

will be found as the rest are<sup>1</sup>. The Roman emperor's custom was at certain solemn times to bestow on his soldiers a donative; which donative they received wearing garlands upon their heads. There were in the time of the emperors Severus and Antoninus<sup>2</sup> many, who being soldiers had been converted unto Christ, and notwithstanding continued still in that military course of life. In which number, one man there was amongst all the rest, who at such a time coming to the tribune of the army to receive his donative, came but with a garland in his hand, and not in such sort as others did. The tribune offended hereat demandeth what this great singularity should mean. To whom the soldier, *Christianus sum*, "I am a Christian." Many there were so besides him which yet did otherwise at that time; whereupon grew a question, whether a Christian soldier might herein do as the unchristian did, and wear as they wore. Many of them which were very sound in Christian belief did rather commend the zeal of this man than approve his action.

Tertullian was at the same time a Montanist, and an enemy unto the church for condemning that prophetic spirit which Montanus and his followers did boast they had received, as if in them Christ had performed his last promise; as if to them he had sent the Spirit that should be their perfecter and final instructor in the mysteries of Christian truth. Which exultation of mind made him apt to take all occasions of contradiction. Wherefore in honour of that action, and to gall their minds who did not so much commend it, he wrote his book *De Corona Militis*, not dissembling the stomach where-

<sup>1</sup> T. C. lib. ii. p. 81. "And to come 'yet nearer, where he disputeth 'against the wearing of crown or 'garland, (which is indifferent of 'itself,) to those which objecting 'asked, where the Scripture saith 'that a man might not wear a 'crown, he answereth by asking, 'where the Scripture saith that they 'may wear. And unto them re- 'plying that 'it is permitted which 'is not forbidden,' he answereth, 'that 'it is forbidden which is not 'permitted.' Whereby appeareth 'that the argument of the Scrip- 'tures negatively holdeth not only 'in the doctrine and ecclesiastical 'discipline, but even in matters ar- 'bitrary, and variable by the advice 'of the Church. Where it is not 'enough that they be not forbidden, 'unless there be some word which 'doth permit the use of them; it 'is not enough that the Scripture 'speaketh not against them, un- 'less it speak for them; and finally, 'where it displeaseth the Lord 'which pleaseth him not: we [one] 'must of necessity have the word 'of his mouth to declare his plea- 'sure."

<sup>2</sup> [Caracalla.]

with he wrote it. For first, the man he commendeth as "one more constant than the rest of his brethren, who pre- "sumed," saith he, "that they might well enough serve two "Lords<sup>1</sup>." Afterwards choler somewhat more rising with him, he addeth, "It doth even remain that they should also "devise how to rid themselves of his martyrdoms, towards "the prophecies of whose Holy Spirit they have already "shewed their disdain. They mutter that their good and "long peace is now in hazard. I doubt not but some of them "send the Scriptures before, truss up bag and baggage, make "themselves in a readiness that they may fly from city to "city. For that is the only point of the Gospel which they "are careful not to forget. I know even their pastors very "well what men they are; in peace lions, harts in time "of trouble and fear<sup>2</sup>." Now these men, saith Tertullian, "they must be answered, where we do find it written in "Scripture that a Christian man may not wear a garland<sup>3</sup>."

And as men's speeches uttered in heat of distempered affection have oftentimes much more eagerness than weight, so he that shall mark the proofs alleged and the answers to things objected in that book will now and then perhaps espy the like imbecility. Such is that argument whereby they that wore on their heads garlands are charged as transgressors of nature's law<sup>4</sup>, and guilty of sacrilege against God the Lord of nature, inasmuch as flowers in such sort worn can neither be smelt nor seen well by those that wear them; and God made flowers sweet and beautiful, that being seen and smelt

<sup>1</sup> Tert. de Coron. Milit. c. 1. ["Dei miles cæteris constantior fratribus, qui se duobus dominis 'servire non posse præsumperat, 'solus libero capite, coronamento 'in manu otioso." The reading before Pamelius was "servire pos- 'se præsumperant." (So Oehler. 1853.)]

