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

51 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 therein, out of Clement’s Constitutions. In the like manner, in vain is it objected that it was omitted by Polycarp, Clement of Rome, and Justin Martyr, because they have not pretended any rule of Faith or Creed of their times. But that which is material in this cause, it is not to be found in the rules of Faith delivered by Irenaeus, *ib. i. cap. 7. c. 10.* by Origen, *ib. 9.* by Proclus, *ib. cap. 2.* by Justin, *Advers. pol. cap. 1.* by Eusebius, *ib. cap. 13.* It is not expressed in those Creeds which were made by the Councils as larger explications of the Apostles’ Creed: not in the Nicene or Constantinopolitan; not in that of Ephesus or Chalcedon; not in those Confessions made at Sardis, Antioch, Seleucia, Sirmiun, &c. It is not mentioned in several Confessions of Faith delivered by particular persons: not in that of Eusebius Cæsariensis, presented to the Council of Nicaea, *Theodoret. Hist. Eccl.*

lib. i. cap. 12. [p. 37.] not in that of Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, delivered to Pope Julius, *Epiphanius. Hær. lxxii.* not in that of Arius and Eusebius, presented to Constantine, *Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. cap. 26. [p. 61.] not in that of Acacius bishop of Cesarea, delivered into the Synod of Sardica, *ib. ii. cap. 40. [p. 151.] not in that of Epiphanius, Theophilus, and Silvanus, sent to Liborius, *ib. lib. iv. cap. 12.* There is no mention of it in the Creed of St. Basil, *Tract. de Fide in Apostolica:* in the Creed of Epiphanius, *in Anacoret.:* § 120. [vol. ii. p. 123.] also, *ibid.* 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, *ib. De Fide et Symbolo,* not in that of *De Symbolo et Catechumenos,* attributed to St. Augustin; nor in that which is expounded by Maximus Tyriensis, nor that so often interpreted by Petrus Chrysologus; nor in that of the Church of Antioch, delivered by Cassianus, *ib. ib. lib. vi. c. 3.* neither is it to be seen in the MS. Creeds set forth by the learned Archbishop of Armagh. Indeed it is affirmed by Ruffinus, that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the Oriental

Creeses; *Saeculum sane est, quod in Ecclesiis Romanis Symbolo non habetur additum, descendit ad infernura: sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo.*

Ruffin., *ib. Symb. [p. 15. c. 301.]* It is certain therefore (nor can we disprove it by any acknowledged evidence of antiquity), that the article of the Descent into Hell was not in the Roman, or any of the Oriental Creeds.*

52 That the Descent into Hell came afterwards into the Roman Creed appeared, not only because we find it there of late, but because we find it often in the Latin Church many ages since: as in that produced by Etherius against Elypius in the year 785; in the 115th Sermon of Tempere, falsely ascribed to St. Augustin, where it is attributed to St. Thomas the Apostle; in the Exposition of the Creed falsely ascribed to St. Chrysostom.

53 As in the Creed attributed to St. Athanasius, which though we cannot say was his, yet we know was extant about the year 600, by the epistle of Isidorus Hispalensis ad Claudium Ducescens. It was also inserted into the Creed of the Council of Ariminum, [A.D. 359.]

Socret. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. cap. 37. and of the fourth Council of Toledo, held in the year 633; and of the sixteenth Council of the same Toledo, held in the year 693.


55 *Nam corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit, spiritus ab illo enim eum spiritum qui in carceri sive in Inferno desinebatur fort, ilisque precedivit, quemadmodum testatur Petri locus, &c.* *Articuli em. 1552.* Which place was also made use of in the exposition of the Creed contained in the Catechism set forth by the authority of King Edward, in the seventh year of his reign.

Psalm, and still remaining at the end of the Psalms, the same exposition is delivered in this stanz:

And so he died in the flesh,
But quickened in the spirit:
His body then was buried,
As is our use and right.

His spirit did after this descend
Into the lower parts,
Of them that long in darkness were
The true light of their hearts.

But in the Synod ten years after, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, the Articles, which continue still in force, deliver the same descent, but without any the least explication, or reference to any particular place of Scripture, in these words: As Christ died for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell. Wherefore being our Church hath not now imposed that interpretation of St. Peter’s words, which before it intimated; being it hath not delivered that as the only place of Scripture to found the descent into hell upon; being it hath alleged no other place to ground it, and delivered no other exposition to expound it: we may with the greater liberty pass on to find out the true meaning of this Article, and to give our particular judgment in it, so far as a matter of so much obscurity and variety will permit.

First then, it is to be observed, that as this Article was first in the Aquelician Creed, so it was delivered there not in the express and formal term of hell, but in such a word as may be capable of a greater latitude, descendit in inferna: which words as they were continued in other Creeds 56, so did they find a double interpretation among the Greeks; some translating inferna, hell; others the lower parts: the first with relation to the true origination, which is from the Greek ἤφθασεν, with the ἀολικὸς digamma, from which dialect most of the Latin language came, ἔφθασεν, infero. Now ἔφθασεν, according to the Greek composition, is nothing else but ἐφέπλω, οὗ τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄφθασα, ὅ ἐστιν, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄφθασο. ἐφέπλω, and ἐθολῶ, οὗ τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔφθασον. Ἑφα is anciently the earth, from whence ἔρχεται, ὁμοιότατος, to the earth: ἔφθασον then are in the earth, as they supposed, not in the spirits of the dead to be: from whence Homer,

—Ἀπνεύσας ἐν τοῖς ἀνάστασις."

Ἰδ. 6. 188.

of Plato; and Hesiod,

Ὑπέκειται οἱ καταληκτέρων ἐν τοῖς ἀνάστασις θανάσις."

Ἑυμ. v. 850.

and in imitation of them Ἀeschylus,

Ὡς τε καὶ ἑαυτῷ, βασιλεὺς τὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀνάστασις,

Πειράματα ἔνθε καὶ φυγὼν εἰς φως."

Parn. v. 631.

Thus ἔφθασον are those which Ἀeschylus elsewhere calls ταῖς γὰς καθαύνεσιν and τοὺς γῆς ἐφάνερον. And as ἔφθασον are the souls of the dead in the earth, so are Inferi in the first reception, that is, Manna. Pomponius Mela, 'Augylos manes tanta de praesuntum; De Sitia Orb. lib. iv. cap. 9. [5. 8. § 8.] Which Pinyo delivers thus: 'Augylos Inferos tantum colunt.' Hist. Nat. lib. v. cap. 8. and Sofinus, 'Augylos vero soluscolunt Inferos.' Polyb. lib. 26. Inferi were then first Infera, the souls of men in the earth: and as manes is not only taken for the souls below, but also for the place, as in the poet:

—Μαννας profundi,

Virg. Georg. i. 243.

and

Hoc manes veniat nidi fames sub imos;

Ἑνειδ. iv. 387.

so Inferi is most frequently used for the place under ground where the departed are; and the Inferi must then be those regions in which they take up their habitations. And so Descendit ad Inferna, καταληκτέρων ἐν τοῖς ἀνάστασις, and Descendit ad Inferos, are the same.

56 So are the words cited in Ruffinus, 'Crucefixus sub Pontio Pilato, descendit in Infera.' And his observation upon them is this: 'Iscendiam esse est quod in Ecclesia Romana Symbolo non habetur addition. Descendit ad Inferos sed nolut in Orientis Ecclesias habetur hic sermon: via tamen verbi cadae videatur esse in eo quod scapius dicitur.' Expos. Sym. [5. 18. p. con.]. The same may also be observed in the Athanasian Creed, which has the Descent, but not the Sepulture; Who suffered for our salvation, descended into Hell, rose again the third day from the dead. Nor is this only observable in these two, but also in the Creed made ad Simonian, and produced at Ariminum, in which the words run thus, Σταρανθωδα, καὶ ταῦτα, καὶ αὐθανασθε, καὶ εἰς τὰ καταληκτέρων καταληκτέρων. [Socr. ii. 57.] Where though the Descent be expressed, and the Burial be not mentioned, yet it is most certain those men which made it (heretics indeed, but not in this) did not understand his Burial by that Descendit: and that appears by addition of the following words: Καὶ τὰ καταληκτέρων καταληκτέρων, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖνο εἰσαγωγήτατα, τοῦ πολυτοῦ θανὸς ἔφηβος ἔφθασεν. For he did not dispose and order things below by his body in the grave, nor could the keepers of the gates of Hell be acquainted with any sight of his corpse lying in the sepulchre.
them in the word buried. It appeareth therefore that the first intention of putting these words in the Creed was only to express the burial of our Saviour, or the descent of his body into the grave. But although they were first put in the Aquillean Creed, to signify the burial of Christ; and those which had only the burial in their Creed, did confess as much as those which without the burial did express the descent: yet since the Roman Creed hath added the descent unto the burial, and expressed that descent by words signifying more properly hell, it cannot be imagined that the Creed, as it now stands, should signify only the burial of Christ by his descent into hell. But rather, being the ancient Church did certainly believe that Christ did some other way descend beside his burial; being Ruffinus himself, though he interpreted those words of the burial only, yet in the relation of what was done at our Saviour's death, makes mention of his descent into hell, beside, and distinct from, his sepulture; being those who in after-ages added it to the burial, did actually believe that the soul of Christ descended: it followeth that, for the exposition of the Creed, it is most necessary to declare in what that descent consisteth.

Thirdly, I observe again, that whatsoever is delivered in the Creed, we therefore believe because it is contained in the Scriptures, and consequently must so believe it as it is contained there; whence all this exposition of the whole is nothing else but an illustration and proof of every particular part of the Creed by such Scriptures as deliver the same, according to the true interpretation of them and the general consent of the Church of God. Now these words, as they lie in the Creed,

---

28 He descended into hell, are nowhere formally and expressly delivered in the Scriptures; nor can we find any one place in which the Holy Ghost hath said in express and plain terms, that Christ as he died and was buried, so he descended into hell. Wherefore being these words of the Creed are not formally expressed in the Scripture, our inquiry must be in what Scriptures they are contained virtually; that is, where the Holy Ghost doth deliver the same doctrine, in what words soever, which is contained, and to be understood in this expression, He descended into hell.

Now several places of Scripture have been produced by the ancients as delivering this truth, of which some without question prove it not; but three there are which have been always thought of greatest validity to confirm this Article. First, the 28th of St. Paul to the Ephesians seems to come very near the words themselves, and to express the same almost in terms 60; Now Eph. iv. 9.

---

60 For the first expression which we find in Ruffinus, 'Descendit in Infernos,' comes most near to this quotation; especially if we take the ancient Greek translation of it, κατάθετα εἰς τὰ κατά-
tατα. For if we consider that κατάτατα may well have the signification of the superlative, especially being the LXXI. of the translators of the Sept. had so translated Psalm lxxii. 9. Εἰκο-
λοσύνης εἰς τὰ κατάτατα τῆς γῆς καὶ Psalm cxxxxvi. 15. Καὶ η ὁποίας μοι εὶ τοῦ κατάτατα τῆς γῆς' what can be nearer than these two, κατάτατο εἰς τὰ κατάτατα, or these two, κατάλογον εἰς τὰ κατά-
tατα, καταθήνεια εἰς τὰ κατάτατα μόρος τῆς γῆς?

61 This appeareth by their quotation of this place to prove, or express, the Descent into Hell, as Irenæus does, lib. v. cap. 31. Origen, Homil. 35. in Matt. Athenæi, Epist. ad Epifetum. Hilarius, in Psalm. lxvii. St. Jerom upon the place; 'Inferiora autem terme Infernus scipitur, ad quem Dominus nostrorum Salvatorque descendit,' [vol. vii. p. 617. p. E.] So also the Commentary attributed to St. Ambrose, and St. Hilary; 'Si itaque hec omnia Christus unus est, neque alius est Christus mortuus, alius sepulcrum aut alius descendere ad In-
fernum, et alius ascendere in celos, secundum illud Apostoli, Ascendit autem qui est, &c.' De Trin. lib. x. cap. 55. [p. 1077. B.]
after his death; or if it were, we cannot be assured that the lower parts of the earth did signify hell, or the place where the souls of men were tormented after the separation from their bodies. For as it is written, No man ascendeth up to heaven, but he that descended from heaven; so this may signify so much, and no more. In that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first? And for the lower parts of the earth, they may possibly signify no more than the place beneath: as when our Saviour said, Ye are from beneath, I am from above; ye are of this world, I am not of this world: or as God spake by the Prophet, I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath. Nay, they may well refer to his incarnation, according to that of David, My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth: or to his burial, according to that of the same Prophet, Those that seek my soul to destroy it, shall go into the lower parts of the earth: and those two references have a great similitude, according to that of Job, Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither.

The next place of Scripture brought to confirm the descent is not so near in words, but thought to signify the end of that descent, and that part of his humanity by which he descended. For Christ, saith St. Peter, was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison: where the spirit seems to be the soul of Christ; and the spirits in prison, the souls of them that were in hell, or in some place at least-separated from the joys of heaven: whither because we never read our Saviour went at any other time, we may conceive he went in spirit then when his soul departed from his body on the cross. This did our Church first deliver as the proof and illustration of the descent, and the ancient Fathers did apply the same in the like manner to the proof of this Article. But yet those words of St. Peter have no such power of probation; except we were certain that the spirit there spoken of were the soul of Christ, and that the time intended for that preaching were after his death, and before his resurrection. Whereas if it were so interpreted, the difficulties are so many, that they staggered St. Augustine, and caused him at last to think that these words of St. Peter belonged not unto the doctrine of Christ's descending into hell. But indeed the spirit by which he is said to preach was not the soul of Christ, but that spirit by which he was quickened; as appeareth by the coherence of the words, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison: Now that spirit by which Christ was quickened, is that by which he was raised from the dead, that is, the power of his Divinity; as St. Paul expresseth it, Though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God: in respect of which he preached to those which were disobedient in the days of Noah, as we have already shewn.

The third, but principal, text is that of David, applied by St. Peter. For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was resurrexit! Nam quoque fuerit anima mortuas in spiritu, hoc est, eo spiritu qui hominis est, quis aerum diaerei cum mori animam non nisi pecatum, ut quod illud immensus fuerat, cum pro nobis carnem mortificaretur. S. August. Epist. xcvii. cap. 6. [Ep. clxiv. vol. ii. p. 532.]"

 ARTICLE V.

Glad: moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thus the Apostle repeated the words of the Psalmist, and then applied them: He being a Prophet, and seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. Now from this place the Article is clearly and infallibly deduced thus: If the soul of Christ were not left in hell at his resurrection, then his soul was in hell before his resurrection: but it was not there before his death; therefore upon or after his death, and before his resurrection, the soul of Christ descended into hell; and consequently the Creed doth truly deliver that Christ, being crucified, was dead, buried, and descended into hell. For as his flesh did not see corruption by virtue of that promise and prophetic expression, and yet it was in the grave, the place of corruption, where it rested in hope until his resurrection: so his soul, which was not left in hell, by virtue of the like promise or prediction, was in that hell, where it was not left, until the time that it was to be united to the body for the performing of the resurrection. We must therefore confess from hence that the soul of Christ was in hell; and no Christian can deny it, saith St. Augustin, it is so clearly delivered in this prophecy of the Psalmist and application of the Apostle.

The only question then remains, not of the truth of the proposition, but the sense and meaning of it. It is most certain that Christ descended into hell; and as infallibly true as any other Article of the Creed: but what that hell was, and how he descended thither, being once questioned, is not easily determined. Different opinions there have been of old, and of late more different still, which I shall here examine after that manner which our subject will admit. Our present design is an exposition of the Creed as it now stands, and our endeavour is to expound it according to the Scriptures in which it is contained: I must therefore look for such an exposition as may consist with all the other parts of the Creed, and may be conformable unto that Scripture upon which the truth of the Article doth rely: and consequently, whatsoever interpretation is either not true in itself, or not consistent with the body of the Creed, or not conformable to the doctrine of the Apostle in this particular, the expositor of that Creed by the doctrine of the Apostle must reject.

