited. For when we are forbidden to bear false witness against our neighbor; therewithal also we are commanded to defend the truth, and earnestly to maintain the good name of our neighbor. And when we are forbidden to steal; we are also commanded to be liberal towards our neighbors, and to communicate such things as we have, to them that want. And to declare that, which oftentimes cometh to my remembrance: the ten commandments seem unto me to extend as largely in every respect, touching honesty and dishonesty, virtue and vice, as the ten predicaments of Aristotle. For even as there can be nothing found in the nature of things, which appertain not unto the nature of those predicaments: so there is no virtue, no vice, no honesty, no dishonesty, but may be referred unto someone of these ten commandments. And as all the general words, and special kinds of the other predicaments, are resolved into the predicament of substance: so may all outward sins be reduced into lust. And as the predicament of substance hath matter and form, as the chief

and principal ground: so the whole consent of our mind to sin, is resolved into the naughtiness of our nature. Wherefore, notwithstanding that in the law, there be set forth those things that be notorious and gross: yet in them God requireth that, which is commanded in the first and last commandment; to wit, that we should have the motions both of the body, and of the mind, honest and clean: and that we should fly from all those things, which God hath forbidden us.

Besides, it is to be noted, that Paul bringeth this as one only precept; to wit, Thou shalt not lust. I marvel therefore at some (amongst whom also is Augustine) which of one commandment do make two: as though in the one is prohibited adultery, when it is said; Thou shalt not lust after the wife of thy neighbor: and in the other is forbidden; Not to covet other men's land, house, ox, servant, and maid. But if the precepts should increase in number, according to the number of the things that we lust after; we should of one commandment make in a manner infinite commandments. For it is possible, that we may covet our neighbors honors, dignities, vessels, money, garments, and infinite other such like things. Howbeit, there be others, which, to keep the full number of ten in the commandments, have left this commandment; Thou shalt not lust, undivided, and have divided the first precept into two parts. So that in the first part they put this; Thou shalt have no other gods: and in the second; Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image. But I think, that either of these parts pertain to one and the same precept. And I suppose the first commandment is set as it were before the rest, instead of a proem; I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt. For in those words we are commanded to count him for the true God.

And that we should not think that he is to be worshipped together with other gods, immediately is added the second precept, wherein we are forbidden to worship strange gods, and graven things and images. And if a man will more narrowly consider the thing, he shall see the Gospel offered unto us together with this first commandment: for God in it promiseth, that he will be our God. And in that, which is mentioned of the delivery out of Egypt, is contained a promise touching Christ. But to return from whence we are digressed, we ought certainly to hold, that by this precept; Thou shalt not lust, are prohibited our corrupt inclinations, and evil motions of the mind: which we should not acknowledge to be sins, unless the law had showed them unto us. Aristotle, Pighius, and such other like (for that they were ignorant of the law of God) affirm, that these are not precepts.

**Of the comparison between sins.**

4. But as touching the comparison between sins, one sin may be reckoned more grievous than another. And the cause of difference is nowhere to be sought for, but in the word of God. For even as the diseases and imperfections of bodies, come through want of the temperateness of humors, which is agreeable with the creature that liveth; and as the proportion is more or less preserved, diseases are said to be more or less painful: even so cometh it to pass of sins. For, according unto that, that they do less or more go from the ordinances of God, they are declared to be more or less grievous. Howbeit, this is certain, that two tables were given; namely, the first and the latter: by reason whereof, those sins, which be done against the first table, be more condemned, than those which be against the latter table. But this I would not have so to be understood, as though all that is committed against the first table, should be accounted more wicked than that which is repugnant to the latter. For it may be, that a

man will violate some ceremony of no great importance, which appertaineth to the first table; who for all that shall not sin more grievously than he, which doth commit either murder or adultery. Howbeit, the comparison must be made between those sins, which be of equal degree and greatness. For set down on the one side the chiefest sin against the first table, and on the other side the greatest against the latter table; then shall that be judged more grievous, whereby the first table is broken, than that which is done against the latter. And even the same case must be in the mean sort of sins, and also in the lower; so that ever ye compare like with like.

It happeneth also sometimes, that one man is more vehemently moved to sin than another. And certainly, his sin shall be judged more grievous, that offendeth, having small assaults or provocations; than he that by greater violence is driven to transgress the law of God. The grievousness also of the sin is sometimes weighed, according to the easiness or difficulty of forgiving. For Christ saith, that They shall be forgiven, which speak against the son of man: but that the fault of them, which had blasphemed the holy Ghost, should not be forgiven. Further, they transgress more grievously, which are most furnished with excellent knowledge. For The servant, which knoweth the will of his Lord, and fulfilleth it not, is much more beaten, than he that doth offend upon ignorance. Also, the heap of benefits bestowed, doth add a more weight unto sins: seeing they, which transgress, being adorned with many gifts, their sin is the more grievous, when they do transgress: for the vice of ingratitude increaseth their sin.

Over this, the dignity of the person is weighed: insomuch as princes, and also bishops, and ministers of the word of God, do sin much more grievously, than the common persons. For they sit at the stern, and have in their hand the helm of the church or common-wealth: by reason whereof all

men take example by them. Some sin also are counted the more grievous, because they be not alone, but they draw many other mischiefs with them. By reason whereof the sin of David is very much reproved; because his adultery was joined with the murder of a good and faithful man; namely, of Uriah: besides that there happened the slaying of many valiant soldiers, and the victory betrayed and translated unto the enemies of God's name. Wherefore, more grievous is that sin judged to be, than if the fault had been single and alone. Also, that crime is most condemned, that bringeth most harm. For undoubtedly, he that taketh away a man's life, doth more harm, than if he do but wound or else maim any one part of the body. And further, the vehemency and ardent desire of the will is considered, wherewith men run headlong into sin. For they that with all liberty run into mischief, are more to be reproved, than they that unwillingly and striving there against, with great fight of conscience, transgress the law of God.

Also the offense of them is less, which after a sort be constrained to fall into sin, through great fear and want of strength to endure affliction; then, if they should willingly and of their own accord fall thereinto. And wonderful grievous doth the contempt of the word of God make sin to be. Furthermore, those things that be openly committed, because they give an offense, and stumbling block unto others; therefore are more condemned, than such as are done privately and in secret. And the sins, which be committed against holy men, such as are the prophets, and ministers of the church, be horrible; because that injury and contumely doth more evidently redound unto God. Wherefore it is written; He that hurteth you, doth as if he should touch the apple of mine own eye. He that despiseth you (saith Christ) despiseth me also. And God warned the princes of this world, that they should do no violence against his Christ; that is, his anointed.

Also, even in civil matters, the dignity of the person that is hurt is weighed. For he doth worse, that hurteth his own father; and the daughter, that riseth against her own mother, than if they should rage against any other persons; as the prophet Micah in the seventh chapter doth testify. Again, he is more sharply rebuked, that hurteth the magistrate and public power; than he, which worketh injury to private men. Wherefore, by express words it is commanded of God; Thou shalt not speak evil of the prince of the people. Likewise sin becometh more detestable through continuance. And certainly, God doth more grievously punish them, which do as it were rot in their sins; than others, which once or twice do amiss. Wherefore Amos the prophet, in the name of God, repeated very often that sentence; Upon three or four wickedness's I will not convert him. Yea and God testified in the law, that he would take vengeance upon sins, unto the third and fourth generation: when as they should be continued through so many degrees. Hereunto the place, time, and age doth draw a great weight with it. And there might be gathered well-near innumerable other things, which either aggravate or lighten sins: the which both willingly and wittingly I over-pass.

5. Chrysostom noted, that we must not conclude that all sins be of equality. Although it be reckoned, that even the least sins be of so great a moment, as they exclude us from the kingdom of God. This is common with them all, that they bereave men of the most happy inheritance: yet shall they not be punished with the like pains. Augustine, in his fourth book of baptism, against the Donatists, saith; that The words of Paul are not so to be understood, as though none should be excluded from the kingdom of God, unless they be guilty in all sins joined together: but we must understand, that whosoever shall be defiled, but even with one of them; he

is to be banished out of the kingdom of Christ. Indeed he granteth, that it is impossible any one sin should be committed, but the same is accompanied with some other. Albeit, it be not of necessity, that where one vice is, all the rest should follow: for sins are not linked together as virtues be. Which is declared by two reasons. The first is, that unto one virtue are repugnant two vices, which are of the greatest diversity one from another: whereupon he, which is infected with one of them, cannot always be defiled with the other; so as one man should all at once be both fearful and bold. Further, it happeneth oftentimes, that one sin expelleth another: as ambition putteth away covetousness; covetousness, drunkenness and surfeiting. So then we cannot say, that vices are [always] joined one with another.

6. But that virtues be joined one with another, the Philosophers make no doubt: as Augustine writeth in an epistle unto Jerome. For because there is no wisdom found, that is unjust and intemperate: and again, no temperance, unwise or slothful. But Aristotle, in his fifth book of Ethics, declareth this more plainly; to wit, that we cannot appoint wisdom to be, where other moral virtues be wanting: because reason should then be troubled by naughty desires, neither could it keep still the right course thereof. And again, the rest of the virtues without wisdom can take no place, seeing every one of them is a habit according to right reason. And the goodness and right course of reason hath no other being, but in wisdom itself. These things do the Philosophers affirm. But a Christian man must not very easily be led to consent unto them; seeing he cannot deny, but that godly men are endued with many most excellent virtues: and yet he ought to confess, that they do sin very often. For James saith; In many things we sin all. And John saith; If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and there is no truth in us. But he that hath sins, how can he be adorned with all virtues; seeing sin

is contrary and likewise repugnant to virtues? Wherefore the Christian seemeth in this matter to dissent or disagree from the Philosopher.

Augustine, in the same epistle, goeth about to undo this knot on this wise; to wit, that the only virtue in Christian religion is charity, which containeth in itself all other virtues; and the same, if it could be most perfectly had, would utterly suffer no sin to be with it: for charity is the fulfilling of the law. Where the law is fulfilled, and performed, there is no place left for sin. But seeing, while we abide here in this life, our charity is feeble and imperfect; therefore it is easy to be proved, that the same suffereth many defects and sins therewith. The very which thing we perceive to happen in heat, and other qualities of that kind; which being in their perfection, admit not by any means any contraries: but if they be remiss, and of less force, they receive perpetually something that is contrary unto them. Howbeit, in my judgment we may easilier resolve the matter; to say, that those things, which are taught by the Philosophers, are true, concerning the moral virtues, and sins only, which they in their books entreat of: but that the Christian faith doth more narrowly look into the nature of sin, than they were able to discern. And those things, which we admit to be sin, they would judge not to be repugnant to their virtues; and consequently, would repute them not in the place of sins.

7. But to return to our purpose. There seemeth a doubt to remain, against that which we have affirmed touching sins; namely, when as we said, that they of necessity be not joined one with another. For James wrote; He that offendeth in one, is become guilty of all. So as it seemeth, that one sin being committed, the same draweth all other sins with it. Howbeit, it should appear, that the sentence of the apostle must be understood of charity, which is violated by every kind of sin: the same being taken away, all vices do

break forth. Or else we will take his meaning thus; when as a man transgresseth one commandment, if he should be stirred up by the same force of temptation against the rest of the commandments, he should in like manner transgress them. Nevertheless, the former exposition seemeth to approach more nigh the truth; seeing, whatsoever James saith; he manifestly referreth it unto charity. For he that falleth into any sin against his neighbor, he is straightway convicted, to be guilty of the violating of love. Wherefore, seeing it is not necessary, that he, which is burdened with one sin, should be judged to be guilty of all, the words of Paul (in the first to the Corinthians, the sixth chapter, verse the ninth) must not as we said be understood; as though the sins, which he reckoned, do not exclude us from the kingdom of heaven, unless that all the sins be joined together in one man at once. One only sin is sufficient unto destruction. And those things, which are spoken by the apostle, do repress them which flatter themselves in the profession of their faith, and make no reckoning to live justly and godly.

Very well did Augustine, in his fourth book of baptism against the Donatists, write, that An infidel disputeth against the faith, but an ill Christian liveth against the faith. Seeing therefore either of them is against faith, neither of them can be saved by faith. Against the infidels, Christ said; Unless a man be born anew of water and the holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. And on the other part, against the ungodly Christians this is to be alleged; that Unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Wherefore, even as the infidels have not wherewith to delight themselves in moral virtues: no more can those, that be baptized (if they live ill) promise unto themselves everlasting felicity; especially, if they be infected with those heinous crimes, which the apostle reckoneth up:

seeing how can they with these crimes be in the kingdom of God? For God governeth his kingdom by the word and the spirit: but these men do these things, neither by the word, nor yet by the spirit; but rather by the flesh and suggestions of the devil.

8. Our Savior, in the 22nd of Matthew, Mark the twelfth, and Luke the tenth chapters, rehearseth the sum of the commandments on this wise; Love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. And whereas he named the mind among the rest (which word is not in the Hebrew) that he did in his own right. For seeing he was the law-maker, it was lawful for him to expound the same. Augustine, in his fourth book, and sixth chapter, *De origin animae*, showed; that [here] the heart ought not to be taken for that little member of the body, which lieth hidden under the ribs: but he will have it understood to be that power of the mind, out of which the cogitations do arise. And in very deed; even as the heart is never at rest: so the mind doth never cease from cogitations. Moreover, there be others, that expound the heart to be the desiring power of the soul; and therefore they say, that Christ added The mind. It liketh others to say, that the heart containeth the whole desire; the soul, the angry part; the mind, the knowing part; and finally, that under the name of powers or strengths, it comprehendeth all the other faculties of the mind. Or else it is added for the more vehement expressing of all those things, which were mentioned before; namely, that God must not be loved for an outward fashion sake, but with the whole endeavor. Wherefore, Barnard saith; that The manner how to love God, is to love him without measure. And Augustine, in his first book, chapter 22. *De doctrina christiana*, wrote: When it is said; With all the heart, there is now no part left unto us, which may attend or give place to other desires. And those

things, which we have a mind unto, must of necessity have relation to that, wherein the force of our love consisteth: that is, unto God. If the words of the law, and of David were examined with a right judgment, the works of supererogation would quite be overthrown; and the reasons, alleged for our merits, convinced: seeing, what is there remaining unto us, that is not bound unto God? For if we do well, we do but that which we ought to do.

9. Paul disputing of brotherly charity; Be you (saith he) affectioned to love one another with brotherly love. In Greek it is τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι: in which words is declared, what manner of affect love is; namely, a brotherly affect. And it is called στοργή, which word signifieth an affect not coming of election: such as are friendships, which men enter into one with another, but grafted in by nature; and therefore so joined to our minds, that in a manner it can never utterly be shaken off. And forsomuch as of these natural affections, there are sundry sorts or kinds (for either they are between the parents and the children, or between the husband and wife, or else between brethren) the apostle expresseth that kind, which most agreed with his exhortation, which he had begun; namely, to give us to understand, that our love towards others ought to be a brotherly love. Which therefore is more vehement than common friendships; for that these friendships are dissolved, even between honest men; when they perceive that their friends are fallen away from justice, and are become wicked and corrupt. But as touching our parents, brethren, and children, it is undoubtedly a grief unto us, to see them behave themselves otherwise than we would they should: yet is not therefore the affection of our mind towards them extinguished. Besides, in these near friendships, we expect not, that in loving, one should recompense another with mutual benefits. For we love our children and brethren, of our own accord;

although they have not bound us unto them by any benefit of theirs towards us. And forsomuch as these things ought to be observed in Christian love, therefore Paul calleth it στοργή; although it come not of nature, but of the spirit of God, and of grace.

And how much the consideration of brotherhood is of force to stir up love between Christian men, we are taught by the example of Moses. For the next day after he had slain the Egyptian, when he went to visit the Hebrews, and saw a certain Hebrew doing injury to another Hebrew (as saint Stephen reciteth the history) said unto them; Ye are brethren, why do ye on this sort injury one to another? The strength also of this affect, Joseph declareth. For he, when he meant upon the sudden to reconcile himself unto his brethren, of whom he had been sold to be a bond-man, said unto them; I am your brother Joseph. And so soon as he had spoken that, he could not refrain himself from tears. So great is the force of this friendship with the godly. Neither is the mutual love between Christians without just cause called a brotherly love; seeing Christ called his disciples, Brethren: and that at that time chiefly, when, after his resurrection, he was now endued with immortality. Aristotle, in his ninth book of Ethics, when he treateth of friendship; Among brethren (saith he) one and the self-same thing is distributed unto diverse. And therefore, forsomuch as they communicate among themselves, in one and the self-same thing; in good right, the one loveth the other. By that one and the self-same thing, wherein brethren do communicate, he meaneth the substance of the father and of the mother; whereof each have their part. The like consideration also is there between the faithful: for (as Peter saith) they be made partakers of the nature of God. So as they ought to love one another as brethren, which if they do not, they are worthily called ἄστοργοι, that is, without natural affections. Which vice,

as a sin most grievous, Paul, in the first chapter of the epistle to the Romans, attributed unto those, which fell away from the true worshipping of God; and were therefore delivered by him into a reprobate mind.

10. But as touching charity, we have decreed, that the same is a bountiful gift of the goodness of God, and is evermore joined unto true faith; whereby we are justified. Wherefore, none that is a Christian indeed, is utterly destitute thereof. But to increase and give it augmentation in us, if perhaps it become weak and faint, and out of courage; these helps we may use. First, let us diligently consider with our selves, and weigh the benefits that we have received of God by Christ. He gave his only begotten son for us, he delivered us from sin, from death, from hell, and from the devil; he adopted us for his children, and appointed us heirs of everlasting life: and he now feedeth us, nourisheth us, and (as a most merciful father) bestoweth all care and good will upon us. These things if we oftentimes repeat in our memory, they may effectually kindle our mind to love Christ, and God our creator. Also let us regard the dignity of our neighbor, who, how weak soever he be, and subject to vices, yet is he borne withal, and sustained by God, and endued with many benefits. He denieth him not the benefit of the sun, he sendeth his gracious rain upon him, he giveth him health and the riches of this world: neither taketh he his image from him, as he deserveth. What cause therefore may there be, why thou canst not abide him? Peradventure thou wilt say, that he is a wicked man.

I will ask of thee, whether thou do more detest and abhor sin, than God doth? Where undoubtedly thou canst not answer otherwise than it is; to wit, that God doth far go beyond thee, in detesting of sin and wickedness. And yet nevertheless, seeing thou seest that he doth not immediately revenge, but doth prolong the time of repentance, and defer the punishment; why

dost not thou imitate him, and amend thy neighbor with patience, as much as in thee lieth? But if peradventure he shall seem to be incurable, thou must take heed (as much as in thee lieth) that by the often restraining of his naughtiness, there come not much harm. We see that the most wild lions, being otherwise fierce and cruel beasts, are kept in iron chains, and close places, least they should do hurt; and that at the pleasure of their masters, who desire to behold in them both the workmanship of nature, and the strength of this kind of beasts. But wilt thou also (to do God service) keep thy neighbor in guard and custody, though he be evil, least he should hurt others; that the patience of God toward them may be seen and perceived?

But if thou wilt say, that he is become so wicked, as he cannot be staid from doing much harm; and that he must in any wise be cut off; then let public authority (I mean the magistrates) execute their office. For if we, being stirred up of our own lust, desire to revenge; we of our good cause shall make it evil. But if thou take in evil part the injuries and wrongs done unto thee, and therefore think that thou art moved upon just cause: put the person of another man upon thyself, and imagine, that those things, which be committed against thee, be done against other men; then thou shalt see, that the disquietness of thy mind will be the less, and by this alteration of persons, thou shalt perceive how greatly thou art infected with the love of thyself. Also, for the retaining of charity, it furthereth, to call very often to mind, that the whole law is fulfilled thereby. It helpeth forward also to repeat in our memory, how many and how great debts we ourselves are bound to perform. And hereof let us not be forgetful, that in departing from charity, we shall be nothing.

11. By these, and such other like means, there is a great help for the keeping and preserving of charity towards our neighbors; although the same

proceed from the mere liberality of God. Of this charity spake Paul in the twelfth chapter of the first to the Corinthians; And I will yet show you a more excellent way. It is all one, as if he had said: I see you are possessed with a certain desire to excel other, now will I show you the way; the same is charity, which (as concerning the word) hath affinity with favor and with love. From the which nevertheless it so differeth, as favor is the meaner and lesser affect, and love is the more vehement affect. But charity is appointed to be, where a certain knitting together, and near friendship happeneth between the parties. So as we call that charity, which is towards parents, towards the country, and towards kindred: which self thing is very correspondent to Christian love. For all we, which are believers, have one father, which is God; and one brother, the first begotten, which is Christ: wherefore we be knit together with a most near friendship. Now that we know what the word meaneth, there resteth, that we declare somewhat, although rudely, of the nature thereof. Aristotle, in his Ethics, taught many things concerning friendship: and in his Rhetoric's he entreated at large concerning the same. And in effect his judgment is, that to love a man, consisteth in this; namely, that when we wish well unto him, then we do well unto him; and that for himself, not for our own sake. Here doth human wisdom stay, but Christian godliness is lifted higher. For such a one both willeth well, and doth well unto his neighbor; and not for his own proper commodity, but for God and Christ his sake; because he knoweth that his neighbor is created by God the father, and is redeemed by the blood of Christ. Let charity then be thus defined; that It is a power inspired into our minds by the heavenly spirit, whereby we wish well unto our neighbors, and do good unto them, according to our power; and that for God and Christ his sake.

12. Augustine, in his 29th Epistle unto Jerome, saith; that This knowledge he hath of virtue, that it is charity, to love those things that ought to be beloved. And the same he saith is greater in some, but less in other some, and in some none at all. But the most perfect charity, whereunto nothing can be added, must not be ascribed unto any, while we live in this world. And he addeth, that there may be somewhat added thereto while we live here, because somewhat is wanting thereunto, which doth testify both the fault and imperfection thereof; and thereby it cometh to pass (as he saith,) that There is not a man that doth good, and sinneth not. And if we shall say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. And it is written of David; Enter not into judgment with thy servant. And we say all in the Lord's prayer; Forgive us our trespasses. It appeareth therefore, that this man of God ascribeth perfect charity to no man in this life; nay rather, there is somewhat ever to be added thereunto, so long as we live, which declareth both the corruption and imperfection thereof. The very same we may assure our selves to be in all the good works that we do. But it must be considered, that those things, which be spoken of Paul concerning charity, and the definition which we have brought, do pertain unto that charity, which we have towards our neighbor. And when he commendeth that love, he by an Antithesis condemneth hatred, factions, disagreements, and finally all sins, which are contrary unto the same. Upon good consideration he calleth the way thereof excellent; because thereby we ought to do well unto the wicked, though they be ungrateful and unwilling: in the amending of whom, godly men, for reward and good will, do suffer hatred and persecutions.

13. Now, as touching the degrees in charity, oftentimes the kindred of the flesh is the cause of loving our neighbor, and that according unto charity.

Paul saith unto Timothy; He that hath not a care of his own, and especially of his family, renounceth his faith, and is worse than an infidel: because, under pretense of religion, he liveth worse than infidels, who by the only guide of nature show benevolence towards their own kindred, and provide necessary things for them. So then, we must judge that the joining of flesh and kindred is given unto us by God, for to stir us up unto charity; not to have respect unto those things as our own, but as joined unto us by God. For otherwise, there is none that shall make a choice unto himself of parents, brothers, or country. We ought therefore to care for those things, which be given unto us by God; and not to spend our labor after our own pleasure, without making of choice. Not but that we ought to extend our good will and charity upon all men, whatsoever they be: but now we only speak of the degrees, and show of the ordinary and usual charity, where we ought to begin; unless some other occasion draw us to that, which is more needful.

14. Howbeit, seeing Paul seemeth to be moved with a desire and good will towards the Jews, for the zeal that they had without knowledge; there ariseth a question, whether any sins may so please us, as of them we should take a delight; or that therefore should be engendered any good will? We must put a difference between sins. For there are certain gross and immeasurable sins, which all men understand to be sins. And there be other sins, which although they be condemned before God, and are sins in very deed, for that they be committed by men not regenerate, who be as yet evil trees, neither direct they their works unto God, as they ought to do; yet are they morally good. Wherefore, if we mean of gross sins, and speak of sins properly and truly, as they are of their own nature; then none that is godly will delight in this kind of sin. For if a man love God with all his heart, it is

necessary that he refrain and detest all sins, which are manifestly repugnant unto the will of God, and unto his law. But accidentally, or indirectly, it is possible that some pleasure may be taken in them.

As if we be now set at liberty, the more and more grievous acts they be, which we have committed, the more shall we rejoice. And if a man have been before time proud, and arrogant, and after some fall, being repentant, do behave himself more modestly; he will somewhat rejoice, by reason of his sin. Which also happeneth, if after faults be committed, good laws be made, and an order appointed, that such faults be not afterward committed. For we rejoice, that such an occasion was offered. And because that (as Paul saith) Where sin hath abounded, grace also hath more abounded, and unto them that love God, all things work to good: we will grant, that by a phrase of speech, (although not proper, but by accidents) the godly may sometime take pleasure of sins. But in speaking of moral works, which are done by them that are not regenerate; if we look perfectly into them, we cannot but rejoice in them. For even as it is a pleasure, and that not small, to behold the virtues of herbs, the properties of living creatures, of precious stones, and of the stars: so also it is a delight to see the acts of notable men, which acts God would have to be in the nature of man, for the preservation of Common-wealths, and of civil discipline.

Who taketh not pleasure, when he readeth the honest life and virtuous acts of Socrates? Or when he weigheth with himself the notable acts done by Scipio Aphricanus? And also, when he seeth the things that be done in our time of notable men, that are even void of Christian religion? Yea, for so much as they have a certain show and countenance of sound virtues, the godly are so much delighted with them, as they are often times stirred up to pray earnestly for the salvation of those men: thus thinking with

themselves; If God vouchsafe to change these men, and to draw them unto Christ, they would be a great ornament and help unto the church: neither do they easily despair of their salvation. Even as a skillful husbandman, if perhaps he see a ground very rank with brakes and weeds, desireth to buy the same; thinking with himself, that if the naughty herbs were weeded out, and the brakes with a plough rooted up, fruits would plentifully grow thereon. And so also will he do, if he see wild vine trees, or wild olive trees spring in any place of their own accord: for he will thereby judge the ground to be meet both for vine trees, and for fat olive trees; if it might be well husbanded.

Also Christ our savior, when a young man had asked him, what he should do to attain to everlasting life: and he had answered him; Keep the commandments: and when the young man had replied, that he endeavored himself thereunto even from his youth, (which nevertheless was not true) Jesus for all that delighted in that endeavor of his, whatsoever it was, touching the inquiry of salvation, and of obeying the commandments of God, as much as in him lay. For this is the meaning of that, which Mark writeth in the tenth chapter, that Christ loved him; to wit, that considering his present calamity, he was moved with mercy: for that he, laboring and going about to attain unto the righteousness of works, fell away from it. The same Lord also (when he had made answer that the greatest commandment is To love God with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our strength; and that the next commandment is, To love our neighbor as ourselves: and that a certain Scribe had commended the answer of the Lord) the Lord said; Thou art not far from the kingdom of heaven, although he yet believed not, neither was he justified by Christ. But the Lord would declare, that this his assent to the truth, resembled some show of duty and godliness.

Wherefore, in such works, as morally be called good, the mind of the godly sort is delighted; although it be also grieved, that those works be not done as they ought to be. And as touching the saying of the apostle, we must not gather, that he of sin, that is, of zeal, without true knowledge conceived a love and good will towards the Jews. For he reasoneth not from the cause; nay rather, by the effect he declareth his love towards them; namely, in that he not only prayeth for the salvation of them, but also for that he aggravateth not the crime, which they were guilty of, but rather excuseth it, so far as the matter will permit. It should be a false argument *A non causa ut causa* (that is, taking that for the cause, which is not the cause) if a man would hereby prove, that Paul was delighted in the sins of the Jews. But if a man will needs contend, that this argument is taken from the cause; we will say, that εὐδοκία, which in English is Heart's desire, is in this place an affect, which pertaineth unto mercy. And so Paul had compassion of the Jews, because he saw them so miserably deceived.

**Of Salutations.**

15. That, which in the scriptures is commanded of forbidding salutations one towards another, seem to be a very hard and unusual thing; forsomuch as a salutation is nothing else, but a lucky and happy praying, and it is not the least work of charity towards our neighbors. Among the Hebrews it is expressed in the word *Beraca*, which is (as they commonly call it) a benediction, or a good and gladsome praying: and of the Greeks it is called εὐλογία. Further, to salute again, cometh of a grateful mind, and belongeth unto exchanging or recompensing justice. For it is meet and good right, that we should in like manner wish good things to them, which have first wished well to us. And there is no doubt, but that mutual salutations do very much further unto the joining together of minds. Which conjunctions, how

necessary and profitable they be in a Christian Common-wealth, and in the church of Christ, all men do know. Augustine, in his 42nd sermon *De sanctis*; If any do not salute a man, whom he meeteth, or use not salutations again unto him that hath saluted him, he shall not be taken of the traveler for a man, but for a stock, a stone; or for Mercury, who standing by the way, directeth the journey, and speaketh not a word.

Neither can mutual salutation be justly forbidden; seeing we are bound thereunto by commandment. For it is commanded, that we should pray, not only for our friends, but also for those, which be adversaries unto us: so as we must wish good and prosperous things unto them also. Whereupon Christ, in the fifth of Matthew, saith; If you will only salute those, which salute you, what reward shall ye have? Do not the Publicans and sinners the same? Neither are these kinds of salutations unprofitable; but if they be done by faith, they be acceptable unto God, and are by him graciously and gently heard. The old fathers, when they were departing out of this life, spake salutations or comfortable words unto their friends, to the great benefit of them: as Moses did unto the Israelites, Jacob unto his children, and Isaac unto his. And in that kind of salutations, many mysteries are opened by the holy Ghost. Christ also commanded his apostles, that they should salute the household, whereunto they did come: as it is written in the tenth of Matthew. The manner of the salutation is set forth; namely, that they should say; Peace be unto this house. And that, which Christ gave in commandment, he expressed by example: for he saluted the apostles, saying; Peace be with you. And when he was risen from the dead, he said unto the women, which returned from the sepulcher; All hail.

It seemeth also, that among the apostles, there was a custom, that at their meeting and departing they saluted one another, and their master also.

Wherefore, Judas that betrayed Christ, when he came unto him, he said; Hail master, and gave him a kiss, which was a sign of a lucky prayer. Yea moreover, Paul, in the writing of his epistles, did put salutations, as well to the beginning as ending of them: and he commanded the Corinthians, that they should salute one another with a holy kiss. And in the Church the manner was, that when the holy supper was ministered, the brethren should one kiss another. The which custom is deformed in Popery; and in the stead of that kiss, they carry about signs and little images to be kissed. The angels likewise have sometimes saluted godly men: as Gabriel did Marie, saying; χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη, that is, All hail thou freely beloved. And the angel wished health unto Gideon, saying; The Lord be with thee. And the mother of Samson heard a salutation that came from the angel. Howbeit, we read not, that God did salute any man; seeing it is the property of him to give health, and not to pray for the same: because, in that he is the highest nature, to make prayers do not belong unto him.

16. And salutations were common, and in estimation not only among the Hebrews, but also among the Ethnics. For the Romans counted it a great honor to be saluted: and salutations were numbered among the principal duties. Wherefore, to such as used to salute, there was a certain daily alms distributed, either of money, or else of meat. And the noble personages of that Common-wealth, built porches before their gates, where the saluters should remain, and after a sort be harbored; in the morning, before they were licensed to come unto them. The forms of saluting were of diverse sorts. [Among the Grecians] χαίρειν, εὖ πράττειν, ἔρρωσο. Among the Hebrews, *Schalom*; and such like. Yea and the men in old time, did say likewise that their gods ought to be saluted. Wherefore one saith in a Comedy of Terence; From hence I will depart home to salute the gods. And

there be some, which think, that in the same, and such like forms of speech, to salute, is to worship. Which me thinketh is not rightly said, seeing the very proper signification therein may be retained: for so much as it is lawful to wish well unto God; not as though he hath need of anything, but we may pray that his glory, majesty, name, and dominion, may always be famous and spread abroad: as Christ taught in the former petitions of his prayer.

Emperors also, and kings, are said to be saluted; so soon as these honors and dignities be given unto them. For armies were wont to salute their captain by the name of Emperor, when he had well performed his affairs. And even in this point they depart not from the proper signification of the word; because, in the promoting of men unto high dignities, they prayed that God would prosper them well. Besides this, there be salutations of rejoicing; either for the victory gotten, or at the return of a man home into his country; or else for the attainment of goods or riches: wherein also nothing else is done, but a praying unto God, that these goods may have good success with them, whom we favor. So as the salutations, that be of those kinds, may not be condemned, but ought to be very well allowed; were it not, that superstition, which corrupteth all things, had not many times been mingled therewith. For the old Ethnics in their funerals, did salute the souls of them that were dead, speaking unto them their last farewell. Yea and they visited the ashes of dead men, their sepulchers, relics, and spoils, praying for the happiness of them that were dead. Whereupon Aeneas in Virgil said; All hail O blessed father mine, yet once again all hail. And from the Ethnics, those customs descended unto the Christians: for in the Popes church, they salute the souls of them that be departed, while they pray for their rest, and for delivering them from the

pains of purgatory. They make voyages also to salute saints; namely, Antony, James, Peter, Paul, and Marie.

17. Wherefore, let these superstitions be rejected: but in the meantime, let profitable and honest salutations continue, the which Elisha by his commandment did not take away. For that, which he commanded unto his servant Gehazi, must not be understood, as the words signify at the first view; seeing it is a figurative speech: even as all other speeches be, that seem to be against charity, as Augustine hath declared unto us. Surely, the mind of the prophet is more to be weighed than his words: for his meaning was nothing else (as D. Kimhi hath very well expressed) but that he should make hast, and find no delays by the way; and that he should bend his mind and cogitation only to that thing, whereunto he was sent, setting his heart upon nothing else, whether he were speaking or doing. In the self-same sense Christ, (as we have in the tenth of Luke) commanded his apostles, when he sent them about to preach, that they should salute none by the way; for he would not, that by their finding of talk and communication with other, their minds should have been drawn aside from preaching of the Gospel. Assuredly, the devil is not more busily occupied about anything, than in bringing in of lets and delays, when we are in hand with our vocation.

But we, on the contrary part, must set all things aside, to perform the vocation that is laid upon us. Which was not unknown unto the old Ethnics, who used to say unto the priest, while he was occupied about his service; Apply this thing. And Augustine, in the place above alleged, did declare the force of this speech, saying; that in these words was meant a strait charge to make hast. He addeth moreover a very witty exposition, but such, as doth not much serve unto the history: We (saith he unto the people) speak

salutations unto you, when we are preaching of the Gospel; because you can be saved by nothing else, but by the Gospel of the son of God. So that ye must be saluted with this kind of salutation, but not in the way, that is to say, incidentally or indirectly. Which thing they do, that preach not the truth from their heart; but for lucre sake, for honor, or else to bring some man into envy and hatred, not to win the hearers unto the Lord; as they did, of whom Paul admonished the Philippians. For they, that salute a traveler by the way, go not purposely to him; they go not home to his house to wish him well, but they do it incidentally and in the way. Indeed these words be true that Augustine declareth; but they belong not to the meaning, either of the prophet, or of Christ. Both the one and the other of them would have our mind to be wholly employed upon our vocation, not to be carried here and there with sundry cares; not to make any delays, and that the function committed unto us, should be performed with most fervent desire.

18. But if any be not satisfied with the figurative speech, there will be no discommodity, if he expound it according to the literal sense. For affirmative precepts, although they appertain unto charity, yet did they bind men to perform them: howbeit, in certain times and places, and with circumstances. For it is commanded us, that we should receive the sacraments: yet this must not be done always, and in every place, but at such time only, as we meet together in the holy assembly; and the same is to be distributed in such place, and after such sort, as Christ hath commanded. Also, there is a commandment for the distributing of alms, but yet not to be done towards all persons: since, who is he that will bestow alms upon them that be rich and wealthy? Neither must we give at all times: for surly, they that want themselves, cannot give unto others. Even so likewise, the precept of saluting may be deferred and suspended, when other weightier duties are

to be taken in hand. Neither also must salutations be used unto them, which be excommunicated; or unto those, which come unto us with infected and corrupted doctrine. For unto them (as John hath commanded) we may not say, God speed. And thus much of salutations.

# CHAP. XV. Whether the commandment of God be so set forth, that it may be kept in this life: moreover, of the use and abrogating of the law.

They, which affirm this position, are wont to vouch the place of Paul, in his second epistle to Timothy, where he saith, that he giveth thanks unto God, because he had served him from his forefathers with a pure conscience. Wherefore it seemeth, that there was nothing that lacked unto his obedience and service. Moreover, David pronounced, that he did confess God with his whole heart. Further, the divine history doth give a certain testimony to diverse of the kings, that they sought the Lord with their whole heart. But on the other side, we must understand, that God is not loved with all the heart, and with all the soul; unless the heart be altogether cleansed of all naughty cogitations. Then, let us consider in ourselves, whether our hearts he purged from naughty motions; and whether we have pure cogitations, while we live here in the flesh. Wherefore, so long as we be in this life, we must be fully persuaded, that we be not able to satisfy this commandment. For in the eighth chapter to the Romans, it is written; That which was impossible to the law, in as much as it was weak by reason of the flesh, God sending his own son, in the similitude of sinful flesh, &c. So as,

if we, being now regenerate, carry the flesh still with us, the law is weak, we fulfill it not; and yet the righteousness thereof is said to be fulfilled in us: because Christ hath brought to pass, that that, which was his, should be communicated with us. Also it was written to the Galatians, that The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, so as ye do not that which ye would.

But some cavil, saying; that The consideration is far otherwise, when we speak of the state of man in general, than it is when we entreat of one particular action only. Therefore they demand, whether we be able to perform any one act, as the law requireth? To these men I answer, that we must not only deny that fullness of justice universally to be in man, as touching all works, according to the state of this present life; but also, that their works are rebellious against the law, even in respect of private actions. Howbeit, I grant them to be good, so far forth as they have a certain obedience begun in them that be regenerate, whereas they be evil nevertheless; both in respect that they swerve from the rule of God's commandments, as also that they do proceed from the flesh. Neither is it absurd, that one and the same work is called both good and evil; since contradictories have no place, where there is a respect to diverse originals. But we pronounce, that the works of godly men be good, as they have their springing from the spirit of God: yet as they are derived from ourselves, we say, that they be unjust. Whereupon Isaiah, in the 64th chapter, saith; that All our righteousness is like unto vile rags. Neither doth he entreat there, of gross and manifest sins; but of those actions, which have the semblance of righteousness. And Jerome, treating of this place, saith; Those things that seem to be righteousness in us, are compared unto the cloth of a polluted woman. And this he speaketh very well, notwithstanding that he miss

afterward in other matters. Moreover, where it is said; Enter not into judgment with thy servant, according to thy righteousness: Again; Forgive us our trespasses, and such other like sayings, I understand to be spoken generally, and not particularly of those things only, which be manifest sins: but even of those actions, which be honest and good in appearance. For these, if they be examined by the rule of the law, will always be found short of the same.

Wherefore Augustine, in his tenth book of confessions; and 13th chapter; Woe (saith he) be unto man's life, though it seem laudable, if it should be judged when mercy were absent. Also *De spiritu & litera*, the last chapter, he wrote; that Those things cannot be beloved of us, which we know not. And again, that those things, which we love, are loved by us: but yet according to a measure of knowledge. So then it followeth, that seeing the knowledge of God, which we have in this life, is imperfect; he saith, that our love also towards him cannot be perfect. Nevertheless, when we shall behold him, as he is, in the everlasting habitation; there we shall perfectly love him. And (I pray you) saith Augustine, what shall we then do more, but love him with all our heart, and with all our soul? But now, seeing our knowledge is dull, our love also is the more imperfect: wherefore, while we live here, we do not love God so much as the law requireth. And they, which have profited in loving of God above others, do acknowledge how far they be from the way of true love. Howbeit, there is a certain measure of the love of God agreeable to this life; the which consisteth in the not following of our lusts, but that we should continually wrestle against them. He addeth moreover, that it cannot be denied, but that (if God will) he can bring this to pass; and that he may give such plenty of his grace and spirit, as all vice may be removed. But this he never did, nor yet promised that he

would do it: because, if it be lawful for him to give this unto the saints, in the everlasting habitation; he might also (if it pleased him) have granted it in this life. And they seem not to teach aright, which in God deny his power to be distinguished from his will: for Christ saith; Could not I require my father, and he would give me more than twelve legions of angels?

2. This reason of Augustine might in very deed suffice: but I have yet more sure and more perfect confirmations. For Paul, in the seventh chapter to the Romans, doth plainly declare, what was in himself, as well touching the flesh as the spirit. Albeit, I know there be some, which judge, that the apostle spake not there of himself, nor yet of them which be regenerate; but that in his own person he sustaineth the speeches of the ungodly. Of which mind Chrysostom was. Also Augustine, in his book of 83. questions, in the 66th question, was of the same mind, while he was yet somewhat young. But in his sixth book against Julian the Pelagian, the eleventh chapter, having weighed the thing better, he affirmed, that Paul spake of them which be regenerate. And in his book of retractations, the 23rd chapter, he corrected his first opinion. Ambrose, in his book *De paradiso*, and also in his book *De sacramento*, as it is cited by Augustine, referred those sayings of Paul unto the godly, and to them that be already regenerate. The which also, Hilarius, and Gregorius Nazianzen do. And undoubtedly, the place being so understood, doth bring great consolation unto the godly. For, although they belong to Christ; yet they find themselves to be exceedingly troubled with ill motions and affections: with the which temptations they being exercised, might easily think, that they pertain not to the elect. For further proof also, the same apostle writeth unto the Galatians; that The spirit fighteth against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit, that ye

cannot do those things, which ye would do. In which place, without question, he speaketh of the regenerate.

That those things also, which in the place now alleged; namely, in the seventh chapter to the Romans, are to be referred unto the godly, it is hereby proved; in that he saith, his mind is delighted in the law of God. Which is not agreeable with them that be not regenerate, who account not the law of God for any pleasant thing unto them; whereas unto the godly it is more pleasant than honey, and more deer than gold and precious stones. And he addeth these words; namely, Of the inward man. And no man is ignorant, but that the inward man is attributed unto the godly, so far forth as they be regenerate. But in them which be not regenerate, there is no mention at all, either of the new or inward man. Besides, Paul crieth out in that place; O unhappy man that I am! The which cannot be ascribed unto them, that be not born anew: for they do not therefore think themselves unhappy, because they be drawn back from the law of God. He added also; Who shall deliver me? Where the pronoun of the first person hath an effectual emphasis, and proveth not a little, that he writeth of his own self. And in the same chapter, he saith; To will is ready with me, but I find no means to perform that which I would. Here would I have it answered, how unto those that are not regenerate, a will to do good can be present? There is no doubt, but that God doth grant unto the justified to will well. Afterward he saith; I do the evil, which I hate, and not the good, which I would. But, to hate evil, and to will good, belongeth to none other, but to the regenerate. He addeth also; I serve the law of God in my mind. Then must it needs be, that he speaketh of himself regenerate; otherwise it had not been lawful for him to have pronounced these things of himself. In the end he saith; that He was drawn captive into the law of sin: when as the ungodly, and those that

be strangers from Christ, go willingly, and without resistance unto evils, from which they are not plucked away.

3. But it seemeth to be a let unto the exposition, which we have brought, when he saith; that He is carnal. Unto this we answer, that although we be born anew, yet is there very much of the flesh remaining in us. Wherefore the same apostle saith unto the Corinthians; I could not speak unto you, as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal. And he sometimes calleth them in a manner beastly, when nevertheless they were now regenerate. There were some, which judged, that the apostle spake there by a philosophical reason, wherein our mind is sundered into the power reasonable, and into the grosser powers; namely, into the power of concupiscence, and the power of anger; so as the apostle would place some uprightness, even in men not yet regenerate, as touching their mind, unto which the brutish desires be adversary and repugnant. And they endeavor to draw this opinion out of those words, wherein he saith; I serve the law in my mind: and he distinguisheth the law of the members, from the law of the mind. But certainly, Paul in that place dealeth not in philosophical reasons, neither doth he understand the mind absolutely: but he joineth regeneration with the same. For the regeneration of the believing man hath his first original from the mind, from whence it is derived unto all the parts of man. So as, if the grosser powers of the mind be not altogether regenerate, and be somewhat less renewed than the mind; yet are they somewhat mastered, and tamed by the spirit of Christ.

Howbeit, to make the matter more plain, let us respect the whole man, and let us admit him in some sort to be restored as touching all parts; and in some sort not: because our regeneration in this life is not absolute. Neither do I thus speak of these things, as though a man were to be divided in

sunder; as though in the one part he may be renewed, and in the other not (as Pighius hath fondly and impudently objected against us:) but I affirm, that the whole man, as touching all his parts, hath somewhat that is new, and somewhat that is not new. In like manner, as when wine is mingled with water, there is in every part thereof, both wine, and also water: even so, in the renewed man, there be found conditions and properties both of the new and old man. Aristotle, in his Ethics, taught, that the mind doth continually desire better things; but that the inferior powers, which men commonly call sensuality, do perpetually strive against the same. We easily grant, that the mind of them, which be not yet regenerate, is not so greatly corrupted; but that it retaineth still moral and civil knowledges, and certain desires that be honest in show. Howbeit, Paul speaketh not of this matter, but writeth of the law, which he calleth spiritual, good, and holy. The which in very deed was unknown unto the Philosophers: for Carnal men cannot attain thereunto.

Wherefore, let Aristotle speak what he list of civil matters, his disputation belongeth nothing unto Paul; in saying, that the mind desireth the best things. God pronounceth a sentence far differing from him, and testifieth; that The imagination of man's heart is wicked, even from his childhood. In which place, the Latin interpreter would somewhat mollify the proposition uttered by God; saying, that Mans imagination is prone unto evil. Nay rather, it is to be proved, that the very mind and reason itself is corrupted, where there is no regeneration. In the second chapter to the Ephesians, the apostle wrote; that We also had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, in fulfilling the will of the flesh, and of the reason. So he affirmeth, that not only the flesh, but also the reason was corrupted. And in the fourth chapter of the same epistle, he saith; that The wicked do walk in the vanity of their mind. And to the Colossians; Ye were sometimes aliens

from God, and as touching the mind, enemies unto him. And in the eighth to the Romans; The wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God. In the which words, φρόνημα, that is, Wisdom, must be referred to the mind, which is not renewed. The apostle therefore speaketh not philosophically, as many do cavil.

