

upon Christ our head, is by him diffused through all the members of his body⁹². For God hath established and anointed us in Christ: We have an unction from the Holy One, and the anointing which we have received from him abideth in us. Necessary then it cannot choose but be, that we should know Jesus to be the Christ: because as he is Jesus, that is, our Saviour, by being Christ, that is, anointed; so we can have no share in him as Jesus, except we become truly Christians, and so be in him as Christ, anointed with that unction from the Holy One⁹³.

Thus having run through all the particulars at first designed for the explication of the title, Christ, we may at last clearly express, and every Christian easily understand, what it is we say when we make our confession in these words, *I believe in Jesus Christ*. I do assent unto this as a certain truth, that there was a man promised by God, foretold by the Prophets to be the Messiah, the Redeemer of Israel, and the expectation of the nations. I am fully assured by all those predictions that the Messiah so promised is already come. I am as certainly persuaded, that the Man born in the days of Herod of the Virgin Mary, by an angel from heaven called Jesus, is that true Messiah, so long, so often promised: that, as the Messiah, he was anointed to three special offices, belonging to him as the Mediator between God and Man: that he was a Prophet, revealing unto us the whole will of God for the salvation of man; that he was a Priest, and hath given himself a sacrifice for sin, and so hath made an atonement for us; that he is a King, set down at the right hand of God, far above all principalities and powers, whereby, when he hath subdued all our enemies, he will confer actual, perfect, and eternal happiness upon us. I believe this unction, by which he became the true Messiah, was not performed by any material oil, but by the Spirit of God, which he received as the Head, and conveyeth to his members. And in this full acknowledgment, *I believe in Jesus Christ*.

His only Son.

AFTER our Saviour's nomination immediately followeth his filiation: and justly, after we have acknowledged him to be the

⁹² 'Inde apparet Christi corpus nos esse, quia omnes unguimur, et omnes in illo et Christi et Christus sumus, quia quodammodo totus Christus caput et corpus est.' *S. August. in Psal. xxvi.*

[Enarr. II. §. 2. vol. iv. part. I. p. 119 B.]

⁹³ Ταγαροῦν ἡμεῖς τούτου ἐνεκεν καλούμεθα Χριστιανοί, ὅτι χρισμέθα ἔλαιον Θεοῦ. *Theoph. ad Autol. lib. i. [§. 12. p. 345 C.]*

Christ, do we confess him to be the *Son of God*; because these two were ever inseparable, and even by the Jews themselves accounted equivalent. Thus Nathanael, that true Israelite, maketh his confession of the Messiah; *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel*. Thus Martha makes expression of her faith; *I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world*. Thus the high priest maketh his inquisition; *I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God*. This was the famous confession of St. Peter; *We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God*. And the Gospel of St. John was therefore written, that *we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*. Certain then it is that all the Jews, as they looked for a Messiah to come, so they believed that Messiah to be the Son of God, (although since the coming of our Saviour they have denied it⁹⁴;) and that by reason of a constant interpretation of the second Psalm, as appropriated unto him. And the primitive Christians did at the very beginning include this filial title of our Saviour, together with his names, into the compass of one word⁹⁵. Well therefore after we have expressed our faith in Jesus Christ, is added that which always had so great affinity with it, *the only Son of God*.

In these words there is little variety to be observed, except that what we translate the *only Son*⁹⁶, that in the phrase of the

⁹⁴ For when Celsus, in the person of a Jew, had spoken these words, 'ΑΛΛ' εἶπεν ὁ ἐμὸς προφήτης ἐν Ἱερουσόλοιμοις ποτὲ, ὅτι ἦξει Θεοῦ υἱός, τῶν ὁσίων κριτῆς, καὶ τῶν ἀδίκων κολαστῆς, Origen says they were most improperly attributed to a Jew, who did look indeed for a Messiah, but not for the Son of God, i. e. not under the notion of a Son; 'Ιουδαῖος δὲ οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσαι ὅτι προφήτης τις εἶπεν ἦξει Θεοῦ υἱόν· ὃ γὰρ λέγουσιν ἔστιν, ὅτι ἦξει ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ πολλάκις γὰρ ζητοῦσι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐθέως περὶ υἱοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς οὐδενὸς ἕντος ταιούτου, οὐδὲ προφητευσθέντος. *Cont. Cels. lib. i. [§. 49. p. 365 E, 366 A.]*

⁹⁵ That is, ΙΧΘΥΣ. 'Nos pisciculi secundum aquarum nostrum Jesum Christum in aequa nascimur.' *Tertul. de Bapt. cap. i. [p. 224 A.]* Which is thus interpreted by Optatus, 'Cujus piscis nomen secundum appellationem Græcam in uno nomine per singulas literas turbam sanc-

torum nominum continet, ἰχθύς, quod est Latinum *Jesus Christus Dei Filius Salvator*.' *Lib. iii. [c. 2. p. 52.]*

⁹⁶ The Latins indeed generally use the word *unicum*. So Rufinus: 'Et in unico filio ejus:' [§. 6. p. cciii.] which is so far from being in his apprehension the same with *unigenitus*, that he refers it as well to Lord as Son. 'Hic ergo Jesus Christus, Filius unicus Dei, qui est et Dominus noster unicus, et ad Filium referri et ad Dominum potest.' [§. 8. p. ccv.] So St. Augustin in *Enchiridio*, *cap. 34.* and *Leo Epist. 10. [Ep. xxiv.]* Which is therefore to be observed, because in the ancient copies of those Epistles the word *unicum* was not to be found, as appeareth by the discourse of Vigilius, who in the fourth book against Eutyches hath these words: 'Illa primitus uno diluens volumine quæ Leonis objiciuntur Epistolæ, cujus hoc sibi primo capitulum iste, nescio quis,

Scripture and the Greek Church is the *only-begotten*. It is then sufficient for the explication of these words, to shew how Christ is the Son of God, and what is the peculiarity of his generation; that when others are also the sons of God, he alone should so be his Son, as no other is or can be so; and therefore he alone should have the name of the *only-begotten*.

First, then, it cannot be denied that Christ is the Son of God, for that reason, because he was by the Spirit of God born of the

Matt. i. 20. Virgin Mary; for that which is conceived (or begotten⁹⁷) in her,

proposuit; *fidelium universitas profitetur credere se in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus, Dominum nostrum.* That which he aims at is the tenth Epistle of Leo, in which those words are found, but with the addition of *unicum*, which, as it seems, then was not there; as appears yet farther by the words which follow: 'Miror tamen quomodo hunc locum iste notavit, et illum prætermisit, ubi unici filii commemorationem idem beatus Leo facit, dicens, *Idem vero sempiterni genitoris unigenitus sempiternus, natus de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine;*' which words are not to be found in the same Epistle. Howsoever it was in the first copies of Leo; both Rufinus and St. Augustin, who were before him, and Maxinus Taurinensis, Chrysologus, Ethe-rius, and Beatus, who were later, read it, *et in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum*. But the word used in the Scriptures, and kept constantly by the Greeks, is *μονογενής*, the *only-begotten*.

⁹⁷ For the original is τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν· and it is the observation of St. Basil, οὐκ εἶρηται, τὸ κηθέν, ἀλλὰ, τὸ γεννηθέν. [vol. ii. p. 598 E.] Indeed the vulgar translation renders it, *quod in ea natum est*, and in St. Luke, *quod nascetur sanctum*; and it must be confessed this was the most ancient translation. For so Tertullian read it; 'Per virginem dicitis natum, non ex virgine, et in vulva, non ex vulva, quia et Angelus in somnis ad Joseph, *Nam quod in ea natum est*, inquit, *de Spiritu Sancto est.*' *De Carne Christi*, cap. 20. [p. 322 C.] And of that in St. Luke, 'Hæc et ab angelo exceperat secundum nostrum Evangelium, *Propterea, quod in te nascetur vocabitur sanctum, filius Dei.*' *Adv. Marcion*. lib. iv. cap. 7. [p. 418 A.] Yet

quod in ea natum est cannot be proper, while it is yet in the womb; nor can the child first be said to be born, and then that the mother shall bring it forth. It is true, indeed, γεννᾶν signifies not always to beget, but sometimes to bear or bring forth; as ἡ γυνή σου Ἐλισάβετ γεννήσει υἶόν σοι, Luke i. 13. and ver. 57. Καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἶόν. So τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βηθλεέμ, Matt. ii. 1. must necessarily be understood of Christ's nativity; for it is most certain, that he was not begotten or conceived at Bethlehem. And this without question must be the meaning of Herod's inquisition, Ποῦ ὁ Χριστὸς γεννάται, where the *Messias was to be born*. But though γεννᾶν have sometime the signification of bearing or bringing forth; yet τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν cannot be so interpreted, because it speaks of something as past, when as yet Christ was not born; and though the conception was already past, and we translate it so, *which is conceived*; yet St. Basil rejects that interpretation; γεννᾶν is one thing, συλλαμβάνειν another. Seeing then the nativity was not yet come, and γεννηθέν speaks of something already past, therefore the old translation is not good, *quod in ea natum est*. Seeing, though the conception indeed were past, yet γεννᾶν signifieth not to conceive, and so is not properly to be interpreted, *that which is conceived*; seeing γεννᾶν is most properly to beget, as ἡ γεννητικὴ the generative faculty: therefore I conceive the fittest interpretation of those words, τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν, *that which is begotten in her*. And because the angel in St. Luke speaks of the same thing, therefore I interpret τὸ γεννώμενον ἐκ σοῦ, in the same manner, *that which is begotten of thee*.

by the testimony of an angel, *is of the Holy Ghost*; and because of him, therefore the Son of God. For so spake the angel to
106 the Virgin; *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power* Luke i. 35.
of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee (or, *which is begotten of thee*) *shall be called the Son of God*. And the reason is clear, because that the Holy Ghost is God. For were he any creature, and not God himself, by whom our Saviour was thus born of the Virgin, he must have been the Son of a creature, not of God.

Secondly, it is as undoubtedly true, that the same Christ, thus born of the Virgin by the Spirit of God, was designed to so high an office by the special and immediate will of God, that by virtue thereof he must be acknowledged the *Son of God*. He urgeth this argument himself against the Jews; *Is it not written in your* John x. 34,
Law, I said, Ye are gods? Are not these the very words of the 35, 36.
eighty-second Psalm? *If he called them gods*, if God himself so spake, or the Psalmist from him, if this be the language of the Scripture, if they be called gods, *unto whom the word of God came*, (and the Scripture cannot be broken, nor the authority thereof in any particular denied,) *say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world*, whom he hath consecrated and commissioned to the most eminent and extraordinary office, *say ye of him, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?*

Thirdly, Christ must therefore be acknowledged the Son of God, because he is raised immediately by God out of the earth unto immortal life. For *God hath fulfilled the promise unto us*, Acts xiii.
in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the 33.
second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. The grave is as the womb of the earth; Christ, who is raised from thence, is, as it were, begotten to another life: and God, who raised him, is his Father. So true it must needs be of him, which is spoken of others, who are *the children of God, being the* Luke xx.
children of the resurrection. Thus was he defined or constituted, 36.
and appointed the *Son of God with power by the resurrection from* Rom. i. 4.
the dead; neither is he called simply the first that rose, but with a note of generation, *the first-born from the dead*. Col. i. 18.

Fourthly, Christ, after his resurrection from the dead, is made actually heir of all things in his Father's house, and Lord of all the Spirits which minister unto him, from whence he also hath the title of the Son of God. He is *set down at the right hand of* Heb. i. 3,
4, 5.

the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? From all which testimonies of the Scriptures it is evident, that Christ hath this fourfold right unto the title of the Son of God: by generation, as begotten of God; by commission, as sent by him; by resurrection, as the first-born; by actual possession, as heir of all.

But beside these four, we must find yet a more peculiar ground of our Saviour's filiation, totally distinct from any which belongs unto the rest of the sons of God, that he may be clearly and fully acknowledged the *only-begotten Son*. For although to 107 be born of a Virgin be in itself miraculous, and justly entitles Christ unto [the name of] the Son of God; yet it is not so far above the production of all mankind, as to place him in that singular eminence which must be attributed to the only-begotten.

Lukeiii.38. We read of Adam *the son of God*, as well as Seth the son of Adam: and surely the framing Christ out of a woman cannot so far transcend the making Adam out of the earth, as to cause so great a distance as we must believe between the first and second Adam. Beside, there were many while our Saviour preached on earth who did believe his doctrine, and did confess him to be the Son of God, who in all probability understood nothing of his being born of a Virgin; much less did they foresee his rising from the dead, or inheriting all things. Wherefore supposing all these ways by which Christ is represented to us as the Son of God, we shall find out one more yet, far more proper in itself, and more peculiar unto him, in which no other son can have the least pretence of share or of similitude, and consequently in respect of which we must confess him the only-begotten.

To which purpose I observe, that the actual possession of his inheritance, which was our fourth title to his Sonship, presupposeth his resurrection, which was the third: and his commission to his office, which was the second, presupposeth his generation of a Virgin, as the first. But I shall now endeavour to find another generation, by which the same Christ was begotten, and consequently a Son, before he was conceived in the Virgin's womb. Which that I may be able to evince, I shall proceed in this following method, as not only most facile and perspicuous, but also most convincing and conclusive. First, I will

clearly prove out of the Holy Scriptures, that Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, had an actual being or subsistence before the Holy Ghost did come upon the Virgin, or the power of the Highest did overshadow her. Secondly, I will demonstrate from the same Scriptures, that the being which he had antecedently to his conception in the Virgin's womb was not any created being, but essentially Divine. Thirdly, we will shew that the Divine essence which he had, he received as communicated to him by the Father. Fourthly, we will declare this communication of the Divine nature to be a proper generation, by which he which communicateth is a proper Father, and he to whom it is communicated, a proper Son. Lastly, we will manifest that the Divine essence was never communicated in that manner to any person but to him, that never any was so begotten besides himself, and consequently, in respect of that Divine generation, he is most properly and perfectly *the only-begotten Son of the Father*.

As for the first, that Jesus Christ had a real being or existence, by which he truly was, before he was conceived of the Virgin Mary, I thus demonstrate. He which was really in heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into heaven or went unto the Father, he had a real being or existence before he was conceived in the Virgin, and distinct from that being which was conceived in her. This is most clear and evident, upon these three suppositions not to be denied. First, that Christ did receive no other being or nature after his conception, before his ascension, than what was begotten of the Virgin. Secondly, that what was begotten of the Virgin had its first being here on earth, and therefore could not really be in heaven till he ascended thither. Thirdly, that what was really in heaven, really was; because nothing can be present in any place, which is not. Upon these suppositions certainly true, the first proposition cannot be denied. Wherefore I assume; Jesus Christ was really in heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the 108 Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into heaven, or went unto the Father; as I shall particularly prove by the express words of the Scripture. Therefore I conclude, that Jesus Christ had a real being or existence before he was conceived in the Virgin; and distinct from that being which

was conceived in her. Now that he was really in heaven before he ascended thither, appeareth by his own words to his disciples; *What and if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* For he speaketh of a real ascension, such as was to be seen or looked upon, such as they might view as spectators. The place to which that ascension tended was truly and really the heaven of heavens. The verb substantive, not otherwise used, sufficiently testifieth, not a figurative but a real being, especially considering the opposition in the word *before*. Whether we look upon the time of speaking, then present, or the time of his ascension, then to come, his being or existing in heaven was *before*. Nor is this now at last denied, that he was in heaven before the ascension mentioned in these words, but that he was there before he ascended at all. We shall therefore farther shew that this ascension was the first; that what was born of the Virgin was never in heaven before this time of which he speaks: and being in heaven before this ascension, he must be acknowledged to have been there before he ascended at all. If Christ had ascended into heaven before his death, and descended from thence*, it had been the most remarkable action in all his life, and the proof thereof of the greatest efficacy toward the disseminating of the Gospel. And can we imagine so divine an action of so high concernment could have passed, and none of the Evangelists ever make mention of it? Those which are so diligent in the description of his nativity and circumcision, his oblation in the temple, his reception by Simeon, his adoration by the wise men; those which have described his descent into Egypt; would they have omitted his ascent into heaven? Do they tell us of the wisdom which he shewed when he disputed with the doctors? and were it not worthy our knowledge whether it were before he was in heaven or after? The diligent seeking of Joseph and Mary, and her words when they found

John vi. 62. θεωρήτε as it came to pass, βλέπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη. Acts i. 9. ὕπου ἦν.

Luke ii. 48. him, *Son, why hast thou dealt so with us?* shew that he had not been missing from them till then, and consequently not ascended

Luke ii. 51. into heaven. After that he went down to Nazareth, and *was subject to them*: and I understand not how he should ascend

into heaven, and at the same time be subject to them; or there receive his commission and instructions as the great legate of God, or ambassador from heaven, and return again unto his old subjection; and afterwards to go to John to be baptized of him, and to expect the descent of the Spirit for his inauguration. Immediately from Jordan he is carried into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil; and it were strange if any time could then be found for his ascension: for *he was forty days in the wilderness*, and certainly heaven is no such kind of place; he was all that time *with the beasts*, who undoubtedly are none of the celestial hierarchy; and *tempted of Satan*, whose dominion reacheth no higher than the air. Wherefore in those forty days Christ ascended not into heaven, but rather heaven descended unto him; for *the angels ministered unto him*. After this *he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee*, and there exercised his prophetic office: after which there is not the least pretence of any reason for his ascension. Beside, the whole frame of this antecedent or preparatory ascension of Christ is not only raised, without any written testimony of the word, or unwritten testimony of tradition, but is without any reason in itself, and contrary to the revealed way of our redemption. For what reason should Christ ascend into heaven to know the will of God, and not be known to ascend thither? Certainly the Father could reveal his will unto the Son as well on earth as in

109 heaven. And if men must be ignorant of his ascension, to what purpose should they say he ascended, except they imagine either an impotency in the Father, or dissatisfaction in the Son? Nor is this only asserted without reason, but also against that rule to be observed by Christ as he was anointed to the sacerdotal office. For the holy of holies *made with hands* was the *figure of the true*, (that is, heaven itself,) into which the *High Priest alone went once every year*: and Christ as our High Priest *entered in once into the holy place*. If then they deny Christ was a Priest before he *preached the Gospel*, then did he not enter into heaven, because the High Priest alone went into the type thereof, the holy of holies. If they confess he was, then did he not ascend till after his death, because he was to enter in but once, and that not without blood. Wherefore being Christ ascended not into heaven till after his death, being he certainly was in heaven before that ascension, we have sufficiently made good that part of our argument, that Jesus Christ was in heaven before that

Mark i. 13. wilderness, and certainly heaven is no such kind of place; he was all that time with the beasts, who undoubtedly are none of the celestial hierarchy; and tempted of Satan, whose dominion reacheth no higher than the air. Wherefore in those forty days Christ ascended not into heaven, but rather heaven descended unto him; for the angels ministered unto him. After this he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, and there exercised his prophetic office: after which there is not the least pretence of any reason for his ascension. Beside, the whole frame of this antecedent or preparatory ascension of Christ is not only raised, without any written testimony of the word, or unwritten testimony of tradition, but is without any reason in itself, and contrary to the revealed way of our redemption. For what reason should Christ ascend into heaven to know the will of God, and not be known to ascend thither? Certainly the Father could reveal his will unto the Son as well on earth as in heaven. And if men must be ignorant of his ascension, to what purpose should they say he ascended, except they imagine either an impotency in the Father, or dissatisfaction in the Son? Nor is this only asserted without reason, but also against that rule to be observed by Christ as he was anointed to the sacerdotal office. For the holy of holies made with hands was the figure of the true, (that is, heaven itself,) into which the High Priest alone went once every year: and Christ as our High Priest entered in once into the holy place. If then they deny Christ was a Priest before he preached the Gospel, then did he not enter into heaven, because the High Priest alone went into the type thereof, the holy of holies. If they confess he was, then did he not ascend till after his death, because he was to enter in but once, and that not without blood. Wherefore being Christ ascended not into heaven till after his death, being he certainly was in heaven before that ascension, we have sufficiently made good that part of our argument, that Jesus Christ was in heaven before that

* [This remark is made in refutation of the extraordinary notion of the Socinians, that Jesus was taken up into heaven some time before his ministry began. In this way they explained John i. 18. iii. 13, &c. See Socinus, Op. vol. i. p. 146. ed. 1656. Schlichtingius, in Joan. iii. 13. Mosheim refuted it in a Dissertation, 'De raptu Christi in cœlos.']

which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither. Now that which followeth will both illustrate and confirm it: for as he was there, so he descended from thence before he ascended thither.

John vi. 33. 51. This he often testifieth and inculcateth of himself: *The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven; and, I am the living bread which came down from heaven.* He opposeth himself unto the manna in the wilderness, which never was really in heaven,

John vi. 32. or had its original from thence. *Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, but the Father gave Christ really from thence.*

John vi. 38. Wherefore he saith, *I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.* Now never any person upon any occasion is said to descend from heaven, but such as were really there before they appeared on earth, as the Father, the Holy Ghost, and the angels: but no man, however born, however sanctified, sent, or dignified, is said thereby to descend from thence; but rather when any is opposed to Christ, the opposition is placed in this very origination. John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb;

Luke i. 15. born of an aged father and a barren mother, by the power of God; and yet he distinguisheth himself from Christ in this:

John iii. 31. *He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from heaven is above all.* Adam was framed immediately by God, without the intervention of man or woman: and yet he is so far from being thereby from heaven, that even in that he is distinguished from the second Adam. For *the first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.* Wherefore the descent of Christ from heaven doth really presuppose his being there, and

1 Cor. xv. 47. that antecedently to any ascent thither. For *that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first?* So St. Paul, asserting a descent as necessarily preceding his ascension, teacheth us never to imagine an ascent of Christ as his first motion between heaven and earth*; and consequently, that the first being or existence which Christ had, was not what he received by his conception here on earth, but what he had before in heaven, in respect whereof he was with the Father, from whom he came. His Disciples believed that he *came out from God*: and he com-

Eph. iv. 9. mended that faith and confirmed the object of it by this assertion: *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.* Thus having, by undoubted testimonies, made good the latter part of the argument, I may safely conclude, that being Christ was really in heaven, and descended from thence, and came forth from the Father, before that which was conceived of the Holy Ghost ascended thither; it cannot with any show of reason be denied, that Christ had a real being and existence antecedent unto his conception here on earth, and distinct from the being which he received here.

110 Secondly, we shall prove not only a bare priority of existence, but a preexistence of some certain and acknowledged space of duration. For whosoever was before John the Baptist and before Abraham, was some space of time before Christ was man. This no man can deny, because all must confess the blessed Virgin was first saluted by the angel six months after Elizabeth conceived, and many hundred years after Abraham died. But Jesus Christ was really existent before John the Baptist, and before Abraham, as we shall make good by the testimony of the Scriptures. Therefore it cannot be denied but Christ had a real being and existence some space of time before he was made man. For the first, it is the express testimony of John himself; *This is he of whom I spake, he that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me.* In which words, first, he taketh to himself a priority of time, speaking of Christ, *he that cometh after me*: for so he came after him into the womb, at his conception; into the world, at his nativity; unto his office, at his baptism; always after John, and at the same distance. Secondly, he attributeth unto Christ a priority of dignity, saying, *he is preferred before me*, as appeareth by the reiteration of these words: *He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose.* The addition of which expression of his own unworthiness sheweth, that *to be preferred before him** is the same with being *worthier than he*; to which the same expression is constantly added by all the other three Evangelists. Thirdly, he rendereth the reason or cause of that great dignity which belonged to Christ, saying *for*, or rather, *because, he was*

John xvi. 27, 28.

* [Pearson therefore understood εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς in Eph. iv. 9. to refer to Christ's coming upon earth, and not to his descent into the grave. See more in his remarks upon Art. V.]

* [It will be observed that *he is preferred before me* is in the Greek ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν; but *he was before me*, in ver. 30. is πρῶτός μου ἦν.]

before me. And being the cause must be supposed different and distinct from the effect, therefore the priority last mentioned cannot be that of dignity. For to assign any thing as the cause or reason of itself, is a great absurdity, and the expression of it a vain tautology. Wherefore that priority must have relation to time or duration (as the very tense, *he was before me*, sufficiently signifieth), and so be placed in opposition to his coming after him. As if John the Baptist had thus spoke at large: "This man Christ Jesus, who came into the world, and entered on his prophetic office six months after me, is notwithstanding of far more worth and greater dignity than I am; even so much greater, that I must acknowledge myself unworthy to stoop down and unloose the latchet of his shoes: and the reason of this transcendent dignity is from the excellency of that nature which he had before I was; for though he cometh after me, yet he was before me."

Now as Christ was before John, which speaks a small, so was he also before Abraham, which speaks a larger time. Jesus himself hath asserted this preexistence to the Jews; *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.* Which words, plainly and literally expounded, must evidently contain this truth. For, first, Abraham in all the Scriptures never hath any other signification than such as denotes the person called by that name; and the question to which these words are directed by way of answer, without controversy, spake of the same person. Beside, Abraham must be the subject of that proposition, *Abraham was*; because a proposition cannot be without a subject, and if Abraham be the predicate, there is none. Again, as we translate *Abraham was*, in a tense signifying the time past, so it is most certainly to be understood; because that which he speaks unto, is the preexistence of Abraham, and that of long duration; so that whatsoever had concerned his present estate or future condition, had been wholly impertinent to the precedent question. Lastly, the expression, *I am*, seeming something unusual or improper to signify a priority in respect of any thing past, because no present instant is before that which precedeth, but that which followeth, yet the use⁹⁸ of it sufficiently main-

⁹⁸ So Nonnus here more briefly and plainly than usual, [viii. 187]:

Ἀβραὰμ πρὶν γένος ἔσχευ, ἐγὼ πῆλον—
So St. John xiv. 9. Τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ'

ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκός με; Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me? And St. John xv. 27. "Ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔστε, because ye

taineth, and the nature of the place absolutely requireth, that it should not here denote a present being, but a priority of existence, together with a continuation of it till the present time. And then the words will plainly signify thus much: "Do you question how I could see Abraham, who am not yet fifty years old? Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before ever Abraham, the person whom you speak of, was born⁹⁹, I had a real being and existence (by which I was capable of the sight of him), in which I have continued until now." In this sense certainly the Jews understood our Saviour's answer, as pertinent to their question, but in their opinion blasphemous; and therefore *they took up stones to cast at him.*

This literal and plain explication is yet farther necessary; because those which once recede from it, do not only wrest and pervert the place, but also invent and suggest an answer unworthy of and wholly misbecoming him that spake it. For (setting aside the addition of the *light of the world*, which there can be no show of reason to admit¹); whether they interpret the former

have been (or *continued*) with me from the beginning. Thus Nonnus, [xv. 111]:

Ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγαῶτες ἅλον δηήτορες ἔργων.
St. John vi. 24. "Ὅτε οὐδ' εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ. When the people saw that Jesus was not there. Nor only doth St. John use thus the present tense for that which is past, but as frequently for that which is to come. For as before, Τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, so on the contrary, ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, St. John vii. 33. and ἔπου εἰμι ἐγὼ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμός ἐσται, St. John xii. 26. xiv. 3. xvii. 24. Wherefore it is very indifferent whether (John vii. 34.) we read, ἔπου εἰμι ἐγὼ, or ἔπου εἰμι. For Nonnus seems to have read it εἰμι by his translation, [vii. 130.]

—εἰς ἀτραπὸν ἦν περ ὀδεύσω
and the Jews' question, Ποῦ οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι; shews they understood it so: for this εἰμι, though of a present form, is of a future signification. *Hesych.* Εἰμι, πορεύσομαι. And so it agreeth with that which follows, St. John viii. 21. "Ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἔλθειν. If we read εἰμι, as the old translation, *ubi ego sum*, it will have the force of ἔσομαι, and agree with the other, ἵνα ἔπου εἰμι ἐγὼ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἴτε.

Howsoever it is clear, St. John useth the present εἰμι either in relation to what is past, or what is to come, and is therefore to be interpreted as the matter in hand requireth. And certainly the place now under our consideration can admit no other relation but to the time already past, in which Abraham lived. And we find the present tense in the same manner joined with the aorist elsewhere: as Psal. xc. 2. Πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γεννηθῆναι, καὶ πλασθῆναι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος σὺ εἶ. What can be more parallel than, Πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γεννηθῆναι, το πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, and σὺ εἶ, το ἐγὼ εἰμι? in the same manner, though by another word, Πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη ἐδρασθῆναι, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γενεῶν με. Prov. viii. 25.

⁹⁹ So the Æthiopic version, *Amen dico vobis, priusquam Abraham nasceretur, fui ego*; and the Persian, *Vere, vere vobis dico, quod nondum Abraham factus erat, cum ego eram.*

¹ This is the shift of the Socinians, who make this speech of Christ elliptical, and then supply it from the twelfth verse, *I am the light of the world.* Ad quod vero ea verba, *Ego sum*, sint ad eum

part (*Before Abraham was*) of something to come, as the calling of the Gentiles, or the latter (*I am*) of a preexistence in the divine foreknowledge and appointment; they represent Christ with a great asseveration highly and strongly asserting that which is nothing to the purpose to which he speaks, nothing to any other purpose at all; and they propound the Jews senselessly offended and foolishly exasperated with those words, which any of them might have spoken as well as he. For the first interpretation makes our Saviour thus to speak: "Do ye so much wonder how I should *have seen Abraham*, who am *not yet fifty years old*? Do ye imagine so great a contradiction in this? I tell you, and be ye most assured that what I speak unto you at this time is most certainly and infallibly true, and most worthy of your observation, which moves me not to deliver it without this solemn asseveration (*Verily, verily, I say unto you*), Before Abraham shall perfectly become that which was signified in his name, *the father of many nations*, before the Gentiles shall come in, *I am*. Nor be ye troubled at this answer, or think in this I magnify myself: for what I speak is as true of you, as it is of me; before Abraham be thus made Abraham, ye are. Doubt ye not therefore, as ye did, nor ever make that question again, whether I *have seen Abraham*." The second explication makes a sense of another nature, but with the same impertinency. "Do ye continue still to question, and that with so much admiration? Do ye look upon my age, and ask, *Hast thou seen Abraham*? I confess it is more than eighteen hundred years since that Patri-

112

arch died, and less than forty since I was born at Bethlehem: but look not on this computation; for before Abraham was born, I was. But mistake me not, I mean in the foreknowledge and decree of God. Nor do I magnify myself in this, for ye were so." How either of these answers should give any reasonable satisfac-

modum supplenda, ac si ipse subjecisset iis, *Ego sum lux mundi*, superius e principio ejus orationis, ver. 12. et hinc quod Christus bis seipsum iisdem, *Ego sum*, lucem mundi vocaverit, ver. 24 et 28.—deprehendi potest. *Catech. Racov.* [de Cognitione Dei, c. i. p. 44.] Whereas there is no ground for any such connexion. That discourse of the light of the world was in the treasury, ver. 20; that which followeth was not, at least appeareth not to be so. Therefore the ellipsis of the 24th and 28th verses

is not to be supplied by the 12th, but the 24th from the 23d, *Ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἁνωθέν εἰμι*, and the 28th either from the same, or that which is most general, his office, *Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός*. Again, verse 31, it is very probable that a new discourse is again begun, and therefore if there were an ellipsis in the words alleged, it would have no relation to either of the former supplies, or if to either, to the latter; but indeed it hath to neither.

tion to the question, or the least occasion of the Jews' exasperation, is not to be understood. And that our Saviour should speak any such impertinencies as these interpretations bring forth, is not by a Christian to be conceived. Wherefore being the plain and most obvious sense is a proper and full answer to the question, and most likely to exasperate the unbelieving Jews; being those strained explications render the words of Christ not only impertinent to the occasion, but vain and useless to the hearers of them; being our Saviour gave this answer in words of another language, most probably incapable of any such interpretations: we must adhere unto that literal sense already delivered, by which it appeareth Christ had a being, as before John, so also before Abraham (not only before Abram became Abraham, but before Abraham was Abram), and consequently that he did exist two thousand years before he was born, or conceived by the Virgin.

Thirdly, we shall extend this preexistence to a far longer space of time, to the end of the first world, nay to the beginning of it. For he which was before the flood, and at the creation of the world, had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin. But Christ was really before the flood, for he preached to them that lived before it; and at the creation of the world, for he created it. That he preached to those before the flood, is evident by the words of St. Peter, who saith, that Christ was *put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing**. From which words it appeareth, that Christ preached by the same Spirit by the virtue of which he was raised from the dead: but that Spirit was not his soul, but something of a greater power. Secondly, that those to whom he preached were such as were disobedient. Thirdly, that the time when they were disobedient was the time before the flood, while the ark was preparing. It is certain then that Christ did preach unto those persons which in the days of Noah were disobedient all that time *the longsuffering of God waited*, and, consequently, so long as repentance was offered. And it is as certain that he never preached to them after they died; which I shall not need here to prove, because those,

1 Pet. iii.
18, 19, 20.

Ἀπειθήσασιν ποτε, ὅτε ἀπαξ ἐξεδέχεται ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε.

