positive laws the Apostles did bring in between the churches of Jews and Gentiles, it was in those things only which might either cease or continue a shorter or a longer time, as occasion did most require; the second, that they did not impose upon the churches of the Gentiles any part of the Jews' ordinances with bond of necessary and perpetual observation, (as we all both by doctrine and practice acknowledge,) but only in respect of the convenience and fitness for the present state of the Church as then it stood. The words of the council's decree concerning the Gentiles are, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no more burden "saving only those things of necessity, abstinence from idol- "offering, from strangled and blood, and from fornication 1." So that in other things positive, which the coming of Christ did not necessarily extinguish, the Gentiles were left altogether free.

[6.] Neither ought it to seem unreasonable that the Gentiles should necessarily be bound and tied to Jewish ordinances, so far forth as that decree importeth. For to the Jew, who knew that their difference from other nations which were aliens and strangers from God, did especially consist in this, that God's people had positive ordinances given to them of God himself, it seemed marvellous hard, that the Christian Gentiles should be incorporated into the same commonwealth with God's own chosen people, and be subject to no part of his statutes, more than only the law of nature, which heathens count themselves bound unto. It was an opinion constantly received amongst the Jews, that God did deliver unto the sons of Noah seven precepts: namely, first, to live in some form of regimen under public laws; secondly, to serve and call upon the name of God; thirdly, to shun idolatry; fourthly, not to suffer effusion of blood; fifthly, to abhor all unclean knowledge in the flesh; sixthly, to commit no rape; seventhly, and finally, not to eat of any living creature whereof the blood was not first let out.

1 [Acts xvi. 28.]
2 Lib. qui Seder Olam inscribatur. [Or "The World's Order," being a summary of events and dates from the creation to the War of Bar Cochba, supposed to have been written about A.D. 390. Wolf. Bibl. Hebr. l. 491. ed. 1715. The passage cited is cap. 5, p. 16. ed. Meyer. Amsterdam. 1669. "From the Red sea they journeyed unto Marah..." There were given unto Israel ten precepts: [Exod. xvi. 23. 25.] seven of them, concerning which commandment had been given to the sons of Noah.] 7. [In

If therefore the Gentiles would be exempt from the law of Moses, yet it might seem hard they should also cast off even those things positive which were observed before Moses, and which were not of the same kind with laws that were necessarily to cease. And peradventure hereupon the council saw it expedient to determine, that the Gentiles should, according unto the third, the seventh, and the fifth, of those precepts, abstain from things sacrificed unto idols, from strangled and blood, and from fornication. The rest the Gentiles did of their own accord observe, nature leading them thereto.

[7.] And did not nature also teach them to abstain from fornication? No doubt it did. Neither can we with reason think, that as the former two are positive, so likewise this, being meant as the Apostle doth otherwise usually understand it. But very marriage within a number of degrees being not only by the law of Moses, but also by the law of the sons of Noah (for so they took it) an unlawful discovery of nakedness; this discovery of nakedness by unlawful marriages such as Moses in the law reckoneth up, I think it for mine own part more probable to have been meant in the words of that canon, than fornication according unto the sense of the law of nature. Words must be taken according to the matter whereof they are uttered. The Apostles command to abstain from blood. Construe this meaning according to the law of nature, and it will seem that homicide only is forbidden. But construe it in reference to the law of the Jews about which the question was, and it shall easily appear to have a clean other sense, and in any man's judgment a truer, when we expound it of eating and not of shedding blood. So if we speak of fornication, he that knoweth no law but only the law of nature must needs make thereof a narrower construction, than he which measureth the same by a law, wherein sundry kinds

"[the judgments]: 2. אֲשֶׁר מָשָׂא שַׁמָּה (of God); 3. אָרֹן מְגִין [strange words] "[ship]," "the worship of idols;" 4. אַרְבָּעָה [the shedding of blood]; 5. אַרְבָּעָה [the discovery of nakedness]; 6. שִׁפֵּי [rape]; 7. לֹא יְהִי נָשִׂי [partaking of any member of a living creature.] Israel added unto these at that

1 Heb. xiii. 1; 1 Cor. v. 11; Gal. v. 19.
2 Lev. xviii.
as the Christian Jews at the first in the Apostles' times; some as heretics, holding the same no less even after the contrary determination set down by consent of the Church at Jerusalem; finally some being herein resolute through mere infidelity, and with open professed enmity against Christ, as unbelieving Jews.

