

## ARTICLE IV.

*Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.*

THIS Article hath also received some accession in the particular expressions of Christ's humiliation. For the first word of it, now generally speaking of his passion, in the most ancient Creeds was no way distinguished from his crucifixion; for as we say, *suffered* and *crucified*, they only, *crucified under Pontius Pilate*<sup>47</sup>: nor was his crucifixion distinguished from his death, but where we read, *crucified, dead, and buried*, they only, *crucified and buried*. Because the chief of his sufferings were on the cross, and he gave up the ghost there; therefore his whole passion and his death were comprehended in his crucifixion.

But again, being he suffered not only on the cross; being it was possible he might have been affixed to that cursed tree, and yet not have died; therefore the Church thought fit to add the rest of his sufferings, as antecedent, and his death, as consequent to his crucifixion.

47 'Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 14. p. ccix.] *Cassian. de Incarn. Domini.* 'Credimus in eum qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus.' *S. August. de Fide et Symb. cap. 5.* [vol. vi. p. 156.] *et de Trin. lib. i. cap. 14.* [c. 13. §. 28. vol. viii. p. 767.] 'Caput nostrum Christus est, crucifixum et sepultum, resuscitatum ascendit in coelum.' *Idem in Psal. cxxxii.* [vol. iv. p. 1488 A.] 'Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus.' *Max. Taurin. Chrysol. Euseb. Gallic.* [Hom. ii. p. 554.] 'Ὁν ἐν Ποντίῳ Πιλάτῳ σταυρωθέντα, ταφέντα.' 'Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus.' *MSS. Armach.* And beside these, a witness without exception, Leo the Great; 'Unigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum et sepultum, omnes etiam in Symbolo confitemur.' *Epist. x. cap. 5.* Afterwards the passion was expressed: 'Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus et sepultus.' *Etherius Uzam.* [p. 344 E.] and the death: 'Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus.' *Auctor lib. de*

*Symb. ad Catechum.* [c. iii. §. 6. S. Aug. vol. vi. p. 550 C.] Not but both these were expressed before in the rule of Faith by Tertullian, but without particular mention of the crucifixion. 'Hunc passum, hunc mortuum, et sepultum.' *Adv. Prax. cap. 2.* [p. 501 B.] As Optatus, 'Passus, mortuus, et sepultus resurrexit.' *lib. i.* [c. i. p. 2.] 'Passus, sepultus, et tertia die resurrexit.' *Capitul. Caroli 82.* And generally the ancients did understand determinately his crucifying by that more comprehensive name of his suffering. For as Marcellus and St. Cyril have σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα, Eusebius and the Nicene Council to the same purpose have παθόντα only in their Creeds. As St. Clemens Alexandrinus, Τὴν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν πίστιν, τὴν εἰς τὸν παθόντα ὁμολογίαν. *Paed. lib. ii. cap. 3.* [vol. i. p. 189.] Which was farther enlarged afterwards by the Council of Constantinople into σταυρωθέντα, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα.

To begin then with his passion in general. In those words, *He suffered under Pontius Pilate*, we are to consider part as substantial, part as circumstantial. The substance of this part of the Article consisteth in our Saviour's passion, *He suffered*: the circumstance of time is added, declared by the present governor, *under Pontius Pilate*.

Now for the explication of our Saviour's passion, as distinct from those particulars which follow in the Article, more, I conceive, cannot be required than that we shew, *who* it was that suffered, *how* he suffered, *what* it was he suffered.

First, if we would clearly understand him that suffered in his full relation to his passion, we must consider him both in his office and his person; as Jesus Christ, and as the only-begotten Son of God. In respect of his office, we believe that he which was the Christ did suffer; and so we make profession to be saved by faith in a suffering Messiah. Of which that we may give a just account, first, we must prove that the promised Messiah was to suffer: for if he were not, then by professing that our Jesus suffered, we should declare he was not Christ. 182 Secondly, we must shew that Jesus, whom we believe to be the Messiah, did really and truly suffer: for if he did not, then while we proved the true Messiah was to suffer, we should conclude our Jesus was not that Messiah. Thirdly, it will farther be advantageous for the illustration of this truth, to manifest that the sufferings of the Messiah were determined and foretold, as those by which he should be known. And fourthly, it will then be necessary to shew that our Jesus did truly suffer whatsoever was so determined and foretold. And more than this cannot be necessary to declare *who* it was that suffered, in relation to his office.

For the first of these, that the promised Messiah was to suffer, to all Christians it is unquestionable; because our Saviour did constantly instruct the Apostles in this truth, both before his death, that they might expect it, and after, that they might be confirmed by it. And one part of the doctrine which St. Paul disseminated through the world was this, *that the Christ must needs have suffered*.

But because these testimonies will satisfy only such as believe in Jesus, and our Saviour himself did refer the disbelieving Jews to the Law and the Prophets, as those who testified of him; we will shew from thence, even from the oracles committed to the

Jews, *how it was written of the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things*; and how the Spirit of Christ which was in the Prophets testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ. Mark ix.  
12.  
1 Pet. i. 11.

The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is beyond all question a sad, but clear, description of a suffering person: *a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, oppressed and afflicted, wounded and bruised, brought to the slaughter, and cut off out of the land of the living*. But the person of whom that chapter treateth was certainly the Messiah, as we have formerly proved by the confession of the most ancient Jews<sup>48</sup>, and may farther be evidenced both

<sup>48</sup> Page 155, note 57, we shewed by the authority of the Targum, the *Bere-shith Rabba*, and the *Midrash* upon Ruth, and by the confession of Solomon Jarchi and Moses Alshech, that the ancient Rabbins did interpret that chapter of the Messiah; which might seem a sufficient acknowledgment. But because this is the most considerable controversy between us and the Jews, it will not seem unnecessary to prove the same truth by farther testimonies. In the Talmud, *Cod. Sanhedrin*, [fol. 98vo.] to the question, *What is the name of the Messiah?* it is answered, הַיּוֹרָא הַלֵּפֶר. And the reason of the name is there rendered, שְׂנֵאמַר *because it is spoken in this*, Isa. liii. 4. *Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken*, i. e. נִגְרַע. And because הַנִּגְרַע is used of the leprosy, Levit. xiii. 13. therefore from נִגְרַע they concluded his name to be a *Leper*, and consequently did interpret that place of the Messiah. In the *Pesikta* it is written, הַרְצִיָּה הַרְצִיָּה הַרְצִיָּה *God produced the soul of the Messiah, and said unto him, Wilt thou redeem my sons after 6000 years? He answered, I will. Wilt thou bear the chastisements, to take away their sins? הַרְצִיָּה רַחֲמֵי אֲבֹתַי אֲנִי הַיּוֹרָא* As it is written, Isa. liii. 4. *Surely he hath borne our griefs. And he answered, I will bear them with joy*. Which is a clear testimony, considering the opinion of the Jews that all souls of men were created in the beginning, and so the soul of the Messiah to suffer for the rest. The shift of the Jews, turning these expressions off from the Messiah, and attributing of them to the people as to one, is something ancient: for we

find that Origen was urged with that exposition in a disputation with the Jews. Μέννημαι δέ ποτε ἐν τινι πρὸς τοὺς λεγομένους παρὰ Ἰουδαίους σοφούς ἐκζητήσει ταῖς προφητείαις ταύταις χρησάμενος· ἐφ' οἷς ἔλεγεν ὁ Ἰουδαῖος ταῦτα πεπορητεῦσθαι ὡς περὶ ἐνὸς τοῦ ὄλου λαοῦ, καὶ γενομένου ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, καὶ πληγέντος, ἵνα πολλοὶ προσήλυτοι γένωνται, τῇ προφᾶσει τοῦ ἐπεσπάρθαι Ἰουδαίους τοῖς πολλοῖς ἔθνεσι. Thus the Jew interpreted those places, Isa. lii. 14. *His visage was so marred more than any man*; lii. 15. *That which had not been told them shall they see*; liii. 3. *A man of sorrow, and acquainted with grief*: and applied them to the people of Israel in their dispersions. But Origen did easily refute him, by retorting other places of the same prophecy, as liii. 4. *Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows*; verse 5. *He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, and with his stripes are we healed*. Σαφῶς γάρ, says he, οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις γενόμενοι, καὶ ἰαθέντες, ἐκ τοῦ τὸν σωτήρα πεπονθέναι, εἴτ' ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ ἐκείνου, εἶτε καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔθνων, ταῦτα λέγουσι. But especially he confounded the Jew with those words of the 8th verse, *He was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgressions of my people was he stricken*. Μάλιστα δὲ ἐδόξαμεν θλίβειν, ἀπὸ τῆς φασκουσύνης λέξεως τὸ, Ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ λαὸς κατ' ἐκείνους εἰσὶν οἱ προφητεούμενοι, πῶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγεται ἤχθαι εἰς θάνατον οὗτος, εἰ μὴ ἕτερος ὢν παρὰ τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ; τίς δ' οὗτος εἰ μὴ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός; Orig. cont. Cels. lib. i. [c. 55. vol. i. p. 370.]

Mark ix.

12.

Luke xxiv.  
26, 46.

Acts xvii. 3.

from them, and from the place itself. For surely no man's *soul* can be *made an offering for our sins*, but our Saviour's: nor hath God *laid on any man the iniquity of us all*, but on our Redeemer. Upon no person but the Messiah could the chastisement of our peace be; nor with any stripes could we be healed but his. It is sufficiently then demonstrated by the Prophet, that the suffering Person whom he describes was to be the Christ, in that he *bare our griefs, and carried our sorrows*.

This prediction is so clear, ever since the *serpent was to bruise 183 the heel of the woman's seed*, that the Jews, who were resolved to expect a Messiah which should be only glorious, have been forced to invent another, which should suffer. And then they answer us with a distinction of their own invention; That a Messiah was to redeem us, and a Messiah was to suffer for us: but the same Messiah was not both to redeem us and to suffer for us. For they say that there are two several persons promised under the name of the Messiah<sup>49</sup>; one of the tribe of Ephraim, the other of the tribe of Judah; one the Son of Joseph, the other the Son of David; the one to precede, fight, and suffer death, the other to follow, conquer, triumph, reign, and never to die. If then our Saviour were a Christ, we must confess he was a suffering Messiah, and consequently, according to their doctrine, not a Saviour. For if he were the Son of David, then, say they, he was never to die; or if he ever died, he was not that Messiah which was promised to sit upon the throne of David. And while we confess our Saviour died, and

<sup>49</sup> So indeed the Jews expect a double Messiah, one, משיח בן יוסף *Messias the son of Joseph*, the other, משיח בן דוד *Messias the son of David*. So the Targum expressly upon the Canticles iv. 5. הריין טריקיך דעחידין למשקין. *Two are thy deliverers which shall deliver thee, Messias the son of David, and Messias the son of Ephraim*: and in the same manner, chap. vii. 3. This that Paraphrast, nothing so ancient as the rest, is conceived to have taken out of the Talmud in *Massecheth Succa* [fol. 52v.] where, cap. 5. יהוה לילי, God saith to Messias the son of David, שאל מה אהא *Ask what thou wilt*, (according to the second Psalm,) and I will give it thee. כיון שראה משיח בן יוסף שנהרג *Who seeing Messias the son of Joseph*

*which was slain, asked of God nothing but life*. Thus from the Talmud and the later Targum the Rabbins have generally taught a double Messiah, one the son of David, the other of Joseph. As Solomon Jarchi, Isa. xxiv. 18. Zach. xii. 10. Aben Ezra, Zach. ix. 9. Malach. iii. 1. Kimchi, Zach. xii. 10. whom the later Jews constantly follow. And this Marcion the heretic seems to have learned of the Jews, and to have taught with some alteration in favour of his own opinion. 'Constitutum Marcion alium esse Christum, qui Tiberianis temporibus a Deo quondam ignoto revelatus sit in salutem omnium gentium; alium, qui a Deo creator in restitutionem Judaici status sit destinatus, quandoque venturus.' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib. iv. cap. 6.* [p. 416 C.]

withal assert his descent from the house of David, we do, in their opinion, involve ourselves in a contradiction.

But this distinction of a double Messiah is far from prevailing over our belief: first, because it is in itself false, and therefore of no validity against us; secondly, because it was first invented to counterfeit the truth, and so very advantageous to us.

That it is in itself false, will appear, because the Scriptures never mention any Messiah of the tribe of Ephraim; neither was there ever any promise of that nature made to any of the sons or offspring of Joseph. Beside, as we acknowledge but one Mediator between God and man, so the Scriptures never mention any Messiah but one. Under whatsoever title he is represented to us, there can be no pretence for a double person. Whether the *seed of the woman*, or the *seed of Abraham*, whether *Shiloh*, or the *son of David*, still one person promised: and the style of the ancient Jews before our Saviour was, not they, but he *which is to come*. The question which was asked him, when 'Ο ἐρχόμενος. he professed himself to be Christ, was, whether it was he which *was to come*, or whether they were to *look for another?* not that Matt. xi. 3. they could look for him and for another also. The objection then was, that Elias was not yet come, and therefore they expected no Messiah till Elias came. Nor can the difference of the Messiah's condition be any true reason of imagining a double person, because in the same place the Prophets, speaking of the Zech. ix. 9. same person, indifferently represent him in either condition. Isa. ix. 6. Being then, by the confession of all the Jews, one Messiah was to be the Son of David, whom Elias was to precede; being by the tenor of the Scriptures there was never promise made of more Christs than one, and never the least mention of the tribe of Ephraim with any such relation; it followeth that that distinction is in itself false.

Again, that the same distinction, framed and contrived against 184 us, must needs be in any indifferent person's judgment advantageous to us, will appear, because the very invention of a double person is a plain confession of a twofold condition; and the different relations, which they prove not, are a convincing argument for the distinct economies, which they deny not. Why should they pretend to expect one to die, and another to triumph, but that the true Messiah was both to triumph and to die, to be humbled and to be exalted, to put on the rags of our infirmity

before the robe of majesty and immortality? Why should they tell us of one Mediator to be conquered, and the other to be victorious, but that the serpent was to bruise the heel of the seed of the woman, and the same seed to bruise his head? Thus even while they endeavour to elude, they confirm our faith; and, as if they were still under the cloud, their error is but as a shadow to give a lustre to our truth. And so our first assertion remaineth firm; the promised Messiah was to suffer.

Secondly, that Jesus, whom we believe to be Christ, did suffer, we shall not need to prove, because it is freely confessed by all his enemies. The Gentiles acknowledged it, the Jews triumphed at it. And we may well take that for granted, which is so far from being denied, that it is objected. If hunger and thirst, if revilings and contempt, if sorrows and agonies, if stripes and buffetings, if condemnation and crucifixion, be sufferings, Jesus suffered. If the infirmities of our nature, if the weight of our sins, if the malice of man, if the machinations of Satan, if the hand of God could make him suffer, our Saviour suffered. If the annals of times, if the writings of his Apostles, if the death of his Martyrs, if the confession of the Gentiles, if the scoffs of the Jews, be testimonies, Jesus suffered. Nor was there ever any which thought he did not really and truly suffer, but such as withal irrationally pretended he was not really and truly man<sup>50</sup>.

50 Those which were called by the Greeks *Δοκηταί* and *Φαντασιασταί*, who taught that Christ was man only *putative*, and came into the world only *in phantasmate*, and consequently that he did only *putative pati*. These were called *Δοκηταί*, not from their author, but from their opinion, that Christ did all things only *ἐν δοκῆσει*, *in appearance*, not reality. As Clemens Alexandrinus, *Τῶν αἰρέσεων αἱ μὲν ἀπὸ δογμάτων ἰδιαζόντων προσαγορεύονται, ὡς ἡ τῶν Δοκητῶν*. *Strom. lib. vii.* [c. 17. vol. ii. p. 900.] *viz. οἱ δοκῆσει Χριστὸν πεφανερῶσθαι ὑπέλαβον*. *Idem. lib. vi.* 'Neque in phantasia, id est, absque carne, sicut Valentinus asserit, neque de thesi, putative imaginatum, sed verum corpus.' *Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm. cap. 2.* [S. Aug. vol. viii. App. p. 75 C.] where

for *de thesi*, I suppose we should read *δοκῆσει*. The original of this train of heretics is to be fetched from Simon Magus, whose assertion was 'Christum nec venisse, nec a Judæis quicquam pertulisse.' *S. August. Hæres. 1.\** Wherefore making himself the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he affirmed, 'se in Filii persona putative apparuisse,' and so that he suffered as the Son amongst the Jews; *ἀληθεία μὴ πεπονθέναι δὲ, ἀλλὰ δοκῆσει μόνον*. *Damasc. de Hæres.* Now what Simon Magus said of himself, when he made himself the Son, that those who followed affirmed of Christ. As Saturninus, who taught, 'Christum in substantia corporis non fuisse, et phantasmate tantum quasi passum fuisse.' *Tertul. de Præscr. adv. Hæret. cap. 46.* [p. 219 D.] *Vide*

Thirdly, to come yet nearer to the particular acknowledgment of this truth, we shall farther shew that the promised Messiah was not only engaged to suffer for us, but by a certain and express agreement betwixt him and the Father, the measure and manner of his sufferings were determined, in order to the redemption itself which was thereby to be wrought; and what was so resolved, was before his coming in the flesh revealed to the Prophets, and written by them, in order to the reception of the Messiah, and the acceptation of the benefits to be procured by his sufferings.

That what the Messiah was to undergo for us was predetermined and decreed, appeareth by the timely acknowledgment of the Church unto the Father; *Of a truth, against thy holy child* Acts iv. 27, 185 *Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.* For as when the two goats were presented before Lev. xvi. 8. the Lord, that goat was to be offered for a sin-offering upon which the lot of the Lord should fall; and that lot of the Lord was lift up on high in the hand of the high priest, and then laid upon the head of the goat which was to die: so the *hand* of God is said to have *determined* what should be done unto our Saviour, whose passion was typified by that sin-offering. And well may we say that the *hand* of God as well as his *counsel determined* his passion, because he was *delivered by the determinate counsel and* Acts ii. 23. *foreknowledge of God.*

*Epiph. mutilum, Hæres. xxiii. §. 1.* [p. 62.] And Basilides, who delivered, *εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν φαντασίαν ἐν τῷ φαίνεσθαι, μὴ εἶναι δὲ ἄνθρωπον, μηδὲ σάρκα εἰληφέναι—οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν φύσκων πεπονθέναι, ἀλλὰ Σίμωνα τὸν Κυρηναῖον*. *S. Epiph. Hæres. xxiv. §. 3.* [p. 70 D.] 'A Judæis non credunt Christum crucifixum, sed Simonem Cyrenensem, qui angariatus sustulit crucem ejus.' *S. August. Hæres. 4.\** Thus the Valentinians, particularly Marcus, the father of the Marcosian heretics: 'Marcus etiam nescio quis hæresim condidit, negans resurrectionem carnis, et Christum non vere, sed putative, passum asseverans.' *S. August. Hæres. 14.* [vol. viii. p. 8 C.] Thus Cerdon;

'Christum in substantia carnis negat, in phantasmate solo fuisse pronunciat, nec omnino passum, sed quasi passum.' *Tertul. de Præscr. Hæret. cap. 51.* [p. 222 D.] 'Christum ipsum neque natum ex femina, neque habuisse carnem, nec vere mortuum vel quicquam passum, sed simulasse passionem.' *S. August. Hæres. 21.* [p. 9 B.] And the Manichees, who taught, 'Christum—non fuisse in carne vera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus præbuisse; ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem, mentiretur.' *Idem, Hæres. 46.* [p. 16 F.] Whom therefore Vincentius Lirinensis calls 'Phantasiæ prædicatores,' *cap. 20.* [p. 242 F.]

\* [The Benedictine editors reject these words, vol. viii. p. 6.]

\* [The Benedictine editors reject these words, vol. viii. p. 6.]

And this determination of God's counsel was thus made upon a covenant or agreement between the Father and the Son, in which it was concluded by them both what he should suffer, what he should receive. For beside the covenant made by God with man, confirmed by the blood of Christ, we must consider and acknowledge another covenant from eternity made by the Father with the Son: which partly is expressed by the Prophet,

Isa. liii. 10. *If he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed,*

Heb. x. 7. *he shall prolong his days; partly by the Apostle, Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. In the condition of making his soul an offering for sin, we see propounded whatsoever he suffered; in the acceptance, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God, we see undertaken whatsoever was propounded. The determination therefore of our Saviour's passion was made by covenant of the Father who sent, and the Son who suffered.*

And as the sufferings of the Messiah were thus agreed on by consent, and determined by the counsel of God; so they were revealed by the Spirit of God unto the Prophets, and by them delivered to the Church; they were involved in the types, and acted in the sacrifices. Whether therefore we consider the prophecies spoken by God in the mouths of men, they clearly relate unto his sufferings by proper prediction; or whether we look upon the ceremonial performances, they exhibit the same by an active representation. St. Paul's apology was clear, that he

Acts xxvi. 22, 23. *said none other things but those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come, that Christ should suffer.* The Prophets said in express terms that the Messiah, whom they foretold, should suffer; Moses said so in those ceremonies which were instituted by his ministry. When he caused the passover to be slain, he said that Shiloh was the Lamb slain before the foundations of the world. When he set the brazen serpent up in the wilderness, he said, the Son of Man should be lifted up upon the cross. When he commanded all the sacrifices for sin, he said, without effusion of blood there was no remission, and therefore the Son of God must die for the sins of men. When he appointed Aaron to go into the Holy of Holies on the day of Atonement, he said, Christ, our High Priest, should never enter through the veil into the highest heavens to make expiation for us, but by his own blood. If then we look upon the fountain, the eternal counsel of the will of God, if we look upon the revelation of

that counsel, either in express predictions or ceremonial representations, we shall clearly see the truth of our third assertion, That the sufferings of the promised Messiah were predetermined and foretold.

Now all these sufferings which were thus agreed, determined, and revealed as belonging to the true Messiah, were undergone by that Jesus of Nazareth, whom we believe to be the true Christ. Never was there any suffering type which he outwent not, never prediction of any passion which he fulfilled not, never any expression of grief and sorrow which he felt not. When the appointed time of his death approached, he said to his Ap-  
186 stles, *Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written* Luke xviii. *by the Prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished.* 31. When he delivered them the blessed sacrament, the commemoration of his death, he said, *Truly the Son of Man goeth as it was* Luke xxii. *determined.* After his resurrection, he chastised the dulness of his Disciples, who were so overwhelmed with his passion, that they could not look back upon the antecedent predictions; saying unto them, *O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the* Luke xxiv. *Prophets have spoken! ought not Christ to have suffered these* 25, 26. *things, and to enter into his glory?* After his ascension St. Peter made this profession before the Jews, who had those prophecies, and saw his sufferings; *Those things which God before had shewed* Acts iii. 18. *by the mouth of all his Prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.* Whatsoever therefore was determined by the counsel of God, whatsoever was revealed by the Prophets concerning the sufferings of the Messiah, was all fulfilled by that Jesus whom we believe to be, and worship as, the Christ. Which is the fourth and last assertion propounded to express our Saviour's passion in relation to his office.

Having considered him that *suffered* in his office, we are next to consider him in his person. And being in all this Article there is no person expressly named or described, we must look back upon the former, till we find his description and his name. The Article immediately preceding leaves us in the same suspension; but for our satisfaction refers us to the former, where we find him named Jesus, and described *the only-begotten Son of God.*

Now this Son of God we have already shewed to be therefore truly called the *Only-begotten*, because he was from all eternity generated of the essence of the Father, and therefore is, as the

eternal Son, so also the eternal God. Wherefore by the immediate coherence of the Articles<sup>51</sup>, and necessary consequence of the Creed, it plainly appeareth that the eternal Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, *suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.* For it was no other person which *suffered under Pontius Pilate*, than he which *was born of the Virgin Mary*; he which *was born of the Virgin Mary*, was no other person than he *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost*; he *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost*, was no other person than *our Lord*; and that *our Lord* no other than the *only Son of God*: therefore by the immediate coherence of the Articles it followeth, that *the only Son of God, our Lord, suffered under Pontius Pilate.* That Word which was in the beginning, which then was with God, and was God, in the fulness of time being made flesh, did suffer. For the *princes of this world crucified the Lord of glory*<sup>52</sup>; and *God purchased his church with his own blood.* That Person which was begotten of the Father before all worlds, and so was really the *Lord of glory* and most truly *God*, took upon him the nature of man, and in that nature, being still the same Person which before he was, did suffer. When our Saviour fasted forty days, there was no other person hungry, than that Son of God which made the world; when he sat down weary by the well, there was no other person felt that thirst, but he which was eternally begotten of the Father the fountain of the Deity; when he was buffeted and scourged, there was no other person sensible of those pains, than that eternal Word which before all worlds was impassible; when he was crucified and died, there was no other person which gave up the ghost, but the Son of him, and so of the same nature with him, *who only hath immortality.* And thus we conclude our first consideration propounded, viz. Who it was which suffered; affirming that, in respect of his office, it was the Messias, in respect of his Person, it was God the Son.

But the perfect probation and illustration of this truth requireth first a view of the second particular propounded, How, or in what he suffered. For while we prove the Person suffering to be God, we may seem to deny the passion, of which the

perfection of the Godhead is incapable. The Divine nature is of infinite and eternal happiness, never to be disturbed by the least degree of infelicity, and therefore subject to no sense of misery. Wherefore while we profess that the Son of God did suffer for us, we must so far explain our assertion, as to deny that the Divine nature of our Saviour suffered. For being the Divine nature of the Son is common to the Father and the Spirit, if that had been the subject of his passion, then must the Father and the Spirit have suffered. Wherefore as we ascribe the passion to the Son alone, so must we attribute it to that nature which is his alone, that is, the human. And then neither the Father nor the Spirit will appear to suffer, because neither the Father nor the Spirit, but the Son alone, is man, and so capable of suffering.

Whereas then the humanity of Christ consisteth of a soul and body, these were the proper subject of his passion; nor could he suffer any thing but in both or either of these two. For as the *Word was made flesh*, though the Word was never made<sup>53</sup>, (as John i. 14. being in the beginning God,) but the flesh, that is, the humanity, was made, and the Word assuming it became flesh; so saith St. Peter, *Christ suffered for us in the flesh*, in that nature of man which he took upon him: and so God the Son did suffer, not in that nature in which he was begotten of the Father before all worlds, but in that flesh which by his incarnation he became. For he was *put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit*<sup>54</sup>; suffered in the weakness of his humanity, but rose by the power of his divinity. As he was *made of the seed of David according to the flesh*, in the language of St. Paul; so was he *put to death in the flesh*, in the language of St. Peter: and as he was *declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness*; so was he *quickened by the Spirit.* Thus the proper subject and recipient of our Saviour's passion, which he underwent for us, was that nature which he took from us.

Far be it therefore from us to think that the Deity, which is immutable, could suffer; which only hath immortality, could

<sup>51</sup> This is that *inseparabilis connexio* in the Creed, which Cassianus urgeth so much against Nestorius. *de Incarn. lib. vi.*

<sup>52</sup> 'Dominum passum symboli tenet

authoritas, et Apostolus tradidit, dicens, *Si enim cognovissent, nunquam Dominum gloriæ crucifixissent.* *Vigil. adv. Eutych. lib. ii. [c. 8. p. 20.]*

<sup>53</sup> 'Ο λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο—ἵνα καὶ ὁ λόγος αἰεὶ ἦ λόγος, καὶ σάρκα ἔχη ὁ λόγος, ἐν ᾗ τὸ πάθος καὶ τὸν θάνατον ἀνεδέξατο ἐν μορφῇ τῆ ἀνθρωπίνῃ, μέχρι τάφου, καὶ ᾧδου ἐπιβὰς. *S. Athanas. de Incarn. Dom. cont. Apol. lib. i. cap. 12. [vol. i. pt. ii. p. 932 B.]*

<sup>54</sup> Adeo salva est utriusque propri-

etas substantiæ, ut et Spiritus res suas egerit in illo, id est, virtutes et opera et signa; et caro passiones suas functa sit, esuriens sub Diabolo, sitiens sub Samaritide, fiens Lazarum, anxia usque ad mortem, denique et mortua est. *Tertul. adv. Prax. cap. 27. [p. 517 A.] S. Clem. Alex. Pæd. lib. i. cap. 5.*

die. The conjunction with humanity could put no imperfection upon the divinity; nor can that infinite nature by any external acquisition be any way changed in its intrinsic and essential perfections<sup>55</sup>. If the bright rays of the sun are thought to insinuate into the most noisome bodies without any pollution of themselves, how can that spiritual essence contract the least infirmity by any union with humanity<sup>56</sup>? We must neither harbour so low an estimation of the Divine nature, as to conceive it capable of any diminution; nor so mean esteem of the essence of the Word, as to imagine it subject to the sufferings of the flesh he took; nor yet so groundless an estimation of the great mystery of the incarnation, as to make the properties of one nature mix in confusion with the other. These were the wild collections of the Arian and Apollinarian heretics<sup>57</sup>, whom the Church hath long since silenced by a sound and sober assertion, that all the sufferings of our Mediator were subjected in his human nature.

<sup>55</sup> Τὸ γὰρ φύσει ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον ἂν τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν, οὐ συναλλοιούμενον τῇ ταπεινῇ φύσει, ὅταν ἐν ἐκείνῃ κατ' οἰκονομίαν γένηται. *S. Greg. Nyss. Epist. ad Eustath.* [vol. iii. p. 657 D.]

<sup>56</sup> Ὡς οὐδ' ἡλιακοῦ φωτὸς πάθειεν τι ἀκτῖνες τὰ πάντα πληροῦσαι, καὶ σωματῶν νεκρῶν καὶ οὐ καθαρῶν ἐφαπτόμεναι· πολλὸν πλέον ἢ ἀσώματος τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις ὄντ' ἐν πάθῳ τὴν οὐσίαν, ὄντ' ἐν βλαβείῃ—σώματος ἀσωμάτως ἐπαφωμένη. *Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. iv. cap. 13.* [p. 168 A.]

