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 47: 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 afflicted 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.' Rufin. in Symb. [s. 14. p. cit.] Cassiæan. 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. [s. 13. § 28. vol. viii. p. 767.] 'Caput nostrum Christus est, crucifixum et sepultum, resuscitatum ascendit in coelum.' Idem in Paul. cxxii. [vol. iv. p. 1488 A.] 'Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus.' Mss. Taurins. Chrysol. Euseb. Gallio. [Hom. ii. p. 554.] 'Τὸν εὐαγγελικὸν Παλάτιον σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφηθέντα.' 'Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus.' MSS. Armach. And beside these, a witness without exception, Leo the Great; 'Unigenitus Filium Dei crucifixum et sepultum, omnes etiam in Symbolo confitebuntur.' Epist. x. cap. 5. Afterwards the passion was expressed: 'Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus et sepultus.' Eusebius. [p. 348 E.] and the death: 'Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuos, et sepultus.' Author lib. de Symb. ad Catechum. [c. iii. § 6. S. Ang. 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 sepulsum.' Adv. Prax. cap. 3. [p. 301 B.] As Opitius, 'Passus, mortuos, et sepulsum resurrectum.' lib. i. [c. i. p. 2.] 'Passus, sepultus, et tertia die resurrectum.' Capitol. Caroli 81. And generally the ancients did understand determinately his crucifying by that more comprehensive name of his suffering. For as Marcellus and St. Cyril have σταυρωθήντα καὶ ταφηθήντα, Eusebius and the Nicean Council to the same purpose have σταυρωθέντα only in their Creed. As St. Clemens Alexandrinus, Ἡ τε ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ πίστις, τὴν ἐκ τοῦ παιδείου δοξολογίαν. Pat. lib. ii. cap. 3. [vol. i. p. 189.] Which was farther enlarged afterwards by the Council of Constantinople into σταυρωθήντα, καὶ ταφηθήντα, καὶ ταφηθήντα.
ARTICLE IV.

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. 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.

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 Messias, as we have formerly proved by the confession of the most ancient Jews, and may farther be evidenced both 48 Page 155, note 37, we shewed by the Targum, the Bereišīth Rabba, and the Midrash upon Ruth, and by the confession of Solomon Jarchi and Moses Abishoch, that the ancient Rabbins did interpret that chapter of the Messias; which which may seem an insufficient acknowledgment. But this is the most considerable controversy between us and the Jews, it was not unnecessary to prove the same truth by farther testimonies. In the Talmud, Cod. Sanhedrin, [fol. 98v], he testifyeth, What is the name of the Messias? It is answered, Παρθένος, the Leper. And the reason of the name is there rendered, because it is spoken in this, Isa. iii. 4. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrow: yet we did esteem him stricken. And because 321 he was used of the prophecies, Lev. xiii. 13, therefore from 322 they concluded his name to be a Leper, and consequently did interpret that place of the Leper in the Parkia it is written, יֵבְּשׁוּ לֶא הֲבָנִי יְהוָה שִׁפְּתוֹן God produced the soul of the Messias, and said unto him, Will thou redeem my sons after 6000 years? He answered, I will. Will thou bear the chastisements, to take away their sins? It is written, Isa. li. 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 Messias to suffer for the rest. The shift of the Jews, turning these expressions off from the Messias, 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 dispute with the Jews. Μάνυμασθε δέ ποτε εἰς τούτο λεγόμενα παρὰ ιουδαίοις σοφῶις ἐκείνους τῶν προφητῶν ταῦτα χαράκτησις; or else εἷς ἐλευθήρ οἱ Ιουδαίοι ταῦτα περιγράφοντο τί κινήθηκεν καὶ κλονίζηται, καὶ πολλοὶ προφητζούμενοι γένεται, τα τρομού τὸν εὐνοῦχον ταῦτα πολλοί εἶναι θέλει. Thus the Jews interpreted those places, Isa. iii. 14. His visage was so marred more than any man; iv. 15. That which had not been told them shall they see; iii. 3. A man of sorrows, 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 fol. 4. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrow; verse 5. He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, and with his stripes we are healed. Καὶ ἃνὴρ δὲ ἐστώ οἱ τινες, καὶ ὄντως ἀπ' τὸν κύριον τεκνικοῦς εἶς ἰνάν τοῦ λαοῦ ἐκεῖνος, εἰς καὶ οἱ ἀνὰ τῶν θεών, ταῖς λέγεται. But especially he confounded the Jew with those words of the 8th verse. He was cut out of the land of the living; for the transgressions of my people was he stricken. Μάνυμασθε δέ εὐδοκοῦσιν διδάσκοντες το παι διαφθοράς λεγέται, ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ λαοῦ μου χτίσει εἰς δόνατον. Εἰ γὰρ τὸ λαός ως ἐκεῖνος εἰς τοὺς περιτομουσῶς, πᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγεται χάθη εἰς τοὺς ούκετος εἰς, καὶ μὴ ἔστησιν ἐν παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ νόμου; τίς δὲ οὖσα εἰς οὐτὸς Ἰσραήλ; Orig. cont. Cels. lib. i. [p. 255. vol. i. p. 370.]
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 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; 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

SUFFERED.

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 the Son of Joseph, as Solomon Jarchi, Isa. xxiv. 18. Zech. xii. 10. Aben Ezra, Zach. ix. 9. Malch. iii. 1. Kimchi, Zach. xii. 10. whom we shall yet reflect. This is a constant Mosaic authority, and the Morice seems to have learned of the Jews, and to have taught with some alteration in favour of his own opinion. 'Constituit Mariion alium esse Christum, qui Tiberianis temporibus a Deo quadrans ignoto revelatus sit in salutationem omnium gentium; alium, quia Deo creatorem in resurrectionem Judaeorum status sit destinatus, quandoque venturus.' Tortul. 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 Messias 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 Shilo, 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 ἡγούμενος* 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 was then, that Elias was not yet come, and therefore they expected no Messias 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 Messia 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 Christ 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 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 Messias 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 serpant 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 Messias 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 revellings and contempt, if sorrows and agonies, if stripes and buffettings, if condemnation and crucifixion, be sufferings, Jesus suffered. If the iniquities 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 time, 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 50.

---

40 Those which were called by the Greeks Δικαιός and Φαλακτομάτων, who taught that Christ was man only putative, and came into the world only in phantasmate, and consequently that he did only putative pass. These were called aspersi, not from their author, but from their opinion, that Christ did all things only in ὁμοιοτροπία, in appearance, not reality. As Clemens Alexandrinus, τῶν ἁρώνων ἐν ὑπεράντων πραγματευόμενον, ὡς ἔν ὁμοιοτροπία. Stroem. lib. ii. p. 903. [ viz. o δεδομένον Χριστόν νεογενέστατον ἐπικαλεσθ. Idem. lib. vi. 'Neque in phantasia, id est, absent carnis, sicut Valentine ascis, neque de thesi, putativa inphantasmate, sed verum corpus.' Genmad. de Eccles. Dogm. cap. 2. [S. Aug. vol. viii. App. p. 75 G.] where far de thesi. I suppose we should read ὁμοιοτροπία, The original of this train of heretics is to be fetched from Simon Magnus, whose assertion was 'Christum nec venisse, nec a Judaeis quiocquam pertulisse.' S. August. Haeres. 1. * Wherefore making himself the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he affirmed, 'atque in Filli persona putative apparuisset,' and so that he suffered as the Son amongst the Jews; ἐκήρυξεν μὴ πνευματικά ἐκ, ἀλλὰ διέσω ὁμοιοτροπία. * Denaeus. Now what Simon Magnus 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, sed phantasmate tantum quasi pasum fuisse.' Tertull. de Prav. adv. Haeret. cap. 46. [p. 219 D.] Vedel. 63. And Basilides, who delivered, εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν φαλακράτων ἐν τῇ φασίας, ὡς ἐκ τῆς φασιας, μὴ δέ τομοποιήσει, μὴ δέ αὐτοφυία—οὐχ ἐν αὐτοφυία φάσιων πνευματικά, ἀλλὰ ἐν αὐτοβοιήτω καὶ κομοσφράση. Eph. vii. [p. 70 D.] 'A Judaeus non credunt Christum crucifirum, sed Simonem Cyrenensem, qui angustias sustulit crucem ejus.' S. August. Haeres. 4. * Thus the Valentine, particularly Marcus, the father of the Marcionitae heretics: 'Marcus etiam nescio quis hereinim condidit, nequaquam resurrectionem carnis, et Christum non verum sed putative, passum asserere.' S. August. Haeres. 14. [vol. viii. p. 8 C.] Thus Ordon; 'Christum in substantia carnis negavit, in phantasmate solo frusse pronunciat, nec omnino passum, sed quasi passum.' Tertul. de Prav. adv. Haeret. cap. 51. [p. 196 D.] 'Christum ipsum neque natum ex femina, neque helenice carnis, neque mortuum vel quiescumque passum, sed simulasse passionem.' S. August. Haeres. 21. [p. 9 B.] And the Manichoe, who taught, 'Christum—non de humano in humanum fuisse, sed simulans specium carnis ludicandis humanis sensibus praebuisse, ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem, mentiretur.' Idem. Haeres. 14. [p. 16 F.] Whom therefore Vincentius Lirinensis calls 'Phantasiae predictores.' Tertul. de Prav. adv. Haeret. cap. 75. [p. 243 F.]

* [The Benedicite 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, *If he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed,* 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 Messias 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 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 Messias, 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 Messias were predetermined and foretold.