<sup>2</sup> ["Plane superest ut etiam mar- 'tyria recusare meditentur, qui 'prophetias ejusdem Sp. Sancti re- 'spuerunt. Mussitant denique tam 'bonam et longam sibi pacem peri- 'clitari. Nec dubito quosdam 'Scripturas emigrare, sarcinas ex- 'pedire, fugæ accingi de civitate in 'civitatem. Nullam enim aliam 'Evangelii memoriam curant. Novi

"et pastores eorum in pace leones, 'in prælio cervos." p. 205.]

<sup>3</sup> [Quatenus illud opponunt, 'Ubi autem prohibemur coronari? 'hanc magis localem substantiam 'causæ præsentis aggrediar." ibid.]

<sup>4</sup> [Ibid. c. 5. "In capite quis 'sapor floris? quis coronæ sensus, 'nisi vinculi tantum? quia neque 'color cernitur, neque odor ducitur, 'nec teneritas commendatur. Tam 'contra naturam est florem capite 'sectari, quam cibum aure, quam 'sonum nare. Omne autem quod 'contra naturam est monstri me- 'retur notam penes omnes, penes 'nos vero etiam elogium sacrilegii, 'in Deum naturæ Dominum et 'auctorem."]

unto they might so delight. Neither doth Tertullian bewray this weakness in striking only, but also in repelling their strokes with whom he contendeth. They ask, saith he, "What Scripture is there which doth teach that we should not be crowned? And what Scripture is there which doth teach that we should? For in requiring on the contrary part the aid of Scripture, they do give sentence beforehand that their part ought also by Scripture to be aided<sup>1</sup>." Which answer is of no great force. There is no necessity, that if I confess I ought not to do that which the Scripture forbiddeth me, I should thereby acknowledge myself bound to do nothing which the Scripture commandeth me not. For many inducements besides Scripture may lead me to that, which if Scripture be against, they all give place and are of no value, yet otherwise are strong and effectual to persuade.

Which thing himself well enough understanding, and being not ignorant that Scripture in many things doth neither command nor forbid, but use silence; his resolution in fine is, that in the church a number of things are strictly observed, whereof no law of Scripture maketh mention one way or other<sup>2</sup>; that of things once received and confirmed by use, long usage is a law sufficient; that in civil affairs, when there is no other law, custom itself doth stand for law<sup>3</sup>; that inasmuch as law doth stand upon reason, to allege reason serveth as well as to cite Scripture<sup>4</sup>; that whatsoever is reasonable, the same is lawful whosoever is author of it; that the authority

<sup>1</sup> [Ibid. c. 2. "Facile est statim exigere, ubi scriptum sit, ne coronemur? At enim ubi scriptum est, ut coronemur? Expostulantes enim Scripturæ patrociniū in parte diversa, præjudicansuæ quæque parti Scripturæ patrociniū adesse debere. Nam si ideo dicitur coronari licere, quia non prohibeat Scriptura, æque retorquetur ideo coronari non licere, quia Scriptura non jubeat."]

<sup>2</sup> [Ibid. c. 3. "Etiam in traditionis obtentu exigenda est, inquis, auctoritas scripta. Ergo quæramus an et traditio non scripta non debeat recipi? Plane negabimus recipiendam, si nulla exemplum præjudicent aliarum observationum, quas sine ullius Scrip-

turæ instrumento, solius traditionis titulo, exinde consuetudinis patrociniū vindicamus." He then instances in the customs of interrogatories in baptism, of trine immersion, and several other Church usages.]

<sup>3</sup> [Ibid. c. 4. "His igitur exemplis renunciatum erit, posse etiam non scriptam traditionem in observatione defendi, confirmatam consuetudine. . . . Consuetudo autem etiam in civilibus rebus pro lege suscipitur, cum deficit lex."]

