

17TH CENTURY PRESBYTERIANS

A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies, by George Gillespie (revised edition, 2013)

Previously Published

A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies, by George Gillespie (1993)

Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici or The Divine Right of Church-Government, by sundry ministers of London (1995)

Lectures on Job, by James Durham (1995; second ed., 2003)

Christ Crucified: Or, the Marrow of the Gospel in Seventy-Two Sermons on the Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah, by James Durham (2001; second printing, 2007)

A Practical Exposition of the Ten Commandments, by James Durham (2002)

Sermons Preached before the English Houses of Parliament by the Scottish Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly of Divines, 1643–1645, by Alexander Henderson, Robert Baillie, George Gillespie and Samuel Rutherford. Edited by Chris Coldwell. Introduction by Guy M. Richard (2011)

A DISPUTE AGAINST
THE ENGLISH POPISH CEREMONIES
OBTUDED ON THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

WHEREIN NOT ONLY OUR OWN ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE SAME ARE
STRONGLY CONFIRMED, BUT LIKEWISE THE ANSWERS AND DEFENSES
OF OUR OPPOSITES, SUCH AS HOOKER, MORTON, BURGES, SPRINT, PAY-
BODY, ANDREWES, SARAVIA, TILEN, SPOTSWOOD, LINDSAY, FORBES, ETC.,
PARTICULARLY CONFUTED.

by GEORGE GILLESPIE

Edited by Chris Coldwell
Historical Introduction by Roy Middleton

Jeremiah 9:12–14. Who is the wise man, that may understand this? and who is he to whom the mouth of the Lord hath spoken, that he may declare it, for what the land perisheth? ... And the Lord saith, Because they have forsaken my law which I set before them, and have not obeyed my voice, neither walked therein; but have walked after the imagination of their own heart, and after Baalim....

NAPHTALI PRESS
P. O. Box 141084 Dallas, Texas 75214

A Dispute Against The English Popish Ceremonies Obtruded on the Church of Scotland. Revised Edition. Copyright © 2013 by Chris Coldwell.

All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. No part of this new edition may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles or reviews and fair use. For information write Naphtali Press, P. O. Box 141084, Dallas, Texas, 75214.

ISBN 978-0-941075-31-2

*A DISPUTE AGAINST
THE ENGLISH POPISH CEREMONIES*

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	XI
HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION	XV
OVERVIEW & ANALYSIS.....	XXXV

TO ALL THE REFORMED CHURCHES	3
PROLOGUE	19
ORDER	21

THE FIRST PART: AGAINST THE NECESSITY OF THE CEREMONIES

1. That our opposites do urge the ceremonies as things necessary.....	23
2. The reason taken out of Acts 15 to prove the necessity of the ceremonies, because of the church's appointment, confuted	25
3. That the ceremonies thus imposed and urged as things necessary, do bereave us of our Christian liberty, first, because our practice is adstricted.....	26
4. That the ceremonies take away our Christian liberty proved by a second reason, namely, because conscience itself is bound and adstricted ...	31
5. That the ceremonies take away Christian liberty, proved by a third reason, viz., Because they are urged upon such as in their consciences do condemn them.....	41
6. That the ceremonies take away Christian liberty proved by a fourth reason, viz., Because they are pressed upon us by naked will and authority, without giving any reason to satisfy our consciences.....	44
7. That festival days take away our liberty, which God has given us proved; and first out of the law	47
8. That festival days take away our Christian liberty proved out of the gospel.....	52
9. Showing the weakness of some pretenses which our opposites use for holy days	60

THE SECOND PART: AGAINST THE EXPEDIENCY OF THE CEREMONIES

1. Against some of our opposites who acknowledge the inconveniency of the ceremonies, and yet would have us yield to them.....	69
2. Against those of our opposites who plead for the ceremonies as things expedient.....	82

3. That the ceremonies are inexpedient because they are preparatives for greater evils.....84

4. That the ceremonies are inexpedient, because they hinder edification89

5. That the ceremonies are inexpedient, because they are occasions of injury and cruelty93

6. That the ceremonies are inexpedient, because they harden and confirm the papiſts95

7. That the ceremonies are inexpedient, because they diſturb the peace of the church.....98

8. That the inexpediency of the ceremonies in reſpect of the ſcandal of the weak may be plainly perceived, twelve propoſitions touching ſcandal are premitted102

9. All the defenses of the ceremonies, uſed to juſtify them againſt the ſcandal imputed to them, are confuted107

THE THIRD PART: AGAINST THE LAWFULNESS OF THE CEREMONIES

1. That the ceremonies are unlawful, because ſuperſtitious, which is particularly inſtanced in holy days and miniſtering the ſacraments in private places.....129

2. That the ceremonies are unlawful, because they are monuments of bypaſt idolatry, which not being neceſſary to be retained, ſhould be utterly aboliſhed, because of their idolatrous abuſe: all which is particularly made good of kneeling.....149

3. That the ceremonies are unlawful, because they ſort us with idolaters, being the badges of preſent idolatry among the papiſts.....172

4. That the ceremonies are idols among formaliſts themſelves; and that kneeling in the Lord’s Supper before the bread and wine, in the aſt of receiving them, is formally idolatry187

5. The fifth argument againſt the lawfulness of the ceremonies, taken from the myſtical and ſignificant nature of them225

6. That the lawfulness of the ceremonies is fauſely grounded upon the holy ſcripture; where ſuch places as are alleged by our opposites, either for all the ceremonies in general, or for any one of them in particular, are vindicated from them237

7. That the lawfulness of the ceremonies cannot be warranted by any eccleſiaſtical law, nor by any power which the church has to put order to things belonging to divine worſhip.....254

8. That the lawfulness of the ceremonies cannot be warranted by any ordinance of the civil magiſtrate; whoſe power in things ſpiritual or eccleſiaſtical is explained271

DIGRESSION ONE

Of the vocation of men of eccleſiaſtical order.....313

DIGRESSION TWO
 Of the convocation and moderation of synods329

DIGRESSION THREE
 Of the judging of controversies and questions of faith.....333

DIGRESSION FOUR
 Of the power of the keys, and ecclesiastical censures.....337

9. That the lawfulness of the ceremonies cannot be warranted by the
 law of nature.....359

THE FOURTH PART: AGAINST THE INDIFFERENCY OF THE CEREMONIES

1. Of our opposites' pleading for the indifferency of the ceremonies367

2. Of the nature of things indifferent368

3. Whether there is anything indifferent *in actu exercito*373

4. Of the rule by which we are to measure and try what things are
 indifferent.....387

5. The first position which we build upon the ground confirmed in
 the former chapter390

6. Another position built upon the same ground392

7. Other positions built upon the former ground.....402

8. That the ceremonies are not things indifferent to the Church of
 Scotland; because she did abjure and repudiate them by a most
 solemn and general oath405

9. A recapitulation of sundry other reasons against the indifferency
 of the ceremonies.....414

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....423

SECTION INDEX443

EDITION ERRATA.....445

AUTHOR INDEX461

SCRIPTURE INDEX472

SUBJECT INDEX.....477

OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY, EXAMPLES OF FIRST USE486

COMMENDATIONS 487

Abbreviations

ANF	<i>The Ante-Nicene Fathers</i> , ed. James Donaldson, Arthur Cleveland Coxe, and Alexander Roberts. 10 volumes (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1885).
Calvin, <i>Commentaries</i>	<i>Calvin's Commentaries</i> , 45 volumes (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844–1856; repr. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983)
Calvin, <i>Traçts & Letters</i>	<i>Calvin's Selected Works: Traçts and Letters</i> , ed. Henry Beveridge, Jules Bonnet, David Constable, and Marcus Robert Gilchrist, 7 vols. (1849–1858; repr. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983)
CCSL	<i>Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina</i> (Turnholti: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, 1953–).
CO	<i>Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia</i> , 59 volumes, in <i>Corpus Reformatorum</i> , volumes 29–87.
CR	<i>Corpus Reformatorum</i> , ed. G. Baum, Ed Cunitz, Eduard Reuss, and Alfred Erichson. 87 volumes (Brunsvigae: C.A. Schwetschke, 1834–1900)
Hefele	Karl Joseph von Hefele, <i>A History of the Councils of the Church: From the Original Documents</i> (T. & T. Clark: 1871–1896). 5 vols.
Mansi	<i>Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio</i> , ed. Giovanni Domenico Mansi, Philippe Labbe, Gabriel Cossart, and Niccolo Coleti, (Florence and Venice: Zatta, 1759–1798).
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca</i> , ed. J. P. Migne. 166 volumes (Petit-Montrouge, Apud J.-P. Migne, 1857–1866)
PL	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina</i> , ed. J. P. Migne. 217 volumes (Petit-Montrouge, Apud J.-P. Migne, 1844–1855). Citations are from the original Migne printing; the pagination in the later Garnier reprint may vary.
NPNF1	<i>A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, first series</i> , ed. Philip Schaff (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1886–1890)
NPNF2	<i>A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, second series</i> , ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1890–1900)
r	In paginations, recto (right hand page)
v	In paginations, verso (left hand page)

FOREWORD

ERRORS AND CIRCUMSTANCES of the times have compelled many holding the Reformed faith to engage over the years in contests for biblical truth. None of these contests has been more frequent or compelling than the struggle for purity of worship. Although these battles since the Reformation were often engaged outside the mainstream of the church's history, a renewed interest in biblical worship has grown throughout the last century and into the current one. This has resulted in a significant body of literature on the subject which now goes under the moniker of the *Regulative Principle of Worship*, which is simply the doctrine of sola scriptura applied to worship.¹

The continued defense of this Reformation principle owes a significant debt to the trail blazed by *A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies*, which is an exhaustive defense of God's right to order the institutions of worship in His church. The work appeared on the eve of the Second Reformation in Scotland just prior to the English Civil War and the deliberations of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. George Gillespie was an unknown man in his early twenties; but despite his youth, the arguments of the "learned bishops" fell before his assault. Their defeat was so thorough that the bishops never attempted a direct reply. Gillespie was master of both his material and his foes. One can truly say that this book marked the end of that theological and biblical controversy. And the work made such an impression on his fellow reformers that they placed him amongst the leading divines of the Scottish church of that day.

As important as this work is as theological literature, it is a seventeenth century polemic. The reader should prepare himself for the literary style of that day. That generation was not satisfied with making an assertion and supplying a few "proof texts." They thought it necessary to conquer an error with a multitude of arguments, considering their work only partially done until they had completely eradicated the offense.

Often, their pursuit of their opponents seems relentless. They multiply

1. See Frank J. Smith, Ph.D., D.D. with Chris Coldwell, "The Regulative Principle of Worship: Sixty Years in Reformed Literature. Part One (1946–1999)," *The Confessional Presbyterian* 2 (2006) 89–164; Part Two (2000–2007), *The Confessional Presbyterian* 3 (2007) 155–216.

arguments and attempt to uncover every possible hiding place an enemy of truth might use. As a result, their works are often much longer than what many would consider sufficient today. Likewise, Gillespie makes fine distinctions between arguments, and also attacks his subject in a manner that results in a degree of repetition (see his Prologue and Order).

These considerations should not discourage even the hurried modern day reader. Significant effort was concentrated on making this edition generally more accessible and usable than any previously published. The patient and diligent reader will find reward for his time.

The first Naphtali Press printing of this work was published twenty years ago in 1993 in an edition of about 650 copies. A great deal of effort was undertaken to create a useful version, accessible to a modern audience.¹ The text was based on the 19th century edition in Gillespie's *Works* edited by William Hetherington,² and this was compared, corrected and collated with the first edition of 1637. This 1993 printing was exhausted a number of years ago, and a reprinting appeared to be in order.

However, in reviewing the work for a reissue, the work done in 1993 called for improvement, and ultimately extensive revision. The text has been carefully compared and collated again with the Hetherington text and the first edition. Significant and many less significant mistakes, not only in the 1993 text, but in the *Works*, as well as obvious errors in the 1637 edition, have been noted in the errata in the appendices.

In addition, while the bibliographical work in the 1993 text was helpful compared to previous editions, it was apparent that much more work was necessary, as well as a greater degree of analysis than was first attempted. Significantly, almost all if not all of the variety of references,³ have been traced and compared with some edition of the referenced text, if not perhaps the edition originally used by Gillespie. Most all if not all quotations were traced and checked for accuracy. For some of the references to works in Latin where Gillespie only supplied a translation, the Latin original has been supplied in the footnotes. Errors in citations are noted as well.

There were a variety of difficulties which impeded the tracing of Gillespie's references:—Exact and inexact quotations or paraphrases were originally both set in the italic face, and things are complicated yet again where Gillespie possibly may have been citing a paraphrase from a secondary source but noting the primary source.⁴—Apparently, mostly due to a mis-setting

1. George Gillespie, *A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies* (Naphtali Press, 1993).

2. Gillespie, "A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies, obtruded upon the Church of Scotland," in *Works: A Presbyterian's Armoury* (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, 1844–1846).

3. This work included identifying Gillespie's allusions to or citations from classical literature which the readership of his day would have more readily recognized.

4. One example may be the citation supposedly from Bellarmine which seems to be a paraphrase of him from Ames' *Bellarminus Enervatus* (see part one, chapter four, on page

of the type by the printer, numbers of pages, chapters,¹ and books are often wrong, necessitating some significant searches for the intended reference. Similarly, rare complete misidentifications of the referenced work due to a slip on Gillespie's part, or as likely a misreading of the script by the compositor of the type, created mysteries to solve.²—Some books are different from later editions even in an author's lifetime, such as Melanchthon's work on Colossians which has three distinct forms, and a quotation in one is not in the others (see part two, chapter five, page 93).—Specific and often not readily accessible editions of correspondence are necessary to identify specific letters, such as those of Calvin, for which Gillespie used the Vignon and Chouët edition of his works;³ and of Cyprian, for which he used the Manutius text with its distinct numbering scheme.⁴—

All told, more than a few references became small research projects in their own right. Where there was still room for doubt a best guess and case for it is given. The result is an extensive expansion of the footnotes over the 1993 edition.

To a large extent, the explosion of material available on the Internet has made this research much more possible than in 1993. However, it was still necessary to consult physical copies of a variety of rare titles in various libraries and collections. Consequently, I would like to thank James J. Cassidy, Kenneth Kang-Hui, and Frank J. Smith, for their time and trips to rare book rooms at Princeton Seminary, Union Seminary, and Emory University respectively. I am also very much in debt to David T. King for his ready and generous help with some of the Patristic research. My thanks are also due to Adam Brink and Paul Korte for assistance in finding some of the more obscure Latin citations, as well as to Dr. Steven Dilday, who also proofread all the 1993 Latin texts and translations, as well as the source Latin added for this new edition. For their helpfulness and aid, I would also like to express appreciation to: Daniel J. Slive and Eric White with Bridwell Library Special Collections (Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University), Paul Fields and Geneva College's Meeter Center; Grace Mullen and Westminster Seminary Library, Philadelphia; Bente Løj Polites and Falvey Memorial Library, Villanova University, and the Beinecke Rare Books &

37). Another is a citation supposedly from Augustine which may be a paraphrase of him by George Cassander (part one, chapter eight, page 55).

1. It should be noted that in some instances traced, more than once, it was easy to see Gillespie noting a wrong chapter from the page header when his reference fell at the end of one chapter and the beginning of the next on facing pages.

2. For example, a reference to Augustine on Psalm 39 is more than likely a reference to his Sermon 129. See part one, chapter six, page 46.

3. *Johannis Calvini Opera omnia theologica in septem tomos digesta*, Epistolae et Responsa, volume 6 (Geneva: Jean Vignon, Pierre and Jacob Chouët, 1617).

4. *Divi Caecilii Cypriani, episcopi Carthaginensis et gloriosissimi martyris, Opera* (Rome: Paulus Manutius, 1563).

Manuscript Library at Yale University. I wish to note again with thanks the help of those whose efforts made the first edition of 1993 possible which paved the way for this present revision: Alice Zents for Latin translations, and Roy Middleton for providing the historical introduction; and for various help, Richard Bacon; David C. Lachman, Sherman Isbell, and Kevin Reed.

The text has been revised in so far as possible without marring the author's work, to reflect contemporary spelling, punctuation, and usage. Words or insertions supplied by the editor are in square brackets []. Quotations are italicized, while Scripture citations are in quotation marks. The mistakes introduced by the previous editions have been corrected, some of which are noted in the footnotes, and most noted in the Indices. The short Latin phrases or quotations are translated in place. For longer quotations the translation has been placed in the text and the original Latin placed in a footnote.

There has been some attempt to standardize Gillespie's abbreviated references, and this for the most part has not been editorially indicated. In footnotes, notes and commentary on a reference are in square brackets. In addition to supplying the title in the footnotes, an extensive and revised bibliography has been provided in the appendices, as well as an index of cited authors. Many difficult, archaic or Scottish words are defined within the text. A complete index of Scripture passages cited, and a lengthy subject index are also supplied. The section divisions in those chapters with sections have been retained for those wishing to cross reference from previous editions of the *Dispute*. Also for this new edition, a helpful overview and summary has been provided. Due to length constraints, the bibliography of Gillespie's writings and the 1638 tract against the imposition of Laud's service book published in the 1993 edition, have not been retained in this revision.¹

I do hope the reader enjoys and benefits from this new revised edition of George Gillespie's *Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies*, now published in this the four hundredth anniversary year of his birth.

October 11, 2013

Chris Coldwell

1. The tract is now available in *The Anonymous Writings of George Gillespie* (Dallas, Texas: Naphtali Press, 2008).

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

THE SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH has from time to time been adorned by young ministers who were outstanding witnesses for Christ in their day and generation. Andrew Bonar in his *Memoir* of one of these young men—Robert Murray M'Cheyne—has this most instructive footnote: “It is worthy of notice how often the Lord has done much by a few years of holy labour. In our church George Gillespie and James Durham died at thirty-six; Andrew Gray when scarcely twenty-two. Of our witnesses, Patrick Hamilton was cut off at twenty-four and Hugh McKail at twenty-six. In other churches we might mention many, such as John Janeway at twenty-three, David Brainerd at thirty and Henry Martyn at thirty-two. Theirs was a short life, filled with usefulness and crowned with glory. Oh to be as they!”¹

George Gillespie, according to Principal John Macleod, was “one of the mighties of his age which was so fertile in massive heroic figures in the field of evangelical Christian theology.”² His brief ministry stamped an indelible impress on the Westminster Confession of Faith, particularly those chapters dealing with ecclesiology. More was wrought by him in eleven years, for the good of the Reformed churches, than most men accomplish in a lifetime. Gillespie seems to have been unknown until 1637 when, at just twenty-four years of age, his book, *A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies*, burst like a bombshell on the Scottish ecclesiastical scene. The subject he dealt with was the burning question of the hour, and his treatment of it brought him, in one bound, to the forefront of the polemic divines of his age. William M. Hetherington, the editor of his collected works, observes, “his first work ... dazzled and astonished his countrymen by the rare combination it displayed of learning and genius of the highest order.”³ From then until his death, Gillespie held an undisputed position of authority among the distinguished band of men, led by Alexander Henderson, who delivered the Scottish Church from the grip of prelacy. The true significance of

1. Andrew A. Bonar, ed. *Memoir and Remains of Robert Murray McCheyne* (1892; rpt. London: Banner of Truth, 1966), 25–26.

2. John Macleod, *Scottish Theology in Relation to Church History Since the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1943), 80.

3. W. M. Hetherington, “Memoir,” prefixed to *The Works of Mr. George Gillespie* (Edinburgh, 1846), Vol. I, ix.

though he had been a Minister only seven months, and though he was still a very young man, he was called to be one of the preachers at this illustrious Assembly. Robert Baillie, in a letter to his cousin, writes concerning Gillespie's sermon, "wherein the youth very learnedly and judiciously as they say, handled the words: 'The king's heart is in the hands of the Lord:'"¹

The Assembly sat from 21 November until 20 December. In closing the Assembly, the Moderator said, "Now we are quit of the Service Book, which was a book of slavery and service indeed, the Books of the Canons which tied us to spiritual bondage; the Book of Ordination, which was a yoke put upon the necks of faithful ministers.... All these evils God has rid us of..."

The 133rd Psalm was then sung:

Behold, how good a thing it is,
And how becoming well
Together such as brethren are
In unity to dwell.

The apostolic blessing was pronounced, and Alexander Henderson dismissed the Assembly with these memorable words, "We have now cast down the walls of Jericho; let him that rebuildeth them beware of the curse of Hiel the Bethelite."² And so, says Robert Baillie, "We all departed with great comfort and humble joy, casting ourselves and our poor church in the arms of our good God."³ Thomas M'Crie Jr. concludes his description of the Assembly in this way: "The Assembly of 1638 may be regarded as one of the noblest efforts ever made by the church to assert her intrinsic independence, and the sole headship of Christ. Single martyrs have borne witness to the same purpose, single ministers and even congregations have stood for the same truth; but here we have the whole church of Scotland, by her representatives, in her judicial capacity lifting up her voice and proclaiming before the whole world, the sovereign rights of her Lord and King. No church, except one constituted on the Presbyterian model, could have borne such a testimony or gained such a triumph..."⁴

It is to his honor that, whilst yet a young man, George Gillespie, by his writings and public witness, played such a noble part in these contendings for God and truth.

Roy Middleton
Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland
Barnoldswick, England

1. Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, Vol. I, 146.
2. See Joshua 6:26 and 1 Kings 16:34.
3. M'Crie, *Story of the Scottish Church*, 165.
4. M'Crie, *Story of the Scottish Church*, 165.

OVERVIEW & ANALYSIS OF THE DISPUTE AGAINST THE CEREMONIES

GEORGE GILLESPIE'S *Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies* was so highly regarded when first published that it was thought to have definitively ended the worship controversy of the time.¹ Certainly, whatever Anglican sentiment was regarding the work (the only answer it received was to be outlawed and publicly burned in 1637²), Presbyterian worship principles held firm within that tradition and within other nonconformist churches for many centuries afterward. However, adherence to biblical principles of worship began to wane in the late 19th century, and while there has been a recent resurgence of appreciation for the Regulative Principle,³ it has not come without resistance and opposition, necessitating continued clarification and defense. One help toward this goal is the republication of good editions of those earlier works that blazed pathways which now need to be recovered and maintained. Unquestionably, the importance of Gillespie's *Dispute* to Scottish as well as Presbyterian history, with his valuable insights into issues such as liberty of conscience, biblical rules for reform and of the use of things indifferent in such things as the mere circumstances of worship, the avoiding of scandal and what it is, and all he has to say about idolatry and superstition, which remain not even subtle issues in our day, justify as careful and critical an edition as possible, making his case against illicit ceremonies accessible and useful to this and future generations.

STYLE AND PRESENTATION

Unfortunately, Gillespie's manner of approach and presentation offer some difficulties to the present-day reader. Even the structure of the *Dispute* evokes

1. My thanks go to Ruben Zartman and Paige Britton for their input regarding literary style and for proof reading, and to the Rev. Matthew Winzer for his assistance in the summaries. Their help significantly aided in the pulling together of this overview and summary look at George Gillespie's *Dispute*. For a significantly longer version of this overview with extensive chapter summaries, see *The Confessional Presbyterian*, volume 9 (2013).

2. The *Dispute* was outlawed by the Privy Council of Scotland, all copies ordered confiscated, and burned by the hangman. See Roy Middleton's Historical Introduction (xxv).

3. See the publisher's Foreword, xi.

some initial puzzlement, which Gillespie addressed in his “Order.”¹ As he explained,

... [b]ecause polemic and eristic discourses must follow the adversaries at the heels whithersoever they go, finding them out in all the lurking-places of their elaborate subterfuges, and conflicting with them wheresoever they pitch, until not only all their blows be awarded, but themselves also all derouted; therefore, perceiving the informality of the formalists to be such that sometimes they plead for the controverted ceremonies as *necessary*, sometimes as *expedient*, sometimes as *lawful*, and sometimes as *indifferent*, I resolve to follow the trace, and to evince, by force of reason, that there is none of all those respects to justify either the urging or the using of them” (21).

Therefore, because the arguments of the formalists (the term used for defenders of the forms opposed by Gillespie) lacked fidelity to any one defense of the popish ceremonies (hence their “informality”), but rather ran from their necessity to their expedience to their lawfulness, and finally to their indifference, the *Dispute* is likewise divided into four distinct parts. And while such an arrangement might inevitably lead to repetitiveness, John Macleod noted the main reason for what he considered the work’s needless prolixity:

The vice of [the then] current controversial method, however, cleaves to his course of argument. [Gillespie] answered his opponents in detail. Instead of grouping as one all the champions of what was in substance the one line of argument and dealing with their principle once for all, he followed them into minutiae and then he virtually fought all his battles over again and thrice he slew the slain. This, however, was a fault of the method of his age and it did in his case only what it did in that of others—it made for redundancy and prolixity.²

Lucid brevity may be a desired quality in difficult theological disputes, but impatience is a fault of the current age; certainly writers and readers of Gillespie’s era had more endurance for lengthy, even over-lengthy, argumentation. Nevertheless, while today it may be difficult to appreciate Gillespie’s long 17th century polemic, it astounded and confounded the audience of the day. That the author was so young was cause for even more amazement.

1. “If it seems to any that it is a strange method to speak now of indifferency, in the end of this dispute, which ought rather to have been handled in the beginning of it, they may consider, that the method is not ours, but our opposites:...” (367).

2. John Macleod, *Scottish Theology in Relation to Church History since the Reformation* (1943; Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1974), 79.

“The problem that Gillespie handled was the burning question of the hour, and his treatment of it brought him at one bound into the forefront of the polemic divines of his age.”¹

Hopefully, then, once one gets beyond the cultural barrier of its general presentation, it may be easier to see the scope and value of the *Dispute*, and discover that for all the perceived faults of a previous age, it is not a peculiarly difficult read. James Walker, writing in 1880, noted that “Gillespie, like Rutherford, was all his days in the midst of strife; but his works are not disfigured by the *odium theologicum*. His style is notable for the times, at least among Scotch writers. It is generally clear and nervous.² There is no art, but there is often a terseness and vivacity very different from many of his contemporaries...”³ And Macleod noted that Gillespie “was a master of swordplay with his rapier. The type of mental clarity, though not with quite the same lucid style, that one finds in Francis Turretine is found also in George Gillespie...”⁴

Walker’s apparent criticism of “no art” may be a more subtle expression of disapproval for the whole form of the book which Macleod, writing six decades later, made more explicit.⁵ Or it may simply mean that Gillespie writes straightforwardly; there is no artfulness or artifice in his argument, no roundabout polite argumentation. This disputant against the ceremonies gets to his point—sharply, to allude to Macleod’s analogy; Gillespie’s writing is tight, functional, straightforward and clear.

