upon Christ our head, is by him diffused through all the members of his body. 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 One.

Thus having run through all the particulars at first designed for the explanation 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 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 conveyed to his members. And in this full acknowledgment, I believe in Jesus Christ.

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

94 For when Celsus, in the person of a Jew, had spoken these words, 'ALL εἴπειν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἰχθύς ἔστιν τοῦ Ἐρασίωννος πατρὸς, ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός ἡ αἰώνιος αἰνής, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κολαστῶν, 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; 'τούτοις δὲ ὡς ὁ φιλόσοφος δι' ψυχήν πατρὸς ἐστι, ὃς δὲ Χριστός τοῦ Θεοῦ' καὶ παλαιοὶ γυναικεῖς αὐτῷ εἶναί γαρ ἐνίκης παρὰ θεῷ, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκτός τοῦ αἰρετοῦ, διὰ τούτων ἐδίδοντος, ἐναντίον προτέρων. Cont. Cels. lib. i. [§ 49. p. 365 B. 366 A.]

95 The Latin generally renders the word unicum. So Rufinus: 'Et in unico filio ejus.' [§ 6. p. cxxi.] 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 unius, et ad Filium referri et ad Dominum poterat.' [§ 8. p. cvr.] So St. Augustin in Enchirid. cap. 24, and Leo Epist. 10, [Ep. xxiv.] Which is therefore to be observed, because in the ancient copies of those Epistles the word unicus was not to be found, as appeareth by the discourse of Vigilius, who in his fourth book against Eutyches hath these words: 'Illa primitus uno dilucibus volumine que Leonis olivlicentur Epistole, cujus hoc sibi primo capitulum isto, necesse quis,
Scripture and the Greek Church is the only-begotten. It is then sufficient for the explanation of these words, to show 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 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 Virgin Mary; for that which is conceived (or begotten?) in her, propositum; fidem universitatis profectum crearetur ne 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 omnium, which, as it seems, then was not there; as appears yet farther by the words which follow: ’Miror tamen quomodo humancum iste notavit, et illum praetermissit, ubi unice filii comminationes imus beatum Leo foedum. Idem vero sanctitern genitoris unigenitus sempiternus, natus de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virginem; ’which words are not to be found in the same Epistle. However we read it in the first copies of Leo; both Basilus and St. Augustin, who were before him, and Maximus Taurinensis, Chrysologus, Ethelrius 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 panegyphos, the only-begotten.

37 For the original is τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν γεννηθὲν and it is the observation of St. Basil, εἶναι ἐν αὐτῷ γεννηθέν, ἐὰν τὸ γεννηθέν. [vol. ii. p. 568 E.] Indeed the vulgar translation renders it, good in es naturam est, and in St. Luke, good nasceretur sanctum; and it must be confessd this was the most ancient translation. For so Tertullian read it: ’Per virghinem dictit natum, non ex virgine, et in vulvo, non ex vulvo, quia et Angelus in seminis ad Joseph, Nam quod in es naturam est, inquit, de Spiritu Sancto sanctum.’ De Carne Christi, cap. 20. [p. 322 C.] And of that in St. Luke, ’Hece est ab angelo excepsum secundum nostrum Evangelium, Propoteron, good in te nascetur vocabitur sanctum, Flavia Dei. ’Adv. Marci. lib. iv. cap. 7. [p. 418 A.] Yet good in es naturam 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, γεννηθέν signifies not always to beget, but sometimes to bear or bring forth; as ἢ γεννήθη εἰς Ἑλεσθείρ γεννηθὲν νησίδον, Luke i. 13, and ver. 57. Kal ενεκεραμευνος νω. So τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν 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; γεννηθέν is one thing, κολλαθεικος another. Seeing then the nativity was not yet come, and γεννηθέν speaks of something already past, therefore the old translation is not good, good in es naturam est. Seeing, though the conception indeed was past, yet γεννηθέν signifies not to conceive, and so is not properly to be interpreted, which it is conceived; yet γεννηθέν is most properly to beget, as κολλαθεικος the generative faculty: therefore I conceive the fittest interpretation of those words, τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν γεννηθέν, that which is begotten in her. And because the angel in St. Luke speaks of the same thing, therefore I interpret τὸ γεννηθέν εἰς αὐτῷ, 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 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, that because 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 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 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.
ARTICLE II.

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 which all 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 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.

Luke iii. 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 prentice 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, presupposes his resurrection, which was the third: and his commission to his office, which was the second, presupposes 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 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 further show that this ascension was the first; that what was born of the Virgin was never in heaven before this time of which he speaketh; 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 obligation 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 him, Son, why hast thou dealt so with us? shew that he had not been missing from them till then, and consequently not ascended 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 Mark i. 13. wilderness, and certainly heaven is not 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 these forty days Christ ascended not into heaven, but rather heaven descended unto him; for the angels ministered unto him. After this he Mark i. 13. returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, and there exer- cised 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 Heb. ix. 24. true, (that is, heaven itself,) into which the High Priest alone Heb. ix. 7. went once every year: and Christ as our High Priest entered in Heb. ix. 12. 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
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 vii. 32. This he often testifieth and inculceth 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; born of an aged father and a barren mother, by the power of God; and yet he distinguisheth himself from Christ in this: Luke i. 15. He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, 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, earthly: the second man is the Lord from heaven. Wherefore the descent of Christ from heaven doth really presuppose his being there, and 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 consequentially, 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-

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 John i. 15. is he of whom I speak, 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 repetition of these words: He it John i. 27. 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

* [Pearson therefore understood εἰκὸν αὐτοῦ as referring 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 ενυπηρέτως μοι γεγονος; but he was before me, in ver. 30. is υπηρέτως μοι 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 meant 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 unjust 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 Nomois here more briefly and plainly than usual. [viii. 167].

The Ethiopic version, Amen dico vobis, praesumnum Abraham nascetur, fuo ego; and the Persic, Verum, vere vobis dico, good nometh Abraham faciet erat, cum ego eram.

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. 'Quod vero et verbum, ego sum, sicut ad eum have been (or continued) with me from the beginning. Thus Nomois, [v. 117]: "Eis ἀπέκλειε γεγονένει διὸ οὐδὲν εἴρη αὐτῷ οὐδὲν. St. John viii. 63. 'Ori ἐγὼ ἐγώ οὖσα ζῶν τρόπο υπάρχειν αὐτών ἐστιν. 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, Τοιών τών χρόνων μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, so on the contrary, εἰς μνημῶν τίνος μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, St. John viii. 33. and ὅταν εἰμι ἐγώ, ἐστιν καὶ ὅταν τὸν αὐτόν ἐστιν, St. John xii. 26. xiv. 3. xvii. 24. Wherefore it is very indifferent whether (John xvi. 34. ) we read, ἐστώ ὅταν εἰμι, or ὅταν εἰμι. For Nomois seems to have read it εἰμι by his translation, [vii. 130.] ——— εἰς τὴν ἐβαθμίζοντα καὶ πρὸς ἐνέχων; and the Jew's question, ἰησοῦς μὲν ἐυλογεῖσθαι; shews they understood it so; for this εἰμι, though of a present form, is of a future signification. Ἐστώ, εἰμι, παρεισποντο. And so it agreeeth with that which follows, St. John xiv. 21. "Ὅταν ἐγὼ ἐστώ, ἐμὲ ἐκ τῶν διακοσμητῶν αὐτῶν. If we read εἰμι, as the old translation, ως εγὼ sum, it will have the force of eischem, and agree with the other, ἵνα δεδείκην ἐγώ, καὶ ὅμως ἔσται. However 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. xx. 2. Πρὸ τοῦ ἢρεμθέντος, καὶ πλατύνθην οὐσίαν καὶ τὴν ὁμοσπονδίαν, καὶ κατα τοῦ αἰῶνος εἰς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐν εἰ. What can be more parallel than, ἥπνοι τοῦ ἐρεμθήσεται, τοῦ ἄλοιπον γενέσεται, καὶ εὐς εἰς, καὶ εὐς εἰς! in the same manner, though by another word, πρὸ τοῦ ἢρεμθήσεται, πρὸ δὲ πάντως βοῶσε νεκρό με. Hesom. viii. 55.