First then, we shall consider the opinion of Durandus, who, as often, so in this, is singular. He supposeth this descent to belong unto the soul, and the name of hell to signify the place where the souls of dead men were in custody; but he maketh a metaphor in the word descended, as not signifying any local motion, nor inferring any real presence of the soul of Christ in the place where the souls of dead men were; but only including a virtual motion, and inferring an efficacious presence, by which descent the effects of the death of Christ were wrought upon the souls in hell: and because the merit of Christ's death did principally depend upon the act of his soul, therefore the effect of his death is attributed to his soul as the principal agent; and consequently Christ is truly said at the instant of his death to descend into hell, because his death was immediately efficacious upon the souls detained there. This is the opinion of Durandus, so far as it is distinct from others.

But although a virtual influence of the death of Christ may be well admitted in reference to the souls of the dead, yet this opinion cannot be accepted as the exposition of this Article: being neither the Creed can be thought to speak a language of so great scholastic subtlety, nor the place of David, expounded by St. Peter, can possibly admit any such exposition. For what can be the sense of those words, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, if his being in hell was only virtually acting there? If the efficacy of his death were his descent, then is he descended still, because the effect of his death still remaineth. The opinion therefore of Durandus, making the descent into hell to be nothing but the efficacy of the death of Christ upon the souls detained there, is to be rejected, as not expositive of the Creed's confession, nor consistent with the Scripture's expression.

The next opinion, later than that of Durandus, is, that the
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that Scripture upon which the truth of the Article doth rely: and consequently, whatsoever interpretation is either not true in itself, or not consistent with the body of the Creed, or not

230 conformable to the doctrine of the Apostle in this particular, the expositor of that Creed by the doctrine of the Apostle must reject.

First then, we shall consider the opinion of Durandus, who, as often, so in this, is singular. He supposeth this descent to belong unto the soul, and the name of hell to signify the place where the souls of dead men were in custody; but he maketh a metaphor in the word descended, as not signifying any local motion, nor inferring any real presence of the soul of Christ in the place where the souls of dead men were; but only including a virtual motion, and inferring an efficacious presence, by which descent the effects of the death of Christ were wrought upon the souls in hell: and because the merit of Christ's death did principally depend upon the act of his soul, therefore the effect of his death is attributed to his soul as the principal agent; and consequently Christ is truly said at the instant of his death to descend into hell, because his death was immediately efficacious upon the souls detained there. This is the opinion of Durandus, so far as it is distinct from others.

But although a virtual influence of the death of Christ may be well admitted in reference to the souls of the dead, yet this opinion cannot be accepted as the exposition of this Article: being neither the Creed can be thought to speak a language of so great scholastic subtlety, nor the place of David, expounded by St. Peter, can possibly admit any such exposition. For what can be the sense of those words, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, if his being in hell was only virtually acting there? If the efficacy of his death were his descent, then is he descended still, because the effect of his death still remaineth. The opinion therefore of Durandus, making the descent into hell to be nothing but the efficacy of the death of Christ upon the souls detained there, is to be rejected, as not expositive of the Creed's confession, nor consistent with the Scripture's expression.

The next opinion, later than that of Durandus, is, that the

65 'Dominum quidem carne mortificatum venisse in Infernum satis constat. Neque enim contradictum potest vel prophetae quae dixit, Quem ad Infrum non descendit, exierit iniqua impossibile erat eum teneri. Quis ergo nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud Inferos Christum?' Epist. xxix. [al. cxxiv.] cap. 2. [§ 2. vol. i. p. 574 B.]

66 'Cum Articulus sit, Christum ad Inferos descendisse, et non posset intelligi ratione Divinatiani, secundum quam est ubique; nos ratione corporis, secundum quod fuit in sepulcro; restat quod intelligatur ratione animae: quo supposito, videndum est quidam anima Christi descendit ad Infernum.' Durand. Const. in Sentent. Thol. Jii. dist. 22. q. 3. § 4.
descent into hell is the suffering of the torments of hell; that the soul of Christ did really and truly suffer all those pains which are due unto the damned; that whatsoever is threatened by the Law unto them which depart this life in their sins, and under the wrath of God, was fully undertaken and borne by Christ; that he died a true supernatural death, the second death, the death of Gehenna; and this dying the death of Gehenna was the descending into hell; that those which are now saved by virtue of his death, should otherwise have endured the same torments in hell which now the damned do and shall endure; but that he, being their surety, did himself suffer the same for them, even all the torments which we should have felt, and the damned shall.

This interpretation is either taken in the strict sense of the words, or in a latitude of expression; but in neither to be admitted as the exposition of this Article. Not if it be taken in a strict, rigorous, proper, and formal sense; for in that acceptance it is not true. It must not, it cannot, be admitted that Christ did suffer all those torments which the damned suffer; and therefore it is not, it cannot, be true, that by suffering them he descended into hell. There is a worm that never dieth, which could not lodge within his breast; that is, a remorse of conscience, seated in the soul, for what that soul hath done: but such a remorse of conscience could not be in Christ, who though he took upon himself the sins of those which otherwise had been damned, yet that act of his was a most virtuous, charitable, and most glorious act, highly comfortable to the will of God, and consequently could not be the object of remorse. The grief and horror in the soul of Christ, which we have expressed in the explication of his sufferings antecedent to his crucifixion, had reference to the sins and punishment of men, to the justice and wrath of God; but clearly of a nature different from the sting of conscience in the souls condemned to eternal flames.

an essential part of the torments of hell is a present and constant sense of the everlasting displeasure of God, and an impossibility of obtaining favour, and avoiding pain; an absolute and complete despair of any better condition, or the least relaxation: but Christ, we know, had never any such resentment, who looked upon the reward which was set before him, even upon the cross, and offered up himself a sweet-smelling sacrifice; which could never be efficacious, except offered in faith. If we should imagine any damned soul to have received an express promise of God, that after ten thousand years he would release him from those torments, and make him eternally happy; and to have a true faith in that promise, and a firm hope of receiving eternal life; we could not say that man was in the same condition with the rest of the damned, or that he felt all that hell which they were sensible of, or all that pain which was due unto his sins; because hope and confidence, and relying upon God, would not only mitigate all other pains, but wholly take away the bitter anguish of despair. Christ then, who knew the beginning, continuance, and conclusion of his sufferings, who understood the determinate minute of his own death and resurrection, who had made a covenant with his Father for all the degrees of his passion, and was fully assured that he could suffer no more than he had freely and deliberately undertaken, and should continue no longer in his passion than he had himself determined, he who by those torments was assured to overcome all the powers of hell, cannot possibly be said to have been in the same condition with the damned, and strictly and properly to have endured the pains of hell.

Again, if we take the torments of hell in a metaphorical sense, for those terrors and horrors of soul which our Saviour felt, which may therefore be called infernal torments, because they are of greater extremity than any other tortures of this life, and because they were accompanied with a sense of the wrath of God against the unrighteousness of men; yet this cannot be an interpretation of the descent into hell, as it is an Article of the Creed, and as that Article is grounded upon the Scriptures. For all those pains which our Saviour felt (whether, as they pretend, properly infernal, or metaphorically such), were antecedent to his death; part of them in the garden, part on the cross; but all before he commended his spirit into the hands of his Father, and gave up the ghost. Whereas it is sufficiently evident that...
Psalmist used, and in the Greek, which the Apostle used, and we translate the soul, is elsewhere used for the body of a dead man, and translated so. And when we read in Moses of a prohibition given to the High Priest or to the Nazarite, of going to or coming near a dead body, and of the pollution by the dead; the dead body in the Hebrew and the Greek is nothing else but that which elsewhere signifies the soul. And Mr. Ainsworth, who translated the Pentateuch nearer the letter than the sense, hath so delivered it in compliance with the original phrase; and may be well interpreted thus by our translation,

Ye shall not make in your flesh any cutting for a soul, that is for the dead.

For a soul he shall not defile himself among his people that is, There shall none be defiled for the dead among his people:

He that toucheth any thing that is unclean by a soul, that is, by Lev. xxvi. 4.

The dead: Every one defiled by a soul, that is, by the dead: He Num. v. 2. shall not come at a dead soul, that is, He shall come at no dead body. Thus Ainsworth's translation sheweth, that in all these places the original word is that which usually signifies the soul; and our translation teacheth us, that though in other places it signifies the soul, yet in these it must be taken for the body, and that body bereft of the soul.

Secondly, the word 70 which the Psalmist used in Hebrew, man under the Law by the touch thereof. And Maimonides hath observed, quod animam commemorat: quia et absente populo, id est ecclesia, locus tamen illium nihilominus ecclesiam nuncupat. Epist. civit. ad Optatum, de Animarum Officinis, cap. 5. [Epist. exeg. vol. ii. p. 787 P.]

70 The Hebrew word is יָּשָׁתֶל, and the Greek φυσιν εἶναι μειγνεῖται μοι εἰς σῶμα, Psalm xvi. 10. But both יָּשָׁתֶל and φυσιν are used for the body of a dead man, Num. vi. 6. and it is so translated; for Moses, speaking there of a Nazarite, gives this law, All the days that he separate himself unto the Lord he shall come at no dead body: in the original, יָּשָׁתֶל וְשָׁבֵל, and in the LXX. Ἐνὶ πάντες φυσὶν καθαρεύονται οἴε σωματεύονται. In the same manner the law for the High Priest, Lev. xxi. 11. Neither shall he go in to any dead body, יָּשָׁתֶל וְשָׁבֵל לֹא יָּשָׁתֶל לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא לֹא LXX. Ἐνὶ πάντες φυσὶν καθαρεύονται οἴε σωματεύονται. And the general law, Lev. xxii. 4. And whoso toucheth anything that is unclean by the dead, יָּשָׁתֶל וְשָׁבֵל וְשָׁבֵל וְשָׁבֵל וְשָׁבֵל LXX. Ἐνὶ πάντες φυσὶν καθαρεύονται οἴε σωματεύονται. Which is further cleared by that of Num. xix. 11. He that toucheth the dead body of any man, Qui tigitur cadaver humanum, and ver. 13. Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, Omnis qui tigitur humanum animum mortuem. Therefore the יָּשָׁתֶל and φυσιν in Lev. xxvi. 4. do signify the cadaver or mortuum; as also Num. v. 2. Whosoever is defiled by the dead יָּשָׁתֶל יָּשָׁתֶל יָּשָׁתֶל יָּשָׁתֶל יָּשָׁתֶל יָּשָׁתֶל לֹא יָּשָׁתֶל לֹא יָּשָׁתֶל לֹא יָּשָׁתֶל לֹא יָּשָׁתֶל לֹא יָּשָׁתֶל לֹא יָּשָׁתֶל לֹא יָּשָׁתֶל לֹא יָּשָׁתֶל LXX. Ἐνὶ πάντες φυσὶν καθαρεύονται οἴε σωματεύονται. Poluman super mortuo. And גָּלַעֲרֵם ἐνὶ φυσὶν: Hag. ii. 13. is rightly translated, One that is uncles by a dead body. Thus several times יָּשָׁתֶל and φυσιν are taken for the body of a dead man; that body which polluted a
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omit the burial, and express the descent, did shew, that by that descent they understood not that of the body, but of the soul. Secondly, because they which put these words into the Roman Creed, in which the burial was expressed before, must certainly understand a descent distinct from that; and therefore though it might perhaps be thought a probable interpretation of the words of David, especially taken as belonging to David, yet it cannot pretend to an exposition of the Creed, as now it stands.

The next opinion is, that the soul may well be understood either for the nobler part of man distinguished from the body; or else for the person of man consisting of both soul and body, as it often is; or for the living soul, as it is distinguished from the immortal spirit: but then the term hell shall signify no place, neither of the man, nor of the body, nor of the soul; but only the state or condition of men in death, during the separation of the soul from the body. So that the prophecy shall run thus, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, that is, Thou shalt not suffer me to remain in the common state of the dead, to be long deprived of my natural life, to continue without exercise, or power of exercising my vital faculty: and then the Creed will have this sense, that Christ was crucified, dead, and buried, and descended into hell; that is, he went unto the dead, and remained for a time in the state of death, as other dead men do.

But this interpretation supposeth that which can never appear, that hades signifieth not death itself, nor the place where souls departed are, but the state and condition of the dead, or their perdition in death; which is a notion wholly new, and contrary to every thing hitherto used, and is consequently cannot interpret that which representeth something known and believed of old, according to the notions and conceptions of those times. And that this notion is wholly new will appear, because not any of the ancient fathers is produced to avow it, nor any of the Heathen authors which are produced do.

72 I shewed before, that in the Creed made at Rimini there was the Descent mentioned, and the Burial omitted, and yet that Descent was so expressed that it could not be taken for the Burial: besides now I add, that it was made by the Arians, who in few years before, had given in another Creed, in which both the Burial and the Descent were mentioned; as that of Nice in Thracia, [Ἀνάγνωσή, καὶ ἁρέμε, καὶ εἰς τὰ καταραχήνα καταλίθον, χω ράδος καὶ ἡμέρα ἰερομυκτος. Theodoret. Hist. Ecces. lib. ii. cap. 21. and not long after gave in another at Constantinople to the same purpose, Θεοποιηθήνα, καὶ ἠθόποιην, καὶ εἰς τὰ καταραχήνα καταλίθον, χω ράδος καὶ ἡμέρα ἰερομυκτος. Socrat. Hist. Ecces. lib. ii. cap. 41.]

PEARSON.
affirm it: nay, it is evident that the Greeks did always by *hades* understand a place into which the souls of men were carried and conveyed, distinct and separate from that place in which we live; and that their different opinions shew, placing it, some in the earth, some under it, some in one unknown place of it, some in another. But especially *hades*, in the judgment of the ancient Greeks, cannot consist with this notion of the state of death, and the permanence in that condition, because there were many which they believed to be dead, and to continue in the state of death, which yet they believed not to be in *hades*; as those who died before their time, and those whose bodies were unburied.23

23 The opinion of the ancient Greeks in this case is excellently expressed by Tertullian, who shews three kinds of men to be thought not to descend ad *hades* when they die; the first *Insepti*, the second *Auri*, the third *Bionathanat*: *Creditus, insepultos non ante ad Inferos redigi quam justa percepimus.* De Anima, cap. 56. p. [304 C.]