* [Another interpretation of this text is considered in Art. V. *He descended into Hell*.]

against whom I bring this argument, deny it not. It followeth therefore, that he preached to them while they lived, and were disobedient; for in the refusing of that mercy which was offered to them by the preaching of Christ, did their disobedience principally consist. In vain then are we taught to understand St. Peter of the promulgation of the Gospel to the Gentiles after the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles, when the words themselves refuse all relation to any such times or persons. For all those of whom St. Peter speaks were disobedient in the days of Noah. But none of those to whom the Apostles preached were ever disobedient in the days of Noah. Therefore none of those to which the Apostles preached, were any of those of which St. Peter speaks. It remaineth therefore that the plain interpretation be acknowledged for the true, that Christ did preach unto those men which lived before the flood, even while they lived, and consequently that he was before it. For though this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God, as if he personally had appeared on earth, and actually preached to that old world; but by the ministry of a Prophet², by the sending of Noah, *the eighth Preacher of righteousness*³: yet to do any

² 2 Pet. ii. 5.

113

² 'Prophetæ ab ipso habentes donum in illum prophetaverunt.' *Barnabæ Epist.* [Vet. Int. c. 5. p. 60.]

³ I have thus translated this place of St. Peter, because it may add some advantage to the argument: for if Noah were the eighth preacher of righteousness, and he were sent by the Son of God; no man, I conceive, will deny that the seven before him were sent by the same Son: and so by this we have gained the preexistence of another 1000 years. However those words, 'ἄλλ' ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξε, may be better interpreted than they are, when we translate them, *but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness*. For, first, if we look upon the Greek phrase, ὄγδοος Νῶε may be, not the eighth person, but one of eight, or Noah with seven more; in which it signifieth not the order in which he was in respect to the rest, but only consignifieth the number which were with him. As when we read in the *Supplices* of Æschylus, ver. 715.

Τὸ γὰρ τεκόντων σέβας
Τρίτον τὰδ' ἐν θεσμίοις
Δίκας γέγραπται μεγιστοτίμου,

we must not understand it, as if honour due to parents were the third commandment at Athens, but one of the three remarkable laws left at Eleusis by Triptolemus. So Porphyrius, *Φασὶ δὲ καὶ Τριπτόλεμον Ἀθηναίους νομοθετῆσαι, καὶ τῶν νόμων αὐτοῦ τρεῖς ἔτι Ξενοκράτης δὲ φιλόσοφος λέγει διαμένειν Ἐλευσίνι τούσδε: Γονεῖς τιμῶν Θεοῦ καρποῖς ἀγάλλειν· Ζῶα μὴ σίνεσθαι. De Abstinent. lib. iv. [§. 22.]* Which words are thus translated by St. Jerom, who hath made use of most part of that fourth book of Porphyrius: '*Xenocrates Philosophus de Triptolemi legibus apud Athenienses tria tantum præcepta in templo Eleusinæ residere scribit; Honorandos Parentes, Venerandos Deos, Carnibus non vescendum.*' *Adv. Jovinian. lib. ii. [§. 14. vol. ii. p. 344 B.]* Where we see honour due to parents the first precept, though by Æschylus called the third, not in respect of the order, but the number. Thus Dinarchus the Orator, *Καὶ τὰς Σεμνὰς θεὰς αἰς ἐκείνους ἱεροποῖς καταστάς δέκατος αὐτός.* From whence we must not collect that the person of whom he speaks was the tenth in order of that office, so that nine were neces-

thing by another not able to perform it without him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause, as if he did it of himself without any intervening instrument.

The second part of the argument, that Christ made this world, and consequently had a real being at the beginning of it, the Scriptures manifestly and plentifully assure us. For the same Son, by whom *in these last days God spake unto us*, is he, *by whom* Heb. i. 2. *also he made the worlds.* So that as *through faith we understand* Heb. xi. 3. *that the worlds were framed by the word of God*, so must we also believe that they were made by the Son of God⁴. Which the Apostle doth not only in the entrance of his Epistle deliver, but in the sequel prove. For shewing greater things have been spoken of him than ever were attributed to any of the angels, the most glorious of all the creatures of God; amongst the rest, he saith, the Scripture spake *unto the Son, Thy throne, O God, is* Heb. i. 8. *for ever and ever.* And not only so, but also, *Thou, Lord, in the* 10, 11, 12. *beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.* Now whatsoever the person be to whom these words were spoken, it cannot be denied but he was the Creator of the world. For he must be acknowledged the Maker of the earth, who laid the foundation of it; and he may justly challenge to himself the making of the heavens, who can say they are the work of his hands. But these words were spoken to the Son of God, as the Apostle himself

sarily before or above him, and many more might be after or below him: but from hence it is inferred, that there were ten *ἱεροποιοί* waiting on the *Σεμνὰ θεὰ*, and no more, of which number that man was one. After this manner speak the Attic writers, especially Thucydides. And so we may understand St. Peter, that God preserved Noah (a preacher of righteousness) with seven more, of which he deserveth to be named the first, rather than the last or eighth. But, secondly, the ordinal ὄγδοον may possibly not belong to the name or person of Noah, but to his title or office; and then we must translate ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, *Noah the eighth preacher of righteousness*. For we read at the birth of Enos, that men

began to call upon the name of the Lord, Gen. iv. 26. which the ancients understood peculiarly of his person: as the LXX. *Οὗτος ἤλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and the vulgar Latin, *Iste cœpit invocare nomen Domini.* The Jews have a tradition, that God sent in the sea upon mankind in the days of Enos, and destroyed many. From whence it seems Enos was a preacher or prophet, and so the rest that followed him; and then Noah is the eighth.

⁴ It being in both places expressed in the same phrase by the same author, *Δὲ οὐ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν*, Heb. i. 2. *Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι Θεοῦ.* xi. 3.

acknowledgeth, and it appeareth out of the order and series of the chapter; the design of which is to declare the supereminent excellency of our Saviour Christ. Nay, the conjunction *and* refers this place of the Psalmist plainly to the former⁵, of which he had said expressly, *but unto the Son he saith*. As sure then as *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, was said unto the Son: so certain it is, *Thou, Lord, hast laid the foundation of the earth*, was said unto the same. Nor is it possible to avoid the Apostle's 114 connexion by attributing the destruction of the heavens, out of the last words, to the Son, and denying the creation of them, out of the first, to the same. For it is most evident that there is but one person spoken to, and that the destruction and creation of the heavens are both attributed to the same. Whosoever therefore shall grant that the Apostle produced the Scripture to shew that the Son of God shall destroy the heavens, must withal acknowledge that he created them: whosoever denieth him to be here spoken of as the Creator, must also deny him to be understood as the destroyer. Wherefore being the words of the Psalmist were undoubtedly spoken of and to our Saviour (or else the Apostle hath attributed that unto him which never belonged to him, and consequently the spirit of St. Paul mistook the spirit of David); being to whomsoever any part of them belongs, the whole is applicable, because they are delivered unto one; being the literal exposition is so clear, that no man hath ever pretended to a metaphorical: it remaineth as an undeniable truth, grounded upon the profession of the Psalmist, and the interpretation of an Apostle, that the Son of God created the world. Nor needed we so long to have insisted upon this testimony, because there are so many which testify as much, but only that this is of a peculiar nature and different from the rest. For they which deny this truth of the creation of the world by the Son of God, notwithstanding all those Scriptures produced to confirm it, have found two ways to avoid or decline the force of them. If they speak so plainly and literally of the work of creation, that they will not endure any figurative interpretation,

⁵ The answer of Socinus to this conjunction is very weak, relying only upon the want of a comma after *καὶ* in the Greek, and *et* in the Latin. And whereas it is evident that there are distinctions in the Latin and Greek copies after that conjunction, he flies to the

ancientest copies, which all men know were most careless of distinctions, and urgeth that there is no addition of *ursum* or the like after *et*, whereas in the Syriac translation we find expressly that addition, ܘܪܫܘܡ.

then they endeavour to shew that they are not spoken of the Son of God. If they speak so expressly of our Saviour Christ, as that by no machination they can be applied to any other person, then their whole design is to make the creation attributed unto him appear to be merely metaphorical. The place before alleged is of the first kind, which speaketh so clearly of the creation or real production of the world, that they never denied it: and I have so manifestly shewed it spoken to the Son of God, that it is beyond all possibility of gainsaying.

Thus having asserted the creation acknowledged real unto Christ*, we shall the easier persuade that likewise to be such, which is pretended to be metaphorical. In the Epistle to the Colossians we read of the Son of God, *in whom we have redemption* Col. i. 14. *through his blood*; and we are sure those words can be spoken of none other than Jesus Christ. He therefore it must be, who was thus described by the Apostle; *who is the image of* Col. i. 15, *the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For by him* 16, 17. *were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* In which words our Saviour is expressly styled the *first-born of every creature*⁶, that is, begotten by God, as the *Son of his love*⁷, antecedently to all other emanations, before any thing proceeded from him, or was framed and created by him. And that precedency is presently proved by this undeniable argument, that all other emanations or productions came from him, and whatsoever received its being by creation, was by him created. Which assertion is delivered in the most proper, full, and pregnant expressions imaginable. First, in the vulgar phrase of Moses, as most consonant to his description; *for by him were all things created*

⁶ *The first-born of every creature* is taken by Origen for an expression declaring the Divinity of Christ, and used by him as a phrase in opposition to his humanity to express the same. 'Ελέγμεν δὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέροις, ὅτι αἱ μὲν τινες εἰσι φωναὶ τοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ πρωτότου πάσης κτίσεως, ὡς ἡ, 'Εγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ, καὶ αἱ τοῦ-

τοῖς παραλήσειαι· αἱ δὲ τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν νοουμένου ἀνθρώπου, ὡς ἡ τοῦ, Νῦν δὲ με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτείναι, ἔνθρωπον ὃς τὴν ἀληθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα. Lib. ii. cont. Cels. [§. 25. p. 409 F.]

⁷ In relation to the precedent words, *Τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ*, for that *υἱὸς ἀγαπητός* was the *υἱὸς πρωτότοκος*.

* ["Having asserted unto Christ" means "having asserted it to belong to "Christ."]

that are in heaven, and that are in earth; signifying thereby, that he speaketh of the same creation. Secondly, by a division which Moses never used, as describing the production only of corporeal 115 substances: lest therefore those immaterial beings might seem exempted from the Son's creation, because omitted in Moses his description, he addeth *visible and invisible*; and lest in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestial hierarchy, any order might seem exempted from an essential dependence upon him, he nameth those which are of greatest eminence, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, and under them comprehendeth all the rest. Nor doth it yet suffice, thus to extend the object of his power by asserting all things to be made by him, except it be so understood as to acknowledge the sovereignty of his person, and the authority of his action. For lest we should conceive the Son of God framing the world as a mere instrumental cause which worketh by and for another, he sheweth him as well the final as the efficient cause; for *all things were created by him and for him*. Lastly, whereas all things first receive their being by creation, and when they have received it, continue in the same by virtue of God's conservation, in whom *we live, and move, and have our being*; lest in any thing we should be thought not to depend immediately upon the Son of God, he is described as the Conserver, as well as the Creator; for *he is before all things, and by him all things consist*. If then we consider the two last cited verses by themselves, we cannot deny but they are a most complete description of the Creator of the world; and if they were spoken of God the Father, could be no way injurious to his majesty, who is nowhere more plainly or fully set forth unto us as the Maker of the world.

Now although this were sufficient to persuade us to interpret this place of the making of the world, yet it will not be unfit to make use of another reason, which will compel us so to understand it. For undoubtedly there are but two kinds of creation in the language of the Scriptures, the one literal, the other metaphorical; one old, the other new; one by way of formation, the other by way of reformation. *If any man be in Christ, he is* 2 Cor. v. 17; *a new creature*, saith St. Paul, and again, *In Christ Jesus neither* Gal. vi. 15; *circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature*. Instead of which words he had before, *faith working* Eph. ii. 10. *by love*. *For we are the workmanship of God, created in Christ*

Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. From whence it is evident, that a new creature is such a person as truly believeth in Christ, and manifesteth that faith by the exercise of good works; and the new creation is the reforming or bringing man into this new condition, which by nature or his first creation he was not in. And therefore he which is so created is called a new man, in opposition to *the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts*: Eph. iv. from whence the Apostle chargeth us to be *renewed in the spirit* 22, 23, 24. *of our mind, and to put on that new man, which after God is* Col. iii. 10. *created in righteousness and true holiness; and which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him*. The new creation then is described to us as consisting wholly in renovation⁸, or a translation from a worse unto a better condition by way of reformation; by which those which have lost the image of God, in which the first man was created, are restored to the image of the same God again, by a real change, though not substantial, wrought within them. Now this being the notion of the new creation in all those places which undoubtedly and confessedly speak of it, it will be necessary to apply it unto such Scriptures as are pretended to require the same interpretation.

116 Thus therefore I proceed. If the second or new creation cannot be meant by the Apostle in the place produced out of the Epistle to the Colossians, then it must be interpreted of the first. For there are but two kinds of creation mentioned in the Scriptures, and one of them is there expressly named. But the place of the Apostle can no way admit an interpretation by the new creation, as will thus appear: The object of the creation, mentioned in this place, is of as great latitude and universality as the object of the first creation, not only expressed, but implied, by Moses. But the object of the new creation is not of the same latitude with that of the old. Therefore that which is mentioned here cannot be the new creation. For certainly if we reflect upon the true notion of the new creation, it neces-

⁸ Ἀνανέωσις or ἀνακαινώσις as, *the new man, νέος ἄνθρωπος, or καινός ἄνθρωπος*. The first, ὁ ἀνανεούμενος, the last, ὁ ἀνακαινούμενος, both the same. Suidas, Ἀνακαινώσις, ἢ ἀνανέωσις λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἀνακαινώσις which is the language of the New Testament. This renovation being thus called καινή κτίσις, the ancients framed a proper word for it, which is, Ἀνάκτισις ἐν ᾗ γίνεται πάντων τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα κακῶν ἢ ἀναίρεισι. S. Justin. Mart. Quæst. et Resp. ad Græcos. [p. 513 A.] This new creation doth so necessarily infer an alteration, that it is called by St. Paul a metamorphosis; Μεταμορφώσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν. Rom. xii. 2.

Acts xvii. 28.

2 Cor. v. 17. *If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature*, saith St. Paul, and again, *In Christ Jesus neither* Gal. vi. 15; *circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature*.

Eph. ii. 10. *by love*. *For we are the workmanship of God, created in Christ*

sarily and essentially includes an opposition to a former worse condition, as the new man is always opposed to the old; and if Adam had continued still in innocency, there could have been no such distinction between the old man and the new, or the old and new creation. Being then all men become not new, being there is no new creature but such whose faith worketh by love, being so many millions of men have neither faith nor love; it cannot be said that by *Christ all things were created anew that are in heaven, and that are in earth*, when the greatest part of mankind have no share in the new creation. Again, we cannot imagine that the Apostle should speak of the creation in a general word, intending thereby only the new, and while he doth so, express particularly and especially those parts of the old creation which are incapable of the new, or at least have no relation to it. The angels are all either good or bad: but whether they be bad, they can never be good again, nor did Christ come to redeem the devils; or whether they be good, they were always such, nor were they so by the virtue of Christ's incarnation, for *he took not on him the nature of angels*.

Heb. ii. 16. We acknowledge in mankind a new creation, because an old man becomes a new; but there is no such notion in the celestial hierarchy, because no old and new angels: they which fell, are fallen for eternity; they which stand, always stood, and shall stand for ever. Where then are the regenerated *thrones and dominions*? Where are the recreated *principalities and powers*? All those angels of whatsoever degrees were created by the Son of God, as the Apostle expressly affirms. But they were never created by a new creation *unto true holiness and righteousness*, because they always were truly righteous and holy ever since their first creation. Therefore except we could yet invent another creation, which were neither the old nor the new, we must conclude, that all the angels were at first created by the Son of God; and as they, so all things else, especially man, whose creation all the first writers of the Church of God expressly attribute unto the Son⁹, asserting that those words, *Let us make man*, were spoken as by the Father unto him.

⁹ 'Ad hoc Dominus sustinuit pati pro anima nostra, cum sit orbis terrarum Dominus, cui dixit die ante constitutionem seculi, *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram.*' *Barnabæ Epist. cap. 5.* [Vet. Int. p. 60.] And again, *Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή περὶ ἡμῶν ὡς λέγει τῷ Τίτῳ, Ποίησωμεν κατ' εἰκόνα,*

Nor need we doubt of this interpretation, or the doctrine arising from it, seeing it is so clearly delivered by St. John: *In John i. 1, the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and^{2, 3} the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* Whereas we have proved Christ had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary, because he was at the beginning of the world; and have also proved that he was at the beginning of the world, because he made it; this place of St. John gives a sufficient testimony to the truth of both 117 the last together. *In the beginning was the Word*; and that Word made flesh is Christ; therefore Christ was in the beginning. *All things were made by him*: therefore he created the world. Indeed nothing can be more clearly penned, to give full satisfaction in this point, than these words of St. John, which seem with a strange brevity designed to take off all objections, and remove all prejudice, before they teach so strange a truth. Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, and his age was known to them for whom this Gospel was penned. St. John would teach that this Christ did make the world, which was created at least four thousand years before his birth: the name of Jesus was given him since at his circumcision; the title of Christ belonged unto his office, which he exercised not till thirty years after. Neither of these with any show of probability will reach to the creation of the world. Wherefore he produceth a name of his, as yet unknown to the world, or rather not taken notice of, though in frequent use among the Jews, which belonged unto him who was made man, but before he was so. Unto that name he shews at first that he had a being in the beginning¹⁰; when all things were to be created, and consequently were not yet, then *in the beginning was the Word*, and so not created. This is the first step, the Word was not created when the world was made. The next is, that the same Word which then was,

&c. cap. 6. Ἐγκαλοῦμεν οὖν Ἰουδαίους τοῦτον μὴ νομίσασι Θεὸν ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν πολλαχοῦ μεμαρτυρημένον ὡς μεγάλῃ ὄντα δύναμιν καὶ Θεὸν, κατὰ τὸν τῶν ἄλων Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα· τοῦτ' ἂν φάμεν ἐν τῇ κατὰ Μωσέα κοσμοποιῆσά προστάτοντα τὸν Πατέρα εἰρηκέναι τὸ, Γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ, Γενηθήτω σπερέωμα, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, ὅσα προσέταξεν ὁ Θεὸς γενέσθαι· καὶ τοῦτ' εἰρηκέναι τὸ, Ποίησωμεν ἄν-

θρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν ἡμετέραν. *Orig. cont. Cels. lib. ii.* [§. 9. p. 393 B.] ¹⁰ Ἐν ἀρχῇ, the first word of Moses; whence the Syriac translation, *ברישׁי*. So Solomon, *מראשׁ מן תּוֹכַח מִן אֱלֹהִים* 'En ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τῆν γῆν ποιῆσαι. *Prov. viii. 23.* 'In principio erat Sermo; in quo principio scilicet Deus fecit cœlum et terram.' *Tertul. adv. Hermog. cap. 20.* [p. 240 D.]

and was not made, at the same time, *was with God*¹¹, when he made all things: and therefore well may we conceive it was
 Gen. i. 26. he to whom *God said, Let us make man in our image, after our*
 Gen. iii. 22. *likeness*; and of whom those words may be understood, *Behold, the man is become as one of us*. After this, lest any should conceive the creation of the world too great and divine a work to be attributed to the Word; lest any should object, that none can produce any thing out of nothing but God himself; he addeth, that the *Word*, as he *was with God*, so *was he also God*. Again, lest any should divide the Deity, or frame a false conception of different Gods, he returns unto the second assertion, and joins it with the first, *The same was in the beginning with God*: and then delivers that which at the first seemed strange, but now, after those three propositions, may easily be accepted; *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*. For now this is no new doctrine, but only an interpretation of those Scriptures which told us, God made all things by his word before. For *God said, Let there be light; and there was light*. And so, *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth*.
 Gen. i. 3. From whence we understand that the worlds were framed by the
 Ps. xxxiii. 6. *word of God*. Neither was it a new interpretation, but that which was most familiar to the Jews, who in their synagogues, by the reading of the paraphrase¹² or the interpretation of the

11 Πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, that is, παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, that is, *by God*. As Nonnus, [i. 4.] Πατρὸς ἔην ἡμέριστος, ἀτέρμονι σύν-θρονος ἡδρη.

As Wisdom speaketh, Prov. viii. 30. *Then I was by him*, וְאִנִּי הָיִיתִי בְּצַדִּיקוֹ *et eram in latere ejus*, Moschopolus, Περὶ σχεδῶν. Πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, τούτέστι, μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. As Matth. xiii. 56. Αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἴδον αὐτὸν ἕως ἄρτι; Mar. xiv. 49. Καθ' ἡμέραν ἤκουον πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 1 Cor. xvi. 6. Πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ τυχὸν παραμηνῶ. Πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς πρὸ αἰῶνων παρὰ Πατρὶ ἦν, καὶ ἐν τέλει ἔφρανη. S. Ignat. ad Magnes. [§. 6. p. 19.]

12 I conceive this Chaldee Paraphrase to represent the sense of the Jews of that age, as being their public interpretation of the Scripture. Wherefore what we find common and frequent in it, we cannot but think the vulgar and

general opinion of that nation. Now it is certain that this paraphrast doth often use מִיְסֻרָא דֵי *the word of God*, for יהוה *God himself*, and that especially with relation to the creation of the world. As Isa. xlv. 12. אֲנִי עָשִׂיתִי אֶרֶץ וְעָרָא וְאָדָם עָלֶיהָ בְּרַחֲמֵי יְהוָה *I made the earth, and created man upon it, saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel*; which the Chaldee translathet אֲנָא בְּמִימְרֵי יְהוָה *I by my word made the earth, and created man upon it*. In the same manner, Jer. xxvii. 5. *I made the earth, and men and beasts on the face of the earth*; the Targum אֲנָא בְּמִימְרֵי יְהוָה יָרַדְתִּי אֶרֶץ וְאָדָם וְבְהֵמָה *And I made the earth, and men and beasts on the face of the earth*: the Chaldee אֲנָא בְּמִימְרֵי שְׁכֻלֵי אֶרֶץ *Etiam in verbo meo fundavi terram*. And most clearly Gen. i. 27, we read, *Et creavit Deus hominem*: the Jerusalem Targum, *Verbum Domini creavit hominem*. And Gen.

Hebrew text in the Chaldee language, were constantly taught, that the Word of God was the same with God, and that by that Word all things were made. Which undoubtedly was the cause
 118 why St. John delivered so great a mystery in so few words, as speaking unto them who at the first apprehension understood

iii. 8. *Audierunt vocem Domini Dei*: the Chaldee Paraphrase וְשָׁמְעוּ יְחִיקָא מִיְסֻרָא דֵי אֱלֹהִים *Et audierunt vocem verbi Domini Dei*. Now this which the Chaldee Paraphrase called מִיְסֻרָא the Hellenists named *Λόγος* as appeareth by Philo the Jew, who wrote before St. John, and reckons in his Divinity, first, Πατέρα τῶν ὄλων, then δεῦτερον Θεόν, ὃς ἐστιν ἐκείνου Λόγος. *Quæst. et Solut.* [Fragm. i. vol. ii. p. 625.] Whom he calls Ὁρθὸν Θεοῦ Λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἷόν. *De Agricult.* [vol. i. p. 308.] He attributes the creation of the world to this *Λόγος*, whom he terms Ὁργάνον Θεοῦ, ὃ' οὐδ' (ὁ κόσμος) κατεσκεύασται. *De Flammeo Gladio.* [p. 162.] Σαὶδ δὲ Θεοῦ ὁ Λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν, ᾧ καθάπερ ὄργανον προσχρησάμενος ἐκοσμοποίη. *Idem, Allegor. lib. ii.* [lib. iii. vol. i. p. 106.] Where we must observe, though Philo makes the *Λόγος*, of whom he speaks, as instrumental in the creation of the world; yet he taketh it not for a bare expression of the will of God, but for a God, though in the second degree, and expressly for the Son of God. Nor ought we to look on Philo Judæus in this as a Platonist, but merely as a Jew, who refers his whole doctrine of this *Λόγος* to the first chapter of Genesis. And the rest of the Jews before him, who had no such knowledge out of Plato's school, used the same notion. For as Isa. xlviii. 13. *the hand of God* is by the Chaldee Paraphrast translated the *Word of God*: so in the book of Wisdom, Ἡ παντοδυναμὸς σου χεῖρ καὶ κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον, Sap. xi. 17. is changed into ὁ

* [In the Alexandrian MS. but not in the Vatican.]

† [Other persons have contended, that the Christian writers did not borrow their use of the term *Logos* from the Chaldee Paraphrasts. Writers on both sides of the question are referred to in Wolf's *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, vol. ii. p. 1186-1189. Though it is true that the later Platonists and the Alexandrian Jews had taken to speak of the *Word of God*, as a distinct Being, yet if all the passages in Philo are examined, it will be seen that he did not really understand by the *Logos* a distinctly existing Being, i. e. a person, but merely an attribute of God. St. John may have borrowed the term *Logos* from the Platonists or the Gnostics, but his object was to shew that the *Logos* of the Christians was totally different from the Platonic *Logos*.]

him. Only that which as yet they knew not, was, that this Word was made flesh, and that this Word made flesh was Jesus Christ. Wherefore this exposition being so literally clear in itself, so consonant to the notion of the Word, and the apprehension of the Jews; it is infinitely to be preferred before any such interpretation as shall restrain the most universals to a few particulars, change the plainest expressions into figurative phrases, and make of a sublime truth, a weak, useless, false discourse. For who will grant that *in the beginning* must be the same with that in St. John's Epistle, *from the beginning*, especially when the very interpretation involves in itself a contradiction? For *the beginning* in St. John's Epistle is that in which the Apostle saw, and heard, and touched the Word: *the beginning* in his Gospel was that in which *the Word was with God*, that is, not seen nor heard by the Apostles, but known as yet to God alone, as the new exposition will have it. Who will conceive it worthy of the Apostle's assertion, to teach that the Word had a being in the beginning of the Gospel, at what time John the Baptist began to preach, when we know the Baptist taught as much; who therefore *came baptizing with water, that he might be made manifest unto Israel?* when we are sure that St. Matthew and St. Luke, who wrote before him, taught us more than this, that he had a being thirty years before? when we are assured, it was as true of any other then living as of the Word, even of Judas who betrayed him, even of Pilate who condemned him? Again, who can imagine the Apostle should assert that the Word was, that is, had an actual being, when as yet he was not actually the Word? For if *the beginning* be when John the Baptist began to preach, and the Word, as they say, be nothing else but he which speaketh, and so revealeth the will of God; Christ had not then revealed the will of God, and consequently was not then actually the Word, but only potentially or by designation. Secondly, it is a strange figurative speech, *the Word was with God*, that is, was known to God, especially in this Apostle's method. *In the beginning was the Word*; there *was* must signify an actual existence; and if so, why in the next sentence (*the Word was with God*) shall the same verb signify an objective being only? Certainly though to be in the beginning be one thing, and to be with God, another; yet *to be* in either of them is the same. But if we should imagine this *being* understood of the knowledge of God, why we

should grant that thereby is signified, he was known to God alone, I cannot conceive. For the proposition of itself is plainly affirmativè, and the exclusive particle *only* added to the exposition maketh it clearly negative. Nay more, the affirmative sense is certainly true, the negative as certainly false. For 119 except Gabriel be God, who came to the Virgin; except every one of the heavenly host which appeared to the shepherds be God; except Zachary and Elizabeth, except Simeon and Anna, except Joseph and Mary be God; it cannot be true that he was known to God only, for to all these he was certainly known. Thirdly, to pass by the third attribute, *and the Word was God*, as having occasion suddenly after to handle it; seeing the Apostle hath again repeated the circumstance of time as most material, *the same was in the beginning with God*, and immediately subjoined those words, *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*; how can we receive any exposition which referreth not the making of all these things to him in the beginning? But if we understand the latter part of the Apostles, who after the ascension of our Saviour did nothing but what they were commanded and impowered to do by Christ, it will bear no relation to the beginning. If we interpret the former of all which Jesus said and did in the promulgation of the Gospel, we cannot yet reach to the beginning assigned by the new expositors: for while John the Baptist only preached, while in their sense the Word was with God, they will not affirm that Jesus did any of these things that here are spoken of. And consequently, according to their grounds, it will be true to say, In the beginning was the Word, and that Word in the beginning was with God, insomuch as in the beginning nothing was done by him, but without him were all things done which were done in the beginning. Wherefore in all reason we should stick to the known interpretation, in which every word receiveth its own proper signification without any figurative distortion, and is preserved in its due latitude and extension without any curtailing restriction. And therefore I conclude from the undeniable testimony of St. John, that in the beginning, when the heavens and the earth and all the hosts of them were created, all things were made by the Word, who is Christ Jesus being made flesh; and consequently, by the method of argument, as the Apostle antecedently by the method of nature, that in the beginning Christ was. He then who was in heaven and

descended from thence, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither, he who was before John the Baptist and before Abraham, he who was at the end of the first world, and at the beginning of the same; he had a real being and existence before Christ was conceived by the Virgin Mary. But all these we have already shewed belong unto the Son of God. Therefore we must acknowledge, that Jesus Christ had a real being and existence before he was begotten by the Holy Ghost: which is our first assertion, properly opposed to the Photinians¹³.