99 So the Ethiopic version, Amen dico vobis, praesumnum Abraham nascetur, fuo ego; and the Persic, Verum, vere vobis dico, good nometh Abraham faciet erat, cum ego eram.
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 Patriarch 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 satisfaction 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,

* [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 Prophet, by the sending of Noah, the eighth Preacher of righteousness: yet to do any 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 God. Which the Apostle doth not only in the entrance of his Epistle deliver, but in the sequel prove. For showing 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 remeainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shall 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

...
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 former, 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 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 ascribed 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 need 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 flries to the ancientest copies, which all men know were most careless of distinctions, and urgeth that there is no addition of however or the like after et, whereas in the Syriac translation we find expressly that addition, ἄνω.

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 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 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, that is, begotten by God, as the Son of his love, antecedently to all other emanations, before any thing proceeded from him, or was framed and created by him. And that preeminency 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. ἐκλεῖσαν γὰρ τὸν κόσμον ἐκ τοῦ ιωνίαν, ἐκ τον ιονιον πρωτοτοκον και διὰ αὐτοῦ. Lib. ii. cont. Cels. [§ 25. p. 405 E.]

7 In relation to the preceding words, τοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ, for that which is divine was the νῦν πρωτοτοκος.

* ["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 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 comprehended 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 a new creature, saith St. Paul, and again, In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation. Instead of which words he had before, faith working by love. For we are the workmanship of God, created in Christ 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 manifests 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 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 renovation, 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.

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 old creation, it neces-
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: which they 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 Son,9 asserting that those words, Let us make man, were spoken as by the Father unto him.

Gen. i. 26. 9 'Ad hoc Domini sustinuit pul pro anima nostra, cum sit orbis terrarum Dominus, cui dixit die ante constitutionem succuli, Pactamus hominem ad im-

EC. 6. 'Εγκαλαμοις ως Ιαβαίους τούτοις μὴ νομίζασε Θεον ὑπὸ τῶν προηγωμένων πολλάχια μετατροπήσεων ἃς μεγάλην ἔγενε δίκαιος καὶ Θεος, κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἔδωκεν καὶ Παρείσπετο τῷ τόπῳ τὴν φωνήν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἀπεξερατοῦσα τὴν Παρακλήσεις ἡμῶν, τὴν θεοτόκου φησί, καὶ Γεννηθέντος συνέγειος, καὶ τὰ λεγόντα, ἢν προστάτευξα δ Ἰδοὺ γενετθήκας καὶ τούτῳ ἐνοφόρεσκα τῇ Ποιησάμενος θεο-

Oric. cont. Oeci. ii. [5. 9. p. 393 B.]

10 ἐν ἀρχή, the first word of Moses; whence the Syriac translation, כְּלָלָה: So Solomon, גְּלָלָה שִׁקֶּר שְׁכִי וְהוֹרֶנ. Prov. viii. 25. 'In principio creat Scorsir; in quo principio scilicet Deus factit coelum et terram.' Tertul. adv. Hermog. cap. 20. [p. 240 D.]
and was not made, at the same time, was with God; but he was made all things; and therefore well may we conceive it was he to whom God said, Let us make man in our image, after our 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 a divine work to be attributed to the Word; lest any should object, that none can produce anything 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. From whence we understand that the worlds were framed by the 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 paraphrase or interpretation of the

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

Gen. i. 6. 2 Pet. iii. 5. 118

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. Aucturunt vocem Domini Dei: et fuit omnipotens Deus in se ipsum. Et exiguam septem vocem verbi Domini Dei. Now this which the Chaldee Paraphrase called וֹיֶנְשָׁע, as the Hebrews named אָדָם, as appeared by Philo the Jew, who wrote before St. John, and reckons in his Divinity, first, פַּרְעָוָה, then פָּרָאָבָה, then פְּרָאָבָה, דְּבַּרְיָא לְאָדָם. Quanti. et Solvit. [Francis. l. vol. ii. p. 625.] Whom he calls οὐ καὶ Θεός ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἄνθρωπος Θεός. De Agricult. [vol. i. p. 308.] He attributes the creation of the world to this Λόγος, whom he terms Οὐρανος Θεος, οὗ τό θέαμα συνεφεσία τε και Ναζαρέτων. De Florumce Flavio. [p. 162.] ἐν θεός ὁ λόγος ὁ θεοὸς θεοῦ. Εἰ καθήκων διηγήματα προεικηκήσεις προεικηκτήρων. Iadem, Allégor. ib. ii. [lib. iii. vol. i. p. 105.] Where we must observe, though St. John, as he wrote of 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 Judaism in this as a Platonic, but merely as a Jew, who referr’d 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 Paraphrase translated the principle of God: so in the book of Wisdom, Η λόγος διʼ ευθείας καὶ επιστείρας της θεονομίας. Sap. xi. 17. is changed into θεονομίας σοι λόγος εὐθείας, επιστείρας της θεονομίας. [5. 31. vol. i. p. 413.] C.] And although Origen object that in this Celebs makes the Jew speak improperly, because the Jews which he had conversed with did not understand that the Son of God was the Word; yet Celebs his Jew did speak the language of Philo; but between the time of Celebs and that of Origen, (I guess about threescore years,) the Jews had learnt to deny that notion of Λόγος, that they might with more colour reject St. John. If then all the Jews, both they which understood the Chaldee exposition, and those which only used the Greek translation, had such an notion of the Word of God; if all things by their confession were made by the Word; we have no reason to believe St. John should make use of any other notion than what they before had, and that by means whereof he might be so easily understood.

* [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 Paraphrase. 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 word 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 show that the Logos of the Christians was totally different from the Platonist Logos.]

PEARSON.
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 1 John 1. 1. 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 John 1. 31. 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 than 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 affirmative, 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 those 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 empowered 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
The second assertion, next to be made good, is, that the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin, was

His only son.

Natzizen, according to his custom, gives a very brief, but remarkable expression: "Figuravit eum divum et mundum creavit, sanctificavit." Orat. i. 16. p. 614 D.

But the opinion of Phocinus 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, added many and various anathemas, according to the several heresies which were then apparent, without mentioning their names. Of these the fifth aims clearly at Photinus. "Si quis secundum praescientiam volut debeat identificationem a Maria dictum illius esse, et non ante secuela ad Patrem, apud Deum esse, et per eum facta esse carnis, 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 secuela subsistentem, et ministerum Patri ad omnium perfectionem, non dicit, sed ex quo de Maria natum est, ex eo Christum Filium nominatum esse, et iudice accepts ut sit Deus, dicit, anathema sit." [p. 262 E.]

Upon which the observation of St. Hilary is this: "Concludi damnatio ejus heres, preposter quam quandam error, et quod, Phocinus, exponere toto fidelibus, qui adversatismus, opus est, quod beati Filii ex partu Virginis monticabatur." [St. Hilary. De syn. cont. Arien. 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 Catholicks; and therefore say, Photinus has committed a great sin, and he is an anathema.