*Erie nee estercs Inferorum habebantur, quas vi eos sequebatur, praecepue abdicavit supplicium; crux dieo et securis, et gladii, et ferro.* *Ibid.* The souls then of those whose bodies were unburied were thought to be kept out of Hades till their funeral ceremonies were performed, and the souls of them who died an untimely or a violent death were kept from the same place until the time of their natural death should come. This he further expresses in the terms of the Magicians, whose art was conversant about souls departed. *Aut optimum est hic retinendi secundum ahoras,* aut pessimum, secundum biobothanatae (Biaothanatae), ut ipsis saepe vocabulis utar, visum est nobis quod de omnibus opinionum istorum ignotis saeis, Hosteas, et Typhon, et Dardanus, et Damigeon, et Nectabia, et Bernico. Publica jam litera est, quia animas etiam justa etate soepnas, etiam primum morte dissignatas, quae praepe humanae disputaciones, evocaturam se ab Inferum incolata poletctor." *Ibid.* cap. 57. Of that of the *Insepti*, he produceth the example of
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Thus likewise the ancient fathers differed much concerning the place of the *infernus*; but never any doubted but that it signified some place or other: and if they had conceived any such notion as the state of death, and the permanence of the dead in that state, they needed not to have fallen into those doubts or questions; the Patriarchs and the Prophets being as certainly in the state of death, and remaining so, as Corah, Dathan, and

is one thing, and to be in *Hades* is another; and that every one which died was not in Hades, Oi τὰς τεκνάδας καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας, as *Eustathius* speaks. *Logitamos proteros in sexto inseptulorum animas vagas esse.* Serv. Com. in *Eneid.* iii. 68. The place which he intended I suppose is this,

*Hec omnis, quae surrexerat, suae intromatique terra est;* *Portitor ille, Charon; hi, quos vehit unda, sepultis.* *Ne ripas datur horrocens et ruos fascia* *Transire fore prius, quom sedibus ossa quiescent.* *Centum erunt annos, volupante hac littoris circum.*


Thus he is to be understood in the description of the funeral of Polydorus, and *ergo instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia* *Centum erunt annos, volupante hac littoris circum.*


Thus he is to be understood in the description of the funeral of Polydorus, and *ergo instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia* *Centum erunt annos, volupante hac littoris circum.*


Thus he is to be understood in the description of the funeral of Polydorus, and *ergo instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia* *Centum erunt annos, volupante hac littoris circum.*


Thus he is to be understood in the description of the funeral of Polydorus, and *ergo instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia* *Centum erunt annos, volupante hac littoris circum.*


Thus he is to be understood in the description of the funeral of Polydorus, and *ergo instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia* *Centum erunt annos, volupante hac littoris circum.*


Thus he is to be understood in the description of the funeral of Polydorus, and *ergo instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia* *Centum erunt annos, volupante hac littoris circum.*


Thus he is to be understood in the description of the funeral of Polydorus, and *ergo instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia* *Centum erunt annos, volupante hac littoris circum.*


Thus he is to be understood in the description of the funeral of Polydorus, and *ergo instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia instauram Polydoros funum, et ingenia* *Centum erunt annos, volupante hac littoris circum.*

Abiram are, or any person which is certainly condemned to everlasting flames. Though therefore it be certainly true that Christ did truly and properly die, as other men are wont to do, and that after expiration he was in the state or condition of the dead, in deadliness, as some have learned to speak; yet the Creed had spoken as much as this before, when it delivered that he was dead. And although it is true that he might have died, and in the next minute of time revived, and consequently his death doth not (precisely taken) signify any permission or duration in the state of death, and therefore it might be added, he descended into hell, to signify further a permission or duration in that condition; yet if hell do signify nothing else but the state of the dead, as this opinion doth suppose, then to descend into hell is no more than to be dead; and so notwithstanding any duration implied in that expression, Christ might have ascended the next minute after he descended thither, as well as he might be imagined to revive the next minute after he died. Being then to descend into hell, according to this interpretation, no more than to be dead; being no man ever doubted but that person was dead who died; being it was before delivered in the Creed that Christ died, or, as we render it, was dead; we cannot imagine but they which did add this part of the Article to the Creed, did intend something more than this, and therefore we cannot admit this notion as a full or proper exposition.

There is yet left another interpretation grounded upon the general opinion of the Church of Christ in all ages, and upon a probable exposition of the prophecy of the Psalmist, taking the soul in the most proper sense, for the spirit or rational part of Christ; that part of a man which, according to our Saviour’s doctrine, the Jews could not kill; and looking upon hell as a place distinct from this part of the world where we live, and distinguished from those heavens whither Christ ascended, into which place the souls of men were conveyed after or upon their death; and therefore thus expounding the words of the Psalmist in the person of Christ; Thou shalt not suffer that soul of mine which shall be forced from my body by the violence of pain upon the cross, but resigned into thy hands, when it shall go into that place below where the souls of men departed are detained; I say, thou shalt not suffer that soul to continue there as theirs have done; but shalt bring it shortly from thence, and reunite it to my body.
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For the better understanding of this exposition, there are several things to be observed, both in respect of the matter of it, and in reference to the authority of the fathers. First therefore, this must be laid down as a certain and necessary truth, That the soul of man, when he dieth, dieth not, but returneth unto him that gave it, to be disposed of at his will and pleasure: according to the ground of our Saviour’s counsel, Fear not them which kill the body, but cannot kill the soul. That better part of us therefore in and after death doth exist and live, either by virtue of its spiritual and immortal nature, as we believe; or at least by the will of God, and his power upholding and preserving it from dissolution, as many of the fathers thought. This soul thus existing after death, and separated from the body, though of a nature spiritual, is really and truly in some place; if not by way of circumscriptio, as proper bodies are, yet by way of determination and indistinctness; so that it is true to say, this soul is really and truly present here, and not elsewhere.

Again, the soul of man, which, while he lived, gave life to the body, and was the fountain of all vital actions, in that separate existence after death, must not be conceived to sleep, or be bereft and stript of all vital operations, but still to exercise the powers of understanding and of willing; and to be subject to the affections of joy and sorrow. Upon which is grounded the different estate and condition of the souls of men during that time of separation; some of them by the mercy of God being placed in peace and rest, in joy and happiness; others by the justice of the same God left to sorrow, pains, and misery.

As there was this different state and condition before our Saviour’s death, according to the different kinds of men in this life, the wicked and the just, the elect and reprobate; so there were two societies of souls after death; one of them which were happy in the presence of God, the other of those which were left in their sins and tormented for them. Thus we conceive the righteous Abel the first man placed in this happiness, and the souls of them that departed in the same faith to be gathered to him. Whosoever it was of the sons of Adam which first died in his sins, was put into a place of torment; and the souls of all those which departed after with the wrath of God upon them, were gathered into his sad society.

Now as the souls at the hour of death are really separated from the bodies; so the place where they are in rest or misery
lived successively, and wrote in several ages, and delivered this exposition in such express terms as are not capable of any other interpretation: but also because it was generally used as an argument against the Apollinarian heresy: than which nothing can shew more the general opinion of the Catholics and the heretics, and that not only of the present, but of the precedent ages. For it had been little less than ridiculous to have produced that for an argument to prove a point in controversy, which had not been clearer than that which was controverted, and had not been some way acknowledged as a truth by both. Now the error of Apollinarius was, that Christ had no proper

---

79 As Irenæus: "Cum enim Dominus in medio umbra mortis abierit, ibi animas mortuorum erat, post deinde corporaliter resurrectur, et post resurrectionem assumptum est: manifestum est, quia et discipulorum ejus, propter quos et hanc operatum est Dominus, animas abhinc in invisibilibus locum definiuntur: et a Deo, &c." Ade. Hær. lib. v. ch. 26. [c. 31, 5, p. 331.] Clemens Alexandrinus was so clearly of that opinion, that he thought the soul of Christ preached salvation to the souls in hell. Strom. lib. vi. [c. 6.] And Tertullian proves that the Inferi are a cavity in the earth, where the souls of dead men are, because the soul of Christ went thither. "Quod si Christus Deus, quia et homo mortuus secundum scripturas, et sepultus secus easdem, haec quoque..."
intellectual or rational soul, but that which was to him in the place of a soul: and the argument produced by the fathers for the conviction of this error was, that Christ descended into hell; which the Apollinarians could not deny: and that this

76 What the Apollinarians* heresy was is certainly known: they denied that Christ had an human soul, affirming that the Word was to him in the place of a soul. *Apollinaristas Apollinis institutiss. qui de anima Christi a Catholicis diversorum, diversius, siue Ariani, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepsisse. In quas quaestiones testimoniorum Evangelicorum viæ, mentem, qua rationalis est anima hominis, declaravit Animos, sed pro hac ipsum Verbum in eo fuisse, dixerunt.* S. August. de Hæres. 55. [vol. viii. p. 19 B]

Against this heresy the Catholic argued from the descent into hell, as that which was acknowledged by them all, even the Arians, (with whom the Apollinarists in this accord,) as we have shown before by three several Creeds of theirs, in which they expressed this Deiscent. This is the argument of Athanasius in his fourth Dialogue de Trinitate, which is particularly with an Apollinarian: *Τάπειρα ουκ ἐξενεγινενος ος θεὸς ὑμέως καὶ ἐν τῷ γεγένηται, εἰ μὴ εἶχε τὸ τίμημα τούτον σῶμα, οὐκ ἦν ἡ ἐξερρημένης σωματος, πανταχοῦ καὶ καὶ τὰ πάντα περίκρους, εἰ μὴ εἶχε τὸ κυριωτέρα τούτῳ, μὴ δῆ καὶ τοιὲν ἐν ἐνεργεῖσθαι ἔδορ τὴν πνευματικὴν καὶ καὶ ἐν θεών λαμπράστων καὶ καὶ τούτῳ τῷ γνώριμοι ὑμῖν ἔνεργοι διὰ τὴν πνεύματος καὶ καὶ μετατρέπεται διὰ τὸ σῶμα. But because these Dialogues may be questioned as not genuine, the same argument may be produced out of his book de Incarnatione Christi, written particularly against Apollinarista.* *Deum hominemque commixtum, et tali confusione carnem et Verbi quasi aliquod corpus effectum* does thus express the reality and distinction of the two persons, and body: in the same Christ: *Tam Christus filius Dei
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He descended not by his divinity, or by his body, but by the motion, and presence of his soul, and consequently that he had a soul distinct both from his flesh and from the Word. Whereas if it could have then been answered by the heretics, as now it is by many, that his descent into hell had no relation to his soul, but to his body only, which descended into the grave: or that it was not a real, but only virtual, descent, by which his death extended to the destruction of the powers of hell; or that his soul was not his intellectual spirit, or immortal soul, but his living soul, which descended into hell, that is, continued in the state of death: I say, if any of these senses could have been affixed to this Article, the Apollinarians' answer might have been sound, and the Catholics' argument of no validity. But being those heretics did all acknowledge this Article; being the Catholic fathers did urge the same to prove the real distinction of the soul of Christ both from his divinity and from his body, because his body was really in the grave when his soul was really present with the souls below; it followeth that it was the general doctrine of the Church, that
tune mortuos jacuit in sepulchro, quam idem Christus filius Dei ad Inferna descedit; sicut beatus Apostolus dicit, Quod ostens ascendit, quid est nisi quod descendit primum in inferiors partes terrae!—ipsa utique Dominus et Deus noster Jesus Christus unius Dei, qui cum anima ad Inferna descedit, ipsa cum anima et corpore ascendit ad caelum._[Epist. ad Thessalon. i. c. x. p. 399 C] And Capreolus bishop of Carthage, writing against the Nestorian heresy, prove that the soul of Christ was united to his Divinity when it descended into Hell, and follows that argument, urging it at large: in which discourse among the rest he hath this passage: *Tantum abest, Deum Dei filium, incommutabilem atque incommunicabilem, ab Inferis potissime concludi; ut nee ipsum adsumptum animam creandam, aut exiibitiam sustinere, aut tenaciter derelizat. Sed nee carnis ejus ereminum contagione aliquius corruptionis infectat. Ipsum manum ex ostiis in Psalmo, sicut Petrus interpretatur Apostolus, Non dereliquit animam memini apud Inferos, neque stabat in suam videere corruptionem.*

Epi. ad Vital. et Constant. [v. 5. p. 494 E.] Lastly, The true doctrine of the Incarnation against all the enemies thereof, Apollinarists, Nestorians, Eutychians, and the like, was generally expressed by declaring the verity of the soul of Christ really present in Hell, and the verity of his body at the same time really present in the grave: as it is excellently delivered by Fulgentius: *Humanitas vera Filii Dei nec tota in sepulchro fuit, nec tota in Inferno; sed in sepulchro secundum veram carnem Christi mortuos jacuit, et secundum animam ad Infernum Christus descendit; at secundum eandem animam ab Inferno ad carnem quam in sepulchro relinquaret redit; secundum divinitatem vero suam, quam nee loco tenetur, nec fine definita vocatur, totus est in sepalchro cum carne, totus in Infernum cum anima; ac poe locum plenus ubi Christus; quia non est Deus ab humanitate quam suscepserat separatas, qui et in anima sua fuit, ut solutis Inferni doloribus ab Inferno vexit rexedit, et in carne sua fuit, ut celeri resurrectione corrumpi non posset._ Ad Thrasim. lib. ili. c. 34. [p. 140.]
Christ did descend into hell by a local motion of his soul, separated from his body, to the places below where the souls of men departed were.

Nor can it be reasonably objected, that the argument of the fathers was of equal force against these heretics, if it be understood of the animal soul, as it would be if it were understood of the rational; as if those heretics had equally deprived Christ of the rational and animal soul. For it is most certain that they did not equally deprive Christ of both; but most of the Apollinarians denied an human soul to Christ only in respect of the intellectual part, granting that the animal soul of Christ was of the same nature with the animal soul of other men. Therefore the fathers had proved only that the animal soul of Christ had descended into hell, they had brought no argument at all to prove that Christ had an human intellectual soul. It is therefore certain that the Catholic fathers in their opposition to the Apollinarian heretics did declare, that the intellectual and immortal soul of Christ descended into hell.

The only question which admitted any variety of disagreement among the ancient was, Who were the persons to whom whose souls the soul of Christ descended? and which depended on that question, What was the end and use of his descent? In this indeed they differed much, according to their several apprehensions of the condition of the dead, and the nature of the place into which the souls before our Saviour's death were gathered; some looking on that name which we translate now hell, hades, or infernus, as the common receptacle of the souls of all men; 259

27 At first indeed the Apollinarians did so speak, as they denied the human soul in both acceptations; but afterwards they clearly affirmed the psyché, and denied the nous alone. So Socrates testifies of them: Vértεtòs μὲν ξέγονα ἀναληψάμενα τοὺς λόγους ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ἐν τῇ σκότωσι τῇ ἀναθροῖσε τῷ ψυχῆς δαιμόνι ἐλήθη ἐν τῷ δυναμικῷ τῷ ἀναστροφῇ σεισμῷ ψυχῆς δαιμόνι ἐλήθη διὰ τοῦ δυναμικοῦ ἐπικαλοῦσθαι, ὑπόθεσαν ψυχής μὲν ἀναστροφῇ, ἐυτε ὑπὸ τοῦ ξέγονα δαιμονίου, τοῦ δὲ ξέγονα δαιμονίου, ἐλήθη τὸν δόκιμον λόγον ἐκ τοῦ τῶν ἀναληφθέντων καθώς. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. 48. p. 162.) "Nam et aliquorum fuisse in Christo animam negare non putarentur. Videte absumitatem et insaniam non forettam. Animam irritacionem eum habere voluerunt, rationalem negaverunt: dederunt ei animam pecoris, subtraxerunt hominis." S. August. Tract. 47. in Ioan. [§ 5. vol. iii. part ii. p. 611 B.] This was so properly indeed the Apollinarian heresy, that it was thereby distinguished from the Arian. "Nam Apollinarista quidem carnem et saepe naturam sine mente adsumpserit Dominum credunt; Arianis vero carnem tantummodo." Paschas. lib. ix. cap. 3. (p. 762 C.)

28 Some of the ancient Fathers did believe that the word ἐσώ σε ἐν the Scriptures had the same signification which it hath among the Greeks, as comprehending all the souls both of the wicked and the just; and so they took Infernus in the same latitude. As therefore the ancient Greeks did assign esse for all which died, Πάντα ἐσώ θυσίας ἐσώ both the just and unjust, thought the soul of Christ descended unto those which departed in the true faith and fear of God, ἐσώ δέσσαντι καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων ἐσώσων ἔσώσατο: as they made within one esse two several receptacles, one for the good and virtuous, the other for the wicked and unjust, (according to that of Diphilos, apud Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. v. [c. 14. vol. ii. p. 731.] Καὶ γὰρ καθ’ ἐσώσαν διὸ τίθεσιν νομι- ζούσιν·

Μνεῖ οὖν τὴν κατὰ πάντας ἐσώσαν ἔσωσιν τὸν λόγον: καὶ τὸν λόγον ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἱλαρίας, ἐν τῷ πάντοτε τῷ δόκιμῳ, τῷ ἐκ πάντων ἐσώσασθαι, διὸ ἔσώσατο: as they made within one esse two several receptacles, one for the good and virtuous, the other for the wicked and unjust, (according to that of Diphilos, apud Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. v. [c. 14. vol. ii. p. 731.] Καὶ γὰρ καθ’ ἐσώσαν διὸ τίθεσιν νομι- ζούσιν·

Μνεῖ οὖν τὴν κατὰ πάντας ἐσώσαν ἔσωσιν τὸν λόγον: καὶ τὸν λόγον ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἱλαρίας, ἐν τῷ πάντοτε τῷ δόκιμῳ, τῷ ἐκ πάντων ἐσώσασθαι, διὸ ἔσώσατο: as they made within one esse two several receptacles, one for the good and virtuous, the other for the wicked and unjust, (according to that of Diphilos, apud Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. v. [c. 14. vol. ii. p. 731.] Καὶ γὰρ καθ’ ἐσώσαν διὸ τίθεσιν νομι- ζούσιν·

27 At first indeed the Apollinarians did so speak, as they denied the human soul in both acceptations; but afterwards they clearly affirmed the psyché, and denied the nous alone. So Socrates testifies of them: Πράγματες μὲν ξέγονα ἀναληψάμενα τοὺς λόγους ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ἐν τῇ σκότωσι τῇ ἀναθροῖσε τῷ ψυχῆς δαιμόνι ἐλήθη διὰ τοῦ δυναμικοῦ ἐπικαλοῦσθαι, ὑπόθεσαν ψυχής μὲν ἀναστροφῇ, ἐυτε ὑπὸ τοῦ ξέγονα δαιμονίου, τοῦ δὲ ξέγονα δαιμονίου, ἐλήθη τὸν δόκιμον λόγον ἐκ τοῦ τῶν ἀναληφθέντων καθώς. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. 48. p. 162.] "Nam et aliquorum fuisse in Christo animam negare non putarentur. Videte absumitatem et insaniam non forettam. Animam irritacionem eum habere voluerunt, rationalem negaverunt: dederunt ei animam pecoris, subtraxerunt hominis." S. August. Tract. 47. in Ioan. [§ 5. vol. iii. part ii. p. 611 B.] This was so properly indeed the Apollinarian heresy, that it was thereby distinguished from the Arian. 'Nam Apollinariste quidem carnem et saepe naturam sine mente adsumpserit Dominum credunt; Arianis vero carnem tantummodo." Paschas. lib. ix. cap. 3. (p. 762 C.)