<sup>57</sup> This danger is the rather to be unfolded, because it is not generally understood. The heresy of Arius, as it was condemned by the Council of Nice, is known to all. But that he made the nature of the Word to suffer in the flesh, is not so frequently or plainly delivered. This Phœbadius (the first of the Latin Church who wrote against the Arians) chargeth them with. 'Duplicem hunc statum, non conjunctum, sed confusum, vultis videri; ut etiam unus vestrum, id est epistola Potamii, quæ ad orientem et occidentem transmissa est, qua asserit, carne et spiritu Christi coagulatis per sanguinem Mariæ, et in unum corpus redactis, passibilem Deum factum. Hoc ideo, ne quis illum ex eo crederet, quem impassibilem satis constat.' *Lib. adv. Arianos,*

*cap. 7.* [c. 5. p. 251 A.] And again; 'Non ergo sit spiritus caro, nec caro spiritus, quod isti volunt egregii doctores, ut factus sit scilicet Dominus et Deus noster ex hac substantiarum permutatione passibilis. Ideo autem passibilem volunt dici, ne ex impassibili credatur.' *cap. 8. Μάτην οὖν Ἀρειανοὶ σοφίζονται σάρκα μόνην ὑποτιθέμενοι ἀπειληθέναι τὸν Σωτῆρα, τὴν δὲ τοῦ πάθους νόησιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπαθῆ θεότητα ἀναφέροντες ἀσεβῶς. S. Athanas. de Incarn. Dom. cont. Apol. lib. i. cap. 15.* [vol. i. pt. ii. p. 935 B.] Of this St. Hilary is to be understood: 'Sed eorum omnis hic sensus est, ut opinentur metum mortis in Dei Filium incidisse, qui asserunt non de æternitate esse prolatum, neque de infinitate paternæ substantiæ existisse, sed ex nullo per eum qui omnia creavit effectum; ut assumptus ex nihilo sit, et cœptus ex opere, et confirmatus ex tempore. Et ideo in eo doloris anxietas, ideo spiritus passio cum corporis passione.' *Com. in Mat. cap. 31.* [p. 742 B.] where clearly he argues against the Arians. The right understanding whereof is the only true way to reconcile those harsh sayings of his, which so troubled the Master of the Sentences, and the whole Schools ever since.

188 And now the only difficulty will consist in this, how we can reconcile the person suffering with the subject of his passion; how we can say that God did suffer, when we profess the God-head suffered not. But this seeming difficulty will admit an easy solution, if we consider the intimate conjunction of the Divine and human nature, and their union in the person of the Son. For hereby those attributes which properly belong unto the one are given to the other<sup>58</sup>; and that upon good reason. For being the same individual Person is, by the conjunction of the nature of God and the nature of man, really and truly both God and man; it necessarily followeth, that it is true to say, *God is man*, and as true, *A man is God*: because in this particular he which is man is God, and he which is God is man. Again, being by reason of the incarnation it is proper to say, *God is man*, it followeth unavoidably, that whatsoever necessarily belongeth to the human nature may be spoken of God; otherwise there would be a man to whom the nature of man did not belong, which were a contradiction. And being by virtue of the same incarnation it is also proper to say, *A man is God*, by the same necessity of consequence we must acknowledge, that all the essential attributes of the Divine nature may truly be spoken of that man; otherwise there would be one truly and properly God, to whom the nature of God did not belong, which is a clear repugnancy. Again, if the properties of the Divine nature may be truly attributed to that man which is God, then may those actions which flow from those properties be attributed to the same. And being the properties of the human nature may be also attributed to the eternal Son of God, those actions or passions which did proceed from those properties may be attributed to the same Son of God, or God the Son. Wherefore as God the Son is truly man, and as man truly passible and mortal; so God the Son did truly suffer, and did truly die. And this is the only true communication of properties<sup>59</sup>.

<sup>58</sup> 'Per indissolubilem unitatem Verbi et carnis, omnia quæ carnis sunt ascribuntur et Verbo, quomodo et quæ Verbi sunt prædicantur in carne.' *Orig. in Epist. ad Rom. lib. i. cap. 1.* [§. 6. p. 467 B.] Διὰ τὴν ἀκριβῆ ἐνόητα τῆς τε προσληφθείσης σαρκὸς, καὶ τῆς προσλαβομένης θεότητος, ἀντιμεθ στανται τὰ ὀνόματα· ὥστε καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τῷ θεῷ,

καὶ τὸ θεῖον τῷ ἀνθρώπινῳ, κατονομάζονται. *S. Greg. Nyss. Epist. ad Theoph.* [vol. iii. p. 265 D.] Χρῆ μέντοι εἶδέναι ὡς ἡ ἕνωσις κοινὰ ποιεῖ τὰ ὀνόματα. *Theodoret. Dial. iii. cap. 17.* [vol. iv. p. 151 C.]

<sup>59</sup> Called by the Schools ordinarily *Communicatio idiomatum*: by the ancient Greek divines Ἀντιθέσις, and sometimes Ἀντιμετάστασις.

Not that the essential properties of one nature are really communicated to the other nature, as if the Divinity of Christ were passible and mortal, or his humanity of original omnipotence and omnipresence; but because the same God the Son was also the Son of Man, he was at the same time both mortal and eternal: mortal, as the Son of Man, in respect of his humanity; eternal, as the Son of God, in respect of his Divinity. The sufferings therefore of the Messiah were the sufferings of God the Son: not that they were the sufferings of his Deity, as of which that was incapable; but the sufferings of his humanity, as unto which that was inclinable. For although the human nature was conjoined to the Divine, yet it suffered as much as if it had been alone; and the Divine as little suffered as if it had not been conjoined: because each kept their respective properties distinct, without the least confusion in their most intimate conjunction. From whence at last the person suffering is reconciled to the subject of his passion: for God the Son being not only God, but also man, suffered, though not in his Deity, by reason of which he is truly God; yet in his humanity, by which he who is truly God, is as truly man. And thus we conclude our two first disquisitions, Who it was that suffered; in respect of his office, the Messiah; in respect of his person, God the Son: How it was he suffered; not in his Deity, which is impassible, 189 but in his humanity, which he assumed, clothed with our infirmities.

Our next inquiry is, What this God the Son did suffer as the Son of man; not in the latitude of all his sufferings, but so far as they are comprehended in this Article; which first prescindeth all the antecedent part by the expression of time, *under Pontius Pilate*, who was not governor of Judæa long before our Saviour's baptism; and then takes off his concluding passion, by adding his crucifixion and his death. Looking then upon the sufferings of our Saviour in the time of his preaching the Gospel, and especially before his death, we shall best understand them by considering them in relation to the subject or recipient of them. And being we have already shewed his passion was wholly subjected in his human nature, being that nature consisteth of two parts, the soul and body; it will be necessary to declare what he suffered in the body, what in the soul.

For the first, As we believe the Son of God took upon him the nature of man, of which the body is a part: so we acknow-

ledge that he took a true and real body, so as to become flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone. This body of Christ, really and truly human, was also frail and mortal, as being accompanied with all those natural properties which necessarily flow from the condition of a frail and mortal body: and though now the same body, exalted above the highest heavens, by virtue of its glorification be put beyond all possibility of passion, yet in the time of his humiliation it was clothed with no such glorious perfection; but as it was subject unto, so it felt weariness, hunger, and thirst. Nor was it only liable to those internal weaknesses and natural infirmities, but to all outward injuries and violent impressions. As all our corporal pain consists in that sense which ariseth from the solution of that continuity which is con-natural to the parts of our body, so no parts of his sacred body were injuriously violated by any outward impression, but he was truly and fully sensible of the pain arising from that violation. Deep was that sense, and grievous was that pain, which those scourges produced, *when the ploughers ploughed upon his back and made long their furrows*: the dilaceration of those nervous parts created a most sharp and dolorous sensation. The coronary thorns did not only express the scorn of the imposers, by that figure into which they were contrived; but did also pierce his tender and sacred temples to a multiplicity of pains, by their numerous acuminations. That spear directed by an impertinent malice which opened his side, though it brought forth water and blood, caused no dolorous sensation, because the body was then dead: but the nails which pierced his hands and feet made another kind of impression, while it was yet alive and highly sensible. Thus did the body of the Son of Man truly *suffer* the bitterness of corporal pains and torments inflicted by violent external impressions.

And as our Saviour took upon him both parts of the nature of man, so he *suffered* in them both, that he might be a Saviour of the whole. In what sense the soul is capable of suffering, in that he was subject to animal passion<sup>60</sup>. Evil apprehended to come tormented his soul with fear, which was as truly in him in respect of what he was to suffer, as hope in reference to the recompense of a reward to come after and for his sufferings. Evil apprehended as present tormented the same with sadness,

<sup>60</sup> 'Quia suscepit animam, suscepit *Fide, lib. ii. cap. 3.* [§ 56. vol. ii. p. et animæ passiones.' *S. Ambros. de 480 F.*]



sorrow, and anguish of mind. So that he was truly represented  
 Isa. liii. 3. to us by the Prophet, as *a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief*; and the proper subject of that grief he hath fully expressed who alone felt it, saying unto his disciples, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.*  
 Matt. xxvi. 38.

We ought not therefore to question whether he suffered in his 190  
 soul or no; but rather to endeavour to reach, if it were possible, the knowledge how far and in what degree he suffered; how bitter that grief, how great that sorrow and that anguish was. Which though we can never fully and exactly measure; yet we may infallibly know thus much, both from the expressions of the Spirit of God, and from the occasion of his sufferings, that the griefs and sorrows which he felt, and the anguish which he underwent, were most incomparably far beyond all sorrows of which any person here was sensible or capable.

The Evangelists have in such language expressed his agony, as cannot but raise in us the highest admiration at the bitterness of that passion. *He began to be sorrowful*, saith St. Matthew; *He began to be sore amazed*, saith St. Mark, *and to be very heavy*, say both: and yet these words in our translation come far short of the original expression<sup>61</sup>, which render him suddenly, upon a

Matt. xxvi.  
 37.  
 Mark xiv.  
 33.

61 The words in the original are three, *λυπέσθαι, ἐκθαμβείσθαι, and ἀδημονεῖν*. *Λυπέσθαι*, the first, is of a known and ordinary signification, but in this case it is to be raised to the highest degree of its possible signification, as appears by the words which follow, *Περίλυτος ἔστω ἡ ψυχὴ μου*. For, as the ancient grammarians observe, *Ἡ περὶ πρόθεσις ἐπίτασιν δηλοῖ* and again, *Ἡ περὶ πρόθεσις λαμβάνεται ἀντὶ τῆς ὑπὲρ κατὰ λόγον ὑπερθέσεως καὶ περιττότητος*, and therefore *περίλυτος* of itself must signify a man possessed with an excessive grief; as in Æschylus, [Eum. 161] *περιβαρὺ κρῖος*, that is, according to the Scholiast, *περισσῶς βαρὺ*. But beside this Greek notation, here is to be observed a reference to the words of David, Psal. xlii. 5. *Ἰνατὶ περίλυτος εἶ, ἡ ψυχὴ μου*; *יְהוָה יִשְׁמַח בְּיָדָי*. So that it doth not only signify an excess of sorrow surrounding and encompassing the soul; but also such as brings a consternation and dejection of mind, bowing the soul under the pressure and burden of it. And if neither the nota-

tion of the word, nor the relation to that place in the Psalms did express that sorrow, yet the following part of our Saviour's words would sufficiently evidence it, *ὥς θανάτου*, it was a sorrow which like the *pangs of death* compassed him, and like *the pains of hell* got hold upon him. Psal. cxvi. 3. The second word, used by St. Mark alone, is *ἐκθαμβείσθαι*, which with the Vulgar Latin is *ravere*, but in the language of the Greeks bears a higher sense. *Θάμβος σημαίνει τὴν ἐκπληξιν*, says Etymologus: and Hesychius, *Θάμβος, θαῦμα, ἐκπληξίς*. *Gloss. Vet.* *Θάμβος, stupor*. Philoponus, preserved by Eustathius *Ἰα. μ'. [310] Θάμβος μὲν ἢ ἐκπληξίς· θαμβός δ' ἐκατ' ὀξείαν τάσιν ὁ ἐκπλαγείς*. From hence the verb *θαμβεῖν*, in termination active, in signification passive, *perculsum esse*, in Homer, *Ἰα. α'. 199. Θάμβησεν δ' Ἀχιλεὺς* where it is the observation of Eustathius, *τὸ ἐθάμβησεν ἐνεργητικὸν ἢ νεώτερα χρῆσις οὐκ ἔχει· θαμβούμενοι γὰρ καὶ ἐθαμβήθη καὶ τεθάμβημαι φασὶν οἱ μετ' Ὅμηρον* but not universally true. For (as to our purpose) we have

present and immediate apprehension, possessed with fear, horror, and amazement, encompassed with grief, and overwhelmed with sorrow, pressed down with consternation and dejection of mind, tormented with anxiety and disquietude of spirit.

This he first expressed to his disciples, saying, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful*; and lest they should not fully apprehend the excess, adding, *even unto death*, as if the pangs of death had already encompassed him, and, as the Psalmist speaks, the pains of hell had got hold upon him. He *went but a little farther* before he expressed the same to his Father, falling on his face and praying, even *with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death*. Nor were his cries or tears sufficient evidences of his inward sufferings, nor could the sorrows of his 191  
 breast be poured forth either at his lips or eyes; the innumerable pores of all his body must give a passage to more lively

both the use and sense of this word in the Old Testament. As I Sam. xiv. 15. *γῆ καὶ ἐθάμβησεν ἡ γῆ, and the earth quaked*. And Psal. xlvi. 5. *ἰσχυρῶ, Aquila, ἐθαμβήθησαν, Symmachus, ἐξεπλάγησαν, as Psal. xxxi. 22. Ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει μου, Aquila, θαμβήσει, Symmachus, ἐκπλήξει*. The like is also in the passive termination: as Daniel expresses his fear in a vision, *Ἐθαμβήθη, καὶ πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου, Dan. viii. 17. and the wicked are described by the Wise Man, Θαμβούμενοι δεινῶς, καὶ ἰνδάλμασιν ἐκταρασσόμενοι, Sap. xvii. 3. From whence it appeareth that *θαμβεῖσθαι* of itself signifieth a high degree of fear, horror, and amazement. *Θαμβούμεμαι, Obstusce, stupeo, ravescio. Gloss. Vet.* And by the addition of the preposition ἐξ the signification is augmented. *Ἐκθαμβος, ἐκπληκτος, Hesych.* passively; *Θηριον—φοβερὸν καὶ ἐκθαμβον, Dan. vii. 7. actively, i. e. ἐκπληκτικόν*. Such an augmentation in this word is justifiable by that rule left us in Eustathius *ad Ἰα. ε'. [v. 142]. Ἡ ἐξ πρόθεσις οὐ μόνον τὴν ἕξω δηλοῖ σχέσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔψωμα πολλάκις σημαίνει*. Of which he gives an example in *ἐκνομίως*, used by Aristophanes *in Pluto*, though not named by him. And again, *ad Ἰα. ν'. [v. 278.] Ἡ ἐξ πρόθεσις ἐπίτασιν δηλοῖ, ὅποιαν καὶ τὸ μάλιστα. Ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι therefore is μάλιστα θαμ-**

*βεῖσθαι*, to be surprised with horror in the highest degree, even unto stupefaction. *Ἐκθαμβούμεμαι, obstuscesco, Gloss. Vet.* The third word is *ἀδημονεῖν, Vulg. Lat. tædere*, in St. Mark; *mæstus esse* in St. Matthew: but it hath yet a farther sense. *Ἀδημονῶ, ἀκηδιά, ἀγωνιά*, says Hesychius; *Ἀδημονῶ, τὸ λιαν λυπούμαι. Suid.* It signifieth therefore grief and anguish in excess; as appeareth also by the origination of it. For, as Eustathius observes, *τοῦ ἀδημονεῖν πρωτότυπον ἀδήμων ἀδήμονος, ὁ ἐκ λύπης ὡς οἴα καὶ τινος κόρου, ὃς ἄδος λέγεται, ἀναπεπτακός. Ἰα. λ'. [v. 88.] From ἀδῶ, ἀδήσω, ἀδήμων, from ἀδήμων, ἀδημονῶ*. It hath therefore in it the signification of *ἄδην*, or *λιαν*, *satiety*, or *extremity*. From whence it is ordinarily so expounded, as if it contained the consequence of the greatest fear or sorrow, that is, anxiety of mind, disquietude, and restlessness. *Ἀδημονεῖν, ἀλβεῖν καὶ ἀπορεῖν, ἀμχανεῖν, Etymol.* As Antony is expressed by Plutarch, after the loss of eight thousand men, being in want of all things necessary for the rest, *Κλεοπάτραν περιέμενε, καὶ βραδυνοσῆς ἀδημονεῖν ἤλυε. Vit. Anton. cap. 51. [p. 939 E.]* So where the Heb. *בְּרַחֲמָיו* is by the LXX. translated *ἐκπλαγῆς*, by Symmachus it is rendered *ἀδημονῆς*, Eccles. vii. 16.

representations of the bitter anguish of his soul: and therefore  
 Luke xxii. while he *prayed more earnestly, in that agony his sweat was as*  
 44. *it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.* As the  
 Ps. xxii. 14. Psalmist had before declared; *I am poured out like water, and*  
*all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax, it is melted in*  
*the midst of my bowels.* The heart of our Saviour was as it were  
 melted with fear and astonishment, and all the parts of his body  
 at the same time inflamed with anguish and agony; well then  
 might that melting produce a sweat, and that inflamed and  
 rarefied blood force a passage through the numerous pores.

And as the Evangelist's expressions, so the occasion of the  
 grief, will manifest the height and bitterness thereof. For God  
 Isa. liii. 6. *laid on his own Son the iniquities of us all;* and as we are  
 obliged to be sorry for our particular sins, so was he grieved for  
 the sins of us all. If then we consider the perfection and lati-  
 tude of his knowledge; he understood all the sins of men for  
 which he suffered, all the evil and the guilt, all the offence  
 against the Majesty, and ingratitude against the goodness of  
 God, which was contained in all those sins. If we look upon  
 his absolute conformity to the will of God; he was inflamed  
 with most ardent love, he was most zealous of his glory, and  
 most studious to preserve that right which was so highly vio-  
 lated by those sins. If we look upon his relation to the sons of  
 men; he loved them all far more than they did themselves, he  
 knew those sins were of themselves sufficient to bring eternal  
 destruction on their souls and bodies, he considered them whom  
 he so much loved as lying under the wrath of God whom he so  
 truly worshipped. If we reflect upon those graces which were  
 without measure diffused through his soul, and caused him with  
 the greatest habitual detestation to abhor all sin; if we consider  
 all these circumstances, we cannot wonder at that grief and  
 sorrow. For if the true contrition of one single sinner, bleeding  
 under the sting of the law only for his own iniquities, all which  
 notwithstanding he knoweth not, cannot be performed without  
 great bitterness of sorrow and remorse; what bounds can we  
 set unto that grief, what measures to that anguish, which pro-  
 ceedeth from a full apprehension of all the transgressions of so  
 many millions of sinners?

Add unto all these present apprehensions, the immediate hand  
 of God pressing upon him all this load, laying on his shoulders  
 at once an heap of all the sorrows which can happen unto any

of the saints of God; that he, being *touched with the feeling of* Heb. iv. 15.  
*our infirmities,* might become a *merciful High Priest, able* and ii. 17, 18.  
*willing to succour them that are tempted.* Thus may we behold Lam. i. 12.  
*and see if there be any sorrow like unto that sorrow which was*  
*done unto him, wherewith the Lord afflicted him in the day of his*  
*fierce anger.* And from hence we may and must conclude, that  
 the Saviour of man, as he took the whole nature of man, so he  
 suffered in whatsoever he took: in his body, by internal infirm-  
 ities and external injuries; in his soul, by fears and sorrows, by  
 unknown and inexpressible anguishes. Which shews us fully  
 (if it can be shewn) the third particular propounded, What our  
 Saviour suffered.

That our Saviour did thus *suffer,* is most necessary to believe.  
 First, that thereby we may be assured of the verity of his  
 human nature. For if he were not man, then could not man be  
 redeemed by him; and if that nature in which he appeared were  
 not truly human, then could he not be truly man. But we may  
 be well assured that he took on him our nature, when we see  
 him subject unto our infirmities. We know the Godhead is of  
 infinite perfection, and therefore is exalted far above all possi-  
 bility of molestation. When therefore we see our Saviour truly  
 192 suffer, we know his Divine essence suffered not, and thence  
 acknowledge the addition of his human nature, as the proper  
 subject of his passion. And from hence we may infallibly con-  
 clude, surely that Mediator between God and man was truly  
 man, as we are men, who when he fasted was an hungry, when  
 he travelled was thirsty and weary as we are, who being grieved  
 wept, being in an agony sweat, being scourged bled, and being  
 crucified died.

Secondly, It was necessary Christ should suffer for the re-  
 demption of lapsed men, and their reconciliation unto God;  
 which was not otherwise to be performed than by a plenary  
 satisfaction to his will. He therefore was by all his sufferings  
 made an expiation, atonement, and propitiation for all our sins.  
 For salvation is impossible unto sinners without remission of  
 sin; and remission, in the decree of God, is impossible without  
 effusion of blood. Our redemption therefore could not be  
 wrought but by the blood of the Redeemer, but by a Lamb  
 slain, but by a suffering Saviour.

Thirdly, It behoved Christ to suffer, that he might purchase  
 thereby eternal happiness in the heavens both for himself the

Ps. cx. 7. Head, and for the members of his body. *He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore hath he lift up his head. Ought not Christ to suffer, and so to enter into his own glory?* And doth he not, by the same right by which he entered into it, confer that glory upon us? The recompense of the reward was set before him, and through an intuition of it he cheerfully underwent whatsoever was laid upon him. He must therefore necessarily suffer to obtain that happiness, who is therefore happy because he suffered.

Fourthly, It was necessary Christ should suffer, that we might be assured that he is truly affected with a most tender compassion of our afflictions. For this end was he subjected to misery, that he might become prone unto mercy: for this purpose was he made a sacrifice, that he might be a compassionate High Priest: and therefore was he most unmerciful to himself, that he might be most merciful unto us.

Fifthly, It was necessary the Son of Man should suffer, thereby to shew us that we are to suffer, and to teach us how we are to suffer. For *if these things were done to the green tree, what shall be done to the dry?* Nay, if God spared not his natural, his eternal, his only-begotten Son; how shall he spare his adopted sons, who are best known to be children because they are chastised, and appear to be in his paternal affection because they lie under his fatherly correction? We are therefore heirs, only because co-heirs with Christ; and we shall be kings, only because we shall reign together with him. It is a certain and infallible consequence, *If Christ be risen, then shall we also rise;* and we must look for as strong a coherence in this other, *If Christ hath suffered, then must we expect to suffer.* And as he taught the necessity of, so he left us the direction in, our sufferings. Great was the example of Job, but far short of absolute perfection: the pattern beyond all exception is alone our Saviour, who hath taught us in all our afflictions the exercise of admirable humility, perfect patience, and absolute submission unto the will of God.

And now we may perceive the full importance of this part of the Article, and every Christian may thereby understand what he is to believe, and what he is conceived to profess, when he makes this confession of his faith, *He suffered.* For hereby every one is obliged to intend thus much: I am really persuaded within myself, and do make a sincere profession of this

as a most necessary, certain, and infallible truth, that the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, and of the same essence with the Father, did for the redemption of mankind really and truly suffer; not in his divinity, which was impassible, but in his humanity, which in the days of his humiliation was subject unto our infirmities: that as he is a perfect Redeemer of the whole man, so he was a complete sufferer in the whole; in his body, by such dolorous infirmities as arise internally from human frailties, and by such pains as are inflicted by external injuries; in his soul, by fearful apprehensions, by unknown sorrows, by anguish unexpressible. And in this latitude and propriety I believe our Saviour *suffered.*

#### *Under Pontius Pilate.*

AFTER the substance of this part of the Article, consisting in our Saviour's passion, *He suffered,* followeth the circumstance of time, declared by the present governor, *under Pontius Pilate.* Which though the name of a stranger to the commonwealth of Israel and the Church of Christ, is well preserved to eternal memory in the sacred articles of our Creed. For as the Son of God by his determinate counsel was sent into the world to die in the fulness of time, so it concerns the Church to be assured of the time in which he died. And because the ancient custom of the world was to make their computations by their governors, and refer their historical relations to the respective times of their government; therefore, that we might be properly assured of the actions of our Saviour which he did, and of his sufferings, (that is, the actions which others did to him,) the present governor is named in that form of speech which is proper to such historical or chronological narrations, when we affirm that he suffered *under Pontius Pilate*<sup>62</sup>.

62 *Ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου.* Which words are capable of a double construction. First, as they are used by St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 13. *Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν, Who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession:* that is, standing before him as before a judge. As of the same person, Matt. xxviii. 14. *Καὶ ἔδν ἀκουσθῆ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, If this come to be tried before the procurator.* Thus Festus propounded it to St. Paul, Acts xxv. 9. *Θέλεις—κρίνεσθαι ἐπ' ἐμοῦ;* and

St. Paul answered in the same propriety of speech, *Ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καίσαρος ἕστώς ἐμῷ.* Thus Christ tells his Apostles, Mark xiii. 9. *Ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλείων σταθήσεσθε.* And in this sense *ἐπὶ* is often used by the Greeks. Secondly, *ἐπὶ Πιλάτου* is *under Pilate*, that is, in the time of his government, when and while he was procurator of Judæa: as *ἐπ' ἀρχιερέων Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα,* Luke iii. 2. and *ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως.* Mark ii. 26. Which is also according to the custom and language of the

And because he not only suffered under him as the present governor, but also was arraigned and condemned by him as a judge; therefore it will be necessary for the illustration of the manner, and confirmation of the truth, of our Saviour's sufferings, to declare what hath been left and derived to our knowledge, both concerning his person and his office.

For the first, we find him described by two names: nor is any other name of his extant, although according to the general custom of the Romans<sup>63</sup>, he should have three. The first of 194 these two is *Pontius*<sup>64</sup>, the name descending to him from the

Greeks: as Κατακλυσμός ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος ἐγένετο. *Marin. Arundel.* Οὔτοι ἦσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ Λαομέδοντος ἑξααστάντων Τρώων. *Platon. Epist. ad Archytam*; [Ep. xii. p. 359 D.] and ἐπὶ τούτου βασιλεύοντος, in this king's reign, is the common phrase of Pausanias. Thus the Athenians among their nine Ἄρχοντες had one who was called Ἐπώνυμος, because his name was used for the denotation of that year; and the phrase was usually, ἐπὶ τοῦ δαίνα, or ἐπὶ τοῦ δαίνα ἄρχοντος, as I find it thrice together in one place. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ (Ἰσοκράτης) ἐπὶ Λυσιμάχου, Πλάτων δὲ ἐπὶ Ἀμειβίου γέγονεν, ἐφ' οὗ Περικλῆς ἐτελεῦθησεν. *Diog. Laert. in Platone.* [l. iii. §. 3.] In the same manner did the Lacedæmonians make their historical accounts by their Ephori, and the Argivi by the priestesses of Juno: Ἐπὶ Χρυσίδος ἐν Ἀργεὶ τότε πενήτηντα δυοῖν δέοντα ἔτη ἱερωμένης, καὶ Διησιῶν ἐφόρου ἐν Σπάρτη, καὶ Πυθοδάρου ἔτι δύο μῆνας ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίσι. *Thucyd. lib. ii. cap. 2.* And as the Greeks thus referred all actions to the times of these governors, so did the Jews under the Roman government to the procurators of Judæa: as appeareth by Josephus, who, mentioning the first of that office, Coponius, presently relates the insurrection of Judas Galilæus in this manner: Ἐπὶ τούτου (Κωπωνίου) τῆς ἀνὴρ Γαλιλαίας, Ἰούδας ὄνομα, εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνήγε τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους. *De Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. 12.* then names his successor Ambivius, ἐφ' οὗ Σαλώμη Ἰαμυιὰν καταλείπει· after him Rufus, ἐφ' οὗ δὴ καὶ τελευτᾷ Καίσαρ. *Antiq. Jud. lib. xviii. cap. 3.* And in the same manner in the Creed, καθόλου ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, our Saviour suffered under Pontius Pi-

late: that is, at the time when he was procurator of Judæa; as Ignatius fully, ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου. *Epist. ad Magnesios.* [§. 11. p. 20.]

<sup>63</sup> Pausanias speaking of the Romans, saith, Τρία ὄποτε ἢ ὀλίγιστα, καὶ ἔτι πλεονα ὄνοματα ἐκάστω τίθενται. *Achaic. cap. 7.* And although Diomedes and Plutarch have observed, that even among the Romans there were some διώνυμα, yet the prænomens was never omitted, as Priscian affirmed; 'Ex illo tempore consuetudo tenuit, ut nemo Romanus sit absque prænomine.' *Lib. ii.*

<sup>64</sup> *Pontius* and *Pilatus* were his nomen and cognomen, in the same manner as *Julius* and *Cæsar* are described by Suetonius: 'Non Cæsar et Bibulo, sed Julio et Cæsare, Coss. actum scriberent, his eundem præponentes, nomine atque cognomine.' *Lib. i. cap. 20.* Thus, without a prænomens or agnomen, he is only known to us by his nomen properly called, and his cognomen. The nature of which two is thus described by the ancients: 'Nomen proprium est gentilitium, id est, quod originem gentis vel familiæ declarat, ut Portius, Cornelius; cognomen est quod uniuscujusque proprium, et nominibus gentilitiis subjungitur, ut Cato, Scipio.' *Diom. de Orat. lib. i. p. 306.* 'Nomen, quod familiæ originem declarat, ut Cornelius; cognomen, quod nomini subjungitur, ut Scipio.' *Charis. lib. ii.* The first of these Dionysius calls τὸ συγγενικὸν καὶ πατρωνυμικόν, Plutarch, οἰκίας ἢ γένους κοινόν, and κοινὸν ἀπὸ συγγενείας· the second he calls προσσηγορικὸν ἢ ἐπιθέτου. Thus *Pontius* was his nomen gentis or gentilitium, and *Pilatus* his cognomen. As therefore Pon-

original of his family, which was very ancient; the second *Pilatus*, as a cognominal addition distinguishing from the rest descending from the same original.

He was by birth a Roman, by degree of the Equestrian order, sent by Tiberius the emperor to be a governor in Judæa. For about threescore years before our Saviour's birth, the Jews by Pompey the Great were made tributary to the Romans. And although during the life of Hyrcanus the high priest, the reign of Herod, and his son Archelaus, the Roman state suffered the Jews to be ruled by their own laws and governors; yet when Archelaus was banished by Augustus, they received their governors from the Roman emperor, being made a part of the province of Syria<sup>65</sup>, belonging to his care. In the life of Augustus there was a succession of three, Coponius, Ambivius, and Rufus. At the beginning of the reign of Tiberius they were governed by Valerius Gratus, and at his departure by Pontius Pilate.

The office which this Pilate bare was the procuratorship of Judæa, as is most evident out of the history both of the Romans<sup>66</sup>, from whom he received his authority, and of the Jews,

tius Aquila, Pontius Cominius, Pontius Herennius, Pontius Paulinus, &c. so also Pontius Pilatus. Wherefore in vain have some of the ancients endeavoured to give an etymology of these names, as they do of Greek and Hebrew names in the Scripture, and think thereby to express the nature or actions of them that bare the names. As Isidorus Hispalensis, *Orig. lib. vii. cap. 10.* [p. 62 F.] 'Pontius, declinans consilium, utique Judæorum: accepta enim aqua lavit manus suas, dicens, Innocens ego sum a sanguine hujus justis.' And Eutychius patriarch of Alexandria deduced *Pontius* from an island called Ponta, near to Rome. And St. Jerom, 'Quod significat nomen Pilati, i. e. Malleatoris, i. e. qui domat ferreas gentes, ad Mat. xv. Pilatus, Os malleatoris; quia dum Christum ore suo et justificat et condemnat, more malleatoris utrinque ferit.' *Isidor. ibid.* 'Pontius, declinans consilium; Pilatus, Os malleatoris.' *S. Hieron. de Nom. Hebræis, in Luca, et rursus in Actis.* [vol. iii. p. 96.] Where he lets us understand that these etymologies were made from the Hebrew language; and makes an excuse, be-

cause the letter P is here taken for the Hebrew פ, to which the Latin F more properly answers. 'Sed sciendum est quod apud Hebræos P litera non habetur, nec ullum nomen est quod hoc elementum sonet: abusive igitur accipienda, quasi per F litteram scripta sint.' Thus did they vainly strive to find an Hebrew original, and that such an one as should represent the conditions of Pilate; when these two names are nothing else but the Roman nomen and cognomen of that person.

