

whereof whole kingdoms and nations professing Christ both have been heretofore and are at this present day divided about Christ. During which divisions and contentions amongst men albeit each part do justify itself, yet the one of necessity must needs err if there be any contradiction between them be it great or little, and what side soever it be that hath the truth, the same we must also acknowledge alone to hold *with the true Church in that point*, and consequently reject the other as an enemy *in that case fallen away from the true Church*.

Wherefore of hypocrites and dissemblers¹ whose profession at the first was but only from the teeth outward, when they afterwards took occasion to oppugn certain principal articles of faith, the Apostles which defended the truth against them pronounce them "gone out" from the fellowship of sound and sincere believers, when as yet the Christian religion they had not utterly cast off.

In like sense and meaning throughout all ages heretics have justly been hated as branches cut off from the body of the true Vine, yet only so far forth cut off as their heresies have extended. Both heresy and *many other crimes* which *wholly sever from God* do sever from the Church of God *in part only*. "The mystery of piety" saith the Apostle "is without peradventure great, God hath been manifested in the flesh, hath been justified in the Spirit, hath been seen of Angels, hath been preached to nations, hath been believed on in the world, hath been taken up into glory²." The Church a pillar and foundation of this truth, which no where is known or professed but only within the Church, and they all of the Church that profess it. In the meanwhile it cannot be denied that many profess this who are not therefore cleared simply from all either faults or errors which make separation between us and the wellspring of our happiness. Idolatry severed of old the Israelites, iniquity those scribes and Pharisees from God, who notwithstanding were a part of the seed of Abraham, a part of that very seed which God did himself acknowledge to be his Church. The Church of God may therefore contain both them which indeed are not his yet must be reputed his by us that know not their inward thoughts, and them whose

¹ 1 John ii. 19.² 1 Tim. iii. 16.

apparent wickedness testifieth even in the sight of the whole world that God abhorreth them. For to this and no other purpose are meant those parables which our Saviour in the Gospel¹ hath concerning mixture of vice with virtue, light with darkness, truth with error, as well an openly known and seen as a cunningly cloked mixture.

That which separateth therefore *utterly*, that which cutteth off *clean* from the visible Church of Christ is plain Apostasy, *direct* denial, utter rejection of the whole Christian faith as far as the same is professedly different from infidelity. Heretics as touching those points of doctrine wherein they fail; schismatics as touching the quarrels for which or the duties wherein they divide themselves from their brethren; loose, licentious and wicked persons as touching their several offences or crimes, have all forsaken the true Church of God, the Church which is sound and sincere in the doctrine that they corrupt, the Church that keepeth the bond of unity which they violate, the Church that walketh in the laws of righteousness which they transgress, this very true Church of Christ they have left, howbeit not altogether left nor forsaken simply the Church upon the main foundations whereof they continue built, notwithstanding these breaches whereby they are *rent at the top* asunder.

[7.] Now because for redress of professed errors and open schisms it is and must be the Church's care that all may in outward conformity be one, as the laudable polity of former ages even so our own to that end and purpose hath established divers laws, the moderate severity whereof is a mean both to stay the rest and to reclaim such as heretofore have been led awry². But seeing that the offices which laws require are

¹ [Matt. xiii. 24, 47.]² [Namely, the Act of Uniformity: that under which the High Commission acted and the Queen's Injunctions were issued from time to time: other acts in 1562, 1581, 1593. Of interference with regard to the Communion in particular two instances occur in Strype: one in Park. i. 568: where a person of the Temple is interrogated, "Whether he had received the Communion in the Temple church, accusomably, as others of the house

"had done:" the other, Ann. I. ii. 347; a circular signed by the magistrates, pledging themselves to "receive the holy Sacrament from time to time, according to the tenor of the Act of Uniformity:" both dated 1569, when the rebellion in the north was yet rife. The act of 1581 appears to have been thought necessary on account of certain doubts which existed as to the construction of the previous general enactments, and consequent lawfulness of the pecuniary penalties which

always definite, and when that they require is done they go no farther, whereupon sundry ill-affected persons to save themselves from danger of laws pretend obedience, albeit inwardly they carry still the same hearts which they did before, by means whereof it falleth out that receiving unworthily the blessed sacrament at our hands, they eat and drink their own damnation; it is for remedy of this mischief here determined¹,

the court of High Commission had been in the habit of occasionally enforcing. *Strype, Grind.* 345. A. D. 1577.]