Whatever Walker may have meant, “no art” cannot mean a lack of literary style: the young Scot clearly was trained in the classics and appropriately used stylistic embellishments for hortatory effect. These are not overdone, but are fitting and clever, displaying more than a little wit. His initial address to the Reformed churches begins with a colorful ‘polemical *dramatis personae*’ in which he uses many literary devices in his piercingly perceptive roll call of the various enemies of reform. And while such devices predominate in the opening epistle, his wordcraft continues throughout the whole work (though as Gillespie gets into the argumentation his creativity focuses more on the task of smoothly weaving together support from his many sources).

1. Macleod, *Scottish Theology*, 79.

2. Nervous—spirited, marked by strength of thought, feeling, and style.

3. James Walker, *The Theology and Theologians of Scotland: Chiefly of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1888) 15.

4. Macleod, *Scottish Theology*, 80. The comparison to Turretin is apt. Both writers give the sense that they have the whole of their topic at their command, spread out before them like a map.

5. While it is possible “no art” is pointing out that the *Dispute* is not of a high literary quality, some usage from Walker’s time would suggest understanding “art” in this context as meaning literary skill with specific reference to questions of arrangement or the organization of presentation; “[the] gift of shaping and picturesque grouping” (*British Quarterly Review*, 80 [1884]: 170).

There are many apt allusions to and quotations from classical literature. For example:

“Bishop Lindsay will have the will of the law to rule our consciences, which is by interpretation, *Sic volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas*.¹ He gives us not the reason or equity of the law, but only the will of it to be our rule” (44).

“We will not then call any man rabbi nor *jurare in verba magistri*,² nor yet be Pythagorean³ disciples to the church herself, but we will believe her and obey her in so far only as she is the pillar and ground of truth” (47).

“Do I talk of a *chimera* and imagine now that which is not? Nay, I will really exemplify that which I say, in that Proteus and Versipelles,⁴ the Archbishop of Spalato; for in the narration of the passages which were between his Majesty and him, collected by the Bishop of Durham, we find that he thought the procuring of concord between the church of England and the church of Rome to be easy” (87).

“...so among our opposites, not a few have been overcome with ease, pleasure, riches, favor, preeminence, etc., to like well of the ceremonies which never had their first love, when they had both spoken and disputed against them. What drew them overstay⁵ to contend for them, except (I say not the seeking of, lest I be thought uncharitable, but) their being sought by some worldly benefit? And how could such a one excuse himself but by Paris’s apology, *Ingentibus ardent, judicium domis sollicitare meum*?⁶ And what marvel that Balak’s promotion (Num. 22:17) and Saul’s fields and vineyards (1 Sam. 22) prevail with such as love this present world (2 Tim. 4:10)?” (98–99).

“Wherefore I conclude, *aliquid mysterii alunt*, and so *aliquid monstri* too” (148).⁷

“Yet let these Momus-like⁸ spirits understand that their censorious verdicts do also reflect upon those ancient Christians of whom we read, that with their own hands they destroyed the temples of idols..” (159).

“Which distinction, methinks, would have made Heraclitus himself to fall a-laughing with Democritus” (288).⁹

1. “I will it so, I order it so, let my willing stand for a reason.” Juvenal, *Satire VI*, 223–224.

2. “To echo the sentiments of a teacher.” Horace, *Epistolarum*, Book I, Epistle 1, line 14.

3. Pythagorean disciples: A philosophy which interpreted reality in terms of numbers and imposed strict ordinances of life on disciples as if they were divine laws.

4. Proteus was a mythical sea god who assumed various shapes; Versipelles implies having the faculty of changing the skin. i.e. the Archbishop is an inconstant person.

5. What drew them over to their side to contend, etc.

6. “They are eager to inveigle [ensnare] my judgment with huge houses.” Publius Ovidius Naso (Ovid), *Heroides*, Epistola XVI, Paris Helenæ, line 79.

7. *Aliquid mysterii alunt, aliquid monstri*: “they maintain (or cherish) something of a mystery” and so “something of a monster” too. This is a possible allusion to Terence’s *Andria*, Act 1, Scene 5, line 15. See the lengthy footnote on page 148.

8. Momus was a Greek god of ridicule who, for his criticism of the gods, was banished from heaven; hence, someone who is hyper-critical.

9. Heraclitus is known as the “weeping philosopher;” Democritus, the “laughing philosopher.”

“There is one place which they will have in mythology to stand for the head of Medusa,¹ and it they still object to us for all their ceremonies: even that of the Apostle, “Let all things be done decently and in order” (1 Cor. 14:40)” (238).

“... the method is not ours, but our opposites²; for they have been fleeing upon Icarus’ wings,³ and soaring so high, that their wings could not but melt from them: so have they, from necessity fallen down to expediency; from it to lawfulness, and from thence to indifferency.... And so being wooed and solicitously importuned by our former arguments against the ceremonies, they take them to the weaving of Penelope’s web,³ thereby to suspend us, and to gain time against us: this indifferency, I mean, which they shall never make out, and which themselves, otherwhiles, unweave again. Always, so long as they think to get any place for higher notions about the ceremonies, they speak not so meanly of them as of things indifferent; but when all their forces of arguments and answers are spent in vain, then are our ears filled with uncouth outcries and declamations, which tend to make themselves appear blameless for receiving, and us blameworthy for refusing matters of rite and indifferency” (367).

Gillespie also makes use of metaphor and composes the occasional extended metaphor;⁴ but his preferred verbal devices are the rhetorical question and alliteration. There are many examples of the latter and these are usually quite effective: “... rotten relics, riven rags, and rotten remainders of Popery” (14); “what a piacular prevarication is it to borrow from any other church, which was less reformed, a pattern of policy for this church which was more reformed?” (14); “... discuss their best arguments, allegations, answers, assertions, and distinctions” (22); “[a]nd shall a popish prince speak more reasonably than protestant prelates?” (31). In one example from the second part of the *Dispute* Gillespie piles up this alliteration: “He is bold to object, *Where one is offended with our practice of kneeling, twenty, I may say ten thousand, are*

1. In Greek Mythology all who gazed upon Medusa were turned to stone. In other words, the defenders of the English popish ceremonies used this one objection to turn away all arguments against them.

2. Icarus—fabled in escaping from Crete, to have flown so high that the sun melted the wax with which his artificial wings were fastened on, so that he fell into the Aegean Sea: hence applied to ambitious or presumptuous acts, which end in failure or ruin (OED).

3. Penelope—wife of Ulysses, who unraveled her web of tapestry at night, in order to put off her suitors, whom she had promised to entertain when the web was completed.

4. “All your winning or losing of a good conscience, is in your first buying; for such is the deceitfulness of sin, and the cunning conveyance of that old serpent, that if his head be once entering in, his whole body will easily follow after; and if he make you handsomely to swallow gnats at first, he will make you swallow camels ere all be done” (page 17). Other usages of metaphor include these examples: “We must therefore be mortised together, not by the subscudines of error, but by the bands of truth and unity of faith” (12); “Moreover, because the foredeck and hinddeck of all our opposites’ probations do resolve and rest finally into the authority of a law, and authority they use as a sharp knife to cut every Gordian knot which they cannot unloose, and as a dreadful pale [peal] to sound so loud in all ears that reason cannot be heard...” (14).

offended with your refusal. O adventurous arithmetic! O huge hyperbole! O desultorious declamation! O roving rhetoric! O prodigal paradox!" (127).

An extended quotation shows both effective use of alliteration and a well placed classical line from the satires of Juvenal.

Shall we not then call the ceremonies idols, which are observed with the neglecting of God's commandments, and which are advanced above many substantial points of religion? Idolatry, blasphemy, profanation of the Sabbath, perjury, adultery, etc., are overlooked, and not corrected nor reproved, nay, not so much as discountenanced in those who favor and follow the ceremonies; and if in the fellows and favorites, much more in the fathers. What if order is taken with some of those abominations in certain abject poor bodies? *Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas.*¹ What will not an episcopal conformist pass away with, if there is no more had against him than the breaking of God's commandments by open and gross wickedness? But O what narrow notice is taken of non-conformity! How mercilessly is it menaced! How cruelly corrected! (188).

Also prominent is Gillespie's use of the rhetorical question, such as: "Oh! transformed virgin, whither is thy beauty gone from thee? Oh! forlorn prince's daughter, how art thou not ashamed to look thy Lord in the face? Oh! thou best beloved among women, what hast thou to do with the inveigling appurtenances and habiliment of Babylon the whore?" (6). "What tyranny is there so great, spoiling men wholly of their liberty, but this pretense agrees to it?" (48). Indeed, at one point Gillespie carries on his argument for a lengthy paragraph largely by this device: "It skills not that many will judge us too precise for doing so. What? Do they think this preciseness any other than that which the law of God requires...?" (88). Other examples abound (see pp. 123, 256, 301, 403, 412; and there is a clear example of false argument on p. 399, answer 1).

Gillespie also often makes use of apostrophe, which is sometimes paired with alliteration. "O land" (7); "O horrible blasphemy"; "O double deceitfulness" (49); "O egregious impudency!" (74); "O strange and monstrous invention!" (86); "O *bellua multorum capitum!*" [*O the beast of many heads!*] (86); "O unhappy ceremonies! woe unto you, you mischievous lets and prejudices to the edification of the church" (92). "O golden sentence, and worthy to be engraven with a pen of iron, and the point of a diamond!" "Blush, O paper, which art blotted with such a notable lie!" (168). "O desultorious levity" (171). "O prodigious licentiousness, and hellish disorder, worthy to be drowned in the lake of Lethè" (352). "O damnable impiety which makes so small account of the violation of the aforesaid oath..." (406).

It may be that Gillespie's writing tends toward the technical and

1. "Censure acquits the raven, but pursues the dove." Juvenal, Satire II, line 63.

straightforward argumentation, and certainly there are extended sections where he suppresses these flourishes of style. But although Gillespie may not have had the poetic imagination of his friend Samuel Rutherford, the use of these literary devices do show a poetic sensibility and appreciation for their effect

Questions of style aside, though it is true there are inherent difficulties in reading a work such as the *Dispute*, they are not so much a feature of the writing itself as of the period-bound method of disputation. And, while Macleod sees the negative in this perhaps needless prolixity, it actually affords at least one clear benefit. As Walker noted, "You do not wonder at the impression it made. With an entire self-composure, the youthful theologian debates the points at issue with the great writers opposed to him. The whole literature of the subject seems to be at his call. I do not suppose that from the pen of so young a man there has ever appeared in our country a work of more consummate learning"¹ Gillespie's seemingly exhaustive approach does bring the reader into contact with a large number of works and authors, certainly all the writers pro and contra of the period on the questions involved in his *Dispute*.²

THE LITERATURE CITED

The *Dispute* contains over a thousand citations from nearly two hundred authors and over three hundred works, from leading Reformers and Protestant works marshaled to defend biblical worship principles, to all the important writers of the time defending the English popish ceremonies, classical literature, church fathers, scholastics, linguists, as well as the leading Roman Catholic writers, commentators, anti Catholic and anti Protestant polemicists, and other works of the period.

Of the Reformers and Protestant writers, Calvin, not surprisingly, is one of the most cited, with over ninety references to various works, including a dozen references to the *Institutes*, twice that to his letters, and nearly fifty citations from commentaries. The next most cited Reformed theologians are Zanchi and Junius with nearly sixty references apiece, and Paræus with over sixty citations from his commentaries.

Of the defenders of Puritan views, Thomas Cartwright's *Confutation of the Rhemish Testament* is cited over forty times, Fulk's works are cited about seventeen times, Ames' works around twenty, but Gillespie's fellow Scot, David Calderwood, is cited only about a dozen times, which is interesting given he may have been one of Gillespie's sources in helping to draft his *Dispute*.³

1. Walker, *Theology and Theologians of Scotland*, 14.

2. As already noted in the editor's preface, for this new edition an attempt has been made to trace and confirm all Gillespie's many allusions and references. See the bibliography and the author index for more information on these authors and works.

3. In a letter to his cousin William Spang, Robert Baillie wrote, "This same youth is now given out also, by these that should know, for the author of the English Popish Ceremonies:

The *Summa Theologica* of Aquinas is cited three dozen times, and other scholaſtics occasionally, such as Báñez, Cajetan, Fonseca, Lombard, and Suárez. Of poſt-Reformation Roman Catholic commentators, Gillespie made use of Jansen (five times), à Lapide (four), Loren (once), Maldonatus (nine), Salmeron (once), Sánchez (nine), Stella (five), and Toledo (once). Earlier commentators cited include Gerson, Nicholas de Lyra, Oecumenius, and Pagnini. From the high middle ages, the learned ritualiſt Guillaume Durand is cited four times.

From classical and occasionally English literature, there are citations or allusions to Accius (or Macrobius), Sedulius and Silius Italicus (pp. 22, 282, 12), as well as citations from Cicero's *De Officiis* (p. 362) and *De Natura Deorum* (365), Seneca's *De Beneficiis* (368, 374) and *Thyestes* (128), with the occasional reference to Pliny, Plutarch, Juſtin, and poſſibly Quintilian (101–102, 20, 159, 169). There are several allusions or citations each from Horace (47, 223, 392), Juvenal (44, 188, 280), Ovid (12, 99, 233), Terence (148), and Virgil (21, 93, 282). Of other literature, there is a full ſtanza cited at one point from the epigrams of John Owen (262),¹ and a poſſible allusion to Spenser's *Fairie Queen* (352). From Scottish literature there is an apparent citation from the firſt line of George Buchanan's elegy on the dull academic life (257).

Of the fathers and councils, Auſtine is cited over a dozen times in various works or letters, Jerome fifteen times, Tertullian eleven times, Ambrose, Chryſoſtom and Cyprian, each less than ten times, various church councils and canon law over forty times, and ſingularly or occasionally, Baſil, Clement, Epiphanius' *Panarium*, Hilary, Iſidore, Gregory I, Laſtantius, Leo I, Gregory Nazianzen, Origen, Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Theophylaſt.

Of various other hiſtorians and hiſtories, Gillespie made use of Baronius and Caſaubon, Bini, Bodin, Buchanan, Conti, Knox, Lonicer, Nicephorus, Perren, Platina, Roſinus, Row, Simson, Sleidan, Speed and Voſſius; of linguists and translators of Scripture, Beza, Buxtorf, Calepino, Bellarmine's *Linguae Hebraicae*, Hadrian Junius, Marlorat, Montano, Scapula, Tremellius and Thomas Thomasius.

Of thoſe often used to either illuſtrate the ſimilarity of the Anglo-catholic view to the Roman Catholic, or at times to ſhow the error of the former

whereof we all doe marvell; for though he had gotten the papers, and help of the chief of that ſide, yet the very composition would ſeem to be farre above ſuch ane age: bot if that book be truly of his making, I admire the man, though I miſlike much of the matter; yea, I think, he may prove amongst the beſt witts of this Iſle" (*The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, edited by David Laing, 3 vols. [Edinburgh: Printed for Robert Ogle, 1841–1842] 1.90). Samuel Rutherford, who Baillie noted earlier in a letter to his couſin had been deprived of his charge for preaching againſt the articles of Perth, may be as likely intended, except that Baillie who freely names him earlier, does not give name to this individual here, though writing to his couſin on both occasions (ſee vol. 1, p. 8). If "chief" is to be taken in the plural, which would explain the lack of a name, Baillie could well have meant both men as well as other or different opponents of the ceremonies at that time.

1. John Owen (1564–1622), Welsh epigrammatist.

from the latter (Gillespie often used an opponent to refute an opponent), Bellarmine is cited nearly thirty times, and the Roman Catholic, turned Stuart defending Protestant, turned Roman Catholic again, Marco Antonio de Dominis (Archbishop of Spalato), is cited over thirty times.

In addition to other works too numerous to note, other Reformed and Lutheran authors often cited include twenty references to works by Vermigli, seventeen citations from Parker's *Scholaſtical Diſcourſe againſt ſymbolizing with Antichriſt in ceremonies*, and eighteen references to works by Rudolph Hoſpinian, whose ſcholarſhip in works ſuch as his *Feſta Chriſtianorum* was highly regarded at the time.¹ The *Synopſis Purioris Theologiæ* of the profeſſors at Leyden is cited ſeventeen times, various works by Perkins fourteen, works by Beza eighteen, and the Scottish-born theologian John Cameron is cited twenty times from his *Prælectiones* and four times from his *Popiſh Prejudices*. Daneau's *De Politice Chriſtianæ* is cited ſeven times; commentaries of Bullinger, ſix, and Fenner's *Sacra Theologiæ*, four; works of Alſted, nine; Martin Bucer, four; and Gerson Bucer, two. Of Lutheran theologians, Martin Chemnitz is cited fifteen times from his work on the Council of Trent; Johann Gerhard, alſo fifteen; works of Meiſner, three; and Friedrich Balduin's *de caſibus conſcientiæ* is cited nineteen times. Johann Forſter's *Nervosæ* is cited once (one of the more obſcure works traced); and the Magdeburg Centuries are cited eighteen times. Luther is cited twice, from his commentary on 1 Peter, and from his *de Bonis Operibus*. Melancthon is cited once, from the third edition of his *Scholia* on Colossians.

Of the defenders of the English popiſh ceremonies againſt which Gillespie's *Diſpute* was directed per the lengthy title, the tally runs to Andrewes with nearly forty citations, Burges with thirty-two, Field with ſixteen, Forbes' *Irenicum* with thirty-seven, Hooker with twenty-nine, Morton with nine, Saravia with fifteen, Sprint alſo with fifteen, Tilen with ſeventeen, Paybody with twenty-three, and John Davenant, who muſt fall within the title's etcetera, is cited ſeventeen times. The moſt cited of the defenders of the English popiſh ceremonies, and the moſt cited ſingle work of any in the *Diſpute*, is *Proceedings at Perth Aſſembly*, to which reference is made over ninety times, whether to David Lindsay's preface, the narration of the proceedings, or John Spottiswood's ſermon. The great number of references to this work illuſtrates the point noted by Roy Middleton in the hiſtorical introduction, that Gillespie's *Diſpute* is eſſentially a polemic againſt the five articles paſſed by the Aſſembly at Perth in 1618, which had been opposed by the then five-year-old George's father, John Gillespie, and grandfather, Patrick Simſon.²

1. John Dowden, *The Church Year and Kalendar* (Cambridge University Preſs, 1910) xiv.

2. Gillespie cites his grandfather's magnum opus once in his *Diſpute*. Patrick Simſon, *The Hiſtory of the Church of Scotland* (1634).

OVERVIEW OF CONTENTS

TO ALL THE REFORMED CHURCHES

No doubt because of the nature of the *Dispute*, published anonymously overseas and smuggled into Scotland, there is no customary “dedication” to a patron or other notable, and the equally customary epistle to the reader, Gillespie casts as an open letter to “All the Reformed Churches,” using it as an apology for and a means to stir up his compatriots to “suffer for the truth of Christ and for the purity of His worship” (8). As a whole, the opening epistle is probably the best written section of the work, the genre of an opening preface allowing Gillespie to make the greater use of the rhetorical flourishes noted previously. He forecasts some of the argumentation of the work, and at one point gives one of the clearest and more succinct statements regarding the church’s power and the nature of circumstances of worship at the heart of the debate over the English popish ceremonies (which Gillespie pursues later in part three, pp. 261ff).

Besides all this, there is nothing which any way pertains to the worship of God left to the determination of human laws, beside the mere circumstances, which neither have any holiness in them, forasmuch as they have no other use and praise in sacred than they have in civil things, nor yet were particularly determinable in Scripture, because they are infinite; but sacred, significant ceremonies, such as cross, kneeling, surplice, holy days, bishopping, etc., which have no use and praise except in religion only, and which, also, were most easily determinable (yet not determined) within those bounds which the wisdom of God did set to His written Word, are such things as God never left to the determination of any human law (16).

The opening lines of Gillespie’s epistle are striking and bear recalling by each generation of Christ’s church, each of which will be tested by trials. “As Satan’s malice and man’s wickedness cease not to molest the thrice happy estate of the Church of Christ, so has the eternal council of the only wise God predetermined the coming of offenses, persecutions, heresies, schisms and divisions, that professors may be proved before they be as approved and made manifest (1 Cor. 11:19). And hence *it must needs be that offenses come* (Matt. 18:7); neither has the church ever enjoyed both purity and peace any long time together.” Speaking generally still, but also clearly with his own church in mind, he continues, “But whiles the Church of God, thus disquieted, as well with dangerous alterations, as with doleful altercations, is presented in the theater of this world, and cries out to beholders, *Have ye no regard, all ye that pass by* (Lam. 1:12)? A pity it is to see

the crooked and sinistrous courses of the greatest part, every man moving his period within the enormous confines of his own exorbitant desires. . . . This crooked cast, that ‘polemical *dramatis personae*’ noted previously, indifferent and uncaring of the church’s estate are: the “atheistical nullifidian,” “sensual Epicurean and riotous ruffian,” “cynical critic,” “scenical jester,” “avaricious worlding,” “aspiring Diotrephes,” “lofty [court] favorite,” “subdolous Machiavillian,” “turn-coat temporizer,” “gnathonic parasite,” “mercenary pensioner,” “silly idiot,” “lapped Nicodemite,” and “pragmatical adiaphorist.” Gillespie bemoans how few are found who would help the church in her current condition, but encourages himself and his readers that God has reserved a remnant, whom he wished to rightly inform of the state of the reformed churches.

There is a rehearsal of history to that point. The reformation in England had been defective (5); but Scotland experienced a more glorious and perfect reformation in doctrine, worship, discipline, government, and policy, which enjoyed civil sanction and was made a matter of sworn obligation. It also received the applause of foreign divines; but more importantly, it was in all points agreeable to the Word of God. But Scotland suffered a grievous backsliding, and became corrupted with “the symbolizing badges of conformity with Rome.” She was now licking up what had not been “purged away from England and Ireland” (5–6).

This corruption is especially seen in the imposition of ceremonies which included kneeling to receive the Lord’s supper, the sign of the cross in baptism, bishopping (confirmation of children), and holy days, among others. These had been “pressed under the name of things indifferent,” but Gillespie contended that in reality, these obscured the substance of true religion. Far from being indifferent, the imposed English popish ceremonies had led to the persecution of the godly, the expulsion of faithful ministers, and the offence of brethren. They opened the door for unlearned, ungodly ministers to be brought into the church, and there had been a growth of Popery, Arminianism, and movement towards reconciliation with Rome (6–7).

Besides these inconveniences of the imposed ceremonies, Gillespie’s intention in the ensuing *Dispute* was to demonstrate that they were at root unlawful. The remaining and largest part of the epistle is taken up with twelve admonitions to stir up the reader to defend the purity of Christ’s worship.

Gillespie admonished the reader, 1. To follow blindly neither side of the dispute, but diligently to try things which are different by the touchstone of Scripture.

2. To heed the Word of God as the rule, which includes submitting to the cross of Christ. Since the true knowledge of God is contrary to the natural man, this requires self-denial and a view steadily fixed on God’s glory and the preserving of a good conscience.

3. Not to be led astray by error, which requires growth both in grace and

knowledge (8–9). Error and licentiousness increase daily, requiring a greater measure of the lively work of sanctifying grace to combat it (9).

4. To beware of those who use the pretence of religion to further their errors, and who steal away true devotion by resting in external things; who advance religion by violence (9–10); and who fearfully violate God’s own commandments in order to enforce their own (10).

5. To consider that a true church does not mix human inventions with God’s ordinances: “a true church, as it retains pure doctrine, so also it keeps simplicity of ceremonies” (10–11). The illicit ceremonies greatly tend to detract from matters which require much more attention (11), as the ensuing *Dispute* demonstrates.

6. Not to let the pretence of peace and unity cool fervor. In actual fact “peace is violated by the oppugners of the truth” (12). Bands of truth and unity of faith should bind together. True peace is conjoined with obedience to God’s will and separated from “all depravation of the heavenly doctrine and divine worship” (12–13).

7. Not to be deceived with appeals to the practices of the ancient church or of the reformed churches of Gillespie’s day; it cannot be proved the illicit ceremonies were ancient, and some were only tolerated in reformed churches until they could be seasonably removed (13–14). Having been removed from the Church of Scotland it would be detestable to bring them back (14), and at root, even if historical basis could be found for the ceremonies, it still would not justify them because the Word of God is the rule.

8. Not to rest in bare human authority. “We are to obey the church but commanding and teaching right things.” As for civil authority, faith, obedience, and a good conscience are not under that power (15). The magistrate only has power for good and the church only has power for edification (15–16). Only circumstances of worship are left to the determination of human laws (16). Refusing to obey such illicit laws is not inconsistent with subjection to those in authority.

9. Not to think that good intentions are sufficient. A good conscience is one that is “rightly informed out of the Word of God” (16–17). The fact that a person intended to do good is no excuse for an evil action (17).

10. To understand that yielding to the ceremonies will open the door for greater corruptions to follow. It is a deceitful and dangerous temptation to yield to the beginning of evil, and God is just to leave men to what follows.

11. To demonstrate disapproval of the ceremonies in both profession and action.

12. Not to ignore the means for the church’s recovery, which consist mostly in prayers and crying; but also in secondary means useful to convince adversaries and to exonerate conscience (17–18).

Gillespie concludes his epistle by warning the reader against disregarding the admonitions (18). The Church of Scotland, blessed with the gospel,

and with the reformation and preservation of purity, had broken sacred bonds and God had borne long with her. Ordinarily this would bring down judgment, and hence there was urgent need to avert judgment by turning again. He ends by noting that true reformation carries with it the promise of sweet consolation here and an everlasting crown of glory hereafter (19).

PROLOGUE

The prologue and order both stood as separate introductory pieces in the 1637 edition, and some of the language of the former may indicate it could have begun life as the original stand alone introduction before Gillespie penned the masterful epistle. Perhaps he initially thought another would write the epistle and thus the prefatory type language in the prologue? Whatever the case, the prologue does have some language to evoke compassion for the state of the Scottish Church. Gillespie then lists three endeavors to employ to “succor their dear, though distressed mother,” the Church of Scotland. Besides prayer, reformation is to be attained by refusing to let disagreements detract from the doctrine of godliness and practice of piety heretofore attained (19–20); making diligent search into truth (20); and testifying to the truth which has been attained and contending for it earnestly (20–21). Gillespie then notes that these considerations have led him to “take some pains in the study of the controversies which are agitated in this church about the ceremonies, and (after due examination and discussion of the writings of such as have played the proctors for them) to compile this ensuing dispute against them, both for exonerating [*exonerating*] myself, and for provoking of others to contend yet more for the truth, and for Zion’s sake not to hold their peace, nor be at rest, until the amiable light of long-wished-for peace break forth out of all these confusions...”