<sup>65</sup> Τῆς Ἀρχελαῶν ἐθνάρχιας μεταποσούσης εἰς ἑπαρχίαν. *Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. 13.* Τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελαῶν χώρας ὑποτελοῦς προσνημηθείσης τῇ Σόρων. *Antiq. Jud. lib. xvii. cap. 15.* Παρῆν δὲ Κυρήνιος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν προσθήκη Συρίας γινωμένην. *Ibid. lib. xviii. cap. 1.*

<sup>66</sup> Tacitus speaking of the Christians, 'Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus est,' *Annal. lib. xv. cap. 44.* and Tertullian, most skilful of their laws and customs, speaks thus of our Saviour; 'Postremo oblatum Pontio Pilato, Syriam tunc ex

over whom he exercised his dominion. But what was the office of a procurator in those times<sup>67</sup>, though necessary for our pre-

parte Romana procuranti.' *Apol. cap.* 21. [p. 20 C.] Whom St. Cyprian follows: 'Hunc Magistri eorum—Pontio Pilato, qui tunc ex parte Romana Syriam procurabat, tradiderunt.' *De Idol. Van.* [p. 228.] Thus also Josephus for the Jews: Περμφθεις δὲ εἰς Ἰουδαίαν ἐπίτροπος ὑπὸ Τιβερίου Πιλάτος. *De Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. 14.* and Philo, Πιλάτος ἦν τῶν ὑπάρχων ἐπίτροπος ἀποδεδειγμένος τῆς Ἰουδαίας. *De Legat. ad Caium.* And therefore those words of St. Luke, iii. 1. ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, were properly translated by the old Interpreter, *procurante Pontio Pilato Judæam.* Thus Lucius Dexter *ad annum Christi* 28. 'Pontius Pilatus procurator Judææ a Tiberio mittitur in Judæam.' and Justin Martyr most properly; τὸν σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, τοῦ γενομένου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπὶ χρόνοις Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐπιτρόπου. *Apol. i. §. 13.* [p. 51 B.] and again, speaking to the emperors by whom the procurators were sent, καὶ Πιλάτου τοῦ ὑμετέρου παρ' αὐτοῖς γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου. §. 40. [p. 67 D.] and again, κατὰ τοῦ ὄνματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, τοῦ γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου τῆς Ἰουδαίας. *Dial. cum Tryph. §. 30.* [p. 128 A.] As also Eusebius, Δωδεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ τῆς Τιβερίου βασιλείας, ἐπίτροπος τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὑπὸ Τιβερίου καθίσταται Πιλάτος. *Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 9.* [p. 30.] and St. Jerom's translation of his Chronicon; 'Pilatus procurator Judææ a Tiberio mittitur.' Thus it appears that Pilate of the equestrian order was properly procurator, as that office was ordinarily given to men of that order, as Tacitus testifies; 'Cn. Julius Agricola utrumque avum procuratorem Cæsarium habuit, quæ equestris nobilitas est;' *in Vit. Jul. Agr. cap. 4.* which is to be understood concerning the imperial provinces; for into those which were of the provinces of the people, the procurators sent by Cæsar were of the Liberti. For the emperor sent into all the provinces his procurators, but with this difference, as Dio observes; Εἰς πάντα ὁμοίως τὰ ἔθνη, τὰ τε ἑαυτοῦ δὴ καὶ τὰ τοῦ δήμου, τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἰππέων,

τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπελευθέρων, πέμπει. *Hist. lib. liii. c. 15.*

<sup>67</sup> The Roman procurator is ordinarily in Greek authors expressed by their 'Ἐπίτροπος, as the Glossa Latino-Græca, Procurator, 'Ἐπίτροπος. But yet they are not of the same latitude in their use; 'Ἐπίτροπος comprehending the notion of tutor, as well as procurator. 'Ἐπίτροπος, ὁ προστατῶν χωρίων, καὶ ὄλης τῆς οὐσίας, καὶ ὀρφανῶν. *Hesych.* 'Ἐπίτροπος, procurator, tutor. *Gloss. Vet.* 'Ἐπίτροπος therefore was used by the Greeks in both notions, whereof procurator of the Latins is but one: and in the language of the Romans he is a procurator, which undertakes to manage the business of another man. 'Procurator si negotium suscipit,' saith Ascenius in *Divinat.* and Sex. Pompeius, *lib. iii.* 'Procurator absentis nomine actor fit;' he to whom the care of another man's estate or affairs was committed. 'Ἐντολή, commissum, et Ἐντολεύς, procurator. *Gloss. Vet.* In correspondence to these procurators of the affairs and estates of private persons, there were made such as did take care in every province of the imperial revenue; who, in respect of the person whom they served, were called *Procuratores Cæsaris*, or *Augustales*; in respect of the countries where they served, were termed *procuratores provinciales.* Their office is best described by Dion, *Hist. lib. liii. c. 15.* Τοὺς ἐπιτρόπους, οὕτω γὰρ τοὺς τὰς τε κοινὰς προσόδους ἐκλέγοντας, καὶ προσταγαμένα σφίσι ἀναλίσκοντας, ὀνομάζομεν. We call, says he, these 'Ἐπιτρόπους, that is, *procuratores*, which receive the public revenues, and dispose of them according to the commands received from the emperor. For they acted in his name, and what was done by them was accounted as done by the emperor himself. 'Quæ acta gesta sunt a procuratore Cæsaris, sic ab eo comprobari ac si a Cæsare gesta essent.' *Ulpian. lib. i. ff.* As we read in Tacitus of the emperor Claudius; 'Sæpius audita vox principis, parem vim rerum habendam a procuratoribus suis judicatarum, ac si

sent purpose, is not so easy to determine, because it was but newly introduced into the Roman government. For before the dominion of that city was changed from a commonwealth into an empire, there was no such public office in any of the provinces, and particularly in Judæa none till after the banishment of Archelaus, some years after our Saviour's birth. When Augustus divided the provinces of the empire into two parts, one of which he kept for his own care, and left the other to the inspection of the senate, he sent, together with the president of each province, as the governor in chief of the province, a procurator, whose office was, to take an account of all the tribute, and whatsoever else was due to the emperor, and to order and dispose of the same for his advantage. Neither was there at the first institution of this office any other act belonging properly to their jurisdiction, but such a care and disposal of the imperial revenue: which they exercised as inferior and subordinate to the president, always supreme provincial officer.

Now Judæa being made a part of the province of Syria, and consequently under the care of the president of that province, according to this institution, a particular procurator was assigned unto it for the disposing of the emperor's revenue. And because the nation of the Jews were always suspected of a rebellious disposition against the Roman state, and the president of Syria, who had the power of the sword, was forced to attend upon the other parts of his province; therefore the procurator of Judæa was furnished with power of life and death<sup>68</sup>, and so administered all the power of the president,

ipse stauisset;' *Annal. lib. xii. cap. 60.* and in Suetonius; 'Ut rata essent quæ procuratores sui in judicando statuere, precario exegit.' *Lib. v. cap. 12.* [Claud. 12.] The proper office therefore of the provincial procurator was, to receive the imperial revenue, and dispose of it as the emperor commanded, and to all intents and purposes to do such things as were necessary thereunto, with such authority as if the emperor himself had done them.

<sup>68</sup> This appeareth by Coponius, the first proper procurator of Judæa, who was brought in by Quirinus Præses of Syria, when he came to dispose of the goods of Archelaus, and to reduce Judæa into the form of a province, and

adjoin it to Syria. Of this Coponius Josephus writeth after this manner; Κωπώνιος τε αὐτῷ (Κυρηναίῳ) συγκαταπέμπεται τάγματος τῶν ἰππέων ἡγησόμενος Ἰουδαίαν τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ξουσίᾳ, that being of the Equestrian order, he was sent with Quirinus to govern the Jews with the supreme power; *Antiq. Jud. lib. xviii. cap. 1.* and yet more expressly as to the time, occasion, and extent of his power: Τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελάου χώρας εἰς ἐπαρχίαν περιγραφείσης, ἐπίτροπὸς τις ἰππικῆς παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τάξεως, Κωπώνιος πέμπεται, μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβῶν παρὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος ξουσίαν. *Idem, De Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. 11.* [c. 8. §. 1.] When those parts which were under the command of Archelaus were reduced into a

which was, as to the Jews, supreme. Which is very observable, as an eminent act of the providence of God, by which the full power of judicature in Judæa was left in the hands of the resident procurator.

For by this means it came to pass that Christ, who by the 196 determinate counsel of God was to die, and by the prediction of the Prophets was to suffer in a manner not prescribed by the Law of Moses, should be delivered up to a foreign power, and so suffer death after the customs of that nation to whose power he was delivered. The malice of the obstinate Jew was high to accuse and prosecute him, but the power of the Jews was not so high as judicially to condemn him. For although the chief priests and the elders and the scribes *condemned him to be guilty of death*; yet they could not condemn him to die, or pronounce the sentence of death upon him, but *delivered him up unto Pilate*: and when he refusing said unto them, *Take ye him, and judge him according to your Law*, they immediately returned, *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death*. The power of life and death was

Mark xiv.  
64.

Mark xv. 1.

John xviii.  
31.

province, Coponius was sent thither by the emperor, and furnished with power of life and death. For although in the proconsular provinces the procurator of the emperor had no power but in those things which belonged to the exchequer, yet in those provinces which were properly *præsidales*, the procurator was often *loco præsidis*. From whence, in the ancient inscriptions, we read of the same person, 'procurator et præsides Alpium,' 'procurator et præsides provinciarum per orientem,' 'procurator et præsides provinciae Sardiniae.' It was often therefore so, that the procurator did 'præsidis partibus fungi' as Ulpian; 'In provinciam enim præsidium provinciarum, nec aliter procuratori Cæsaris hæc cognitio injungitur quam præsidis partibus in provincia fungatur.' *Lib. viii. de officio Proconsulis*. And this is very necessary to be observed, because a procurator barely such, not armed with the power of the præsides provinciae, had not the power of the sword. As Antoninus to Valerius; 'Procurator meus, qui vice præsidis non fungebatur, exilli tibi penam non potuit irrogare.' *Lib. ix. Cod. de penis*: and to Heliodorus; 'Procurator meus, qui vice præsidis provincie non fungitur, sicut exi-

gere penam desertæ accusationis non potest, ita judicare ut ea inferatur sententia sua non potest.' *Lib. iii. C. Ubi causæ*. This was plain in the case of Lucilius Capito, procurator of Asia Minor, who was called in question for exceeding his power, and deserted therein by Tiberius. 'Procurator Asiae Lucilius Capito, accusante provincia, causam dixit, magna cum adseveratione principis non se jus nisi in servitia et pecunias familiares dedisse: quod si vim prætoris usurpasset, manibusque militum usus foret, spreta in eo mandata sua: audirent socios.' *Tacit. Annal. lib. iv. cap. 15*. and Dion upon the said example observes in general, that the procurators had no such power: *Ὁδὲ γὰρ ἐξῆν τότε τοῖς τὰ αὐτοκρατορικὰ χρήματα διοικοῦσι πλέον οὐδὲν ποιεῖν, ἢ τὰς νενομισμένας προσόδους ἐκλέγειν, καὶ περὶ τῶν διαφορῶν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ἐξ ἴσου τοῖς ἰδιωταῖς δικάζεσθαι. Hist. lib. lvii. cap. 23*. But although the ordinary procurators had no other power but to dispose of the revenue, and determine private causes; yet he which was *vice præsidis* had the power of the præsides: and such a procurator was Pontius Pilate in Judæa, as the others who preceded him also were.

not in any court of the Jews, but in the Roman governor alone as supreme; and therefore<sup>69</sup> they answered him, it was *not lawful*: not in respect of the Law of Moses, which gave them both sufficient power and absolute command to punish divers offenders with death; but in relation to the Roman empire, which had taken all that dominion from them. Forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews themselves acknowledge that they lost their power; which is sufficient to shew that they had it not when our Saviour suffered: and it is as true that they lost it twenty years before, at the relegation of Archelaus, and the coming of Coponius the procurator with full power of life and death. Wherefore our Saviour was delivered unto Pilate as the supreme judge over the nation of the Jews, that he might pronounce the sentence of death upon him.

But how this judge could be persuaded to an act of so much injustice and impiety, is not yet easy to be seen. The numerous controversies of the religion of the Jews did not concern the Roman governors, nor were they moved with the frequent quarrels arising from the different sects. Pilate knew well it was *for envy* that the chief priests *delivered him*; and when he had *examined him, he found no fault touching those things whereof they accused him*. Three times did he challenge the whole nation of the Jews, *Why? what evil hath he done?* Three times did he make that clear profession, *I have found no cause of death in him*. His own wife, admonished in a dream, *sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man*: and when he heard that he *made himself the Son of God, he was more afraid*: and yet, notwithstanding these apprehensions and professions, he condemned and crucified him.

Here we must look upon the nature and disposition of Pilate,

<sup>69</sup> I say therefore the Jews answered that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death, because that power was taken out of their hands. For although St. Augustin think they thought it not lawful in respect of the passover, 'Intelligendum est eos dixisse, non sibi licere interficere quenquam, propter diei festi sanctitatem, quem celebrare jam cœperant.' *Tract. 14. in Joan. [s. 4. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 789 F.]* and St. Cyril be of the same opinion; yet others of the ancients deliver the true cause why they applied themselves to Pilate to

be their want of power, as Ammonius most expressly; *τίνας ἐνεκεν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἀνεῖλον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον ἤγαγον; μάλιστα μὲν τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ὑπετέμμετο, λοιπὸν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους τῶν πραγμάτων κεκλιμένον* and upon those words in St. John, 'Ὡς ἐκπεσόντες τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἤσαν γὰρ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους, εἶπον τοῦτο. So Theophylact, 'Ἀγούσιν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πραιτόριον, οὐ γὰρ εἶχον αὐτοὶ ἐξουσίαν ἀνελεῖν, ἀτε τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους κεκλιμένον. *Com. in Joan. cap. 18. [p. 812 D.]* and before him St. Chrysostom.

Matt. xxvii.

18.

Luke xxiii.

14.

Verse 22.

Matt. xxvii.

19.

John xix.

7, 8.

which inclined and betrayed him to so foul an act. He was a man of an high, rough, untractable, and irreconcilable spirit<sup>70</sup>, as he is described by the Jews, and appeareth from the beginning of his government, when he brought the bucklers stamp't with the pictures of Cæsar into Jerusalem (which was an abomination to the Jews), and could neither be moved by the blood of many, nor persuaded by the most humble applications and submiss entreaties of the whole nation, to remove them, till he received a sharp reprehension and severe command from the emperor Tiberius. After that, he seized on the Corban, that sacred treasury, and spent it upon an aquæduct: nor could all their religious and importunate petitions divert his intentions, but his resolution went through their blood to bring in water. 197

When the Galileans came up to Jerusalem to worship God at his own temple, *he mingled their blood with their sacrifices.* Add to this untractable and irreconcilable spirit, by which he had so often exasperated the Jews, an avaricious and rapacious disposition, which prompted him as much to please them, and we may easily perceive what moved him to condemn that Person to death whom he declared innocent. The Evangelist telleth us that *Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus to be crucified.* They accused him at Rome for all the insolences and rapines<sup>71</sup> which he had committed, and by this act he thought to pacify them.

It was thus necessary to express the person under whom our Saviour suffered, first, that we might for ever be assured of the time<sup>72</sup> in which he suffered. The enemies of Christianity began

70 So Philo testifieth of him: Ἦν γὰρ τὴν φύσιν ἀκαμπῆς, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ αὐθάδους ἀμείλικτος. *De Legat. ad Caium.* [vol. ii. p. 590.] And again: Οἷα οὖν ἐγκότως ἔχων καὶ βαρύνῃς ἄνθρωπος.

71 For that which is observed by Philo upon the dedication of the shields at the first entrance into his government, must needs be much more true at this time of our Saviour's passion, when he had committed so many more insolences, viz. that he feared the Jews should complain of him to Tiberius. Τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο μάλιστα αὐτὸν ἐξετράχυνε καταδείσαντα μὴ τῷ ὄντι προσβυσάμενοι καὶ τῆς ἄλλης αὐτοῦ ἐπιτροπῆς ἐξελέγξωσι τὰς δωροδοκίας, τὰς ὕβρεις, τὰς ἀρπαγὰς, τὰς αἰκίας, τὰς ἐπηρείας, τοὺς

ἀκρίτους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους φόβους, τὴν ἀνήνυτον καὶ ἀργαλεωτάτην ὀμότητα διεξελθόντες. *De Legat. ad Caium.* [p. 590.]

72 'Cautissime qui symbolum tradiderunt, etiam tempus, quo sub Pontio Pilato gesta sunt, designaverunt, ne ex aliqua parte velut vaga et incerta gestorum traditio vacillaret.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 18. p. cccxii.] 'Credimus itaque in eum qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus. Addendum enim erat iudicis nomen propter temporum cognitionem.' *S. August. de Fide et Symb.* cap. 5. [§. 11. vol. vi. p. 156 E.] 'Pilatus iudex erat in illo tempore ab Imperatore positus in Judæa, sub quo Dominus passus est; cujus mentio ad temporis significationem, non ad personæ illius

first to unsettle the time of his passion, that thereby they might at last deny the passion itself; and the rest of their falsehood was detected by the discovery of their false chronology<sup>73</sup>. Some fixed it to the seventh year of the reign of Tiberius<sup>74</sup>; whereas it is certain Pontius Pilate was not then procurator in Judæa; and as certain that our Saviour was baptized eight years after, *in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar.* Luke iii. 1. Some of the Jews, lest the destruction of Jerusalem might seem to follow upon, and for our Saviour's crucifixion, have removed it near threescore years more backward yet, placing his death in the beginning of Herod's reign<sup>75</sup>, who was not born till toward the death of the same king. Others have removed it farther yet near twenty years<sup>76</sup>, and so vainly tell us how he died under

pertinet dignitatem.' *Serm.* 131. *de Temp.\** Irenæus speaking of St. Paul, 'Evangelizabat Filium Dei Christum Jesum, qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est.' *Lib. v. cap. 12.* [§. 5.] and to make the more certain character of time, Ignatius added to the name of Pilate that of Herod: Ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ Ἡρώδου τετραρχοῦ καθηλωμένον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκί. *Epist. ad Smyrn.* [§. 1. p. 34.]

73 So Eusebius detected some of those which lived not long before him: Οὐκ οὖν σαφῶς ἀπελήλεγκται τὸ πλάσμα τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα χθὲς καὶ πρόνῃ διαδεδοκῶτων, ἐν οἷς πρῶτος αὐτὸς ὁ τῆς παρασημειώσεως χρόνος τῶν πεπλακῶτων ἀπελέγχει τὸ ψεῦδος: *Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 9.* [p. 30.]

74 'Ἐπὶ τῆς τετάρτης δ' οὖν ὑπατείας Τιβερίου, ἣ γέγονεν ἔτους ἐβδόμου τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, τὰ περὶ τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῖς πάθος τολμηθέντα περιέχει καθ' ὃν δέικνυται χρόνον, μὴδ' ἐπιστάς πω τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ Πιλάτος. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 9.* [p. 30.]

75 Divers of the Jews place the passion of Christ in the year of their account 3724, which is sixty-nine years before our common account of the year in which he truly suffered. This inven-

tion of their own, grounded upon no foundation, and backed with not so much as the least probability, they deliver as a tradition amongst them, continued in this rhythm,

בשנת ג'אלפים חש'כ"ו הנצרי נלכד  
ובשנת תקל"ב בעץ נצלב:  
i. e. *In the year 3724 he of Nazareth was taken,*

*And in the year 532 he was crucified on a tree.*

Not that they thought him taken in one year, and crucified in another; but these two unequal numbers signify the same year; the lesser number being a period of years, which seven times numbered equalleth the greater. So that their meaning is, that after seven periods consisting of 532 years, in the year of the world 3724, Jesus of Nazareth was crucified.

76 Others of the Jews pretend another account, viz. that Jesus was born in the year 3671, which was the fourth of Jannæus, and crucified in the year 3707, which was the third of Aristobulus; making him the disciple of R. Joshua the son of Perachiah, according to that usual phrase of theirs, כרבי יהושע בן פרחיה שדחסו לישו בשנת יד' *Vide Sopher Juchasin.* †

\* [This Sermon is rejected as spurious by the Benedictine editors. *Append. ad vol. v. part. ii. p. 398 A. Serm. ccxlii. 3.*]

† [This computation may be found in the first edition of the *Sopher Juchasin*, Constant. 1566, f. 15 a. l. 15. In the second ed. Cracov. 1581, f. 16 b. antep. it is very much altered: thus for יהושע the Nazarean, we have איתו האיש that man, and for הנוצרים Christians merely הם they.—R. P. S.]



Aristobulus, above fifty years before his birth in Bethlehem. This do they teach their proselytes, to this end, that they may not believe so much as the least historical part of the blessed Evangelists. As therefore they deny the time of our Saviour's passion, in design to destroy his doctrine; so, that we might establish the substance of the Gospel depending on his death, it was necessary we should retain a perfect remembrance of the time in which he died. Nor need we be ashamed that the 198 Christian religion, which we profess, should have so known an epocha, and so late an original. Christ came not into the world in the beginning of it, but in *the fulness of time*.

Gal. iv. 4.

Secondly, it was thought necessary to include the name of Pilate in our Creed, as of one who gave a most powerful external testimony<sup>77</sup> to the certainty of our Saviour's death, and the innocency of his life. He did not only profess, to the condemnation of the Jews, that he found nothing worthy of death in Christ; but left the same written to the Gentiles of the Roman empire. Two ways he is related to have given most ample testimony to the truth: first, by an express written to Tiberius<sup>78</sup>, and by him presented to the senate; secondly, by records written in tables of all things of moment which were acted in his government<sup>79</sup>.

77 'Nota quod in Pilato et uxore ejus, justum Dominum confitentibus, Gentilis populi testimonium sit.' *S. Hieron. in Matt. xxvii.* [vol. vii. p. 229 C.]

78 That Pontius Pilate wrote unto Tiberius of the death and resurrection of our Saviour, is testified by Tertullian, who was best acquainted with the Roman history: 'Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianus, Cæsari tunc Tiberio nuntiavit.' *Apolog. cap. 21.* [p. 20 D.] And again; 'Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in seculum intravit, annuntiata sibi ex Syria Palestina, quæ illic veritatem istius (Christi) divinitatis revelarant, detulit ad Senatam cum prærogativa suffragii sui.' *Ibid. cap. 5.* [p. 6 B.] This is related by Eusebius out of Tertullian in his Ecclesiastical History, *lib. ii. cap. 2.* and referred to the two and twentieth year of Tiberius in his Chronicon; 'Pilato de Christianorum dogmate ad Tiberium referente, Tiberius retulit ad Senatam, ut inter

cætera sacra reciperetur.' The authority of this express is grounded on the great reputation of Tertullian (as is observed also by the author of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, who concludes the relation with these words, *ὡς ἱστορεῖ Τερτυλλιανὸς ὁ Ῥωμαῖος*), and the general custom by which all the governors of the provinces did give an account unto the emperor of all such passages as were most remarkable: *Παλαιῶν κερρατηκότος ἔθους τοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἄρχουσι, τὰ παρὰ σφισι καινοτομούμενα τῷ τῆν βασιλείων ἀρχὴν ἐπικρατοῦντι σημαίνει, ὡς ἂν μηδὲν αὐτὸν διαδιδράσκει τῶν γινομένων.* *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. 2.* [p. 46.]

79 The ancient Romans were very desirous to preserve the memory of all remarkable passages which happened in the city: and this was done either in their *Acta Senatus*, or *Acta diurna populi*, which were diligently made and carefully kept at Rome. In the same manner the governors in the provinces

Thirdly, it behoved us to take notice of the Roman governor in the expression of our Saviour's passion, that thereby we might understand how it came to pass that Christ should suffer according to the Scriptures. The Prophets had foretold his death, but after such a manner as was not to be performed by the Jews, according to whose law and custom no man amongst them ever so died. Being then so great a Prophet could not die but in Jerusalem, being the death he was to suffer was not agreeable to the laws and customs of the Jews; it was necessary a Roman governor should condemn him, that so the counsel of the will of God might be fulfilled, by the malice of the one, and the customs of the other.

And now the advantage of this circumstance is discovered, every one may express the importance of it in this manner. I am fully persuaded of this truth, as beyond all possibility of contradiction, that in the *fulness of time* God sent his Son, and that the eternal Son of God so sent by him did suffer for the sins

took care that all things worthy of remark should be written in public tables, and preserved as the Acta in their government. And agreeably to this custom Pontius Pilate kept the memoirs of the Jewish affairs, which were therefore called *Acta Pilati*, in which an account was given of our blessed Saviour; and the primitive Christians did appeal unto them in their disputes with the Gentiles, as to a most undoubted testimony. Justin Martyr urged them even unto the Roman emperors: *Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων Ἀκτῶν Ἀπολ. i. §. 35.* [p. 65 D.] and again: "Ὅτι δὲ ταῦτα ἐποίησεν, ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων Ἀκτῶν μαθεῖν δύνασθε." *Ibid. §. 48.* [p. 72 A.] And in the differences between the Christians, they were cited by both parties. As the *Tessaresdecimite* alleged them for their custom of the observance of Easter, as Epiphanius testifieth of them: 'Ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀκτῶν δὴθεν Πιλάτου αὐχοῦσι τὴν ἀκριβειαν εὐρηκέναι, ἐν οἷς ἐμφέρεται, τῇ πρὸ ὀκτῶ καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων τὸν Σωτῆρα πεπονθέναι' and Epiphanius urgeth the same Acta against them, but according to other copies: 'Ἐτι δὲ εὐρομεν ἀντίγραφα ἐκ τῶν (lege Ἀκτῶν) Πιλάτου, ἐν οἷς σημαίνει πρὸ δεκαπέντε καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων

*τὸ πάθος γεγενῆσθαι. Hæres. l. §. 1.* [vol. i. p. 420.] Though the author of the eighth Homily in *Pascha*, under the name of St. Chrysostom, agreeth in this reading with the *Tessaresdecimite*: 'Ὁ μὲν χρόνος καθ' ὃν ἔπαθεν ὁ Σωτῆρ οὐκ ἠγνόηται· τὰ γὰρ ὑπομνήματα τὰ ἐπὶ Πιλάτου πραχθέντα καὶ τὴν προθεσμίαν περιέχει τοῦ Πάσχα· ἱστορεῖται γοῦν, ὅτι τῇ πρὸ ὀκτῶ καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων ἔπαθεν ὁ Σωτῆρ. [Hom. vii. in Pascha. §. 2. vol. viii. App. p. 277 D.] These were also mentioned in the *Acta S. Tarachi, Probi et Andronici, cap. 9.* 'Præses dixit, Inique, non scis, quem invocas, Christum, hominem quidem fuisse factum, sub custodia Pontii Pilati, et punium, cujus exstant Acta passionis?' These Acta in the time of Maximinus were adulterated, and filled with many blasphemies against our Saviour; as appears by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 9.* [p. 30.] Οὐκοῦν σαφῶς ἀπελήγετται τὸ πάσμα τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα χθὲς καὶ πρῶην διαδεδωκότων' and *lib. ix. cap. 5.* [p. 443.] Πλασμένοι δὴτα Πιλάτου καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα, πάσης ἐμπλεα κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βλασφημίας· γνώμη τοῦ μείζονος ἐπὶ πάσαν διαπέμποντα τὴν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχήν.



of men, after the fifteenth year of Tiberius the Roman emperor, and before his death, in the time of Pontius Pilate the Cæsarean procurator of Judæa; who, to please the nation of the Jews, did 199 condemn him whom he pronounced innocent, and delivered him, according to the custom of that empire, and in order to the fulfilling of the prophecies, to die a painful and shameful death upon the cross. And thus I believe in Christ that *suffered under Pontius Pilate.*

*Was crucified.*

FROM the general consideration of our Saviour's passion, we proceed to the most remarkable particular, his crucifixion, standing between his passion, which it concludeth, and his death, which it introduceth. For the explication whereof it will be necessary, first, to prove that the promised Messiah was to be crucified, that he which was designed to die for our sins, was to suffer upon the cross; secondly, to shew that our Jesus, whom we worship, was certainly and truly crucified, and did suffer, whatsoever was so foretold, upon the cross; thirdly, to discover what is the nature of crucifixion, what peculiarities of suffering are contained in dying on the cross.

That the Messias was to be crucified, appeareth both by types which did apparently foreshew it, and by prophecies which did plainly foretell it. For though all those representations and predictions which the forward zeal of some ancient Fathers<sup>80</sup>

<sup>80</sup> The ancient Fathers, following the steps of the Apostles, to prove all the particulars of our Saviour's death out of the Old Testament, have made use of those types and prophecies which did really and truly foreshew it; but, together with them, partly out of their own conceptions, partly out of too much credit to the translations, have urged those places which the Jews may most easily evade, and we can produce but with small or no pretence. As for the extending of the hands of Moses, they conceive it to be a perfect type; and Barnabas tells us, the Spirit commanded Moses that he should make the similitude of a cross; λέγει εἰς τὴν καρδίαν Μωσῆ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα ποιῆσῃ τύπον σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος πάσχειν. *Barnabæ Epist. cap. 12.* [p. 39.] but the text assures us no more than that Moses held

up his hand, which might be without any similitude of a cross; and when both were lifted up by Aaron and Hur, the representation is not certain. And yet after Barnabas, Justin tells us that Moses represented the cross, τὰς χεῖρας ἑκατέρωσ ἐκπετάσας. *Dial. cum Tryph. §. 90.* [p. 188 A.] and Tertullian calls it 'habitus crucis.' *Adv. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 18.* [p. 408 A.] In the same manner, with the strange Indian statue, which is described by Bardisanes as ἀνδρίας ἐστὼς ὀρθὸς, ἔχων τὰς χεῖρας ἠπλωμένας ἐν τύπῳ σταυροῦ. *Porphyg. de Styge.* With less probability did they gather both the name of Jesus, and the cross of Christ, from the 318 servants of Abraham. Ἰῶτα δέκα, ἦτα ὀκτώ, ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν· ὅτι δὲ σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ Τ, ἐμελλεν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν· λέγει καὶ τοὺς τριακοσίους· δηλοῖ οὖν τὸν μὲν Ἰη-

gathered out of the Law and the Prophets cannot be said to signify so much, yet in many types was the crucifixion of Christ represented, and by some prophecies foretold. This was the true and unremovable *stumblingblock to the Jews*, nor could they ever 1 Cor. i. 23. be brought to confess the Messiah should die that death upon a tree to which the curse of the Law belonged<sup>81</sup>: and yet we need no other oracles than such as were committed to those Jews, to prove that Christ was to suffer.