<sup>4</sup> [Ibid. "Nec differt, Scriptura an ratione consistat, quando et legem ratio commendat. Porro si lex ratione constat, lex erit omne jam quod ratione constiterit a quocunque productum."]

of custom is great<sup>1</sup>; finally, that the custom of Christians was then and had been a long time not to wear garlands, and therefore that undoubtedly they did offend who presumed to violate such a custom by not observing that thing, the very inveterate observation whereof was a law sufficient to bind all men to observe it, unless they could shew some higher law, some law of Scripture, to the contrary<sup>2</sup>. This presupposed, it may stand then very well with strength and soundness of reason, even thus to answer, "Whereas they ask what Scripture forbiddeth them to wear a garland; we are in this case rather to demand what Scripture commandeth them. They cannot here allege that it is permitted which is not forbidden them: no, that is forbidden them which is not permitted." For long-received custom forbidding them to do as they did, (if so be it did forbid them,) there was no excuse in the world to justify their act, unless in the Scripture they could shew some law, that did license them thus to break a received custom.

Now whereas in all the books of Tertullian besides there is not so much found as in that one, to prove not only that we may do, but that we ought to do, sundry things which the Scripture commandeth not; out of that very book these sentences are brought to make us believe that Tertullian was of a clean contrary mind. We cannot therefore hereupon yield; we cannot grant, that hereby is made manifest the argument of Scripture negatively to be of force, not only in doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline, but even in matters arbitrary. For Tertullian doth plainly hold even in that book, that neither the matter which he intreateth of was arbitrary but necessary, inasmuch as the received custom of the Church

<sup>1</sup> [Ibid. "Hanc (rationem divinam) nunc expostula, salvo traditionis respectu, quocunque traditione censetur: nec auctorem respicias, sed auctoritatem: et in primis consuetudinis ipsius, quæ propterea colenda est, ne non sit rationis interpres, ut si hanc Deus dederit, tunc discas, cur nam observanda sit tibi consuetudo."]

<sup>2</sup> [Ibid. c. 2. "Neminem dico fidelium coronam capite nosse alias, extra tempus tentationis ejusmodi. Omnes ita observant

"a catechumenis usque ad confessores et martyres, vel negatores. Viderint, unde auctoritas moris, de qua cum maxime quæritur. Porro cum quæritur [cur] quid observetur, observari interim constat. Ergo nec nullum nec incertum videri potest delictum, quod committitur in observationem suo jam nomine vindicandam, et satis auctoritatem consensus patrociniū." And c. 3. "Habentes observationem inveteratam, quæ præveniendū statum fecit."]

did tie and bind them not to wear garlands as the heathens did; yea, and further also he reckoneth up particularly a number of things, whereof he expressly concludeth, "Harum et aliarum ejusmodi disciplinarum si legem expostules Scripturarum, nullam invenies<sup>1</sup>;" which is as much as if he had said in express words, "Many things there are which concern the discipline of the Church and the duties of men, which to abrogate and take away the Scripture negatively urged may not in any case persuade us, but they must be observed, yea, although no Scripture be found which requireth any such thing." Tertullian therefore undoubtedly doth not in this book shew himself to be of the same mind with them by whom his name is pretended.

The first assertion endeavoured to be confirmed by the Scripture's custom of disputing from divine authority negatively.

VI.<sup>2</sup> But sith the sacred Scriptures themselves afford oftentimes such arguments as are taken from divine authority both one way and other; "The Lord hath commanded, therefore it must be;" and again in like sort, "He hath not, therefore it must not be;" some certainty concerning this point seemeth requisite to be set down.

God himself can neither possibly err, nor lead into error.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. c. 4.

<sup>2</sup> T. C. l. ii. p. 48. "It is not hard to shew that the Prophets have reasoned negatively. As when in the person of the Lord the Prophet saith, *Whereof I have not spoken*, Jer. xix. 5. And *which never entered into my heart*, Jer. vii. 31. And where he condemneth them because they have not asked counsel at the mouth of the Lord, Isai. xxx. 2. And it may be shewed that the same kind of argument hath been used in things which are not of the substance of salvation or damnation, and whereof there was no commandment to the contrary, (as in the former there was. Levit. xviii. 21; and xx. 3; Deut. xvii. 16.) In Josua the children of Israel are charged by the Prophet that they asked not counsel at the mouth of the Lord, when they entered into covenant with the Gibeonites, Josh. ix. 14. And yet that covenant was not made con-