ORDER

As already stated, the order is one of the three original introductory pieces to the *Dispute*, and the shortest. The purpose is to explain Gillespie’s order of proceeding which he obviously realized presented some initial puzzlement. As a disputant against the English popish ceremonies, he felt obliged to follow the order established by their proponents; and therefore he collects their arguments and answers them under four main divisions: their necessity, their expedience, their lawfulness, and their indifference. He is not fearful of “the vain flourish of their great words,” and aimed to combat them where they thought themselves strongest (21–22). Gillespie explains that “lawfulness” refers to that which may be done, “indifference” to that which may be done or left undone, “expedience” to that which is done profitably, and “necessity” to that which may not be left undone (22). As “necessity” was the weightiest of the pretences urged in behalf of the ceremonies, the *Dispute* commenced with those arguments.

I. AGAINST THE NECESSITY OF THE CEREMONIES

Part one of the *Dispute* handles the arguments advocating the necessary observance of the English popish ceremonies urged by the formalists upon the Church of Scotland. There are nine chapters, a structure continued in the three subsequent parts. In part one, after proving that his opponents did indeed urge the ceremonies as necessary to be observed in chapter one, and in chapter two proving that Acts 15 cannot support such an imposition, the next four chapters are spent proving in four ways how the urging of the ceremonies violates Christian liberty. Gillespie directs his attention in the last three chapters specifically to the imposing of unscriptural holy days upon the church, first proving that this violated Christian liberty from the Old Testament (chapter 7), and then from the New (chapter 8), before spending the final chapter showing the weakness of arguments for such days.

One of the more notable exchanges in part one occurs in chapter nine, where Gillespie handles the allegations from Bishop Lindsay that Calvin, Perkins, and Zanchius allowed for the observance of holy days of man's devising. Our disputant explains Perkins' view and puts the view of Zanchi in context. It is true that on this question (as Gillespie makes clear), Zanchi straddled the fence, so to speak. The Italian Reformer allowed for additional days to be set aside by the church's authority, as long as there was no superstition; however, he conceded that it was more agreeable to apostolic writings and first institution, that only one day in the week be sanctified, and that "they have not acted incorrectly, who have abolished all days except 'the Lord's Day'" (66, n1). This of course was the stance taken by the Church of Scotland at the First Reformation, which the supporters of the popish ceremonies had overturned by force and civil authority.

Regarding Calvin, some lesser known passages from some of the Reformer's letters were miscited and Gillespie gives the fuller text and sense (64–68), and concludes, "If holy days, in Calvin's judgment, be fooleries; if he gave advice not to approve them; if he thought them occasions of superstition; if he held it superstition to distinguish one day from another, or to esteem one above another; if he calls them Judaical, though kept to the honor of God, judge then what allowance they had from him" (68). This section regarding the Reformer's view of holy days is of interest still, because the same misunderstanding of Calvin crops up in modern discussions of the observance of days of the so called 'Christian calendar.'

Much of the case made against this particular of the English popish ceremonies is directed toward the urging of necessary observance of such days by church and state authority, and while that is not so much the case today, and some of the other arguments against holy days as unlawful may be of more immediate pertinence, these other arguments may still be applicable to the more subtle urgings of necessity Christians tend to face in this age.

This opposition to holy days will strike many readers as strange. This

TO ALL THE REFORMED CHURCHES

TO ALL AND EVERY ONE IN THE REFORMED CHURCHES OF SCOTLAND,
ENGLAND, AND IRELAND, WHO LOVE THE LORD JESUS, AND MEAN TO ADHERE
UNTO THE REFORMATION OF RELIGION: GRACE, MERCY, AND PEACE, FROM
GOD OUR FATHER, AND FROM THE LORD JESUS CHRIST

AS SATAN'S MALICE and man's wickedness cease not to molest the thrice happy estate of the Church of Christ, so has the eternal council of the only wise God predetermined the coming of offenses, persecutions, heresies, schisms and divisions, that professors may be proved before they be as approved and made manifest (1 Cor. 11:19). And hence *it must needs be that offenses come* (Matt. 18:7); neither has the church ever enjoyed both purity and peace any long time together. But whiles the Church of God, thus disquieted, as well with dangerous alterations, as with doleful altercations, is presented in the theater of this world, and cries out to beholders, *Have ye no regard, all ye that pass by* (Lam. 1:12)? A pity it is to see the crooked and sinister [*siniſter*]¹ courses of the greatest part, every man moving his period [*goal*] within the enormous confines of his own exorbitant desires:

— The atheistical nullifidian,² nothing regards the assoiling [*absolving*] of ecclesiastical controversies; he is of Gallio's humor (Acts 18:17), and cares for none of those things.

— The sensual Epicurean and riotous ruffian (go church matters as they will) eats and drinks, and takes his pleasure.

— The cynical critic spews out bitter aspersions, gibes and justles³ at everything that can be said or done in the cause of religion.

— The scenical jester plays fast and loose, and can utter anything in sport, but nothing in earnest.

— The avaricious worlding has no tune but *Give, give*, and no anthem pleases him but *Have, have*.

1. [OED, 3. Underhand; dishonest; corrupt; this sentence is cited in the examples.]

2. [One of no faith; a skeptic in matters of religion.]

3. [Gib (jib): halt, balk, or resist, as an animal. Justle (jostle): contend, push, shove.]

— The aspiring Diotrephes puffs down every course which cannot puff up [3 John 9, 10].

— The lofty favorite takes the pattern of his religion from the court ichnography,¹ and, if the court swims, he cares not though the church sink.

— The subdulous [*cunning*] Machiavellian accounts the show of religion profitable, but the substance of it troublesome; he studies not the oracles of God, but the principles of Satanical guile, which he learns so well, that he may go to the Devil to be bishopped.

— The turn-coat temporizer wags with every wind, and (like Diogenes turning about the mouth of his voluble [*rotating*] hogshhead, after the course of the sun) wheresoever the bright beams of coruscant [*flashing*] authority do shine and cherish, thither he follows and flits.

— The gnathonic [*fawning*] parasite swears to all that his benefactor holds.

— The mercenary pensioner will bow before he breaks; he who only studies to have the praise of some witty invention cannot strike upon another anvil.

— The silly idiot (with Absalom's two hundred, 2 Sam. 15:11) goes in the simplicity of his heart after his perverse leaders.

— The lapped [*disguised*] Nicodemite holds it enough to yield some secret assent to the truth [John 3], though neither his profession nor his practice testify so much; he whose mind is possessed with prejudicate opinions against the truth, when convincing light is held forth to him, looks asquint,² and therefore goes awry.

— The pragmatial adiaphorist [*latitudinarian, indifferentist*], with his span-broad faith and ell-broad³ conscience, does no small harm; the poor pandect [*legal code*] of his plagiarist [*plagiarized*] profession in matters of faith reckons little for all, and in matters of practice all for little.

Shortly, if an expurgatory *index* were compiled of those, and all other sorts of men who, either through their careless and neutral onlooking, make no help to the troubled and disquieted Church of Christ, or through their nocent [*harmful*] accession and overthwart intermeddling, work out her greater harm, alas! how few feeling members were there to be found behind who truly lay to heart her estate and condition?

Nevertheless, in the worst times, either of raging persecution or prevailing defection, as God Almighty has ever hitherto, so both now, and to

1. [Plan or map (a ground-plan, like a modern blueprint).]

2. [Voluntary look aside.]

3. [Span: The distance between the tip of the thumb and the little finger (about nine inches). Ell: Arm's length (from the elbow to the tip of the middle finger).]

the end, He will reserve to Himself a remnant according to the election of grace, who cleave to His blessed truth and to the purity of His holy worship, and are grieved for the affliction of Joseph, as being themselves also in the body, in confidence whereof I take boldness to stir you up at this time, by putting you in remembrance.

If you would be rightly informed of the present estate of the reformed churches, you must not acquiesce in the pargetting [*whitewashed*] verdict of those who are wealthy and well at ease, and mounted aloft upon the uncogged [*not blocked*] wheels of prosperous fortune (as they call it). Those whom the love of the world has not enhanced to the serving of the time can give you the soundest judgment. It is noted of Dionysius Hallicarnasensis (who was never advanced to magistracy in the Roman republic) that he has written far more truly of the Romans than Fabius, Salustius, or Cato, who flourished among them with riches and honors.¹

After that it pleased God, by the light of His glorious gospel, to dispel the more than Cimmerian² darkness of antichristianism, and by the antidote of reformation, to avoid the poison of Popery; forasmuch as in England and Ireland, every noisome weed which God's hand had never planted was not pulled up, therefore we now see the faces of those churches overgrown with the repullulating [*budding*] twigs and sprigs of popish superstition. Mr. Sprint acknowledges the Reformation of England to have been defective, and says, *It is easy to imagine of what difficulty it was to reform all things at the first, where the most part of the privy council, of the nobility, bishops, judges, gentry, and people, were open or close papists, where few or none of any countenance stood for religion at the first, but the Protector and Cranmer.*³ The Church of Scotland was blessed with a more glorious and perfect reformation than any of our neighbor churches. The doctrine, discipline, regiment [*government*], and policy established here by ecclesiastical and civil laws, and sworn and subscribed unto by the king's majesty and several presbyteries and parish churches of the land, as it had the applause of foreign divines, so was it in all points agreeable unto the Word; neither could the most rigid Aristarchus [*severe critic*] of these times challenge any irregularity of the same. But now, alas! even this church, which was once so great a praise in the earth, is deeply corrupted, and has *turned aside quickly out of the way* (Exod. 32:8). So that this is the Lord's controversy against Scotland: *I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed: How then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me* (Jer. 2:21)?

It is not this day feared, but felt, that the rotten dregs of Popery, which were never purged away from England and Ireland, and having once been spewed out with detestation, are licked up again in Scotland, prove to be

1. Jean Bodin, *Methodus ad facilem Historiarum Cognitionem*, [(1610)] cap. 4, p. 47.

2. [Cimmerian: a mythical people (in Homer) who inhabit a land of perpetual darkness.]

3. John Sprint, *Reply to the Answer*, p. 269 [in *Cassander Anglicanus* (1618)].

valiant champions of that faction, knowing that *Trophaeum ferre me a forti viro, pulchrum est: Sin autem et vincar, vinci à tali nullum est probrum*.¹ But what? Shall I speak doubtfully of the victory, or fear the foil? Nay, I consider that there is none of them so strong as he was who said, “We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth” (2 Cor. 13:8). I will therefore boldly adventure to combat with them even where they seem to be strongest, and to discuss their best arguments, allegations, answers, assertions, and distinctions. And my dispute shall consist of four parts, according to those four pretenses which are given out for the ceremonies, which, being so different one from another, must be severally examined. The lawfulness of a thing is in that it may be done; the indifferency of it in that it may either be done or left undone; the expediency of it in that it is done profitably; and the necessity of it in that it may not be left undone. I will begin with the last respect first, as that which is the weightiest.

1. [“For me to carry off a trophy from a strong man is a beautiful thing; but if I am conquered instead, it is no disgrace to be conquered by such a one.” The line is from the surviving fragment of the Roman tragedy *Armorum Judicium* attributed to Accius (or Attius), adduced also in *The Saturnalia* by Macrobius (book 6, chapter 1).]

THE FIRST PART

AGAINST THE NECESSITY OF THE CEREMONIES

CHAPTER ONE

THAT OUR OPPOSITES DO URGE THE CEREMONIES AS THINGS NECESSARY

§1. This I prove, 1. from their practice; 2. from their pleading. In their practice, who sees not that they would tie the people of God to a necessity of submitting their necks to this heavy yoke of human ceremonies? which are with more vehemency, forwardness, and strictness urged, than the weighty matters of the law of God, and the refusing whereof is far more inhibited, menaced, espied, delated [*accused*], aggravated, censured, and punished, than idolatry, Popery, blasphemy, swearing, profanation of the Sabbath, murder, adultery, etc. Both preachers and people have been, and are, fined, confined, imprisoned, banished, censured, and punished so severely, that he may well say of them that which our divines say of the papists,¹ *These contrivances of theirs they place before the Decalogue, and punish those who violate them more severely than those who transgress the divine precepts.* Wherefore, seeing they make not only as much, but more ado about the controverted ceremonies than about the most necessary things in religion, their practice herein makes it too, too apparent what necessity they annex to them.

§2. And if we will hearken to their pleading it tells no less; for howbeit they plead for their ceremonies as things indifferent in their own nature, yet when the ceremonies are considered as the ordinances of the church, they plead for them as things necessary. M. G. Powel, in the *Consideration of the Arguments Directed to the High Court of Parliament in Behalf of the Ministers Suspended and Deprived*, has these words, yea, these particulars: “Subscription, ceremonies, etc., being imposed by the church, and commanded by the magistrate, are necessary to be observed under the pain of sin.”²

The Bishop of Edinburgh resolves us concerning the necessity of giving obedience to the laws of the church, enacted about the ceremonies, thus:

1. P. Martyr in 1 Reg. 8 [1 Kings 8]. *de Templ. dedic. Hæc [deinde] sua inventa Decalago anteponunt, et gravius eos multarent qui ea violarent, quàm qui divina præcepta transgredierentur.* [Cf. *Melachim; id est, Regum libri duo ...* (1599 ed.) 65v.]

2. [Gabriel Powel, *A Consideration of the Deprived and Silenced Ministers' Arguments* (London, 1606),] answer 3 to argument 16.

permit many of their people either to kneel or to sit at the communion? Have not many of themselves taken the communion sitting in some places? Have not our conformists in Scotland hitherto commonly omitted bishoping of children, and the ministrations of the sacraments in private places? As for ourselves, we make our meaning plain when we object the scandal of conformity; for many ignorant and superstitious persons are by the ceremonies confirmed (*expertus loquor*)¹ in their error and superstition; so that now they even settle themselves upon the old dregs of popish superstition and formality, from which they were not well purged. Others are made to practice the ceremonies with a doubting and disallowing conscience, and to say with Naaman, *In this the Lord be merciful unto us if we err*: with my own ears have I heard some say so. And even those who have not practiced the ceremonies, for that they cannot see the lawfulness of them, yet are animated by the example of practicing conformists to do these things which, in their consciences, they condemn as unlawful (which were to sin damnably); and if they do them not, then is there no small doubting and disquietness, trouble and trepidation, harbored in their consciences. And thus, one way or other, some weakening or deterioration comes to us by the means of the ceremonies; and if any of our opposites dare think that none of us can be so weak as to stumble or take any harm in this kind, because of the ceremonies, we take God Himself to witness, who shall make manifest the counsels of the heart, that we speak the truth, and lie not.

Finally, let that be considered which divines observe to be the perpetual condition of the church,² namely, that as in any other family, there are found some great, some small, some strong, some weak, some wholesome, some sickly; so still is there found such an inequality in the house of God, which is the church — and that because some are sooner, some are later called, some endued with more gifts of God, and some with fewer.

1. [*Expertus loquor* (Seneca, *Thyestes*, Act 3, line 453). “I speak as a man of experience.” Cf. *Seneca in Nine Volumes*. IX. *Tragedies II*. Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1917) 128.]

2. Paræus, Com. in Rom. 15:1 [*In Divinam ad Romanos* (Frankfurt, 1608) col. 1585]. Sermon on John 16:7 [Andrewes, *Ninety-Six Sermons* (Oxford: Parker, 1841) 3.168].

THE THIRD PART

AGAINST THE LAWFULNESS OF THE CEREMONIES

CHAPTER ONE

THAT THE CEREMONIES ARE UNLAWFUL, BECAUSE SUPERSTITIOUS, WHICH
IS PARTICULARLY INSTANCED IN HOLY DAYS AND MINISTERING THE
SACRAMENTS IN PRIVATE PLACES

§1. The strongest tower of refuge to which our opposites make their main recourse, is the pretended lawfulness of the ceremonies, which now we are to batter down and demolish, and so make it appear how weak they are even where they think themselves strongest.

My first argument against the lawfulness of the ceremonies I draw from the superstition of them. I cannot marvel enough how Dr. Morton and Dr. Burges could think to rub the superstition upon Nonconformists, whom they set forth as fancying their abstinence from the ceremonies to be a singular piece of service done to God, placing religion in the not using of them, and teaching men to abstain from them for conscience' sake. Dr. Ames has given a sufficient answer, namely, that abstaining from sin is one act of common obedience, belonging as well to things forbidden in the second table, as to those forbidden in the first; and that we do not abstain from those ceremonies but as from other unlawful corruptions, even out of the compass of worship.¹ We abstain from the ceremonies even as from lying, cursing, stealing, etc. Shall we be held superstitious for abstaining from things unlawful? The superstition therefore is not on our side, but on theirs.

§2. For 1. Superstition is the opposite vice to religion, in the excess, as our divines describe it; for it exhibits more in the worship of God than He requires in His worship. *Furthermore, Zanchius says upon that same worship, that there is sin in excess; now if you add something to that which Christ established, or if you follow something added by others; so that if you add other sacraments to those established by Christ; or if to His sacrifices, other sacrifices; or if you add rites to the ceremonies of some sacrament, all those are rightly called by the name "Superstition."*² We see he accounts superstition to be in the addition

1. *Fresh Suite Against the Ceremonies*, cap. 9, pp. 96, 100 [Amsterdam: 1633].

2. Lib. 1, *De Vitiis Externo Vero Cultui Oppos.*, col. 501, 502. *Porro, saith Zanchius, in cultum ipsum excessu ut, peccatur; si quid illi quem Christus instituit, jam addas, aut ab aliis additum*

of ceremonies not instituted by Christ, as well as in the addition of more substantial matters. *Superstitio* (as some derive the word) is that which is done *supra statutum* [*beyond what is established*]; and thus are the controverted ceremonies superstitious, as being used in God's worship upon no other ground than the appointment of men.

§3. 2. Superstition is that which exhibits divine worship, *either to whom it does not owe it, or not in the way in which it owes it*, say the schoolmen.¹ Now our ceremonies, though they exhibit worship to God, yet this is done inordinately, and they make the worship to be otherwise performed than it should be; for example, though God be worshipped by the administration of the sacraments in private places, yet not so as He should be worshipped. The Professors of Leyden condemn private baptism as inordinate, because *baptism is a supplement to public ministry, not to private exhortation*.² It is marked in the fourth century, both out of councils and fathers, that it was not then permitted to communicate in private places; but this custom was thought inordinate and unbecoming.³

If it is said, that the communion was given to the sick privately in the ancient church, I answer: Sometimes this was permitted, but for such special reasons as do not concern us; for, as we may see plainly by the fourteenth canon of the first Council of Nicea (as those canons are collected by Rufinus),⁴ the sixty-ninth canon of the Council of Eleberis, and the sixth canon of the Council of Ancyra,⁵ the communion was only permitted to be given in private houses to the *pœnitentes* [*penitents*], who were *abstenti* [*kept away*] and debarred from the sacrament, some for three years, some for five, some for seven, some for ten, some for thirteen, some longer; and who should haply [*perchance*] be overtaken with some dangerous and deadly sickness before the set time of abstention was expired. As for the judgment of our own divines, *The Calvinians*, Balduin says,⁶ *reject that custom by which the eucharist is offered*

sequaris; ut si sacramentis à Christo institutis, alia addas sacramenta; si sacrificiis, alia sacrificia; si ceremoniis cujusvis sacramenti, alios addas ritus, qui merito omnes superstitionis nomine appellantur. [Cf. *Opera Theologorum*, 8 vols. in 3 (third ed. 1617–19), bk 4. 501–502. The 1613/1617 editions may vary in spelling and punctuation, but appear to have identical pagination.]

1. Aquin., 2^a 2^e quest. 92, art. 1. *vel cui non debet, vel eo non modo quo debet.* [1637 ed.—“vel non eo?”]

2. *Syn. Pur. Theol.*, disp. 44, thes. 53. *baptismus publici ministerii, non privatæ exhortationis est appendix.* [*Synopsis Purioris Theologiæ*, ed. Bavinck (1881) 502.]

3. Magdeb., cent. 4, cap. 6, col. 427. [*Quarta Centuria, Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ* (Basil: Oporinum, 1560) col. 427.]

4. [Cf. Rufinus, “*Historia Ecclesiastica*,” PL 21.474. Cf also *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia: Books 10 and 11*, trans. Philip R. Amidon (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1997) 15.]

5. [Cf. For Nicæa, canon 14, Hefele, 1.420–421; Elvira, canon 69, 1.167; Ancyra, canon 6, 1.207–208.]

6. *De Cas. Consc.*, lib. 2, cap. 12, cas. 13. *Calviniani*, says Balduin, *morem illum quo eucharastia ad ægrotos tanquam viaticum defertur improbant, eamque non nisi in cætibus publicis usurpandam censent.* [Cf. *Traclatus lucentus*, 1654 ed., p. 340.]

to the sick as a farewell provision, and they hold the opinion that it is taken unlawfully if it is not taken in a public meeting. For this he alleges Beza, Aretius, and Musculus. It was a better ordinance than that of Perth, which said, *it is not suitable that offerings be made in homes, whether by bishops or elders.*¹ But to return.

§4. 3. The ceremonies are proved to be superstitious, by this reason: if there were no more, they have no necessary nor profitable use in the church (as has been proved), which kind of things cannot be used without superstition. It was according to this rule that the Waldenses and Albigenses taught that the exorcisms, breathings, crossings, salt, spittle, unction, chrism, etc., used by the church of Rome in baptism, being neither necessary nor requisite in the administration of the same, did occasion error and superstition, rather than edification to salvation.²

4. They are yet more superstitious, for that they are not only used in God's worship unnecessarily and unprofitably, but likewise they hinder other necessary duties. They who, though they serve the true God, *yet with needless offices, and defraud him of duties necessary*, are superstitious in Hooker's judgment.³ I wish he had said as well to him as from him.⁴ What offices [are] more unnecessary than those Roman rituals? Yet what more necessary duties than to worship God in a spiritual and lively manner; to press the power of godliness upon the consciences of professors; to maintain and keep faithful and well qualified ministers in the church; to bear the bowels of mercy and meekness; not to offend the weak; not to confirm papists in Popery; to have all things in God's worship disposed according to the Word, and not according to the will of man; not to exercise lordship over the consciences of those whom Christ has made free; to abolish the monuments of by-past and badges of present idolatry? Yet are those and other necessary duties shut quite out of doors by our needless ceremonial service.

§5. 5. The ceremonies are not free of superstition, inasmuch as they give to God an external service, and grace-defacing worship, which He cares not for, and make fleshly observations to step into the room of God's most spiritual worship. Augustine alleges that which is said, "The kingdom of God is within you" (Luke 17[:21]), against superstitious persons who *devote their primary concern to externals.*⁵ The Christian worship ought to be *in spirit, without the carnal ceremonies and rites*, says one of our divines.⁶ Yea,

1. Concil. Laodic., can. 58. *non oportet in domibus oblationes ab episcopis sive presbyteris fieri.* [Cf. NPNF2 14.151. Mansi, vol. 2, col. 590.]

2. *Hist. of the Waldenses*, part 3, lib. 1, cap. 6. [Cf. *History of the Ancient Christians Inhabiting the Valleys of the Alps* (1847) 231.]

3. *Eccles. Polity*, lib. 5, sect. 3. [Cf. *Works* (1821) 2.13.]

4. [Probably akin to "I wish he had taken his own advice?"]

5. Apud Aquinas, 2^a 2^e quest. 93, art. 2. *exterioribus principalem curam impendunt.* [Cf. Augustine, *De Vera Religione*, PL 34.125, ¶4.]

6. John Rainold's *Confer. with J. Hart*, cap. 8, divis. 4, p. 489 [1609 ed.].

the kingdom of God cometh not *with splendor and worldly ostentation, so that a time or place can be noticed*, says a papiſt.¹ Carnal worship, therefore, and ceremonial observations, are (to say the least) superfluous in religion, and by consequence superstitious.

§6. Worship is placed in the ceremonies, therefore they are most superstitious. To make good what I say, holiness and necessity are placed in the ceremonies, *ergo*, worship. And (1) Holiness is placed in them. Hooker thinks festival days clothed with outward robes of holiness;² nay, he says plainly, *No doubt, as God's extraordinary presence has hallowed and sanctified certain places, so they are His extraordinary works that have truly and worthily advanced certain times, for which cause they ought to be, with all men that honor God, more holy than other days.*³ He calls also the cross a holy sign.⁴ Dr. Burges defends that the ceremonies are and may be called worship of God,⁵ not only *ratione modi*, as belonging to the reverend usage of God's prescribed worship, but also *ratione medii*, though not *medii per se*, of and by itself; yet *per aliud*, by virtue of somewhat else.⁶

Now, do not papiſts place worship in their cross and crucifix? Yet do they place no holiness in it *per se*, but only *per aliud*, in respect of Christ crucified thereby represented; and they tell us,⁷ that *insensible creatures are not owed honor or reverence, unless by reason of a rational nature*; and that they give no religious respect unto the tree whereon Christ was crucified, the nails, garments, spear, manger, etc., but only *upon such reason as contact with the limbs of Christ*.⁸ Says Dr. Burges any less of the ceremonies? Nay, he places every way as much holiness and worship in them in the forequoted place. And elsewhere he teaches, that after a sort the ceremonies are worship in themselves, even such a worship as was that of the free-will offerings under the law,⁹ and such a worship as was the building and use of altars here and

1. Stella, Com. in Luke 17:20. *cum apparatu aut pompa mundana, ita ut observari possit tempus vel locus*. [Didacus Stella (Diego de Estella), *In sanctum Jesu Christi evangelium secundum Lucam* (1599) page 194.]

2. *Ecl. Polity*, lib. 5, 70 [Cf. *Works* (1821) 2.282.].

3. *Ibid.*, sect. 69 [*ibid.*, 281].

4. *Ibid.*, sect. 65 [*ibid.*, 236].