Now all these sufferings which were thus agreed, determined, and revealed as belonging to the true Messias, 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 Apostles, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the Prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished. When he delivered them the blessed sacrament, the commemoration of his death, he said, Truly the Son of Man goeth as it was 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 Prophets have spoken! ought not Christ to have suffered these 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 showed by the mouth of all his Prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled. Whatevery therefore was determined by the counsel of God, whatsoever was revealed by the Prophets concerning the sufferings of the Messias, was all fulfilled by that Jesus whom we believe to be, and worship as, the Christ. Which is the fourth and last assertion predetermined 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, 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 prince of this world crucified the Lord of glory; 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, there 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 flesh, 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; 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 suffer in any other form or manner, than that of a human nature. It is the creature which was only created, and which is subject to all the changes of time and mortality, which was capable of being made our Saviour; and which, being in the Redeemer, must needs have suffered, as that of which he was the Head and Representative.

54 'Adeo salva est utiusque proprietas substantiae, ut et Spiritus res sua egerit in illo, illo est, virtutes et opera et insignia; et caro passionum sua functa sit, ensimis sub Diobolo, sibi sub Samarias, ibis Lasarum, axiis usque ad mortem, denique et mortua est. Tert. adv. Pravos. cap. 27. [p. 517 A.] S. Clem. Alex. Pat. 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. 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? 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, 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.


57 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 Pneabasius (the first of the Latin Church who wrote against the Arians) charge them with. 'Duplicium hunc statum, non conjunctum, sed confusum, vulnus visceri ut etiam unus vestrum, id est epistola Potamii, quae as ordinata et occidentem translata est, qua auctoris verborum Christi coagulatur per sanguinem Mariæ, et in unum corpus redactus, passibilis Deum factum. Hoc ideo, ne quis filium ex eo crederet, quem impassibilis satis constat.' Lib. adv. Arianos, cap. 5. [p. 251 A.]


Of this St. Hilary is to be understood: 'Sed eorum omnium hic sensus est, ut opineretur motum mortis in Dei Filium incidisse, qui asserunt non de attachments esse prolegetum, neque de infinitate paterno substantiae existisse, sed ex nullo in pulcro omnium crescit effectum; ut assumptum ex nihil sit, et corpus ex opere, et factum ex tempore. Et ideo in eo doloribus anxietas, ideo spiritus passio cum corporis passione.' Com. in Mat. cap. 21. [p. 741 B.] Where clearly he argues against the Arians. The right understanding wherewith is the only true way to reconcile those harsh sayings of his, which so troubled the Master of the Sentences, and the whole School ever since.

188 And now the only difficulty will consist in this, how can reconcile the person suffering with the subject of his passion; how we can say that God did suffer, when we profess the Godhead 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; 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 the 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 the 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 passive and mortal; so God the Son did truly suffer, and did truly die. And this is the only true communication of properties.

58 Per indissolubilium unitatem Verbi et carnis, omnis quae carnis sunt acribis et Verbo, quomodo e eisque Verbi sunt predicatae in carne.' Orig. in Epist. ad Rom. lib. i. cap. 1. [p. 6. p. 467 B.]

195 Called by the Schools ordinarily Communicatio idiomatum: by the ancient Greek divinos 'Antithesai, and sometimes 'Antiparodoieszai.
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 that which was incapable; but the sufferings of his humanity, as unto which that was incinable. 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, 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 Judea 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 acknowledge 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 connatural 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. 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.
sorrow, and anguish of mind. So that he was truly represented
Isa. lili. 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 ex-
pressed who alone felt it, saying unto his disciples, My soul is
exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.

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 infully 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
Mark xiv.
of that passion. He began to be sorrowful, saith St Matthew;
37. 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 61, which render him suddenly, upon a

61 The words in the original are, τραχύνει, καθαυμασία, καὶ δέχθη
τραχύνει, the first, is of a known and ordinary significance, but
in this case it is to be raised to the highest degree of its possible signifi-
cance, as appears by the words which follow, Περίστραφος έτην ἡ φύσιν μου. For,
as the ancient grammarians ob-
serve, Η περί πράσινος έτην τινα δόλος; and again, Η περί πράσινος λυμαίνεται
κινήμα τίνα κατά λόγος ἣν κρίνεται καί περιεργάς, and therefore περίστραφος
itself must signify a man possessed with an
excessive grief; as in Æsychus, [Eum. 161.] πέριστραφος κρέος, that is, ac-
cording to the Scholiast, περιστραφος δόλος. But beside this Greek notification, here it
was to be observed a reference to the words of
David, Psal. xil. 5. ιησού τε περίστραφος ζητήττει, ἡ φύσιν μου; τοπίας της. So
that it doth not only signify an excess of
sorrow surrounding and encompassing the
soul; but also such as brings a con-
sternation and dejection of mind, bow-
ing 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, εἰς ἄθανα, it was a sorrow
which like the pangs of death compassed
him, and like the pains of hell got hold
upon him. Psal. cxii. 3. The second
word, used by St Mark alone, is καθαυ-
μασία, which with the Vulgar Latin
is serious, but in the language of the
Greeks be a higher sense. φυμαθις
σημαίνει, the καθαυμασία, says Etymologus:
and Hesychius, θαυμαστής, θαυμασμός, καθαυμασία. Gloss. Vet. θαυμα-
στής, θαυμασμός, Philoponus, preserved by Eustathius Ιαυ. μ. [310]
θαυμάθιον μοι ετοι καθαυματικά θαυμάθιον μοι ετοι κα-
τα τούτον τόν τεούς, κατα τούτον τόν τεούς. From hence the
verb θαυμάζω, in termination active,
in signification passive, percutunt aspect,
in Homer, ἄν. c. 193. Θαυμάζων μοι τ' ἀρχηγό-
τος where it is the observation of
Euripides, ὡς τινας ἑγίστρεαν τὸν αἰτίαν
καλὰ τοὺς συμφόρους οὐ κατάζειν οἰκεῖοι
καὶ καθαυματικά καὶ τεούς καὶ δέχθηντα
φαντάζεσθαι. Of which he gives an example
in ἐκβολομοι, used by Aristophanes in
Plutarch, after the loss of eight thousand men, being in want of
all things necessary for the rest, ἰσο-
πάτης περίστραθης, καὶ κυβροκοτήθη εἰκα-
σιν δῶνος. Vit. Anton. cap. 51. [p. 930 E.] So while the Hebrew יק
was by the LXX. translated καθαυμασία, by
Symmachus it is rendered δέχθηντα,
Eccles. vii. 16.

bored, to be surprised with horror in
the highest degree, even unto stupe-
faction. καθαυμασία, καθαυματικά, Gloss.
Vet. The third word is θαυμάθιον, θαυμα-
στής, in St Mark; see the use in St Matthew: but it hath yet a farter
sense. θαυματικός, θαυματικός, θαυματικός, says
Heusneris; θαυματικός, τὸ λαοῦ λυπημένοι.
Said. It signifies therefore grief and
anguish in excess; as appears also by
the origin of it. For, as Eustathius observes, Ήπαθηματικά πρώτων
δόλον θαυμάθιον, δέ εἰς λύπην ἡ εἰς κα-
τα τούτον τὸν, εἰς ἅλνε λέγεται, διακατη-
κόλο. Ιαυ. μ. [88.] From ἄλιθως, ἄθως, ἄθως, from ἄθω, ἄθω, ἄθω.
It hath therefore in it the signification of ἄθω,
or λυπή, solitute, or extremity. From
whence it is ordinarily so expounded, as if it contained the consequence of the
greatest fear or sorrow, that is,
annoyance of mind, disquietude, and rest-
lessness. θαυματικός, θαυματικός, θαυματικός, θαυματικός, θαυματικός, θαυματικός,
Eurip. As Antony is ex-
pressed by Plutarch, after the loss of
eight thousand men, being in want of
all things necessary for the rest, Κλο-
νάτορ περίστραθης, και κυβροκοτήθη εἰκα-
σιν δῶνος. Vit. Anton. cap. 51. [p. 930 E.] So while the Hebrew יק
was by the LXX. translated καθαυμασία, by
Symmachus it is rendered δέχθηντα,
Eccles. vii. 16.
representations of the bitter anguish of his soul: and therefore
while he prayed more earnestly, in that agony his sweat was as
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 vi-
olated 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.
will 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 infirmi-
ties and external injuries; in his soul, by fears and sorrows, by
unknown and inexpressible anguishs. 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
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
went, 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
Head, and for the members of his body. He drank of the brook in the way, therefore hath he lifted 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 he was 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, whereby 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 father's 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 left us the direction in, our sufferings. Great was the example of Job, but of shortness 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 impossible, 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 fearfull 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.  