trary unto any commandment of God. Moreover, we read that when David had taken this counsel, to build a temple unto the Lord, albeit the Lord had revealed before in his word that there should be such a standing-place, where the ark of the covenant and the service should have a certain abiding; and albeit there was no word of God which forbade David to build the temple; yet the Lord (with commendation of his good affection and zeal he had to the advancement of his glory) concludeth against David's resolution to build the temple with this reason, namely, that he had given no commandment of this who should build it. 1 Chron. xvii. 6." [The first part of this extract, from "It is not hard" to "Isai. xxx. 2." is from T. C. i. 13, 14. The parenthesis ("As in the former . . . Deut. xvii. 16.") seems to be a note of Hooker's. The latter part from "Moreover" is from T. C. ii. 49.]

For this cause his testimonies, whatsoever he affirmeth, are always truth and most infallible certainty<sup>1</sup>.

Yea further, because the things that proceed from him are perfect without any manner of defect or maim; it cannot be but that the words of his mouth are absolute, and lack nothing which they should have for performance of that thing whereunto they tend. Whereupon it followeth, that the end being known whereunto he directeth his speech, the argument even negatively is evermore<sup>2</sup> strong and forcible concerning those things that are apparently requisite unto the same end. As for example: God intending to set down sundry times that which in Angels is most excellent, hath not any where spoken so highly of them as he hath of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; therefore they are not in dignity equal unto him. It is the Apostle St. Paul's argument<sup>3</sup>.

[2.] The purpose of God was to teach his people, both unto whom they should offer sacrifice, and what sacrifice was to be offered. To burn their sons in fire unto Baal he did not command them, he spake no such thing, neither came it into his mind; therefore this they ought not to have done. Which argument the Prophet Jeremy useth more than once, as being so effectual and strong, that although the thing he reproveth were not only not commanded but forbidden them<sup>4</sup>, and that expressly; yet the Prophet chooseth rather to charge them with the fault of making a law unto themselves, than with the crime of transgressing a law which God had made<sup>5</sup>. For when the Lord hath once himself precisely set down a form of executing that wherein we are to serve him; the fault appeareth greater to do that which we are not, than not to do that which we are commanded. In this we seem to charge the law of God with hardness only, in that with foolishness; in this we shew ourselves weak and unapt to be doers of his will, in that we take upon us to be controllers of his wisdom; in this we fail to perform the thing which God seeth meet,

<sup>1</sup> 1 John i. 5. "God is light, and there is in him no darkness at all." Heb. vi. 18. "It is impossible that God should lie." Numb. xxiii. 19. "God is not as man that he should lie."

1st ed. "Ever-more," Spencer. 1604.] 1886. [<sup>3</sup> Heb. i. 5-13; ii. 5-8.] [<sup>4</sup> Levit. xviii. 21; xx. 3; Deut. xviii. 10.] [<sup>5</sup> See Whitgift, Defence, &c. p. 78.]

convenient, and good, in that we presume to see what is meet and convenient better than God himself. In those actions therefore the whole form whereof God hath of purpose set down to be observed, we may not otherwise do than exactly as he hath prescribed; in such things negative arguments are strong.

[3.] Again, with a negative argument David is pressed concerning the purpose he had to build a temple unto the Lord; "Thus saith the Lord, Thou shalt not build me a house to dwell in. Wheresoever I have walked with all Israel, spake I one word to any of the judges of Israel, whom I commanded to feed my people, saying, Why have ye not built me an house<sup>1</sup>?" The Jews urged with a negative argument touching the aid which they sought at the hands of the King of Egypt; "Woe to those rebellious children, saith the Lord, which walk forth to go down into Egypt, and have not asked counsel at my mouth; to strengthen themselves with the strength of Pharaoh<sup>2</sup>." Finally, the league of Joshua with the Gabeonites is likewise with a negative argument touched. It was not as it should be: and why? the Lord gave them not that advice; "They sought not counsel at the mouth of the Lord<sup>3</sup>."