5. *Of the Lawfulness of Kneeling*, cap. 3. [John Burges, *The Lawfulness of Kneeling in the Aet of Receiving the Lords Supper. Wherein (by the way) also, somewhat of the Crosse in Baptisme. First Written for the satisfaction of a Friend, and now published for the Common Benefit* (London: 1631) 3–4. This was published as a supplement to *An Answer Rejoyned to that much applauded pamphlet, A Reply to Dr. Morton's General Defense of Three Nocent Ceremonies*.]

6. [*Ratione modi*: 'by reason of the method;' *ratione medii*: 'by reason of the means;' *medii per se*: 'the means of and by itself;' *per aliud*: 'by virtue of somewhat else' or 'through something else'.]

7. Aquinas, 3^a q. 25, art. 4. *creaturæ [autem] insensibili non debetur honor vel reverentia, nisi ratione rationalis naturæ*. ["4. 25" for "q. 25"; *autem* lacking, all editions; 1637—*ratione naturæ rationalis*.]

8. *quantum ad rationem contactus membrorum Christi*.

9. *Ubi Supra*, cap. 15, p. 42. [Burges, *Lawfulness of Kneeling*, 42.]

there¹ (before God had chosen out the standing place for His altar), though to the same end for which the Lord's instituted altar served.

Thus we see that they offer the ceremonies as worship to God: yet put the case they did not, the school says, that a thing belongs to the worship of God, *either so that it might be offered, or so that it might be assumed.*² Whereupon it follows, that superstition is not only to be laid to their charge who offer to God for worship that which He has not commanded, but theirs also who assume in God's worship the help of anything as sacred or holy which [He] himself has not ordained.

(2) They place as great a necessity in the ceremonies as papiſts place in theirs, whereby it shall also appear how superſtitiously they place worship in them. For, *Whatever observance is recommended as though necessary is continually felt to pertain to the worship of God,* says Calvin.³ The Rhemiſts think, that meats of themselves, or of their own nature, do not defile, *but so far as by accident they make a man to sin; as the disobedience of God's commandment, or of our superiors, who forbid some meats for certain times and causes, is a sin.*⁴ And they add, *that neither flesh nor fish of itself defiles, but the breach of the church's precept defiles.* Aquinas defends that trin-immersion is not *out of the necessity of the baptism,* only he thinks it a sin to baptise otherwise, because this rite is instituted and used by the church.⁵

Do not formalists place the same necessity in the ceremonies, while, as they say, they urge them not as necessary in themselves, but only as necessary in respect of the determination of the church, and the ordinance of those who are set over us? Nay, papiſts place not so great necessity in many ordinances of their church as formalists place in the ceremonies. If the cause be doubtful, Aquinas sends a man to seek a dispensation from the superior. *But if there is evident cause, certainly a man can by his own authority pass over the observance of a rule.*⁶ What formalist dare yield us such liberty, as by ourselves, and without seeking a dispensation from superiors, to neglect

1. [Burges,] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

2. Aquin., 2^a 2^æ ques. 95, art. 2. "vel quo ad offerendum, vel quo ad assumendum." [This is not a quotation from the *Summa Theologica*, but a paraphrase or summary. "Now a thing pertains to the worship of God in two ways: in one way, it is something offered to God; as a sacrifice, an oblation, or something of the kind: in another way, it is something divine that is assumed, as stated above with regard to an oath (Q. LXXXIX., A. 4, ad 2)." *The "Summa theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (London: 1922) 9.193.]

3. *De Vera Eccl. Reform.*, p. 367. *quæcunque observatio quasi necessaria commendatur, continuo censetur ad cultum Dei pertinere.* [*Vera Christianæ Pacificationis et Ecclesiæ Reformandæ Ratio*, in CR 35 (CO 7), 661; "The True Method of Giving Peace to Christendom and Reforming the Church," *Traçts & Letters*, 3.328.]

4. Annot. on Matt. 15, sect 5. [Cartwright, *Confutation*, 69.]

5. Aquinas, 3^a quest. 66, art. 6. *de necessitate baptismi.*

6. Aquinas, 2^a 2^æ quest. 147, art. 4. *si causa sit evidens, per seipsum licite potest homo statuti observantiam præterire.*

the observation of their statutes, when we see evident cause for so doing? They think that we have no power at our own hand to judge that we have an evident cause of not obeying those who are set over us; yet this much is allowed by this papist, who also elsewhere acknowledges that there is nothing necessary in baptism but the form, the minister, and the washing of water, and that all the other ceremonies which the church of Rome uses in baptism are only for solemnity.¹

Bellarmino says,² that the neglecting and not observing the ceremonies of the church, with them is not a mortal sin, except it proceed *ex contemptu* [out of contempt]. And that he who entering into a church does not asperge [sprinkle] himself with holy water, sins not, if so be he do it *circa contemptum* [skirting contempt].³ Now, to be free of contempt will not satisfy our formalists, except we obey and do that very same thing which we are commanded to do.

Cornelius Jansenius, commenting upon these words, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," says, that the commandments of men there forbidden and condemned, are those which command nothing divine, but things merely human; and therefore he pleads for the constitutions of the church about feasts, choice of meats, festivities, etc., and for obedience to the same upon no other ground than this, because *any pious man easily sees the origin they have from the scriptures and how they agree with them, because they make for the chastisement and temperance of the flesh, or toward the unity and building up of the faithful*.⁴ I know it to be false which this papist affirms; yet in that he thus pleads for those constitutions of the church from Scripture and reason, forsaking the ground of human authority, he is a great deal more modest and less superstitious than those our opposites, who avouch the ceremonies as necessary, and will have us bound to the practice of them upon no other ground than the bare will and authority of superiors, who have enjoined them, as has been shown in the first part of this dispute. Yea, some of them place a certain and constant necessity in the ceremonies themselves, even beside and without the church's constitution (which is more than papists have said of their ceremonies).

Dr. Forbes calls the Articles of Perth, *pauca necessaria*, etc., a few things necessary for God's glory, and the promoting of piety in our church, for

1. Aquinas, 3^a quest. 66, art. 10.

2. *De Sac. Missæ*, lib. 6, cap. 13. [Cf. "Controversiarum de Eucharistia. Liber Sextus. Qui est Secundus de Sacrificio Missæ," *Opera Omnia* (Paris, 1870, 1873) 4.398–400.]

3. *De Pont. Rom.*, lib. 4, cap. 18. [Cf. "Controversiarum de Summo Pontifice. Liber Quartus. De Potestate Spirituali," *Opera Omnia* (Paris, 1870, 1873) 2.133–134.]

4. *Conc. Evan.*, cap. 60. *pious quisque facile videt quam habeant ex scripturis originem et quomodo eis consonant, eò quòd faciunt ad carnis castigationem et temperantiam, aut ad fidelium unionem et edificationem*. [Cf. Jansen, *Commentariorum in suam Concordiam ac totam Historiam Euangelicam* (Lugduni: Petri Landry, 1606) 468.]

order, peace, unity, and charity;¹ and particularly he teaches, that a minister may not lawfully omit to administer the sacraments in private places, and without the presence of the congregation, to such as through sickness cannot come to the public assemblies; which he calls, *eis necessaria ministrare* [*necessary to minister to them*]. To say the truth, the ministrations of the sacraments in private places imports a necessity in the matter itself, for which cause the divines of Geneva resolved that in *Ecclesiis publice institutis* [*in churches publicly established*], baptism might not be administered [*administered*] in private places, but only publicly in the congregation of the faithful, *partim ne sacramenta, etc., partly* (say they) *lest the Sacraments, being separate from the preaching of the Word, should be again transformed in certain magical ceremonies, as in Popery it was; partly that that gross superstition of the absolute necessity of external baptism may be rooted out of the minds of men.*²

Surely, the defenders of private baptism place too great necessity in that sacrament. Hooker plainly insinuates the absolute necessity of outward baptism, at least in wish or desire, which is the distinction of the schoolmen, and followed by the modern papists to cloak their superstition.³ But whatsoever show it has, it was rightly impugned in the Council of Trent by Marianus, who alleged against it that the angel said to Cornelius his prayers were acceptable to God, before ever he knew of the sacrament of baptism;⁴ so that, having no knowledge of it, he could not be said to have received it, no not in vow or wish; and that many holy martyrs were converted in the heat of persecution, by seeing the constancy of others, and presently taken and put to death, of whom one cannot say, but by divination, that they knew the sacraments, and made a vow.

§7. I will now apply this argument, taken from superstition, particularly to holy days. *We teach*, Beza says, *that it is superstition to decide that any one day is holier than another.*⁵ Now I will show that formalists observe holy days as mystical and holier than other days, howbeit Bishop Lindsay thinks good to dissemble and deny it. *Times* (he says) *are appointed by our church for morning and evening prayers in great towns; hours for preaching on Tuesday, Thursday, etc.; hours for weekly exercises of prophesying, which are holy in respect of the use whereunto they are appointed; and such are the five*

1. *Irenicum*, lib. 1, cap. 5, sect. 6 [p. 34]; cap. 7, sect. 7 [p. 44]. [*“Multo magis igitur, quando postulatur ab illis pauca hæc necessaria, & expedientia ad gloriam Dei ...”*, p. 34. Cf. *The First Book of the Irenicum*, trans. E. G. Selwyn, p. 106.]

2. Apud Zanch., *Epist.*, lib. 1, p. III. [Cf. Zanchi, *Opera*, vol. 8., *Epistolarum Libri Duo*, “*Quæstiones Octo Propositæ Theologis Ecclesiæ Genevensis: responsio, De Prima*,” III.]

3. *Ecl. Polity*, lib. 5, sect. 60 [cf. *Works* (1821) 2.192ff.].

4. *Hist. of the Council of Trent.*, lib. 2. [Cf. Paolo Sarpi, *The History of the Council of Trent*, trans. Nathanael Brent (1620; London: 1676) pages 220–221.]

5. *Confess.*, cap. 5 [De Ecclesia], art. 41. *Superstitiosum esse docemus*, says Beza, *arbitrari unum aliquem diem altero sanctiorem*. [XLI. De dierum & ciborum delecta. Cf. *Confessio Christianæ Fidei* (1570) 50.]

*days which we esteem not to be holy, for any mystic signification which they have, either by divine or ecclesiastical institution, or for any worship which is appropriated unto them, that may not be performed at another time, but for the sacred use whereunto they are appointed to be employed as circumstances only, and not as mysteries.*¹

ANSWER. This is but falsely pretended, for as Didoclavius observes, *one is to appoint, another to dedicate, yet another to sanctify.*² Designation or deputation is when a man appoints a thing for such an use, still reserving power and right to put it to another use if he please; so the church appoints times and hours for preaching upon the week-days, yet reserving power to employ those times otherwise, when she shall think fit. Dedication is when a man so devotes a thing to some pious or civil use, that he denudes himself to all right and title which thereafter he might claim unto it, as when a man dedicates a sum of money for the building of an exchange, a judgment-hall, etc., or a parcel of ground for a church, a churchyard, a glebe,³ a school, a hospital, he can no longer claim right to the dedicated thing. Sanctification is the setting apart of a thing for a holy and religious use, in such sort that hereafter it may be put to no other use (Prov. 20:25). Now whereas times set apart for ordinary and weekly preaching, are only designed by the church for this end and purpose, so that they are not holy, but only for the present they are applied to a holy use; neither is the worship appointed as convenient or beseeeming for those times, but the times are appointed as convenient for the worship.

Festival days are holy both by dedication and consecration of them; and thus much the Bishop himself forbears not to say,⁴ only he labors to plaster over his superstition with the untempered mortar of this quidditative⁵ distinction, that some things are holy by consecration of them to holy and mystical uses,⁶ as water in baptism, etc., but other things are made holy by

1. *Proc. in Perth Assembly*, part 3, p. 18. [Cf. Lindsay, *Proceedings* (1625 ed.) 18–19; “So times . . .”; and varying punctuation. What Gillespie refers to as part three, is the section, “An Answer to the reasons used by the penner of the Pamphlet, against Festivall Dayes.” The parts are not numbered, but this is the third section that begins again numbering from page 1.]

2. [David Calderwood.] *Alt. Damasc.* [1623], cap. 10, p. 878 [sic 678; (1708) p. 500]. *aliud est deputare, aliud dedicare, aliud sanctificare.*

3. [*Glebe*: A portion of land assigned to a clergyman as part of his benefice (OED).]

4. *Ubi Supra*, p. 29.

5. [Full of Equivocations.]

6. *Ibid.*, p. 28. [*Proceedings*, “An Answer” etc. “The consecration of things to holy mystical uses, as of water in Baptisme to be a signe of the bloud, and Spirit of Christ; the elements of Bread and Wine in the Supper to be the Sacrament of His Bodie and Bloud; the Sabbath to bee unto the Jewes a memoriall of the Creation, a type of signification, and a badge of their profession; the Temple, the Altars, the Sacrifices, and Priests, to bee shadows of things to come: all these, and such like are made, and ordained holy by God; but the consecration of things to holy uses for policie, as for maintaining religion, or for order, and decency to be observed in the worship of God, is not onely God’s prerogative, but a privileged, and liberty granted by him to the Church; for example, to build, and consecrate

consecration of them to holy political uses. This way, he says, the church has power to make a thing holy, as to build and consecrate places to be temples, houses to be hospitals; to give rent, lands, money and goods, to the ministry and to the poor; to appoint vessels, and vestures, and instruments for the public worship, as table, table-cloths, etc.

ANSWER. (1) The Bishop, I see, takes upon him to coin new distinctions at his own pleasure; yet they will not, I trust, pass current among the judicious. To make things holy by consecration of them to holy uses for policy, is an uncouth speculation, and, I dare say, the Bishop himself comprehends it not. God's designation of a thing to any use, which serves for his own glory, is called the sanctification of that thing, or the making of it holy, and so the word is taken (Isa. 13:3; Jer. 1:5), as G. Sanctius notes in his commentaries upon these places;¹ and Calvin, commenting upon the same places, expounds them so likewise;² but the church's appointing or designing of a thing to a holy use, cannot be called the making of it holy. It must be consecrated at the command of God, and by virtue of the Word and prayer: thus are bread and wine consecrated in the holy supper.

Sacred things, says Fennerus, *are those which are sanctified and dedicated by the Word of God to commanded use.*³ Polanus, speaking of the sacramental elements, says, *the sanctification of an earthly thing is a ministerial act, by which it appoints an earthly thing for a sacred use, as a result of the command of God*, etc.⁴ The Professors of Leyden call only such things, persons, times

places to be Temples, houses to be Hospitals; to give rent, lands, money, and goods to the Ministry & poore; to appoint Vessels, Vestures, & Instruments for the bubble [sic public] worship, as Tables, Table-clothes, Napkins, Basens, Cups, and Lavers for the holy Sacraments, these things and the like are made holy by the dedication and consecration of men. After this last manner, the Church hath power to consecrate the five Anniversary dayes to the commemoration of our Saviour his benefits, to separate them from all other ordinary workes, and so to make them sacred and holy dayes." Cf. *Proceedings*, 1625 ed., "An Answer ... Festivall Dayes," 28–29.]

1. [Cf. *In Jeremiam Prophetam Commentarii cum Paraphrase* (Lugduni: sumptibus Horatii Cardon, M.DC. XVIII. [1618]) cols. 20D–22C. *In Isaiam Prophetam Commentarii cum Paraphrasi* (Lyon: [1615]) 158E; (Maintz: [1616]) 151. Heading: *Sanctifico*, idem quod *desfino*. "Hæc sane probabilia. Sed non improbarem si quis diceret ibi in sanctificatis non connotari aliquam sanctitatem, quæ militibus conueniat, sed destinationem ad aliquod munus, id est, ad punienda Chaldæorum peccata. Verbum enim קָדַשׁ *kadas*, non solum sanctitatem sonat, sed etiam separationem, aut designationem ad ministerium, seu opus. Quo sensu multi, & verè putant accipiendum illud *Jerem.* I. *Antequam exires de vulua sanctificaui te*, id est, ad propheticum munus destinaui vel segregavi mihi. Exempla occurrent plurima in eadem sententiam, quæ nunc omitto, quæ valde mihi persuadent veram esse posteriorem hanc explicationem."]

2. [Cf. *Commentaries*, vol. VII, 1.441, vol. IX, p. 1.36.]

3. *Theol.*, lib. 6, cap. 3. *Res sacræ*, says Fennerus, *sunt quæ Dei verbo in prædictum usum sanctificatæ et dedicatæ sunt.* [Cf. Dudley Fenner, *Sacra theologia, sive, Veritas quæ est secundum pietatem ad unicæ & versæ methodi leges descripta & in decem libros* ({S.l.: T. Dawson, 1585}) 208.]

4. *Syntagma*, lib. 6, cap. 51, p. 433. *sanctificatio rei terrenæ est actio ministri, qua desinat rem*

and places holy, as are consecrated and dedicated to God and His worship, and that *divina præscriptione* [*by divine precept*].¹

If our ordinary meat and drink cannot be sanctified to us, so that we may lawfully, and with a good conscience, use those common things, but by the Word of God and prayer, how then shall anything be made holy for God's worship but by the same means (1 Tim. 4:5)? And, I pray, which is the word, and which be the prayers, that make holy those things which the Bishop avouches for things consecrated and made holy by the church, namely, the ground whereupon the church is built, the stones and timber of a hospital; the rents, lands, money, or goods given to the ministry and the poor; the vessels, vestures, tables, napkins, basons, etc., appointed for the public worship.

§8. (2) Times, places and things, which the church designs for the worship of God, if they be made holy by consecration of them to holy political uses, then either they may be made holy by the holy uses to which they are to be applied, or else by the church's dedicating of them to those uses. They cannot be called holy by virtue of their application to holy uses; for then (as Ames argues)² the air is sacred, because it is applied to the minister's speech, whilst he is preaching; then is the light sacred which is applied to his eye in reading; then are his spectacles sacred which are used by him reading his text, etc. But neither yet are they holy, by virtue of the church's dedicating of them to those uses for which she appointed them; for the church has no such power as by her dedication to make them holy.

P. Martyr condemns the dedication or consecration (for those words he uses promiscuously) whereby the papists hallow churches, and he declares against it the judgment of our divines to be this, *that it is lawful, indeed that it is by the law of piety, that in the first use of anything, we should give thanks to God, and celebrate His goodness, etc. We good men united call for this religious and holy practice.* This he opposes to the popish dedication of temples and bells, as appears by these words: *quanto sanius rectiusque decernimus* [*By so much we differentiate more reasonably and rightly*].³ He implies, therefore, that these things are only consecrated as every other thing is consecrated to us. Of this kind of consecration he has given examples. *In the book of Nehemiah, the dedication of the fortifications of the city is recounted, which was nothing else except that when the city walls had been restored, the people as one with the Levites and priests, likewise the chief men, gathered there and there gave thanks to God for the rebuilt fortifications, and asked that the use of the city be righteous, for which reason likewise we, before we consume food, also bless it.*⁴

terrenam ad sanctum usum, ex mandato Dei, etc. [Cf. 1609 ed., col. 3169C.]

1. *Syn. Pur. Theol.*, disp. 21, thes. 7. [*Synopsis Purioris Theologiæ*, ed. Bavinck (1881) 187.]

2. *Fresh Suite*, cap. 5, p. 59 [1633].

3. Martyr, Comm. in 1 Reg. viii. *de Templ. Dedic. Licere ... imò jure pietatis requiri, ut in prima cujusque rei usurpatione gratias Deo agamus, ejusque bonitatem celebremus, etc.... collati boni religiosum ac sanctum usum poscamus.* [*Melachim; id est, Regum libri duo...* (1599 ed.) 65r.]

4. [Et] *in libro, Nehemiæ dedicatio mœniam civitatis comemoratur, quæ nil aliud fuit, nisi quod*

As the walls of Jerusalem then, and as our ordinary meat are consecrated, so are churches consecrated, and no otherwise can they be said to be dedicated, except one would use the word dedication in that sense wherein it is taken [in] Deuteronomy 20:5; where Calvin turns the word *dedicavit* [*dedicated*];¹ Arias Montanus, *initiauit* [*consecrated*];² Tremelius, *cæpit uti* [*began to use*].³ Of this sort of dedication, Gaſpar Sanctius writes thus: *There is another kind of dedication, used not only among the common peoples, but also among the Hebrews, which has nothing sacred about it, but is only a sign, or commencement of the work for which the place is intended, or the thing the firſt use of which was then consecrated. Thus Nero Claudius is said to have dedicated his own home when he firſt began to live in it. Thus Suetonius on Nero.*⁴ *In the same way Pompey dedicated his theatre, when he firſt opened it to public games and common use;*⁵ *Cicero on that, lib. 2, epiſt. 1.*⁶ Any other sort of dedicating churches we hold to be superſtitious.

Peter Waldo, of whom the Waldenses were named, is reported to have taught that the dedication of temples was but an invention of the devil.⁷ And though churches be dedicated by preaching and praying, and by no superſtition of ſprinkling them with holy water, or using such magical rites, yet even these dedications, say the Magdeburgians, *seem born out of Judaism, but without any precept of God.*⁸ There is, indeed, no warrant for such dedication of churches as is thought to make them holy. Bellarmine would warrant it by Moses' consecrating of the tabernacle, the altar, and the vessels of the same; but Hoſpinian answers him: *Moses' action had the*

muris urbis inſtauratis, populus unà cum Levitis et sacerdotibus, nec non principibus, eò se contulit, ibique gratias Deo egerunt de mœnibus reædificatis, et juſtam civitatis usuram poſtularunt. Qua item ratione, prius quam sumamus cibum, nos etiam illum consecramus ... [Ibid., 64v].

1. [Cf. CR 52 (CO 24) 710.]

2. [Antwerp Polyglot: Benito Arias Montano, *Biblia Sacra Hebraice, Chaldaice, Græce, & Latine ...* (Antwerp: Plantinus, 1569–1572) vol. 7, *Hebraicorum Bibliorum*, Gen.–Deut., p. 135.]

3. [Cf. *Biblia Sacra*, etc. (Hanover, 1602) 184.]

4. [Cf. C. Suetonius Tranquillus, *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, ed. Alexander Thomson (London: 1893) c. 31, 360–361.]

5. [Cf. Letters of Cicero, ed. J. H. Muirhead (London: 1885) 218.]

6. *Alia dedicatio eſt, non ſolum inter prophanos, ſed etiam inter Hæbreos uſitata, quæ nihil habet ſacrum ſed tantum eſt auſpicatio aut initium operis, ad quod deſtinatur locus, aut res, cujus tunc primum libatur uſus. Sic Nero Claudius dedicasse dicitur domum ſuam cum primum illam habitare cæpit. Ita Suetonius in Nerone. Sic Pompeius dedicavit theatrum ſuum, cum primum illud publicis ludis et communibus uſibus aperuit (de quo Cicero lib. 2, epiſt. 1).* [Gillespie is citing the commentary on Ezra. Gaspar Sánchez, *Gaſparis Sanctii Centumputeolani, e Societate Iesu Theologi, in Collegio Complutensi ſacrarum literarum interpretis, In libros Ruth, Eſdræ, Nehemiæ, Tobiæ, Iudith, Eſther, Machabæorum commentarij. Nunc primum prodeunt. Cum indicibus locupletissimis, rerum, locorum S. Scripturæ, regularum & prouerbiorum* (Lugduni: Sumpt. Iacobi Cardon et Petri Cauellat, 1627) 61, ¶13.]

7. *Hiſt. of the Waldenses*, lib. 1, cap. 1. [Cf. *Hiſtory of the Ancient Chriſtians Inhabiting the Valleys of the Alps* (1847) 22.]

8. Cent. 4, cap. 6, col. 408. *ex Judaismo natæ videntur ſine ullo Dei præcepto.* [Cf. *Quarta Centuria, Eccleſiaſtica Hiſtoriæ* (Basil: Oporinum, 1560) col. 408, 40.]

his propitiatory sacrifice, offering up for the quick and the dead, and for all yet unborn, at Easter. And it was the tenth day; and this now is the tenth day since. He has told us why there is not a certain day of the month appointed for Easter, as there is for the nativity, namely, because the fast of Lent must end with that high feast, according to the prophecy of Zechariah.¹ Wherefore I conclude, *aliquid mysterii alunt*, and so *aliquid monstri* too.²

1. Serm. on Matt. 6:16 [(1841) 1.394].

2. [*Aliquid mysterii alunt, aliquid monstri*: “they maintain (or cherish) something of a mystery” and so “something of a monster” too. Given the number of classical lines Gillespie has used throughout this work, the phrase *aliquid monstri*, may be an allusion to Terence’s *Andria*, Act 1, Scene 5, line 15, “*aliquid monstri alunt: ea quoniam nemini obrudi potest ...*” (cf. *P. Terenti Afri Andria*, edited with Introduction and Commentary by G. P. Shipp {1938; second edition, Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1960; reprint as *Terence Andria edited with Introduction and Commentary by G. P. Shipp*, London: Bristol Classical Press, 2002} 75). “They breed some monster” (George Coleman, *The Comedies of Terence, translated into familiar blank verse* {London: 1765; second edition, London: 1768} 22). “They are nursing up some wretched creature, and since she cannot be thrust upon any one else, they have recourse to me” (James Davies, *Andria et Heautontimorumenos* {1877} 62). On the other hand, Pasquale and Linda White Mazini Villari, commenting on Italian translations from the Latin in their biography of Niccolò Machiavelli, write: “Machiavelli translates this literally: “*They nourish some monster*,” which only makes nonsense. Cesari gives the far better rendering: “*There must be some devilry in this*” (Pasquale Villari and Linda White Mazini Villari, *The Life and Times of Niccolò Machiavelli* {London: T.F. Unwin, 1892} 357). A mid-nineteenth century review of the mid-eighteenth century translation by George Colman similarly writes: “We are doubtful whether *monstrum* in Latin strictly signified what we properly call a monster. A number of passages in the oldest classics convince us that it is a kind of an haruspical term, and applicable to any extraordinary appearance” (*The Critical Review: or, Annals of Literature*, volume 19 {London: Printed for A. Hamilton, MDCCLXV} 329). Whether this is an allusion to Terence or not, Gillespie is not simply noting the ugliness or monstrous nature of his opponents’ argument. The literal definition of *monstri (monstrum)* is “divine omen” or “portent” (“*Monstrum*, any occurrence out of the ordinary course of nature supposed to indicate the will of the gods,” John Ogilvie, *Imperial Dictionary of the English Language*, volume 3 {1883}). Our author is underscoring the argument and conclusion of this chapter with a play on words equating the claim of mystery to an act of divination. In his introduction to the 1923 edition of book one of Forbes’ *Irenicum*, Selwyn singles out this conclusion: “In part III Gillespie assails the lawfulness of the ceremonies. They are superstitious, because they exceed what the Church has power to do: ‘*aliquid mysterii alunt*, and so *aliquid monstri* too’” (*The First Book of the Irenicum of John Forbes of Corse; A Contribution to the Theology of Re-Union* [Cambridge: The University Press, 1923} 38).]