4. But let us return unto that seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans. There he saith; We know that the law is spiritual, whereas I am carnal. The law is called spiritual, as well because it is come from the spirit of God, as for that it chiefly belongeth unto the spirit; seeing it is not satisfied with the outward actions. But he calleth himself carnal; because, though he were born anew, yet being compared with the law of God, he was in part found to be carnal. Whereby we may gather, that the condition of carnal men is of two sorts. For some, of what estimation so ever they be, are nothing else but flesh, as being altogether void of Christ. And there be others, that notwithstanding they be renewed; yet for all that they have still very much of the flesh: and so as yet the Corinthians were by Paul called carnal. Albeit some man will say, that the Corinthians were not born anew; because, there were both sects and grievous sins among them. But we must answer, that even regenerate persons behave not themselves all after a sort. For some of them undoubtedly are stirred up by naughty desires, the which they do manfully resist; so as they fall not into foul offenses. And there be others, which indeed fall miserably into sins; but yet, after a sort, they wrestle against them, although they yield to temptations. For the apostles were regenerate, and yet nevertheless ambitiously jarred among themselves, who should be the greatest in the kingdom of Christ: insomuch as two of them foolishly coveted to sit in the kingdom of the Lord the one at the right hand and the other at the left. And it is well known, that Peter denied Christ; and

David became an adulterer. These men were regenerate, when they committed these grievous sins; but seeing they pertained to the elect, they were restored by repentance.

Furthermore, whereas Paul saith, that he was sold under sin; he declareth, that he had the old man still in him. Where we must know that as well those, which be renewed; as those which be not renewed, are sold under sin: although there be a great difference in the manner thereof. Insomuch as they that be not renewed, do even willingly and of their own accord, lie down unto sin. But the renewed, so long as they live here, do sometimes wrestle; but being overcome, they commit grievous sins: neither is the foam or corruption (which is naughty lust) taken from them, but doth greatly trouble and molest them. Also there is a very great difference between serving of sin, in such sort as we suffer the same to reign in us: and on the other side, to be forced to endure some bondage thereof, when as we can neither will nor choose, but have the same in the secret places of our soul. Wherefore Paul in his latter epistle to Timothy, writing of the wicked, saith, that Satan holdeth them captive at his own pleasure; which cannot be seemly for the elect. Wherefore the justified persons may wrestle against sin, but they cannot utterly be rid of the same.

5. That which I do (saith he) I know not. This doubtless he spake, not as though he were altogether ignorant what he should do, but he used knowing instead of allowing. So the sense is; Those things, which be done by me, in that I am not yet regenerate, I do not allow. And thereby we gather, that by reason of the remnant of corruption, or sin original, we be not masters of our own actions, affections, and inclinations. Wherefore Ambrose, upon the Gospel of Luke, wrote truly; that Our heart is not in our own power. For oftentimes, when we pray, we are desirous to be attentive; but sundry and

manifold cogitations enter into our mind, and drawing it to and fro, do violently pluck the same away, whether we will or no. And he saith, that It is hard to bridle such motions; but to take them away, it is a thing impossible. This saying of Ambrose, Augustine upon a time recited. But I return to Paul, who addeth, that he doth not the good which he would, but the evil which he hateth. Whereby we may perceive, that the forces of the mind, which stir us up against the commandments of God, can of themselves be called neither good nor evil, but so far forth as they be compared to the law of God. So then, being repugnant unto the same, they be evil; but agreeing thereunto, they be called good.

Neither must they be harkened unto, which neglect the first motions of the mind; and think that there must no heed be given unto them. But against these men we must reason on this wise; The motions, which be of this kind, we will appoint either to be good, or evil, or neither of both. Good they cannot be, seeing they are commanded by the scriptures to be mortified and kept under; which for things that be good is not convenient. For good things must neither be kept under, nor mortified; but rather quickened and stirred up. And again, we must not affirm them to be neuters; because the law of God doth not suffer that. For no part of the mind, neither action nor motion, is left as neuter or free unto us: seeing we be commanded to love God with all our heart, with all our mind, and with all our strength; so then they shall be reckoned among sins and evil things. Seeing therefore Paul saith, that he doth that, which he would not; it is gathered, that he indeed did not satisfy even himself: much less than the law of God.

And every man easily judgeth of his own self, that he performeth a great deal less than he ought to do; and that, if he do any good at any time, he doth not the same without striving and wrestling. Whereby it is declared,

that as yet there remain faculties in us, which be repugnant unto God. Whereupon he inferreth; Now is it not I that work that, but sin which dwelleth in me. And he saith that he doth not work; namely, in that he is new born. Who then worketh sin? Even sin itself, that is, the evil froth and naughtiness of corrupted nature. So as we will prove, that Paul doth not commit the sin, as touching all the parts of his mind: neither doth he wholly consent to that evil, which he committeth. And that, which is concluded touching sin, must be affirmed of the obedience and love of God. For in Paul, and other regenerate persons, there be yet some parts remaining, which do not love God. We love not then God with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our strength. And when he saith; that Sin dwelleth in him: he teacheth, that men, although they be godly, do with this corrupt mansion, omit many things which the law commandeth, and admit things which be contrary to the law.

6. It followeth; To will is ready with me, but I find no means to perform: that is; By regeneration I have a good will now put into me, the which of myself I had not. Here the Pelagians did exceedingly err, who taught, that we ourselves ought to begin, yet that it is God's part to prosper our determinations. But Paul, on the other side, showeth, that we of our selves are not apt once to think any good thing. And while he saith now; I find no means to perform, he agreeth very well to himself, who teacheth in his epistle unto the Philippians; that It is God which worketh in us, as well to will as to perform. Neither are the things, which he now writeth, against those words. For, to perform perfectly that, which the law commandeth, we find not in us: but after a sort we may perform it, and that not of ourselves, but we have it of God. And whereas to us that be regenerate, to will things that be right is present, that cometh likewise of God. Also, both good and

evil are ready with us: and in that good taketh place, we wrestle against sin; but in that evil is also therein, we be hindered from our right purpose. Such is our condition, while we are in this life. Wherefore Augustine, *De nuptijs, & concupiscentia*, the first book, and 29th chapter, saith; that Love is then performed, when the impediments be absent. For, when we are let, it can be no perfect thing, but a certain mixture contrived of contraries.

Moreover, he noted the apostles words, who saith (I find no means to perform it) and not simply To do it. For it is granted (as we have said) that we may do well in some respect. Augustine further addeth, that The commandment; Thou shalt not lust, cannot be fulfilled in this life. But hereof I have noted elsewhere. Howbeit, some man will demand; If the law cannot absolutely be performed, wherefore is it set forth unto us? Hereunto I answer, that we must not gather by the law, how much we be able to do, but how much we ought to do. Besides, there is no doubt, but that the law hath many ends. First, it showeth sin: for it is written; By the law cometh the knowledge of sin. And unto the Galatians it is written; The law entered in, because of transgressions, namely, to make them manifest. And to the Romans; It entered in, that sin might the more abound. Over this; It is our schoolmaster unto Christ. And it is a preacher that showeth righteousness unto us, and exhorteth us thereunto: and also it showeth us most evidently, unto what mark we must level. So that it is not unprofitable, although it cannot be performed to the full.

Also there be some, which ask; Whether God have commanded things impossible to be done? Unto whom we must answer, that as touching them, which be not born anew, the commandments are impossible. But if the question be of persons regenerate, then, either we must understand a full observation of the law, the which (as we have said) none can perform: or

else we must understand an obedience only; in respect whereof we affirm, that the precepts of the law are possible to be kept. But I will return to Paul, who further wrote, in the place now alleged; I feel another law in my members. Whereby it is gathered, that if the law of the members strive against the law of the mind, Paul loved not God with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his strength. Whereupon, he crieth out; O unhappy man that I am, &c. As though through strange motions he was not only shaken, but in a manner overwhelmed by the law. And he concludeth; I serve the law, according to the inward man. And he showeth himself to be after a sort divided, as he that partly hath the spirit of God, and serveth him; and partly is carnal, and obeieth the flesh. By these things that I have already spoken, I think it now appeareth, that they, which be born anew, do not fulfill that great commandment. Besides this, there is none of us, unless he will too much flatter himself, which feeleth not some defect in his actions, though they do seem good. Which might not be, if we loved God with all our heart. When we shall come to the celestial habitation, then shall our works be actually perfect; because we shall love God with all our heart. Doubtless, not so much as he is to be beloved (for, seeing he is incomprehensible, our souls, which are within limit, are not capable of an infinite love:) but it shall be sufficient, if we will love him with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our strength.

While we are in this life, we cannot go beyond the condition of the apostle, who in the third chapter to the Philippians, saith; Not as though I had already attained unto it, or were already perfect. Neither is there any doubt, but he spake of himself being already regenerate. And seeing he denieth himself to be perfect, and saith, that he doth perpetually hie himself towards the mark; which of us can attribute unto himself a perfect

observation of the commandments of God? But I will follow (saith the apostle) if I may comprehend that, for whose sake I am comprehended of Christ Jesus. And to this hath Christ comprehended me, that I should run in his way, and evermore be going forward. And there is no cause for any man to cavil, that he talketh here of the resurrection. For that must be considered, which is added; to wit, that I might know Christ, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his afflictions, while I am made conformable unto his death. Neither did any man doubt, that he was not yet risen, seeing he was not dead: so as he speaketh there of the spiritual resurrection, which accompanieth the mortification of naughty affections and motions.

This if the godly had already attained unto upon the earth, surly they would not say; Enter not into judgment with thy servant: And; Who knoweth how often he sinneth? Cleanse me from my secret faults. If thou wilt mark what is done amiss, who shall abide it? And; No flesh shall be justified in thy sight. Moreover, it is very agreeable unto godliness, that both in all our actions and motions, we have need of the mediator, by whom all our defects, wherewith we are defiled, shall be forgiven. I do not allow of their interpretation, which say; that To love God with all the heart, with all the soul, &c. Is nothing else, but to love him above all things, in such sort as we prefer neither ourselves, nor anything else above him. For I weigh the words of God with deep consideration, wherein it is not said; Above all things: but, With all the heart, with all the soul, and with all the strength. For it may be, that some man loveth God above all things, and yet loveth him not altogether: but that in loving him he is drawn aside by many impediments, and is compelled to wrestle with his own flesh.

7. But wherein the love of God chiefly consisteth, we may by this means know; because as (men commonly say) He is said to be beloved, towards whom we both will well, and do well: and that verily, not for our own sakes, but for his sake. Howbeit, we cannot do good to God; seeing he is most perfect, and hath no need of other men's goodness. But then we love him, when we both desire and endeavor that his glory may be royally advanced. And this is it, that by his precept we ought to do, with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our strength. Wherein we never profit so much, but it behooveth us still to profit much more. Wherefore Paul wrote, that Our inward man is renewed daily. Where he plainly teacheth, that the relics of old Adam remain always in us, the which ought to be cleansed, that we may fully at the length be restored. I might also add that saying of Peter; Why do ye tempt God, by laying a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither we, nor our forefathers were able to bear? Assuredly, he taught us by those words, that the law cannot be borne, nor fulfilled, without transgressions. Neither must we allow of that, which some affirm; namely, that he meant this touching ceremonies. For although this be true, yet there followeth thereof a firm conclusion; that no more can the table of the ten commandments be abidden, and fulfilled without transgressions; since it is much easier to perform outward rites and ceremonies, than to fulfill the precepts of the ten commandments. But besides the reasons now alleged, there resteth for us to consider, after what sort Paul to the Corinthians describeth charity. There he writeth on this wise; Charity is not puffed up, it is not provoked to anger, it seeketh not her own, it suffereth all things, it believeth all things, it endureth all things, &c. Who is it that performeth all this? Verily no man. But forsomuch as I perceive, that these things, which I have spoken, are sufficient enough, to

prove that which I purposed at the beginning: now there remaineth, that we answer those things which are objected by our adversaries.

8. [ 1] They say, that Paul, in the latter epistle to Timothy, giveth thanks unto God; for because he had served him from his forefathers, and that with a pure conscience. Howbeit, these words trouble us not; seeing they were spoken by the apostle, to the end he might purge and defend himself. For other adversaries laid to his charge, that he had departed from the law, and had alienated himself from the God of Israel; and that therefore men should beware of the Jews, as of deceivers. But he made answer, that he worshipped the living God, and that even him, whom his forefathers had worshipped; and that in preaching of the son of God, as he did, he did not feignedly, or by fraud; but with a pure and faithful conscience. Neither can it be gathered hereby, that he boasted of a full and perfect observation of the commandments of the law. [ 2] Furthermore, it was objected; that David (as himself testifieth) confessed God with all his heart, and that he searched out the commandments of God, with his whole heart. Of which perfection also there was a testimony given to some kings in the holy history; namely, that they sought God with their whole heart.

9. We answer, that our works, if they be regarded as they be in their own nature, and of themselves, are of no such virtue, as they answer unto the law of God in all points. But if they be considered, as they be accepted of the heavenly father through his divine mercy, and by the means of Christ; it may be said that they are done with all the heart, with all the soul, and with all the strength. But thou wilt say; Doth God use a perverse judgment, so as he accepteth things otherwise than they be indeed? I affirm that iniquity is altogether removed from God: for our works, when we be once renewed, are not offered to God barely, as they be in their own nature; but jointly,

together with Christ. Wherefore, with them is joined the love and obedience of Christ, which was done with all the heart, with all the soul, and with all the strength. God esteemeth not things that be offered, better than they be indeed: and therefore, by the mediator is forgiven and amended whatsoever hath wanted in our actions. Neither is that feigned, which is alleged by me; seeing the scripture testifieth the same. For in the first epistle to the Corinthians, it is written of Christ, that He became our wisdom, our righteousness, our holiness, and redemption.

Besides this, we are said to love God with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our strength; because we bend ourselves thereto, and stand in hope that once it shall so be. And it cometh not seldom to pass, that a motion taketh name of that term, or end, whereunto it tendeth. Neither doth the scripture disagree with this manner of speaking. For it is said unto the Romans, that We are saved by hope; when nevertheless, we be as yet conversant in miseries and sins; and do hold salvation itself, not in deed, but in hope. It is written also unto the Ephesians, that God hath already quickened us together with Christ, and hath made us sit together with him on the right hand, in the celestial places: when as notwithstanding, we be here upon the earth. Yet we are declared to have this already, because by faith and hope we enjoy the same, as if we presently held it. Also Christ said; He that believeth in me, hath everlasting life: whereas yet his faithful people are both troubled with diseases, and they also die, as concerning their body. But they are truly said to have obtained everlasting life; because the same is already begun in them.

In like manner, the son of God said; Blessed are they that suffer persecution: and what blessedness is this? Certainly none other, but a beginning of the chief felicity. To the Romans also it is written; that We are

buried together with Christ in baptism: albeit, that our corrupt affections, and old man, be not removed from us as yet, much less buried or dead. Unto the Galatians the apostle saith; They that be of Christ, have crucified their flesh, with the desires of the same. And unto the Romans; Our old man is crucified, that the body of sin might be abolished. All these things verily are said, although that the remnants [of sin,] naughty lusts, and sin itself are not as yet utterly extinguished; because we possess these things as begun, though not brought to perfection. And things, which have their beginning, are described, as though they were already finished. Which Augustine also himself perceived, who in his second book *De peccatorum meritis & remission*, the 15th chapter, saith; that Some man is at some time counted to be perfect, because he hath profited in a great part.

9. Further, it is argued, that God testifieth by the prophesy of Ezekiel, that he would give us a heart of flesh, and a spirit, in such sort as he would write his law in our hearts, whereby we might walk in his commandments. Also in the 30th chapter of Deuteronomy; I will circumcise (saith he) the fore-skin of thy heart, that thou mayest love me, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, &c. I grant that these promises of God are extant, but those must be understood after such a manner, as I have before declared; namely, that our love is accepted by God, through Christ; that it is repaired and fulfilled by the perfection and obedience of Christ himself. Moreover, that which the Lord promised unto his, that hath he given them, partly in this life, and partly he will fulfill and perform the same in the life to come. Which is confirmed by another saying of Christ: for he pronounced them blessed, which be clean of heart; since they shall see God. Doth he wholly perform this promise in this life? No verily. For now we only know in part, by a glass, and in a dark saying; but in the everlasting habitation we shall see

him at the full, and as he is. While we be in this life, we hunger and thirst after righteousness; seeing we cannot as yet have the same perfect and absolute.

Also they say, that it maketh against us, which is written by Paul, that Love is the fulfilling of the law: And again; He that loveth his neighbor, hath fulfilled the law. Certainly these things be true: and there is no doubt, but that every faithful person fulfilleth the law, according to the measure of charity, which he hath. But yet we must remember in the meantime, that there is none in this life, that hath perfect and absolute charity. For if any man could attain thereunto, he could not profit any further. Howbeit, that this matter may the more evidently appear, let us consider the words of John; Herein (saith he) we know his love, for that he gave his life for us, and we ought to give our life for our brethren, even as he gave his. These words sufficiently declare, that no ordinary kind of love is required of us; but even the same, which bestoweth the life for other men; and the same not after any sort, but in such wise as Christ himself gave it. But there be none, which attain unto the charity of Christ; though the same (as the apostle saith) be required, and that by virtue of the law. For the bond doth arise thorough no other means, but by the law.

Neither is that place to the Galatians any other way to be expounded; namely, Bear you one an others burden, and so ye shall fulfill the law of Christ. For it is necessary to bear those things, even as we would ours to be borne, and that as Christ hath thoroughly borne them: but this none do perform. Hereunto also might that be said, which is brought before, touching Christ's love; the which may be joined to our love, and accepted by God, as though it had been fulfilled. It is also objected, that the same John writeth; that He which loveth God, keepeth his commandments. But

we must add, that so much shall the keeping of God's commandments be, as the love of God hath been: but seeing we have not that love perfect, therefore we keep not the commandments fully and perfectly. [ 4] Howbeit, after these things they add, that the same apostle affirmeth The commandments of God to be easy. But to this I answer: If they be set forth unto them, which be not yet born anew, they be impossible to be kept; much less easy. Again, if they be offered unto persons regenerate, they be not easily kept, according as they be set forth in the law: but they may be called easy, seeing the spirit of Christ is present with such, and doth communicate his righteousness with them. For by the same, the wants of our works are supplied: and while we be endued with the spirit, we obey willingly, and with a good courage. And by this means, the commandments of God be made both delectable, and easy to be kept: I mean, according to the portion of grace, which God doth bestow. In the self-same sense must the words of Christ be understood, wherein he saith; My yoke is pleasant, and my burden is light. But the commandments (as they be expressed in the law) do, through our weakness, rather bring malediction than pleasantness; unless they be performed of us, in such sort as they be described.

10. [ 5] Furthermore, that is brought against us, which Christ saith unto his apostles; When ye have done all these things, say with yourselves, that ye be unprofitable servants. But that must be understood of obedience begun: as I have said before. Wherefore Augustine, in his third book against the two epistles of the Pelagians, the eighth chapter wrote; that The perfection of saints must always be understood, according to the measure and capacity that they have in this life. [ 6] This moreover they urge, that the scriptures diverse times do call some men perfect. For Paul said; We speak wisdom among them that be perfect. And to the Philippians we read;

So many of you as be perfect, judge all one thing. Whereunto I say, that there is a certain measure of perfection, whereby the godly men do acknowledge their imperfection, and be not deceived therein. Which no less rightly than prudently Augustine taught in his third book against the two epistles of Pelagius; and in his first book, 7th chap. *De peccatorum meritis & remission*. Also they after a sort be called perfect, which do imitate the perfection of the Heavenly father, who sendeth rain upon the just and unjust, and maketh his sun to shine as well upon the good as the bad.

Others undoubtedly be called just, which aptly give ear unto spiritual things; of which sort the Corinthians as yet were not. The Hebrews indeed were such, as it is written in the sixth chapter. And this kind of imperfection it behooved the saints, not only to acknowledge and feel, but also to confess the same. But Jerome, in his first dialogue against the Pelagians, saith; that We be then just, when we confess ourselves to be sinners. And unto Cresiphon he also wrote; This only is a perfection in men, if they acknowledge themselves to be imperfect. [ 7] Barnard, in his 50th and 51st sermons upon the Canticles, wrote very elegantly of this matter: and so did Augustine, in his epistle unto Xystus, and in many other places. But the Pelagians, when they withstood Augustine (as we read in his book against their epistle the fifth chapter) said, that He did not put any difference between most wicked men and saints, but by comparison: because he affirmed, that just men be therefore saints, because they sin less than evil men. Hereunto that godly man answereth, that Wicked men and saints do differ one from another by faith, and not by works. For so much as the godly do believe in Christ, by whom, if they fall, they receive forgiveness of their sins, and are also lightened by his spirit and grace. But the wicked,

believing not in Christ, do altogether lie in their sins: whereof they neither repent, nor yet receive forgiveness of the same.

[ 8] The same father also, in his second book *De peccatorum meritis & remission*, the seventh chapter, objecteth against himself, that which is written in the 14th chapter of the Apocalypse; namely, that The 144000 saints, which follow the lamb, were virgins, and defiled not themselves with women, and that in their mouths there was found no guile. He answereth to himself, that such were therefore unblameable, because they justly reproved themselves: and in their mouth there was no guile, because they did not profess themselves to be without sin. For if they had said that they had been without sin, they had been found in a lie. The same father goeth further, and in the 12th chapter of the same book, objecteth against himself a place out of Luke, where it is written, that Zechariah and Elizabeth were just before God, walking without reproof before him, in all the precepts and justifications of the Lord. By which words (he saith) there might appear to be a full observation of the law. But he answereth, that they had no more in them, than Paul had, who denied himself to be perfect. Indeed they were just before God, even as he said that he had served God from his forefathers, with a pure conscience; that is, with an unfeigned and undissembling heart.

But it is one thing, to do from the heart; and another thing, to do with all the heart. And they were said to walk in all the precepts of God, because they, being justified by faith, showed the fruit of faith, by living according to the law: which fruit nevertheless, while they lived in the flesh, they uttered not perfectly and absolutely. And whereas it is added, that they were without reproof, the same father (in his first book, and 48th chapter *De gratia Christi*, against Pelagius and Coelestinus) expoundeth the same to be

meant, as touching their honest and laudable conversation among men; the which no man could justly quarrel at as a crime. For there be some very grievous crimes, whereof the apostle saith; that They which commit such things, shall not possess the kingdom of heaven. And assuredly, the persons regenerate may beware of these sins. And it is said, that they were so without reproof before God; because God allowed them to be such, as before men they were accounted. Undoubtedly, the praise of this couple (man and wife) was very great; because they did not execute the traditions of men, but the works which were prescribed in the law. They being first therefore justified by faith, did then add honest and godly life, to be joined with the righteousness of Christ. Wherefore God vouchsafed to extol their works with these praises and commendations. And yet for all that, it cannot be proved, that they perfectly fulfilled the law of God.

[ 10] Augustine also expounded that saying, which Paul speaketh of himself; namely, I have fought a good fight, I have run my course, I have kept the faith, &c. The last fight (saith he) remained, for when he did write these words, he was not yet dead; but because he remained in hope of steadfast dying in the faith, therefore he wrote so boldly. He finished his course, howbeit not fully and perfectly, but in an obedience that was more than begun. Neither doth he write, that he sinned not; but if he had so written, yet would we have said, that the same had been done in respect of his hope. For that, which is certainly looked for, is reckoned as if it were done. And it is no doubt, but at that time he had need, as well as the rest of the apostles, to pray; according to the commandment of Christ; Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.

11. [ 11] Our adversaries also teach, that those impediments, which we have rehearsed; namely, corrupt affections, and naughty motions unto evil,

are no sins; unless there be added a consent thereunto: which opinion of theirs must be utterly repelled. True indeed it is, that Augustine, in defining of sin, declared the same to be a thing spoken, done, or lusted against the law of God: albeit, that is a doubtful definition. For if lusting be meant according to the consent of the will, only actual sins (as they term them) are comprehended therein: but original corruption, and naughty motions of the mind, are excluded from thence. Wherefore Peter Lombard, in his second book, distinction the 25th bringeth in this definition, what time as he steppeth from the treating of original sin, to treat of actual sins. Nevertheless, if by the word lusting, he comprehend both original sin, and also naughty motions; the definition will be general. But Ambrose saith; that Sin is a transgressing of the law, or a disobedience of the heavenly commandments. Howbeit, letting these things go, we must give ear unto the holy scriptures. It is written in the first epistle of John, the third chapter; ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστίν ἀνομία, that is, Sin is the transgression of the law.

The word ἀνομία (as all men know) is compounded of the privative particle ἄ, that hath a strength of depriving; and of νόμος, that signifieth Law: whereupon it followeth, that to be deprived of that righteousness, which the law doth require, is sin. But shall we stand in contention, whether our corrupt motions, and naughty passions do impugn the law of God? Certainly, Paul affirmeth, that they do strive against it, when he writeth; that He feeleth another law in the members, striving against the law of the mind: whereunto if it be repugnant, it is ἀνομία, that is, transgression of the law. Neither doth he otherwise judge, when he saith; It is not I that work that, but it is sin, which dwelleth in me. And we do not only deal now, as concerning those first motions of the lusting and wrathful faculty; but also of those motions of reason, which provoke unto sin. For it is said, that

φρόνημα, that is, The wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God. Undoubtedly, all these things be sin, and deface the image of God. Man is not made, to the intent he should be against the law of God; but that all the motions of his mind should be a spur to provoke him to godliness. Tertullian saith, that Herein consisteth God's image, even to have the motions of our minds and our wills all one with God. Yea and Paul himself taught this, in his epistle to the Philippians; Let the same mind be even in you, that was in Christ Jesus. Wherefore, seeing these evils deface and corrupt this state and condition of our mind, they cannot be otherwise called than sins.

12. But perhaps some will ask, that seeing Adam, at his creation, had no corrupt motions and affections: how it came to pass, that he so grievously fell. This is demanded, as though sin might not be committed by his own will. Assuredly, the angels did fall, who were without any such perturbations. Truth it is, that we are compelled more often and more vehemently unto sin, than Adam was: we having many naughty persuasions and provocations unto sin, the which he had not, till such time as he transgressed. But if it be so, that some of the fathers now and then do deny, that these motions (whereof we entreat) be sins, because they have no bond joined with them unto everlasting punishment, seeing Christ hath cancelled the same: yet can it not be denied by any man, but that the deformity, which was brought by them, remaineth in the mind. Further it is so written of them by way of comparison. For if so be that these evils be compared with actual sins, they do not so vehemently and so manifestly contend against the law of God. Also those fathers teach us, that these be not called sins; saving for that they be the causes and effects of sins: as when a man saith of his own writing; This is my hand; meaning that it was written with his own hand.

And men call the cold weather dull; because it maketh us dull. Such similitudes as these, Augustine was wont to use: but then he compared this kind of sin with actual sins.

Howbeit, it is better to hear the same father, when he examineth these sins by themselves. In the sixth book against Julian, the 8th chapter: It is not (saith he) no iniquity, when the superior parts do shamefully give place unto the inferior; and the inferior do shamefully wrestle against the superior, although they be not permitted to overcome. And in the fifth book, and third chapter, he saith; The concupiscence of the flesh, against which the good spirit doth strive, is sin; because therein is a disobedience against the dominion of reason. And it is the punishment of sin, because it is given as a reward to the deserts of our disobedience. Also it is the cause of sin, by reason of the fall of him that consenteth thereto. Wherefore he considereth of this concupiscence, according to three degrees. First, by the nature thereof, and that he affirmeth to be sin, because it impugneth the sovereignty of the mind. Secondly, as an effect and punishment laid upon sin. And lastly, as being the cause of sin. Besides, in his third book *De libero arbitrio*, the 18th chapter he writeth on this wise; These things be therefore reckoned among sins, because through them we depart from the form, wherein man was made at the beginning.

13. And to declare further, that these deformities appertain not unto sin, they allege for themselves the infancy of our savior Christ, whereof Luke doth write in the 2nd chapter of his Gospel; And Jesus increased and grew in years, in wisdom, and in favor with God and men. And a little before; And the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, and was filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was with him. If he profited daily (say they) it followeth, that first there were wants in him; and that he was not so wise at

the first, as he proved afterward. Some have expounded these things to be meant as concerning the spirit, which appeared daily more and more, whom they think to be most perfect at the first: yet that the scripture hath been accustomed to say, that anything is then done, when it first appeareth. Doubtless, I can readily condescend, and I see, that I ought so to do; namely, that Christ took upon him man's infirmities for our sakes. Neither do I doubt, but that his mind had access of wisdom, according to the proportion of age. But the defects in his infancy were not like unto our defects. For, as touching ignorance, we must not affirm every ignorance to be sin; since even the angels are ignorant of very many things: especially of the time when the latter day shall be. But shall we say, that this is a sin in them? Further, shall we think, that Adam did straightway know all things? No certainly.

Wherefore we call blindness of the mind, the ignorance that belongeth unto sin; through the which blindness, those things be unknown which ought to be known; and whereby things contrary unto the truth are perceived. Aristotle, in *Posterioribus analyticis*, distinguisheth ignorance, calling one an ignorance of denying, another of contrary disposition. An example of the first is a rustical and husbandman, who is utterly ignorant of the mathematical sciences; because he never learned them. The other ignorance is ascribed unto him, which sometime applied his endeavor to the mathematicals, but perceived ill those things that were taught him: so as those things, which be true in them, he judgeth to be put contrary; and thinketh the line to be crooked, which is straight. Wherefore I might be lawful to say, that ignorance of denying is no sin; unless it be as touching men of ripe years, seeing they be ignorant of things which be necessary for obtaining of salvation. Therefore Christ, in taking of our infirmities, did not

receive sin into himself. By reason whereof, at his death, he felt natural motions, through which he trembled at death; but yet those perturbations proceeded of sound and perfect nature, not of evil and corrupt relics of nature. Now then the infirmities of Christ were far differing from our infirmities. And therefore it is written in the fourth chapter to the Hebrews; that The Lord was tempted in all things as we be. But the exception is added; Yet without sin. And whereas Paul saith; When I was a child, I spake as a child: it is meant, that one day, shall be voided all that, which before was imperfect, and we shall at the last come to eternal life, where all things shall be absolute. Briefly, it must be considered, that our naughty motions, though they be the first of all, are not only rude and imperfect things; but that they be also repugnant unto the law of God, as it is declared in the seventh chapter to the Romans. Where we must not hearken unto those men, which think such a thing to be there described by the apostle, as the Poets described of Medea, who said; I see the better, and I allow the better, but I follow the worser. For (as I taught a little before) the apostle did not there dispute, of civil honesty, but of the law of God, the which he called holy, just, and honest, whose equity the natural man doth not perceive.

14. [ 12] Also there is much ado made against us, because Christ said; Be ye perfect, as the heavenly father is perfect. Where nevertheless it seemeth absurd, that God's goodness, being infinite, should be commanded unto us. Hereunto I answer, that Christ is set forth, as a familiar example for us, the which we ought to follow as much as in us lieth. And think not, that of him, and of the heavenly father, all one consideration must be had thoroughly in all respects: for the soul of Christ, being a part of his humanity, was not immensible; seeing it was a creature: so as the love that came from thence, was limited, and not infinite. And therefore, in the loving of God, we are

bound to imitate him. Certainly, the heavenly father, although in his own nature he be infinite; yet the effects of his charity (I mean the good things, which he bestoweth upon us) are measured; because they shall not exceed the order of things created. Furthermore, I dispute not of this adverb Sicut, that is, As: whether it express an equality in quantity, or a likeness in quality. This I leave for other men to consider of.

[ 13] Yet further they press us, as if there might some work of man be found, that should please God thoroughly, seeing it is written in the second book of the kings: God pronounceth of Jehu, when he had rooted out the family of Ahab; Thou hast done that which is right, according to all that which I had in my heart. [ 14] To Abraham also it was said; Because thou hast done this thing, I will acknowledge that thou lovest me, &c. Touching Abraham, it might be lawful to say that, which we have before affirmed of them that be justified; namely, that his work was joined with the righteousness of Christ: and was well taken and accepted by God, seeing he already believed in Christ, and that was reputed to him unto righteousness. Wherefore, God would adorn him with excellent promises. But indeed, concerning Jehu, it is not so easy a thing to answer; because (to speak truly) he was not perfectly good. Neither do I think, that he was moved by a just zeal to extinguish the house of Ahab, and to destroy the worshippers of Baal. For the sincerity of faith can abide no idolatry with it. And there is no doubt of him, but that he kept still the service of Jeroboam, being one that worshipped the golden calves with Israel. But even as it was said unto Ahab, that by reason of his outward submission, and show of repentance, punishment should be mitigated: even so it is very likely, that those things, which were brought concerning Jehu, were pronounced to the same purpose also.

For certain things there be, that God vouchsafeth to grant, and by a certain testimony commendeth: not as though they can be good, in as much as they proceed of evil men; but that the knitting together of things, which he himself hath ordained, as touching a civil and natural conjunction, might be preserved. But if any man shall urge those words, wherein it is said, that Jehu did all things which God had in his heart; we will say, that the same must be referred unto the determination and decree of God, wherein he steadfastly minded to destroy the house of Ahab. Wherefore Jehu did that, which was God's will to be done. Even as Nebuchadnezzar, in destroying the children of Israel, fulfilled that which God had in his heart; although he were provoked to that destruction, through cruelty and ambition. Perhaps thou wilt say; I do not weigh the words alone, but I am specially moved, for that there was a reward given unto Jehu, as for a thing well done. Certainly, I will bring an example not unlike unto this, out of the prophet Ezekiel; who in the 29th chapter writeth of Nebuchadnezzar; The Lord saith, He with his host hath served me against the men of Tyre. Wherefore I will give him the land of Egypt for a reward. Neither is there any doubt, but that king fought against the people of Tyre, through ambition and greedy desire of enlarging his kingdom: yet nevertheless, God gave him the government of Egypt, which he had for his reward.

15. The things, which hitherto we have reasoned of, because they shall not seem to lie scattered and divided, we will comprehend into four principal points. [ 1] Whereof the first is, that the precept of loving God with all the heart, with all the soul, and with all the strength, is not kept so long as we live here. [ 2] The second, that we must not deny, but that God can indue any man with so much grace and strength, as he may be able to fulfill the commandments. For, seeing he granteth the same unto the saints in the

world to come; what should let him, but that he may grant it unto strangers in this life? But yet he hath not done this hitherto, neither appeareth it that he will do it. So as we are to talk and determine of this matter, according to common order and reason. [ 3] The third is, that they, which be born anew, may be affirmed to fulfill after some sort that commandment. [ 4] In the fourth, is set out the way to interpret the promises, which we read to be sometimes made concerning this matter. In the fifth and last is declared, that the first motions, which provoke a man to offend, are sins.

**Whether we ought by rewards, to be moved to the obedience of God.**

16. We must understand, that good and honest actions are of themselves sufficiently to be sought for: forsomuch as in this world nothing can happen more pleasant, than to obey God; and by a good conscience to be joined to him, in living uprightly, according to his commandments. Wherefore, admit we should obtain no other thing, yet a sufficient reward and gain should be rendered unto us, if we may have a quiet and peaceable conscience, and be inwardly filled with spiritual joy. But God (such is his goodness) would set forth unto us gifts and rewards. For he seeth the disposition and nature of man to be feeble and slow to all things that be good, wholesome, and honest; therefore he would stir up the same, by promising sundry and manifold rewards. Which kind of remedy we should not have needed, if we had continued perfect and absolute, as we were created. Who (I pray you) needeth with reward to be stirred up to drink, when he is thirsty; or to eat, when he is hungry? Surely no man. Wherefore, neither should there be any need, by reward, to stir up men unto righteousness, if they hungered and thirsted for it, as they ought to do.

A mother useth not to be enticed with rewards, to give suck, to feed, and to care for her own child, that it perish not. So as the promises of God are

therefore necessary unto men; because they, by reason of sin, have waxed cold from a vehement affection and zeal towards godly and holy works. We be altogether dull and sluggish unto the duties of godliness and righteousness: wherefore God, for his clemency sake, would use the spurs of promises. Which appeareth most manifestly in the law, where, almost for every commandment, are added both threatening's, and also promises. Seeing then holy men have oftentimes done this, seeing also the law of God hath done so, and that the same is found in the New Testament; we may conclude without doubt, that it is lawful. For then is that, which we do, to be allowed; when it agreeth with the example of God himself, and with the rule of the scriptures; or else, with the excellent acts of holy men.

17. But now must we see, whether he, which doth good works, and performeth that, which he is bound to do by the law of God, ought to be moved with hope of the reward; or whether he should rather have a regard only to goodness, righteousness, and God's pleasure. To answer to this question, I think that this must be the first ground; to wit, that a man is not only appointed to some certain end, when as God doth nothing rashly or by chance; but also he is appointed to many ends: which nevertheless are so joined together, that they do mutually serve and help one another by a certain order. First, we are created to set forth the glory of God; then, that by the sight and perfect knowledge of God, we should come to be happy; and that whilst we live here, we should live together among ourselves, in an acceptable fellowship to God. Soldiers do therefore bear weapons, and make wars, to defend honest and just causes; after the same manner doubtless, by which God hath commanded them to be defended by his laws: who moreover ought so to be encouraged to perform this thing, as although

they should have no other reward or gift to come unto them, yet ought they to take the enterprise in hand.

Furthermore, men use to fight for the defense of their country, wives, children, kinsfolk, and friends. And if so be that they, besides these things, look for just stipends, whereby they may honestly nourish both themselves, and theirs; no man will count that for a vice in them. For the apostle hath said in the first epistle to the Corinthians; Who goeth on warfare at his own cost? But now, to come more particularly unto things; when any man tempereth himself from any grievous and wicked act, he ought first to do that, to the intent he may obey the commandments of God, as it is meet: then, that thereby he may escape either eternal or civil punishments: moreover, that he may not offend the minds of the brethren, and pluck them back from an holy conversation, and pure life by his wicked example: and finally, that by his wickedness he provoke not the wrath of God, either against himself or his family, or against the people. Wherefore, it is manifest, that the end of our actions is not simple, but sundry and manifold.

18. And this, being thus finished and concluded, we must diligently take heed, that when many ends are set before us, we may prefer that before the rest, which by good right excelleth the rest. For, if it should be otherwise done, and that those things, which be hindermost, and of smaller importance, should be preferred before the better; we might justly be condemned for perverting the order of things. So as we must take heed, that we direct not God himself, or the worshipping of him, according unto our own commodity, or else unto any other ends. For then should that surely happen unto us, which Augustine doth so sore detest; to wit, that we should enjoy those things, which we ought to use; and on the other side, we should use those things, which we ought to enjoy: than which perverseness, in

human actions, no worse thing can be thought. Wherefore, when it is demanded, whether it be lawful in well doing to have respect unto the gain or reward; we cannot well deny, but that it is lawful: forsomuch as God himself hath promised a reward to them, which live godly. Neither did God that for any other cause, than by his gifts and allurements to stir up men to just, good, and holy works.

But although we do not unjustly, in having a regard to the reward offered us by God, when we are occupied in good works; yet this is diligently to be taken heed of, that we be not moved only because of the reward which is offered us. Neither is this sufficient: for if a man would say, that he would in doing good, both obtain the reward set forth, and by the same work obey God; he must take heed, that he attribute not the chiefest parts to the gift or reward; because always among the ends (as I have already said) as every one of them is more excellent by nature, so it ought to be preferred in the first place. And in this there needeth an excellent diligence, since it oftentimes happeneth, that we deceive ourselves; falsely supposing, that nothing is more excellent or deer unto our minds than God: from whom nevertheless we are by little and little withdrawn and plucked back, by reason of too much desire and delight of reward or gift. Wherefore, it afterward happeneth, that we come to great miseries thereby. For when God perceiveth, that we most esteem those things, which ought to be of lest estimation with us; he withdraweth them away, least they should more and more pluck us from him. And this happened many times to the Israelites, from whom God sometimes took away riches, liberty, and the promised land; to call them again to himself, whom they less esteemed, than their riches, possessions, yea than their idols. Wherefore, those things being marked and observed, which I have rehearsed; I doubt not, but that it is

lawful for godly men, after a sincere and earnest endeavor towards God, to do good for reward and gift.

19. Neither am I ignorant, that Barnard writeth in his little book of loving God, that charity by itself cannot be empty, although it behold no reward, &c. By which words he putteth us in mind of two things; both, that the works of charity, in themselves, have so much delectation, pleasure, and commodity, as may be sufficient for them which live well; although, for that their well doing, they should have no other reward given them of God. And that we, in loving of God, should look for no other reward but this; that he, according to his goodness, will unfeignedly give those things, which are to be given. And therefore, no man ought to be moved, chiefly with a desire of the reward. And he addeth, that he doth far prefer the love of the wife, towards her husband, before the love and obeisance, wherewith the children love the father. Forsomuch as the sons do so love the father, because they hope they shall be enriched of him by his inheritance. Wherefore, their love (as he thinketh) is not so pure. But the wife, if she be such a one, as she ought to be, wisheth good to her husband for his own sake, and for his own cause, although she hopeth or looketh to obtain no good at his hands.

Many have thought, that the opinion of this father ought to be allowed, and have gone about to make the same plain by a certain distinction, not so circumspectly invented by them, in my opinion. For they affirm, that we may measure God, or his nature, according to his worthiness; and that we may behold him, according to our own perfection and uprightness. Moreover, they say, that whatsoever we do, we must do it for his sake, in the first consideration; and not in respect that he is our chief goodness and felicity. And this they think that Barnard meant, by the words now recited. For they allege him, who after this manner writeth in another place; namely,

that he suspected all that love, wherewith we love anything besides God. Howbeit, these men do not mark, that by this distinction, which is found out, rather by the judgment of men, than by the verity of the scriptures, they are against the meaning of God. Since he said unto Abraham, as it is written in Genesis; I am thine exceeding great reward, walk therefore before me, and be perfect. Undoubtedly, by these words God offereth himself unto us, not imagined by himself, or plucked away from our commodities; but in respect that he is our reward.

Moreover, as I already said at the first, God would not adjoin promises, gifts, and rewards to his commandments in vain, or without effect; but most prudently and with consideration: did he this (I pray thee) that our eyes being shut, we should overskip them? I think not. Neither canst thou say, that they serve for the ruder sort, and such as be not yet singular and perfect. For I will demand straightway of thee, whether Abraham, Moses, David, the prophets, and apostles, were not so perfect, as either the nature of men in this life can be; or is required of us? If thou wilt say, they were imperfect; then can I not tell what excellency or perfection of men thou fainest to thyself. Undoubtedly, Paul setteth forth himself unto others, as a perfect man, in such sort as a man in this life may be perfect, when he wrote; Be ye perfect, as I am perfect. I speak not how the scripture, yea God himself pronounceth Moses to be most meek. He commendeth David also, that he was made according to his will and heart. Wherefore, if thou wilt grant, that these men were notable, excellent, and perfect men (as men may be in this world;) neither canst thou deny the promises and rewards offered to them of God. This without doubt followeth, that men of the more excellent sort, may in well living and doing lift up their eyes to the reward.

20. Howbeit, I think that Augustine hath very well opened all this matter, when he saith in his book of Confessions; He loveth thee not (speaking to God) which loveth anything besides thee that he loveth not for thy sake. By these words is gathered, that we may love gain and rewards for God's sake: seeing it is lawful to embrace the mean ends for the last and chief goodness sake. Neither are we forbidden, but that we may sometimes wish for meat, drink and cloth, and such things as are needful for this life. Yea and Christ hath commanded by express words, that we should ask them: and he hath promised them to those which seek for the kingdom of God, when he hath said; First seek the kingdom of God, and all things shall be ministered unto you. Wherefore it is true, that these things may be so hoped for, regarded, and received of God, as gifts and rewards; and not as the principal things. For they are also to be referred to a further end, according to Paul's most wholesome admonition, who hath written; Whether we eat, or whether we drink, or whether we do any other thing, let us do it to the glory of God. And finally, seeing God himself, his glory, good will, and favor, be the root and foundation of other promises, and of every reward; so often as we shall behold these other things, seeing they are comprehended in those former things, we must take heed, that we never separate them one from another; but in the latter, continually look upon those that are first. Whereby (as Augustine hath counseled,) we shall love nothing besides God, but that we love it for his sake. And this much of this question.

**Of the use and abrogating of the law.**

21. The mind of God must be reckoned the beginning of all laws: for whatsoever is accounted just and honest in any laws, that hath generally flowed from thence. So as we may say, that all laws are interpretations of the mind of God; whereby it cometh to pass, that the laws, which be not

just, ought not to be accounted laws. The knowledge, which we have by the law, as touching sin, is of two sorts. One is altogether weak, and without effect: whereby our minds be not terrified, nor yet our consciences dejected. As when we see drunkards otherwhile, which in the minds of their cups condemn the vice of drunkenness. Also the Poets, in their verses and miters, cunningly described vices; but yet they themselves did not refrain from them any whit more than others. And certainly, that knowledge of sin, which terrifieth, doth not always bring salvation. If it be without hope of remedy, it is pernicious. As it came to pass in Judas, Esau, and Cain; who having knowledge of their wickedness, fell into despair. But as touching the elect, there is a hope of obtaining salvation by Christ; the which hope, like a perpetual companion, is joined with the knowledge of sins.

If we shall by particulars reckon up the sins, which are known by the law; the first we account to be that, which is engendered in us by nature, which is called original sin; and it is the filth and corruption of all our whole nature. Of the which we be taught in the psalm; I was shapen in wickedness, and in sins my mother hath conceived me. Secondly, from the same do perpetually flow the motions and assaults, which the Grecians call ὁρμάς, and they resist the law of God. Concerning the which, Paul saith; that He felt another law in his members, resisting the law of the mind, and leading him away captive unto the law of sin. Then thirdly, cometh the consent of the will, and then sin is made more grievous. And as touching this, we do read; Let not sin reign in your mortal body. Moreover, there also followeth a custom, and by the bonds thereof we are more strictly held under the power of sin: so as it is in a manner impossible to put away the use, which hath now been brought in, seeing Jeremiah saith; An Ethiopian cannot change his skin. Lastly, the wicked are sometimes thrust down so

far, as they sin against the holy Ghost: the forgiveness of which crime is utterly denied, as Christ in the Gospel hath taught; and it was commanded unto Jeremiah, that he should not pray any longer for the people.

Also sin might be distinguished, into those things, which be devised, spoken, and done against the law of God. And of all these things the law hath instructed us. But sin in general, is to stray from the ordinance of the law. Even as archers, when they go from their mark, on which part so ever it happen; they swerve and do amiss. Wherefore, seeing man is made according to the image of God, to the intent he should in life and manners express his nature and property; whatsoever swerving there be from this, it is sin. But this benefit, to be accused and warned as touching our faults, hath no absolute commodity: seeing we be not able of ourselves to shun the things, whereof we be accused; or to perform those things, whereof we be warned. Therefore, we must be sure to have an eye unto Christ, unto whom we are led by the law.

And it is to be marked, that these things are chiefly written of the law by an antithesis, or contrary position unto faith; for being taken by itself, it is so far from giving righteousness and honor unto us, as it discloseth and maketh manifest what so ever we have shamefully committed. So as we draw from thence nothing but confusion: which happeneth not through default of the law, but through the corruption of our own mind; because the law lighteth upon it being corrupt and bent unto evil things. Insomuch as we be prone to do all things, that be against the law of God. For the law commandeth us to put our confidence in God; but we trust in our own selves. The law commandeth us to do service unto our neighbor; but we covet to have all men serve us. And seeing we run with a full swinge, into such like things as these be; therefore doth the law of God set itself as a

stop against a mighty stream, which by meeting therewith, swelleth and rageth the more. For as the saying is, We stick to that we are forbidden, and desire that which we are denied. Notwithstanding which things, it is an excellent benefit of God, (that is given unto us by the law) not to be ignorant of our selves.