28 Some of the ancient Fathers did believe that the word ἐσώ σε ἐν the Scriptures had the same signification which it hath among the Greeks, as comprehending all the souls both of the wicked and the just; and so they took Infernus in the same latitude. As therefore the ancient Greeks did assign esse for all which died, Πάντα ἐσώ θυσίας ἐσώ both the just and unjust, thought the soul of Christ descended unto those which departed in the true faith and fear of God,
the souls of the Patriarchs and the Prophets, and the people of God.

But others there were who thought 'hades or infernus was never taken in the Scriptures for any place of happiness'; and therefore they did not conceive the souls of the Patriarchs or the Prophets did pass into any such infernal place; and consequently, that the descent into hell was not his going to the Patriarchs or the Patriarchs, which there. For, as, if it had been only said that Christ had gone unto the bosom of Abraham, or to Paradise, no man would ever have believed that he had descended into hell; so being it is only written, 'Thou shalt 240

not leave my soul in hell,' it seems incongruous to think that he went then unto the Patriarchs who were not there.

This being the diversity of opinions anciently in respect of the persons unto whose souls the soul of Christ descended at his death, the difference of the end or efficacy of that descent is next to be observed. Of those which did believe the name of 'hades' to belong unto that general place which comprehended all the souls of the men (as well those which died in the favour of God, as those which departed in their sins), some of them thought that Christ descended to that place of 'hades' where the souls of all the faithful, from the death of the righteous Abel to the death of Christ, were detained; and there dissolving all the power by which they were detained below, translated them into a far more glorious place, and estated them in a condition far more happy in the heavens above.

Others of them understood no such translation of place, or alteration of condition there, conceiving that the souls of all men are detained below still, and shall not enter into heaven until

80 This is the opinion generally received in the Schools, and delivered as the sense of the Church of God in all ages: but though it were not so general as the Schoolmen would persuade us, yet it is certain that many of the Fathers did so understand it. 'O μεν η χωρία της νεκρωσεως η τινι φυγει παρα ει δια των πραγματων αυτων, ἢ της ετερικας χωριας.' S. Cyril. Hier. Catech. iv. cap. 11. p. 57 B. 'Πηνηλη γαρ η θεσπιστη τελειωη τα πτωτα τα κοτη τω μωσηρι τω πατης, και σωμα της φυσις καταλει της η κατακλυσμον περιερον.' S. Clement. Strom. ii. p. 631 D. This doctrine was maintained by all those who held that the soul of Samuel was raised by the Witch of Endor: for though he were so great a Prophet, yet they thought that he was in Hades; and not only so, but under the power of Satan. Thus Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho: 'Quandoo dei et de

81 Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho first begins: 'Αλλα μεν ecce άνθρωποιν, πρωτην των φυλων της ομοιωσε εις θεον και ην οικοιμισθής των πα-
the general resurrection. They made no such distinction at the death of Christ, as if those which believed in a Saviour to come 241

He descended into hell.

should be kept out from heaven till he came; and those which now believe in the same Saviour already come should be admitted therewith immediately upon their expiration.

But such as thought the place in which the souls of the Patriarchs did reside could not in propriety of speech be called hell, nor was ever so named in the Scriptures, conceived, that as our Saviour went to those who were included in the proper hell, or place of torment, so the end of his descent was to deliver souls from those miseries which they felt, and to translate them to a place of happiness and a glorious condition. They which did think that hell was wholly emptied, that every soul was presently released from all the pains which before it suffered, were branded with the names of heretics 82: but to believe that many

82 St. Augustine in his book de Herculis reckons this as the seventy-ninth heresy: ‘Aliis, descendente ad Inferos Christi credidisse incredulos, et omnes exinde existitam liberatos.’ [vol. viii. p. 576 B.] And if they did not say that this was without a name, as he found it in Philastrias, yet we find the opinion not very singular. For Eudocius propounded it to St. Augustine as a question in which he desired satisfaction, ‘Aliis, Christus omnibus quidem a tormentis, quidem a tribulationibus evanescuit, omnes qua aeternis omnibus ut gressus pestiferus et per gentiam liberavit, ut a tempore resurrectionis Dominici judicium expectet, exinanit Inferos?’ [Epist. 56. ad St. August. [Epist. clxviiii, vol. ii. p. 152 C.] And in his answer to that question, he looks not upon the affirmative part as an heresy, but as a doubtful proposition. His resolution, first, is, that it did not concern the Prophets and the Patriarchs, because he could not see how they should be thought to be in hell, and so capable of a deliverance from thence: ‘Addunt quidam hoc beneficiam antiquis etiam Sanctis suae concedeaut, Abal, Sech, Noe, et dominis ejus, Abraham, Isaac, et Jacob, aliasque Patriarchis et Prophetis, ut cum Domini in Infernorum verisimus, illis doloribus solvereunt. Sed superno modo intelligatur Abraham, in cujus spiritum usque ilium, usque in ilium sui suos, usque in ilium suos remanere, usque in ilium suos, usque in ilium suos non video: expellere fortesque qui possunt.’ [Epist. xxcvii. ad Eudocium, cap. 3. [Epist. cliv. 6. p. 575 D.] Est pax autem: ‘Unde illis justis qui in sinu Abraham erant, cum illis in Inferna descederent, nundam quod contulisset inveni, a quis eum secundum beatificam passionem suae divinitatis nuncupavit video recessisse.’ [iv. 8. p. 576 B.] And this was the conclusion. In that place he did not say that he believed the contrary, nor did he think their opinion absurd. ‘Si enim non absurde credidisset, antiquos etiam Sanctos, qui venturi Christi tenerentur, oportet, quidem, habeant nihil in oppositione omnium remotissimis, sed apud Eudocius, ille, inquit, eius esse in quibus sancti absurde credidissent, et eorum locotionem esse in eo, quod sanctos esse invenisset.’
were delivered, was both by them and many others counted orthodox.

The means by which they did conceive that Christ did free the souls of men from hell, was the application of his death unto them, which was propounded to those souls by preaching of the Gospel there: as that he revealed here on earth the will of the tormentors of Hell was uncertain, and therefore temerarious to define. 'Sed utrum omnes quos in eis invenit, an quodam quos illo beneficio dignos judicavist, adhuc requiro.' Ibid. cap. 3. [S. p. 575 A.]

'The seer seeth quod scopos, qui ille invenit sunt, qui non omnium, sed in quibusdam acopi potest, quos ille dignos ista liberationes jussisset: ut neque frustra illud descedisse existimaretur, nulli eorum profuturum qui ille tenebantur inclus; nec tam est consequens, ut quod divina quibusdam misericordia justitiasque concessit, omnibus concessum esse putandum sit.' Ibid. cap. 5. [S. p. 575 B.]

'Potest et sic, ut eos dolores eum solvisse censaretur, quibus temeriti ipse non poterat, sed quibus alii tenebantur, quos ille noverat liberandos. Verum quinam isti sint, temerarium est defaire. Si enim omnes omnino dixerimus tamen esse liberatos, et quibus titillia divina quibusdam misericordia justitiasque concessit, omnibus concessum esse putandum sit.' Ibid. cap. 2. [P. 574 D.]

Thus the opinion of St. Augustine is clear, that those which departed in the faith of Christ were before in happiness and the beatific vision of God, and that of those which were not, no translation by the Descent of Christ; and of those which were kept in the pains of Hell, some were loosed and delivered from them, some were not: and this was the proper end or effect of Christ's Descent into Hell. Thus Caecilius: 'Ipsi in homine visitate Inferorum dignatos abstulit, et prepostos mortis presentia invicta majestatis spectavit, ut propter liberandos quos voluit, Inferorum portas reseraret precptu.' Epist. ad Vital. et Constant. [S. p. 494 D.]

St. Ambrose: 'Ipsi autem inter mortuos liber, remissam in Inferno posita, soluta mortis lego, donata' in Eun. cap. 10. [S. p. 494 D.]
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Thus the opinion of St. Augustine is clear, that those which departed in the faith of Christ were before in happiness and the beatific vision of God, and that of those which were not, no translation by the Descent of Christ; and of those which were kept in the pains of Hell, some were loosed and delivered from them, some were not: and this was the proper end or effect of Christ's Descent into Hell. Thus Caecilius: 'Ipsi in homine visitate Inferorum dignatos abstulit, et prepostos mortis presentia invicta majestatis spectavit, ut propter liberandos quos voluit, Inferorum portas reseraret precptu.' Epist. ad Vital. et Constant. [S. p. 494 D.]
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God unto the sons of men, and propounded himself as the object of their faith, to the end that whosoever believed in him should never die; so after his death he shewed himself unto the souls departed, that whosoever of them would yet accept of and acknowledge him should pass from death to life.

212 Thus did they think the soul of Christ descended into hell to preach the Gospel to the spirits there, that they might receive him who before believed in him, or that they might believe in him who before rejected him. But this cannot be received as the end, or way to affect the end, of Christ's descent: nor can I look upon it as any illustration of this Article, for many reasons. For first, I have already shewed that the place of St. Peter, so often mentioned for it, is not capable of that sense, nor hath it any relation to our Salvation after death. Secondly, the ancients seem upon no other reason to have interpreted this place of St. Peter in that manner, but because other apocryphal writings led them to that interpretation, upon the authority whereof this opinion only can rely. A place of the Prophet Jeremy was first produced, that The Lord God of Israel remembered his dead,
which slept in the land of the grave, and descended unto them, to
preach unto them his salvation. But being there is no such verse
extant in that Prophet or any other, it was also delivered that
it was once in the translation of the Septuagint, but raised out
from thence by the Jews: which as it can scarce be conceived
true, so, if it were, it would be yet of doubtful authority, as
being never yet found in the Hebrew Text. And Hermes in his
book, called the Pastor, was thought to give sufficient strength
to this opinion; whereas the book itself is of no good authority,
and in this particular is most extravagant: for he taught, that
not only the soul of Christ, but also the souls of the Apostles,
preached to the spirits before; that as they followed his steps
here, so did they also after their death, and therefore descended
to preach in hell.

Nor is this only to be suspected in reference to those pre-
tended authorities which first induced men to believe it, and
to make forced interpretations of Scripture to maintain it; but also

Peter; and yet there is no authority in
it. For it is not to be found in the
Hebrew text, and Justin Martyrs charges
the Jews only of raising it out of the
LXX: which how they could do out of
those copies which were in the Chris-
tians’ hands, is scarce intelligible; and
yet it is not now to be found there.

Clemens Alexandrinus first brings
a strange place of Scripture to prove
Christ’s preaching in Hell; Strom. lii.
v. [c. 6. p. 562.] Θνησκόντι τὸν θάνατον,
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to be rejected in itself, as false, and inconsistent with the nature,
scope, and end of the Gospel (which is to be preached with such
commands and ordinances as can concern those only which are
in this life), and as incongruous to the state and condition of
those souls to whom Christ is supposed to preach. For if we
look upon the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all saints before de-
parted, it is certain they were never disobedient in the days of
Noah; nor could they need the publication of the Gospel after
the death of Christ, who by virtue of that death were accepted
in him while they lived, and by that acceptance had received
a reward long before. If we look upon them which died in
disobedience, and were in torments for their sins, they cannot
appear to be proper objects for the Gospel preached. The rich
man, whom we find in their condition, desired one might be
sent from the dead to preach unto his brethren then alive, lest
they also should come unto that place: but we find no hope
that had any should come from them which were alive to
preach to him. For if the living, who heard not Luke xvi.
Moses and the Prophets, would not be persuaded though one
rose from the dead; surely those which had been disobedient
unto the Prophets, should never be persuaded after they were
dead.

Whether therefore we consider the authorities first intro-
ducing this opinion, which were apocryphal; or the testi-
monies of Scripture, forced and improbable; or the nature of this
hoping, inconsistent with the Gospel; or the persons to whom
Christ should be thought to preach (which, if dead in the faith
and fear of God, wanted no such instruction; if departed in
infidelity and disobedience, were unworthy and incapable of such
a dispensation); this preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison
cannot be admitted either as the end, or as the means proper
to effect the end, of his descent into hell.

Nor is this preaching only to be rejected as a means to pro-
duce the effect of Christ’s descent; but the effect itself pre-
tended to be wrought thereby, whether in reference to the just
or unjust, is by no means to be admitted. For though some of
the ancients thought, as is shewn before, that Christ did there-
to descend into hell, that he might deliver the souls of some
which were tormented in those flames, and translate them to a
place of happiness; yet this opinion deserveth no acceptance,
neither in respect of the ground or foundation on which it is

"There is added in the first edition, "And if it ever were, as many additional
"patches have been in that translation, it could be of no authority, having no
"foundation in the original."]
of any other; but only that he was preserved from enduring them.

Again, as the authority is most uncertain, so is the doctrine most incongruous. The souls of men were never cast into infernal torments, to be delivered from them. The days which follow after death were never made for opportunities to a better life. The angels had one instant either to stand or fall eternally; and what that instant was to them, that this life is unto us. We may as well believe the devils were saved, as those souls which were once tormented with them. For it is an ever-lasting fire, an everlasting punishment, a worm that dieth not.

Nor does this only belong to us who live after the death of Christ, as if the damnation of all sinners now were ineradicable and eternal, before that death it were not so; as if faith and repentance were now indispensably necessary to salvation, but then were not. For thus the condition of mankind before the fulness of time, in which our Saviour came into the world, should have been far more happy and advantageous than it hath been since. But neither they nor we shall ever escape eternal flames, except we obtain the favour of God before we be swallowed by the jaws of death. We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body; but if they be in the state of salvation now by virtue of Christ’s descent into hell, which were numbered amongst the damned before his death, at the day of the general judgment they must be returned into hell again; or if they be received then into eternal happiness, it will follow either that they were not justly condemned to those flames at first, according to the general dispensations of God, or else they did not receive the things done in their body at the last; which all shall as certainly receive, as all appear. This life is given unto men

---

86 The Vulgar Latin renders it thus, *Quem Deus suscitavit, solutus doloribus Inferni: sicut etiam syriacum, &c.* *Epist. cxxiv. 8. vol. ii. p. 576. A.* But in the original Greek it is generally written *ἀμών αἰδρύων,* and in all these copies of it, only that of Petrus Fraxardus, and two of the sixteen copies which Robertus Stephanus made use of, read it *ἀμών.* And this mistake was very easy: for in the eighteenth Psalm, verse the fourth, there is *πόνηροι ἀμών,* and verse the fifth, *πόνηροι ἄμων.* And we find twice in the Proverbs, xii. and xvi. 25, *πόνηροι ἀμών,* translated *πόνηροι,* and *πόνηροι.*

87 Quod si mortem, quemadmodum accipienium sit Inferni ab illo solutos dolores (neque enim Cooperat in eis esse tanquam in vinicul, et sic eos solvit quam si catenas solvisse quisquis fuerat alligatus); facile est intelligere sic eos solutos esse quemadmodum solvi postquam laquei Venetianum, ne teneant; non quis teneantur. *S. August. Epist. xix. cap. 2 [s. 3. p. 574 C.]