¹³ The Photinians were heretics, so called from Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, but born in Gallogræcia, and scholar to Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra. 'Photinus de Gallogræcia, Marcelli discipulus, Sirmii Episcopus ordinatus, Hebionis hæresin instaurare conatus est.' *S. Hieron. Catal. Eccles.* [c. 107. vol. ii. p. 923.] 'Photinus Sirmiensis Episcopus fuit a Marcello imbutus. Nam et Diaconus sub eo aliquandiu fuit.' *S. Hilary. Frag.* [II. 19. p. 1295 D.] Wherefore when Epiphanius speaketh thus of him, *Ὁδτος ἀρχαῖο ἀπὸ Σιρμίου*, it hath no relation to the original of his person, but his heresy; of which St. Hilary, 'Pestifere, natum Jesum Christum ex Maria, Pannonia defendit.' *De Trin.* [VII. 3. p. 916 E.] He was a man of singular parts and abilities, *Φύσεως ἔχων εὖ λέγειν, καὶ πείθειν ἱκανός*, says Sozomen, *lib. iv. cap. 6.* [p. 135.] *Γέγονε δὲ οὗτος ὁ Φωτεινὸς λάλος τὸν τρόπον, καὶ ὠχυμμένος τὴν γλῶτταν, πολλοὺς δὲ δυνάμενος ἀπατῆν τῆ τοῦ λόγου προφορᾷ καὶ ἐτοιμολογίᾳ.* *S. Epiph. Hæres. 71.* [vol. i. §. 1. p. 829 B.] 'Erat et ingenii viribus valens, et doctrinæ opibus excellens, et eloquio præpotens, quippe qui utroque sermone copiose et graviter disputaret et scriberet.' *Vincent. Lirin. adv. Hæres. cap. 16.* [p. 241 C.] He is said by some to follow the heresy of Ebion. 'Hebionis hæresin instaurare conatus est,' says St. Jerome; and St. Hilary ordinarily understands him by the name of Hebion, and sometimes expounds himself, 'Hebion, qui est Photinus.' [*De Trin.* VII. 3. p. 916. c. 7. p. 919 D.] But there is no similitude in their doctrines, Hebion being more Jew than Christian, and teaching Christ as much begotten by

Joseph, as born of Mary. Philaster will have him agree wholly with Paulus Samosatenus 'in omnibus.' Epiphanius with an *ἀπὸ μέρους*, and *ἐπέκεινα*. Socrates and Sozomen, with him and with Sabellius: whereas he differed much from them both, especially from Sabellius, as being far from a Patripassian. 'Marcellus Sabellianæ hæresis assertor extiterat: Photinus vero novam hæresin jam ante protulerat, a Sabellio quidem in unione dissentiens, sed initium Christi ex Maria prædicabat.' *Sever. Hist. Sacr.* [lib. ii. c. 37. vol. ii. p. 201.] Wherefore it will not be unnecessary to collect out of antiquity what did properly belong unto Photinus, because I think it not yet done, and we find his heresy, in the propriety of it, to begin and spread again. 'Photinus mentis cæcitate deceptus in Christo verum et substantiæ nostræ confessus est hominem, sed eundem Deum de Deo ante omnia sæcula genitum esse non credit.' *Leo de Nativ. Christi, Serm. iv.* [vol. i. p. 155.] 'Etiam Photinus hominem tantum proficitur Dei Filium; dicit illum non fuisse ante beatam Mariam.' *Lucifer Calarit. [De non parcendo in Deum delinq. p. 203.]* 'Si quis in Christo sic veritatem prædicat animæ et carnis, ut veritatem in eo nolit accipere Deitatis, id est, qui sic dicit Christum hominem, ut Deum neget, non est Christianus Catholicus, sed Photinianus Hæreticus.' *Fulgent. ad Donat.* [c. xvi. p. 206.] *Φωτεινὸς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγει τὸν γεγεννημένον, Θεοῦ μὴ λέγων εἶναι τὸν τόκον, καὶ τὸν ἐκ μητρας προελθόντα, ἄνθρωπον ὑποτίθεται διηρημένον Θεοῦ.* *Theodot. Homil. de Nativ. Ephes. Concil. p. 3. cap. 10.* [Mansi, v. p. 205 E.] 'Anathematizamus Photinum, qui He-

120 The second assertion, next to be made good, is, that the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin, was

bionis hæresim instaurans, Dominum Jesum Christum tantum ex Maria Virgine confitetur.' *Damas. Profess. Fidei.* [Ep. iii. p. 326 B.] *Φάσκει δὲ οὗτος, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸν Χριστὸν μὴ εἶναι, ἀπὸ δὲ Μαρίας καὶ δεῦρο αὐτὸν ὑπάρχον, ἐξότε, φησί, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπήλθεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐγεννήθη ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου.* *S. Epiph. Hæres. 71.* [vol. i. p. 829 A.] **Ἐλεγε δὲ ὡς Θεὸς μὲν ἐστὶ παντοκράτωρ εἷς, ὁ τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ τὰ πάντα δημιουργήσας· τὴν δὲ πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων γέννησιν τε καὶ ὑπαρξιν τοῦ υἱοῦ οὐ προσέτετο, ἀλλ' ἐκ Μαρίας γεγενῆσθαι τὸν Χριστὸν εἰσηγήτο.* *Sozomen. lib. iv. cap. 6.* [p. 135.] 'Photini ergo secta hæc est. Dicit Deum singulum esse et solitarium, et more Judaïco confitendum. Trinitatis plenitudinem negat, neque ullam Dei Verbi, aut ullam Spiritus Sancti putat esse personam. Christum vero hominem tantummodo solitarium assertit, cui principium adscribit ex Maria; et hoc omnibus modis dogmatizat, solum nos personam Dei Patris, et solum Christum hominem colere debere.' *Vincent. Lirin. adv. Hæres. cap. 17.* [p. 241 E.] In the disputation framed by Vigilus out of the seventh book of St. Hilary, as I conceive, Photinus rejecting the opinion of Sabellius (whom Socrates and Sozomen said he followed) as impious, thus declares his own: 'Unde magis ego dico, Deum Patrem Filium habere Dominum Jesum Christum, ex Maria Virgine initium sumentem, qui per sanctæ conversationis excellentissimum atque inimitabile beatitudinis meritum, a Deo Patre in Filium adoptatus et eximio Divinitatis honore donatus.' [Dial. I. iv. p. 122.] And again, 'Ego Domino nostro Jesu Christo initium tribuo, purumque hominem fuisse affirmo, et per beatæ vitæ excellentissimum meritum Divinitatis honorem fuisse adeptum.' [c. x. p. 128.] *Vide eundem, lib. ii. adv. Eutych.* 'Ignorat etiam Photinus magnum pietatis, quod Apostolus memorat, sacramentum, qui Christi ex Virgine fateatur exordium—Et propterea non credit sine initio substantialiter Deum natum ex Deo Patre, in quo carnis veritatem confitetur ex Virgine.' *Fulgent. ad Thrasim. lib. i.* [c. 6. p. 74.] Gregory

Nazianzen, according to his custom, gives a very brief, but remarkable expression; *Φωτεινοῦ τὸν κάτω Χριστὸν καὶ ἀπὸ Μαρίας ἀρχόμενον.* *Orat. 26.* [Orat. xxxiii. 16. p. 614 D.] But the opinion of Photinus cannot be better understood than by the condemnation of it in the Council of Sirmium; which having set out the confession of their faith in brief, addeth many and various anathemas, according to the several heresies then apparent, without mentioning their names. Of these the fifth aims clearly at Photinus. 'Si quis secundum præscientiam vel prædestinationem a Maria dicit filium esse, et non ante sæcula ex Patre natum, apud Deum esse, et per eum facta esse omnia, anathema sit.' [Mansi iii. p. 259 D.] The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth also were particulars directed against him, as St. Hilary hath observed: but the last of all is most material. 'Si quis Christum Deum, Filium Dei, ante sæcula subsistentem, et ministrantem Patri ad omnium perfectionem, non dicat, sed ex quo de Maria natus est, ex eo et Christum et Filium nominatum esse, et initium accepisse ut sit Deus, dicat, anathema sit.' [p. 260 E.] Upon which the observation of St. Hilary is this: 'Concludi damnatio ejus hæresis, propter quam conventum erat, (that is, the Photinian,) expositione totius fidei cui adversabatur, oportuit, quæ initium Dei Filii ex partu Virginis mentiebatur.' *S. Hilary. de Syn. cont. Arianos.* [c. 61. p. 1185 D.] Thus was Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, condemned by a Council held in the same city. They all agreed suddenly in the condemnation of him, Arians, Semi-Arians, and Catholics; *Καθεῖλον εὐθύς*, says Socrates, *καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ὡς καλῶς καὶ δικαίως γενόμενον, πάντες ἐπήρσαν καὶ τότε καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα.* *lib. ii. cap. 29.* [p. 124.] And because his history is very obscure and intricate, take this brief catalogue of his condemnations. We read that he was condemned at the Council of Nice, and at the same time by a Council at Rome under Sylvester: but this is delivered only in a forged *Epilogus Concilii Romani*. He was then first condemned with Marcellus his

not any created, but the Divine essence, by which he always was truly, really, and properly God. This will evidently and necessarily follow from the last demonstration of the first assertion, the creating all things by the Son of God; from whence we inferred his preexistence, *in the beginning*, assuring us as much that he was God, as that he was. *For he that built all things was God.* And the same Apostle which assures us, *All things were made by him*, at the same time tells us, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Where *in the beginning* must not be denied unto the third proposition, because it cannot be denied unto the second. Therefore *in the beginning, or ever the earth was, the Word was God*, the same God with whom he was. For we cannot with any show of reason either imagine that he was with one God, and was another, because there can be no more supreme Gods than one; or conceive that the Apostle should speak of one kind of God in the second, and of another in the third proposition: in the second, of a God eternal and independent, in the third, of a made and depending God¹⁴. Especially, first considering

Heb. iii. 4.

Prov. viii. 23.

master, as Sulpitius Severus relates, probably by the synod at Constantinople; for in that Marcellus was deprived. *Sozomen. lib. ii. cap. 33.* [p. 91.] *Socrat. lib. i. cap. 36.* [p. 72.] Secondly, his heresy is renounced in the second synod at Antioch. *Athanas. de Syn. [§. 5, 6. vol. i. p. 740.] Socrat. lib. ii. cap. 19.* Thirdly, he was condemned in the Council of Sardes. *S. Epiphani. et Sulpit. Sever. Fourthly, by a council at Milan. S. Hilar. Frag. [II. xix. p. 1296 A.] Fifthly, in a synod at Sirmium he was deposed by the Western bishops; but by reason of the great opinion and affection of the people he could not be removed. S. Hilar. Frag. [II. xxi. p. 1299 A.] Sixthly, he was again condemned and deposed at Sirmium by the Eastern bishops, and being convicted by Basil Bishop of An-cyra, was banished from thence. S. Hilar. S. Epiphani. Socrat. Sozomen. Vigil. Indeed he was so generally condemned not only then, but afterwards under Valentinian, as St. Jerome testifies, and the Synodic Epistle of the Aquileian Council, that his opinion was soon worn out of the world. "Ἡγή γὰρ καὶ διεσκεδάσθη εἰς ἄλλοιον χρόνον ἢ τούτου τοῦ ἡπατημένου αἰρέσεως, says Epiphanius, who lived not*

long after him. [Hæres. lxxi. §. 6. vol. i. p. 833 C.] So suddenly was this opinion rejected by all Christians, applauded by none but Julian the heretic, who railed at St. John for making Christ God, and commended Photinus for denying it; as appears by an epistle written by Julian unto him, as it is (though in a mean translation) delivered by Facundus. 'Tu quidem, O Photine, verisimilis videris, et proximum salvare, bene faciens nequam in utero inducere, quem credidisti Deum.' *Facund. ad Justinian. lib. iv. [c. 2. Galland. xi. p. 706 B.]*

¹⁴ And that upon so poor a ground as the want of an article, because in the first place it is ἢ ἢ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, in the second, Θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος, not ὁ Θεός, from hence to conclude, ὁ Θεός is one God, that is, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the supreme God; Θεός another, not the supreme, but one made God by him. Indeed they are beholden to Epiphanius for this observation, whose words are these: 'Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, Θεός, ἄνευ τοῦ ἄρθρου, τὴν τυχόντα εἴπαμεν Θεὸν τῶν ἐθνῶν, ἢ Θεὸν τὸν ὄντα (or rather οὐκ ὄντα): εἰς δὲ εἴπωμεν, ὁ Θεός, δῆλον ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ ἄρθρου τὸν ὄντα σημαίνομεν, ἀληθῆ τε καὶ γνωσκόμενον. *Samarit. Hæres. [§. 4. vol. i.*

that the eternal God was so constantly among the Jews called
121 the Word, the only reason which we can conceive why the

p. 27 A.] But whosoever shall apply this rule to the sacred Scriptures will find it most fallacious. *In the beginning ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν*, undoubtedly belongs to the true and supreme God: but it does not thence follow, that πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος should be understood of the Spirit of another or inferior God. Certainly St. John, when he speaks of the Baptist, ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ Θεοῦ, meant, he had his commission from heaven; and when it is spoken of Christ, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, and again, ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν, it must be understood of the true God the Father. In the like manner, Θεὸν οὐδέ τις ἐώρακε πώποτε, if it were taken τυχόντως of any ever called God, nay, even of Christ Jesus as man, it were certainly false. How can then any deny the Word to be the supreme God, because he is called simply Θεός, when St. John in the four next places, in which he speaketh of the supreme God, mentioneth him without an article? This criticism of theirs was first the observation of Asterius the Arian; and Oὐκ εἶπεν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος Χριστὸν κηρύσσειν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν, ἢ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφίαν, ἀλλὰ δέχαι τῆς προσθήκης, δύναμιν Θεοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ σοφίαν ἄλλην μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν τὴν ἔμφυτον αὐτοῦ καὶ συναρχούσαν αὐτῷ ἀγεννήτως, κηρύσσειν. These are the words of Asterius recorded by Athanasius, *Orat. 2. cont. Arianos. [Orat. I. 32. vol. i. p. 436 B.]* In which place, notwithstanding, none can deny but Θεοῦ is twice taken without an article for the true and supreme God. Thus Didymus of Alexandria *de Spiritu Sancto* would distinguish between the person and the gift of the Holy Ghost, by the addition or defect of the article; 'Apostoli quando intelligi volunt personam Spiritus Sancti addunt articulum, τὸ πνεῦμα, sine quo Spiritus Sancti dona notantur.' [See S. Jerome, vol. ii. p. 123 D.] And Athanasius objects against his adversaries

denying the Holy Ghost to be God, that they produced places out of the Prophets to prove him a creature, where πνεῦμα had not so much as an article prefixed, which might give some colour to interpret it of the Holy Spirit. Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ κἀν τὸ ἄρθρον ἔχει τὸ παρὰ τοῦ προφῆτου λεγόμενον νῦν πνεῦμα, ἵνα κἀν πρόφασιν ἔχητε. *Epist. ad Serapionem [I. 7. vol. i. p. 655 C.]* Whereas we find in the same place of St. John, the same Spirit in the same sense mentioned with and without an article. 'Ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῆ ἔξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, St. John iii. 5. and, Τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, ver. 6. So I John iv. 1. Μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πιστεύετε, ἀλλὰ δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα. And again, 'Ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκει τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ: πᾶν πνεῦμα, &c. And beside, according to that distinction, τὸ πνεῦμα certainly stands for the gift of the Spirit, I Thess. v. 19. Τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε. In the like manner, it is so far from truth, that the Scriptures observe so much the articles, as to use ὁ Θεός always for the true and supreme God, and Θεός for the false or inferior; that where the true is professedly opposed to the false, even there he is styled simply Θεός. As, 'Ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν οὐκ εἶδότες Θεόν, ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς μὴ φύσει οἰσι θεοῖς. Νῦν δὲ γινόντες Θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ. Gal. iv. 8, 9. And where the supreme is distinguished from him whom they make the inferior God, he is called likewise Θεός, without an article: as, Δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἄφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, and, Τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, Rom. i. 1, 4. 'Ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, I Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1. And if this distinction were good, our Saviour's argument to the Pharisees were not so: Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἅρα ἐφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Matth. xii. 28. For it doth not follow, that if by the power of an inferior or false God he cast out devils, that therefore the kingdom of the true and supreme God is come upon them*.

* [It is perhaps almost superfluous to refer to the admirable work of Bishop Middleton upon the Greek Article.]

Apostle should thus use this phrase: and then observing the manner of St. John's writing, who rises strangely by degrees, making the last word of the former sentence the first of that

John i. 4, 5. which followeth: As, *In him was life, and the life was the light of men; and the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not: so, In the beginning was the Word, and the Word, which so was in the beginning, was with God, and the Word was God; that is, the same God with whom the Word was in the beginning. But he could not be the same God with him any other way, than by having the same Divine essence. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin, was the Divine nature, by which he was properly and really God.*

Secondly, he who was subsisting in the form of God, and thought himself to be equal with God (in which thought he could not be deceived, nor be injurious to God), must of necessity be truly and essentially God; because there can be no equality between the Divine essence, which is infinite, and any other whatsoever, which must be finite. But this is true of Christ, and that antecedently to his conception in the Virgin's

Phil. ii. 6, 7. womb, and existence in his human nature. For, *being (or rather subsisting¹⁵) in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Out of which words naturally result three propositions fully demonstrating our assertion. First, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man. Secondly, that he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant. Thirdly, that he was as much in the form of God, that is, did as truly and really subsist in the Divine nature, as in the form of a servant, or in the nature of man. It is a vain imagination, that our Saviour then first appeared a servant, when he was apprehended, bound, scourged, crucified. For they were not all slaves which ever suffered such indignities, or died that death; and when they did, their death did not make, but find them or suppose them servants. Beside, our Saviour in all the degrees of his humiliation never lived as a servant unto any master on earth. It is true, at first he was subject, but as a son, to his reputed father and undoubted mother. When he appeared in

122

¹⁵ 'In effigie Dei constitutus.' Tertul. Dei constitutus.' S. Cyprian. [Testim. ii. [adv. Marcion. v. 20. p. 486 B.]] 'In figura 13. p. 290.]

public, he lived after the manner of a Prophet and a Doctor sent from God, accompanied with a family, as it were, of his Apostles, whose master he professed himself, subject to the commands of no man in that office, and obedient only unto God. The form then of a servant, which he took upon him, must consist in something distinct from his sufferings, or submission unto men; as the condition in which he was, when he so submitted and so suffered. In that he was *made flesh*, sent *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, subject unto all infirmities and miseries of this life, attending on the sons of men fallen by the sin of Adam: in that he was *made of a woman, made under the law*, and so obliged to perform the same; which Law did so handle the children of God, as that they differed nothing from servants: in that he was born, bred, and lived in a mean, low, and abject condition; *as a root out of a dry ground, he had no form nor comeliness*, and when they saw him, there was no beauty that they should desire him; but was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: in that he was thus made man, he took upon him the form of a servant. Which is not mine, but the Apostle's explication; as adding it not by way of conjunction, in which there might be some diversity, but by way of apposition, which signifieth a clear identity. And therefore it is necessary to observe, that our translation of that verse is not only not exact, but very disadvantageous to that truth which is contained in it. For we read it thus; *He made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Where we have two copulative conjunctions, neither of which is in the original text¹⁶, and three distinct propositions, without any dependence of one upon the other; whereas all the words together are but an expression of Christ's exinanition, with an explication shewing in what it consisteth: which will clearly appear by this literal translation, *But emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.* Where if any man doubt how Christ emptied himself, the text will satisfy him, by *taking the form of a servant*; if any still question how he took the form of a servant, he hath the Apostle's resolution, by *being made in the likeness of men.*

¹⁶ 'Αλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, which is also exactly observed by the vulgar Latin, *Sed semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, in similitudine hominum factus*; where *γενόμενος* is added by apposition to *λαβὼν*, and have both equal relation to *ἐκένωσε*: or, which is all one, *ἐκένωσε λαβὼν, ἔλαβε γενόμενος.*

Indeed after the expression of this exinanition, he goes on with a conjunction, to add another act of Christ's humiliation; *And being found in fashion as a man*, being already by his exinanition in the form of a servant or the likeness of men, *he humbled himself, and became* (or rather *becoming*¹⁷) *obedient unto death, even the death of the cross*. As therefore his humiliation consisted in his obedience unto death, so his exinanition consisted in the assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man. All which is very fitly expressed by a strange interpretation in the Epistle to the Hebrews. For whereas these words are clearly in the Psalmist, *Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened*: the Apostle appropriateth the sentence to Christ; *When he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me*. Now being the boring of the ear under the Law was a note of perpetual servitude, being this was expressed in the words of the Psalmist, and changed by the Apostle into the preparing of a body; it followeth that when Christ's body first was framed, even then did he assume the form of a servant.

Ps. xl. 6.

Heb. x. 5.

Exod. xxi. 6.

Deut. xv. 17.

Again, it appeareth out of the same text, that Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, and consequently before he was made man. For he which is presupposed to be, and to think of that being which he hath, and upon that thought to assume, must have that being before that assumption: but Christ is first expressly said to be in the form of God, and, being so, to think it no robbery to be equal with God, and notwithstanding that equality, to take upon him the form of a servant: therefore it cannot be denied, but he was before in the form of God. Beside, he was not in the form of a servant, but by the emptying himself, and all exinanition necessarily presupposeth a precedent plenitude; it being as impossible to empty any thing which hath no fulness, as to fill any thing which hath no emptiness. But the fulness which Christ had, in respect whereof assuming the form of a servant he is said to empty himself, could be in nothing else but in the form of God, in which he was before. Wherefore, if the assumption of the form of a servant be contemporary with his exinanition; if that ex-

¹⁷ Ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν, γενόμενος ὑπήκοος. For in both these verses there is but one conjunction, joining together two acts of our Saviour, his first exina-

tion, or ἐκένωσε, and his farther humiliation, or ἔταπεινώσε: the rest are all participles added for explication to the verbs.

inanition necessarily presupposeth a plenitude as indispensably antecedent to it; if the form of God be also coæval with that precedent plenitude; then must we confess, Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant: which is the second proposition.

Again, it is as evident from the same Scripture, that Christ was as much in the form of God, as the form of a servant; and did as really subsist in the Divine nature, as in the nature of man. For he was so *in the form of God*, as thereby *to be equal with God*¹⁸. But no other form beside the essential, which is

18 Τὸ εἶναι Ἰσα Θεῷ. *Pariari Deo*. Tertul. [*adv. Marcion*. v. 20. *de Resur. Carnis*, c. 6.] *Esse se æqualem Deo*. S. Cyprian. [*Testim.* ii. 13. p. 290.] *Esse æqualis Deo*. Leporius. [*Gall.* ix. p. 398 B.] Thus all express the notion of equality, not of similitude: nor can we understand any less by τὸ εἶναι Ἰσα, than τὴν ἰσότητα, Ἰσον and Ἰσα being indifferently used by the Greeks, as Pindarus, *Olymp. Od.* 2. 109.

Ἴσον δὲ νύκτεσσιν αἰεὶ,
Ἴσα δ' ἐν ἡμέραις ἀλι-
ον ἔχοντες, ἀπονέστερον
Ἐσθλοὶ νέμονται βίονον.

So whom the Greeks call ἰσόθεον, Homer Ἰσα θεῷ.

Τὸν νῦν Ἰσα θεῷ Ἰθακήσιοι εἰσορῶσι.

Ἵδ. σ'. 520.

Where Ἰσα has not the nature of an adverb, as belonging to εἰσορῶσι, but of a noun referred to the antecedent τὸν, or including an adverb added to a noun, τὸν νῦν ὡς ἰσόθεον. The collection of Grotius from this verse is very strange; εἶναι Ἰσα Θεῷ, est spectari tanquam Deum. As if he should have said, εἰσορῶσι signifies spectant, therefore εἶναι signifies spectari. This he was forced to put off thus, because the strength of our interpretation, rendering an equality, lies in the verb substantive τὸ εἶναι. As Dionysius of Alexandria very anciently, *Κενώσας ἑαυτὸν, καὶ ταπεινώσας ἕως θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ, Ἰσα Θεῷ ὑπάρχει*. *Epist. ad Paulum Samosat.* [p. 211.] For we acknowledge that Ἰσα by itself oftentimes signifieth no more than *instar*, and so inferreth nothing but a similitude: as we find it frequently in the book of Job. Where it sometimes answereth to the inseparable particle כ; as, כליה

quasi in nocte, Ἰσα νυκτὶ, v. 14. כנבנה sicut caseum, Ἰσα τυρῷ, x. 10. כרקב quasi putredo, *Sym.* ὁμοίως σηπεδῶνι, LXX. Ἰσα ἄσκαφ, xiii. 28. כמים sicut aquam, Ἰσα ποτῷ, xv. 16. כעפר tanquam lignum, Ἰσα ξύλῳ, xxiv. 20. כחמר sicut lutum, Ἰσα πηλῷ, xxvii. 16. כמעייל sicut vestimento, Ἰσα διπλοῖδι, xxix. 14. כנקר quasi bos, Ἰσα βοσίν, xl. 15. [10.] Where we see the vulgar Latin useth for the Hebrew כ, quasi, sicut, tanquam, the LXX. Ἰσα. Sometime it answereth to no word in the original, but supplieth a similitude understood, not expressed, in the Hebrew: as ועיר tanquam pullum, Ἰσα ὄνυ, xi. 12. וזמן et lapis, Ἰσα λίθῳ, xxviii. 2. וזמן luto, Ἰσα πηλῷ, xxx. 19. Once it rendereth an Hebrew word rather according to the intention, than the signification; משלימים, comparabitur cineri, ad verbum proverbium cineris, Ἰσα σποδῷ, xiii. 12. So that in all these places it is used adverbially for *instar*, and in none hath the addition of τὸ εἶναι to it. As for that answer of Socinus, that Christ cannot be God, because he is said to be equal with God, 'Tantum abest ut ex eo quod Christus sit æqualis Deo sequatur ipsum esse æternum et summum Deum, ut potius ex hoc ipso necessario consequatur, non esse æternum et summum Deum. Nemo enim sibi ipsi æqualis esse potest.' *Socin. ad 8. c. Vujek*. [*Arg.* iii. p. 576.] as if there could be no predication of equality where we find a substantial identity: it is most certainly false, because the most exact speakers use such language as this is. There can be no expressions more exact and pertinent than those which are used by geometricians, neither can there be any better judges of equality than they

Isa. xl. 25; the Divine nature itself, could confer an equality with God. *To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal? saith the Holy One.* There can be but one infinite, eternal, and independent Being; and there can be no comparison between that and whatsoever is finite, temporal, and depending. He therefore who did truly think himself equal with God, as being in the form of God, must be conceived to subsist in that one infinite, eternal, and independent nature of God. Again, the phrase, *in the form of God*, not elsewhere mentioned, is used by the Apostle with a respect unto that other, of the *form of a servant*, exegetically continued ¹²⁴ *in the likeness of man*; and the respect of one unto the other is so necessary, that if the form of God be not as real and essential as the form of a servant, or the likeness of man, there is no force in the Apostle's words, nor will his argument be fit to work any great degree of humiliation upon the consideration of Christ's exinanition. But by the *form* is certainly understood the true condition of a servant, and by the *likeness* infallibly meant the real nature of man: nor doth the *fashion*, in which he was found, destroy, but rather assert the truth of his humanity. And therefore, as sure as Christ was really and essentially man, of the same nature with us, in whose similitude he was made; so certainly was he also really and essentially God, of the same nature and being with him, in whose form he did subsist. Seeing then we have clearly evinced from the express words of St. Paul, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man, that he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, that the form of God in which he subsisted doth as truly signify the Divine, as the likeness of man the human nature; it necessarily followeth, that Christ had a real existence before he was begotten of the Virgin, and that the

are; but they most frequently use that expression in this notion, proving an equality, and inferring it from identity. As in the fifth proposition of the first Element of Euclid, two lines are said to contain an angle equal to the angle contained by two other lines, because they contained the same angle, or *γωνίαν κοινήν* and the basis of one triangle is supposed equal to the basis of another

triangle, because the same line was basis to both, or *βάσις κοινή*. In the same manner certainly may the Son be said to be equal to the Father in essence or power, because they both have the same essence and power, that is *οὐσίαν καὶ δύναμιν κοινήν*. *Ocell. de Universo.* 'Αλλ' αἰεὶ κατὰ τ' αὐτὸ καὶ ὡσαύτως διατελεῖ καὶ ἴσον καὶ ὅμοιον αὐτὸ ἐαυτοῦ*. [c. i. § 6.]

* [It may be added, that there is a particular force in the form *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*, which should be translated, *the being equal with God*: it implies, not that Christ was about to become equal with God, but that he was so already.]

being which he had was the Divine essence, by which he was truly, really, and properly God.

Thirdly, he which is expressly styled *Alpha* and *Omega*, the first and the last, without any restriction or limitation, as he is after, so was before any time assignable, truly and essentially God. For by this title God describeth his own being, and distinguisheth it from all other. *I the Lord, the first, and with the last, I am he.* *I am he, I am the first, I also am the last.* *I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God.* But Christ is expressly called *Alpha* and *Omega*, the first and the last. He so proclaimed himself by a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, *I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.* Which answereth to that solemn call and proclamation in the Prophet, *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called.* He comforteth St. John with the majesty of this title, *Fear not, I am the first and the last.* Which words were spoken by one like unto the Son of man, by him that liveth, and was dead, and is alive for evermore; that is undoubtedly, by Christ. He upholdeth the church of Smyrna in her tribulation by virtue of the same description, *These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive.* He ascertaineth his coming unto judgment with the same assertion, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.* And in all these places, this title is attributed unto Christ absolutely and universally, without any kind of restriction or limitation, without any assignation of any particular in respect of which he is the first or last; in the same latitude and eminence of expression¹⁹, in which it is or can be attributed to the supreme God. There is yet another Scripture, in which the same description may seem of a more dubious interpretation: *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* For being it is *the Lord* who so calls himself, which title belongeth to the Father and the Son, it may be doubted whether it be spoken by the Father or the Son; but whether it be understood

¹⁹ With the article so much elsewhere stood upon, *τὸ α καὶ τὸ ω, ὁ πρῶτος, καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος*, *The Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last.* For we must not take *τὸ α* as the grammarians do, by which they signify only the letter written in that figure, and called by that name. As appeareth by Erastosthenes, who was called *Βῆτα*, not *τά*

βήματα, as Suidas corruptly. Hesychius Illustrius, from whom Suidas had that passage: *Ἐρατοσθένης διὰ τὸ δευτερεῖν ἐν παντὶ εἶδει παιδείας τοῖς ἄκροις ἐγγίσαντα Βῆτα ἐπεκλήθη.* And Martianus Heracleota in *Periplo*, *καὶ μετ' ἐκείνων Ἐρατοσθένης, ὃν Βῆτα ἐκάλεσαν οἱ τοῦ Μουσείου προστάντες.* [Hæsch. Geogr. p. 95.]

of the one or of the other, it will sufficiently make good what we intend to prove. For if they be understood of Christ, as the precedent and the following words imply, then is he certainly that *Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty*; that is, the supreme eternal God, of the same Divine essence with the Father, who was before described by *him which* 125 *is, and which was, and which is to come*, to whom the six-winged beasts continually cry, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come*: as the familiar explication of that name which God revealed to Moses. If they belong unto the supreme God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; then did he so describe himself unto St. John, and express his supreme Deity, that by those words, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending*, he might be known to be the one Almighty and Eternal God; and consequently, whosoever should assume that title, must attribute as much unto himself. Wherefore being Christ hath so immediately, and with so great solemnity and frequency, taken the same style upon him, by which the Father did express his Godhead; it followeth, that he hath declared himself to be the Supreme, Almighty, and Eternal God. And being thus the *Alpha* and the first, he was before any time assignable, and consequently before he was conceived of the Virgin; and the being which then he had was the Divine essence, by which he was truly and properly the Almighty and Eternal God.

Fourthly, he whose glory Isaiah saw in the year that king Uzziah died, had a being before Christ was begotten of the Virgin, and that being was the Divine essence, by which he was naturally and essentially God: for he is expressly called *the Lord, Holy, holy, holy the Lord of hosts, whose glory filleth the whole earth*; which titles can belong to none beside the one and only God. But Christ was he whose glory Isaiah saw, as St. John doth testify, saying, *These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him*: and he whose glory he saw, and of whom he spake, was certainly Christ; for of him the Apostle treateth in that place, and of none but him. *These things spake Jesus and departed. But though he (that is, Jesus) had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, that is, Christ who wrought those miracles. The reason why they believed not on him was, that the saying of Esaias the Prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our*

report? and as they did not, so *they could not believe in Christ, John xiii. because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and* 39, 40. *hardened their hearts; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them.* For those who God foresaw, and the Prophet foretold, should not believe, could not do it without contradicting the prescience of the one, and the predictions of the other. But the Jews refusing to assent unto the doctrine of our Saviour, were those of whom the Prophet spake: for *these things said Esaias* John xii. *when he saw his glory, and spake of him.* Now if the glory which 41. Isaias saw were the glory of Christ, and he of whom Isaias in that chapter spake were Christ himself; then must those blinded eyes and hardened hearts belong unto these Jews, and then their infidelity was so long since foretold. Thus doth the fixing of that prophecy upon that people, which saw our Saviour's miracles, depend upon Isaias's vision, and the appropriation of it unto Christ. Wherefore St. John hath infallibly taught us, that the Prophet saw the glory of Christ; and the Prophet hath as undoubtedly assured us, that he, whose glory then he saw, was the one omnipotent and eternal God; and consequently both together have sealed this truth, that Christ did then subsist in that glorious majesty of the eternal God-head.

Lastly, he who, being man, is frequently in the Scriptures called God, and that in such a manner, as by that name no other can be understood but the one only and eternal God, he had an existence before he was made man, and the being which then he had was no other than the Divine essence; because all novelty is repugnant to the Deity, nor can any be that one God, 126 who was not so from all eternity. But Jesus Christ, being in the nature of man, is frequently in the sacred Scriptures called God; and that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and Eternal God.

Which may be thus demonstrated. It hath been already proved, and we all agree in this, that there can be but one Divine essence, and so but one supreme God. Wherefore, were it not said in the Scriptures, there are *many gods*; did not he 1 Cor. viii. himself who is supreme, call others so; we durst not give that 5. name to any but to him alone, nor could we think any called God to be any other but that one. It had been then enough to

have alleged that Christ is God, to prove his supreme and eternal Deity: whereas now we are answered, that there are gods many, and therefore it followeth not from that name that he is the one eternal God. But if Christ be none of those many gods, and yet be God; then can he be no other but that one. And that he is not to be numbered with them, is certain, because he is clearly distinguished from them, and opposed to them. We read in the

Ps. lxxxii. 6. Psalmist, *I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the most High.* But we must not reckon Christ among those

Ps. lxxxii. 5. children. For *they knew not, neither would they understand, they walked on in darkness:* and whosoever were gods only as they were, either did, or might do so. Whereas Christ, in whom

Col. ii. 9. alone *dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,* is not only distinguished from, but opposed to, such gods as those, by his

John xvi. 30. John viii. 12. Disciples saying, *Now we are sure that thou knowest all things; by himself proclaiming, I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness.* St. Paul hath told us,

1 Cor. viii. 5, 6. *there be gods many, and lords many;* but withal hath taught us, that *to us there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ.* In which words as the *Father* is opposed as much unto

the *many lords* as *many gods*, so is the Son as much unto the *many gods* as *many lords*; the Father being as much Lord as God, and the Son as much God as Lord. Wherefore being we find in Scripture frequent mention of one God, and beside that one an intimation of many gods, and whosoever is called God, must either be that one, or one of those many; being we find our blessed Saviour to be wholly opposed to the many gods, and consequently to be none of them, and yet we read him often styled God, it followeth, that that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and Eternal God.