A clearer type can scarce be conceived of the Saviour of the world, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed,

σοῦν ἐν τοῖς δυοῖ γράμμασι, καὶ ἐν ἐνὶ τῶν σταυρῶν. *Barnabæ Epist. cap. 9.* [p. 29.] As if IH stood for Jesus, and T for the cross. And yet Clemens Alexandrinus follows him: Φασὶν οὖν εἶναι τοῦ μὲν κυριακοῦ σημείου τύπον κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τὸ τριακοσιοστὸν στοιχείων· τὸ δὲ Ἰῶτα καὶ τὸ ἦτα τοῦνομα σημαίνει τὸ σωτήριον. *Strom. lib. vi.* [c. 11. vol. ii. p. 782.] As also St. Ambrose; 'Nam et Abraham 318 duxit ad bellum, et ex innumeris trophæa hostibus reportavit, signoque Dominicæ crucis et nominis, &c.' *Prol. ad lib. i. de Fide.* [§. 3. vol. ii. p. 444 A.] 'Eos adscivit quos dignos numero fidelium judicavit, qui in Domini nostri Jesu Christi passionem crederent. Trecentos enim T Græca litera significat; decem et octo autem summum IH exprimit.' *Idem de Abrah. lib. i. cap. 3.* [§. 15. vol. i. p. 287 E.] And St. Augustine of another 300: 'Quorum numerus, quia trecenti erant, signum insinuat crucis, propter literam T Græcam, qua iste numerus significatur.' *Quest. in Heptat. lib. vii. quest. 37.* [vol. iii. part i. p. 605 G.] And Clemens Alexandrinus again of the 300 cubits in the Ark: Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ τοὺς τριακοσίους πήχεις σύμβολον τοῦ κυριακοῦ σημείου λέγουσι. *Strom. lib. vi.* [c. 11. vol. ii. p. 783.] 'Sed sicut ille non multitudine nec virtute legionum, sed jam tum in sacramento crucis, cujus figura per literam Græcam T numero trecentorum exprimitur, adversarios principes debellavit: cujus mysterii virtute trecentis in longum

texta cubitis superavit arca diluvium, ut nunc Ecclesia hoc seculum super-navigat.' *S. Paulinus Epist. 2.* [al. Ep. xxiv. p. 162 B.] As unlikely a type did they make Jacob's ladder. 'Et puto crucem Salvatoris istam esse scalam quam vidit Jacob.' *S. Hieron. Com. in Psal. xci.\** 'Scala usque ad cælum attingens crucis figuram habuit; Dominus innixus scalæ, Christus crucifixus ostenditur.' *S. August. Serm. de Temp. 79.†* These, and many others, by the writers of the succeeding ages were produced out of the Old Testament as types of the cross, and may in some sense be applied to it being otherwise proved, but prove it not.

<sup>81</sup> Trypho the Jew, in the Dialogue with Justin Martyr, when he had confessed many of the Christian doctrines, would by no means be brought to this; Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀτίμως οὕτως σταυρωθῆναι τὸν Χριστὸν (subaud. ἔδει) ἀποροῦμεν· ἐπικατάρατος γὰρ ὁ σταυρούμενος ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λέγεται εἶναι· ὥστε πρὸς τοῦτο ἀκμῶν δυσπέσιτος ἔχω. §. 89. [p. 187 A.] And afterwards granting his passion, urgeth him to prove his crucifixion; Ἡμεῖς γὰρ οὐδ' εἰς ἐννοίαν τούτου ἐλθεῖν δυνάμεθα. *Ibid.* So Tertullian describes the Jews, 'Negantes passionem crucis in Christum prædicatam, et argumentantes insuper non esse credendum, ut ad id genus mortis exposuerit Deus Filium suum, quod ipse dixit, *Maledictus omnis homo qui pependit in ligno.*' *Adv. Jud. cap. 10.* [p. 195 A.]

\* [This is not a work of Jerom. See Op. vol. vii. Append. p. 250.]

† [This Sermon is rejected by the Benedictine editor. Append. ad vol. v. part ii. p. 24. Serm. xi. 6.]

than Isaac was: nor can God the Father, who gave his only-begotten Son, be better expressed than by that Patriarch in his

Gen. xxii. 2. readiness to sacrifice his son, *his only son Isaac, whom he loved.*

Now when that grand act of obedience was to be performed, we find Isaac walking to the mountain of Moriah with the wood on his shoulders, and saying, *Here is the wood, but where is the sacrifice?* while in the command of God, and the intention and resolution of Abraham, Isaac is the sacrifice who bears the wood. And the Christ, who was to be the most perfect sacrifice, the person in whom all nations were perfectly to be blessed, could die no other death in which the wood was to be carried; and being to die upon the cross, was, by the formal custom<sup>82</sup> used in that kind of death, certainly to carry it. Therefore Isaac bearing the wood did presignify Christ bearing the cross<sup>83</sup>.

When the fiery serpents bit the Israelites, and *much people* Num. xxi. 9. *died, Moses, by the command of God, made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole: and it came to pass that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived.* Now

Gen. iii. 15. if there were no expresser promise of the Messiah than the *seed of the woman, which should bruise the serpent's head; if he were to perform that promise by the virtue of his death; if no death could be so perfectly represented by the hanging on the pole as that of crucifixion; then was that manifestly foretold which*

John iii. 14. *Christ himself informed Nicodemus, As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up*<sup>84</sup>.

<sup>82</sup> This custom is very considerable as to the explication of this type; and is to be therefore confirmed by the testimonies of the ancients, which are most express. Βαστάζειν τινα τῶν δαιμόνων χθονίων — κακούργου μὲν ἰδόντι σταυρὸν αὐτῷ σημαίνει· εἶκοι γὰρ ὁ σταυρὸς θανάτου, καὶ ὁ μέλλων προσηλοῦσθαι πρότερον αὐτὸν βαστάζει. Artemid. Onειροερ. lib. ii. cap. 61. Τῷ μὲν σώματι τῶν κολαζομένων ἕκαστος τῶν κακούργων ἐκφέρει τὸν αὐτοῦ σταυρὸν. Plutarch. de his qui sero puniuntur. [vol. ii. p. 554 A.] So these not long after our Saviour's death; and much before it, Plautus in Carbonario, [Fragm. ii. 445.]

*Patibulum ferat per urbem, deinde affigatur cruci.*

<sup>83</sup> This is not only the observation of the Christians, but the Jews themselves have referred this type unto that custom. For upon Gen. xxii. 6. *And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering, and laid it upon Isaac his son, the lesser Bereshith hath this note, כוה ששׂוין כוה בנחשו צלבוו as a man carries his cross upon his shoulders.\**

<sup>84</sup> The common phrase by which that death was expressed. 'In cruce[m] tolli:' Paul. lib. v. Sentent. tit. 22, 23, et 25. As in the Chaldee תרעקרי by origination elevatio, by use is particularly crucifixio.

\* [Quoted from Martini Pugio Fidei, p. 663. The passage is however to be found in the Bereshith Rabba, Venice 1556, f. 116 a. and in the Jalkut, Livorno 1657, f. 62 b. ult.—R.P.S.]

The paschal lamb did plainly typify that Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world; and the preparing of it did not only represent the cross<sup>85</sup>, but the command or ordinance of the passover did foretell as much. For while it is said, *Ye shall not break a bone thereof,* it was thereby intimated, that the Saviour of the world should suffer that death to which the breaking of the bones belonged (and that, according to the constant custom, was the punishment of crucifixion<sup>86</sup>), but only in that death should by the providence of God be so particularly preserved, as that not one bone of his should be touched. And thus the crucifixion of the Messiah in several types was represented.

Nor was it only thus prefigured and involved in these typical resemblances, but also clearly spoken by the Prophets in their particular and express predictions. Nor shall we need the accession of any lost or additional prophetic expressions, which some of the ancients have made use of<sup>87</sup>: those which are still

<sup>85</sup> Justin Martyr shews how the manner of the roasting of the paschal lamb did represent the affixing of a man unto the cross, and thereby was a type of Christ. Τὸ κελευσθὲν πρόβατον ἐκεῖνο ὁπτιὸν ζῶον γίνεσθαι, τοῦ πάθους τοῦ σταυροῦ δι' οὗ πάσχειν ἐμελλεν ὁ Χριστὸς, σύμβολον ἦν· τὸ γὰρ ὀπτῶμενον πρόβατον σχηματιζόμενον ὁμοίως τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σταυροῦ ὀπτᾶται. Eis γὰρ ὁρθίος ὀβελίσκος διαπερονᾶται ἀπὸ τῶν κατωτάτω μερῶν μέχρι τῆς κεφαλῆς, καὶ εἰς πάλιν κατὰ τὸ μετὰφρονον, ἔ προσαρτῶνται καὶ αἱ χεῖρες τοῦ προβάτου. Dial. cum Tryph. §. 40. [p. 137 B.] To which Arnouldus Carnotensis alludeth: 'In veru crucis boni odoris assatio excoquat carnalium sensuum cruditatem.' De Oena Domini, commonly attributed to St. Cyprian. Nor is this roasting of the lamb any far-fetched figure of the cross; for other roasting hath been thought a proper resemblance of it: where the body of the thing roasted hath limbs, as a lamb, there it bears the similitude of a proper cross, with an erect and transverse beam; where the roasted body is only of length and uniform, as a fish, there the resemblance is of a straight and simple σταυρός. As it is represented by Hesychius: Σκόλοψιν ὡς ὀπτησιν' τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν τοὺς κακουργοῦντας ἀνεσκολόπιζον δέζοντες

ξύλον διὰ τῆς βράχως καὶ τοῦ νότου, καθάπερ τοὺς ὀπταμένους ἰχθὺς ἐπὶ ὀβελίσκων.

<sup>86</sup> Although indeed it must be confessed, that the crucifixion and the roasting were two several punishments, and that they ordinarily made the cross a lingering death; yet because the Law of Moses did not suffer the body of a man to hang upon a tree in the night, therefore the Romans, so far to comply with the Jews, did break the bones of those whom they crucified in Judæa constantly; whereas in other countries they did it but occasionally.

<sup>87</sup> As Barnabas cites one of the Prophets whom we know not: 'Ὁμοίως πάλιν περι τοῦ σταυροῦ ὀρίζει ἐν ἄλλω προφήτῃ λέγοντι, Καὶ πότε ταῦτα συντελεσθήσεται; καὶ λέγει Κύριος, 'Όταν ξύλον κλιθῆ καὶ ἀναστῆ, καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ξύλου αἶμα στάξῃ, Epist. cap. 12. [p. 38.] which words are not to be found in any of the Prophets. Thus Justin Martyr, to prove ὅτι μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι βασιλεύσει ὁ Χριστός, produceth a prophecy out of the 66th Psalm, in these words; 'Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, Dial. cum Tryph. §. 73. [p. 170 C.] and Tertullian, who advances all his conceptions, 'Age nunc, si legisi penes Prophetam in Psalmis, Dominus regnavit a ligno; exspecto quid intelligas, ne forte

preserved even among the Jews, will yield this truth sufficient testimonies.

When God foretells by the Prophet Zachary, what he should suffer from the sons of men, he says expressly<sup>88</sup>, *They shall look*

Zech. xii.  
10.

lignarium aliquem regem significari putetis, et non Christum, qui exinde a passione Christi (lege crucis, for he himself hath it ligni, *Adv. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 19.* [p. 408 B.]) superata morte regnavit.' *Adv. Jud. cap. 10.* [p. 196 B.] and in the place cited against Marcion: 'Etsi enim mors ab Adam regnavit usque ad Christum, cur Christus non regnasse dicatur a ligno, ex quo crucis ligno mortuus, regnum mortis exclusit?' Thus they, and some after them, make use of those words, ἀπὸ ξύλου, a ligno, which are not to be found either in the Greek or Latin translation, from whence they seem to produce them; nor is there any thing like them in the original, or any translation extant, nor the least mention or footstep of them in the *Catena Græcorum Patrum*. Justin Martyr indeed accused the Jews for rasing the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου out of the text: 'Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνενηκοστοῦ πέμπτου ψαλλοῦ τῶν διὰ Δαβὶδ λεχθέντων λόγων, λέξεις βραχειάς ἀφείλοντο ταύτας, ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου' εἰρημέου γὰρ τοῦ λόγου, Ἐπάτε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, 'Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, ἀφῆκαν, Ἐπάτε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, 'Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν. *Ibid.* But first he doth not accuse them for rasing it out of the original Hebrew, for his discourse is only to shew that they abused the LXX. Secondly, though the Jews had rased it out of their own, it appeareth not how they should have gotten it out of the Bibles in the Christians' hands, in which those words are not to be found.

<sup>88</sup> These words of Zachary are clear in the original, והבישו אלי אה אשר-דקר, although the LXX. have made another sense, Ἐπιβλήσονται πρὸς με, ἀπὸ ὧν καταρχήσαντο, by translating אה אשר ἀπὸ ὧν, eo quod; as also the Chaldee Paraphrase על די with the Arabic ver-

sion; and the Syriac another yet, by rendering it *per eum quem*, as if they should look upon one, and pierce another: yet the plain construction of אה אשר is nothing else but *quem*, relating to the person in the affix of the precedent אלי, who, being the same with him who immediately before promiseth to pour upon man the Spirit of grace, must needs be God. Which that the Jews might avoid, they read it not אלי, but אליו, not *on me*, but *on him*, to distinguish him whom they were to pierce, from him who was to give the Spirit of grace. But this fraud is easily detected, because it is against the Hebrew copies, the Septuagint, and Chaldee Paraphrase, the Syriac and Arabic translations. Nor can the Rabbins shift this place, because it was anciently by the Jews interpreted of the Messiah, as themselves confess. So R. Solomon Jarchi upon the place, ירו' יוסף: פירושוהו על משיח בן יוסף. *Our masters have expounded this of the Messiah the son of Joseph.* That they interpreted it therefore of the Messiah, is granted by them; that any Messiah was to be the son of Joseph, is already denied and refuted: it remaineth therefore that the ancient Jews did interpret it of the true Messiah, and that St. John did apply it to our Saviour according to the acknowledged exposition. And in *Bereshith Rabba*, we are clearly taught thus much; for unto that question, *Who art thou, O great mountain?* Zech. iv. 7. he answereth, הר הגדול זה משיח בן דוד. *The great mountain is the Messiah the son of David.* And he proves it from, *Grace, grace unto it*, שהו נתן הן, ומהנוניי because he giveth grace and supplications; as it is written, Zech. xii. 10.\*

\* [Quoted from Martini Pugio Fidei, 330, 331, who repeatedly adduces these words from the *Bereshith Rabba* on Gen. xxviii. 10. But Galatinus de Arcanis, l. iii. c. 21. says that it is from that *Bereshith* of which Moses Haddarshan is the reputed author. It is not to be found in the real *Bereshith*, but a somewhat similar passage may be seen in the *Jalkut* on the Prophets ילקוט נביאים on Zechariah, §. טקז.—R.P.S.]

upon me whom they have pierced; and therefore shews that he speaks of the Son of God, which was to be the Son of Man, and by our nature liable to vulneration; and withal foretells the piercing of his body: which being added to that prediction in the Psalms, *They pierced my hands and my feet*<sup>89</sup>, clearly Ps. xxii. 16. representeth and foretellet to us the death upon the cross, to which the hands and feet of the person crucified were affixed with nails. And because these prophecies appeared so particular and clear, and were so properly applied by that Disciple whom our Saviour loved, and to whom he made a singular application even upon the cross; therefore the Jews have used more than ordinary industry and artifice to elude these two predictions, but in vain<sup>90</sup>. For these two Prophets, David and Zachary, manifestly did foretell the particular punishment of crucifixion.

202 It was therefore sufficiently adumbrated by types, and promulgated by prophecies, that the promised Messiah was to be *crucified*. And it is as certain that our Jesus, the Christ whom we worship, and from whom we receive that honour to be named Christians, was really and truly *crucified*. It was first the wicked design of Judas, who *betrayed* him to Matt. xxvi. 2.

<sup>89</sup> This translation indeed seems something different from the Hebrew text, as we now read it, כארי די ורגלי כארי ירי ורגלי. *Sicut leo, manus meas et pedes meos.* But it was not always read as now it is. For R. Jacob the son of Chajim, in *Massoreth magna* מרכה איה האלה *ordine* אה, [ad. calc. Bibl. Rabb. ed. 2a.] testifieth that he found כפריה in some correct copies, כתוב, and therefore written in the margin כארי, but קרי read, and the same is testified by the *Masorah* on Num. xxiv. 9. citing the words of this text, and adding כארו כהיב. And Johannes Isaac Levita confirmeth it by his own experience, who had seen in an ancient copy כארו in the text, and כארי in the margin. It was anciently therefore without question written כארו, as appeareth not only by the LXX., who translated it ἄρπυγας, *fedarunt*; and Aquila, who rendered it ἤσχυαν, *fedarunt*, (in the same sense with that of Virgil;

*Obscenas pelagi ferro fedare volucres.*  
Æneid. iii. 241.

and the old Syriac, which translatheth it כארו *transfixerunt*; but also by the less, or marginal, *Masorah*, which noteth that the word כארי is found written alike in two places; this and Isaiah xxxviii. 13. but in divers significations: wherefore being in Isaiah it manifestly signifieth *sicut leo*, it must not signify the same in this; and being the Jews themselves pretend to nothing else, it followeth that it be still read as it was, and translated *foderunt*. From whence it also appeareth, that this was one of the eighteen places which were altered by the Scribes.

<sup>90</sup> For the *Masorah* in several places confesseth, that eighteen places in the Scriptures have been altered by the Scribes; and when they come to reckon the places, they mention but sixteen: the other two without question are those concerning the crucifixion of the Messiah, Psal. xxii. 16. and Zech. xii. 10. For that of Zachary, a Jew confessed it to Mercerus; and that of David, we shewed before to be the other.

that death; it was the malicious cry of the obdurate Jews, *Crucify him, crucify him.* He was actually condemned and delivered to that death by Pilate, who gave sentence that it should be as they required: he was given into the hands of the soldiers, the instruments commonly used in inflicting that punishment<sup>91</sup>, who led him away to crucify him. He underwent those previous pains which customarily antecede that suffering, as flagellation<sup>92</sup>, and bearing of the cross: for Pilate when he had scourged Jesus, delivered him to be crucified; and he bearing his cross went forth into Golgotha. They carried him forth out of the city, as by custom in that kind of death they were wont to do<sup>93</sup>; and there between two malefactors, usually by the Romans condemned to that punishment<sup>94</sup>, they crucified him. And that he was truly fastened to the cross, appears by the satisfaction given to doubting Thomas, who said, *Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, I will not believe:* and our Saviour said unto him, *Reach hither thy finger,*

John xix.  
15.  
Luke xxiii.  
24.

Matt. xxvii  
31.

Verse 26.

John xix.  
17.

John xx.  
25, 27.

<sup>91</sup> That the soldiers did execute the sentence of death given by the Roman magistrates in their provinces, and not only in the camp, is evident out of the historians of that nation.

<sup>92</sup> 'Sciendum est Romanis [Pilatum] legibus ministrasse, quibus sancitum est, ut qui crucifigitur prius flagellis verberetur.' *S. Hieron. ad Matt. xxvii. 26.* [vol. vii. p. 230 E.] To which Lucian alludes in his own condemnation: 'Ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀνεσκολοπίσθαι δοκεῖ αὐτῶν, νῆ Δία, μαστιγωθέντα γὰρ πρότερον. *Lucian. in Piscatore, cap. 2.* 'Multi occisi, multi capti, alios verberatos crucibus affixit.' *Liv. lib. xxxiii. cap. 36.* So Curtius reports of Alexander, 'Omnes verberibus affectos sub ipsis radicibus petræ crucibus jussit affigi.' *Lib. vii. cap. 11.* Thus were the Jews themselves used, who caused our Saviour to be scourged and crucified: *Μαστιγούμενοι καὶ προβασαιόμενοι τοῦ θανάτου πᾶσαν αἰκίαν, ἀνεσταυρόντο. Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib. v. cap. 28.* [c. 11.]

<sup>93</sup> This was observed both by the Jews and Romans, that their capital punishments were inflicted without their cities: and that particularly was observed in the punishment of crucifixion. Plautus;

*Credo ego isthoc exemplo tibi esse eundem actutum extra portam, Dispersis manibus, patibulum cum habebis.*—

Miles Glor. act. ii. sc. 4.

Tully; 'Cum Mamertini more atque instituto suo crucem fixissent post urbem in via Pompeia.' *Lib. v. in Verr. cap. 66.*

<sup>94</sup> Thieves and robbers were usually by the Romans punished with this death. Thus Cæsar used his pirates, *Τοὺς ληστὰς ἅπαντας ἀνεσταύρωσε. Plutarch. in Vita, cap. 2.* 'Imperator provinciæ jussit latrones crucibus affigi.' *Petron. Satyr. [c. cxi.]* 'Latronem istum, miserorum pignorum meorum peremptorem, cruci affigatis.' *Apul. de Aur. Asin. lib. iii.* 'Latrocinium fecit aliquis, quid ergo meruit? ut suspendatur.' *Sen. Epist. 7.* Where suspendi is as much as crucifigi, and is so to be understood in all Latin authors which wrote before the days of Constantine. 'Famosos latrones, in his locis ubi grassati sunt, furca figendos compluribus placuit.' *Callis. lib. xxxviii. de penis.* Where *furca figendos* is put for *crucifigendos*; being so altered by Tribonianus, who, because Constantine had taken away the punishment, took also the name out of the Law.

and behold my hands: whereby he satisfied the Apostle, that he was the Christ; and us, that the Christ was truly crucified; against that fond heresy<sup>95</sup>, which made Simon the Cyrenean not only bear the cross, but endure crucifixion, for our Saviour. We therefore infer this second conclusion from the undoubted testimonies of his followers, and unfeigned confessions of his enemies, that our Jesus was certainly and truly crucified, and did really undergo those sufferings, which were pretypified and foretold, upon the cross.

Being thus fully assured that the Messiah was to be, and that our Christ was truly, crucified; it, thirdly, concerns us to understand what was the nature of crucifixion, what the particularities of suffering which he endured on the cross. Nor is this now so easily understood as once it was: for being a Roman punishment, it was continued in that empire while it remained heathen: but when the emperors themselves received Christianity, and the towering eagles resigned the flags unto the cross, this punishment was forbidden by the supreme authority<sup>96</sup>, out of a due respect and pious honour to the death of Christ. From whence it came to pass, that since it hath been disused universally for so many hundred years, it hath not been so rightly conceived as it was before, when the general practice of the world did so

<sup>95</sup> This was the peculiar heresy of Basilides, a man so ancient, that he boasted to follow Glaucias as his master, who was the disciple of St. Peter. And Irenæus hath declared this particularity of his: 'Quapropter neque passum eum; sed Simonem quendam Cyrenæum angariatium portasse crucem ejus pro eo; et hunc secundum ignorantiam et errorem crucifixum, transfiguratum ab eo, uti pateret ipse esse Jesus; et ipsum autem Jesum Simonis accepisse formam, et stantem irrisisse eos;' *Adv. Hæres. lib. i. cap. 23.* [c. 24. §. 4. p. 101.] and Tertullian, of the same Basilides: 'Hunc (Christum) passum a Judæis non esse, sed vice ipsius Simonem crucifixum esse: unde nec in eum credendum esse qui sit crucifixus, ne quis confiteatur in Simonem credidisse.' *De Præscr. adv. Hæret. cap. 46.* [p. 219 D.] From these is the same delivered by Epiphanius, *Hæres. xxiv. §. 3.* and by St. Augustin, *Hæres. 4.*

<sup>96</sup> This is observed by St. Austin,

*Serm. 18. de Verbis Dom. [c. ix. §. 8. vol. v. pt. i. p. 473 F.]* 'Quia ipse honoraturus erat fideles suos in fine hujus seculi, prius honoravit crucem in hoc seculo; ut terrarum principes credentes in eum prohiberent aliquem nocentium crucifigi;' and, *Tract. 36. in Joan. [vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 546 A.]* speaking of this particular punishment; 'Modo in pœnis reorum non est apud Romanos; ubi enim Domini crux honorata est, putatum est quod et reus honoraretur si crucifigeretur.' Whence appears, first, that in the days of St. Austin crucifixion was disused; secondly, that it was prohibited by the secular princes. But when it was first prohibited, or by whom, he sheweth not. It is therefore to be observed, that it was first forbidden by the first Christian emperor, Constantine the Great: of whom Sozomenus gives this relation; 'Ἀμέλει τοι πρότερον νενομισμένην Ῥωμαίοις τὴν τοῦ σταυροῦ τιμωρίαν νόμῳ ἀνέειλε τῆς χριστέως τῶν δικαστηρίων. *Lib. i. cap. 8.* [p. 20.]

frequently represent it to the Christian's eyes. Indeed if the word which is used to denote that punishment did sufficiently represent or express it, it were enough to say that Christ was *crucified*: but being the most usual or original word<sup>97</sup> doth not

<sup>97</sup> The original word in the New Testament, for the tree on which our Saviour suffered, is *σταυρός*, and the action or crucifixion *σταύρωσις*, the active *σταυροῦν*, and the passive *σταυροῦσθαι*. Now *σταυρός*, from which the rest mentioned are manifestly derived, hath of itself originally no other signification than of a *stake*. As we find it first used by Homer;

Ἐκ τῶν δ' ἑκτὸς ἔλασσε διαμπερὲς ἔνθα  
καὶ ἔνθα,

Πυκνοῦς καὶ θαμέας, τὸ μέλαν δρυὸς  
ἀμφικέσασσας. Ὅδ. ξ'. ιι.

Ἄμφι δὲ οἱ μεγάλῃν αὐλὴν ποίησαν  
ἕνακτι

Ἐσταυροῖσιν πυκνοῦσι—  
Ἰλ. ω'. 452.

These are the same which Homer elsewhere calls *σκόλοpes*, and the ancient grammarians render each by other. As Eustathius; *Ἐσταυροὶ δὲ ὀρθὰ καὶ ἀπωξυμμένα ξύλα*.—οἱ δ' αὐτοὶ καὶ σκόλοpes λέγονται, ἀφ' ὧν τὸ ἀνασκοποῦσθαι καὶ ἀνασταυροῦσθαι so he, expounding *σταυρός*; and in the same manner expounding *σκόλοpes*. [Il. η'. 441.] *Λέγονται δὲ οἱ τοιοῦται σκόλοpes καὶ σταυροί*.—ἐκ δὲ τούτων τὸ ἀνασκοποῦσθαι, καὶ ἀνασταυροῦν. As when Homer describes the Phæacian walls,

Τείχεα μακρὰ,

Ἐψηλὰ σκολόπεσσιν ἀρηρότα, —  
Ὅδ. η'. 44.

he gives this exposition; *Σκόλοpes δὲ καὶ νῦν ξύλα ὀρθὰ, οἱ καὶ σταυροί*. In the same manner Hesychius; *Ἐσταυροί, οἱ καταπεπηγότες σκόλοpes, χάρακες* and *Σκόλοpes, ὀρθέα, (l. ὀρθὰ) καὶ ὀξέα ξύλα, σταυροί, χάρακες* and again, *Χάραξι, φραγμοῖς, ὀξέα ξύλα*.—οἱ δὲ, καλὰμοις, οἱ δὲ, *σταυροί*. Besides they all agree in the same etymology, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴστασθαι, and therefore always take it for a straight standing stake, pale, or palisado. Thus κελόντες in Antiphon are briefly rendered ὀρθὰ ξύλα but more expressly thus by Etymologus, *Κελόντες, κυρίως οἱ ἰσθόποdes, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὰ καταπεπηγότα ξύλα, ἃ καὶ σταυροὺς καλοῦσι*. This is the undoubted signifi-

cation of *σταυρός*, in vain denied by Salmasius, who will have it first to signify the same with *furca*, and then with *crux*; first the figure of T, and then of T. Whereas all antiquity renders it no other than as a straight and sharp stake: in which signification it came at first to denote this punishment, the most simple and prime *σταύρωσις* or *ἀνασκολόπισις* being upon a single piece of wood, a *deflexus et erectus stipes*. And the Greeks which wrote the Roman history used the word *σταυρός* as well for their *palus* as their *crux*. As when Antony beheaded Antigonus the king of the Jews, Dion thus begins to describe his execution; *Ἀντίγονον ἐμαστίγωσε σταυρῷ προσδήσας*. *Hist. Rom. lib. xlix. cap. 22.* not that he crucified him, as Baronius mistakes; but that he put him to another death after the Roman custom, as those died in Livy, *'Deligati ad palum, virgisque cæsi, et securi percussi.'* *Lib. xxviii. cap. 29.* So that *σταυρῷ προσδεῖν*, is *'ad palum deligare.'* Thus were the heads of men said *ἀνασταυρωθῆναι*, as of Niger and Albinus in Dio, *lib. lxxiv. cap. 8. et lib. lxxv. cap. 7.* and Herodian, *lib. iii. cap. 24.* which cannot be meant but of a single *palus*: and we read in Ctesias how Amytis put Inarus to death, *Ἀνεσταύρωσε μὲν ἐπὶ τρισὶ σταυροῖς*, not that he crucified him upon three crosses, but pierced his body with three stakes fastened in the ground, and sharpened at the upper end; as appears by the like Persian punishment inflicted by Parysatis on Mesabates, as delivered by Plutarch *in Artaxerxe, cap. 17.* *Προσέταξεν ἐκδεῖραι ζῶντα, καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα πλάγιον διὰ τριῶν σταυρῶν ἀναπῆξαι, τὸ δὲ δέρμα χάρις διαπατταλεῖσθαι* which the Latin translator renders *in tres sustollit cruces*, (a thing impossible;) whereas it was to be transversely fastened to three stakes piercing the body lying, and thrust down upon them; which in the *Excerpta* of Ctesias is delivered only in the word *ἀνεσταυρίσθαι*. *Ἐσταυρός* therefore is no more originally than *σκόλοψ*, a single stake, or an erect

of itself declare the figure of the tree, or manner of the suffering, it will be necessary to represent it by such expressions as we find partly in the evangelical relations, partly in such representations as are left us in those authors whose eyes were daily witnesses of such executions.