¹ T. C. lib. i. p. 167. [132, 133.]
“If the place of the fifth to the
“Corinthians do forbid that we
“should have any familiarity with
“notorious offenders, it doth much
“more forbid that they should be
“received to the Communion. And
“therefore papists being such as
“which are notoriously known to
“hold heretical opinions ought not
“to be admitted much less compelled
“to the Supper. For seeing that
“our Saviour Christ did institute
“his supper amongst his disciples
“and those only which were as St.
“Paul speaketh within, it is evident
“that the papists being without, and
“foreigners and strangers from the
“Church of God ought not to be
“received if they would offer them-
“selves: and that minister that
“shall give the Supper of the Lord
“to him which is known to be a
“papist and which hath never made
“any clear renouncing of popery
“with which he hath been defiled
“doth profane the table of the Lord,
“and doth give the meat that is pre-
“pared for the children unto dogs,
“and he bringeth into the pasture
“which is provided for the sheep,
“swine and unclean beasts, contrary
“to the faith and trust that ought
“to be in a steward of the Lord’s
“house as he is. For albeit that I
“doubt not but many of those
“which are now papists pertain to
“the election of God, which God also
“in his good time will call to the
“knowledge of his truth: yet not-
“withstanding they ought to be
“unto the minister and unto the
“Church touching the ministering

“of sacraments as strangers and
“as unclean beasts. . . . The mi-
“nistering of the holy sacraments
“unto them is a declaration and
“seal of God’s favour and reconci-
“liation with them, and a plain
“preaching partly that they be
“washed already from their sins,
“partly that they are of the house-
“hold of God and such as the Lord
“will feed to eternal life, which is
“not lawful to be done unto those
“which are not of the household of
“faith. And therefore I conclude
“that the compelling of papists un-
“to the communion, and the dis-
“missing and letting of them go
“when as they be to be punished
“for their stubbornness in popery
“(with this condition, if they will
“receive the communion) is very
“unlawful, when as although they
“would receive it yet they ought
“to be kept back till such time as
“by their religious and gospel like
“behaviour,” &c. [Comp. T. C. i.
34. ap. Whitg. Def. 178. Whitgift
in his answer had pleaded against
popular election of bishops, that
“the Church is now full of papists,
“atheists, and such like.” T. C.
replies, “Now you bring in papists,
“idolaters, and atheists, which are
“not only filthy but also poisoned
“and venomous beasts. I am not
“ignorant of that distinction which
“saith that there be in the Church
“which are not of the Church; and
“those are hypocrites as is before
“said: but I would gladly learn of
“you, what scripture there is to
“prove that idolaters and papists
“and atheists are in the Church,
“when St. Paul calleth all such
“without the Church, and with
“whom the Church hath nothing
“to do, nor they with the Church.

that whom the law of the realm doth punish unless they communicate, such if they offer to obey law, the Church notwithstanding should not admit without probation before had of their gospel-like behaviour.

[8.] Wherein they first set no time how long this supposed probation must continue; again they nominate no certain judgment the verdict whereof shall approve men’s behaviour to be gospel-like; and that which is most material, whereas they seek to make it more hard for dissemblers to be received into the Church than law and polity as yet hath done, they make it in truth more easy for such kind of persons to wind themselves out of the law and to continue the same they were. The law requireth at their hands that duty which in conscience doth touch them nearest, because the greatest difference between us and them is the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, whose name in the service of our communion we celebrate with due honour, which they in the error of their mass profane. As therefore on our part to hear mass were an open departure from that sincere profession wherein we stand, so if they on the other side receive our communion, they give us the strongest pledge of fidelity that man can demand. What their hearts are God doth know. But if they which mind treachery to God and man¹ shall once apprehend this