02 Ἐνι Ποντίου Πιλάτου. Which words are capable of a double construction. First, as they are used by St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 13. ἦσαν γὰρ μακροπροσεχτεῖς ἐν Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῷ κυρίῳ διδασκάλῳ, 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. Και ἐν ἄνωθεν ἐεσθανοῦν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. If this come to be tried before the procurator. Thus Festus propounded it to St. Paul, Acts xxv. 9. Θέλετε ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ; and St. Paul answered in the same propriety of speech, Ἐνι τοῦ βασιλέως ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐστίν εἰς εὐλογίαν. Thus Christ tells his Apostles, Mark xiii. 9. Ἐνι ἐχεσνόν τινα κατὰ καθαρά, And in this sense it is often used by the Greeks. Secondly, Ἐνι Πιλάτου is under Pilate, that is, in the time of his government, when and while he was procurator of Judaea: Ἐνι ἐν Χριστῷ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐνὶ οδί τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Lake Il. 2. and Ἐν ἄνωθεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 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, he should have three. The first of two is Pontius, which name descending to him from the Greek: ας Κασαλλωνας ει Ενεστιον τον Ναυαρκοτον τον Πλατανον. Epist. ad Arch. chap. [Ep. xii. p. 359 D. and ev τον τον Προθύρων, in this king's reign, is the common phrase of Pausanias. Thus the Athenians among their nine ἄρχοντες had one who was called Ενεστιον, because his name was used for the denotation of that year; and the phrase was usually, ἐν τοις άρχονται, or ἐν τοις ἄρχονται, as I find it thrice together in one place. οῦ μην ημέρας ἐν ονομάκον, Πλατάνος ή οδοί τοίς ἄρχονται, και Αλεξάνδρης ἔφορος ἐν Ίουλίω, και Πασχάντων ήταν δυνάμεις ἄρχονται. 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 Galileus in this manner: οος τοις Κασαλλωνας ει Ενεστιον τον Πλατανον. In the same manner did the Lacedaemonians make their historical accounts by their Ephori, and the Argivi by the priestesses of Juno: ἐν τοις εἴρηκοι και ἐν τοις συνήνοικοι, και ἐν τοις ἄρχονται και ἐν τοις ἀρχικομήνοι. 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 Galileus in this manner: ἐν τοις Κασαλλωνας ει Ενεστιον τον Πλατανον. In the same manner did the Lacedaemonians make their historical accounts by their Ephori, and the Argivi by the priestesses of Juno: ἐν τοις εἴρηκοι και ἐν τοις συνήνοικοι, και ἐν τοις ἄρχονται και ἐν τοις ἀρχικομήνοι.

UNDER PONTIUS PILATE.

Of the first of these two names, Pontius, 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 three score 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, 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, from whom he received his authority, and of the Jews, and of the Herodians, Pontius Pilatus, saith, in the Scripture, Deut. xv. 2. "And I the Lord have chosen thee, to put thee unto my service skilful in the knowledge of their own laws and customs, speaks thus of our Saviour: 'Postremo obsidum Pontio Pilato, Syrian tune ex
over whom he exercised his dominion. But what was the office of a procurator in those times, though necessary for our pre-195
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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 Judea 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 Judaea 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 Judaea was furnished with power of life and death, and so administered all the power of the president, and adjudged it to Syria. Of this Cesonius Josephus writeth after this manner; "Cesonius and the others, sickly, and worn out, with procuring the revenues of the province, the emperor's property, and the emperor himself, and all to intents and purposes to do such things as were necessary thereto, with such authority as the emperor himself had done them. This appeareth by Cesonius, the first procurator of Judea, who was brought in by Quirinius Probus of Syria, when he came to dispose of the goods of Archelaus, and to reduce Judea into the form of a province, and..."
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 Judea 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 Jews 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 province, Coponius was sent thither by the emperor, and furnished with power of life and death. For although in the provincial 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 praetorials, the procurator was often less praetorials. From whence, in the ancient inscriptions, we read of the same person, 'procurator and praetor Alpinus,' 'procurator et praetor provinciarum per orientem,' 'procurator et praetor provinciae Sarditiae.' It was often therefore so, that the procurator did 'praetorius partes fungi,' as Ulpius; 'in provinciam enim praetorium provinciarum, nec aliter procuratoribus Caesaris hae cognitio injustit quam praetorius partes in provincia fungitur.' Lib. viii. de officio Procuratoris. And this is very necessary to be observed, because a procurator barely such, not armed with the power of the praetor in the province, had not the power of the sword. As Augustus to Vellius: 'Procurator meius, qui vice praesiis non fungatur, exilli tibi praesiis non potuit irrogare.' Lib. ix. Cod. de pecunia: and to Heliodorus: 'Procurator meius, qui vice praesiis non fungatur, sit et exi-...'

Under Pontius Pilate.

not in any court of the Jews, but in the Roman governor alone as supreme; and therefore 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 relagation of Archelans, 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 Matt. xxvii. for enoy that the chief priests delivered him; and when he had 18 examined him, he found no fault touching those things whereof they Take xxiii. accused him. Three times did he challenge the whole nation 44 of the Jews, Why? what evil hath he done? Three times did he Ver. 22 make that clear profession, I have found no cause of death in him.

His own wife, admonished in a dream, sent unto him, saying, Matt. xxvii. Have thou nothing to do with that just man: and when he heard 19 that he made himself the Son of God, he was more afraid: and John xix. yet, notwithstanding these apprehensions and professions, he 5,8 condemned and crucified him.

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

60 I may 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, 'Intelligentum acceperat, sibi licere interficere quosque, propter diuu 55 non sita sanctitatem, quam celebrare iam non procurator, Prax. 14. in Joan. [4. 4. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 720 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...
which inclined and betrayed him to so foul an act. He was a man of an high, rough, untractable, and irreconcilable spirit, as he is described by the Jews, and appeareth from the beginning of his government, when he brought the bucklers stampt 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 reprehen sion and severe command from the emperor Tiberius. After that, he seized on the Corban, that sacred treasury, and spent it upon an aqueduct: nor could all their religious and importance petitions divert his intentions, but his resolution went through their blood to bring in water. 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 rapine which he had committed.

It was thus necessary to express the person under whom our Saviour suffered, first, that we might for ever be assured of the time in which he suffered. The enemies of Christianity began 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. Some fixed it to the seventh year of the reign of Tiberius; whereas it is certain Pontius Pilate was not then procurator in Judea: 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 three-score years more backward yet, placing his death in the beginning of Herod’s reign, which was not born till toward the death of the same king. Others have removed it farther yet near twenty years, and so vainly tell us how he died under pertinet dignitatem.' Serv. 171. de Temp. 'Irenæus speaking of St. Paul, Evangelizat Filium Dei Christum. I. lib. v. cap. 12. § 5.] and to make the more certain character of time, Ignatius added to the name of Pilate that of Herod: 'Akhosis ètis Pontioi Plathos kal ἡ ἁράμος γνήσιών καθ' ἑαυτόν ἐν σωφρ. Epist. ad Smyrn. [1. i. p. 34.] 78 So Eusebius detected some of those which lived not long before him: ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀνάπλησε τὰ πλαίσια τῶν κατὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ἥμισυ ἑκατομμυρίων γένους καὶ πρῶτος διαθήκης, τὸν λύπος αὐτὸς τὸν παραπομπηδοὺς χρόνον τῶν νεκρασίων αἰσθάνεται το διόπτως Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 9. [p. 30.] 79 'E khow de tòv òllo vespasia Tiberioú, ἡ γέννησις ἤταν ἐνδοτὴν τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, τά περὶ τὸ σωτήριον αὐτὸς τῶν πολλομενία μηρίδας καθ' ἡ διδοµενον χρόνον, καὶ ἐκτίσει αὐτὸ τῇ ἰναπλάθεται Platon. Epist. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 9. [p. 30.] 80 Divers of the Jews place the passion of Christ in the year of their account 3774, which is sixty-nine years before our common account of the year in which he truly suffered. This invention of their own, grounded upon no foundation, and backed with not so much as the least probability, they deliver as a truth amongst them, continued in this rhapsody. i. o. In the year 3774 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 equalled the greater. So that their meaning is, that after seven periods consisting of 532 years, in the year of the world 3774, 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 Jannaeus, and crucified in the year 3477, which was the third of Aristobulus; making him the disciple of R. Joseph the son of Perachiah, according to that usual phrase of theirs, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς, τὸς Ἰακώβαντος υἱὸν Ἰορδάνου, συνέσθη τῷ Χριστῷ. Vides Soph. Juchasian. * [This Sermon is rejected as spurious by the Benedictine editors. Append. ad vol. v. part ii. p. 398 A. Serv. coxxii. 3.] [This computation may be found in the first edition of the Soph. Juchasian, Constant. 1566, f. 13 s. 15. In the second ed. Orat. 1581, f. 16 s. autop. It is very much altered: thus for Ἰησοῦς of the Necessarum, we have Ἰωάννης of that man, and for καὶ τῶν Christians merely ἡ θεοί.—R. P. S.] PEARSON.
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 fullness of time.

Secondly, it was thought necessary to include the name of Pilate in our Creed, as of one who gave a most powerful external testimony? to the certainty of our Saviour's death, and the innocence 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?8, and by him presented to the senate; secondly, by records written in tables of all things of moment which were acted in his government?9.

77 'Nota quod in Pilato et uxore ejus, iustum Dominum confessius, Gentiliis populi testimonium sit.' S. Hieron. in Matt. xxvii. (vol. vii. p. 239 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: 'Et omnium super Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam prae sua conscientia Christianus, Cesari tunc Tiberio numtiavit.' Apolog. cap. 21, [p. 26 D.] And again: 'Tiberiis ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in seculum inFravit, annunuiatae ibi ex Syria Palestinae, que illae virtutem divina damnnaverat, et ab eis revelarerat, detulit ad Senatorum eum praemittente sibi manus.' Ibid. cap. 5. (p. 6 B.)

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 pepuli, which were diligently made and carefully kept at Rome. In the same manner the governors in the provinces took care that all things worthy of remark should be written in public tables, and preserved as the Acts 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: 'Et coram eis gerens, honesta mora et in eis post Pontium Pilatum gerendis ætatem maeæ dixsest.' Ibid. cap. 48. [p. 72 A.] And in the differences between the Christians, they were cited by both parties. As the Tertullianist alleged them for their custom of the observance of Easter, as Epiphanius testifieth of them: 'Alii eum ob acta Pontium Pilato instituiti, quod in eis viam instituisset, eam post Pontium Pilatum gerendum.' Et alii eum ob acta instituentes consueverunt eam post Pontium Pilatum gerendum.' Ibid. cap. 48. (p. 72 A.)
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 Judea; 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 upon the cross.