The form then of the cross on which our Saviour suffered was not a simple, but a compounded, figure, according to the custom of the Romans, by whose procurator he was condemned to die. In which there was not only a straight and erected piece of wood fixed in the earth, but also a transverse beam<sup>98</sup> fastened

piece of wood, upon which many suffered who were said *ἀνασταυροῦσθαι* and *ἀνασκοποῦσθαι*. And when other transverse or prominent parts were added in a perfect cross, it retained still the original name, not only of *σταυρός*, but also of *σκόλοψ*. as *Ἦφειλεν εἰς ἐπίδειξιν θεότητος ἀπὸ τοῦ σκόλοπος γοῦν εὐθὺς ἀφανῆς γένεσθαι, &c. τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ σκόλοπος αὐτοῦ φωνὴν ὅτ' ἀπέπνει.* *Celsus apud Orig. lib. ii. [§. 68, 58.]* Thus in that long, or rather too long, verse written by Audaux to St. Augustin, *Epist. 139. [Ep. 260. S. Aug. ii. p. 887 C.]*

*Exspectat quos plena fides Christi de stipite pendens.*

<sup>98</sup> That the figure and parts of a Roman cross, such as that was on which our Saviour suffered, may be known, we must begin with the first composition in the frame or structure of it; and that is the conjunction of the two beams, the one erect, the other transverse; the first to which the body was applied, the second to which the hands were fastened. These two, as the chief parts of the cross, are several ways expressed: first, by the Jews, who had no one word in their language particularly to express that punishment, (as being not mentioned in the Law, or at all in use among them,) and therefore call it by a double name, expressing the conjunction of these beams, *ערוך ויהי stamen et subtegmen, the warp and the woof*. The Greeks express the same by the letter *ταῦ*, as partly appears by what is already spoken of the number 300, and is yet more evident by the testimony of Lucian, who makes mankind complain of the letter *ταῦ*, because tyrants in imita-

tion of that first made the cross. *Ἐφ γὰρ τούτου σώματι φασι τοὺς τυράννοις ἀκολουθήσαντας, καὶ μιμησαμένους τὸ πλάσμα, ἔπειτα σχήματι τοιοῦτ' ξύλα τεκτῆραντας, ἀνθρώπους ἀνασκοποῦσθαι ἐπ' αὐτὰ.* *Jud. Vocal. cap. 12.* *'Ipsa est enim litera Græcorum Tau, nostra autem T, species crucis.'* *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 22. [p. 410 C.]* St. Jerom affirms the same of the Samaritan *Tau*: but there is no similitude to be found in that which is now in use, or any other oriental, only in the Coptic alphabet *Salebdî*, that is the cross *Dî*. These two parts of the cross are otherwise expressed by the mast and yard of a ship. So Justin Martyr: *Θάλασσα μὲν γὰρ οὐ τέμνεται, ἢν μὴ τούτο τὸ τρόπαιον ἢ καλεῖται ἰστίον, ἐν τῇ νηὶ σώων μείνη.* *Apolog. i. §. 55. [p. 76 D.]* and Tertullian: *'antenna navis crucis pars est.'* *Adv. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 18. [p. 407 C.]* and Minucius Felix: [p. 287. ed. 1672.] *'Signum sane crucis naturaliter visum in navi, cum velis tumebibus vehitur.'* and *Maximus Taurinensis*; *'Cum a nautis scinditur mare, prius arbor erigitur, velum distenditur, ut cruce Domini facta aquarum fluenta rumpantur.'* [*Hom. ii. p. 198.*] Now because the extremities of the antenna are a kind of *κεράτια*, (as Virgil, that great master of proprieties,

*Cornua velatarum obvertimus antenarum;* *Æneid. iii. 549.*)

therefore in Greek *κεφαία* is *antenna*: and from thence the Greek Fathers applied the words of our Saviour, *Matt. v. 18.* *Ἰῶτα ἐν, ἢ μία κεφαία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται*, to the cross of Christ; *Τοῦ γὰρ σταυροῦ ἰῶτα ἐστὶ τὸ ὀρθὸν ξύλον, καὶ κεφαία τὸ*

unto that towards the top thereof: and beside these two cutting 204 each other transversely at right angles (so that the erected part extended itself above the transverse), there was also another piece of wood<sup>99</sup> infixed into, and standing out from, that which

πλάγιον. Because ἰῶτα is like the straight piece or mast of the cross, and κεραία the yard or transverse part; therefore some of the ancients interpreted this place of the cross, says Theophylact on the place. And Gregory Nyssen; Ἀληθῶς γὰρ τοῖς καθορᾶν δυναμένοις ἐν τῷ νόμῳ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὸν σταυρὸν θεωρεῖται μυστήριον· διὸ φησὶ που τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ νόμου τὸ ἰῶτα καὶ ἡ κεραία οὐ παρέρχεται· σημαῖνον διὰ τῶν εἰρημένων τὴν τε ἐκ πλαγίου γραμμὴν καὶ τὴν κάθετον, δι' ὧν τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ καταγράφεται. *Lib. ii. de Vita Moysis.* [vol. i. p. 217 C.] Not that this is the true interpretation of that place (for κεραία signifies a part of a letter, as in Apollonius, *Syntax. lib. i. cap. 7.* Τοῦ ἄ τὴν κεραίαν ἀπήλειψε); but by that they testify their apprehension of the figure of a cross; which is well expressed by Eusebius, describing the form of the cross which appeared to Constantine, Ὑψηλὸν δόρυ χρυσοῦ καταμφισμένον, κέρας ἔχεν ἐγκάρσιον, σταυροῦ σχήματι ποιημένον. *De Vita Constant. lib. i. cap. 31.* [p. 516.] And this similitude of the mast and yard leads to the consideration of that part of the erected pale, which was eminent above the transverse beam. For as the κερῆσιον was above the κεραία, so the stipes did extend itself above the patibulum. And this is evident by those expressions which make the two beams have four sides, and four extremities, as two lines cutting each other at equal angles needs must have. These Theophanes, *Homil. 4.* [p. 19 C.] and Gregory Nyssen, in *Christi Resur. Orat. i.* [vol. iii. p. 396 D.] call τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ μέσου τέσσαρας προβολὰς· Damascenus, *Orthod. Fid. lib. iv. cap. 11.* [vol. i. p. 264 B.] τὰ τέσσαρα ἄκρα τοῦ σταυροῦ διὰ τοῦ μέσου κέντρον κρατούμενα καὶ συσφιγόμενα. Hence Nonnus calls the cross δόρυ τετράπλευρον. And of these four parts the Fathers interpret the height and breadth, and length and depth, mentioned by St. Paul, *Eph. iii. 18.* As Gregory Nyssen: Ἐφεσίοις τὴν

τὸ πᾶν διακρατούσαν τε καὶ συνέχουσαν δύναμιν τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σταυροῦ καταγράφει—ὕψος καὶ βάθος καὶ πλάτος καὶ μήκος κατονομάζων, ἐκάστην κεραίαν κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ θεωρουμένων, ἰδίους προσαγορεύων ὀνόμασιν· ὡς τὸ μὲν ἄνω μέρος ὕψος εἰπεῖν· βάθος δὲ τὸ μετὰ τὴν συμβολὴν ὑποκείμενον· τὴν δὲ ἐγκάρσιον καθ' ἐκάτερον κεραίαν τῷ τοῦ μήκους τε καὶ πλάτους ὀνόματι διασημαίνων. *Cont. Eunom. Orat. 4.* [vol. ii. p. 582 D.] et *idem Catech. Orat. cap. 32.* et in *Christi Resur. Orat. 1.* And St. Augustin makes the same interpretation: 'In hoc mysterio figura crucis ostenditur;' which he thus expresseth; 'Latitudo est in eo ligno quod transversum desuper figur;—longitudo in eo quod ab ipso ligno usque ad terram conspicuum est;—altitudo est in ea ligni parte, quæ ab illo quod transversum figur sursum versus relinquuntur, hoc est, ad caput crucifixi;' &c. *Epist. cxx. cap. 26.* [Ep. cxl. 64. vol. ii. p. 446 D.] et *alibi sæpe.* These four parts are severally expressed by the ancients, and particularly by the figure of a man with his hands stretched forth; which is the most proper similitude, because the cross was first made and adapted to that figure. 'Quod caput emicat, quod spina dirigitur, quod humerorum obliquatio cornuat, si statueris hominem manibus expansis, imaginem crucis feceris.' *Tertul. ad Nat. lib. i. cap. 12.* [p. 49 D.]

<sup>99</sup> Beside the direct and transverse part of the cross, with their four extremities, which only usually are considered, and represented in the figures, we must find yet another part, and a fifth extremity. Irenæus giving several examples of the number Five, delivers it plainly thus; 'Ipse habitus crucis fines et summitates habet quinque, duos in longitudine, et duos in latitudine, et unum in medio, ubi requiescit qui clavus affigitur.' *Adv. Hæres. lib. ii. cap. 24.* [§. 4. p. 151.] Besides therefore the four extremities of the direct and transverse beams, there was a fifth ἄκρον in

was erected and straight up. To that erected piece was his body, being lifted up, applied, as Moses' serpent to the pole; and to the transverse beam his hands were nailed: upon the lower part coming out from the erected piece his sacred body rested, and his feet were transfixed and fastened with nails: his head, being pressed with a crown of thorns, was applied to that part of the erect which stood above the transverse beam; and above 205 his head, to that was fastened the table<sup>1</sup> on which was written,

medio (viz. of the erected palus), on which the crucified body rested. This fifth part of the cross fastened to the *arrectarius stipes* was before Irenæus acknowledged and described by Justin Martyr, under the notion of the horn of the rhinoceros, taken to be a figure or type of the cross. *Μονοκέρωτος γὰρ κέρατα οὐδενός ἄλλου πράγματος ἢ σχήματος ἔχει ἂν τις εἰπεῖν καὶ ἀποδείξει, εἰ μὴ τοῦ τύπου ὡς τὸν σταυρὸν δείκνυσιν.* ὄρθιον γὰρ τὸ ἐν ἐστὶ ξύλον, ἀφ' οὗ ἐστὶ τὸ ἀνώτατον μέρος εἰς κέρας ὑπεργερμένον, ὅταν τὸ ἄλλο ξύλον προσαρμοσθῆ, καὶ ἐκατέρωθεν ὡς κέρατα τῶ ἐνὶ κέρατι παρεζευγμένα τὰ ἄκρα φαίνηται· καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ πηγνύμενον, ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτὸ ἐξέχον ἐστίν, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρούμενοι· καὶ βλέπεται ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτὸ σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις κέρασι συνεσχηματισμένον καὶ πεπηγμένον. *Dial. cum Tryph. §. 91.* [p. 188 C.] Where beside the ὄρθιον ξύλον, or *arrectarius stipes*, and the ἄλλο ξύλον, or *transversarium lignum*, there is a third, τὸ ἐν μέσῳ πηγνύμενον, fastened in the middle; ἐφ' ᾧ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρούμενοι, says he: 'ubi requiescit qui clavus affigitur,' says Irenæus. So Tertullian; 'Pars crucis, et quidem majus, est omne robur quod de recta statione defigitur. Sed nobis tota crux imputatur, cum antenna scilicet sua, et cum illo sedilis excessu.' *Ad Nat. lib. i. cap. 12.* [p. 49 C.] Where the *excessus* is the τὸ ἐξέχον, signifying the nature, as the *sedile* signifieth the use of the part. Which in another place, in imitation of Justinus, he refers unto the typical unicorn: 'Nam et in antenna navis, quæ crucis pars est, extremitates cornua vocantur: unicornis autem, media stipitis, palus.' *Adv. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 18.* [p. 307 C.] et *adv. Jud. cap. 11.* To this *sedile* in the cross Mæcenas seemeth to allude in those words in Seneca;

*Hanc mihi, vel acuta*

*Si sedeam cruce, sustine.*

And Seneca himself does expound him, 'Suffigas licet, et acutam sessoro crucem subdas; est tanti, vulnus suum premere, et patibulo pendere districtum.' *Epist. 101.* Of this Innocentius the First [Third] also speaks, *Serm. 1. de uno Mart.* [vol. i. p. 171.] 'Fuerunt in cruce Dominica ligna quatuor; stipes erectus, et lignum transversum, truncus suppositus, et titulus superpositus.' This Gregorius Turonensis, after the use of the cross was long omitted, interpreted of *suppedaneum*, a piece of wood fastened under the feet of him that suffered: 'Clavorum ergo Dominicorum gratia, quod quatuor fuerint, hæc est ratio. Duo sunt affixi in palmis, et duo in plantis; et queritur cur plantæ affixæ sint quæ in cruce sancta dependere visæ sunt potius quam stare. Sed in stipite erecto foramen factum manifestum est. Pes quoque parvulæ tabellæ in hoc foramen insertus est. Super hanc vero tabulam tanquam stantis hominis sacræ affixæ sunt plantæ.' *De Glor. Mart. cap. 6.* [p. 727 D.]

<sup>1</sup> That which was written over the head of our Saviour is called simply by St. Luke ἐπιγραφή, by St. Matthew αἰτία, by St. Mark ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας, and by St. John τίτλος, making use of a Latin word, as is observed by Nonnus; [xix. v. 101.]

Καὶ Πιλάτος θητήρον ἐπέγραφε μάρτυρι γάμοφφ

Γράμμα, τόπερ καλέουσι Λατινίδι τίτλον ἰωψ.

From all which we may collect, that there was an inscription written over the head of our Saviour, signifying the accusation and pretended crime for which he was condemned to that death. *Gloss. Vet. Aitria, causa, materia, titulus.*

in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin characters, the accusation, according to the Roman custom; and the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS.

Thus by the propriety of the punishment, and the titular inscription, we know what crime was then objected to the immaculate Lamb, and upon what accusation Pilate did at last proceed to pass the sentence of death upon him. It was not any opposition to the Law of Moses, not any danger threatened to the temple, but pretended sedition and affectation of the crown objected, which moved Pilate to condemn him. The Jews did thus accuse him; *We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying, that he himself is Christ a King.* And when Pilate sought to release him, they cried out, saying, *If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's*

John xix.  
19.

Luke xxiii.  
2.

John xix.  
12.

As Ovid;

*Causa, superpositæ scripto testata coronæ,  
Servatos cives indicat hujus opæ.*

Trist. lib. iii. Eleg. i. v. 47.

that is, OB CIVES SERVATOS was ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας, *Causa scripto testata.* In the language of Suetonius; 'Titulus, qui causam poenæ indicaret;' *Calig. cap. 32.* as Ovid;

*Vixit, ut occideret damnatus crimine regni:*

*Hunc illi titulum longa senecta  
dabat.* Fast. lib. vi. ver. 189.

This was done according to the Roman custom; as we read in Dio of the son of Cæpio, τὸν δούλον—τὸν προδόντα αὐτὸν, διὰ τε τῆς ἀγορᾶς μέσης μετὰ γραμμάτων τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς θανατώσεως αὐτοῦ δηλοῦντων, διαγαρόντος, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνασταυρώσαντος. *Lib. liv. cap. 3.* This title was written upon a table, and that table fastened to the upper part of the cross. The Syriac, Arabic, and Persian translations render τίτλον expressly a table: and Hesy chius, τίτλος, πτυχίον ἐπιγράμμα ἔχον (not ἔχων, as it is printed), not the inscription itself, but that upon which the inscription was written. Thus the epistle of the French unto the Christians in Asia represents the inscription of the martyr Attalus in a table: Περιαχθεὶς κτύφου τοῦ ἀμφιθεάτρου, πίνακος αὐτὸν προάγοντος, ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο Ῥωμαϊστὶ, Οὐδὲς ἐστὶν Ἀτταλὸς ὁ Χριστιανός. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. v. cap. 1.* [p. 2-6.] And Sozomen, describing the invention of the

cross by Helena, says there were three several crosses in the same place: Καὶ χωρὶς ἄλλο ξύλον ἐν τάξει λευκώματος, βήμασι καὶ γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς, Ἑλληνικοῖς τε καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς. *Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. 1.* [p. 44.] This Nicephorus calls λευκὴν σανίδα, which is the proper interpretation of λεύκωμα. Suidas, λεύκωμα, τοῖχος (Ἐτυμολ. πίναξ) γίνεσθαι ἀλληλεμμέσους πρὸς γραφὴν πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιτήδειος. *Hesy ch. Σανὶς, θύρα, λεύκωμα* (as Julius Pollux joins σανὶς and λεύκωμα together), ἐν ᾧ αἱ γραφαὶ Ἀθήνησιν ἐγράφοντο πρὸς τοὺς κακούργους· τίθεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ταύρου, *leg. σταυροῦ.* His meaning is, that such a λεύκωμα as contained the accusation or crime of malefactors was placed upon the cross on which they suffered; and without question he spake this in reference to our Saviour's cross, because he used in a manner the same words with St. John: Τίθεται ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, says Hesy chius; Ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, saith St. John, xix. 19. It was therefore a table of wood whitened and fastened to the top of the cross, on which the accusation or crime was written, as it is expressed by Nicephorus: Σανὶς ἐτέρα λευκῆ, ἣ βασιλεία τῶν Ἰουδαίων γράφων διαφόροις γράμμασιν ὁ Πιλάτος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἐτίθει, ἐν εἶδει στήλης βασιλεία τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὸν σταυρωθέντα κηρύττων. *Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. 29.* And thus there were, as Xanthopulus observes,

Ὁ σταυρὸς, ἤλοι, καὶ γραφῆς τίτλος ἕνω.

*friend: whosoever maketh himself a King speaketh against Cæsar.* This moved Pilate to pass sentence upon him, and, because that punishment of the cross was by the Roman custom used for that crime<sup>2</sup>, to crucify him.

Two things are most observable in this cross; the acerbity, and the ignominy of the punishment: for of all the Roman ways of execution it was most painful and most shameful<sup>3</sup>. First, the exquisite pains and torments in that death are manifest, in that the hands and feet, which of all the parts of the body are most nervous, and consequently most sensible, were pierced through with nails; which caused, not a sudden despatch, but a lingering and tormenting death: insomuch that the Romans, who most used this punishment, did in their language deduce their expressions of pains and cruciation<sup>4</sup> from the cross. And the acerbity of this punishment appears, in that those who were of any merciful disposition would first cause such as were adjudged to the cross to be slain<sup>5</sup>, and then to be crucified.

As this death was most dolorous and full of acerbity, so was it also most infamous and full of ignominy. The Romans themselves accounted it a servile punishment<sup>6</sup>, and inflicted it upon

2 'Auctores seditionis et tumultus, vel concitatores populi, pro qualitate dignitatis, aut in crucem tolluntur, aut bestiis objiciuntur, aut in insulam deportantur.' *Jul. Paulus, lib. v. tit. 22.*

3 'Illa morte pejus nihil fuit inter omnia genera mortium.' *S. August. Tract. 36. in Joan.* [§. 4. vol. iii. part ii. p. 545 F.] Tully calls it 'crudelissimum terriberrimumque supplicium;' *lib. v. in Verr. cap. 66.* and Apuleius 'poena extrema.' *De Aur. Asin. lib. x.*

4 'Ubi dolores acerrimi exagitant, cruciatus vocatur, a cruce nominatus: pendentes enim in ligno crucifixi, clavis ad lignum pedibus manibusque confixi, producta morte necabantur. Non enim crucifigi hoc erat occidi; sed diu vivebatur in cruce: non quia longior vita eligebatur, sed quia mors ipsa protendebatur, ne dolor citius finiretur.' *S. August. Tract. 36. in Joan.* To this etymology did Terence allude in those words,

— *Et illis crucibus, quæ nos nostramque adolescentiam*

*Habent despiciatui, et quæ nos semper omnibus cruciant modis.*—

*Eunuch. act. ii. sc. 3. v. 91.*

5 As it was observed of Julius Cæsar: 'Piratas a quibus captus est cum in ditionem redeisset, quoniam suffixurum se cruci ante juraverat, jugulari prius jussit, deinde suffigi.' *Suet. lib. i. cap. 74.*

6 Vulcatius Gallicanus relateth of Avidius Cassius, in the case of some centurions which had been prosperous, but in fighting without orders given: 'Rapi eos jussit, et in crucem tolli, servilique supplicio affici; quod exemplum non exstabat.' *Cap. 4.* And Juvenal speaks with relation to this custom,

*Pone crucem servo*—

*Sat. vi. ver. 219.*

So Palæstrio in Plautus;

*Nisi quidem illa nos volt, qui servi sumus,*

*Propter amorem suum omnes crucibus contubernales dari.*

*Mil. Glor. act. ii. sc. 2. ver. 28.*

And again:—



their slaves and fugitives. It was a high crime to put that dishonour upon any free-man, and the greatest indignity which the most undeserving Roman<sup>7</sup> could possibly suffer in himself, or could be contrived to shew their detestation to such creatures as were below human nature<sup>8</sup>. And because, when a man is

*Noli minitari; scio crucem futuram  
mihî sepulchrum.*

*Ibi mei majores sunt siti, pater, avus,  
proavus, abavus.*

Ibid. act. ii. sc. 4. ver. 19.

So in Terence,

— Pam. *Quid meritus es? Dav.  
Crucem.*

Andr. act. iii. sc. 5. ver. 15.

And Horace,

*Si quis eum servum, patinam qui tol-  
lere jussus,*

*Semesos pisces tepidumque ligurrierit  
jus,*

*In cruce suffigat—*

Lib. i. Sat. iii. ver. 80.

So Capitolinus of Pertinax, 'In crucem sublati talibus servis;' cap. 9. and Herodian of Macrinus, Δούλοι ὅσοι δεσπότας κατήγγελλον ἀνεσκόλισθησαν. Lib. v. cap. 2. This punishment of the cross did so properly belong to the slaves, that when servants and freemen were involved alike in the same crime, they were very careful to make a distinction in their death, according to their condition: 'Ut quisque liber aut servus esset, suæ fortunæ a quoque sumptum supplicium est.' Liv. lib. iii. cap. 18. And then the servants were always crucified, as Servius observes among the Lacedæmonians; 'Servos patibulis suffixerunt, filios strangulare, nepotes fugaverunt.' Com. in Æneid. iii. v. 551. 'Novercæ quidem perpetuum indicitur exilium; servus vero patibulo suffigitur.' Apul. de Aur. Asin. lib. x. Thus in the combustion at Rome, upon the death of Julius Cæsar; Ἀμυνόμενοι ἀνηρέθησαν ἔνιοι, καὶ συλληφθέντες, ἕτεροι ἐκρεμάσθησαν, ὅσοι θεράποντες ἦσαν, οἱ δὲ ἐλεύθεροι κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ κατερρίφθησαν. Appian. de Bell. Civil. lib. iii. [c. 3.] 'Ea nocte speculatores prehensi servi tres, et unus ex legione vernacula; servi sunt in crucem sublatis, militi cervices abscessæ.' Hist. lib. de Bell. Hispan. cap. 20. So Africanus 'gravius in Romanos, quam in Latinos transfugas

animadvertit: illos enim, tanquam patriæ fugitivos, crucibus affixit; hos, tanquam perfidos socios, securi percussit.' Valer. Max. lib. ii. cap. 7. [§. 12.] This punishment of the cross was so proper unto servants, that *servile supplicium* in the language of the Romans signifies the same: and though in the words of Vulcatius before cited they go both together, as also in Capitolinus, 'Nam et in crucem milites tulit, et servilibus suppliciis semper affecit,' In Macrino, cap. 12. yet either is sufficient to express crucifixion: as in Tacitus, 'Malam potentiam servili supplicio expiavit;' Hist. lib. iv. cap. 11. and again, 'Sumptum de eo supplicium in servilem modum.' Hist. lib. ii. cap. 72. And therefore when any servants were made free, they were put out of fear of ever suffering this punishment. 'An vero servos nostros horum suppliciorum omnium metu dominorum benignitas una vindicta liberavit? Nos a verberibus, ab unco, a crucis denique terrore, neque res gestæ, neque acta ætas, neque nostri honores vindicabunt?' Cic. Orat. pro Rabir. cap. 5. [§. 16.]

7 'Carnifex, et obductio capitis, et nomen ipsum crucis absit, non modo a corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus. Harum enim omnium rerum non solum eventus atque perpessio, sed etiam conditio, expectatio, mentio ipsa denique, indigna cive Romano atque homine libero est.' Cic. Orat. pro Rabir. cap. 5. 'Facinus est vincire civem Romanum, scelus verberare, prope parricidium necare: quid dicam in crucem tollere? [crudelissimum teterimumque supplicium?] verbo satis digno tam nefaria res appellari nullo modo potest.' Idem, act. ii. lib. v. in Verr. cap. 66.

8 As when the Capitol was betrayed by the silence of dogs, but preserved by the noise of geese; they preserved the memory by a solemn honouring of the one yearly, and dishonouring the other.

beyond possibility of suffering pain, he may still be subject to ignominy in his fame; when by other exquisite torments some men have tasted the bitterness of death, after that, they have in their breathless corpse<sup>9</sup>, by virtue of this punishment, suffered a kind of surviving shame. And the exposing the bodies of the dead to the view of the people on the cross, hath been thought a sufficient ignominy to those which died, and terror to those which lived to see it<sup>10</sup>. Yea, where the bodies of the dead have been out of the reach of their surviving enemies, they have thought it highly opprobrious to their ghosts, to take their representations preserved in their pictures, and affix them to the cross<sup>11</sup>. Thus may we be made sensible of the two grand aggravations of our Saviour's sufferings, the bitterness of pain in the torments of his body, and the indignity of shame in the interpretation of his enemies.

It is necessary we should thus profess faith in Christ *crucified*, as that punishment which he chose to undergo, as that way which he was pleased to die. First, because by this kind of death we may be assured that he hath taken upon himself, and consequently from us, the malediction of the Law. For we were all under the curse, because it is expressly written, *Cursed* Deut. xxvii. *is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in* Gal. iii. 10. *the book of the Law to do them:* and it is certain none of us hath so continued; for the *Scripture hath concluded all under sin,* Verse 22.

'Eadem de causa supplicia annua canes pendunt inter ædem Juventutis et Summani, vivi in furca sambucea arbore fixi.' Plin. lib. xxix. cap. 4. [c. 14.] Πομπείη μέχρι νῦν ἐπὶ μνήμῃ τῶν τότε συμπτωμάτων ἢ τύχη, κῶνον μὲν ἀνασταυρωμένους, χῆν δὲ μάλα σεμνῶς ἐπὶ στραωνῆς πολυτελοῦς καὶ φορελοῦ καθήμενος. Plutarch. de Fort. Rom. [p. 325 D.]

9 As Oroetes the Persian, when he had treacherously and cruelly murdered Polycrates the tyrant of Samos, ἀποκτείνας δὲ μιν οὐκ ἄξιον ἀπηγήσισιο ἀνεσταύρωσε. Herodot. lib. iii. cap. 125. So Antiochus first cut off the head of Achæus, and then fastened his body to a cross: Ἐδοξε πρώτον μὲν ἀκρωτηριάσαι τὸν ταλαίπωρον μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτεμόντας αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταρράψαντας εἰς ὄνειον ἀγκῶν, ἀνασταυρῶσαι τὸ σῶμα. Polyb. lib. viii. cap. 23.

10 This was the design of Tarquinius Priscus, when the extremity of labour

which he laid upon his subjects made many lay violent hands upon themselves: 'Passim conscita nece Quiritibus tædium fugientibus, novum et inexcogitatum antea posteaque remedium invenit ille rex, ut omnium ita defunctorum figeret crucibus corpora spectanda civibus, simul et feris volubribusque laceranda.' Plin. lib. xxxvi. cap. 15. [c. xxiv. §. 3.] who makes this handsome observation of it: 'Quam obrem pudor Romani nominis proprius, qui sæpe res perditas servavit in præliis, tunc quoque subvenit: sed illo tempore imposuit, tum erubescens cum puderet vivos, tanquam puditura esset extinctos.' [Ibid.]

11 Thus they used Celsus, one of the thirty tyrants of Rome, as Trebellius Pollio testifieth: 'Novo injuriæ genere imago in crucem sublata, persultante vulgo, quasi patibulo ipse Celsus videtur affixus.' Cap. 29.



which is nothing else but a breach of the Law: therefore the curse must be acknowledged to remain upon all. But now Gal. iii. 13. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us; that is, he hath redeemed us from that general curse, which lay upon all men for the breach of any part of the Law, by taking upon him that particular curse, laid only upon them which underwent a certain punishment of the Law: for it was written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.* Not that suspension was any of the capital punishments prescribed by the Law of Moses; not that by any tradition or custom of the Jews they were wont to punish their malefactors with that death: but such as were punished with death according to the law or custom of the Jews, were for the enormity of their fact oftentimes after death exposed to the ignominy of a gibbet; and those who being dead were so hanged on a tree<sup>12</sup>, were accursed by the Law. Now though Christ was not to die by the sentence of the Jews, who had lost the supreme power in causes capital, and so not to be condemned to any death according to the Law of Moses; yet the providence of God did so dispose it, that he might suffer that death which did contain in it that ignominious particularity to which the legal curse belonged, which is, *the hanging on a tree.* For he which is crucified, as he is affixed to, so he hangeth on the cross: and therefore true and formal crucifixion is often named by the general word suspension<sup>13</sup>; and the Jews themselves do commonly call our blessed

<sup>12</sup> Deut. xxi. 22. *If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree.* In which words, *being put to death* precedeth *being hanged*: but, I confess, in our English translation it hath another sense, *and he be to be put to death*, as if he were to die by hanging: and so the Vulgar Latin, *Et adjudicatus morti appensus fuerit patibulo*, as if he were adjudged to be hanged, and so his sentence were suspension: and the Syriac yet more expressly, *Et appendatur ligno atque interficiatur.* But there is no such sentence contained in the original as the Vulgar, nor futuration of death, as our English translation mentioneth. The Hebrew is וְהוּמָהּ in *Hophal*, that is, *interfectus, occisus, mori factus fuerit*; or, as the LXX. clearly translate it, *καὶ*

*ἀποθάνη*, and the Chaldee ܠܡܩܬܝܢ *et occisus fuerit.*

<sup>13</sup> As we before noted on the words of Seneca. Thus the Greeks do often use *κρεμᾶν*, for *crucifigere*. For Curtius, speaking of the taking of Tyre by Alexander, says, 'Duo millia—crucibus affixi per ingens littoris spatium pependerit.' *Lib. iv. cap. 4.* [c. 19.] and Diodorus Siculus relating the same, *Τοὺς δὲ νέους πάντας ὄντας οὐκ ἐλάττους τῶν διαχιλιῶν ἐκρέμασεν. lib. xvii. cap. 46.* So the same Curtius testifies that Musicanus was *in crucem sublatus*; *lib. ix. cap. 8.* of whom Arrianus speaks thus; *Τούτων κρεμάσαι Ἀλέξανδρος κελεύει ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ γῆ. De Exped. Alex. lib. vi. cap. 17.* Thus in the language of the Scriptures, *Εἰς τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων* is one of the crucified thieves; Luke xxiii. 39:

Saviour by that very name to which the curse is affixed by Moses<sup>14</sup>; and generally have objected that he died a cursed death<sup>15</sup>.