22. And it must not be thought, that we be now void of that benefit, because we are said in the scriptures, to be delivered from the law by Christ: for that must not altogether be so taken. For there is two kinds of abrogating of the law. One, whereby we are not bound to perform those things that be commanded: as we see it come to pass as touching the judicial precepts and ceremonies. Which must not be understood as concerning the moral laws. Christ saith, that He came not to break the law, but rather to fulfill the same. And Paul saith: What then? Do we abolish the law by faith? God forbid. Nay rather, we establish the law. Another abrogating there is, whereby the law is hindered from accusing of us to condemnation: and after that sort the moral law also is meant to be abolished. But if we shall speak more directly, it is not the law that is abrogated, but the domination or power which followeth it: so that we may rather understand, that the sting is plucked out, than that the law itself is taken away. True indeed it is, which is written unto Timothy, that The law is not made against the righteous. For (as Augustine writeth *De spiritu & litera*;) Who can impose a law upon him, that of his own accord doth, and willingly executeth that which belongeth unto righteousness? Wherefore he thinketh, that just men do use a law towards others, whom they instruct; while they often repeat the same, and set it forth diligently for to move them to repentance.

And whereas the apostle might seem to have spoken things repugnant one to another (for on the one part he affirmeth, that the law is not set down against the righteous man; and on the other part he saith, that the same is good, so a man use it lawfully; howbeit, none useth it lawfully, but he that is just) Augustine reconcileth those things after this manner; namely, that he may have a good use of the law, who is not yet justified, but directeth himself to justification by the help thereof. And he endeavoreth to make the thing evident by two similitudes. It happeneth (saith he) that a man, setting forward to any place, is carried in a chariot; to which place he being come, forsaketh that wherein he was carried. Again, we appoint a schoolmaster for children which be ignorant; but when they shall be well instructed, we take them [from their teacher.] Even so (saith he) while a man is called from his sins, and goeth forward unto righteousness, the law is profitable unto him: but after he hath obtained righteousness, he is loosed from the same.

Howbeit, we must not deny, but that they also, which be converted unto Christ, are continually more and more instructed by the law. Besides this, much of the flesh remaineth, and a great deal of darkness is cast into our mind and senses, while we are here in this life. Wherefore the use of the law is not superfluous, no not as touching them that be justified. And seeing we be not wholly renewed, in that there remaineth some part of the old man, and offenses do creep upon us, both unawares, and against our wills: the law findeth matter as well to reprove us, as to accuse us; although, through the benefit of Christ, it cannot proceed to condemnation. Which certainly it would do, as much as therein lieth; unless we were already justified by faith.

23. Therefore in very good time doth Paul, in the 3rd chapter to the Romans, demand; Do we therefore through faith make the law of none

effect? God forbid. Yea rather we establish the law. Here he useth the figure *Occupatio*. For a man might have said; If the law bring not righteousness, why then did God give it? Why may we not then live loosely, and follow our lusts? Not so undoubtedly (saith Paul;) seeing the law is not abolished by faith, but rather confirmed. These men thought, that Paul had made void the law, seeing he abrogated the ceremonies. But in abrogating them, he used the liberty, which was granted him in the Gospel; and unto the law he did no injury. For God in very deed would not, that the old ceremonies should continue any longer. And yet notwithstanding, Paul lieth not, when he saith, that he in no case, by faith, maketh the law void. And they, which reason, that it is abolished, because ceremonies are made of none effect, do make a false argument of the accident. For, though the accidents of anything be taken away, yet it followeth not, that the thing itself is straightway abolished. But that is counted an accident unto the law, which hath not his force as touching all places, and all times, and all men.

And, that ceremonies are so, it is not to be doubted. For when the people were in captivity, the ceremonies were not observed. Wherefore the Israelites, being among the Chaldeans, said; that They could not sing a song in a strange land. And Daniel complained, that in that captivity, the people wanted both captain and sacrifice. Circumcision, all the while they were in the desert, was not observed. And they fought on the sabbath day, as we read in the book of the Macchabeis; which books if a man reject, we have again in the book of Joshua, that God commanded the Israelites to go about the city of Jericho, by the space of seven days: and to carry the Ark about with them, and to sound with trumpets. Which works could not be done [seven days together] save that the sabbath day must needs be one. But if a man demand; If these be accidents of the law, what was then the principal,

firm, and perfect thing in these ceremonies, that should always abide? To answer to every particular thing, would now require too long a time. Briefly, this I say; God would, that men should not forget him: and therefore, by certain outward signs he provided, that he might always be set before their eyes, and come into their thoughts; that by such means they might continually both worship him, and call upon him.

If they had looked upon their bodies, circumcision was before their eyes; if they beheld their garments, they had their fringes to consider; if they came to the table, then had they to consider of the choice of meats; if they entered into their houses, their thresholds and posts had the commandments of God written on them; if they had brought forth children, they were to remember that the first born should be redeemed, and that the child-wife was long time unclean; if they had turned themselves to their flocks or cattle, then were the first born to be offered unto God; if they had gone into the fields, the first fruits and tenths should be gathered and offered; if their fruits gathered should be laid up, then had they to celebrate the feast of the tabernacles. The revolutions of every week, of every month, of every year, or seven years, or fifty years, had certain rites appointed unto them. Wherefore, that which was the chiefest and principallest thing in the law, was confirmed by faith: and it is now also retained of godly men; namely, in everything to remember God, and to think upon him. Which now ought to be observed, without outward signs, neither is that now abrogated, either by Paul or by faith.

24. But that God would no longer have these outward ceremonies observed, may thereby be gathered, in that he hath overthrown the public-wealth of the Jews, and hath caused the city of Jerusalem clean to be defaced: so that now, there is neither temple nor tabernacle standing.

Neither is the propitiatory or mercy seat to be found, from whence the voice of God was wont to give oracles. And the breastplate is lost, wherein were the precious stones, out of which answer was given of things to come. The anointment also is clean gone; whereby he sometimes changed men, when they were consecrated to execute any functions. For Saul prophesied, when he was now anointed. Neither is fire now had from heaven, wherewith the sacrifices were consumed; and prophesies are now clean out of use. Which God would not have permitted, if his will had been, that the ceremonies of Moses should have continued any longer. And this chiefly is a let to the continuing of them; that it was lawful to exercise them nowhere, but only in the land promised to the fathers. And when the apostle affirmeth, that By faith he established the law: this is chiefly to be understood, as concerning the moral parts of the law; for faith bringeth with it the obedience of the law. Wherefore this we ought to fix in our minds, that without faith, the law cannot be observed. And contrariwise, that by faith, obedience begun, may be accomplished. Which also may by reasons be confirmed.

The law commandeth, that We should love God, and that with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our strength. But who is able to perform this, unless he know God thoroughly, the which cannot be done without faith? And if any man should set God before him, as a law-giver, as a most severe judge, and as a revenger; he will rather abhor him, and fly from him of hatred, as a most cruel manslayer, than that his mind can thereby be induced to love him. But who can without faith in Christ persuade himself, that God is unto him as a father, either merciful, or loving? Further, the law commandeth, that we should call upon him. Which without faith we can never perform: for it is said; How shall they call upon him, in whom they have not believed? Moreover, we are commanded To

love our neighbors as our selves. Which, forsomuch as it is most difficult to be done, we never accomplish the same: nay rather, we fail oftentimes therein. Whereby then shall we have forgiveness of sins, that of Christ's righteousness there may be imputed unto us, to supply the want of our righteousness, unless we use the benefit of faith?

Augustine judgeth, that the law is two manner of ways confirmed by faith. First, because we thereby obtain the holy Ghost, by means whereof is ministered unto us strength to obey the law. Howbeit, perhaps a man may doubt how this can be, that by faith we have the holy Ghost: when as of necessity, he always goeth before faith. For faith both is his gift, and also cometh from him unto us. But we answer, that between the causes and the effects, seem to be certain circuits; as it is manifest by clouds and showers. From clouds descend rains; and out of waters, which are in the inferior places, are taken up vapors by the heat of the heavens, which are thickened into clouds; out of which again descend showers upon the earth. But in this circuit we must always have a recourse to the first, according to the order of nature; which is, when we affirm, that there is an humor, whereof clouds may increase: so likewise must we do here. We will grant, that faith, by the benefit of the holy Ghost, springeth in us: by which faith is increased the abundance of the self-same spirit, whose increase the former faith hath prevented: and of a greater faith is still made a greater increase of the spirit. But yet nevertheless, we constantly affirm, that there is but one thing chiefly, from whence all these good things flow; to wit, the holy Ghost.

Secondly (saith Augustine) the law by the help of faith is otherwise confirmed: because by faith we pray; and calling upon God with prayers, we do not only obtain remission of sins, but also a great portion of the spirit and of grace, so that we have strength to obey the law. Doubtless, the law, if

it be taken by itself, maketh us both uncertain of the good will of God, and after a sort bringeth desperation; unless faith come and help: which both maketh us assured, that God is pacified and merciful towards us, and also by grace obtaineth the renewing of strength. And the apostles phrase, whereby he saith, that by faith he established the law, is to be noted. For thereby he signifieth, that the law, if it be left unto itself, and without faith, is weak: so that it cannot firmly stand. And therefore, unless it be holden up by faith, it will easily fall. And this is the point of a singular artificer, not only to repel from him that which is objected; but also to declare, that the self-same maketh most of all for his purpose. The law and faith help one another, and (as the common saying is) give hands each to other. For the law doth (as a schoolmaster) bring men unto the faith of Christ. And on the other side, faith bringeth this to pass; that it maketh them, after a sort, able to accomplish the law. For, straightway, so soon as a man believeth in Christ, he obtaineth justification, and is liberally endued with abundance of the spirit, and with grace. The intent and purpose of the law was, that man should both be made good, and also saved. But this, it was not able to perform. Then succeeded faith, and did help it: for through it a man is renewed; so that he is able to obey God and his commandments. Chrysostom saith, that Paul proveth here three things; first, that a man may be justified without the law; secondly, that the law cannot justify; thirdly, that faith and the law are not repugnant one to the other.

25. Ambrose teacheth, that therefore by faith is the law stablished; because that those things, which by the law are commanded to be done, are by faith declared to be done. And we know that this righteousness, which Paul here commendeth, hath testimonies both of the law and of the prophets. And if any man object, that therefore the law is made void by

faith; because thorough it ceremonies are abolished: he answereth, that this therefore so happeneth, because the law itself would have it so; and foreshowed, that it would so come to pass. In Daniel we read, that after the coming of Christ, and after the slaying of him, the daily sacrifices should be taken away, and so also should be the holy anointing, and such like kind of ceremonies. Wherefore Christ did not without cause say; The law and the prophets endured unto the time of John the Baptist. Jeremiah also manifestly said, that another covenant should be made, far differing from that which was made in old time. The epistle to the Hebrews thereby concludeth, that that, which was the old covenant, and so was called, should one day be abolished. Zechariah the prophet, in his second chapter, saith; that The city of Jerusalem should be inhabited without walls. Which signifieth, that the church of the believers should be so spread abroad, and dispersed through the whole world, that it should not be closed in by any bounds and limits.

Which self-same thing Isaiah seemeth to testify, when he saith; that Mount Zion, and the house of the Lord, should be on the top of the hills, so that the Gentiles should come unto it out of all places. And Malachi the prophet pronounceth, that The name of God should be called upon from the rising of the Sun, to the going down of the same; so that to God everywhere should be offered *Mincha*, which many have transferred unto the Eucharist; as though it were a sacrifice: when as yet the prophet thereby understandeth prayers, and the offering up even of ourselves, as Tertullian testifieth in his book against the Jews; and also Jerome, when he interpreteth that place. Wherefore, when the prophets seem to affirm, that ceremonies should be transferred unto the Ethnics; they are so to be understood, as though by the signs, they meant the things themselves. The Ethnics, being converted unto

Christ, received that which was represented by the ceremonies of the Hebrews. But they rejected the outward signs, and this was by faith to confirm the law. And forsomuch as the prophets foretold, that ceremonies should be abolished; the same is to be taken, as if it had been spoken of the law: since that the prophets were interpreters of the law.

And that Christ, when he should come, should change the ceremonies, the Jews themselves doubted not. Which is manifest, by the history of John Baptist, which we read in the Gospel. For when he would purge men, being converted unto God, he sent them not unto sacrifices, and unto the ceremonies of Moses, whereby sins were said to be purged; but baptized them into repentance, to the forgiveness of sins, adjoining doctrine thereunto, wherein he made mention of the father, the son, and the holy Ghost. Which doctrine undoubtedly the high Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees could in no case abide, that he rejecting the ceremonies, which were received, should put in their stead another kind of way. Wherefore, they sent a messenger to him, to ask him, whether he were the Messias, or Elias, or the prophet: as it were confessing, that under Messias, it would come to pass, that the ceremonies of the law should be altered, which should not be lawful for others to do.

26. And if thou demand why God gave ceremonies, which should be afterward abolished: Chrysostom hath thereof a proper similitude. If a man have a wife prone to lasciviousness, he shutteth her up in certain places (I mean in chambers or parlors) so that she may not wander abroad at her pleasure. He moreover appointeth for her, Eunuchs, waiting maids, and handmaids, to have a most diligent eye to her. So dealt God with the Jews, he took them to him at the beginning as a spouse: as it is said by the prophet; I have wedded thee unto me with mercy and with love. And by this

nation, his will was to instruct the whole world, at the time appointed. Which was done by the apostles, when Christ was departed from the earth.

But that people was weak and feeble, and above measure given to adultery and idolatry. Wherefore God separated them from other nations, and would have them to dwell in the land of Canaan apart by themselves; and to be kept in on every side with ceremonies and rites, as it were by school-masters, until this spouse was so strengthened and confirmed, that her faith was no more had in suspicion. Which when husbands perceive to be in their wives, they suffer them to go at their pleasure whither they will, and to be conversant with men; neither do they any longer set keepers to watch them: so God, when he had now by Christ given the holy Ghost unto the church, he removed from it the custody of ceremonies, and sent forth his faithful to preach over all the world. The self-same father proveth in another place, that the ceremonies and rites of the Jews were not instituted by God of set purpose and counsel. For God would have a people, that should worship him in spirit and in truth. But the Israelites, which had been conversant in Egypt, and had defiled themselves with idolatry, would needs in any wise have sacrifices and ceremonies: so as if these things had not been permitted them, they were ready to turn to idolatry.

Wherefore God so dealt with them, as the manner is of a wise Physician to do; who happening to come unto one sick of a burning fever, which for extreme heat requireth in any wise to have some cold water given him; and except it be given him, he is ready to run and hang himself, or by some other means to destroy himself. In this ill case, the Physician compelled by necessity, commandeth a vial of water to be brought, which he himself hath prepared, and giveth the sick man to drink: but yet, with such a charge, that he drink no drink else, but out of that vial. So God granted unto the

Hebrews, sacrifices and ceremonies: but yet so, as they should not exercise them otherwise than he himself had commanded them. And that this is true, he proveth; insomuch as God prescribed not ceremonies, until such time as he made manifest his wrath against the Israelites; when they, hurling in their bracelets, earrings, and rings, caused a golden calf to be made for themselves, which they worshipped. And seeing it is so, we must grant this with Paul, when he saith, that the law is not by faith abolished, although those ceremonies be taken away. Unto which doctrine Christ also agreeth, when he saith; that He came not to take away the law, but to fulfill it. The sense of which words may easily be gathered out of those things, which we have before spoken.

27. Moreover, let us consider, that in every ceremony of the old law, there were three things; the first, a commendation of any benefit received; secondly, a token and shadow of Christ; and lastly, a lesson of honesty, and of framing a godly life. As touching the paschal solemnity, these things are most manifest. First, therein was a memory of the deliverance out of Egypt, a shadow of Christ his death, whereby we, through grace, be delivered from eternal damnation. Finally, by the sweet bread, a pureness of life was laid before our eyes. And even the very like may be perceived in the rite of the first fruits, therein was a giving of thanks for receiving new fruits: and Christ was there signified to be the first fruits of the dead, and the first begotten among many brethren. And they were admonished, that the first fruits of their actions were so due unto God, as for his sake they should order all their affairs. And in every solemnity, through the death of the beast offered in sacrifice, by faith was apprehended the sacrifice of Christ: whereby they, believing in him, were justified. There was also in them a celebration of divine praises, a holy congregation, the administration of the

word of God, the communion of the faithful, and the confession of sins. Such exercises as these, are required to be in the whole life of Christians.

28. Therefore Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness, unto everyone that believeth. And Christ is said to be the end of the law, because he bringeth the perfection and absolution thereof. But we must note the property of this word τέλος, for it signifieth two things; namely, the extreme or uttermost part or limit of things. And by this means death is said to be the end of living creatures: not because we live, to the end we should die; for that which is the worse, cannot be the cause of the better. Moreover, it signifieth the perfection and absolution of anything, which is brought to the uttermost of his motion and bringing forth. Now, although as touching the first signification, Christ by his coming made an end of the law (for he took away the ceremonies and the curse thereof:) yet in that place Paul meaneth not, that Christ is in such manner the end of the law. But he hath a respect unto the other signification of this word; namely, unto perfection and absolution: forsomuch as Christ finished and perfected that, which the law could not perform. Which the better to understand, the scope and end of laws must be considered. Laws are made to make men good and just: for they set forth things that be right and honest; for no other cause, but that they should be put in practice. But among other laws, this that God made, chiefly requireth of men righteousness and holiness. But this it cannot bring to pass: certainly, not by default of itself, but by reason of our corruption.

Howbeit, that which it can do, it doth; namely, it urgeth us, it accuseth us, and it condemneth us: that at the least, we being overcharged with so great a burden, may think upon our deliverer, and by that means be converted unto Christ, by whom, as well we may be absolved from sins, as also by his spirit and grace be thoroughly able (as much as the condition of this life

will give leave) to obey his law given unto us. Which two things Christ most liberally giveth unto them that believe in him. And so is he called the end, that is, the consummation and perfection of the law. This did Paul in plain words express, when he said; That which was impossible unto the law, in as much as it was made weak through the flesh, God sending his own son in the similitude of the flesh of sin, by sin condemned sin, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.

Hereunto also had Ambrose a respect, who thus interpreteth this place: that Christ is called the end of the law, because God by him bringeth things to pass, which he had promised, and commanded. These words of the apostle teach, that the principal office of the law is, to direct us unto Christ: and therefore unto the Galatians it is called a school-master. So then, they are worthily to be reproved, which of a school-master make it a father; seeking for righteousness at the law, which ought only to be looked for at the hands of Christ. Let us therefore learn hereby, to consider two things in every precept of the law; namely, our sins, and Christ our redeemer, whom all the commandments do set forth: for otherwise we shall unprofitably consider of the law. And the Jews, for that they excluded Christ, boasted of the law in vain: as they which had not the law, but a shadow of the same.

29. But now let us see what testimonies there be out of the law and the prophets, of this righteousness, which Paul affirmeth was made manifest in Christ. And although Christ hath spoken generally, that Moses had written of him, and that it is showed by Luke, that in the habit of a stranger, while he was by the way, he talked with two disciples, beginning to teach them at Moses, and after, by the prophets and psalms: yet is there no certain place brought forth, in the which is express mention of Messias. Nevertheless, if we shall speak particularly of Christ, we read in Genesis, that The seed of

the woman should bruise in sunder the serpents head. And to Abraham it is said; In thy seed shall all nations be blessed. And of the same man it is written; Abraham believed, and that was imputed unto him unto righteousness. Hereunto is added that, which Paul saith; Say not in thy heart, Who ascendeth into heaven, or who shall descend into the depth? The word is near, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart. Paul addeth; And this is the word of faith, which we preach; if thou wilt believe with thy heart, and confess with thy mouth. Again, The scepter shall not be taken away from the tribe of Judah, neither a captain out of his loins, till he be come, which shall be sent, and he shall be the expectation of the Gentiles.

Jeremiah writeth of Christ, He shall be called God our righteousness. And in the same prophet we read, that God appointed to give a New Testament: not according to that, which he made with the fathers; but by writing his law in their hearts, and in their bowels. Abacuk saith; The just man shall live by faith. Isaiah saith; I am found of them that sought me not. Also, God hath laid upon him all our iniquities. David also saith; Blessed are they, whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man, unto whom the Lord hath not imputed sin. Also, another kind of testimonies is had out of the acts of the old fathers; which were certain foreshowing's, that Christ should come to redeem mankind. For, as he is said to live in us; for we be members of him: so also he both lived, and was in the old fathers: wherefore they were no less his members, than we are. But how the head suffereth, and is recreated in his members, it is most manifestly declared in Paul, when it was said; Saul, Saul, why persecute thou me? And in the last judgment, Christ will pronounce, that whatsoever hath been given unto the least of his, is given unto him.

Wherefore, so often as we read, that the ancient fathers were overcome, brought into captivity, and oppressed with calamities; we must understand, that Christ in them suffered the self-same things. And again, when we here that they got the victory, and were restored and delivered; let us think, that Christ also was in like sort affected in them. And in the one we have a show of his death begun; and in the other, a shadow and beginning of his resurrection. And that this is so, we are taught by that which Christ said; that He should be in the heart of the earth three days, and three nights, like as Jonah the prophet. He also likened himself unto the brazen serpent, which Moses set up, whereupon whosoever looked, obtained health, being otherwise in danger to die of the venomous stinging. And in the prophet Ose we read; Out of Egypt have I called my son. Which Oracle the Hebrews labor to wrest unto Pharaoh, which was destroyed; and unto the people of Israel delivered from his tyranny. Which if we should in the meantime grant, then yet would I ask of them; of whence that nation had the preeminence, to be called by the name of the children of God?

That undoubtedly could not be proved to come by any other means, than by Christ, which is the son of God, being the first begotten among many brethren. By whom others also, as many as are numbered to be the children of God, have aspired to such a divine adoption. So as the apostle saith, that Christ was the first fruits: and pronounced, that he hath the principality over all things. Wherefore, not without cause hath our Evangelist cited this place of the prophet, touching the Lord; forsomuch as he also was by the admonishment of the angel called back out of Egypt. Lastly, the sacrifices, oblations, and ceremonies of the fathers, bear witness of this kind of righteousness: seeing in those beasts, which were slain, the death of Christ was manifest to the faith of the old fathers. For, even as the thing sacrificed,

which otherwise had not offended at all, was slain for the sin of another, which escaped free: so was thereby showed, that Christ should be slain for us, which were guilty of death; that by pacifying of the heavenly father, we might escape the punishments, which we had deserved.

30. But some man will demand, by what reason it may appear unto us, that the death of Christ was shadowed in the sacrifices of the forefathers? I answer, that first God saith, that he granted blood unto the Jews, to the intent they should use the same at the altar for purging's by sacrifice; but not to eat the same: and he added a reason; namely, because blood is the life. So he would signify by the rite, that sin might not be purged by sacrifice, unless it were by death. Seeing therefore that death was due to sin, as Paul doth very well declare, saying; The reward of sin is death: and that God in Genesis warned Adam, saying; In what day soever ye shall eat of that tree, ye shall die the death. And they that offered sacrifices would not die themselves, wherefore, instead of themselves, they put to be slain a bullock, or a goat, laying their hand upon the heads of those beasts; as if they had declared, that they themselves indeed were sinners, but that they would lay their sins upon the sacrifice: so that it should be punished for them. But this was no just mends making, because the life of man is of much greater value, than is the life of a beast.

Wherefore, by this ceremony the people was taught, that they should wait for that sacrifice, which of all other was most perfect; namely, Jesus Christ our savior, of whom John in plain words testified; Behold the lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world. And Isaiah prophesied of him, that he should be led as a sheep to the slaughter. After this manner therefore was Christ figured in the old sacrifices. But thou wilt demand moreover, whether the old church understood this? Truely I doubt not, but that the

same was known in those days; I mean of godly men, and such as were studious in the law of God, but not of idle persons and contemners. For they might consider, that God first said that he would be pleased with the blood of sacrificed beasts: and yet, that he afterward in the Psalms, and in the Prophets testifieth, that he is not delighted with those sacrifices. These two places, seeming in outward show to be repugnant, must so be reconciled, as the people, by means of the latter sentence should be taught, that those sacrifices, of their own strength and nature were not sufficient to please God, who only (for Christ his sake) showeth himself to be gracious and merciful: and in those sacrifices setteth forth the Messias to be beholden, who was looked for.

But thou wilt say, that all did not behold him. Concerning those, which were idle and negligent, I grant no less; when as notwithstanding, this was beaten even into their memory by the prophets, seeing by them was often repeated the promise made before time unto Abraham, touching Messias. As many therefore of them, as did earnestly apply their minds unto that doctrine, might easily behold Christ in those sacrifices. But it is yet objected; Why did they never expressly call upon Christ? Why did they not pray for forgiveness of sins for Messias sake? I answer, that they performed those things abundantly, when as they said; Remember Lord the covenant that thou hast made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and also with David. For even to those fathers was promise made of the seed, wherein all nations should be blessed; that is to say, of Christ: as Paul to the Galatians doth express. Wherefore, so often as the old fathers called these things to remembrance, they no less included Christ in their prayers, than we at this day do; when we pray for anything to be granted unto us, in the name of Jesus Christ.

# CHAP. XVI. Of the likeness and unlikeness of the Old and New league or covenant.

The word league in Latin *Foedus*, is derived of the verb *Ferire*, To strike; because the ambassadors of each party killed a hog: from which etymology perhaps the Hebrew word Kerith differeth not much. By which outward sign also, they wished by prayer the destruction of that part, which should violate the covenant: as we may gather out of Livie, in his first book after the building of the city: and as the same author writeth in his fourth book *De bello Macedonico*. There be three kinds of leagues. The first kind is, where the conquerors make laws unto them, whom they have conquered, in punishing and commanding them in such things, as they will afterward have them to do. The second kind is, when things being yet in their own state, and neither party overcome, they agree together, that such things, as are taken from each party, may be restored, and that covenants of peace may be established. The third kind is, when there hath been no war between the parties; and when certain cities or princes are joined together by some covenants, either to live the more peaceably, or else to take some public affairs in hand. These things being on this wise declared, let us show

what a league is. A league is that bond between men, whereby they testify, both by words and signs one to another, that they are bound to perform certain things, so long as they deal faithfully either towards other.

And if it be a bond, and pertain to relation, it is grounded upon human actions; and is referred to those things, which the parties confederate ought to perform one towards another. It is expressed by words, and for the most part, signs are added. When God made a covenant with mankind, after the flood, he not only set forth the form of the bond by words; but he also put the rainbow in the clouds as a witness. And in the covenant, which he made with Abraham, he put the sign of circumcision. Furthermore, in the same, which was made by Moses at the mount Sina, there were twelve pillars erected, and the people was sprinkled with blood. Joshua also, when he should die, erected up a very great stone; thereby as it were to sign the league renewed between God and the people. And what the promises were, which should be kept of each parties, the scripture oftentimes teacheth. For God promised, that he would be the God of his people; namely, that he would be with them, to help them, to deliver them, and by all means (as touching all kind of good things) to bless them. The people again promised, that they would count the Lord Jehovah for their God, in believing, worshipping, and obeying him. And Christ was in the league, as the mediator between ech party. This is the exposition and nature of the covenant between God and man.

2. League is divided into the new, and into the old: which division is not of a general thing, into special things; but of the subject into accidents. Forsomuch as in either league, the thing itself, and the substance, is utterly one and the self-same: only certain qualities do vary. For the old league was made with one only nation of the Jews, and had certain things annexed; I

mean the possession of the land of Canaan, the kingdom of the Jews, and the priesthood of Aaron, and also the promise of Messias, according to the birth of the flesh, and the ministry of his own person. Moreover, it had very many signs of ceremonies, and sacrifices very meet for that age. In it also were mysteries of salvation, and promises of eternal life; although far more obscure than they were afterward taught unto us. And on the other side, in the new league there be properties, in a manner contrary. For it pertaineth not to any one certain nation, but to all nations, how far so ever the world be extended: neither is there any peculiar civil administration joined thereto.

Furthermore, there are but a very few ceremonies and outward signs, and they very plain and simple, annexed unto it. And (to conclude) all things are contained more openly, plainly, and manifestly in the New Testament, than they are in the old. By these qualities doth the new league and the old differ one from another: howbeit, the thing itself, and the substance abideth one and the same. For as Jehovah would then be the God of the Hebrews: so hath he now decreed to be the God of the Christians. And that also, which they in those days promised; namely, that they would believe in the true God, and obey, and worship him as he hath prescribed; we also ought to perform. Christ cometh between both parties, as a mediator: and forgiveness of sins; yea and eternal life also is promised by him. Also the moral laws remain the very same now, which they were then.

3. Paul, in the eleventh chapter to the Romans, hath very well declared, that the league of the fathers in old time, and ours, is all one; when he compareth the church with the tree, which hath Christ as it were the root. Then he addeth, that from such a tree certain branches were cut off; namely, the Hebrews, which believed not; and we, which are Gentiles, were planted in their place; that is to say, we were chosen into the same league, wherein

they were comprehended. The same tree he affirmeth to remain, into which some are graffed by faith; and from the which other some, because of their incredulity, be cut off. Wherefore, each league containeth both the law and the Gospel. And there be in either of the testaments, the self-same sacraments: as it is declared in the first epistle to the Corinthians, the tenth chapter: for, The fathers were all under the cloud, and were baptized in the sea, and did eat the same spiritual meat, and drank of the spiritual rock following them, and the rock was Christ. Furthermore, we grant, that as touching outward signs, there is some difference between their sacraments and ours: which nevertheless, as concerning the things signified by the sacraments, is found to be nothing at all.

Otherwise, the argument of Paul might not have persuaded the Corinthians, to be subject unto the same punishments that the Hebrews were. For they might have said, that they had far better sacraments than had the Hebrews; and that therefore they should not so much need to fear, lest they should suffer the like: forsomuch as the excellency of the sacraments might put off those misfortunes, from which the Hebrews could not be delivered by the sacraments of the law. So as the apostle took away this shift from them, and maketh our sacraments and theirs equal and alike, as touching the things themselves. He writeth also to the Romans, the first chapter, concerning the Gospel; that It was in the old time promised by the prophets in the holy scriptures. And in the third chapter he speaketh on this wise; But now is the righteousness of God made manifest, being testified by the law and the prophets.

4. Neither mayest thou say unto me, that these things were indeed promised in the holy scriptures of the Old Testament; but not that they should be performed unto the men that lived in those days. For the apostle

doth very well show the meaning of this place, when he saith; that Every law doth speak to those men, which live under it. And it is not to be doubted, but that the fathers were justified after the same sort that we are now at this present. For even they were no less justified by faith only in Christ, than we be. Wherefore it is written in the book of Genesis, of Abraham, that he believed, and the same was counted unto him for righteousness. John also testified, that Christ said of Abraham; that He had seen his day, and rejoiced. The epistle unto the Hebrews, the 13th chapter, affirmeth; that Christ was yesterday, and today, and remaineth forever. Wherefore, even as we are said now to be saved, not by works, but by the mere mercy of God, through faith in Christ; so was it with the fathers at that time; for they were justified by no merits, but only by faith in Christ. Furthermore, what obedience so ever the fathers had toward the commandments of God, and also faith in the promises: those things were not derived from their own strength and power; but (even as it also happeneth unto us) they came unto them by the grace of God and Christ.

5. It is true indeed, that Jeremiah, in the 31st chapter, writeth (as it is also alleged in the eighth chapter to the Hebrews;) that There must be another league made in the name of God, not as it was made in the old time with the fathers. And among other things he saith, that God would give his laws in the hearts and inward parts of men; so that none should need any more to teach his neighbor: because all, from the least to the greatest, should have the knowledge of God. And further it is said, in the person of God; I will be merciful unto their sins, and will no more remember their iniquities, &c. As touching those words, both of Jeremiah, and also of the epistle to the Hebrews, we must understand; that they prove not that there is any difference between the testaments, as touching the substance and the thing

itself; but touching the properties and qualities: as we have before said. Neither must we think, that the old fathers (who in obeying the commandments of God, and in right faith, worshipped him purely) could perform those things of their own strength or natural power. For, unless they had had the laws and promises of God written in their hearts and minds, by the holy Ghost; and also a will, by the grace of God, ready to obey his commandments: they had never been able to perform such things.

They wanted not therefore the light of God, which shined before their eyes, to make them believe: yea and their sins were forgiven them through Christ. So then they had also the fruition of those things, which God promised to give in the new covenant. The only difference herein was touching the largeness, and perspicuity. For at that time, those gifts were kept within the compass of a few; but now they be everywhere communicated to the Gentiles. In that age, they were somewhat obscure; but to us they are made evident and clear, so that we have no more need of the old discipline. Hereby it manifestly appeareth, how they err from the truth, which affirm, that the old league had promises only for possessing the land of Canaan, and for worldly felicity; and that the people of the Hebrews were bound only to an outward observation of certain rites and works, and not to show forth good and perfect motions of the mind towards God. The prophets do not interpret the matter to be in such wise; nay rather, they deny, that God anything esteemeth outward works without inward godliness: and they pronounce in every place, that the ceremonies, which be void of faith, and of the fear of God, are a most grievous burden; and so troublesome, as he cannot abide them.

Yea, and the law itself maketh express mention of the circumcision of the heart; and God everywhere requireth, that we should hear his voice: which

is nothing else, but to deal with him by faith. Wherefore, the faith of the promises and commandments of God, ought to be counted as the root and foundation, which always abideth: when as outward sacraments, and visible rites, should at the length be changed. So that it is very manifest, that God would not have them for their own sakes. Howbeit, they endured so long, as men were endued with a childish spirit; as Paul speaketh to the Galatians, whiles they lived as yet under tutors, and as yet differed very little from servants. But when they received a more full spirit, then were the sacraments and childish rites (as Augustine saith) taken away. It is manifest therefore, that the difference between the two covenants must not be taken of the thing or substance; but of the qualities and properties.

6. Let them therefore forsake their foul error, which think, that God in the old law only promised earthly things, as though at that time he only provided for the bodies, and not for the souls: as do shepherds, ploughmen, and hog-herds; which only have a care of the bodies and carcasses of their sheep, swine, and oxen; neither endeavor they anything else, but to make those beasts strong and fat. We must not so imagine of God, who in such sort made a league with the fathers, as he promised them the chief felicity, which specially appertaineth unto the soul. Also it is written in the 144th Psalm; Blessed are the people, which have the Lord for their God. In Deut. also, God took upon him to bring to pass, that they should walk in his commandments. But what more? Our Savior, out of the words of the old league hath most aptly taught the resurrection of the dead. For when the Lord said, that he was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (and they were then dead;) Christ inferred, that they were not thou dead, but that they still lived, and that their bodies should be received; namely, in the blessed resurrection. Her unto pertaineth that, which God assured to Abraham; to

wit, that he himself would be his reward. Which words plainly teach us, that in that covenant were not promised carnal and earthly good things alone.

Undoubtedly, it were a great shame, even for kings and princes, which (being compared unto God) are but flesh and blood; if they should be counted to govern the public-wealth's, in respect only of the bodies of subjects; seeing they profess, that they provide for the outward commodities, quietness, and peace of their citizens; because they may live happily, and according to virtue. So then, if earthly princes provide goods of the mind for their subjects; is it not fit, that God himself did provide far more excellent things for the public wealth of the Israelites, whom he faithfully governed? Furthermore, I say not how foolish it is to believe, that the forefathers, by the league, bound themselves only to outward rites, and visible ceremonies, whereby they would worship God; seeing the very Ethnics were not ignorant: but rather, they have most plainly testified, that the worshipping of God consisteth not in those things. For Plautus in *Rudente* writeth thus; They think that they please God with gifts and sacrifices, but they lose both their labor and cost. I will not declare those things, which Plato in his *Alcibiades* writeth, concerning this matter. Yea, and (as I have before taught) the law itself and the prophets declare, that the thing was far otherwise.

7. We will note also, that the fathers made a league with God; not only for themselves, but also for their posterity: as God again, for his part, promised them, that he would be the God, not only of them, but also of their seed and posterity. Wherefore, it was lawful for them to circumcise their children being yet infants. And in the like manner it is lawful for us also to baptize our little children, when they are yet infants; forsomuch as they also are comprehended in the league. For they, which already have the thing itself,

there is nothing that may let, but that they should receive the sign. It is plainly written in the 29th chapter of Deuteronomy; that The league was made, not only with them, which were present, but also with them, which were absent, and not yet born. But some doubt, whether the posterity may be bound by their forefathers. We do answer: we must look whether the things, which were promised to our forefathers, were just and honest; then must we consider, whether these promises pertained unto civil things, or unto godliness. When they are made for civil things, the bond is firm; because it is not lawful for the posterity, to infringe the contracts of their forefathers: such as are buying's, selling's, bargains, and such like. Provided, that they contain nothing that is shameful and dishonest. But if the bonds and covenants belong to godliness, or to a right faith; then the obligation is of full strength: because we are all bound to true godliness, and to a sound faith; although there were no covenant to bind us. But if the forefathers have bound themselves, and their posterity, unto dishonest and wicked things, it is no bond at all. But whereas God so humbled himself, as to enter in league with men; that cometh of his own mere mercy and good will; to stir us up thereby more and more, to do those things, which otherwise is our duty to do.

8. But some affirm, that Paul taketh something from the Old Testament: when, in the second epistle to the Corinthians, he calleth the same The ministry of death. And unto the Galatians he wrote; Ye have begun in the spirit, take ye heed that ye do not end in the flesh. In which place he calleth the old law, Flesh. And in the same epistle he showeth, that those, which be under the law, do persecute them which belong to the Gospel. But in such places as these be, Paul speaketh of the Old Testament, according as it was thrust upon them by false apostles, without Christ, and without faith. Then

is it even as if thou shouldest take away the very life from it, and leave nothing remaining but death and offense of the flesh. But when the apostle speaketh of the law by itself, he writeth far otherwise. Unto the Romans it is written; The law indeed is spiritual, a holy commandment, just and good; but I am carnal, &c. And unto Timothy; For we know, that the law is good, if a man use the same lawfully. Wherefore, when as it seemeth that the law is by Paul, either diminished, or reproved; that is not in respect of itself, but for our fault sake. For it meeteth with such, as be defiled, and endeavor themselves to resist it; and therefore it breedeth those discommodities. Or else (as I have said) he spake thereof, so far forth as the false apostles severed Christ from the same. Perhaps thou wilt affirm, that the false apostles did not take away Christ; but rather preached the law together with him. But yet nevertheless, seeing they taught, that he was not sufficient unto salvation; no doubt but they took him away. For he that hath need of the law, to save men, is not the true Christ that was promised.

9. But because Paul said, out of the testimony of Isaiah, that This is a testament; and that we read the same in the 31st chapter of Jeremiah, that The new covenant herein consisteth, that the deliverer should come, and be merciful unto iniquities: there ariseth a doubt, whether the new testament and the old be diverse or no. Of the which matter I have somewhat spoken before; but now I intend more at large to entreat thereof. At the first sight they seem altogether diverse: so that the one is altogether distinguished from the other. For in Jeremiah it is said; that There should be a new covenant, and not according to that which he made with the fathers. And the epistle to the Hebrews addeth; When it is said, A new, then is that abolished, which was old. But who seeth not, that one thing, if it abolish and make void another thing, differeth altogether from the same? There is also another

argument, for that (as they say) in the Old Testament, was no forgiveness of sins. For the epistle to the Hebrews, in the tenth chapter saith; that The blood of goats, and of oxen, and of calves, could not take away sins. But in the New Testament, no man doubteth, but that there is remission of sins: so as no man will say, but that the things, which in so great a matter differ, are diverse.

Yet this on the other side is to be considered; that that faith, whereof justification consisteth, is in either testament all one. Moreover, that the mediator is one, and the same; namely, Christ Jesus; and the promise of remission of sins, and of eternal life through him, all one. The commandments (those at leastwise which be moral) all one, the signification of sacraments all one; the root and plant, out of which some of the Jews were cut off, and we in their place grafted in, is all one. All which things plainly declare, that either testament, as touching the substance or essence (if I may so call it) is all one thing. Although there must be granted some differences, by reason of the accidents, which are, that; Jesus Christ was there known, as he that was to come; but with us he is known, as he which is already come. Also, their signs were diverse from us in form, but of like strength in signification: as Augustine saith. Moreover they had a certain and assured public wealth, for the preservation whereof, they had civil precepts delivered unto them, which we have not. And finally, unto the promise of the remission of sins, by the Messias, were in the old time added a great many other promises: as of the increase and preservation of their posterity, and of the possession of the land of Canaan; which promises we have not. And besides all this, our sacraments are more easy, and fewer in number, and also more manifest, and extend much further, seeing they are not shut up in a corner, as theirs were in Jewry; but are spread abroad

throughout the whole world. Wherefore we may affirm, that the New Testament and the old are in very deed all one, as touching the substance; and differ only in certain accidental things, which we have now mentioned.

10. But now resteth to answer, unto the two arguments, which were before brought touching remission of sins. We deny not, but that the same was in the Old Testament; seeing if we consider the promise, which there also was of force, the old fathers were justified by the same. For it was said of Abraham; He believed God, and it was imputed unto him to righteousness: as the apostle hath declared. And David saith; Blessed are they, whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Yet if we look upon the sacraments or ceremonies, they did not pardon sins, as touching the work; neither yet have our sacraments strength so to do. But whereas Paul saith unto the Hebrews; that The blood of goats, oxen, and calves, could not take away sins: we deny not this to be true; but yet in the meantime, neither doth Paul deny, but that the faith of the old fathers (whereby they had a respect unto Christ, and embraced him in the signification of those sacrifices) did justify and obtain remission of sins. Doubtless the blood of those sacrifices washed not away the sins of the world, but only the blood of Christ, as he himself said; This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you, and for many for the remission of sins.

But whereas we are said to be baptized into the remission of sins: the meaning thereof is, that by that sacrament is sealed and signified unto us the remission of sins, which by the blood of Christ we have already obtained. Which self-thing is also done in the Eucharist. And faith ought always to go before the receiving of the sacraments, if we receive them rightly, and the order be not inverted. For as without faith men eat and drink unworthily; so without faith baptism is unworthily received: which yet must be understood

as touching them, that are of full age. For touching infants, how it is with them, we will else-where declare. Then, if faith go before, it is manifest, that sins be forgiven; because the sacraments that follow, do seal, and also confirm us, as concerning the will of God: and when they be set forth unto us, they oftentimes stir up faith; no otherwise than doth the word of God, when it is heard.

So that it is not possible, but that faith, being newly stirred up; justification is apprehended more and more, and new strength of restoring is laid hold upon. And therefore whereas Chrysostom (interpreting these words; When I shall take away their sins) saith upon the same: When they were yet uncircumcised, when they did not yet offer, and when they did not yet other things pertaining to the law, their sins were taken away. Certainly he must not so be understood, as though the fathers, in the old time, when they did these things, and by them exercised their faith (because they saw Christ to be signified in them) had not thereby fruit as we have: but he meant, that these things now after Christ hath suffered, are unprofitable; and that in the old time they did not by the work itself, give grace as the Jews dreamed. Wherein also in our days the sophistical Divines are deceived, as touching our sacraments.

11. But as touching the other argument, that in the epistle to the Hebrews it is said, that The old testament is abolished, and made void, the new taking place: And whereas Jeremiah saith; that God would make a new league, not according to the league, which he made with the fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt: We answer, that there the league is taken for the law, and is distinguished from the Gospel. Which is manifest, in that he saith he will write his laws in their hearts, and grave them in their inward parts. But that thing is not agreeable with the law, which only showeth sins,

condemneth and accuseth: neither doth it give strength; yea rather, it after a sort commandeth infinite things, and layeth such a burden upon us, as we are not able to bear. And therefore the prophet there saith, that They did not abide in his covenant. So as this word league, or testament, is not there so taken, as we here now take it: for (as we here entreat of it) it comprehendeth both the law and the Gospel. And in this respect there is no difference between the old testament and the new; but only as we have declared.

And if thou wilt say, that the prophet there also understandeth this word testament, in such sort as we now speak of it: we may then grant, that by the coming of Christ, is made some abrogation; seeing those accidents, conditions, and qualities, which we have showed in the Old Testament, are now abrogated. Wherefore therein is used the figure Synecdoche; whereby a thing is perfectly or absolutely said to be abolished, or made void, when it is only taken away as touching some part thereof. The Jews are wonderfully troubled with this sentence of the prophet, and can scarcely tell what to say. For while they seek to defend the old law, and so to defend it, as they say nothing thereof is to be changed; and reprove us, because we have changed circumcision into baptism, and the day of the sabbath, into the lords day; and have rejected many other things: how can they affirm, that a new league shall be made, and not according to that which was made, when they were brought out of Egypt?

Here they can scarce tell which way to turn themselves. Howbeit, least they should seem to give place, they say, that only the manner shall be diverse; and think, that the league, as touching the thing, shall be all one: but that under Messias, it shall more firmly and more surely be established. But we may more truly say, that this was done at the beginning of the church, when so great abundance of the holy Ghost was poured into the

believers; that not only they spread abroad the Gospel, throughout the whole world; but also no torments, no persecutions, were they never so horrible, no nor death, though it were most sharp, could cause them to depart from the league, which they had now through Christ made with God. And as many as are faithful indeed, do willingly and of their own accord cleave unto the truth, and unto holiness. And forsomuch as here is mention made of the league, let this be understood; that it is for the most part of the Latins called *Testamentum*; of the Grecians, διαθήκη; of the Hebrews, *Berith*, all which words do fitly express it.

12. But here again riseth a doubt; because if the thing be all one as well on the one part, as the other, in the sacraments of both testaments; how may ours be said to be greater in power and virtue? Further, how could it be, that they did eat the flesh of the Lord; seeing the son of God had not yet taken the same upon him? To the latter question I say: in the Apocalypse it is written, that the lamb was slain from the beginning of the world. For to the foreknowledge of God all things are present, though they be never so far off. Wherefore Christ, seeing he was to come, and was to be offered for us upon the cross; in this respect was comprehended of the fathers by faith, and was food for their souls unto eternal life. For those things, which be furthest off from us, the same doth faith make present; so that they took hold of the same Christ which we at this time do enjoy. But the difference standeth in the time: for they believed, that he should be born; and we that he is already born: they affirmed that he should die, and we affirm that he hath died.

Wherefore Augustine, in his 16th book against Faustus, saith; that He vehemently erreth, that doth think the sacraments of the Jews ought to be retained in Christian religion: seeing God hath now finished what he would

have to be done. And it was necessary, that other signs should be ordained. Neither ought this to seem absurd. For when we signify anything that is done, or that is to be done; we use diverse and sundry manner of speech. The very same he writeth unto Ianuarius, to Optatus, and elsewhere. Neither is that any let, which the same father, upon the 73rd Psalm, speaketh on this wise; Their sacraments promised salvation, our declare a Savior. Of these words the Papists do wonderfully boast, and cry out; that our sacraments do give grace, which the sacraments of the Hebrews could not give. Howbeit, what Augustine's mind was in that place, they cannot tell. He meant nothing else, but that, which he taught against Faustus; namely, that our sacraments do give and exhibit Christ: that is, they testify and bear record, that he is given and exhibited. For he addeth; I say not, that it hath now salvation, but because Christ is now come. And if Augustine at any time say, that the thing, which is now unto us, and that was in time past promised unto the Jews, is not all one; undoubtedly he dealeth concerning other things, and not touching that, which was principal in the promises of God. For in them, besides Christ, there was promised an earthly kingdom. Also the country of Canaan, being a land flowing with milk and honey; and such other like things were promised: which be strange and differing from the promises of the Gospel. But Christ is common, both to us, and to them; and is to us no otherwise than he was unto them.