Vincent. L. v. lib. xii. cap. 16. [p. 241 C.] He is said by some to follow the heresy of Ebonius. "Hebionia heresin instaurata constat ex eo," says St. Jerome; and St. Hilary ordinarily understands him by the name of Ebonius, and sometimes expounds himself, "Hebionia, qui est Photinus." [De Trin. vii. 3. p. 916 c. 7. p. 919 D.]

But there is no similitude in their doctrines, Ebonius 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 Samosatarense in omnibus. Epiphanius with Aetius, and Cyprian. Sozomen and Sozomenus, with him and with Sabinus: whereas he differed much from them both, especially from Sabinus, as being far from a Patristic persuasion. Marcellus Cappellane heresin assertor exteritus: Photinus vero novam heresin jam ante protulerat, a Sabinio quidem in unioni dissentiente, sed initium Christi ex Maria praecipitavit. Sever. Hist. Sac. lib. ii. c. 37. vol. ii. p. 201. Wherefore it will not be necessary to call 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 magnus ecclesiastice deceptus in Christo verum et substantia nostrae confessus est hominem, sed eundem Deum Deo ante omnia secula genitus esse non credit. Leo de Nativ. Christ. Serm. xii. [c. l. p. 152.] Etiam Photini hominem tantum profutur Dei Filium, dicit illum non fuasse ante bestiam Marian. Lucifer Calarit. [De non parendo in Deum delin. p. 252.] 'Si quis in Christo se veritatem praelatus animae et carnis, ut verifacile in eo noli accipere Deutatis, id est, quies dicet Christum hominem, ut Deum neget, non est Christianus Catholicus, sed Photini anus Hereticus.' Fulgent. ad Donat. c. xx. p. 106. 'Furensus est filius Dei, qui in nemini, quem in nostrum principem negavit, quem profecto in Deum apertissime et eximio Divinissimorum honoratum.' [Diath. l. v. p. 122.] And again, 'Ego Domino nostro Christo initium tribue, quem hominem, non seminum, sed Deum patrem Filium habere Dominum Jesum Christum, ex Maria Virginis initium sumentem, qui per congregata conversioessens esset inquantum inabilissimus meritorum, a Deo Patre in Filium adoptatus est, et eximio Divinissimorum honoratum.' [ibid. l. v. p. 122.] And again, 'Quem in Christo nostro Jesu Christo initium tribue, quem hominem, non seminum, sed Deum patrem Filium habere Dominum Jesum Christum, ex Maria Virginis initium sumentem, qui per congregata conversioessens esset inquantum inabilissimus meritorum, a Deo Patre in Filium adoptatus est, et eximio Divinissimorum honoratum.' [Ex. x. p. 128.] Iteum igitur, ib. ii. adv. Eugasub. 'Ignorat etiam Photini magnum potestas, quod Apostolus memorabat, sacramentum, quia Christi ex Virginis fatururum, sicut semper precor, non credere ainitio substantialiter Deum natum ex Patre, in quo carnis veritatem confestret ex Virginis.' Fulgent. ad Thrasim. lib. i. [c. 6. p. 74.] Gregory
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 
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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 which followeth: As, In him was life, and the life was the light of men; and the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth 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 womb, and existence in his human nature. For, being (or rather subsisting) 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

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 professor 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 Gal. iv. 4 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 Isa. lii. 7, 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 text, and three distinct propositions, without any dependence of one upon the other; whereas all the words together are but an expression of Christ's eximination, with an explanation 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.
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192 *Alla* οὖν ἐκεῖνος, ὁ μόνος αὐτοῦ υἱός, ὁ ἐσώμενος ἐν θεῷ γεννημένος, ὃς is also exactly observed by the vulgar Latin, Sed semetipsum exinanivit, formam servæ accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus: where γεννημένος is added by apposition to λαβὸν, and have both equal relation to δεῖκνυς, or, which is all one, ὁ ἐσώμενος λαβὼν, δεῖκνυς γεννημένος.
Indeed after the expression of this exanition, 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 exanition in the form of a servant or the likeness of men, he humbled himself, and became (or rather becoming) obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. As therefore his humiliation consisted in his obedience unto death, so his exanition 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 wouldest 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 servant; it followeth that when Christ's body first was framed, even then did he assume the form of a servant.

Again, it appeareth out of the same text, that Christ was in 123 the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, and consequently before he was made man. For he which is presupposeth 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 exanition 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 exanition; if that exanition necessarily presupposeth a plentitude as indispensably antecedent to it; if the form of God be also coeval 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. But no other form beside the essential, which is


Ἐν θεῷ εὐλογούμενον ηὐλογούμενον ἐν θεῷ ἐυλογούμενον, ἐν θεῷ ἐυλογούμενον. So whom the Greeks call ἱδεῖς, He was in the ὁ ἦν ὁ θεός ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦν ἦ

17 ἐκπροσώπου, ἐκπροσώπου, ἐκπροσώπου, ἐκπροσώπου. For in both these verses there is but one conjunction, joining together two acts of our Saviour, his first exanition, or ἐκπροσώπου, and his farther humiliation, or ἐκπροσώπου: the rest are all participles added for explication to the verbs.
ARTICLE II.

Isa. xl. 5: the Divine nature itself, could confer an equality with God. To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal? with 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 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 contain the same angle, or γωνία γνώριθη and the basis of one triangle is supposed equal to the basis of another

triangle, because the same line was basis to both, or ἰσοπλευρικά. 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 ὁμοίως καὶ ἐνίκημος καταρχῆς. Ocelli, de Unitate. 'Αλλ' ἴσος κατὰ τ' ἀνθρώπον καὶ δουλείαν διασώστι καὶ

λόγον καὶ δύναμιν αὐτὸν εὐθωμάτος. [T. I. § 6.]

* [It may be added, that there is a particular force in the form ὁ Ἰησοῦς θεός, 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.]
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 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 Isaiah, 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 Isaiah 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 xii. because that Isaiah said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and 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 presence 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 Isaiah when he saw his glory, and spake of him. Now if the glory which Isaiah saw were the glory of Christ, and he of whom Isaiah 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 Isaiah'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 Godhead.