By the virtue of which examples if any man shall suppose the force of negative arguments approved, when they are taken from Scripture in such sort as we in this question are pressed therewith, they greatly deceive themselves. For unto which of all these was it said that they had done amiss, in purposing to do or in doing any thing at all which "the Scripture" commanded them not? Our question is, Whether all be sin which is done without direction by Scripture, and not, Whether the Israelites did at any time amiss by following their own minds without asking counsel of God. No, it was that people's singular privilege, a favour which God vouchsafed them above the rest of the world, that in the affairs of their estate which were not determinable one way or other by the Scripture, himself gave them extraordinarily direction and counsel as oft as they sought it at his hands. Thus God did first by speech unto Moses, after by Urim and Thummim unto priests, lastly by dreams and visions unto prophets, from whom in such cases they were to receive the answer of God.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Chron. xvii. 6.<sup>2</sup> Isaiah xxx. 1, 2.<sup>3</sup> Josh. ix. 14.

Concerning Josua therefore, thus spake the Lord unto Moses, saying, "He shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall ask counsel for him by the judgment of Urim before the Lord<sup>1</sup>;" whereof had Josua been mindful, the fraud of the Gabeonites could not so smoothly have passed unespied till there was no help.

The Jews had prophets to have resolved them from the mouth of God himself whether Egyptian aids should profit them, yea or no; but they thought themselves wise enough, and him unworthy to be of their counsel. In this respect therefore was their reproof though sharp yet just, albeit there had been no charge precisely given them that they should always take heed of Egypt.

But as for David, to think that he did evil in determining to build God a temple, because there was in Scripture no commandment that he should build it, were very injurious: the purpose of his heart was religious and godly, the act most worthy of honour and renown; neither could Nathan choose but admire his virtuous intent, exhort him to go forward, and beseech God to prosper him therein<sup>2</sup>. But God saw the endless troubles which David should be subject unto during the whole time of his regiment, and therefore gave charge to defer so good a work to the days of tranquillity and peace, wherein it might without interruption be performed. David supposed that it could not stand with the duty which he owed unto God, to set himself in a house of cedar-trees, and to behold the ark of the Lord's covenant unsettled. This opinion the Lord abateth, by causing Nathan to shew him plainly, that it should be no more imputed unto him for a fault than it had been unto the Judges of Israel before him, his case being the same which theirs was, their times not more unquiet than his, not more unfit for such an action.

Wherefore concerning the force of negative arguments so taken from the authority of Scripture as by us they are denied, there is in all this less than nothing.

[4.] And touching that which unto this purpose is borrowed from the controversy sometime handled between M. Harding<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Numb. xxvii. 21.<sup>2</sup> 1 Chron. xvii. 2.<sup>3</sup> T. C. l. ii. p. 50: "M. Harding

"reproacheth the Bishop of Salis-bury with this kind of reasoning; unto whom the Bishop answereth,

and the worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years<sup>1</sup>, who being brought up together in one University<sup>2</sup>, it fell out in them which was spoken of two others, "They learned in the same that which "in contrary camps they did practise<sup>3</sup>:" of these two the one objecting that with us arguments taken from authority negatively are over common, the Bishop's answer hereunto is, that "4 This kind of argument is thought to be good, "whensoever proof is taken of God's word; and is used not "only by us, but also by St. Paul, and by many of the Catholic "Fathers. St. Paul saith, God said not unto Abraham, 'In "thy seeds all the nations of the earth shall be blessed:' but, "'In thy seed, which is Christ:' and thereof he thought he "made a good argument<sup>5</sup>. Likewise, saith Origen, 'The "bread which the Lord gave unto his disciples, saying unto

"The argument of authority negatively is taken to be good, whensoever proof is taken of God's word; and is used not only by us, but also by many of the Catholic Fathers.' A little after he sheweth the reason why the argument of authority of the Scripture negatively is good; namely, 'For that the word of God is perfect.' In another place unto M. Harding casting him in the teeth with negative arguments, he allegeth places out of Irenæus, Chrysostom, Leo, which reasoned negatively of the authority of the Scriptures. The places which he allegeth be very full and plain in generality, without any such restraints as the Answerer imagineth; as they are there to be seen."