“You might as well have placed in
“the Church, wolves, tigers, lions
“and bears, i.e. tyrants and perse-
“cutors. . . . But now I hear you ask
“me what then shall become of the
“papists and atheists, if you will
“not have them to be of the Church?
“I answer that they may be of
“and in the Commonwealth, which
“neither may, nor can be, of or in
“the Church. And therefore the
“Church having nothing to do with
“such, the magistrate ought to see
“that they join to hear the sermons
“in the place where they are made,
“. . . and cause them to be examined,
“how they profit; and if they pro-
“fit not, to punish them; and as
“their contempt groweth, so to in-
“crease the punishment, until such
“time as they declare manifest to-
“kens of unrepentantness, and then
“as rotten members. . . cut them off.”
¹ [This expression refers perhaps

to the Jesuits and seminary priests especially: who were very busy in England about 1596. See *Strype, Ann.* iv. 422. Compare in the same vol. p. 53, Topclyff’s statement in a letter to Burghley: “There is a great danger in many others, who sometimes do come to the church, and yet be papists both in their inward hearts, and in their outward actions and conversations, refusing to receive the communion; and in every thing else as ill as the worst. Of which there be also two sorts. The one goeth to the church for saving of the penalties of thirteen score pounds a year: yet his wife and whole family, or most of them, continue resolute recusants and harbour traitors. The other sort go to the church because they may avoid suspicion of the magistrates the better, and is dispensed withal by some secret

advantage given them, whereby they may satisfy law in pretending themselves conformable (for what can law with reason or justice require more?) and yet be sure the Church will accept no such offer, till their gospel-like behaviour be allowed; after that our own simplicity hath once thus fairly eased them from sting of law, it is to be thought they will learn the mystery of gospel-like behaviour when leisure serveth them. And so while without any cause we fear to profane sacraments, we shall not only defeat the purpose of most wholesome laws, but lose or wilfully hazard those souls from which the likeliest means of full and perfect recovery are by our indiscretion withheld.

For neither doth God thus bind us to dive into men's consciences, nor can their fraud and deceit hurt any man but themselves. To him they seem such as they are, but to us they must be taken for such as they seem. In the eye of God they are against Christ that are not truly and sincerely with him, in our eyes they must be received as with Christ that are not to outward show against him.

The case of impenitent and notorious sinners is not like unto theirs whose only imperfection is error severed from pertinacy, error in appearance content to submit itself to better instruction, error so far already cured as to crave at our hands that sacrament the hatred and utter refusal whereof was the weightiest point wherein heretofore they swerved and went astray.

[9.] In this case therefore they cannot reasonably charge us with remiss dealing, or with carelessness to whom we impart the mysteries of Christ, but they have given us manifest occasion to think it requisite that we earnestly advise rather and exhort them to consider as they ought their sundry oversights, first in equalling undistinctly crimes with errors as touching force to make incapable of this sacrament; secondly in suffering indignation at the faults of the church of Rome to blind and withhold their judgments from seeing that which withal they should acknowledge, concerning so much nevertheless still due to the same church, as to be held and reputed

“dispensation of a delegate or such a great priest as hath episcopal authority, to the end they may

“the better, and with the less suspicion, serve the turn of their cause catholic.”]

a part of the house of God, a limb of the visible Church of Christ; thirdly in imposing upon the Church a burden to enter farther into men's hearts and to make a deeper search of their consciences than any law of God or reason of man enforceth; fourthly and lastly in repelling under colour of longer trial such from the mysteries of heavenly grace, as are both capable thereof by the laws of God for any thing we hear to the contrary, and should in divers considerations be cherished according to the merciful examples and precepts whereby the gospel of Christ hath taught us towards such to shew compassion, to receive them with lenity and all meekness, if any thing be shaken in them to strengthen it, not to quench with delays and jealousies that feeble smoke of conformity which seemeth to breathe from them, but to build wheresoever there is any foundation, to add perfection unto slender beginnings, and that as by other offices of piety even so by this very food of life which Christ hath left in his Church not only for preservation of strength but also for relief of weakness.

[10.] But to return to our own selves in whom the next thing severely reprov'd is the paucity¹ of communicants; if they require at communions frequency we wish the same, knowing how acceptable unto God such service is when multitudes cheerfully concur unto it²; if they encourage men thereunto, we also (themselves acknowledge it³) are not utterly forgetful to do the like; if they require some public coaction⁴ for remedy of that wherein by milder and softer means little good is done, they know our laws and statutes provided in that behalf, whereunto whatsoever convenient help may be added more by the wisdom of man, what cause

¹ T. C. lib. i. p. 147. [116.]