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, 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 Cor. viii. himself who is supreme, call others so; we durst not give that 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 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 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 alone dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, is not only distinguished from, but opposed to, such gods as those, by his 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, 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 whosoever 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 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: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of 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.
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 language, 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: `Suspctum nobis hanc lectionem faciunt interpretes veteres, Latinos, Syrus, Araba et Ambrosius, qui omnes legentur, † φαραγη λατεων υπογεγραμμενναι, Vulgatus Latinus reads it otherwise than the Greek, Quod manifestatum est in sacris; and it cannot be denied but the Syriac, however translated by Translitters, agree with the Latin; and both seem to have read † 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 agree expressly with them. But that which Grotius hath farther observed is of far greater consideration: `Addit Hicnerus opusculum 55, illud Θεός hic postumum a Nosterianis.' [Comm. ad loc. vol. ii. p. 569.] For if at first the Greek copies read † φαραγη λατεων, and that † were altered into Θεός by the Nosterianists, 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 Nosterianists should find it in the original, †, and make it Θεός, because that by so doing they had overthrown their own assumption, 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, and the angel announced unto them in the name of Θεός, that thus they did not make this alteration, because the Catholic Greeks read † Θεός before there were such heretics, so called 'Nosteriani a Nestorio Episcopo, (Patriarcha Constantinopolitano), S. Aug. Haer. [see S. Aug. vol. viii. p. 28, note] Nosterius, from whom that heresy began, was patriarch of Constantinople after Simmias, Simmias after Atticus, Atticus after Nestorius, and was called Joannes, vulgarly called Chrysotomus. But St. Chrysostom read not †, but Θεός, as appears by his commentators upon the place; Θεός εφαρμοσθη εις σαρκι, τονοςτας, η σωματωμας. [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: Τα † εν σαρκι φαραγη λατεων, η δεουλου, ωτι πεποτα δ εν Θεοτοκου, Ιουδαιος εν σαρκι ουδερ εστι μεγα της εις ευχης αυτος. [Cyril. Alex. de Recta Fide, vol. v. pt. ii. p. 214 C.] Wherefor in St. Paul he read Θεος God, and took that God to be the Word. In the second, repeating the same text verbatim, he manageoth it thus against Nestorius: Ει Θεος εν λογος ενεκαταφης λεγοντα ιεραγος, και ου βηυνυ μενοι τοι εις Θεος, δελτι εν ις ις λην, δαμασκουν, μεγας δε τυμα και ουδαμουν μαντην εστι της εις επιφανειας αυτος δε δευτερους νοειν κοινας Θεοτοκου, της εν σαρκι φαραγης, και τα πα σε ως ανωτερον ουκαγωνται, ποι δευτερους εν σαρκι το εις ευχης, και ουδε δι ευρημα δην εις [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 Ephesus: *Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over 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 grammatical use of no other text but this, to prove the hypothetical union, give it this gloss or exposition: *Τέτραγωνον ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν; τοιαύτης, γένοις ὁμοί αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός κατάγεται λόγος, Κεκ.[vol. vi. p. 146 C.]*. The same he urgeth in his Scholion on Unigenitus Incarnationis. So also Theodoret, contemporary with St. Cyril: *θεός γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν θεόν ὅσα, καὶ ἄλλας ἐξόντων χάρα τῆς φύσεως, δόλος ἐστὶν ἑνών ἐνεργοφόρων σχέσεις, σωμάτος ἢ ἐν καθάρισις ἐνεργείᾳ, ὁμοίως εἰς τὸν κύριον την φύσιν ἐνεργοφόρων φύσιν. Thirdly, Hesychius 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 nimiumipsa Scripturae verbis illicitis impostulatorum: sicut Macedonius Constantiopolitanus Episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore ideo a civitate exulatus est, quoniam falsum Evangelion, et illum Apostolici locum ubi dicit, ψωλος apparens in carne, justitiamque est in Spiritu, per cogitationem necaremus Hierarum, O et θ, hoc modo mutando falsari. Qui ubi eximiam habuit Ψ, hoc est θεός, monosyllabum Grecum, illora mutata O in θ verit et fecit θεός ο, id est usum, Deus apparens per carmen. Quoquepter tandem Nestorianus fuit expulsi.* Henc. Opusc. iv. cap. 18. [vol. ii. p. 449.] Now whereas Hesychius says expulsus est, we read not in Eugenius, or the Excerpta of Theodorus, or in Ioannes Malalas, 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. 154] we have the same relation, only with this difference, that O is not turned into θ, but into θεός, and so θεός becomes not θεός, but θεός. So that first the Greek copies are not said to have read it, but θεός, and so not to have relation to the mystery, to the person of Christ; and therefore this makes nothing for the vulgar Latin. Secondly, whereas Hesychius says there was but one letter changed, no such mutation can of θεός make that which may not, as we read in Liberatus; and then this is nothing to the Greek text. Thirdly, Macedonius was not a Nestorian, but Anastasius an Eutychian; and he ejected him *as* he did other Catholic Bishops under the pretence of Nestorianism, but for other reasons. However 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 θεός, which we find not in any copy. It remaineth therefore that the Nestorians did not falsify the text by reading θεός φανερῶς, but that the ancient Greek Fathers read it so; and consequently, being the Greek is the original, this lection must be acknowledged authentic.*

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

† [The fullest information upon the various readings in this passage is given by Berrimnan, 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 θεός, but not one reads it: five have been said to read θεός, but only three do so for certain.]

**HIS ONLY SON.**

228 

ARTICLE II.

matrical 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 Church, 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 it 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 who 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 price were we bought; and therefore it may well be said, that Christ our God hath purchased us with his own blood.

No one can express the 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 as ἐκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. xvi. 16, as we do of the Churches of God, 1 Cor. xi. 2, 2 Thess. i. 4, and 1 Thess. i. 14; yet ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ is frequently used; so 1 Cor. i. 2, and x. 33, and xii. 25, 2 Cor. i. 1, 1 Tim. iii. 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 χριστοῦ, and then make θεοῦ, when it is so often written Θεοῦ, not Χριστοῦ. Some MSS. as the Alexandrian, Cantonian, and New Coll. MSS., read it τοῦ Κοιπίου, and the interpreter of Ireneus, Regere Ecclesiam Domini, lib. iii. cap. 14. Others represent Κοιπίου καὶ Θεοῦ, followed by the Arabic interpreter; which makes not at all against our argument, but, because in this peculiar unusual, not like to be true. The Syriac translating it Christi, (ἐν Χριστῷ not Domini, as it is in the Latin translation,) gives rather an exposition than a version.*

* [It is stated by Professor Lox, 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 another: 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 Father. Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood 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 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, 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 it. Christ hath delivered us; and the Father is said to deliver Col. i. 13. 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 Gal. i. 4. 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, Col. i. 13, 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 testamento, 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.]
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 faith; for our Saviour replied, Thomas, because thou sawst not, and yet didst believe, thou art blessed. For as we have said before, he that believeth without seeing, he shall receive a crown of glory; but he that believeth after seeing, he shall receive a crown of righteousness. But to him that hath been given, shall be given; and to him that hath not been given, shall be taken away even that which he hath received. For this is the word of the living God, which abideth for ever. Amen. Amen.
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having 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 Authors, hath also assured us that he is the true God. For, we know, saith he, the Son of God is come, and hath given us 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.

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 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 that, in grammatical construction they may be ascribed to the Father. As, when another king arose who knew not Joseph, the same dealt subtilly with our kindred; the same refereth us not to Joseph, but to the king of Egypt. But, without anything 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; this being 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.

Τότες, δι' θεοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ—ἀλήθειαν ἀπεκ. 28. Οὕτως ἦν ὁ δέξασθαι Θεὸν, καὶ ἂν ἐκλέγων. * Hic agitur non solvum de vero Deo, sed de illo uno vero Deo, ut articulus in Graeco additus indicat.* Cat. Plo. [c. i. 1. p. 52.]
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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 write.