That the Messiah 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 80 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 stumbling-block to the Jews, nor could they ever 1 Cor. i. 23.

be brought to confess the Messias should die that death upon a tree to which the curse of the Law belonged 81: 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, texta cubitis superavit aera diluvium, ut nunc Ecclesie hoc solum super-navigat. S. Paulinus Epist. 2. [al. Ep. xxiv. p. 161 B.] As unlikely a type did they make Jacob’s ladder. Etc puto crucem Salvatoris istam esse scalam quam vidit Jacob.” S. Hierem. Com. in Psal. xci.* “Seals unque ad eam attingens crucis figuram habebat: Dominus in unus scelus, Christus crucifixus est. Etc. S. August. Sermon. 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.

Si Trypho the Jew, in the Dialogue with Justin Martyr, with what sound did he confess the Christian doctrines, would by no means be brought to this; Etc de atque eorum totius strophas emendavit, et Etc. (ab origine) etiam daturum est eum quem legunt ejusdem. But 1 Cor. i. 25. and afterwards granting his passion, urged him to prove his crucifixion: Etc iudicatae etiam super eam, cuius verbi deo iudicatae etiam super eam, cuius verbi legenium, sed jam tum in sacramentum crucifixus, cujus figura per litteram Grecam T number trecentorum expressit, adversarios principes debellavit: cujus mysterii virtutis trecentis in longum
than Isaac was: nor can God the Father, who gave his only-begotten Son, be better expressed than by that Patriarch in his 200 Gen.xii.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 used in that kind of death, certainly to carry it. Therefore Isaac bearing the wood did presignify Christ bearing the cross.

When the fiery serpents bit the Israelites, and much people 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.xiii.16. 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.

82 This custom is very considerable as to the expiation of this type; and is to be therefore confirmed by the testimonies of the ancients, which are most express. [Trans. of J. D.] Hastings: Euseb.-[See p. 631. In other words, etc.] Eusebius. Ant. II. p. 267. If the Jews and the Rabbins were [Trans. of the Hebrew] to notice the wood, etc.] The wood was used in the sacrifice of the type. [Trans. of the Hebrew] and laid it upon Isaac his son, the lesser Beraisheth hath this note, וה.getClient-23 פּוּרְשָׁה הָעַפּוּרָה שֶׁאֵּל פָּרָשִׁיָּהánh as a man carries his cross upon his shoulders.

84 The common phrase by which that death was expressed. 'In cruce post. Paul. li. v. Sentent. tit. 22, 23, et 25. As in the Chaldee יִנְגַּר עַל עֹנֵס דְּנֵי by origination dience, by use is particularly crucifixus.

85 This is not only the observation of the Christians, but the Jews themselves have referred this type unto that custom. For upon Gen. xiii. 6. And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering, and laid it upon Isaac his son, the lesser Beraisheth hath this note, וה sincerum portare una Item que in the Hebrew is read as a man carries his cross upon his shoulders.

86 Although indeed it must be confessed, that the crucifjagram and the crucifixion 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 who were crucified in Judea constantly; whereas in other countries they did it but occasionally.

87 As Barnabas cites one of the Prophets whom we know not: 'Omnis pae- no per tuum stercoribus esse in eodem pro- fission, aeternus, Kaff, et susus sustellam symbesin, et egena Kyrinos, Oioun [Trans. of the Hebrew] xylon, kai anet, kai egena e xylon aera stak, Epist. cap. 12. [p. 38.] which words are not to be found in any of the Prophets. Thus Justin Martyr, to prove the Messiah to be the one who was to suffer death as in the 25th Psalm, in these words: 'O Kyrinos Haplostenon a tôn xylon, Dial. cum Thphl. § 73. [p. 170 C.] and Ter- tullian, who advances all these conceptions, 'Age nunc, si legistis penes Pro- phetae in Psalmis, Domine regnasti a sinistro; expecto quid intelligis, 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 88, They shall look

[Excerpt from Martin Pugio Fidici, 330, 331, who repeatedly address these words from the Bereshith Rabba on Gen. xxviii. 16. But Gaalainus de Arounix, l. iii. c. 21, says that it is from that Bereshith of which Moses Haddaran 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 בֵּית אֱלֹהִים on Zechariah, §. 427.—R.F.S.]
and hold my hands: whereby he satisfied the Apostle, that he was the Christ; and us, that the Christ was truly crucified; against that fond heresy, 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 prefigured and foreshadowed, 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, 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

91 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.

92 Scis est Romanus [Plautum] legis ministrae, quibus sanctorum ut qui crucigerit priscis flagellis verberetur. S. Hieron. ad Matt. xxvii. 26. [vol. v. p. 320 E.] To which Lucian alludes in his own condemnation: Σουλ το δεν ζυγωθησαται, δεν ασβονους, δεν αναβει gamma γαι προσωπη. Lucian. in Plebiscate, cap. 2. "Multi occisi, multi capti, alias verberatos crucibus affixi." Liv. lib. xxxiii. cap. 36. So Curtius reports of Alexander, "Onnes verberati assaulted sub ipse radices petra crucibus jussit affixi." Liv. lib. iii. cap. 11. Thus were the Jews themselves used, who caused our Saviour to be scourged and crucified: Μαθητησαν μια συναρτησαν τον δεν αναβει γαι προσωπη παλαιος λατρεαρχητος. Joseph. de Bell. Iud. lib. v. cap. 28. [p. 117.] 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 isto exemplo tibi esse exadactulum extra portam, Diapna manibus, patibulum cum habenda.— Miles Glor. act. ii. sec. 4.

Tully; "Cum Manerintae more atque instituto asse crucem auxilium post urbem in via Pompeia." Lib. v. in Vet. cap. 66.

95 Thieves and robbers were usually by the Romans punished with this death. Thus Caesar used his pirates, Tiberis navis cruentari et navis cruentari Poeth. in Vita. cap. 2. "Imperator provinciae jussit latrones crucibus affixi." Petron. Satyr. [c. cxii.] "Laternum istum, miserorum pigmentorum morsum peremptorum, cruci affigita." Apul. de Adv. Aes. lib. iii. "Lato cruentum festa aedis, quid ergo meruit ut suspenderat." Sen. Epist. 7. Where suspendit is as much as crucifixi, and is so to be understood in all Latin authors which wrote before the days of Constantine. "Famoso latrones, in his locis ubi gratus sunt, farca fignitos compturbus placuit." Callii. lib. xxxii. de poenis. "Where farca fignos is put for crucifixos; being so altered by Tibullianus, who, because Constantine had taken away the punishment, took also the name out of the Law.

96 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: "Quoque proximo passum aegrotum cum; sed Simonem quem Cyreniensem angrNatium portasse crucem ejus posse fecit; et hunc secundum ignorantiam et errorem crucifixum, transfiguratum ab eo, uti putaretur ipse esse Iesus; et ipsum autem Jesus Simonis acceptum, et stantem irrisisse eos." Adr. Hær. lib. i. cap. 53. [c. 24. § 4. p. 101.] and Tertullian, of the same Basilides: "Hunc (Christum) passum a Judaeis non esse, sed ipsis Simon cruentum esse: unde esse in eum credendum esse qui sit crucifixus, non quis consecutator in Simonem credidisse." De Prud. adv. Hær. cap. 46. [p. 219 D.] From these is the same delivered by Epphanus, Hær. xxiv. § 3. and by St. Augustine, Hær. 4.

This is observed by St. Austin, Serm. 18. de Verbis Dom. [c. ix. § 8. vol. v. pt. i. p. 473 F.] "Quia ipse honoratus erat sibi suos in friges juxta, priscus honoravit crucem in hoc seculo; ut terrarum principes crederent in eum prophetarum aliquem nomen crucifixi." and, Tract. 35. in Joan. [vol. iii. ii. p. 546 A.] speaking of this particular punishment; "Modo in poenis rerum non est adus Romanus; ubi enim Domini crux honorata est, putat igitur est quod et reus honoratus est cruciferetur." 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 Stoa- menes gives this relation: Ανέπιλο εν προφορος αυτοματάρχων Ρωμαίων τον τον στραταρχαί τιμώντος τὸν ἥτις τῷ διαμετρεῖ τὰς καθολικὰς τῶν διακρίσεως. Lib. i. cap. 8. [p. 20.].
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 fastened to the top of it, upon which many suffered who were said to suffer crucified and crucified (as in the Latin). And when other constructions were added in a perfect cross, it retained still the original name, not only of a cross, but also of a transverse part or beam, which was fastened to the top of the crucifixion apparatus, and was called in Latin the transversum crucei (as in the Latin). The Romans who lived in the time of Christ, and the Corinthians also, who lived in the time of the apostles, knew this form of the cross, and in their writings always speak of it as the cross.

These two parts of the cross are otherwise expressed by the mast and yard of a ship. So Justin Martyr: Ἐξεραυλώσατε μην γὰρ οὐκ ἀπέκτισατε, ἕν τὸν τρόπον τοῦ κατείλατος ἑνίων ἐν τῇ σάυνος μετά, Ἀπολογ. i. § 52. [p. 76 D.] and Tertullian: ‘antenna navis crucis paras est.’ Adc. Marcius. lib. iii. cap. 18. [p. 407 C.] and Minucius Felix. I. 28. [p. 167 C.] ‘Signum sanum crucis naturaliter visum nos, cum velis tenuitibus vehitum’; and Maximus Tyriusenensis; ‘Cum a nauis scinditur mares, prion aboriri, velum distenditur, ut cruci Domini facta aquarum fluctuam.rumpuntur.’ [Hom. ii. p. 195.] Now the extremities of the mast are a kind of our σκέπασμα, (as Virgil, that great master of propitiations, Corunna celatum obsercetum aternum; [Non. i. 249.] therefore in Greek κεραία is a semicircle, and from hence the Greek Fathers applied the words of our Saviour, Matt. vi. 18, Ἰησοῦς ἡ δέ κεραία ὑμῖν μὴ κραγανύῃ διὰ τοῦ φόνου, ἵνα το ἐναντίον γίνηται, to the cross of Christ; and τὸ γὰρ σταυρός ἱδεῖσθαι ὑμῖν διὰ τοὺς ἑκάστους, καὶ κεραία 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 59 infixsed into, and standing out from, which 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 1 on which was written,  

1. [The text is corrupt and difficult to interpret.]