² 2 Chron. xxx. 13; Psalm cxxii. 1.

³ [T. C. i. 117. al. 148. “It may be objected, that in this point the “Book of Common Prayer is not in “fault, which doth not only not for- “bid that all the Church should re- “ceive together, but also by a good “and godly exhortation moveth “those that be present that they “should not depart. . . . It is true “that it doth not forbid, and that “there is godly exhortation for that

“purpose.”]

⁴ [T. C. i. 117. al. 149. “It” (the Prayer Book) “ought to pro- “vide that those which would with- “draw themselves should be by ec- “clesiastical discipline at all times, “and now also under a godly prince “by civil punishment brought to “communicate. . . . This is the law “of God, (Numbers ix. 13.) and “this is now and hath been hereto- “fore the practice of the churches “reformed.”]

BOOK V. have we given the world to think that we are not ready to
Ch. lxviii. 10. hearken to it, and to use any good mean of sweet compul-
sion¹ to have this high and heavenly banquet largely fur-
nished? Only we cannot so far yield as to judge it convenient
that the holy desire of a competent number should be un-
satisfied, because the greater part is careless and undisposed
to join with them.

Men should not (they say) be permitted a few by them-
selves to communicate when so many are gone away, because
this sacrament is a token of our conjunction with our brethren²,
and therefore by communicating apart from them we make an
apparent show of distraction. I ask then on which side unity
is broken, whether on theirs that depart or on theirs who
being left behind do communicate? First in the one it is not
denied but that they may have reasonable causes of departure,
and that then even they are delivered from just blame. Of
such kind of causes two are allowed³, namely danger of im-
pairing health and necessary business requiring our presence
otherwise. And may not a third cause, which is *unfitness* at
the present time, detain us as lawfully back as either of these
two? True it is that we cannot hereby altogether excuse our-
selves, for that we ought to prevent this and do not⁴. But

¹ Luke xiv. 23.

² [T. C. i. 116. al. 147. "The holy Sacrament of the Supper of the Lord is not only a seal and confirmation of the promises of God unto us, but also a profession of our conjunction as well with Christ our Saviour and with God, as also (as St. Paul teacheth) a declaration and profession that we are at one with our brethren. . . . The departing therefore of the rest of the Church from those three or four is an open profession that they have no communion, fellowship, nor unity, with them that do communicate; and likewise of those three or four, that they have none with the rest. . . . Therefore St. Paul driving thereunto wisheth that one should tarry for another." Whitg. Def. 528. "If the book should appoint that three or four should communicate together, and no more; or if it did not allow that communion best wherein

"most of the church do participate; then were your reasoning to some end. But seeing that it is appointed that there should not be fewer than three or four, to the end that it might be a communion, and have no similitude with the papistical mass, there is no cause why you should take this pains. . . . Shall none communicate because all will not? Or shall not three or four because the rest refuse? Or is it lack of love towards our neighbour, or any token thereof, if we resort to the Lord's table when other will not? Where learn you that?"]

³ [By T. C. i. 117.]

⁴ [Id. i. 118. al. 149. "Here may rise another doubt of the words of Moses in the Book of Numbers. 'For seeing he maketh this exception, 'if they be clean,' it may be said that those that depart do not feel themselves meet to receive. . . . For answer whereunto. . . . the

if we have committed a fault in not preparing our minds before, shall we therefore aggravate the same with a worse, the crime of unworthy participation? He that abstaineth doth want for the time that grace and comfort which religious communicants have, but he that eateth and drinketh unworthily receiveth death, that which is life to others turneth in him to poison.

Notwithstanding whatsoever be the cause for which men abstain, were it reason that the fault of one part should any way abridge their benefit that are not faulty? There is in all the Scripture of God no one syllable which doth condemn communicating amongst a few when the rest are departed from them.