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 God, even he who came of the Jews, though not as he came...
of them, that is, according to the flesh, which is here distinct 133 guished from his Godhead. 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. Thirdly, he hath also added the title of blessed, which of itself elsewhere signifies the supreme God, and was always used by the Jews to express secundum carmen, qui est super omnín Deus benedictus in secula. So also St. Augustin, 'Non solum Pater Deus est, sicut omnes etiam heretici concedunt, sed etiam Filius; quod velit noluit, coguntur litteris, dicente Apostolo, Qui est super omnín Deus benedictus in secula.' De Trin. lib. ii. cap. 13. [i. 23. vol. viii. p. 764 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 δέ είναι πάντων, for in his exposition he passeth over wholly δέ είναι πάντων θεός εἰσαχῇς, but it doth not follow that he read not δέ είναι πάντων in the text. But when he repeats the words of the Apostle, he agrees wholly with the Greek text, δέ είναι πάντων θεός εἰσαχῇς [Rom. xvi. 5. i. vol. ix. p. 604 E.] and Theodorex, who lived not long after him, doth not only acknowledge the words, but gives a full exposition of them: 'Hanc mēν η τω κατά σάμεν προσελκυθηναι παραλογίζω τω θεόπνευτων Χριστων των θεωσεως και υπέρ τω επιχειρήσης επί θεον προστάσεως εκ σφηκώς διδα κατά σάμεν, ἐνθεόν, πνευμatoσιν τινος θεου εἰς δυνάμεις ου των ἤματι τω σώματι τω παρενεκλησις, τοις ἔργοις, καθως δὲ είναι πάντων θεός εἰσαχῇς εἰς τούς αἰώνας. [In loc. vol. iii. p. 74 B.]' As for the omission of Dein 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. 57. p. 569 E.] 'Non ignorat Paulus Christum Deum, dicente, quorum Patres, et cuius Christus qui est super omnín Deus. Non hic creatura Deum deputatur, sed creaturam Dei est, qui super omnín Deus est.' The preface 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, Ἐραμος ἂν ἄν τοις αἰώνας. 32 To κατὰ σάμεν opposed unto τὸ πάντων θεός. As Rom. i. 3. where κατὰ σάμεν is used without an article, because κατὰ σάμεν, to which it is opposed, followeth, and so the expression of itself appearant. But here being κατὰ σάμεν is not to be expressed in the following words, the article τοῦ, signifying of itself a distinction or exception, showeth that it is to be understood. 33 Ο οὐ εἰναι πάντων. Not in omnino, as Erasmus, nor super omnes, as Bozzi, with reference to the Fathers, which should have been εἰναι πάντων αἰώνας, but as the vulgar translation, and the ancient Fathers before that, super omnín, εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, as John iii. 31. 'Ο δὲ Χριστὸς εἰς τούς αἰώνας εἰσαχῇς, which signifies no less than the ordinary name of God, ο θεός, the Most High, as it is taken for the supreme God by itself, Acts vii. 48, and is described, Psalm xix. 9. 'Ὅτι αὐτον εἶναι Κύριον, δ διμύον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν.' As Mark xiv. 61, δὲ εἰς κρατοὺς θεοῦ. AIR IT II. HIS ONLY SON.

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 2 Cor. xi. Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore. 31 of the Creator, who is blessed for ever, Amen; and thereby doth Rom. i. 25. 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 sublina a style, who is over all, God blessed for ever, Rom. ix. 5. 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 Heb. ii. 16. him the need 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.

He then who was the Word which in the beginning was with God, and was God; and whose glory Isaiah saw as the glory of the God of Israel; he who is styled Alpha and Omega without δὲ τοῦ εἰσαχῆς; Art thou the Christ the Son of the Blessed One where the vulgar attribute is taken for God himself, which is usually added to the name of God, as 2 Cor. xi. 31. 'Ο θεός, δὲ τοῦ εἰσαχῆς εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας or to any description of him; as 'Εκδοξωσίας τού παρα των κάμων, δω τού εἰσαχῆς εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας,' Apol. Rom. i. 55. And these expressions of St. Paul are consonant to the ancient custom of the Jews, who, when the priest in the sanctuary re-beareth 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 Rabbinics, אמת ה' אל יהוה הקדוש או בconciliation the Blessed One, and מְבָא ה' בָּשֵׁם דע נְבָא the Holy Blessed One, and מְבָא ה' בָּשֵׁם דע נְבָא the Holy One, that they are written by abbreviation, נב' or נב'; and the infinite Blessed One, מְבָא ה' בָּשֵׁם דע נְבָא; Blessed be God for ever, and amen, וְאֵת נְבָא; and amen, וְאֵת נְבָא.'
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 heresy.

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 person 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 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* John xvi. things whatsoever the Father hath, are mine, saith Christ; be- cause 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 John v. 36. to have life in himself, not 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, John v. 18, 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
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 was which equal, even in that equality professeth a priority, saying, The Father is greater than I: the Son equal in respect of his nature, the Father greater in reference to the communication of the Godhead. 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. 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 of himself, but from himself.

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

with the Father; as the Council of Nice determined, and the ancient Fathers before them taught. Hence appeared 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
such Son, nor any equal with him; and his disciples have corrupted the Psalm of David 46, reading (instead of Thou art Psalm ii. 7, my Son, this day have I begotten thee,) Thou art my Prophet, I have educate thee. The later Jews 47, 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 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 Alfraxabadus in his Kuman: 'Dictionem omnipotentiam ad Jesum, (mi propitiis sit et paenam concedat Deus) Tu es Nabiya, Propheta meus, ego salutatore, fovi te; at disserunt Christiani, Tu es Bonaqque, Filius meus, ego salutatore, tu genui. Longe est supra hunc Deum. And to the same purpose Emnul Athir: In Evangelio dixit Iss, Ego salutatore, i.e. educavi te; at Christiani, denuo itera Lam altera, ipsum ei filium stutemur. Qui longe elatus est super ea que dicit.' [Marracio, Promotor in Alcoranum, P. iii. 5. p. 49.] Whereas then the Apostles attributed those words of the Psalm to Christ, the Mahometans, who could not deny but they were spoken of the Messiah, 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 a Son, or a Father; and indeed whosoever would bring in another prophet 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 belonged not to the Messiah; but the ancient Jews understood them of the Christ; as appeareth not only out of these places in the Evangelists where the Christ and the Son of God are synonymous; but also by the testimony of the later Jews themselves, who have confessed no less. So Rabbi David Kimchi in the end of his Commentaries on the second Psalm, says propter homoem suum subinde dixerunt (Ahem.) Some interpret this Psalm of Goy and Moog, and the anointed to Messias the King; and so our doctors of happy memory have expounded it. And Rabbi Solomon Jarchi 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: 'הנה וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחנש וברחn
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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 begat 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 men, 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 nature: 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 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 begetheth 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 fecundity. 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

49 Καὶ ὅπως ἐναρξ宣传 υἱός καὶ αὐτόν ζητοῦσιν αὐτόν θεληματία, ὡς δέν πότε τῷ αὐτῷ ἐξελεύσης τῆς γενενδυτέου ἀλείας καὶ φύσεως. Phot. Epist. 1. [p. 4.] This is in the language of Aristotle [De Anima II. 4. § 3.] 'τὸ πάντα ἐν τῷ χάριτι πόντῳ διὰ τοῦ ζῷου αὐτοῦ μὲν, φόροι μὲν φόροι, Λόθ Στ. Μαυρ., lib. ii. cont. Εἰσοδ. [5. 22. vol. i. p. 258 D.] Ἵ�ν ἡμιν τὸ ἔργον τοῦ εὔην καὶ τῶν διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ χρῆσθαι τῆς ἐνχρίσθαι φύσεως τῆς ἀρχῆς
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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 distinction, 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 belongeth 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 heretics, as that thereby they might avoid all necessity of an eternal generation. So the Roman Catechism: 'Casus Christi data attributa (proprium et unigenitus Dei Filium esse) competent, haec est: quod inter omnem Dei filios, et precipue sibi, et Deo charissimam, quemadmodum Isaac, quia Abrahamus charissimus et heres existit, unigenitus vocatus est, et cetera.' But this might be applied to the interpretation of the Creed, Schlichthinus hath inserted it as a material observation: 'Nam hic unusquisque unigenitus nominatur, qui ceteris longe carior est Patri, longoque praestantior;' 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 pletion of their parents. Or if Christ were the only-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, then he was 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.