88 This is the argument of Gregory the Great; *Si fideles nunc sine bonis operibus non salvatur, et infideles ac reprehens sine bona actione, Domine ad Inferos descendet, salvati sunt; melior illorum sors fuit, qui incarnationem Domini minime viderunt, quam honestam qui post incarnationem ejus mysterij nasi sunt.* Quod quin aut facultas sit dicere vel sentire, ipsa Dominus testatur disciplulis, dicens, *Muli Reges et Prophetae superarent vitam quae vos visitate, et non vident.* *Lib. vii. Epist. xv. [vol. ii. p. 862 A.]*
to work out their salvation with fear and trembling; but after death cometh judgment, reflecting on the life that is past, not expecting amendment or conversion then. He that liveth and believeth in Christ shall never die; he that believeth, though he die, yet shall he live; but he that dieth in unbelief shall neither believe nor live. And this is as true of those which went before, as of those which came after our Saviour, because he was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world. I therefore conclude, that the end for which the soul of Christ descended into hell, was not to deliver any damned souls, or to translate them from the torments of hell unto the joys of heaven.

The next consideration is, whether by virtue of his descent 245 the souls of those which before believed in him, the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all the people of God, were delivered from that place and state in which they were before; and whether Christ descended into hell to that end, that he might translate them into a place and state far more glorious and happy. This hath been in the later ages of the Church the vulgar opinion of most men, and that as if it followed necessarily from the denial of the former; he delivered not the souls of the damned, therefore he delivered the souls of those which believed, and of them alone 98; till at last the schools have followed it so fully, that they deliver it as a point of faith and infallible certainty 99, that the soul of Christ by descending into hell did deliver from thence all the souls of the saints which were in the bosom of Abraham, and did confer upon them actual and essential beatitude, which before they enjoyed not. And this they lay upon two grounds: first, that the souls of saints departed saw not God; and secondly, that Christ by his death opened the gate of the kingdom of heaven.

But even this opinion, as general as it hath been, hath neither that consent of antiquity, nor such certainty as it pretended, but is rather built upon the improbabilities of a worse. The most ancient of all the Fathers, whose writings are extant, were so far from believing that the end of Christ’s descent into hell was to translate the saints of old into heaven, that they thought them not to be in heaven yet, nor ever to be removed from that place in which they were before Christ’s death, until the general resurrection. Others, as we have also shewn, thought the bosom of Abraham was not in any place which could be termed hell; and consequently could not think that Christ should therefore descend into hell to deliver them which were not there. And others yet which thought that Christ delivered the Patriarchs from their infernal mansions, did not think so exclusively, or in opposition to the disobedient and damned spirits, but conceived many of them to be saved as well as the Patriarchs were, and doubted whether all were not so saved or not 92. Indeed I think

98 So Gregory the Great, after he had proved that none of the damned were released by Christ’s descent, thus infers and concludes: ‘(Hic itaque omnis perspectantia nihil aliud tenet nisi quod vera fides per Catholicam Ecclesiam docet: quia descendet ad Inferos Dominus illos solummodo ab Inferni clausulis eripit, quos viventes in carne per suam gratiam in fide et bona operatione servavit.)’ Lib. vii. Epist. xv. [p. 867 E.]

99 So Idoico Hispanolam by way of opposition: ‘ideo Dominus in Inferno descendit, ut his, qui ab eo non poterint detinebantur, viam aperiret revertendi ad eum.’ Sentent. lib. 1. cap. 16. [p. 450 E.]

So Venerable Bede upon the place of St. Peter: ‘Catholicas fides habet, quia descendens ad Infernos Dominus non incredulos inducit, sed fideles tantummodo suos eduxit, ad colosiam securum regna perduxerit; neque exuis corpore animabus, et Infernorum carceres inclusis, sed in hac vita vel per sepium, vel per saeculum, vivit verba fidelium, quae videt viae demonstraret.’ [vol. 9, p. 98.]

91 We have shewed this before to have been the opinion of the most ancient, producing the express testimonies of Justin Martyr, Ireneus, Tertullian, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen. So also Novatus. Quoniam terram iacent, neque ipsa sunt digestis et ordinatis potestatis us vacua. Locus enim est, quo plurum animae implorantque ducentur futuri judicii praestitue sententiis.’ Lib. de Trin. cap. 1. [p. 375 E. C.]

92 We have already shewn that many did believe all the damned souls were saved then; and St. Augustin had his adhibito rogue, when he wrote unto Eusebius concerning that opinion. Beside, the doubt of that great divine, Gregory Nazianzen, is very observable, who in his second Oration de Paschata hath these words: ‘Quoniam Nazianzenus non videtur illa scripta verba, quoniam de hac veritate dubitaret, sed solutum ut propo-
there were very few (if any) for above five hundred years after Christ, which did so believe Christ delivered the saints out of hell, as to leave all the damned there; and therefore this opinion cannot be grounded upon the prime antiquity, when so many of the ancients believed not that they were removed at all, and so few acknowledged that they were removed alone.

And if the authority of this opinion in respect of its antiquity be not great, the certainty of the truth of it will be less. For first, if it be not certain that the souls of the Patriarchs were in some place called hell after their own death, and until the death of Christ; if the bosom of Abraham were not some infernal mansion, then it not be certain that Christ descended into hell to deliver them. But there is no certainty that the souls of the just, the Patriarchs, and the rest of the people of God, were kept in any place below, which was, or may be called hell: the bosom of Abraham might well be in the heavens above, far from any region where the Devil and his angels were; the Scriptures nowhere tell us that the spirits of just men went unto or did remain in hell; the place in which the rich man was in torments after death is called hell, but that into which the angels carried the poor man’s soul is not termed so. There was a vast distance between them two; nor is it likely that the angels, which see the face of God, should be sent down from heaven to convey the souls of the just into that place, where the face of God cannot be seen. When God translated Enoch, and Elias was carried up in a chariot to heaven, they seem not to be conveyed to a place where there was no vision of God; and yet it is most probable, that Moses was with Elias as well before as upon the mount: nor is there any reason to conceive that Abraham should be in any worse place or condition than Enoch was, having as great a

But there is no certainty that the Patriarchs and the Prophets are now in another place and a better condition than they were before our blessed Saviour died; there is no intimation of any such alteration of their state delivered in the Scriptures; there is no such place with any probability pretended to prove any actual accession of happiness and glory already past. Many shall Matt. viii. come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham; and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: there then did the Gentiles which came in to Christ find the Patriarchs, even in the kingdom of heaven; and we cannot perceive that they found them any where else than Lazarus did. For the description is the same, There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, Luke xiii. when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. For as the rich man in hell lift up his eyes, being in torments, Luke xvi. and seeth Abraham afar off, before the death of Christ; so those that were in weeping and gnashing of teeth, saw Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the Prophets, when the Gentiles were brought in.

Thirdly, though it were certain that the souls of the saints had been in a place called hell, as they were not; though it were also certain that they were now in a better condition than they were before Christ’s death, as it is not; yet it would not follow that Christ descended into hell to make this alteration; for it might not be performed before his resurrection, it might not be effected till his ascension, it might be attributed to the merit of his passion, it might have no dependence on his descension. I conclude therefore that there is no certainty of truth in that proposition which the schoolmen take for a matter of faith, That Christ delivered the souls of the saints from that place of hell which they call Limbus of the Fathers, into heaven; and for that purpose after his death descended into hell.

Wherefore being it is most infallibly certain that the death of Christ was as powerful and effectual for the redemption of the saints before him, as for those which follow him; being they Cor. x. 3, did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; being Abraham is the father of us all, and we Rom. iv. now after Christ’s ascension are called but to walk in the steps of 12, 16, the faith of that father; being the bosom of Abraham is clearly propounded in the Scriptures as the place into which the blessed angels before the death of Christ conveyed the souls of those
which departed in the favour of God, and is also promised to them which should believe in Christ after his death; being we can find no difference or translation of the bosom of Abraham, and yet it is a comfort still to us that we shall go to him; and, while we hope so, never fear that we shall go to hell; I cannot admit this as the end of Christ's descent into hell, to convey the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and those which were with them, from thence; nor can I think there was any reference to such an action in those words, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell.

Another opinion hath obtained, especially in our Church, that the end for which our Saviour descended into hell, was to triumph over Satan and all the powers below within their own dominions. And this hath been received as grounded on the Scriptures and consent of Fathers. The Scriptures produced for the confirmation of it are these two; Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them: and, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts

...Although the bosom of Abraham in express and formal terms be spoken only of Lazarus, whom Christ being yet alive in the flesh supposed dead; yet the same bosom is virtually and in terms equivalent promised to those which afterwards should believe. For the joys of the life to come are likened to a feast, in which, according to the custom then in use, they lay down with the head of one toward the breast of the other, who is therefore said to lie in his bosom, as we read of St. John, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ νεκροῦ. St. John xiii. 23. Thus in that heavenly feast in the kingdom of God, Lazarus is in τοῦ κόσμου Αʹβραάμ'; St. Luke xvi. 23; and in St. Matt. viii. 11. Christ saith, that many shall come from the east and from the west, καὶ ἀναλύσατον μετὰ Αʹβραάμ', discambient cum Abraham, set down with Abraham, as we translate it after our custom, at the same feast, that is, ἀναλύσατον εἰς τοῦ κόσμου Αʹβραάμ', &c. as Euthynius, 'Quis Deus Abraham, coeli conditor, Pater Christi est; iderico in regno coelorum est et Abraham, cum quo secumbitibus sunt nationes qua cre- diderunt in Christum filium Creatoris.'

94 St. Augustin often shews the comfort which he had in going to the bosom of Abraham: as in the case of his friend Nebridius; 'Nunc illæ vivit in sinu Abraham. Quicquis illud est quod illo significatur sinu, illi Nebridius meus vivit, dulcis amicus meus, tuis autem, Domine, adoptivus ex liberto filius, illi vivit. Nam quis alius tali animus locus? Confess. lib. ix. exp. 3. § 6. (vol. i. p. 159 B.) And he seats that place (as uncertain as before) where it before. 'Post vitam istam parvum nundum eris ubi erunt sancti, quibus diecubit, Venite benedicti Pater mei, periculi regni tuorum non est ab initio mundi. Nondum ibi eris, quis nescit? Sed jam potes ini esse, ubi illum quondam ulterius pauperem, dives ille superbus et solidus in medias sua tormentis videt a longa requiescentem.' Cons. i. in Psal. 56. [s.c. vol. iv. p. 253 C.] And this he must necessarily take for a sufficient comfort to a dying Christian, who seats that place in conspiciu Domini,' De Civit. Dei, lib. i. cap. 12. [vol. vi. p. 15 D.] And looked upon them which were in it, as upon those 'a quibus [Christus] secundum heastisiam presentium sum duae divinae munera re- cessit.' Epist. xix. [al. clxiv.] exp. 5. [s. 8. vol. i. p. 576 B.]

HE DESCENDED INTO HELL.

unto men. Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? By the con- B. Bilson, junction of these two they conceive the triumph of Christ's P. 294- descent clearly described in this manner. Ye were buried with Col. ii. 12, Christ in baptism, with whom ye were also raised: and when ye 13, 14, 15. were dead in sins, he quickened you together with him, forgiving your sins, and cancelling the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and spoiling powers and principalities, he made an open shew of them, triumphing over them in himself. That is, say they, ye died and were buried with Christ, who fastened the handwriting of ordinances to the cross, that he might abolish it from having any right to tie or yoke his members. Ye likewise were quickened, and raised together with Christ, who rising spoiled powers and principalities, and triumphed over them in his own person. So that these words, spoiling principalities and powers, are not referred to the cross, but to Christ's resurrection. This triumph over Satan and all his kingdom, the same Apostle to the Ephesians setteth down as a consequent to Christ's death, and pertinent to his resurrection, Ascending on Eph. iv. 8, high he led captivity captive: and this, He ascended, what meaneth it, but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth? So that ascending from the lower parts of the earth he led captivity captive, which is all one with, he triumphed over powers and principalities. With this coherence and conjunction of the Apostle's words, together with the interpretation of the ancient Fathers, they conceive it sufficiently demonstrated, that Christ after his death, and before his resurrection, in the lowermost parts of the earth, even in hell, did lead captivity captive, and triumphed over Satan.

But notwithstanding, I cannot yet perceive either how this triumph in hell should be delivered as a certain truth in itself, or how it can have any consistency with the denial of those other ends, which they who of late have embraced this opinion do ordinarily reject. First, I cannot see how the Scriptures mentioned are sufficient to found any such conclusion of themselves. Secondly, I cannot understand how they can embrace this as the interpretation of the Fathers, who believe not that any of the souls of the damned were taken out of the torments of hell, or that the souls of the saints of old were removed from thence by Christ's descent; which were the reasons why the Fathers spake of such a triumphing in hell, and leading captivity captive there.
That the triumphing in the Epistle to the Colossians is not referred to the cross but to the resurrection, cannot be proved; the coherence cannot enforce so much: no logic can infer such a division, that the blotting out of the handwriting belongeth precisely to our burial with him; and the triumphing over principalities and powers particularly to our being quickened together with him; or that the blotting out was performed at one time, and the triumphing at another. Our present translation attributeth it expressly to the cross, rendering the last words, triumphing over them in it, that is, in the cross mentioned in the former verse; and though anciently it have been read, triumphing over them in himself, yet still there are these two great advantages on our side: first, that if we read, in it, it proves the triumph spoken of in this place performed upon the cross; and if we read, in himself, it proveth not that the triumph was performed in another place, because he was himself upon the cross: secondly, the ancient Fathers of the Greek Church read it as we do, in it, and interpret the triumph of his death; and those others of the Latin Church, which did read it otherwise, did also acknowledge with the Greeks the cross not only to be the place in which the victory over Satan was obtained, but also to be the trophy of that victory, and the triumphal chariot.