[II.] As for the last thing which is our imparting this sacrament privately unto the sick¹, whereas there have been of old (they grant²) two kinds of necessity wherein this sacrament might be privately administered³, of which two

"uncleanness which Moses speaketh of was such as men could not easily avoid: and whereunto they might fall sometimes by necessity duty. . . . which thing cannot be alleged in those that are now of the Church. For if they will say, they be not meet, it may be answered unto them that it is their own fault; and further, if they be not meet to receive the holy Sacrament of the Supper, they are not meet to hear the word of God, they are not meet to be partakers of the prayers of the Church. . . . To whomsoever of them the Lord will communicate himself by preaching the word, to the same he will not refuse to communicate himself by receiving of the sacraments."

¹ [Adm. ap. Whitg. Def. 529. In this book three or four are allowed for a fit number to receive the Communion, and the priest alone together with one more, or with the sick man alone, may in time of necessity, that is when there is any common plague, or in time of other visitation minister it to the sick man, and if he require it it may sure be denied. This is not I am sure like in effect to a private mass: that Scripture,

"Drink ye all of this,' maketh not against this, and private Communion is not against the Scriptures." Whitg. Answer, 185. "Drink ye all of this' may as well be applied to prove that ten, twenty, forty, is no sufficient number. . . . I know there be some of the old Fathers, as Basilius Magnus, which would not have fewer communicants than twelve." (t. ii. 320. D.) "But of the number of communicants there is nothing determined in Scripture."

² [T. C. quotes Justin Martyr, Apol. c. 85. Οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι, διδάσκειν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι. Tertull. de Orat. c. xix. (speaking of the scruple which some persons felt of breaking their fast on a day of humiliation, by participation of the Eucharist: "Accepto corpore Domini, et reservato, utrumque saluum est: et participatio sacrificii, et executio officii." And Cyprian, de Lapsis, p. 132. "Cum quædam arcam suam, in qua Domini Sanctum fuit, manibus indignis tentasset aperire, igne inde surgente deterrita est, ne auferat attingere."]

³ T. C. i. 146. [al. 115. "It is

the one being erroneously imagined, and the other (they say) continuing no longer in use, there remaineth unto us no necessity at all, for which that custom should be retained. The falsely surmised necessity is that whereby some have thought all such excluded from possibility of salvation as did depart this life and never were made partakers of the holy Eucharist¹. The other case of necessity was, when men, which had fallen in time of persecution, and had afterwards repented them, but were not as yet received again unto the fellowship of this communion, did at the hour of their death request it, that so they might rest with greater quietness and comfort of mind, being thereby assured of departure in unity of Christ's Church, which virtuous desire the Fathers did think it great impiety not to satisfy. This was Serapion's case of necessity. Serapion a faithful aged person and always of very upright life till fear of persecution in the end caused him to shrink back, after long sorrow for his scandalous offence and suit oftentimes made to be pardoned of the Church, fell at length into grievous sickness, and being ready to yield up the ghost was then more instant than ever before to receive the sacrament. Which sacrament was necessary in this case, not that Serapion had been deprived of everlasting life without it, but that his end was thereby to him made the more comfortable². And do we think, that all cases of *such*

"not to be denied that this abuse is very ancient, and was in Justin Martyr's time, in Tertullian and Cyprian's time, even as also there were other abuses . . . First of all in the primitive Church the discipline of the Church was so severe, and so extreme, that if any one who professed the truth and was of the body of the Church did through infirmity deny the truth, and joined himself unto the idolatrous service, although he repenting came again unto the Church, yet was he not received to the communion of the Lord's Supper any more. And yet lying in extremity of sickness, and ready to depart this life, if they did require the Communion in token that the Church had forgiven the fault, . . . they granted that he

"might be partaker of it: as may appear by the story of Serapion. Another cause was that which was before alleged: which is the false opinion they had conceived that all those were condemned that received not the Supper of the Lord. And therefore when catechumens or young children fell sick dangerously they ministered the Supper of the Lord unto them, lest they should want their voyage victual (as they termed it)."

¹ [On this point so far as regards Infant Communion see especially Waterland's Inquiry concerning that practice. Works, ix. 473, &c. (vol. vi. p. 41. ed. 1844.)]