Secondly, it was necessary to express our faith in Christ crucified, that we might be assured that he hath *abolished in his* Eph. ii. 15. *flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments*; which if he had not done, the strength and power of the whole Law had still remained: for all the people had said *Amen* to the curse upon every one that kept not the whole law; and entered into a curse<sup>25</sup>. Neh. x. 29. *and into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord their God, and his judgments and his statutes.* Which was in the nature of a bill, bond, or obligation, perpetually standing in force against them, ready to bring a forfeiture or penalty upon them, in case of non-performance of the condition. But the strongest obligations may be cancelled; and one ancient custom of cancelling bonds was, by striking a nail through the 208 writing: and thus God, by our crucified Saviour, *blotted out the* Col. ii. 14. *handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.*

Thirdly, hereby we are to testify the power of the death of Christ working in us after the manner of crucifixion<sup>16</sup>. For we are to be *planted in the likeness of his death*; and that we Rom. vi. 5, 6.

and the Jews are said to have slain our Saviour, *κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου*, Acts v. 30. and x. 39. The Latins likewise often use the word *suspendere* for *crucifigere*. As Ausonius, in the Idyllium whose title is *Cupido cruci affixus*, v. 59. describes him thus,

*Hujus in excelso suspensum stipite Amorem;*

and when we read in Polybius, that they did *ἀνασταυρῶσαι τὸ σῶμα* of Achæus; *lib. viii. cap. 23.* Ovid describes his punishment thus,

*More vel intercas capti suspensus Achæi,*

*Quò miser aurifera teste pependit aqua.* Ibis v. 301.

<sup>14</sup> The words of Moses are, Deut. xxi. 23. *מלכה אלהים הלוּי, maledictio Dei suspensus*: and this word *תלוּי*, which is of itself simply *suspensus*, (as 2 Sam. xviii. 10. I saw Absalom *תלוּי בַּאֵלֶךְ* *hanged on an oak*), is ordinarily attributed by the Jews to our Saviour, to signify that he was crucified. Hence they term Christians *תלוּי הלוּי cul-*

*tores suspensi*; and they call the crucifix *תלוּי הלוּי figuram suspensi.*

<sup>15</sup> So Trypho the Jew objected to Justin Martyr: *Ὁδτος δὲ ὁ ἑμέτερος λεγόμενος Χριστός ἕτιμος καὶ ἔδοξος γέγονεν, ὡς καὶ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ κατὰρ τῆ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ περιπεσεῖν· ἐσταυρώθη γάρ.* *Dial. cum Tryph. §. 32.* [p. 129 B.]

<sup>16</sup> *Ἐνόησα γὰρ ὑμᾶς καταρτισμένους ἐν ἀκινήτῳ πίστει, ὡσπερ καθηλαμένους ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ σαρκί τε καὶ πνεύματι.* *S. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. §. 1.* [p. 34.] St. Augustin speaking of the Church; 'Mundatur ut non habeat maculam, extenditur ut non habeat rugam: Ubi eam extendit fullo, ni? in ligno? Videmus quotidie a fulonibus tunicas quodammodo crucifiggi: crucifiguntur ut rugam non habeant.' *Enar. in Psal. 132.* [§. 9. vol. iv. part ii. p. 1489 A.] *Ἀναφερόμενοι εἰς τὰ ὕψη διὰ τῆς μηχαρίας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶ σταυρός, σχοινίῳ χρώμενοι τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ.* *S. Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. §. 9.* [p. 14.]

may be so, we must acknowledge, and cause it to appear, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed; we must confess, that they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts; and they which have not, are not his. We must not glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ: nor can we properly glory in that, except by it the world be crucified unto us, and we unto the world.

Fourthly, by the acerbity of this passion we are taught to meditate on that bitter cup which our Saviour drank; and while we think on those nails which pierced his hands and feet, and never left that torturing activity till by their dolorous impressions they forced a most painful death, to acknowledge the bitterness of his sufferings for us, and to assure ourselves that by the worst of deaths he hath overcome all kinds of death<sup>17</sup>; and with patience and cheerfulness to endure whatsoever he shall think fit to lay upon us, who with all readiness and desire suffered far more for us.

Fifthly, by the ignominy of this punishment, and universal infamy of that death, we are taught how far our Saviour descended for us, that while we were slaves and in bondage unto sin, he might redeem us by a servile death: for he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant; and so he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross: teaching us the glorious doctrine of humility<sup>18</sup> and patience in the most vile and abject condition which can befall us in this world; and encouraging us to imitate him, who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame; and withal deterring us from that fearful sin of falling from him, lest we should crucify unto ourselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame, and so become worse than the Jews themselves, who crucified the Lord of life without the walls of Jerusalem, and for that unparalleled sin were delivered into the hands of the Romans, into whose hands they delivered him, and at the same walls in such

17 'Mori voluit pro nobis: parum dicimus, crucifigi dignatus est; usque ad mortem crucis obediens factus. Elegit extremum et pessimum genus mortis, qui omnem fuerat ablaturus mortem: de morte pessima occidit omnem mortem.' S. August. Tract.

36. in Joan. [§. 4. vol. iii. part ii. p. 545 F.]  
18 'Humilitatis enim magister est Christus, qui humiliavit semetipsum, factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis.' S. August. Tract. 51. in Joan. [§. 3. ib. p. 635 D.]

multitudes were crucified, till there wanted room for crosses, and crosses for their bodies<sup>19</sup>.

Lastly, by the public visibility of this death, we are assured that our Saviour was truly dead, and that all his enemies were fully satisfied. He was crucified in the sight of all the Jews, who were made public witnesses that he gave up the ghost. There were many traditions among the Heathen, of persons supposed for some time to be dead, to descend into hell, and afterwards to live again; but the death of these persons was never publicly seen or certainly known. It is easy for a man that liveth to say that he hath been dead; and, if he be of great authority, it is not difficult to persuade some credulous persons to believe it. But that which would make his present life truly miraculous, must be the reality and certainty of his former death. The feigned histories of Pythagoras and Zamolxis, of Theseus and Hercules, of Orpheus and Protesilaus, made no certain mention of their deaths, and therefore were ridiculous in the assertion of their resurrection from death. Christ, as he appeared to certain witnesses after his resurrection, so he died before his enemies visibly on the cross, and gave up the ghost conspicuously in the sight of the world<sup>20</sup>.

And now we have made this discovery of the true manner and nature of the cross on which our Saviour suffered, every one may understand what it is he profeseth when he declareth

19 Προσήλουν δ' οἱ στρατιῶται δι' ὄργην καὶ μῖσος τοὺς ἀλόντας, ἕλλον ἄλλω σχήματι πρὸς χλεύην, καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος χώρα τε ἐνελεῖπετο τοῖς σταυροῖς, καὶ σταυροὶ τοῖς σώμασιν. Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib. vi. cap. 28.

20 This is excellently observed and expressed by Origen, who returneth this answer to the objection made by the Jews in Celsus, of those fabulous returns from the dead: φέρε παραστήσωμεν, ὅτι οὐ δύναται τὸ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἱστορούμενον ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγγιγῆθαι τοῖς παραβάλλεσθαι. Ἐκαστος μὲν γὰρ τῶν λεγομένων κατὰ τοὺς τόπους ἠρώων βουληθεὶς ἂν ἐδυνήθη ἑαυτὸν ἐπεκκλέψαι τῆς ὕψεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ πάλιν κρίνας ἐπαυελθεῖν πρὸς οὐδὲ καταλείπειν Ἰησοῦ δὲ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ πάντων Ἰουδαίων, καὶ καθαιρεθέντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ σώματος ἐν ὄψει τοῦ δήμου αὐτῶν, πῶς οἴονται τὸ παραπλήσιον πλάσασθαι, λέγει αὐτὸν τοῖς ἱστορούμενοις ἠρώων εἰς ἔδου καταβεβηκέναι, καὶ κέκειθεν ἀνεληλυθέναι; φάμεν δ' ὅτι μήποτε πρὸς ἀπολογίαὶν τοῦ ἐσταυρωθῆναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοιοῦτο λέγοιτ' ἂν, μάλιστα διὰ τὰ περὶ τῶν ἠρώων ἱστορηθέντα τῶν εἰς ἔδου καταβεβηκέναι βία νομιζομένων. ὅτι εἰ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν δ' Ἰησοῦς ἐτεθνήκει ἀσήμῳ θανάτῳ, οὐχ ὥστε δηλὸς εἶναι ἀποθανὼν δια τῶ δήμῳ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτ' ἀληθῶς ἦν ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν, χάραν εἶχεν ἂν τὸ ὑπονοηθῆναι περὶ τῶν ἠρώων, καὶ περὶ τούτου λεχθῆναι μὴ ποτ' οὐδὲν πρὸς ἄλλοις αἰτίοις τοῦ σταυρωθῆναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ τοῦτο δύναται συμβάλλεσθαι τῷ αὐτὸν ἐπισήμως ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἀποτεθνηκέναι, ἵνα μηδεὶς ἐξ ἡμῶν λέγειν, ὅτι ἐκὼν ἐπεξέστη τῆς ὕψεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἔδοξεν ἀποτεθνηκέναι, οὐκ ἀποτέθηκε δέ' ἄλλ' ἐπιφανεὶς ἐπετατέυσαστο τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν. Cels. lib. ii. [c. 56. vol. i. p. 430 D.]

his faith, and saith, I believe in Christ *crucified*. For thereby he is understood and obliged to speak thus much: I am really persuaded, and fully satisfied, that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, Christ Jesus, that he might cancel the handwriting which was against us, and take off the curse which was due unto us, did take upon him the form of a servant, and in that form did willingly and cheerfully submit himself unto the false accusation of the Jews, and unjust sentence of Pilate, by which he was condemned, according to the Roman custom, to the cross; and upon that did suffer that servile punishment of the greatest acerbity, enduring the pain; and of the greatest ignominy, *despising the shame*. And thus I believe in Christ *crucified*.

*Dead.*

THOUGH crucifixion of itself involveth not in it certain death, and he which is fastened to a cross is so leisurely to die, as that he being taken from the same may live; though when the insulting Jews in a malicious derision called to our Saviour to *save himself*, and *come down from the cross*; he might have come down from thence, and in saving himself have never saved us: yet it is certain that he felt the extremity of that punishment, and fulfilled the utmost intention of crucifixion: so that, as we acknowledge him *crucified*, we believe him *dead*.

For the illustration of which part of the Article, it will be necessary, first, to shew that the Messiah was to die; that no sufferings, howsoever shameful and painful, were sufficiently satisfactory to the determination and predictions divine, without a full dissolution and proper death: secondly, to prove that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messiah, did not only suffer torments intolerable and inexpressible in this life, but upon and by the same did finish this life by a true and proper death: thirdly, to declare in what the nature and condition of the death of a person so totally singular did properly and peculiarly consist. And more than this cannot be necessary to shew we believe that Christ *was dead*.

1 Cor. xv. 3. First then, we must consider what St. Paul *delivered* to the Corinthians *first of all*, and what *also he received*, *how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures*; that the Messiah was **210**  
 Rev. xiii. 8. the *Lamb slain before the foundations of the world*, and that his death was severally represented and foretold. For though the sacrificing Isaac hath been acknowledged an express and lively

type of the promised Messiah; though, after he was bound and laid upon the wood, he was preserved from the fire, and rescued from the religious cruelty of his father's knife; though Abraham be said to have *offered up his only-begotten son*, when Isaac died Heb. xi. 17. not; though by all this it might seem foretold that the true and great promised seed, the Christ, should be made a sacrifice for sin, should be fastened to the cross, and offered up to the Father, but not suffer death: yet being *without effusion of blood there is* Heb. ix. 22. *no remission*, without death no sacrifice for sin; being the saving of Isaac alive doth not deny the death of the antitype, but rather suppose and assert it as presignifying his resurrection from the dead, *from whence Abraham received him in a figure*; we may Heb. xi. 19. safely affirm the ancient and legal types did represent a Christ which was to die. It was an essential part of the Paschal Law, that the lamb should be slain: and in the sacrifices for sin, which presignified a Saviour to *sanctify the people with his own* Heb. xiii. *blood, the bodies of the beasts were burnt without the camp, and* 11, 12. *their blood brought into the sanctuary*.

Nor did the types only require, but the prophecies also foretel, his death. For *he was brought*, saith Isaiah, *as a lamb to the* Isa. liii. 7, *slaughter: he was cut off out of the land of the living*, saith the 8, 10. same Prophet; and *made his soul an offering for sin*. Which are so plain and evident predictions, that the Jews shew not the least appearance of probability in their evasions<sup>21</sup>.

Being then the obstinate Jews themselves acknowledge one Messiah was to die, and that a violent death; being we have

21 That this place of Isaiah must be understood of the Messiah, I have already proved against the Jews, out of the text, and their own traditions. Their objection particularly to these words is, that the *land of the living* is the land of Canaan. So Solomon Jarchi, *מארץ חיים היא ארץ ישראל* *From the land of the living, that is, the land of Israel*. And D. Kimchi endeavours to prove that exposition out of David, *כי נגזר מארץ חיים כאשר גלה מארצו שנקראת ארץ חיים כמו אהלהך לפני*: as if the land of the living must be the land of Canaan, because David professeth he will walk before the Lord in the *land of the living*: whereas there is no more in that phrase than that he will serve God while he liveth. As Psal. xxvii. 13. *I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living*; and Isa. xxxviii. 11. *I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord in the land of the living*; which is sufficiently interpreted by the words which follow: *I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world*. The *land of the living* then was not particularly the land of Canaan: nor can they persuade us that it could not refer to Christ, because he was never removed out of that land: but to be *cut off out of the land of the living* is, certainly, to be taken away from them which live upon the earth, that is, to die.

already proved there is but one Messias foretold by the Prophets, and shewed by those places, which they will not acknowledge, that he was to be slain: it followeth by their unwilling confessions and our plain probations, that the promised Messias was ordained to die: which is our first assertion.

Secondly, we affirm, correspondently to these types and prophecies, that *Christ our Passover is slain*; that he whom we believe to be the true and only Messias did really and truly die. Which affirmation we may with confidence maintain, as being secure of any even the least denial. Jesus of Nazareth upon his crucifixion was so surely, so certainly dead, that they which wished, they which thirsted for his blood, they which obtained, which effected, which extorted his death, even they believed it, even they were satisfied with it: the chief priests, the scribes and the Pharisees, the publicans and sinners, all were satisfied; the Sadducees most of all, who hugged their old opinion, and loved their error the better, because they thought him sure for ever rising up. But if they had denied or doubted of it, the very stones would cry out and confirm it. Why did the sun put on mourning? why were the graves opened, but for a funeral? Why did the earth quake? why were the rocks rent? why did the frame of nature shake, but because the God of nature died? Why did all the people, who came to see him crucified, and love to feed their eyes with such tragic spectacles, why did they beat their breasts and return, but that they were assured *it was finished*, there was no more to be seen, all was done? It was not out of compassion that the merciless soldiers brake not his legs, but because they found him dead whom they came to despatch; and being enraged that their cruelty should be thus prevented, with an impertinent villainy they pierce his side, and with a foolish revenge endeavour to kill a dead man; thereby becoming stronger witnesses than they would, by being less the authors than they desired, of his death. For out of his sacred but wounded side came blood and water, both as evident signs of his present death, as certain seals of our future and eternal life. These are the two blessed sacraments of the spouse of Christ, each assuring her of the death of her beloved. The sacrament of Baptism, the water through which we pass into the Church of Christ, teacheth us that he died to whom we come. *For know ye not, saith St. Paul, that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ, are baptized into his death?*

John xix.  
30.

Rom. vi. 3.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the bread broken, and the wine poured forth, signify that he died which instituted it; and *as often as we eat this bread, and drink this cup, we shew forth the Lord's death till he come.* 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Dead then our blessed Saviour was upon the cross; and that not by a feigned or metaphorical, but by a true and proper death. As he was truly and properly man, in the same mortal nature which we the sons of Adam have; so did he undergo a true and proper death, in the same manner as we die. Our life appeareth principally in two particulars, motion and sensation<sup>22</sup>; and while both or either of these are perceived in a body, we pronounce it lives. Not that the life itself consisteth in either or both of these, but in that which is the original principle of them both, which we call the soul: and the intimate presence or union of that soul unto the body is the life thereof. The real distinction of which soul from the body in man, our blessed Saviour taught most clearly in that admonition; *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.* Matt. x. 28. Now being death is nothing else but the privation or recession of life<sup>23</sup>, and we are then properly said to die when we cease to live; being life consisteth in the union of the soul unto the body, from whence, as from the fountain, flow motion, sensation, and whatsoever vital perfection; death can be nothing else but the solution of that vital union, or the actual separation of the soul<sup>24</sup>, before united to the body. As therefore when the

22 Τὸ ἐμψυχον δὴ τοῦ ἀψύχου δυοῖν μάλιστα διαφέρειν δοκεῖ, κινήσει τε καὶ τῷ αἰσθάνεσθαι. παρειλήφαμεν δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν προγενεστέρων σχεδὸν δύο ταῦτα περὶ ψυχῆς. Aristot. de Anīma, lib. i. cap. 2. [§. 2.] Ὅτι διαφέρει τὰ ἄψυχα (leg. ἐμψυχα) τῶν ἀψύχων, τοῦτο ἔστι ψυχῆ· διαφέρει δὲ κινήσει, αἰσθήσει, φαντασίᾳ, νοήσει. Sallust. de Diis et Mundo, cap. 8.

23 As Secundus, Φυγή καὶ ἀπόκτησις βίαι.

24 As the Philosophers have anciently expressed it, especially Plato, who by the advantage of an error in the original of souls, best understood the end of life: Τοῦτό γε θάνατος ὀνομάζεται, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος. In Phædone. [p. 67 D.] Again, Ὁ θάνατος τυγχάνει ὄν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ δυοῖν πραγμάτων διάλυσις, τῆς

ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος, ἀπ' ἀλλήλων. In Gorgia. [p. 524 B.] And more plainly and fully yet: Ἡγοῦμεθὰ τι τὸν θάνατον εἶναι; Πάνυ γ', ἔφη ὑπολαβὸν ὁ Σιμμίας. Ἄρα μὴ ἄλλο τι ἢ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλαγὴν; καὶ εἶναι τοῦτο τὸ τεθνάναι, χωρὶς μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαλλαγέναι, καὶ εἶναι τὸ τεθνάναι, χωρὶς δὲ τῆν ψυχὴν τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλαγείσαν αὐτὴν καθ' αὐτὴν εἶναι; ἄρα μὴ ἄλλο τι ἢ ὁ θάνατος ἢ τοῦτο; Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο, ἔφη. In Phædone. [p. 64 C.] Thus with four several words, λύσις, διάλυσις, χωρισμὸς, and ἀπαλλαγῆ, doth Plato express the separation of the soul from the body, and maketh death formally to consist of that separation. This solution is excellently expressed by Phocylides; Οὐ καλὸν ἁρμονίην ἀναλυμένῃ ἀνθρώποι·

soul of man doth leave the habitation of its body, and being the sole fountain of vitality bereaves it of all vital activity, we say that body or that man is dead: so when we read that Christ our Saviour died, we must conceive that was a true and proper death, and consequently that his body was bereft of his soul, and of all vital influence from the same.

Nor is this only our conception, or a doubtful truth; but we are as much assured of the propriety of his death, as of the death itself. For that the unspotted soul of our Jesus was really and actually separated from his body, that his flesh was bereft of natural life by the secession of that soul, appeareth by his own resignation, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit;* and by the Evangelist's expression, *and having said thus, he gave up the ghost*<sup>25</sup>. When he was to die, he resigned his soul, when he gave it up, he died; when it was delivered out of the body, then was the body dead<sup>26</sup>: and so the eternal Son of God upon the cross did properly and truly die.

Luke xxiii.  
46.

Ψυχὰς γὰρ μίμνουσιν ἀκήριοι ἐν φθιμένοισι.

Πνεῦμα γὰρ ἔστι θεοῦ χρῆσις θνητοῖσι καὶ εἰκῶν.

Σῶμα γὰρ ἐκ γαίης ἔχομεν· καὶ πάντες ἐς αὐτὴν

Λυόμενοι κόνις ἐσμέν, ἀπὸ δ' ἀπὸ πνεύματος δέδεκται. *Cartm. admon. v. 97.*

So Tertullian: 'Opus autem mortis in medio est, discretio corporis animæque.' *De Anim. cap. 51.* [p. 301 B.] 'Si mors non aliud determinatur, quam disjunctio corporis animæque, contrarium morti vita non aliud definitur, quam conjunctio corporis animæque.' *Ibid. cap. 27.* [p. 284 B.] This description of death is far more philosophical than the notion of Aristotle, who makes it to consist in the corruption of natural heat; *Ἀνάγκη τοίνυν ἅμα τὸ τε ζῆν ὑπάρχειν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ θερμῶ τούτου σωτηρίαν, καὶ τὸν καλούμενον θάνατον εἶναι τὴν τούτου φθοράν. Lib. de Juvent. et Senect. cap. 4.* [§. 6.] inasmuch as the soul is not that natural heat, and the corruption of that heat followeth upon the separation of the soul.

<sup>25</sup> This is expressed three ways, all signifying the separation of his soul from his body. St. Mark and St. Luke, *ἐξέπνευσε*, which is of the same force with *ἐξέψυξε*. But because *ἐκψύχων*

doth not always signify an absolute expiration, but sometimes a lipothymy only (as Hesychius, *Ἐκψύχουσι, λειποθυμοῦσι*: so Hippocrates useth it; *Εἰσι δὲ δέξυται (καίροι) ὅσοις ἢ ἐκψύχουσι δεῖ τι ὠφελεῖσθαι. De Morbis, lib. i. cap. 3.* [vol. vii. p. 533 E.] and again, *Ἐκψύχουσι δὲ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν μετέστασιν ἐξαπίνης γινομένην*), lest therefore we should take *ἐξέπνευσε* in such an imperfect sense, St. Matthew hath it, *ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα*, and St. John *παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα*. Which is a full expression of the secession of the soul from the body, and consequently of death, which is, in the language of Secundus, *πνεύματος ἀπόστασις*.

<sup>26</sup> These three points or distinctions of time I have therefore noted, that I might occur to any objection which possibly might arise out of the ancient philosophical subtilty, which Aulus Gellius reports to be agitated at the table of Taurus. The question was propounded thus, 'Quæsitum est, quando moriens moreretur, cum jam in morte esset, an tum etiam cum in vita foret,' Where Taurus admonisheth the rest, that this was no light question; for, says he, 'Gravissimi philosophorum super hac re serio quæsierunt; et alii moriendi verbum atque momentum manente adhuc vita dici atque fieri putaverunt;

This reality and propriety of the death of Christ is yet farther illustrated from the cause immediately producing it, which was an external violence and cruciation, sufficient to dissolve that natural disposition of the body which is absolutely necessary to continue the vital union of the soul: the torments which he endured on the cross did bring him to that state, in which life could not longer be naturally conserved, and death, without intervention of supernatural power, must necessarily follow.

For Christ, who took upon him all our infirmities, sin only excepted, had in his nature not only a possibility and aptitude, but also a necessity of dying; and as to any extrinsical violence, able, according to the common course of nature, to destroy and extinguish in the body such an aptitude as is indispensably required to continue in union with the soul, he had no natural preservative; nor was it in the power of his soul to continue its vital conjunction unto his body bereft of a vital disposition.

It is true that Christ did voluntarily die, as he said of himself, *No man taketh away my life from me, but I lay it down of myself:* John x. 18. *I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.* For it was in his power whether he would come into the hands of his enemies; it was in his power to suffer or not to suffer the sentence of Pilate, and the nailing to the cross; it was in his power to have come down from the cross, when he was nailed to it: but when by an act of his will he had submitted to that death, when he had accepted and embraced those torments to the last, it was not in the power of his soul to continue any longer vitality to the body, whose vigour was totally exhausted. So not by a necessary compulsion, but voluntary election, he took upon him a necessity of dying.

It is true that *Pilate marvelled he was dead so soon*, and the two thieves lived longer to have their legs broken, and to die by the accession of another pain: but we read not of such long

alii nihil in eo tempore vitæ reliquerunt, totumque illud quod mori dicitur morti vindicaverunt.' The ancients philosophers were divided; some saying a man died in the time of his life, others in the time of his death. But Plato observed a contradiction in both; for a man can neither be said to die while he is alive, nor when he is dead; 'et idcirco peperit ipse expressitque aliud quoddam novum in confinio tempus, quod verbis propriis atque integris τὴν ἐξαίφνης φύσιν

appellavit.' which he thus describes in his *Parmenides*; [p. 156 D.] *Τὸ γὰρ ἐξαίφνης τοῦνδε τι εἶκοι σημεῖναι, ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνου μεταβάλλον εἰς ἕτερον.* So Aulus Gellius, *lib. vi. cap. 13.* Thus when our Saviour commended his soul into the hands of the Father, he was yet alive; when the soldier pierced his side, he was already dead: and the instant in which he gave up the ghost was the *τὸ ἐξαίφνης* when he died.

Mark xv.  
37. 39.

furrows on their backs as were made on his, nor had they any such kind of agony as he was in the night before. What though he *cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost?* What though *the centurion, when he saw it, said, Truly this man was the Son of God?* The miracle was not in the death, but in the voice: the strangeness was not that he should die, but that at the point of death he should cry out so loud: he died not by, but with, a miracle.

Acts ii. 23.  
v. 30.

Should we imagine Christ to anticipate the time of death, and to subtract his soul from future torments necessary to cause an expiration; we might rationally say the Jews and Gentiles were guilty of his death, but we could not properly say they slew him: guilty they must be, because they inflicted those torments, on which in time death must necessarily follow; but slay him actually they did not, if his death proceeded from any other cause, and not from the wounds which they inflicted: whereas St. Peter expressly chargeth his enemies, *Him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain;* and again, *The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree*<sup>27</sup>. Thus was the Lamb properly slain, and the Jews authors of his death, as well as of his crucifixion.

Wherefore being Christ took upon himself our mortality in the highest sense, as it includeth a necessity of dying; being he voluntarily submitted himself to that bloody agony in the garden, to the hands of the ploughers who made long their furrows, and to the nails which fastened him to the cross; being these torments thus inflicted and continued did cause his death, and in this condition *he gave up the ghost;* it followeth that the only-begotten Son of God, the true Messias promised of old, did die a true and proper death. Which is the second conclusion in this explication.

But, thirdly, because Christ was not only man, but also God, and there was not only an union between his soul and body while he lived, but also a conjunction of both natures, and an union in his person: it will be farther necessary, for the understanding of his death, to shew what union was dissolved, what continued; that we may not make that separation either less or greater than it was.

<sup>27</sup> Acts ii. 23: v. 30. In both which places the original sheweth more expressly, that by their crucifixion they slew him: in the former thus, *Διὰ χει-*

*ρῶν ἀνόμων προσήξαντες ἀνέλεστε.* In the latter thus, *Ὅν ὑμεῖς διεχειρίσασθε κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου.*

Whereas then there were two different substantial unions in Christ, one of the parts of his human nature each to other, in which his humanity did consist, and by which he was truly man; the other of his natures, human and divine, by which it came to pass that God was man, and that man God: first, it is certain, as we have already shewed, that the union of the parts of his human nature was dissolved on the cross, and a real separation made between his soul and body. As far then as humanity consists in the essential union of the parts of human nature, so far the humanity of Christ upon his death did cease to be, and consequently he ceased to be man. But, secondly, the union of the natures remained still as to the parts, nor was the soul or body separated from the Divinity, but still subsisted as they did before, by the subsistence of the second Person of the Trinity.

The truth of this assertion appeareth, first, from the language of this very Creed<sup>28</sup>. For as we proved before, that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, was *conceived, and born, and suffered,* and that the truth of these propositions relied upon the communion of properties, grounded upon the hypostatical union: so while the Creed in the same manner proceedeth speaking of the same Person, that he *was buried and descended into hell,* it sheweth that neither his body, in respect of which he was buried, nor his soul, in respect of which he was generally conceived to descend into hell, had lost that union.

Again, as we believe that God redeemed us by his own blood, so also it hath been the constant language of the Church, that God died for us: which cannot be true, except the soul and body in the instant of separation were united to the Deity.

Indeed, being all the gifts of God are without repentance, nor doth he ever subtract his grace from any without their abuse of it, and a sinful demerit in themselves; we cannot imagine the grace of union should be taken from Christ, who never offended,

<sup>28</sup> *Credimus certe non in solum Deum Patrem, sed et in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum. Modo totum dixi, in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum. Totum ibi intellige, et verbum, et animam, et carnem. Sed utique confiteris etiam illud quod habet eadem fides, in eum Christum te credere qui crucifixus est et sepultus,*

*Ergo etiam sepultum Christum esse non negas; et tamen sola caro sepulta est. Si enim erat ibi anima, non erat mortuus; si autem vera mors erat, ut ejus vera sit resurrectio, sine anima fuerat in sepulchro; et tamen sepultus est Christus. Ergo Christus erat etiam sine anima caro, quia non est sepulta nisi caro.* *S. August. Tract. 47. in Joan.* [*§. 12. vol. iii. part ii. p. 613 C.*]

and that in the highest act of obedience, and the greatest satisfaction to the will of God.

Matt. xxvii. 46. It is true, Christ cried upon the cross with a loud voice, saying, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* But if that dereliction should signify a solution of the former union of his natures, the separation had been made not at his death, but in his life<sup>29</sup>. Whereas indeed those words infer no more than that he was bereft of such joys and comforts from the Deity, as should assuage and mitigate the acerbity of his present torments.

It remaineth therefore, that when our Saviour yielded up the ghost, he suffered only an external violence; and what was subject to such corporal force did yield unto those dolorous impressions. Being then such is the imbecility and frailty of our nature, that life cannot long subsist in exquisite torments; the disposition of his body failed the soul, and the soul deserted his body. But being no power hath any force against omnipotency, nor could any corporal or finite agent work upon the union made with the Word, therefore that did still remain entire both to the soul and to the body. The Word was once indeed without either soul or body; but after it was made flesh<sup>30</sup>, it was never parted either from the one or from the other.

Thus Christ did really and truly die, according to the condition of death to which the nature of man is subject: but although he was more than man, yet he died no more than man can die; a separation was made between his soul and body, but no disunion of them and his Deity. They were disjoined one from another, but not from him that took them both together; rather by virtue of that remaining conjunction they were again united

<sup>29</sup> Ὁλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνακρίσεως εἰς τὴν θέλαν φύσιν μετασκευάσαντος, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς κατὰ τὸ πάθος οἰκονομίας οὐ θατέρου μέρους τὸ ἅπαξ ἐγκραθὲν ἀνεχώρησεν ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ χαρίσματα ἄλλα τὴν μὲν ψυχὴν τοῦ σώματος ἢ θεότης ἑκουσίως διεξέυξεν, αὐτὴν δὲ ἐν ἀμφοτέροις μένουσαν ἔδειξε. *S. Greg. Nyss. de Christi. Resur. Orat.* i. [vol. iii. p. 392 D.]