13. Now come I unto the former demand, wherein was asked; How our sacraments can be of more virtue, if the thing be one on both parts. Hereunto I answer: when the self-same thing is set before us, of the which one man taketh more than another, there is no difference in the thing itself, but in the instrument, wherewith it is taken. As if so be that a heap of money be set before any man, from whence it may be lawful for everyone

to take so much, as he is able to hold in his hand; the larger and more strong hand everyone hath, so much the more may he take of the money set before him: even so, seeing our faith, wherewith we comprehend Christ, is greater, and more strong than was that of the Jews; we take more of Christ than they in the old time did. But thou wilt say; How can our faith be greater than was the faith of the Jews? Here it behooved to answer warily. For there were some among the Hebrews, endued with excellent faith; namely, the prophets and patriarchs, of the which diverse spent even their life for religion sake. Neither is there anymore believed of us, then was of them; seeing their Church and ours is all one, and Christ is ours alike: but the difference is in the perspicuity of the things believed. For to us in these days, all things are more clear and manifest, than they were to them. Unto us Christ is born, is dead, is risen out of the grave, and is taken up into heaven: all which things they also had, but more obscurely, and as it were in a shadow.

Seeing therefore these things are more bright and manifest unto us, our faith also may be called greater, and more sure; because it is more stirred up by things that be manifest, than it is by obscure things. For which cause in times past, the faith in Christ was very smally advanced beyond the borders of Jewry; whereas at this day it is spread over all the world. And when I say, that our faith is greater than the faith of the Jews; I mean of the universal state of them, and as it happened for the most part, and in most places generally; and not of particular persons. For I dare not affirm, that the faith of any man was more steadfast than the faith of Abraham, of David, of Isaiah, and such like. For Christ testified of Abraham, that He saw his day, and was glad. Isaiah also, in the 53rd chapter, so expressed the whole kingdom of Christ, and his death, as Jerome pronounceth him rather to be

an Evangelist than a prophet. And David, in his psalms most plainly prophesieth many things of Christ.

14. But there seemeth to be no small controversy, between those words in the tenth chapter of the first to the Corinthians, and that which Christ taught in the sixth of John: where he said, that the meat which he ordained, was a great deal better than that, which the fathers had by Moses in the wilderness, who he saith were dead, although they used that meat. And he declared, that they, which did eat him, being the true bread, should not die. Moreover, he addeth, that Moses did not give them bread from heaven; and that he is the bread, the which God the father sent from heaven. These things do show, that Christ put no small difference between our sacraments, and the sacraments of the old fathers; whereas Paul endeavoreth to make them all one. Howbeit, in the holy scriptures, things be sometimes entreated of according to their own nature; but other whiles, according to that that men (with whom they have to do) esteem of them. Paul so writeth of the sacrament of the old-fathers, as the nature thereof was; and as it was granted by God.

But Christ hath a respect unto the judgment and disposition of those men, which came unto him; who repaired to him for no other cause, but to be satisfied with the bread. For they saw, that a few days before he had satisfied a very great number with a few loaves: for which cause they said unto him; What sign dost thou, that we may believe thee? For Moses gave Manna unto the fathers in the wilderness. As if they had said; It behooveth thee also (if thou wilt have the multitude to obey thee) to sustain them no less than Moses did. Seeing therefore Christ perceived beforehand, that these men esteemed or embraced nothing in this meat (which the fathers received in the wilderness) save only the outward substance, which filled

the belly; he tempered his doctrine to reprove this base and vile understanding of theirs, and speaketh of the outward substance of that meat, and not of the spiritual thing, which was represented thereby: and (as he might) called their minds from that earthly meat, unto the spiritual food; and denied, that Manna, as concerning corporal substance, was from heaven. For (as it was understood by them,) the divine and heavenly nature of Christ was secluded there-from. And so he concluded, that they which were like unto these, might not be quickened with that meat; They be dead (saith he:) which should not have happened, if they had together with the sign eaten me by faith, which am the true bread sent down from heaven.

15. Paul, after the same manner, when he hath occasion to entreat of circumcision, speaketh honorably thereof, according to the nature of it. Unto the Romans, he calleth it The seal of the righteousness of faith. And we ourselves that be the faithful of Christ (saith he) are circumcised in baptism, with a circumcision not made with hands. And on the other side, when he writeth thereof, as it was obtruded by the false apostles (saith he) to the Galatians; If ye be circumcised, Christ profiteth you nothing. Ye are fallen away from grace, and ye are become debtors of keeping the whole law. And unto the Philippians he speaketh so contemptuously thereof, as he calleth it Concision. The same doth he, when he writeth of the Old Testament: of the which he speaketh diversely according to the distinction that is brought. No otherwise said Christ unto the Jews; Ye only have respect unto carnal meat, ye have only a care for the belly, ye specially follow idleness; and therefore above me ye prefer Moses, of whom the fathers, like unto yourselves, had no other but earthly food; but I am to give you heavenly food, if so be ye apply your faith thereto.

16. And that the thing may the more appear, we learn of Augustine, in the 26th treatise upon John; that the sacraments of the old fathers, as touching the signs, were differing from ours; but as concerning the things signified, they were all one. By these things it is perceived, that as many of the fathers as were godly, notwithstanding that they received other signs than we do; yet they had all one thing with us, and were partakers of Christ, in like manner as we be: but they, which were wicked, and destitute of faith, indeed took the outward thing, but they were utterly destitute of the spiritual gift and grace. Of them Christ speaketh, because they might be compared to the unbelieving multitude, with whom he had then dealing. Thou wilt say, that the very same happeneth in the Eucharist. For the ungodly, coming thereunto, do indeed receive the bread and wine; howbeit, they have no fruit thereof, but do eat and drink unto their damnation: whereas the godly and faithful persons use not the simple and bare signs, but through belief are therewithal partakers of the body and blood of Christ. Wherefore, that which he saith, that Christ did with these men; the same also cometh to pass with us; and our sacrament. For which cause there ought no such difference to be put by him, seeing the self-same thing cometh to pass, as well in the one, as in the other. But this is meet to be considered; that Christ, when he spake these things in the sixth of John, meant only of spiritual eating, which is performed by faith. For thereof Augustine saith; Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and belly? Believe and thou hast eaten.

The institution of the signs was long time afterward delivered in the last supper, which he had with his apostles; where he added no new thing unto those things which were spoken in the sixth of John, except it were the outward signs of bread and wine. And even as Christ spake only of the spiritual eating, which was then at that time; so the Jews, against whom he

disputed, had only an understanding of the outward eating. Therefore Christ called them from that gross and earthly feeding, unto that which is mere spiritual, of the which he then framed his talk, and saith; that the fathers, which were like unto them, died in the desert, and were not holpen by the meat offered unto them by Moses; and that they should not die, which received that spiritual feeding, which he then entreated of. And the death, which he there mentioneth, is not this temporal death; but everlasting death. Howbeit, our death of body (so we be faithful) cannot truly be called death; seeing thereby the way is open to life; yea and that to the blessed life. So then, Manna in the Old Testament, as touching the institution thereof, was heavenly and spiritual meat; but all that did eat, received not the same spiritually, only those received it so, which did eat it by faith. Neither doth Christ in the meantime deny, but that there were many of the father (as Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Caleb, and others) who faithfully and to life received that meat. But this he denieth; namely, that the outward meat or sign, being taken alone and by itself (as they with whom he spake regarded the same) had any virtue or utility, as concerning the spirit. And so we must take heed, that we attribute not severally unto the sign, that which belongeth unto the thing.

17. David, in the 78th Psalm, maketh evident mention of the food given to the fathers in the wilderness, saying; And God commanded the clouds, and opened the doors of heaven, &c. Where thou hearest the prophet say, that the bread was then given from heaven. Which saying thou must as well refer unto the outward sign, as unto the spiritual thing, unto Christ (I mean) who is thereby represented. For the substance itself being Manna, was given out of the air or clouds; and that region is very oftentimes in the scripture called heaven. In the Gospel we read; Behold the birds of heaven: and it

oftentimes speaketh of raining from heaven, and such other like speeches. Doubtless, it is truly said of Christ, that he came down; seeing he had his divine nature out of the heavens, whose body also is by Paul called heavenly. Furthermore, David in the same place added, that Man did eat the bread of Giborim: which word may be interpreted, Of princes, or noble personages. The 70 interpreters have translated it, Of angels: which thing the Chaldean interpreter seemeth to expound, as though Manna were sent down from the place of angels habitation. Others think it was therefore called angels food, in respect of being brought forth in the clouds by their ministry. And here I might easily acknowledge a figure to be: as if it should be said; The Hebrews did eat a most noble bread, which the angels might have used, if they did eat bread. As we commonly speak of excellent fare; This is the meat of lords and princes.

And whereas by Paul, this meat is called spiritual; it is signified, that sacraments are no common signs, as though none of those things, which be signified, were there received: for else they should only be externe and earthly meats, and not spiritual. Furthermore, God mocketh not, neither doth he deceive, that he would promise anything in the sacraments, which he will not perform by any means. Neither for all this is there any need, why there should be a metamorphosis (which they call transubstantiation) to the intent that the sacrament should become spiritual food. We ought not to confound the nature of the signs together with the things signified. Let us follow the mean and sound way; and let us judge honorably of the sacraments: not thinking them to be things altogether void of spiritual goodness. Neither let us so join the signs with the things, as they did altogether pass into them. It sufficeth there to appoint a profitable and most

excellent signification, whereby the faithful mind, through believing, may be made partaker of the things signified.

18. This word Manna is a Hebrew word, and it may signify a gift, or else a portion, and a part: forsomuch as that thing was all wholly given by God unto the Israelites. Or else it signifieth something prepared, not attained unto by labor; but such a thing as we may use without any endeavor of our own. But (letting the word pass) we say that as touching the nature, it was not the same, which of Galen and Dioscorides is called Manna; because they so call certain small pieces and fragments of frankincense. Of the Arabian philosophers, honey of the air is called by this name, the which the Grecians call δροσίμελι. And I doubt not, but that the Arabians used the word Man, by imitating of the holy scriptures. For their language is somewhat near unto the Hebrew. Ibn-ezra, upon the 16th chapter of Exodus, rehearseth many miracles or properties of this holy [food] Man or Manna, far differing from the nature of Manna among the Arabian philosophers. For natural Manna is not to be found upon mount Sina, and about the wilderness. Further, it raineth not always, but in the spring and autumn only. But that, which was holy, was given forty years continually. The day before the sabbath, it fell more plentifully; to the intent a double quantity might be gathered for that day, and for the sabbath: for upon the sabbath day it was not to be found.

The same melted with the sun in the afternoon time: the which happeneth not in our natural Manna. That was ground with a mill, so as it might be baked in the form of cakes; whereas ours is soft enough. That was a nourishing food, but this of ours is taken for a medicine, and purgeth away choler and phlegm. That, being reserved until the morrow, bred worms; whereas ours is kept, and that above a year. Also this of ours hath certain

places, in the which it falleth; but that of the Hebrews followed the Hebrews wheresoever they went. Ours hath one certain taste therewith, which is not declared to be in the other, but rather (as it is written in the book of Wisdom) It had in itself all manner of delight. These things have I, for this cause, recited; to the end it may be understood, that this sign had many properties, whereby it might most aptly express that which it signified.

For as those words, which be made, to show the signification of things, partly are natural, and partly are given after the mind of them which first named them: for they provided, that when as they might not express the whole nature of the thing, and all the properties thereof, yet that they should be able at the least wise, to show someone property more notable and known: whereupon they did not much vary from naming of things after their own nature. Because also it was free for them, among many properties, to choose that which they were most desirous to signify: therefore names are said to proceed, according to the will and pleasure of them. Hereunto add that which Plato in *Cratylus* doth testify; (to wit) that the first inventors of names were so prudent, as they chose the qualities of syllables and letters to be agreeable to the qualities of things, which they would name: as unto mild things, they made apt those that were mild; and to unpleasant things, they applied harsh and unpleasant syllables: and such like.

19. On this wise God hath done in the sacraments, the which be names and visible words whereby he effectually expresseth his promises. For he provided, that the properties of the signs might excellently well agree with the things, which were to be assigned: which we perceive now did happen in Manna. Then, in so much as the same was given without any travel of the Israelites; it signified, that Christ was to be given unto men; not through

their own works or merits, but freely, and of the mere goodness of God. Manna rained down from heaven, which was not without miracle: in like manner Christ had the divine nature; and the body, which he applied to himself, he took of the virgins his mother, without the help of man's seed. Manna, was equally distributed to all; neither had one anymore of the same than another: so Christ imparteth himself to the faithful, he is common to all, without exception of person; in him is neither man nor woman, neither bond nor free. Manna at the beginning was unknown, for when the Hebrews saw it, they said one to another, *Manbu*, which signifieth; What is this? For so some do interpret it, as if it had been said *Mahhu*; and the letter *Nun* is set between, to shun the ill pronunciation of the word, if two aspirations should meet together. Christ likewise was unknown in the earth; for If they had known him, they would never (as Paul saith) have crucified the Lord of glory.

Manna did nourish, and it was given abundantly; Christ also is our meat, and is sufficient to nourish many, yea even all. Manna had a pleasant, yea a marvelous taste; Christ also said that His yoke is pleasant, and his burden easy. And of him it is aptly written; Taste and see, for the Lord is sweet. Manna was pure and white; Christ neither committed sin, neither yet was there any guile found in his mouth. Manna was beaten in a mill and a mortar; Christ, to become our meat, was knocked upon the cross and died. Manna was given by the way in the wilderness; and to us the meat of Christ is given in the Eucharist, while we pass our peregrination in this world: which agreeth with the example of the desert. Manna ceased, when they came to the land of promise; and we in heaven shall have no need of sacraments. For Christ shall be before us, and we shall behold God in such sort, as he is. All these things declare unto us, how aptly this sign is applied

unto the thing signified. In the desert, God would have this meat to be given unto the Hebrews; first, to declare his power; to wit, that Man liveth not by bread only, but is nourished by everything which God hath commanded man to eat. Moreover, his mind was to win authority to Moses and Aaron, least that people should think themselves to be deceived by them: for they began already to suspect the same.

But meat being given in such sort, it caused the promise and will of God to be believed. Wherefore Moses and Aaron were no more suspected of falsehood. Moreover, God showed himself most ready of performing his covenant, wherein he promised to be their God; that is, to help them so often as they should have need. Lastly, he would teach all us, that believe in him, that we shall not be forsaken of him, when we follow our vocation. By this means the promise of Christ is performed; First seek ye the kingdom of God, and these things shall be given unto you. They followed God, when he called: and he forsook them not. And so he will in like manner not forsake us. Thou mayest add out of the saying of Paul, that God provided not only that they should have meat, but also a sacrament. Ambrose, writing upon this place, saith; that Manna had a figure of this mystery, which we receive in remembrance of the Lord. Where he very well admonisheth, that as we now in the Eucharist bear in remembrance the Lord's death that is past; so in Manna, and in other sacrifices of the old fathers, the same death was shadowed to come. Moreover he writeth, that this Manna was given on the Lord's day. Which I know not how he can proved.

20. But when as Paul saith; These things were our figures or examples: many do infer upon these words, that the sacraments of the old fathers were shadows of our sacraments, yet not all one with them. Although forsooth it might not be, that they were both figures of our sacraments, and had also all

one thing with them. Assuredly both the one and the other may be: for there can be no other matter of the sacraments appointed than Christ himself, whom Paul in express words affirmeth, that the forefathers had. But they might be called shadows of our sacraments; because they did not so manifestly and clearly express the mysteries of man's salvation as ours do. Again, there is objected against us a place out of the epistle to the Colossians, where after Paul had reckoned up those things, which pertained unto the Old Testament, he addeth; Which are shadows of things to come, but the body is of Christ. Hereunto I answer, that the sacraments of the forefathers of right may be called shadows and figures, if thou respect those things, which were performed at their time appointed; I mean the death and passion of Christ: all which things were there represented to be exhibited. Yet nevertheless, they offered in the meantime unto the fathers these things to be received by faith, so far forth as was sufficient for their salvation.

Thou mayest add moreover, that those sacraments were sometime to be abrogated; also, that ours shall not give place unto latter sacraments. Further, that the same, which is abrogated and made void, may have the effect of a shadow which is past; but those things that be firm and durable, seeing they be sound, are compared to the body. Howbeit, thou oughtest to understand, that the abrogating of the sacraments of the forefathers, is only touching the signs. Lastly, when thou shalt read among the fathers, that the sacraments of the forefathers are so compared with ours, that they are said to be delivered out of Egypt, and we from our sin; that they obtained the land of Canaan, and we the kingdom of heaven; they temporal kingdoms, and we grace and the holy spirit; and such like things: thou must understand, that these men of God meant the things, which the old Jews had outward and visible; and that our men do compare them to spiritual and

heavenly gifts. Not as though these things were not among the Jews, in times past; but because in the Old Testament, those spiritual gifts were folden up in these externe and temporal things. Neither yet do they speak on this wise, as though no temporal and visible things were extant among us; but because we have those spiritual things more expressed, and larger entreated of in the New Testament: the outward things doubtless, as concerning the signs, far fewer; and as touching the promises, very much straitened.

Chrysostom, in a Homily, which he wrote particularly of these words of Paul, which we have now in hand, compareth the old sacraments with the new, by a certain similitude after this manner. A painter that is to express a king, with his horsemen, and his enemies overcome in triumph, while the work is yet rude or unpolished, he draweth his lines but slight and obscure. The which nevertheless do contain the whole that was devised to be done, and yet the same things so painted, are not discerned but of them that be very skillful. But afterward, when he hath laid it over with flourishing and goodly colors, all things are manifest, and are made evident and easy to be known, of all them, that have access thereunto. Wherefore he compareth the sacraments of the old fathers unto the first portraiture, and our sacraments unto the latter: so that, as in each similitude one thing is contained, although there happen some difference as touching the apparent show and obscurity; even so in each kind of sacraments there is an equality with some difference.

21. But again, because here seemeth to be signified a difference of the old and New Testament, in these words; For ye have not received the spirit of bondage to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father: it shall not be amiss to see, with what spirit we are now

led in the Gospel. Undoubtedly, Chrysostom upon this place writeth diverse things as touching that matter, whereunto I cannot assent. For first he doth affirm, that the Jewish people in old time had not the holy Ghost. But seeing he saith, that the apostle in this place maketh express mention of the spirit; he saith, that he doth this, because the law of the forefathers being given by the spirit of God, was therefore called spiritual: and forsomuch as those men were instructed by that law, therefore mention is here made of the spirit. And although in the tenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, those fathers are said to have eaten one and the self-same spiritual meat; and to have drunk one and the self-same drink of the spiritual rock: yet will not Chrysostom grant, that they were partakers of the spirit; but he saith, that those things were called spiritual; because they were given neither by the strength of man, nor of nature, but by the power of God. And it is to be wondered at, that this father should deem, that the people of the old time were excluded from the spirit of God; seeing we read in the 31st chapter of Exodus, that Bezeleel and Aholiab were replenished with the holy Ghost, and also with wisdom and understanding, to make all such things, as God had commanded to be made, in the work of the tabernacle.

And we read, that the seventy elders, which were given to be helpers unto Moses, were in such sort made partakers of his spirit, that they also prophesied; and that Joshua was endued with the holy Ghost; and that Gideon had given unto him the same spirit; and that the same holy spirit departed from Saul: which might not have been, unless he had had the same before. And what meaneth this, that David saith in the psalm; Take not away thy spirit from me? Again; Thy spirit shall lead me. Again; Confirme me with a principal spirit. Neither can we deny, but that Elias and Elisha

had the spirit of God, when the one desired to have the spirit of the other given double unto him. We read also, that Daniel had the spirit of the saints. But unto these so many oracles, we will also add a firm reason. That the fathers were justified, we have no doubt; and they could not be justified without faith in Christ: but faith can neither be had, nor retained without the holy Ghost. And whereas Chrysostom saith, that the apostle maketh mention of the spirit; because those men were governed by the law, which was given by the spirit; that is frivolous: seeing the law cannot do the office pertaining thereto, to bring men unto Christ, which be now made afraid by the same; unless the power thereof be holpen by the spirit. For how many Epicures and godless men be there, who hearing the law, are neither brought unto Christ, nor yet appalled at the horribleness of their sins committed?

22. And that place, in the tenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, must not so be understood as he thinketh: seeing Paul saith, that the sacraments of the old fathers were the self-same with ours. For unless it were so, the reason of Paul (as it hath been said) might easily have been made feeble. For the Corinthians might have thought, that the Jews had been afflicted with so many punishments; because they had no sacraments like unto ours: and contrariwise, that they themselves, although they sinned, should not be chastised; for that their sacraments were more perfect: the which might be able to pacify God, although he were angry, and drive away all adversities which hung over their heads. But seeing Paul saith, that their sacraments were all one with ours; this place of refuge is utterly taken from them. And that Paul had respect unto this, we may therefore believe it undoubtedly; because he maketh mention only of those sacraments of the Old Testament, which answer unto our two sacraments,

omitting all the rest, which were innumerable. For he affirmeth, that they were baptized as we are baptized; and saith moreover, that they received one and the self-same spiritual meat and drink, which we at this day receive: to signify thereby our Eucharist, or supper of the Lord. If thou take away this cause, thou shalt find no other cause, why he made only mention of these two sacraments. Further, what have we in our sacraments, which we receive as the chief and principal thing? Is it not Christ? But the apostle testifieth, that the old fathers received him in their sacraments. For he saith, that They drank of the spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ. But we can in no wise drink Christ, unless together therewith we be partakers of his spirit also. Wherefore we ought not to think, that the old fathers had not the spirit of God.

But thou wilt say peradventure; They had rewards and punishments. As though we have not so likewise. For what? Doth not Paul grievously threaten the Corinthians, if they follow the sins, which their forefathers committed in the wilderness? Doth not he say, that Many are weak, and many fallen asleep, for that they had after a shameful manner abused the Eucharist? And doth not he say; When we are judged, we are corrected of the Lord, least we should be condemned with this world? And what? Will you say that in the New Testament also, there wanteth rewards promised unto the godly? For if we give anything to a prophet, in the name of a prophet, we do receive a prophets reward. And; He that forsaketh his own, for Christ his sake, shall receive a hundredth-fold, even in this world also. But Chrysostom addeth, that unto them was promised a land flowing with milk and honey; but unto us is promised the kingdom of heaven. I grant indeed, that the old fathers had many temporal promises; but yet not in such sort, as unto them was made no promise of eternal life. For Christ bringeth

a testimony of the resurrection out of the law; I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And God saith unto Abraham; I am thy protector and thy exceeding great reward. And Daniel saith; that They shall rise again, which have slept in the dust of the earth, some to eternal life, and some to everlasting damnation. And Isaiah saith of the damned; Their fire shall not be quenched, and their worm shall not die. And to omit all other testimonies, which are infinite; Christ himself is promised in the law. For he himself saith; that Moses wrote of him. And Paul saith; that he was the end of the law. Besides, there be many such other testimonies, both in the Gospels, and in the epistles of Paul, which are all taken out of the Old Testament.

23. Chrysostom addeth moreover, that the forefathers used outward purifying's. Neither do we deny, but that they were bound to a great many more and more grievous ceremonies than we are: and yet are not we altogether without outward signs. For we also have bread, wine, and water, as elements of our sacraments: but one and the self-same Christ was common, both unto our sacraments and unto theirs. Since no man can deny, but that circumcision was the sacrament of regeneration; even as our baptism is also. Yea and the Schoolmen themselves confess, that original sin was forgiven unto the forefathers in circumcision. Wherefore judgment ought not so lightly to have been given, that they had only outward purifying's. But this is a great deal surer, when he addeth; that They restrained their hands from evil works, but we restrain both the mind and conscience. Chrysostom seemeth always to be of this mind, that the law forbiddeth only the outward work; and that the Gospel afterward forbiddeth anger, hatred, and lust of the mind; and considereth not that the old fathers had also this commandment; Thou shalt not lust; and that the prophets

every-where require circumcision of the heart, and that in the first commandment is comprehended faith, hope, charity, and whatsoever pertaineth to the spiritual motions of the mind. But whereas he saith, that they were driven by fear, and we by love; that indeed is true after a sort: howbeit, not so, as they were utterly without love, and we altogether without fear. And that is most untrue of all, when he saith, that they performed the law; but we far pass those things, which are commanded in the law. For as we have else-where proved, they themselves that be regenerate, cannot so frame their works, that they can in all points satisfy the law of God.

He addeth moreover, that they could not be corrected and amended, otherwise than by stoning, maiming, burning, and other such like kind of punishments: but we are only excommunicated, when we deserve to suffer the extremist punishment that the church can lay upon us. Howbeit, he should have remembered, that those punishments, which he maketh mention of, were civil punishments; which our Christian magistrates also do lay upon such as be malefactors. But they (saith he) had only in name the honor of adoption, and of children: but we have it in very deed. Certainly, it cannot be denied, but that God was in the Old Testament called the father of his people. For of him he saith; that He had called his first begotten son out of Egypt. And Moses saith in Deuteronomy; Thou hast forsaken God, which begat thee. And Malachi, in his second chapter; There is one God, and father of us all. And Isaiah; I have nourished and brought up children, and they have despised me. And doth not Paul say; Unto whom appertain the covenant and adoption: speaking then of the fathers of the Israelites, of whom was Christ according to the flesh. I said ye are gods, and children of the most high. They also called God their father, when they said in Isaiah;

Thou art our father, for Abraham knew us not, and Israel had no knowledge of us. And so great an affection did God the father bear towards them, as he saith; Can a mother forget her child, but although she can, yet will not I forget thee. And as Chrysostom hath thus written in this place; so hath he in other places also many things like unto the same, which (as I have said) must be read warily, and with judgment.

24. Augustine, in the handling of that place, saith; that there is put a difference between the Old and New Testament: of which the one consisteth in fear, and the other in love. He addeth moreover, that it is without controversy, that the spirit of adoption is the holy Ghost: but the spirit of bondage, he thinketh to be that, which hath the power of death; that is, Satan: seeing so many are held under the evil spirit, as are destitute of grace; and being not regenerate, live under the law. For they are addicted unto temporal things, and obey their own lusts: not indeed through default of the law, but because they themselves are strangers from Christ, and from God: for they cannot observe the law of God, and therefore they are both wrapped in sins, and also disquieted with continual furies. He also signifieth, that of this place, there is another interpretation; as though the spirit should here signify our mind, which is sometime the servant of lusts, and sometime liveth under the liberty of the sons of God.

But this opinion (saith he) cannot stand; because the spirit of adoption is a little afterward said to be external, and received from without; namely, being inspired from above. For so Paul writeth; It is the spirit that beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the sons of God. Which words plainly declare, that there is a difference put between the spirit that persuadeth, and that spirit, which is persuaded. And if this (saith he) be true, concerning the spirit of adoption; the same opinion also must we have of the spirit of

bondage. So that Augustine herein agreeth with Chrysostom; that they, whom he thinketh to be under the spirit of bondage, are quite void of the spirit of God. For those kind of men he affirmeth not to be regenerate, and that they be also strangers from God: yea rather addicted unto the spirit of Satan, of whom we cannot understand Chrysostom to speak. For out of the law and the sacraments he bringeth a reason, why the forefathers wanted the spirit. But Augustine denieth, that this came to pass through the default of the law: wherefore his saying is more probable than Chrysostom's. Howbeit, herein I agree not with Augustine; to think, that by the spirit of bondage is to be understood, Satan: for here (as I said) are to be understood two effects of the holy Ghost.

The first is, when we are touched with the knowledge of the law, and remorse of our sins; we straightway despairing of salvation, perceive that we be utterly undone, unless we repair unto Christ. So that the self-same spirit being our guide, we come unto Christ, and by faith lay hold upon him, and the promise of the mercy of God: by which means our sins be forgiven us, and we are received into the adoption of the sons of God. Wherefore Paul's meaning was, to declare unto the Romans; that they being now past that first step, and being regenerate in Christ, have obtained adoption: and therefore it behooved them, not only to live godly; but also willingly and of their own accord to work uprightly. Unto this interpretation of ours, Ambrose subscribeth: for he saith, that the apostle here teacheth the Romans, that they be no longer under the law; but do now live under faith. I judge therefore with him, that in these words is set forth two degrees of conversion.

25. And if a man do demand as touching the people in the old law, in what case they stood, concerning the spirit of Christ: that I think may be thus

answered; to wit, if we divide the Jews into three sundry parts. For some of them were utterly wicked, and ungodly; which besides name, habitation, and outward circumcision, had nothing common with the people of God. These men I grant be utterly void of the spirit of Christ; yea rather they lived under the spirit of Satan. On the other side, there were some excellent and holy men; as David, Hezekiah, Josiah, Elias, Daniel, and many such other like; whom we can by no means deny, but that they had the spirit of the Gospel; although (as the time required) they were compelled to observe many ceremonies, and rites pertaining unto the law. Again, there be some others, which were weak, who, although they cannot be compared with those, whom we have mentioned; yet, forsomuch as they, being godly, believed in the Messias to come, and were by that faith justified; we ought not to think, that they were strangers from the spirit of Christ; although, by reason of their imperfection, the law challenged great power over them. And they were with others, as those times required, compelled to be subject unto infinite ceremonies. And this is the reason, why the old fathers are said to have lived under the law, and under the spirit of bondage.

They had not the sacraments of their salvation so manifest and clear, as ours now are; neither had they the mysteries of Christ so commonly revealed, as we now have in the Gospel. Wherefore, although amongst us are many wicked men, and a great number of weak ones; yet are we said to be delivered from the law; both because we be delivered from ceremonies, and for that we have the sacraments and mysteries of salvation obtained through Christ, and made more clear and more manifest than theirs commonly were. Paul also calleth the old fathers, little ones; for that they lived under tutors and governors, and were instructed of the law, as of a schoolmaster. And when they are called servants, we ought to understand,

that they were profitable servants. For such servants bear great goodwill and love to their masters; and are persuaded, that that which is to the honor of their master, shall also turn to their own honor. But lewd servants never refrain from vices, neither do they anything well; unless they be by stripes compelled. These their two titles, which I have mentioned, Paul joineth together in the epistle to the Galatians. For thus he saith; The heir, so long as he is a little one, liveth under tutors and governors, and differeth nothing from a servant, when as yet he is lord of all. By which words he declareth, that the elect of God, amongst the old fathers, were in very deed heirs; although, considering the time, they were as little ones, under the form of servants, kept under the schooling of the law and elements of this world. Thus I think is to be thought of the old fathers.

26. But now let us diligently examine those things which we touched a little before; namely, that our minds must be lifted up from temporal things, unto eternal and heavenly things: since in this mortal life we be sometimes delivered from afflictions, yet unperfectly. For by Christ we be allotted unto righteousness, and unto many excellent gifts of God: but yet, we possess all those gifts of God, unperfectly. But when the horn of Christ shall be exalted (as speaketh Anna) then shall all these things at length be fully perfect in us: and that shall then be, when the Lord shall judge all the ends of the earth; and when (as Paul saith) he shall deliver the kingdom unto God and the father. But this kind of exposition (will some say) is not proper; seeing it savoreth of an allegory, and that it ought not to be the very due meaning of the scriptures. But we must assure our selves, that those things, that were written in the Old Testament, concerning temporal things, do belong unto eternal things. In the old time God promised unto the patriarchs, that he

would give the kingdom unto David and his posterity. And this is to be understood, not only of Solomon; but also of Christ.

Wherefore the angel speaking of him said; God will give unto him the kingdom of his father David, and he shall reign in the house of Jacob forever. Also in Deuteronomy, God commanded his people, that they should not take counsel of witches or sorcerers; For God (saith he) will raise up a prophet among you. The which, although it may be understood of the prophets, which never should be wanting, of whom the people might take counsel; yet doth Peter, in the Acts of the apostles, translate the same unto Christ, and affirmeth, that the kingdom promised to David, was made perfect in Christ. For even so the promise of seed made unto Abraham, in the book of Genesis; although it may be referred unto Isaac, yet by Paul it is applied unto Christ. For he saith; It is said, Not in thy seeds, as in many, but in one, which is Christ. So that, when we refer the song of Anna unto higher matters, we offend not against the doctrine of the apostles. And why it is thus done, the reason is easily showed. In weighing of all the benefits of God, it is meet to return to the fountain and head itself, from whence all those things do flow. Assuredly, the highest benefit of God towards mankind is Christ: wherefore all other things must be reduced wholly unto this root. Whereupon Paul unto the Romans reasoneth after this manner; If God gave his own son unto us, how shall he not with him give us all things also?

27. But thou wilt say, that many benefits are bestowed upon the wicked, who nevertheless have not Christ for their head; neither do they acknowledge him. I grant it: but those be gifts without gift, as the poet saith, and make not unto their salvation, but unto their destruction. Even so Paul unto the Philippians, although he had many gifts before he came unto

Christ, and even such as were not to be despised: yet he saith, that He accounted them for losses and dung. For the wicked, when they flourish in all wealth and abundance, are like unto the beasts appointed for sacrifices, which being found most fat, are slain in she shambles. But to the intent that these things may the better be understood, let us thus conclude the reason; God either angry or well pleased, bestoweth his benefits upon men. He being angry, no man Would receive of him, because such things should be no benefits, seeing they would work to destruction, not to salvation. So as it is to be wished, that he would give those things, when he is well pleased and merciful: but he is not well pleased, unless it be for Christ his sake; for which cause there is no perfect benefit of God bestowed upon us, that hath not his rooting in Christ.

To conclude, we must wholly affirm, that one and the same covenant, between God and man, is both of the old and New Testament: in the which God promised, that he would be their God, and they should be his people. This covenant they in the Old Testament, no less had, than we in the New Testament have. And Paul, in the eleventh chapter unto the Romans, describeth that covenant to be as a plant or tree, whereof as well the Jews as the Christians be branches and boughs. And therefore he saith; If some of the branches were broken off, and thou being but a wild olive tree wast grafted in their place, and made partaker of the root and fat of the olive tree, &c. Wherefore, the tree is all one, the stock all one, the plant all one that beareth us and them. But herein is the difference; that we be branches grafted in, whereas they are natural. Briefly, what difference soever is between each testament, that doth every whit consist, not in the substance of the covenant, but in the accidents. For the principal point of the old covenant was, that the true God would be indeed our God.

Afterward, there were other promises adjoined; namely, of the kingdom in the stock of David, of the possession of the land of Canaan, of the outward priesthood: also commandments touching ceremonies and judgments. But those leaves of ceremonies, the flowers of the kingdom, and the bark of the priesthood are now taken away by Christ, who was expressed in them: as in the ninth chapter to the Hebrews it is diligently considered, where it is declared, that it was requisite for the high priest, every year once, to enter by blood into the holiest place. In the which custom the death of Christ was shadowed, who by himself, and not by the blood of another, entered into the true and proper holy places. So as the apostle calleth all that stage of ceremonies and sacrifices, the pattern of Christ; because (according as the time required) they shaped out Christ to the Jews. After the same manner he speaketh in that epistle of the land of promise; This day (saith he) if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the time of bitterness, in the day of temptation in the wilderness.

28. Of this matter, the old prophets, being not ignorant, do so entreat of things in their time, as they apply the greatest part of their doctrine unto Christ: and therefore do seem sometimes to write more magnifically, than the things which they treat of do require. And a man might easily judge, that the event of things, other whiles answered not to their sayings. In the prophet Zechariah, God promiseth, that he would be a fiery wall unto the city of Jerusalem: which thing never came to pass after the restitution of the temple. But a little after, the Jews were so in a manner destroyed by the Macedonians, as they were scarcely ever in more lamentable case. In the 72nd Psalm is contained this prophesy of the kingdom of Solomon; All kings shall fall down before him, and all nations shall do him service, and in the name of him all people shall be blessed. These things never happened

unto Solomon, neither can they be any other way understood, but of Christ. Also Isaiah saith; that So great should the peace be, that men would convert spears into spades, and that the wolf and lamb should couch together. Which sayings being referred unto those times, be altogether excessive speeches: but they do very well and properly agree unto Christ.

Wherefore, none may justly complain, if these and such like things be wrested by us unto Christ; seeing this is the just and true interpretation of the scriptures. Neither are these kind of oracles less agreeable unto Christ, than unto those times, of which they seemed to be written. And least that any man should think, that only the apostles or evangelists dare make this exposition; let him ponder, that the Chaldean interpreter did the very same thing, who showeth, that by the words of the prophetess; (The horn of his Christ shall be exalted) is meant Messias. The other Rabbins of the Hebrews also do apply not only that place, but also many other unto Messias; especially those that were more ancient than the apostles and evangelists: unto whom it was sufficient to show only a reason, how that many acts and sayings in the Old Testament were referred unto Christ; thinking it needless to go through with everything.

Zechariah also, the father of John Baptist, sufficiently saw and testified, that this is the true and natural exposition of the Old Testament, when in his song he saith; He hath raised up a horn of salvation in the house of his servant David, as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, even since the world began. Now at the length (saith he) God stirred up the horn so long looked for in the house of David: which he therefore saith; because Christ derived his pedigree from the family of David. But when shall this horn be raised up? Certainly it is even now already lifted up, because Christ doth presently also reign at the right hand of his father. But he shall then at

the length be evidently and magnifically advanced, when he shall judge the whole world, and shall deliver the kingdom to God the father, when as all things shall be put under his feet. For (as saith the author of the epistle to the Hebrews;) All things are not yet subdued unto him, but they shall then be subdued, when as death the last enemy shall be destroyed.

29. Wherefore, under temporal blessings was comprehended the sum of all felicity, that godly men are to wait for by Christ: and it is after that sort described, because it must be expressed, forsomuch as it is promised unto us. But there lack words; for that, seeing it cannot be perceived by man's understanding, there is no word properly attributed to express the same. Neither is the power of man's words such, as it can be able to express those divine and celestial things. Yet, to the intent we might be stirred up, to desire the same; the holy Ghost hath of his mercy provided to have it set forth unto us, by these words of terrestrial felicity; which may best agree with the capacity of man. Which thou mayest perceive almost in all the prophets, when they take in hand to describe the kingdom of Christ: for there they describe an abundance of all good things. Of which things to rehearse some, they say, that the dominion of his kingdom shall most amply be extended; there shall be no end of peace; nations and people shall no more fight one against another; of their swords and spears they shall make scythes, plough-shards, and spades. Yea they add, that the wolf and the lamb should dwell in one place together. Also, that wearing and wasting shall be no longer; that the infant and old man shall fulfill their days; that sorrows shall be taken away; yea, that God shall wipe away tears and weeping.

Which sayings of the prophets, when they be objected unto us by the Jews, who, by such kind of arguments would prove that our savior Jesus is

not Messias: we must so understand them, as we acknowledge that there be two comings of Christ; the first (I mean) and the second. Further, that some things be had, either in their full and perfect possession; or else, only by participation, and a certain taste and feeling begun. So that, as touching the first coming, we will answer; that these prosperous and happy successes are not due unto us: nay rather, it was foretold us otherwise by Christ himself, that his people should be delivered into the synagogues, that they should be brought before kings and rulers; and (as Paul said) All that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecutions. But in the second coming of Christ, we have a full and absolute felicity; the which shall be altogether heavenly. For Christ testifieth; that We in the kingdom shall be like unto angels, which neither marry, nor be married. And yet is it described unto us, as if it were temporal and earthly; and that not alonely in the Old Testament, but in the new: where Christ saith, that he would provide for his elect, to sit down, and that he passing by, will minister unto them.

And in the 19th chapter of Luke, he said; We be like men that expect their Lord, when he will return from the marriage. Wherein Christ is described to have gone unto his father; howbeit, as unto a marriage feast. Wherefore, we now wait for him, until his second coming. And the felicity, which he now enjoyeth, is called by him, a feast and marriage. Howbeit, this felicity, which now Christ hath, and we hereafter shall have; we, by a certain participation, have in the meantime while we live here: for Paul saith, that We by hope are saved. So that now we enjoy and have the tranquility of conscience; For we know that there is no damnation to them that be in Christ Jesus. We have moreover peace towards God, unto whom, before we were most hateful: whereof Paul warneth us unto the Romans; We being justified freely, are at peace with God. Also, we by the holy Ghost, have

received the gift of grace, and notable virtues, also brotherly charity, then which nothing is more excellent in the world, the riches of the word of God, and of the holy sacraments, and the general publishing of the Gospel; whereby we be declared to be reconciled unto God, and absolved from sins.

30. And through this description, which the holy scripture useth, (by these temporal good things, to shadow heavenly things, which we look for) we not only enjoy this commodity; that we are led by the hand unto the knowledge of them: but we also, in the meantime, acknowledge almighty God to be the distributer, as well of that felicity, as also of these temporal good things. Unto which doctrine if thou adjoin that notable title of God; namely, that he is the helper in necessities; thou mayest most effectually conclude, that we also must hope, that we shall not be left destitute, even of these temporal good things, when they shall be meet for us. Wherefore, by the admonition of Peter and David, we will cast all our cark and care upon God: which unless we do, we shall not be far from the detestable crime of sacrilege. For otherwise, we should challenge unto us those things, which God would have to rest and be entire unto himself. If it be the office of God, to take the care of us; he that taketh away the same from him, may be accused of the robbery of holy things. Howbeit, we must not through this argument, securely leave off from praying most fervently, for the obtaining of these things at God's hands. For he that hath promised the same, hath commanded, that we should desire our daily bread of the father.

Besides this, we will labor; neither will we leave off the works that we be enjoined to do: in doing whereof, we shall be assured, by the promise of Christ, that these things also shall be cast upon us. For he saith; First seek the kingdom of God, and all things shall be given unto you. They all seek the kingdom of God, which walk in their vocation. For all the vocations of

Christians do hold it their duty, to spread far abroad and establish the dominion of Christ. Unto all such, as thus apply themselves, Christ testifieth; that All these other things, which serve for livelihood, shall be added. And this is not to be understood only of them, which labor in preaching of the Gospel (which is the principal duty of apostles and ministers of the church:) but also as touching all them, which serve Christ in their vocation. Thou seest therefore, how profitably the everlasting good things are described by temporal things; which in like manner thou mayest understand to be done, concerning punishments. In the 19th chapter of Luke, there is a saying touching those wicked men, which would not have Christ to reign as king over them; Bring them, and slay them before me.

But it is certain, that at the day of judgment, neither the souls shall be converted into nothing; neither that men, being raised again, shall be deprived of their corporal life: but, under that description is expressed unto us, the last sentence of those that shall be condemned. And even so thou mayest understand that, which is spoken of the state of hell fire; There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth: when as now, the spirits, which be tormented in hell, have neither teeth nor eyes, in the which gnashing and tears may have place. Neither are we any otherwise to understand that, which is written of that rich glutton, whose tongue was tormented in the flame with extreme pain. All these things no doubt must be understood metaphorically. But the goodness of God had this blessing (to wit, as well spiritual felicity, and heavenly happiness, as also the necessary use of things temporal, which we for the merits and worthiness of Christ do receive) not only laid up in his secret treasure, before all worlds, and bestoweth the same upon us in time convenient; but also he provided, that by his prophets and

holy scriptures, it should be delivered unto us by apt words, and by figures most effectual, and most profitable to teach.

31. But yet it seemeth to be doubted, whether the Jews of our time, which give no credit unto Christ, have any right in this league, which is made with Abraham and his posterity; to wit, whether they be contained therein; or else, whether they are understood to be utterly excluded from the same. This (in my judgment) ought thus to be expounded; if the league have Christ for the foundation and substance thereof, now are they by supposition strangers from the same. Further, in this league are considered the ceremonies, and the holy rites: the which being now, since the coming of Christ, abolished; although they be at this day retained by the Jews, do nothing at all make unto this covenant. Nay rather, if they be kept, they are against it; because they gain-say Christ, which is the principal substance of the covenant. Wherefore in act, and in very deed, we deny that they at this day be contained in this covenant. Unto whom nevertheless we deny not that, which Paul doth grant unto them; namely, that the word of God is committed unto them: for we see, that by a certain wonderful providence of God, the holy bible is kept among them. And if so be they believe not, that disanulleth not, but that they are to be received, being as yet adorned by so excellent a benefit of God.

Furthermore, whereas Paul, in the eleventh chapter to the Romans, prophesieth of them, that they shall be converted, when the fullness of the Gentiles is come in; and calleth them enemies for our sakes; and beloved, because of the fathers; and speaketh of them, when as they were now departed from Christ: this also (me thinketh) is to be attributed unto them; namely, that the promise of God, as concerning that generation, is not yet clearly taken away. For by the power of the promise, God continually

calleth some of them; and it is thought, that hereafter he will more fully call them. Again, we acknowledge with Paul, that the same good olive tree, from whence they being cut, and grafted again, is more proper unto them, than unto us: for they are not only grafted in by the predestination of God, as we be; but they are more near to Christ, in respect of the flesh; and their stock is more near knit unto him, than ours is. Wherefore Paul saith; To the Jew first, and to the Greek. For the which causes the apostle speaking of them, yea even when they were swerved from the truth, said, that he was exceeding sorrowful for their destruction; forsomuch as to them belonged the fathers, the adoption, the glory, the testament, and the promise. All which things are not so to be interpreted, as though the Jews do now in act pertain to the league; but are meant as touching them, which of their stock are to be adopted into that league. These things be thus spoken of their kindred, that is, of their nation, as it had the old fathers, apostles, and those that were afterward to believe; and not particularly for every Jew: as who would say, that they should be verified of the unbelievers and obstinate.

32. The works of God are so ordered, as they easily help, and by no means hinder one another. Therefore, the blinding of the Jews, although in them it be sin; yet in that it is the work of God, it had a good end; namely, the conversion of the Gentiles: and the conversion of the Gentiles shall help, towards the salvation, which shall be given unto the Jews; for it shall provoke them to envy. And in the meantime, until this come to pass, let us consider with our selves the wonderful work of God: they as yet continue, and are kept in so great adversities, and in so diverse and grievous captivity and dispersion; they hold still their religion, as much as they may; they exercise themselves in the holy scriptures, although they understand all things corruptly. Doubtless, no ancient Trojans, Lombards, Huns, or

Vandals, have so held still their own, as they could be dissevered from all other nations, in civil life and religion; and could show their original and history set forth in most true writing; and being every-where dispersed (as they were) could nevertheless keep their own ordinances. Which, forsomuch as it so continueth among the Jews, it is undoubtedly a singular work of God, and bringeth unto us no small commodity; since they are witnesses of our books, which they carry about with them as their own, and authentical. And that doth Augustine also note. For, unless that people were yet still remaining, the Ethnic philosophers might suspect; that these things are of our own inventing, which we believe and preach, as touching the creation of the world, of Adam, of Noah, of Abraham, of the patriarchs, kings, and prophets. So as they are doubtless all this while perpetually preserved of God, for some salvation to come.

# CHAP. XVII. Of Christ, and his manifestation in the flesh; and by what means he performed all the parts of our salvation.