To control slanderers of the Law and Prophets, such as Marcionites and Manichees were, the Church in her liturgies hath intermingled with readings out of the New Testament lessons taken out of the Law and Prophets; whereunto Tertullian alluding, saith of the Church of Christ, "It intermingleth with evangelical and apostolical writings the Law and the Prophets; and from thence it drinketh in that faith, which with water it sealeth, clotheth with the Spirit, nourisheth with the Eucharist, with martyrdom setteth forward." They would have wondered in those times to hear, that any man being not a favourer of heresy should term this by way of disdain, "mangling of the Gospels and Epistles?"

[10.] They which honour the Law as an image of the wisdom of God himself, are notwithstanding to know that the same had an end in Christ. But what? Was the Law so abolished with Christ, that after his ascension the office of Priests became immediately wicked, and the very name hateful, as importing the exercise of an ungodly function? No, as long as the glory of the Temple continued, and till the time of that final desolation was accomplished, the very Christian Jews did continue with their sacrifices and other parts of legal service. That very Law therefore which our Saviour was to abolish, did not so soon become unlawful to be

1 Tertull. de Præscript. advers. Heret. [c. 36.]: "Unum Deum novit Creatorem universitatis, et Christum Jesum ex Virgine Maria Filium Dei Creatoris, et carnis resurrectionem: legem et prophetias cum evangelicis et apostolicis literis miscet, et inde potat fidem: eam aqua signat, Sancto Spiritu vestit, eucharistia pacit, martyrio exhortatur."
2 T. C. lib. iii. p. 171. "What an abusing also is it to affirm the
BOOK IV. observed as some imagine; nor was it afterwards unlawful so far, that the very name of Altar, of Priest, of Sacrifice itself, should be banished out of the world. For though God do now hate sacrifice, whether it be heathenish or Jewish, so that we cannot have the same things which they had but with impiety; yet unless there be some greater let than the only evacuation of the Law of Moses, the names themselves may (I hope) be retained without sin, in respect of that proportion which things established by our Saviour have unto them which by him are abrogated. And so throughout all the writings of the ancient Fathers we see that the words which were do continue; the only difference is, that whereas before they had a literal, they now have a metaphorical use, and are as so many notes of remembrance unto us, that what they did signify in the letter is accomplished in the truth. And as no man can deprive the Church of this liberty, to use names whereunto the Law was accustomed, so neither are we generally forbidden the use of things which the Law hath; though it neither command us any particular rite, as it did the Jews a number, and the weightiest which it did command them are unto us in the Gospel prohibited.

[11.] Touching such as through simplicity of error did urge universal and perpetual observation of the Law of Moses at the first, we have spoken already. Against Jewish heretics and false apostles teaching afterwards the selfsame, St. Paul in every epistle commonly either disputeth or giveth warning. Jews that were zealous for the Law, but withal infidels in respect of Christianity, and to the name of Jesus Christ most spiteful enemies, did while they flourished no less persecute the Church than heathens. After their estate was overthrown, they were not so much as to be feared. Howbeit, because they had their synagogues in every famous city almost throughout the world, and by that means great opportunity to withdraw from the Christian faith, which to do they spared no labour; this gave the church occasion to make sundry laws against them. As in the council of Laodicea

1 Conc. Laod. Can. 37, 38. ["Non oportet a Judaeis arynma ac-"oparet a Judaeis vel haereticis "cipere, aut communicare impiesta-"feriatica que mittuntur acipere, "tibus eorum." Conc. Reg. II. nescum eis dies agere festos. 116.] T. C. lib. i. p. 132. [103.]

forbidding Communion, not Imitation.

"The festival presents which Jews or heretics use to send must not be received, nor Holidays solemnized in their company." Again, "from the Jews men ought not to receive their unleavened, nor to communicate with their impieties." Which council was afterwards indeed confirmed by the sixth general council. But what was the true sense or meaning both of the one and the other? Were Christians here forbidden to communicate in unleavened bread because the Jews did so being enemies of the Church? He which attentively shall weigh the words will suspect, that they rather forbid communion with Jews, than imitation of them: much more, if with these two decrees be compared a third in the Council of Constantinople, "Let no man either of the clergy or laity eat the unleavened of the Jews, nor enter into any familiarity with them, nor send for them in sickness, nor take physic at their hands, nor as much as go into the bath with them. If any do otherwise being a clergyman, let him be deposed; if being a lay person, let excommunication be his punishment." [12.] If these canons were any argument, that they which made them did utterly condemn simulidet between the Christians and Jews in things indifferent appertaining unto religion, either because the Jews were enemies unto the Church, or else for that their ceremonies were abrogated; these reasons had been as strong and effectual against their keeping the feast of Easter on the same day the Jews kept theirs, and not according to the custom of the West church. For so they did from the first beginning till Constantine's time. For in these two things the East and West churches did interchangeably both confront the Jews and concur with them: the West church using unleavened bread, as the Jews in their passover did, but differing from them in the day whereon they kept the feast of Easter; contrariwise the East church celebrating the feast of Easter on the same day