² [S. Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. H. E. vi. 44. *Σαραπίων τις ἦν παρ' ἡμῖν πιστὸς γέρον, ἀμέμπτως μὲν τὸν πολὺν διαβιώσας χρόνον, ἐν δὲ*

necessity are clean vanished? Suppose that some have by mis-persuasion lived in schism, withdrawn themselves from holy and public assemblies, hated the prayers, and loathed the sacraments of the Church, falsely presuming them to be fraught with impious and Antichristian corruptions, which error the God of mercy and truth opening at the length their eyes to see, they do not only repent them of the evil which they have done but also in token thereof desire to receive comfort by that whereunto they have offered disgrace, (which may be the case of many poor seduced souls even at this day), God forbid we should think that the Church doth sin in permitting the wounds of such to be supplied¹ with that oil which this gracious Sacrament doth yield, and their bruised minds not only need but beg.

[12.] There is nothing which the soul of man doth desire in that last hour so much as comfort against the natural terrors of death and other scruples of conscience which commonly do them most trouble and perplex the weak, towards whom the very law of God doth exact at our hands all the helps that Christian lenity and indulgence can afford. Our general consolation departing this life is the hope of that glorious² and blessed resurrection which the Apostle St. Paul³ nameth *ἐξανάστασις*⁴, to note that as all men shall

τῷ πειρασμῷ πεσών οὗτος πολλακίς εἶδειτο, καὶ οὐδεὶς προσείχεν αὐτῷ, καὶ γὰρ ἐτεθύκει, ἐν νόσῳ δὲ γενόμενος, τριῶν ἕξης ἡμερῶν ἄφωνος καὶ ἀναίσθητος διετέλεσε· βραχὺ δὲ ἀνασφίγας τῇ τετάρτῃ, προσεκαλέσατο τὸν θυγατριδοῦν καὶ, μέχρι τίνος, φησὶν, ὃ τέκνον, με κατέχετε; δέομαι, σπεύσατε, καὶ με θάττον ἀπολύσατε, τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μοί τινα κἀλεσον· καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν, πάλιν ἦν ἄφωνος. ἔδραμεν ὁ παῖς ἐπὶ τὸν πρεσβύτερον· νύξ δὲ ἦν· κἀκείνος ἠσθένει· ἀφικέσθαι μὲν οὐκ ἐδυνήθη· ἐντολῆς δὲ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δεδομένης, τοὺς ἀπαλλασσομένους τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέονται, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ πρότερον ἰκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν, ἀφίεσθαι, ἢ εὐέλπιδες ἀπαλλασσόμενοι, βραχὺ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἐπέδωκε τῷ παιδαρίῳ, ἀποβρέξαι κελεύσας, καὶ τῷ πρεσβύτῃ κατὰ τοῦ στόματος ἐπιστάξαι· ἐπήνηκεν ὁ παῖς φέρον· ἐγγύς τε γενομένου, πρὶν εἰσ-

ελθεῖν, ἀνενέγκας πάλιν ὁ Σαραπίων, Ἦκε, ἔφη, τέκνον; καὶ ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτερος ἐλθεῖν οὐκ ἠδυνήθη, σὺ δὲ ποιήσον ταχέως τὸ προσταχθέν, καὶ ἀπαλλαστέ με· ἀπέβρεξεν τε ὁ παῖς, καὶ ἅμα τε ἐνέχεε τῷ στόματι· καὶ μικρὸν ἐκείνος καταβροχθίσας, εὐθέως ἀπέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. Ἄρ' οὐκ ἐναργῶς διετηρήθη καὶ παρέμεινε ἕως λυθῆ, καὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἐξαλειφθείσης, ἐπὶ πολλοῖς οἷς ἔπραξε καλοῖς ὁμολογήθηναὶ δυνήθη;]

¹ [So Bodl. MS. A. 1616, 1662, K. 1836-1863. Cf. p. 481, note 3; Bale's *Kynge Johan*, p. 62, "No salve that sore can suppell," (quoted s. v. in Halliwell's Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words); and G. Eliot, *Middlemarch*, ch. xlv. p. 332.—*Συφθιέδ*, edd. 1793, and 1865.] 1887.

² 1 Cor. xv. 21. ³ Phil. iii. 11. ⁴ Διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἔπαρσιν. Theophyl. [in Phil. iii. 11. *ἐξανά-*