Undoubtedly, God is truly said to come to us many ways; but yet properly and specially, the son of God, which is the true God, came in the nature of man to save mankind. For, although God be in every place; yet we say, that he came; because he put upon him the nature of man: and thus we say he came unto us, and presented himself unto us; both the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghost. Because, albeit that the works of the Trinity, as touching inward matters be particular: as, to beget, to inspire, to proceed; (for these things are done by the divine power, which is common unto the three persons:) yet the same, as concerning outward things, are inseparable. Then wilt thou say; Wherefore is the son only said to be incarnate? Here two things are to be considered of us; namely, the action and the work. As touching the work itself, Christ alone took upon him the nature of man; since that nature is joined with the only substance of the son. But with the action both the father and the holy Ghost had to do: for the efficient cause, and the action pertained unto the three persons. And that may be proved by the scriptures, insomuch as Isaiah saith; The Lord and his

spirit hath sent me. And Paul to the Galatians; When the fullness of time was come, God sent his own son. And in Luke the angel saith; The holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee. And afterward, as it is in Matthew; She was found great with child by the holy Ghost. By these testimonies it appeareth, that Christ was sent, both by the Father, and by the holy Ghost.

Besides this, the son himself was the cause of his own coming. Indeed that might seem to be a hard matter, that one and the same thing should both be the efficient cause, and the effect: yet may it be proved many ways. For first, as touching sanctification, in the tenth chapter of John it is thus read; Whom the fathers sent and sanctified, do ye say that he blasphemeth, because he saith; I am the son of God? Afterward, in the 17th chapter, Christ again saith; For their sakes sanctify I myself. The very same may be said as touching the death of Christ: for Paul unto the Romans, writeth; Who spared not his own son, but gave him for all our sakes. And to the Galatians he saith; Who loved me, and gave himself for me. The same also is said touching the resurrection, seeing Paul unto the Romans saith; He that hath raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, shall also raise up your mortal bodies. But Christ himself in John saith; Destroy ye this temple, and I will in three days re-edify the same. Again; I have power to lay down my life, and to take it again. And; By him all things were made. The same also we may say of the incarnation of Christ: for Paul unto the Galatians, saith; When the fullness of time was come, God sent his own son. The same apostle to the Philippians saith; He made himself of no reputation, taking upon him the form of a servant. We see therefore, that it appeareth sufficiently by the holy scriptures, that Christ was both the efficient cause, and the effect. Wherefore, there were three that came, as touching the

efficient cause; although the work itself did pertain only to the son. Of this matter writeth Augustine at large, in his second book *De trinitate*, the fourth chapter; and against Felix the Arian, chapter 24: to prove, that Christ is both the efficient cause, and the work. And as concerning that, which Christ speaketh of himself in John; namely, I came not of myself, must either be filled up, with adding this one word, Onely: as if he had said; I came not only of myself: or else it is to be understood touching his human nature.

2. Paul, in the 9th to the Romans hath an excellent commendation of Christ, wherein he expressly confesseth the two natures in him, joined together in one and the self-same person: so that of both natures is made Christ; Of the which (saith he) is Christ, according to the flesh, who is God over all things blessed forever. His human nature is declared in these words; Of the Jews, as touching the flesh: for by the flesh, in the Hebrew tongue, is understood the whole man. His divine nature is most manifestly described in these words; Who is God over all, blessed forever. The same also is not obscurely signified in that, which is added; As touching the flesh: for that particle should not have been put, unless he had had something more than the flesh. This doctrine the Arians, Mahumetists, (and whatsoever they be that hold, that Christ is a mere man) do impugn, among the which also are the Rabbins of the Hebrews. For even as by a corrupt interpretation they had corrupted the law, as touching manners and life (which is manifest by the interpretation, that Christ made of the law, and in that he reproved their vain devises,) so had they also depraved the sincere faith of the Messias to come; so that they thought he should be a mere and simple man. For when Christ demanded of them, what they thought of the Messias; they made answer, that he should be the son of David: neither had they any deeper or higher consideration of him.

Wherefore Christ objected unto them the 110th Psalm, where David called the Messias his Lord: which could not agree to a mere and simple man, born of his stock, as they fondly imagined. Ambrose, expounding this place, affirmeth; that These words must needs be applied unto Christ, since there is here no mention made of any other person, unto whom they may aptly be applied. If they will not (saith he) have these things to be understood concerning Christ, let them show some other person, mentioned by Paul, unto whom they may be referred: and if, besides Christ, they can find none other; then let them leave unto Christ, the glory which is attributed unto him by Paul. Ambrose indeed confesseth, that when the father and the son are joined together in the holy scriptures, the father is called God, and the son Lord. And this he saith is done, for this consideration; because we preach, that we worship one God only. And if we should repeat the name of God, we might peradventure seem to depart somewhat from that unity: and therefore are those names so varied. But I see that that rule is not in the holy scriptures perpetually observed: for we read in the psalm (as it is cited in the Hebrews;) Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness. Here for that he entreateth of the father and the son, he repeateth the name of God twice. He saith moreover, that Christ is above all, is read also in the epistle to the Philippians: for there it is written, that In the name of Jesus every knee should bow, both of things celestial, terrestrial, and infernal.

Out of which place, no less than out of this, which we have here in hand, he gathereth the divine nature in Christ; seeing if he were not God, he should not be worshipped. For in the Apocalypse, John was forbidden of the angel to worship him; I am thy fellow servant (saith he) take heed thou do it not. But Christ, when he often times permitted himself to be worshipped,

did plainly testify that he was very God. For seeing he was a most sharp defender of the divine, sincere, and true worshipping of God; he would never have suffered himself to be worshipped instead of God, unless he had been God in very deed. Yea (saith he) Paul doth so vehemently affirm Christ to be God, that unto his words he addeth; Amen: which particle, without all controversy, maketh a great affirmation. Chrysostom also seemeth to ascribe these things unto the son: for he saith, that when Paul had reckoned up the wonderful great benefits, which God had bestowed upon the Hebrews (which were so great, that our Savior took flesh of that people) he by this exclamation, both gave thanks, and also ascribed the praise unto the son of God, and that upon good consideration; especially, when as he knew, that Christ was everywhere blasphemed and reproached by the Jews; and that most of all, when they rejected and cast from them his Gospel and preaching.

3. We have else-where taught by testimonies brought out of the scriptures; and those most certain, that Christ is God: so as to repeat them again in this place, it is not needful. John, in the fifth chapter of his first epistle, expressly pronounceth, that Christ is the true God, and eternal life. At this time it shall be sufficient to have noted, that by this sentence of the apostle, which we are in hand with, are overthrown and confuted many heresies. The Manichees taught, that Christ had not a true body; but that, whatsoever seemed to be in him, as touching a human body, was only a fantasy and an illusion of the eyes. But Paul saith, that Christ had flesh, and that he took it of the nation of the Hebrews. Which words of Paul make also against those, that confess, that Christ had indeed a true body; but yet say, that he brought it from heaven, and took it not of the virgins Marie. For they trifle with us, to say, that Christ conveyed his body through her, no otherwise than water

is derived through a conduit or pipe. But Paul manifestly saith; that the flesh of Christ was made, not by the Hebrews, but of the Hebrews.

Arius also is by these words confuted; who impudently durst affirm, that Christ was only a creature; and with blasphemous speech durst deny the son of God to be God. Among these also is Nestorius, who confesseth both the natures of Christ; but he so severed the one from the other, as he held, that that conjunction between them is only by grace: and that of these two natures is not made one person. Wherefore he denied, that the blessed virgins could be called θεοτόκος, that is, the mother of God; but that she ought to be called the mother of man: for it cannot agree with the divine nature, to be born again. But he considereth not, that Paul here saith, that Christ is of the Jews, as touching the flesh. We do grant indeed, that the things, which were universally spoken of Christ, are sometimes to be understood of the one nature, and sometimes of the other: when yet notwithstanding, Christ himself is only one person and substance. So we say, that the immortal God was born, crucified, and died. For there is a certain communicating of the properties, by the wonderful connection of the two natures, which Nestorius went about to separate and pull in sunder.

Howbeit I am not ignorant, that Erasmus, in this place, maketh mention of two other readings, besides this, which we follow. One of them is, that we should thus read, Of whom is Christ as touching the flesh; so that there should be put a stop: and then followeth that which remaineth, as an exclamation separated, wherein Paul saith; that God, which is over all, is to be praised forever. So that, God signifieth either the father, or else the whole trinity. The other is to be read after this manner; Of whom is Christ as touching the flesh, which is over all: and there make a point, and then add this as a member by itself; God blessed forever. These readings I see no

cause why we should admit; for, seeing the common received reading is plain and manifest, I think it rather most meet to follow the same. For these readings put a new apostrophe or turning of speech, either to God the father, or to the holy trinity; when as there is no such need. Further Paul seemeth to follow the same manner, that is oftentimes used by the Hebrew prophets, and also in the psalms, that the latter part of the period should repeat that, which is contained in the former: which he doth here most plainly, and with much efficacy Because first he teacheth the divinity of Christ, when he said; As touching the flesh. For that particle should not have been necessary, if there had been in Christ nothing else, but his human nature. And he addeth; Who is over all: which belongeth unto God only. Wherefore, that which was in those clauses spoken somewhat obscurely, in the other part of the period he speaketh more expressly: for he saith; Who is over all, God blessed forever, Amen.

4. Neither is the reason of Ambrose lightly to be weighed, that there is no other thing or person in this place to be sought; seeing here the speech was purposely of the son only. Erasmus excuseth this his devise, that it nothing hindereth the divine nature, which we affirm to be in Christ; especially, seeing the same may be abundantly proved by other places of the scripture. We answer, that we also know right well, that the divine nature in Christ is by many other places of the scriptures sufficiently testified, but yet (we think) that this is also, together with the rest, to be retained: for so we see all the fathers have done. Neither is it meet, that we should without cause decay the armory of the church, which we ought rather daily to fulfill and renew. But peradventure he will say; They trust but a little to other places, which so earnestly contend for this one. Verily we do not a little put confidence in other places: but since this place is very firm and clear, we

will not lose it. The Commentaries of Origin testify, that these things are spoken of Christ; as though Paul in these words would refell those, which at that time durst not openly call Christ, God. Which is marvel to hear Origin affirm, when as he otherwise did not think rightly of the son of God. But Erasmus thinketh, that that part, in those Commentaries to the Romans, is none of his. For he saith, that Ruffinus, or him whosoever he were, that translated Origin, amended certain things of set purpose; least the readers should be too much offended.

And Jerome against Ruffinus testifieth; that Origin in his other books, never thought well of those things, touching which he had erred in his book περί ἀρχῶν. Which if it be true; then, forsomuch as in these books he had a most wicked judgment of the son of God, it may easily be proved, that these things could not be written by him in his Commentaries to the Romans. But howsoever it be touching Origin, (for his Commentaries to the Romans are not extant in the Greek, whereby we should judge anything of them) this is certain, that Cyprian, a most ancient writer, in his second book against the Jews, the fifth chapter, useth this testimony to prove the divinity of Christ: albeit that, when he citeth the words of Paul, he leaveth out this word, God. And so we perceive to be done by Hilary, upon the 122nd Psalm. But that may seem to have come through the negligence of the Registers, as Erasmus himself confesseth. Neither must we omit, that that particle, Over all, may be adjoined to that particle, Blessed, which followeth: so that the sense is; God that is to be praised above all.

**Touching the uniting of substance of the two natures into one person of Christ, look the dialogue of Peter Martyr himself, set forth particularly concerning that matter.**

5. But in that sentence of Paul, which is written in the first to the Corinthians, the 15th chapter; The first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord himself from heaven. That to this purpose the Antithesis might be perfect, many have thought, it should be understood; that even as the first man had his body fashioned out of the earth, so the second man; namely Christ, brought his body out of heaven. Hereof it cometh, that Valentinus, Martion, and among the latter heretics Swenkfeldius and his fellows agree not, that Christ took flesh of the virgins; but thought, that he brought his body with him out of heaven. But it is not necessary, that the comparison should be answerable in every point. This rather is a certain allusion of the apostle, wherein is not weighed the substance of things compared; but the qualities, conditions, and gifts of nature are compared together. Neither meaneth the apostle any other thing, but that Adam was the figure of this our life; and that the latter Adam (I mean Christ) is the form of the life to come, which we expect. Neither doth he here make mention of a body, nay rather, when he had said; The first man of the earth earthy: he added; And the second is the Lord from heaven. It is not denied of the godly, that Christ is from heaven; seeing they attribute unto him the divine nature: but yet it cometh not to pass thereby, that whatsoever the Lord, who came down from heaven, had, is either of heavenly nature, or else brought from heaven. For if we list after that sort to reason of the first Adam, we shall not say that he is utterly of the earth earthy; seeing (beside the body) he had also a soul, which is a divine thing, and was not taken out of the slime of the earth.

So as (according to this reason) we may say; that as Adam had not only a body fashioned out of the earth, but also a heavenly mind: so Christ comprehendeth not only the divine nature, which was out of heaven, but a

natural body, which he took out of the earth in the virgins womb. And Augustine, in the 13th chapter *De civitate Dei*, feareth not howsoever to attribute unto the man Christ a natural body: otherwise, if we shall grant unto Christ a body brought out of heaven, he shall not be a man; seeing heavenly things are furthest of all differing from earthly things. But that Christ was very man, as well the scripture everywhere testifieth, as also Paul in this place expressly calleth him a man. Albeit (as touching the humanity) Christ may be said to have come out of heaven, seeing his body had no original from the seed of man, but from the holy Ghost: as the angel promised unto the virgins, when he said; The spirit of the highest shall overshadow thee. Moreover, he might be said to come from heaven, in respect of affections and actions of his human conversation: when as in manners and holiness of life, he altogether behaved himself heavenly and divinely. Furthermore, the apostle speaketh of Christ, having respect unto the state of the resurrection, whereunto we also shall be brought. And it is not to be doubted, but that he challenged unto himself the condition of resurrection; not naturally, but by his divine power.

6. But now seeing the exposition of this place is manifest, there resteth yet to reprove them, which have otherwise judged, saying; that Christ took not his body of the virgins, but brought the same forth with him out of heaven: and that he passed through the virgins Marie as through a conduit. But specially let us consider, what reasons they rest upon. First they say; that If the body of Christ be not divine and heavenly, but a creature taken of the virgins womb; when as Paul saith; that Christ dwelleth in our hearts (as we read unto the Ephesians:) we shall have no more but half of him. For it shall be no otherwise than according to his divine nature. But we answer them, that in what sort Christ dwelleth in our hearts, the same apostle doth plainly

declare: for he added; By faith. Which faith doth not apprehend Christ in part, but wholly; as well in the sacrament of the Eucharist, as also in the word of God, which is set forth unto us for our salvation. And that this must be judged after a spiritual sort, it appeareth, by comparing together of other places.

In the eight chapter unto the Romans it is said; If Christ do dwell in you, God, which raised him from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, for his spirit sake, which dwelleth in you. Here now we plainly hear, that Christ, by his spirit, dwelleth in us. And in the third chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, we are by no other reason affirmed to be the temple of God; but because the holy Ghost dwelleth in us. Neither is there required unto that conjunction, which we have with Christ; that his body should in very deed penetrate our breasts or our minds. By faith, and by the spirit, Christ is all wholly apprehended of us; as well touching his divine nature, as touching his human nature. And when we affirm the divine nature of Christ to be every-where, we do not so say of the human. It must not be thought, that we make a division of Christ, as Nestorius did. For we grant, that whole Christ, if (as I may say) thou understand him personally, is in every place: yet nevertheless, we will not grant that all that is of Christ is everywhere.

For wheresoever the son of God is, he undoubtedly it is, that hath the human nature joined with him; although not wheresoever he be, he maketh the same to be present in very deed, wheresoever he himself is: seeing for the very truth thereof it is necessary, that it be bounded within his own limits, and be contained within a certain place. Further, they argue, that in the last day of judgment, the body of Christ shall be seen of all them, which shall be judged. The which, forsomuch as they shall be an exceeding great

number, so as they will occupy a great part of the whole world; unless we grant unto Christ a body of wonderful greatness, as the sun, or some notable star is, he cannot be manifest unto all. Here do we say, that all those which shall be judged, shall be changed: so as they shall no longer have a natural body. And although the wicked shall not pass into the change of glory, yet shall they have a body so restored, as they shall have no longer need of meat or drink. So that they may be so endued with such a perfectness of sense, as they shall be able to behold their Judge, from the parts that be very far distant.

7. They say also, that according to our doctrine, Christ is not to be worshipped but by half; since it is manifest, that no creature must be worshipped. For if Christ had his body from the virgins, it was undoubtedly created: wherefore, in right it should not be worshipped. But hereunto we have already said, that we must not sunder the natures of Christ, as Nestor did. We must consider, that they be united to the person, and whole Christ is worshipped by us: that is to say, the same divine person, which wheresoever it be, or is worshipped, it hath the humanity joined unto it, which cannot be sundered from the divine nature. But if we would search the very cause of worshipping, the same is not to be found in the humanity, but in the deity. Also they say, that a human body, seeing it is affirmed of us to be a creature, is subject unto the curse, and unto sin: and that therefore it is not meet that we should join the same with the son of God. Nevertheless, we confess it to be true, which these men say concerning the flesh and a human body; unless it be prevented and sanctified by the holy spirit.

But we deny that, which they take as granted; namely, that human flesh cannot be so sanctified, as it may be void of spot and curse. Let these men tell us, whether they think, that the body of the first man (when it was

fashioned by God, and made perfect and sound in mind) were under the curse and sin. Detestable it were so to think. For those things, which God made, were very good. Wherefore, seeing we read, that the holy Ghost did overshadow Marie, before she conceived; why will we deny the flesh and matter which Christ took from thence to be sanctified? And they are wont to allege diverse places of the scripture to confirm their devise, as that of Matthew; namely, That which is born in her is of the holy Ghost. Whereby they are of the opinion, that Christ was born in Marie, but not of Marie, as from thence taking substance. Howbeit, this place doth specially confute them: for it is attributed unto Christ, that he was born in the virgins. But to be born, is not to pass through by a pipe or conduit; but thence to take very matter of the body whereby it is said to be born.

And where they urge, that it is written; In her, that only they show but once: whereas on the other side, we have it in infinite places, that Christ is of the seed of David. Which when these heretics spied out, they became so impudent, that (as Tertullian reporteth) where so ever this preposition Ex, that is, Of, is had, they blotted it out, and instead thereof, for confirming their opinion, did put Per, that is, By, or through. Also they cite that place of John; The word became flesh: as though the body of Christ consisted not of the matter gathered of the virgins womb, but rather of the word of God. Howbeit, these men, which speak on this wise, should consider how absurd a thing it is, to appoint God to be changed and turned into another kind. They further allege against us, that which we read in John; Ye be of the earth, I am from above. Which purpose of theirs, how smally it prevaileth, the common and vulgar interpretation doth declare. Christ is from above, as touching his divine nature: over this, his actions were governed, not by earthly affections, but by the heavenly and divine spirit. But in the Jews,

whom he reproved, it was otherwise: for, as they were mere and bare men, so were they also led by carnal and earthly desires.

8. Moreover, they call to remembrance, that Christ denied that he had a mother: whereupon when he taught in the synagogue, and a certain man said; Thy mother and thy brethren inquire for thee at the door, he answered him; Who is my mother, and who be my brethren? But here they be far deceived, as they be in other places. For some have expounded that place, as though that messenger, which said these things, had mocked his divinity, as if he should say; This man professeth himself to be God, and I cannot tell what divinity he boasteth of, seeing nevertheless, his brethren and mother oftentimes seek for him. Wherefore Christ repelling this temptation, as touching his divine nature, answered; Who is my mother, and who be my brethren? As if he had said; So far forth as I am God, I have neither mother nor brethren. Or else we will expound the place more truly and easily; namely, that Christ then taught, that the function of teaching was committed to him of the father: and that therefore he ought not to be let from the same, either for his mother, or his brethren sake. For, in respect of such business, we must not know mother, brethren, and human affections: for first of all the kingdom of God must be sought. Wherefore Christ said in like manner unto his parents, when he was found in the temple, propounding and answering among the doctors; Did ye not know that I must be occupied about my fathers business? Again, they avouch that sentence out of Luke; namely, that when a certain woman had said; Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps that gave thee suck: Christ answered; Yea rather, happy are they, which hear the word of God, and keep the same. But Christ, by this answer, rejected not the friendship of his mother: but he showed which was to be counted the better degree of felicity. Besides this, they allege, that

the angels in the Old Testament could take human flesh upon them, and indue themselves with our bodies; who, for all that, were not born of women. And what shall let (say they) but that we may say the very same of Christ, that he put on the form of man; and yet took not the same of Marie? We answer, that (according to the power of God) it was no hard matter for Christ to be clad with a human body, by any other means than by the virgins womb.

But the similitude of angels, appearing in human form, must not be compared with the incarnation of the Lord: for they took no bodies upon them, to be crucified, to die, and to redeem mankind; but to execute the message that was committed unto them. But Christ, to the intent he might redeem men, would be in very deed a man. Which had not happened, if his body had been brought out of heaven; seeing that celestial and terrestrial natures do differ more, than in kind. Also they think, that Hilarius is on their side, who in his treatise *De trinitate*, wrote; that Marie the virgins added nothing of hers unto the flesh and body of Christ, besides the ministry of conceiving, bearing, and bringing forth: when as this sentence nevertheless doth vantage them but little. For Hilarius most manifestly beareth witness, that the body of Christ is a creature: but he saith that the virgins Marie added nothing of hers, as touching those three ministries, which he mentioneth, of conceiving, bearing, and bringing forth. For the 4th ministry had been to have had the company of man, to have joined with him, and to have admitted his seed: which Marie did not of her own.

9. But on the other side, that he had a true human body, it is proved many ways. For by the evangelists, his genealogy is set forth, the which by Luke is finished in Adam. In Matthew it is begun at Abraham. Neither is it any hindrance, that he nameth Joseph as the father of Christ; because Joseph

and Marie were both of one kindred: wherefore both their pedigrees be joined together. Which, whether it be done in the great grandfather's grandfather, or afterward, it is no need at this present to inquire. Further, Christ every-where pronounceth himself to be the son of man. And unto Eve was promised the seed, that should break the serpent's head. And unto Abraham was promised a seed, wherein all nations should be blessed. And Paul, in the first to the Rom. writeth of Christ; Who was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh. And again, in the ninth chapter to the Romans; Of whom are the fathers, and of whom, concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is God over all, blessed forever. Moreover, unto the Galatians we read; When the fullness of time was come, God sent his own son, in the similitude of sinful flesh, made of a woman, made under the law.

And also in the same epistle is treated of the seed of Abraham, by which the blessing should afterward come. And the apostle urgeth the word Seed, that it is not spoken in the plural number, Seeds (as though we should understand the same of many:) but the scripture useth the singular number, that we should have respect unto one man Christ. Unto Timothy it is written; Remember thou, that the Lord Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, according to my Gospel, is risen from the dead. But most evidently of all doth the epistle to the Hebrews prove this doctrine, where it is said; that God took the seed of Abraham, not of angels: and affirmeth, that Christ is like unto us in all things, and was tempted in all things: and that, seeing his children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part with them (I mean of flesh and blood.) And he is declared to be our high priest, which could suffer infirmities with us, and was taken from among men. And again; He that doth sanctify, and they that are sanctified, be all of one. And we are called his very brethren.

10. Tertullian bringeth another argument, wherein he proveth, that Christ had a very human body; Nothing (saith he) is taken out of any matter, but it retaineth some tokens and marks of the same. Because the body of the first man was wrought out of clay, therefore it retained the kind of the two elements: for flesh representeth the earth, and blood the water. And many things declare us to be earthy, in respect of our body. In the earth thou mayest see clods; in our body muscles: the earth hath stones; our body hath bones: in the earth there be seen rivers and floods; over all our body veins be derived, which water all the members with blood: in the earth are spread the roots of plants and trees; in the body are placed sinews in all the parts: in the earth are found pebble stones; neither is our body destitute of gravel-stones, nails, and such other like: the earth, within her bowels and secret places, hath metals; our bodies do hold marrow in the hollowness of the bones: we see moss and herbs to spring out of the earth; also upon our body there do grow hairs, beard, and bush of hair. All which things, seeing they took place in the body of Christ; there is no cause why the adversaries should endeavor to make Christ of heavenly nature; seeing these be tokens of earthy matter. Their opinion might seem to be probable, if they could show, in the body of Christ, any token of the seven stars, of Orion, Lucifer, or Arcturus: for then after a sort they might prove the matter thereof to be brought from heaven.

**Of the personal union of the two natures into one person of Christ, look the dialogue of P. Martyr, specially set forth touching that matter.**

11. Jesus, in Latin *Servator*, a savior, is derived from the Hebrew word *Jeschah*. And why he was so called, the angel declared; For (saith he) he shall save his people from their sins. This word Christ is a Greek word, in Hebrew it is called *Meschiah*; that is, anointed. In old time, among the

people of God, kings, prophets, and priests were anointed: for very hard conflicts rest upon them, which are appointed to these offices. Wherefore, under that token they be admonished, that they should become like unto wrestlers, if they will do according to their vocation. And no man is ignorant, but that the wrestlers were accustomed to anoint the parts of their body before they buckled together. Or else (which is a good deal the more likely) by unction was signified abundance of the spirit, with the which these three kind of men are endued: since prophets, kings, and priests, in the administration of their functions, have need of an abundant spirit. And that the inspiration of the spirit is in the holy scriptures called unction, we have no need to doubt. Isaiah saith; The spirit of the Lord upon me; therefore hath he anointed me. Which place Christ interpreteth to be written of himself, so as it needeth the less exposition of us.

And in the psalm, by the testimony of the epistle to the Hebrews, it is spoken as touching our savior; Therefore hath God thy God anointed thee with oil of gladness above thy fellows. And in the Acts of the apostles the 10th chapter, Peter preached unto Cornelius the Centurion, of Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with spirit, and with power. And in the epistle of John it is written: The unction shall teach you in all things. Also in the 105th Psalm, when there was mention made of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, &c: it is written; Touch not mine anointed. And he could not call them, anointed, (so far as can be gathered of the holy scripture) by reason of any external and symbolical unction: wherefore it is wholly to be referred unto the instinct of the holy spirit. Neither must it be passed over, that our Lord Jesus Christ attained to so abundant and plentiful unction of the spirit, as the same by him floweth also unto us, which believe in him: according whereunto it is written in the second epistle to the Corinthians, the first

chapter, in these words; It is God surly that confirmeth us, together with you, in Christ; and hath anointed us, who also hath sealed us, and hath given the earnest of the spirit in our hearts. Whereby it cometh to pass, that so many as truly believe, are not unfitly called both Christ's and Christians.

12. But this we must note, that those ceremonies of the law did vanish by the coming of Christ. Wherefore the papists, and some of the fathers also were lead with a certain false affectation, in that they obtruded to us their anointing. They would have that oil of theirs to be set forth so curiously, with such pomp and solemnity, as no other sacrament is so highly commended unto us by Christ. This is the disposition of men, that they always make more account of their own inventions, than of the commandments of God. But these men, in their oil, do dream I cannot tell what more than a mark that cannot be blotted out. And yet, what the same is, they understand not; neither being asked, be able to teach others what it meaneth. But all these things, Christ, by his coming, did abrogate: wherefore, there is now no need of oil. It is sufficient if ministers be lawfully chosen, that they may with some authority teach the people. Neither is it now need for kings and princes to be anointed. But if so be there be any that at this day be anointed; the whole consideration thereof (in my judgment) belongeth to civil ordinance, and not to religion. Albeit therein also seemeth to be some false affectation of the Jews: for now we be all anointed, and Christians; and it is sufficient to have the thing itself. There is no need of a sign, after that we have dedicated our name unto Christ. And we are said to be anointed, not because we be stroked with oil; but in respect that we have attained unto that, which the oil in old time signified. Oftentimes the thing itself is put for the sign, and the sign also for the thing. Christ was never anointed with oil, so far as we read: and yet

Isaiah thus writeth of him; The holy spirit be upon me, because he hath anointed me. And in the 105th Psalm, David saith of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; When they were but a few in number, and God had led them about, defended them, and punished kings for their sakes: Touch not (saith he) mine anointed. We read not, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were anointed with oil; yet, because they were consecrated for to instruct the people of God, they be called Christ's, and anointed. The thing itself is used for the sign.

13. Christ also is called Lord. Which name doth fitly agree with him: for all things are given unto him by the father, and he hath paid the price for our salvation; wherefore he is justly called Lord. And we may gather, that hereby he obtained this name; because the Hebrews never pronounce the holy name Tetragrammaton, written of four letters, which is, Jehovah, but pronounced by other words, that is, Elohim, and Adonai, which signifieth, might or dominion. Which thing seemed to be the cause, that the 70 interpreters, when they read this name Tetragrammaton, translated it by this word κύριος, which is, Lord. As it appeareth in many places, of the which we will allege one; The Lord said unto my Lord: where in the first place is written Jehovah, which they translated, Lord. So as when Christ is called Lord, it is as much as if he had been called God. Although Tertullian, against Praxea, saith; that Christ is called Lord, when he is joined with the father: for then the father is called God. But and if the son, being joined with him, should also be called God; the Ethnics might think, that we grant more gods than one. Wherefore, to withstand their suspicion, we make this word Lord an epitheton of the son. But if we name Jesus Christ by himself, and alone; he is plainly called God: as it appeareth in many places of the scriptures. And he useth a certain similitude. As a beam of the sun, when we

make mention of it by itself, we call it the sun; and we say, that the sun entereth in at our windows: but when it happeneth, that the sun is to be named together with the beam, we call not the beam by the name of the sun, but say it is the beam of the sun. But the first reason is more firm.

14. As concerning the kingdom of Christ, it seemeth to bring no small difficulty, when as be the holy scriptures, there is often mention made of the eternal kingdom of Christ; which, if it shall have an end, as the words of Paul in the 15th chapter of the first to the Corinthians, seem to signify, some contrariety will appear to be stirred up. Gabriel said unto Marie; God shall give unto him the seat of his father David, he shall reign in the house of Jacob forever, and there shall be no end of his kingdom. And Daniel, when he prophesied covertly of the Monarchies, he was not silent as touching the kingdom of Christ; but he prophesied, that that should be a kingdom of all worlds, and forever. This knot did Ambrose undo, that we must not believe, that the son will so deliver up this kingdom unto the father, as he shall cease to reign: but because he will then declare unto all persons, that he doth not reign by himself, but that all his strengths and actions be of the father, from whom is all paternity both in heaven and in earth. And after this sort he shall openly glorify him. Which thing shall be, to deliver the kingdom unto God, and to the father; that is, not to use the same unto himself only. Augustine, wheresoever he entreateth of this place, consenteth unto Ambrose. But we may expound it otherwise, and (as I think) with a meet exposition, by these ways that follow; as to say, that to reign, is sometime taken as it were to excel, to be above others, and to hold the highest place. And in this signification Christ shall reign perpetually.

But if we say, that to reign, is in such sort as to exercise the office of a king, to fight, to defend, to overcome, and other such like; Christ shall not

always reign. For when we shall be perfect and absolute, there will be no need of these helps of Christ. When he came into the world, he preached, he taught, he died for our salvation: now also he maketh intercession for us unto the father, he defendeth us from evils that hang over our heads, neither doth he at any time cease from the office and actions of a mediator: but in the end, when all things be pacified, he shall resign these offices to his father, when as there is no longer place for them. Even as when a most mighty king sendeth his only son into some province of his kingdom, that is disquieted with seditions, tumults, and rebellions; and his son going foreward with empire, and with a strong host, when he hath set at quiet, and hath reduced the rebels into subjection, he returneth a conqueror unto his father, triumpheth, and delivereth unto him the province subdued, and useth the empire of war and legions no longer. So was it used at Rome: when the enemies were subdued, the Dictator renounced his authority; and being become a private person, returned to his accustomed business. But between such like things, and this that we have now in hand, this is the difference; that the son of God will not so renounce himself, as he can be deprived of his honor: but because (as I have said) in the latter day he shall rest from the office of reigning, and shall be said to deliver unto God the father, the kingdom being in peace and tranquility, and the enemies subdued.

15. Touching the death and resurrection of the Lord, the apostle writeth, that he taught the Corinthians first of all. For these two be the two principal and chief points of our religion, unto which (without controversy) all the rest be referred. Further he saith, that He taught them, even as he had received of God, and of Christ Jesus our Lord: as he testifieth unto the Galatians, and as we read in the Acts. He would not have us to stick unto the authority of man; but he calleth us back unto the authority of God,

whose ordinance they resist, which command us to believe only those things, which the Roman church believeth. These men do give place, neither unto God, nor yet unto the scriptures: they account the Pope to be one above all. But the apostle, not only confesseth, that he received those things, which he taught; but he also twice mentioned the scriptures, when as he writeth, that Christ died according to them, and that he rose again according to them. And seeing by the scriptures he meaneth the Old Testament, we easily gather thereby, for what cause, or to what purpose we ought to read the same; to wit, that we may confirm the New Testament by sundry and manifold testimonies.

We ought also to consider with our selves, when we hear that Christ died for our sins, how outrageous and cruel our sin is; seeing, it behooved the son of God to be therefore delivered unto the death of the cross. Neither let any man tell me, that God might have redeemed the world by some other means; and that it was not altogether necessary for the salvation of man, that the son of God should be fastened unto the cross. For if we once determine, that God is a most, wise and just considerer of things; we will acknowledge, that he choosing this means of our salvation, did exceedingly detest the nature of sin, when he decreed to give his own son unto death, and that unto a shameful death; to the end he might rid his elect from sin. Neither will we judge it to be done without cause, if we remember that sin is the only thing, whereby we resist God. There is nothing in the world, or in the nature of things, except it be sin, that resisteth the will of God: which property spreadeth so far, as it doth not only comprehend those sins, which the schoolmen call actual sins; but also original sin, and the first motions of the mind. That original sin is against God, hereby it is showed, in that he made man unto his own image, in righteousness, in holiness, and in truth.

Now against this institution, we are born the children of wrath, and strangers from God; and are wholly given to lying and ungodliness. Wherefore original sin doth altogether contend against the ordinance of God.

These things therefore have we now alleged, to the intent we may acknowledge the whole and perfect benefit of Christ. We must not weigh the gift of God, as though it were but half a benefit. When thou doest hear, that he died for our sins; understand the same to be not only for the original fault, but extend thou this sentence, even unto the engendered and natural lusts, and also unto those sins, which we commit by the consent of reason. Assuredly, we owe even ourselves also unto Christ, for so notable gifts. The people of Rome yielded unto Curtius, and unto the Decij: because they had vowed themselves to death for the safeguard of the people. But these things being compared with Christ, are nothing: for those men otherwise should have died. Unto which law Christ was not bound; seeing in him it was as well to lay down his life, as to take it again. Before their eyes was set present glory, and praise of men, for the notable act which they took in hand: but the death of Christ, as concerning human judgment, had shame joined therewith on every side. Those men, for their loving country and deer friends took their death: but Christ, (as we read unto the Romans) died for the weak, for the wicked, for sinners, and for his enemies: which doth excel all manner of charity.

16. And when he saith; According to the scriptures: this is not to be referred unto his death, which was apparent enough. Since, human reason, and many historiographers do testify this; that Jesus of Nazareth suffered death upon the cross: but that he was made a sacrifice for our sins, that is not proved by the sense or reason of man’s judgment. He added also

mention of burial, the which appertaineth unto death: for in that he was buried, it gave a more certain declaration of his death. And although here it be not added; According to the scriptures, yet is it commonly admitted. Touching the resurrection also he addeth, that it was done according to the scriptures. Wherefore it now remaineth, that we see, by what scriptures the death of Christ and his resurrection are proved. Undoubtedly, the places are many: all which it shall not greatly force to recite. Only this I will admonish, that it should not much trouble us, if the Hebrews at any time withstand these testimonies, which Christ and the apostles allege for confirmation of these articles. Because it is not to be doubted, but that the apostles, and Christ, did chiefly admit the common and received expositions of the fathers. For it was so allowed of at that time, that those places should be so understood of the Messias, as they that were present could not for shame and conscience sake deny the same.

Wherefore we read not in the Gospels, that they withstood; because the scriptures, which were brought, were not to be understood touching Messias: but we rather perceive, that their mouths were so stopped, as they had not wherewith to answer. But now, when those received expositions are no longer allowed among the Hebrews, we may perceive lies to be ready with them. Wherefore we, when we shall hear Christ or the apostles to have interpreted any place; let us give undoubted credit unto them. Albeit there are found in the scriptures, certain places so manifest, as the Hebrews themselves cannot resist them, if they would. In the 22nd Psalm, as well the death as the resurrection of Christ are very plainly set forth. Unto which psalm it seemeth that Christ of very purpose sent us, when he died upon the cross. And the 53rd chapter of Isaiah is so evident, as thou mightest think thyself not to read a prophesy, but an history of the evangelist. Also the

apostles were accustomed, for confirming of the resurrection, to bring in those places of the prophets, which make mention of restoring David's kingdom.

For seeing that external kingdom is not restored, nor that we ought to look for restitution; we must have respect unto Christ, who reigneth in heaven, and in them which be his; and shall reign eternally. Christ alleged the type of Jonah the prophet, concerning his death and resurrection: and in many such like places the death and resurrection of Christ were shadowed. Again, it is to be noted, that these things, which so went before, were not only types and shadows of the Lord's death and resurrection; but after a sort also had in them the very truth itself of those things. For, seeing that those holy men suffered many grievous things, and that within a while, help and deliverance came by God, insomuch as they were the members of Christ, and had Christ for their head: it followeth, that Christ in them both suffered, and was delivered. Wherefore we say, that the passion and resurrection of Christ began even from the first times; but that afterward, they took place more manifestly in Christ himself, and yet still become more evident unto the church, through the present death, which it daily abideth in labors and sorrows, expecting the blessed resurrection of the flesh. Then indeed shall these two principal points of our religion be truly fulfilled, and become most manifest.

17. Augustine, in his 14th book against Faustus, disputeth against a heretic, which refused Moses, as though he were contumelious against Christ, when he wrote; Cursed be everyone that hangeth upon the tree. Unto whom Augustine answereth; If thou, upon this occasion, condemn Moses, thou must also reject Paul: for he writeth, that Christ became accursed for us. And the same Paul saith; that He, which knew not sin, became sin for

our sakes. Moreover, he citeth a place to the Romans; that God sent his own son in the similitude of the flesh of sin, and by sin condemned sin. He bringeth also a reason, why the flesh of Christ is called sin; namely, because it was mortal, and tasted of death, which of necessity followeth sin. And he affirmeth this to be a figurative kind of speech, wherein, by that which goeth before, is expressed that which followeth. But besides this interpretation of Augustine, I remember also another, which the same Augustine followeth, and it seemeth he learned the same out of Origin.

And that interpretation is taken out of Leviticus; where, when as there be diverse kinds of sacrifices instituted, mention is made of an oblation for sin. But unto that word is oftentimes added a preposition: and in the Hebrew it is written *Lechataath*, and *Leaschma*, that is, for sin and for trespass. So that hereby we may see, that the sacraments (as we have often said) have the names of those things that they signify. And other tongues also, both Latin and Greek, seem to have imitated this form of speaking. For the Latins call that *Piaculum* or *Piacularem hostiam*, which is offered to turn away the wrath of God. The same thing the Grecians call κάθαρμα, of making clean, and ἀνάθημα. And this is it, which Paul sometimes calleth sin, and a curse. This therefore is the meaning; that Christ condemned sin, which was in our flesh; by sin, that is, by that oblation, which was for sin; that is, by his flesh, which is now called περί ἁμαρτίας, which (after the Hebrew manner of speaking) is the sacrifice for sin. But, to condemn, signifieth in this place to take away, and to discharge those things, which use to follow them that are condemned. And that we may the easilier understand, how Christ by his death condemned sin; we ought by faith to be assured, that he hath obtained the holy spirit for us, by whom our sins be

forgiven; and by whom, lusts, which are the root of all sins, be repressed in us.

18. But here ariseth a doubt: by what means the apostle may seem to sever and pluck these things one from another; namely, forgiveness of sins, and justification: and on the other part, the faith of the death, from the faith of the resurrection; when as it may seem, that by the saith of both parts (I mean of the death and resurrection) not only is given remission of sins, but also justification. Augustine, in his 16th book against Fautus, seemeth to bring this interpretation; that our faith is chiefly directed unto the resurrection of Christ. That he died, the Ethnics also grant; but that he rose again, they utterly deny. And therefore, seeing faith is said to be the thing, whereby we are justified; Paul would make mention of that thing, wherein faith is most conversant. And for confirmation of his saying, he citeth a place out of the tenth chapter to the Romans; If with thy mouth thou confess thy Lord Jesus Christ, and believe in thy heart, that he was raised from the dead; thou shalt be saved. By which words it appeareth, that salvation and justification are attributed unto the faith of Christ's resurrection.

But these things must not so be understood, as though our faith should not be directed, even unto the death of the Lord. Indeed it is true, that the Ethnics confess that Christ hath been slain: but they believe not the same to be done for the sins of men, but either for some fault of his own, or else by injury. Whereas we assuredly believe, that he was crucified for the salvation and redemption of mankind. So as our faith is exercised, as well in the death of Christ, as in his resurrection. And that, which he bringeth out of the tenth chapter to the Romans, doth make nothing against us. For who understandeth not, that in the faith of the resurrection of Christ, is comprehended that faith also, which we have of his death and cross?

Wherefore, there remain two other interpretations very likely to be true. Whereof the first is, that by she very death of Christ, the price of our redemption was performed. But that this might be applied unto us, there was need of the holy Ghost, by whom we might be led to believe Christ; that it should be expedient for us, that he had risen from death, that he had sent abroad his apostles to preach in all parts, and that he is now with his father as an intercessor and high priest. He is said to have therefore risen again, that he might help us to obtain justification. Chrysostom seemeth to like of this exposition.

Another exposition is, that the faith of the death and of the resurrection bringeth justification; but that Paul dissevered these things, to the intent he might aptly declare the analogy and proportion between them. Unto the death of Christ very well answereth the forgiveness of sins; for by reason of them, death was due unto us. And as Christ, concerning this corruptible life, died; so also we ought, when we are justified, to die unto sin. Again, because justification seemeth herein to be declared, in that we begin a new life; therefore it is referred unto the resurrection of Christ, for that he then seemed to have begun a heavenly and happy life. Paul useth in a manner the self-same form of words, when he saith; With the heart we believe unto righteousness, and with the mouth we confess unto salvation. For the faith of the heart both worketh righteousness, and also bringeth salvation. Howbeit, because salvation and instauration are chiefly declared in action; therefore he ascribeth it to confession. But whether of these expositions is the truer, neither do I contend, nor yet willingly will I now declare.

19. Rightly therefore is it said, that God commended his love towards us; when he delivered his own son unto the cross for our sakes. For there is nothing, that men hold more deer, and set more store by, than their children.

Wherefore we read, that wicked mothers, when they would testify to their adulterous lovers, their most fervent love and faithfulness of their continual company, slue their own children; because they saw they had no other argument more sure to testify their good will towards them. So God, when for our sakes he delivered his son unto the death, and that unto a most shameful death, gave unto us a most sure token of his exceeding good will towards us. In that he created the world for our sakes, it was indeed a great sign of his good will towards us: although therein rather shined forth his power, and divine might and wisdom. For it is the part of liberal and free hearted lords, to give and bestow many things upon their subjects. Howbeit, lords will never go so far, as they will endanger themselves for their servants sakes. Wherefore, when God gave his own son unto the death for our sakes; therein (as Paul saith) he most of all set forth his love towards us: which thing he therefore did, to stir us up to love him again.

God had commanded us in the law, that we should love him with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our strength. And that we might the willinglier perform this, he would first declare his good will towards us, that it might appear, that he loved and cared for us, more than for himself. For he would die, even for our sakes: which death yet we so little esteem, that we will suffer nothing for it; nor restrain ourselves from any commodities of the body, or delights of the flesh. His will was, that all men should be in good case, and in the meantime one alone to suffer: but we desire to be in good case ourselves alone, although all other in the meantime must perish. But it is not possible, that there should be in us so great a contempt both of our own salvation, and also of the salvation of others; but that either we believe not so great a benefit of God, or else we do not earnestly enough weigh it. There was never wooer, that with so great

a desire and fervent love married his spouse, as Christ hath married unto himself his church. Neither hath any man, at any time, married a wife so unmeet and unworthy for him to match with, as Christ hath done the church. For in what state the church was, before Christ matched with it, Ezekiel in the 16th chapter describeth, where he saith; that She lay upon the ground, and that her naval string was not cut off, neither was she washed with water, nor powdered with salt, and there was no eye that had compassion on her.

Paul also, both to the Romans, and elsewhere, doth oftentimes declare at large, in what state we were before we came to Christ. Unto the Ephesians, he not only faith, that We are by nature the children of wrath, but also he addeth; Ye were once darkness, but now ye are light in the Lord. Unto Titus he saith; We were as fools, not obedient, but wandering out of the way, giving ourselves to sundry lusts, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. In the first to the Corinthians, when he had reckoned a beadroll of most heinous sins, he saith; These things undoubtedly were ye sometimes, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified. Wherefore, we have the son of God given unto us, as a pledge of the love of God. He placed not in his stead an angel, or an archangel; although he might so have done. He vouchsafed to come himself, and to suffer a most bitter death upon the cross. It behooved, that for our redemption there should be some such good thing offered unto God, which might either equally, or else more please God, than all the sins of the world had displeased him. And this hath Christ offered for us. And if a man demand, why the death of Christ was so acceptable unto God; there can no other reason be given, but his immeasurable charity and love. God indeed might have been contented with any other thing: but his will was rather to have this thing; not because he

would feed his eyes and mind with the affliction and punishments of Christ (for that had been the part of a cruel father) neither for that he foresaw the great love and modesty in his son (although these things were in Christ most singular, and of very great force with the father:) but (as I verily judge) because that by this only means, he might see his love towards us to be most perfectly declared; and also an example of most holy life to be set forth for men to follow. For if thou demand, whether it were of necessity, that the son of God should in such sort die? I answer, that here must be put no necessity of compulsion; seeing there is nothing in God, that is by violence: neither also was there any necessity of nature. For although there be in the divine nature, many things of necessity; namely, that it be one, that it be three, and that it begat a son, and such other; yet were it a wickedness to think, that any outward effect proceedeth from the same, through natural necessity, seeing whatsoever God doth, he doth it freely. Neither do we here put any necessity by supposition of the end. For the salvation of man might have been wrought by many other ways and means, if God's will had been so. But it was of necessity, that Christ should die by supposition of the divine providence and counsel; because God had decreed it should be so. And this he did chiefly to declare his infinite love.

20. Now resteth to see, what this so great love of God towards us requireth again at our hands: and those things are many. For first, as Christ applied all his will and endeavor to redeem us; so is it our part on the other side, utterly and all wholly to addict ourselves unto him. And as he, setting aside all things, had a care only of our salvation; so also ought we to pluck away our mind from all things, and not to seek our own anymore, but that which belongeth unto Christ. They, which have returned again into favor with their enemies, may be an example unto us. For they, least they should

have seemed to do it counterfeitly or feignedly, leave no duty undone, but that they show unto their new reconciled friends: yea and take special heed, that they be not thought to retain still any remnants of enmity, or dissimulation closed up in their mind; as we read that Cicero, Crassus, Pompeius, and many other did.