CHAPTER TWO

THAT THE CEREMONIES ARE UNLAWFUL, BECAUSE THEY ARE MONUMENTS
OF BYPAST IDOLATRY, WHICH NOT BEING NECESSARY TO BE RETAINED,
SHOULD BE UTTERLY ABOLISHED, BECAUSE OF THEIR IDOLATROUS ABUSE:
ALL WHICH IS PARTICULARLY MADE GOOD OF KNEELING

§1. I have proved the ceremonies to be superstitious; now I will prove them to be idolatrous. These are different arguments; for every idolatry is superstition, but every superstition is not idolatry, as is rightly by some distinguished.¹ As for the idolatry of the controverted ceremonies, I will prove that they are thrice idolatrous: I. *Reductivè* [*retrospectively*], because they are monuments of by-past idolatry; II. *Participativè* [*participation*], because they are badges of present idolatry; III. *Formaliter* [*formally*], because they are idols themselves.

First, then, they are idolatrous, because having been notoriously abused to idolatry heretofore, they are the detestable and accursed monuments, which give no small honor to the memory of that by-past idolatry which should lie buried in hell. Dr. Burges reckons for idolatrous all ceremonies devised and used in and to the honoring of an idol, whether properly or by interpretation such. *Of which sort* (he says) *were all the ceremonies of the pagans, and not a few of the papists.*² If an opposite, writing against us, is forced to acknowledge this much, one may easily conjecture what enforcing reason we have to double out our point. The argument in hand I frame thus:

All things and rites which have been notoriously abused to idolatry, if they are not such as either God or nature has made to be of a necessary use, should be utterly abolished and purged away from divine worship, in such sort that they may not be accounted nor used by us as sacred things or rites pertaining to the same.

But the cross, surplice, kneeling in the act of receiving the communion, &c., are things and rites, &c., and are not such as either God or nature, &c.

Therefore they should be utterly abolished, &c.

1. *Synop. Pur. Theol.*, disp. 19, thes. 30 [*sic thesis 3*]. [*Synopsis*, ed. Bavinck (1881) 162–163.]

2. *Manuducl.*, sect. 2, p. 38. [Cf. *An Answer Rejoined* (1631)].

enough to purge them from the abuse, and to restore them again to their right use. Hence Saravia will not have *pium crucis usum* [*pious use of the cross*] to be abolished *cum abusu* [*along with the abuse*], but holds it enough that the abuse and superstition be taken away.¹ Dr. Forbes' answer is, that not only things instituted by God are not to be taken away for the abuse of them, but farther, *neither must indifferent matters thoughtfully introduced by men always be done away with because of ensuing abuse. The popish have abused temples, and places of prayer, and cathedrals, and holy vessels, and bells, and the blessing of marriage; however, thoughtful reformers have not proposed that such things must be abandoned.*²

ANSWER. (I) Calvin,³ answering that which Cassander alleges out of an Italian writer, *abusu non tolli bonum usum* [*abuse does not take away the good use*], he admits it only to be true in things which are instituted by God

1. *N. Fratri et Amico*, art. 17. ["N. Fratri et Amico," in *Diversi Tractatus Theologici* (1611) 16.]

2. *Irenicum*, lib. 1, cap. 7, 9, 6. *neque res mediæ ab hominibus prudenter introductæ, propter sequentem abusum semper tollendæ sunt. Abusi sunt Papiæ templis, et oratoris, et cathedris, et sacris vasis, et campanis, et benedictione matrimoniali; nec tamen res istas censuerunt prudentes reformatores abjiciendas* [7–6, p. 43]. [The quotation comes from section 6. Section 9 reads: "IX. Atque ita iam paret justas fuisse & idoneas rationes, ex ipsarum rerum intuitu, propter quas Patres Perthenses articulos à Rege propositos, partim potuerunt, partim etiam admittere debuerunt. Nam in rebus illis quædam sunt necessaria, omnes autem licitæ ac laudabiles: illæ sine peccato contemni non possunt; istæ licitè et laudabiliter admittuntur" (7–9, p. 45). Cf. *The First Book of the Irenicum*, trans. E. G. Selwyn, p. 118–119, 121–122.]

3. *Responso Ad Versipellem Quendam Mediatorem*, p. 41–44. [Cf. *CR* 37 (CO 9), 542. Cf. [French] "Response a Un Certain Moyenneur Rusé," *Recueil des Opuscles* (Geneva: Stoer, 1611) 2191–2192. "Similarly, what is alleged of an Italian writer, that abuse does not take away good use, will not be true if one holds to it without exception: because it is clearly commanded to us to prudently watch that we would not offend the infirm brothers by our example, and that we should never undertake what would be illicit. For Saint Paul prohibits offending the brothers in eating flesh that was sacrificed to idols [1 Cor. 10:28], and speaking to this particular issue he shows a general rule that we are to keep ourselves from troubling the consciences of the weak by a bad or damaging example. One might speak better and more wholesomely if he were to say that what God himself ordains may not be abolished for wrong use or abuse that is committed against it. But even here, it is necessary to abstain from these things if, by later human ordinance, they have become corrupt with error, and if their use is harmful or scandalizes the brothers.

"Here I marvel how this "Reformer," after granting that superstitions sometimes have such strong popularity that it is necessary to remove from the realm of man those things once ordained by public authority (as we read of Hezekiah doing with the bronze serpent), finally does not consider even a little that his shrewdness is a horror to the ways of good action: as if in defending supportable rituals, he would oblige that all superstitions should be considered as safe and whole because they are weighty. For what is there in the papacy now that would not resemble the bronze serpent, even if it did not begin that way [Num. 21:9]? Moses had it made and forged by the commandment of God: he had it kept for a sign of recognition. Among the virtues of Hezekiah told to us is that he had it broken and reduced to ash [2 Kings 18:4]. The superstitions for the most part, against which true servants of God battle today, are spreading from here to who knows where as covered pits in the ground. They are filled with detestable errors that can never be erased unless their use is taken away. Why, therefore, do we not confess simply what is true, that this remedy is necessary for taking away filth from the church?" See the translation of this tract by Raymond V. Bottomly, *The Confessional Presbyterian* 8 (2012) 264.]

Himself, not so in things ordained by men, for the very use of such things or rites as have no necessary use in God's worship, and which men have devised only at their own pleasure, is taken away by idolatrous abuse. *Pars tutior* [*The safer part*] here, is to put them wholly away, and there is, by a great deal, more danger in retaining than in removing them.

(2) The proofs which I have produced for the proposition about which now we debate, do not only infer that things and rites which have been notoriously abused to idolatry should be abolished, in case they be not restored to a right use, but simply and absolutely that in any wise they are to be abolished. God commanded to say to the covering, and the ornaments of idols, "Get thee hence" (Isa. 30:22). It is not enough they be purged from the abuse, but *simpliciter* they themselves must pack them and be gone. How did Jacob with the earrings of the idols; Elijah with Baal's altar; Jehu with his vestments; Josiah with his houses; Manasseh with his altars; Moses with the golden calf; Joshua with the temples of Canaan; Hezekiah with the brazen serpent? Did they retain the things themselves, and only purge them from the abuse? Belike [*Suppose*], if these our opposites had been their counselors, they had advised them to be contented with such a moderation; yet we see they were better counseled when they destroyed utterly the things themselves, whereby we know that they were of the same mind with us, and thought that things abused to idolatry, if they have no necessary use, are far better away than a-place [*in place*]. Did Daniel refuse Bel's meat because it was not restored to the right use? Nay, if that had been all, it might have been quickly helped, and the meat sanctified by the Word of God and prayer. Finally, were the churches of Pergamos and Thyatira reprov'd because they did not restore things sacrificed to idols to their right use? Or, were they not rather reprov'd for having anything at all to do with the things themselves?

§8. (3) As for that which Dr. Forbes objects to us, we answer, that temples, places of prayer, chairs, vessels, and bells, are of a necessary use, by the light and guidance of nature itself; and matrimonial benediction is necessary by God's institution (Gen. 1:28); so that all those examples do except themselves from the argument in hand. But the Doctor intends to bring those things within the category of things indifferent;¹ and to this purpose he alleges, that it is indifferent to use this or that place for a temple, or a place of prayer; also to use these vessels, and bells, or others. And of matrimonial benediction to be performed by a pastor, he says there is nothing commanded in Scripture.

ANSWER. Though it be indifferent to choose this place, etc., also to use these vessels or other vessels, etc.; yet the Doctor, I trust, will not deny that temples, houses of prayer, vessels and bells, are of a necessary use (which exempts [*exemptis*] them from the touch of our present argument); whereas, beside that it is not necessary to kneel in the communion in this place more

1. Ubi Supra [*Forbes, Irenicum*].

than in that place, neither to keep the feast of Christ's nativity, passion, etc., upon these days more than upon other days, etc. The things themselves are not necessary in their kind; and it is not necessary to keep any festival day, nor to kneel at all in the act of receiving the communion.

There is also another respect which hinders temples, vessels, etc., from coming within the compass of this our argument, but neither does it agree to the controverted ceremonies. Temples, houses of prayer, vessels for the ministrations of the sacraments, and bells, are not used by us in divine worship as things sacred, or as holier than other houses, vessels, and bells; but we use them only for natural necessity—partly for that common decency which has no less place in the actions of civil than of sacred assemblies. Yea, in some cases they may be applied to civil uses, as has been said;¹ whereas the controverted ceremonies are respected and used as sacred rites, and as holier than any circumstance which is alike common to civil and sacred actions, neither are they used at all out of the case of worship. We see now a double respect wherefore our argument infers not the necessity of abolishing and destroying such temples, vessels, and bells, as have been abused to idolatry, *viz.*, because it can neither be said that they are not things necessary, nor yet that they are things sacred.

§9. Nevertheless (to add this by the way), howbeit for those reasons the retaining and using of temples which have been polluted with idols be not in itself unlawful, yet the retaining of every such temple is not ever necessary, but sometimes it is expedient, for farther extirpation of superstition, to demolish and destroy some such temples as have been horribly abused to idolatry, [as] Calvin also² and Zanchius³ do plainly insinuate. Whereby I mean to defend (though not as in itself necessary, yet as expedient *pro tunc* [for that time]) that which the reformers of the Church of Scotland did in casting down some of those churches which had been consecrated to popish idols, and of a long time polluted with idolatrous worship. As on the one part the reformers (not without great probability) feared, that so long as these churches were not made even with the ground, the memory of that superstition, whereunto they had been employed and accustomed, should have been in them preserved, and, with some sort of respect, recognized; so, on the other part, they saw it expedient to demolish them, for strengthening the hands of such as adhered to the reformation, for putting papists out of all hope of the re-entry of Popery, and for hedging up the way with thorns, that the idolatrously-minded might not find their paths. And since the pulling down of those churches wanted [lacked] neither this happy intent nor happy event, I must say that the bitter invectives given forth against it, by some who carry a favorable eye to the pompous bravery of the Romish

1. *Supra*, cap. i, sect. ii [see part three, chapter one, §ii, p. 143].

2. *Com. in Deut. 12:2*. [Cf. Calvin, *Commentaries*, vol. II, 2.357.]

3. In 4 *Præc.*, col. 709. [Cf. *Opera* (1617), book 4, col. 709.]

THE FOURTH PART

AGAINST THE INDIFFERENCY OF THE CEREMONIES

CHAPTER ONE

OF OUR OPPOSITES' PLEADING FOR THE INDIFFERENCY
OF THE CEREMONIES

If it seems to any that it is a strange method to speak now of indifferency, in the end of this dispute, which ought rather to have been handled in the beginning of it, they may consider, that the method is not ours, but our opposites'; for they have been fleeing upon Icarus' wings,¹ and soaring so high, that their wings could not but melt from them: so have they, from necessity fallen down to expediency; from it to lawfulness, and from thence to indifferency.

I knew certain of them, who, after reasoning about the ceremonies with some of our side, required, in the end, no more but that they would only acknowledge the indifferency of the things in themselves. And so being wooed and solicitously importuned by our former arguments against the ceremonies, they take them to the weaving of Penelope's web,² thereby to suspend us, and to gain time against us: this indifferency, I mean, which they shall never make out, and which themselves, otherwhiles, unweave again. Always, so long as they think to get any place for higher notions about the ceremonies, they speak not so meanly of them as of things indifferent; but when all their forces of arguments and answers are spent in vain, then are our ears filled with uncouth [*strange*] outcries and declamations, which tend to make themselves appear blameless for receiving, and us blameworthy for refusing matters of rite and indifferency.

Upon this string they harp over and over again, in books, in sermons, in private discourses. Mr. G. Powell (in his book *De Adiaphoris*),³ and Tilen (in the 12th and 17th chapters of his *Parænesis*),⁴ condemn those who make

1. [Icarus—fabled in escaping from Crete, to have flown so high that the sun melted the wax with which his artificial wings were fastened on, so that he fell into the Aegean Sea: hence applied to ambitious or presumptuous acts, which end in failure or ruin (OED).]

2. [Penelope—wife of Ulysses, who unraveled her web at night, in order to put off her suitors, whom she'd promised to entertain when the web was completed.]

3. [Gabriel Powel, *De Adiaphoris. Theological and Scholaſtical positions concerning things indifferent* (London, 1607).]

4. [Tilen, *Parænesis ad Scotos* (Andreapoli: Rabanus, 1620) 45–56; 70ff.]

aught ado about the controverted English ceremonies, for so much as they are things indifferent. Paybody, in his *Apology* for kneeling at the communion, stands much upon the indifferency of this gesture, both in every worship of God, and in that sacrament namely.¹ The Archbishop of St. Andrews, in his sermon at Perth Assembly, because he could not prove this indifferency, he chose to suppose it. *Of the indifferency of these articles* (he says) *I think there is little or no question amongst us.*² Whether he spoke this of ignorance or of policy, I leave it to be guessed at. Howsoever, if we should thus compose [settle] our controversy about the ceremonies, embrace them, and practice them, so being that they are only called things indifferent, this were to cure our church, as L. Sylla cured his country, *by remedies harsher than the dangers were*, says Seneca.³ Wherefore we will debate this question of indifferency also.

CHAPTER TWO

OF THE NATURE OF THINGS INDIFFERENT

§1. To say nothing here of the homonymy [*ambiguity*] of the word *indifferent*, but to take it in that signification which concerns our present purpose, it signifies such a mean between good and evil in human actions, as is alike distant from both these extremes, and yet susceptible of either of them. *The indifferent*, says Calepin, is that *which by its own nature is neither good nor evil.*⁴ Aquinas calls that an indifferent action which is neither good nor evil.⁵ *I call a thing indifferent which in itself is neither good nor evil*, says a later writer.⁶

But Dr. Forbes likes to speak in another language.⁷ He will have that which is indifferent to be opposed [*opposed*] to that which is necessary; and a thing indifferent he takes to be such a thing as is neither necessarily

1. [See Gillespie's previous discussion at part one, chapter three, §4 (p. 29), and part two, chapter nine, §16–19 (pp. 123–128). See specifically chapter three (“Of things indifferent, and of divine worship”) in the first part of Paybody's *Apology*.]

2. [Lindsay, *Proceedings*, Sermon, 21; Miscellany, 1.65.]

3. *De Beneficiis*, lib. 5, cap. 16[.3]. *durioribus remediis quam pericula erant*. [Cf. *Moral Essays*, volume 3. With an English translation by John W. Basore. Loeb Classical Library (1935).]

4. *Indifferens, quod sua natura neque bonum est neque malum*. [Cf. Ambrogio Calepino, *Ambrosii Calepini Dictionarium oclolingue, In quo Latinis Dictionibus Hebraeae, Graecae, Gallicae, Italicae, Germanicae, Hispanicae, atque Anglicae adiectae sunt* (Coloniae Allobrogum: Sumptibus Caldorianae Societatis, 1609) 730.]

5. Aquinas, 1^a 2^a quest. 18, art. 9.

6. Bald., *de Cas. Consc.*, lib. 2, cap. 9, cas. 9. *Rem indifferentem voco quae neque bona neque mala in se est*. [Cf. 1654 ed., page 243.]

7. *Irenicum*, lib. 1, cap. 13, sect. 7 [pp. 79–82]. [Selwyn, 172–177.]

to be done, nor yet necessarily to be omitted, in respect of any necessity of the commandment of God; or such a thing as is neither remunerable with eternal life, and commends a man unto the reward of God, nor yet is punishable with eternal death, and pollutes a man with guiltiness. Now, because he knew that divines define a thing indifferent to be that which is neither good nor evil, he therefore distinguishes a twofold goodness of an individual action.¹ The one he calls *general goodness, accompanying, and necessary*;² by which goodness is meant the doing of an action in faith, and the doing of it for the right end, as he expounds himself. This goodness, he says, is necessary to every human action, and hinders not an action to be indifferent. The other he calls *special goodness, causing, and by reason of which*.³ This goodness he calls legal, and says that it makes an action necessary; in which respect indifferent actions are not good, but those only which God in his law has commanded, and which are remunerable [*rewardable*] with eternal life.

§2. But that we may have the vanity of these quiddities [*captious subtleties*] discovered to us, let us only consider how falsely he supposes that there are some things which we do neither laudably nor culpably, and for which we shall neither be rewarded (it is his own phrase which I use) nor yet punished by God. I thought we had learned from Scripture that we must all compare [appear] before the judgment-seat of Christ, to give an account of every word which we speak, and of every deed which we do in the flesh [2 Cor. 5:10], and accordingly to receive either a reward or a punishment. What! Could the Doctor say that these good actions which he calls indifferent, and of which he says that they are done in faith, and for the right end, are not laudable nor remunerable? Nay, but he says that the general goodness which accompanies the action is remunerable, because it is necessary;⁴ but the action itself is not necessary, because that general goodness may be had as well in the omission of it, or in the doing of the contrary, as in the doing of it, whereupon he would have it to follow that the action itself is not remunerable.

ANSWER I. The Doctor had done well to have remembered that he is speaking only of individual actions, and that *an action is individuated by circumstances and accompanying mode*,⁵ so that whilst all that he says turns to this, that one action considered in itself, without the circumstances and concomitant goodness, is not remunerable, he makes not out his point; for he says no more in effect, but that *actus quo ad speciem* [*an act as to its kind*] is not remunerable, which none of us denies.

1. Ibid., sect. 10 [p. 83]. [Selwyn, 178.]

2. *bonitas generalis, concomitans, et sine qua non.*

3. *bonitas specialis, causans, et propter quam* [bonitate speciali, & propter quam, seu specialiter causante.]

4. Ubi supra.

5. *actus individuatür à circumstantiis et adjecto modo.*

2. An individual good action of that kind which the Doctor calls necessary, is no otherwise remunerable and laudable than an individual good action of that kind which he calls indifferent; for example, when I go to hear God's Word upon the Lord's day, let this action of mine be considered *quo ad individuum* [*as it is individual*], is it any otherwise remunerable than in respect of the goodness which accompanies it? Whence it is that the hearing of hypocrites, not being accompanied with such goodness, is not remunerable, yet the hearing of the Word is an action necessary, because commanded? Now may we know wherein stands the difference between the remunerable good of this action of hearing, and remunerable good of one of those actions which the Doctor calls indifferent; for example, a woman's action of marrying.

I perceive what the Doctor would answer; for he says, if a woman marry in the Lord, this action is good *with respect to its accompanying manner, although in itself it may be indifferent and free, even as it is individual*,¹ implying that if, on the other part, an individual action is necessary (as for example the action of hearing the Word), then it is in itself good, *etiam quo ad individuum* [*even as it is individual*].

But, I reply, what means he by these words, *in se* [*in itself*]? Means he the individual nature of the action? Nay; then the sense shall be no other than this, *as far as it is individual, even as far as it is individual*.² And besides, the Doctor cannot define to us any other nature in an individual thing than the nature of the species or kind.

Is it not held, *individuum non posse definiri, nisi definitione speciei* [*an individual thing cannot be defined except by definition of its species*]?³ Surely a perfect definition, expressing the nature of the thing defined, cannot be given to any individual thing other than the definition of the species; needs, therefore, must the Doctor, by *in se* [*in itself*], understand the specific nature; and, indeed, when divines speak of things indifferent, *in se, per se, or sua natura* [*in itself, of itself, or by its own nature*], they mean only things indifferent *quo ad speciem* [*as to its species*]. Yet thus also the Doctor has said nonsense; for so we should take his words, *with respect to its accompanying manner, although in itself it may be indifferent and free, even as it is individual*.⁴

1. Ubi supra, cap. 13, sect. 7 [p. 81]. *respeçtu adjecti modi, quamvis in se sit media et libera, etiam quo ad individuum*. [Et sic hæc actio, respectu adjecti modi, est vel bona, vel mala: quamvis in se sit media, & libera, etiam quoad individuum. Cf. Selwyn, 176.]

2. *quo ad individuum, etiam quo ad individuum*.

3. *Quæstio, quid eſt; de quolibet individuo contento sub specie, non petit quidditatem ejus singularem, sed communem totius speciei* [A complaint, that is: of whichever individual member contained in a species, he is not looking for its peculiar distinction, but its shared quality with the whole species.] saith P. Fonseca, *Com. in Mataph. Ariſt.*, lib. 7, cap. 15, quest. unic., sect. 2. [Cf. *Commentaria Petri Fonseccæ Lusitani, Doctoris Theologi Societatis Jesu, In Libros Metaphysicorum Ariſtotelis*, volume 3 (Coloniæ Zetznerus, 1604) 408–409.]

4. *quamvis quoad speciem sit media et libera, etiam quo ad individuum*.

§3. But to let his manner of speaking pass, we will consider what he would or could have said. There is no difference which can here be imagined except this: That the individual action of hearing the Word (when one hears aright) is good and remunerable in a double respect, namely, because it is both good in itself, or *quo ad speciem*, and likewise *respectu adjecti modi* [with regard to the accompanying manner]; whereas a woman's action of marrying (when she marries in the Lord) is only good and remunerable in the last respect, namely, *respectu modi* [with regard to the manner]; for, *in se*, or, *quo ad speciem*, it has no remunerable goodness in it.

ANSWER. What do we hear of any difference between these actions *quo ad speciem*? That which we crave is, that a difference may be shown between the remunerable goodness of the one and of the other, both being considered *quo ad individuum*.

That whereby the Doctor either was deceived, or would deceive, appears to be this: That he takes everything which agrees to an individual thing to agree to it *quo ad individuum*, as if to speak of Peter *quatenus est homo* [as far as he is man], and to speak of him *as far as he is designated "individual" or a singular instance of the species "human,"* were all one thing.¹ Even so, to say of my individual action of hearing the Word, that it is necessary because of the commandment of God (and in that respect remunerable), is not to speak of it *quo ad individuum*, but as the specific nature of that action of hearing the Word (which God has commanded) is found in it; for if we speak of this individual action, *quo ad individuum*, we cannot consider it otherwise than *respectu adjecti modi*, because, in moral actions, *modus adjectus* [an accompanying mode] is *principium individuationis* [a principle of individuation], and nothing else does individualize a moral action.

§4. Thus shall my position stand good, namely, that those individual actions which the Doctor calls necessary, because their *species* is commanded of God, and those individual actions which he calls indifferent, because their *species* is not commanded, both being considered *quo ad individuum*, the former has no other remunerable good in them than the latter, and the whole remunerable good which is in either of them stands only *in objecto modo* [in the mode added]; which being so, it is all one when we speak of any individual moral action *quo ad individuum*, whether we say that it is good, or that it is remunerable and laudable, both are one. For, as it is well said by Aquinas, *It is necessary for every act of a man, as it is good or bad, to take an account of the praise[worthy] or blameworthy element.*² And again: *For to*

1. *quatenus est individuum signatum, or res singularis sub specie hominis.*

2. Aquinas, 1^a 2^{ae} quest. 21, art. 2. *Necessarium est omnem actum hominis, ut bonum vel malum, culpabilis vel laudabilis rationem habere.* [1^a 2^{ae} quest. 18, art. 9 co: *Unde necesse est omnem actum hominis a deliberativa ratione procedentem, in individuo consideratum, bonum esse vel malum.* 1^a 2^{ae} quest. 21, art. 2: *Videtur quod actus humanus, ex hoc quod est bonus vel malus, non habeat rationem laudabilis vel culpabilis.*] And again: *Nihil enim est aliud laudari vel culpari, quam imputari alicui malitiam vel bonitatem sui actus* [1^a 2^{ae} quest. 21, art. 2 co].

*be praised or blamed means nothing other than the evil or goodness of his own act being reckoned to someone; wherefore that distinction of a twofold goodness, causans and concomitans, which the Doctor has given us, has no use in this question, because every action is laudable and remunerable which is morally good, whether it be necessary or not. Now moral goodness, says Scaliger, is the perfecting of act with right reason.¹ Human moral actions are called good or evil, in turn with regard to reason, which is the peculiar principle of human acts, says Aquinas,² thereupon inferring that those practices which are in accord with reason are called good; but those which are inconsistent with reason, evil.³ Dr. Forbes does therefore pervert the question whilst he says, in this question, along with those related to it, this "good" is what is necessary.⁴ Nay, those actions we call morally good which are agreeable to right reason, whether they are necessary or not. Since, then, those actions are laudable and remunerable which are morally good, and those are morally good which are agreeable to right reason, it follows, that forasmuch as those actions which the Doctor calls indifferent, are agreeable to right reason, they are, therefore, not only morally good, but also laudable and remunerable, and so not indifferent. Yea, those actions which he calls necessary, being considered *quo ad individuum* [as individual], are no otherwise laudable and remunerable than those which he calls indifferent, being considered in like manner *quo ad individuum*, as has been shown.*

§5. And besides all this, we have somewhat more to say of the Doctor's speculation about the nature of things indifferent.

For 1. The Doctor makes that which is indifferent to be opposed [*opposed*] to that which is necessary, and yet he makes both those to be morally good. Now albeit in natural things one good is opposed to another good, as that which is hot to that which is cold, yet *one good does not oppose other goods in moral matters.*⁵ The reason of the difference is, because *natural or relative goodness is a certain harmony of nature*, says Scaliger;⁶ and because two natures may be contrary one to another, therefore the good which is congruous to the one may be contrary to the good which is congruous to the other; but *the good of virtue*, says Aquinas,⁷ *is perceived only by agreement on some one thing, naturally, reason*; so that it is impossible for one moral good to be opposed to another.