<sup>1</sup> [Vaughan in his Life of Dr. Thos. Jackson, prefixed to his (Jackson's) works, p. 8, says of him, "I shall willingly associate him to those other worthies, his predecessors in the same college, (all living at the same time:) to the invaluable Bishop Jewel, *Theologorum quos orbis Christianus per aliquot annorum centenarios produxit maximo*: as grave Bishop Goodwin hath described him. To the famous Mr. Hooker, who for his solid writings was surnamed,

"The Judicious, and entitled by the same, *Theologorum Oxonium*;" "The Oxford of Divines:" as one calls Athens, 'The Greece of Greece itself.' To the learned Dr. Reinolds, who managed the government of the same college with the like care, honour and integrity, although not with the same austerities" as Dr. Jackson. Bishop Godwin borrowed the expression referred to (De Præsul. Angl. p. 354, ed. 1743,) from Hooker: and adds concerning him, that he was "a magno Theologo Literarum Oxonium appellatus."

<sup>2</sup> [According to Camden, they were bred in the same grammar school also. "Out of this town's school" (he is speaking of Barnstaple) "there issued two right learned men and most renowned divines, John Jewell Bishop of Sarisbury, and T. Hardinge." Britannia, transl. by Holland, p. 208.]

<sup>3</sup> Vell. Paterc. "Jugurtha ac Marius sub eodem Africano militantes, in iisdem castris didicere quæ postea in contrariis facerent." [l. ii. c. 9.]

<sup>4</sup> [Reply to M. Harding's Answer.] Art. i. Divis. 29. [p. 51, ed. 1611.]

<sup>5</sup> Gal. iii. 16.

"them, Take and eat, he deferred not, nor commanded to be "reserved till the next day<sup>1</sup>.' Such arguments Origen and "other learned Fathers thought to stand for good, whatsoever "misliking Master Harding hath found in them. This kind "of proof is thought to hold in God's commandments, for "that they be full and perfect: and God hath specially "charged us, that we should neither put to them nor take "from<sup>2</sup> them; and therefore it seemeth good unto them that "have learned of Christ, *Unus est Magister vester, Christus*<sup>3</sup>, "and have heard the voice of God the Father from heaven, "*Ipsam audite*<sup>4</sup>. But unto them that add to the word of "God what them listeth, and make God's will subject unto "their will, and break God's commandments for their own "tradition's sake, unto them it seemeth not good."

Again, the English Apology alleging the example of the Greeks, how they have neither private masses, nor mangled sacraments, nor purgatories, nor pardons; it pleaseth Master Harding to jest out the matter, to use the help of his wits where strength of truth failed him, and to answer with scoffing at negatives. The Bishop's defence in this case is<sup>5</sup>, "The "ancient learned Fathers having to deal with impudent "heretics, that in defence of their errors avouched the judgment of all the old bishops and doctors that had been before "them, and the general consent of the primitive and whole "universal Church, and that with as good regard of truth "and as faithfully as you do now; the better to discover the "shameless boldness and nakedness of their doctrine, were "oftentimes likewise forced to use the negative, and so to "drive the same heretics, as we do you, to prove their affirmatives, which thing to do it was never possible. The "ancient father Irenæus thus stayed himself, as we do, by "the negative<sup>6</sup>, 'Hoc neque Prophetæ prædicaverunt, neque "Dominus docuit, neque Apostoli tradiderunt;' 'This thing "neither did the Prophets publish, nor our Lord teach, nor "the Apostles deliver.' By a like negative Chrysostom saith<sup>7</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Orig. in Levit. Hom. 5. [t. ii. 211. ed. Bened.]

<sup>2</sup> ["fro:" edd. 1, 2, 4.] 1886.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. xxiii. 8. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xvii. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Defens. par. v. cap. 15, divis. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Lib. i. cap. 1.

<sup>7</sup> De incom. nat. Dei, Hom. 3. t. vi. 403. ["Hanc arborem non

"Paulus plantavit, non Apollos rigavit, non Deus auxit."]