Further also, seeing by the mercy of God, through the death of Christ, we are so steadfastly placed; we must take heed, that through wicked and shameful acts, we throw not our selves down headlong from thence. For they, which after they have been once reconciled, persist in defiling themselves with vices, do not only fall headlong from their most excellent state and condition; but also (as it is written unto the Hebrews) do tread underfoot the son of God, and pollute his blood, which was shed for them. By this place also we are taught to love our enemies, not after that ordinary manner; as when men are wont to say, that it is enough to wish well unto their enemy, if they hate him not: but yet in the meantime, they will put no endeavor, either to amend him, or to bring him to salvation. And that, which is more grievous, they not only are not beneficial towards their enemies; but also through their slothfulness, they suffer the weak brethren to perish. They wink at their faults, neither do they use their admonitions and reprehensions to amend them. There are besides, infinite other instructions, which the love of God teacheth us. For we have no book furnished with more plentiful doctrine, than is the death of Christ; the which if we diligently examine, we shall be thoroughly taught almost in all the duties, which be necessary unto salvation.

21. Furthermore, those things that be said, touching the death and resurrection of Christ, are most manifest. But what it is to sit at the right hand of God, it doth not so plainly appear. The speech is metaphorical,

derived from princes and kings, who place at their right hand such as they hold in greatest honor and estimation. In the 100th Psalm it is written; Sit at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. And Solomon, when he was minded to show great honor unto his mother Bersaba, he commanded that she should have a throne set for her upon his right hand. Also the sons of Zebede desired of Christ, that they might sit, the one at his right hand, and the other at his left hand. Touching this high honor granted to him of his father, Christ himself saith; All things are given unto me of my father, and there is given unto me all power, both in heaven and earth. And John the Evangelist saith; Jesus knowing that all things should be delivered unto him. And Paul, unto the Ephesians, saith; He is set above all principality, power, virtue, dominion, and above every name that is named, be it in this world, or in the world to come.

And unto the Philippians; He gave him a name that is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow; of things in heaven, of things in earth, or of things under the earth. And unto the Colossians; He is the beginning and first begotten of the dead, that in all things he might have the preeminence. For it pleased the father, that in him all fullness should dwell. And although the right hand of God (as we have said) signifieth honor and high dignity; yet must we not think, that the body of Christ is spread out so far, as his Godhead and right hand is extended. For that body (as the state of human nature requireth) is comprehended in a certain and definite place, the which is heaven; as Peter in the Acts of the apostles doth testify, as the article of his ascension doth teach us to believe, and as Augustine and many of the fathers have instructed us.

*For further reading look to D. Peter Martyr on the dialogue of both natures in Christ. Of Christ's person, death, and resurrection, 3 sermons,*

*and the epistle unto the brethren of Poland.*

When as I was come thus far forward, there happened into my hands (which I had in vain sought long before) our authors exposition upon the apostolical Creed, written in his own natural language. The which D. Peter Martyr, divorcing himself from the dregs of popery, set forth, when he departed out of Italy: as Master Josiah Simlerus testifieth in his life. The same, for so much as (to my knowledge) it was not yet extant in Latin, set forth in this manner, I thought it would be both pleasant and profitable to the readers, that it might come to light: a few things being cut off, because they were both largelier, and more exactly treated of in another place. Further, as touching the causes of departing from popery, look the second epistle.

# CHAP. XVIII. A plain exposition of Peter Martyr, upon the twelve articles of the Christian faith.

The articles of our faith, set forth nothing unto us but the knowledge of God. And as we be not able thoroughly to comprehend him, he being perfect and uncorrupt in nature: so is there particularly given us, sometime someone small taste and feeling of him, and sometime another. And seeing in the divine nature, there be three persons (as we believe) of one essence; namely, the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghost, the whole essence pertaineth to each one of them. But now this first article, which properly concerneth the Father, propoundeth four things to be observed; first, that he, in whom we believe, is the true God; secondly, that the same is the Father; thirdly, that he is omnipotent; and lastly, that he is the author and first original of all things created. Now go to: let us see particularly, what the proper meaning is of these words; I believe in God. Assuredly, we cannot otherwise explain this sentence, then to say, that he is to be acknowledged as God.

So as, if a man demand of thee; What is God? (refusing all human subtlety, and laying aside the difficulties that be unsearchable) thou must

boldly and absolutely answer without sticking, that God is the eternal good, of whom every other good doth come. Whereupon it appeareth, that he, which esteemeth anything as much, or more than God, cannot truly say; I believe in God. For if so be thou acknowledge him to be the chief good, thou wilt never prefer anything before him. Neither yet can he rightly believe this, that at any time setteth his hope any other way; seeing hope is not but of some good thing. If then, God (as I have said) be the good, from whence every good thing doth flow; whosoever expecteth any good elsewhere, believeth not truly in him. Furthermore, they which attribute the good things, which they possess, unto their own righteousness, endeavor, doings, and finally to themselves, have not the sense and (as I may say) the true taste of this first article of our faith. What then wilt thou say of them, which have appointed to themselves certain ends of good things, out of the vanity of their own devise, and out of the decrees of Philosophers and politic men; yea, and out of the sense of brute beasts, in the which they in very deed repose themselves, whatsoever evil they bring? Such kind of men doubtless properly worship not God, but in the place of God, do worship the fancies and inventions of their own brain. The thing (believe me) is of greatest importance, for a man to have the true God to be his God. The prophet David pronounced that people blessed, whose God is the true God.

2. But now it doth appear what it is to believe in God: howbeit, we have not yet declared, why the father is called by the name of father. That name is attributed unto him for two causes chiefly. The one is, for that he is the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is the second person in divine nature. The other, because it pleased him to be our father. And he is therefore called father, because he distributeth his inheritance to us; and so communicateth his nature with us, as Paul to the Romans calleth us The heirs of God: and

Peter saith, that we participate of the divine nature. For these two things specially, the parents are wont to give unto their children. For first, they endeavor (as much as they can) to make them like unto themselves, as concerning nature and state of living. Then, when they have made them their heirs, they desire to enrich them with all their substance. The similitude undoubtedly, which the regenerate have with God their father, consisteth in wisdom, justice, simplicity of mind, magnanimity, charity, and in other like heavenly and divine affections of the mind: whereby they judge themselves to be made according to the image of God, as they were created at the beginning. And the inheritance, which they expect of so excellent a father, is eternal and most blessed life.

And (I pray you) how much doth this generation differ from that, wherein we are begotten according to flesh and bones? And how great a diversity is there between the same inheritance of eternal life, and the free gifts among them that be alive, or that are wont to be done by testaments, concerning fields, vineyards, houses, cattle, money, or any other thing? For albeit we have not so much as these things any other way than of him, and by him now presently; yet we speak only of that, by reason whereof, God is properly called The father of them that be regenerate in Christ. If so be that men would embrace this thing (as meet it were) with faith and readiness of mind, they should not so err from the properties and similitude of God our father; neither yet could they show the disposition of false begotten children, by their shameful actions and wicked deeds; as at this day many are accustomed to do.

This is that fatherly image and shape, whereunto Christ invited us in these words; Be ye perfect, as your heavenly father is perfect. Yet did he nevertheless not keep in silence that goodly and rich inheritance, when he

said unto Peter; Who soever shall leave that that is his, for my names sake; he shall not only receive an hundredth fold for me, but besides this, shall have even eternal life also. Whosoever therefore expecteth so great an inheritance by faith, even as he is not puffed up by prosperity, so neither is he sorrowful above measure in adversity, but he hath always his mind bent unto greater matters: neither will he ever persuade himself, that the labors and vexations, which he is subject unto in this life, are not equivalent to the reward which he looketh for.

3. But now let us come to the third point, wherein we believe him to be omnipotent. And this doth first signify, that he, of his own only power, was able to bring forth (as afterward shall be said) whatsoever is contained both in heaven and earth. Further, when he will protect me from all evils, and heap every good thing upon me, (I being his own workmanship) he can show the same by many means; and he being omnipotent (as we believe him to be) can easily remove all lets and impediments. Hereof dependeth, as of a most sure foundation, all the honor and worthiness of our faith. For how much soever the wisdom of man, the world, the flesh, our own very sense, or temptation of the devil, is able to withstand the promises contained in the holy scriptures, by this article is beaten down. Hereof it cometh, that Paul saith unto the Romans; that Abraham gave the glory unto God, when he believed perfectly, that he was able to perform that, which he promised, although the same might not be granted by human reason and power. Wherefore, thou must not make any account of that, which importunate men shall object: neither yet of that, which troublesome cogitations entering into thy mind, and withstanding those things which be contained in the holy scriptures and divine promises, shall move; since to thee is manifest both the infinite power of God, and also his fatherly will, in

whom thou professest thyself to believe. Thou must also remember, that neither miracles are wrought, nor prayers are heard; unless that faith be fully given unto this omnipotency of God, and unto the love, wherewith he loveth us. For this cause Christ said; that All things are possible unto him that believeth.

4. Now remaineth to expound the last part of this article; namely, The maker of heaven and earth. By which saying is refelled the error, which the schools of philosophers endeavor to persuade, that the world in very deed was without beginning; and that it cannot by any possible means be, that the same should be made of nothing: seeing here all we, that be endued with faith, do see much more perfectly than they have seen. For it shall be an absurd thing, to measure the works of God omnipotent, with a certain measure of natural works. Further, we also believe hereby, that God is the perpetual preserver of the things which he hath made. For unless he should govern all things by the self-same virtue, wherewith he made them; without doubt, all things would be reduced to naught: which, to have their being, were at the first brought forth by him of nothing. Whereupon also it is lawful to conclude another thing; namely, that if all things be created by God (as we have before declared) and that he is verily a father unto thee, and so merciful a father; whatsoever is made by him, cometh to thy use.

Unto Adam, the parent of all mankind, all things in a manner became subject: but seeing he was ungrateful of mind, he (by his grievous offense) spoiled both himself, and all us of so precious and ample inheritance; the which inheritance Paul doth manifestly show, and that with very great and most forceable arguments, to be restored to us again by Christ; teaching, that the benefit of Christ is mightier, and of more efficacy, than the malice and wickedness of Adam. Therefore he also writeth unto them, that All

things happen well unto them which truly love God. It is therefore our part, rightly and justly to apply unto our use and commodity, those things that be created; that for the use of them, and for the delectable fruit, which we receive by them, the goodness of God may be praised, and thanks given unto him. For (as the same apostle, writing unto Timothy saith;) Things created by God are good, that the faithful may use them, and give due thanks to God, so as none of them be received as evil. Yea, and although the same have drawn any evil unto it; yet, by the word and by prayer it is made holy. Yea, and things created do no less serve for the sustentation of man's life, than do give us an apt testimony of the perfect and singular goodness of our most merciful father: which thing as it is most true, so it ought not to be contemned.

**Five other principal points belonging to the person of the son.**

5. I believe in Jesus Christ, his only son our Lord, conceived of the holy Ghost, born of the virgins Marie, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, buried, who descended into hell, the third day he rose again from the dead, he ascended into heaven, he sitteth at the right hand of God the father almighty, from thence shall he come to judge both the quick and the dead.

In these articles, whereby we are led to believe those things, which be necessary to salvation, we are to note five things of the greatest importance, concerning the second person in divinity: which (as I have said) is called the son. The first is, that this son of God, Jesus Christ, is our true and lawful Lord; Secondly, that he was made to be such a one for our use and behoove; Thirdly, that whatsoever he suffered, he suffered for our sakes; Fourthly, that he was also for our commodity exalted above all heavens; Finally, that he shall come at the last day for our succor. Now therefore let us see,

touching the first; to wit, that Jesus Christ, the only son of God, is truly and properly our Lord. Of which matter that we may entreat orderly, let us first see, who this is that we set forth with the title of Lord: for afterward it will easily be judged, whether so excellent a prerogative be fit for him or no. And we be constrained (as faith itself witnesseth to us) to confess, that this Christ is nothing else, but a particular person, in whom are joined together the divine and human nature with an indissoluble knot.

And this doth John, in the first chapter, manifestly declare, saying; that The word became flesh. Whereas, by the names of Word and Flesh, he meaneth nothing but these two natures; namely, that God and man is a perpetual society in the person of Christ. And as concerning the word, it may easily be gathered, because it is written before; And the word was with God, and that word was God. Also, that Flesh in the holy scriptures betokeneth human nature, it is very evident unto him, that diligently and many times peruseth them over. But to proceed no further without some testimony of this matter, I will bring two, whereof the first is in Isaiah, where it is thus spoken; And all flesh shall see that God spake: and the latter is in that, which is spoken of Joel; I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh. In the which places it is manifest; that in the name of flesh, there is signified men. Hereby therefore it appeareth, that the Evangelist, when he said that the word was made flesh, meant no other, than that which he had first declared; namely, that the natures divine and human were united together in Christ.

6. Moreover, that human nature was in him, the things which follow in this place do plainly enough declare; to wit, that he suffered death, and was buried. Wherefore the enemies of Christian religion (I mean the subtler and more witty sort) do not for the most part oppose themselves much against

the human nature of Christ: and they, which at a certain time went about to make trial of it, were easily convicted and confuted. But the number of them was greater, which stirred up often tumults, and that with greater vehemency, concerning the deity of Christ. Nevertheless, their false and perverse opinion was constrained of necessity, to their great shame, to give place to the clear and comfortable light of the holy scriptures. For, besides that testimony of John now cited; And the word was God, we have that saying of the apostle, which he wrote unto the Romans; to wit, that Christ, according to the flesh, should come of the people of the Jews. And therewithal he addeth; Who is God blessed forever. These two places being so manifest, they ought to suffice for the confirming of the minds of faithful men in the truth of God.

But yet the holy scriptures do furnish us with many other places besides these, if we will ponder them well. Wherefore I leave it wholly to the judgment and wisdom of them, which frequent themselves modestly in the reading of the scriptures. I for my part am satisfied with this one reason, which I would not pass over in silence. For it is fit enough, not only to prove, but also constraineth to confess, that Christ is the true God. This express prohibition is plainly uttered in many places, namely, that we must not put our trust in any creature, no not in very man by name: as in Jeremiah this is manifestly showed; Cursed is he that trusteth in man, and putteth flesh for his arm. Further, David doth earnestly reprehend the confidence, which they used to put in men, and in princes. Wherefore, if Christ be a mere man, and by no means God, it may not be lawful for us to trust in him at all: which notwithstanding the holy scriptures do not only permit, but also command expressly; that our faith be fastened with a lively hope in Christ, or in Messias, if so be thou list to call him as the Jews did:

that on the other side, whosoever doth not believe nor trust in him, is subject to the curse. Herby therefore we boldly conclude, that this particular person, of whom we presently entreat, hath verily in himself the nature both divine and human.

7. For which cause it is not in vain, that he is described unto us in the books of the holy scriptures, by this famous double name JESUS CHRIST. Whereof the one; namely, JESUS signifieth nothing else, but A savior, which hath delivered the children of God from their sins, and therefore from all evil. For Joseph the husband of Marie was commanded by the angel, to call him JESUS: seeing He shall save his people (saith he) from their sins. And I have added further; From all evil: because there is no evil, which hath not his original from sin. So as he that can glory, that the root of evil is taken from him, may also affirm justly, that he hath rid away all evil. But this if we do not perfectly as yet perceive, we shall at the length prove it, in that happy time of resurrection. The other name certainly (which is CHRIST) betokeneth The anointed of God, and the sanctified king: which name doth very well agree with him, seeing that by the guide of his spirit and word, he directeth and leadeth his children to life eternal. Wherefore, by reason of those two natures, whereof he consisteth, and by those two names it is easily perceived, that the title, wherewith we magnify him, calling him, Our Lord; is very meet and fit for him.

8. For first, as touching his divine nature, it cannot be doubted, but that in the Old Testament, God many times is called Lord: as he that is far above all things, seeing he is the maker of them. And this title also pertaineth unto man, who in the person of him, of whom we entreat, was united with God; because he, being clear from all sin, was replenished with all good. If any such therefore were in this world (as there never was besides him any)

would he not seem to be adorned with those gifts, for the which the name of Lord might duly agree unto him? Even so indeed it seemeth to me, that when as a man is free from sin, he is by no means a servant. The first servitude entered into the world by sin; and he that is endued with divine properties, out of doubt is able to help others. Hereof it cometh, that lords, and they that are rulers over others, if they be lawfully called, are not preferred to be above others for any other end, but because they should not be hurtful unto their subjects, and that they, being void of all vice, may be so armed with strength and fortitude, as they should be able to succor all those, which be under their subjection.

That Christ was undoubtedly without sin, I suppose it needless to prove unto any: seeing (as Matthew beareth record;) He was conceived by the holy Ghost, that by this means he might be free from original sin. The which also is manifest, in that he, living among us, never sinned. And Peter writeth; that He did no sin. To whom agreeth Paul, when he saith; He, that knew no sin, for our sakes became sin. John Baptist also showed him to his disciples, as the most pure lamb of God, which should take away the sins of the world. For it was meet for him to be pure, and without all blemish; as a sacrifice that should be offered up unto God. Further, the heavenly father, not without miracle, testified with his own voice, that he was well pleased in him; that is to say, that he was innocent and pure from all fault: since this is an acceptable thing unto God. And who doubteth, but that he was adorned with divine properties? Seeing Paul unto the Colossians calleth him, The image of the invisible God; because he truly expresseth him, and all things that be in him: in such sort, as there never hath been, nor now is, nor hereafter shall be, any son more perfectly resembling his father than Christ Jesus did. Wherefore, of all us he is called as well God as man. And we

confess him to be the only son of God, as he that in divine nature hath no other brethren; insomuch as he is the only word of God, of which we now speak. And among men, though he have many brethren by adoption, he may justly be called Only, for the heap that he hath of the well pleasing graces of God; and because of the image and similitude of the eternal father. Meet therefore it is, that he be called Lord; as well, for that he is without sin, as for the heap that he hath of divine gifts.

9. I let pass this, that he, which payeth ransom to redeem a captive, is his Lord. Which thing that Christ did for us wretches, and bondslaves of sin and Satan, none that be faithful ought to doubt: seeing Paul, both to the Romans and Ephesians, affirmeth; that We have obtained remission of sins; namely, by his blood, which he hath plentifully and liberally shed for us upon the cross. So therefore he must of good right be called our Lord. Furthermore, there is a custom received by long use among lawful sons of kings and princes; that the first begotten son obtaineth the Lordship among his younger brethren. Which thing is not doubtful unto them, which have read either the holy or profane histories; or else, which have in very deed understood what is the manner of governing in kingdoms and seignories of the world. And unto the Romans and Galatians it is plainly showed; that All the faithful be the children of God. Unto the Romans it is written; that His spirit testifieth with our spirit, that we be the children of God. And unto the Galatians it is said; Because ye be the sons of God, he hath sent into your heart's the spirit of his son. For this cause, all we that believe be now brethren, because of that divine adoption: but among all, Christ is the first begotten, we (as we read unto the Romans) being made like unto the image of his son, that he might be the first begotten among many brethren.

Let us not marvel therefore, if Paul in his epistles, for the most part, calleth God Father; and further, coming unto Christ, calleth him Lord. Which manner also the church hath retained, when as in our prayers we ascribe all unto God for Christ our Lord's sake; as well that, which we do desire, as that which we have obtained. But seeing now, that after the declaration of those things, which were proposed, the principality of Jesus Christ is so manifest: which of us can abide himself to be brought into the power of any tyrant from such a Lord, who also is our brother? Which (I say) of us, refusing this so notable a captain, will betake himself to his enemies already conquered and put to flight by him, when as they be mortal enemies to ourselves? Shall there be found any, that will shake off the yoke of so bountiful a Lord, to submit himself unto him that wisheth nothing more than to destroy both body and soul? For my part, I think there can be none found among them, which have tasted the sweetness of so acceptable a Lordship, whereof Christ made mention, when he said; My yoke is easy, and my burden is light. This subjection is voluntary, as the prophet (if we have a consideration unto the Hebrew truth) declareth in the 110th Psalm, wherein it is said unto Messias; Thy people doth worship thee of their own accord.

And the apostle also saith; Ye be no more under the law, but under grace. Wherefore, all the charge and burden of this principality, was laid upon the shoulders, not of us, but of Jesus Christ: as it was foretold of him by Isaiah the prophet; Upon his shoulders shall he bear the sovereignty or rule. Note, that the prophet saith not that his sovereignty shall be laid upon the shoulders of poor miserable subjects, but upon his own shoulders. If therefore Christian princes would be persuaded in mind, not to oppress with such tyranny the people of God committed unto them; they ought to take

example of their government from so mild and easy a government of Christ. But passing over them, let us rejoice among ourselves; that it is brought to pass by the goodness of God, that we be reckoned in so happy a society, under the banner of so noble a prince and valiant brother; unto whom shall never want, either will or power to help us. Let us wholly with confidence betake ourselves unto him; seeing we cannot apply our travel better. Let us serve him diligently, and with all our heart; let us worship and reverence him from the heart. For both this is our duty, and he is worthy of these things.

**Conceived of the holy Ghost, born of the virgins Marie.**

10. This blessed God and man Jesus Christ, who (as we heard before out of the holy oracles) is our lawful Lord, although as concerning divine essence he was yesterday, today, and shall be forever (as it is written in the 13th chapter to the Hebrews) yet, in respect of his human nature he was not without beginning: so by reason hereof, we say, that he was made. Seeing Paul saith unto the Galatians, that He was sent from God, and was made of a woman, and under the law. Unto the Romans also; Who was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh. And least we should either stand in doubt touching this procreation, or else judge otherwise of it than becometh us: faith doth direct us unto these two things, and bindeth us unto them. The one is, that he was conceived by the holy Ghost; and the other, that he was born: and that both of the virgins Marie. Which also we specially confess. And this is written distinctly by the Evangelists, to let us understand, that he (even according to the flesh) was free from the curse, and from sin. Whereby also it appeareth most plainly, that all the posterity of Adam were so subject to the curse and sin, as there was no place for any to be exempted.

Wherefore, to exempt Christ, according to the flesh, from the common fall of all mankind, so as he might ever retain his own nature; the wisdom of God decreed by a wonderful counsel, that man, which was to be assumed in the unity of person, should have a beginning, both divine and human. For this cause, as it had been foreshowed by the angel unto Marie, so the holy Ghost came down into her, and by the principal power thereof, the blood being now purified by his grace, did create a singular and perfect man, which the merciful God, even God, which was the word from everlasting, did miraculously take upon him. Insomuch as the womb of the virgins Marie, and holy mother was the divine furnace, whereby the holy Ghost, of a matter well purified, built this one only body, which was a most obedient instrument of a noble soul. And by this means, all the old blemishes of Adam were alienated from Christ, albeit that his body, as concerning the nature and form of creation, was not much disagreeable from the body of Adam. For our first parent Adam also was marvelously, and by divine power created out of the earth, without accustomed seed. And certainly, there is no need of any longer talk, to show how much Christ, in respect of his manhood, excelled Adam in all excellent gifts of nature: seeing the order and circumstance of his nativity is described; to wit, his humble and base state of poverty, which nevertheless had a glorious and renowned testimony from the majesty of God, and from the angelical nature.

11. Wherefore, passing over these things, we will occupy our whole speech in this profitable consideration; namely, that who so is regenerated by Christ, must call to remembrance, what and how great hath been the love of God towards us, who disdained not our foul and unclean nature; but cleansing the same, did cloth himself therewith, to make us partakers of his divine nature. True indeed it is, that the devil, by his lying spirit, feigned;

and that idolaters endeavored to persuade, that the gods, which they worshipped, took sometimes human form upon them: howbeit, not to the intent they might sanctify our nature, but to contaminate the same with infinite and beastly filthiness. So that none of such like appearances, as are read in the writings of the Poets do bring any other thing with them; seeing they both shamefully pollute the body, and that minds by such infamous examples are allured unto evil. For if they would order their life after the example of those things, they were also to let slack the bridles of lusts unto adultery, fornication, and other horrible offenses. But on the contrary part, the divine word hath cleansed our nature, by heaping of divine gifts upon the same. And this is not only to be understood, touching that man, which it assumed; but of all them, which with him in true faith be joined together as members of him. And this heavenly word (which is Christ) being secretly hidden under that nature, is so covered with justice, patience, temperance, prudence, wisdom, and submission of the mind, showed forth such perfect examples of singular justice, &c. that his life only, if it be duly considered, is a mistress fit enough to live well.

12. Wherefore, let dissolute and wanton Christians go; let them count it but a small matter to live unpurely, let them make but small account of the nature and members, which Christ by putting on hath sanctified; let them despise that noble example of holiness and righteousness, which Christ showed, while he lived in the flesh; let them cease also to express in their deeds, what participation of divine nature they have obtained in Christ. Undoubtedly, this is no part of the end, which God purposed to himself, when he became man: neither certainly did he, upon this consideration, live among us by the space of 33 years. Wherefore, it should be meet for the children of God, to live a divine life; seeing their nature is made divine. But

the life of brute beasts and of men should be left unto those, which in their incredulity, either have remained mere men; or else, which have degenerated through their wicked acts, and be changed as it were into brute beasts. Here hence moreover we have to take comfort, if we be driven at any time by the sense of the flesh, to take it grievously, and complain that we are subject to human infirmities; namely, if we do believe indeed, that Christ suffered those infirmities for us: for by this means they will seem to be much more easy unto us, than the nature of them doth permit. Moreover, if he so humbled himself for our sakes, that when he was Lord, yet he appeared in the form of a servant; it ought not to seem so hard a thing unto us, sometime to slack the sails, and to submit the loftiness of mind for the safety of our weak and poor brethren. Therefore, not without just cause Paul exhorted the Philippians, that amongst them should be The very same affection that was in Christ Jesus, who, when he was in the form of God, yet disdained not to put upon him the form of a servant. And thus far touching the original conception, and nativity of Christ, according to the human nature. Now let us go forward.

**He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, buried, descended into hell.**

13. The order, which we before appointed, requireth, that first we should speak of the death of Christ; secondly, of that state, wherein he was after his death, as well touching the body, as touching the soul. First therefore, this death of Christ, the which can never be sufficiently praised or considered by us, had two things; one, that it was very ignominious; the other, that it was grievous above measure. The rebukes that Christ suffered, although they were very many, and very hard to be abidden; yet let us consider, that they depend upon two principal points. The one is, that infamous quality and

nature of sins, which were laid upon him: but the other is the perfect innocence and pure righteousness of his life. For even as, when any uncleanly and impure thing, if it be seen in the common street, is not so ill agreeing; and it less offendeth, than if through the envy and ill dealing of some man it be thrown upon a certain noble and precious painted table: so is it much less decent for a man that far excelleth all other creatures, to be stained with infamy and dishonor. And as concerning Christ, which was the head of men, the prince of angels, and the only son of God (he being not only just and innocent, but also very innocence and justice itself) certainly it was too too shameful and ignominious, that he should be burdened with so grievous crimes; and that in judgment, not before the citizens of one city only, but before all the people of the whole kingdom of Jewry, who at that time, by a usual custom, was compelled to celebrate Easter at Jerusalem.

Neither did it satisfy them, that they had oftentimes defamed him with railings, calling him a possessor of evil spirits, a sorcerer, a familiar of devils, by whose help he did work miracles; and that they called him a gluttonous fellow, a drunkard, from whom no sound doctrine could proceed; likewise a companion of publicans and sinners, and finally of infamous and wicked men; that from him proceeded nothing but offenses, and evil examples. They called him a Samaritan, a stranger from the true worshipping of God, from whom, as from some profane person that was excommunicated from the church, all men were to shun. They (I say) being not content with these reproaching's, to the intent they might pursue him unto death, they laid this thing against him before Pilate and Herod; namely, that he had uttered intolerable blasphemy against the law of God, arrogating unto himself the name of the son of God; that he was a seditious man, not only against their own laws, but also against the common state of the

Roman empire, by persuading of the people to deny tribute unto Caesar: and that he earnestly pursued this one thing; to wit, that contrary unto order, and without consent of the Romans, he challenged the dignity of a king.

14. And by this means he came into such shame and contempt, as Barabbas, though he were a wicked and notable thief, was judged to be more just than he: so that such a man being quit, our Christ was condemned. And in token of his just condemnation, and to have it manifest, that he (above all other which commonly are judged wicked) was worthy of the cross; he (by decree of the judge) was hanged between two thieves, as though he had been the chiefest among those that were most wicked and mischievous persons. But then was fulfilled that prophesy, which is written in Isaiah, which saith; that Christ should be contemned and nothing regarded among men: from whose sight everyone should withdraw himself, and that at the length he should be reckoned among the wicked. And certainly, his sentence doth not disagree with that, which Paul writeth in his epistle to the Galatians, where he saith, that He became a curse for us, to deliver us from the curse of the law: for because it is written; Cursed is everyone that hangeth upon a tree. And here cometh to remembrance to speak a few words of the justice of God, how exceeding severe so ever the same were. But show me (I pray thee) if shame and confusion be of good right due unto sins; what greater and more heaped measure of shame might there be found, than that, which Christ suffered for our sakes?

Were not the offenses of man sufficiently and above measure derived unto Christ, and the same punished in him with all shame and dishonor? Some man perhaps will say, that the rebukes were of less wait; because of his grounded innocence. And in very deed on this behalf some easement might have been brought to those reproaches, if that innocence had been most

manifest to the sight of all men. But assuredly, upon that day, wherein Christ was lifted upon the cross, he was so oppressed with the great heap of despiteful railings, and false accusations of evil, as the people miserably beheld him nailed unto the cross, wagging their head at him; not as though they were troubled by perceiving his afflictions, but that they might pursue him still being wearied with ignominies and slanders, as though they allowed by their judgment, all those troubles and miseries, which environed him on every side. Justly therefore may we rejoice, that we by faith are made partakers of so great a benefit; seeing all the rebukes and ignominies, which were due for our sins, Christ our head took upon him, and utterly abolished. Yea undoubtedly, in the place of this shame and ignominy, we by that merit of Christ possess in hope both glory and honor in the sight of God, as a thing due unto us.

15. But seeing not only shame and ignominy is by the just judgment of God due to sin, but also punishments, which are laid upon us, according to the manner and measure of the sin: for this cause Christ departed this life, not only loden with railings and contumelies, but also was as it were plucked from the same life by the violence of most grievous pains, and most cruel punishments. The which seeing the evangelists do plentifully recite, it is not our meaning to spend any longer time in particular describing of the same. Howbeit, it seemeth that all those punishments of Christ, which undoubtedly are innumerable, may be contrived specially into four chief partes. Among which, the first appear to be the sundry sorts of scorning's, wherewith he was diverse times assailed: such were the spitting in his face, the saluting, and intituling him by the name of king; the putting off of his own garments, and cladding him with other garments unaccustomed; the reputing of him sometime to be a fool, and sometime a

prince; by blindfolding his eyes with a cloth, and by putting the scepter of a king (though the same were of a reed) into his hands: also, being so arrayed, the bidding of him to prophesy by such as mocked him; also to be set naked in the sight of all the people: finally, to see his garments divided to most wicked knaves, and lots to be cast upon them. I pass over, that he was accounted of Herod as it were a common fool, and an infinite number of other mocks, with the which he was disquieted; as the wise reader shall easily understand out of the holy scriptures. But if one demand, wherein the rebukes and ignominies laid upon Christ, whereof we have spoken before, do differ from these latter: I answer, that those belong to unjust infamy, to accusation, and unjust condemnation; but these were added for the punishment of those faults, which slanderously were laid upon him.

16. Besides these reproaches, we must weigh the stripes and bloody wounds, which he sustained in his whole body, the blows, the scourging's, the striking's with the reed, the pricking's with thorns, and an infinite number of other things more, which he suffered at the sessions of the priests and elders, in the judgment hall, in the streets, and else-where in diverse other places. These hard afflictions received he under the cross, the which he bare on his shoulders with great travel, before it held him stretched out upon it with his whole body. But he was crucified being not tied with any bands, as perhaps the rest were; yet nailed unto the wood through hands and feet, even as he himself hereof gave a sure testimony after his resurrection, when he said unto Thomas; Bring thy finger hither, and see my hands, and put forth thine hand, and put it into my side. Which he added, by reason of the wound that he received in his side by a certain soldier after his death. The very which thing David, by the spirit of prophesy, had foretold in the Psalms; They pierced (saith he) my hands and my feet. The same prophet

also passed not over in silence, that unpleasant taste of myrrh, the which being mingled with vinegar, was proffered unto Christ for a drink. For he writeth in the 69th Psalm; They gave me gall for my food, and vinegar for quenching of my thirst. The fourth and last punishment, which Christ for our sake took upon him, was that separation of the soul from his precious body; the which as he that had the same fully in his own power, and that saw all things to be fulfilled that were foretold of him by the prophets, touching the former matter, he of his own accord, making a loud voice yielded up his spirit.

17. But here, seeing everything is most worthy to be noted; I stand in some doubt, what thing I may here first settle myself to examine. Howbeit among many things. I will now entreat (as briefly as I can) of this, which I next add. First, let me ask you one question; whether it seem most strange unto you, that God (who by another easier kind of means might have reconciled mankind to himself) took in hand the performance thereof by so many and so grievous pains and labors of his own son? For this is certain, that he might have taken any other way in hand for reconciling of us with his son: why then did he make him subject to so many miseries and rebukes? Here might I answer, that the justice of God might by no other means be satisfied. Which answer, as it is true, so is it commonly received. Wherefore I think it meet to note here three things most profitable to be known. The first shall be this; that we may sufficiently understand, by that so hard a means, which God used for procurement of our salvation, how great a bond by the just judgment of God was grown through our sins, how grievous was the burden of them, how great was the wrath, enmity, and hatred which God had conceived against us, and how horrible a revenge hung over our heads. Which, if it be diligently enough considered, will it

not be a most fit bridle to restrain our lusts, and to stay us from falling into foul and shameful acts, and into the unclean works of darkness of this world, and of the flesh? Undoubtedly we, considering with the eyes of our faith, how severely and sharply God hath punished them in Christ, every one of us ought to be careful to fly wisely from them.

Another thing that is meet here to be noted is this; namely, that the consciences of men, which through the infirmity of the flesh do oftentimes faint, could never assure themselves, from damnation, which by their continual, yea and shameful falls they deserve; especially when as God, the most just judge, who never leaveth our sins unpunished, is always set before our eyes Men's minds (I say) being stricken with the feel of sin, could never have taken any comfort unto them; unless the severe sentence against Christ had gone before. But when we perceive, that the son of God, by so hard and bitter chastisement, abode the punishment for all our sins; besides, that from hence springeth a full assuredness to our minds: we can never be satisfied in giving of thanks unto the mercy of God, for that he cast all our iniquities upon Christ, according as it was foreshowed by Isaiah, that so he should suffer for our sins those grievous wounds and afflictions: And that is it which Paul remembereth in the eight chapter to the Romans; that God spared not his own only son, but gave him to death for us all.

18. But now let us come to the third point of doctrine, which it behooveth us diligently to weigh. Besides the profitable uses that we have before assigned, as touching the sufferings of Christ; here he showeth himself an example and lively image of all perfection: seeing we may here behold what patience, obedience, and charity our Christ taught us in dying for us. Certainly, this doctrine is a most fit thing, invented for the keeping of constancy in all afflictions. Shall there any be found, if he be pressed with

adversities, or overcharged with devilish temptations, or if he run into any other miseries whatsoever, that turning his eyes upon Christ hanging on the cross, doth not in the greatest troubles and calamities whatsoever, comfort himself with this joy? I boldly here affirm, that such a man, above all others, will keep the quietness and tranquility of his mind; seeing he acknowledgeth himself by reason hereof to walk in the paths, and to tread in the steps of our most beloved master, and only redeemer Jesus Christ. There is no affliction will be grievous unto him, neither will it disquiet him to sustain any adversities or hard persecutions, whatsoever they be, for the honor of God, and glory of his Gospel. Who is it from hence forward, that will refuse to drink of this cup of afflictions; seeing Christ our head and prince hath so cheerfully drunk thereof for obtaining salvation unto others?

These things (I say) if every faithful man will thoroughly consider with himself, he will not suffer the concupiscence's of the flesh any longer to take place, and bear rule in his mind; but with this prick of the cross will day and night be egged forward, and be profitably driven to the mortifying of them; while he shall consider, that the flesh of Christ, by the commandment of his father, was humbled upon this tree; and that the same was obedient even unto death, the which death was no less cruel than ignominious. So as, by the passion of Christ, we not only pick out a consolation in our miseries, misfortune's, and calamities, which often times light upon us; but also a lively exhortation, that we may be crucified with him, as concerning the old man and our flesh: according to that, which Paul to the Galatians taught; They (saith he) that be of Christ, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. Wherefore the same apostle used to call his afflictions, Stigmata, that is, The prints and seals of Christ engraved in his body.

By reason whereof we cannot marvel enough at the folly and also madness of some Christians; which run hither and thither on pilgrimage, as far as Hiesa or Avernia, for the prints and seals where with they vaunt that their Francis was marked. But persecutions, or rather infamies and losses, which must be sustained either in goods or in bodies themselves for Christ's religion sake, or else for showing of obedience to God, they refuse them; or else certainly they unworthily complain of them every moment. Of all these things it followeth, that we ought very much to esteem afflictions, punishments, and troubles, which we endure by the will of God, for the glory of Christ; as being seals and marks of all those things, which the only son of God, and our redeemer Christ suffered for us upon the cross. Now, albeit that the Majesty and worthiness of this matter in hand doth no small deal allure me unto it, and scarcely permitteth me to be led so soon from hence unto another discourse: yet, while I consider, that I here give only an instruction unto them that be the more ignorant, and no full teaching of the better learned Christians: I will here stay myself, and take in hand to describe that state, which the body and the soul of Christ tasted of after his death.

**He was buried, he descended into hell.**

19. Two parts there be of man, assumpted by the word into the unity of the person; namely, the soul and the body, even as other men also consist of a soul and body: but those parts were separated and disjoined upon the cross. The body (as the evangelists do testify) was laid in the sepulcher, wherein it remained until the third day: which was the time appointed by the eternal father, for the most happy resurrection of Christ. Of which mystery, when Paul entreateth in the epistle to the Romans, he saith; that The faithful which be baptized into Christ Jesus, are buried in baptism.

Which saying must thus be understood; namely, that we are so dead unto sin in Christ, that we have no more to do therewith; seeing Christ dying blotted out the same, so that it should not afterward be imputed unto us unto death. Whereby, that as the bodies of them that be dead, be buried in the sepulcher; neither do appear from thence unto the eyes of men (not that they be not in the world, but because that that which is corrupt and rotten in them is not seen:) even so our sin, perverse will, and naughty lust, howsoever they be destroyed by the cross of Christ, yet they cease not to remain in us, but are covered in the sight of God. Not that God knoweth not of them sufficiently, unto whose eyes all things are discovered and manifest: but that he doth mercifully dissemble them, revengeth not, nor yet is so angry that he bringeth death upon us by reason of them. Wherefore the flesh of Christ, being buried after his death, signified that our sin is as it were buried before the just tribunal seat of God. It signified also, that the power of the law is broken. Finally, it betokened, that the old shadows and ceremonies of the law are utterly abolished.

20. As concerning the very soul itself, immediately after that it departed from the body; it remained not idle, but it descended into the lower parts. Which words declare nothing else, but that it entered into the same state, which the rest of the souls separated from the bodies have experience of; the which are either chosen into the fellowship of saints, or else are thrust out into everlasting destruction, with the spirits of them that be damned. And assuredly, both the one and the other; as well the society of the godly spirits, as also of them that should be damned, felt the presence of the soul of Christ. For the spirits of the faithful (who as Christ saith in Luke, while he maketh mention of that unhappy rich man, and of most happy Lazarus) rested in a very quiet place, which there is aptly called The bosom of

Abraham, that they being all endued with one faith of that holy patriarch, should wait for salvation, through Christ, which there was named from Abraham. Those spirits (I say) rejoiced with great consolation, and gave thanks unto the excellent God, who had delivered them by the hand of the mediator; and because he had performed that thing, which he so long before had promised. Also the other spirits, which were appointed to damnation, felt the coming of the soul of Christ. For (as we read in the first epistle of Peter, the third chapter) To them the spirit of Christ preached.

Which may be understood after this sort; namely, that he might reprove them for their obstinacy and unbelief, wherein they were hardened against the word of God, and against the godly admonitions, which ever among were propounded unto them, while they yet lived: or else, that he even then showed unto them, that same wholesome and most true word. Which word, seeing they, being always like to themselves, did obstinately reject; and being dead, retained still that incredulity which they did being alive, they themselves gave a most manifest testimony against themselves of their most just condemnation; especially, seeing they might not any longer pretend any manner of ignorance. Thus the wisdom of God through his judgments carrieth perfect praise and renown. And here we are to crave of God, that he will vouchsafe to give unto us such a mind, as we esteem not more of our perverse lusts, than of a stinking carcass, which is already laid close in a sepulcher: and that he will so open our heart, to embrace his holy promises; least while our ears are stricken only with the outward sound of them, we wickedly resist the truth and certainty of them. It is our part also, that seeing Christ, by so many labors and sufferings, approved himself for certainty to be very man; we being comforted by his help, should plainly meditate divine and heavenly life. And having so great a benefit given of God, by the

death and burial of Christ; we should do him no small wrong, if we would in very deed think, that our own works avail anything for reconcilement of us unto him: when as we profess rather by this article of faith, that he was pacified with mankind, by the only death of Christ, and by his bitter passion.

**He rose again the third day, he ascended into heaven, he sitteth at the right hand of God the father almighty.**

21. If Christ that only son of God, which came down unto us, and for our salvation was slain by a most bitter death of the cross, had shrunk, or not been able to have sustained death; and being closed in the sepulcher, had tasted the force of corruption, as other men do: how might we have confidence to be saved by him, that had not been able to save himself? In like manner, as if a man that would proffer his help to one perishing in the water, leapeth with a good courage into the water: nevertheless, he himself, whiles he endeavoreth to save another, perisheth, being swallowed up in the deep of the water; can he that perisheth himself, bring any help to him that is perishing? Undoubtedly no other commodity can come thereof, but that the loss groweth to be double; if unto the death of the first, there is also added the death of a second, who by his death should bring so much the more loss, in how much his life was more pure and holy. So then it altogether behooved, first, that for our salvation Christ should deliver himself from death: then, to persuade us most fully, that by faith in him salvation is obtained for us. Wherefore, they which beheld him hanging upon the cross, did reproachfully cast him in the teeth with these things; Let him save himself, and we will believe him; he saved others, himself he cannot save. And he rose again from death: wherein he expressed forth a greater power, than if he had then descended from the cross. He strove in

such sort with death, as he mightily conquering and destroying the same, might not be retained thereby. For this cause do we here confess, that he was raised up the third day, according to the scriptures; and that by his fathers decree he ascended into heaven, and that he sitteth at the right hand of the father. By which article of our faith we now suck out most sweet comfort; to wit, that Christ is exalted for our salvation. And here fall out two things most worthy to be noted; the first is, what manner of exaltation and new glory of Christ the same was; the second, what profit may redound to the faithful thereby.

22. Whosoever is desirous to perceive aright, unto what a height Christ is raised up; first it behooveth him to weigh, unto how base an estate he first of his own accord humbled himself for our sakes. This doth Paul in his epistle to the Philippians contrive in few words; He (saith he) made himself of no reputation, and took on him the form of a servant, and was made like unto men, and was found in shape as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross. In like manner also, as we have more at large showed before, his body was closed up in the sepulcher; but his soul had proof of that state, which the spirits of men enter into, when they be separated from their bodies by death. The viler therefore and more abject that these things were unto the show, so much the more honorable it was to dispatch himself from hence, and to mount up unto things mere contrary. And seeing that mankind is subject everywhere to sundry miseries; those doubtless are no small miseries, which even they commonly suffer, who abounding in riches, seem to have obtained the more happy state of life. Yet the miseries of the poor be more grievous: but when they serve in bondage, they be much more extreme.

Howbeit, if so be that a man, which is of a courageous and noble mind, be delivered into the bondage of such his enemies, as not only are of base calling among men, but also of naughty and wicked behavior; his lamentable and miserable state seemeth then to be most intolerable. Yet verily, all these things happened unto Christ, who as he undoubtedly put on the true nature of man, so was he a servant, not only unto his disciples (unto whom he said; that He came into the world, not to be ministered unto, but to minister unto others, which the thing it self-declared, when as he humbled himself even unto the ground to wash their feet:) but that which is a great deal harder, he declared himself as a servant, even to his own enemies; namely, unto the wicked, and unto them which were wholly covered in the sink of wickedness; towards whom he so executed the parts of a servant, as for the safety of them he spent his own life. And this is it, that Paul writeth in his epistle to the Romans; When as (saith he) we were yet but weak, sinners, enemies, and wicked men, Christ died for us. He therefore being so humbled and abased, as he is called by the prophet A worm and no man; seeing he mounted up from so base a servitude, unto so high and noble a degree of dignity; from an earthly condition, unto a celestial glory; out of a place subject to many infirmities and tribulations, unto a state sure and free from miseries; from mortal flesh, unto an immortal body; finally, when as he being so thrust down, ascended nevertheless unto the highest state of the most excellent monarchy: doth it not appear to you, that he hath been very honorably lifted up on high?

23. And that he being raised up from the dead, hath attained chief principality; Paul doth aptly teach in his epistle to the Ephesians, saying; Whom God placed at his right hand in heaven, far above all principality, and power, and might, and domination, and above every name that is

named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come. And he hath put all things in subjection under his feet, and hath appointed him over all things to be head to the Church. The very same things also doth the same apostle put us in mind of, in his epistle to the Philippians, where by Christ's voluntary submission of himself, even to the time of his glory, he gathereth profitable and excellent doctrine in these words, saying; For that he submitted himself, and became obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross; therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name that is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, both of things in heaven, and of things in earth, and things under the earth. Which saying in very good right is agreeable to him, according to the rule prescribed by himself in another place; He that will humble himself shall be exalted. Whereby also it may be gathered, that the glory must be high and magnificent, according as the submission is voluntary.

And seeing there never was, nor never shall be, any voluntary submission so abject as the same that appeared in Christ: it followeth thereby, that of a most deserved right, he is advanced above every creature that is most high. Many afflictions and miseries did he suffer, while he lived here amongst men: now he enjoyeth most blessed rest, and is safe, as well in body as in soul, from all trouble and disquietness. He so passed from the most shameful and ignominious death, unto the most excellent life, as he is now all wholly blessed and immortal. Wherefore the apostle, in his epistle to the Romans, saith; that Christ being raised up from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more power over him. Now then, if he be altogether free from death, he must of necessity also be rid from all infirmities and sufferings, which in like manner be the ministers and soldiers of death. There is none, but doth sufficiently understand, how far distant heaven is from earth. In

like manner also must we consider, that the same high state, unto the which Christ is now carried, doth even as much differ from that state, to the which he submitted himself, while he lived here among men.