Again, those who deny our Saviour to be the same God with the Father, have invented rules to be the touchstone of the eternal power and Godhead. First, where the name of God is taken absolutely, as the subject of any proposition, it always signifies the supreme Power and Majesty, excluding all others from that Deity. Secondly, where the same name is any way used with an article, by way of excellency, it likewise signifieth the same supreme Godhead as admitting others to a communion of Deity, but excluding them from the supremacy. Upon these

two rules they have raised unto themselves this observation, that whensoever the name of God absolutely taken is placed as the subject of any proposition, it is not to be understood of Christ: and wheresoever the same name is spoken of our Saviour by way of predicate, it never hath an article denoting excellency annexed to it; and consequently leaves him in the number of those gods who are excluded from the majesty of the eternal Deity.

Now though there can be no kind of certainty in any such observations of the articles, because the Greeks promiscuously often use them or omit them, without any reason of their usurpation or omission (whereof examples are innumerable); though if 127 those rules were granted, yet would not their conclusion follow, because the supreme God is often named (as they confess) without an article, and therefore the same name may signify the same God when spoken of Christ, as well as when of the Father, so far as can concern the omission of the article: yet to complete my demonstration, I shall shew, first, that the name of God taken subjectively is to be understood of Christ; secondly, that the same name with the article affixed is attributed unto him; thirdly, that if it were not so, yet where the article is wanting, there is that added to the predicate, which hath as great a virtue to signify that excellency as the article could have.

St. Paul, unfolding the mystery of godliness, hath delivered six propositions together, and the subject of all and each of them is God. *Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: 1 Tim. iii. God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of 16. angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.* And this God, which is the subject of all these propositions, must be understood of Christ, because of him each one is true, and all are so of none but him. He was the Word which was God, and was made flesh, and consequently *God manifested in the flesh.* Upon him the Spirit descended at his baptism, and after his ascension was poured upon his Apostles, ratifying his commission, and confirming the doctrine which they received from him: wherefore he was *God justified in the Spirit.* His nativity the angels celebrated, in the discharge of his office they ministered unto him, at his resurrection and ascension they were present, always ready to confess and adore him: he was therefore *God seen of angels.* The apostles preached unto all nations, and he whom they preached was Jesus Christ. The Father separated St. Paul from his mother's womb, and called him

Rom. xvi. *by his grace, to reveal his Son unto him, that he might preach him*
 25. 2 Cor. *among the heathen: therefore he was God preached unto the Gen-*
 i. 19; xi. 4. *tiles. John the Baptist spake unto the people, that they should*
 Phil. i. 18. *believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ*
 Gal. i. 15; *Jesus. We have believed in Jesus Christ, saith St. Paul, who so*
 16. *taught the gaoler trembling at his feet, Believe in the Lord Jesus*
 Acts xix. 4. *Christ, and thou shalt be saved: he therefore was God believed on*
 Gal. ii. 16. *in the world. When he had been forty days on earth after his*
 Acts xvi. 31. *resurrection, he was taken visibly up into heaven, and sat down*
at the right hand of the Father: wherefore he was God received
up into glory. And thus all these six propositions, according to
the plain and familiar language of the Scriptures, are infallibly
true of Christ, and so of God, as he is taken by St. John, when
he speaks those words, the Word was God. But all these cannot
be understood of any other, which either is, or is called, God.
For though we grant the Divine perfections and attributes to
be the same with the Divine essence, yet are they never in the
Scriptures called God; nor can any of them with the least show
of probability be pretended as the subject of these propositions,
or afford any tolerable interpretation. When they tell us that
God, that is the will²⁰ of God, was manifested in the flesh, that
is, was revealed by frail and mortal men, and received up in glory,
that is, was received gloriously on earth²¹, they teach us a
language which the Scriptures know not²², and the Holy Ghost 128

20 'Deus, i. e. voluntas ipsius de servandis hominibus, per homines infirmos et mortales perfecte patefacta est, &c.' *Catech. Racov. ad Quæst. 59. [p. 77.]*

21 'Insignem in modum et summa cum gloria recepta fuit.' *Ibid. 16.*

22 For Θεός is not θέλημα Θεοῦ, much less is ἀνελήφθη received or embraced. Elias speaketh not of his reception, but his ascension, when he saith to Elisha, Τί ποιήσω σοι πριν ἢ ἀναληφθῆναι με ἀπὸ σοῦ; 2 Kings ii. 9; and, ver. 11, 'Ἐὰν ἴδῃς με ἀναλαμβάνομενον ἀπὸ σοῦ, καὶ ἔσται σοὶ οὕτως. When he actually ascended, as the original, ἔστη, it is no otherwise translated by the Septuagint, than ἀνελήφθη Ἠλιὸν ἐν συσσεισμῷ ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Which language was preserved by the Hellenizing Jews: 'Ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἐν λαίλαπι πυρός. Sirac. xlviii. 9; and again, 'Ανελήφθη ἕως εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. 1 Mac. ii. 58. Neither did they use it of Elias only, but of Enoch also.

Ὀὐδὲ εἰς ἐκτίσθη οἶος Ἐνώχ, — καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. Sirac. xlix. 14. The same language is continued in the New Testament of our Saviour's ascension, 'Ανελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Mark xvi. 19. 'Ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἀπὸ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Acts i. 11; and singly, ἀνελήφθη. Acts i. 2; and ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ ἡμῶν. Acts i. 22. As therefore ἀνάληψις τοῦ Μωσέως, in the language of the Jews, was not the reception of Moses by the Israelites, but the assumption of his body; so ἀνάληψις τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the ascension of Christ, Luke ix. 51. Wherefore this being the constant notion of the word, it must so be here likewise understood, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ; as the vulgar Latin, (whose authority is pretended against us,) assumption est in gloria; rendering it here by the same word by which he always translated ἀνελήφθη.

23 For being the epistle was written in the Greek language, it is enough if all those copies do agree. Nor need we be troubled with the observation of Grotius on the place: 'Suspectam nobis hanc lectionem faciunt interpretes veteres, Latinus, Syrus, Arabs et Ambrosius, qui omnes legerunt, δ ἐφανερῶθη.' I confess the vulgar Latin reads it otherwise than the Greek, Quod manifestatum est in carne; and it cannot be denied but the Syriac, however translated by Tremellius, agreeth with the Latin; and both seem to have read δ instead of Θεός. But the joint consent of the Greek copies and interpreters is above the authority of those two translators, and the Arabic set forth in the *Biblia Polyglotta* agreeth expressly with them. But that which Grotius hath farther observed is of far greater consideration: 'Addit Hincmarus opusculo 55, illud Θεός hic positum a Nestorianis.' [Comm. ad loc. vol. ii. p. 969.] For if at first the Greeks read δ ἐφανερῶθη, and that δ were altered into Θεός by the Nestorians, then ought we to correct the Greek copy by the Latin, and confess there is not only no force, but not so much as any ground or colour for our argument. But first, it is no way probable that the Nestorians should find it in the original, δ, and make it Θεός, because that by so doing they had overthrown their own assertion, which was, that God was not incarnate, nor born of the Virgin Mary; that God did not ascend unto heaven, but Christ by the Holy Ghost remaining upon him, καὶ τὴν ἀνάληψιν αὐτῷ χαρισάμενον. *Concil. Ephes. par. i. cap. 17. [Mansi, iv. 1009 B.]* Secondly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, be-

never used; and as no attribute, so no person but the Son can be here understood under the name of God: not the Holy Ghost, for he is distinguished from him, as being justified by the Spirit; not the Father, who was not manifested in the flesh, nor received up in glory. It remaineth therefore that, whereas the Son is the only person to whom all these clearly and undoubtedly belong, which are here jointly attributed unto God, as sure as the name of God is expressed universally in the copies of the original language²³, so thus absolutely and subjectively taken must it be understood of Christ.

23 For being the epistle was written in the Greek language, it is enough if all those copies do agree. Nor need we be troubled with the observation of Grotius on the place: 'Suspectam nobis hanc lectionem faciunt interpretes veteres, Latinus, Syrus, Arabs et Ambrosius, qui omnes legerunt, δ ἐφανερῶθη.' I confess the vulgar Latin reads it otherwise than the Greek, Quod manifestatum est in carne; and it cannot be denied but the Syriac, however translated by Tremellius, agreeth with the Latin; and both seem to have read δ instead of Θεός. But the joint consent of the Greek copies and interpreters is above the authority of those two translators, and the Arabic set forth in the *Biblia Polyglotta* agreeth expressly with them. But that which Grotius hath farther observed is of far greater consideration: 'Addit Hincmarus opusculo 55, illud Θεός hic positum a Nestorianis.' [Comm. ad loc. vol. ii. p. 969.] For if at first the Greeks read δ ἐφανερῶθη, and that δ were altered into Θεός by the Nestorians, then ought we to correct the Greek copy by the Latin, and confess there is not only no force, but not so much as any ground or colour for our argument. But first, it is no way probable that the Nestorians should find it in the original, δ, and make it Θεός, because that by so doing they had overthrown their own assertion, which was, that God was not incarnate, nor born of the Virgin Mary; that God did not ascend unto heaven, but Christ by the Holy Ghost remaining upon him, καὶ τὴν ἀνάληψιν αὐτῷ χαρισάμενον. *Concil. Ephes. par. i. cap. 17. [Mansi, iv. 1009 B.]* Secondly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, be-

cause the Catholic Greeks read it Θεός before there were such heretics, so called 'Nestoriani a Nestorio Episcopo, (Patriarcha Constantinopolitano).' *S. August. Hæres. [see S. Aug. vol. viii. p. 28, note.]* Nestorius, from whom that heresy began, was patriarch of Constantinople after Sisinnius, Sisinnius after Atticus, Atticus after Nectarius, who succeeded Joannes, vulgarly called Chrysostomus. But St. Chrysostom read not δ, but Θεός, as appears by his commentaries upon the place; Θεός ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί, τουτέστιν, δ δημιουργός. [Hom. xi. c. 3. vol. xi. p. 606 A.] And St. Cyril, who by all means opposed Nestorius upon the first appearance of his heresy, wrote two large epistles to the queens Pulcheria and Eudocia, in both which he maketh great use of this text. In the first, after the repetition of the words as they are now in the Greek copies, he proceedeth thus; Τίς δ ἐν σαρκί φανερωθεὶς; ἢ δῆλον, ὅτι πάντα τε καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος οὕτως γὰρ ἔσται μέγα τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, Θεός ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί. [Cyril. Alex. de Recta Fide, vol. v. pt. ii. p. 224 C.] Wherefore in St. Paul he read Θεός God, and took that God to be the Word. In the second, repeating the same text *verbatim*, he manageth it thus against Nestorius; Εἰ Θεός ὢν ὁ λόγος ἐνανθρωπήσας λέγοιτο, καὶ οὐ δῆπου μεθεὶς τὸ εἶναι Θεός, ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς ἦν αἰεὶ διαμένων, μέγα δὴ τότε καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἔσται τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον; εἰ δὲ ἄνθρωπος νοεῖται κοινὸς ὁ Χριστός, — πῶς ἐν σαρκί πεφανέρωται; καὶ τοι πῶς οὐχ ἅπασιν ἐναργὲς, ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαρκί τε ἔσται, καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἑτέρῳ ὄρωτό τισι. [Ibid. p. 153 D.] And in the explanation of his second Anathematism, he

Again, St. Paul speaketh thus to the elders of the Church of Acts xx. 28. Ephesus; *Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* In these words this doctrinal proposition is clearly contained; God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. For there is no other word either in or near the text which can by any gram-

maketh use of no other text but this, to prove the hypostatical union, giving it this gloss or exposition: *Τί ἐστι τὸ, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί; τουτέστι, γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, &c.* [vol. vi. p. 148 C.] The same he urgeth in his *Scholion in Unigeniti Incarnatione*. So also Theodoret, contemporary with St. Cyril: *Θεὸς γὰρ ὢν καὶ Θεοῦ υἱός, καὶ ἀάρατον ἔχων τὴν φύσιν, δῆλος ἅπασι ἐνανθρωπήσας ἐγένετο, σαφῶς δὲ ἡμᾶς δύο φύσεις ἐδίδαξεν, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ τὴν θείαν ἔφη φανερωθῆναι φύσιν.* Thirdly, Hincmarus does not say that the Nestorians put Θεός into the Greek text, but that he which put it in was cast out of his bishopric for a Nestorian: his words are these; *‘Quidam nimirum ipsas Scripturas verbis illicitis imposturaverunt: sicut Macedonius Constantiopolitanus Episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore ideo a civitate expulsus legitur, quoniam falsavit Evangelia, et illum Apostoli locum ubi dicit, quod apparuit in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu, per cognationem Græcarum literarum, O et Θ, hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubi enim habuit Qui, hoc est OΣ, monosyllabum Græcum, litera mutata O in Θ vertit; et fecit OΣ, id est ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem.* Quapropter tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsus.’ *Hincm. Opusc. lv. cap. 18.* [vol. ii. p. 449.] Now whereas Hincmarus says *expulsus legitur*, we read not in Euagrius, or the Excerpta of Theodorus, or in Joannes Malala, that Macedonius was cast out of his bishopric for any such falsation. It is therefore probable that he had it from Liberatus, a deacon of the Church of Carthage,

who wrote a Breviary, collected partly out of the Ecclesiastical Histories and Acts of the Councils, partly out of the relations of such men as he thought fit to believe, extant in the fourth tome of the Councils. In which, chap. xix. [p. 134] we have the same relation, only with this difference, that O is not turned into Θ, but into Ω, and so OΣ becomes not ΘΣ, but ΩΣ. So that first the Greek copies are not said to have read it ὁ, but ὅς, and so not to have relation to the mystery, but to the person of Christ; and therefore this makes nothing for the vulgar Latin. Secondly, whereas Hincmarus says there was but one letter changed, no such mutation can of OΣ make ΘEOΣ, it may ΩΣ, as we read in Liberatus; and then this is nothing to the Greek text. Thirdly, Macedonius was no Nestorian, but Anastasius an Eutychian; and he ejected him* as he did other Catholic Bishops under the pretence of Nestorianism, but for other reasons. Howsoever Macedonius could not falsify all the Greek copies, when, as well those which were before his time, as those which were written since, all acknowledge Θεός. And if he had been ejected for substituting Θεός, without question Anastasius would have taken care for the restoring ὁς, which we find not in any copy. It remaineth therefore that the Nestorians did not falsify the text by reading Θεός ἐφανερώθη, but that the ancient Greek Fathers read it so; and consequently, being the Greek is the original, this lection must be acknowledged authentical †.

* [The fifth and following editions read *not as he did.*]

† [The fullest information upon the various readings in this passage is given by Berriman, in his *Critical Dissertation*. He sums up the evidence by saying that ninety-one Greek MSS. read Θεός. Four MSS. have been said to read ὁ, but not one reads it: five have been said to read ὅς, but only three do so for certain.]

129 matical construction be joined with the verb, except the Holy Ghost, to whom the predicate is repugnant, both in respect of the act, or our redemption, and of the means, the blood. If then the Holy Ghost hath not purchased the Church; if he hath not blood to shed for our redemption, and *without blood-shed there is no remission*; if there be no other word to which, according to the literal construction, the act of purchasing can be applied; if the name of God, most frequently joined to his Church²⁴, be immediately and properly applicable by all rules of syntax to the verb which followeth it: then is it of necessity to be received as the subject of this proposition, then is this to be embraced as infallible Scripture truth, God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. But this God may and must be understood of Christ: it may, because he hath; it must, because no other person which is called God hath so purchased the Church. *We were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.* With this price¹⁹ were we bought; and therefore it may well be said, that Christ our God *hath purchased us with his own blood.* But no other person which is, or is called, God, can be said so to have purchased us, because it is an act belonging properly to the Mediatorship; and *there is but one Mediator between God and men*: ¹Tim. ii. 5. and the Church is *sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.* Nor can the expression of this act, peculiar to the Son, be attributed to the Father, because this blood signifieth death; and though the Father be omnipotent, and can do all things, yet he cannot die. And though it might be said that he purchased us, because he gave his Son to be a

²⁴ Τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. For though the Church be properly the Church of Christ, Matt. xvi. 18. Col. i. 24, and in the plural we read once *αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Rom. xvi. 16, as we do of the *Churches of God*, 1 Cor. xi. 16. 2 Thess. i. 4. and 1 Thess. ii. 14; yet ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ is frequently used; as 1 Cor. i. 2. and x. 32. and xv. 9. and xi. 22. 2 Cor. i. 1. 1 Tim. iii. 5. 15; but ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ not once named. And therefore we have no reason to alter it in this text, or to fancy it first written *χοῦ*, and then made *θεοῦ*, when

it is so often written Θεοῦ, not Χριστοῦ. Some MSS., as the Alexandrian, Cantabrigian, and New Coll. MSS., read it τοῦ Κυρίου, and the interpreter of Irenæus, *Regere Ecclesiam Domini*, lib. iii. cap. 14. Others represent Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, followed by the Arabic interpreter; which makes not at all against our argument; but, because in this particular unusual, not like to be true. The Syriac translating it *Christi*, (ܡܫܝܚܐܢܘܬܐ ܕܘܕܘܡܝܢܘܐ,) gives rather an exposition than a version*.

* [It is stated by Professor Lee, that the oldest MSS. of the Syriac version read *Dei* and not *Christi*. The Vatican MS. reads Θεοῦ.]

ransom for us, yet it cannot be said that he did it *by his own blood*; for then it would follow, that he gave not his Son, or that the Son and the Father were the same person. Beside, it is very observable, that this particular phrase of *his own blood*, is in the Scripture put by way of opposition to the blood of another²⁵: and howsoever we may attribute the acts of the Son unto the Father, because sent by him; yet we cannot but acknowledge, that the blood and death was of another than the

Heb. ix. 12. Father. *Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood*

Heb. ix. 25, *he entered in once into the holy place; and whereas the high priest entered every year with the blood of others, Christ appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* He then which purchased us wrought it by his own blood, as an High Priest opposed to the Aaronical, who made atonement by the blood of others. But the Father taketh no priestly office, neither could he be opposed to the legal priest, as not dying himself, but giving another. Wherefore wheresoever the Father and the Son are described together as working the salvation of man, the blood by which it is wrought is attributed to the Son, not to the

Father: as when St. Paul speaketh of *the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness; his, that is, his own righteousness*, hath reference to God the Father; but *his*, that is, *his own blood*, must be referred to Christ the Son. When he glorifieth the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, attributing unto him, that he hath blessed, elected, predestinated, adopted, accepted us, made known unto us the mystery of his will, and gathered us together in one; in the midst of

Rom. iii. 24, this acknowledgment he brings in *the Beloved, in whom we have redemption through his blood*, as that which cannot be attributed to the Father. Christ hath blessed us; and the Apostle saith,

Eph. i. 6, 7. the Father hath blessed us; which is true, because *he sent his Son to bless us*. Christ hath made known unto us the will of his Father; and the Apostle saith, the Father hath *made known unto us the mystery of his will*; because he sent his Son to reveal

Acts iii. 26. his Father; and the Apostle saith, the Father hath *made known unto us the mystery of his will*; because he sent his Son to reveal

Eph. i. 9. *unto us the mystery of his will*; because he sent his Son to reveal

unto us the mystery of his will; because he sent his Son to reveal

²⁵ *Ἰδιον αἷμα is opposed to αἷμα ἀλλότριον. And therefore it is observable that the author of the Racovian Catechism, in his answer to this place of Scripture, doth never make the least mention of ἰδιον or proprium, but only affirms that the blood of Christ may be called the blood of God the Father;

and totidem verbis did Socinus answer to Wiekus [Vujekius] before, but in his whole answer concealed the force of ἰδιον, whereas the strength of our argument lies in those words, διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, or, as the Alexandrian MS. and one mentioned by Beza, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου.

it. Christ hath delivered us; and the Father is said to *deliver us from the power of darkness*: not that we are twice delivered, but because the Father delivereth us by his Son. And thus these general acts are familiarly attributed to them both; but still a difference must be observed and acknowledged in the means or manner of the performance of these acts. For though it is true, that the Father and the Son revealed to us the will of God; yet it is not true that the Father revealed it by himself to us; but that the Son did so, it is. They both deliver us from sin and death: but the Son *gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us*; the Father is not, cannot be, said to have given himself, but his Son: and therefore the Apostle giveth thanks unto the Father, *who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood*. Now this blood is not only the blood of the new covenant, and consequently of the Mediator, but the nature of this covenant is such, that it is also a Testament, and therefore the blood must be the blood of the Testator: *for where a Testament* is, there must also of necessity be the death of the Testator*. But the Testator which died is not, cannot be, the Father, but the Son; and consequently the blood is the blood of the Son, not of the Father. It remaineth therefore that God, who purchased the Church with his own blood, is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or any other which is called God, but only Jesus Christ the Son of God, and God. And thus have I proved the first of the three assertions, that the name of God, absolutely taken and placed subjectively, is sometimes to be understood of Christ.

The second, that the name of God invested by way of excellency with an article is attributed in the Scriptures unto Christ, may be thus made good. He which is called Emmanuel, is named God by way of excellency: for that name, saith St. Matthew, *being interpreted is, God with us*, and in that interpretation the Greek article is prefixed. But Christ is called Emmanuel; *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel*. Therefore he is that *God with us*, which is expressed by way of excellency

* [The word διαθήκη, which is here translated a testament, is rendered in almost every other passage of the New Testament, and even in this chapter, a covenant, and so it perhaps ought to be rendered here.]

ἐστὶ μεθερ-
μηνευόμε-
νον, Μεθ' ἡ-
μῶν ὁ Θεός.

Exod. xvii. 15. Judg. vi. 24. Jer. xxxiii. 16.

John i. 14.

Mat. xxviii. 20. Ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί.

Isa. ix. 6. בְּבוֹרָה

Ezek. xlvi. 35.

John xx. 28.

lency, and distinguished from all other who are any way honoured with that name: for it is a vain imagination to think that Christ is called Emmanuel, but that he is not what he is called: as Moses built an altar, and called the name of it *Jehovah Nissi*, and Gideon another called *Jehovah Shalom*, and yet neither altar was Jehovah; as Jerusalem was called, *The Lord our righteousness*, and yet that city was not the Lord. Because these two notions, which are conjoined in the name Emmanuel, are severally true of Christ. First he is *Emmanu*, that is, *with us*, for he hath dwelt among us: and when he parted from the earth, he said to his Disciples, *I am with you always, even to the end of the world*. Secondly, he is *El*, and that name was given him, as the same Prophet testifieth, *For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God*. He then who is both properly called *El*, that is, *God*, and is also really *Emmanu*, that is, *with us*, he must infallibly be that *Emmanuel*, who is *God with us*. Indeed if the name Emmanuel were to be interpreted by way of a proposition, *God is with us*, as *the Lord our righteousness*, and *the Lord is there*, must be understood where they are the names of Jerusalem, then should it have been the name not of Christ, but of his Church; and if we under the Gospel have been called so, it could have received no other interpretation in reference to us. But being it is not ours, but our Saviour's name, it bears no kind of similitude with those objected appellations, and is as properly and directly to be attributed to the Messiah, as the name of Jesus. Wherefore it remaineth that Christ be acknowledged God with us, according to the evangelical interpretation, with an expression of that excellency which belongeth to the supreme Deity.

Again, he to whom St. Thomas said, *My Lord and my God*, or rather, *The Lord of me, and the God of me*, he is that God before whose name the Greek article is prefixed, which they require, by way of excellency. But St. Thomas spake these words to Christ²⁶.

26 Indeed it hath been answered, that these words are not to be referred to Christ, but to God the Father. So Theodorus Mopsuestenus in his Commentary on St. John; 'Thomas quidem, cum sic credidisset, *Dominus meus et Deus meus* dicit, non ipsum Dominum et Deum dicens (non enim resurrectionis scientia docebat et Deum esse eum qui resurrexit) sed quasi pro miraculoso facto Deum collaudat.' *Syn. V. Collat. 4.*

[xv. Mansi ix. p. 209 B.] As if Thomas had intended only to have praised God for raising Christ. But first, it is plain that Thomas answered Christ; secondly, that he spake unto *him*, that is, to Christ, and consequently that the words which he spake belong to Christ; thirdly, that the words are a confession of his faith in Christ, as our Saviour doth acknowledge. And whereas Franciscus Davidis did object, that in a Latin Testament

For *Jesus spake unto Thomas, and Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God*. And in these words he made confession of his faith²⁷; for our Saviour replied, *Thomas, because thou* John xx. 29.

he found not *et dixit ei*, but *et dixit* without *ei*, it is sufficiently discountenanced by Socinus in his epistle, affirming that all the Greek and Latin copies had it, except that one which he had found: and therefore the omission must be imputed to the negligence of the printer.

27 Ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου. Either in these words there is an ellipsis of *εἶ σὺ*, *Thou art my Lord, thou art my God*; or an antiptosis, the nominative case used for the vocative, as Ἐλωὲ, Ἐλωὲ, ὁ Θεός μου, ὁ Θεός μου, Mark xv. 34; Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ, Mark xiv. 36; and Χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, John xix. 3. If it be an ellipsis of the verb *εἶ*, so frequent in the Scriptures, and of the person sufficiently understood in the preceding pronoun, then is it evident that *ὁ Θεός*, is attributed unto Christ, for then St. Thomas said unto him, *Thou art ὁ Θεός μου*. If it be an antiptosis, though the construction require not a verb, yet the signification virtually requireth as much, which is equivalent; for he acknowledgeth him as much God while he calleth him so, as if he did affirm him to be so. Neither can it be objected that the article *ὁ* serveth only in the place of *ᾧ*, as signifying that the nominative is to be taken for the vocative case; because the nominative may as well stand vocatively without an article, as Ἰωσήφ υἱὸς Δαβίδ. Matt. i. 20. and Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, Κύριε, υἱὸς Δαβίδ. Matt. xx. 30, 31; and therefore when the vocative is invested with an article, it is as considerable as in a nominative. And being these words were an expression of the Apostle's faith, as Christ understood and approved them, they must contain in them, virtually at least, a proposition; because no act of our faith can be expressed, where the object is not at least a virtual proposition. And in that proposition, *ὁ Θεός* must be the predicate, and Christ, to whom these words are spoken, must also be the subject. It cannot therefore be avoided, but that St. Thomas did attribute the name of God to our Saviour with an article. Indeed to me

there is no doubt but St. Thomas in these words did make as true and real a confession of his faith concerning the Person of Christ, as St. Peter did, when he answered and said, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God*, Matt. xvi. 16; and consequently, that *ὁ Κύριος* and *ὁ Θεός* do as properly belong unto him, as St. Peter's *ὁ Χριστός* and *ὁ υἱός*. As therefore Christ said to his Disciples, *Vos vocatis me ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ ὁ Κύριος, et bene dicitis, sum etenim*, John xiii. 13; so he might have replied to Thomas, *You call me ὁ Κύριος and ὁ Θεός, and you say well, for I am so*. As for the objection of Socinus, that though *Θεός* be here spoken of Christ, and that with an article *ὁ*, yet that article is of no force, because of the following pronoun *μου*, it is most groundless: for the article *ὁ* cannot have relation to the following pronoun *μου*. Ἐπεὶ πᾶς ἡ ἀπαράδεκτος ἀντωνυμία τῶν ἄρθρων ἐν γενικῇ πτώσει εὐθείας ἄρθρον παραδέχεται, as that great critic Apollonius Alexandrinus observes, *lib. i. de Syntaxi, cap. 30*. And if for *μου* it were *ὁ ἐμός*, yet even that article would belong to *Θεός*, for in these words, *ὁ Θεός ὁ ἐμός*, neither article belongs to *ἐμός*, but both to *Θεός* for, as the same critic observes in the same case, τὰ δύο ἄρθρα εἰς μίαν τὴν εὐθείαν ἀναφέρεται οὐκ ἔρα ἐν τῷ, ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐμός, κατηνάρκασται τὸ ἕτερον τῶν ἄρθρων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀντωνυμίαν φέρεσθαι. So that if *ὁ Θεός* be the supreme God, then *ὁ Θεός μου* must be *my supreme God*: as when David speaks to God Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεός μου, πρὸς σε ὀρθρίζω, Psal. lxii. 1, the latter is of as great importance as the former. So again, Psal. xlii. 4. Ἐξομολογήσομαι σοι ἐν κithara, ὁ Θεός. ὁ Θεός μου and xlix. 3. Ὁ Θεός ἐμφανὴς ἦξει, ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν and lxx. 12. Ὁ Θεός μὴ μακρόνης ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὁ Θεός μου. I dare not therefore say to any person, that he is *ὁ Θεός μου*, except I do believe that he is *ὁ Θεός*. Wherefore I conclude that the words of St. Thomas, Ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου, are as fully and highly significant as those of David, Πρόσχες τῇ φωνῇ τῆς δεήσεώς μου, ὁ βασιλεὺς μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου, Psal. v. 2. or those, Ὁ

hast seen me, thou hast believed. And let him be the Lord of me, and the God of me, who was the Lord and the God of an Apostle.

Nor have we only their required testimony of Christ's supreme Divinity, but also an addition of verity asserting that supremacy. For he is not only termed *the God*, but, for a further certainty, *the true God*: and the same Apostle, who said the Word was God, lest any cavil should arise by any omission of an article, though so frequently neglected by all, even the most accurate

1 John v.
20.

Authors, hath also assured us that he is the true God. For, *we know*, saith he, *that the Son of God is come, and hath given us* 132 *an understanding that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life*²⁸. As therefore we read in the

Acts x. 36.

Acts of the word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all: where it is acknowledged that the Lord of all is by the pronoun *he*²⁹ joined unto *Jesus Christ*, the immediate, not unto *God*, the remote antecedent: so likewise here *the true God* is to be referred unto *Christ*, who stands next unto it, not unto the Father, spoken of indeed in the text, but at a distance. There is no reason alleged why these last words should not be referred to the Son of God, but only this, that in grammatical construction they may be ascribed to the Father. As, when *another king arose which knew not Joseph, the same dealt subtilly with our kindred; the same* referreth us not to Joseph, but to the king of Egypt. Whereas, if nothing else can be objected but a possibility in respect of the grammatical construction, we may as well say that Joseph dealt subtilly with his kindred as the king of Egypt; for whatsoever the incongruity be in history, it makes no solecism in the syntax. Wherefore being Jesus Christ is the immediate antecedent to which the relative may properly be referred; being the Son of God is he of whom the Apostle chiefly speaketh; being this is rendered as a reason why *we are in him that is true*, by being *in his Son*, to wit, because that Son is *the true God*;

Acts vii.
18, 19.

Θεός μου και δ Κύριός μου, εις την δικην μου, Psal. xxxv. 23. or those, Τὰ θυσιαστήρια σου, Κύριε τῶν δυναμέων δ Βασιλεύς μου, και δ Θεός μου, Psal. lxxxiv. 3. or those of St. John in the Revelation [iv. 11.] as they lie in the Alexandrian and Complutensian copies; 'Αξιός εἶ, δ Κύριος και δ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ ἅγιος, λαβεῖν, &c. or that lastly in the most ancient hymn, Κύριε δ

Θεός, ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ Θεοῦ—ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς.

²⁸ Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινός Θεός, και ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. 'Hic agitur non solum de vero Deo, sed de illo uno vero Deo, ut articulus in Græco additus indicat.' *Catech. Racov.* [c. i. §. 1. p. 52.]

²⁹ Οὗτος for ὅς, as Acts viii. 26. 'Ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ εις Γάζαν' αὕτη ἐστὶν ἐρημος. *quæ est deserta.*

being in the language of St. John the constant title of our Saviour is *eternal life*; being all these reasons may be drawn out of the text itself, why the title of the true God should be attributed to the Son, and no one reason can be raised from thence why it should be referred to the Father; I can conclude no less, than that our Saviour is *the true God*, so styled in the Scriptures by way of eminency, with an article prefixed, as the first Christian writers which immediately followed the Apostles did both speak and write³⁰.