51 'Mulsum distat inter dominacionem et conditionem, inter generationem et adoptionem, inter substantiam et gratiam. Ideoque hic non permixte nec passim dicitur, Ascendo ad Patrem nostrum et 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 sibi quem naturam sequatur, missirodictum humiliat: nos vero naturam prostratam, missirodictum originet.' Capreolus Carthog. Epist. [Galland, ix. p. 496.] 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 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 139 later heretics, 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. Econom. ii. 20. vol. i. p. 255. D.]. Eut thea γὰρ θεοῦ γενεσθαι γενέσθαι καὶ καθως τὰ عقوبة τῶν ἄνθρωπων, οὐ τῷ μονόθεν. Eut γενεσθαι τῷ μονόθεν, καὶ τῷ λαμβάνειν συνεργότατον εὐτέρυφον πνεύματος, καὶ τῷ τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἔναντι τῶν γορών παράδοντα εὐπλασμένον αὐτῶν τῷ διόσκορει. Μονογενὴς γάρ ὁ γὰρ τῷ μονόθεν γεννηθείς, ἄλλο δὲ μονογενής, ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς χρήσεως κοινωνεῖται. [Ibid. p. 256. A.] Secondly, by a sort peculiar to that heresy, which held the Son of God might be called συγγενής as well as γενεσθαι, created as well as begotten, and consequently might be as properly named μονογενής as μονογενής. Ei μὴ παρὰ τὸ μόνοθεν γεγενηθείς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ τὰ τῶν μονόθεν λαμβάνων, τὸ δὲ ἐστὶ κατὰ αὐτὸ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῷ γεγενηθείς, τὸ οὐχὶ καὶ μονογενῶς αὐτῶν δομηθεῖς; Thirdly, by a particular instance showing the absurdity of such an interpretation, for that thereby no man could properly be called μονογενής, because not begotten of one, but two parents. Μονογενὴς δὲ, ός τῶν, δυνάμεως οἴδας κατὰ τὰ τὰ ἄνθρωπον λόγων, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἐν συνανθετικῷ πάντων χάρισμα τῶν γεγενηθείς, οὐδὲ ὁ πάροικός μονογενής οὐ παῖς, δηλάτ' ὁ μόνοθεν αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τοῦ ἀρχοντικοῦ τῆς παλαιοτέρου. [Ibid.] 48 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 Roman Catechism: 'Casus Christi data attributa (proprium et unigenitus Dei Filium esse) competent, haec est: quod inter omnem Dei filios, et precipue sibi, et Deo charissimam, quemadmodum Isaac, quia Abrahamus charissimus et heres existit, unigenitus vocatus est, &c. [sect. iv. c. i. p. 84.] And that this might be applied to the interpretation of the Creed, Schlichthinus hath inserted it as a material observation: 'Nam hic unusquisque unigenitus nominatur, qui ceteris longe carior est Patri, longoque praestantior;' 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 pletion of their parents. Or if Christ were the only-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, then he was 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 generating 54, 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 begotten in and through the Son. In the same manner Christ

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, Heb. ii. 11. 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 1 Cor. iv. the begotten of God, whose seed remaineth in them 55; but withal, 1 John iii. 9.

54 Eunomius would have it only ταρά μυθον, in relation to the Father only. St. Basil shows that no way proper, and shows that μοισχις is not he which ταρά μυθον but μυον γεννηται. St. Cyril of Alexandria adds these two ταρά μυθον and μυον together, in relation to the Father and the Son: Μοισχις κατα μυον δε Θεου πατηρ δωρεται δεσμη, δει μυον δε μυον γεννηται τον πατηρ. Epist. 1. ad Bechin. as Ruffinus doth in unicum: 'Ideo subjunxit unicium hunc esse Filium Dei,— Unus enim de uno nascitur.' Expos. Ευσοδ. [3. 6. p. oevr.] St. Gregory Nazianzen adds to these two a third, in respect of the manner: Μοισχις δει μυον δε Μυον και μυον, άλλως δει και μοισχις, μυον δε το 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 Nicodemus: Λεγεται μοισχις, δει μυον δε μυον τον πατηρ μυον γεννηται, ουδε γηρον δεν χρονος υπο του Θεου. [De Fide Orthodox. i. 8. vol. i. p. 135 A.]

55 Εν ηρη Χριστη ημεω δι τον αυτον γενετο εν αυτη τον εν θεον ετος Θεου γενετον. 1 Cor. iv. 15. Πηγα γενετομενως εκ του θεου ημαρται και παρα του θεου γενετον, ουκ οντων, ουδε εκ του θεου γενετον ουδε επεκειναι. Quae jam 1 John iii. 9. And more expressly, 1 John v. 1. Πης οι εστελεχον του θεου ετος Θεου γενετον εκ του θεου γενετον και παρα του θεου γενετον, ουκ οντων. Quae jam 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 being; 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 by the generation by which we are begotten but to metaphorical: whereas Christ is so truly begotten, so properly the natural Son of God, that his generation clearly excludeth the name of adoption; and not

genitus est; et quia quis diligit eum qui genuit, diligit etiam eum qui ex eo geni

tus est.

36 'Nós genuit Deus ut filii ejus simus, quos fecerat ut homines essessem. Unicum autem genitus, non solum ut filius esset, sed etiam ut Deus esset, quod et Pater est.' S. August. de Deo. Evang. lib. ii. cap. 3. [§ 7. vol. iii. part 2. p. 30 A.]

In the book of Celene there was a Jew introduced speaking thus to Christ, Et tu autem, legi, quin tu esset filius Dei, sed tu esset Dominus meus, et servus meus. 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 only by the grace of God adopted, as

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, falseness 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 adopted. 38 Son; he who by those proper and peculiar appellations is distinguished from us, 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 only by the grace of God adopted, as

non adoptivus sed versus, non alienus sed proprius. And again; 'Foro adoptivus dii non potest, nisi quia aliquis est ab eo a quo dicitur adoptatus: et gratia adoptio tributum, quoniam non ex debito, sed ex indulgentia tantummodo adopto praestatur: sicut nos aliquando sum hanc pocuendo filii irae, alieni eramus a Deo, pro proprium et verum Filium, qui non egit adoptione, adoptio nobis filiorum donata est.' [p. 856.]

And of this they give us the true ground in the Synodical Epistle: 'Unius personae quae est in Dei filio et filio Virginiae adoptionis toliit injuryam.' [p. 893 A.]

58 'Legit et relegi Scripturas, Jesum Filium Dei maximam adoptione iuravit.' Ambrosiaster Com. in Ep. ad Hom. 'Dices mihi, Cur times adoptionem Christum Dominum nominare? Dico tibi, quia nec Apostoli eum sic nominabant, nec sancta Dei et Catholici Ecclesia consuetudinem habuit eum sum appeller. Synod. Epist. Concil. Francosfor. [Mansi xiii. p. 895 B.]: From whence they charge all those to whom they write that Synodical Epistle, that they should be satisfied with such expressions as they found in the Scriptures; 'Intelligite, fratres, quia negatis, et noleto novae et incognita nomine fingere, sed quae in S. Scriptura inventorum tenete, &c.'