249 This place then of St. Paul to the Colossians cannot prove that Christ descended into hell, to triumph over the Devil there; and if it be not proper for that purpose of itself, it will not be more effectual by the addition of that other to the Ephesians. For, first, we have already shewn, that the descending into the lower parts of the earth, doth not necessarily signify his descent into hell, and consequently cannot prove that either those things which are spoken in the same place, or in any other, are to be attributed to that descent. Again, if it were granted, that those words did signify hell, and this Article of our Creed were contained in them, yet would it not follow from that Scripture, that Christ triumphed over Satan while his soul was in hell; for the consequence would be only this, that the same Christ who led captivity captive, descending first into hell. In that he ascended, (and ascending led captivity captive,) what is it but that he descended into Hell.

potestates exulit, et triumphavit eos cum ligno crucis. 'Idea
77 Tertullian;
Serpentis spolia, dextra principie mundi;
Affixit ligno, refugiarum immane trophym.
Adv. Marcion. lib. ii. [amongst the works of Tertullian, p. 632.]
Prudentius;
Die troporum passionis, die triumphum crucis.
Cathem. Hymn. ix. ver. 83.
St. Hilary most expressly; 'Manus ejus eductor ad bellum sunt cum secun-
num Lincet. Ego enim, ait, hic mundum, cum extensus in crucem invictissimi
armis potas passionis simulacrum. Et posuit, inquit, ut arcum arcum brachia
soa, cum de omnibus virtutibus ac po-
testate, in ipso se, trophaeo glorioso
triumphu, et principatus ut potestates traduci cum fulmina triumphans
eos in semito.' Tract. in Paul. 143.
[p. 553 F.]
Where it is observable that the Father does read it in sempiterno, and interprets it in cruce. 'Nos quoniam trophaeum jam videmus, et quod currum sumum triumphator ascendit, considera-
mos quod non arborum, non quadrupugii
plasmati mammibius de mortalis hoste que-
stras; sed patibulo triumphali captiva
de seculo spolia suspendit. S. Ambro.
lib. i. in exp. 23. S. Luc. [5. 109. vol.
i. p. 1537 C.]; and amongst the rest of
the captives he recks afterwards captivi-
tum principem mundi, et spiritualia
nequitia quae sunt in coelis.' To this
alludes Fulgentius; 'Sic opusuit
nostrostrum pectororum deleri chirograp-
phum, ut dum vetus homo noster simul
Crucifixit, tanquam in trophaeo,
triumphatoria victoria panderetur.' Ad
Thras. lib. iii. cap. 29. [p. 125.]
Which therfore we read it in aevum, with
the Greeks, that is, in stauaro, or in
aevum, with the Latin, in aevum, it is the same
for: he triumphed over the Devil by himself upon the cross, as in the
same case it is written, Eph. ii. 16. Kai
apokateleisthe tois amforitos en elai a-
mati tis Th Kyrios kai tis stauaro, apostaei
the exousia en autou.'
first? The descent then, if it were to hell, did precede the triumphant ascent of the same person; and that is all which the Apostle’s words will evince. Nay farther yet, the ascent mentioned by St. Paul cannot be that which immediately followed the descent into hell, for it evidently signifieth the ascension which followed forty days after his resurrection. It is not an ascent from the parts below to the surface of the earth, but to the heavens above, an \textit{ascending up on high, even far above all heavens.}\footnote{99 So St. Jeron on that place of the Ephe- sians; \textit{inferiora autem terrae, Infernum sciscit, ad quem Dominus nos- ter Salvatorque descendit, ut sancto- rum seuis, quem iit tenentur in- cluse, secum ad coelestis victor abduc- ret.} [vol. viii. p. 513 E.] And on Matt. xii. 29. \textit{Alligatus est fortis, et regi- tus in Tartaron, et Domini contritus pede; quodquidque sedebitur tyranni, cap- tiva ducta est captivitas.} [ib. p. 80 E.] So Arnoldus Carnotensis is to be under- stood; \textit{Passus est rex illi, et vita occidi; descendenteque ad Infernos capti- tivi sunt antiqui captivitate redixit.} \textit{De Eclipsibus Chrysologus;} \textit{[in the Appen- dix to St. Cyrilian, p. xxxiv.]} applying it to the custom of the Church, \textit{Omnia convenit, ut eo tempore que Christus captivos eductum ab Inferis, reconciliati congregatos ad Ecclesiam reducarent.} } 

\textit{Ibid. Thus Athanasius, when he speaks of Christ’s triumphing over Satan in Hell, he mentions \textit{Æôma voida a} \textit{âpoliosth.}\textit{ Hell spoiled, to wit, of those souls which before it kept in hold. Otherwise in the same narration, in \textit{Passionem et Crusum} [c. 20. vol. ii. p. 96 C.], he ac- knowledged the triumph on the cross; \textit{Ekei gar tòv Òpovipntov tòv òrphavov (not Òrphavov) kathà tòv Òdaklon, µελλων τòv nòtiocra, δια tòv Òdaklou tòv Òdaklon.} Theod. Leo the Emperor; \textit{Xwres de òntos tòv Æôma voida a} \textit{âpoliosth.} } 

This was the very notion which those Fathers had\footnote{99 So St. Jeron on that place of the Ephe- sians; \textit{inferiora autem terrae, Infernum sciscit, ad quem Dominus nos- ter Salvatorque descendit, ut sancto- rum seuis, quem iit tenentur in- cluse, secum ad coelestis victor abduc- ret.} [vol. viii. p. 513 E.] And on Matt. xii. 29. \textit{Alligatus est fortis, et regi- tus in Tartaron, et Domini contritus pede; quodquidque sedebitur tyranni, cap- tiva ducta est captivitas.} [ib. p. 80 E.] So Arnoldus Carnotensis is to be under- stood; \textit{Passus est rex illi, et vita occidi; descendenteque ad Infernos capti- tivi sunt antiqui captivitate redixit.} \textit{De Eclipsibus Chrysologus;} \textit{[in the Appen- dix to St. Cyrilian, p. xxxiv.]} applying it to the custom of the Church, \textit{Omnia convenit, ut eo tempore que Christus captivos eductum ab Inferis, reconciliati congregatos ad Ecclesiam reducarent.} }.

\textit{[It is most probably spurious.]}

As for the testimonies of the Fathers, they will appear of small validity to confirm this triumphant descent as it is distinguished from the two former effects, the removal of the saints to heaven, and the delivering the damned from the torments of hell. In vain shall we pretend that Christ \textit{descended into hell} to lead captivity captive, if we withhold maintain, that when he de-\textbf{scended thither he brought none away which were captive there.}
sufficiently observed in their writings, and is certainly most conformable to that prophetic expression, upon which we have hitherto grounded our explanation, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither will thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.

Secondly, by the descent of Christ into hell, all those which believe in him are secured from descending thither: he went unto those regions of darkness, that our souls might never come into those torments which are there. By his descent he freed us from our tears, as by his ascension he secured us of our hopes. He passed to those habitations where Satan had taken up


* [This treatise is not considered genuine. Vol. viii. append. p. 44.]
possession and exerciseth his dominion; that having no power over him, we might be assured that he should never exercise any
Heb. ii. 14, over our souls departed, as belonging unto him. Through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil; and by his actual descent into the dominion of him so destroyed, secured all which have an interest in him of the same freedom which he had. Which truth is also still preserved (though among many other strange conceptions) in the writings of the Fathers. Having thus examined the several interpretations of this part of the Article, we may now give a brief and safe account thereof, and teach every one how they may express their faith without any danger of mistake, saying, I give a full and undoubting assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the cross, and his soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his soul died not; and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die; and being dead in the similitude of a sinner, his soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who died for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death: but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him; therefore as God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ, of never coming under the power of Satan, or suffering in the flames prepared for the Devil and his angels. And thus, and for these purposes may every Christian say, I believe that Christ descended into hell.

He rose again.

WHATSOEVER variations have appeared in any of the other Articles, this part of Christ's resurrection hath been constantly delivered without the least alteration, either by way of addition or diminution. The whole matter is so

2 As we read of the opinion in Tertullian's time, though not of him; 'Sed in hoc, iussunt, Christus Infernus addit, ne nos adiremus.' Ceterum, quod dictam Ethiconorum et Christianorum, sicut mortui identem? De Anim. cap. 55. [p. 304 A.] 'Aut ipsius vox est hic, Eius sit animam ens ex Inferno inferius; aut nostra vox per ipsum Christum Dominum nostrum; quia ideo

He rose again.

necessary and essential to the Christian faith, that nothing of it could be omitted; and in these few expressions the whole doctrine is so clearly delivered, that nothing needed to be added. At the first view we are presented with three particulars: First, the action itself, or the resurrection of Christ, he rose again. Secondly, the verity, reality, and propriety of that resurrection, he rose from the dead. Thirdly, the circumstance of time, or distance of his resurrection from his death, he rose from the dead the third day.

For the illustration of the first particular, and the justification of our belief in Christ's resurrection, it will be necessary, first, to shew the promised Messias was to rise from the dead; and secondly, that Jesus, whom we believe to be the true and only Messias, did so rise as it was promised and foretold. As the Messias was to be the Son of David, so was he particularly typified by him and promised unto him. Great were the oppositions which David suffered both by his own people and by the nations round about him; which he expressed of himself, and foretold of the Messias in those words, The kings of the earth set Ps. ii. 2. themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his Anointed, that is, his Christ. From whence it came to pass, that the holy child Jesus, whom God had anointed Acts iv. 26, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together to do whatsoever the hand and the counsel of God determined before to be done, which was to crucify and slay the Lord of life. But notwithstanding all this opposition and persecution, it was spoken of David, and foretold of the Son of David, Yet have I set mine anointed upon my holy hill Ps. ii. 6, 7, of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. As therefore the persecution in respect of David amounted only to a depression of him, and therefore his exaltation was a settling in the kingdom; so being the conspiration against the Messias amounted to a real crucifixion and death, therefore the exaltation must include a resurrection. And being he which riseth from the last word, a mortuis, and some copies in Eusebius have it not; yet it is generally expressed in all the rest, which are more ancient than Eusebius or Fortunatus: and therefore that omission is to be imputed rather to negligence either of the author or the scribe, than to the usage of the Church in their age. 'Quod die tertio resurrexit a mortuis Dominus Christus, nullus ambitus Christi-
dead, begins as it were to live another life, and the grave to him is in the manner of a womb to bring him forth, therefore when God said of his Anointed, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee, he did foretell and promise that he would raise the Messias from death to life.

But because this prediction was something obscured in the figurative expression, therefore the Spirit of God hath cleared it farther by the same Prophet, speaking by the mouth of David, but such words as are agreeable not to the person, but the Son, of David, 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. As for the Patriarch David, he is both dead and buried, and his flesh consumed in his sepulchre; but being a Prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. They were both to be separated by his death, and each to be disposed in that place which was respectively appointed for them; but neither long to continue there, the body not to be detained in the grave, the soul not to be left in hell, but both to meet, and being reunited to rise again.

Again, lest any might imagine that the Messias dying once might rise from death, and living after death, yet die again, there was a further prophecy to assure us of the excellency of that resurrection and the perpetuity of that life to which the Messias was to be raised. For God giving this promise to his people, I will make an everlasting covenant with you, (of which the Messias was to be the Mediator, and to ratify it by his death,) and adding this expression, even the sure mercies of David, could signify no less than that the Christ, who was given first unto us in a frail and mortal condition, in which he was to die, should afterwards be given in an immutable state, and consequently that he being dead should rise unto eternal life. And thus by virtue of these three predictions we are assured that the Messias was to rise again, as also by those types which did represent and prefigure the same. Joseph, who was ordained to save his brethren from death who would have slain him, did represent the Son of God, who was slain by us, and yet dying saved us; and his being in the dungeon typified Christ's death; his being taken out from thence represented his resurrection; as his ejection to the power of Egypt next to Pharaoh, signified the session of Christ at the right hand of his Father. Isaac was sacrificed, and yet lived, to shew that Christ should truly die, and truly live again. And Abraham offered him up, accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead, from whence also he received him in a figure. In Abraham's intention Isaac died, in his expectation he was to rise from the dead, in his acceptance being spared he was received from the dead, and all this acted to prefigure, that the only Son of God was really and truly to be sacrificed and die, and after death was really and truly to be raised to life. What was the intention of our father Abraham not performed, that was the resolution of our heavenly Father and fulfilled. And thus the resurrection of the Messias was represented by types, and foretold by prophecies; and therefore the Christ was to rise from the dead.

That Jesus, whom we believe to be the true and only Messias, did rise from the dead according to the Scriptures, is a certain and infallible truth, delivered unto us, and confirmed by testimonies human, angelical, and divine. Those pious women which thought with sweet spices to anoint him dead, found him alive, held him by the feet, and worshipped him, and as the first preachers of his resurrection, with fear and great joy ran to bring his Disciples word. The blessed Apostles follow them, to whom also Acts i. 254 he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs: who with great power gave witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus; the principal part of whose office consisted in this testimony, as appeareth upon the election of Matthias into the place of Judas, grounded upon this necessity: Wherefore of these men Acts i. 22, which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection. The rest of the Disciples testified the same.

to whom he also appeared, even to six hundred brethren at once. These were the witnesses of his own family, of such as worshipped him, such as believed in him. And because the testimony of an adversary is in such cases thought of greatest validity, we have not only his Disciples, but even his enemies to confirm it. Those soldiers that watched at the sepulchre, and pretended to keep his body from the hands of his Apostles; they which felt the earth trembling under them, and saw the countenance of an angel like lightning, and his raiment white as snow; they who upon that sight did shake and became as dead men, while he whom they kept alive; even some of these came into the city and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done. Thus was the resurrection of Christ confirmed by the highest human testimonies, both of his friends and enemies, of his followers and revilers.

But so great, so necessary, so important a mystery had need of a more firm and higher testimony than that of man: and therefore an angel from heaven, who was ministerial in it, gave a present and infallible witness to it. He descended down, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. Nay, two angels in white, sitting on the one at the head, the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain, said unto the women, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen. These were the witnesses sent from heaven, this the angelical testimony of the resurrection.

And if we receive the witness of men, or angels, the witness of God is greater, who did sufficiently attest this resurrection; not only because there was no other power but that of God which could effect it, but as our Saviour himself said, The Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me; adding these words to his Apostles, and ye shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning. The Spirit of God sent down upon the Apostles did thereby testify that Christ was risen, because he sent that Spirit from the Father; and the Apostles witnessed together with that Spirit, because they were enlightened, comforted, confirmed, and strengthened in their testimony by the same Spirit. Thus God raised up Jesus, and shewed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to those who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And thus, as it was foretold of the Messiah, did our Jesus rise; which was the first part of our inquiry.

For the second, concerning the reality and propriety of Christ’s resurrection, expressed in that term, from the dead, it will be necessary first to consider what are the essential characters and proprieties of a true resurrection; and secondly, to shew how those proprieties do belong and are agreeable to the raising of Christ. The proper notion of the resurrection consists in this, that it is a substantial change by which that which was before, and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again. It is said to be a change, that it may be distinguished from a second or new creation. For if God should annihilate a man or angel, and make the same man or angel out of nothing, though it were a restitution of the same thing, yet were it not properly a resurrection, because it is not a change or proper mutation, but a pure and total production. This change is called a substantial change, to distinguish it from all accidental alterations: he which awaketh from his sleep ariseth from his bed, and there is a greater change from sickness to health; but neither of these is a resurrection. It is called a change of that which was, and hath been corrupted, because things immaterial and incorruptible cannot be said to rise again; resurrection implying a reproduction; and that which after it was, never was not, cannot be reproduced. Again, of those things which are material and corruptible, of some the forms continue and subsist after the corruption of the whole, of others not. The forms of inanimate bodies, and all irrational souls, when they are corrupted, cease to be; and therefore if they should be reproduced out of the same matter, yet were not this a proper resurrection, because thereby there would not be the same individual which was before, but only a restitution of the species by another individual. But when a rational soul is separated from its body, which is the corruption of a man, that soul so separated doth exist, and consequently is capable of conjunction and reunion with the body; and if these two be again united by an essential and vital union, from which life doth necessarily flow, then doth the same man live which lived before; and consequently this reunion is a perfect and proper resurrection from death to life, because the same individual person, consisting of the same soul and body, which was dead, is now alive again.

Having thus delivered the true nature of a proper resurrection, we shall easily demonstrate that Christ did truly and properly rise from the dead. For, first, by a true though miraculous
they might be yet further assured that it was the same soul by which that body lived before, he gave a full testimony of his Divinity by the miracle which he wrought in the multitude of fishes caught, by breathing on the Apostles the Holy Ghost, and by ascending into heaven in the sight of his Disciples. For being no man ascended into heaven but he which came down from heaven, the Son of man which was in heaven, being the Divinity was never so united to any human soul but only in that person, it appeared to be the same soul with which he lived and wrought all the miracles before. To conclude, being Christ appeared after his death with the same body in which he died, and with the same soul united to it, it followeth that he rose from the dead by a true and proper resurrection.

Moreover, that the verity and propriety of Christ's resurrection may further appear, it will be necessary to consider the cause thereof, by what power and by whom it was effectuated. And if we look upon the meritorious cause, we shall find it to be Christ himself. For he by his voluntary sufferings in his life, and exact obedience at his death, did truly deserve to be raised unto life again. Because he drank of the brook in the way, because he humbled himself unto death, even to the death of the cross, therefore it was necessary that he should be exalted, and the first degree of his exaltation was his resurrection. Now being Christ humbled himself to the sufferings both of soul and body; being whatsoever suffered, the same by the virtue and merit of his passion was to be exalted; being all other degrees of exaltation supposed that of the resurrection; it followeth from the meritorious cause that Christ did truly rise from the dead with the same soul and the same body, with which he lived united, and died separated.