But, thirdly, were there no such particular place in which the article were expressed, yet shall we find such adjuncts fixed to the name of God when attributed unto Christ, as will prove equivalent to an article, or whatsoever may express the supreme Majesty. As when St. Paul doth magnify the Jews, *out of* Rom. ix. 5. *whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen.* First, it is evident that Christ is called God³¹, even he who came of the Jews, though not as he came

³⁰ Δοξάζω Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Θεόν. *S. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn.* [c. 1. p. 33.] 'Ἐν θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς, και Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν. *Idem, Epist. ad Ephes.* [c. 1. Procem. p. 11.] 'Ὁ γὰρ Θεός ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκνομορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας. *Ibid.* [c. 18. p. 15.] 'Ὁ γὰρ Θεός ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν Πατρὶ ὦν μᾶλλον φαίνεται. *Epist. ad Rom.* [c. 3. p. 27.] Τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου τὰ λογικὰ πλάσματα ἡμεῖς. *S. Clem. Alex. ad Gentes.* [c. i. vol. i. p. 6.] And it was well observed by the author of the *Μικρὰ Λαβύρινθος*, written about the beginning of the third century, that not only the ancients Fathers before him, as Justin, Miltiades, Tatianus, Clemens, Ireneus, Melito, &c. did speak of Christ as God, but that the hymns also penned by Christians from the beginning did express Christ's divinity. Ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι και ὡδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσθαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Χριστὸν ἡμῶσι θεολογοῦντες. [apud Eus. H. E. v. 28. p. 252.] And the Epistle of Pliny to Trajan testifies the same: 'Quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere.' l. x. ep. 97.

³¹ Though some would leave *God* out of the text, upon this pretence, because St. Cyprian, *lib. ii. adv. Judæos*, [c. 6. p. 287.] citing this place, leaves it out.

But that must needs be by the negligence of some of the scribes, as is evident. First, because Manutius and Morellius found the word *Deus* in their copies, and both the MSS. which Pamelius used acknowledge it. Secondly, because St. Cyprian produceth the text to prove *quod Deus Christus*; and reckoneth it among the rest in which he is called expressly God. Thirdly, because Tertullian, whose disciple St. Cyprian professed himself, did both so read it, and so use it. 'Solum autem Christum potero Deum dicere, sicut idem Apostolus: *Ex quibus Christus, qui est, inquit, Deus super omnia benedictus in ævum omne.*' *Adv. Præceam.* [c. 13. p. 507 D.] And again, in the same book, 'Hunc et Paulus conspexit, nec tamen Patrem vidit. *Nonne, inquit, vidit Jesum?* Christum autem et ipse Deum cognominavit: *Quorum Patres, et ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est per (vel super) omnia Deus benedictus in ævum.*' [c. 15. p. 509 A.] Novatian, *de Trinitate* [c. 13, 30], useth the same argument. And another ancient author very expressly; 'Rogo te, Deum credis esse Filium, an non? Sine dubio, responsurus es, Deum; quia etsi negare volueris, sanctis Scripturis convinceris, dicente Apostolo, *Ex quibus Christus*

of them, that is, according to the flesh, which is here distinguished from his Godhead³². Secondly, he is so called God as not to be any of the many gods, but the one supreme or most high God; for he *is God over all*³³. Thirdly, he hath also added the title of *blessed*, which of itself elsewhere signifieth the supreme God³⁴, and was always used by the Jews to express

secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in secula. So also St. Augustin, 'Non solum Pater Deus est, sicut omnes etiam hæretici concedunt, sed etiam Filius; quod, velint nolint, coguntur fateri, dicente Apostolo, *Qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in secula.* De Trin. lib. ii. cap. 13. [§. 23. vol. viii. p. 786 A.] et cont. Faustum, lib. xvi. cap. 15. [ib. p. 292 A.] As for the objection, that St. Chrysostom doth not signify in his Commentaries that he read Θεός in the text: I answer, that neither does he signify that he read *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων*, for in his exposition he passeth over wholly *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός*, but it doth not follow that he read not *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων* in the text. But when he repeats the words of the Apostle, he agrees wholly with the Greek text, *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός εὐλογητός* [Hom. xvi. §. 1. vol. ix. p. 604 E.] and Theodoret, who lived not long after him, doth not only acknowledge the words, but give a full exposition of them: 'Ἦρκει μὲν ἡ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα προσθήκη παραηλωσάσαι τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ τὴν θεότητα· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ προομιῶ εἰρηκῶς, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, ἐπήγαγε, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει οὕτως ἐνταῦθα εἰπὼν τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, προστέθεικε τὸ, ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. [In loc. vol. iii. p. 74 B.] As for the omission of *Deus* in St. Hilary on the Psalms, it must of necessity be attributed to the negligence of the scribe, not to the reading of the Father. For how he read it, he hath clearly expressed in his books *de Trinitate*: [viii. 37. p.

969 E.] 'Non ignorat Paulus Christum Deum, dicens, *Quorum Patres, et ex quibus Christus qui est super omnia Deus.* Non hic creatura in Deum deputatur, sed creaturarum Deus est, qui super omnia Deus est.' The pretence therefore of Erasmus from the Fathers is vain; and as vain is that of Grotius from the Syriac translation, which hath in it the name of *God* expressly, as well as all the copies of the original, and all the rest of the translations, וְהוּא דְאֵלֵינוּ כְּכֹל דְעָלְמָא*.

³² Τὸ κατὰ σάρκα opposed unto τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα. As Rom. i. 3. where κατὰ σάρκα is used without an article, because κατὰ πνεῦμα, to which it is opposed, followeth, and so the opposition is of itself apparent. But here being κατὰ πνεῦμα is not to be expressed in the following words, the article τὸ, signifying of itself a distinction or exception, sheweth that it is to be understood.

³³ Ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων. Not *in omnibus*, as Erasmus, nor *super omnes*, as Beza, with reference to the Fathers, which should have been ἐπὶ πάντων αὐτῶν but as the vulgar translation, and the ancient Fathers before that, *super omnia*, ἐπὶ for ἐπάνω, as John iii. 31. Ὁ ἔνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν, which signifieth no less than יְיָ the ordinary name of God, *ὁ ὑψιστος*, the *Most High*, as it is taken for the supreme God by itself, Acts vii. 48. and is described, Psalm xcvi. 9. Ὅτι σὺ εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ ὑψιστος ἐπὶ πάντων τὴν γῆν, σφόδρα ὑπερνώστους ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς θεούς.

³⁴ As Mark xiv. 61. Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς

* [To the Fathers mentioned in this note we may add Irenæus, III. 16. 3. p. 205. Hippolytus, *cont. Noëtum*, c. 2, 6. Origen, *in Rom.* vii. 13. vol. iv. p. 612 B. Concil. Antioch. (A. D. 269.) *apud Routh. Rel. Sacr.* II. p. 467. Athanas. *Orat.* IV. *cont. Ariam.* I. vol. i. p. 617 C. *Epist.* II. *ad Serap.* 2. p. 684 A. *Epist.* ad Epict. 10. p. 908 E. *Cont. Apol.* I. 10. p. 930 D. Epiphani. *Hær.* LVIII. [vol. i.] p. 487 D. *Hær.* LXXIV. 6. p. 894 C. *Hær.* LXXVI. p. 977-8. Theodoret. *Hær. Fab.* v. 14. vol. iv. p. 287 A, all of whom quote the passage as proving the divinity of Christ.]

that one God of Israel. Wherefore it cannot be conceived St. Paul should write unto the Christians, most of which then were converted Jews or proselytes, and give unto our Saviour not only the name of God, but also add that title which they always gave unto the one God of Israel, and to none but him; except he did intend they should believe him to be the same God whom they always in that manner, and under that notion, had adored. As therefore the Apostle speaketh of *the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore*,³¹ of the Creator, *who is blessed for ever, Amen*; and thereby doth signify the supreme Deity, which was so glorified by the Israelites; and doth also testify that we worship the same God under the Gospel which they did under the Law: so doth he speak of Christ in as sublime a style, *who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen*; and thereby doth testify the equality, or rather identity, of his Deity. If we consider the scope of the Apostle, which is to magnify the Israelites by the enumeration of such privileges as belonged peculiarly to that chosen nation (the most eminent of which was contained in the genealogy of our Saviour), we shall find their glory did not consist in this, that Christ at first was born of them a man, and afterwards made a God; for what great honour could accrue to them by the nativity of a man, whose Godhead is referred not to his birth, but to his death? whereas this is truly honourable, and the peculiar glory of that nation, that the most high God blessed for ever should *take on him the seed of Abraham*, and come out of the Israelites *as concerning the flesh*. Thus every way it doth appear the Apostle spake of Christ as of the one eternal God. Heb. ii. 16.

He then who was the Word which in the beginning was with God, and was God; he whose glory Isaias saw as the glory of the God of Israel; he who is styled *Alpha* and *Omega* without

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ; Art thou the Christ the Son of the Blessed? where the vulgar attribute is taken for God himself, which is usually added to the name of God, as 2 Cor. xi. 31. Ὁ Θεός—ὁ ὢν εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας or to any description of him; as Ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, Ἀμήν. Rom. i. 25. And these expressions of St. Paul are consonant to the ancient custom of the Jews, who, when the priest in the sanctuary rehearsed the name of God, were wont to

answer, *Blessed be his name for ever.* Insomuch as *the Blessed One* did signify in their language as much as *the Holy One*; and both, or either of them, the God of Israel. Hence are so frequent in the Rabbin, הַקדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא *the Holy Blessed One*, and הַקדוֹשׁ הַבְּרוּךְ *the Blessed One*, that they are written by abbreviation, הַקב"ה or הַקב"ה; and the *infinite Blessed One*, ב' א"ס ב' ה'; *Blessed be God for ever, Amen and amen*, ב' יא"י, and יא"י.

any restriction or limitation; he who was truly subsisting in the form of God, and equal with him, before he was in the nature of man; he who being man is frequently called God, and that in all those ways by which the supreme Deity is expressed; he had a being before Christ was conceived by the Virgin Mary, and the being which he had was the one eternal and indivisible Divine essence, by which he always was truly, really, and properly God. But all these are certainly true of him in whom we believe, Jesus Christ, as hath been proved by clear testimonies of the sacred Scriptures. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived of the Virgin was not any created, but the Divine essence; nor was he any Creature, but the true eternal God: which was our second assertion, particularly opposed to the Arian heresy³⁵.

The third assertion, next to be demonstrated, is, that the Divine essence which Christ had as the Word, before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary, he had not of himself, but by communication from God the Father. For this is not to be denied, that there can be but one essence properly Divine, and so but one God of infinite wisdom, power, and majesty; that there can be but one person³⁶ originally of himself subsisting in that infinite Being, because a plurality of more persons so subsisting would necessarily infer a multiplicity of Gods; that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is originally God, as not

³⁵ This heresy was so called from two who bare the same name, and fell at the same time into the same opinion: one of them being a presbyter, and rector of a church in Alexandria, the other a deacon: as Alexander Bishop of Alexandria, in his epistle extant in Theodoret, *Eisì dè oi ànavematìsthènres àire-siàwtai, àpò presbutèrwn mèn 'Aρειος, àpò διακόνων δè, 'Αχιλλᾶς, Εὐζώσιος, — 'Αρειος ἕτερος, &c.* [Theod. H. E. lib. i. c. 4. p. 21.] In the epistle of the Arians to Alexander, he is reckoned amongst the presbyters; 'Αρειος, 'Αειθαλῆς, 'Αχιλλᾶς, Καρπώνης, Σαριατάς, 'Αρειος, presbutèroi. Of these two Phœbadius *cont. Arian. cap. 25.* [c. xiii. p. 253 B.] 'Patrem et filium non esse unam personam, ut Sabellius, ut duas substantias, ut Arius.' The heresy is so well known, that it needs no explication: and indeed it cannot be better described than in the anathematism of the Nicene Council.

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας ἦν πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ Καθολικὴ καὶ 'Αποστολικὴ 'Εκκλησία. [Socr. H. E. lib. i. c. 8. p. 24.] Thus translated by St. Hilary; 'Eos autem qui dicunt, erat quando non erat, et antequam nasceretur non erat, et quod de non extantibus factus est, vel ex alia substantia aut essentia, dicentes esse convertibilem et demutabilem Deum, hos anathematizat Catholica Ecclesia.' [De Synod. c. 84. p. 1198 B.]

³⁶ 'Ἐνα γὰρ οἶδαμεν ἀγέννητον, καὶ μίαν τῶν ὄντων ἀρχὴν, τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ. S. Basil. *Epist.* 78. [Epist. cxxv. 3. vol. iii. p. 216 D.] 'Ἐν ἀγέννητον, ὁ Πατήρ. Alex. *Epist. apud Theodoretum.* [lib. i. c. 4.]

receiving his eternal being from any other. Wherefore it necessarily followeth that Jesus Christ, who is certainly not the Father, cannot be a person subsisting in the Divine nature originally of himself, and consequently, being we have already proved that he is truly and properly the eternal God, he must be understood to have the Godhead communicated to him by the Father, who is not only eternally, but originally God. *All things whatsoever the Father hath, are mine*³⁷, saith Christ; because in him is the same fulness of the Godhead, and more than that the Father cannot have: but yet in that perfect and absolute equality there is notwithstanding this disparity, that the Father hath the Godhead not from the Son, nor any other, whereas the Son hath it from the Father: Christ is the true God and eternal life; but that he is so, is from the Father: *for as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself*³⁸, not by participation, but by communication. It is true, our Saviour was so in the form of God, that he thought it no robbery to be equal with God: but when the Jews sought to kill him because he *made himself equal with God*³⁹, he answered them, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do:* but that

³⁷ Πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατήρ, τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐστίν, ὡς ἐμπαλιὺν τὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ, τοῦ πατρὸς· οὐδὲν οὖν ἴδιον, ὅτι κοινὰ, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι κοινὸν καὶ δόξτιμον, εἰ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς. S. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 2. *de Filio.* [Orat. xxx. ii. p. 547 A.]

³⁸ 'Hoc dixit, *Vitam dedit Filio ut haberet eam in semetipso*, tanquam diceret, Pater, qui esset vita in semetipso, genuit Filium qui esset vita in semetipso. Pro eo enim quod est genuit, voluit intelligi *dedit*, tanquam si cuiquam diceremus, dedit tibi Deus esse.' S. August. [Tract. xix. in Joh. §. 13. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 443 D.] Et paulo post, 'Quid ergo Filio dedit? dedit ei ut Filius esset; genuit ut vita esset; hoc est, dedit habere ei vitam in semetipso, ut esset vita non egens vita, ne participando intelligatur habere vitam. Si enim participando haberet vitam non in semetipso, posset et amittendo esse sine vita: hoc in Filio ne accipias, ne cogites, ne credas. Manet ergo Pater vita, manet et Filius vita. Pater vita in semetipso, non a Filio; Filius vita in semetipso, sed

a Patre.' [Ibid.] So again, *de Trin. lib. i. cap. 12.* 'Plerumque dicit, *Dedit mihi Pater*; in quo vult intelligi quod eum genuerit Pater: non ut tanquam jam existenti et non habenti dederit aliquid, sed ipsum dedisse ut haberet, genuisse est ut esset.' [§. 26. vol. viii. p. 766 E.]
³⁹ 'Tanquam diceret, Quid scandalizati estis quia Patrem meum dixi Deum, quia æqualem me facio Deo? Ita sum æqualis, ut non ille a me, sed ego ab illo sim. Hoc enim intelligitur in his verbis, *Non potest Filius a se facere quicquam*, &c. hoc est, quicquid Filius habet ut faciat, a Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet a Patre ut faciat? quia a Patre habet ut possit, quia a Patre habet ut sit. Filio enim hoc est esse quod posse.' S. August. *in locum.* [Tract. xx. in Joh. §. 4. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 450 C.] Paulo post, 'Hoc est, *Non potest Filius a se quicquam facere*, quod esset, si diceret, non est Filius a se. Etenim si Filius est, natus est; si natus est, ab illo est de quo natus est.' [Ibid. §. 8. p. 452 C.]

connexion of his operations, shewing the reception of his essence; and by the acknowledgment of his power, professing his substance from the Father. From whence he which was equal, even in that equality professeth a priority, saying, *The Father is greater than I*⁴⁰: the Son equal in respect of his nature, the Father greater in reference to the communication of the God-head. *I know him*, saith Christ, *for I am from him*. And because he is from the Father, therefore he is called by those of the Nicene Council, in their Creed, *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God*⁴¹. The Father is God, but not of God, Light, but not of Light; Christ is God, but of God, Light, but of Light. There is no difference or inequality in the nature or essence, because the same in both; but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ hath that essence of himself, from none; Christ hath the same not of himself, but from him.

And being the Divine nature, as it is absolutely immaterial and incorporeal, is also indivisible, Christ cannot have any part of it only communicated unto him, but the whole, by which he must be acknowledged co-essential⁴², of the same substance

⁴⁰ Δῆλον ὅτι τὸ μείζον μὲν ἐστὶ τῆς αἰτίας· τὸ δὲ ἴσον, τῆς φύσεως. *S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 36.* [Orat. xxx. 7. p. 544 D.]

⁴¹ So St. Augustin hath observed: *Ab ipso*, inquit, *sum*, quia Filius de Patre, et quicquid est filius, de illo est cujus est filius: ideo Dominum Jesum dicimus Deum de Deo; Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo, sed tantum Deum: et dicimus Dominum Jesum lumen de lumine; Patrem non dicimus lumen de lumine, sed tantum lumen: ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixit, *Ab ipso sum.* [Tract. xxxi. in Joh. §. 4. vol. iii. p. 521 F.] From hence then did the Nicene Council gather those words of their Creed, *Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ.* [Mansi ii. 516 B. Socr. i. 8. p. 21.] But not immediately, for they were partly in some of the Oriental Creeds before; as appeareth by that confession which Eusebius presented to the Council, as containing what he had believed and taught ever since his baptism, in which he had these words, *καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς.* [Socr. p. 23.] And as Eusebius calls him *Life of Life*, so others *Power of Power*,

and *Wisdom of Wisdom*. 'Ideo Christus virtus et sapientia Dei, quia de Patre virtute et sapientia etiam ipse virtus et sapientia est, sicut lumen de Patre lumine, et fons vitæ apud Deum Patrem, utique fontem vitæ.' *S. August. de Trin. lib. vii. cap. 3.* [§. 4. vol. viii. p. 856 C.] And not only so, but *Essence of Essence*. 'Pater et Filius simul una sapientia, quia una essentia; et singillatim sapientia de sapientia, sicut essentia de essentia.' *Ibid. cap. 2.* [§. 3.]

⁴² 'Ὁμοούσιος, which is co-essential or consubstantial, is not to be taken of a part of the Divine essence, as if the Son were a part of the essence of the Father, and so of the same nature with him, which was the opinion of the Manichees. Οὐχ ὡς Οὐαλερτίου προβολὴν τὸ γέννημα τοῦ πατρὸς ἐδογματίσεν· οὐδ' ὡς Μανιχαῖος μέρος ὁμοούσιον τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ γέννημα εἰσηγήσατο' as Arius in his epistle to Alexander. [Epiph. HæR. LXIX. §. 7. vol. i. p. 732 D.]: by the interpretation of St. Hilary; 'Nec ut Valentinus, prolationem unius Patris commentatus est—nec, sicut Manichæus, partem unius substantiæ Patris natum exposuit.' *De Trin. lib. vi. cap. 9.* [p. 883 A, 884 B.] 'Quod Hilarius ita Latine reddidit;

with the Father; as the Council of Nice determined, and the ancient Fathers before them taught. Hence appeareth the truth of those words of our Saviour, which raised a second motion in the Jews to stone him; *I and the Father are one*: John x. 30. where the plurality of the verb, and the neutrality of the noun, with the distinction of their persons, speak a perfect identity of

tanquam *δμοούσιον* id significaret quod *partem substantiæ* habet ex toto resectam,' says Dionysius Petavius, without any reason; [de Trin. lib. iv. c. 5. §. 8.] for St. Hilary clearly translates *δμοούσιον* barely *unius substantiæ*, and it was in the original μέρος *δμοούσιον*, which he expressed by *partem unius substantiæ*. Under this notion first the Arians pretended to refuse the name *δμοούσιον*, as Arius in the same epistle signifieth, lest thereby they should admit a real composition and division in the Deity: *Εἰ τὸ ἐκ γαστρὸς, καὶ τὸ ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον, — ὡς μέρος τοῦ δμοουσίου καὶ ὡς προβολὴ ὑπὸ τινῶν νοεῖται, σύνθετος ἔσται ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ διαμερὲς, καὶ τρεπτὸς.* [Epiph. vol. i. p. 733 C.] And St. Jerom testifies thus much, not only of Arius and Eunomius, but also of Origen before them. 'Habetur Dialogus apud Græcos Origenis, et Candidi Valentinianæ hereseos defensoris, in quo duos Andabatas digladiantes inter se spectasse me fateor. Dicit Candidus, Filium de Patris esse substantia, errans in eo quod *προβολήν*, id est, *prolationem*, asserit: e regione Origenes, juxta Arium et Eunomium, repugnat eum vel prolatum esse vel natum, ne Deus Pater dividatur in partes.' *Apol. ii. in Rufin.* [§. 19. vol. ii. p. 512 A.] And therefore Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea refused not to subscribe to the Nicene Creed, being so interpreted as that objection might be taken away. *Τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας, ὡμολόγητο πρὸς αὐτῶν δηλωτικὸν εἶναι τοῦ ἐκ μὲν τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι, οὐ μὲν ὡς μέρος ὑπάρχειν τοῦ Πατρὸς.* [Socr. H. E. i. c. 8. p. 25.] Upon this confession he subscribed to that clause, *Begotten of the substance of the Father*, which was not in his own Creed. And again, *Ὅντα δὲ καὶ τὸ δμοούσιον εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν νιδὸν ἐξεταζόμενος ὁ λόγος συνίστησιν, οὐ κατὰ τῶν σωμάτων τρόπον, οἷδε τοῖς θνητοῖς ζώοις παραπλησίως· ὅτε γὰρ κατὰ διαίρεσιν τῆς*

οὐσίας, ὅτε κατὰ ἀποτομήν, &c. [Ibid.] Upon this acknowledgment he was persuaded to subscribe to the other clause also, (added to that Creed which he himself gave in to the Council,) *Being of one substance with the Father*: which clause was inserted by the Council at the instance of Constantine the emperor. Now as the Manichees made use of the word *δμοούσιος* to express their errors concerning the nature of God, and the person of Christ; so the ancient Fathers, before the Nicene Council, had used the same in a true catholic sense, to express the unity in essence of the Father and the Son: as appeareth by the confession of the same Eusebius; 'Ἐρεὶ καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν τινῶν λογίους καὶ ἐπιφανεῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ συγγραφεῖς ἔγγυμεν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ θεολογίας τῷ τοῦ δμοουσίον συγρηρησαμένους ὀνόματι. [Ibid.] Wherefore the other Eusebius of Nicomedia, understanding the ancient catholic sense, confessed that if they believed Christ to be the true begotten, and not created, Son of God, they must acknowledge him *δμοούσιον*, which the Arians endeavoured to make so odious, and therefore the Council in opposition to them determined it: 'Quid est aliud cur *δμοούσιον* Patri nolint Filium dici, nisi quia nolunt verum Dei Filium confiteri? sicut auctor ipsorum Eusebius Nicomediensis epistola sua prodidit, scribens, Si verum, inquit, Dei Filium et increatum dicimus, *δμοούσιον* cum Patre incipimus confiteri. Hæc cum lecta esset epistola in Concilio Nicæno, hoc verbum in tractatu Fidei posuerunt Patres, quia id viderunt adversariis esse formidini, ut tanquam evaginato ab ipsis gladio ipsorum nefandæ caput hereseos amputarent.' *S. Ambros. de Fide, lib. iii. cap. 15.* [§. 125. vol. ii. p. 518 E.] De voce 'Ὁμοούσιος vide Dionys. Petav. de Trin. lib. iv. cap. 5. 6.]

John x. 38. their essence. And though Christ say, *The Father is in me, and*
 John xvi. 28. *I in him*; yet withal he saith, *I came out from the Father*; by
 the former shewing the Divinity of his essence, by the latter
 the origination of himself. We must not look upon the Divine
 nature as sterile⁴³, but rather acknowledge and admire the
 fecundity and communicability of itself, upon which the creation
 of the world dependeth⁴⁴; God making all things by his Word, 136
 to whom he first communicated that omnipotency which is the
 cause of all things. And this may suffice for the illustration of
 our third assertion, that the Father hath communicated the
 Divine essence to the Word, who is that Jesus, who is the
 Christ.

The fourth assertion followeth, that the communication of the
 Divine essence by the Father is the generation of the Son; and
 Christ, who was eternally God, not from himself, but from the
 Father, is the eternal Son of God. That God always had a
 Son, appeareth by Agur's question in the Proverbs of Solomon;
 Prov. xxx. 4. *Who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his
 name? and what is his Son's name, if thou canst tell?* And it
 was the chief design of Mahomet to deny this truth, because
 he knew it was not otherwise possible to prefer himself before
 our Saviour. One Prophet may be greater than another, and
 Mahomet might persuade his credulous disciples that he was
 greater than any of the sons of men; but while any one was
 believed to be the eternal Son of God, he knew it wholly impos-
 sible to prefer himself before him. Wherefore he frequently
 inculcates that blasphemy in his Alcoran⁴⁵, that God hath no

⁴³ Ἀδύνατον γὰρ τὸν Θεὸν εἰπεῖν ἔρημον
 τῆς φυσικῆς γονιμότητος. *Damasc. de Fide*
Orthod. lib. i. cap. 8. [vol. i. p. 133 B.]

⁴⁴ Εἰ δὲ μὴ καρπογόνος ἐστὶν αὐτὴ ἡ
 θεία οὐσία, ἀλλ' ἔρημος, κατ' αὐτοὺς, ὡς
 φῶς μὴ φωτίζον, καὶ πηγὴ ἕρῃα, πῶς δη-
 μιουργικῆν ἐνέργειαν ἔχειν αὐτὸν λέγοντες
 οὐκ αἰσχύνονται; *S. Athanas. Orat. ii.*
cont. Arianos. [§. 2. vol. i. p. 470 A.]

⁴⁵ This is often repeated there, and
 particularly in the last chapter but one,
 called *Alechlas*. 'Est ipse Deus unus,
 Deus æternus, qui nec genuit, nec ge-
 nitus est, et cui nullus est æqualis.'
 [Marracio, Ref. Alcorani, i. 831.] And
 the *Saracenicæ* set forth by Sylburgius
 [p. 2, l. 25.] mention this as the first
 principle of Mahometanism, 'Οτι εἰς Θεὸς
 ἐστὶ, ποιητὴς τῶν ὄλων, μήτε γεννηθεῖς,

μήτε γεννήσας. [c. i. p. 2.] And Joannes
 Siculus and Georgius Cedrenus relate
 how Mahomet gave command, 'Ἐνα μόνον
 προσκυνεῖν Θεὸν, τὸν δὲ Χριστὸν τι-
 μᾶν ὡς λόγον Θεοῦ οὐχ ὡς υἱὸν δέ. [Hist.
 Byz. vol. vii. p. 333 C.] And we read
 of his ridiculous history, that Christ,
 after his ascension into heaven, was ac-
 cused by God for calling himself his Son,
 and that he denied it, as being so named
 only by men without any authority from
 him. 'Οτι ἀνελθόντα τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν
 οὐρανὸν ἠρώτησεν ὁ Θεὸς, λέγων, 'Ω Ἰη-
 σοῦ, σὺ εἶπες τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, 'Οτι υἱὸς
 εἰμι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεός· καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἰη-
 σοῦς, 'Οτι οὐκ εἶπον ἐγὼ, οὐδὲ αἰσχύνομαι
 εἶναι δούλος σου· ἀλλ' οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγου-
 σιν ὅτι εἶπον τὸν λόγον τοῦτον. [Sylb.
 Sarac. p. 5.]

such Son, nor any equal with him: and his disciples have
 corrupted the Psalm of David⁴⁶, reading (instead of *Thou art* Psalm ii. 7.
my Son, this day have I begotten thee.) *Thou art my Prophet,*
I have educated thee. The later Jews⁴⁷, acknowledging the
 words, and the proper literal reading of them, apply them so
 unto David, as that they deny them to belong to Christ; and
 that upon no other ground, than that by such an exposition they
 may avoid the Christians' confession. But by the consent of
 the ancient Jews, by the interpretation of the blessed Apostles,
 we know these words belong to Christ, and in the most proper
 sense to him alone. *For, unto which of the angels said he at* Heb. i. 5.
any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? as
 the Apostle argues. And if he had spoken them unto any other
 man, as they were spoken unto him, the Apostle's argument had
 been none at all.

Now that the communication of the Divine essence by the
 Father (which we have already proved) was the true and proper

⁴⁶ Alfirozabadius in his *Kamuz*: 'Dic-
 tum Dei omnipotentis ad Jesum, (cui
 propitius sit et pacem concedat Deus)
 Tu es *Nabiya*, Propheta meus, ego *wal-
 ladtoqa*, fovi te; at dixerunt Christiani,
 Tu es *Bonaiya*, Filius meus, ego *walad-
 toqa*, te genui. Longe est supra hæc
 Deus. And to the same purpose Ebnol
 Athir: In Evangelio dixit Isæ, Ego
walladtoqa, i. e. educavi te; at Christi-
 ani, dempta litera Lam altera, ipsum ei
 filium statuerunt. Qui longe elatus
 est super ea quæ dicunt.' [Marracio,
 Prodrumi in Alcoranum, P. iii. §. 15.
 p. 49.] Whereas then the Apostles at-
 tributed those words of the Psalm to
 Christ, the Mahometans, who could not
 deny but they were spoken of the Mes-
 sias, were forced to corrupt the text:
 and for that they pretend the eminency
 and excellency of the Godhead, as if it
 were beneath the majesty of God to be-
 get a Son, or be a Father: and indeed
 whosoever would bring in another pro-
 phet greater than Christ, as he was than
 Moses, must do so.

⁴⁷ I say the later Jews so attribute
 those words to David, as if they be-
 longed not to the Messias; but the an-
 cient Jews understood them of the
 Christ; as appeareth not only out of
 those places in the Evangelists where

the Christ and the Son of God are synony-
 mous; but also by the testimony of the
 later Jews themselves, who have con-
 fessed no less. So Rabbi David Kimchi
 in the end of his Commentaries on the
 second Psalm, ויש מפרשין זה המומר
 על נוג ומנוג ומשיח הוא מלך המשיח
 וכן פירשו רבותינו ו'ל: *Some inter-
 pret this Psalm of Gog and Magog,*
and the anointed is Messias the King;
and so our doctors of happy memory have
expounded it. And Rabbi Solomon Jar-
 chi not only confesseth that the ancient
 Rabbins did interpret it of the Messias,
 but shews the reason why the later Jews
 understood it rather of David, that
 thereby they might the better answer
 the argument of the Christians deduced
 from thence: רבותינו דרשו את המשיח
 על מלך המשיח ולפי משמטו ולתשובת
 Our המינים נכון לפותרו על דוד עצמו;
doctors have expounded it of the Messias:
but as to the literal sense, and for the
answering heretics, (that is, in their
language, Christians.) it is rather to
be interpreted of David in his own person.
 [The words לתשובת המינים are omitted
 in the later Rabbinic Bibles, but are
 found in Bomberg's, 1525, and in the
 MS. spoken of above, Opp. 34, f. 243.
 R.P.S.]

generation by which he hath begotten the Son, will thus appear: because the most proper generation which we know, is nothing else but a vital production of another in the same nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced. Thus man begetteth a son, that is, produceth another man of the same human nature with himself; and this production, as a perfect generation, becomes the foundation of the relation of paternity in him that produceth, and of filiation in him that is produced. Thus after the prolific benediction, *Be fruitful and multiply*, Adam begat in his own likeness, after his image: and by the continuation of the same blessing, the succession of human generations hath been continued. This then is the known confession of all men⁴⁸, that a son is nothing but another produced by his father in the same nature with him. But God the Father hath communicated to the Word the same Divine essence by which he is God; and consequently he is of the same nature with him, and thereby the perfect image and similitude of him, and therefore his proper Son. In human generations we may conceive two kinds of similitude; one in respect of the internal nature, the other in reference to the external form or figure. The former similitude is essential and necessary; it being impossible a man should beget a son, and that son not be by nature a man: the latter accidental; not only sometimes the child representing this, sometimes the other parent, but also oftentimes neither. The similitude then, in which the propriety of generation is preserved, is that which consisteth in the identity of nature⁴⁹: and this communication of the Divine essence by the Father to the Word is evidently a sufficient foundation of such a similitude; from whence Christ is called *the image of God, the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person*.