59 St. Augustine hath observed, that St. Paul made use of iustitia, that he might distinguish the filiation of Christ from ours. 'Aut vero etiam nos, quibus dedit Deus potestatem filiis ejus fieri, de natura atque substantia sui non nos genuit, sicut unicum Filium, sed utique dilectione adoptavit. Quo vero Apostolus sepe uti non ob aliud intelligit, 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 destruction of that adopted: 'Apostolium filium non difficilium filium esse natura, sed sum cum dignitatem esse qui verum est filius.' De Institutione Sacr. exp. 8. § 87. [vol. ii. p. 732 A.]

60 'Si unicus, quomodo adoptivus,' [In the first edition, it is substance.]

† [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.]

HIS ONLY SON.
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 receivedeth 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 begotten. Wherefore in the language of the sacred Scriptures and the Church, the Holy Ghost is never said to 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 any, 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,
ARTICLE II.

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 purging 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 proportionally 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 John v. 21, honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. As it was represented to St. John in a vision, when he heard every creature Rev. v. 13, 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 him 64; and that Deut. x. 20, with such an emphasis, as by him we are to understand him alone, because the Lord our God is one Lord. From whence, Deut. vi. 4, 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 Seor Ze- truth, that one God only must be worshipped, is above all evi- dence 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, Matt. iv. 10. 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 Heb. i. 6, 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 Ps. xcvii.5. 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 η ελαττων of service εις, but η ελαττων εν εις service, with such a peculiar restriction as is expressed by the Chaldee Paraph. בות יִבְנֵו יִבְנֵו הָאָנָבָא, Theodorus. Exeget. Fab. lib. v. cap. 2. [vol. iv. p. 253 C.]

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 God is frequently extolled and admired by the Apostles. God so loved the world, saith St. John, that he gave his only-begotten Son. God commendeth his love towards us, saith St. Paul, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us; in that he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. In this, saith 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 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 proportionately 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 condensation 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 Messiah, 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 Creeds as

---

66 For though in the first rules of faith mentioned by Irenæus and Tertullian we find those words; probably inserted because we find not Domitian nostrum, yet denied by the Valentinians, of whom Pearson,
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 notion of the word, it will not be so necessary to inquire into the use or origin of the Greek\(^c\), much less into the etymology of the correspondent

---


---

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 men\(^6\), 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 New\(^6\). But it is most

thority; yet Phrynichus will sufficiently secure us of this sense. *Εστι τοις ἐστιν μεν ἐν ημῖν ἡ γνώμη, ἐκδόθη δὲν ἡ γνώμη ποιήσας με τοὺς εὐγενεῖς, μετὰ τοῦ ἐστιν ἡ γνώμη διάκονον. *Συνεντούθη ἄρα τοις ἔργοι ταῖς ἔργοις ἄρα τοις ἔργοις* ἐπικράτησε. As she appears by that observation of Ammonius, thus delivered by Eustathius in Ὠδ. xvi. 46. *Κύριος γεννᾶται καὶ νικᾶν ἐκ τοῦ πάσης ἐφέσωσε ἐκ τοῦ χρυσοῦ*.

6 As εἶναι is generally translated *kúrios* when it signifies lord or master in respect of a servant or inferior. So Sarah called her husband, Gen. xxvi. 11. Pet. iii. 6. so Eleezer his master Abrah- ham, Gen. xxix. frequently. Thus Rachel saluted her father Laban, Gen. xxxii. 55. and Jacob his brother Esau, Gen. xxvii. 18. There is no other the *kúrios* of Joseph whom he bought, Gen. xxxix. 2, 4, and Joseph in power is so saluted by his brethren, Gen. xlii. 10. and acknowledged by his servant, xliii. 5. The general name in the Law of Moses for servant and master is *kúrios* and *kúiros*, Exod. xxi. 4. It is indeed so plain that the ancient Jews used this word to signify no more than human power, that we find the same name used translated, as is *kúrios* and *kúiros* by the *kúrios* of Filipino, John xii. 21. and Mary Magdalene speaking unto Christ, but taking him for a gardener, *Kúrios*, εἶ ὑμῖν ἀδέσποτα ἀνέθεω, John x. 15. And it cannot be denied but 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, *Kúrios*, εἶ ὑμῖν ἄνεθα, ἀδιστάκτως ἔχω, John iv. 11; and the inform man at the pool of Bethesda, when he wist not who it was, said unto him, *Kúrios*, ἀνέθα ὑμῖν ἐως ἤγαμον, John v. 7; the blind man, to whom he had restored his sight, with the confession of his ignorance, and his faith, *Tis ἐστιν, Kúrios; and Παρθένος, Kúrios*. John ix. 56, 38.
1 Cor. viii. 10; there are many lords, but he is in that notion Lord which admits of no more than one. They are only masters according to the flesh; he the Lord of glory, the Lord from heaven, King of kings, and Lord of all other lords.

Nor is it difficult to find that name amongst the books of the 146 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 expressed 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 did they 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 omni potentia, nomen Adonai non indicavi eciam, 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 true importance of his name, or that it were any thing to the present inaudience, 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 heterogenous translation, where we read Koi to dionou mou Kuros av ouk elhka auton. Thus again, where God speaks unto Moses, Ovines Brenda tois avous Ilou, Kuros av oav av rov avovoun avoun avantaxiav me perous omia, tovou mou avetiz dionous adonoun. Exod. iii. 15. whoever thinks Kuros stands for Adonai does injury to the translators; and whoever reads 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. lxxxii. 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 Euphianus de Ponderibus [5.6. p. 153], Jehovah hlech, kaphet, leumal, lomhia avdav, which very corruptly represent part of the first verse of the 141st Psalm, which kamos krepos tois avous avetivou, kai ejeto tos avous avetivou, but plainly enough render render Jehovah. Notwithstanding it is very observable, that they were not so explicit as to distinguish Kuros in the Greek translations, where it stood for Jehovah, from Kuros, where it stood for Adonai; and that was done by adding in the margin the tetragrammaton itself, Jehovah, which, by the ignorance hereof, the Greek translators, who stood 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 Curetius with the Commentary of Clement, and St. Jerome gives an account of it in the Greek copies of his age; 'Nomen tetagrammaton, quod ἀνεκδοτότον, id est, ineffabile putaverunt, quod his litteris scribunt, δοῦλος, τοῦ ιουαθα, τοῦ θεοῦ, quod quidam non intelligere poterant... tympanum, sublepton, κατ' εἰς τοσούτον, extra plerumque, which is utterly false. But it must be observed, that the ancient Scholiast took his various translations, did not read Adonai in that place; but kept the Hebrew characters, which they understood not, in those places which Kuros was.
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 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 root, and so denoting the essence or existence of God, and whatsoever else may be deduced from thence, as revealed by him to be signified thereby.

Our Lord.

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

Our Lord. Our Lord.

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

Being then this title Lord thus signifieth the proper name of 148 God Jehovah, being the same is certainly attributed unto Christ in a notion far surpassing all other lords, which are rather to be looked upon as servants unto him; it will be worth our inquiry next, whether, as it is the translation of the name Jehovah, it belong to Christ; or whether though he be Lord of all other lords, as subjected under his authority, yet he be so inferior unto him whose name alone is Jehovah, as that in that propriety and eminence in which it belongs unto the supreme God it may not be attributed unto Christ.