24. And albeit that difference between the earthly and heavenly state may seem to be ample, this nevertheless is certain, that I proceed not so far in these words as Paul doth; who, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, calleth that body, which shall be restored to us, in the last resurrection, not celestial, but spiritual; It is sown (saith he) a natural body, and shall be raised up a spiritual body. He meaneth not, that Christ and the rest of the saints, which shall rise with him, shall not have flesh, bones, blood, distinct members, and finally a true body. For without doubt, the truth and property of human nature shall still remain: but he calleth it a spiritual body, because that same noble nature and form, unto the which it shall be restored, shall not flow from an earthly original, such as human seed is; but from the power of God's spirit. Furthermore, the body being raised up, shall be adorned with new qualities, which shall draw near unto the nature of the spirit, and not unto the nature of the earth; and for that cause shall justly be called spiritual. Wherefore, he that rightly shall weigh the words of the apostle, while he nameth it a spiritual body, will not allege the same against a corporal body, but against an earthly, mortal, and corrupt body. Wherefore he addeth these words; It is sown an infamous body, it riseth a glorious body; it is sown in weakness, it riseth in power; it is sown a natural body, it riseth a spiritual body. In a body raised up, be no infirmities or natural motions to resist the spirit; and no heaviness or grossness so great, but that it cheerfully obeyeth the right affects of the spirit.

Howsoever it be, it is sufficiently confirmed by those things, which have been spoken; that the name of spiritual doth in very good right appertain

unto the body of Christ, being raised up; because it is somewhat more, than if thou shouldst say, Heavenly: for so much as Christ, after his resurrection (as it is added in this Creed) not only ascended into heaven, but also was carried above heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of God the father almighty. Which manner of speech, seeing it layeth before our eyes a certain human form, we must diligently ponder from whence it is derived. I say therefore, that no others are placed at the prince's side, but those, whom princes favoring have exalted to some high degree of dignity. And among those, which be endued with this honor, no others are placed at the right hand, but those which are advanced to the highest room of honor or power next the prince. But this, which here is declared touching Christ, we must understand to be altogether figuratively spoken of Christ; seeing God is without body, hands, and sides: neither hath he right hand or left. But by this manner of speech, we be given to understand, that Christ, in that he is man, is by God endued after the resurrection with such honor and dignity, as there is nothing in his whole empire, that not only cannot be preferred above him, but not compared with him.

25. But this being now declared; namely, unto what high glory Christ by his resurrection ascended, and the same being set forth as plains as the capacity of them, to whom these things be written, will bear, and as the occasion of mine own leisure would give me leave; it shall be very necessary to add what profit the same may bring unto us; whereby also we shall understand, unto what use we ought to refer the same. For, seeing there is no action of Christ, that is not of very great importance, to the furtherance of our salvation; this we ought to account with our selves, that by this action, which easily appeareth among others, the greatest and chiefest commodities do redound unto us. Wherefore let this cogitation first

enter into our mind, that seeing Christ could not be overcome of death; he is able now the better a great deal to relieve our necessities, and that by the favor and power of his father, unto whom he hath always (as it hath been said) so familiar access, and to whom he continually offering prayers of singular efficacy for us, winneth us his favor, and procureth us such strength, as otherwise we could never obtain to ourselves. Moreover, Christ being raised from death, who is our head, we also are raised in him. Tell me (I beseech you) will you not judge him to have escaped the danger of death, which falling into a swift river, holdeth up all his head above those deep and dangerous waters; notwithstanding that the rest of his members be as yet drowned in the same? Even so we, which be one body in Christ; seeing he, which is our head, hath escaped from the exceeding depth of death; why also of good right are not we said to be raised up from death, howsoever we as yet in this mortal state be covered with the same? For otherwise doubtless we should deny him to be our head. And if we profess ourselves to be the members of him, we must of necessity also acknowledge, that our resurrection is after a sort begun in his resurrection.

If in the winter time we see a bare tree without leaves, flowers, and fruit, so that by the outward rind it may be taken as withered, and yet so long as the root sticketh fast in the ground, it is alive, and is not counted dead. But if a man cannot persuade himself thereof, let him expect till the spring of the year, and then the truth of the matter will appear by the leaves and flowers which spring forth. For by evident effects it will be well known, that the life of that tree lay hidden before. Even so we, which here seem to be as it were the bootie of death, and in whom no tokens of sound life do appear: if we be engrafted in Christ, which is our root, who liveth, and for our sakes is raised up again, wherefore do we now doubt of our resurrection

to come? And this is it that Paul writeth in the epistle to the Colossians. Ye are dead (saith he) and your life is hidden in Christ with God: when Christ, which is your life, shall be made manifest, then also shall ye be made manifest with him in glory. Further, Christ departing into heaven, gratified us with that singular gift of the spirit: to whom, as the original and life of our souls, and beginning of Christian regeneration is chiefly due; so is it also of the resurrection of our bodies: as Paul testifieth in his epistle to the Ephesians; to wit, that We be led unto faith through the effectual working of his strong power, which God showed forth in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his right hand in heavenly places.

Seeing therefore we have the first fruits of the spirit, by the virtue whereof Christ rose again from the dead, who (as we know) hath attained unto that glorious end, whereunto he endeavored to come; we must be of a cheerful mind, and confirm our selves in that gift, which he hath granted unto us. For what so great disquietness of state shall happen unto us in this life, that can keep us in sadness and heaviness of mind? For (as Paul saith in the epistle to the Romans;) We are now saved by hope. Assuredly, it is not to be counted a small gain, that we by Christ are delivered from death: so that we may now boldly triumph, not only against it, but against all other miseries and misfortunes, which be as it were guarders of the same. And we may comfort and cheer up our minds against the violent motions of the flesh, the which being constrained by such miseries, doth continually murmur; seeing there is not only a promise made unto us of a new life, but we have also a certain and sure pledge of the same in Christ.

26. Furthermore, that noble resurrection doth out of all doubt further greatly our salvation. For, albeit that sins be forgiven by the death of Christ, and by that only and most acceptable sacrifice; and that in his flesh fastened

upon the cross all our faults have been punished: yet nevertheless, the form of that spiritual life (wherein we must live no longer unto the flesh, but unto the spirit; not unto old Adam, but unto Christ; not unto ourselves, but unto God our father) is not perceived thereby. But this did afterward appear in that life, which Christ received by his most mighty resurrection. And therefore Paul writeth in his epistle to the Romans; that Christ died for our offenses, and was raised up for our justification. Indeed, by the death of Christ we were reconciled unto God: howbeit, therein is not discerned any pattern of our state to come, but doubtless in the resurrection it shall shine most perfectly. For it was not beyond nature, that the flesh of Christ (which was subject to the same infirmities that we be) should die: but his resurrection so went beyond nature itself, as when the flesh of itself was instructed in no virtue, whereby it might assure itself of a new life, that wholly was given to it by the mere grace and bountifulness of God. We also, as far as appertaineth to that new and justified regeneration, can compass the same by no virtue or desert of our own works; but God, of his grace and goodness, gave it unto us without any respect of our own merits. Further, even as Christ, being risen from the dead, ascended into heaven; so we, being justified by his grace, it is meet for us, in all our whole life, to think no more upon earthly, but upon heavenly things. This doth Paul teach us in his epistle to the Colossians; If ye be risen (saith he) with Christ, seek ye the things that be above, and not earthly things.

Besides this, as Christ being risen from the dead, dieth no more; so he that is regenerated by faith, let him take heed, that he do not fall again into miserable and dangerous infidelity. For which cause Paul admonished Timothy, that he should remember, that Jesus Christ was risen again from the dead. For the remembrance of the same resurrection of Christ, is of no

small stirring up to the leading of a godly and innocent life; that in such sort we may follow Christ, who dying once, delivered himself from death forever. So we, being for his sake freed from sin, it is not convenient, that we should entangle ourselves again under the yoke of sin. And hereof doth the same apostle, in his epistle to the Romans, very well admonish us; Even as Christ (saith he) was raised up from the dead unto the glory of the father, so we also should walk in newness of life. And unto this ought we, with all endeavor, to apply our selves, continually going forward, as Paul in the epistle to the Philippians speaketh of himself; namely, that Forgetting those things, which were behind, and endeavoring to that, which should be before, we might follow hard towards the mark, for the price of the high calling of God, whither he was not yet come. This verily was to know Christ, and the strength of his resurrection. And he said a little before; I will try if I may by any means attain to the resurrection of the dead.

Herein standeth the whole sum of Christianity, that inwardly we should be ever renewed, and that outwardly, as far as lieth in us, we should pleasure and benefit our neighbors: seeing Christ, being raised from the dead, hath so greatly endued us with his benefits, by giving from that time unto his children that precious gift of the holy Ghost; and first went unto his father, where he continually beholdeth us, and offereth most acceptable prayers unto God for us. Life being renewed in him by his resurrection, he bountifully and in heaped measure increaseth his gifts in his elect. He being exalted unto that most excellent power, doth now protect us from all evil, and filleth us with all goodness. Wherefore, our part is to bend all our care and diligence unto that end, that we may honor him after a godly sort: not with earthly ceremonies, or with sundry inventions of men; but with spiritual worshipping, and with that which may be agreeable unto that

heavenly and spiritual state, whereunto Christ is now received. Before that he was come unto us, and so long as he was conversant in the world after an human sort, the shadows and figures of the law, corporal worshipping's, and worldly ceremonies were in force: but now, we being raised up with Christ, it is meet, that even as we behold him both in the place and degree, wherein he is set; so also, that we should with lifted up eyes of our mind, fasten our hope upon him.

**From thence he shall come to judge both the quick and the dead.**

27. Our flesh, human reason, and the whole rout of wicked men, shall not evermore obstinately upbraid us, that we have devised to ourselves a God, a Lord, and a Prince, which will never exhibit himself to be seen, or to be perceived of human sense: I mean Christ our savior. For, after that we have confessed him to sit gloriously at the right hand of the father; we add, that the same Christ will at the length evidently show himself to the world, when he shall come into his kingdom, to execute the parts of a judge. For it shall be a most meet thing, that he, which was condemned unjustly, by sentence of the judge, should at the length make manifest unto the whole world, that most excellent authority and righteousness of his, the which was condemned; not only when Christ received the sentence of death, but also as it were by continual succession it endured by human flesh and wisdom the same judgments, in the ages that came after: and that not only in the person of Christ, but also in his holy members and brethren, whether they be already dead, or as yet wander here in this earth, who are vexed with many reproaches and contumelies, suffer persecutions, and all kind of injuries; in such sort, as there is scarce any corner of the world, that ringeth not of the sorrowful lamentations of the godly.

But seeing all such judgments be corrupt and perverse, that last judgment shall at the length come forth (from the which there shall be no appeal to a higher judge) and the which shall correct and reform men's ordinances and decrees, which indeed were contrary unto equity and justice: forsomuch as it shall have powers and qualities, altogether contrary unto those wicked judgments. Christ the most excellent judge shall flourish in wisdom, which shall perse and perceive all alike, as well those things which be most manifest and evident to all men, as everything else that is most obscure and most secret: according to that, which Paul declareth in his epistle to the Romans; namely, that He shall judge of the secrets of men. He shall then have no need of auditors, and inquisitions. But on the other side, though I hold my peace, every one of the faithful doth sufficiently understand those perverse judgments, which the ungodly do oftentimes decree, touching Christ and his members, how plainly they set abroad their own foolishness, and extreme darkness of mind. Christ, when he shall exercise his judgment in that latter day, shall most justly yield right unto everyone, and shall temper his sentence with singular justice; neither shall he decline to this side or that, who cannot be removed from the right, neither by perverse affections, neither by any gifts.

28. Wherefore, this is spoken touching him, that With him there is no exception of persons: which vice suffereth not the enemies of true godliness, either to speak or judge aright of Christianity. But one man being moved with the endeavor of private commodity, another being plucked away with other perverse affections, rashly condemneth Christ, and them that be his, and persecuteth them with sundry reproaches. Whereupon it is said in the Gospel; How can ye speak good things, seeing yourselves be evil? That most high judge lacketh no power or ability to execute those

things, which he hath determined, either in favor of the godly, or for the destruction of the wicked: seeing he himself saith; All power is given unto me. And it is written also of the wicked, in the first epistle to the Thessalonians; When they shall say, peace, and that all is well, then shall come upon them sudden destruction, as the travel upon a woman with child, so as they may not escape. In the perverse judgment of the tyrants of this world, which they give out oftentimes against Christian religion, the contrary is perceived. For ether such decrees take none effect, or else they fall again upon the heads of those tyrants themselves; so as they be rather hurtful unto themselves, than unto the Christians. But that they may bring to effect those things, which they have wickedly decreed; those judgments extend no further, than unto goods, and unto this temporal life. Which things are of the least account unto the spiritual man, and to him which is renewed by Christ: as Christ himself testifieth, who speaking unto his disciples, said; Fear ye not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul. But I will show you whom ye ought rather to fear; namely, God, who after he hath killed the body, is able to destroy the soul in hell fire.

Which of us therefore (dearly beloved brethren in Christ) will not so prepare himself, as he may receive with a cheerful mind, such a judge, through whose sentence an end shall be appointed unto all the injuries that are done unto us? This is that most high good man of the house, which at the length shall make all his servants to be known; and shall demand an account of them, touching such affairs as he hath committed unto them. This is that mighty rich merchant, that will return, to call for gains of his great sum of money delivered into bank. This is that new bridegroom, that by a just choice shall sever the wise virgins from the foolish. This is that wise and expert steward, that knoweth how to lay up the pure wheat in his

barn, and to burn the chaff with fire; and who like a good shepherd can sever the sheep from the goats; and like a wary fisher, the good fishes from the bad: and finally, who like a wise husbandman will throw the cockle into the fire, but wisely will save the profitable and precious seed. Whosoever therefore thirsteth after the pure church, or the sincere kingdom of Christ, and after the sound and perfect fellowship of the chosen, or that doth long to see that most excellent and immaculate spouse; cannot but be pierced in mind with the remembrance of that most sweet and acceptable day: that it is no marvel, if the same be therefore called by Paul, Blessed hope. And in Luke, after that he had reckoned up diverse tokens of the coming of that day, he added; When ye shall see these tokens, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth near.

29. But least the joy conceived of that latter coming, should be disturbed through the mistrust of salvation, which might enter into your mind, while ye understand that the same most high judge will be inquisitive of men's works, (and this I say, because, if thou wilt believe me, there shall be no man, how much honesty soever he be endued with, that standing upon the consideration of his own works, is able to hold fast this confidence; and so, if these things be not rightly understood by you, in that blessed day, there would seem to be an argument presented before your eyes, of nothing else, but horrible and exceeding fear of everlasting death) we must thoroughly consider, and diligently weigh what shall come into trial and examination at the latter day. Wherein I first affirm, that there shall be no need of examination at all against the infidels; as they, that for their infidelity be already condemned. So Christ plainly teacheth in John; Whosoever (saith he) believeth not, is already condemned. But, because this doubting might creep into the minds of many, how it should come to pass, that of them

which are equally entitled by the name and title of Christians, some are adjudged to salvation, and other some to eternal damnation: for this cause our most just judge Christ, will have the reason of this difference to appear to all the world; seeing, as he will never hereafter suffer his justice to be hidden to the world, in such wise as it was, when he came first into the world, to be conversant among us; he will (I say) at that second coming of his, make his justice known unto all persons, that it may manifestly appear, who hath truly taken upon him his name and titles, or who hath done the same feignedly and by hypocrisy.

30. At the length also we may be warned hereby, that not only the dead, but also the living must come under the judgment of Christ. Which must be understood (as Paul teacheth in his epistle to the Corinthians) that undoubtedly We shall not all die, but we shall be all changed. And to the Thessalonians. We which shall live, and shall be remaining, shall be caught up together with them into the clouds, to meet with the Lord in the air, and so we shall ever be with the Lord. Hereby it is gathered, that of them, which shall stand before that high judgment seat, some shall be raised from death and dust, and others in very deed shall not die: but it will come to pass by the grace of God, that they shall be translated unto a better state, the same not subject to any infirmities. They shall be those elect, which then shall be found alive: for there will be no need for them to put off their bodies, but their bodily mass shall attain unto glory; so that death shall not take the same away from them. Among them Paul did wish to be numbered, as it is written in the epistle to the Corinthians: and we also with him expect the same with great desire. Howbeit, in this matter, as in all other things also, let us so behave ourselves, that all may tend unto the glory of God.

**I believe in the holy Ghost.**

31. Seeing the word Spirit signifieth many things, to the end we may the more easily perceive that which we believe, it shall be very good, first to sever and distinguish into diverse parts, whatsoever is signified to us under that name. Out of which significations we will choose that, which is agreeable unto our purpose; and will prosecute the same more at large. That word spirit in general, doth always express a certain secret strength or power, which is able both to move and to drive forward. Wherefore the winds, together with those organs, whereby the life doth govern, move, and stir the body, are called the spirit. And although this power be included and mixed with corporal nature, yet seeing the bodies, wherein it is conversant, be so subtle, that they cannot for the most part be seen; this word is also derived to this point, that it signifieth natures and essences, which be simple and of diverse sorts: such as is God, the company of angels, together also with the souls of men now separated from their bodies: and therefore the divine nature is called a spirit. This doth Christ manifestly declare in John; Because God is a spirit, he will be worshipped in spirit. Neither is there in this respect any difference between the father, the son, and the holy Ghost. To conclude, that word of the spirit, signifieth not only the nature divine, invisible, and without body; but specially also it betokeneth unto us the third person of the divinity, distinct from the father and the son. And specially is he thus called by the name of spirit, by reason of his property, because the property of him is to move, to set forward, to persuade, to comfort and lighten the spirits and hearts of men; and at length, to work in them such things as pertain to our sanctification. And the saints have such trial of the marvelous effects thereof, as neither reason, neither man’s wisdom is able to comprehend those things, neither yet can they be discerned by the eyes of men.

Wherefore of good right do we hear say; I believe in the holy Ghost: as in a thing that far exceedeth the capacity of our nature, and yet is distinctly set forth unto us in the holy scripture. And that the same spirit is the third person in divine nature, Christ sufficiently expresseth in these words, in the which he said unto his apostles; Go ye and baptize in the name of the father, of the son, and of the holy Ghost. Which signifieth no other thing, than that they, which be washed in baptism, are bound to this confession; namely, that the father, the son, and also the holy Ghost, do give salvation unto them. Now see (I beseech you) what it is to be baptized in the name of the three persons of the deity. And the distinction of this third person is not only known here from the other two; but thereby also we gather it, when the eternal father speaketh unto John Baptist, concerning the holy Ghost, as of a thing distinct from himself and from the son; He it is (meaning by Christ) upon whom thou shalt see the spirit come down, in the likeness of a dove. He speaketh not as if he meant by himself; Upon whom I will descend: but, Upon whom he shall descend, speaking of another. It is manifest also, that he was not the son; because the spirit in shape of a dove was to light on Christ, who properly is called the son. Yea doubtless and Christ, in the Gospel of John, speaketh of the same spirit; He shall take of mine, and shall come in my name. And there he addeth; The father shall give you another comforter, that is to say; another beside me, and distinct from myself. By which places it is most assuredly proved, that the holy Ghost is a distinct person in the most holy Trinity, the which we constantly believe and confess.

32. This also is meet of us to be considered, that the spirit is not the same that be his gifts and works: seeing Paul, in the first to the Corinthians, the 12th chapter, reckoning up sundry effects thereof, afterward addeth; And all

these things work that one and the same spirit, distributing them to every man severally as he will. So is it evident enough, that we here confess the third person of divinity, by the power of whom we be renewed in Christ, and therefore may become like unto Christ. For even as he was begotten without man's seed, so are we born again unto a new life by the power of God's spirit: as testifieth John, when he saith; that He which believeth, is made the son of God; and is neither born of blood, neither of the will of the flesh, neither of the will of man, but of God. Which thing is particularly attributed to this third person, seeing Christ expressly saith; that He which is not born of the water, and of the spirit, shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. From the very same also is the remission of sins said to flow. Wherefore Christ breathed upon the face of the apostles, and said; Receive ye the holy Ghost, whose sins ye shall forgive, the same shall be forgiven, and whose sins ye retain shall be retained. Whosoever then sinneth against the holy Ghost, doth not obtain remission of his sins; because that it is directly done against him, from whom the remission of sins proceedeth.

Neither for all that do we attribute this unto him, but forsomuch as we be loden with such weightiness, as we be scarce able to rise from the earth, being always pressed down with the burden of our flesh, and with our corporal senses, we should lie still in the earth; unless we were raised up by that spirit, who straighteneth and erecteth up unto heaven our minds (which through natural corruption are altogether sunken in the affections of the flesh) even as the soul sustaineth the frail and mortal body, and setteth the same upright: that in this life the elect may in a manner have the same experience of themselves, that is perceived to be in bottles, the which being thrown empty into the water, fall to the bottom; but if so be they be blown and filled with wind, they float above the water. Even so men's minds,

being void of that spirit, are drowned through their own affections and lusts: but when they be filled with that holy spirit, they be masters over sin, and they suffer not themselves at any time to be overcome by it. This also we obtain by the benefit of the same spirit, both to will aright, and to work justly. For our nature, as it is corrupt and perverse, would never in very deed be willing of itself, or would show forth any actions, which either in respect of themselves should be acceptable unto God, or in that they proceed from us, being enemies unto him, but that he would refuse and condemn them. But that spirit of God placing himself here amongst us, doth so fashion our minds, as whatsoever floweth from us by the help of him, is most grateful and acceptable unto God: and that because he inwardly reformeth us, that we may become most welcome friends, yea rather most deer beloved children.

33. Here ye see, what singular benefit this article of our faith bringeth, when it is known and understood. And undoubtedly our affections, our mind, yea and the members of the very body be instruments of the spirit itself. Wherefore Paul writeth unto the Romans, that Those finally be the children of God, which be led by the spirit of God. And even as he cannot be called a man, who is destitute of the mind of man; nor that, a dog, which beareth not the form or living property of a dog: no more is he partaker of the divine nature, which is void of the spirit of God. And therefore I cannot marvel enough at the folly of some, which if a man say, that they be no Christians, cannot abide this reproach; and yet in the meantime will neither seem to be endued with that spirit, neither will be persuaded, or themselves grant that none may be a Christian without the same. Nevertheless, Paul in his epistle to the Romans doth boldly affirm, that He which hath not the spirit, the same is no son. Wherefore let such men go, and by the same

infidelity, whereby they mistrust of the having of God's spirit; let them stand in doubt whether they be Christians. And if so be any man ask, how we have him? I answer, that the most excellent father, for Christ his sake, sendeth him unto us: according as Christ promised to us in the person of his apostles; The comforter (saith he) which is the holy Ghost, whom my father will send in my name, &c.

Yea and this I may boldly add, that Christ himself sendeth him unto us from the father: even as in another place he saith; The spirit, which I will send from the father unto you. Neither is he given unto us, either from the father, or from the son, for any other end, but to enrich us abundantly with those gifts and very excellent riches. But yet the scripture showeth, that his chiefest work doth specially consist in teaching. Christ promised to his disciples, that he would send the holy Ghost, which should teach them, and lead them into all truth, which he had showed unto them. He warned them also, that when they should be brought before princes, they should take no care; because it should not be they that should speak, but the spirit of their father that should speak in them. And certainly, the apostles were not dispersed abroad in the world for preaching of the Gospel, before they were endued from above with that heavenly power: by the help whereof, they not only preached the Gospel mightily for bringing of men unto the obedience of Christ; but they also established the truth of their doctrine with wonderful signs and miracles. And that manner of teaching, by which that spirit is performed towards us, must be inwardly considered in the mind: the which he not only replenisheth with his light, but also doth gently allure and persuade the same, and maketh those things acceptable, from which otherwise, by reason of our corrupt nature, we do utterly fly. Thus doth he work a marvelous transforming in the minds of the elect, while he stirreth

them up unto the endeavor of good works and godly actions, which by the guide of nature they might not be able to perform.

34. And yet doth he not by force constrain them unto those works, but rather with effect persuade them inwardly. And this is that happy liberty, wherewith the chosen of Christ be endued, who by the power and persuasion of the same spirit, do employ their whole endeavor unto such actions, which by the only guide of nature could neither be done by them, nor yet would be acceptable unto God. Further also, from that spiritual doctrine, which flourisheth inwardly, there springeth afterward an assured mortification, as well in the mind as in the flesh: as Paul testifieth in his epistle to the Romans, whom he warned, that If they would by the spirit mortify the deeds of the flesh, they should live. To these things add, if you will, that the comfort, which springeth by the assurance of our salvation, is so great; as even in the midst of troubles, miseries, calamities, and sorrows of this world, we may lead a cheerful and merry life. And that not without cause; seeing we feel in us that singular and noble gift, which Paul to the Ephesians calleth The pledge of our salvation. I see not now how any man, upon just cause, can doubt of his coming one day into that state of Christ, when he perceiveth already, that his soul liveth by the same spirit of Christ.

But if a man will demand; how we know that our soul is quickened by the same spirit? Answer may be made by the words of Paul, I live not any longer (saith Paul to the Galatians) but Christ liveth in me. And unto the Philippians; Christ unto me is life. Which sayings declare no other thing; but that the godly do live in Christ, and Christ in them, and that by his spirit. It is also written in the epistle to the Romans, that The same spirit doth testify with our spirit, that we be the sons of God. And it is not fit by any means to refuse so certain a testimony. But whosoever hath not this

testimony inwardly in himself, is unworthy to be called a Christian. But if any man object, that although Paul were endued with this assured persuasion; and that he felt inwardly this inward testimony in himself: it followeth not, that the self-same thing must be granted to be in others. I answer, that Paul wrote all these things unto the Romans, who as yet were far off from perfection: neither had they profited so much as Paul. And that do their own contentions, suspicions, and rash judgments, and also their very feeble and weak consciences bear witness: all which things the apostle doth oftentimes reprehend in these his writings.

And yet nevertheless, when the Romans were such, he wrote unto them of that adoption, whereby God had determined to make them his children, when they should embrace Christian religion. Wherefore (beloved brethren) let us put off the spirit that miserable doubteth of our salvation; seeing there is nothing that is more enemy to our faith, which is the lively and most sure foundation of all our felicity. Who doth not sufficiently understand, how great contraries are believing and doubting; and how much they are repugnant the one to the other? I certainly, for my part, do not see how these things may agree; To believe truly in Christ my only and true savior, and To stand likewise in doubt of him, whether he will save me or no; seeing he hath received me into his faith, and so greatly testifieth by his spirit unto my mind, that sweet and bountiful affection of his towards me. And if we admit the testimonies of men, who naturally are liars, and prove to deceit, that we in like manner should cleave to them; how much rather ought we to repose ourselves in all those things, which that good and true spirit of God doth confirm by his testimony? Unless peradventure we suffer ourselves to be persuaded, that there is more truth and fidelity in men, than there is in God.

Which if any be so hardy to say, he shall in this point alone most plainly bewray himself to be such a one as he is.

Wherefore let us yield unto the most benign and merciful God, as great and many thanks as we can, who hath (not by the ministry of angels, or of any other creature whatsoever; but by the power of his own spirit) engrafted us in Christ his true and natural son, and by him hath renewed and sanctified us; and so enriched us with the knowledge of him, and with other heavenly gifts, as now we are destitute neither of strength, neither of force, neither of light, neither of any faculty to let us, whereby we should the less either will or work aright. And thus we shall retain a cheerful and quiet life, even in the midst of persecutions, which often the world and Satan do stir up; so that we be most fully persuaded by that holy spirit, that we shall obtain eternal life: and that not of our own merits, but by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which liveth and reigneth forever, Amen.

**I believe in the holy catholic church, the communion of Saints, &c.**

35. This article of the faith is so aptly knit unto the other that goeth before, as to any man that is of sound judgment, the former may seem to be the root or stem of the latter, out of which this latter article ariseth and buddeth forth as a most fit branch. And that is showed unto us after this sort. In whatsoever body life is placed, the power and strength thereof is to guide, and also by a most sure bond to unite all the parts of the whole body, by how great a space soever they be dissevered one from the other: even so the congregation of the godly, which commonly (if the believers be considered of in respect that they be earthly men) is called the church, how much soever it be compact of sundry people, and hath her parts settled a great space one from another in the world: and that, as much as the uttermost quarter of the world is distant by the spaces of regions, from the

other part of the world; yet nevertheless it is joined, knit, and couched together. And for that cause it is by Paul compared to a body, and that oftentimes in his epistles unto the Ephesians and Corinthians. But by what bond the Christians (who so greatly differ one from another, whether respect be to their condition, country, or language) are so strictly knit together, it is sufficiently understood, by the order which joineth this latter article of our faith unto the former. For there our faith confesseth the holy Ghost; and here it treateth of the body of the faithful, which with a sincere faith, embracing the doctrine of Christ, is by him gathered together in one.

And this congregation by a Greek name is called Ecclesia, which signifieth no other thing, than a multitude called together. For it is compact of them, which by the holy Ghost are called unto the Christian faith; from the which they be excluded, which by a human motion, or persuasion, or double heart, or by any other sinister means, without any instinct of the spirit of God, do join themselves unto it. Even as if one should artificially join unto a human body some piece of a bone, of a sinew, of a gristle, or else a piece of flesh; these be not therefore accounted parts of that body, seeing they are not moved by the life thereof: but they altogether depend of this cunning art. Even so indeed we acknowledge, that the communion of saints is here found upon the earth; to wit, the congregation of the faithful, the which is gathered together in one, not by the will of man, or by any cunning craft of the world; but by the only spirit of Christ: not doubtless, that it should be contained together in one place, but that it should retain one true understanding of faith.

36. By these things therefore ye understand, that the church is a mystical body, the which is governed by the holy Ghost. Hereby also it is manifest enough, who they be, that appertain unto the same, and who live out of the

communion of it. Further, it is not obscure how aptly the name of church agreeth unto it. First it is evidently proved, that this marvelous body is governed by the holy Ghost, by those words which Paul teacheth in the epistle to the Ephesians; We (saith he) be one body and one spirit. Again also it is more plainly showed in the first epistle to the Corinthians; By one spirit we are all baptized into one body, and have drunk of one spirit. Whereupon it followeth, that whosoever be destitute of that spirit, do not belong to this body. For he that hath not the spirit of Christ, how can he assure himself to be a member of that body, whereof Christ is the head, and in whom there is no other life, than the divine spirit itself? Undoubtedly it sufficeth not, it sufficeth not (I say) to put on certain colorable shows, whereby we should be taken by the judgment of men for members of that body. Peter was called of Christ, blessed: not because he confessed him with outward voice to be the son of God; but because neither flesh, nor blood, nor any human reason had revealed unto him so great a mystery, but only the heavenly father. Paul also in his first epistle to the Corinthians, in the place above recited, writeth; that No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the holy Ghost. By which places it is manifest, what confession at the least is required in the church; namely, not that which proceedeth of man's sense, but that which is stirred up and brought forth by the spirit of God. For otherwise the devils themselves, and also the Mahumetanes in their Alcoran, do ascribe a certain honor unto Christ, while they confess his praise.

37. But here might appear some difficulty. What? Is the church invisible, that it cannot be perceived in the world with corporal eyes? And doth not the very sense itself tell, that the company of men is there gathered together, for celebrating and calling upon the name of Christ? How then is that

believed, which is seen? Is faith carried unto those things, which be most manifest, and are subject even to the senses themselves? Hereunto we answer, that the multitude of men, which outwardly profess Christ, are indeed seen of us, but not sufficiently known of us, because we apprehend it with our outward sense, as it hath been said. But we believe certainly, that this company of men doth so come together, as nevertheless it is no human work. A philosopher, or some other heathen man would object, that such assemblies be sects of men, which might spring up of diverse and sundry opinions; and be brought forth into light, according as places and times require. Undoubtedly, we live not by the industry of men, but this work must be attributed to the spirit of God, whom we have before confessed.

Neither must we pass over the cause, why the church is called Catholic, which is a Greek word, and signifieth no other thing, than if thou shouldst say, universal: for that it is not bound more to one place than to another. But even as God is a God of the whole universal world; even so will he, that the body of his son, which is his church, should be extended into every place. With him there is no exception of persons; neither had he respect, whether those, which he calleth into his church, be either husbandmen or smiths, men or women, princes or servants, rich or poor, barbarous, citizens, or Gentiles; as though he were moved for these outward things to choose them: but of every nation he chooseth those, whom he thinketh meet. Wherefore the church is a universal body, compacted of men of every kind and condition. But it excelleth also in a nobler society, which is of such sort, as whosoever be truly gathered together into that body, be endued with the same feeling of faith. And undoubtedly, in vain shall every other consent be, if minds disagree in the doctrine of faith.

Neither is there ever anything, that bringeth more detriment unto this faith, than the inventions of men. From hence have flowed all the heresies that ever were, which in very deed are nothing else, but the opinions of men, conceived besides the meaning of the scriptures, and sown abroad among diverse people: as if they were certain divine mysteries, which bring salvation; or else works most acceptable unto God. And forsomuch as such doctrines are nothing else, but devises of men, by which the authors of them have sought their own gain and commodity; first they be mere lies, deceits, and wicked juggling's; secondly, when as they proceed from the inventions of men, they cannot satisfy all men. For look how many men, so many sundry opinions there be: so that some dissent in one article of the faith, and some in another. So in very deed it happened among the Greeks and other Christians, which inhabit towards the East part, whom if thou examine, thou shalt undoubtedly find, that by a common consent they have allowed the holy scriptures: but in those sundry superstitions, the which they have oftentimes devised, there will appear great disagreement.

38. Howbeit, in these devises of superstitions, the church of Rome carrieth away the price. For while they provide to stuff into the pure and simple religion of Christ infinite abominations, drawn out of the sinks of paganism, in restoring and (as they say, or rather as they lie) in reforming them to a better form; it hath trodden under foot and destroyed all things. Also this it obstinately urgeth, that every man's faith doth rest in such goodly things. And men's inventions are more esteemed than the lawful doctrine of the truth, drawn out of the holy fountains of the scriptures. And this might not others, which in like manner be infected with their own superstitions, abide; that they, any less than the Romans, should stoutly keep still and defend their feigned worshipping's and human inventions.

But they, which have embraced the principal and sincere doctrine of Christ, be utter enemies against those superstitions; seeing they perceive, that thereby the glory of Christ and his merits are altogether obscured, the honor of God translated unto his creatures, his service used without his word, and set forth only after the devise of men: so that the church, which at this day challengeth proudly unto itself alone, the name of Catholic; she alone (I say) more than others hath severed, and even rent in sunder that common and universal society of the faithful.

For if it had staid itself in that religion and service, which the holy scriptures do prescribe unto us; there had not proceeded so many schisms from thence. But hitherto it hath used no measure of her own feigned devises, and it hath endeavored by force and arms to constrain every man to receive the same. From hence have risen infinite dissensions, amongst which there be some that remain unto this day; as experience itself plainly testifieth. And as touching those that have been in the former ages, whosoever will diligently apply his mind in reading of histories, shall easily perceive them. Howbeit, whatsoever Satan, by his cunning, hath wrought; the Catholic church remaineth still steadfast and immoveable, and shall firmly abide even until the last day of judgment. For the same betokeneth nothing else, but an universal body, compact together of men of every state and condition; the which, in what parts soever of the earth they dwell, they retain the same faith and grace, righteousness, holiness, and happiness; and finally, they embrace every good thing offered them in Christ: and so, as they will never suffer themselves one jot to be led from that truth, which the spirit of God hath revealed to us in the holy scriptures; but they will assure themselves of that only worshipping to be lawful and acceptable unto God, which he hath prescribed in those holy scriptures.

39. Neither are they for any other end compacted together in this society, but that they should edify one another to their power: even as the joining together, that is in the members of a man's body, is chiefly ordained for the help and preservation of every particular member. The church striveth not, to the intent it might challenge unto itself some chief empire or temporal jurisdiction: it promiseth no such end unto itself, as it would heap up exceeding treasures and earthly riches. The scope thereof is not to rule nations, to make wars, to lay hold upon cities, and to vanquish them. Indeed this body is not destitute of his weapons, but these be spiritual, and not carnal weapons; namely, the word and the spirit, with the which it overcometh the wisdom of man, casteth it to the ground, leadeth captive the mind and cogitation to the obedience of Christ. And the same (undoubtedly) oppresseth not the bodies with tyrannical servitude, or draweth away men's goods by grievous tributes. This self-same doctrine doth Paul in very many words inculcate in his later epistle to the Corinthians, where he very well describeth the wrestling's of this congregation: and he in the same epistle, entreating there of his own, and of other of the apostles authority, saith; that The same was granted unto him to edify, and not to destroy. Unto the which notwithstanding, they do singularly bend themselves, which will alone be called heads, and apostles of the church.

Howbeit (in the meantime) with all their power they resist the word of God. Neither do they suffer the perfect state of our justification to be preached; but rather by their human decrees and constitutions, lay infinite snares against the miserable souls of the people committed to them, the which notwithstanding are redeemed by the precious blood of Christ. And yet further, they pollute with their sundry abuses, the sacraments ordained of God, and especially the holy supper of the Lord, which they have turned

into filthy and shameful idolatry, and of the signs or seals thereof, they admit the simple flock to the participation of one only; as though it were in their power to invert the order, which the Lord hath appointed. They not content (I say) to defraud the flock of Christ of that principal food of souls, which is the word of God, do also cut away half the sacrament, which is as it were the visible word, and the evident testimony of the goodness, charity, and ardent affection of Christ toward us, a memorial of his death, the most effectual mark of that union, whereby they grow up together under Christ himself being head, unto a holy body of the church. But this will I here add, that this one thing they work by their traditions; namely, they establish that tyranny of theirs, and make it to extend further abroad. Howbeit, the hope is, that Christ will at length take pity of so noble a body of his, and that he will not suffer a mortal man any longer to vaunt himself so proudly against his head. This Christ only, Christ (I say) is the head of the church.

40. But they, which say, that the Pope is head of the church (as he will commonly be accounted, (which also his shameless flatterers fear not to publish openly, both by words and writings) seem in my judgment to be like unto those wicked Jews, which all with one voice denied Christ to be their king, and professed Caesar to be their prince. Even as in a body well framed, there is one head: so must the church, unless it be transformed into some kind of monster, be endued with one head only, the which head is Christ. Neither standeth it with any reason that they say they have the Roman bishop to be appointed another head, as it were under the chief head Christ: whose bishop; to wit, that other head, they will have to be a necessary instrument. For there was never seen, in a well shapen body, such a disorder, as thereunto should be joined two heads; wherewith one should be subject unto another: seeing the very name of Head, signifieth the chief

part of the body. But Christ alone showeth himself above the church, and he altogether by marvelous and unspeakable means, joined the human nature unto the divine nature. Behold the head, which God appointed to that beloved body, as it is written in the epistle to the Ephesians. We confess in deed, that the members in that body be diverse, whereof one is more excellent than another: but in this point they conspire all in one, that they be subject unto that head, and are to serve faithfully under it. Wherefore it is not lawful to devise more heads than one: and undoubtedly it is very intolerable pride, for one to arrogate unto himself the honor of Christ.

But (I beseech you) let it be as these men will; that the Pope should be counted another head, under Christ the principal head. Yet, with what faith he is under Christ, as a fit instrument, experience itself speaketh: which beareth record, that he not only doth not cleave unto Christ, but that he is plainly against him, both in works, deeds, and counsels. Neither is it my purpose, to set forth at large the proof of this matter; seeing Barnard hath declared the same, indeed not fully; but yet so, as their crafty and subtle exception may be discovered. Wherefore, being content with this profitable declaration; I will not here at this time add anymore, but that I conclude again, that that body hath only Christ to be the head; and not any silly man, which with his authority alone may wrest, corrupt, pervert, and rent in sunder the words of the scriptures (whereof he boasteth among his sort, that he within the closet of his breast, hath the full knowledge and perfect interpretation;) not a silly man, which (according to the naked judgment of his own will) may expulse out of the church whom he please, and accuse and condemn them; not a silly man, that at his own only beck may appoint pastors, rectors, and bishops unto churches, to whom he will not commit the custody, no not of their own goods; because he mistrusteth their wit and

industry, whereof he hath not had any one jot of trial. Now then we be content with one head; namely Christ, the holy Ghost being the guide, and the holy scripture being as an outward testimony of his will: the certain persuasion whereof, the power of the holy Ghost doth inwardly seal in our minds.

41. But let us weigh (I beseech you) by what means that most holy body of the church may be established, edified, and also increase. And here I affirm, that besides the inward grace, faith, and outward scripture, we have also need of admonitions and godly sermons out of the word of God; the which be miserably intermitted at this day, by them which would be called Christians. And yet nevertheless this is the chief and principal work of the Apostolical office, the which, as though it were unworthy for the dignity of a Bishop (forsooth) these new heads of the church have committed it unto certain hungry Monks, who nevertheless are threatened unto gallies, unto perpetual prisons, and to be put to every most cruel death, if they pass the bounds prescribed by them. Indeed, they know very handsomely how to withdraw themselves from their own office, charge, and labor; but so, as they will never preach unto the people concerning holy things. Yet nevertheless, whosoever do take that charge in hand, they will have them to preach after the rules prescribed by them. Whereof it cometh to pass, that the poor small flocks of Christ, either perish with hunger, or else are scantly and slenderly fed. And commonly, the sermons touching holy things, are only made in the time of Lent, and a very few days besides; and that either by a sort of unlearned and indiscreet men which know not sufficiently those things that they speak; or else by them which stand more afraid of some, than they ought to do; or else by such as hunt after honors, riches, or favor, which are not fit for their vocation. Wherefore, at that time they have

sermons; but yet such, as in them they utter mere trifles, and bewray the gross darkness of ignorance.

But if otherwhile they show something of the truth, it is done with such cloaked speeches, with such intricate, minced, and nice terms, as they rather destroy than edify; or else they preach flatteries, the which undoubtedly unto all godly men are mere intolerable. And such be they, that preach for the desire they have either of honor, or of private commodity. All the rest of the year is spent in walking up and down the churches, in chaunting, singing, and sounding [of instruments.] In all which things, not so much as the least word is understood that might serve for edifying of the people. At which time, those chief priests, bishops, and other prelates are occupied (as they say) in great affairs, as to take upon them the administration of the common-wealth, to examine accounts, to search out the yearly revenues of lands, and many times to find out new ways of government. I pass over those things that be more outrageous; not because it grieveth them to hear such things, but partly, for that I am ashamed of them; and partly, because those things are sufficiently known, and manifest to everyone. If they be apostles, it pertaineth unto their office to preach; if they be pastors, to feed; if they be school-masters of the church, to teach; if they be dispensers of the treasures of Christ, they ought to enrich their sheep therewith: I mean not with their pardons, bulls, and blessings; but with the word of God, with continual admonitions and corrections, by which means the infidels are converted unto God, the faithful are stirred up from their sloth and idleness, and receive comfort in the furnace of afflictions.

42. These be those exquisite arts, whereby the body of Christ is preserved; unto the which must be added the use of the sacraments, but yet whole and thoroughly cleansed from the devises of men. Oh thou that holy supper of

the Lord, how many ways art thou here miserably dishonored and polluted! Oh mass, mass, mass, what remaineth sound in thee! But here will I forbear my style, seeing I write a Catechism, and not a full treatise of the sacraments, which nevertheless I hope shortly (if the Lord lend me life) to bring to pass. These few things I have written only to this end, that I may show how ill these things have been handled, which did make for the increase and profit of the church. I will speak nothing of baptism, seeing by the mercy of God, the same hath been somewhat less polluted with foul abuses. And although it be not purely and soundly used; yet there is less cause for thee to complain herein. Wherefore the use of the sacraments is most profitable unto the church; seeing they be as it were visible words, the which consist in those evident signs of water, bread, and wine. By which signs, as it were by words, all the promises of God's mercy are effectually represented unto us.

And here, not only the promises are given us, but we be assuredly partakers of the thing itself: and therefore those sacraments are very necessary unto us, and further us not a little unto salvation. Unto which sacraments must be joined brotherly correction, which in these days is so neglected, as no man will apply it, either to another man's use, or will submit himself thereunto: such profit have we taken in the school of Christ. Yea, which is more, those which are careful but of their own matters, are counted godly, yea and in a manner holy; which nevertheless is so indecent and dishonest, as it is not allowed, no not of the heathen philosophers; seeing they freely confess, that Man is not born only to himself. Yea and very oxen, or sheep, or asses, if they be fallen down by the way, will help one another. And shall not we have a care of our brethren, that when they faint under the burdens of their sins, to relieve them with the help of holy

correction? But if that do not prevail, it behooveth that excommunication follow, which God hath left us, as the last remedy against obstinate persons.

43. To conclude: that holy body is preserved by equal and just laws, by the which it must be ruled and governed, so far as concerneth those outward exercises. Of which sort be the coming together unto public prayers, at places and times convenient, to sing praises unto God, to give thanks unto Christ, and to come unto the administration of the sacraments. All which things must be done in order, decently, and honestly: even as Paul teacheth in the first epistle to the Corinthians. These laws must not be appointed by the will and discretion of one man, neither yet must they be accounted of so great authority, as those things, which the Lord hath revealed to us in the holy scriptures. And they must be so ordained, as they cannot be repealed and changed by one man's consent; but by the consent of the whole church, if any detriment come to the church by them. Moreover, let no man settle his hope upon those things, as though they can bring righteousness or salvation, but let him remember, that they be ordinances of men: further, that they have not to do with yearly rents, with gain, or with the private commodity of any man; but that they must wholly have a respect to the glory of God, and to the profit of our neighbor.

Let not their number be so augmented, as either they may be naughtily comprised, or else that they should oppress the people with a more grievous burden. Let them not despoil the people of that liberty, which is given in Christ: let them not bind men's consciences, with the terror of eternal death. With these conditions (I say) if laws be appointed by the church, let Christians embrace them, let them obey and reverently submit themselves to them. Where the matter so standeth, that laws be after this order appointed, they cannot be contemned or little set by, without grievous

offense. Hitherto we have largely enough disputed, what that holy body of the church is, how it may be joined together in one, what head it hath, by what means it is nourished, augmented, and preserved. And if so be that I have been induced to stand longer upon this matter, than my manner is to do, it must altogether be imputed, not to any superfluity of speech, but unto the nature and state of the cause; which aboundeth with such plenty and store of matter, as I have rather touched the principal points of things, than sufficiently expressed it according to the worthiness thereof. But that, which may be wanting at this time, we will prosecute more largely in another place.

**The remission of sins.**

44. Unto the former article of the conjunction and union of the faithful, into one body of the church; now is aptly added the doctrine of faith, and remission of sins, which is nowhere else to be hoped for, but in the church. For although the same be granted unto us, by the only liberality and grace of God; yet can we not obtain the same, but only in the name of Christ. Whosoever therefore shall not come into this fellowship, can by no means be partaker thereof; seeing it is only granted unto them which by faith are united unto Christ, the head of the church. Whereof it may be soundly concluded, that it is a peculiar gift for them, which be true members of this body under the head Christ. And this treatise of the remission of sins, we will for the easier understanding divide into three points to be considered. Of which the first is; that we, by the grace and spirit of Christ, be made partakers of the remission of our sins. But here must we see, by what way and means the Lord is wont to give this grace and spirit: the which we cannot otherwise define, then by faith. For the benefits, which God offereth unto us, are meet to be received of him that will enjoy them. And faith is

nothing else, but a receiving of the mercy of God, which is offered unto us by him.