Hanc milii, vel acuta
Sin sedem crucem, sustine
And Seneca himself does expound him,
'Suffles lies, et acutam sessuro crucem subdas; est tantu, valusum sume precern, et pablo pede pendere distincum.' *Epist. ret. 10. Of this Innocentius the First [Third] also speaks, Serm. 1. de uno Murt. [vol. i. p. 171.] 'Fuerunt in cruce Dominica ligna quatuor; stipes eretus, et lignum transversum, truncus suppositus, et titulus superpositus.' This Gregorius Turonensis, after the use of the cross was long omitted, interpreted Suppositus, a piece of wood fastened under the feet of him that suffered: 'Clavorum ergo Dominicum gratia, quod quattuor fuerint, hec est ratio. Duo sunt affixi in palmis, et duo in plantis; et quatuor sunt quattuor, ut in cruce sanctae deprecante vise sunt potissum quam stare. Sed in stipite ereto foramen factum manifestum est. Fes quoque parvulce tabellia in loco foramen invenit et supras cruce intermittenst. Supras cruce eros tantum situm hominis secreto affixa sunt plantae.' *De Glor. Murt. cap. 6. [p. 727 D.]

1 That which was written over the head of our Saviour is called simply by St. Luke ἔγγραφον, by St. Matthew αφίγμα, by St. Mark άφιγμα τος αιρειας, and by St. John τίτλον, making use of a Latin word, as is observed by Nonnus; [xiv. v. 101.]

Kai Πλατανος θερινος έγγραφας μεταφορα γάμφος
Γράμμα, τόσο καλούς παντοτινη τίτλοι λαβας.
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. *Oras. Vetus. Aria, concus, materie, titulus;
friend; whoever maketh himself a King speaketh against Caesar.
This moved Pilate to pass sentence upon him, and, because that
punishment of the cross was by the Roman custom used for that
crime, 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.
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 de-
spatch, but a lingering and tormenting death: insomuch that
the Romans, who most used this punishment, did in their
language dudge their expressions of pains and crucification 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, 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 them-

2 'Anctores seditionis et tumultus, vel conciliares populi, pro qualitate
dignitas, aut in cruce tumultur, aut
destitut obliviscuntur, aut in insulae de-
portantur.' Tit. Paul. lib. v. tit. 22.
3 'Illa morte pejus nihil fuit inter omnia genera mortuidor.' S. August.
Tract. 36. in Joan. [5. 4. vol. iii. part. ii.
p. 245 F. 'Tully calls it 'crucelissimum
tertiumque supplicium'; ibid. v. in
Verr. cap. 66, and Apuleius 'puna ex-
trema.' De Aur. Asin. lib. x.
4 'ubi doloribus acerribus exagitatum,
cruciatum vocatur, a cruce nominatus:
pendantem enim in ligno crucifis, elatis
ad lignum podibus manubisque condis,
producta morte necabantur.' Euth. lib. 1.
ap. 74.
5 Valentinus Gallicanus relateth of
Avitus Cassius, in the case of some
centurions which had been prosperous,
but in fighting without orders given:
'Ecce, quis est, et in cruce sollicito,
seriffe supplicio affict, quantum maxime
non existabat.' Cap. 4. And Juvenal
speaks with relation to this custom,
Pone crucem sercite.

Sat. vi. ver. 119.

So Pasileus in Pliatae;

Nisi quidem illa nos vult, qui servi
sumus.

Propter amorem suum oman cruceos
contubernales dari.

Mil. Gler. act. ii. sc. 2. ver. 18.

And again —

PEARSON.
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 Roman7 could possibly suffer in himself, or could be contrived to shew their detestation to such creatures as were below human nature. And because, when a man is

Noli ministrari; seio crucem futuram milii sepelamur.

Ibi mei majora sunt stili, pater, avus, proceres, abanues.

Tib. act. ii. sc. 4. ver. 19.

So in Terence,

— Fum. Quid meritus est? Dav.

Ornatus.

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

And Horace,

SQ quis cum servum, patiunmin qui tol-
tere iussus,

Senatus placet tepidamine igneuitur jus.

In crucem sufragat —

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

So Capitoline of Pertainax, ‘In crucem subiit talibus servis’; cap. 9, and Herod.

Il. M. cap. 4, in Ioannem qui generavit

κατάφυλλον ανακοινωσθείσαν. 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 quique liber aut servus eset, sui fortuna a quaque sumpsum suffragat.’ Lib. ii. cap. 38. And then the servants were always crucified, as Servius observes among the Lacedemonians: ‘Servos patibulis suffragat, filios straguckle, nepotes fugaverant.’ Com. in Aenid. iii. p. 552. ‘Necesse quidem perpetuum indiculor exilium; servus vero patibulo suffragat.’ Apul. de Auv. Aen. lib. x. Thus in the combat at Rome, upon the death of Julius Caesar: ‘Aequium neque frigor neque calorem, nisi aequum, Graecum, servum sumus, servum tuum.’

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.

Was crucified.

b beyond possibility of suffering pain, he may still be subject to ignominy in his fame; when by other exquisite tortures some men have tasted the bitterness of death, after that, they have in their breathless corpse,9 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.10 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.11 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, Curset Deus xxvi. is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in 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.

207 of 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.

7 Eadem de causa supplicia annua canes pendunt inter adem Juventutia et Summan, vivi in forca sambucis arbore fixi.' Plin. lib. xxiv. cap. 4. [p. 143.]

8 "Pomptos maxe noli et multum teneo somnus, ut verti se teneo!" In Macrino, cap. 12. Yet either is sufficient to express crucifixion: as in Tacitus, 'Malam potentiam servili supplicii explicavit.' Hist. lib. iv. cap. 11, and again, 'Sumptum de co supplicium in servitum modum.' Hist. lib. ii. cap. 72. And therefore when any servitors were made free, they were put out of fear of ever suffering this punishment. ‘An vero servos nostros horum suppliciorum omnium metu dominorum benignitias una vindicta liberavit! Nos a verbis, ab uno, a cruces denuque terrere, neque res gestae, neque acta acta, neque nostri honoros vindictabant!’ Cic. Orat. pro Rabor. cap. 5. [p. 150.]

9 Carnitas, et quinque capitia, et nomen ipsa cruce absit, non modo a corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus. Harum enim omnium rerum non solum eventus aequo perpessit, sed etiam conditionis, exp FACTIO, mentio ipsa denique, indigna cive Romano aequam hominum libero est.'

Cic. Orat. pro Rabor. cap. 5. 'Taceans est vincere cim Romenum, scelerus verborum, prope parvissimae necare: quid dicam in crucem tellerius terrenissimum supplicium? Verum erat verum erat erat.'

As when Achaeus, and then fastened his body to a cross: 'Eõicis parametro nem tenebrae' Rom. viii. 15. 'Eõicis parametro nem tenebrae' Rom. viii. 15. 'Quem olim adipocidavit' Rom. viii. 15. 'Eõicis parametro nem tenebrae' Rom. viii. 15.
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; but 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 oftimes after death exposed to the ignominy of a gibbet; and those who being dead were so hanged on a tree, 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 which he 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; and the Jews themselves do commonly call our blessed

12 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 prooedeth being hanged: but, I confess, in our English translation it hath another sense, and he be to be put to death, as he were to die by hanging: and so the Vulgar Latin, Ex judicibus morti suspenderi potiulo, as if he were adjudged to be hanged, and so his sentence were suspension: and the sense yet more expressly, Et appendatur ligno alicui intersecutator. But there is no such sentence contained in the original as the Vulgar, nor futurition of death, as our English translation mentioneth. The Hebrew is יַעֲקֹב, the Chaldee יַעֲקֹב, and the Chaldee יַעֲקֹב, at occasio furtur.

15 As we before noted on the words of Seneca. Thus the Greeks do often use κρύστη, for crucify. For Curtius, speaking of the taking of Tyre by Alexander, says, ' Duo millia—crucibus affixi per ingens litoris spatium pependentes.' Lib. iv. cap. 4. [s. 19.] and Diodorus Siculus relating the same, Tota et vixio pusta detum us plures spatiis loco superadverso. Lib. xvi. cap. 46. So the same Curtius testifieth that Musicanus was in erouos sublatos; lib. ix. cap. 8. of whom Arrianus speaks thus: 'Teograph 67 ad 67. De Espan. Alca. vi. cap. 17. Thus in the language of the Scriptures, Et in cruce peridingit eum in one of the crucified thieves; Luke xxi. 39:

Saviour by that very name to which the curse is affixed by Moses; and generally have objected that he died a cursed death.

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 the power of the whole Law had still remained: for all the people had said Amen to the curse upon Deut. xxxvii every one that kept not the whole law; and entered into a curse Neh. x. 39. 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. 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, συντέταρθα προς σαλινα, Acts v. 32. and x. 39. The Latins likewise often use the word suspenderi for crucifixer. As Ausonius, in the Idyllium whose title is Osioro cruciatus aei, v. 59. describes him thus:

Hujus in excelsa suspensione stipite Amonem;
and when we read in Polybius, that they did δυναστευοντας τοι σωματα των Αχαρων; lib. viii. cap. 23. Onil describes his punishment thus,

More vel intercus capei suspensus Acha,
Quin mihi auras quaeris testa pandentem argo.