1 T. C. lib. iii. p. 176. [["What can be in itself more indifferent than these two, forbidden the Christians for that they were used of the enemies of the Church?"]]

2 Conc. Constantinop. vi. cap. 11. [Μηδεὶς τῶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰς ἑράρχους γίνεσθαι ἃ μὴν εἴη πρὸς τὸν Κυρίον ἑαυτῷ ἐπίθεσιν, εἰ δὲ τὰ ἑαυτῷ πρῶτοι ἐπικεραυνοῦ ἔσται, μὴ εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦτοις ὀρθαί νομοί δὲ ἔστιν ἀδόκησθαι, xvi. 618.]
with the Jews, but not using the same kind of bread which they did. Now if so be the East church in using leavened bread had done ill 1, either for that the Jews were enemies to the Church, or because Jewish ceremonies were abrogated; how should we think but that Victor the bishop of Rome (whom all judicious men do in that behalf disallow) did well to be so vehement and fierce in drawing them to the like dissimilitude for the feast of Easter 2? Again, if the West churches had in either of those two respects affected dissimilitude with the Jews in the feast of Easter, what reason had they to draw the Eastern church herein unto them, which reason did not enforce them to frame themselves unto it in the ceremony of leavened bread? Difference in rites should breed no controversy between one church and another; but if controversy be once bred, it must be ended. The feast of Easter being therefore litigious in the days of Constantine, who honoured of all other churches most the church of Rome, which church was the mother from whose breasts he had drawn that food, which gave him nourishment to eternal life; sith agreement was necessary, and yet impossible unless the one part were yielded unto; his desire was that of the two the Eastern church should rather yield. And to this end he used sundry persuasive speeches.

When Stephen the Bishop of Rome going about to shew what the Catholic Church should do, had alleged what the heretics themselves did, namely, that they received such as came unto them, and offered not to baptize them anew; St. Cyprian being of a contrary mind to him about the matter at that time in question, which was, "Whether heretics converted ought to be rebaptized, yea or no?" answered the allegation of Pope Stephen with exceeding great stomach, saying, "To this degree of wretchedness the church of God and Spouse of Christ is now come, that her ways she frameth to the example of heretics; that to celebrate the Sacraments 1 [So it stands in the original edition, p. 104. But it is most likely an oversight, the sense requiring "not done ill," or "done well." Which reading has been followed by all the editors except Mr. Hanbury. The correction appears to have been Spenser's: at least it occurs in the reprint of his edition, 1622.]*

3 [Euseb. v. 24.]

"Not heavenly instruction hath delivered, light itself doth borrow from darkness, and Christians do that which Anti-

1 Cypr. ad Pomp. cont. Steph. [Ep. 74. § 2. "Ad hoc enim malorum devoluta est Ecclesia Dei et spei S. Christi, ut here-
ticorum exempla sectetur, ut ad celebenda sacramenta cælestis discipline lux de tenebris mutuaret, et id faciant Christiani, quod Antichristi faciunt."

2 Socrat. Ecclesiast. Hist. lib. v. c. 22. "Plerique in Asia minore antiquitatis die mensis, nulla ratione diei Sabbati habita, hoc festum observavant. Quod dum faciebant, cum alii, qui illam rationem in eodem festo agendo sequerabantur, usque ad nequaquam dissererunt, quod Victor episcopus Romanus, supra modum iracundia inflammatum, omnes in Asia qui crant, numquid subsecuamur apPELLATi excommunicaservatur."

