with he wrote it. For first, the man he commendeth as "one more constant than the rest of his brethren, who pre-
sumed," saith he, "that they might well enough serve two "Lords."" Afterwards choler somewhat more rising with
him, he addeth, "It doth even remain that they should also
devishe how to rid themselves of his martyrdoms, towards
"the prophecies of whose Holy Spirit they have already
"shewed their disdain. They mutter that their good and
"long peace is now in hazard. I doubt not but some of them
"send the Scriptures before, truss up bag and baggage, make
"themselves in a readiness that they may fly from city to
"city. For that is the only point of the Gospel which they
"are careful not to forget. I know even their pastors very
"well what men they are; in peace lions, harts in time
"of trouble and fear." Now these men, saith Tertullian,
"they must be answered, where we do find it written in
"Scripture that a Christian man may not wear a garland.
"
And as men's speeches uttered in heat of distempered
affection have oftentimes much eagerness than weight,
so he that shall mark the proofs alleged and the answers to
things objected in that book will now and then perhaps espy
the like imbecility. Such is that argument whereby they that
on their heads garlands are charged as transgressors of
nature's law, and guilty of sacrilege against God the Lord
of nature, inasmuch as flowers in such sort worn can neither
be smelt nor seen well by those that wear them; and God
made flowers sweet and beautiful, that being seen and smelt

1 Tert. de Coron. Milit. c. i. 2 [Dei miles caeteris constantior
fratribus, qui se diobus dominis
servire non posse presumpserat.
3 [Quatenus ilid opponunt,
Ubi autem prohibemur coronari?]
4 [Dei miles caeteris constantior,
hanc magis localem substantiam
cause praesentis aggregandi.] 5 [Ibid.
sapor floris? quis coronae sensus,
nisi vinculi tantum? quia neque
color cernitur, neque odor ducitur,
unc tenerias commendatione. Tamen
contra naturam est florem capite
sectari, quam cibum aure, quam
sonum nare. Omne autem quod
retur notam penes ornes, penes
vos vero etiam elogium sacrilegi,
in Deum naturae Dominum et
aucor.]

in the doctrine and ecclesiastical
discipline, but even in matters ar-
bitrary, and variable by the advice
of the Church. Where it is not
enough that they be not forbidden,
unless there be some word which
doth permit the use of them; it
is not enough that the Scripture
spake not against them, unless
it speak for them; and finally,
where it displeaseth the Lord
which pleaseth him not: we [one]
must of necessity have the word
of his mouth to declare his plea-
sure."
unto they might so delight. Neither doth Tertullian bewray this weakness in striking only, but also in repelling their strokes with whom he contendeth. They ask, saith he, "What Scripture is there which doth teach that we should not be crowned? And what Scripture is there which doth teach that we should? For in requiring on the contrary part the aid of Scripture, they do give sentence beforehand that their part ought also by Scripture to be aided!" Which answer is of no great force. There is no necessity, that if I confess I ought not to do that which the Scripture forbiddeth me, I should thereby acknowledge myself bound to do nothing which the Scripture commandeth me not. For many inducements besides Scripture may lead me to that, which if Scripture be against, they all give place and are of no value, yet otherwise are strong and effectual to persuade.

Which thing himself well enough understanding, and being not ignorant that Scripture in many things doth neither command nor forbid, but use silence; his resolution in fine is, that in the church a number of things are strictly observed, whereof no law of Scripture maketh mention one way or other; that of things once received and confirmed by use, long usage is a law sufficient; that in civil affairs, when there is no other law, custom itself doth stand for law; that inasmuch as law doth stand upon reason, to allege reason serveth as well as to cite Scripture; that whatsoever is reasonable, the same is lawful whosoever is the author of it; that the authority

1 [Ibid. c. 2. “Facile est statim exigere, ubi scriptum sit, ne cornemur. At enim ubi scriptum est, ut cornemur? Expositantes enim Scripture patrocinium in parte diversa, praebent etiam suo quoque parte patrocinium, adesse debebunt. Nam siideo dicetur coram non licere, quia non prohibet. Nulla Scriptura, qua quosque, nonnulla patrocinium dicat, quae non licet.”]

2 [Ibid. c. 3. “Etiam in traditionibus obtenta exigenda est, inquis, auctoritas scripta. Ergo quosque mus an et traditio non scripta non debit recipit? Plane negabimus recipiendum, si nulla exempla praejudicet aliarum observationum, quas sine illius Scripturatus instrumento, solius traditio

3 [Ibid. c. 4. “His igitur exemplis renunciatum est, posse etiam non scriptum traditum in observandum, confirmandum consuetudine. . . . Consuetudo aeternam in civilibus rebus pro lege suscipitur, cum deficit lex.”]

4 [Ibid. c. 2. “Nec dicit, Scriptura an ratione consistat, quando et legem ratio commendat. Porro si lex ratione constat, lex erit omne jam quod ratione consistit a quoque praeceptu.”]