1. *De Subtil.*, exerc. 307, dict. 27. *est perfectio actus cum recta ratione.* [Cf. Scaliger, *Exotericarum exercitationum liber XV ... de subtilitate* (Hanover, 1620) 935.]

2. 1^a 2^a quest. 100, art. 1 [co]. *in ordine ad rationem, quæ est proprium principium humanorum actuum.*

3. *illi mores dicuntur boni, qui rationi congruunt; mali autem, qui à ratione discordant.*

4. Ubi supra, cap. 13, sect. 7 [p. 79]. *in hac cum fratribus quæstione, hoc bonum est quod necessarium.* [Selwyn, 173.]

5. Aquin., 1^a 2^a quest. 31, art. 8. *bonum bona non contrariatur in moralibus.*

6. Ubi supra. *bonitas physica, or relativa est congruentia naturæ quædem.*

7. Ubi supra. *bonum virtutis non accipitur nisi per convenientiam ad aliquid unum, scilicet rationem.*

2. Since divines take a thing indifferent to be *medium inter bonum et malum morale* [the middle between moral good and moral evil]; and since (as the very notation of the word shows) it is such a means as comes not nearer to the one extreme than to the other, but is alike distant from both, how comes it that the Doctor so far departs both from the tenet of divines and from the notation of the word, as to call some such actions indifferent as have a moral remunerable goodness, and yet not evil in them? Or where learned he such a dialect as gives to some good things the name of the things indifferent?

3. Why does he also waver from himself; for he cites out of the Helvetic Confession, Jerome's definition of a thing indifferent, and approves it.¹ *An indifferent thing*, he says, *is that which is neither good nor bad, so that whether you did it or did not do it, you have neither justice nor injustice.*² Behold the goodness which is excluded from the nature of a thing indifferent is not only necessity but righteousness also, yet has the Doctor excluded only the good of necessity from things indifferent, making the other good of righteousness to stand with them; for things which are done in faith, and done for the right end (such as he acknowledges these things to be which he calls indifferent), have righteousness in them, as all men know.

CHAPTER THREE

WHETHER THERE IS ANYTHING INDIFFERENT IN ACTU EXERCITO

§1. For our better light in this question I will premit these considerations: 1. When we measure the goodness or the badness of a human action, we must not only measure it by the object and the end, but by all the circumstances which accompany it. Federic Morel, upon those words of Seneca, *Refert quid, cui, quando, quare, ubi*, etc. [*he reports what, to whom, when, why, where*], says, that without those circumstances of things, persons, times,

1. Ubi supra, lib. 2, cap. 5, num. 1. [*Irenicum*, p. 105.]

2. *Indifferens illud est quod nec bonum nec malum est, ut sive feceris sive non feceris, nec justitiam habebas nec injustitiam.* [Cf. The Second Helvetic Confession, Article 27.3, in *The Creeds Of Christendom*, ed. Philip Schaff (1919; repr. Baker Book House, 1977) 3.303. "Neque enim indifferentia sunt inter bonum et malum, sicut philosophi disputant. Bonum est continentia, malum est luxuria; inter utrumque indifferent, ambulare, digerere alvi stercora, capitis naribus purgamenta projicere, sputis rheumata jacere: hoc nec bonum, nec malum est; sive enim feceris, sive non feceris, nec justitiam habebis, nec injustitiam." Cf. James T. Dennison, *Reformed Confessions* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2010) 2.877. See Jerome's letter to Augustine in the works of both: Augustine, *Epistola LXXV*, Caput IV, §16, PL 33.260; Jerome, *Epistola CXII*, §16, PL 22.926. See the translation in NPNF1 1.340, *Letters of St. Augustine*, Letter 75 – Jerome to Augustine, Chapter 4, §16.]

places, *facti ratio non constat* [the reason of the deed is not known].¹ Circumstances sometimes establish the type of things that are done, say our divines, meaning that circumstances do make an action good or bad.² *Human actions*, say the schoolmen, are called good or bad not only because of their objects but also because of their circumstances.³ It is not every man's part, saith one of our opposites, to judge about the circumstance which renders an action either good or bad.⁴ *Some circumstances*, says another of them,⁵ are intrinsical and essential to actions, and specially making up their nature. The principal circumstances which here we speak of, are comprehended in this versicle:

*Quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando.*⁶

The first circumstance which makes an action good or bad is *quis* [who], which designs the person: If a magistrate puts to death a malefactor, the action is good; but if a private person puts him to death, it is evil.

The second is *quid* [what], which notes the quality or condition of the object: If a man takes *sua* [his own], the action is good; if *aliena* [another's], it is evil.

The third is *ubi* [where]: If men banquet in their own houses, the action is good; if in the church, it is evil.

The fourth is *quibus auxiliis* [by what means]: If men seek health by lawful means, the action is good; if by the devil, or his instruments, it is evil.

The fifth is *cur* [why]: If I rebuke my brother for his fault, out of my love to him, and desire to reclaim him, the action is good; if out of hatred and spleen [spite], the action is evil.

The sixth is *quomodo* [how]: For he who does the work of the Lord carefully does well; but he who does it negligently does evil.

The seventh is *quando* [when]: To do servile work upon the six days of labor, is good; but to do it upon the Lord's Sabbath, is evil.

§2. 2. There is another consideration which follows upon the former; and it is this: The goodness or badness of a human action may be considered

1. Schol. in lib. 2 [§XVI], Seneca, *de Beneficiis*. [Cf. *Moral Essays*, volume 3. With an English translation by John W. Basore. Loeb Classical Library (1935); Federic Morel et al, *L. Annæi Senecæ philosophi et M. A. Senecæ rhetoris* ... (Paris, 1619), Morelli, *Scholæ*, p. 5 (separate pagination, after "Index ... Notas Andreae Schotti." "Refert quid, cui, quando, quare, ubi, &c.") De his circumstantiis rerum, personarum, temporis, loci, sine quibus ... facti ratio non constat, Aristoteles iv. Ethic."]

2. Jun., *de Pol. Mos.*, cap. 5. *constituunt rerum earum quæ aguntur speciem*. [Cf. Abraham Kuyper, *D. Francisci Junii opuscula theologica selecta* (Amstelodami: 1882) 381.]

3. Aquinas, 1^a 2^a quest. 18, art. 3 [cf. Article 3, Conclusio, *Doctōris angelici divi Thomæ Aquinatis Opera omnia*, Volume 2 (Paris: Vivès, 1872) 178.] *Humani actus non solum ex objectis, verum ex circumstantiis boni vel mali esse dicuntur*.

4. Camero, *Prael.*, tom. 2, p. 49. *de circumstantia, quæ reddit actionem vel bonam vel malam*.

5. Dr. Burges, *Of the Lawfulness of Kneeling*, cap. 1, [p. 2].

6. [Cf. Aquinas, 1^a 2^a quest. 7, art. 3. *Who, what, where, by what means, why, how, when.*]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This is a listing of all works referenced in *A Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies*. Editions cited are not necessarily those George Gillespie would have consulted. An asterisk (*) denotes a work adduced by the editor for common literary and classical allusions, or as additional background on the author's citations.

Abbreviations.

ANF. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and Arthur Cleveland Coxe. 10 volumes. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1885.

NPNF1. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1886–1890.

NPNF2. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series*. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1890–1900.

PG. *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Græca*. Edited by J. P. Migne. Petit-Montrouge: Apud J.-P. Migne, 1857–1866.

PL. *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina*. Edited by J. P. Migne. Petit-Montrouge: Apud J.-P. Migne, 1844–1855.

*Accius, Lucius (or Attius). Roman tragic poet and literary scholar (170–c. 86 BC). *Armorum Judicium*. See Macrobius.

Ainsworth, Henry. Puritan divine (1571–1622). *Annotations Upon the Five Bookes of Moses, and the Booke of the Psalmes, and the Song of Songs*. London: 1627.

Alsted, Johann. German Reformed divine (1588–1638). *Theologia Casuum*. Hanover: 1621; 1630. The second edition of 1630 has the additional chapter 27, “De casibus conscientiae circa Disciplinam ecclesiasticam.”

———. *Thesaurus Chronologiae*. Herborn: 1624.

Ambrose. Bishop of Milan (c.340–397). *Epiſtola 31 (Epiſtola XVIII)*. Cf. *Opera Omnia, Epiſtolarum Classis I*. In PL 16.

———. *Epiſtola Syricii Papæ ad Mediolanensem Ecclesiam*. In *Epiſtolarum Classis I. PL 16*. *Cf. “The Letter of Pope Siricius to the Church of Milan.” In *The Letters of S. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan*. Translated by H. Walford. Oxford: James Parker and Co., and Rivingtons, 1881.

Ambrosiaſter (c. 366–384). *Commentaria in XII Epiſtolas Beati Pauli*. Cf. Ambrose, *Opera Omnia*. In PL 17.

———. In *Epiſtolam B. Pauli Ad Corinthios Primam*.

———. *In *Epiſtolam B. Pauli ad Ephesios*.

———. In *Epiſtolam B. Pauli ad Timotheum Primam*.

Ambrose, of Milan (pseudo). Of the Sacraments. Cf. *Opera Omnia, De Sacramentis. PL 16*. *See also, *St. Ambrose. “On the Mysteries” and the Treatise on the Sacraments by an Unknown Author*. Translated by T. Thompson and edited by J. H. Srawley. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919.

Ames, William. Puritan divine (1576–1633). *Bellarmino Enervatus*. 1630.

———. *De Conscientia*. 1630. **Conscience with the Power and Cases thereof*. 1639; 1643.

- . *Fresh Suit against Human Ceremonies in God's Worship*. 1633.
- Andrewes, Lancelot. Bishop of Winchester (1555–1626). *Sermons*. 1628. Cf. *Ninety-Six Sermons*. Oxford: Parker, 1841.
- Aquinas, Thomas. Medieval philosopher and theologian (1224–1274). *Summa Theologica*. Cf. *Summa Theologica*. Rome: 1888. Online: <http://www.corpus Thomisticum.org/iopera.html>.
- . **Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas*. Anton C. Pegis. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub, 1997.
- . *Opera omnia*. Paris: Vivès, 1872.
- . *The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Fathers of the English Dominican Province. 2nd rev. ed., 1920. <http://www.newadvent.org/summa/>.
- Augustine. Bishop of Hippo (354–430). *Epistolæ*. Cf. “*Epistolæ Classes Quatuor*.” Migne, *PL* 33.
- . “*The Confessions and Letters of St. Augustin*.” In *NPNF1* 1.
- . *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani Liber Tres*. Cf. *PL* 43.
- . *De Baptismo Contra Donatistas*. Cf. *PL* 43.
- . *De Bono Conjugali*. Cf. *PL* 40.
- . *De Civitate Dei (City of God)*. Cf. *NPNF1* 2.
- . *De Moribus Manichæorum*. Cf. *PL* 32; *NPNF1* 4.
- . *De Vera Religione*. Cf. *PL* 34.
- . *De Verbis Domini (Sermones de Scripturis)*. Cf. *PL* 38.
- . **Exposition of the Book of Psalms*. *NPNF1* 8.
- . **Letter to Consentius: Against Lying*. *NPNF1* 3.
- . **Reply to Faustus the Manichean*. *NPNF1* 4.
- . *Works of Monks*. Cf. *NPNF1* 3.
- . *Works of Saint Augustine. Vol. 1: Letters 1–99*. Translated by John Rotelle and Roland J. Teske. New City Press, 2001.
- . **Works of Saint Augustine. Vol. 4, Sermons 94A–147A, Part 3*. Translated by Edmund Hill. New City Press, 1992.
- Augustine (pseudo-Ambrosiaster). *Quæstiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*. Cf. Migne, *PL* 35.2213–2412.
- Balduin, Friedrich. Lutheran theologian (1575–1627). *Tractatus De Casibus Conscientiæ*. In *Tractatus lucentis posthumus*. 1628. Cf. Frankfurt: Impensis Caspari Wächtleri, 1654.
- Báñez, Domingo. Spanish Thomistic theologian (1528–1604). *Scholastica Commentaria*. 1582. Cf. *Scholastica commentaria in secundam secundæ*. Duaci: Ex typographia Petri Borremans, 1615.
- *Bannerman, James. Scottish theologian (1807–1868). *The Church of Christ*. 2 volumes. Edinburgh: 1868.
- Baronius, Cesare (Cesare Baronio). Cardinal, Roman Catholic ecclesiastical historian (1538–1607). *Annales Ecclesiastici*. 1588–1607. Paris: Barri-Ducis, 1864–1883.
- Basil of Caesaria (c.328–379). *Epistolæ*. In *Opera Omnia*. PG 32.
- . *Letters and Select Works*. *NPNF2* 8.
- Bastwick, John. Medical doctor, Puritan and Presbyterian pamphleteer (1594–c.1654). *Elenchus Papiſticæ Religionis In Quo Probatur Neque Apoſtolicam, Neque Catholicam, Imo Neque Romanam Eſſe*. London: 1627. Cf. Amsterdam: Ioannem Ianssonium, 1634.

- Baynes, Paul. Puritan divine (d. 1617). *A Help to True Happiness. Or a brief and learned Exposition of the Points of Christian Religion*. 1618. Cf. 3rd ed., 1635.
- Becan, Martin. Jesuit controversialist (1563–1624). *Manuale Controversiarum*. Heriboli: Volmar & Dalius, 1623.
- *Belgic Churches. *Kerkelyk Hantboekje*. Edited by P. Biesterveld and H. H. Kuyper. Kampen: Bos, 1905. Cf. Richard De Ridder, “Translation of Ecclesiastical Manual: including the decisions of the Netherlands Synods.” Calvin Theological Seminary, 1982.
- Bellarmino, Robert. Jesuit apologist, Cardinal (1542–1621). *Disputationes de Controversiis Christiane Fidei*. Cf. *Opera Omnia*. Edited by Justinus Fevre. Paris: Vives, 1870.
- . *Institutiones Linguae Hebraicae*. 1580. Cf. Paris: 1622.
- Beza, Theodore. French Protestant theologian and Reformer (1519–1605). *Ad Tractationem de Ministrorum Evangelii Gradibus ab Hadriano Saravia editam responsio*. Excudebat Ioannes Le Preux. [1592].
- . *Antithesis Papatus & Christianismi*. In *Confessio Christianae Fidei et ejusdem collatio cum papisticis haeresibus*. Geneva: 1570.
- . *Confessio Christianae Fidei et ejusdem collatio cum papisticis haeresibus*. 1570.
- . *Jesu Christi D.N. Novum Testamentum*. Geneva: Jacobi Stoer, 1616. Cf. *Annotationes ad Novum Testamentum* (1642), but Gillespie appears to have used the smaller NT translation with short notes, rather than the larger *Annotationes*.
- . *Quaestionum et Responsonum Christianarum pars altera, Quae est de Sacramentis*. Geneva: Excudebat Eustathius Vignon, 1582.
- *Bingham, Joseph. English scholar and divine (1668–1723). *Origines Ecclesiasticae: The Antiquities of the Christian Church*. 1708–1722. Cf. London: H. G. Bohn, 1856.
- Bini, Severin. German Roman Catholic priest, historian and critic (d. 1641). *Concilia Generalia, et Provincialia, Graeca et Latina*. 4 vols. 1606. Cf. 2nd ed. Coloniae Agrippinae: Antonij Hierati, 1618.
- Bodin, Jean. French jurist (1520–1596). *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*. 1566. Cf. Geneva: Stoer, 1610.
- Boniface VIII. Pope (c.1234–1303). “De Regulis Juris.” In *Liber Sextus Decretalium D. Bonifacii Papae VIII*. Francofurti: Feyrabendius, Fischerus & Tackius, 1586.
- *Brown, K. M., et al. *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*. St Andrews, 2007–2011. <http://www.rps.ac.uk>. Date accessed: 9 January 2011.
- Bucer, Gerson. Protestant preacher, Veere, Zeeland (c.1565–1631). *Dissertatio de Gubernatione Ecclesiae*. Middelburgi Zelandorum: 1618.
- Bucer, Martin. Strasburg Reformer (1491–1551). *Censura*. In *Scripta Anglicana fere omnia*. Basle: 1577. Cf. *Censura*, chapters 9–16. In Thomas Mount Fallow, *The Order of Baptism, Both Public and Private, According to the Use of the United Church of England and Ireland: Illustrated from the Use of Salisbury, the Religious Consultation of Herman, ... and Revisers of the Book of Common Prayer*. London: James Burns, 1838.
- . “Martin Bucer et Matthew Parker Florilegium Patristicum.” In *Martini Buceri Opera Latina*. Volume III. Brill, 1988.
- Buchanan, George. Scottish humanist (1506–1582). **Georgii Buchanani Franciscanus et fratres. Quibus accessere varia eiusdem et aliorum poemata*. Guarinus, 1564.
- . *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*. 1582. English ed., 1690.
- Bullinger, Heinrich. Swiss Reformer (1504–1575). In *Divinum Jesu Christi Domini Nostri Evangelium Secundum Joannem, Commentariorum libri X*. Tiguri: 1543.

- . *In Omnes Apostolicas Epiſtolas*. Tiguri: 1549.
- . *The Second Helvetic Confession*. Cf. *The Creeds Of Christendom*. Edited by Philip Schaff. 1919. Repr. Baker Book House, 1977.
- Burges, John. Moderate/Conforming Puritan divine (1563–1635). *An Answer Rejoined to that much applauded pamphlet A reply to Dr. Morton's general defense of three nocent ceremonies*. 1631.
- . *A Manuduction unto the following Diſpute* (pp. 27–42 of *An Answer Rejoined*). 1631.
- . *The Lawfulness of Kneeling in the act of receiving the Lord's Supper*. Appended to *An Answer Rejoined*. 1631.
- Buxtorff, John. Firſt Proteſtant Hebrew ſcholar; Hebrew profeſſor at Baſel (1564–1629). *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*. 1634. Cf. *Joannis Buxtorffii Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*. Edited by Bernard Fiſcher. Lipſiæ: M. Schaeferi, 1875.
- . *Lexicon Hebraicum et Chaldaicum*. Sixth edition. Baſil: 1607.
- Calderwood, David. Scottish theologian and hiſtorian (1575–1650). *Altare Damascenum, ceu politia eccleſiæ Anglicanæ obruſa Eccleſiæ Scoticanæ, a formalifta quodam delineata, illuſtrata & examinata, ſtudio & opera Edwardi Didoclavii. Cui locis ſuis interſerta conſutatatio Pareneſeos Tileni ad Scotos Genevenſis, ut ait, diſciplinæ zelotas; et adjecta Epiſtola Hieronymi Philadelphi de regimine eccleſiæ Scoticanæ. Ejusque vindiciæ contra calumnias Iohannis Spotsuodi Fani Andreæ Pſeudoarchiepiſcopi per anonymum* (pseudonym Edwardus Didoclavius). Amſterdam: 1623. Lugdunum Batavorum: 1708.
- . *The Courſe of Conformitie: as it hath proceeded, is concluded, ſhould be reſuſed*. 1622. Also attributed to William Scot (1558–1642).
- . **Hiſtory of the Kirk of Scotland*. Edited by Thomas Thomſon. 8 volumes. Edinburgh: Printed for the Wodrow Society, 1842–1849.
- . *The Paſtor and the Prelate, or Reformation and Conformitie*. 1628.
- . *Perth Aſſembly: Containing 1 The proceedings thereof. 2 The prooffe of the nullitie thereof. 2 [sic] Reaſons preſented thereto againſt the receiving the five new articles impoſed. 4 The oppoſiteneneſſe of it to the proceedings and oath of the whole ſtate of the land. An. 1581. 5 Prooffes of the unlawfulleneſſe of the ſaid five articles, viz. 1. Kneeling in the act of receiving the Lords Supper. 2. Holy daies. 3. Biſhopping. 4. Private baptiſme. 5. Private Communion*. [Leiden]: 1619.
- . *A Reply to Dr. Mortons Particular Defence of Three Nocent Ceremonies*. [Amſterdam]: 1623. Also attributed to William Ames.
- Calepino, Ambrogio. Italian lexicographer (1436–1511). *Cornucopiae*. 1502 (many later and expanded editions of multiple languages). Cf. *Ambrosii Calepini Dictionarium octolingue, In quo Latinis Diſtionibus Hebrææ, Græcæ, Gallicæ, Italicæ, Germanicæ, Hiſpanicæ, atque Anglicæ adiectæ ſunt*. Coloniae Allobrogum: Sumpſtibus Caldorianæ Societatis, 1609.
- Calvin, John. Reformer (1509–1564). *Calvin's Commentaries*. 45 volumes. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society. 1844–1856. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983.
- . *Calvin's Selected Works: Tracts and Letters*. Edited Henry Beveridge et al., 7 volumes. 1849–1858. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983.
- . *Joannis Calvinii Opera quæ ſupersunt omnia*. 59 volumes. In *Corpus*

- Reformatorem*, volumes 29–87. Edited G. Baum, Ed Cunitz, Eduard Reuss, and Alfred Erichson. 87 volumes. Brunsvigæ: C.A. Schwetschke, 1834–1900.
- . *Epistolæ et Responsa*. In *Johannis Calvini Opera omnia theologica in septem tomos digesta*. Volume 6. Geneva: Jean Vignon, Pierre and Jacob Chouët, 1617.
- . *De Fugienda Idololatria*. Cf. *Ioannis Calvini homiliæ sive conciones IV*, translated by Claude Baduel (1553); *Opera omnia*, volume 8 (1667). Calvin was not involved in the publication of any of his sermons except for the 1552 French first edition of these. Cf. Wulfert De Greef, *Writings of John Calvin*, translated by Lyle Bierma (Westminster John Knox Press, 2008) 96. Cf. “Quatre sermons de M. Iehan Calvin traictans des matieres fort utiles pour nostre temps,” CR 36 (CO 8). Cf. *Come Out from Among Them: Anti-Nicodemite Writings of John Calvin*, translated by Seth Skolnitsky (Protestant Heritage Press, 2001).
- . *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John T. McNeill. Translated by Ford Lewis Battles. Library of Christian Classics. Volumes 20–21. 2 volumes. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.
- . *Responsio Ad Versipellem Quendam Mediatorem*. In CR 37 (CO 9). “Response a Un Certain Moyenneur Rusé.” In *Recueil des Opuscles*. Geneva: Stoer, 1611.
- Cameron, John. Scottish synegetic theologian (c.1579–1625). *An Examination of those plausible appearances which seem most to commend the Romish Church and to prejudice the Reformed [Popish Prejudice]*. Oxford: 1626.
- . *Opera*. Geneva: Petri Chouët, 1658.
- . *Prælectiones Theologicae in selectiora quædam loca N.T.* 3 volumes. Saumur: 1626–28.
- *Cameron, Nigel M. de S., et al. *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology*. InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Cartwright, Thomas. Puritan divine (1535–1603). *A Confutation of the Rhemists Translation, Glosses and Annotations on the New Testament*. [Leidan]: 1618. Reprint, English Experience, its record in early printed books published in facsimile, no. 364. Amsterdam and New York: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum and Da Capo Press, 1971.
- Casaubon, Issac. French humanist scholar (1559–1614). *Isaaci Casauboni De rebus sacris et ecclesiasticis exercitationes XVI: ad Cardinal. Baronii Prolegomena in Annales, et primam eorum partem, de D. N. Iesu Christi Nativitate, Vita, Passione, Assumptione. Ad Iacobum, Dei gratia, Magnæ Britannia, etc. Regem sereniss. Cum prolegomenis Auctoris, in quibus de Baronianis Annalibus candidè disputantur*. Frankfurt: Ruland, 1615.
- . **De Libertate Ecclesiastica*. Paris: 1607. Cf. Melchior Goldastus, *Monarchia S. Romani Imperii*. 1614. See Goldast. Cf. George Hicckes, *Two Treatises*. 1848.
- Cassander, George. Flemish Humanist and theologian (1513–1566). *De Officio Pii ac Publicæ Tranquillitatis vere amantis viri, in hoc religionis dissidio*. Paris: 1562.
- Chemnitz, Martin. German Lutheran theologian (1522–1586). *De Examen Concilii Tridentini*. 4 volumes. 1565–1573. Berlin: 1861. Cf. *Examination of the Council of Trent*. Translated by Fred Kramer. Concordia, 1971–1986.
- Chrysostom, Greek Father (347–407). *Opera Omnia*. In PG 47–64. Cf. NPNF1 9–14.
- . *Epistolam ad Ephesios*. Cf. PG 62.
- . Homilies on 1 Corinthians. Cf. NPNF1 12; PG 61.
- . Homilies on 1 Timothy. NPNF1 13.
- . Homilies on Matthew. NPNF1 10; PG 58.
- . Homilies on Titus. Cf. NPNF1 13; PG 62.