Nor is this communication of the Divine essence only the proper generation of the Son, but we must acknowledge it far

⁴⁸ Κοινὸν ὑπάρχει πᾶσι καὶ αὐτοῖς ἰδιότροπον ὁμολόγημα, ὡς ἅπας υἱὸς τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστὶ τῆ γεγεννηκότι οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως. Phot. Epist. I. [p. 4.] This is in the language of Aristotle [de Anima II. 4. §. 3.] Τὸ ποιῆσαι ἕτερον αἰὼν αὐτό· ζῶον μὲν ζῶον, φυτὸν δὲ φυτόν. And St. Basil, lib. ii. cont. Eunom. [§. 22. vol. i. p. 258 D.] Πατὴρ μὲν γὰρ ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ ἕτερον τοῦ εἶναι κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν ἑαυτῷ φύσιν τὴν ἀρχὴν

παρασχόν.

⁴⁹ 'Etiam si filius hominis, homo, in quibusdam similibus, in quibusdam sit dissimilis patri; tamen quia ejusdem substantiæ est, negari verus filius non potest, et quia verus est filius, negari ejusdem substantiæ non potest.' S. August. cont. Maximin. lib. ii. cap. 15. [§. 2. vol. viii. p. 711 A.]

more proper than any natural generation of the creature, not only because it is in a more perfect manner, but also because the identity of nature is most perfect. As in the Divine essence we acknowledge all the perfections of the creature, subtracting all the imperfections which adhere unto them here in things below: so in the communication we must look upon the reality without any kind of defect, blemish, or impurity. In human generation the son is begotten in the same nature with the father, which is performed by derivation, or decision of part of the substance of the parent: but this decision includeth imperfection, because it supposeth a substance divisible, and consequently corporeal: whereas the essence of God is incorporeal, spiritual, and indivisible; and therefore his nature is really communicated, not by derivation or decision, but by a total and plenary communication. In natural conceptions the father necessarily precedeth the son, and begetteth one younger than himself; for being generation is for the perpetuity of the species, where the individuals successively fail, it is sufficient if the parent can produce another to live after him, and continue the existence of his nature, when his person is dissolved. But this presupposeth the imperfection of mortality wholly to be removed, when we speak of him who inhabiteth eternity: the essence which God always had without beginning, without beginning he did communicate; being always Father, as always God. Animals when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolific; in God eternal perfection sheweth his eternal fecundity⁵⁰. And that which is most remarkable, in human generations the son is of the same nature with the father, and yet is not the same man; because though he hath an essence of the same kind, yet he hath not the same essence; the power of generation depending on the first prolific benediction, *Increase and multiply*, it must be made by way of multiplication, and thus every son becomes another man. But the Divine essence, being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication, is so communicated as not to be multiplied; insomuch that he which

⁵⁰ Πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἤδη τέλεια γεννᾷ· τὸ δὲ αἰετὸν αἰετὸν καὶ αἰδίου γεννᾷ. Euseb. de Præp. Evang. ex Plotino. [xi. c. 17.] Ἐπιφανίου μὲν γὰρ ἴδιον τὸ ἐν χρόνῳ γεννᾷν, διὰ τὸ ἀτελὲς τῆς φύσεως· Θεοῦ δὲ αἰδίου τὸ γέννημα, διὰ τὸ αἰετὸν αἰετὸν τῆς φύσεως. S. Athanas. Orat. i. cont. Arianos. [§. 14. vol. i. p. 419 A.] This was it which so much troubled the Arians, when they heard the Catholics constantly asserting, αἰετὸν Θεοῦ, αἰετὸν υἱοῦ· ἅμα πατὴρ, ἅμα υἱός.

proceedeth by that communication hath not only the same nature, but is also the same God. The Father God, and the Word God; Abraham man, and Isaac man: but Abraham one man, Isaac another man; not so the Father one God, and the Word another, but the Father and the Word both the same God. Being then the propriety of generation is founded in the essential similitude of the son unto the father, by reason of the same nature which he receiveth from him; being the full perfect nature of God is communicated unto the Word, and that more intimately and with a greater unity or identity than can be found in human generations: it followeth that this communication of the Divine nature is the proper generation by which Christ is, and is called the true and proper Son of God. This was the foundation of St. Peter's confession, *Thou art the Son of the living God*; this the ground of our Saviour's distinction⁵¹, *I go unto my Father, and to your Father*. Hence did St. John raise a verity, more than only a negation of falsity, when he said, *we are in the true Son*: for we which are in him are true, not false sons, but such sons we are not as *the true Son*. Hence did St. Paul draw an argument of the infinite love of God toward man, in that he *spared not his own proper Son*. Thus have we sufficiently shewed, that the eternal communication of the Divine essence by the Father to the Word was a proper generation by which Christ Jesus always was the true and proper Son of God: which was our fourth assertion.

The fifth and last assertion followeth, that the Divine essence was so peculiarly communicated to the Word, that there was never any other person naturally begotten by the Father; and in that respect Christ is the *only-begotten* Son of God. For the clearing of which truth, it will first be necessary to inquire into the true notion of the *only-begotten*; and then shew how it belongs particularly to Christ, by reason of the Divine nature communicated by way of generation to him alone. First, therefore, we must avoid the vain interpretation of the ancient heretics⁵²,

51 'Multum distat inter dominationem et conditionem, inter generationem et adoptionem, inter substantiam et gratiam. Ideoque hic non permixte nec passim dicitur, Ascendo ad Patrem nostrum aut Deum nostrum: sed, ad Patrem meum et Patrem vestrum, ad Deum meum et ad Deum vestrum. Aliter enim illi Deus Pater est, aliter

nobis. Illum siquidem natura coæquat, misericordia humiliat: nos vero natura prosternit, misericordia erigit.' *Capreolus Carthag. Epist.* [Galland. ix. p. 496 C.]

52 'This was the fallacy which Eunomius endeavoured to put upon the Church, as appears by those words of his delivered and answered by St.

who would have the restraining term *only* to belong, not to the Son, but to the Father; as if the *only-begotten* were no more than *begotten* of the Father *only*. Which is both contrary to the language of the Scriptures, and the common custom of men, who use it not for him who is begotten of one, but for him who alone is begotten of any.

Secondly, we must by no means admit the exposition of the later heretics⁵³, who take the *only-begotten* to be nothing else but the most beloved of all the sons; because Isaac was called the *only son* of Abraham, when we know that he had Ishmael beside; and Solomon said to be the *only-begotten before his mother*, when David had other children even by the mother

Basil, [cont. Eunom. ii. 20. vol. i. p. 255 D.] Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ, φησὶ, μονογενῆς, ἐπειδὴ παρὰ μόνου τῆ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου δυνάμει γεννηθεὶς καὶ κτισθεὶς τελειώτατος γέγονεν ὑπουργός, as if *μονογενῆς* were only *παρὰ μόνου*, and *uni-genitus* were nothing else but *genitus ab uno*. This St. Basil refuteth copiously; first, from the language of the Scriptures and the usage of mankind; Διὰ τὴν πανουργίαν, ἣν περὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐκακούργησε, παρὰ τε τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων συνθήθειαν, καὶ παρὰ τὴν εὐσεβῆ τῶν γραφῶν παράδοσιν ἐκλαμβάνων αὐτοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν. *Μονογενῆς γὰρ οὐχ ὁ παρὰ μόνου γενόμενος, ἀλλ' ὁ μόνος γεννηθεὶς, ἐν τῇ κοινῇ χρήσει προσαγορεύεται.* [Ibid. p. 256 A.] Secondly, by a retort peculiar to that heresy, which held the Son of God might be called *κτισθεὶς* as well as *γεννηθεὶς*, created as well as *begotten*, and consequently might be as properly named *μόνοκτιστος* as *μονογενῆς*. Εἰ μὴ παρὰ τὸ μόνος γεγεννησθαι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ παρὰ μόνου μονογενῆς εἶρηται, ταῦτ' ὁ δὲ ἐστὶ κατὰ σὲ τὸ ἐκτισθαι τῷ γεγεννησθαι, τί οὐχὶ καὶ μόνοκτιστον αὐτὸν ὀνομάξεις; Thirdly, by a particular instance shewing the absurdity of such an interpretation, for that thereby no man could properly be called *μονογενῆς*, because not begotten of one, but two parents. *Μονογενῆς δὲ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀνθρώπων οὐδεὶς κατὰ γὰρ τὸν ἑμέτερον λόγον, διὰ τὸ ἐκ συνδυασμοῦ πᾶσιν ὑπάρχειν τὴν γέννησιν· οὐδὲ ἡ Σάρρα μήτηρ μονογενοῦς ἦν παιδός, διότι οὐχὶ μόνη αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, ἐτεκνώσατο.* [Ibid.]

53 The Socinians make very much of this notion, and apply it so unto Christ,

as that thereby they might avoid all necessity of an eternal generation. So the Racovian Catechism: 'Causa cur Christo ista attributa (sc. *proprium et unigenitum Dei Filium esse*) competant, hæc est: quod inter omnes Dei filios et præcipuus sit, et Deo charissimus: quemadmodum Isaac, quia Abrahamo charissimus et hæres exstitit, *unigenitus* vocatus est, *Heb.* xi. 17. licet fratrem Ismaelem habuerit; et Solomon *unigenitus coram matre sua*, licet plures ex eadem matre fratres fuerint.' 1 *Paral.* iii. 1, 2, 3, &c. [sect. iv. c. i. p. 84.] And that this might be applied to the interpretation of the Creed, Schlichtingius hath inserted it as a material observation; 'Nam hic *unicus* seu *unigenita* filius nominatur, qui cæteris longe carior est Patri, longeque præstantior;' and confirms the interpretation with those two testimonies concerning Isaac and Solomon. But certainly this observation of theirs is vain, or what else they say is false. For if Christ be called the *Son of God*, because conceived by the Holy Ghost, and none else was ever so conceived, then is he the *only-begotten* by virtue of his generation. And if so, then is he not the *only-begotten*, as Isaac and Solomon were, that is, by the affection and prelation of their parents. Or if Christ were the *only-begotten* as Isaac and Solomon were, then was he not conceived after a singular manner, for the brethren of Solomon no way differed from him in their generation. It is plain therefore that this interpretation was invented, that when all the rest should fail they might stick to this.

of Solomon. For the *only-begotten*, and the *most beloved* are not the same; the one having the nature of a cause in respect of the other; and the same cannot be cause and effect to itself. For though it be true, that the only son is the beloved son; yet with this order, that he is therefore beloved, because the only, not therefore the only, because beloved. Although therefore Christ be the only begotten and the beloved Son of God, yet we must not look upon these two attributes as synonymous, or equally significant of the same thing, but as one depending on the other; his unigeniture being the foundation of his singular love. Beside, Isaac was called the only son of Abraham for some other reason than because he was singularly beloved of Abraham; for he was the only son of the free-woman, the only son of the promise made to Abraham, which was first this, *Sarah shall have a son*, and then, *In Isaac shall thy seed be called*. So that Isaac may well be called the only son of Abraham in reference to the promise, as the Apostle speaks expressly; *By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac, and he that had received the promises offered up his only-begotten son*. Avoiding therefore these two expositions, as far short of the true notion of the *only-begotten*; we must look upon it in the most proper, full, and significant sense, as signifying a Son so begotten as none other is, was, or can be: so as the term restrictive *only* shall have relation not only to the Father generating⁵⁴, but also to the Son begotten, and to the manner of the generation. It is true, the Father spake from heaven, saying, *Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*; and thereby we are to understand, that whosoever of us are beloved by the Father, are so beloved in and through the Son. In the same manner Christ

Gen. xviii.
14; xxi. 12.

Heb. xi. 17.

Mark. i. 11.

⁵⁴ Eunomius would have it only *παρὰ μόνου*, in relation to the Father only. St. Basil shews that no way proper, and shews that *μονογενής* is not he which *παρὰ μόνου* but *μόνος γεγέννηται*. St. Cyril of Alexandria adds these two *παρὰ μόνου* and *μόνος* together, in relation to the Father and the Son: *Μονογενής κατὰ φύσιν ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἀνόμασται λόγος, ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου γεγέννηται τοῦ πατρὸς*. *Epist. 1. ad Regin.* as Ruffinus doth in *unicus*: 'Ideo subjungit unicum hunc esse Filium Dei.—Unus enim de uno nascitur.' *Expos. Symb.* [§. 6. p. cciv.] St. Gregory Nazi-

anzen adds to these two a third, in respect of the manner: *Μονογενής δὲ, οὐχ ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου καὶ μόνου, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ μονοτρόπως, οὐχ ὡς τὰ σώματα*. [Orat. xxx. 20. p. 554 A.] So he something obscurely and corruptly, but plainly enough in Damascene, who aims often to deliver himself in the words of Nazianzen: *Λέγεται μονογενής, ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς μόνως ἐγενήθη; οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁμοιοῦται ἑτέρα γέννησις τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεννήσει, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄλλος υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*. [De Fide Orthod. i. 8. vol. i. p. 135 A.]

is the only-begotten Son of God; and as many of us as God hath bestowed his love upon, that we should be called the sons of God, are all brought into that near relation by our fellowship with him, who is by a far more near relation the natural and eternal Son.

Having thus declared* the interpretation of the word, that properly, as primogeniture consisteth in prelation, so unigeniture in exclusion; and that none can be strictly called the only-begotten, but he who alone is so begotten: we shall proceed to make good our assertion, shewing that the Divine essence was peculiarly communicated to the Word, by which he was begotten the Son of God, and never any was so begotten beside that Son.

140 And here we meet with two difficulties: one shewing that there were other sons of God said to be begotten of him, to whom either the Divine essence was communicated, and then the communication of that to the Word made him not the only-begotten; or it was not communicated, and then there is no such communication necessary to found such a filiation: the other, alleging that the same Divine essence may be communicated to another beside the Word, and not only that it may, but that it is so, to the person of the Holy Ghost; whence either the Holy Ghost must be the Son of God, and then the Word is not the only-begotten; or if he be not the Son, then is not the communication of the Divine essence a sufficient foundation of the relation of sonship. These two objections being answered, nothing will remain farther to demonstrate this last assertion.

For the first, we acknowledge that others are frequently called the Sons of God, and that we call the same God *our Father*, which Christ called his; that *both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren*: we confess that those whom St. Paul *hath begotten through the Gospel* may well be termed *the begotten of God, whose seed remaineth in them*⁵⁵: but withal,

* [In the first edition, it is cleared.]

⁵⁵ 'Ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα. 1 Cor. iv. 15. Πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει. 1 John iii. 9. And more expressly, 1 John v. 1. Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται. καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν γεννησάντα, ἀγαπᾷ οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει. Quisquis credit Jesum esse Christum illum, ex Deo

we affirm that this our regeneration is of a nature wholly different from the generation of the Son. We are first generated, and have our natural being⁵⁶; after that regenerated, and so receive a spiritual renovation, and by virtue thereof an inheritance incorruptible: whereas the generation of Christ admits no regeneration, he becoming at once thereby God, and Son, and Heir of all. The state of sonship which we come into is but of adoption, shewing the generation by which we are begotten to be but metaphorical: whereas Christ is so truly begotten, so properly the natural Son of God, that his generation clearly excludeth the name of adoption⁵⁷; and not

genitus est; et quisquis diligit eum qui genuit, diligit etiam eum qui ex eo genitus est.

⁵⁶ 'Nos genuit Deus ut filii ejus simus, quos fecerat ut homines essemus. Unicum autem genuit, non solum ut filius esset, quod Pater non est, sed etiam ut Deus esset, quod et Pater est.' *S. August. de Consensu Evang. lib. ii. cap. 3.* [§. 7. vol. iii. part 2. p. 30 A.] In the book of Celsus there was a Jew introduced speaking thus to Christ, *Εἰ τοῦτο λέγεις, ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος κατὰ θέλαν πρόνοιαν γεγωνῶς υἱὸς ἐστὶ Θεοῦ, τί ἂν σὺ ἄλλου διαφέρῃς;* who is thus answered by Origen; *Πρὸς τὸν ἐρωτῶμεν, ὅτι πᾶς μὲν ὁ, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος ἠνόμασε, μηκέτι ὑπὸ φόβου παιδαγωγούμενος, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτὸ τὸ καλὸν αἰρούμενος, υἱὸς ἐστὶ Θεοῦ· οὗτος δὲ πολλῶ καὶ μακρῶ διαφέρει παντὸς τοῦ διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν χρηματίζοντος υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅστις ὡσπερὲ πηγὴ τις καὶ ἀρχὴ τῶν τοιαύτων τυγχάνει.* *Orig. cont. Cels. lib. i.* [§. 57. p. 37 F.]

⁵⁷ First, it is most certain that the Word of God, as the Word, is not the adopted, but the natural, Son of God. 'Non est Dei Filius Deus falsus, nec Deus adoptivus, nec Deus connumeratus, sed Deus verus.' *S. Hilar. de Trin. lib. v. cap. 5.* [p. 857 D.] 'Hic etiam Filius Dei natura est Filius, non adoptione.' *Concil. Tolét. xi.* [Mansi xi. p. 133 C.] *Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ φύσει, καὶ οὐ θέσει, γεννηθεὶς ἐκ πατρὸς.* *S. Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. xi.* [§. 7. p. 152 A.] And again, *Οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν παρήγαγεν, οὐδὲ τὸν μὴ ὄντα εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ἤγαγεν· ἀλλ' αἰδιος ὢν ὁ πατήρ, αἰδιως ἐγένησε καὶ ἀνεκφράστως υἱὸν ἕνα μόνον, ἀδελφὸν οὐκ ἔχοντα.* [*Ibid.* §. 14. p.

156 A.] This hath been so generally confessed, that Felix and Elipandus, who were condemned for maintaining Christ as man to be the adopted Son of God, did acknowledge it, as appeareth by the beginning of their book. 'Confitemur et credimus Deum, Dei Filium, ante omnia tempora sine initio ex Patre genitum, coeternum et consubstantialem, non adoptione sed genere.' [Mansi xiii. p. 884 E.] Secondly, it is also certain, that the man Christ Jesus taken personally is the natural, not the adopted, Son of God: because the man Christ Jesus is no other person than the Word, who is the eternal and natural Son, and by subsisting in the human nature could not leave off to be the natural Son. The denial of this by Felix and Elipandus was condemned as heretical in the Council of Francford; [*Ibid.* p. 909 C.] and their opinion was thus expressed, partly in the words of St. Augustin, partly in their own additions. 'Confitemur et credimus eum factum ex muliere factum sub lege; non genere esse Filium Dei, sed adoptione, non natura, sed gratia.' [p. 885 A.] this they maintained by forged testimonies of some Fathers, and by the Liturgy of the Church of Toledo, composed by Hildephonsus, as the Roman by Gregory; in the Mass *de Cena Domini*, 'Qui per adoptivi hominis passionem dum suo non indulsit corpori.'—And in the Mass *de Ascensione Domini*, 'Hodie Salvator noster, per adoptionem carnis, sedem repetivit Deitatis.' [p. 886 C.] To this the Synod opposed their determination in *Sacrosyllabo*; 'Quod ex te nascetur sanctum vocabitur filius Dei,

only so, but when he becometh the Son of Man, even in his humanity refuseth the name of an adopted Son. For when the Gal. iv. 4, 5. fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law, (not that he, but) that we might receive the adoption of sons. He then whose generation is totally different from ours whom he calleth brethren; he whom in the sacred Scriptures the Spirit nameth the true Son, the Father sometimes his own, sometimes his beloved, but never his adopted⁵⁸ Son; he who by those proper and peculiar appellations is distinguished from us⁵⁹, who can claim no higher filiation than that which we receive by the privilege of adoption; he is truly the *only-begotten Son* of God, notwithstanding the same God hath begotten us by his Word; and the reason why he is so is, because the Divine essence was communicated unto him in his natural and eternal generation, whereas only the grace of God is conveyed unto us in our adoption. Indeed if we were begotten of the essence* of God as Christ was, or he were only by the grace of God adopted⁶⁰, as

non adoptivus sed verus, non alienus sed proprius.' And again; 'Porro adoptivus dici non potest, nisi is qui alienus est ab eo a quo dicitur adoptatus: et gratis ei adoptio tribuitur, quoniam non ex debito, sed ex indulgentia tantummodo adoptio præstatur: sicut nos aliquando cum essemus peccando filii iræ, alieni eramus a Deo, per proprium et verum Filium, qui non eguit adoptione, adoptio nobis filiorum donata est.' [p. 876.] And of this they give us the true ground in the Synodic Epistle; 'Unitas personæ quæ est in Dei filio et filio Virginis adoptionis tollit injuriam.' [p. 893 A.]

⁵⁸ 'Legi et relegi Scripturas, Jesum Filium Dei nusquam adoptione inveni.' *Ambrosiaster Com. in Ep. ad Rom.* 'Dices mihi, Cur times adoptivum Christum Dominum nominare? Dico tibi, quia nec Apostoli eum sic nominarunt, nec sancta Dei et Catholica Ecclesia consuetudinem habuit sic eum appellare. *Synod. Epist. Concil. Francoford.* [Mansi xiii. p. 895 B.] From whence they charge

all those to whom they write that Synodic Epistle, that they should be satisfied with such expressions as they found in the Scriptures; 'Intelligite, fratres, quæ legitis, et nolite nova et incognita nomina fingere, sed quæ in S. Scriptura inveniuntur tenete, &c.'

⁵⁹ St. Augustin hath observed, that St. Paul made use of *υἱοθεσία*, that he might distinguish the filiation of Christ from ours. 'Aut vero etiam nos, quibus dedit Deus potestatem filios ejus fieri, de natura atque substantia sua non nos genuit, sicut unicum Filium, sed utique dilectione adoptavit. Quo verbo Apostolus sæpe uti non ob aliud intelligitur, nisi ad discernendum Unigenitum.' *De Consensu Evang. lib. ii. cap. 3.* [§. 6. vol. iii. part 2. p. 29 C.] And St. Ambrose takes notice that the name of true destroyeth that of adopted: 'Adoptivum filium non dicimus filium esse natura, sed eum dicimus natura esse qui verus est filius.' *De Incarn. Sacr. cap. 8.* §. 87. [vol. ii. p. 723 A.]

⁶⁰ 'Si unicus, quomodo adoptivus,

* [In the first edition, it is *substantia*.]

† [The following texts may be quoted as proving Jesus Christ to be the begotten, and not the adopted, Son of God: John iii. 16—18. Rom. viii. 3. 32. Gal. iv. 4. Heb. iii. 5, 6. 1 John iv. 9.]

we are, then could he by no propriety of speech be called the *only Son*, by reason of so many brethren: but being we cannot aspire unto the first, nor he descend unto the latter, it remaineth we acknowledge him, notwithstanding the first difficulty, by virtue of his natural and peculiar generation, to be the *only-begotten Son*.

But though neither men nor angels be begotten of the substance of God, or by virtue of any such natural generation be called sons; yet one person we know, to whom the Divine essence is as truly and really communicated by the Father as to the Son, which is the third person in the blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost. Why then should the Word by that communication of the Divine essence become the Son, and not the Holy Ghost by the same? or if, by receiving the same nature, he also be the Son of God, how is the Word the *only Son*? To this I answer, That the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence from the Father which the Word receiveth, and thereby becometh the same God with the Father and the Word: but though the essence be the same which is communicated, yet there is a difference in the communication; the Word being God by generation, the Holy Ghost by procession: and though every thing which is begotten proceedeth, yet every thing which proceedeth is not begotten⁶¹. Wherefore in the language of the sacred Scriptures and the Church⁶², the Holy Ghost is never said to

dum multi sunt adoptivi filii? Unicus itaque de multis non potest dici.' *Concil. Francoford.* [Mansi xiii. p. 893 A.] 'Quod si etiam unigenitus Filius factus dicitur ex gratia, non vere genitus ex natura, proculdubio nomen et veritatem unigeniti perdidit, postquam fratres habere jam cepit: privatur enim hujus veritate nominis, si in unigenito non est de Patre veritas naturalis.' *Fulgent. ad Thrasim. lib. iii. cap. 3.* [p. 114.] 'Si divina illa Filii sempiternaque nativitas non de natura Dei Patris, sed ex gratia, creditur substituisse, non debet unigenitus vocari, sed tantummodo genitus. Quoniam sicut ei nomen geniti largitas adoptionis paternæ contribuit, sic eum ab unigeniti nomine nobis quoque tributa communio paternæ adoptionis exclusit. Unigenitus enim non vocatur, quamvis genitus possit vocari, cum genitis.' *Ibid. cap. 4.*

⁶¹ 'Non omne quod procedit nascitur,

quamvis omne procedat quod nascitur.' *S. August. cont. Maxim. lib. ii. cap. 14.* [§. 1. vol. viii. p. 703 D.] who gives the same solution to the same argument: 'Quæris a me, *Si de substantia Patris est Filius, de substantia Patris est etiam Spiritus Sanctus, cur unus Filius sit, et alius non sit Filius?* Ego respondeo, sive capias, sive non capias; De Patre est Filius, de Patre est Spiritus Sanctus, sed ille genitus, iste procedens.' [*Ibid.*] Πολλῶ τοῦτου πιθανώτερον, τὸ φάναι ἐξ ἐκείνου γε τοῦ ἀγεννήτου φύσαι τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸ πανάγιον πνεῦμα τὸν μὲν, ὡς λόγον, ἐκ τοῦ νοῦ γεννώμενον· τὸ δὲ, ὡς πνεῦμα, ἐκπορευόμενον· ἐμπρόδεισι γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ τὸ πνεῦμα, οὐ συγγενώμενον, ἀλλὰ ξυὸν καὶ παρομαρτοῦν, καὶ ἐκπορευόμενον. *Theodoret. Serm. ii.* [vol. iv. p. 504 B.]

⁶² 'Nunquam fuit non Pater, a quo Filius natus, a quo Spiritus Sanctus non natus, quia non est Filius.' *Genad. de Eccles. Dogm.* [c. i. p. 75 A.]

be begotten, but to proceed from the Father; nor is he ever called the Son, but the gift of God. Eve was produced out of Adam, and in the same nature with him, and yet was not born of him, nor was she truly the daughter of Adam: whereas Seth proceeding from the same person, in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and properly the Son of Adam. And this difference was not in the nature produced, but in the manner of production; Eve descending not from Adam as Seth did, by way of generation, that is, by natural fecundity. The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father in the same nature with him, the Word proceedeth from the same person in the same similitude of nature also; but the Word proceeding is the Son, the Holy Ghost is not, because the first procession is by way of generation, the other is not. As therefore the regeneration and adoption of man, so the procession of the Holy Ghost doth no way prejudice the eternal generation, as pertaining solely to the Son of God.

Seeing then our Saviour Jesus Christ had a real being and existence before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary; seeing the being which he had antecedently to that conception was not any created, but the one and indivisible Divine essence; seeing he had not that Divinity of himself originally, as the Father, but by communication from him; seeing the communication of the same essence unto him was a proper generation; we cannot but believe that the same Jesus Christ is the begotten Son of God: and seeing the same essence was never so by way of generation communicated unto any⁶³, we must also acknowledge him the *only-begotten*, distinguished from the Holy Ghost, as Son; from the adopted children, as the natural Son.

The necessity of the belief of this part of the Article, that Jesus Christ is the proper and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father, and by that singular way of generation the *only Son*, appeareth first in the confirmation of our faith concerning the redemption of mankind. For this doth shew such an excellency and dignity in the person of the Mediator,

'Deus Pater innascibilis non ex aliquo, Deus Filius unigenitus ex aliquo hoc est, ex Patre, Spiritus Sanctus innascibilis ex aliquo, hoc est, ex Patre.' *Isaac. lib. Fidei.* [Galland. vii. p. 597 B.] 'Quod neque natum neque factum est, Spiritus Sanctus est, qui a Patre et Filio

procedit,' *S. Ambros. in Symb.* [sive de Trinitate, c. 3. vol. ii. App. p. 323 A.]

⁶³ 'Ὡς μὲν οὖν υἱὸς, φυσικῶς κέκτηται τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς· ὡς δὲ μονογενὴς, ὅλα ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ συλλαβῶν, οὐδεὶς καταμεριζόμενος πρὸς ἕτερον.' *S. Basil. Homil. de Fide.* [§. 2. vol. ii. p. 132 B.]

as will assure us of an infinite efficacy in his actions, and value in his sufferings. We know *it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins*: and we may very well doubt how the blood of him, who hath no other nature than that of man, can take away the sins of other men; there appearing no such difference as will shew a certainty in the one, and an impossibility in the other. But since we may be *bought with a price*, well may we believe the blood of Christ sufficiently *precious*, when we are assured that it is the *blood of God*: nor can we question the efficacy of it in *purg[ing] our conscience from dead works*, if we believe *Christ offered up himself through the eternal Spirit*. If we be truly sensible of our sins, we must acknowledge that in every one we have offended God; and the gravity of every offence must needs increase proportionably to the dignity of the party offended in respect of the offender; because the more worthy any person is, the more reverence is due unto him, and every injury tendeth to his dishonour: but between God and man there is an infinite disproportion; and therefore every offence committed against him must be esteemed as in the highest degree of injury. Again, as the gravity of the offence beareth proportion to the person offended; so the value of reparation ariseth from the dignity of the person satisfying; because the satisfaction consisteth in a reparation of that honour which by the injury was eclipsed; and all honour doth increase proportionably as the person yielding it is honourable. If then by every sin we have offended God, who is of infinite eminency, according unto which the injury is aggravated; how shall we ever be secure of our reconciliation unto God, except the person who hath undertaken to make the reparation be of the same infinite dignity, so as the honour rendered by his obedience may prove proportionable to the offence and that dishonour which arose from our disobedience? This scruple is no otherwise to be satisfied than by a belief in such a Mediator as is the only-begotten Son of God, of the same substance with the Father, and consequently of the same power and dignity with the God whom by our sins we have offended.

Secondly, the belief of the eternal generation of the Son, by which he is the same God with the Father, is necessary for the confirming and encouraging a Christian in ascribing that honour and glory unto Christ which is due unto him. For we are commanded to give that worship unto the Son, which is truly and

properly Divine; the same which we give unto God the Father, who hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. As it was represented to St. John in a vision, when he heard every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, saying, Blessing, honour, glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Again, we are commanded to fear the Lord our God, and to serve him⁶⁴; and that with such an emphasis, as by him we are to understand him alone, because the Lord our God is one Lord. From whence, if any one arose among the Jews, teaching under the title of a prophet to worship any other beside him for God, the judgment of the Rabbins was, that notwithstanding all the miracles which he could work, though they were as great as Moses wrought, he ought immediately to be strangled, because the evidence of this truth, that one God only must be worshipped, is above all evidence of sense. Nor must we look upon this precept as valid only under the Law, as if then there were only one God to be worshipped, but since the Gospel we had another; for our Saviour hath commended it to our observation, by making use of it against the Devil in his temptation, saying, *Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*. If then we be obliged to worship the God of Israel only, if we be also commanded to give the same worship to the Son which we give to him; it is necessary that we should believe that the Son is the God of Israel. When the Scripture bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, it saith, *Let all the angels of God worship him*; but then the same Scripture calleth that first-begotten *Jehovah*⁶⁵, and the Lord of the whole earth. For a man to worship that for God which is not God, knowing that it is not God, is affected and gross idolatry: to worship that as God which is not God, thinking that it is God, is not in the same degree, but the same sin: to worship him as God who is God, thinking that he is not God, cannot be

⁶⁴ The emphasis appears in this, that it is not barely והעבודו *et servies ei*, but והעבוד והואו תעבוד *et ipsi servies*, with such a peculiar restriction as is expressed by the Chaldee Paraph. והקדמותיהוה *et in conspectu ejus servies*; by the LXX. καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις: and that re-

striction approved by our Saviour, Matt. iv. 10.

⁶⁵ Εὖ δὲ μὴ μονοθεῖς ἐστίν, ὡς περ οὖν ἐστίν, οὐδεμίαν ἕρα ἔχει πρὸς τὰ κτιστὰ κωνανίαν. Theodoret. Hæret. Fab. lib. v. cap. 2. [vol. iv. p. 253 C.]