Dei v. 301. 14 The words of Moses are, Deut. xxii. 23. Ιησους τον θεον χρυσον, matutictio Dei suspensus: and this word συντεταρθη, which is of itself simply suspensus, (as 2 Sam. xiii. 10. I saw Absalom hanged on an oak,) is ordinarily attributed by the Jews to our Saviour, to signify that he was crucified. Hence they term Christians Ιησους χρυσοι cal-
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; 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 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 multitudes were crucified, till there wanted room for crosses, and crosses for their bodies.

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 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 Zosimos, 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.

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 professeth when he declareth

19 Προσκυνώ τῷ εὐφράτου δὲ ἄργην καὶ μένα τοῦ κόσμου, ἐκλεγμένος εὐφράτου διά μεταφοράς, ἐκλεγμένος ἀλήθειας; φημές τῷ εὐφράτου ἐκεῖνῳ προτεινε τοὺς ἐκατομμυρίους ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγγυήθη τούτους παρασκέυασαι. Ἔκειστο μὲν γὰρ τῶν λεγομένων κατὰ τῶν τάσσων ἱδρῶν μεταφοράς διὰ ἐνίδρυσθαι κατὰ τὸν ἑκάστῳ ἐν τῷ ἑκάστῳ ἑκάστῳ τὸν ἑκάστῳ. Ἔκειστο δὲ σταυρώθητος έξ ὑπόλυτο ἢκάθωτος, καὶ καθαρίζομεν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ἐν ἔρει τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ, τώσον ἄντω ναὶ παρασκέυασαι, λέγει αὐτῷ τοις ἐκατομμυρίους ἐκεῖνοι εἰς ἐκατομμυρίους εὐφράτου ἐκλεγμένος εὐφράτου διά μεταφοράς, ἐκλεγμένος ἀλήθειας; φημές τῷ εὐφράτου ἐκεῖνῳ προτεινε τοὺς ἐκατομμυρίους ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγγυήθη τούτους παρασκέυασαι. Οὐδὲ καθαρίζομεν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ἐν ἔρει τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ, τώσον ἄντω ναὶ παρασκέυασαι, λέγει αὐτῷ τοις ἐκατομμυρίους ἐκεῖνοι εἰς ἐκατομμυρίους εὐφράτου ἐκλεγμένος εὐφράτου διά μεταφοράς, ἐκλεγμένος ἀλήθειας; φημές τῷ εὐφράτου ἐκεῖνῳ προτεινε τοὺς ἐκατομμυρίους ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγγυήθη τούτους παρασκέυασαι. 

20 This is excellently observed and expressed by Origem, who returneth this answer to the objection made by the Jews in Celsus, of those fabulous returns from the dead: 'ψήν ναμαστήσωμεν, οὐδεν οἶδαν ἐν τῷ ἑκάστῳ τοῦ τῆς ἑκάστῃ, εἴμαι ἐπί τοῦ τῆς ἑκάστῃ, καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἱδρῶν, καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἱσωρομοιαίς, καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἱδρῶν, καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἱσωρομοιαίς, καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἱσωρομοιαίς.'

17 'Mori voluit pro nobis: parum dicimus, crucifici dignatus est; uxor ad mortem crucis obediens factus. Elegit extremum et postimum 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 E.]

18 Humilitas enim magister est; Christus, qui humilissimam semipersonam factus obediens uxor ad mortem, mortem autem crucis. S. August. Tract. 51. in Joan. [§ 3. lib. p. 635 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, desiring the shame. And thus I believe in Christ crucified.

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 Messias 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 Messias, 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 Messias was 210 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 Messias; 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 Pæchial Law, that the lamb should be slain: and in the sacrifices for sin, which presignified a Saviour to sanctify the people with his own 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 foretell, his death. For he was brought, saith Isaiah, as a lamb to the Is. iii. 7, slaughter: he was cut off out of the land of the living, saith the 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 21.

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

21 That this place of Isaiah must be understood of the Messias, 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,améliorer העבר ארץ שראים ממורי. From the land of the living, that is, the land of Israel. And D. Kimchi endeavours to prove that exposition out of David, יב נגוז אחרית יב אשה נשבע מהו וגו מכאן אחרית נשים תב אברם צאן וגו as if the land of the living must be the land of Canaan, because David prophesied 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 have fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living; and Is. 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 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 211 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 criminals 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 pierced 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 Rom. vi. 3. 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?

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 show forth the Lord's death till he come.

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; 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 more clearly in that admonition; Fear not them Matt. x. 28. 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. Now being death is nothing else but the privation or recession of life, 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, before united to the body. As therefore when the

22 Το έξοπλων έγ των άφθονων δυνα μαλακτησαν διαφφεαν διεκρινεται, κινετε τε και τη αθάνατησαν. Παρακιλαζοντες ει τε και παρα ην οικογενεστερι του τοιαυτο περι άνθρωπων. Αριστοτελ. de Anima, lib. i. cap. 1. [1. 3.] Τοι διαφθονον τε άφθονον (ν. άφθονον) των αθανατων, τασον έτοι ψυχης διεκρινεται δι κινησις και ψυχης, κινησις και ψυχης, καθοικησε τε και ουσιους. Quod. de Diva et Mundo, cap. 8. 23 ως έκεις, ψυχη και άνθρωπος δειναι. Πανεκκλητον, της ψυχης και των ανθρωπων, δι' εικονων. Ια. Gorgias. p. 534 B. And more plainly and fully yet: 'Προμηθει τη των άθανατων ειναι; Παν τε, ηρι ως μελετησεν η Νευματος, "Αμα χε άθανα ανταλλαγης της ψυχης αντων, και ειναι τοιαυτα το τιμητε, χωρις μοι και την ψυχην ανταλλαγης αυτη και αντων ειμαι; Αμα χε άθανα ανταλλαγης της ψυχης αντων ειμαι; Παν τε, ηρι ως μελετησεν η Νευματος, και ειναι τοιαυτα το τιμητε, χωρις μοι και την ψυχην ανταλλαγης αυτη και αντων ειμαι; Αμα χε άθανα ανταλλαγης της ψυχης αντων ειμαι; "

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: Τοις γε Άθανας ουμεταξιον, λοιπων και χρονου ψυχης λοιπων σωματος. In Phaedo. [p. 67 D.] Αριστοτελ. ο θανατος τοιαυτης δευ, αν ει σωματικη, αλλ' άθανα τοις πραγματοι διανοιας, της ψυχης και των σωματων, δι' εικονων. Phaedo. [p. 64 C.] Thus with four several words, ικος, διανοιας, χρονου, and άνταλλαγης, both 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:

Οι κακοι άνθρωποι άνταλλαγες ακριβως
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soul of man doth leave the habitation of its body, and being the sole fountain of vitality beares 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 unspeckled 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.

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: and so the eternal Son of God upon the cross did properly and truly die.

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 crucificion, 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 extrinsic 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 himself a necessity of dying.

It is true that Pilate marvelled he was dead so soon, and the Mark xv.

218 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

ali nihil in eo tempore vita relinquuerat. tomentum illud quod mori dicitur morti vindicaverat. Tho ancipiter philosophi pertisi exprimere atque quid quidquam nouum in confino tempus, quod verba proprias atque integritas eis quum appellavit: which he thus describes in his Parmenides; [p. 136 D. 1.] τὸ τρεῖς φησιν, τοις τοις δικαιον τοις τοις δικαιον. So Aulus Gelius, 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 d θάλασσα when he died.
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.

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 they actually they did not, if his death proceeded from any other cause, and not from the wounds which they inflicted: whereas

Acts ii. 23. 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. 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.

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

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 union of his natures, the separation had been made not at his death, but in his life. 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, it was never parted either from the one or from the other.

Thus Christ did truly and really 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 disjouined one from another, but not from him that took them both together; rather by virtue of that remaining conjunction they were again united after their separation. 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 Prophet, the 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 esta-

ished upon better promises, and that was to be ratified with his blood; which is therefore called by Christ himself the blood of Matt. xxvii.

the new testament, or everlasting covenant; for that covenant was established upon better promises, and that was to be ratified with his blood; which is therefore called by Christ himself the blood of Matt. xxvii.


Heb. i. 11.

Deut. xii. 24.

 Heb. ii. 3.

as 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 

Heb. xii. 16.

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 John x.

might take it again; in the bitterness of his torments to command Luke xxiii.

his spirit into the hands of his Father; and, for the joy that was to come before him, to endure the cross, despising the shame? What a pattern of meekness, patience, and humility, for the Son of Man, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life for many; to be led like a sheep to the slaughter, and Acts viii.

like a lamb dumb before the shearers, not to open his mouth; to en-

Heb. xii. 3.

humbly 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 Heb. v.

Christi Resur. Ora. i. [vol. iii. p. 393 B.]

'Tam velox incorrupte carnis vi-
ficatio fuit, ut major ibi esset soporis similitudo quam moris; quoniam Dei-
tas, quod ab utraque suscipit hominis substantia non recessit, quod potentiae divinae, potestate conjunctis.' Leo de 

Resur. Dom. Serm. i. cap. 2. [vol. i. p. 304.]

PEARSON.
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that he suffered; to be made under the Law, and, though he never broke the Law, to become obedient unto death; to go with cheerfulness to the cross upon this resolution, as my Father gave me commandment, even so I do? What exemplar of charity, to die 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 apologize for such as barbarously slew him; Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do? Thus Christ did suffer for us, leaving 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 prophetic office.