5 of custom is great; finally, that the custom of Christians was then and had been a long time not to wear garlands, and therefore that undoubtedly they did offend who presumed to violate such a custom by not observing that thing, the very inveterate observation whereof was a law sufficient to bind all men to observe it, unless they could shew some higher law, some law of Scripture, to the contrary. This presupposed, it may stand then very well with strength and soundness of reason, even thus to answer, “Whereas they ask what Scripture forbiddeth them to wear a garland; we are in this case rather to demand what Scripture commandeth them. They cannot here allege that it is permitted which is not forbidden them: no, that is forbidden them which is not permitted.” For long-received custom forbidding them to do as they did, (if so be it did forbid them,) there was no excuse in the world to justify their act, unless in the Scripture they could shew some law, that did license them thus to break a received custom.

Now whereas in all the books of Tertullian besides there is not so much found as in that one, to prove not only that we may do, but that we ought to do, sundry things which the Scripture commandeth not; out of that very book these sentences are brought to make us believe that Tertullian was of a clean contrary mind. We cannot therefore hereupon yield; we cannot grant, that hereby is made manifest the argument of Scripture negatively to be of force, not only in doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline, but even in matters arbitrary. For Tertullian doth plainly hold even in that book, that neither the matter which he intretareth of was arbitrary but necessary, inasmuch as the received custom of the Church of custom is great; finally, that the custom of Christians was then and had been a long time not to wear garlands, and therefore that undoubtedly they did offend who presumed to violate such a custom by not observing that thing, the very inveterate observation whereof was a law sufficient to bind all men to observe it, unless they could shew some higher law, some law of Scripture, to the contrary. This presupposed, it may stand then very well with strength and soundness of reason, even thus to answer, “Whereas they ask what Scripture forbiddeth them to wear a garland; we are in this case rather to demand what Scripture commandeth them. They cannot here allege that it is permitted which is not forbidden them: no, that is forbidden them which is not permitted.” For long-received custom forbidding them to do as they did, (if so be it did forbid them,) there was no excuse in the world to justify their act, unless in the Scripture they could shew some law, that did license them thus to break a received custom.

Now whereas in all the books of Tertullian besides there is not so much found as in that one, to prove not only that we may do, but that we ought to do, sundry things which the Scripture commandeth not; out of that very book these sentences are brought to make us believe that Tertullian was of a clean contrary mind. We cannot therefore hereupon yield; we cannot grant, that hereby is made manifest the argument of Scripture negatively to be of force, not only in doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline, but even in matters arbitrary. For Tertullian doth plainly hold even in that book, that neither the matter which he intretareth of was arbitrary but necessary, inasmuch as the received custom of the Church
must be limited by the known Scope of the Place.

For this cause his testimonies, whatsoever be affirmeth, are always truth and most infallible certainty.

Yea further, because the things that proceed from him are perfect without any manner of defect or maim; it cannot be but that the words of his mouth are absolute, and lack nothing which they should have for performance of that thing whereunto they tend. Whereupon it followeth, that the end being known whereunto he directeth his speech, the argument even negatively is evermore strong and forcible concerning those things that are apparently requisite unto the same end. As for example: God intending to set down sandry times that which in Angels is most excellent, hath not any where spoken so highly of them as he hath of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; therefore they are not in dignity equal unto him. It is the Apostle St. Paul's argument.

[3.] The purpose of God was to teach his people, both unto whom they should offer sacrifice, and what sacrifice was to be offered. To burn their sons in fire unto Baal he did not command them, he spake no such thing, neither came it into his mind; therefore this they ought not to have done. Which argument the Prophet Jeremy useth more than once, as being so effectual and strong, that although the thing he reproveth were not only not commanded but forbidden them, and that expressly; yet the Prophet chooseth rather to charge them with the fault of making a law unto themselves, than with the crime of transgressing a law which God had made. For when the Lord hath once himself precisely set down a form of executing that wherein we are to serve him; the fault appeareth greater to do that which we are not, than not to do that which we are commanded. In this we seem to charge the law of God with hardness only, in that with foolishness; in this we shew ourselves weak and unapt to be doers of his will, in that we take upon us to be controllers of his wisdom; in this we fail to perform the thing which God seeth meet,
convenient, and good, in that we presume to see what is meet and convenient better than God himself. In those actions therefore the whole form whereof God hath of purpose set down to be observed, we may not otherwise do than exactly as he hath prescribed; in such things negative arguments are strong.