The efficient cause of the resurrection of Christ is to be considered either as principal or instrumental. The principal cause was God himself; for no other power but that which is omni-

---

6 Thas Ignatius disputat against the Docetism of his days: Εἰ χρῆ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σωματίτισι σῶμα ἀνήλθεν, καὶ ποιεῖσαν δόσιν. Καὶ δεύτερος τὸι τεῖχος Πέτρος ἐλθείς, ἔφυ τοῖς Ἀδελθῶν, φασάρεις με, καὶ δεύτερος, ἵνα ἵνα ἐμὴ διάκονος ἀνακοινωνήσῃ. Καὶ ἔδωκεν ἑπάνω ἀλήθειαν, καὶ πεποίησεν, κατά τινα τιμήματα τοὺς τυφλούς τῇ Ἀπόστ. Epist. ad Smyrn. cap. 3. p. 34. 

7 Η δεκαοικία τῶν ἁγίων ὁμοιόμορφων σωμάτων, ἐπεὶ ἑπάνω κατὰ τὸ καθάρον, καὶ ἐπεὶ ὁ Κύριος ἐπελεύσθητα, εἰς τὸ σώμα τοῦ ὁλοκλήρου, καὶ τὸ σώμα τοῦ Αναστασίας.

8 Ut mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus resurrexit clarificaretur et glorificaretur, prius humilitatis esset passio: non enim a mortuis resurrectionem, si mortuis non fuisse. Humilitas claritas est mermitt, claritas humilitatis est præmium. S. August. Tract. 104 in Joan. [4. 3. vol. iii. part ii. p. 760 A.]
potent can raise the dead. It is an act beyond the activity of any creature, and unproportionate to the power of any finite agent. 

Acts ii. 32. This Jesus hath God raised up, saith the Apostle, whereof we all are witnesses. And generally in the Scriptures as our, so Christ's resurrection is attributed unto God; and as we cannot hope after death to rise to life again without the activity of an infinite and irresistible power, no more did Christ himself, who was no otherwise raised than by an eminent act of God's omnipotence; which is excellently set forth by the Apostle, in so high an exaggeration of expressions, as I think is scarce to be paralleled in any author; that we may know what is the exceeding greatness of his power to set-ward who believe, according to the working of the might of his power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him up from the dead. Being then omnipotence is a Divine attribute, and infinite power belongs to God alone; being no less power than infinite could raise our Saviour from the dead; it followeth, that whatsoever instrumental action might concur, God must be acknowledged the principal agent.

And therefore in the Scriptures the raising of Christ is attributed to God the Father (according to those words of the Apostle, Paul, an Apostle, not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised him from the dead), but is not attributed to the Father alone. For to whomsoever that infinite power doth belong, by which Christ was raised, that person must be acknowledged to have raised him. And because we have already proved that the eternal Son of God is of the same essence, and consequently of the same power with the Father, and shall hereafter shew the same true also of the Holy Ghost, therefore we must likewise acknowledge that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost raised Christ from the dead. Nor is

9 Eph. I. 19. Καὶ τὸ ὄφειμάλλον μέγεθος τῆς θυσίας αὐτῶν—καὶ τὸ ἐπερημμένον τῷ κράτοι τῆς ἱεράς αὐτῶν, ἢ ἐνθρησκυνον ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. Which words our translation comes far short of, and I doubt our language can scarce reach it. For first, here are δώρα and λύγια, two words to express the power of God, and the validity and force of it, but not sufficient; wherefore there is an addition to each of them, μέγεθος τῆς θυσίας, and κράτος τῆς ἱεράς, two words more to express the eminent greatness of this power and force, but not sufficient yet; and therefore there is another addition to each addition; τὸ ὄφειμάλλον μέγεθος, and ἢ ἐπερημμένον τῷ κράτοι, to set forth the eminence and activity of that greatness; and all yet as it were but flat and dull, till he be quickened with an active verb, ἢ ἐνθρησκυνον ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἱεράς αὐτῶν ἐν κράτοι. All which he set on work, all which he acted in Christ, when he raised him from the dead.

10 Quis nisi solus Filius resurrexit! Quia solus mori potuit, qui carnem habuit: et tamen ab hoc opera, quae solus

this only true by virtue of this ratiocination, but it is also delivered expressly of the Son, and that by himself. It is a weak fallacy used by the Socinians, who maintain, that God the Father only raised Christ, and then say they teach as much as the Apostles did, who attribute it always either generally unto God, or particularly to the Father. For if the Apostles taught it only so, yet if he which taught the Apostles taught us something more, we must make that also part of our belief. They believe the Father raised Christ, because St. Paul hath taught them so, and we believe the same; they will not believe that Christ did raise himself; but we must also believe that, because he hath said so. These were his words unto the Jews, Destroy this temple, John ii. 19, and in three days I will raise it up; and this is the explication of the Apostle, But he spake of the temple of his body, which he might very properly call a temple, because the fulness of the God. Col. ii. 9. head dwelt in him bodily. And when he was risen from the dead, John ii. 22. his Disciples remembered that he had said this unto them, and they believed the Scripture, and the word that Jesus had said. Now if upon the resurrection of Christ the Apostles believed those words of Christ, Destroy this temple, and I will raise it up, then did they believe that Christ raised himself; for in those words there is a person mentioned which raised Christ, and no other person mentioned but himself.

A strange opposition they make to the evidence of this argument, saying, that God the Father raised Christ to life, and Christ being raised to life did lift and raise his body out of the grave, as the man sick of the palsy raised himself from the bed, or as we shall raise ourselves out of the graves when the trump should sound: and this was all which Christ did or could do. But if this were true, and nothing else were to be understood in those words of our Saviour, he might as well have said, Destroy this temple, and in three days any one of you may raise it up. Filias resurrexit, non enim Pater aliquus, de quo scriptum est, Qui suscipit et mortuis Jesum. An forte se ipse non suscipit? Et ubi est quod ait, Solvit templum hoc, et trivio suscibat illud? Et quod potestatem se habere dicit pomendi et iterum sumendis animis suum? Quis autem ilia desipit, ut putet Spiritum sanctum resurreccionem hominis Christi non cooperet, cum ipsum hominem Christum fuerit operarius? Serm. Arian. c. 15. [vol. viii. p. 625 E.]
For when life was restored unto it by God, any one of them might have lifted it up, and raised it out of the grave, and have shewn it alive.

This answer therefore is a mere shift: for to raise a body which is dead, is, in the language of the Scriptures, to give life unto it, or to quicken a mortal body. For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." He then which quickeneth the dead bodies of others when he raiseth them, he also quickened his own body when he 258

raised that. The temple is supposed here to be dissolved, and being so to be raised again; therefore the resurrection must answer to the dissolution. But the temple of Christ’s body was dissolved when his soul was separated, nor was it any other way dissolved than by that separation. God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, and therefore the parts of his body, in respect of each to other, suffered no dissolution. Thus as the Apostle desired to be dissolved and to be with Christ, so the temple Phil. i. 23. of Christ’s body was dissolved here, by the separation of his soul: for the temple standing was the body living; and therefore the raising of the dissolved temple was the quickening of the body. If the body of Christ had been laid down in the sepulchre alive, the temple had not been dissolved; therefore to lift it up out of the sepulchre when it was before quickened, was not to raise a dissolved temple, which our Saviour promised he would do, and the Apostles believed he did.

Again, it is most certainly false that our Saviour had power only to lift up his body when it was revived, but had no power of himself to reunite his soul unto his body, and thereby to revive it. For Christ speaketh expressly of himself, I lay down John x. 17. my life (or soul) that I might take it again. No man taketh it 18. from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. The laying down of Christ’s body was to die, and the taking of it again was to revive; and by this taking of his life again he showed himself to be the John xi. 25. resurrection and the life. For he which was made of the seed of Rom. i. 34. David according to the flesh, was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead. But if Christ had done no more in the resurrection, than lifted up his body when it was revived, he had done that which any other person might have done, and so had not declared himself to be the Son of God with power. It remaineth therefore that Christ, by that power which he had within himself, did take his life again which he had laid down, did reunite his soul unto his body, from which he separated it when he gave up the ghost, and so did quicken and revive himself: and so it is a certain truth, not only that God the Father raised the Son, but also that God the Son raised himself 213.
three days and three nights in the heart of the earth: and as he was restored alive unto the dry land again, so should the Messias, after three days, be taken out of the jaws of death, and restored unto the land of the living.

The type in respect of the day was the waved sheaf in the feast of the first-fruits, concerning which this was the law of God by Moses: When ye come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the priest: and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it. And ye shall offer that day when ye wave the sheaf an he-lamb without blemish of the first year for a burnt offering unto the Lord. For under the Levitical Law, all the fruits of the earth in the land of Canaan were profane; none might eat of them till they were consecrated; and that they were in the feast of the first-fruits. One sheaf was taken out of the field and brought to the priest, who lifted it up as it were in the name of all the rest, waving it before the Lord, and it was accepted for them; so that all the sheaves in the field were holy by the acceptance of that: for if the first-fruits be holy, the lump is also holy. And this was always done the day after the sabbath, that is, the paschal solemnity, after which the fulness of the harvest followed: by which thus much was foretold and represented, that as the sheaf was lifted up and waved, and the lamb was offered on that day by the priest to God, so the promised Messias, that immaculate Lamb which was to die, that Priest which dying was to offer himself to God, was upon this day to be lifted up and raised from the dead, or rather to shake and lift up and present himself to God, and so to be accepted for us all, that so our dust might be sanctified, our corruption hallowed, our mortality consecrated to eternity. Thus was the resurrection of the Messias after death typically represented both in the distance and the day.

And now, in reference to both resemblances, we shall clearly shew that our Jesus, whom we believe, and have already proved to be the true Messias, was so long and no longer dead, as to rise the third day; and did so order the time of his death, that the third day on which he rose might be that very day on which the sheaf was waved, the day after that sabbath mentioned in the Law.

As for the distance between the resurrection and the death
of Christ, it is to be considered, first, generally in itself, as it is some space of time: secondly, as it is that certain and determinate space of three days. Christ did not, would not, suddenly arise, lest any should doubt that he ever died. It was as necessary for us that he should die, as that he should live; and we, which are to believe them both, were to be assured as well of the one as of the other. That therefore we may be ascertained of his death, he did some time continue it. He might have descended from the cross before he died; but he would not, because he had undertaken to die for us. He might have revived himself upon the cross after he had given up the ghost, and before Joseph came to take him down; but he would not, lest as Pilate questioned whether he were already dead, so we might doubt whether he ever died. The reward of his resurrection was immediately due upon his passion, but he deferred the receiving of it, lest either of them being questioned, they both might lose their efficacy and intended operation. It was therefore necessary that some space should intercede between them.

Again, Because Christ’s exaltation was due unto his humiliation, and the first step of that was his resurrection; because the Apostles after his death were to preach repentance and remission of sins through his blood, who were no way qualified to preach any such doctrine till he rose again; because the Spirit could not be sent till he ascended, and he could not ascend into heaven till he rose from the grave; therefore the space between his resurrection and passion could not be long; nor can there be any reason assigned why it should any longer be deferred, when the verity of his death was once sufficiently proved. Lest therefore his Disciples should be long held in suspense, or any person after many days should doubt whether

he rose with the same body with which he died, or no; that he might shew himself alive while the soldiers were watching at his grave, and while his crucifixion was yet in the mouths of the people, he would not stay many days before he rose. Some distance then of time there was, but not great, between his crucifixion and his resurrection.

The particular length of this space is determined in the third day: but that expression being capable of some diversity of interpretation, it is not so easily concluded how long our Saviour was dead or buried before he revived or rose again. It is written expressly in St. Matthew, that as Jonas was three days and three Matt. xii. nights in the whale’s belly, so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. From whence it seemeth to follow, that Christ’s body was for the space of three whole days and three whole nights in the grave, and after that space of time rose from thence. And hence some have conceived, that being our Saviour rose on the morning of the first day of the week, therefore it must necessarily follow that he died and was buried on the fifth day of the week before, that is on Thursday; otherwise it cannot be true that he was in the grave three nights.

But this place, as express as it seems to be, must be considered with the rest in which the same truth is delivered: as when our Saviour said, After three days I will rise again; and Matt. xxvii. 63. again, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up; or, within three days I will build another made without hands. But John ii. 19. that which is most used, both in our Saviour’s prediction before his death, and in the Apostle’s language after the resurrection, is, that he rose from the dead the third day. Now according Matt. xvi. 21.

14 'De cruci descensore poterat, sed differebat ut de supraclito resurgeret.' S. August. Tract. 12 in Ioan. [3. 6. vol. iii. part ii. p. 386 D.]
16 'Εκείκα μὲν αὐτὸν τὸν δειμφέοντα τὸν θάνατον εἰπὼν σῶμα, τριάδαν ἀντικείσον τοιοῦτον Τι θα να μὴ εἶπεν διαμείνας καὶ ἐφοράς τὸν δειμφέοντα τὸν θάνατον ἢρας, ὡς ἢ τὸν ἀντικείσουν σῶμα, καὶ ἐπεκαλέσατο τὴν γενέσθαι τὸ κράτος καὶ τὰ συντηρήματα τῶν ἡμερῶν. S. Chrysost. Homil. 43. in Matt. [al. Hom. 44. 2. vol. vii. p. 459 D.]
17 These several phrases are used;—first that Christ was in the heart of the earth treis ἡμέρας, and treis τάκτης secondly, that he was to rise after three days; thirdly, that he would rebuild this temple in treis ἡμέραις, and δεκα τριὰ ἡμέρας; and lastly, that he rose τριά τρίτης, which is the most general and constant form of speech.
Matt. xvii. to the language of the Scriptures, if Christ were slain and rose the third day, the day in which he died is one, and the day on which he rose is another, and consequently there could be but one day and two nights between the day of his death and his resurrection. As in the case of circumcision, the male child eight days old was to be circumcised, in which the day on which the child was born was one, and the day on which he was circumcised was another, and so there were but six complete days between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision.

The day of Pentecost was the fiftieth day from the day of the wave-offering; but in the number of the fifty days was both the day of the wave-offering and of Pentecost included; as now among the Christians still it is. Whitsunday is now the day of Pentecost, and Easter-day the day of the resurrection, answering to that of the wave-offering; but both these must be reckoned to make the number of fifty days. Christ then, who rose upon the first day of the week, (as is confessed by all,) died upon the sixth day of the week before; or if he had died upon the fifth, he had risen not upon the third, but the fourth day, as Lazarus did. Being then it is most certain that our Saviour rose on the third day; being according to the constant

language of the Greeks and Hebrews, he cannot be said to rise to life on the third day, who died upon any other day between which and the day of his resurrection there intervened any more than one day: therefore those other forms of speech which are far less frequent, must be so interpreted as to be reduced to this expression of the third day so often reiterated.

When therefore we read that after three days he would raise the temple of his body, we must not imagine that he would continue the space of three whole days dead, and then revive himself; but upon the third day he would rise again: as Joseph and his mother after three days found him in the temple, that is, Luke ii. 46, the third day after he tarried behind in Jerusalem. And when we read, that he was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, we must not look upon those nights as distinct from the days, but as Moses spake, the evening and the morning,

mission; the Quaran diō hēmērōn μεσον. In the same manner he mentions the ςαββατών, the εἴσοδον, and σάββατον, in all which this is constantly observed, that the days of the week are divided into periods of seven days, the day of intermission is but one, if τετάρτη two, if τετάρτης three, if εἴσοδον five, if ἐσόδον seven. Thus if our Saviour were one whole day in the grave, and died the day before, and rose the day after, he did rise τετάρτη; if he were two whole days in the grave, he rose τετάρτης. So Αζαλιζοῦντα διήτησε τετάρτην έχει; ετεροτεύς δέν άντι μόνον καί άνθρωπος δρίχει; ἡ τρίτη δέ κρίσιμος. Prøthl. 14. sect. xxvi. τῇ τρίτῃ therefore and τετάρτη may be the same. For from τρίτη comes τριάδα, and from τετάρτης, τεταρτάδα, in which ἕξις is always understood. Τεταρτάδα, τεταρτάδες. Said. τετάρτη then is προμέρος πέρας τετάρτης διδ τετάρτης τεταρτάδας. Thus being Christ did certainly rise τῇ τρίτῃ ήμέρῃ. In the Quaran he did rise according to the Greeks τετάρτης and according to the same then he must also rise παρά μέρος, that is, one day only interoccurring between the day of his death, and the day of his resurrection.