- Church, Catholic. *Corpus Juris Canonici*. Edited by Justus Henning Böhmer, Aemilius Ludwig Richter, Emil Friedberg, 1839. Cf. Lipsiæ: 1876–1881. Reprint, 1959.
- Cicero. Roman statesman (106–43 BC). *Letters of Cicero*. Edited by J. H. Muirhead, 1885.
- . *De Natura Deorum*. Cf. Loeb Classical Library, 268. Edited by H. Rackham. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- . *De Officiis*. Cf. Loeb Classical Library, 30. *De Officiis with an English translation by Walter Miller*. London and New York: 1913.
- Clement of Rome. Apostolic Church Father (fl. c.90–100). *Clementine Homilies* (Pseudo-Clementine). Cf. PG 2. See also, “The Clementine Homilies.” In ANF 1.
- *Coke, Sir Edward. English jurist (1552–1634). *The Reports of Sir Edward Coke in thirteen parts complete*. London: Printed for J. Rivington, 1777.
- Confessions, Reformed. See *Harmonia Confessionum*.
- Conti, Natale. Italian mythographer, poet, humanist and historian (1520–1582). *Natalis Comitis Mythologiae*. 1567. Cf. Patauij: Apud Petrumpaulum Tozzium, 1616.
- Cyprian. Bishop of Carthage (d. 258). *Opera Omnia*. In PL 4. Cf. ANF 5.
- . *Epištolaē*. ANF 5. PL 4. Also, *Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, The Epištles of S. Cyprian*. Oxford: Parker, 1868. And *Letters, 1–81*. Translated by Rose Bernard Donna. Fathers of the Church, volume 51. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, Inc., 1964.
- . *De Haereticis Baptizandis*. Cf. “Acta et Monumenta Celeberrimæ de Hæreticorum Baptismate Disputationis.” PL 3.
- Daneau, Lambert. French Calvinist minister (1530–1596). *De Politice Christianæ*. Geneva: Vignon, 1596.
- Davenant, John. Bishop of Salisbury (1576–1641). *Expositio Epišt. D. Pauli ad Colossenses*. Cambridge, 1630.
- . *Disputatio de Juštitia Habituali et Actuali altero*. In *Prælectiones De Dubus In Theologia Controversis Capitibus*. 1631. Cf. *A Treatise on Justification*. Translated by Josiah Allport. 1844.
- . *De Judice Controversiarum Primo*. In *Prælectiones De Dubus In Theologia Controversis Capitibus*. 1631.
- *Dennison, James T. *Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation*. Volume 2, 1552–1566. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2010.
- Dominis, Marco Antonio de. Archbishop of Spalato (1566–1624). *De Republicâ Ecclesiastica*. Part I. London: 1617. Part II. 1620. Part III. Hanov: 1622.
- . *Oštensio Errorum P. Francisci Suarez*. In *De Republica Ecclesiastica ... libros quintum et sextum*. London: 1620.
- Downname, George. Bishop of Derry (d. 1634). *An Abstract of the Duties Commanded, and Sinnes Forbidden in the Law of God*. 1619.
- . *A Defence of the Sermon Preached at the Consecration of the L. Bishop of Bath and Welles against a Confutation thereof by a Namelesse Author*. London: Printed by Thomas Creed, William Hall, and Thomas Snodham, 1611.
- . “A Sermon defending the honourable function of Bishops....” In *Two Sermons, the one commending the ministerie in generall: the other defending the office of bishops in particular: both preached, and since enlarged*. London: 1608.
- Du Moulin, Pierre. French Huguenot minister (1568–1658). *A Defence of the*

INDICES

Section Index

- Part 1 Chap. 1 Sect. 1 23.
 Part 1 Chap. 1 Sect. 2 23.
 Part 1 Chap. 1 Sect. 3 25.
 Part 1 Chap. 2 25.
 Part 1 Chap. 3 Sect. 1 26.
 Part 1 Chap. 3 Sect. 2 27.
 Part 1 Chap. 3 Sect. 3 29.
 Part 1 Chap. 3 Sect. 4 29.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 1 31.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 2 31.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 3 32.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 4 33.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 5 35.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 6 35.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 7 36.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 8 37.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 9 37.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 10 38.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 11 38.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 12 40.
 Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 13 41.
 Part 1 Chap. 5 Sect. 1 41.
 Part 1 Chap. 5 Sect. 2 42.
 Part 1 Chap. 5 Sect. 3 43.
 Part 1 Chap. 6 Sect. 1 44.
 Part 1 Chap. 6 Sect. 2 46.
 Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 1 47.
 Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 2 48.
 Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 3 48.
 Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 4 49.
 Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 5 49.
 Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 6 50.
 Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 7 51.
 Part 1 Chap. 8 Sect. 1 52.
 Part 1 Chap. 8 Sect. 2 53.
 Part 1 Chap. 8 Sect. 3 54.
 Part 1 Chap. 8 Sect. 4 57.
 Part 1 Chap. 8 Sect. 5 59.
 Part 1 Chap. 9 Sect. 1 60.
 Part 1 Chap. 9 Sect. 2 60.
 Part 1 Chap. 9 Sect. 3 62.
 Part 1 Chap. 9 Sect. 4 63.
 Part 1 Chap. 9 Sect. 5 67.
 Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 1 69.
 Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 2 69.
 Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 3 71.
 Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 4 73.
 Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 5 75.
 Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 6 77.
 Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 7 80.
 Part 2 Chap. 2 Sect. 1 82.
 Part 2 Chap. 2 Sect. 2 82.
 Part 2 Chap. 2 Sect. 3 83.
 Part 2 Chap. 3 Sect. 1 84.
 Part 2 Chap. 3 Sect. 2 85.
 Part 2 Chap. 3 Sect. 3 86.
 Part 2 Chap. 3 Sect. 4 86.
 Part 2 Chap. 3 Sect. 5 88.
 Part 2 Chap. 4 Sect. 1 89.
 Part 2 Chap. 4 Sect. 2 90.
 Part 2 Chap. 4 Sect. 3 92.
 Part 2 Chap. 5 Sect. 1 93.
 Part 2 Chap. 5 Sect. 2 93.
 Part 2 Chap. 5 Sect. 3 94.
 Part 2 Chap. 6 Sect. 1 95.
 Part 2 Chap. 6 Sect. 2 95.
 Part 2 Chap. 6 Sect. 3 96.
 Part 2 Chap. 6 Sect. 4 97.
 Part 2 Chap. 7 Sect. 1 98.
 Part 2 Chap. 7 Sect. 2 98.
 Part 2 Chap. 7 Sect. 3 99.
 Part 2 Chap. 7 Sect. 4 100.
 Part 2 Chap. 7 Sect. 5 100.
 Part 2 Chap. 8 Sect. 1 102.
 Part 2 Chap. 8 Sect. 2 102.
 Part 2 Chap. 8 Sect. 3 103.
 Part 2 Chap. 8 Sect. 4 104.
 Part 2 Chap. 8 Sect. 5 104.
 Part 2 Chap. 8 Sect. 6 105.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 1 107.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 2 107.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 3 108.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 4 109.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 5 110.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 6 111.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 7 112.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 8 113.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 9 114.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 10 115.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 11 116.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 12 118.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 13 120.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 14 121.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 15 122.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 16 123.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 17 124.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 18 124.
 Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 19 125.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 1 129.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 2 129.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 3 130.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 4 131.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 5 131.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 6 132.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 7 135.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 8 138.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 9 140.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 10 141.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 11 143.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 12 144.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 13 144.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 14 145.
 Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 15 145.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 1 149.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 2 150.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 3 150.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 4 151.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 5 152.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 6 154.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 7 155.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 8 157.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 9 158.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 10 160.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 11 160.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 12 161.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 13 162.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 14 163.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 15 165.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 16 166.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 17 167.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 18 168.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 19 170.
 Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 20 171.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 1 172.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 2 172.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 3 173.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 4 174.

- Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 5 175. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 3 240. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 25 297.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 6 176. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 4 241. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 26 299.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 7 177. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 5 242. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 27 302.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 8 178. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 6 242. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 28 305.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 9 180. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 7 244. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 29 306.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 10 181. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 8 245. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 30 307.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 11 182. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 9 246. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 31 309.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 12 183. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 10 248. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 32 311.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 13 183. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 11 248. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 33 312.
 Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 14 186. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 12 251. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 34 313.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 1 187. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 13 252. Part 3 Chap. 8, Digres. 1 313.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 2 187. Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 14 253. Part 3 Chap. 8, Digr. 2 329.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 3 188. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 1 254. Part 3 Chap. 8, Digr. 3 333.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 4 191. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 2 256. Part 3 Chap. 8, Digr. 4 337.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 5 192. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 3 257. Part 3 Chap. 9, Sect. 1 359.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 6 192. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 4 258. Part 3 Chap. 9, Sect. 2 359.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 7 193. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 5 259. Part 3 Chap. 9, Sect. 3 360.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 8 194. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 6 261. Part 3 Chap. 9, Sect. 4 361.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 9 195. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 7 262. Part 3 Chap. 9, Sect. 5 362.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 10 198. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 8 263. Part 3 Chap. 9, Sect. 6 363.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 11 199. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 9 264. Part 3 Chap. 9, Sect. 7 363.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 12 201. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 10 265. Part 3 Chap. 9, Sect. 8 364.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 13 202. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 11 266. Part 3 Chap. 9, Sect. 9 365.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 14 204. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 12 267. Part 4 Chap. 1 367.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 15 206. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 13 268. Part 4 Chap. 2, Sect. 1 368.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 16 209. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 14 269. Part 4 Chap. 2, Sect. 2 369.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 17 211. Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 15 270. Part 4 Chap. 2, Sect. 3 371.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 18 213. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 1 271. Part 4 Chap. 2, Sect. 4 371.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 19 214. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 2 272. Part 4 Chap. 2, Sect. 5 372.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 20 216. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 3 273. Part 4 Chap. 3, Sect. 1 373.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 21 217. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 4 274. Part 4 Chap. 3, Sect. 2 374.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 22 217. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 5 275. Part 4 Chap. 3, Sect. 3 377.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 23 218. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 6 276. Part 4 Chap. 3, Sect. 5 381.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 24 219. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 7 276. Part 4 Chap. 3, Sect. 6 381.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 25 219. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 8 277. Part 4 Chap. 3, Sect. 7 382.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 26 220. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 9 277. Part 4 Chap. 3, Sect. 8 383.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 27 223. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 10 278. Part 4 Chap. 3, Sect. 9 384.
 Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 28 223. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 11 279. Part 4 Chap. 3, Sect. 10 386.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 1 225. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 12 279. Part 4 Chap. 4, Sect. 1 387.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 2 226. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 13 280. Part 4 Chap. 4, Sect. 2 388.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 3 227. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 14 281. Part 4 Chap. 4, Sect. 3 388.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 4 228. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 15 284. Part 4 Chap. 3, Sect. 4 379.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 5 229. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 16 285. Part 4 Chap. 4, Sect. 4 389.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 6 230. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 17 288. Part 4 Chap. 4, Sect. 5 390.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 7 232. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 18 289. Part 4 Chap. 5, Sect. 1 390.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 8 233. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 19 290. Part 4 Chap. 5, Sect. 2 391.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 9 233. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 20 292. Part 4 Chap. 6, Sect. 1 392.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 10 235. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 21 293. Part 4 Chap. 6, Sect. 2 393.
 Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 11 236. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 22 294. Part 4 Chap. 6, Sect. 3 394.
 Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 1 237. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 23 295. Part 4 Chap. 6, Sect. 4 395.
 Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 2 238. Part 3 Chap. 8, Sect. 24 296. Part 4 Chap. 6, Sect. 5 396.

Part 4 Chap. 6, Sect. 6	397.	Part 4 Chap. 8, Sect. 2	406.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 3	415.
Part 4 Chap. 6, Sect. 7	398.	Part 4 Chap. 8, Sect. 3	407.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 4	416.
Part 4 Chap. 6, Sect. 8	401.	Part 4 Chap. 8, Sect. 4	408.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 5	416.
Part 4 Chap. 7, Sect. 1	402.	Part 4 Chap. 8, Sec. [5]	409.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 6	417.
Part 4 Chap. 7, Sect. 2	402.	Part 4 Chap. 8, Sect. 6	410.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 7	417.
Part 4 Chap. 7, Sect. 3	403.	Part 4 Chap. 8, Sect. 7	410.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 8	418.
Part 4 Chap. 7, Sect. 4	403.	Part 4 Chap. 8, Sect. 8	412.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 9	418.
Part 4 Chap. 7, Sect. 5	403.	Part 4 Chap. 8, Sect. 9	413.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 10	419.
Part 4 Chap. 7, Sect. 6	404.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 1	414.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 11	419.
Part 4 Chap. 8, Sect. 1	405.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 2	415.	Part 4 Chap. 9, Sect. 12	419.

Edition Errata

This index presents errors in the previous editions of the text. The editions of 1637, 1846 and 1993 were collated and the 1660 edition upon which the 1846 was based, was checked when an error appeared to originate in the latter.

To All the Reformed Churches

sits for flits (flitteth): Works; 1993: 4.
104 for 204 in Cassander Anglicanus, p. 104: all editions 13.
“adversary” in “nothing terrified by your adversaries”: 1993 8.
Aquinas 1a (Works; 1993) for 2a (1637) 17.
[impeding] for [fault-finding] (1993) 10.
Meritricious misdefined as meritorious (1993). 6.
“tuli nullum” for “tali nullum”: 1993 22.
Verbveribus for verberibus: 1993 10.
In “Order”: “the” for “their” in “their elaborate”: 1993 21.

Part 1 Chap. 2

Tilen translation: “if love” for “since love”: 1993 26.

Part 1 Chap. 3 Sect. 1

“irritan” for “irritam”: 1993 27.
Paræus translation: “slavery of men. That is obvious since injustice was done” for “slavery of men, for that would be done with injury”: 1993 27.
Paræus translation: “we are free in Christ” for “we are the freedmen of Christ”: 1993 27.
Tilen translation: “need not be obeyed unless” for “need only to be obeyed “as far as to the altars”: 1993 (see footnote) 27.

Part 1 Chap. 3 Sect. 2

“Be ye not the servants”; dropped “not”: 1993 28.
Chemntiz translation: “in the church” missing: 1993 28.
“conscience of their ceremonies” for “conscience of their ordinances”: 1993 28.
Cyprian translation: “should yield to his own judgment” for “should yield his own right”: 1993 29.
“perverse command, wants, or desires” for “perverse commandments, or desires”: 1993 28.

Part 1 Chap. 3 Sect. 3

“will of God’s word” for “rule of God’s word”: Works; 1993 29.

Part 1 Chap. 3 Sect. 4

Tilen trans.: “strength” for “force” in “the force of directing and warning”: 1993 33.
Calvin translation: “As I grant” for “Although I might grant”; “your church has” for “your churches have”: 1993 62.

Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 1

Tilen translation: “authority for enforcing” for “authority for compelling”: 1993 31.
Tilen translation: “function of conducting” for “function of grieving”: 1993 31.

Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 2

Ames translation: “that a conscience may subject” for “so that conscience ought to subject”: 1993 32.
Ames translation: “to have that kind of authority” for “to hold that as an authority”: 1993 32.

Ames translation: "to the extent that" for "in such a way that": 1993 32.

Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 3

"legasti" for "legati": 1993 33.

"ssubditi" for "subditi": 1993 32.

Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 4

"altunde" for "aliunde": Works; 1993 34.

"church do not only bind" for "church do only bind": Works; 1993 35.

"hab ent" for "habent": 1993 34.

Junius translation: "as a right order, because of love" for "because of order, love": 1993 34.

Junius translation: "but" for "moreover" in "but it does not force": 1993 34.

Junius translation: "indeed even directs as a canon, one already voluntarily" for "hence it as a canon directs one acting voluntarily": 1993 34.

Junius translation: "is a warning of a cause of offense" for "wariness of scandal": 1993 34.

Junius translation: "though if perhaps" for "but if" in "but if compulsion": 1993 34.

Leyden professors translation: "chiefly" for "primarily" and "accident" for "circumstance": 1993 34.

Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 5

"nihil que" for "nihilque": Works 35.

Tillen footnote, "offendeicula" for "offendicula": 1993 35.

Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 6

Calvin translation: "were regarded as good by divine providence" for "divinely approved": 1993 35.

Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 8

Bellarmino translation: "is so bound by a rule to do external work, that if he does not do it" for "is bound by a rule to do an external work, in such a way, that if he does not do it": 1993 37.

Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 9

"voluntate" for "voluntate": 1993 37.

Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 11

Footnote: "Ibid., p. 363" for "Ibid., 366": 1993 39.

In translation of "respectu præcipientis", "teacher" for "one commanding": 1993 39, 40.

"posse los" for "posse eos" (Works); "cos:" for "eos" (1660) 39.

The word "matter" missing from translation of "respectu materiæ præcepti": 1993 39.

Part 1 Chap. 4 Sect. 12

"æiernæ" for "æternæ": Works; 1993 40.

"Legesæ human" for "leges humanæ": Works 40.

Leyden professors translation: "alone" missing in "dominion of God alone": 1993 41.

Part 1 Chap. 5 Sect. 1

"thing" for "things": Works; 1993 41.

Part 1 Chap. 5 Sect. 2

Hemmingius translation: "so that in taking its meaning, one sins by doing something contrary to it" for "by thus understanding that the one acting contrary to it sins": 1993 42.

"Quiequid" for "Quicquid": 1993 42.

Part 1 Chap. 6 Sect. 1

1 Cor. 10: 15 misplaced after "will and authority" (Works) 44.

1 Thess. 5: 25 (1637; Works) for 1 Thess. 5: 21 46.

Cameron translation: "and what isn't, and therefore what things proceed from the church" missing after "And if they should be unable to grasp what is a religious matter": 1993 45.

Danæus translation: "Apologetic" for "Apology"; "almost two" for "generally two"; "even Plato writes" for "Plato also writes"; "without doubt" for "that is;": 1993 45.

"eebent eæ leges" for "debent eæ leges": 1993 46.

"pærscripti" for "præscripti": Works; 1993 45.

Part 1 Chap. 6 Sect. 2

Aquinas footnote: "4. 147" for "q. 147": all editions 47.

Aquinas footnote: "causa fit" for "causa sit" and "se ipsum" for "seipsum": all editions 47.

Aquinas footnote: "oservantiam" for "observantiam" 1993 47.

Augustine translation: "counted up, but considered" for "counted up, but weighted": 1993 46.

Calvin translation: "we rightly feel" for "we feel"; "of questioning" for "of judging rightly"; "it must be indicated by" for "it is to be sought from": 1993 47.

"codem" for "eodem": 1993 47.

"liberum ... ant reprobandi" for "liberum ... aut reprobandi": 1993 47.

Paræus translation: "therefore they remove their blame" for "therefore their inability is their own fault": 1993 47.

Pythagorean disciples: definition in 1993 refined 47.

"suffragis" for "suffragia": 1993 46.

Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 1

"week; therefore our" for "week. Ergo. Our": Works; 1993 48.

Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 2 48.

Tilen translation: "for would the laws" for "for then the laws": 1993 48.

Tilen translation: "of distinguished men possibly have been ungodly on account of the lordship" for "of princes would be impious on account of the dominion": 1993 48.

Tilen translation: "subordinates" missing after "conceded to some": 1993 48.

Tilen translation: "that distinguished men have God's permission to encroach upon his own right where indifferent matters are concerned" for "that the permission of God does not deminish from princes their right concerning indifferent things": 1993 48.

Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 5

Translation: "de genere in genus" translated "from type to type": 1993 50.

"vicious" for "vitious" [defective]: Works; 1993 49.

Part 1 Chap. 7 Sect. 6

Number of 2nd point omitted: Works 50.

Part 1 Chap. 8 Sect. 1

v. 8 for v. 9 of Galatians 4: Works 53.

Part 1 Chap. 8 Sect. 3

Augustine translation: "religion Christ" for

"religion that Christ"; "be a free one" for "be free": 1993 55.

Beza translation: "called an element" for "called elements"; "since just as God" for "since God"; "these first principles" for "these rudiments, as it were": 1993 56.

"discremen" for "discrimen": Works 55.

"no less these" for "no less than these": Works; 1993 55.

Vorstius translation: "the Apostle teaches that except for the Jewish, no division of days was supported" for "the Apostle teaches that only the Jewish distinction of days was removed": 1993 54.

Part 1 Chap. 8 Sect. 5

"seeth" for "saith": all editions 59.

Part 1 Chap. 9 Sect. 1

The word "quidditative" replaced with "equivocative": Works; 1993 60.

Part 1 Chap. 9 Sect. 2

"consuitudine" for "consuetudine": 1993 61.

Missing text & footnote confusion: 1993 61.

Part 1 Chap. 9 Sect. 3

"inrebus" for "in rebus": Works 62.

Part 1 Chap. 9 Sect. 4

"dominicm" for "dominicum": 1993 64.

"prosententia" for "pro sententia": 1993 64.

"will the church were free of them" for "wish the church were free of them": Works 63.

Part 1 Chap. 9 Sect. 5

Calvin translation: "informed" for "consistent" in "I may wish you were more consistent": 1993 68.

Calvin translation: "we feel thus" for "we judge thus"; "those following after superstitions" for "those superstitions following hence": 1993 68.

"deferendam" for "deserendam": 1993 68.

Translation of "quod dies a die discernitur" as "which discriminates a day from (another) day": 1993 68.

Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 4

Missing "as" in "But as for the ministers": 1993 74.

Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 5

alius for aliis: Works 76.

Missing “)” at “to be done”: Works 77.

Thuani Latin: “puriorum” for “puriozem”: 166c; Works 76.

Translation of “specie actionis manente eadem” as “in appearance of action, but remaining the same”: 1993 77.

Waldenses translation: “England place” for “England manifest”: 1993 76.

Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 6

Alsted translation: “there is no choice to be made” for “none is to be chosen”: 1993 79.

In point 6, “viz.” dropped after “Cambridge”: 1993 78.

Translation of “fiunt ex accidenti illicita et peccata, proindè vitanda?” as “unlawful things and sins happen as a result of accidental circumstances, and must accordingly be avoided?”: 1993 79.

Part 2 Chap. 1 Sect. 7

Sleidan translation (p. 381): “you consider” for “you consider that” and “doing, that we” for “doing, we”: 1993 81.

Sleidan translation (p. 485): “and one” for “and the one” and “and indeed most freely” for “and we do this most willingly”: 1993 81. “opugners” for “oppugners”: 1993 81.

Part 2 Chap. 3 Sect. 1

Sleidan Latin: “nune dum” for “nunc dum”: 1993 84.

Part 2 Chap. 3 Sect. 4

Cassander Latin: “sublatum” for “sublatam”: Works 87.

Cassander translation: “although I used to hold them hateful as superstitions and abuses which had been mixed together with many church ceremonies, I would”: 1993 86–87.

Citations from Richard Neile (Bishop of Durham), M. Ant. de D[omi]nis Arch-bishop of Spalato, his shiftings in religion: A man for many masters (John Bill, 1624) not noted: 1993 87–88.

“ipsum” for “ipsam”: Works 87.

Part 2 Chap. 3 Sect. 5

Junius translation: “presumption, then idolatry” for “and all idolatrous”: 1993 88.

Part 2 Chap. 4 Sect. 1

Bellarmino translation: “strange” for “external” in “to present a certain external majesty to the senses”: 1993 89.

Part 2 Chap. 4 Sect. 2

In Camero, “availing” for “annealing”: all editions 92.

Part 2 Chap. 4 Sect. 3

Hospinian translation: “those same” for “the very” in “the very teachers” and “the very pupils”; and “manners of divine” for “institutes of the divine”: 1993 92.

Part 2 Chap. 5 Sect. 1

“superbes” for “superbos”: 1993 93.

Part 2 Chap. 5 Sect. 2

Canon Latin: “cos” for “eos” twice in “sed illi qui eos persequantur; nec ipsis episcopis hoc imputari potest, sed illis qui eos hoc agere cogunt”: 1993 94.

Part 2 Chap. 6 Sect. 1

Calvin to Somerset translation: “It cannot happen” for “It cannot be helped” and “would not become rather arrogantly elated” for “grow more insolently proud”: 1993 95.

Reference: “Orthodox Faith and Way to the Church” by Francis White for “Way to the Church” by John White: 1993 95.

Part 2 Chap. 6 Sect. 2

Zanchius translation: “the very same” for “that” in “Indeed, that most learned”: 1993 95.

Part 2 Chap. 6 Sect. 3

Augustine Latin: “onmes” for “omnes” in “Deserite omnes solennitates ipsorum”: 1993 96.

Augustine translation: “called to health” for “called to salvation”: 1993 96.

Part 2 Chap. 6 Sect. 4

Points 2, 3, & 4 should not end with question marks: Works; 1993 97.

Part 2 Chap. 7 Sect. 2

Sleidan translation: “that those anointers would forsake it” for “that they themselves might depart with greater anointing”: 1993 99.

Part 2 Chap. 7 Sect. 5

“matters” for “matter”: 1993 101.

Part 2 Chap. 8 Sect. 1

Pliny translation: “in their food” for “in food”: 1993 102.

Part 2 Chap. 8 Sect. 2

Greek: *Εκάνδλον* for *Σκάνδλον*: 1993 102.

Jerome translation: “of the least of these” missing from translation: 1993 103.

Part 2 Chap. 8 Sect. 3

Aquinas translation: “from its own reckoning” for “properly of itself”; “a persuasion to sinning” for “inductive to sin”: 1993 103.

De Dominis Latin: “turbatvum” for “turbativum” and “impeditvum” for “impeditivum”: 1993 104.

De Dominis translation: “addest-on occurrence” for “super-added accident”: 1993 104.

Part 2 Chap. 8 Sect. 6

Bullinger translation: “the gospel liberty ... preaching was elevated” for “with the gospel liberty ... preaching removed”: 1993 106.

Calvin Latin: “calumniain” for “calumniam”: 1993 106.

Latin in footnote 5: “gradum” for “gradum”: 1993 105.

“omittendas” for “omittendæ”: 1993 106.

Translation of “gradum ejusdem speciei” as “appearance” for “sort”: 1993 105.

Translation of “non variant speciem scandali” as “appearance of a” for “sort of”: 1993 105.

Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 2

“not acceptum” for “non acceptum”: 1660; Works 108.

Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 4

De Dominis translation (Part 1, p. 130): “if the same person’s intent would not bring him to this” for “if his intention is not directed toward this”: 1993 109.

Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 5

Parker translation: “plundered” for “wrested” twice: 1993 111.

Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 7

“feast of the Sabbath” for “fast of the Sabbath”: Works; 1993 113.

Rom. x for Rom. 14: Works (in footnote) 112.

Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 8

An. 55 for An. 51: all editions 113.

Baronius translation: “by which it is known, or ought to be known” for “by which he knows, or ought to know”: 1993 114.

Baronius translation: “hope” for “expectation”: 1993 113.

De Dominis Latin: “facit autem” for “facit tamen”: 1660; Works; 1993 114.

Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 9

Aquinas translation: “Nothing can be a sufficient cause of sin in a man” for “To a man nothing can be a sufficient cause of sin”: 1993 114.

Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 16

Vermigli (Martyr) translation: “to be entirely the goal of our life” for “to be the goal of our whole life”: 1993 124.

Virmigli (Martyr) Latin: “Poro Scandalum” for “Porro Scandalum”; and see note: 1993 124.

Part 2 Chap. 9 Sect. 19

Ames Latin: “pro” for “pio”: all editions 125.

Final footnote Part 2 Chapter 9 split into two: Works; 1993 128.

Numbering of point 4 dropped: Works; 1993 126.

Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 2

“excessu ut, peccatur” for “excessu peccatur”: 1660; Works; 1993 129.

Zanchi translation: “sin in digression” for “sin in excess”: 1993 129.

Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 4

“nor” for “not” in “not to confirm Papists”: 1660; Works 131.

“unnecessary” for “unnecessarily”: Works 131.

Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 6

Jansen translation: "righteous man easily" for "pious man easily"; "with them, in what" for "with them, because"; "bring about toward" for "make for": 1993 134.

Mistranslation, "either for the purpose of offering or receiving" for "either so that it might be offered, or so that it might be assumed": 1993 133.

"partly that the" for "partly that that": Works; 1993 135.

"Thereupon" for "Whereupon" in "Whereupon it follows": 1993 133.

Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 8

Cerco for Cicero: 1993 139.

Hospinian quotation not in italics: 1993 139.

In Centuries, page 480 for page 408: 1660; Works 139.

Magdeburg translation: "without being any teaching of God" for "without any precept of God" and "no teaching at all" for "no precept at all": 1993 139-140.

Martyr translation (1 Kings, p. 65r): "Certainly, rather be required of an oath of piety, than that we should give thanks to God, and celebrate his goodness at the beginning by usurping his business, etc. We good men united request a religious" etc.: 1993 138.

"rectusque" for "rectiusque": 1660; Works 138.

Sanctius translation: "or the thing whose use was then first consecrated" for "or the thing the first use of which was then consecrated": 1993 139.

Vermigli Latin, "Quanto sanius rectiusque decernimus, "By so much we determine quite reasonably and rightly" for "By so much we differentiate more reasonably and rightly": 1993 138.

Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 9

Rainolds Latin: "verta" for "certa" in "alligat enim religionem ad certa loca": 1993 141.

Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 11

Boniface Latin: "ono" for "non" in "Simul Deo dicatum non est": 1993 143.

"trust" for "tryst": 1660; Works, 1993 143.

Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 13

Zanchi translation: "very active exercise" for "actual exercise": 1993 144.

Part 3 Chap. 1, Sect. 15

Acts 2: 1-8 for Acts 2: 1-3: 1993 146.

Downname footnote misplaced at the end of the paragraph: 1993 145.

Job for John in "Sermon on John 2: 19": Works; 1993 146.

Translation of "eo nomine" as "by that name": 1993 146.

In reference, Serm. on John 5: 6 for Serm. on 1 John 5: 6: all editions 146.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 1

"here proved" for "have proven": 1660; Works; 1993 149.

In title, "Idoltrous abuses" for "Idoltrous abuse": 1660; Works 149.

Translation of "reductivè" as "by conducting"; "participative" as "by imparting" and "formaliter" as "by form": 1993 149.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 3

"integantur" for "integuntur": 1660; Works; 1993 150.

Quotation marks added around "that the Israelites should destroy the Canaanites": Works 151.

Rollock translation: "The very" for "Even the very"; "or of sin, as he seems" for "or of sin is to be detested, as he seems": 1993 150.

Sanctius translation: "likenesses of Gentile ceremony were put on" for "images according to the custom of the Gentiles were covered": 1993 150.

"the" dropped from "hate the garments": (1660; Works; 1993); "garments" for "garment": Works; 1993 150.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 4

Calvin translation: "in honor of God" for "in honor of false gods": 1993 152.

Zanchi translation: "since we unite ourselves" for "since by these we unite ourselves": 1993 151.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 5

2 Chron. 23: 15 for 2 Chron. 33: 15: 1993 153.

At "places of Baal" v. 19 and other references in sentence deleted: Works; 1993 153.

Calvin translation: “things” missing from “things pertaining to idolatry”: 1993 152.
 Exod 32: 17-20 for Exod. 32: 27, 20: Works; 1993 154.
 “men’s invention” for “men’s inventions”: Works; 1993 153.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 6
 Deut. 25: 19 misplaced after “all reverence”: Works; 1993 155.
 “monumenti” for “monumentis”: 1993 154.
 “revocerantur” for “revocarentur”: Works 155.
 Translation of “Quia monent” as “that they remind”; “Quia movent” as “that they move”; “monumentum” as “a memorial”; “monimentum” as “record of admonition”; and “monet mentem” as “warns the mind”: 1993 154.
 Wolf translation as “we have experience of their use, even after the superstitions might...there were left any reminder of them,...would...of those very superstitions continue among men, but in the end to effect that they resume that practice”: 1993 155.
 Wolf translation: “warned” for “reminded” in “by which succeeding generations, as though by a memorial, may be reminded”: 1993 154.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 7
 Translation of “pium crucis usum” as “righteous use of the cross”: 1993 156.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 9
 Missing “)” after “pro tunc”: 1637 158.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 10
 Heb. 6: 7 for 7: 6: 1637; 1660; Works 160.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 11
 “Efficacious” for “Efficacius”; “muluit” for “maluit”: Works 161.
 “rejecimus” for “rejecimus”: 1993 161.
 “rights” for “rites”: Works; 1993 161.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 12
 Calvin translation (“Jam sie,” etc.): “certainly men will be warned” for “they will admonish men namely”, and “strike at them” for “strike at them now”: 1993 162.

Kirchmeyer translation: “fell” for “fall” in “fall upon the ears”: 1993 161.
 Sect. 12 marker missing: 1637; 1660 161.
 Zanchi translation: “once rather diligently” for “formerly more diligently”; “that we are doing” for “than we are doing”: 1993 161.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 13
 “pernitiosos” for “perniciosos”: 1637; Works; 1993 163.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 14
 Calvin translation: “as it is held to be an expression of pious worship” for “because the expression is held to concern legal worship”: 1993 164.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 15
 Translation of “tanta gratitudine” as “so great a gratitude” (“with” missing): 1993 166.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 16
 Parker translation: “any honorary gift to an idol, if it is overthrown by the” for “all honor to the idol be overthrown with a”: 1993 167.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 17
 Sleidan translation: “nearly-grown boys be confirmed by bishops before being baptized” for “nearly-grown boys previously baptized be confirmed by bishops”: 1993 168.

Zanchi translation: “to attract them to whoring. For all the displays such as those” for “to attract men to whoring. For all those pomps”: 1993 168.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 18
 Chemnitz translation: “for the occasion” for “for the use”; “when certainly the bread is being consecrated” for “that is, when the bread is consecrated”; “that it may be presented” for “that it might be exhibited”: 1993 169.
 “de adpratopme eicjarostoæ” for “de adoratione eucharistiæ”: 1993 169.
 “in in præsentia” for “in præsentia”: 1993 169.
 Sect. 18 & 19 marker missing (Works); Sect. 19 marker missing: 1637; 1660 168.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 19

“mouth” for “mouths”: Works; 1993 171.

Part 3 Chap. 2, Sect. 20

“howbeit it it” for “howbeit if it”: 1993 171.

“too” for “two”: Works; 1993 171.

Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 2

Calvin translation: “lest they bring here strange ceremonies from that side” for “lest from this place and that place they bring in strange rites”: 1993 173.

Deut. 22: 6-11 for Deut. 22 9-11: Works; 1993 173.

Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 5

Calvin translation: “their first small beginnings” for “small beginnings”: 1993 175.

Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 6

Balduine translation: “worship is like a symbol” for “worship, as it were, a symbol”: 1993 176.

Isidore translation: “only is incense burned in offering to demons” for “only is it sacrificed to demons by offering incense”: 1993 176.

Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 9

Canon law Latin: “Januarii calendæ” for “Januarii calendæ”: 1993 180.

Canon law translation: “who respects the worship” for “who observes the worship”: 1993 180.

Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 10

Zanchi quotation misplaced in Calvin in Ps. 16: 4: 1993 181.

Zanchi translation: “any symbol, for there to be on their part, agreement with the superstitions” for “by any symbol, that there is an agreement between them and the superstitions”: 1993 181.

Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 11

Panvinio Latin: “supra dictorum” for “super dictorum”: 1993 182.

Panvinio translation: “formerly appointed ministration of the words of the sacraments” for “solemn ministration of the sacraments formerly mentioned”: 1993 182.

Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 13

“confirmed” for “conformed”: 1993 184.

“meat” for “meats”: 1993 185.

Missing Sect. 13 marker: 1660; Works 183.

Part 3 Chap. 3, Sect. 14

Saravia translation: “rest. Saravia says, it is enough to satisfy us as forbearing ... Christians that they have so far withdrawn ... church”: 1993 186.

“Sect. 2” for “Sect. 10” in “Of the Cross in Baptism, Cap. 2, Sect. 10”: 1660; Works; 1993 186.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 1

Translation of “reductivè” as “by conducting”; “participativè” as “by imparting”: 1993 187.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 3

2 Sam. xv, 5 for 2 Sam. 16: 5 (Works); 15.5 (1660) 190.

“his punishment. There” for “his punishment), there” (poor editing of a long sentence): Works; 1993 190.

“Palastinis” for “Palæsthinis” (Works; 1993); Palesthinis (1660) 190.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 4

De Dominis translation: “performed, wonderful results have sometimes shone forth, even among unbelievers, from the sign of the cross” for “performed, the wonderful results of the sign of the cross have sometimes shone forth, even among unbelievers”: 1993 191.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 6

“communicated” for “communicate”: 1993 192. Translaton of “tanquam pro aris et focus” as “just as before altars and hearths”: 1993 193.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 7

Translation of “Christum sub hac figura figuratum” as “Christ represented within this form”: 1993 193.

Translation of “vicem corporis Christi” as “the office of the body of Christ”; “vicem sanguinis” as “the office of the blood”: 1993 193.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 8

“a” in “Franciscus à Sancta Clara” dropped: 1993 195.

Bellarmino, translation of “status questio-

nis non est" as "the state of the question is nothing other than": 1993 195.

Bellarmino, translation "symbola externa per se et proprie adoranda" as "the external symbols of themselves and for themselves, are not to be adored": 1993 195.

Paybody reference: "part 3, sect. 16" for "part 3, cap. 3, sect. 16": 1660; Works; 1993 194.

Translation of "prototypon per imaginem, ad imaginem" as "the prototype through the image, upon the image" 194.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 9

Cap xi (Works) and cap II (1637; 1660) in "Cornel. à Lapide, Com. in Mal., cap. [1: II]" 197.

"cœteris" for "cæteris": 1993 197.

"cœteroeque" for "cæteroeque": 1993 197.

"Les. Chal." for "Jes. Chal.": 1660; Works; 1993 196.

Translation of "religio" in à Lapide quotation as "religion": 1993 197.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 10

1 Cor. 10: 10 for 1 Cor. 10: 20: 1660; Works 199.

Calvin Latin: "in" for "iis" (Works; 1993); "sophistœ" for "sophistæ" (1993) 198.

Calvin translation: "to adore such a nonexistent as that, indeed," for "that indeed is not to worship": 1993 198.

Paræus Latin: "Idolatriæ nec" for "Idololatræ nec" (1993); Idolatræ (Works) 199.

Paræus Latin: "offerre" for "offerre" (Works); "dæmonibus" for "dæmonibus" (1993) 199.

Translation, "Idolatries did not at one time tend toward paganism, and today they do not tend toward papacy, so what next? offering to demons?" for "Idolators formerly" etc.: 1993 199.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 11

"18" for "82" in "ubi supra, p. 81": 1660; Works; 1993 199.

Becane translations: "considering thanks" for "giving thanks"; "are held to be of worth and honor" for "are held to be of worth and honor among us": 1993 201.

Missing close quote after "up to adore him": Works 199.

Suarez translation: "adore the prototype" for "adore the prototypes": 1993 200.

Translation of "esse scibile" as "the being per-

ceivable"; "rememorativum" as "calling to mind": 1993 199.

"What! Do some papists" for "What do some papists": Works; 1993 200.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 14

"profanatio" for "non profanatio": Works; 1993; "non" dropped: 1660 205.

Translations of "as simply God" for "as God simply" and "as it were partly God" for "as it were God partly": 1993 206.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 15

Aquinas translation: "but in which something is" for "but by which something is": 1993 208.

"lib., sect. 55" for "lib. 5, sect. 55": Works; 1993 209.

Polanus translation: "but a pictured" for "but a figurative"; "not particularly adored in its own consequence" for "not properly adored in itself": 1993 209.

"puta a quoquam" for "puto à quoquam": Works 207.

"sed in quo" for "sed ut quo": 1660; Works; 1993 208.

Translation in à Sancta Clara Latin as "to divine persons absolutely assumed (in it), i.e., under the formal reason which is the designated relation of the persons": 1993 207.

Translations of "omnis actio est suppositi" as "all action is of a subjected kind" and "suppositum" as "subjected"]": 1993 207.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 16

Zanchi translation, words in brackets missing: "[that] the presence of the body of Christ in the supper depends not on [the] ubiquity, but on the words[,] of Christ": 1993 210.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 17

In "Our opposites have raked many things together," "talked" for "raked": Works 212.

Translation of Latin maxim as "they do not vary in appearance, more and less": 1993 212.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 20

Acts 27: 36 for Acts 27: 35: Works 216.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 22

1 Cor. 11: 23 for 1 Cor. 11: 24: Works 218.

Calderwood [Didoc.] translation: “outside, the ears” for “outside, and by the ears”; “because of wandering” for “without the wandering”: 1993 218.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 26

“set days of 150” for “set days of fifty” (corrected by the 2nd edition; “set days of 50”: 1660): 1637 222.

Tertullian translation: “Similarly, concerning the days of the stations, many do not think there should be interruption of the sacrificial prayers, because the station would have to be violated when the body of the Lord was taken. Is the devoted obedience to the eucharist then done away with, or does it put one under more obligation to God? Wouldn’t your station be more religious if you would stand also at the altar of God? If the body of the Lord is taken and reserved, each of these is preserved, the participation in the sacrifice and the fulfillment of duty: 1993 220.

Part 3 Chap. 4, Sect. 28

“cænam” for “cœnam”: 1993 224.

Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 1

“ashamed of his ignominy”, no close quote: Works 225.

Incomplete reference, “Lib. 5, cap. Num. 48” (see note): all editions 226.

Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 2

Misplaced section division: Works put the section division “sect. 2” at the end of the de Dominis reference and also in the text column, the notes being so numerous, the section heading was below the correct location 226.

Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 3

Beza translation: “and by vain” for “and that by vain”: 1993 227.

Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 4

ἐβαλλελεγγεται for ἐβαγγελλίζεται: 1993 229.

“hearts (v. 16)” for “hearts (v. 15)”: 1993 229.

Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 7

Calvin translation: “no doctrine, no sacred sign ought to be admitted among the righteous, unless it agrees with the things originated by God”: 1993 232.

“excternu” for “externo” (1993); “externu” for “externo” (Works) 232.

Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 9

v. 31 reference dropped after “because ye have not committed this trespass against the Lord”: Works; 1993 235.

Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 10

1 Cor. II: 21 for 1 Cor. II: 22: 1993 236.

2 Cor. 13: 22 for 2 Cor. 13: 12: 1637; 1660; Works 236.

“cænas dominicas” for “cœnas dominicas”: 1637; Works; 1993 (1660 correct) 235.

Paræus translation: “but they were love-feasts nonetheless” for “but they were nothing less”: 1993 236.

“sod nihil winus” for “sed nihil minus”: Works 236.

Part 3 Chap. 5, Sect. 11

1 Cor. II: 25 for 1 Cor. II: 15: 1660; Works, 1993 236.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 2

Translation of “probatum” as “approved matter” and “præceptum” as “teaching”: 1993 239.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 3

Translation of “propria religionis” as “the property of religion”: 1993 241.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 4

In italics: “And as touching this blessing of children and imposition of hands upon them”: 1637; 1660 241.

“sect. 6” in “Matt. 19, sect. 9”: 1993 242.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 5

pp. 6, 7 for §6, 7 in reference “Forbes, Irenicum, lib. I, cap. 7, §6, 7”: Works; 1993 242.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 6

“and mark a mark” in italics (1637; 1660; 1993); in Roman (Works) 244.

Junius translation: “and somewhat older ‘T

of the Latins" for "and capital 'T' of the Latins": 1993 243.

Junius translation: "Then that 'T' does not represent the form of the cross which was in use among the ancients when punishments were being inflicted": 1993 243.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 8

69 for 59 in 1 Maccabees 4: 59: 1993 245.

Esther 17-28 for 27-28: 1637 (corrected 1660 forward) 245.

Sect. 7 for Sect. 8: 1637; 1660; Works 245.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 9

"consequenti" for "consequuti" (consecuti): Works; 1993 247.

Translation of "celebres" as "renamed (days)": 1993 247.

Translation of "quam jejunio et precibus fuerant a Deo consequenti" as "as they had been by God in consequence of fasting and prayers" for "which they obtained from God by fasting and prayers": 1993 247.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 10

"reccurrentibus" for "recurrentibus": 1993 249.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 11

"3" missing from "3. There is nothing alleged...": Works; 1993 249.

At note on De Orig. Templ., "lib. 4, cap. 22" for "lib. 4, cap. 2": 1660; Works; 1993 250.

"cœtum" for "cætum": 1993 250.

Junius translation: "but the harmonious gathering of the righteous on a feast day" for "but the assembly of the righteous gathering on a feast day": 1993 250.

"sapientes Israëlīs" for "sapientes Israëlīs": 1993 249.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 12

Sect. 11 for Sect. 12: 1637 & 1660; Works did not number the section 251.

Part 3 Chap. 6, Sect. 13

Augustine translation: "object to our custom, as if custom were more important" for "object custom against us, as if custom were more important": 1993 252.

Gratian translation: "Whatever custom you like it must" for "All custom must": 1993 252.

Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 1

"Whilst" for "Whileas": Works; 1993 255.

Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 2 256.

In translation: "go, light clouds" for "go, light trifles": 1993 257.

Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 3

Camero translation: "being imputed to" for "reflecting upon" (in three places): 1993 258.

Translation of "vidua esse infinita" as "invisible things are indefinite": 1993 258.

Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 4

"public words of God's service" for "public works of God's service": 1660; Works; 1993 259.

Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 5

"having failed by those rocks" for "having sailed by those rocks": Works; 1993 259.

Junius Latin (note), "solemnes" for "solemnes": all editions 260.

Junius translation: "divided rites" for "distinguished rites" and "festive rites" for "solemn rites": 1993 260.

"propiè" (properly) omitted from Junius quotation: all editions 260.

Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 7

Calvin translation (col. 478): "righteous brothers" for "pious brothers": 1993 262.

"lex que" for "lex quo": 1637; 1660; Works 262.

Translation of Epigram (last line): "Laws are for custom and example, and duties for the temple" for "There are laws of custom and example; and ordinance of the temple": 1993 262.

Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 8

Page 2 for page 52 in reference "Of the Lawfulness of Kneeling, p. 52": Works; 1993 264.

Type for 3 lines of the side notes bumped the first figure up a line so the "l" in lawf. appeared next to the note denominator "b" and the k at "kawf:" and the "5" at "5neel": 1637 (which explains the above "2" for "52") 264.

Part 3 Chap. 7, Sect. 9

- Monarchia S. Romani Imperii* 282.
- Gorranus, Nicolaus**
On Matthew 15 [*In quatuor Euangelia commentarius*] 10.
- Gregory I**
Letter to Leander (Letter 43, *NPNF2* 12; *PL* 77) 110, 177.
- Gregory Nazianzen** (see also, Nazianzen)
Apologetica 46.
- Hall, Joseph**
A Common Apology of the Church of England against the Unjust Challenges of the Over-Just Seēt, commonly called Brownists 183, 188, 216.
Contemplations on the Historical Passages of the Old and New Testaments 409, 413, 417.
No Peace with Rome 12.
Works (1837)
“Characters of Virtues and Vices in two books;” book 2, “Characterisms of Vices;” “The Superstitious,” 189.
- Harmonia Confessionum Fidei Orthodoxarum Et Reformatarum Ecclesiarum*
Harmony of the Protestant Confessions (1842) 111, 416.
- Hart, John and John Rainoldes**
Conference between John Rainoldes and John Hart 110, 132, 141, 165, 181, 185, 186, 191.
- Hefele, Karl Joseph von**
A History of the Councils of the Church: From the Original Documents
Ancyra, Council of, canon 6 130.
Carthage 4, Canon 23 352.
Carthage 4, Canon 25 352.
Carthage 4, Canon 66 355.
Elvira, Council of, canon 69 130.
Nicaea, Council of, canon 14 130.
Toledo 4, Council of, canon 6 and 40(?) 178.
- Helvetic Confession, Second** 373.
- Hemmingsen, Niels**
Enchiridion Theologicum 41, 42, 105, 343, 355.
- Hilary**
Contra Constantium Imperatorem, Liber Unus 9.
- Hooker, Richard**
Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity
Works (1821) 11, 15, 48, 89, 107, 121, 123, 131, 132, 135, 140, 141, 143, 173, 175, 178, 180, 191, 192, 209, 225, 226, 237, 242, 267, 312, 313, 359, 402.
- Horace**
De Arte Poetica 223, 392.
Epistola I 47.
- Hospinian, Rudolph**
De Templis hoc eēt, de Origine, Progressu ... 140, 181, 196, 224, 251, 291, 292.
Epistola Dedicatoria, *De Monachis* 89, 92.
Festa Christianorum 25, 35, 54, 56, 61, 248.
Historia Sacramentaria 391, 392, 394.
- Irenæus**
Against Heresies 275.
- Isidore**
Etymologiarum 314.
- Jamieson, John**
Historical Account of the Ancient Culdees of Iona (citing Tertullian) 351.
- Jansen, Cornelius**
Commentariorum in suam Concordiam ac totam Historiam Evangelicam 112, 134, 394, 395, 397.
- Jerome**
Commentaria in Daniele 40.
Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Galatas 61.
Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Titum 314, 326, 328, 348.
Commentariorum in Evangelium Matthæum 103, 351.
Commentariorum in Isaiam 354.
Epistola CXLVI, to Evagrius 314, 328, 351.
Epistola CXXX 351.
Epistola LX, Ad Heliodorum Epitaphim Nepotiani 32.
Letter 75 to Augustine 373.
- Josephus, Flavius**
Antiquitatum Judaicarum 249.
De Bello Judaico 395, 396.
- Junius, Franciscus**
Analytica Explicatio Deuteronomii 408.
Analytica Numerorum Explicatio 151.
Animadversiones ad controversias quintam Christianæ fide 34, 45, 58, 250, 286, 295, 313, 315, 316, 317, 318, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325, 326, 328, 331, 332, 333, 335, 340, 341, 343, 344, 353.
Animadversiones ad controversias quintam Christianæ fide: Animadversiones De Ecclesia Triumphante 88, 228.
De Reliquiis Et Imaginibus Sanctorum 244.
Apocalypsis S. Johannis Apostoli et Evangelistæ 182.
Commentaria in Iechezkelem Prophetam 243.
De Politæ Mosis Observatione 247, 260, 264, 359, 360, 361, 363, 365, 374.

GEORGE GILLESPIE

- Disputationum theologicarum repetitarum trigesima-septima de libertate Christiana* 30, 34.
Ecclesiastici 300, 356.
Expositio Prophetæ Danielis 109, 154.
Opuscula Theologica Selecta, ed. A. Kuyper (1882) 349.
Prælectiones in Geneseos 48, 153, 234.
- Junius, Hadrian**
The Nomenclator, or Remembrance 399.
- Justinian**
Institutes 360.
Novellæ 351, 354, 358.
- Justinus, Marcus Junianus**
Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi 159.
- Juvenal**
 Satire II 188.
 Satire VI 44, 280.
- Kames, Lord Henry**
A Brief Account of Aristotle's Logic 269.
- Keckermann, Bartholomäus**
Systema Systematum 268.
- Knox, John**
 A Letter to the Queen Dowager 267.
History of the Church of Scotland 189, 233.
- Knox, John et al.**
 Confession of Faith (1560) 219, 310, 410.
The First Book of Discipline 317, 327, 413.
John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, ed. William Croft Dickinson (1950) vol. 2. and Laing, vol. 2. 62.
Works of John Knox, vol. 2, ed. David Laing (repr. New York, 1966) 52.
- Lactantius**
Divinarum Institutionum 10, 19.
- Lapide, Cornelius à**
Commentaria in Aggæum Prophetam 191.
Commentaria in Amos Prophetam 400.
Commentaria in Malachiam Prophetam 140, 404.
- Leo I**
 Epistle 95 (Epistola XCV, Ad Pulcheriam Augustam) 321.
 Epistola CVIII, Leo to Theodore of Forum Julii 349.
 Sermon L (alias 49), De Quadragesima XII 144.
- L'Estrange, Hamon**
Alliance of Divine Offices 238.
- Leyden, Professors**
Synopsis Purioris Theologiæ (Leyden; 1625; ed.

THE ENGLISH POPISH CEREMONIES

- Bavinck, Leiden, 1881) 34, 41, 46, 130, 138, 149, 181, 230, 315, 325, 326, 329, 330, 343, 349, 361, 364.
- Lightfoot, John**
Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines 388.
- Lincoln Diocese, Ministers of**
An Abridgement of that Booke which the Ministers of Lincolne Diocess deliuered to His Maieslie upon the First Of December 1605. Being The first part of An Apologie ... (1617) 226, 230, 388.
- Lindsay, David**
Proceedings in Perth Assembly. A True narration of all the passages of the proceedings in the General Assembly (1621) 21, 24, 31, 40, 41, 44, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 57, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 80, 83, 101, 136, 141, 142, 144, 145, 147, 163, 168, 169, 171, 184, 194, 196, 199, 200, 202, 203, 206, 209, 210, 212, 213, 218, 219, 238, 245, 248, 249, 250, 252, 389, 391, 392, 399, 401, 403, 410, 411, 412, 413.
 Epistle to Pastors of the Church of Scotland 24, 25, 29, 31, 45, 99, 115, 256, 260, 267.
- Lipsius, Justus**
De Una Religione Adversus Dialogislam 253.
- Lombard, Peter**
Sententiarum 313, 314.
- Lonicerus, Phillippus**
Chronicorum Turcicorum 11.
- de Lorini, Jean**
In Aëla Apostolorum Commentaria 320.
- Luther, Martin**
Commentary on 1 Peter 41.
De Bonis Operibus (Concerning Good Works) 63.
- Lycerus, Polycarpus**
Harmoniæ Evangelicæ a Martino Chemnitio ... inchoatæ et per Polycarpum Lyserum continuatæ libri quinque 390.
- de Lyra, Nicholas**
Bibliborum Sacrorum Glossa Ordinaria 385.
- Macrobius**
The Saturnalia 22.
- Magdeburg Centuries**
Ecclesiastica Historia 11, 13, 47, 61, 109, 126, 130, 139, 140, 159, 177, 178, 181, 222, 224, 338, 415, 416.
- Maldonatus, Joannes**
Commentarii in Quatuor Evangelistas 114, 241, 250, 391, 392, 395, 396.

AUTHORS CITED