<sup>30</sup> This is the conclusion of St. Augustin, 'Ex quo Verbum caro factum est, ut habitaret in nobis, et susceptus est a Verbo homo, id est totus homo, anima et caro; quid fecit passio, quid fecit mors, nisi corpus ab anima separavit? Animam vero a Verbo non separa-

vit. Si enim mortuus est Dominus—sine dubio caro ipsius expiravit animam: ad tempus exiguum anima deseruit carnem, sed redeunte anima resurrecturam. A Verbo autem animam separatam esse non dico. Latronis animæ dixit, *Hodie mecum eris in paradiso*. Fidelem latronis animam non deserebat, et deserebat suam? Absit: sed illius ut Dominus custodivit, suam vero inseparabiliter habuit. Si autem dixerimus, quia ipsa se anima posuit, et iterum ipsa se sumpsit, absurdissimus sensus est: non enim quæ a Verbo non erat separata, a seipisa poterat separari.' *Tract. 47. in Joan.* [§. 9. vol. iii. part ii. p. 611 F.]

after their separation<sup>31</sup>. And this I conceive sufficient for the third and last part of our explication.

215 The necessity of this part of the Article is evident, in that the death of Christ is the most intimate and essential part of the mediatorship, and that which most intrinsically concerns every office and function of the Mediator, as he was Prophet, Priest, and King.

First, it was necessary, as to the prophetic office, that Christ should die, to the end that the truth of all the doctrine which he delivered might be confirmed by this death. He was *the true and faithful witness, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession. This is he that came by water and blood: and there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood.* He preached unto us a new and better covenant, which was established upon better promises, and that was to be ratified with his blood; which is therefore called by Christ himself the *blood of the new testament, or everlasting covenant*: for that covenant was also a testament; and where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. Beside, Christ, as a prophet, taught us not only by word, but by example: and though every action of his life, who came to fulfil the Law, be most worthy of our imitation; yet the most eminent example was in his death, in which he taught us great variety of Christian virtues. What an example was that of faith in God, *to lay down his life, that he might take it again*; in the bitterness of his torments to commend his spirit into the hands of his Father; and, *for the joy that was set before him, to endure the cross, and despise the shame*? What a pattern of meekness, patience, and humility, for the Son of Man to come not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many; to be led like a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before the shearer, not to open his mouth; to endure the contradictions of sinners against himself, and to humble himself unto death, even the death of the cross? What a precedent of obedience, for the Son of God to learn obedience by the things

<sup>31</sup> Ἐπεὶ διπλοῦν μὲν τὸ ἀνθρώπινον σύγκραμα, ἀπλῆ δὲ καὶ μονοειδὴς ἡ τῆς θεότητος φύσις, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς διαξέυξεως, οὐ συνδιασχίζεται τῷ συνθέτῳ τὸ ἀδιαίρετον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπαλιν γίνεται τῇ γὰρ ἐνότητι τῆς θέλας φύσεως, τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἴσον ἐν ἀμφοτέροις οὐσῆς, πάλιν πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ διεστῶτα συμφέεται. *S. Greg. Nyss. de Christi Resur. Orat.* i. [vol. iii. p. 393 B.] 'Tam velox incorruptæ carnis vivificatio fuit, ut major ibi esset soporis similitudo quam mortis; quoniam Deitas, quæ ab utraque suscepti hominis substantia non recessit, quod potestate divisit, potestate conjunxit.' *Leo de Resur. Dom. Serm. i. cap. 2.* [vol. i. p. 304.]



Gal. iv. 4. *that he suffered*; to be made under the Law, and, though he never  
 Phil. ii. 8. broke the Law, to become obedient unto death; to go with cheer-  
 John xiv. fulness to the cross upon this resolution, as my Father gave me  
 31. Rom. v. 8. commandment, even so I do? What exemplar of charity, to die  
 John xv. 13. for us while we were yet sinners and enemies, when greater love  
 hath no man than this, to lay down his life for his friends; to  
 pray upon the cross for them that crucified him, and to apolo-  
 Luke xxiii. gize for such as barbarously slew him; Father, forgive them, for  
 34. 1 Pet. ii. 21. they know not what they do? Thus Christ did suffer for us, leav-  
 iv. 1, 2. ing us an example that we should follow his steps; that as he  
 suffered for us in the flesh, we should arm ourselves likewise with  
 the same mind. For he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased  
 from sin; that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the  
 flesh, to the lusts of men, but to the will of God. And so his death  
 was necessary for the confirmation and completion of his pro-  
 phetical office.

Secondly, it was necessary that Christ should die, and by his  
 Heb. v. 1. death perform the sacerdotal office. For every high priest taken  
 from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God,  
 that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins. But Christ  
 Heb. x. 4. had no other sacrifice to offer for our sins than himself. For it  
 was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away  
 Heb. x. 8, 9. sins: and therefore when sacrifice and offering God would not,  
 then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God; then did Christ  
 determine to offer up himself for us. And because the sacrifices  
 Heb. ix. 22. of old were to be slain, and generally without shedding of blood  
 there is no remission; therefore if he will offer sacrifice for sin,  
 Isa. liii. 10. he must of necessity die, and so make his soul an offering for sin.  
 If Christ be our Passover, he must be sacrificed for us. We  
 were sold under sin, and he which will redeem us must give his  
 life for our redemption: for we could not be redeemed with cor-  
 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. ruptible things, as silver and gold, but only with the precious blood  
 of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot. We 216  
 all had sinned, and so offended the justice of God, and by an  
 act of that justice the sentence of death passed upon us: it was  
 necessary therefore that Christ our surety should die, to satisfy  
 the justice of God, both for that iniquity, as the propitiation for  
 our sins, and for that penalty, as he which was to bear our griefs.  
 God was offended with us, and he must die who was to reconcile  
 Rom. v. 10. him to us. For when we were enemies, saith St. Paul, we were  
 Col. i. 21. reconciled to God by the death of his Son. We were sometime

alienated, and enemies in our mind by our wicked works; yet now  
 hath he reconciled us in the body of his flesh through death. Thus  
 the death of Christ was necessary toward the great act of his  
 priesthood, as the oblation, propitiation, and satisfaction for the  
 sins of the whole world: and not only for the act itself, but also  
 for our assurance of the power and efficacy of it, (for if the blood Heb. ix.  
 of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how 13, 14.  
 much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit  
 offered himself without spot to God, purge our conscience from dead  
 works?) and of the happiness flowing from it; for he that spared Rom. viii.  
 not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not 32.  
 with him also freely give us all things? Upon this assurance,  
 founded on his death, we have the freedom and boldness to enter Heb. x. 19,  
 into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way 20.  
 which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his  
 flesh. Neither was the death of Christ necessary only in respect  
 of us immediately for whom he died, but in reference to the  
 Priest himself who died, both in regard of the qualification of  
 himself, and consummation of his office. For in all things it Heb. ii. 17,  
 behoved him to be made like unto his brethren: that he might be 18.  
 a merciful and faithful High Priest, and having suffered, being  
 tempted, might be able to succour them that are tempted: so that  
 passing through all the previous torments, and at last through  
 the pains of death, having suffered all which man can suffer, and  
 much more, he became, as an experimental Priest, most sensible  
 of our infirmities, most compassionate of our miseries, most will-  
 ing and ready to support us under, and to deliver us out of, our  
 temptations. Thus being qualified by his utmost suffering, he  
 was also fitted to perfect his offering. For as the high priest Heb. ix. 7,  
 once every year for the atonement of the sins of the people 11, 12.  
 entered into the Holy of Holies not without blood; so Christ being  
 come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more  
 perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, by his own blood entered in  
 once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.  
 And this is the grand necessity of the death of Christ in respect  
 of his sacerdotal office.

Thirdly, there was a necessity that Christ should die in refer-  
 ence to his regal office. O king, live for ever, is either the loyal Dan. iii. 9.  
 or the flattering vote for temporal princes; either the expression  
 of our desires, or the suggestion of their own: whereas our  
 Christ never shewed more sovereign power than in his death,



never obtained more than by his death. It was not for nothing that Pilate suddenly wrote, and resolutely maintained what he had written, *This is the King of the Jews*. That title on the cross did signify no less than that his regal power was active even there: for *having spoiled principalities and powers he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it; and through his death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil*. Nor was his death only necessary for the present execution, but also for the assecution of farther power and dominion, as the means and way to obtain it. *The spirit of Christ in the Prophets of old testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. He shall drink of the brook in the way, saith the Prophet David; therefore shall he lift up his head. He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name. For to this end Christ both died and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and living.*

Thus it is necessary to believe and profess our faith in Christ who died: for by his blood and the virtue of his death was our redemption wrought, as by the price which was paid, as by the atonement which was made, as by the full satisfaction which was given, that God might be reconciled to us, who before was offended with us, as by the ratification of the covenant made between us, and the acquisition of full power to make it good unto us.

After which exposition thus premised, every Christian is conceived to express thus much when he makes profession of faith in Christ Jesus which *was dead*: I do really and truly assent unto this, as a most infallible and fundamental truth; That the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the working out of our redemption, did in our nature, which he took upon him, really and truly die, so as, by the force and violence of those torments which he felt, his soul was actually separated from his body; and although neither his soul nor body was separated from his Divinity, yet the body bereft of his soul was left without the least vitality. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ which was crucified and *dead*.

#### *And buried.*

WHEN the most precious and immaculate soul of Christ

was really separated from his flesh, and that union in which his natural life consisted was dissolved, his sacred body, as being truly dead, was laid up in the chambers of the grave: so that as we believe him *dead*, by the separation of his soul; we also believe him *buried* by the sepulture of his body.

And because there is nothing mysterious or difficult in this part of the Article, it will be sufficiently explicated when we have shewn, first, that the promised Messiah was to be buried; and, secondly, that our Jesus was so buried as the Messiah was to be.

That the Messiah was to be buried, could not possibly be denied by those who believed he was to die among the Jews; because it was the universal custom of that nation to bury<sup>32</sup> their dead. We read most frequently of the sepulchres of their fathers: and though those that were condemned by their supreme power were not buried in their fathers' graves, yet public sepulchres there were appointed even for them to lie in: and not only they, but all the instruments which were used in the punishment were buried with them. And yet beside the general consequence of death among the Jews, there was a perfect type in the person of Jonas: for as that Prophet *was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so was the Messiah, or the Son of Man, to be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.*

218 Nor was his burial only represented typically, but foretold prophetically, both by a suppositive intimation, and by an express prediction. The Psalmist intimated and supposed no less,

32 It is observed by Tacitus of the Jews, in opposition to the Roman custom, 'Corpora condere, quam cremare, e more Ægyptio.' *Hist. lib. v. cap. 5.* As of the Egyptians by others, Θάπτουσι δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν, ταριχεύοντες. 'Ρωμαῖοι δὲ, καλοντες. Παλιν δὲ, εἰς τὰς λίμνας ριπτοῦντες. *Diog. Laert. in Pyrrhonis Vit.* [lib. ix. §. 84.] But the Jews received this custom no more from the Egyptians than from the Persians, whom they may be rather said to follow, because they used not the Egyptian ταριχευσις; neither were they more distinguished from the Romans than from the Grecians, who also burned the bodies of the dead. Διελόμενοι κατὰ ἔθνη τὰς ταφὰς, ὁ μὲν Ἕλληνας ἔκαυσεν ὁ

δὲ Πέρσης ἔθαψεν· ὁ δὲ Ἰουδαῖος ὄλαφ περιχρίει· ὁ δὲ Σκύθης κατεσθίει· ταριχεύει δὲ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος. *Lucian. περὶ πένθους, §. 21.* Although therefore it be not true, that the Jews received their custom of burying their dead from the Egyptians, because Abraham at the first purchased a buryingplace; yet it hath been observed, and is certainly true, that their general custom was to inter. Philo, one of their own writers, Ἀνθρώποις καὶ πᾶσι χερσαίοις οικειότερον ἢ φύσιν χωρίον ἀπένειμε γῆν, οὐ μόνον ζῶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθανοῦσιν, ἢ ἡ αὐτῆ καὶ τὴν πρώτην ὑποδέχεται γένεσιν, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ βίου τελευταίαν ἀνάλυσιν. *Lib. in Flaccum.* [vol. ii. p. 544.]

Ps. xvi.  
9, 10.

when, speaking in the person of the Christ, he said, *My flesh shall rest in hope: for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.* That flesh is there supposed only such, that is, a body dead<sup>33</sup>; and that body resting in the grave, the common habitation of the dead; yet resting there in hope that it should never see corruption, but rise from thence before that time in which bodies in their graves are wont to putrefy. Beside this intimation, there is yet a clear expression of the grave of the Messiah in that eminent prediction of Isaiah; *He was cut off out of the land of the living, and he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death.* For whatsoever the true interpretation of the prophecy be (of which we shall speak hereafter), it is certain that he which was to be cut off, was to have a grave: and being we have already shewn that he which was to be cut off was the Messiah; it followeth, that by virtue of this prediction the promised Messiah was to be buried.

Isa. liii.  
8, 9.

Secondly, that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messiah, was thus buried, we shall also prove, although it seem repugnant to the manner of his death. For those which were sentenced by the Romans to die upon the cross, had not the favour of a sepulchre, but their bodies were exposed to the fowls of the air, and the beasts of the field<sup>34</sup>; or if they escaped their

<sup>33</sup> So the *Midrash Tillim* anciently expounded it, *My flesh shall rest in hope* מִיָּהָר אַחֲרֵי מוֹתוֹ after death; adding ר' א' יצחק מלמד שלא שלט בו רמה וחולעה that Rabbi Isaac said, he taught by these words, that the moth and worm should have no power over him. Whence, by the argument of St. Peter, it must be understood not of David; for his flesh saw corruption; nor of any other but the Messiah. And although the Rabbins are wont to say, that the worms shall never eat the just, in opposition to the last words of Isaiah\*; yet they must confess there is no difference in the grave; and therefore that worm must signify something else but the corruption of the body. Well therefore are those words paraphrased by Didymus, 'Επ' ἔλπιδι κατεκλήρωσεν ἡ σὰρξ, διὰ τὴν εὐθὺς ἐσομένην ἀνάστασιν.

\* [Isa. lxvi. 24. *And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.*]

<sup>34</sup> To this custom Horace alludes, *Non hominem occidi. Non pasces in cruce corvos.*

Lib. i. Epist. 16. v. 48.

And Juvenal,

*Vultur, jumento et canibus crucibusque relictis,*

*Ad factus properat, partemque cadaveris offert.* Sat. xiv. v. 77.

So Prudentius,

— *Cruce illum tollat in auras,*

*Viventesque oculos offerat alitibus.*

Περὶ στεφ. Hymn. xi. v. 65.

This punishment did appear in the mythology of Prometheus; who though he were by some represented simply as δεσμώτης, by others particularly he is described as ἀνεσταυρωμένος, especially by Lucian, who delivers him προσηλούμενον, κρεμάμενον, προσπαταλούμενον, ἀνασταυρούμενον, ἀνασκολοπιζόμενον. And

voracity, to the longer injury of the air and weather<sup>35</sup>. A guard was also usually set about them<sup>36</sup>, lest any pitying

Tertullian, speaking of Pontus, from whence Marcion came; 'Omnia torpent, omnia rigent: nihil illic nisi feritas calet; illa scilicet, quæ fabulas scenis dedit, de sacrificiis Taurorum, et amoribus Colchorum, et crucibus Caucasorum.' *Adv. Marcion. lib. i. cap. 1.* [p. 366 A.] He touches the subject of three tragedies, Medea, Iphigenia in Tauris, and Prometheus Vincetus, or rather Crucifixus. As therefore the eagle there did feed upon his liver, so were the bodies of crucified persons left to the promiscuous rapacity of carnivorous fowls. So true it was of them what Augustus once said; 'Uni suppliciter sepulturam precanti respondisse dicitur; *Jam istam in volucrum fore potestatem.*' *Suet. lib. ii. cap. 13.* Nor were they only in the power of the fowls of the air, as Prometheus was, whom they durst not hang too low, lest men should succour him; *Ὅντε γὰρ ταπεινὸν καὶ πρόσγειον ἐσταυρωσάσαι χρῆ'* says Vulcan in Lucian for that reason; *Prometh. cap. i.* but ordinarily they hung so low upon the cross, that the ravenous beasts might reach them, as Apuleius describes 'Patibuli cruciatum, cum canes et vultures intima protrahunt viscera.' *De Aur. Asin. lib. vi.*

<sup>35</sup> So the bodies were often left upon the cross till the sun and rain had putrefied and consumed them. As when the daughter of Polyocrates did see her father's fate in a dream, to be washed by Jupiter, and to be anointed by the sun, when he hung upon the cross it was performed. Πολυκράτης δὲ ἀνακρεμάμενος ἐπετέλεε πᾶσαν τὴν ὄψιν τῆς θυγατρὸς· ἐλούτο μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς ὕδατος ὕει, ἐχρίετο δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου, ἀνιελὲς αὐτὸς ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἰκμάδα. *Herodot. lib. iii. cap. 125.* Of which Tertullian; 'Ut cum Polycrati Samio filia crucem prospicit de solis unguine et lavacro Jovis.' *De Anim. cap. 46.* [p. 298 C.] and which is farther thus expressed by Valerius Maximus: 'Putres ejus artus, et tabido cruore manantia membra, atque illam lavam, cui Neptunus annulum piscatoris manu restituerat, situ marcidam, Samos—lætis oculis aspexit.'

*Lib. vi. cap. 9.* Thus were the bodies of the crucified left, 'ut in sublimi putrescerent.' 'Quid? Cyrenæum Theodorum, philosophum non ignobilem, nonne miramur? cui cum Lysimachus rex crucem minaretur, *Istis, quæso, inquit, ista horribilia minutare, purpuratis tuis: Theodori quidem nihil interest humine an sublimi putrescat.*' *Cic. Tusc. Quæst. lib. i. cap. 43.* And so they perished, as the Scythians generally did, according to the description of Silius Italicus:

*At gente in Scythica suffixa cadavera trunciis*

*Lenta dies sepe lit, putri liquentia tabo.*

Punic. lib. xiii. v. 486.

Thus, whether by the fowls or beasts, or by the injury of time and weather, the flesh of those which were crucified was consumed; as Artemidorus observed, who concluded from thence, that it was bad for the rich to dream of being crucified: *Τὸς δὲ πλουσίους βλάπτει· γυμνοὶ γὰρ σταυροῦνται, καὶ τὰς σάρκας ἀπολλύουσιν οἱ σταυρωθέντες.* *Oneirocr. lib. ii. cap. 58.*

<sup>36</sup> As appeareth by that relation in Petronius Arbitrator, [Satyr. cap. cxi.] 'Imperator provincie latrones jussit crucibus affigi—Proxima autem nocte, cum miles qui cruces asservabat ne quis ad sepulturam corpora detraheret, &c.' And when that soldier was absent, 'Itaque cruciarii unius parentes, ut viderunt laxatam custodiam, detraxere nocte pendentem, supremoque mandaverunt officio.' Where we see the soldier set for a guard, and the end of that custodia (which the Greek lexicographers do not well confine to the στρατεύμα τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ ἐπικέμενον), to keep the body of him which was crucified from being buried by his friends. Thus when Cleomenes was dead, his body was fastened to a cross (another example of the ignominy of this punishment) by the command of Ptolemy: 'Ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος, ὡς ἔγνω ταῦτα, προσέταξε τὸ μὲν σῶμα τοῦ Κλεομένους κρεμάσαι καταβυσώσαντας. Where κρεμάσαι is again to be observed as taken for ἀνασταυρῶσαι, for not long after in the same

hand should take the body from the cursed tree, and cover it with earth.

Under that custom of the Roman law was now the body of 219 our Saviour on the cross, and the guard was set; there was the *centurion and they that were with him, watching Jesus*. The centurion returned as soon as Christ was dead, and gave testimony unto Pilate of his death; but the watch continueth still. How then can the ancient predictions be fulfilled? How can this Jonas be conveyed into the belly of the whale? Where shall he *make his grave with the wicked, or with the rich, in his death of crucifixion*? By the providence of him who did foretel it, it shall be fulfilled. They which petitioned that he might be crucified, shall intercede that he may be interred. For the custom of the Jews required<sup>37</sup>, that whosoever suffered by the sentence of their law should be buried, and that the same day he suffered. Particularly they could not but remember the express words of Moses, *If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree; his body shall not remain all night upon the tree; but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day*. Upon this general custom and particular law, especially considering the sanctity of the day approaching, *the Jews, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath-day, besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away*. And this is the first step to the burial of our Saviour.

For though, by the common rule of the Roman law, those which were condemned to the cross were to lose both soul and body on the tree, as not being permitted either sepulture or mourning<sup>38</sup>; yet it was in the power of the magistrate to in-

author it follows, 'Ολίγαις δ' ὑπερον ἡμέραις, οἱ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κλεομένου ἀνεσταυρωμένοι παραφυλάττοντες εἶδον εὐμεγέθη δράκοντα τῇ κεφαλῇ περιπελεγμένον, καὶ ἀποκρίπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον, ὥστε μὴδὲν ὄρνεον ἐφίπτασθαι σαρκοφάγον. *Plutarch. in Vit. Cleom. cap. 38, 39.* [vol. i. p. 823.] where we see a guard set to keep him from burial; and the voracious fowls ready to seize on him, had they not been kept off by a serpent involving his head. Thus were soldiers, upon the crucifixion of any person, set as a guard, τὸν ἀνεσταυρωμένον παραφυλάττοντες, or τηροῦντες, 'et crucem

asservantes,' viz. 'ne quis ad sepulturam corpus detraheret.'

<sup>37</sup> מצות עשה לקבור את כל הרגוי בית דין ביום ההריגה; [præceptum legis est, ut omnes Synedrîi damnati eodem in die sepeliantur.] *Maimon. Tract. Sanhed. cap. 15.* So Josephus. *Τοσαύτην Ἰουδαίων περὶ τὰς ταφὰς πρόνοιαν ποιουμένων, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ἐκ καταδικῆς ἀνασταυρωμένους πρὸ δύντος ἡλίου καθελεῖν τε καὶ θάπτειν. De Bell. Jud. lib. iv. cap. 18. [c. 5. §. 2.]*

<sup>38</sup> 'Non solent autem lugeri (ut Neratius ait) hostes, vel perduellionis damnati, nec suspendiosi, nec qui manus

dulge the leave of burial<sup>39</sup>: and therefore Pilate, who crucified Christ only because the Jews desired it, could not possibly deny him burial when they requested it; he which professed to find no fault in him while he lived, could make no pretence for an accession of cruelty after his death.

Now though the Jews had obtained their request of Pilate, though Christ had been thereby certainly buried; yet had not the prediction been fulfilled, which expressly mentioned the *rich in his death*. For as he was crucified between two thieves, so had he been buried with them, because by the Jews there was appointed a public place of burial for all such as suffered as malefactors.

Wherefore to rescue the body of our blessed Saviour from the malicious hands of those that caused his crucifixion, *there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, an honourable counsellor, a good man and a just; who also himself waited for the kingdom of God, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews*: *this Joseph came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and besought him that he might take away the body of Jesus. And Pilate gave him leave, and commanded the body to be delivered: he came therefore and took the body of Jesus*.

Beside, *there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews, a master of Israel; this Nicodemus came and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury*.

And thus was the burial of the Son of God performed, according to the custom of the people of God. For the understanding of which there are three things considerable: first, what was done to the body, to prepare it for the grave; secondly, how the sepulchre was prepared to receive the body; thirdly, how the

sibi intulerunt, non tædio vitæ, sed mala conscientia.' *Digest. lib. iii. tit. 2. l. Liberatorum.*

<sup>39</sup> So Ulpianus, 'Corpora eorum qui capite damnantur cognatis ipsorum neganda non sunt: et id se observasse etiam Divus Augustus libro decimo de vita sua scribit. Hodie autem eorum in quos animadvertitur corpora non aliter sepeliuntur, quam si fuerit petitum

et permissum; et nonnunquam non permittitur, maxime majestatis causa damnatorum.' *Lib. ix. de Officio Proconsulis.* So Paulus, *lib. i. Sententiarum*: 'Corpora animadvorsorum quibuslibet petentibus ad sepulturam danda sunt. Obnoxios criminum digno supplicio subjectos sepulture tradi non vetamus.' *Cod. lib. iii. tit. 43. l. 11.*

Matt. xxvii. 54.

Isa. liii. 9.

Deut. xxi. 22, 23.

John xix. 31.

Matt. xxvii.

Mark xv.

Luke xxiii.

John xix.

John iii. 1,  
10: xix.  
39, 40.

persons were fitted by the interring of our Saviour to fulfil the prophecy.

As for fulfilling the custom of the Jews as to the preparation in respect to his body, we find the *spices* and the *linen clothes*.

Mark xiv. 3. 8. When *there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard, very precious, and she brake the box and poured it on his head*; Christ made this interpretation of that action, *she is come beforehand to anoint my body to the burying*. When Christ

Mark xvi. 1. Luke xxiv. 1. was risen, *Mary Magdalen and the other Mary brought the spices which they had prepared, that they might come and anoint him*.

Thus was there an interpreted and an intended unction of our Saviour, but really and actually he was interred with the spices which Nicodemus brought. The custom of wrapping in the linen clothes we see in Lazarus rising from the grave; for *he came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin*. In the same manner when our Saviour was risen, *Simon Peter went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself*. Thus, according to the custom of the Jews, was the body of Christ bound in several linen clothes<sup>40</sup> with an aromatical composition, and so prepared for the sepulchre.

John xi. 44. clothes we see in Lazarus rising from the grave; for *he came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin*. In the same manner when our Saviour was

John xx. 6, 7. risen, *Simon Peter went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself*. Thus, according to the custom of the Jews, was the body of Christ bound in

40 There are four words in the Gospel expressing the linen clothes in which the dead were buried, *σινδών, ὀθόνια, κείρια, and σουδάριον*. The *σινδών* is used by three Evangelists, as what was brought by Joseph: *Καὶ ἀγοράσας σινδῶνα, καὶ καθελὼν αὐτὸν, ἐπέθηκε ἐπὶ τὸ σινδῶν*. Mark xv. 46. and St. Matthew and St. Luke, *Ἐνετέθεικεν αὐτὸν σινδῶν*. Matt. xxvii. 59. Luke xxiii. 53. 'Ὀθόνια is used by St. John; *Ἐλαβον οὖν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις*. xix. 40. [and St. Luke, *βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα μόνα*. xxiv. 12.] Now both these words shew that the clothes were linen. *σινδών, tunica lineæ*, Gloss. *Φασσάνιον, λιγὸν τι, ἥτοι σινδόνιον*. *Etyim.* So 'Ὀθόνια, *λιγὰ ἱμάτια*. *Hesych.* This was according to the custom of the Jews, amongst whom there was a kind of law, that they should use no other grave-clothes. As therefore the Egyptians in Herodotus, *lib. ii. cap. 86*. *Λούσαντες τὸν νεκρὸν, κατείλισσούσι πᾶν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα σινδῶνος βυσσίνης*, so the Jews. But it is farther to be observed, that

St. John saith, *Ἐθηκαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις*, they bound up his body with several clothes, which signifies it was done *fasciatim*. As Herodotus in another case, *Συῶρησί τε ἰώμενοι τὰ ἔλκεα, καὶ σινδῶνος βυσσίνης τελαμῶσι κατείλισσόντες*. *Lib. vii. cap. 181*. Whereas then Julius Pollux observes, *Εἴρηται δέ που καὶ τελαμῶν σινδονίτης*, *lib. vii. cap. 16. segm. 72*, I conceive these *ὀθόνια* in St. John were such *τελαμῶνες σινδονίται, lineæ fasciæ*, or *institæ*, called in the case of Lazarus *κείρια*, St. John xi. 44. for as he is described *δεδεμένους κείριας*, so it is said of the body of Christ, *Ἐθηκαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις*, *They bound him with linen bandages or swathes*. These are the *ἐντάφια δεσμά*, as the grammarians interpret *κείρια tanquam κηρία*. So the ancient MS. in the library at St. James's reads it, *Δεδεμένους τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας κηρίας*. And so Hesychius read it, when he made that interpretation; *Κείριας* (leg. *Κηρίας*) *ἐπιθανάτια ἐντετυλιγμένα*. What anciently *κείρια* was, will appear by the words of Julius Pol-

221 As for the preparation of the sepulchre to receive the body of our Saviour, the custom of the Jews was also punctually

lux: *Καὶ μὴν τόγε τῇ κλιῆ ἢ τῷ σκίμ-ποδι ἐντεταμένον, ὡς φέρειν τὰ τυλεῖα, σπαρτία, σπάρτα, τόνος, κείρια*. *lib. x. cap. 7. segm. 36*. the bands or cords by which the beds or couches are fastened, and upon which the bedding lies. In this sense it is to be taken in that known place of Aristophanes, *in Avibus*, v. 816.