Whereunto there be two things necessarily required; one is, that that be offered to us which is good; the other, that we give our consent. But to receiving and consent, we have need of the spirit that should inwardly persuade the mind: for otherwise a man, by reason of his natural corruption, would turn away himself; as to whom these promises of God, these mercies offered, and this remission of sins might naturally seem not likely to be true, and to be of no great weight. And he would be far from the through consideration of them; seeing (as the philosophers themselves also say) he would no less be blinded unto divine things, than the mole is at the light of the sun. Whereof there is a testimony of Paul to the Corinthians; The natural man (saith he) understandeth not those things, which be of God; for they be foolishness unto him: that we may have need of that inward moving, least we should refuse the benefit which is offered unto us. And indeed in this moving, there be two excellent gifts. The first is, that we acknowledge the gift and mercy of God offered unto us. The second, that the things which be offered, should be pleasing unto us; and that by giving our assent, we receive and embrace them.

Which for the most part is granted unto us none otherwise to be used, but as it is set forth to us by the word of God; how excellent and great soever the mercy of God is, by the which he freely forgiveth our sins. Wherefore it is written in the Acts of the apostles; While Peter yet spake, the holy Ghost fell down upon them which heard him. And by Paul unto the Romans it is said; that Faith is by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. So as the church, preaching continually the word of God by her ministers, and in such sort offering in her sermons reconciliation by Christ, it giveth remission of

sins; in that by the outward ministry, it pronounceth the same out of the words of the scripture: by the which, through attentive ears, as through a conduit, both the grace and spirit of Christ do slow in, even unto our heart. Wherefore it is most firmly concluded, that the word of God, by the very same means, which I have spoken, is the original of the remission of sins. Which thing seeing it is set forth in the church only, it followeth, that the sins be forgiven nowhere else.

45. Another consideration we will add, which concerneth the sacraments, the which be visible words of this absolution. For even as the word soundeth and is heard in the voice; so in a visible and evident sign, a sacrament doth speak and admonish us; unto the which we giving credit, obtain in very deed that which it doth promise and signify. Neither do we otherwise give credit unto the signification hereof, then by the motion of the same spirit of Christ, which we have above declared. But think you not, that sins be forgiven by the virtue of the work that is wrought, through receiving of the sacrament: seeing this we obtain by faith, while we believe that which it visibly teacheth us, according to the institution of Christ; to wit, that a sacrament may be of the same value that the word of God is. For even as this word signifieth and giveth in very deed unto the believers, whatsoever it doth promise; so baptism, being by faith received, both signifieth and giveth to the believer remission of sins, the which it promiseth by a visible speaking. But indeed it might be objected unto me: If so be that sins (as it hath been said) be forgiven unto them, which believe the word of Christ, as by preaching it is set forth to us; how can they then again be forgiven by baptism?

I answer, that as touching God, both the one and the other absolution is all one: and as concerning our sins, the remission is one and the same. The

which nevertheless is as often confirmed, and renewed in us, as we give credit unto the words, whereby the same is signified unto us; whether it be by word of mouth, or by visible sign, it is all one. So that how often soever we either hear the word, or receive the sacraments in faith, the remission of sins is assured unto us; whereby no small faith is inwardly poured into us. And it ought to seem no marvel unto any man, wherefore the sacraments be ordained by Christ: seeing that by them his pleasure is, that the strength of the spirit should have recourse into the believers, no less than by the outward word of the scripture, even as we are taught by daily experience; but yet so, as neither of these can profit any man without faith. Wherefore we have hitherto declared two means, by which the remission of sins is extant in the church; according to the two ways, whereby the word of God is set forth unto them that believe. But and if thou demand, which of the sacraments by name signifieth this remission of sins in the church? I answer, that it is baptism, in the which (we being washed with visible water) is a sign that we by Christ obtain spiritual cleansing. And that is it which Paul teacheth unto the Ephesians; that God hath purged his church with the washing of water through the word of life.

46. But now let us see, what is the third mean of this remission of sins. The church, by the singular gift and grace of Christ, hath right and authority (as it hath been already said) to cut off from her, by excommunication, them that be obstinate. The order whereof Christ hath described and taught unto her in the Gospel of Matthew, where he speaketh of brotherly correction; whereby men being admonished, that unless they did repent, it should proceed even to the uttermost punishment of separation: the which so long may stand in force, as contrition and repentance is deferred touching the sins committed. And when repentance is performed, then also let an end of

the punishment of excommunication be appointed. For which cause Christ being demanded of Peter, How oftentimes a man should forgive them that offend, whether seven times (which seemed to be much:) answered; Even so often as they shall return again to better life. For that be appointeth, when he saith; Seventy times seven. Wherefore they, which by repentance return to the church, must evermore be admitted.

And least peradventure so often separation and receiving reiterated by the ministry of men, against one and the same man, should seem to be of small importance, and reputed for sport and mockery, as a thing proceeding from the will of man, he addeth; that He giveth them the keys of the church: that is to say, the power, that Whatsoever she should bind or loose upon the earth, should be established in heaven. And this doth the church understand in the same sort, as the holy evangelist writeth it. By this article therefore we believe, that such divine authority is committed unto the church, that it may absolve and set at liberty the persons excommunicate, which repent them of their sins committed; and may reconcile them to herself: whereby they may be restored unto that place of a healed body, whereof Christ is the head. Which absolution being performed with public vows and prayers in the church, no doubt but the church forgiveth them their sins committed. Wherefore, after the grant of this authority of the keys, Christ not in vain added; Whatsoever ye ask in my name, it shall be given unto you: And; Wheresoever two or three shall be gathered together in my name, I am in the midst of them.

Whereby it is gathered, that the church is never present, either to excommunicate, or to reconcile them that be excommunicated, but that Christ himself also is present. Wherefore Paul, to the Corinthians the second epistle, writeth to the church; that forgiving the fault of that sinner,

of whom he had made mention in his first epistle, they should confirm charity towards him, in renewing with him their old friendship. Behold how we contemn not the authority of the church, but we deny it to be in the will and authority of one. We confess this power therefore to be in the earth among the godly. But even as the multitude of believers, gathered together in Christ, have only the right of excommunication; so have they also of reconciling and admitting: and that, which is so performed by them, we believe also to be done and confirmed in heaven. Howbeit note, that in this third means, is contained the forgiveness of public sins only. And as concerning the two former means, the church hath belonging unto it the forgiveness of all sins in general. Here only that absolution taketh place, which appertaineth to public crimes; the which, through evil example, hath offended and done harm unto them, to whom the knowledge thereof hath come. Wherefore, with all the heart and voice let us give thanks unto God, who hath granted unto us so great a benefit upon the earth, and hath laid up greater for us in heaven: as afterward we shall see.

**The Resurrection of the flesh.**

*Look more hereof in the third part.*

47. How these articles should be knit together, by a more fit method, I cannot perceive. Sin (as it is known) hath been the only and whole cause of man's death: and that we have remission of sins through Christ, it was showed a little before. Now then remaineth this one thing; to wit, that by him we shall be delivered from death, and released from the tyranny thereof, so soon as ever we have access unto Christ by faith: since then, shall perish in it the continual jurisdiction, which it obtaineth against us. For seeing the natural power hereof is such, as what it hath once seasoned upon, it firmly holdeth: therefore the philosophers write, that it must not be

granted, that from such a privation men can return to their ancient habit. In which matter certainly they be not deceived, if thou shouldest but consider the power of nature. But we, which be endued with faith, do so taste of death; as we know that there is an end and limit appointed, to the working thereof; we being confirmed through the promise of Christ himself, who in the sixth of John saith; that He will lose none of them which his father hath given him, but will raise them up at the latter day.

But if so be thou object, that he will raise up not only them that be godly, but also the unbelievers: and shall therefore the faith in Christ (as touching the resurrection) profit anything? I answer, that the confidence in Christ shall nothing at all profit unto the mere and absolute resurrection; seeing that degree, both the godly and the wicked shall obtain: but the resurrection unto felicity, unto life eternal, and unto heavenly blessedness, is only granted unto them, which by faith are united unto Christ. Howbeit, I think not meet to pass over this; (to wit) that whereas the wicked shall rise again, they obtain not that, by the power of their own nature, but by Christ. For, seeing we confess that by the death of that one first man, we were all made subject unto death; it is reason also we should grant, that how many soever be made partakers of this second life, should also obtain the same by that one man Christ, who first was raised up. Wherefore the wicked, whether they will or no, shall feel in themselves the power of Christ: but that which these shall obtain to their great harm, just men shall receive to their great benefit. This is the doctrine of Paul to the Corinthians, when he saith; As by one man came death, so by one man came the resurrection of the dead. And as by Adam all men die, so by Christ all shall be made alive: but everyone in his own order. The first fruits is Christ, then they which be of Christ. And

in the last and most unhappy state shall they be, which be strangers from Christ.

And as there shall be a difference in the state and condition; so shall there be also in the place. For the saints then raised up, shall together with the godly, which then perhaps shall remain alive, be caught up, to meet with that high King our Lord Jesus Christ in the air; Who undoubtedly (as we have already confessed) shall come to judge the quick and the dead: as we have expressly showed in the article of the last judgment. Wherefore Christ will show forth his power generally towards all, as well good as bad; not only in the judgment itself, but in the resurrection also. He therefore is the first that hath risen, and we shall follow him at the time appointed. The church is a body quickened by the spirit of God, the which increaseth by degrees; no otherwise than a living body is naturally formed, by little and little. For of the power of forming, which is in the seed, first someone member is formed, and brought forth in the lump; whether the same be the heart, or any other member, it forceth not: it sufficeth, that sense and moving be given to any one of them. The same spirit after that goeth forward by little and little, to frame other members. And even this happeneth in the holy body of believers, wherein the spirit of God hath raised up Christ, the very head of them all. Afterward, the same spirit, by the same power, whereby it raised up Christ in all us, who be the deer members of his body, will bring forth the same effects of resurrection: as we read in the first chapter to the Ephesians, and as we have declared in that article, wherein we entreated of the resurrection of Christ.

48. But how great consolation that blessed hope bringeth to the godly, let even they themselves judge, which in great joy celebrate with such pomp and ambition the day of their nativity; or else that day, wherein they were

preferred to some degree of honor. And thus they celebrate, with joyful memory, the beginnings of so great miseries and calamities, as this life is subject unto; and as are incident unto principalities and worldly honors. This is the true nativity of the saints of Christ, this is the true triumph, this is that heavenly entertaining of them. Then shall be opened unto us the wounds, or rather the gates of glory. Here ought all our hope to revive, if at any time (as oftentimes it doth happen) we appear to be negligent, and to go slowly forward in the way of the Lord; by reason of the burden of our flesh, which oppresseth us. On this wise ought our minds to be strengthened, to endure the troubles, which seem to be hard and difficult unto the body, unto nature, and unto the sense. On this wise ought we to be confirmed to the mortifying of our senses and concupiscence's; seeing we know out of Paul, that We, which have been partakers of the death of Christ, shall also be partakers of his resurrection. For then we shall be delivered from the labors, miseries, sorrows, and torments of this life: and we shall have a body so much more excellent, as a heavenly and spiritual body doth excel an earthly and fleshy body.

And certainly, I speak not this, as though we should not recover so much flesh, blood, and bones, as shall be sufficient unto the constitution of a body: but we believe it will be a much more excellent body; because Heavenly and Spiritual betoken names of nature. The which titles and prerogatives, Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, gave unto bodies renewed by the resurrection. And Christ in Matthew, when he was tempted of the Sadducees, promised that we should be like unto the angels: that in heaven there shall be no use of matrimony. For seeing that death shall have no dominion, there shall be no need also of generation; which is granted unto us for supplying the number of such, as death taketh daily away. The

same is affirmed touching hunger, thirst, and all that evil band of troubles. Whosoever therefore goeth forward unto so noble and glorious a state, ought to regard but a little, all the troubles and labors which he endureth for the name of Christ. Yet this doth not the wicked sort consider; but it seemeth to be a matter of no weight unto them, that they submit their soul unto the bondage of innumerable miseries, and suffer the same to be mastered with the flames of naughty lusts.

They do not make any account of having their body once free, and discharged from natural necessities; as men that judge it a thing impossible, because they measure the power of God by the course of those things, which continually be brought forth, and be here among us. But contrariwise the godly, which by virtue of the resurrection do hope for that most excellent gift (to wit, that neither death, nor yet other natural infirmities may be able to do anymore displeasure to the body) must bend their whole endeavor to rid their minds from the tyranny of vices and affections; whereby they may be more and more confirmed in the hope of recovering of a free body, wherewith the mind may be clothed, that now through Christ hath gotten the victory over lusts and sins, which by means of the body and the flesh do oppress the spirit. And this let us desire of the eternal God, and most merciful father, that he will vouchsafe to bestow upon us at his own appointed time, and that through the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, for that immortal desires sake, wherewith we wish after his kingdom. And this we would desire with all speed to be done, so that his glory and honor might be made more famous and known.

**The life everlasting.**

49. We which here living in the church by the spirit of Christ, have obtained remission of sins; and when we have attained unto regeneration in

felicity and glory, what either can we or ought we afterward wish, but that it be granted us to live evermore joyfully, contentedly, and happily in God through Christ? And although such a state is for many causes very greatly to be desired; yet all the parts of that happy life must be referred to two good things; the first hath respect unto the soul; and the other unto the body. Touching the which this I will say briefly, that it will come to pass, that all labors, griefs, miseries, and sorrows, which we are compelled to suffer in this unhappy vale shall cease from the same. And this is it, which is said in the Apocalypse; that God will wipe away all tears from the eyes of his saints: neither shall there remain to them anymore sorrows, lamentations, sighs, or wailings. Wherefore our body shall merely be renewed, according as we treated in the article of the resurrection. Unto which sentences declared this we add; that there is a lively and effectual example in the resurrection of Christ, what manner of heavenly properties our bodies shall have. It is evident also, even in sundry of his actions, when he was conversant in this passable state of life, what time as he showed miracles even in his own body.

He entered into the place, where the apostles were, the doors being shut. He walked upon the waters of the sea, and sunk not. He was lifted up into the air, or rather ascended into heaven: as we have above confessed. And he offered himself to be seen and felt of his disciples. Besides this, when his will was neither to be seen, nor yet to be caught hold of by any man, he so ordered his body, as neither the one nor the other happened otherwise, than it pleased himself. As in Nazareth, when they endeavored to throw him down headlong from the mountain; or when they went about to stone him in the temple. Again, when he rose up and went out of the sepulcher, which the soldiers kept, he would not be seen. No more would he be seen upon mount

Thabor, wherein his body being transformed, became bright like the sun. And we are not any way forbidden to hope, but that our bodies shall probably be adorned with those qualities in the life eternal. For it seemeth altogether convenient, that the members should be like unto their own head. Wherefore, if any man have a fleshly care of his own body, he dealeth unwisely, to obey it in those things which manifestly strive with so blessed an end. He ought rather, for that favor, wherewith he is endued by the grace of God, to yield the same body of his to the obedience of the spirit; by whom it shall at the length be quickened and carried up into so excellent a state. In consideration whereof, Paul decreed; that Those things, which we presently suffer, are not worthy of the glory, which shall be showed to us: And as in the same manner, Christ disputing of eternal life, said; He that will find his life, shall loose it.

In the which place, under the name of life; he meaneth this natural life; the which whosoever withdraweth from mortification, and the cross laid upon him by God, and doth attempt with highly dishonoring of Christ and his name, to repulse danger and temporal death from it: then doth he verily loose it, although he determine with himself to find it, and to recover it. For he despoileth it of those properties, which otherwise it should perpetually have in that eternal felicity with Christ. But the spiritual and true Christians, which by the judgment of the world are thought to betray their own life, while they make over-small account of the same, taking great and infinite perils in hand, yea and willing death for Christ's his sake: these (I say) as Christ most truly testifieth, in loosing of their soul, do in very deed find and most certainly obtain the same. And that is most aptly expressed in the similitude of a grain of corn, which unless it should first become rotten in

the earth, it would never give out flower or fruit, framed in the order of an ear of corn.

50. But let us proceed, and see, in what thing the spirits of the blessed may rest themselves in that state, whereof we have spoken. They that be justified by Christ, although that, even in this life, they have settled their desire to love God with all their heart, with all their soul, and with all their strength; and so long as they acknowledge, they be very far off from doing that, which they ought to do, they must needs be disquieted with exceeding sorrow. How pleasant a thing (think we) will it be to them, that they shall be able to satisfy their desire, so just, so excellent, so great, and so long desired of them? Then we shall be endued with this gift, that we shall offend him no more: we shall be delivered from the servitude of sin, and from our domestical enemy; namely, from the assaults of the flesh, seeing the same shall be at peace with the spirit. We being constrained with the bonds hereof, cannot fulfill the law of God. But in that state we shall love God with all our strength, and more than either ourselves, or whatsoever else is in the world. Neither shall that flesh let us anything, from the true and perfect love of our neighbor: he undoubtedly shall have no need of the duties of this life, but yet we shall love him, in that we shall no less be desirous of his felicity than of our own.

The motions of envy, self-pleasing, and of other desires (the which things be very great enemies unto us, and make us the slacker to love our neighbors) shall have no longer abiding in us. But as touching that, which is of greatest importance, and is greatly wished for of all men that be endued with reason and any godliness at all (I mean the knowledge of God) shall then at the last be granted unto us. Indeed it is now, after some sort, given unto men to know God by the evident tokens of things created, by the

testimonies of the scriptures, and by inward revelation of the spirit: but there shall be then a full and perfect knowledge. Wherefore saith Paul to the Corinthians; We see (saith he) through a glass as in a dark speaking. Now there be certain dark sentences laid before us, which the Grecians call αἰνίγματα: then shall it be set forth to be perceived indeed. All veils and covering shall be removed, that we may penetrate even to the face of God himself, the which cannot be perceived in this life: as God himself verified to his faithful servant Moses, in these words; It cannot be that a man should see me and live. Therefore thou shalt not see my face, but I will cause, that as I pass by, thou mayest see my back part.

But when we be loosed from this mortal state, we without doubt shall be capable of that excellent gift. In the which thing chiefly consisteth that eternal life, as our savior Jesus teacheth in the Gospel of John; This is the life eternal, that they may know thee only, the true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. And again he saith; that Abraham desired to know the day of the Lord, and he knew it and rejoiced. And unto the apostles he said; Blessed be the eyes, which see that ye see. I say unto you, that many kings and prophets desired to see that which ye see, and yet it was not granted unto them. In which place we must understand, that Christ spake of his first coming, in the which he had the mortal and passable properties of human nature. But if thou wilt object, that they saw him also after his resurrection, when he was now endued with an immortal and impassible life: I answer, that he had not even as yet gotten the full victory of all his enemies, nether had procured the kingdom to be perfect, peaceable, and sure from all adversaries: such as it shall be by the judgment of Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, When he hath put all his enemies under his feet.

51. Wherefore, let everyone ponder in his mind, what a felicity remaineth for us, seeing it is admitted, that we shall see him, and shall have experience of our first begotten brother in that glory and triumph: where we shall not only be one with him, but with the eternal father also, with whom he shall make us firmly to abide, as a kingdom won by his own conquest, and governed in an excellent sort; That the same God the father (as Paul testifieth in that place) may be all in us all. Now then my brethren, what better thing can we desire? How profitable, pleasant, glorious, honest, beautiful, and in every respect good shall it be, that that father and blessed God shall be all in all? These things are not else-where to be fought, seeing they be not else-where to be attained. Some shadow, proof, and little spark of that blessedness of ours did Peter taste upon the mount: and therefore he wished there to have his perpetual habitation. Thereof had Paul a trial, when he was wrapped into the third heaven, where he heard great mysteries so far removed from the sense of man, as they were unspeakable. The face of Moses so glistered, by reason of the conversation which he had with the divine glory, as the Israelites were not able by any means to behold him. What shall happen therefore unto us, when we have obtained with him the place of children and house-dwellers?

If so be at any time it happen here, that we by any motion of the spirit, read the scriptures; if we pour out our earnest prayers before God, if we lament before him with great zeal for the evil which we suffer, or else be moved inwardly through the effectual preaching of the word: do we not conceive a joy, delectation, and consolation, which passeth all delights, pastimes and pleasures of this world? But this is only a beginning of eternal life; whereby nevertheless yet we may conjecture, how pure, perfect, and unmeasurable happiness that shall be, which is in the life to come. Touching

the which, many more things might be disputed; but it is more meet to leave these amplifications to the faith of the godly reader. The which felicity seeing it is the gift of God, which proceedeth not from ourselves, in that God maketh us capable thereof; so are we wont to conceive much more according to the measure which cometh into us. And these sweet conceits of the mind do comfort and refresh us in the calamities of this life: they showing unto us, even in the midst of the storms of this world, the haven of so great a felicity. Unto the which we beseech him to bring us, that by his precious death hath procured it for us. And that it will please him, through his holy spirit, to bring thereunto all such as through him are regenerated by the eternal father: with whom he liveth, triumpheth, and reigneth forever, Amen.

Here (brethren) ye have a short exposition of the particular things belonging to our faith. And as touching those things, which shall be perceived of you to want, I beseech you to allow of these excuses. One is, that my ability is but small and slender; the other is, for that I mean, in the book which I have in hand touching the true worshipping of God: to supply many wants, which for brevity sake I have omitted. God and the Father make you partakers more and more of his grace in Christ Jesus our Lord! Amen.

The end of the Second Part.

# APPENDIX. Scripture References.

*In the original edition of this book, there were a considerable amount of scripture references in the margins. They have been listed here. Duplicate scripture references within a specific chapter have been omitted.*

A good resource for using these references electronically, is to visit Blue Letter Bible at www.blueletterbible.org and utilize their "Multiple Verse Retrieval" tool. Doing so will allow you to paste in an entire section of references and retrieve the whole verses, without having to look them up individually.

**CHAP. I**

**Ge** 1:20; 2:14, 19, 24; 3:12, 13, 17; 6:3, 5; 8:21; 17:7, 14; 19:25; 26:7; 48:16; **Ex** 12:17; 14:21, 28; 16:13; 17:6, 8; 20:5; **Dt** 28:23; 29:5; **Jos** 10:13; **1 Sa** 15:2; **1 Ki** 8:37; **2 Ki** 4:27; 15:12; 16:20; 20:21; **Job** 3:3; 14:4; **Ps** 25:7; 39:6; 47:1; 51:7; 102:26; 109:9; 144:4; **Ec** 1:12; **Is** 13:10; 24:4; 30:16; 38:2, 8; 42:3; 45:9; **Je** 20:14; **Eze** 16:20, 21; 18:20; **Da** 10:13; **Ho** 2:8, 9, 21; **Am** 1:3, 6, 9; **Na** 1:9; **Zec** 1:12; **Mt** 2:2; 6:12; 7:16; 9:12; 16:17, 24, 25; 17:15; 18:10; 23:35; 24:29; 25:34; 27:35, 51; 28:2; **Mk** 13:13; 15:33;

16:15; **Lk** 2:9; 12:5; 15:10; **Jn** 3:3, 6, 36; 5:29; 8:41, 44; 9:3; 21:18; **Ac** 1:9; 12:15; **Ro** 2:15; 3:10, 20; 5:6, 8, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20; 6:2, 12; 7:5, 7, 9, 17, 18, 23, 24; 8:7, 9, 10, 20, 23, 24; 9:11, 20; 11:16, 17; **1 Co** 2:14; 6:19; 7:2, 3, 14; 11:32; 15:22, 56; **2 Co** 5:10; 6:18; **Ga** 3:24; 5:17, 19, 24; **Eph** 2:3; 3:3; 4:24; **Col** 2:11; 3:10; **1 Ti** 2:14; **Heb** 7:9; 11:40; **Jas** 5:17; **1 Jn** 1:10; 3:4; **Re** 6:10

**CHAP. II.**

**Ge** 1:14, 27, 28; 2:3, 5; 19:8, 31; 20:2; 22:10, 19; 29:21; **Ex** 20:17; **Nu** 22:31; **Dt** 19:5; 30:15; **1 Sa** 14:43; 15:16; **2 Sa** 15:9; **1 Ki** 20:35; 21:13; 22:34; **Job** 1:1; **Ps** 8:6; 13:2; 14:1; 31:3; 32:1; 40:15; 49:13; 51:6, 18; 69:9; 111:3; 112:1; 119:36; 127:1; **Pr** 6:27; 21:1; **Is** 1:3, 12, 19; 41:23; 44:18; 58:2; 62:3; 64:6; **Je** 9:23; 10:23; 31:11; **Eze** 11:12; 14:9; 18:30, 32; 36:26; **Mt** 5:10, 22; 6:12, 22, 24; 7:18; 8:29; 10:28, 29, 30, 33, 38, 39; 12:31; 13:17; 16:9, 24, 26; 18:7; 19:12; 22:37; 25:35; 26:41; **Mk** 9:23; **Lk** 10:30; 13:6; 18:13, 34; 21:34; 22:15; 23:34; 24:16, 26; **Jn** 1:48; 3:16, 36; 5:46; 6:44; 8:34; 14:1; 15:1, 5, 13; 17:8; **Ac** 2:37; 5:29; 7:60; 10:2, 3, 4, 22, 34; 17:28; **Ro** 1:10, 21; 2:3, 5; 3:8, 30; 4:20, 25; 5:17; 6:5, 12, 20, 23; 7:13, 14, 15, 18, 23, 24; 8:1, 7, 23, 29; 9:16; 10:14; 11:6, 17; 12:2, 14; 14:23; **1 Co** 1:31; 2:14; 4:7; 6:9; 10:31; 11:19; 12:11; 14:1, 38; **2 Co** 6:14; **Ga** 3:10; 5:17, 18, 24; 6:6; **Eph** 1:4; 2:1, 3, 8; 4:17, 22, 24, 25; 5:18; **Php** 1:6; 2:5, 12, 13; 3:8; 4:13, 18; **Col** 3:5; **2 Th** 2:11; 3:5; **2 Ti** 1:6; 3:17; **Heb** 11:6; 13:16; **Jas** 3:2; 4:15; **1 Jn** 1:10

**CHAP. III.**

**Ge** 19:8; 31:44; **Ex** 15:25; 20:13, 17; 29:32; **Dt** 6:5; **Jdg** 19:14; **1 Sa** 15:3; 21:1, 6, 9; **2 Sa** 3:12; **Pr** 25:21; **Je** 31:33; 41:2; **Ho** 6:6; **Mt** 9:13; **Ro** 3:8, 20; 5:20; 7:11, 12, 25; 8:3, 7; 9:3; **2 Co** 3:7; **Ga** 3:19; **Eph** 4:11; **Php** 1:15; **1 Ti** 3:6

**CHAP. IV.**

**Ge** 4:15; 12:1; 13:1, 12; 17:18; **Ex** 4:10, 14; 7:21; 8:17, 18; 14:7; 19:12; 20:18; 23:32; 32:1, 23; **Le** 17:8; **Nu** 4:20; 15:38; 21:8; 25:1; **Dt** 7:25; 13:3; 17:16; **Jdg** 1:36; 2:11, 19; 6:15; **1 Sa** 6:16; **1 Ki** 11:7; 19:18; 21:3; **2 Ki** 2:14; 6:18; 13:21; 18:4; **Ps** 2:10; 24:1; 59:12; 120:5; **Is** 1:13; 6:5; 45:23; **Je** 1:6; 3:6; **Eze** 6:13; 18:26; **Da** 1:8; 3:5, 18; **Hab** 2:4; **Mt** 4:7; 9:10; 10:28; 15:14; 23:2; 24:36; 26:70; **Mk** 8:38; **Lk** 1:34, 45; 8:38; 15:11; 23:43; **Jn** 2:17; 4:9; 5:39; 21:21, 22; **Ac** 10:37; 11:12; 15:10; 16:3, 24; 17:23; **Ro** 1:17; 3:8, 28; 10:10; 11:17, 25; 13:1; 14:1, 23; **1 Co** 5:10; 6:15, 16; 7:12; 8:4; 9:22; 10:14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27; 11:20; 14:16; **2 Co** 6:14; **Ga** 2:3; 3:20, 28; 5:2, 4; **Eph** 5:11; 6:5; **2 Th** 2:9, 11; **1 Ti** 4:4; **Heb** 10:14; **Jas** 2:11; 3:2; **1 Jn** 1:10; **Re** 22:8

**CHAP. V.**

**Ge** 3:24; 4:26; 8:21; 9:25; 19:1, 16; 22:1, 12; 28:18; 31:19, 30; 35:4; **Ex** 7:8; 11:2; 12:22; 14:19; 20:5; 24:10; 25:17, 18, 31; 31:2, 6; 32:1, 20; 33:23; 34:7; 40:9; **Le** 18:21; 23:40; **Nu** 20:9; 22:24; 23:4; **Dt** 4:12; 5:9; 6:13; 7:26; 12:31; 20:19; 32:17, 35; **Jos** 7:5, 24; **1 Sa** 19:13; **2 Sa** 12:15; 24:16, 17; **1 Ki** 6:13, 23; 7:13, 25, 29; 10:19; 12:28; 18:4; **2 Ki** 3:26; 5:25; 6:17; 17:4; 18:4; 19:35; **1 Ch** 3:10; 6:23; **2 Ch** 26:4; **Ps** 18:12; 19:1, 11; 51:19; 78:49; 115:4, 7; 139:8; 141:2; **Is** 1:11; 6:1, 2, 3; 42:8; 64:6; **Je** 10:8; 31:29; 32:35; 37:15; **Eze** 1:5, 11, 18, 26; 10:1; 18:2, 14, 16; 20:41; **Da** 1:6; 7:9, 10, 13; 9:5; 10:5; 12:1; **Ho** 5:14; 12:10; **Am** 1:3; **Hab** 2:18; **Zec** 1:14; 10:2; **Mt** 1:20; 2:13; 4:1, 10; 5:28; 13:25; 25:40; **Lk** 1:26; 16:1, 13, 18; **Jn** 1:18; 4:23, 24; 9:3; 15:7; **Ac** 20:19; **Ro** 1:1, 23, 25; 10:17; 12:1, 10; **1 Co** 6:15; 8:4; 10:19; 11:22, 23; 12:2; 15:33; **2 Co** 5:16; 6:16; **Ga** 2:13; 3:1; 5:20; **Php** 1:1; **Col** 2:23; 3:24; 4:14; **2 Th** 2:9, 10, 12; **1 Ti** 2:15; 4:5; **2 Ti** 3:17; **Heb** 1:14; **1 Jn** 3:16; 5:21; **Jud** 14; **Re** 2:1; 5:8; 19:10; 22:9

**CHAP. VI.**

**Ge** 21:23; 42:15; **Ex** 20:7; 22:8, 11, 28; 23:13; **Nu** 5:14; **Dt** 6:5; 32:1; **Jos** 9:15; 23:2; **1 Sa** 25:22, 35; **2 Sa** 19:16; 21:2; 23:12; **1 Ki** 8:31; **Ps** 44:2; 95:11; **Is** 1:2; 65:16; **Je** 4:2; **Mt** 5:34, 37; 14:9; 26:63; **Jn** 4:3; **2 Co** 1:3, 23; **Heb** 6:6, 16; **Jas** 5:12; **Re** 10:5

**CHAP. VII.**

**Ge** 1:5; 2:3; **Ex** 23:15; **Dt** 15:14; **1 Sa** 1:3; **Mt** 14:6; 18:19; **Jn** 5:17; **Ac** 17:28; **Ga** 4:10

**CHAP. VIII.**

**Ge** 2:23; 3:16; 4:3; 9:27; 37:9; **Ex** 20:12; **Jdg** 9:5; **1 Sa** 2:22, 27; 3:13; 12:5; **2 Sa** 15:34; **1 Ki** 1:6; 2:22; 17:15; **2 Ki** 5:13; 9:11; **Is** 38:3; **Mt** 5:14, 16; 7:5; 15:5; **Lk** 18:11; **Jn** 14:13; **Ro** 2:29; **1 Co** 4:5; **2 Co** 10:18; 11:3; **Ga** 1:20; 4:15, 16; **Eph** 4:11; 5:23; **Php** 2:22; **1 Th** 2:5; **1 Ti** 2:7; 5:8

**CHAP. IX.**

**Ge** 9:5, 25; 22:1, 3; 26:24; 42:7; **Ex** 2:12; 11:2; 20:13; 32:11; **Nu** 5:19; 16:2; 21:2; 22:5; 25:7; 35:6; **Dt** 6:5; 7:16; 18:20; 27:13; **Jos** 6:17, 26; 7:1; 10:27; **Jdg** 1:6, 17; 4:15; 5:23; 8:1, 16; 9:5, 24; 16:28, 30; **1 Sa** 2:11; 5:6; 15:3, 11, 29, 31, 33, 35; 18:1, 8; 25:11, 39; 26:9; 31:11; **2 Sa** 1:11, 16; 2:12; 3:32; 8:10; 12:5, 14, 31; 14:6; 18:14, 33; 21:9; **1 Ki** 6:34; 17:1, 16; 18:4, 13, 23, 40; 20:42; **2 Ki** 1:9, 10; 2:23, 24; 6:16; **Ne** 13:25; **Job** 17:15; 21:1; **Ps** 2:1; 4:5; 22:29; 24:4; 69:12; 73:2; 83:17; **Je** 9:1; 10:24; **Da** 3:18; **Jon** 1:12; **Hab** 1:1; **Mt** 2:16; 5:7, 10, 11, 24, 39, 43, 44, 45; 6:10; 10:16, 23; 11:25; 25:41; 26:50; 27:5; **Mk** 12:30; 15:25; **Lk** 1:55; 9:54, 55; 10:16, 30; 19:41; 22:38, 51; 23:34, 43, 44; **Jn** 4:20; 7:46; 18:4, 23; **Ac** 5:5; 7:24; 8:20; 13:11; 23:3; 25:14; **Ro** 3:8; 5:3, 8; 9:3; 12:14, 19; 14:23; **1 Co** 1:31; 3:3; 4:12; 5:5; 13:3, 4; 16:22; **Ga** 1:4, 8, 17; 5:12, 26; **Eph** 4:26; **2 Th** 2:8; **1 Ti** 2:1; **Heb** 11:32, 37; **Jas** 1:4; **1 Jn** 5:16; **Re** 6:10

**CHAP. X.**

**Ge** 1:22, 28; 2:18, 22, 23, 24; 4:19; 6:2; 8:17; 9:1; 16:3, 4; 20:12; 21:14; 24:3, 47; 27:46; 28:1, 8; 29:27; 30:1, 15, 23; 31:33, 50; 34:2, 14; 38:2, 11; **Ex** 6:20; 20:12; 21:7, 16, 27, 28, 29; 34:16; **Le** 18:20, 24; **Nu** 5:12; 12:1; 25:1; 36:6; **Dt** 7:3; 19:5; 21:11; 22:28; 23:3, 8; 24:1; 25:5; **Jdg** 14:1, 5; **Ru** 3:9; 4:13, 15; **1 Sa** 1:10; 18:20, 23; 25:42; **2 Sa** 3:3, 14; 12:1, 8; 13:6, 13, 15; 20:3; **1 Ki** 2:17; 3:1, 3; 11:1, 3, 4; 16:31; 22:2; **2 Ki** 8:16; **2 Ch** 18:1, 3; 21:6; **Ps** 113:9; **Pr** 5:19; **So** 6:7, 8; **Is** 4:1; 50:1; **Eze** 16:30; **Mal** 2:16; **Mt** 1:5; 5:31, 32; 19:6, 7, 12; **Mk** 10:4; **Lk** 12:47; 16:18; **Jn** 6:38; 8:11; **Ac** 24:25; **Ro** 3:8; 7:2; **1 Co** 6:15; 7:2, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 26, 29, 39, 40; 11:3; 15:33; **2 Co** 7:11; **Eph** 1:10; 5:23, 25, 30, 32; 6:1; **1 Ti** 3:2; 5:13, 14; **Tt** 2:5; 3:10; **Heb** 3:2; **Re** 1:8

**CHAP. XI.**

**Ge** 2:24; 3:18, 21; 6:2; 9:21; 19:33; 21:14; 22:1; 26:11; 38:15, 21, 24; 39:20; **Ex** 15:20; 20:10, 14; 22:27; 36:6; **Le** 10:9; 11:44; 18:20; 20:10; **Nu** 5:14; 6:3; **Dt** 13:5; 22:5, 22; 23:2, 17; 24:1, 4; **Jdg** 4:19; 16:1, 4; 19:10; **1 Sa** 18:7; **2 Sa** 3:14; 6:16; 11:2, 26; 12:14; 13:28; 16:6; **1 Ki** 3:16; **Es** 5:1; **Job** 31:1; **Ps** 36:9; 50:18; **Pr** 6:25; 9:5; 17:22; 31:4; **Is** 5:11; 44:6; **Je** 3:1; 29:22; 35:5; 36:29; **Eze** 18:32; **Da** 4:30; **Ho** 2:1, 3, 19; **Mt** 1:19; 5:4, 16, 28; 6:12, 34; 14:6; 18:22; 19:8; 21:31; 23:5; 26:29; **Lk** 6:21; 12:13; 21:34; **Jn** 6:15; 8:6; 18:36; **Ac** 15:20; **Ro** 2:1; 3:8; 6:23; 13:11, 13, 14; **1 Co** 1:26; 5:8, 11; 6:13, 19, 20; 7:5, 34; 8:13; 9:27; 10:7; 11:6, 10; 12:23; **2 Co** 7:12; **Ga** 1:10; 5:21; **Eph** 5:5, 18, 25; 6:12; **Php** 4:8; **1 Th** 5:7; **1 Ti** 2:9; 3:2, 4; 4:4; 5:23; **2 Ti** 3:3; **Tt** 1:6, 7; **Heb** 13:14; **1 Pe** 3:3; **Re** 2:6

**CHAP. XII.**

**Ge** 18:2; 19:2, 8; 21:9; 22:2; 32:24; 37:25, 28; **Ex** 21:16; 22:2; 32:20, 29; **Le** 19:9; **Dt** 4:2; 10:18; 12:3; 13:6; 23:7; 24:7; **Jos** 7:1; **Jdg** 4:22; 9:11;

12:3; 19:25; **1 Sa** 15:8; 18:6; **2 Sa** 6:14; 12:5, 18; 13:28; 16:22; 18:14; **1 Ki** 2:25; 17:9, 11; 20:39; **Is** 2:3; **Je** 48:20; **Ho** 2:5; **Mt** 5:4, 21, 45; 11:16; 12:33; 25:35; 27:5; **Lk** 10:36; 19:8; **Jn** 4:22; **Ac** 15:9; **Ro** 2:6, 21; 12:13; **1 Co** 9:24; 10:7, 31; 16:4; **Ga** 2:10; 6:10; **1 Jn** 3:16

**CHAP. XIII.**

**Ge** 11:5; 12:13; 18:21; 22:5; 27:19; 34:13; **Ex** 1:19; 12:3, 35; 14:23; 20:16; **Dt** 13:5, 6; 23:20; **Jos** 2:5; 8:4; 9:4; **Jdg** 3:19; **1 Sa** 2:19; 12:13; 16:7; 21:13; 22:16; 25:14; 29:3; **2 Sa** 15:33; 16:17, 20, 21; 17:7; **1 Ki** 10:21, 22; 17:18; 18:17, 23; **2 Ki** 10:18, 31; 18:30; **Ps** 5:6; 15:4; 22:6, 7; 32:2; 34:13; 51:8; **Pr** 10:12; 11:2; 20:30; 26:4, 5, 10; **Is** 45:9; **Mt** 5:16, 22, 30; 7:1, 5; 18:15; 20:12; 21:33; 22:16; **Lk** 24:25, 28; **Jn** 1:14; 18:23; **Ac** 3:17; 9:4; **Ro** 3:4, 8; 7:18; 9:20; 15:24, 28; **1 Co** 2:8, 15; 4:5; 7:9; 15:14, 33; **2 Co** 1:15; 3:8; 12:6; **Ga** 3:1; 6:1; **Eph** 4:25; 5:3, 4; **Php** 3:6; **Col** 3:9; **1 Ti** 1:15; 5:24; **1 Pe** 2:22

**CHAP. XIV.**

**Ge** 45:4; **Ex** 2:13; 20:4, 17; 22:18; **Jdg** 6:12; **1 Ki** 16:29; **Ps** 14:2; 143:3; **Zec** 2:8; **Mt** 5:44; 6:12; 12:32; 19:16; 26:49; **Mk** 12:34; **Lk** 1:28; 10:5, 16; **Jn** 1:10; 5:10; 20:17, 19; **Ac** 7:26; **Ro** 7:7, 15; 9:3; 10:2; 12:10; **1 Co** 6:9; 12:13, 31; **2 Co** 13:12; **Php** 1:15; **1 Ti** 5:8; **Jas** 3:2; **2 Pe** 1:4; **1 Jn** 1:10

**CHAP. XV.**

**Ge** 2:17; 3:15; 9:4; 15:1, 6; 22:18; 49:10; **Le** 1:4; 19:18; **Dt** 6:5; 30:12; **Jos** 5:5; 6:5, 6; **1 Sa** 3:14; 10:10; **2 Sa** 11:4; **1 Ki** 15:3, 15; **2 Ki** 3:3; 10:35; 23:3; **Ps** 9:2; 19:13; 32:1; 50:8; 51:7; 130:3; 132:2; 137:4; 143:2, 3; **Is** 1:11; 53:6; 57:3; 64:6; 65:5; **Je** 6:20; 7:16, 22; 11:14; 13:23; 14:11; 23:6; 31:33; **Eze** 29:19; 36:26; **Da** 9:27; **Ho** 2:19; **Am** 5:22; **Hab** 2:4; **Zec** 2:4; **Mal** 1:11; **Mt** 3:2, 6; 5:8, 10, 17, 48; 6:12, 33; 11:13, 30; 12:14, 31, 32; 20:21; 23:35; 26:53, 69; **Mk** 9:34; **Lk** 1:6; 17:10; 24:27; **Jn** 1:29; 3:14; 5:39; 6:47;

**Ac** 9:4; 15:10; **Ro** 3:20, 21, 31; 5:20; 6:4, 6, 12, 23; 7:7, 14, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25; 8:3, 24; 10:6, 14; **1 Co** 1:30; 2:6; 3:1, 3; 6:10; 9:7; 10:31; 13:4, 9, 11; 15:23; **2 Co** 4:16; **Ga** 3:16, 19, 24; 5:17, 24; 6:2; **Eph** 2:1; **Php** 2:2, 5, 13; 3:12, 15; **Col** 1:18, 21; **1 Ti** 1:9; **2 Ti** 1:3; 2:26; 4:7; **Heb** 6:1; 10:16; **1 Jn** 2:4, 5; 3:16; 5:3

**CHAP. XVI.**

**Ge** 9:9, 13; 15:1, 6; 17:10; 22:18; 27:28; **Ex** 3:6; 20:17; 24:4, 8; **Nu** 11:17, 24; **Dt** 8:3; 10:16; 18:10, 15; 30:6; 32:18; **Jos** 24:26; **Jdg** 6:34; **1 Sa** 2:10; 15:22; 16:14; **2 Ki** 2:9; **Ps** 2:8; 11:1; 32:1; 34:9; 51:13, 14; 55:23; 72:9, 10, 11; 78:24, 25; 82:6; 89:30; 143:10; **Is** 1:2, 11; 2:4; 9:7; 11:6; 25:8; 49:15; 60:18; 63:16; 65:20; 66:24; **Je** 4:4; 31:33; **Da** 4:9; 12:2; **Am** 5:22; **Zec** 2:5; **Mt** 6:11, 26, 33; 10:17, 41; 11:30; 19:29; 22:13, 30, 31, 32; **Lk** 1:33, 69; 12:37; 16:24; 22:20; **Jn** 5:46; 6:32, 49; 8:26, 56; **Ac** 3:22; **Ro** 1:16; 4:11; 5:1; 7:12; 8:1, 13, 15, 16; 9:2, 4; 10:4; 11:27, 30; **1 Co** 2:8; 10:1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 11; 11:30; 15:24, 25, 47; **Ga** 3:3, 16, 24; 4:1, 3, 29; 5:3, 4, 5; **Php** 3:2, 7, 8; **Col** 2:17; **1 Ti** 1:8; **2 Ti** 3:12; **Heb** 8:13; 10:4, 13; **1 Pe** 2:22; 5:7; **Re** 13:8

**CHAP. XVII.**

**Ge** 3:15; 22:18; **Dt** 6:5; 21:23; **2 Sa** 7:18; **1 Ki** 1:34; 2:19; **Ps** 45:8; 105:15; 110:5; **Is** 48:16; 61:1; **Mt** 1:1, 18, 21, 23; 8:2, 20; 9:6, 18; 11:17; 12:39, 48; 16:2; 20:21; 22:42; 24:40; 28:18; **Lk** 1:32, 35; 2:49; 3:28; 4:18; 11:27, 28; **Jn** 1:3, 14; 7:28; 10:18, 23; 13:3; **Ac** 3:21; 9:10; 10:38; 15:16; **Ro** 1:3, 7; 4:25; 5:6, 8, 9, 10; 8:3, 11, 31; 9:3, 5; **1 Co** 1:3; 6:11; 8:6; 11:3; 15:3, 24, 47; **2 Co** 5:21; **Ga** 1:12; 2:20; 3:13, 16; 4:4; **Eph** 1:20; 2:5; 3:17; **Php** 2:7, 9, 10; **Col** 1:15; **2 Ti** 2:8; **Tt** 3:3; **Heb** 1:9; 2:11, 16; 5:2; 10:29; **1 Jn** 2:20; 5:20; **Re** 19:10; 22:8

**CHAP. XVIII.**

**Ex** 33:20; 34:35; **Ps** 22:7, 17; 110:3; 144:15; 146:5; **Is** 40:5; 53:3, 5; 58:9; **Je** 17:5; **Joe** 2:28; **Mt** 1:18, 21; 5:48; 10:19, 28, 39; 11:30; 12:34; 13:16, 49; 17:2, 4; 18:17, 19, 20; 19:29; 20:28; 22:30; 23:12; 25:1, 14, 32; 27:42; 28:1, 18, 19; **Mk** 9:22; **Lk** 1:35; 4:30; 12:35; 16:22; 21:28; **Jn** 1:1, 29, 33; 3:5, 18; 4:24; 6:19, 39; 8:56, 59; 12:24; 13:5; 14:16, 26; 16:13, 14, 15; 17:3; 20:19, 22; **Ac** 1:9; 10:44; **Ro** 1:3; 2:11, 16; 3:25; 4:20, 25; 5:6, 8, 10, 17; 6:4, 5, 9, 14; 8:9, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 27, 29, 32; 9:5; 10:17; 11:2; **1 Co** 1:3; 10:4; 12:11, 12, 13; 13:12; 14:14; 15:21, 25, 32, 44, 51; **2 Co** 2:2, 7, 8; 5:21; **Ga** 2:20; 3:13; 4:4, 6, 7; 5:24; 6:17; **Eph** 1:7, 14, 19, 20, 21; 2:3; 4:4, 12; 5:23, 26; **Php** 1:21; 2:5, 7; 3:14; **Col** 1:15; 3:1, 3; **1 Th** 4:16, 17; 5:3; **1 Ti** 4:4; **2 Ti** 2:8; **Tt** 2:13; **Heb** 13:8; **1 Pe** 2:22; **2 Pe** 1:4; **Re** 21:4