Secondly, it was necessary that Christ should die, and by his 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 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 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 of old were to be slain, and generally without shedding of blood there is no remission; therefore if he will offer sacrifice for sin, 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 corruptible things, as silver and gold, but only with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot. We 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 him to us. For when we were enemies, saith St. Paul, we were 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. 13, 14. of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how 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 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 Holy by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way 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 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 willing 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. iv. 7, once every year for the atonement of the sins of the people 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 reference 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 show 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 ascension 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 assert 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 Messias was to be buried; and, secondly, that our Jesus was so buried as the Messias was to be.

That the Messias 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 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 Messias, 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, 22 It is observed by Tertullian of the Jews, in opposition to the Roman custom, 'Corpora condere, quam cremare, e more Egyptio.' Hist. lib. v. cap. 5. As of the Egyptians by others, θανατο- σις δι' Ἀργυρίου μὲν, ταραξομένες 'Ρω- μαίων δὲ, κυνηγόντες 'Πωλέων δὲ, αἷς τὰς λίμνας βουνότατα. Dion. Halicarn. in Per- rhaenias 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 ἄρτοις νοθέτων; neither were they more distinguished from the Romans than from the Greeks, who also burned the bodies of the dead. Διελθόμενοι κατὰ ὀλλά τὸν παντότε, ὅ μὲν 'Ελληνες τεκνωτεροί ὃ ὃς ὁ μεγαλότερος τετράτος, τοῦτον ἀποκεφαλοῦν τεκνωτεροί, τὰς τε καὶ τοῦτον ὅποτε ἐκθέτεται γένεσιν, καὶ τὴν ἔκ τοῦ Παλαιαίου ἑρωιδόνοις. Lib. in Flaccus. [vol. ii. p. 144.]
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; 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 Messias 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 Messias; it followeth, that by virtue of this prediction the promised Messias was to be buried. Secondly, that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, 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; or if they escaped their

33 So the Midrash Talmi expounded it, My flesh shall rest in hope, after death; adding, "a מיתא ר""א אינכ""ל שלום זא ע""מ מיכל הלא נון, that Rabbi Elie 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 did not putrefy, nor was his body put to any sudden consumption. And although the Rabbinists 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 Diodorus, έως ἠνεκτεῖ καταλέθαι τόν θάνατον διά τήν θάνατον ἑαυτοῦ, έν την οἰκονμία της ζωής ζωής. And

34 To this custom Horace alludes, Non hortum et pulchrum. Non parvam in corus corum. Lib. i. Epist. 16. v. 48.

35 And he said, Vatur, jumento et canibus cruciisque velicibus. Ad fasts properat, partemque coda- veris offerit. Sat. xiv. v. 77. So Prudentius,

—Cruce illam tollat in auro,
Videntque occultis offertum altior.

Perique Hymn. xi. v. 65. This punishment did appear in the mythology of Prometheus; who though he was by some represented simply as δομικόν, by others particularly he is described as δομικόν, especially by Lucian, who delivers him προσωπολογημένος, κρυμμένος, προσταταπτόμενος, ἀπαράλληλος, ἀποκρυφόμενος. And

36 Lib. vi. cap. 9. Thus were the bodies of the crucified left, ut in sublimi puteocrescant. "Quid! Cyrenaeorum Theodorum, philosophorum nonnullorum, nomine minatus, cui cum Lynybascatus rex crucem minaretur, Subulifera, inquit, ista honori sita minaretur, punificis tuis: Theophi quidem nihil interretiamus an sublimi puteo. Et Thuc. Quaest. i. cap. 43. And so they perished, as the Scythians generally did, according to the description of Silius Italicus:

At gente in Scythia infusa cadaver transeunt.

Lenta diec sepultus, patri lignis tabo.

Panic. lib. xii. 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: Κατὰ τὴν πολυοικανοκτίαν ἅμα τῶν ῥυπατομένων, καὶ τὰς ἀναφερόμενα ἐπὶ σπαθάριας, Oneirocr. ii. cap. 58.

37 As appeareth by that relation in Petrus Arbiter, (Sact. cap. cxi.) Emperor provinciae latrones fuit crucibus affigere—Philoxen autem nocte, cum miles qui crucec assumverant, quae ad sepulturam corpora detracteret, &c. And when that soldier was absent, Παρά παρακόλυτα προέχειται, ut videre, et notasse custodiendam, demixeret nocte pendentum, supremo nocte manu daveret officio. Where we see the soldier set for a guard, and the end of that custodia (which the Greek lexicographers do not at all confine to the στρατάρχης τῆς ἐπιστροφούσης, to keep the body of him which was crucified from being buried by his friends. Thus when Cleomones was dead, his body was fastened to a cross (another example of the ignorance of this punishment) by the command of Ptolemy: Ο δὲ Πτολεμαῖος, ὅ ἐστιν τάναιν, τριπολίτην τὸν μνήμην τού Κλεομένου κρυπτᾷ καταβαζόντας. Where κρυπτάω is again to be observed as taken for ἑκοιμάομαι, 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 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 continued 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 foretell 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, 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 has 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 which were on the tree, as not being permitted either sepulture or mourning; yet it was in the power of the magistrate to impose the leave of burial: 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 pretense 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 Matt.xxvii. a rich man of Arimathaea, named Joseph, an honorable counsellor, Mark xv. a good man and a just; who also himself waited for the kingdom Luke xxiii. of God, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews: John xix. this Joseph came and went 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 John iii. 1, 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 sepulture was prepared to receive the body; thirdly, how the sepulture was

sibi intulerunt, non tardò vitae, sed mala conscientia.' Digst. lib. iii. tit. 2. 1. Liberorum.

So Ulpianus, 'Corpora eorum qui capite damnavit cognatis iis aequa non sunt; et id se observasse estivam Augustus libro decimo de vita sua scribit. Hodie autem eorum in quo animadverterit corpora non alter fecerintur, quam si fuerit petium et permissum; et nonnunciam non permitterit, maxime majestate causa damnavorum.' Lib. ix. de Offic. Proconsulis. So Paulus, lib. i. Sententiarum: 'Corpora animalium velineus seraphtem, petentibus ad sepulturem danda sunt. Obnoxios erimus ignem supplicio subjectos sepulturem tradi non vetamus.' Cod. lib. iii. tit. 43. l. 11.
As for the preparation of the sepulchre to receive the body of our Saviour, the custom of the Jews was also punctually

lux: Καὶ μὲν τὸν τόπον τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐπεκαίνον, ὡς φύλε τῆς σκηνῆς, παρεσάρχη, πάλαι, κεφαλή.  Ιβ. Χ. κα. χ. καπ. σεπ. 36. τὸ πῶς ἢ ἤχος ἢ ἰδίας, τῆς ἀναπάντησις, τὸ πῶς, τὴν ἑκάστης, κεφαλῆς. Εἰς ὅλον τὸ πῶς, ἢ ἤχος ἢ ἰδίας, τῆς ἀναπάντησις, τὸ πῶς, τὴν ἑκάστης, κεφαλῆς. Εἰς ὅλον τὸ πῶς, ἢ ἤχος ἢ ἰδίας, τῆς ἀναπάντησις, τὸ πῶς, τὴν ἑκάστης, κεφαλῆς. Εἰς ὅλον τὸ πῶς, ἢ ἤχος ἢ ἰδίας, τῆς ἀναπάντησις, τὸ πῶς, τὴν ἑκάστης, κεφαλῆς. Εἰς ὅλον τὸ πῶς, ἢ ἤχος ἢ ἰδίας, τῆς ἀναπάντησις, τὸ πῶς, τὴν ἑκάστης, κεφαλῆς. Εἰς ὅλον τὸ πῶς, ἢ ἤχος ἢ ἰδίας, τῆς ἀναπάντησις, τὸ πῶς, τὴν ἑκάστης, κεφαλῆς. Εἰς ὅλον τὸ πῶς, ἢ ἤχος ἢ ἰδίας, τῆς ἀναπάντησις, τὸ πῶς, τὴν ἑκάστης, κεφαλῆς. Εἰς ὅλον τὸ πῶς, ἢ ἤχος ἢ ἰδίας, τῆς ἀναπάντησις, τὸ πῶς, τὴν ἑκάστης, κεφαλῆς. Εἰς ὅλον τὸ πῶς, ἢ ἤχος ἢ ἰδίας, τῆς ἀναπάντησις, τὸ πῶς, τὴν ἑκάστης, κεφαλῆς.
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, and before was called ἡμετέρως καὶ καθαρὸς, as is observed by Julius Pollux, lib. vii. cpr. 16. σερ. 71. To the ἡμετέρως, ἥττα μὲν καὶ τοῦτο ἀληθινόν, ἔστι δὲ ἐν κατέ ἐν τῇ μὲν καθαρίᾳ καθαρότης τῶν καλυμμάτων, ἕν τῶν σαφῶν ἀναμνῄσκει. Ἀριστοφάνης γὰρ ἐν Πλούτῳ ταύτῃ θετήθη ἐν δίκαιω. Ἐσταυρωθη οὖν ἦν, ἐξ αὐτού τοῦ γενόσεως ἱεράτης τῷ θεῷ. Τὸ πλῆρος περίπλους τοῦ ἀνακαλούσαι τὸν καθαρόν. Plut. v. 729. where τὰ βλέφαρα σηυσάμεναι is the same with that in Quintilian, frontem deterit: ἡμετέρως then was the same with it; and so the Scholium upon that place: ἡμετέρως βλέπετε ἁμαρτίαν, οὗ τότε, οὐκ ἔκτόμησεν. This is the proper signification of Σωβαίνω, viz. a linen cloth used to wipe off sweat: but when it was translated into the Chaldee or Syrian languages, it received a more general signification, of any cloth, or veil, or covering of linen, for any other use: as Ruth iii. 16. Bring the veil that thou hast upon thee: the Chaldee rendeth it וּטִבְּרֵת יִתָּעַל, and is held six measure of barley: so when Moes is said to put a veil on his face, Exod. xxxiv. 33. the Chaldee again rendeth it, וּטִבְּרֵת יִתֵּשֶׁך. So the Rabbinists ordinarily use, וּטִבְּרֵת יִתֵּשֶׁך, considering the veil or covering of his head: and in that sense it is here taken, not with any relation to the etymology, as Nonius conceived in those words: 

Τὸ ὁρεῖ ἢ ὅρατα καλυπτόμενον προσόντων. 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 Martyr calls σεύταιρι καλυπτόμενος. Epist. ad Tholos. cap. 1.