*Σπάρτην γὰρ ἂν θέιμην ἐγὼ τῇ ᾗ μὴ πόλει;*

*Οὐδ' ἂν χαμεῖνη πάνυγε κείριαν ἔχων;* Of which Eustathius, *Il. β. [v. 135.]* gives us this account: *Φησὶ μὴ ἂν δεηθῆναι σπάρτης, κείριαν ἔχων ἥτοι μὴ δεηθῆναι σπαρτίου πλέγματος, ἔαν ἕλλην ἔχοι κείριαν, ἥτοι δεσμὸν κλίνης*. Hence the grammarians give that interpretation of *κείρια*. As Etymologus, *Κείρια, σημαίνει τὸ σχοινίον τὸ δεσμεῖον τὴν κλίνην*, viz. in reference to that place of Aristophanes, otherwise it hath no relation to a bed, but indifferently signifieth any fascia or band. So the Scholiast of Aristophanes; *Ἡ δὲ κείρια, εἶδος ζώνης ἐκ σχοινίαν παρεαῖκός ἱμάτι, ἧ δεσμοῦσι τὰς κλίνας*, not the cord of a bed, but a fascia or girdle like unto it. With such linen fasciæ, swathes or bandages, was the body of Lazarus involved:

— *Ἐκ ποδὸς ἄχρι καρῆνον*

*Σφιγγόμενον πλεκτήσιν ὕλον δέμας εἶχε κείριας*, says Nonnus [xi. v. 169.]: and Juvencus,

*Nec mora: connexis manibus pedibusque repente  
Procedit tumulo, vultum cui linea texta,  
Et totum gracilis connectit fascia cor-  
pus.*

De Evang. Hist. lib. iv. [p. 20 B.] Hence Basil bishop of Seleucia makes Lazarus come out of the grave to life like an infant in swaddling-clothes: *Ἐκείθεν ἀνεπήδα νεκρὸς τετραήμερος τὰ τοῦ θανάτου περιεκείμενος συμβολαὶ καὶ τὸν θάνατον ἀποδυσάμενος, τὴν τοῦ τάφου στολήν οὐκ ἠλλάξατο ἄλλ' ἐφίστατο ταῖς κείριας [κηρίας] ὡς ἐκ τάφου τεχθεῖς, καὶ μετὰ τόκον φέρων τὰ σπάργανα*. *Orat. 35. in Publican. et Pharis.* [p. 181 B.] The *κείρια* then were *institæ*, as the

Vulgar Latin; *fasciæ*, as Juvencus and the Syriac translation, *κνηρσοβ ἰρισα vincetus fasciis*. Of the same nature I conceive were the *ὀθόνια* mentioned in our Saviour's burial; and so St. Augustin does express them in reconciling the rest of the Evangelists, who mentioned only Joseph and the *sindon*, with St. John, who addeth Nicodemus and the *ὀθόνια*: *'Neque hic aliquid repugnat recte intelligentibus. Neque enim illi qui de Nicodemo tacuerunt, affirmaverunt a solo Josepho Dominum sepultum, quamvis solius commemorationem fecerint; aut quia illi una sindone a Josepho involutum dixerunt, propterea prohibuerunt intelligi et alia lineæ potuisse afferri a Nicodemo et superaddi: ut verum narraret Joannes, quod non uno linteo, sed linteis involutus sit; quamvis et propter sudarium quod capiti adhibebatur, et institas quibus corpus totum alligatum est, quia omnia de lino erant, etiamsi una sindon ibi fuit, verissime dici potuit, ligaverunt eum linteis.'* *De consensu Evang. lib. iii. cap. 23. [S. 60. vol. iii. part. ii. p. 132 F.]* These which he calls *'institas quibus totum corpus alligatum est,*' were the *כריכה המכניס* *involucra mortui*. Beside these, we read in the history of Lazarus, *Ἡ ὕψις αὐτοῦ σουδαρίῳ περιεδέετο*, John xi. 44. and of our Saviour, *Καὶ τὸ σουδάριον δ' ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ*. St. John xx. 7. The same is rendered by the Syriac *ܘܘܪܝܘܬܝܘܢ*, and Nonnus makes it a Syriac word:

*Καὶ λιγέφ περικαστο καλύμματι κυκλάδα κόρην,*

*Σουδάριον τό περ εἶπε Σύρων στόμα*— *Paraphr. cap. 11. [v. 172.]*

Whereas the word is not of a Syriac, but Latin origination; and from the Latins came to the Greek and Eastern people: *Sudor* and *Sudare*, from thence *Sudarium*. *'Vatinius reus, agente in eum Calvo, candido frontem sudario detersit.'* *Quintil. Inst. Orator. lib. vi. cap. 3.* Suetonius of Nero, *'Plerumque —ligato circa collum sudario, prodiit in publicum'*. *lib. vi. cap. 51.* This was translated into their own language by the later Greeks, to signify that which

observed in that. Joseph of Arimathea had prepared a place of burial for himself, and the manner of it is expressed: for *in the place where he was crucified there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein never man was laid, which Joseph had hewn out of the rock for his own tomb: there laid they Jesus, and rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre.* And so Christ was buried after the manner of the Jews, in a vault made by the excavation of the rocky firm part of the earth<sup>41</sup>, and

before was called *ἡμιτύβιον* and *κασιδρότιον*, as is observed by Julius Pollux, *lib. vii. cap. 16. segm. 71.* Τὸ δὲ ἡμιτύβιον, ἔστι μὲν καὶ τοῦτο Αἰγύπτιον, εἴη δ' ἂν κατὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μέσῃ κομφιδία κασιδρότιον καλούμενον, ὃ νῦν σουδάριον ὀνομάζεται. Ἀριστοφάνει γὰρ ἐν Πλούτῳ τοιαύτη τις ἡ δόξα,

Ἐπειτα καθαρὸν ἡμιτύβιον λαβὼν,  
Τὰ βλέφαρα περιέψησε

*Plut. v. 729.*

where τὰ βλέφαρα περιέψησε is the same with that in Quintilian, *frontem detersit*; ἡμιτύβιον then was the same with *sudarium*; so the Scholiast upon that place: ἡμιτύβιον ῥάκος ἡμιτριβῆς, λινούν τι, ὅσον ἐκμαγέιον. This is the proper signification of *σουδάριον*, viz. a linen cloth used to wipe off sweat: but when it was translated into the Chaldee or Syriac language, it received a more general signification, of any cloth, or veil, or covering of linen, for any other use: as *Ruth iii. 15. Bring the veil that thou hast upon thee*; the Chaldee rendereth it *הבי סודרא די עליך*, and it held six measures of barley: so when Moses is said to *put a veil on his face*, *Exod. xxxiv. 33.* the Chaldee again rendereth it, *יהב על איקונין דביה אנפוי סודרא*, *Targ. Jonath.* So the Rabbins ordinarily use, *הבי סודרא על רישיה* the veil or covering of his head: and in that sense it is here taken, not with any relation to the etymology, as Nonnus conceived in those words,

Θερμὸν ἔχων ἰδρώτα καλυπτομένοιο  
προσώπου.

as if Lazarus had come sweating out of his grave; but only to the use, as being bound about the head, and covering the face, which the Epistle of Martialis calls '*sudarium mortuorum.*' *Epist. ad Tholos. cap. 1.*

<sup>41</sup> Strabo observeth of Jerusalem,

that the ground about it *ἐντὸς ἐξήκοντα σταδίων*, was *ὀπίσπερος*, for *nine miles rocky underneath.* *Lib. xvi. [§. 36.]* It is therefore no wonder that in a garden so near Jerusalem there should be found ground which was *petrosa*. It is said therefore of Joseph, that *μνημεῖον ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ.* *St. Matt. xxvii. 60.* of the sepulchre, that *ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας*, *St. Mark xv. 46.* and *λαξευτόν*, *St. Luke xxiii. 53.* which signify no less than that it was cut out of a rock: and Nonnus [xix. v. 215] makes a particular paraphrase to that purpose of *λαξευτόν* only;

Ἐπὶ δ' ἐνὶ γέλοιον κήφῳ  
Τύμβος ἀδαμητοιο βαθυνομένης ἀπὸ  
πέτρας

Γλυπτὸς ὄλος, νεότευκτος.

where *βαθυνομένης* signifies the excavation of the rock, and *γλυπτὸς* the manner by which that excavation was performed, by incision or excelsion. But Salmasius hath invented another way, making the earth to be digged, and a sepulchre built by art, of stone, within it. And this interpretation he endeavours to prove out of the text; first alleging that *πέτρα* signifies, in the writers of that age, a stone, not a rock, and therefore *λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας* is *ἐκ λίθου*, made of stone: otherwise the article would have been added, *ἐκ τῆς πέτρας*, if he meant the rock which was there. But this is soon answered; for in *St. Matthew* the article is expressly added, *Ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ.* *St. Matthew* therefore understood it of that rock which was in the garden: and the rest without question understood the same. Again, he objects that *λατομεῖν* signifies not only *lapides ex lapicidina cadere*, but also *polire et quadrare ad ædificandum*; and *λαξεῖν* signifies the last only. Wherefore being

that vault secured from external injury by a great massy stone rolled to the mouth or door thereof. After which stone was once rolled thither, the whole funeral action was performed, and the sepulture completed: so that it was not lawful by the custom of the Jews any more to open the sepulchre<sup>42</sup>, or disturb the interred body.

222

it is said not only *λελατομημένον*, which may be understood of building, but also *λαξευτόν*, which can be understood of no other; therefore he concludes, that it was a vault built of square stone within the ground. But there is no necessity of such a precise sense of *λαξεῖν*, which may be extended to any sense of *λατομεῖν* (as Origen indifferently, — *λατομητόν ἢ λαξευτόν μνημεῖον ἐν πέτρᾳ*, *Cont. Cels. lib. ii. [p. 439 B.]*), and that, when it speaks of a Jewish custom, must be taken in that sense which is most congruous to their custom, and as they used the word. Now they rendered the word *צבא* by *λατομεῖν*, as *1 Kings v. 29.* *הצבא לאתומון ἐν τῷ ὄρει.* *Isa. li. 1.* *הצבא צור לא יבשו, Ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὴν στερεὰν πέτραν, ἣν ἐλατομήσατε, ἠδὲ ἐξοῖσι.* As therefore *Deut. vi. 11.* *Δάκκος λελατομημένους οὐς οὐκ ἐξελατόμησας*, so *Isa. xxii. 16.* *Ὅτι ἐλατόμησας σεαυτῷ ὦδε μνημεῖον—καὶ ἔγραψας σεαυτῷ ἐν πέτρᾳ σκηνήν*: in both places *λατομεῖν* is nothing else but *צבא*, and there *μνημεῖον λελατομημένον*, in the language of the Jews, is to be taken in the same sense with *δάκκος λελατομημένος*, that is, digged or hewn out of the ground. This is well expressed by Origen; *Ἡ ταφή ἔχει τὴν καθαρότητα διὰ τοῦ συμβολικοῦ δηλουμένη ἐν τῷ ἀποθεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ἐν μνημεῖῳ καινῷ ὕφαστῶτι, οὐκ ἐκ λογάδων λίθων οἰκοδομηθέντι, καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν οὐ φυσικὴν ἔχοντι, ἀλλ' ἐν μίᾳ καὶ δι' ἄλων ἠρωμένη πέτρᾳ λατομητῇ καὶ λαξευτῇ.* *Cont. Cels. lib. ii. [c. 69. p. 439 D.]* And this cutting the sepulchre out of the rock, rather than building of it in the earth, is very material in the opinion of *St. Jerom*, who makes this observation on *Matt. xxvii. [vol. vii. p. 240 C.]* 'In monumento

novo, quod excisum fuerat in petra, conditus est; ne si ex multis lapidibus ædificatum esset, suffossis tumuli fundamentis, ablatu furto diceretur;' and gives this interpretation of the Prophet *Isaiah*, 'Quod autem in sepulchro ponendus esset, Prophetæ testimonium est dicentis, *Hic habitabit in excisa spelunca petra fortissimæ*; statimque post duos versiculos sequitur, *Regem cum gloria videbitis.*' Another use of the same supposition is made likewise by *St. Ambrose*; 'Domini corpus tanquam per Apostolorum doctrinam infertur in vacuum et in novam requiem lapidis excisi; scilicet in pectus duritiæ gentilis quodam doctrinæ opere excisum Christus infertur, rude scilicet ac novum, et nullo antea ingressu timoris Dei pervium.' *In Matt. cap. 27.* Thus was the sepulchre prepared for the body: and when Joseph had laid it there, *προσεκύλισε λίθον μέγαν πρὸς τὴν θύραν*, he rolled a great stone to the door, *St. Matt. xxvii. 60.* the last part of that solemnity. For this great stone was said to be rolled, by reason of the bigness, as being not portable, (from whence arose the women's doubt, *Mark xvi. 3. Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?*) and that very properly, for it had its name from that rolling, being called constantly by the Jews *גולל* or *גולל*, from *גולל* *volvere.* *אנן גולל הגולל גולה ורחבה שסותמים בה פי הקבר* אלא' *ἐν μίᾳ καὶ δι' ἄλων ἠρωμένη πέτρᾳ λατομητῇ καὶ λαξευτῇ.* *Cont. Cels. lib. ii. [c. 69. p. 439 D.]* And this cutting the sepulchre out of the rock, rather than building of it in the earth, is very material in the opinion of *St. Jerom*, who makes this observation on *Matt. xxvii. [vol. vii. p. 240 C.]* 'In monumento

<sup>42</sup> This hath been observed by the Jews themselves, *הקבר לפתוח הקבר* אסור לפתוח הגולל אחר שנסתם הגולל *It is prohibited for any man to open the sepulchre after it is shut with the rolled stone\*.*

\* [This and the preceding passage may be found in Buxtorf's Rabbinic Lexicon under *גולל*. The former he thus translates, "גולל is a large and broad stone, which they cover over the mouth of the sepulchre, according to the phrase in *Gen. xxix. 3.* And they rolled the stone." *R. P. S.]*

Thirdly, two eminent persons did concur unto the burial of our Saviour, a ruler and a counsellor<sup>43</sup>, men of those orders among the Jews as were of greatest authority with the people; Joseph of Arimathea, rich and honourable, and yet inferior to Nicodemus, one of the great council of the Sanhedrim: these two, though fearful while he lived to acknowledge him, are brought by the hand of Providence to inter him; that so the prediction might be fulfilled, which was delivered by Isaiah to this purpose. The counsel of his enemies, the design of the

Isa. liii. 9.

Jews, *made his grave with the wicked*, that he might be buried with them which were crucified with him: but *because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth*; because he was no ways guilty of those crimes for which they justly suffered; that there might be a difference after their death, though there appeared little distinction in it; the counsel of his Father, the design of Heaven, put him *with the rich in his death*, and caused a counsellor and a ruler of the Jews to bury him.

The necessity of this part of the Article appeareth, first, in that it gives a testimony and assurance of the truth, both of Christ's death preceding, and of his resurrection following. Men are not put into the earth before they die: Pilate was very inquisitive whether our Saviour *had been any while dead*, and was fully satisfied by the centurion, before he would *give the body to Joseph* to be interred. Men cannot be said to rise who never died; nor can there be a true resurrection, where there hath not been a true dissolution. That therefore we might believe Christ truly rose from the dead, we must be first assured that he died: and a greater assurance of his death than this we cannot have, that his body was delivered by his enemies from the cross, and laid by his disciples in the grave.

Secondly, a profession to believe that Christ *was buried* is necessary, to work within us a correspondence and similitude of his burial. For we are *buried with him in baptism*, even

Col. ii. 12.

Rom. vi. 4.

*buried with him by baptism into death*; that like as Christ was *raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father*, even so we *also should walk in newness of life*. That nothing may be

<sup>43</sup> So they are styled in the Scriptures, Joseph, *βουλευτής*, and Nicodemus, *ἄρχων*: and these two powers ruled all then at Jerusalem under the Romans. As appeared when Agrippa

prevented a war by the sudden raising of a tax: *Εἰς δὲ τὰς κόμιας οἱ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ βουλευταὶ μερισθέντες τοὺς φόρους συνέλεγον.* Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. 29. [c. xvii. §. 1.]

done or suffered by our Saviour in these great transactions of the Mediator, but may be acted in our souls, and represented in our spirits<sup>44</sup>.

223

Thirdly, it was most convenient that those pious solemnities should be performed on the body of our Saviour, that his Disciples might for ever learn what honour was fit to be received and given at their funerals. When Ananias died, though for his sin, yet they *wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him*: Acts v. 6. when Stephen was stoned, *devout men carried him* to his burial, Acts viii. 2. *and made great lamentation over him*: and when Dorcas died, they *washed her, and laid her in an upper chamber*: so careful Acts ix. 37. were the primitive Christians of the rites of burial. Before, and at our Saviour's time, the Greeks did much, the Romans more, use the burning of the bodies of the dead, and reserved only their ashes in their urns: but when Christianity began to increase, the funeral flames did cease, and after a few emperors had received baptism, there was not a body burnt in all the Roman empire<sup>45</sup>. For the first Christians wholly abstained

<sup>44</sup> 'Quicquid gestum est in cruce Christi, in sepultura, in resurrectione tertio die, in ascensione in cœlum, in sede ad dextram Patris, ita gestum est, ut his rebus, non mystice tantum dictis, sed etiam gestis, configuraretur vita Christiana quæ hic geritur. Nam propter ejus crucem dictum est, *Qui autem Jesu Christi sunt, carnem suam crucifixerunt cum vitis et concupiscentiis*; propter sepulturam, *Consepulti sumus cum Christo per baptismum in mortem*; propter resurrectionem, *Ut quemadmodum Christus resurrexit a mortuis per gloriam Patris, ita et nos in novitate vite ambulemus*; propter ascensionem in cœlum, sedemque ad dextram Patris, *Si autem resurrexistis cum Christo, quæ sursum sunt quaerite, ubi Christus est ad dextram Dei sedens.*' S. August. Enchirid. ad Laur. cap. 53. [vol. vi. p. 216 D.] And this was before observed by Origen; *Τὰ συμβεβηκέναι ἀναγεγραμμένα τῷ Ἰησοῦ οὐκ ἐν ψιλλῇ τῇ λέξει καὶ τῇ ἰστορίᾳ τὴν πᾶσαν ἔχει θεωρίαν τῆς ἀληθείας.* "Ἐκαστον γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ σύμβολόν τινος εἶναι παρὰ τοῖς συνετώτερον ἐντυγχάνουσι τῇ γραφῇ ἀποδεικνύται. "Ὅσπερ οὖν τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν ἔχει τὴν δηλουμένην ἀλήθειαν ἐν τῷ, *Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι, καὶ τῷ σηματομένῳ ἐκ τοῦ,*

'Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κατὰ τῷ κόσμῳ. καὶ ὁ θάνατος αὐτοῦ ἀναγκαῖος, διὰ τὸ, "Ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ: καὶ διὰ τὸ τὸν δίκαιον λέγειν, *Συμμορφούμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ, Εἰ συναπεθάνομεν, καὶ συζήσομεν οὕτω καὶ ἡ ταφὴ αὐτοῦ φθάσει ἐπὶ τοῖς συμμόρφους τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς συσταυρωθέντας αὐτῷ καὶ συναποθανόντας, καθὼ καὶ τῷ Παύλῳ λέλεκται τὸ, *Συνετάφημεν γὰρ αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, καὶ συναnéστημεν αὐτῷ.* Cont. Cels. lib. ii. [c. 69. p. 438 D.]*

<sup>45</sup> This appeareth by Macrobius, who lived in the time of Theodosius junior, and testifieth thus much; 'Licet urendi corpora defunctorum usus nostro seculo nullus sit, lectio tamen docet, eo tempore quo igni dari honor mortuis habebatur, &c.' Saturnal. lib. vii. cap. 7. That this was done by the Christians is certain, because the heathens anciently did object it to the Christians, 'Inde videlicet et execrantur rogos, et damnant ignium sepulturas.' And the answer given to this objection was, 'Nec, ut creditis, ullum damnum sepulture timeamus, sed veterem et meliorem consuetudinem humandi frequentamus.'

from consuming of the dead bodies with fire, and followed the example of our Saviour's funeral, making use of precious ointments for the dead, which they refused while they lived, and spending the spices of Arabia in their graves<sup>46</sup>. The description of the persons which interred Christ, and the enumeration of their virtues, and the everlasting commendation of her who brake the box of precious ointment for his burial, have been thought sufficient grounds and encouragements for the careful and decent sepulture of Christians<sup>47</sup>. For as natural reason will teach us to give some kind of respect unto the bodies of men, though dead, in reference to the souls which formerly inhabited them<sup>48</sup>: so, and much more, the followers of our Saviour, while they looked upon our bodies living as *temples of*

1 Cor. vi. 19.

*Minuc. Felix in Octavio, cap. 11. et 34.* And Tertullian; 'Et hoc enim in opinione quorundam est; propterea nec ignibus funerandum aiunt, parcentes superfluo animæ. Alia est autem ratio pietatis istius, non reliquis animæ adulatrix, sed crudelitatis etiam corporis nomine aversatrix, quod et ipsum homo non utique mereatur pœnali exitu impendi.' *De Anim. cap. 51.* [p. 301 C.] 'At ego magis ridebo vulgus, tunc quoque quum ipsos defunctos atrocissime exurit, quos postmodum gulosissime nutrit, iisdem ignibus et promerens et offendens. O pietatem de crudelitate ludentem! sacrificat, an insultat, quum crematis cremat? 'Idem, de Resur. Carn. cap. 1. [p. 325 A.]

<sup>46</sup> The Heathens objected it to the primitive Christians; 'Reservatis unguenta funeribus.' *Minuc. Felix in Octavio, cap. 12.* And Tertullian confesseth it, 'Thura plane non emimus. Si Arabiæ queruntur, scient Sabæi pluris et carioris suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profigari, quam diis fumigandis.' *Apologet. cap. 42.* [p. 34 B.] And speaking of spices; 'Etiam hominibus ad pigmenta medicinalia, nobis quoque insuper ad solatia sepulturæ usui sunt.' *De Idololat. cap. 11.* [p. 91 C.] So Clemens Alexandrinus: Μυρίζονται γὰρ οἱ νεκροί and again, Αἱ γὰρ ὑπέμετροι χρίσεις τῶν μύρων κηδείας, οὐ συμβιώσεως ἀποπέουσιν. *Pæd. lib. ii. cap. 8.* [vol. i. p. 205.]

<sup>47</sup> Ipse Dominus die tertio resurrecturus religiosæ mulieris bonum opus

prædicat, prædicandumque commendat, quod unguentum pretiosum super membra ejus effuderit, atque hoc ad eum sepeliendum fecerit. Et laudabiliter commemorantur in Evangelio, qui corpus ejus de cruce acceptum diligenter atque honorifice tegendum sepeliendumque curarunt. Verum istæ auctoritates non hoc admonent, quod insit ullus cadaveribus sensus: sed ad Dei providentiam, cui placent etiam talia pietatis officia, corpora quoque mortuorum pertinere significant, propter fidem resurrectionis astruendam.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib. i. cap. 13.* [vol. vii. p. 14 B.]

<sup>48</sup> Οὐδὲν δὲ—Λυπεῖ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ τὸ ὑπὸ 'Ηρακλείτου λεγόμενον, ὅπερ Κέλσος παρελήφεν, ὅτι νέκυες εἰσι κυρίων ἐκβλητότεροι· καίτοι γε εἴποί τις ἂν καὶ περὶ τοῦτου, ὅτι τὰ μὲν κόπρια ἐκβλητὰ ἔστιν, οἱ δ' ἐξ ἀνθρώπου νέκυες διὰ τὴν ἐνοικήσαν ψυχὴν, καὶ μάλιστα ἐὰν ἦ ἀστειότερα, οὐκ ἐκβλητοί. Κατὰ γὰρ τοὺς ἀστειότερους τῶν νόμων, μετὰ τῆς ἐνδεχομένης ὡς πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα τιμῆς, ταφῆς ἀξιοῦνται· ἵνα μὴ ὑβρίζωμεν τῇ δυνάμει τὴν ἐνοικήσαν ψυχὴν, ἀποριπτόντες μετὰ τὸ ἐξελεῖν ἐκείνην τὸ σῶμα, ὡς καὶ τὰ τῶν κτηνῶν σῶματα. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib. v. [c. 24. p. 595 E.]*

—Νεμεσῶμαί γε μὲν οὐδὲν Κλαίειν ὅς κε θάνῃσι βροτῶν καὶ πότμον ἐπίσπῃ.

Τοῦτό νυ καὶ γέρας οἶον διζυροῖσι βροτοῖσι,

Κεῖρασθαί τε κόμην βαλέειν τ' ἀπὸ δάκρυ παρειῶν. 'Οδ. δ'. 195.

*the Holy Ghost*, and bought by Christ, to be made one day like unto his glorious body, they thought them no ways to be neglected after death<sup>49</sup>, but carefully to be laid up in the wardrobe of the grave, with such due respect as might become the honour of the dead, and comfort of the living. And this decent custom of the primitive Christians was so acceptable unto God, that by his providence it proved most effectual in the conversion of the heathens and propagation of the Gospel<sup>50</sup>.

Thus I believe the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the confirmation of the truth of his death already past, and the verity of his resurrection from the dead suddenly to follow, had his body, according to the custom of the Jews, prepared for a funeral, bound up with linen clothes, and laid in spices; and after that accustomed preparation, deposited in a sepulchre hewn

<sup>49</sup> 'Nec ideo tamen contemnenda et abjicienda sunt corpora defunctorum, maximeque justorum atque fidelium, quibus tanquam organis et vasis ad omnia bona opera Sanctus usus est Spiritus. Si enim paterna vestis et annulus, ac si quid hujusmodi, tanto charius est posteris, quanto erga parentes major affectus; nullo modo ipsa spernenda sunt corpora, quæ utique multo familiarius atque conjunctius quam quælibet indumenta gestamus. Hæc enim non ad ornamentum vel adjutorium, quod adhibetur extrinsecus, sed ad ipsam naturam hominis, pertinent.' *S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib. i. cap. 13.* [vol. vii. p. 13 F.] Ταῦτα τελέσας ὁ ἱεράρχης, ἀποτίθησιν ἐν οἴκῳ τιμῆ τὸ σῶμα, μεθ' ἐτέρων ὁμοταγῶν ἱερῶν σωματίων. Εἰ γὰρ ἐν ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι τὴν θεοφιλεῖ ζωὴν ὁ κεκοιμημένος ἔβρι, τίμον ἔσται μετὰ τῆς δόσιας ψυχῆς καὶ τὸ συναβλήσαν αὐτῇ σῶμα κατὰ τοὺς ἱεροῦς ἰδρώτας, ἐνθεν ἡ θεία δικαιοσύνη μετὰ τοῦ σφετέρου σώματος αὐτῇ δωρεῖται τὰς ἀμοιβαίας λήξεις, ὡς ὁμοπορεύει καὶ συμμετόχῳ τῆς δόσιας ἢ τῆς ἐναντίας ζωῆς. *Dionys. Eccl. Hierarch. cap. 7.* [p. 150 C.] 'Propter patrem militiam Christi deseram, cui sepulturam Christi causa non debeo, quam etiam omnibus ejus causa debeo?' *S. Hieron. Epist. ad Heliodor. de Laude Vit. Solit. cap. 3.* [Epist. xiv. vol. i. p. 30 A.]

<sup>50</sup> This was observed by Julian the Apostate, who, writing to an idolatrous high priest, puts him in mind of those

things by which he thought the Christians gained upon the world, and recommends them to the practice of the heathen priests. Of these he reckons three; the gravity of their carriage, their kindness to strangers, and their care for the burial of the dead. Τί οὖν ἡμεῖς οἴμεθα ταῦτα ἀρκεῖν, οὐδ' ἀποβαλλόμεν ὃ μάλιστα τὴν ἀθεότητα (so he calls Christianity, because they rejected all the heathen gods) συνήχησεν, ἡ περὶ τοὺς ξένους φιλανθρωπία, καὶ περὶ τὰς ταφὰς τῶν νεκρῶν προμήθεια, καὶ ἡ πεπλασμένη σεμνότης κατὰ τὸν βίον; ὧν ἕκαστον οἴομαι χρήναι παρ' ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ἐπιτηδεύεσθαι. *Epist. 49. ad Arsacium.* [p. 429 D.] And as Julian observed the care of burial as a great encouragement to the heathens to turn Christians, so Gregory Nazianzen did observe the same to the great dishonour of the Apostate, comparing his funeral with his predecessor's. 'Ο μὲν γὰρ (that is Constantius) παραπέμπεται πανδήμοις εὐφημίαις τε καὶ πομπαῖς, καὶ τούτοις δὲ τοῖς ἡμετέροις σεμνοῖς, φθαῖς παννύχῳ καὶ θαυοῦχλας, αἷς Χριστιανοῖ τιμῶν μετὰστασιν εὐσεβῆ νομίσομεν καὶ γίνεται πανήγγυς μετὰ πάθους, ἡ ἐκκομιδὴ τοῦ σώματος. But as for Julian, Μίμοι γελῶσαν ἦγον αὐτὸν, καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς σκληρῆς αἰσχρῶν ἐπομπεῦετο—ἔως ἡ Ταρσέων αὐτὸν ὑποδέχεται πόλις—ἐνθα δὲ οἱ τέμενος ἄτιμον, καὶ τάφος ἐξάγιστος, καὶ ναὸς ἀπόπτυστος, καὶ οὐδὲ θεατὸς εὐσεβῶν ὕφεισι. *Orat. in Julian. 2.* [Orat. v. §. 16, 18. pp. 157-159.]

out of a rock, in which never man was laid before, and by the rolling of a stone unto the door thereof, entombed there. Thus I believe that Christ *was buried*.

## ARTICLE V.

225

*He descended into Hell: the third day he rose again from the dead.*

THE former part of this Article, of the descent into hell, hath not been so anciently in the Creed<sup>51</sup>, or so universally, as the

<sup>51</sup> First, it is to be observed, that the Descent into Hell was not in the ancient Creeds or rules of Faith. Some tell us that it was not in the Confession of Ignatius. *Epist. ad Magnes.* But indeed there is no Confession of Faith in that Epistle; for what is read there, was thrust in out of Clemens's Constitutions. In the like manner, in vain is it objected that it was omitted by Polycarp, Clemens Romanus, and Justin Martyr, because they have not pretended any rule of Faith or Creed of their times. But that which is material in this cause, it is not to be found in the rules of Faith delivered by Irenæus, *lib. i. cap. 2.* [c. 10.] by Origen, *lib. περὶ ἀρχῶν, in Procem.* or by Tertullian, *Adv. Prax. cap. 2. De Virg. veland. cap. 1. De Præscr. adv. Hæret. cap. 13.* It is not expressed in those Creeds which were made by the Councils as larger explications of the Apostles' Creed: not in the Nicene or Constantinopolitan; not in that of Ephesus or Chalcedon; not in those Confessions made at Sardica, Antioch, Seleucia, Sirmium, &c. It is not mentioned in several Confessions of Faith delivered by particular persons: not in that of Eusebius Cæsariensis, presented to the Council of Nice, *Theodoret. Hist. Eccles.*

*lib. i. cap. 12.* [p. 37.] not in that of Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, delivered to Pope Julius, *Epiphani. Hæres. lxxii. §. 10.* not in that of Arius and Euzoius, presented to Constantine, *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 26.* [p. 61.] not in that of Acacius bishop of Cæsarea, delivered into the Synod of Seleucia, *Socrat. lib. ii. cap. 40.* [p. 151.] not in that of Eustathius, Theophilus, and Silvanus, sent to Liberius, *Socrat. lib. iv. cap. 12.* There is no mention of it in the Creed of St. Basil, *Tract. de Fide in Asceticis*; in the Creed of Epiphanius, *in Ancorato*, §. 120.\* [vol. ii. p. 122.] Gelasius, Damasus, Macarius, &c. It is not in the Creed expounded by St. Cyril (though some have produced that Creed to prove it)†; it is not in the Creed expounded by St. Augustin, *De Fide et Symbolo*; not in that *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, attributed to St. Augustin; not in that which is expounded by Maximus Taurinensis, nor that so often interpreted by Petrus Chrysologus; nor in that of the Church of Antioch, delivered by Cassianus, *De Incarn. lib. vi.* [c. 3.] neither is it to be seen in the MS. Creeds set forth by the learned Archbishop of Armagh. Indeed it is affirmed by Ruffinus, that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the Oriental

\* [But Epiphanius seems to have heard of the doctrine, since he speaks of τῆς θεότητος συγκατελεύσεως τῆ ψυχῆ τῆ ἀγία εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια. *Anaceph. 9.* vol. ii. p. 155 B.]

† [Though the clause is not in the Creed, Cyril says of Christ, κατῆλθεν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, (Cat. IV. 11. p. 57 B.) and ἐξελάγη δὲ θάνατος θεωρήσας καινὸν τινα κατελεύοντα εἰς ἕδην. Cat. XIV. 19. p. 214 B.) It is probable therefore that Ruffinus spoke of the public creeds, which were recited at baptism. See King on the Creed, p. 246.]