20 A night and a day in the Hebrew language, not used to compositions, is the same with the Greek νυκτίουν or νυκτίουν μεσον, ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ανάμεσα, κατά τόν ουράνιον κυρίον καὶ τῷ μέρῳ
that is, the night and the day, were the first day; and as the saint speake unto Daniel, Unto two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings, intending thereby so many days; nor must we imagine that those three days were completed after our Saviour's death, and before he rose; but that upon the first of those three days he died, and upon the last of those three days he rose. As we find that eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child; and yet Christ was born upon the first, and circumcised upon the last of those eight days: nor were there any more than six whole days between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision; the one upon the fifth and twentieth of December, the other upon the first of January. And as the Jews were wont to speak, the priests in their courses by the appointment of David were to minister before the Lord eight days, whereas every week a new course succeeded, and there were but seven days' service for each course (the sabbath on which they began, and the sabbath on which they went off, being both reckoned in the eight days); so the day on which the Son of God was crucified, dead, and buried, and the day on which he revived and rose again, were included in the number of three days. And thus did our Saviour rise from the dead upon the third day properly, and was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth synecdochically.

263 This is sufficient for the clearing the precise distance of Christ's resurrection from his crucifixion, expressed in the determinate number of three days: the next consideration is, what day of the week that third day was, on which Christ did actually rise, and what belonged to that day in relation to his resurrection. Two characters there are which will evidently prove the particularity of this third day; the first is the description of that day in respect of which this is called the third, after the manner already delivered and confirmed; the second is the Evangelist's expression of the time on which Christ rose.

The character of the day in which our Saviour died is undeniable, for it is often expressly called the preparation; as we

27 So St. Jerom on Jonas ii. 1. [vol. vi. p. 420 C.] Et erat Jonas in ventre piscis tribus diebus et tribus noctibus. Hujus loci mysteriorum in Evangelio Dominus exposuit: et superficium est vel silique, vel clavum, etiam exposuit ipsum qui passus est. Hoc solam querenum, quomodo tres dies et tres noctes fuerit in corde terrae. Quidam paravorcum, quando solo fugiente ab hora sexta usque ad horam novem, nox sucessionis dies, in diem dies et nox dissociat; et apponentes sabbatum, tres dies et tres noctes sustituet, et sabbatum inter nox sustituet ex noxia nox; hunc vero sustitutum totum intelligimus a parte: et ex eo quod in paravo est noturnum, et noctem sustituit, et dies tertiam vocabimus: et semel inter diecimum et noctem, et tertiam noxem, et tertiam noxem ante dies, sequuntur idem praecedentibus; quia diei Dominica mancipatur, reformata ad exordium diei successivi; nunc et in Generi nos non praecedentia diei est, sed sequentia, id est, principium futuri, non finis praeterit.: To the same purpose St. Augustin; I pehum autem trium non tam totam quam et plenam fuisse, Scriptura testis est; sed primum dies a parte extrema totus annuranderus est; dies vero tertium a parte primum, et ipse totalis: nume annua inter aequales, et sequentiam dies absolue totius viginti quatuor horis suis, duodecim nocturnis, et duodecim diurnis. Crucifixus est enim primo ductus noctis: hora totius dies sexta sabbati, cum ostium cruce suspenso est hora sexta, et spiri-
manna. It shall come to pass that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily. This preparation being used both before the sabbath and other festivals, at this time it had both relations: 264 for first, it was the preparation to a sabbath, as appeareth by those words of St. Mark, Now when the even was come, because Mark xv. it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath; and 42 those of St. Luke, That day was the preparation, and the sabbath Luke xxiii. drew on. Secondly, It was also the eve of a festival, even of the 54 great day of the paschal solemnity, as appeareth by St. John, who saith, when Pilate sat down to the judgment-seat, it was John xix. the preparation of the passover. And that the great paschal 14 festivity did then fall upon the sabbath, so that the same day was then the preparation or eve of both, appeareth yet farther by the same Evangelist, saying, The Jews therefore, because it ver. 31. was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath-day, for that sabbath-day was an high day; that is, not only an prominent or weekly sabbath, but also a great festival, even a paschal sabbath. Now being the sabbath of the Jews was constant, and fixed to the seventh day of the week; it followed that the preparation or eve thereof must necessarily be the sixth day of the week; which from the day, and the infinite benefit accruing to us by the passion upon that day, we call Good Friday. And from that day being the sixth of one, the third must consequently be the eighth, or the first of the next week 24.


THE THIRD DAY.
The next character of this third day is the expression of the time of the resurrection in the Evangelists. *When the sabbath was past,* saith St. Mark, which was the day after the preparation on which he was buried, *very early in the morning,* the first day of the week: *In the end of the sabbath,* as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, saith St. Matthew: *Upon the first day of the week early in the morning,* saith St. Luke: *The first day of the week early when it was yet dark,* saith St. John. By all which indications it appeareth that the body of Christ being laid in the sepulchre on the day of the preparation, which was the eve of the sabbath, and continuing there the whole sabbath following, which was the conclusion of that week, and farther resting there still and remaining dead the night which followed that sabbath, but belonged to the first day of the next week, about the end of that night early in the morning was revived by the accession and union of his soul, and rose again out of the sepulchre.

Whereby it came to pass, that the obligation of the day, which was then the sabbath, died and was buried with him, but in a manner by a diurnal transmutation revived again at his resurrection. Well might that day which carried with it a remembrance of that great deliverance from the Egyptian servitude, resign all the sanctity or solemnity due unto it, when that morning once appeared upon which a far greater redemption was confirmed. One day of seven was set apart by God in imitation of his rest upon the creation of the world, and that seventh day which was sanctified to the Jews was reckoned in relation to their deliverance from Egypt. At the second delivery of the Law we find this particular cause assigned, *Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt,* and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm, therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath-day. Now this could not be any special reason why the Jews should observe a seventh day; first, because in reference to their redemption, the number of seven had no more relation than any other number: secondly, because the reason of a seventh day was before rendered in the body of the commandment itself. There was therefore a double reason rendered by God why the Jews should keep that sabbath which they did; one special, as to a seventh day, to shew they worshipped that God who was the Creator of the world; the other individual, as to that seventh day, to signify their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage, from which that seventh day was dated.

Being then upon the resurrection of our Saviour a greater deliverance and far more plenteous redemption was wrought than that of Egypt, and therefore a greater observance was due unto it than to that, the individual determination of the day did pass upon a stronger reason to another day, always to be repeated by a seventhly return upon the reference to the creation. As there was a change in the year at the coming out of Egypt, by the command of God; *This month, the month of Abib, shall be unto you the beginning of months,* it shall be the first month of the year to you; so at this time of a more eminent deliverance a change was wrought in the hebdomadal or weekly account, and the first day is made the seventh, or the seventh after that first is sanctified. The first day, because on that Christ rose from the dead; and the seventh day from that first for ever, because he who rose upon that day was the same God who created the world, and rested on the seventh day: *for by Col. i. 15. him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth—all things were created by him and for him.*

This day did the Apostles from the beginning most religiously observe, by their meeting together for holy purposes, and to perform religious duties. The first observation was performed providentially, rather by the design of God than any such inclination or intention of their own: *for the same day,* saith the John xx. 19. Evangelist, that is, the day on which Christ rose from the dead, at evening, being the first day of the week, the Disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews. The second observation was performed voluntarily, *for after eight days again his Disciples were within, and Thomas with them:* the first day of the week, when Christ rose by the providence of God, the Disciples were together, but Thomas was absent; upon the first day of the next week they were all met together again in expectation of our Saviour, and Thomas with them. *Again, when the day of Pentecost was fully come,* which was also the first day of the week, *they were all with one accord in one place,* and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, they spake with tongues, preached
blessed Apostles, was transmitted to the Church of God, and so continued in all ages.

This day thus consecrated by the resurrection of Christ was left as the perpetual badge and cognizance of his Church. As God spake by Moses to the Israelites, 

*Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep,*

for it is a sign between me and you throughout your genera-
tions, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you; thereby leaving a mark of distinction upon the Jews, who were by this means known to worship that God whose name was Jehovah, who made the world, and delivered them from the hands of Pharaoh; so we must conceive that he hath given us this day as a sign between him and us for ever, whereby we may be known to worship the same God Jehovah, who did not only create heaven and earth in the beginning, but also raised his eternal Son from the dead for our redemption. As therefore the Jews do still retain the celebration of the seventh day of the week, because they will not believe any greater deliverance

---

*S. Hieron. in Epist. ad Gal. cap. iv. v. 10.*

...And St. Augustin in an answer to the same objection; "Nam nos quoque et Dominicum dierum et Pascha solenniter celebravimus, et quaslibet alias Christianas dierum festivitates." *Cont. Adianant. cap. 16.* 

*S. Augustin. cap. ix. c. 13.* "Dixit Iesum septima octava, et dixit Dominicus non Judaizet, sed Christianis resurrec-
tione Dominii declaratus est, et ex illo habebat festivalia suaa." 

*S. Aug. Epist. cap. ix. c. 13.* "Dixit Iesum septima octava, et dixit Dominicus non Judaizet, sed Christianis resurrec-
tione Domini declaratus est, et ex illo habebat festivalia suaa." 

*S. Hieron. in Epist. ad Gal. cap. iv. v. 10.* "Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep," for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you; thereby leaving a mark of distinction among the Jews, who were by this means known to worship that God whose name was Jehovah, who made the world, and delivered them from the hands of Pharaoh; so we must conceive that he hath given us this day as a sign between him and us for ever, whereby we may be known to worship the same God Jehovah, who did not only create heaven and earth in the beginning, but also raised his eternal Son from the dead for our redemption. As therefore the Jews do still retain the celebration of the seventh day of the week, because they will not believe any greater deliverance...
wrought than that of Egypt; as the Mahometans religiously observe the sixth day of the week in memory of Mahomet’s flight from Meeces, whom they esteem a greater Prophet than our Saviour; as these are known and distinguished in the world by these several celebrations of distinct days in the worship of God; so all which profess the Christian religion are known publicly to belong unto the Church of Christ by observing the first day of the week, upon which Christ did rise from the dead, and by this mark of distinction are openly separated from all other professions.

That Christ did thus rise from the dead, is a most necessary article of the Christian faith, which all are obliged to believe and profess, to the meditation whereof the Apostle hath given a particular injunction, Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead. First, because without it our faith is vain, and by virtue of it, strong. By this we are assured that he which died was the Lord of life; and though he were crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. By this resurrection from the dead, he was declared to be the Son of God; and upon the morning of the third day did those words of the Father manifest a most important truth, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. In his death he assured us of his humanity, by his resurrection he demonstrated his Divinity.

Secondly, By his resurrection we are assured of the justification of our persons; and if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, it will be imputed to us for righteousness: for he was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. By his death we know that he suffered for sin, by his resurrection we are assured that the sins for which he suffered were not his own; had no man been a sinner, he had not died; had he been a sinner, he had not risen again: but dying for those sins which we committed, he rose from the dead to shew that he had made full satisfaction for them, that we believing in him might obtain remission of our sins, and justification of our persons: God sending his own Son Rom.viii.32, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, and raising up our surety from the prison of the grave, did actually absolve, and apparently acquit him from the whole obligation to which he had bound himself, and in discharging him acknowledged full satisfaction made for us. Who then shall Rom.viii. lay any thing to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again.

Thirdly, it was necessary to pronounce the resurrection of Christ as an Article of our faith, that thereby we might ground, confirm, strengthen, and declare our hope. For the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled. By the resurrection of Christ his Father hath been said to have begotten him; and therefore by the same he hath begotten us, who are called brethren and coheirs with Christ. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life. He laid down his life, but it was for us; and being to take up his own, he took up ours. We are the members of that body of which Christ is the Head; if the Head be risen, the members cannot be far behind. He is the first-born from Col.i.18, the dead, and we the sons of the resurrection. The Spirit of Lake xx. Christ abiding in us maketh us the members of Christ, and by the same Spirit we have a full right and title to rise with our Head. For if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the Rom.viii. dead dwell in us, he that raised us from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in us. Thus the resurrection of Christ is the cause of our resurrection by a double causality, as an efficient, and as an exemplary cause. As an efficient cause, in regard our Saviour by and upon his resurrection hath obtained power and right to raise all the dead; For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. As Cor.xv. an exemplary cause, in regard that all the saints of God shall rise after the similitude and in conformity to the resurrection of
ARTICLE V.

Rom. vi. 5. Christ: For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. He shall change our vile bodies, that they may be like unto his glorious body: that as we have borne the image of the earthy, we may also bear the image of the heavenly. This is the great hope of a Christian, that Christ rising from the dead hath obtained the power, and is become the pattern of his resurrection. The breaker is come up before them; they have broken up and have passed through the gate; their King shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them.

Fourthly, it is necessary to profess our faith in Christ risen from the dead, that his resurrection may effectually work its proper operation on our lives. For as it is efficient and exemplary to our bodies, so it is also to our souls. When we are dead in sins, God quickeneth us together with Christ. And, as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life. To continue among the graves of sin while Christ is risen, is to incur that reprehension of the angel, Why seek ye the living among the dead? To walk in any habitual sin, is either to deny that sin is death, or Christ is risen from the dead. Let then the dead bury the dead, but let not any Christian bury him who rose from death that he might live. Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light. There must be a spiritual resurrection of the soul before there can be a comfortable resurrection of the body. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in this first resurrection, on such the second death hath no power.

Having thus explained the manner of Christ's resurrection, and the necessity of our faith in him risen from the dead, we may easily give such a brief account, as any Christian may understand what it is he should intend, when he makes profession of this part of his Creed; for he is conceived to acknowledge thus much; I freely and fully assent unto this as a truth of infinite certainty and absolute necessity, that the eternal Son of God, who was crucified and died for our sins, did not long continue in the state of death, but by his infinite power did revive and raise himself, by uniting the same soul which was separated to the same body which was buried, and so rose the same man; and this he did the third day from his death; so that dying on Friday the sixth day of the week, the day of the preparation of the sabbath, and resting in the grave the sabbath-

day, on the morning of the first day of the week he returned unto life again, and thereby consecrated the weekly revolution of that first day to a religious observation until his coming again. And thus I believe the third day he rose again from the dead.

HE ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN.

ARTICLE VI.

He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

This Article hath received no variation, but only in the addition of the name of God, and the attribute Almighty; the ancients using it briefly thus, He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father. It containeth two distinct parts; one transient, the other permanent; one as the way, the other as the end: the first is Christ's ascension, the second is his session.

In the ascension of Christ these words of the Creed propound to us three considerations and no more: the first of the person, He; the second of the action, ascended; the third of the termination, into heaven. Now the person being perfectly the same which we have considered in the precedent Articles, he will afford no different speculation but only in conjunction with this particular action. Wherefore I conceive these three things necessary and sufficient for the illustration of Christ's ascension: first, to shew that the promised Messias was to ascend into heaven; secondly, to prove that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, did really and truly ascend thither; thirdly, to declare what that heaven is, into which he did ascend.

That the promised Messias should ascend into heaven, hath been represented typically, and declared prophetically. The high priest under the Law was an express type of the Messias and his priestly office; the atonement which he made was the representation of the propitiation in Christ for the sins of the

29 Ascendit in celos, sedet ad dextram Patris.' Ruffin. in Symb. [1. 31. p. eexix.] St. Augustine, in Enchirid. Maximum Taurinensis, Chrysologus, Auctor Eges. Symb. ad Catechesmon, Venerio, Fortunatus, the Latin and Greek MSS. set forth by the Archbishop of Armagh. St. Augustine, de Fide et Symb. Hath is, 'Sedet ad dextram Dei Patris'; to which was afterwards added omnipotens. 'Sedet ad dextram Patris omnipotentis.' Et Euseb. Gallican. [p. 553 G.]

'Sedet ad dextram Dei Patris omnipotentis.' Et Euseb. Venerio, et Auctor Serm. De Tempore, the Greek and Latin MSS. in Bennet College Library.