[3.] Again, with a negative argument David is pressed concerning the purpose he had to build a temple unto the Lord; "Thus saith the Lord, Thou shalt not build me a house to dwell in. Wheresoever I have walked with all "Israel, spake I one word to any of the judges of Israel, "whom I commanded to feed my people, saying, Why have "ye not built me an house?" The Jews urged with a negative argument touching the aid which they sought at the hands of the King of Egypt; "Woe to those rebellious "children, saith the Lord, which walk forth to go down "into Egypt, and have not asked counsel at my mouth; to "strengthen themselves with the strength of Pharaoh." Finally, the league of Joshua with the Gibeonites is likewise with a negative argument touched. It was not as it should be: and why? the Lord gave them not that advice; "They "sought not counsel at the mouth of the Lord." By the virtue of which examples if any man shall suppose the force of negative arguments approved, when they are taken from Scripture in such sort as we in this question are pressed therewith, they greatly deceive themselves. For unto which of all these was it said that they had done amiss, in purposing to do or in doing any thing at all which "the Scripture" commanded them not? Our question is, Whether all be sin which is done without direction by Scripture, and not, Whether the Israelites did at any time amiss by following their own minds without asking counsel of God. No, it was that people's singular privilege, a favour which God vouchsafed them above the rest of the world, that in the affairs of their estate which were not determinable one way or other by the Scripture, himself gave them extrordinarily direction and counsel as oft as they sought it at his hands. Thus God did first by speech unto Moses, after by Urim and Thummim unto priests, lastly by dreams and visions unto prophets, from whom in such cases they were to receive the answer of God.

Concerning Josua therefore, thus spake the Lord unto Moses, saying, "He shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who "shall ask counsel for him by the judgment of Urim before "the Lord"; whereof had Josua been mindful, the fraud of "the Gibeonites could not so smoothly have passed unespied "til there was no help.

The Jews had prophets to have resolved them from the mouth of God himself whether Egyptian aids should profit them, yea or no; but they thought themselves wise enough, and him unworthy to be of their counsel. In this respect therefore was their reproof though sharp yet just, albeit there had been no charge precisely given them that they should always take heed of Egypt.

But as for David, to think that he did evil in determining to build God a temple, because there was in Scripture no commandment that he should build it, were very injurious: the purpose of his heart was religious and godly, the act most worthy of honour and renown; neither could Nathan choose but admire his virtuous intent, exhort him to go forward, and beseech God to prosper him therein. But God saw the endless troubles which David should be subject unto during the whole time of his regiment, and therefore gave charge to defer so good a work to the days of tranquillity and peace, wherein it might without interruption be performed. David supposed that it could not stand with the duty which he owed unto God, to set himself in a house of cedar-trees, and to behold the ark of the Lord's covenant unsettled. This opinion the Lord abated, by causing Nathan to shew him plainly, that it should be no more imputed unto him for a fault than it had been unto the Judges of Israel before him, his case being the same which theirs was, their times not more unquiet than his, not more unfit for such an action.

Wherefore concerning the force of negative arguments so taken from the authority of Scripture as by us they are denied, there is in all this less than nothing.

[4.] And touching that which unto this purpose is borrowed from the controversy sometime handled between M. Harding

---

1 1 Chron. xvii. 6. 2 Isaiah xxx. 1, 2. 3 Josh. ix. 14.
and the worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years, who being brought up together in one University, it fell out in them which was spoken of two others, "They learned in the same that which in contrary camps they did practise:" of these two the one objecting that with us arguments taken from authority negatively are over common, the Bishop’s answer hereunto is, that "This kind of argument is thought to be good, whensoever proof is taken of God’s word; and is used not only by us, but also by St. Paul, and by many of the Catholic Fathers. St. Paul saith, God said not unto Abraham, ‘In thy seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed’: but, ‘In thy seed, which is Christ:’ and thereof he thought he made a good argument. Likewise, saith Origen, ‘The bread which the Lord gave unto his disciples, saying unto

"The argument of authority negatively is taken to be good, whensoever proof is taken of God’s word; and is used not only by us, but also by the fathers of the Catholic Church. ‘A little after he shewed the reason why the argument of authority of the Scripture negatives the places which he allowed to be very full and plain in generality, without any such restraints as the Answerer imagines; as they are there to be seen.’ [Vasquez in his Life of Dr. Thomas Jackson, prefixed to his (Jackson’s) works, p. 8, says of him, ‘I shall willingly associate him to the other worthy, his predecessors in the same college, all living at the same time:’ to the invaluable Bishop Jewel, Theologorum Oxoniensis;] a magno Theologorum Literarum Oxoniensis appellatur."

[According to Camden, they were bred in the same grammar school also. ‘Out of this town’s school’ (he is speaking of Barnstaple), ‘there issued two right learned men and most renown’d divines, John Jewell Bishop of Sarisbury, and T. Harding, of Brittania, transl. by Holland, p. 205.]

1 Vell. Paterc. ‘Jugurtha ac Marius sub eodem Africano militantes, in isdem castris didicerunt, que postea in contrariis facerent.’

2 Gaul. iii. 16.

3 Orig. in Levit. Hom. 5. [l. ii. 211, ed. Bened.]

4 "De incomp. nat. Dei, Hom. 3. [fro: edd. 1, 2, 4.] 1886. 5 Matt. xxiii. 8. 10. 6 Lib. i. cap. 1. 7 Matt. xvii. 5. 8 Paulus plantavit, non Apollis rigidavit, non Deus auxit.”