This doubt will easily be satisfied, if we can shew the name Jehovah itself to be given unto our Saviour; it being against all reason to acknowledge the original name, and to deny the interpretation in the sense and full importance of that original. Wherefore if Christ be the Jehovah, as so called by the Spirit of God; then is he so the Lord, in the same propriety and eminence in which Jehovah is. Now whatsoever did belong to the Messias, that may and must be attributed unto Jesus, as being the true and only Christ. But the Jews themselves acknowledge that Jehovah shall be known clearly in the days of the Messias, and not only so, but that it is the name which properly belongeth to him. And if they cannot but confess so much, who only read the prophecies, as the Emuuch did, without an interpreter; how can we be ignorant of so plain and necessary a truth, whose eyes have seen the full completion, and read the infallible interpretation of them? If they could see Jehovah the Lord of hosts to be the name of the Messias, who was to them for a stone of stumbling and rock of offence, how can we possibly be ignorant of it, who are taught by St. Paul, that in Christ this prophecy was fulfilled, As it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a mazan stone which they shall despise among the people, and stone of stumbling and rock of offence, and a name to them which call on him for salvation.

OUR LORD.

stumblingstone, and rock of offence, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. It was no other than Jehovah who spake those words, I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, Hos. i. 7, and will save them by the Lord (Jehovah) their God, and will not save them by bow nor by sword? Where not only he who is described as the original and principal cause, that is, the Father who gave his Son, but also he who is the immediate efficient of our salvation, and that in opposition to all other means or instrumental causes, is called Jehovah; who can be no other than our Jesus, because there is no other name under heaven given unto men whereby we must be saved. As in another place he speaketh, I will strengthen them in the Lord (Jehovah), and they shall walk Zech. x. 14, up and down in his name, saith the Lord (Jehovah); where he which strengtheneth is one, and he by whom he strengtheneth is another, clearly distinguished from him by the personal pronoun, and yet each of them is Jehovah, and Jehovah our God is Deut. vi. 4.

149 one Jehovah. Whatsoever objections may be framed against 72 Hos. i. 7, where it is further observable that the Chaldee Paraphrase hath translated "The Lord" by the word Jehovah, for Jehovah.

73 Two adversaries we have to the exposition of this place, the Jew and the Socinian; only with this difference, that we find the least opposition from the Jew, from whom indeed we have so ample a concession as will destroy the other's contradiction. First Socinius answers, the name belongeth not to Christ, but unto Israel; and that it so appears by a parallel place in the same prophet, Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16. Socin. Refut. Juc. Wicki, cap. 6. Osech. Racco. de Pers. Christi, cap. 1. Caelianus De Deo et Attrit. lib. i. cap. 11. To this we first oppose the constant interpretation of the Jews, who attribute the name Jehovah to the Messias from this one particular text. As in the Septem Ichtharias, lib. ii. c. 8. The Scripture allith the name of the Messias Jehovah, our righteousness, and in Midrash Tiltinn on Psalm xxi. [fol. 16.col.1] עידא עידא ו IDENTIFIED GOD sollen the Messias by his own name, and his name is Jehovah; as it is said, (Exod. xv. 3.) The Lord is a man of war, Jehovah is his name. And it is written of the Messias, (Jer. xxiii. 6.) And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah the righteous. Thus Echa Babati, Lum. i. 16. [fol. 58.col. 2.] ה' Name of Jehovah is 'Adonai, and Jehovah is 'Adonai, and Jehovah is 'Adonai. What is the name of the Messias? R. Abba said, Jehovah is his name; as it is said (Jer. xxiii. 6.) And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness. The same he reports of Rabbi Levi. The Rabbinists then, though enemies to the truth which we deduce from thence, constrained by the literal importance of the text, did acknowledge that the name Jehovah did belong to the Messias. And as for the collection of the contrary from the parallel place pretended, there is not so great a similitude as to inforce the same interpretation. For whereas in Jerem. xxiii. 6, it is expressly said, פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֵלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה אֶלֶּה פֶּה
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, Zech. ii. 10, O daughter of Zion, 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 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 Matt. xvi. 10, 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. xi. 3.
of him that crieth in the wilderness, saith Isaiah, Prepare ye the Matt. iii. 3. 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 Luke i. 76. 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 undeniably Jehovah.

74 I say therefore undeniably, because it is not only the undoubted translation of the name יְהוָה 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, ὁ θεός τοῦ κυρίου Κυρίων, 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, β, ς. Socinus first makes use of this observation for his exposition of Wis. ii.; 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 superstitions. First, אֱלֹהִים קָדוֹשׁ כְּלֵי ג יְהוָה כָּל בְּרֵאשִׁית צְרוּיָה דְּאֵין קְרָנָא בְּרֵאשִׁית. Secondly, Προφετικοὶ ὄνομα ἡμῶν ναμαθεῖσθαι, λειτουργίαν ἀρκετής σιγάτης ρητίας, καὶ αὐτὸ ἀκολουθεῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ αἰτίαν ἀρρενωπότερα. Thirdly, καὶ Κύριος οὐκ ἐπιταγῆς, nor it shall be used, not to speak of the name of God who is the Father with an article, and Κύριος for the Son without an article, (for the Father, Matt. i. 25. ii. 15. xii. 23. x. 2. Acts ii. 25. iii. 19. xiv. 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. 5. 2 Tim. i. 16. Heb. viii. 2. 11. 14. Jam. iv. 10. 1 Pet. ii. 2. For the Son, Matt. iii. 19. xxii. 43. 45. Mark i. 3. Luke vii. 56. ili. 14. iv. 44. John i. 23. Acts ii. 36. x. 26. xi. 16. 21. xv. 11. Rom. i. 7. x. 9. xii. 16. 5. 14. xvii. 5. 11. 12. 13. 22. 1 Cor. i. 3. iv. 17. xii. 2. 25. 29. 38. 1. 2. x. 21. xi. 13. xii. 34. xvi. 37. 38. 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 it is often used as the interpretation of the name Jehovah, so is it also for that of Adon or Adoni. The Lord said unto my Lord, saith David, that is, in the original, Ps. cxv. 3. Jehovah unto Adon; and that Adon is the Word, that Lord is Chaldee-Pa. 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 Mal. iii. 1. his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in. 152

Now this notation, as it is the interpretation of Adon, signifies immediately and properly dominion, implying a right of possession, and power of disposing. Which doth not only agree
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, 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 notion 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 1:1,3. 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 whoever 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 20. 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 2:36. he was made both Lord and Christ. What David spake of man, Heb.2:7,8. 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. 17. 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.

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 drank of the brook in the way, 18. therefore he hath lifted up his head. Because he humbled himself, Phil. ii. 8. and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, therefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name 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 began, 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, empowered and employed to destroy the enemies of his Father's kingdom: and though thus empowered 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 immaterial 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 fulfill 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 signifies 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 beheld, 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 154 they be things in heaven or things on earth. In heaven he is far above all principalties 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 double 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 Rom. vi. 16.
doeth destroy him that had the power of death, that is, Heb. ii. 14.
the Devil, and delivered us, he spoiled principalties and powers, Col. ii. 15.
amd 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;
whenever we have, we receive from him as the Master of the family; we hold of him all temporal and eternal blessings, Acts iii. 15. 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 us our names unto him. In our baptismal Rom. vi. 6, 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 possession of their master; so that their persons were as 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 consist: we cannot do our own wills, but the will of him whose we are. Christ took upon him the form of a servant: and to give us a proper and perfect example of that condition, he tellexeth us, I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but John vi. 38. 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 Rom. xiv. 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 again, 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, Deut. v. 27. said they to him, 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 Dedalus, or the Tripods of Vulcan, which the poets feigned to move of themselves, artists would need no other workmen, nor masters servants.

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

Lev. xxi. 42.

Col. iv. 1. 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 stillled 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 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 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? 