1 Cor. vi.
20; vii. 23;
1 Pet. i. 19.
Acts xx. 28.
Heb. ix. 14.

John v. 22.
23.
Rev. v. 13.

Deut. x. 20.

Deut. vi. 4.

Moses
Maim.
Præf. in
Seder Ze-
raim.

Matt. iv.

10.

Heb. i. 6.

Ps. xcvi. 5.

thought an act in the formality void of idolatry. Lest therefore, while we are all obliged to give unto him Divine worship, we should fall into that sin which of all others we ought most to abhor, it is no less than necessary that we should believe that Son to be that eternal God, whom we are bound to worship, and whom only we should serve.

Thirdly, Our belief in Christ as the eternal Son of God is necessary to raise us unto a thankful acknowledgment of the infinite love of God, appearing in the sending of his only-begotten Son into the world to die for sinners. This love of
 John iii. 16. God is frequently extolled and admired by the Apostles. *God so loved the world, saith St. John, that he gave his only-begotten*
 Rom. v. 8. *Son. God commendeth his love towards us, saith St. Paul, in that*
 viii. 32. *while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us; in that he spared*
 I John iv. *not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. In this, saith*
 9, 10. *St. John again, was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.* If we look upon all this as nothing else, but that God should cause a man to be born after another manner than other men, and when he was so born after a peculiar manner, yet a mortal man, should deliver him to die for the sins of the world; I see no such great expression of his love in this way of redemption, more than would have appeared if he had redeemed us any other way. It is true indeed, that the reparation of lapsed man is no act of absolute necessity in respect of God, but that he hath as freely designed our redemption as our creation; and 144 considering the misery from which we are redeemed, and the happiness to which we are invited, we cannot but acknowledge the singular love of God, even in the act of redemption itself; but yet the Apostles have raised that consideration higher, and placed the choicest mark of the love of God in the choosing such means, and performing in that manner our reparation, by sending his only-begotten into the world; by not sparing his own Son; by giving and delivering him up to be scourged and crucified for us: and the estimation of this act of God's love must necessarily increase proportionably to the dignity of the Son so sent into the world; because the more worthy the person of Christ before he suffered, the greater his condescension unto such a suffering condition; and the nearer his relation to the

Father, the greater his love to us for whose sakes he sent him so to suffer. Wherefore to derogate any way from the dignity of the person and nature of our Saviour before he suffered, is so far to undervalue the love of God, and consequently to come short of that acknowledgment and thanksgiving which is due unto him for it. If then the sending of Christ into the world were the highest act of the love of God which could be expressed; if we be obliged unto a return of thankfulness some way correspondent to such infinite love; if such a return can never be made without a true sense of that infinity, and a sense of that infinity of love cannot consist without an apprehension of an infinite dignity of nature in the person sent; then it is absolutely necessary to believe that Christ is so the only-begotten Son of the Father, as to be of the same substance with him, of glory equal, of majesty co-eternal.

By this discourse in way of explication every Christian may understand what it is he says, and express his mind how he would be understood, when he maketh this brief confession, I believe in Christ *the only Son* of God. For by these words he must be thought to intend no less than this; I do profess to be fully assured of this assertion as of a most certain, infallible, and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Messias, is the true, proper, and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father; which being incapable of division or multiplication, is so really and totally communicated to him, that he is of the same essence with him, *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God.* And as I assert him so to be the Son, so do I also exclude all other persons from that kind of sonship, acknowledging none but him to be begotten of God by that proper and natural generation: and thereby excluding all which are not begotten, as it is a generation; all which are said to be begotten, and are called sons, but are so only by adoption, as it is natural. And thus I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his only Son.

Our Lord.

AFTER our Saviour's relation founded upon his eternal generation, followeth his dominion in all ancient Creeds⁶⁶, as

⁶⁶ For though in the first rules of in all the Creeds afterward we find faith mentioned by Irenæus and Tertul- those words; probably inserted because lian we find not *Dominum nostrum*, yet denied by the Valentinians, of whom

the necessary consequent of his filiation. For as we believe him to be the Son of God, so must we acknowledge him to be *our Lord*, because the only Son must of necessity be heir and Lord of all in his Father's house; and all others which bear the name of sons, whether they be men or angels, if compared to him, must not be looked upon as sons of God, but as servants of Christ.

Three things are necessary, and more cannot be, for a plenary 145 explication of this part of the Article. First, the proper notation of the word *Lord* in the Scripture-phrase, or language of the Holy Ghost: Secondly, the full signification of the same in the adequate latitude of the sense, as it belongs to Christ: Thirdly, the application of it to the person making confession of his faith, and all others whom he involves in the same condition with himself, as saying, not *my*, nor *their*, but *our Lord*.

First then, we must observe that not only Christ is *the Lord*, but that this title doth so properly belong unto him, that *the Lord* alone absolutely taken is frequently used by the Evangelists and Apostles^a determinately for *Christ*, insomuch that the angels observe that dialect^b, *Come, see the place where the Lord lay*. Now for the true notation of the word, it will not be so necessary to inquire into the use or origination of the Greek⁶⁷, much less into the etymology of the correspondent

^a Mark xvi. 19, 20. Luke xii. 42. xxiv. 34. John iv. i. vi. 23. xi. 2. xx. 2, 18, 20, 25. xxi. 7. Acts ix. 1, 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 27, 31, 42. xi. 16, 24. xiii. 47. &c. Κύριος. ^b Matt. xxviii. 6.

Irenæus, Διὰ τοῦτο τὸν Σωτῆρα λέγουσι, οὐδὲ γὰρ Κύριον ὀνομάζειν αὐτὸν θέλουσι. *lib. i. cap. i.* [§. 3. p. 7.]

67 For whosoever shall consider the signification of *Kýrios* in the Scriptures, I think he will scarce find any footsteps of the same in the ancient Greeks. In our sacred Writ it is the frequent name of God; whereas I imagine it is not to be found so used by any of the old Greek authors. Julius Pollux, whose business is to observe what words and phrases may be properly made use of in that language, tells us the gods may be called Θεοί or Δαίμονες, but mentions not *Kýrios*, as neither proper, nor any name of God with them at all. Nor did they anciently use it in their œconomics; where their constant terms were, not *kýrios*, but δεσπότης and δούλος, and they had then another kind of notion of

it, as appears by the complaint of the servant in Aristophanes:

Τοῦ σώματος γὰρ οὐκ ἐγὼ τὸν κύριον
Κρατεῖν ὁ δαίμων, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐωνημένον.
Plut. v. 7.

In which words, if they were interpreted by the Scripture usage, *kýrios* would signify *the master*, and *ἐωνημένος* the person *bought*, that is, the servant; whereas the place requires an interpretation wholly contrary; for *ἐωνημένος* is not here ἡγορασμένος, but ἀγοράσας, or ἀνησάμενος, as the Scholiast, Suidas, and Moschopolus have observed, that is, not the servant, but the master who bought him. And though those grammarians bring no other place to prove this active signification beside this of Aristophanes, by which means it might be still questionable whether they had rightly interpreted him without any au-

Latin, as to search into the notion of the Jews, and the language of the Scriptures, according unto which the Evangelists and Apostles spake and wrote.

And first, it cannot be denied but that the word, which we translate *the Lord*, was used by the interpreters of the Old Testament sometimes for men⁶⁸, with no relation unto any other than human dominion. And as it was by the translators of the Old, so is it also by the penmen of the New⁶⁹. But it is most

thority; yet Phrynicus will sufficiently secure us of this sense. *Ετυχον ἐωνημένος οἰκίαν ἢ ἀγρόν. ἐνταῦθα οὐδὲν ἐγγωρεῖ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πριάσθαι, μένει τὸ ἐωνημένος δόκιμον. *Εωνημένος then here is he which buyeth, that is, the master; and consequently *kýrios* not the master, but the servant bought, whom he supposeth originally to have power over his own body. Indeed it was not only distinguished, but in a manner opposed to δεσπότης, as appears by that observation of Ammonius, thus delivered by Eustathius in *Odys. ζ.* [v. 146.] Κύριος γυναικὸς καὶ νιῶν ἀνῆρ καὶ πατῆρ· δεσπότης δὲ ἀργυρωμένων.

68 As ἰντα is generally translated *kýrios* when it signifieth *lord* or *master* in respect of a servant or inferior. So Sarah called her husband, Gen. xviii. 12. 1 Pet. iii. 6. so Eliezer his master Abraham, Gen. xxiv. frequently. Thus Rachel saluteth her father Laban, Gen. xxxi. 35. and Jacob his brother Esau, Gen. xxxiii. 8. Potiphar is the *kýrios* of Joseph whom he bought, Gen. xxxix. 2, &c. and Joseph in power is so saluted by his brethren, Gen. xlii. 10. and acknowledged by his servant, xlii. 5. The general name in the Law of Moses for *servant* and *master* is παῖς and *kýrios*, Exod. xxi. 2, 4. It is indeed so plain that the ancient Jews used this word to signify no more than human power, that we find ἰντα the name of man so translated, as 1 Sam. xvii. 32. מִן עַלְיָו מִן אֲדָמָה לֵב מִי דָּהּ שׁוּמְפֵסֶטָו קַרְדִּיָּא תוֹד קַרְדִּיָּו מוֹן עַן אֲדָמָה.

69 For *kýrios* is used with relation, and in opposition, to παιδίσκη, Acts xvi. 16. in the sense in which the later, not the ancient, Greeks used it: Παιδίσκη, τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείης οἱ νῦν τιθέασιν οἱ δὲ ἀρχαῖοι ἐπὶ τῆς νεάνιδος, as Phrynicus observes. As it is op-

posed to οἰκέτης, Luke xvi. 13. (according to that of *Etymol.* Κύριος τῶν πρὸς τὴ ἐστίν, ἔχει δὲ πρὸς τὸν οἰκέτην) το δούλος, Matt. x. 24. xviii. 25, &c. and in the Apostolical rules pertaining to Christian œconomics, the master and servant are δούλος and *kýrios*. As also by way of addition, *kýrios τοῦ θερισμοῦ*. Matt. ix. 38. *kýrios τοῦ ἀμπελώου*. Matt. xx. 8. *kýrios τῆς οἰκίας*. Mark xiii. 35. inasmuch as *kýrie* is sometimes used by way of address or salutation of one man to another, (as it is now generally among the later Greeks, and as *dominus* was anciently among the Latins; 'Quomodo obvios, si nomen non occurrat, Dominos salutamus.' *Sen. Ep. iii.*) not only of servants to masters, as Matt. xiii. 27. or sons to parents, as Matt. xxi. 30. or inferiors to men in authority, as Matt. xxvii. 63. but of strangers; as when the Greeks spake to Philip, and desired him, saying, *Kýrie, θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν*. John xii. 21. and Mary Magdalen speaking unto Christ, but taking him for a gardener, *Kýrie, εἰ σὺ ἐβάστασας αὐτόν*. John xx. 15. And it cannot be denied but that this title was sometimes given to our Saviour himself in no higher or other sense than this: as when the Samaritan woman saw him alone at the well, and knew no more of him than that he appeared to be one of the Jews, she said, *Kýrie, οὔτε ἔντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ*. John iv. 11; and the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda, when he wist not who it was, said unto him, *Kýrie, ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω*. John v. 7; the blind man, to whom he had restored his sight, with the same salutation maketh confession of his ignorance, and his faith, *Τίς ἐστι, κύριε*; and Πιστεύω, *κύριε*. John ix. 36, 38.

certain that Christ is called Lord, in another notion than that which signifies any kind of human dominion; because, as so, 1 Cor. viii. 5; there are many lords, but he is in that notion Lord which admits ver. 6. and Eph. iv. 5. of no more than one. They are only masters according to the Col. iii. 22. flesh; he the Lord of glory, the Lord from heaven, King of kings, 1 Cor. ii. 8. and Lord of all other lords. xv. 47. Rev. xix. 16.

Nor is it difficult to find that name amongst the books of the Law in the most high and full signification; for it is most frequently used as the name of the supreme God, sometimes for *El* or *Elohim*, sometimes for *Shaddai* or the *Rock*, often for *Adonai*, and most universally for *Jehovah*, the undoubted proper name of God, and that to which the Greek translators, long before our Saviour's birth, had most appropriated the name of Lord, not only by way of explication, but distinction and particular expression. As when we read, *Thou whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high in all the earth*: and when God so expresseth himself, *I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty: but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them*. In both these places, for the name *Jehovah*, the Greek translation, which the Apostles followed, hath no other name but *Lord*; and therefore undoubtedly by that word which we translate *the Lord*⁷⁰ did they

⁷⁰ I know it is the vulgar opinion, that *Kúrios* properly answereth unto *אֲדֹנָי*, and the reason why it was also used for *יהוה*, is no other than because the Jews were wont to read *Adonai* in the place of *Jehovah*. Of which observation they make great use who deny the divinity of Christ. 'Quia enim *Adonai* pro *Jehovah* in lectione Hebræorum verborum substitui consuevit, ideo illius etiam interpretatio huic accommodatur.' says Crellius *de Deo et Attrib.* cap. 14. [vol. iv. p. 35.] But first it is not probable that the LXX. should think *Kúrios* to be the proper interpretation of *אֲדֹנָי*, and give to it *Jehovah* only in the place of *Adonai*; for if they had, it would have followed, that where *Adonai* and *Jehovah* had met together in one sentence, they would not have put another word for *Adonai*, to which *Kúrios* was proper, and place *Kúrios* for *Jehovah*, to whom of itself (according to their observation) it did not belong. Whereas we read not only *יהוה אֲדֹנָי* translated *Δεσ-*

ποτα Κúριε. Gen. xv. 2, 8. and *הַאֲדֹנָי יְהוה צְבָאוֹת* 'Ο δεσπότης *Kúrios* *Σαβαώθ*. Isa. i. 24. but also *יהוה אֲדֹנָי קְדוֹם* *Kúrios* *τὸ ἅγιον*. Nehem. x. 29. Secondly, the reason of this assertion is most uncertain; for though it be confessed that the Masoreths did read *אֲדֹנָי* where they found *יהוה* and Josephus before them expresses the sense of the Jews of his age, that the *τετραγράμματον* was not to be pronounced, and before him Philo speaks as much; yet it followeth not from thence, that the Jews were so superstitious above 300 years before; which must be proved before we can be assured that the LXX. read *Adonai* for *Jehovah*, and for that reason translated it *Kúrios*. Thirdly, as we know no reason why the Jews should so confound the names of God, so were it now very irrational in some places to read *יהוה אֲדֹנָי* as when God saith, Exod. vi. 3. *I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of the Lord* ὃς ἐστὶν ὄνομα αἰώνιον. Exod. iii. 15. whosoever thinks *Kúrios* stands for *Adonai* does injury to the translators; and whosoever readeth *Adonai* for *Jehovah* puts a force upon the text. As also when the prophet David saith, *That men may know that thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the Most High over all the earth*. Ps. lxxxiii. 18. I confess the ancient Fathers did, together with the Jews, read *Adonai* for *Jehovah* in the Hebrew text; as appeareth by those words of Euphrasianus *de Ponderibus* [§. 6. p. 163 D.] *Ἄδωναι ἡλιγά, καρθί, ισμαήλ, ιεββιτὰ ἀκάλ* which very corruptly represent part of the first verse of the 141st Psalm, *יהוה קראתך חושה לי האוינה קולי* but plainly enough render *יהוה אֲדֹנָי*. Notwithstanding it is very observable, that they were wont to distinguish *Kúrios* in the Greek translations, where it stood for *Jehovah*, from *Kúrios*, where it stood for *Adonai*; and that was done by adding in the margin the *tetragrammaton* itself, *יהוה*, which, by the ignorance of the Greek scribes, who understood not the Hebrew characters, was converted into four Greek letters, and so made a word of no signification, ΠΙΠΙ. This is still extant in the copy

understand the proper name of God, *Jehovah*: and had they placed it there as the exposition of any other name of God, they had made an interpretation contrary to the manifest intention of the Spirit: for it cannot be denied but God was known to Abraham by the true importance of the title *Adonai*, as much

vulgar translation render it, *In Deo omnipotente, et nomen meum Adonai non indicavi eis*, and thereby make an apparent sense no way congruous to the intended importance of the Holy Ghost (for it cannot be imagined either that God should not be known to Abraham by the name *Adonai*, or that it were any thing to the present intendment, which was to encourage Moses and the Israelites, by the interpretation of the name *Jehovah*); yet we have no reason to believe that the LXX. made any such heterogeneous translation, where we read *Kal τὸ ὄνομα μου Κúrios οὐκ ἐδήλωσα αὐτοῖς*. Thus again, where God speaks unto Moses, *Ὁὖτως ἐπέειπεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ, Κúrios ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἀπέσταλκε με πρὸς ὑμᾶς, τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν ὄνομα αἰώνιον*. Exod. iii. 15. whosoever thinks *Kúrios* stands for *Adonai* does injury to the translators; and whosoever readeth *Adonai* for *Jehovah* puts a force upon the text. As also when the prophet David saith, *That men may know that thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the Most High over all the earth*. Ps. lxxxiii. 18. I confess the ancient Fathers did, together with the Jews, read *Adonai* for *Jehovah* in the Hebrew text; as appeareth by those words of Euphrasianus *de Ponderibus* [§. 6. p. 163 D.] *Ἄδωναι ἡλιγά, καρθί, ισμαήλ, ιεββιτὰ ἀκάλ* which very corruptly represent part of the first verse of the 141st Psalm, *יהוה קראתך חושה לי האוינה קולי* but plainly enough render *יהוה אֲדֹנָי*. Notwithstanding it is very observable, that they were wont to distinguish *Kúrios* in the Greek translations, where it stood for *Jehovah*, from *Kúrios*, where it stood for *Adonai*; and that was done by adding in the margin the *tetragrammaton* itself, *יהוה*, which, by the ignorance of the Greek scribes, who understood not the Hebrew characters, was converted into four Greek letters, and so made a word of no signification, ΠΙΠΙ. This is still extant in the copy

of the text of Isaiah printed by Curtearius with the Commentary of Procopius, and St. Jerom gives an account of it in the Greek copies of his age; 'Nomen *τετραγράμματον*, quod *ἀνεκφώνητον*, id est, ineffabile putaverunt, quod his literis scribitur, *jod ἡ he tau ἡ he*; quod quidam non intelligentes, propter elementorum similitudinem, cum in Græcis libris repererint, *Πίπι* legere consueverunt.' *Epist.* 136. [Ep. xxv. vol. i. p. 129 C.] Neither did the Greeks only place this ΠΙΠΙ in the margin of their translations, but when they described the Hebrew text in Greek characters, they used the same ΠΙΠΙ for *יהוה*, and consequently did not read *Adonai* for *Jehovah*. An example of this is to be found in that excellent copy of the prophets according to the LXX., collated with the rest of the translators, in the library of the most eminent Cardinal Barberini; where at the 13th verse of the 2d chapter of Malachi these words are written after the translation of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, out of the Hebrew text, after the manner of Origen's Hexapla, of which there is an excellent example in that MS. *Ὁὖζωθ, σρηθ, θεσου, χεσσουθ, δεμα, ἐθμαζβην, (1. βηκ) πιοι, βεχι, ουανακα, μηην, ωδ, φεννωθ, ελ, αμμανα, ουλακεθ, ρακαν, μειδιχηεμ*, which are a very proper expression of these following Hebrew words, according to the punctuation and reading of that age, *יהוה שינה העשו כמות דמעה אחימונה ויהוה בני ונאקה מאין עור פות אלהמכחה יהוה בני ויקחה רצון מירוכ*: By which it is evident that Origen in his Hexapla, from whence undoubtedly that ancient Scholiast took his various translations, did not read *Ἄδωναι* in that place; but kept the Hebrew characters, which they who understood them not formed into those Greek letters *πιοι*. And certainly the preserving of the name *Jehovah* in the Greek translations was very ancient, for it was described in some of them with the ancient characters, as

Ps. lxxxiii. 18.

Exod. vi. 3.

as by the name of *Shaddai*; as much by his dominion and sovereignty, as by his power and all-sufficiency; but by any experimental and personal sense of the fulfilling of his promises, 147 his name *Jehovah* was not known unto him: for though God spake expressly unto Abraham, *All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever*; yet the history teacheth us, and St. Stephen confirmeth us, that *he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on, though he promised that he would give it to him for a possession*. Wherefore when God saith he was not known to Abraham by his name *Jehovah*, the interpretation of no other name can make good that expression: and therefore we have reason to believe the word which the first Greek translators, and after them the Apostles, used, may be appropriated to that notion which the original requires; as indeed it may, being derived from a verb of the same signification with the Hebrew root⁷¹, and so

St. Jerom testifieth; 'Et nomen Domini tetragrammaton in quibusdam Græcis voluminibus usque hodie antiquis expressum literis invenimus.' *Epist.* 106. Being then we cannot be assured that the LXX. read יהוה; being they have used Κύριος for *Jehovah*, when they have made use of the general word Θεός for *Adonai*; being in some places *Adonai* cannot be read for *Jehovah*, without manifest violence offered to the text; it followeth, that it is no way probable that Κύριος should therefore be used for *Jehovah*, because it was taken for the proper signification of *Adonai*.

71 It is acknowledged by all that יהוה is from הוה or הוה, and God's own interpretation proves no less, יהוה יהוה Exod. iii. 14. and though some contend that futurity is essential to the name, yet all agree the root signifieth nothing but essence or existence, that is, τὸ εἶναι, or ὑπάρχειν. Now as from הוה in the Hebrew יהוה, so in the Greek ἀπὸ τοῦ κύρειν, Κύριος. And what the proper signification of κύρειν is, no man can teach us better than Hesychius, in whom we read κύρει, ὑπάρχει, τυγχάνει. κύρω prima longa, κύρω prima brevi. *Sophocles. Œdip. Colon.* v. 1158:

——— Παρ' ᾧ

Θύων ἔκυρον

Schol. Θύων ἔκυρον, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκύρου,

ταῦτ' ὃν δὲ τῷ ἐτύχωνον. Hence was κύροι by the Attics used for ἔστω sit: so I take it from the words of the Scholiast upon Sophocles, [Ajax, 314.] Τὸ κύρω περισσώμενος φησὶν ἢ συνήθεια καὶ Ἀττικοί, ἐν δὲ ἐκτικαῖς βαρύνουσι αὐτὸ Ἀττικοί μετὰ ἐκτάσεως τοῦ υ, κύροι λέγοντες ἀπὸ τοῦ κυροῖν. Not that they used it by an apocope, taking η from κυροῖν, but that κύροι was taken in the sense of κυροῖν or κυροῖτο, from κύρω, ὑπάρχω, κύροι, εἶη or ὑπάρχοι, as the Scholiast upon those words of Sophocles, *Elect.* v. 849.

Δειλαία δειλαίων κυρεῖς,

Κυρεῖς, ἤγουν ὑπάρχεις. Neither know I better how to render κυρεῖς than by ὑπάρχεις in that place of Æschylus's Prometheus, v. 330;

Ζηλῶ σ' ἰδοῦναι ἐκτὸς αἰτίας κυρεῖς;

Πάντων μετασχὼν καὶ τετολημῶς ἔμοι. As the Arundelian Scholiast upon the *Septem Thebana*, κυρεῖ, ὑπάρχει, and in the same tragedy, ἐπ' ἀσπίδος κυρεῖ, is rendered by the more ancient Scholiast, εἶναι ἐπὶ τῆς ἀσπίδος, as in the *Persæ*, σεσωσμένος κυρεῖ, is by the same interpreter explained κυρεῖ καὶ ὑπάρχει σεσωσμένος. So the same poet in his Agamemnon, v. 1379:

Ταύτην ἐπαινεῖν πάντοθεν πληθύνομαι,

Τρανῶς Ἀτρείδην εἰδέναι κυροῦνθ' ὅπως.

Which the Scholiast renders thus, Ἐπαινοῦμαι διαφόρως ταύτην γνάμην, τὸ μαθεῖν

denoting the essence or existence of God, and whatsoever else may be deduced from thence, as revealed by him to be signified thereby.

ἐν οἷς ἐστὶ καταστάσει ὁ βασιλεύς. And no other sense can be imagined of that verse in Sophocles, *Œdip. Tyrann.* v. 362,

Φρονεῖ σε φημὶ τάνδρος οὗ ζητεῖς κυρεῖν, than by rendering it εἶναι or ὑπάρχειν and *Œdip. Colon.* v. 726,

——— Καὶ γὰρ εἰ γέρων κυρῶ,

Τὸ τῆσδε χάρας οὐ γεγήρακε σθένος and, *Philoct.* v. 899,

'Ἄλλ' ἐνθάδ' ἤδη τοῦδε τοῦ πάθους κυρῶ or of that in Euripides, *Rhœnissæ*, v. 1074,

Ὡς, τίς ἐν πύλαισι δαμάτων κυρεῖ;

This original interpretation appeareth farther in the frequent use of κυρέω for τυγχάνω, as it signifieth no more than *vult*: as in Sophocles, *εὐθύνων κυρεῖς* for *εὐθύνεις*, *μισῶν κυρῆς* for *μισῆς*, *ἐπεικάζων κυρῶ* for *ἐπεικάζω*, *ὄν κυρεῖς* for *εἶς*, *ἐξείδω* *κυρῶ* for *ἐξείδα*, *κυρῶ* *λεύσσω* for *λεύσσω*, *δρῶν κυρεῖς* for *δρῶς*, *ἠπατημένους κυρῶ* for *ἠπάτημαι*, *εἰρηκῶς κυρεῖ* for *εἰρηκεν*, *εἰπῶν κυρεῖς* for *εἶπας*, *ἐκείρε* *ζῶσα* for *ἔζη*, and in Euripides, *ἔχων κυρεῖ* for *ἔχει*, *εἰσβαίνουσα κυρεῖ* for *εἰσβαίνει*, *ἠδικημένη κυρῆ* for *ἀδικῆται*, or *ἀδικηθῆ*, as the Scholiast. From all which it undeniably appeareth, that the ancient signification of κύρω or κυρῶ is the same with εἶμι, or ὑπάρχω, *vult*, *I am*: (which is much confirmed by that it was anciently observed to be a verb transitive, as it was used by the forementioned author, *Κυρῶ συζυγίας πρώτης τῶν περισσώμενων*, τὸ περιτυγχάνω ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπάρχω κατὰ τοὺς τραγικοὺς ἀμετάβατον. So an ancient Lexicon;) and therefore Κύριος immediately derived from thence must be ὁ ὢν, or ὁ ὑπάρχων; and consequently the proper interpretation of יהוה descending from the root הוה of the same signification. And well may we conceive the LXX. for this reason to have so translated it, because we find the origination delivered by them in that notion, rendering יהוה ὁ ὢν, Exod. iii. 14. 'Εγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, and again, ὁ ὢν ἀπέσταλκέ με πρὸς ὑμᾶς. From whence considering the name יהוה proceeding from that root, and given in relation to that sense, they made use of

the word Κύριος for the standing interpretation of that name, as being equivalent to ὁ ὢν. We have no reason then to conceive either that they so translated it out of the superstition of the Jews, (as some would persuade us, whom we have already refuted,) or because they had no letters in the Greek language by which they could express the Hebrew name, whereas we find it often expressed even among the Gentile Greeks; but because they thought the Greek Κύριος to be a proper interpretation, as being reducible to the same signification. For even they which are pretended to have read *Adonai* for *Jehovah*, as Origen, &c. do acknowledge that the heathens and the ancient heretics descending from the Jews had a name by which they did express the Hebrew *Jehovah*. We know that oracle preserved by Macrobius, *Saturnal. lib. i. cap. 18.*

Φράξο τὸν πάντων ὑπατον θεὸν ἔμμεν Ἰαῶ.

And Diodorus hath taught us from whence that name first came, mentioning Moses in this manner, Παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις Μωσῆν τὸν Ἰαῶ ἐπικαλούμενον Θεῶν and Theodoret more expressly, *Quæst. 15. in Exod.* [vol. i. p. 86 B.] Καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ Σαμαρείται μὲν Ἰαβὲ, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ Ἰαῶ. Porphyrius, *lib. iv. cont. Christian.* tells us, Sanchoniathon had his relations of the Jews παρὰ Ἱερομβάλου τοῦ ἱερέως Θεοῦ τοῦ Ἰεῦῶ. Eusebius (as we formerly mentioned) said, Ἰωσουὲ ἐστιν Ἰαῶ σωτηρία. [Dem. *Evang. iv. 17.*] Hesychius, Ἰαῶθαιμ, Ἰαῶ συντέλεια, taking ἰω in composition for the contraction of Ἰαῶ. As Ἰωνὰς ἐρμηνεύεται, ὑψίστου ποιοῦντος. And the LXX., Jer. xxiii. 6. have rendered יְהוָה יהוה Ἰωσεδέκ, id est, *Dominus justus*, saith St. Jerom. And as the heathens and the first Christians, so the heretics had among them the pronunciation and expression of the name יהוה. As the Valentinian was baptized ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰαῶ. *Iren. lib. i. [c. xxi. §. 3. p. 96.]* and the Ophiani had their several gods, among the rest, ἀπὸ

Jer. xxiii.
5, 6.

us, we know Christ is the *righteous branch raised unto David, the King that shall reign and prosper, in whose days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; we are assured that this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness:*

אשר; the simplest interpretation of those words יהוה אשר יקרא לה being, *iste qui vocabit eam*, he which calleth Jerusalem is the Lord our righteousness, that is, Christ. And thus the first answer of Socinus is invalid: which he easily foreseeing, hath joined with the Jewish Rabbins in the second answer, admitting that *Jehovah our righteousness* is the name of the Messias, but withal denying that the Christ is that Jehovah. To which purpose they assert those words, *Jehovah our righteousness*, to be delivered by way of proposition, not of apposition; and this they endeavour to prove by such places of Scripture as seem to infer as much. As *Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah Nissi*, Exod. xvii. 15. *Gideon built an altar unto the Lord, and called it Jehovah Shalom*, Judg. vi. 24. And the name of the city in the last words of Ezekiel is *Jehovah Shamah*. In all which places it is most certain, that the name *Jehovah* is not predicated of that, of whose name it is a part; but is the subject of a proposition, given by way of nomination, whose verb substantive or *copula* is understood. But from thence to conclude, that *the Lord our righteousness* can be no otherwise understood of Christ than as a proposition, and that we by calling him so, according to the prophet's prediction, can understand no more thereby than that God the Father of Christ doth justify us, is most irrational. For first, it is therefore necessary to interpret those names by way of a proposition of themselves, because *Jehovah* cannot be the predicate of that which is named; it being most apparent that an altar or a city built cannot be God: and whatsoever is not *Jehovah* without addition, cannot be *Jehovah* with addition. But there is no incongruity in attributing of that name to Christ, to whom we have already proved it actually given; and our adversaries, who teach that the name *Jehovah* is sometimes given to the angels representing

God, must acknowledge that it may be given unto Christ, whom they confess to be above all angels, and far more fully and exactly to represent the Father. Secondly, That which is the addition in those names cannot be truly predicated of that thing which bears the name. Moses could not say that altar was his exaltation, nor Gideon that it was his peace. And if it could not so be predicated by itself, it could neither be by apposition, and consequently, even in this respect, it was necessary to make the name a proposition. But *our righteousness* may undoubtedly be predicated of him who is here called by the name of *the Lord our righteousness*; for the Apostle hath expressly taught us, that he *is made righteousness unto us*, 1 Cor. i. 30. And if it may be in itself, there can be no repugnancy in its predication by way of apposition. Thirdly, that addition of *our righteousness* doth not only truly belong to Christ, but in some manner properly and peculiarly, so as in that notion it can belong to no other person called Jehovah but to that Christ alone. For he alone *is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth*, Rom. x. 4, and when he is said to be *made unto us righteousness*, 1 Cor. i. 30, he is thereby distinguished from God the Father. Being then Christ is thus peculiarly called *our righteousness* under the Gospel, being the place of the prophet forementioned speaketh of this as a name to be used under the Gospel, being no other person called Jehovah is ever expressly called *our righteousness* in the Gospel; it followeth, not only that Christ may be so called, but that the prophecy cannot otherwise be fulfilled, than by acknowledging that Christ is *the Lord our righteousness*: and consequently that is his name, not by way of proposition, but of apposition and appropriation; so that being both Jehovah and our righteousness, he is as truly Jehovah as our righteousness.

the Lord, that is, Jehovah, the expression of his supremacy; and the addition of *our Righteousness* can be no diminution to his majesty. If those words in the Prophet, *Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Sion; for lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord (Jehovah)*, did not sufficiently of themselves denote our Saviour who dwelt amongst us, as they certainly do; yet the words which follow would evince as much; *And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people; and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee:* for what other Lord can we conceive dwelling in the midst of us, and sent unto us by the Lord of hosts, but Christ?