3 Ob quod factum Irenæus episcopus Lugduni in Victorem per epistolas graviter inventus est." Euseb. de Vita Constant. lib. iii. cap. 18. "Quid praestabilium, quidve augustius esse poterat, quanm ut hoc festum, per quod spem immortalitatis nobis ostentatum habemus, uno modo et ratione apud omnes integre sincerèque observaret. Ac primum omnium indignum plane videbatur, ut ratum et consuetudinem imitantes judicemur qui, quoniam suas ipsorum manus immuni sceleri polluerunt, merito, ut scelestos decrect, caeco animorum errore temeritari interretis istud festum sanctissimum aggravemus. In nostra enim situm est poestate, ut illo "rum mora rejecto, repente autem sincero instituto (quod quidem usque a prima passionis die hastec recolimus) hujus festivitatem ad posteriorum seculorum memoriam propagemus."

"Nihil igitur sit nobis cum Judaeis orum turba, omnium odio maxime."
they cannot choose but be stumblingblocks and grievous causes of offence. Concerning this point therefore we are first to note, what properly it is to be scandalous or offensive; secondly, what kind of ceremonies are such; and thirdly, when they are necessarily for remedy thereof to be taken away, and when not.

[2.] The common conceit of the vulgar sort is, whencesoever they see any thing which they dislike and are angry at, to think that every such thing is scandalous, and that themselves in this case are the men concerning whom our Saviour spake in so fearful manner, saying, "whosoever shall scandalize or "offend any one of these little ones which believe in me" 1 (that is, as they construe it, whosoever shall anger the meanest and simplest artisan which carrieth a good mind, by not removing out of the Church such rites and ceremonies as displease him), "better he were drowned in the bottom of the "sea." But hard were the case of the Church of Christ, if this were to scandalize. Men are scandalized when they are moved, led, and provoked unto sin. At good things evil men may take occasion to do evil; and so Christ himself was a rock of offence in Israel 2, they taking occasion at his poor estate and at the ignominy of his cross, to think him unworthy the name of that great and glorious Messias, whom the Prophets describe in such ample and stately terms. But that which we therefore term offensive because it inviteth men to offend, and by a dumb kind of provocation encourageth, moveth, or any way leadeth unto sin, must of necessity be acknowledged actively scandalous.

Now some things are so even by their very essence and nature, so that wheresoever they are found they are not neither can be without this force of provocation unto evil; of which kind all examples of sin and wickedness are. Thus David was scandalous in that bloody act whereby he caused the enemies of God to be blasphemous: 3 thus the whole state of Israel scandalous, when their public disorders caused the name of God to be ill-spoken of amongst the nations 4. It is of this

kind that Tertullian meaneth: "Offence or scandal, if I be not "deceived (saith he), is, when the example not of a good but "of an evil thing doth set men forward unto sin. Good things "can scandalize none save only evil minds:" good things have no scandalizing nature in them.

[3.] Yet that which is of its own nature either good or at least not evil, may by some accident become scandalous at certain times and in certain places and to certain men; the open use thereof nevertheless being otherwise without danger. The very nature of some rites and ceremonies therefore is scandalous, as it was in a number of those which the Manichees did use, and is in all such as the law of God doth forbid. Some are offensive only through the agreement of men to use them unto evil, and not else; as the most of those things indifferent which the heathens did to the service of their false gods, which another, in heart condemning their idolatry, could not do with them in show and token of approbation without being guilty of scandal given. Ceremonies of this kind are either devised at the first unto evil, as the Eunomian heretics in dishonour of the blessed Trinity brought in the laying on of water but once, to cross the custom of the church which in baptism did it thrice; or else having had a profitable use they are afterwards interpreted and wrested to the contrary, as those heretics which held the Trinity to be three distinct not persons but natures, abused the ceremony of three times laying on water in baptism unto the strengthening of their heresy. 5 The element of water is in baptism necessary; once to lay it on or twice is indifferent. For which cause Gregory making mention thereof saith, 6 "To dive an infant


2 Matt. xviii. 6. "Propter vitandum schis- "matis scandalum, vel heretici dog- "matis usum, simplam teneamus "baptismi missionem; ne videantur "apud nos, qui tertio mergunt, he- "rectorum approbave assertionem "dum sequuntur et morem."

3 Pet. ii. 8. "De trina vero mensione "baptismatis nil responderi verius "potest quam ipse sensistis: quia "in una fide nihil officit ecclesiae "consuetudo diversa. Nos autem "quod tertia meruemus, triduane "sepultura sacra gentis signamus, "ut dum tertia infra, ab aquis edu- "citur, resurrectio triduana tempo- "ris exprimatur. Quod si quis forte "etiam pro summis Trinitatis vene- "rationi estimetur fieri, neque ad "hoc aliquid obstisit, baptizandum "esse in aquis mergere: quia "dum in tribus subsistintias una