41 Strabo observeth of Jerusalem, that the ground about it ἐνεῴδεσται στάσιν, was ύδατος, for nine miles rocky underground. Lib. xvi. [§ 36.] It is therefore no wonder that in a garden so near Jerusalem there should be found ground which was petraeous. It is said therefore of Joseph, that μνήμων ἀνακάλεσεν ἐν τῷ πέτρῳ. St. Matt. xxvii. 60. of the sepulchre, that ἦν λασταμμένος ἐν πέτρᾳ. St. Mark xv. 46. and ἀλατοφυτεύω, St. Luke xxiii. 53. which signify no less than that it was cut out of a rock: and Nonus [xiv. 215] makes a particular paraphrase to that purpose of λασταμμένος only: — "Ἐφ' ἢ ἐν γεγενέτοις ἡμέρας Τοῖς δόξοις ἐξανακάλυπται ἐπάνω τῶν πέτρων."

Πρῶτον δὲλας, πνεύματος — where λαχμονίζω signifies the excavation of the rock, and ἐξανακάλυπται the manner by which that excavation was performed, by incision or excavation. But Salmassius hath invented another way, making the earth and stone to be dugged, and a sepulchre built by art, of stone, within it. And this interpretation he endeavors to prove out of the text: first alleging that πέτρα signifies, in the writers of that age, a stone, not a rock, and therefore ἀλατοφυτεύων ἐν πέτρᾳ 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, ἐξανακάλυπται ἐν τῷ πέτρῳ. 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 λαχμονίζω signifies not only lapides ex lapicidio celeriter, but also polre sē quadrare ad adjectandum: and λαχμονίζω signifies the hat only. Wherefore being

it is said not only λασταμμένος, which may be understood of building, but also λαχμονίζω, 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 λαχμονίζω, which may be extended to any sense of λαχμονίζω (as Origen indifferently,—λαχμονίζω ἐκ λαχμονίζου μνημονεύων τέκνων. 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 consonant to their customs, and as they used the word. Now they rendered the word δύσῃ by λατωσμόν, as 1 Kings v. 29. ὁ δέ τῶν Λατωσμῶν ἐν τῷ δρόμῳ. Isa. ii. 14. Κυρίου ὁ λαθωμός εἰς τὰ κόρην ὑπερορκίας ἐν δόξαις, in duc. secund. As therefore Deut. vi. 11. Δικαίου λαχμονίζουσιν οὐδὲ ζωλαχμονίζουσιν, so Isa. xxii. 16. "Οτί ἐδικασμένος σκαπτῇ δὲ μνημονεύων και ἑφαίνωσε σαρκα ἐν πέτρᾳ σκαπτῷ: in both places λαχμονίζει nothing else but lapidem, and then μνημονεύων λαχμονίζομεν, in the language of the Jews, is to be taken in the same sense with Δικαίου λαχμονίζουσιν, that is, digged or hewn out of the ground. This is well expressed by Origen; Πέτρα ἡ γὰρ καλυπτόμενη τοῦ κυρίου δυναμική ἐκ τούτου ἐξεπετάξατο τῷ τάφῳ ἐν μνημείῳ καὶ κορώνῃ, ὑπὲρ δὲ τοῦ ἐπετάξατο τῷ τάφῳ τῶν μνημείων ἐκ τῆς ἀνακάλυψιν αὐτοῦ, τῷ σώμα την μνημείον καφαὶ δροσίτην, ὑπὲρ δὲ παροικίας διεγένετο, ἐλευθερώθη καὶ ἐκ οὐσίας ὑπερορκίας τῆς ἐκ τῶν Λαχμονίζων καὶ λαχμονίζων. Cont. Cels. lib. ii. [p. 60. p. 430 D.] And this cutting the sepulchre out of the rock, rather than building of it in the earth, is very material of the opinion of St. Jerom, who makes this observation on Matt. xxvii. [vol. vii. p. 240 C.] "In monumento novo, quod exequium fuerat in petra, conditus est; ne si ex multis lapidibus solidatum esset, suffuses tumuli fundamentis, ablatus forte discurreret; " and gives this interpretation of the Prophet Isaiah, Τέλεω τοιμασίαν ἐν σπηλαίῳ. 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 RabbinicLexicon under מורת. The former he thus translates, מורת is a large and broad stone, with which they cover over the mouth of the sepulchre, according to the phrase in Gen. xxxix. 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, men of those orders among the Jews as were of greatest authority with the people; Joseph of Arimathaea, 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 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 decent 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 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

43 So they are styled in the Scriptures, Joseph, bowels, and Nicodemus, αρχιε: 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 τὸ θάνατον οὗ τοῦ άρχιε: καὶ τοῦ Βούλου, πέφρασε τὸν φόνος τῶν συνείδων. 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. 44

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 vi. 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. 45

44 'Quicquid gestum est in cruce Christi, in sepulchrum resurrectionem tibi die in seculo seculo, in seculo de dextram Patris, suum est resurrexi et ascendere in caelum, et descendere in profundum fallacis; et tunc resurrexi et ascendere in caelum, et descendere in profundum fallacis; et tunc resurrectionem, ut quae facta sunt in caelum, seculo seculo de dextram Patris, suum est.'

45 Ἡ τιμὴ τοῦ Κυρίου αὐτόν, ἡ ἱερὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης, καὶ τὸ κοίτασμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ σωτήριος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς καταβάσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς αναβασεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης, καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης. See also Victorinus, Patr. iii. c. 3. 46, 47. This appears by Macrobius, who lived in the time of Theodosius junior, and testified thus much; 'Licet urendi corpora defunctorum usus nostro seculo nullo sit, lectori tamen docet, eo temore quo igni dari honor mortuis habeatur, suum est.' Sueton. liii. c. 75. That this was done by the Christians is certain, because the heathens ancienly did object it to the Christians, 'Inde videlicet et exspectatur rogus, et damnum igni sepulchrum.' And the answer given to this objection was, 'Neque ut creditis, ullam damnum sepulchrum timeamus, sed verbum et meliori con- sustudinem humandi frequentans.'
from consuming of the dead bodies with fire, and followed the example of our Saviour's funeral, making use of precious ointment for the dead, which they refused while they lived, and spending the spices of Arabia in their graves.\textsuperscript{46} The description of the persons which interred Christ, and the enumeration of their virtues, and the everlasting commemoration of the love that they took care of the box of precious ointment for his burial, have been thought sufficient grounds and encouragements for the careful and decent sepulture of Christians.\textsuperscript{47} 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: so, and much more, the followers of our Saviour, while they looked upon our bodies living as temples of 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,\textsuperscript{48} 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.\textsuperscript{50}

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...
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.**

_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, or so universally, as the

11 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 role 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 Ireneeus, _lib. i. cap. 2_. [c. 10.] by Origen, _lib. vi. _apud_ Euseb._ or by Tertullian, _Adv. Prax._ cap. 2. or _De Virg._ _et_ _salv._ cap. 1. or _De Pruseor._ or _Heres._ cap. 15. 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; nor in those Confessions made at Sardica, Antioch, Nicaea, Sirmiurn, &c. It is not mentioned in several Confessions of Faith delivered by particular persons: nor in that of Eusebius Cesarisibns, 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, _Epiphan. Hier._ _lxxi._ § 10. not in that of Arius and Eusebius, presented to Constantine, _Socrat. Hist. Eccles._ _lib. i. cap. 25._ [p. 61] not in that of Acacius bishop of Casarea, delivered into the Synod of Sclaela, _Socrat._ _lib. ii._ _cap. 40._ [p. 151] not in that of Eustathius, Theophilus, and Silvanus, sent to Liborius, _Socrat._ _lib. iv._ _cap. 12._ There is no mention of it in the Creed of St. Basil, _Pract. de Fide in Aelia._ in the Creed of Epiphanus, _in Ancyra._ _§ 120._ [* _vol. ii._ _p._ _123._] Golasius, Damaus, 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 Cæciliam_., 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 Incurr. 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 Rufinus, that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the Oriental

* [But Epiphanus seems to have heard of the doctrine, since he speaks of τὰς θεοτόκους καικρισταλλισθέντας τῇ φωτὶ τῷ ἀνή κεκατεχθέντας. _Dioec. 9._ _vol. ii._ _p._ _155 B._]

† [Though the clause is not in the Creed, Cyril says of Christ, κατάλθων εἰς τὰ κατεχθέντα, (Cat. _iv._ _p._ _57 B._) and ἑπεκτάθη αὐτὸν ὑπερηφανεία κατὰ τῶν κατεκλίθαια εἰς ἐπικ. Cat. _xiv._ _p._ _214 B._) It is probable therefore that Rufinus spoke of the public creeds, which were recited at baptism. See King on the Creed, _p._ _246._]