And as the original *Jehovah* was spoken of Christ by the holy Prophets, so the title of *Lord*, as the usual interpretation of that name, was attributed unto him by the Apostles. In that signal prediction of the first age of the Gospel, God promised by Joel, that *whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord (Jehovah) shall be delivered:* and St. Paul hath assured us that Christ is that Lord, by proving from thence, that *whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed;* and inferring from that, *if we confess with our mouth the Lord Jesus, we shall be saved.* For if it be a certain truth, that whosoever confesseth the Lord Jesus shall be saved; and the certainty of this truth depend upon that foundation, that *whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed;* and the certainty of that in relation to Christ depend upon that other promise, *Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved,* then must *the Lord* in the thirteenth verse of the tenth chapter to the Romans be the same with the Lord Jesus in the ninth verse; or else St. Paul's argument must be invalid and fallacious, as containing that in the conclusion which was not comprehended in the premises. But the Lord in the ninth verse is no other than Jehovah, as appeareth by the prophet Joel from whom that Scripture is taken. Therefore our Saviour in the New Testament is called Lord, as that name or title is the interpretation of Jehovah.

If we consider the office of John the Baptist peculiar unto him, we know *it was he of whom it is written* in the Prophet Malachi, *I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me:* we are sure he which spake those words was (*Jehovah*) *the Lord of hosts;* and we are as sure that Christ is that Lord, before whose face John the Baptist prepared the way. *The voice* Isa. xl. 3.

of him that crieth in the wilderness, saith Isaiah, *Prepare ye the way of the Lord* (Jehovah) : and *this is he that was spoken of by the Prophet Isaiah*, saith St. Matthew : this is he of whom his father Zachariah did divinely presage, *Thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways* : where Christ is certainly the Lord, and the Lord undeniably⁷⁴ Jehovah.

⁷⁴ I say therefore *undeniably*, because it is not only the undoubted translation of the name יהוה in the prophet (which of itself were sufficient), but also is delivered in that manner which is (though unreasonably) required to signify the proper name of God, *προπορεύσει γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου Κυρίου*, not τοῦ Κυρίου, that is, without, not with, an article. For now our Saviour's Deity must be tried by a new kind of school divinity, and the most fundamental doctrine, maintained as such ever since the Apostles' times by the whole Catholic Church, must be examined, censured, and condemned, by δ, ἡ, τό. Socinus first makes use of this observation against Wiekus; and after him Crellius hath laid it as a grave and serious foundation, and spread it out into its several corners, to uphold the fabric of his superstructions. First, 'Vox Jehovah magis quam cetera Dei nomina priorum naturam sequitur; ideo etiam Græca Κύριος, cum pro illa ponitur, priorum indolem, qua licet, æmulatur.' Secondly, 'Propriis nominibus articulus libentius subtrahitur, licet eum etiam sæpe concinnitatis potius quam necessitatis causa admittant. Idem fit in voce Κύριος cum pro Jehovah ponitur.' Thirdly, 'Hæc est causa cur in Novo Testamento, maxime apud Lucam et Paulum, vox Κύριος, cum Deum summum designat, articulo libentius careat; at cum de Christo subjective usurpatur, raro articulo omittitur.' [Crellius de Deo &c. c. 14.] What strange uncertainties are these to build the denial of so important an article as Christ's Divinity upon? He does not say absolutely *Jehovah* is the proper name of God, but only that it doth more follow the nature of proper names than the other names of God. And indeed it is certain that sometimes it hath the nature of an appella-

tive, as Deut. vi. 4. יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד *The Lord our God is one Lord*; and yet if it be not always and absolutely a proper name, though all the rest were granted to be true, the argument must be of no validity. Again, he cannot say an article is never affixed to a proper name, but only that *libentius subtrahitur*, it is rather omitted than affixed; which yet is far from a certain or a true rule, especially in the language of the New Testament. For no man can deny *Jesus* to be the proper name of Christ, given him according to the Law at his circumcision, *καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς*. Luke ii. 21; and yet whosoever shall read the Gospel of St. Matthew, will find it ten times δ Ἰησοῦς with an article, for once Ἰησοῦς without it. And in the Acts of the Apostles, written in a more Attic style, St. Paul is oftener styled δ Παῦλος than simply Παῦλος. So Balaam, Gallio, &c. Some persons we find in the New Testament, whom, if we should stay till we found them without an article, we should never call by their names at all; as Apelles, Balak, &c. Thirdly, δ Κύριος is so often used for that God who is the Father with an article, and Κύριος for the Son without an article, (for the Father, Matt. i. 22. ii. 15. v. 33. xxii. 44. Mark xii. 36. Luke i. 6, 9, 15, 25, 46. ii. 15, 22, 23. x. 2. Acts ii. 25, 34. iii. 19. xvii. 27. Rom. xv. 11. 1 Cor. x. 26. xvi. 7. 2 Cor. v. 11. Eph. v. 17, 19. Col. iii. 16, 20, 23. 2 Thess. iii. 3. 2 Tim. i. 16. Heb. viii. 2, 11. xii. 14. Jam. iv. 10, 15. 1 Pet. ii. 3. For the Son, Matt. iii. 3. xxii. 43, 45. Mark i. 3. Luke i. 76. ii. 11. iii. 4. xx. 44. John i. 23. Acts ii. 36. x. 36. xi. 16, 21. xv. 11. Rom. i. 7. x. 9, 12. xiv. 6, 8, 14. xvi. 2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 22. 1 Cor. i. 3. iv. 17. vii. 22, 25, 39. ix. 1, 2. x. 21. xi. 11. xii. 3. xiv. 37. xv. 58. xvi. 10, 19. 2 Cor. i. 2. ii. 12. iv.

Nor is this the only notation of the name or title *Lord*, taken in a sense Divine, above the expression of all mere human power and dominion; for as it is often used as the interpretation of the name Jehovah, so is it also for that of *Adon* or *Adonai*. *The Lord said unto my Lord*, saith David, that is, in the original, Ps. cx. 1. *Jehovah* unto *Adon*; and that *Adon* is the *Word*, that *Lord* is Chaldee-Pa-rapphrase. *Christ*. We know the temple at Jerusalem was the temple of the most high God, and the Lord of that temple in the 151 emphasis of an Hebrew article was Christ, as appeareth by that prophecy: *The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in.* [Mal. iii. 1. מְשִׁיחַ]

Now this notation, as it is the interpretation of *Adon*, signifieth immediately and properly *dominion*, implying a right of possession, and power of disposing. Which doth not only agree

5. x. 17. xi. 17. xii. 1. Gal. i. 3. v. 10. Eph. i. 2. ii. 21. iv. 1, 5, 17. v. 8. vi. 1, 4, 10, 21, 23. Phil. i. 2, 14. ii. 11, 19, 24, 29. iii. 1, 20. iv. 1, 2, 10. Col. i. 2. iii. 17, 18, 24. iv. 1, 7, 17. 1 Thess. i. 1. iii. 8. iv. 1, 15, 17. v. 2, 12. 2 Thess. i. 1, 2. ii. 13. iii. 4. 1 Tim. i. 1. 2 Tim. ii. 24. Tit. i. 4. Philem. 3, 16, 20. Jam. i. 1. 2 Pet. iii. 8, 10. 2 John 3. Jude 14. Rev. xiv. 13. xix. 16. I say, they are thus so often used,) that though they equal not the number of their contrary exceptions, yet they come so near, as to yield no ground for any such observation, as if the Holy Ghost intended any such article-distinction. Nay, it is most evident that the sacred penmen intended no such distinction, because in the same place speaking of the same person, they usually observe the indifference of adding or omitting the article. As Jam. v. 11. *Τὴν ὑπομονὴν ἰδῶθ' ἠκούσατε, καὶ τὸ τέλος Κυρίου εἶδετε, ὅτι πολλοὶ σπλαγχνὸς ἐστὶν ὁ Κύριος καὶ οἰκτιρῶν.* 2 Tim. i. 18. *Δόξ' αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος εὐρεῖν ἔλεος παρὰ Κυρίου ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.* 1 Cor. vii. 17. *Ἐκαστον ὡς κέκληκεν ὁ Κύριος, οὕτω περιπατεῖτω.* 22. *Ὁ γὰρ ἐν Κυρίῳ κληθεὶς δούλος, ἀπελευθερὸς Κυρίου ἐστί.* See Rom. xiv. 6, 7, 8. Wherefore being *Jehovah* is not affirmed absolutely to be a proper name; being, if it were, yet it appears that it is not the custom of the New Testament to use every proper name oftener without an article than with one; being ὁ Κύριος is

so often taken for him whom they acknowledge God, and Κύριος for him whom they cannot deny to be the Christ: it followeth that Christ, acknowledged to be the Lord, cannot by any virtue of an article be denied to be the true Jehovah. We must not then think to decide this controversy by the articles, of which the sacred penmen were not curious, and the transcribers have been very careless; nor is there so great uncertainty of the ancient MSS. in any thing, as in the words and articles of Κύριος and Θεός. The vulgar edition, Rev. i. 8. hath λέγει ὁ Κύριος only, the Complutensis λέγει Κύριος ὁ Θεός, Plantine, λέγει ὁ Κύριος ὁ Θεός, against the Socinian rule, who will have an accession by ὁ to Θεός, and a diminution by δ from Κύριος. As Rev. iv. 11. *Ἄξιός ἐστι, Κύριε, λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν*: in other MSS. *Ἄξιός ἐστι, ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἅγιος, λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν.* 1 Cor. xi. 27.—*τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίας*, others with an addition, *τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίας τοῦ Κυρίου.* 1 Cor. xiv. 37. the vulgar edition—*ὅτι τοῦ Κυρίου εἰσὶν ἐπιτολά, the Complutensis, ὅτι Κυρίου.* So where we usually read *Χριστός*, divers ancient MSS. have Κύριος. Lastly, it is observable that even in these words of the Creed, which we now expound, Κύριος is spoken expressly of Christ without an article, for so we read it, *Kal eis Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, Κύριον ἡμῶν.*

with that other notion of Jehovah, but presupposes it, as following and flowing from it. For he who alone hath a being or existence of himself, and thereby is the fountain of all things beside himself, must be acknowledged to have full power and dominion over all: because every thing must necessarily belong to him, from whom it hath received what it is. Wherefore being Christ is the Lord, as that title is taken for Jehovah, the name of God, expressing the necessary existence and independence of his single being, and consequently the dependency of all others upon him; it followeth, that he be acknowledged also the Lord, as that name expresseth *Adon*, signifying power authoritative and proper dominion. Thus having explained the notation of the word *Lord*, which we propounded as the first part of our exposition, we come next to the second, which is, to declare the nature of this dominion, and to shew how and in what respect Christ is *the Lord*.

Now for the full and exact understanding of the dominion seated or invested in Christ as the Lord, it will be necessary to distinguish it according to that diversity which the Scriptures represent unto us. As therefore we have observed two natures united in his person, so must we also consider two kinds of dominion belonging respectively to those natures; one inherent in his Divinity, the other bestowed upon his humanity; one, as he is the Lord the Maker of all things, the other as he is made Lord of all things.

John i. 1, 3. For the first, we are assured that the *Word was God*, that by the same Word *all things were made, and without him was not any thing made that was made*; we must acknowledge, that whosoever is the Creator of all things must have a direct dominion over all, as belonging to the possession of the Creator, who made all things. Therefore the Word, that is, Christ as God, hath the supreme and universal dominion of the world. Which was well expressed by that famous confession of no longer doubting, but believing Thomas, *My Lord and my God*.

John xx. 28. For the second, it is also certain that there was some kind of lordship given or bestowed on Christ, whose very unction proves no less than an imparted dominion; as St. Peter tells us, that Acts ii. 36. he was *made both Lord and Christ*. What David spake of man, Heb. ii. 7, 8. the Apostle hath applied peculiarly unto him, *Thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet*.

Now a dominion thus imparted, given, derived, or bestowed, cannot be that which belongeth unto God, as God, founded in the Divine nature, because whatsoever is such is absolute and independent. Wherefore this lordship thus imparted or acquired appertaineth to the human nature, and belongeth to our Saviour as the Son of Man. The right of judicature is part of this power; and Christ himself hath told us, that the Father *hath* John v. 27. *given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man*; and by virtue of this delegated authority, the *Son of Man* Matt. xvi. *shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and reward every man according to his works*. Part of the same dominion is the power of forgiving sins; as pardoning, no less than punishing, is a branch of the supreme magistracy: and Christ did therefore say to the sick of the palsy, *Thy sins be forgiven thee*, Matt. ix. *that we might know that the Son of Man had power on earth to forgive sins*. Another branch of that power is the alteration of the Law, there being the same authority required to abrogate or alter, which is to make a law: and Christ asserted himself 152 to be *greater than the temple*, shewing that the *Son of Man was* Matt. xii. *Lord even of the sabbath day*. 6, 8.

This dominion thus given unto Christ in his human nature was a direct and plenary power over all things, but was not actually given him at once, but part while he lived on earth, part after his death and resurrection. For though it be true that *Jesus knew*, before his death, *that the Father had given all* John xiii. 3. *things into his hands*; yet it is observable that in the same place it is written, that he likewise knew *that he was come from God, and went to God*: and part of that power he received when he came from God, with part he was invested when he went to God; the first to enable him, the second, not only so, but also to reward him. *For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and* Rom. xiv. 9. *revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living*. After his resurrection he said to his disciples, *All power is given unto* Mat. xxviii. *me in heaven and in earth*. *He drunk of the brook in the way,* 18. *therefore he hath lift up his head*. Because he humbled himself, Ps. cx. 7. *and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, there-* Phil. ii. 8, *fore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name* 9, 10, 11. *which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*. Thus for and

after his death he was instated in a full power and dominion over all things, even as the Son of Man, but exalted by the Father, who raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church.

Now as all the power given unto Christ as man had not the same beginning in respect of the use or possession; so neither, when begun, shall it all have the same duration. For part of it being merely economical, aiming at a certain end, shall then cease and terminate, when that end for which it was given shall be accomplished: part, being either due upon the union of the human nature with the divine, or upon covenant, as a reward for the sufferings endured in that nature, must be coeval with that union and that nature which so suffered, and consequently must be eternal.

Of the first part of this dominion did David speak, when by the spirit of prophecy he called his Son his Lord; *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool*: where the continuation of Christ's dominion over his enemies is promised to be prolonged until their final and total subjection: *for he must reign till he hath put all things under his feet*. And as we are sure of the continuation of that kingdom till that time, so are we assured of the resignation at that time. For *when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, then shall he deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father*. And *when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all*. Thus he which was appointed to rule in the midst of his enemies during their rebellion, shall resign up his commission after their subjection.

But we must not look upon Christ only in the nature of a general, who hath received a commission, or of an ambassador, with perfect instructions, but of the only Son of God, impowered and employed to destroy the enemies of his Father's kingdom: and though thus impowered and commissioned, though resigning that authority which hath already had its perfect work, yet still the only Son and the Heir of all things in his Father's house, never to relinquish his dominion over those whom he hath pur-

chased with his own blood, never to be deprived of that reward which was assigned him for his sufferings: for if the prize which we expect in the race of our imperfect obedience be an immarcescible crown, if the weight of glory which we look for from him be eternal, then cannot his perfect and absolute obedience be crowned with a fading power, or he cease ruling over us, who hath always reigned in us. We shall for ever reign with him, and he will make us priests and kings; but so that he continue still for ever High Priest and King of kings.

The certainty of this eternal dominion of Christ, as man, we may well ground upon the promise made to David, because by reason of that promise Christ himself is called David. For so God speaketh concerning his people; *I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their Shepherd*. And *I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them*. *I the Lord have spoken it*. Now the promise was thus made expressly to David, *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever*. And although that term *for ever* in the Hebrew language may signify oftentimes no more than a certain duration so long as the nature of the thing is durable, or at the utmost but to the end of all things; and so the economical dominion or kingdom of Christ may be thought sufficiently to fulfil that promise, because it shall certainly continue so long as the nature of that economy requireth, till all things be performed for which Christ was sent, and that continuation will infallibly extend unto the end of all things: yet sometimes also the same term *for ever* signifieth that absolute eternity of future duration which shall have no end at all: and that it is so far to be extended particularly in that promise made to David, and to be fulfilled in his Son, is as certain as the promise. For the Angel Gabriel did give that clear exposition to the blessed Virgin, when in this manner he foretold the glory of him who was then to be conceived in her womb; *The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end*. Nor is this clearer in Gabriel's explication of the promise, than in Daniel's prevision of the performance, who *saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him*. And there was

given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

Thus Christ is Lord both by a natural and independent dominion, as God, the Creator, and consequently the Owner of the works of his hands: and by a derived, imparted, and dependent right, as man, sent, anointed, raised, and exalted, and so made Lord and Christ: which authority so given and bestowed upon him is partly economical, and therefore to be resigned into the hands of the Father, when all those ends for which it was imparted are accomplished: partly so proper to the union, or due unto the passion of the human nature, that it must be coeval with it, that is, of eternal duration.

The third part of our explication is, the due consideration of the object of Christ's dominion, inquiring whose Lord he is, and how *ours*. To which purpose first observe the latitude, extent, or rather universality of his power, under which all things are comprehended, as subjected to it. For *he is Lord of all*, saith St. Peter, of all things, and of all persons; and he must be so, who made all things as God, and to whom all power is given as man. To him then all things are subjected whose subjection implieth not a contradiction. For *he hath put all things under his feet: but when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him*. God only then excepted, whose original dominion is repugnant to the least subjection, all things are subject unto Christ, whether they be things in heaven or things on earth. In heaven he is far above all principalities and powers, and *all the angels of God worship him*; on earth all nations are his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth are his possession. Thus Christ is certainly our Lord, because he is the Lord of all; and when all things were subjected to him, we were not excepted.

But in the midst of this universality of Christ's regal authority it will be further necessary to find some propriety of dominion, by which he may be said to be peculiarly *our Lord*. It is true, he made us, and not we ourselves, we are the work of his hands; but the lowest of his creatures can speak as much. We are still preserved by his power, and as he made us, so doth he maintain us; but at the same time he feedeth the ravens, and clotheth the lilies of the field. Wherefore beside his original

right of creation, and his continued right of preservation, we shall find a more peculiar right of redemption, belonging properly to the sons of men. And in this redemption, though a single word, we shall find a double⁷⁵ title to a most just dominion, one of conquest, another of purchase.

We were first servants of the enemy of God; for him we obeyed, and *his servants we are to whom we obey*: when Christ through death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil, and delivered us, he spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them. But contrary to the custom of triumphing conquerors, he did not sell, but buy us; because while he saved us, he died for us, and that death was the price by which he purchased us; even so this dying Victor gave us life: upon the cross, as his triumphant chariot, he shed that precious blood which bought us, and thereby became our Lord by right of redemption, both as to conquest and to purchase.

Beside, he hath not only bought us, but provideth for us;

⁷⁵ For the right understanding of this double title involved in the word *redemption*, it will be necessary to take notice of the ways by which human dominion is acquired, and servitude introduced. 'Servi aut nascuntur, aut fiunt,' saith the civilian, *Justinian, lib. i. tit. 3*; but in theology we say more, 'Servi et nascuntur, et fiunt.' Man is born the servant of God his Maker, man is made the servant of his Redeemer. Two ways in general they observed, by which they came to serve, who were not born slaves. 'Fiunt aut jure gentium, id est, captivitate; aut jure civili, cum liber homo major viginti annis ad pretium participandum sese venundari passus est.' Two ways then also there were by which dominion over those servants was acquired, by conquest or by purchase, and both these were always accounted just. Dionysius Halicarnasensis, an excellent historian, a curious observer of the Roman customs, and an exact judge of their actions, being a Grecian, justifieth the right which the masters in Rome claimed over their servants upon these two grounds. 'Ετίγχανον δὴ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις αἱ τῶν θεραπόντων κτήσεις κατὰ τοὺς δικαιοτάτους γινόμεναι τρόπους· ἢ γὰρ ὀνησόμενοι παρὰ

τοῦ δημοσίου τοὺς ἐπὶ δόρυ παλουμένους ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων, ἢ τοῦ στρατηγῶ συγχωρήσαντος ἅμα ταῖς ἄλλαις ὠφελείαις καὶ δορυαλώτους τοῖς λαβοῦσιν ἔχειν, ἢ πρῶτοι παρ' ἐτέρων κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τρόπους κυρίων γενομένων ἐκέκτηντο τοὺς δούλους. *Hist. lib. iv. [c. 24.]*; where it is also farther to be observed, that the same persons were made slaves by conquest, and possessed by purchase; by conquest to the city of Rome, by purchase to the Roman citizen. The general first took and saved them, and so made them his, that is, reduced them to the will and power of the state from which he received his commission, and in whose name and for whose interest he fought. This state exposed their interest to sale, and so whatever right had been gained by the conquering sword, was devolved on the Roman citizen for a certain sum of money paid to the state to defray the charges of that war. Thus every lord or master of a slave so taken had full power over him, and possession of him, by right of purchase, unto which he was first made liable by conquest. And though not exactly in that manner, yet by that double right is Christ become our Lord, and we his servants.

whatever we have, we receive from him as the Master of the family; we hold of him all temporal and eternal blessings, which we enjoy in this, or hope for in another life. He is the *Prince of life*, and by him we live; he is the *Lord of glory*, and we are called by his gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord. Wherefore he hath us under his dominion; and becomes our Lord by right of promotion.

Lastly, men were not anciently sold always by others, but sometimes by themselves; and whosoever of us truly believe in Christ, have given up our names unto him. In our baptismal vow we bind ourselves unto his service, that henceforth we will not serve sin; but yield ourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto God: that, as we have yielded our members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so we should yield our members servants to righteousness unto holiness. And thus the same dominion is acknowledged by compact, and confirmed by covenant; and so Christ becomes our Lord by right of obligation.

The necessity of believing and professing our faith in this part of the article appeareth, first, in the discovery of our condition; for by this we know that we are not our own, neither our persons* nor our actions. Know ye not, saith St. Paul, that ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price. And ancient servitude, to which the Scriptures relate, put the servants wholly in the possession⁷⁶ of their master; so that their persons were as

* [In the first edition, "neither our persons, nor our possessions, nor our actions."]

76 Δούλος κτήματι ἐμφυχον· καὶ ὡς περ ὄργανον πρὸς ὄργανον, πᾶς δὲ ὑπηρέτης. *Aristot. Polit. lib. i. cap. 4. §. 2.* Τὸ τε γὰρ σῶμά ἐστιν ὄργανον σύμφυτον, καὶ τοῦ δεσπότητος δὲ δούλου, ὡς περ μέρηον καὶ ὄργανον ἀφαιρετόν· τὸ δ' ὄργανον ὡς περ δούλος ἄψυχος. *Id. Eth. Eudem. lib. vii. cap. 9. §. 3.* And again more expressly, Τίς μὲν οὖν ἡ φύσις τοῦ δούλου, καὶ τίς ἡ δύναμις, ἐκ τούτων δῆλον· ὁ γὰρ μὴ αὐτοῦ φύσει, ἀλλ' ἄλλου, ἄνθρωπος δὲ, οὗτος φύσει δούλος ἐστίν· ἄλλου δ' ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἂν κτήμα ᾖ, ἄνθρωπος ὢν. *Id. Polit. lib. i. cap. 4. §. 6.* So that the definition of a servant according to Aristotle is, He who, being a man, is notwithstanding the possession of a

man. And although all relatives be predicated of each other in obliquo, as 'Pater est filii pater, et filius patris filius, dominus est servi dominus, et servus domini servus;' yet he observes a difference in this, that a servant is not only 'servus domini,' but simply 'domini,' but the master is not simply 'servi,' but 'dominus servi.' 'Ὁ μὲν δεσπότης τοῦ δούλου δεσπότης μόνον, ἐκείνου δ' οὐκ ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ δούλος οὐ μόνον δεσπότητος δούλος ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλος ἐκείνου. *Ibid. §. 5.* The servant then is so wholly in the possession and for the use of his master, that he is nothing else but a living tool or instrument; insomuch, says he, that if all tools were

properly his as the rest of his goods. And if we be so in respect of Christ, then may we not live to ourselves, but to him; for in this the difference of service and freedom doth properly consist⁷⁷: we cannot do our own wills, but the will of him whose we are⁷⁸. Christ took upon him the form of a servant: and to give us a proper and perfect example of that condition, he telleth us, *I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.* First therefore we must conclude with the Apostle, reflecting upon Christ's dominion and our obligation, that none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.

Secondly, the same is necessary both to enforce and invite us to obedience; to enforce us, as he is the Lord, to invite us, as Christ the Lord. If we acknowledge ourselves to be his servants, we must bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. He which therefore died, and rose and revived, that he might become the Lord both of the dead and living, maketh not that death and resurrection efficacious to any but such as by their service acknowledge that dominion which he purchased. He, though he were a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he is become the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. Thus the consideration of the power invested in him, and the necessity of the service due unto him, should force us to obedience; while the consideration of him whom we are thus obliged to serve should allure and invite us. When God gave the Law with fire and thunder, the affrighted Israelites desired to receive it from Moses, and upon that receipt promised obedience. *Go thou near, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us, and we will hear it and do it.* If they interpreted it so great a favour to receive the Law by the hands of Moses; if they made so ready and cheerful a promise of exact obedience unto the Law so given; how should we be invited to like those of Dædalus, or the Tripods of Vulcan, which the poets feigned to move of themselves, artificers would need no under workmen, nor masters servants.

77 So Aristotle, *Eth. lib. iv. [c. viii. §. 29.]* πρὸς ἄλλον ζῆν—δουλικόν· and in the first of his Rhetorics [c. ix. §. 27.]

on the contrary, 'Ελευθέρου τὸ μὴ πρὸς ἄλλον ζῆν.

78 Τὸ ζῆν ὡς βούλεται τις—τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἔργον—εἶπερ τοῦ δούλου ὄντος τὸ ζῆν μὴ ὡς βούλεται. *Aristot. Polit. lib. vi. cap. 2. [§. 3.]* 'Quid est libertas? potestas vivendi ut velis.' *Cic. Parad. [lib. v. c. i.]*

the same promise, and a better performance, who have received the whole will of God revealed to us by the Son of Man? who are to give an account of our performance to the same Man set down at the right hand of the Father? He first took our nature to become our brother, that with so near a relation he might be made our Lord. If then the Patriarchs did cheerfully live 156 in the land of Goshen, subject to the power and command of Egypt, because that power was in the hand of Joseph their exalted brother; shall not we with all readiness of mind submit ourselves to the Divine dominion now given to him who gave himself for us? shall all the angels worship him, and all the archangels bow down before him, and shall not we be proud to join with them?

Thirdly, the belief of Christ's dominion is necessary for the regulation of all power, authority, and dominion on earth, both in respect of those which rule, and in relation to those that obey. From hence the most absolute monarchs learn, that the people which they rule are not their own, but the subjects of a greater Prince, by him committed to their charge. Upon this St. Paul

Col. iv. 1. doth ground his admonition to masters, *Give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.* God gave a power to the Israelites to make hired servants of their brethren, but not slaves; and gives this reason

Lev. xxv. 42. of the interdiction, *For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen.*

What tenderness then should be used towards those, who are the servants of that Lord who redeemed them from a greater bondage, who bought them with a higher price! From hence those which are subject learn to obey the powers which are of human ordination, because in them they obey the Lord of all. Subjects bear the same proportion, and stand in the same relation to their governors, with servants to their masters: and

Col. iii. 22, 23, 24. St. Paul hath given them this charge, *Obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ.* Neither do we learn from hence only whom, but also how, to obey. For while we look upon one Lord in heaven, while we consider him as the Lord of lords, we regulate our obedience to them by our service due to him, and so are always ready to obey, but *in the Lord.*

Lastly, this title of our Saviour is of necessary belief for our comfort and encouragement. For being Lord of all, he is able to dispose of all things for the benefit of those which serve him. He who commanded the unconstant winds, and stilled the raging seas, he who multiplied the loaves and fishes, and created wine with the word of his mouth, hath all creatures now under exact obedience, and therefore none can want whom he undertaketh to provide for: *for the same Lord over all is Rom. x. 12. rich unto all that call upon him.* Many are the enemies of those persons who dedicate themselves unto his service; but our enemies are his, and part of his dominion is therefore given him, and to continue in him until all his enemies be made his footstool. Great is the power of the lusts of our flesh, which war in our members; but his grace is sufficient for us, and the power of that Spirit by which he ruleth in us. Heavy are the afflictions which we are called to undergo for his sake: but if we suffer with him, we shall reign together with him: and blessed be that dominion which makes us all kings, that he may be for ever Lord of lords, and King of kings.

After this explication, every Christian may perceive what he is to believe in this part of the Article, and express himself how he would be understood when he maketh this profession of his faith, I believe in Christ *our Lord.* For thereby we may and ought to intend thus much; I do assent unto this as a certain and infallible truth, taught me by God himself, that Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, is the true Jehovah, who hath that Being which is originally and eternally of itself*, and of which all other beings do essentially depend: that by the right of emanation 157 of all things from him, he hath an absolute, supreme, and universal dominion over all things, as God: that as the Son of Man he is invested with all power in heaven and earth; partly economical, for the completing our redemption, and the destruction of our enemies, to continue to the end of all things, and then to be resigned to the Father; partly consequent unto the union, or due unto the obedience of his passion, and so

[* This must be taken so as not to contradict what is said at p. 238, that "the Divine essence, which Christ had as the Word, before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary, he had not of himself, but by communication from God the Father:" and that "Jesus Christ cannot be a person subsisting in the Divine nature originally of himself." In the passage now before us, the antecedent to who is not Jesus Christ, but Jehovah. Jesus Christ is not self-originated, but he is one with the self-originated Jehovah.]

eternal, as belonging to that kingdom which shall have no end. And though he be thus Lord of all things by right of the first creation and constant preservation of them, yet is he more peculiarly the Lord of us who by faith are consecrated to his service: for through the work of our redemption he becomes our Lord both by the right of conquest and of purchase; and making us the sons of God, and providing heavenly mansions for us, he acquires a farther right of promotion, which, considering the covenant we all make to serve him, is at last completed in the right of a voluntary obligation. And thus I believe in Christ *our Lord*.

ARTICLE III.

Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

THESE words, as they now stand, clearly distinguish the conception of Jesus from his nativity, attributing the first to the Holy Ghost, the second to the blessed Virgin: whereas the ancient Creeds made no such distinction; but without any particular express mention of the conception, had it only in this manner, *who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary; or of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*⁷⁹; understanding by the

⁷⁹ 'Deum Judei sic prædicant solum, ut negent filium ejus; negent simul cum eo unum esse qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.' *Novatian*. 'Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 9. p. cevi.] 'Natus de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine.' *S. August. Enchirid. ad Laurent. cap. 34, 37, et 38.* [vol. vi. pp. 209-211.] as also the Council of Francford in *Sacrosyllabo*. 'Natus est per Spiritum Sanctum ex Virgine Maria.' *S. August. de Fide et Symb.* [vol. vi. p. 155 C.] 'Nonne de Spiritu Sancto et Virgine Maria Dei filius unicus natus est?' *S. August. de Prædest. Sanct. cap. 15.* [§. 30. vol. x. p. 810 A.] Et paulo post, 'Quia natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.' 'Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine.' *S. Leo, Epist. x. cap. 2.* [Ep. xxiv. vol. i. p. 479.] *Maximus Taurin. Chrysol. Ethe-rius Uxam. Author Symb. ad Catechum.* So also Venantius Fortunatus. From whence Fulgentius *de Fide ad Petrum Diaconum*: 'Natum de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, in symbolo acceptum, et corde ad justitiam credit, et ore ad salutem sancta confitetur ecclesia.' [p. 595.] 'Item prædicandum est quomodo Filius Dei incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.' *Capitul. Caroli 82.* and Alcuinus, *de Trin. lib. iii. cap. 1.* 'Dicitur in symbolo catholicæ fidei, quod Christus de Spiritu Sancto et ex Maria Virgine sit natus.' In the ancient MS. transcribed by the learned Archbishop of Armagh, *Τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου.* So Paulus Samosatenus in his fifth proposition; 'Ἰησοῦς δὲ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας