

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

ARTICLE III.

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

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

⁷⁹ 'Deum Judæi sic prædicant solum, ut negent filium ejus; negent simul cum eo unum esse qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.' *Novatian*. 'Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.' *Ruffin. in Symb.* [§. 9. p. ccvi.] 'Natus de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine.' *S. August. Enchirid. ad Laurent. cap. 34, 37, et 38.* [vol. vi. pp. 209-211.] as also the Council of Francford *in Sacrosyllabo*. 'Natus est per Spiritum Sanctum ex Virgine Maria.' *S. August. de Fide et Symb.* [vol. vi. p. 155 C.] 'Nonne de Spiritu Sancto et Virgine Maria Dei filius unicus natus est?' *S. August. de Predest. Sanct. cap. 15.* [§. 30. vol. x. p. 810 A.] Et paulo post, 'Quia natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.' 'Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine.' *S. Leo, Epist. x. cap. 2.* [Ep. xxiv. vol. i.

p. 479.] *Maximus Taurin. Chrysol. Ethe-rius Uxam. Author Symb. ad Catechum.* So also Venantius Fortunatus. From whence Fulgentius *de Fide ad Petrum Diaconum*: 'Natum de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, in symbolo acceptum, et corde ad justitiam credit, et ore ad salutem sancta confitetur ecclesia.' [p. 505.] 'Item prædicandum est quomodo Filius Dei incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria semper Virgine.' *Capitul. Caroli 82.* and Alcuinus, *de Trin. lib. iii. cap. 1.* 'Dicitur in symbolo catholicæ fidei, quod Christus de Spiritu Sancto et ex Maria Virgine sit natus.' In the ancient MS. transcribed by the learned Archbishop of Armagh, *Τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου.* So Paulus Samosatenus in his fifth proposition; 'Ἰησοῦς δὲ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας

word *born*, not only the nativity, but also the conception and generation. This is very necessary to be observed, because otherwise the addition of a word will prove the diminution of the sense of the Article. For they which speak only of the operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception, and of the manner of his birth, leave out most part of that which was anciently understood under that one term of being *born* of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary.

That therefore nothing may be omitted which is pertinent to express the full intent, and to comprehend the utmost signification of this Article, we shall consider three Persons mentioned, so far as they are concerned in it. The first is He who was conceived and born; the second, He by whose energy or operation he was conceived; the third, She who did conceive and bear him.

For the first, the relative in the front of this carries us clearly back unto the former Article, and tells us that he which was 158 thus conceived and born was Jesus Christ, the only Son of God. And being we have already demonstrated that this only Son is therefore called so, because he was begotten by the Father from all eternity, and so of the same substance with him; it followeth that this Article at the first beginning, or by virtue of its connexion, can import no less than this most certain, but miraculous truth, that he which was begotten by the Father before all worlds, was now in the fulness of time *conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary*⁸⁰. Again, being by the conception and birth is to be understood whatsoever was done toward the production of the human nature of our Saviour; therefore the same relative, considered with the words which follow it, can speak no less than the incarnation of that person. And thus even in the entry of the Article we meet with the

τῆς παρθένου. These words, omitted in the Nicene Creed, were put in by the Council of Constantinople, upon the occasion of the Apollinarian heresy, as was observed by Diogenes Bishop of Cyzicum in the Council of Chalcedon; *Οἱ γὰρ ἅγιοι πατέρες οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα, τὸ ἐσαρκώθη, δὲ εἶπον οἱ ἅγιοι ἐν Νικαίᾳ πατέρες, ἐσαφήμισαν εἰπόντες, ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου.* Mansi vi. p. 632 D.] In the several expositions among the sermons *de Tempore*, falsely

attributed to St. Augustin, 'Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Virgine Maria.' So Eusebius Gallicanus, *Homil. de Symbolo.* [p. 553 F.] And from thence it hath so continued, as we now read it, *Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.*

⁸⁰ 'Huic, quem dudum de Patre natum ineffabiliter didicisti, nunc a Spiritu Sancto templum fabricatum intra secreta uteri virginalis intellige.' *Ruffin.* [In Symb. §. 9. p. ccvi.]

incarnation of the Son of God, that great mystery wrapt up in that short sentence of St. John, *the Word was made flesh*.

Indeed the pronoun hath relation not only unto this but to the following Articles, which have their necessary connexion with and foundation in this third; for he who was *conceived* and *born*, and so made man, did in that human nature suffer, die, and rise again. Now when we say this was the Word, and that Word was God, being whosoever is God cannot cease to be so; it must necessarily follow, that he was made man by joining the human nature with the Divine. But then we must take heed lest we conceive, because the Divine nature belongeth to the Father, to which the human is conjoined, that therefore the Father should be incarnate, or conceived and born. For as certainly as the Son was crucified, and the Son alone; so certainly the same Son was incarnate, and that Son alone. Although the human nature was conjoined with the Divinity, which is the nature common to the Father and the Son; yet was that union made only in the person of the Son. Which doctrine is to be observed against the heresy of the Patripassians⁸¹, which was both very ancient

⁸¹ The heresy of the Patripassians seems only to have relation to the suffering of our Saviour, because the word signifies no more than the passion of the Father. But it is founded in an error concerning the incarnation, it being out of question that he which was made man did suffer. Epiphanius observes, Noetus was the first which taught this heresy, who lived 130 years before him, more or less; and when he was questioned for it, he denied it; *διὰ τὸ μηδένα πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἐξεμέσαι ταυτηνὴν τὴν πικρίαν*. *Hæres.* lvii. §. i. [vol. i. p. 480 A.] But certainly this heresy was ancienter than Noetus; for the Patripassians are named by St. Cyprian*, *Epist.* 73. [p. 130.] and Tertullian his master chargeth it upon Praxeas: 'Duo negotia Diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit, Prophetiam expulit, et Hæresim intulit; Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit.' *Adv. Prax.* cap. i. [p. 501 A.] And expressing the absurdity of that opinion; 'Itaque post tempus Pater natus et Pater passus, ipse Deus Domi-

nus omnipotens Jesus Christus prædicatur.' [Ibid.] cap. 2. And *de Præscr. adv. Hæret.* † 'Post hos omnes etiam Praxeas quidam Hæresim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit. Hic Deum Patrem omnipotentem Jesum Christum esse dicit, hunc crucifixum passumque contendit et mortuum; præterea se ipsum sibi sedere ad dextram suam, cum profana et sacrilega temeritate proponit.' cap. 53. [p. 223 D.] After Praxeas Noetus taught the same; 'Ἐτάλησε λέγειν τὸν πατέρα πεπονθέναι, says Epiphanius: [Hæc. lvii. §. i. vol. i. p. 479 D.] and being questioned for it, he answered, *τί γὰρ κακὸν πεποίηκα; ἕνα Θεὸν δοξάζω, ἕνα ἐπίσταμαι, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλον πλὴν αὐτοῦ γεννηθέντα, πεπονθότα, ἀποθανόντα*. He thought the Father and the Son to be the same person, and therefore if the Son, the Father to be incarnate. *Τισπάρτορα τὸν Χριστὸν ἐδίδαξε, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα*. *S. Epirh. Anaceph.* [vol. ii. p. 145 C.] After the Noetiani followed the Sabelliani. So Philastrius [c. 54.];

* [It is however most probable that Noetus preceded Cyprian, since a treatise was written against him by Hippolytus.]

† [The last eight chapters of this work were probably not written by Tertullian.]

and far diffused, making the Father to be incarnate, and becoming man to be crucified. But this very Creed was always 159 thought to be a sufficient confutation of that fond opinion⁸²,

'Sabellius discipulus ejus, similitudinem sui doctoris itidem secutus est, unde et Sabelliani postea sunt appellati, qui et Patripassiani, et Praxeani a Praxeas, et Hermogeniani ab Hermogene, qui fuerunt in Africa, qui et ita sentientes abjecti sunt ab Ecclesia Catholica.' [Gal. vii. p. 488 E.] So St. Augustin, 'Sabelliani dicti sunt quidam hæretici, qui vocantur et Patripassiani, qui dicunt ipsum Patrem passum fuisse.' *Tract.* 36. in *Joh.* [§. 8. vol. iii. part 2. p. 548 A.] This I confess is denied by Epiphanius, who acknowledged Sabellius to have followed Noetus in many things, but not in the incarnation or passion of the Father. *Σαβελλιανοὶ οἱ τὰ ὅμοια ἀνοήτως* (l. ἀνοήτως, id est, Νοητιανοῖς, vel ἀνοήτως, id est, Νοητῶ, as St. Augustin, *Novato*) *δοξάζοντες παρὰ τοῦτο μόνον λέγουσι γὰρ μὴ πεπονθέναι τὸν πατέρα*. [*Synops.* p. 398.] [vol. ii. p. 146 A.] This St. Augustin wonders very much at in Epiphanius: 'Sabelliani, inquit, similia Noeto dogmatizantes, præter hoc quod dicunt Patrem non esse passum; Quomodo de Sabellianis intelligi potest, cum sic innotuerint dicere Patrem passum, ut Patripassiani quam Sabelliani crebris nuncupentur?' *S. August. de Hæres.* 41. [vol. viii. p. 12 C.] Indeed the Latin Fathers generally call the Sabellians Patripassians; and not only so, but Theodoret doth so describe them as professing one person, *ἐν μὲν τῇ παλαιᾷ, ὡς πατέρα νομοθεῖσθαι, ἐν δὲ τῇ καινῇ, ὡς υἱὸν ἐνανθρωπήσθαι*. [Hæc. Fab.] lib. ii. cap. 9. [vol. iv. p. 223 D.] After the Sabelliani succeeded in the same heresy the Priscillianistæ, as appeareth by Pope Leo, who shews they taught but one Person of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: 'Quod blasphemiae genus de Sabellii opinione sumpserunt, cujus discipuli etiam Patripassiani merito nuncupantur: quia si ipse est Filius qui et Pater, crux Filii Patris est passio, et quicquid in forma servi Filius Patri

obediendo sustinuit, totum in se Pater ipse suscepit.' *Epist.* xciii. cap. i. [al. Ep. xv. p. 450.] Thus the Patripassian heresy, beginning from Praxeas and Hermogenes, was continued by Noetus, Sabellius, and Priscillianus, and mingled with all their several heresies, the sum and substance of which is thus well set down by Victorinus; 'Patripassiani Deum solum esse dicunt quem nos Patrem dicimus; ipsum solum existentem et effectorem omnium, et venisse non solum in mundum, sed et in carnem, et alia omnia quæ nos Filium fecisse dicimus*.' [adv. Arium, lib. i. p. 202 C.]

⁸² It appeareth plainly that Tertullian confuted Praxeas, by reducing him to these words of the Creed. For when he had first declared, 'Nos unicum quidem Deum credimus (which was the objection of Praxeas) sub hac tamen dispensatione, quam *οἰκονομίαν* dicimus, ut unici Dei sit et Filius sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil,' then he subjoineth, 'Hunc missum a Patre in Virginem, et ex ea natum hominem et Deum, filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum. Hunc passum, hunc mortuum et sepultum secundum Scripturas, et resuscitatum a Patre, et in celos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos.' And that we may be assured that he used these words out of the Creed, it followeth, 'Hanc regulam ab initio Evangelii decucurrisse, &c.' *Adv. Prax.* cap. 2. [p. 501 B.] This is yet farther evident out of Epiphanius, who tells us the eastern doctors confuted Noetus in the same manner, by reducing him to the words of the Creed. *ἕνα Θεὸν δοξάζομεν καὶ αὐτοῖ, (just as Tertullian; 'Nos unicum quidem Deum credimus,') ἀλλ' ὡς οἶδαμεν δικαίως δοξάζειν καὶ ἕνα Χριστὸν ἔχομεν, ἀλλ' ὡς οἶδαμεν ἕνα Χριστὸν υἱὸν Θεοῦ, πάθοντα καθὼς ἔπαθεν,*

* [The fullest history of these doctrines is given by Wormius in his *Historia Sabelliana*: and it may be observed, that the opponents of Praxeas may have charged him with the Patripassian heresy, as a necessary consequence of his doctrines, though he may not himself have avowed it.]

in that the incarnation is not subjoined to the first, but to the second Article; we do not say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, which was conceived, but in his only Son, our Lord, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.*

First then, we believe that he which was made flesh was the Word, that he which took upon him the nature of man was not the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, nor any other person but the only-begotten Son. And when we say that person was *conceived and born*, we declare he was made really and truly man, of the same human nature which is in all other men who by the ordinary way of generation are conceived and born. For the *Mediator between God and man is the Man Christ Jesus*: that since by *man came death, by man also should come the resurrection of the dead*. As sure then as the first Adam and we who are redeemed are men, so certainly is the second Adam and our Mediator man. He is therefore frequently called the Son of Man, and in that nature he was always promised: first to Eve, as her seed, and consequently her Son: then to Abraham, *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*; and that *seed is Christ*, and so he is the Son of Abraham: next to David, as his *Son to sit upon his throne*; and so he is *made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham*, and consequently of the same nature with David and with Abraham. And as he was their Son, so are we his brethren, as descending from the same father Adam; and therefore it behoved him to be *made like unto his brethren*. For he *laid not hold on the angels, but on the seed of Abraham*; and so became not an angel, but a man.

1 Tim. ii. 5.
1 Cor. xv. 21.

Gen. iii. 15.
Gen. xxii. 18.
Gal. iii. 16.
[Ps. cxxxii. 11.]
Rom. i. 3.
Matt. i. 1.

Heb. ii. 16.
17.

ἀποθανόντα καθὼς ἀπέθανεν, ἀναστάντα, ἀνελεθόντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ὄντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. *Hæres. lvii. §. i. [vol. i. p. 480 C.]* And when the argument of Tertullian against Praxeas, and the Greeks against Noetus, drawn from the Creed, did not sufficiently convince the Patripassians, the Church of Aquileia, to exclude them wholly, added these two words to the first Article, *invisibilem, and impassibilem*. *Invisibilem*, to shew he was not incarnate; *impassibilem*, to shew he was not crucified. So Ruffinus in the conclusion of his exposition upon these words, *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, addeth, 'His additur invisi-*

bili et impassibili:' and then gives the reason, 'Sciendum quod duo isti sermones in Ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habentur. Constat autem apud nos additos hærescos causa Sabellii, illius profecto quæ a nostris *Patripassiani* appellatur, id est, quæ Patrem ipsum vel ex Virgine natum dicit, et visibilem factum, vel passum affirmat in carne. Ut ergo excluderetur talis impietas de Patre, videntur hæc addidisse majores, et invisiblem Patrem atque impassibilem dixisse. Constat enim Filium, non Patrem, in carne et ex carne natum, et ex nativitate carnis Filium visibilem et passibilem factum.' [p. cciii.]

As then man consisteth of two different parts, body and soul, so doth Christ: he assumed a body, at his conception, of the blessed Virgin. *Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.* The verity of his body stands upon the truth of his nativity⁸³; and the actions and passions of his life shew the nature of his flesh.

He was first born with a *body* which was *prepared for him*, of the same appearance with those of other infants; he grew up by degrees, and was so far from being sustained without accustomed nutrition of our bodies, that he was observed even by his enemies to *come eating and drinking*, and when he did not so, he suffered hunger and thirst. Those plowers never doubted of the true nature of his flesh, who *ploughed upon his back and made long furrows*. The thorns which pricked his sacred temples, the nails which penetrated through his hands and feet, the spear which pierced his sacred side, give sufficient testimony of the natural tenderness and frailty of his flesh. And lest his fasting forty days together, lest his walking on the waters and traversing the seas, lest his sudden standing in the midst of his Disciples when the doors were shut, should raise an opinion that his body was not true and proper flesh, he confirmed first his own Disciples, *Feel and see, that a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me to have*. As therefore we believe the coming of Christ, so must we confess him to have come in the verity of our human nature, even in true and proper flesh. With this determinate expression was it always necessary to acknowledge him: for *every spirit, that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is of God*; and *every spirit, that confesseth not Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is not of God*. This Spirit appeared early in opposition to the apostolical doctrine; and Christ, who is both God and man, was as soon denied to be man, as God. Simon Magus, the arch-heretic, first began, and many after followed him⁸⁴.

⁸³ 'Marcion, ut carnem Christi negaret, negavit etiam nativitatem; aut, ut nativitatem negaret, negavit et carnem: scilicet, ne invicem sibi testimonium redderent et responderent nativitas et caro; quia nec nativitas sine carne, nec caro sine nativitate.' *Tertul. de Carne Christi, cap. i. [p. 307 B.]*

⁸⁴ Simon Magus first made himself to be Christ; and what he feigned of himself, that was attributed by others unto Christ. 'Dixerat se in monte Sina Legem Mosi in Patris persona dedisse Judæis, tempore Tiberii in Filii persona putative apparuisse.' *S. August. [Hæres. i.]** So St. Cyril represents him,

* [These words are rejected by the Benedictine editors. See vol. viii. p. 5. note 6.]

And certainly, if the Son of God would vouchsafe to take the frailty of our flesh, he would not omit the nobler part, our soul, without which he could not be man. For *Jesus increased in wisdom and stature*; one in respect of his body, the other of his soul. Wisdom belongeth not to the flesh, nor can the knowledge of God, which is infinite, increase: he then whose knowledge did improve together with his years, must have a subject proper for it, which was no other than a human soul. This was the seat of his finite understanding and directed will, distinct from the will of his Father, and consequently of his Divine nature; as appeareth by that known submission, *Not my will, but thine be done*. This was the subject of those affections and passions which so manifestly appeared in him: nor spake he any other than a proper language, when before his suffering he said, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death*. This was it which on the cross, before the departure from the body, he recommended to the Father, teaching us in whose hands the souls of the departed are: for *when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit; and having said thus, he gave up the ghost*. And as his death was nothing else but the separation of the soul from his body, so the life of Christ as Man did consist in the conjunction and vital union of that soul with the body. So that he which was *perfect God, was also perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting**. Which is to be observed and asserted against the ancient heretics⁸⁵, who taught that Christ assumed human flesh,

* [This does not merely mean "consisting of a reasonable soul and human flesh," but subsisting is to be taken by itself for having a real and substantial existence, ὑφιστατός.]

Ὁὐκ ἐν σαρκί, ἀλλὰ δοκῆσει, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν φανέντα. *Catech.* 6. [§. 15. p. 96 A.] From this δόκησις of his invention arose the heresy of the Δοκηταί. For Saturnilus or Saturninus followed his disciple Menander with his 'putative tantum hominem,' as Irenæus, and 'in phantasmate tantum venisse,' as Tertullian speaks. After him Valentinus and his followers, Epiphaneus, Isidorus, and Secundus; then the Marcosians, Heracleonitæ and Ophitæ, Cerdon, Marcion, Lucanus, and generally the Manichees. Those were the Δοκηταί or Φαντασιασταί, all conspiring in this, that Christ was not really what he appeared, nor did truly suffer what he seemed to

endure. This early heresy appeareth by the opposition which St. Ignatius made unto it in his Epistles.

⁸⁵ Of this kind two several sects were most remarkable, the Arians and the Apollinarians. Arius taught that Christ had nothing of man but the flesh, and with that the Word was joined. 'Αρειος δὲ σάρκα μόνην πρὸς ἀποκρυφὴν τῆς θεότητος ὁμολογεῖ' ἀπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἔσθωθεν ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπου, τούτεστι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ σαρκί λέγει γεγονέναι. *S. Athanas. de Adv. Christi.* [contra Apollin. ii. §. 3. vol. i. p. 942 C.] So Felicianus the Arian, in *Vigilius de Unitate Trin. cap. 17.* [p. 348.] 'Ita enim a majoribus nostris semper est traditum,

but that the Word or his Divinity was unto that body in the place of an informing soul.

161 Thus the whole perfect and complete nature of Man⁸⁶ was assumed by the Word, by him who was *conceived and born* of a woman, and so made a Man. And being the Divine nature which he had before, could never cease to be what before it was, nor ever become what before it was not; therefore he who was God before by the Divine nature which he had, was in this incarnation made man by that human nature which he then assumed; and so really and truly was both God and man⁸⁷. And thus this third Article, from the conjunction with the second, teacheth us no less than the two natures really distinct in Christ incarnate.

quod Christi corpus ad vicem animæ communis ipsius Filii Dei habitus animarum; nec accensione animalis spiritus indigenis fuerit, cui inhabitans fons vitæ potuit conferre quod vixit.' Eunomius followed him in this particular: 'Αρειος δὲ καὶ Ἐὐνόμιος σῶμα μὲν αὐτὸν ἔφρασαν εἰληφέναι, θεότητα δὲ ψυχῆς ἐνηργηκέναι τὴν χρεῖαν. *Theod. cont. Hæret. lib. v. cap. 11.* [vol. iv. p. 278 D.] Apollinaris distinguished between the soul and the mind, the ψυχή and the νοῦς, and acknowledged that the Word assumed the body and the soul or ψυχή of man, but not the mind or spirit, or the νοῦς, but the Word itself was in the place of that. 'Apollinaristas Apollinaris instituit, qui de anima Christi ab Ecclesia Catholica dissenserunt, dicentes, sicut Ariani, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In quæstione testimoniis Evangelicis victi, mentem, qua rationalis est anima hominis, non fuisse in anima Christi, sed pro hac ipsum verbum in ea fuisse, dixerunt.' This was then the clear difference betwixt the Arian and Apollinarian heresy: 'Apollinaristæ quidem carnis et animæ naturam sine mente assumpsisse Deum credunt, Ariani vero carnis tantummodo.' *Facun. lib. ix.* [c. 3. p. 762 C.] So that two things are to be observed in the Apollinarians, their philosophy and their divinity: their philosophy, in making man consist of three distinct parts, the body, the soul, and the mind; their divinity, in making the human nature of Christ to consist but of two, the body

and the soul, and the third to be supplied by the Word. Which is excellently expressed by Nemesius *de Nat. Hom.* in respect of his philosophy: *Τινὲς μὲν, ὅν ἐστὶ καὶ Πλωτῖνος, ἄλλην εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ ἄλλον τὸν νοῦν δογματίσαντες, ἐκ τριῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπου συνεστάναι βούλονται, σώματος, ψυχῆς, καὶ νοῦ. Οἷς ἠκολούθησε καὶ Ἀπολλινάριος ὁ τῆς Λαοδικείας γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος: τούτων γὰρ πηξάμενος τὸν θεμέλιον τῆς οἰκίας δόξης, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ προσφοδόμησε κατὰ τὸ οἰκίον δόγμα. [c. 1. p. 466 B.] And by Theodoret in respect of his divinity: *Σαρκαθῆναι δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἔφησε λόγον, σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ἀνειληφῶτα οὐ τὴν λογικὴν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἄλογον, ἢ φυσικὴν, ἣρουν ζωτικὴν, τινὲς ὀνομάζουσι. τὸν δὲ νοῦν ἄλλο τι παρὰ τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι λέγων, οὐκ ἔφησεν ἀνειληφῶτα, ἀλλ' ἀρκέσαι τὴν θείαν φύσιν εἰς τὸ πληρῶσαι τοῦ νοῦ τὴν χρεῖαν. [Hæret. Fab. iv. 8. vol. iv. p. 240 D.]**

⁸⁶ 'Quid a Patre Christus acceperat, nisi quod et induerat? hominem sine dubio, carnis animæque texturam.' *Tertul. de Resur. Carnis, cap. 34.* [p. 346 A.] 'Hoc toto credente jam mundo, puto quod et Dæmones confiteantur Filium Dei natum de Maria Virgine, et carnem naturæ humanæ atque animam suscepisse.' *S. Hieron. Apol. 2. adv. Ruffinum.* [vol. ii. §. 4. p. 493 B.]

⁸⁷ Νῦν δὴ ἐπεφάνη ἀνθρώπος αὐτὸς οὐτος ὁ λόγος, ὁ μόνος ἄμφω, Θεὸς τε καὶ ἀνθρώπος. *S. Clem. Alex. ad Gentes.* [vol. i. c. 1. p. 7.]

For if both natures were not preserved complete and distinct in Christ, it must be either by the conversion and transubstantiation of one into the other, or by commixtion and confusion of both into one. But neither of these ways can consist with the person of our Saviour, or the office of our Mediator. For if we should conceive such a mixtion and confusion of substances as to make an union of natures, we should be so far from acknowledging him to be both God and man, that thereby we should profess him to be neither God nor man, but a person of a nature as different from both, as all mixed bodies are distinct from each element which concurs unto their composition. Besides, we know there were in Christ the affections proper to the nature of man, and all those infirmities which belong to us, and cannot be conceived to belong to that nature of which the Divine was but a part. Nor could our humanity be so commixed or confounded with the divinity of our Saviour, but that the Father had been made man as much as the Son, because the Divine nature is the same both of the Father and the Son. Nor ought we to have so low an esteem⁸⁸ of that infinite and independent Being, as to think it so commixed with, or immersed in, the creature.

Again, as the confusion, so the conversion of natures is impossible. For, first, we cannot with the least show of probability conceive the Divine nature of Christ to be transubstantiated into the human nature; as those whom they call *Flandrian Anabaptists* in the Low Countries at this day maintain. There is a plain repugnancy even in the supposition: for the nature of man must be made, the nature of God cannot be made, and consequently cannot become the nature of man. The immaterial, indivisible, and immortal Godhead cannot be divided into a spiritual and incorruptible soul, and a carnal and corruptible body; of which two humanity consisteth. There is no other Deity of the Father than of the Son; and therefore if this was converted into that humanity, then was the Father also that man, and grew in knowledge, suffered, and died. We

⁸⁸ 'Absit ita credere, ut conflatili quodam genere duas naturas in unam arbitremur redactas esse substantiam; hujusmodi enim commixtio partis utriusque corruptio est. Deus enim qui capax est, non capabilis, penetrans, non penetrabilis, implens, non implebilis,

qui ubique simul totus, et ubique diffusus est per infusionem potentiae suae, misericorditer naturae mixtae est humanae, non humana natura naturae est mixtae Divinae.' *Leporius Libel. Emend.* [c. iv. p. 397 D.]

must not therefore so far stand upon the propriety of speech, when it is written, *The Word was made flesh*⁸⁹, as to destroy the propriety both of the *Word* and of the *flesh*.

162 Secondly, we must not, on the contrary, invent a conversion of the human nature into the Divine, as the Eutychians of old did fancy. For sure the incarnation could not at first consist in such a conversion, it being unimaginable how that which had no being should be made by being turned into something else. Therefore the humanity of Christ could not at the first be made by being the Divinity of the Word. Nor is the incarnation so preposterously expressed, as if the flesh were made the Word, but that the Word was made flesh. And if the manhood were not in the first act of incarnation converted into the Divine nature, as we see it could not be; then is there no pretence of any time or manner in or by which it was afterward⁹⁰ so

⁸⁹ In that proposition, 'Ο λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, there hath been strange force used by men of contrary judgments, and for contrary ends, as to the word ἐγένετο. The Socinians endeavouring to prove it can have no other sense than simply *fuit*, the Word *was* flesh: the Flandrian Anabaptists stretching it to the highest sense of *factum est*, the Word *was made* flesh. It is confessed that the verb γίνεσθαι in the use of the Greek language is capable of either interpretation: it is also acknowledged that the most ancient interpreters were divided in their renditions. For the Syriac rendered it כּוּמָא בְּרַא הוּא *Et verbum caro fuit*; the ancient Latin, *Et verbum caro factum est*. It cannot be denied but in the Scriptures it hath been used indifferently in either sense. And the same old vulgar translation in some places renders it, as the Syriac doth here, Matt. x. 16. Γίνεσθε ὄν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, *Estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes*; and 25. Ἀρκερὸν τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, *Sufficit discipulo ut sit sicut magister ejus*. From whence it is evident that they placed not the force in the signification of the word γίνεσθαι, but in the circumstance of the matter in which it was used. Howsoever, neither of these interpretations prove either of these opinions. For if it be acknowledged that the Word was flesh, and it hath

been already proved and presupposed by St. John in his precedent discourse, that the Word had a former being antecedent to his being flesh; it followeth, that he which was before the Word, and was not flesh, if after he were flesh, must be made such. And so the Socinian observation falls. Again, if he which was made flesh was the Word, and after he was made such was still the Word, as certainly he was, and is still the same; then his being made or becoming flesh can no way evacuate that nature in which he did before subsist. And so the Flandrian interpretation is of no validity.

⁹⁰ This was the proper opinion of Eutyches, as appeareth by his own confession in the Council of Chalcedon. 'Ὁμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγενησθαι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως, μετὰ δὲ τῆν ἐνωσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ. Act. I. [Mansi vi. p. 744 B.] Two distinct natures he confessed at first; but when the union was once made, he acknowledged but one. But when that union was made, he expressed not, nor could his followers agree; some attributing it to the conception, some to the resurrection, others to the ascension. Howsoever, when they were united, his opinion clearly was, that the human nature was so absorpt into the divine, so wholly made the same, that it ceased wholly to be what it was, and so there

transubstantiated. Vain therefore was that old conceit of Eutyches, who thought the union to be made so in the natures, that the humanity was absorbed and wholly turned into the Divinity, so that by that transubstantiation the human nature had no longer being. And well did the ancient Fathers, who opposed this heresy, make use of the sacramental union between the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ, and thereby shewed, that the human nature of Christ is no more really converted into the Divinity, and so ceaseth to be the human nature, than the substance of the bread and wine is really converted into the substance of the body and blood, and thereby ceaseth to be both bread and wine. From whence it is by the way observable, that the Church in those days understood no such doctrine as that of transubstantiation⁹¹.

was but one, that is the divine, nature remained. This is sufficiently expressed by St. Leo, who was the strongest opposer of him, and speaketh thus of his opinion, *Serm. 8. de Nativ.* [vol. i. p. 171.] 'Hic autem recentioris sacrilegii profanus assertor unionem quidem in Christo duarum confessus est naturarum; sed ipsa unione id dixit effectum, ut ex duabus una remaneret, nullatenus alterius existente substantia.' And the Eranistes in the Dialogue of Theodoret arguing for that opinion, being urged to declare whether in that union one nature was made of them both, or one remaining, the other did not so, answered plainly, 'Εγὼ τὴν θεότητα λέγω μεμενηκέναι, καταποθῆναι δὲ ὑπὸ ταύτης τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. [Dial. ii. vol. iv. p. 77 A.]

⁹¹ There can be no time in which we may observe the doctrine of the ancients so clearly, as when they write professedly against an heresy evidently known, and make use generally of the same arguments against it. Now what the heresy of Eutyches was is certainly known, and the nature of the sacrament was generally made use of as an argument to confute it. Gelasius Bishop of Rome hath written an excellent book against Eutyches, *De duabus naturis in Christo*, in which he propoundeth their opinion thus: 'Eutychiani dicunt unam esse naturam, id est, divinam;' and, 'Sola existente deitate, humanitas illic esse

jam destitit.' That then which he disputes against is the transubstantiation of the human nature into the divine. The argument which he makes use of against it is drawn from the eucharist: 'Certe sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ: et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus, et sumimus, ut sicut in hanc, scilicet, in divinam, transeant, Sancto Spiritu perficiente substantiam, permanente* tamen in suæ proprietate naturæ; sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter repræsentant, ex quibus constat proprie permanentibus, unum Christum, quia integrum verumque, permanere demonstrant.' [p. 671 B.] In which words it is plain he affirms the union of the human nature of Christ to be the principal mystery, the representation of that mystery to be in the sacrament of the eucharist: he concludes from thence, that as in the representation the substance of the bread and wine remaineth in the propriety of their own nature, so the human nature of Christ in the greater mystery doth still remain. In

* [for. legendum est, permanentia, Routh, Script. Eccles. Opusc. ii. 139.]

163 Being then he which is *conceived* was the *only Son of God*, and that *only Son* begotten of the substance of the Father, and so always subsisted in the Divine nature; being by the same conception he was made truly man, and consequently assumed an human nature; being these two natures cannot be made one either by commixtion or conversion, and yet there can be but one Christ subsisting in them both, because that only Son was he which is conceived and born: it followeth, that the union which was not made in the nature, was made in the person of the Word; that is, it was not so made, that out of both natures one only should result, but only so, that to one person no other should be added.

Nor is this union only a scholastic speculation, but a certain

the margin of this place in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* there is printed *Caute*, as if there could be any danger in observing the sense of the Fathers, when they speak so expressly and considerably. In the same manner we find a disputation between an Heretic and a Catholic in the second dialogue of Theodoret, [vol. iv. p. 85 B.] where Eranistes, as an heretic, asks Orthodoxus by what names he calls the bread and wine after consecration; who answers, the body and blood of Christ: from whence Eranistes argues, 'Ὅσπερ τοίνυν τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματός τε καὶ αἵματος ἄλλα μὲν εἰσὶ πρὸ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως, μετὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἐπίκλησιν μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἕτερα γίνεται. οὕτω τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶμα μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν μετεβλήθη τὴν θεϊαν. *As the symbols of the body and blood of Christ are one thing before consecration, and after that change their name, and become another; so the body of Christ after his ascension is changed into the Divine substance.* To this Orthodoxus answers, 'Ἐδῶς αἱς ὕβρην ἄρκυσιν, *You are taken in your own nets.* Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικά σύμβολα τῆς οἰκίας ἐξίσταται φύσεως, μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἶδους, καὶ ὁρατὰ ἐστὶ καὶ ἄπτα, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. *The bread and wine even after consecration leave not their own nature, but remain in their former substance, shape, and form.* In the same manner, καὶ ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα τὸ μὲν πρότερον εἶδος ἔχει καὶ σχῆμα καὶ περιγραφὴν,

καὶ ἀπαξιαπλῶς εἰπεῖν, τὴν τοῦ σώματος οὐσίαν. *The body of Christ hath the same form, figure, and shape, and indeed the same bodily substance.* And when Eranistes still objects, that the bread is called the body, and not bread, Orthodoxus answers that he is mistaken; Οὐ γὰρ σῶμα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄρτος ζωῆς ὀνομάζεται, οὕτως αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος προσηγόρευσε, καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ σῶμα θεῖον ὀνομάζομεν σῶμα. *For it is not only called the body, but also bread of life, and the body itself we call the Divine body.* Who sees not then that Theodoret believed no more that the bread is converted into the body, than that the body is converted into the Divinity of Christ? Who perceives not that he thought the bread to be as substantially and really bread after the consecration, as the body of Christ is really a body after his ascension? The same argument is used by St. Chrysostom upon the same occasion against the Apollinarians in his Epistle ad *Cæsarium*, not yet published in Greek, and by Ephraïmus in *Photii Bibliotheca* against the Eutychians. As therefore all the μεταστοιχείωσις of the sacramental elements maketh them not cease to be of the same nature which before they were; so the human nature of Christ, joined to the Divine, loseth not the nature of humanity, but continueth with the Divinity as a substance in itself distinct; and so Christ doth subsist not only *ex*, but *in duabus naturis*, as the Council of Chalcedon determined against Eutyches.

and necessary truth, without which we cannot have one Christ, but two Christs, one Mediator, but two Mediators; without which we cannot join the second Article of our Creed with the third, making them equally belong to the same person; without which we cannot interpret the sacred Scriptures, or understand the history of our Saviour. For certainly he which was before Abraham, was in the days of Herod born of a woman; he which preached in the days of Noah, began to preach in the reign of Tiberius, being at that time about thirty years of age; he was demonstrated the Son of God with power, who was the seed of David according to the flesh; he who died on the cross, raised him from the dead who died so, being *put to death through the flesh, and quickened by the Spirit*; he was *of the fathers according to the flesh, who was God over all blessed for ever*. Being these and the like actions and affections cannot come from the same nature, and yet must be attributed to the same person; as we must acknowledge a diversity of natures united, so must we confess the identity of the person in whom they are conjoined, against the ancient heresy of the Nestorians⁹², condemned in the council of Ephesus.

¹Pet.iii.18.

Rom. ix. 5.

⁹² This heresy doth most formally contradict these words of the Creed, because it immediately denies this truth, that the eternal Son of God was conceived and born. And in vain did Nestorius seek not only to avoid it in the Nicene Creed, but to make use of the words of the Creed even against the unity of the Person of Christ. St. Cyril had well objected the series, order, and consequence of that confession: *Ἐφη ἡ ἀγία καὶ μεγάλη Σύνοδος, αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς κατὰ φύσιν υἱὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ ἀληθινὸν, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐκ τοῦ φωτὸς, τὸν δι' οὐ τὰ πάντα πεποιθὲν ὁ Πατὴρ, κατελθεῖν, σαρκωθῆναι τε καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαι, παθεῖν, ἀναστῆναι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθεῖν εἰς οὐρανοῦς.* [Epist. v. vol. v. pt. ii. p. 25 D. The words after *ἀναστῆναι* are not in Aubert's edition.] The strength of this objection lies in this, that Christ, the only-begotten Son, begotten of the Father before all worlds, was incarnate. The answer of Nestorius was in this manner: *Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ· σκόπησον ὅπως Ἰησοῦς, Χρι-*

στὸς, καὶ μονογενῆς, καὶ υἱὸς, πρότερον θέντες, τὰ κοινὰ τῆς θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, ὡς θεμελίου, ὑνόμενα, τότε τὴν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως, καὶ τοῦ πάθους, καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, ἐπικοδομοῦσι παράδοξον. [Ibid. p. 26 B.] And the strength, or rather the weakness, thereof is this: that first the Council placed the names of Jesus, Christ, and the only-begotten Son, names common to the divinity and humanity of Christ; and then upon them built the doctrine of his Incarnation. Whereas it is evident that, supposing the *only-begotten* a term common to the humanity and divinity, yet the Council clearly expounds it of the eternal generation, adding immediately, *begotten of his Father before all worlds*; neither is there any word between that exposition and the *Incarnation*, but such as speak wholly of Christ as God. Therefore that only-begotten Son, who was *begotten of his Father before all worlds*, descended from heaven, and was incarnate. Thus St. Cyril in his second Epistle to Nestorius, and Nestorius in his second to him. Which mistake of his seems yet more strange to

164

By the Holy Ghost.

HAVING thus despatched the consideration of the first Person concerned in this Article, and the actions contained in it so far as distinctly from the rest they belong to him, we descend unto the other two concerned in the same; and first to him whose operation did precede in the conception, the Holy Ghost. Which second part some may think to require a threefold consideration; first, of the conception; secondly, of the Person; thirdly, of the operation. But for the Person or existence of the Holy Ghost, that is here only mentioned obliquely, and therefore to be reserved for another Article, where it is propounded directly. And for the conception itself, that belongeth not so properly to the Holy Ghost, of whom the act cannot be predicated. For though Christ *was conceived by the Holy Ghost*, yet the Holy Ghost did not conceive him, but said unto the Virgin, *Thou shalt conceive*. There remaineth therefore nothing proper and peculiar to this second part, but that operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception, whereby the Virgin was enabled to conceive, and by virtue whereof Christ is said to be *conceived by him*. Luke i. 31.

Now when we say the conception of our Saviour was wrought by the operation of the Spirit, it will be necessary to observe, first, what is excluded by that attribution to the Spirit; secondly, what is included in that operation of the Spirit.

For the first of these, we may take notice in the salutation of the Angel, when he told the blessed Virgin she should conceive and bring forth a Son, she said, *How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?* By which words she excludeth first all men, and

me, when I consider in the same Epistle of Nestorius that fundamental truth asserted, which of itself sufficiently, nay, fully confutes his heresy: for he acknowledged the name of *Christ* to be *ἀπαθὸς καὶ παθητῆς οὐσίας ἐν μοναδικῇ προσώπῳ προσηγορίαν σημαντικῆν*, [Ibid. p. 26 E.] and consequently Christ himself to be a single person in a double nature, passible and impassible: which once granted, it evidently followeth, that he which was born from eternity was also born in time, for by those several natures he had those several natures; that he which was impassible

as God, might and did suffer as man, because the same person was of an impassible and a passible nature; impassible as God, passible as man. Wherefore by that which Nestorius hath confessed, and notwithstanding that which he hath objected, it is evident out of the Nicene Creed, that the Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, was incarnate and made man; and as evident out of the Apostles' Creed, especially expounded by the Nicene, that the same only-begotten Son was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary.

then herself: all men, by that assertion, *I know not a man*; herself, by the question, *How shall this be, seeing it is so?* First, our Melchizedeck had no father on earth; in general, not any man; in particular, not Joseph. It is true, *his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph*: but it is as true, *before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost*. We read in St. Luke, that *the parents brought the child Jesus into the Temple*: but these parents were not the father and the mother, but as it followeth, *Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him*. It is true, Philip calleth him *Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph*; and which is more, his mother said unto him, *Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing**: but this must be only the reputed father of Christ, he being only, *as was supposed, the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli*. Whence they must needs appear without all excuse, who therefore affirm our Saviour to have been the proper son of Joseph, because the genealogy belongs to him; whereas in that very place where the genealogy begins, Joseph is called the supposed father. How can it then therefore be necessary Christ should be the true son of Joseph, that he may be known to be the son of David, when in the same place where it is proved that Joseph came from David, it is denied that Christ came from Joseph? And that not only in St. Luke, where Joseph begins, but also in St. Matthew, where he ends the genealogy. *Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ*⁹³. Howsoever then the genealogies are described, whether one belong to Joseph, the other to Mary, or both to Joseph, it is from other parts of the Scriptures infallibly certain, not only that Christ descended lineally from David according to the flesh, but also that the same Christ was begotten of the Virgin Mary, and not by Joseph.

Secondly, as the blessed Virgin excluded all mankind, and particularly Joseph, to whom she was then espoused, by her assertion, so did she exclude herself by the manner of the question, shewing that of herself she could not cause any such con-

⁹³ Indeed in our translation, *whom* original it evidently belongs to Mary; may relate to both, as well as one, and Τὸν Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγένετο Ἰησοῦς. to Joseph as well as Mary; but in the

* [Jesus might be thought to have tacitly alluded to this incorrect expression of his mother, when he said to her, "Wist ye not that I ought to be in my 'Father's house?" for so the words ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου ought to be translated.]

ception. Although she may be thought the *root of Jesse*, yet could she not germinate of herself; though Eve were the mother of all living, yet generation was founded on the divine benediction which was given to both together: For *God blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth*. Though Christ was promised as the *Seed of the woman*, yet we must not imagine that it was in the power of woman to conceive him. When the Virgin thinks it impossible she should conceive because she knew not a man, at the same time she confesseth it otherwise as impossible, and the Angel acknowledgeth as much in the satisfaction of his answer, *For with God nothing shall be impossible*. God then it was who immediately and miraculously enabled the blessed Virgin to conceive our Saviour; and while Mary, Joseph, and all men are denied, no person which is that God can be excluded from that operation*.

But what is included in the conception by the Holy Ghost, or how his operation is to be distinguished from the conception of the Virgin, is not so easily determined. The words by which it is expressed in Scripture are very general: first, as they are delivered by way of promise, prediction, or satisfaction to Mary; *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee*: secondly, as they suppose the conception already past; *When his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost*; and give satisfaction unto Joseph, *Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost*. Now being the expressions in the Scriptures are so general, that from thence the operation of the Spirit cannot precisely be distinguished from the concurrence of the Virgin, much less shall we be able exactly to conclude it by that late distinction, made in this Article, *conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin*; because it is certain that the same Virgin also conceived him, according to the prophecy, *Thou shalt conceive and bear a Son*: and therefore, notwithstanding that distinction, the difficulty still remains, how he was conceived by the Spirit, how by the Virgin. Neither will any difference of prepositions⁹⁴ be sufficient rightly to distinguish these opera-

⁹⁴ As, 'conceptus de Spiritu Sancto, indeed hath delivered a distinction between *de* and *ex*, after this manner,

* [This last sentence is in the Latin translation, 'Excludi tamen nequit ab hac operatione persona illa, quæ est ille Deus.']

tions. Wherefore there is no other way to bound or determine the action of the Holy Ghost, but by that concurrence of the Virgin which must be acknowledged with it. For if she were truly* the mother of Christ (as certainly she was, and we shall

speaking to those words of the Apostle, 'Quoniam ex ipso, et per ipsum, et in ipso, sunt omnia. Ex ipso non hoc significat quod de ipso. Quod enim de ipso est, potest dici ex ipso; non autem omne quod ex ipso est, recte dicitur de ipso. Ex ipso enim celum et terra, quia ipse fecit ea; non autem de ipso, quia non de substantia sua. Sicut aliquis homo si gignat filium, et faciat domum, ex ipso filius, ex ipso domus; sed filius de ipso, domus de terra et ligno.' *De Nat. Boni adv. Manich. cap. 26, 27.* [vol. viii. p. 508 C.] This distinction having no foundation in the Latin tongue, is ill made use of for the illustration of this Article, because in the Greek language of the Testament there is no such diversity of prepositions; for as we read of Mary, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, so also of the Holy Ghost, εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, and τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου. It is therefore said as well ἐκ πνεύματος, as ἐκ Μαρίας. Again, the Vulgar observeth no such difference, as rendering for the one, *de qua natus est Jesus*, and for the other, *in utero habens de Spiritu Sancto*. Correspondently in the Greek Creeds, συλληθῆντα ἐκ πνεύματος, γεννηθῆντα ἐκ Μαρίας, or as in the Nicene, ἐκ πνεύματος καὶ Μαρίας. And the Latin not only *de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine*, but sometimes *de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine*, and *de Maria Virgine*. Chrysologus and St. Augustin often *de Trinitate*. Wherefore in vain have the Schools first accepted of St. Augustin's distinction, and then applied it to Christ's conception, first taking the preposition *de* to signify no less than a procession from the substance of the cause, and then acknowledge Christ so begotten of the Holy Ghost, because the eternal Son, who was so begotten, was of the same substance with the Holy Ghost. Thus Thomas Aquinas has delivered the subtilty, *Sum. p. iii. q. 32. a. 2.* 'In Spiritu Sancto duplex habi-

tudo consideratur respectu Christi. Nam ad ipsum filium Dei, qui dicitur esse conceptus, habet habitudinem consubstantialitatis; ad corpus autem ejus habet habitudinem causæ efficientis. Hæc autem præpositio *de* utramque habitudinem designat, sicut cum dicimus hominem aliquem esse de suo patre. Et ideo convenienter dicere possumus Christum esse conceptum de Spiritu Sancto hoc modo, quod efficientia Spiritus Sancti referatur ad corpus assumptum, consubstantialitas vero ad personam assumptam.' But this distinction of consubstantiality and effective causality can make nothing for the propriety of the phrase; for the preposition *de* signifieth the material cause as well as the efficient, it must do so in respect of that which is the effect, if it require that the thing which is made be made of the substance of that *de* quo est: then must Christ, according unto that which is made, be made of the substance of the Holy Ghost; or, to speak in the words of the Scripture, 'Quod in ea natum est, de Spiritu Sancto est.' Where either that which was conceived in the Virgin must be acknowledged of the substance of the Holy Ghost, or else the preposition *de* must not be taken in St. Augustin's sense. Howsoever, being there is but one preposition *ἐκ*, common to both in the original Greek; being the Vulgar translation useth *de* indifferently for either; being where they have distinguished *de* and *ex*, they have attributed *ex*, which doth not signify consubstantiality, to the Virgin, of whom they confess he did assume the substance of his body, and *de*, which signifieth (as they say) consubstantiality, to the Holy Ghost, of whose substance he received nothing; it followeth, that the difference in the prepositions can no way declare the different concurrence of the Spirit and the Virgin in Christ's conception.

* [In the first edition it is "truly and properly."]

hereafter prove), then is there no reason to deny to her in respect of him whatsoever is given to other mothers in relation to the fruit of their womb; and consequently, no more is left to be attributed to the Spirit, than what is necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a mother. When the Scripture speaketh of regeneration, or the second birth, it denieth all which belongeth to natural procreation, describing the *sons of* John i. 12, *God as begotten not of bloods, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God:* and in the incarnation of our Saviour, we remove all will or lust of the flesh, we deny all will of man concurring; but as the *bloods* in the language of the Hebrews did signify that substance of which the flesh was formed in the womb, so we acknowledge in the generation of Jesus Christ, that he was made of the substance of his mother.

But as he was so made of the substance of the Virgin, so was he not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, whose essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget him by any communication of his essence, therefore he is not the father of him, though he were conceived by him. And if at any time I have said, Christ was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary*, if the ancients speak as if he generated⁹⁵ the Son, it is not so to be understood, as if the Spirit did perform any proper act of generation, such as is the foundation of paternity.

Again, as the Holy Ghost did not frame the human nature of Christ out of his own substance, so must we not believe that he formed any part of his flesh of any other substance than of the Virgin. For certainly he was of the fathers according to the flesh, and was as to that truly and totally the Son of David and of Abraham. The Socinians, who will acknowledge no other way before Christ's conception by which he could be the only-begotten Son of God, have been forced to invent a strange conjunction in the nature of Christ: one part received from the Virgin, and so consequently from David and from Abraham, from whom that Virgin did descend; another framed by the

⁹⁵ As Chrysologus, *Serm. 57.* [p. 703 C.] 'Ubi Spiritus generat, Virgo parit.' [p. 707 F.]

* [Such expressions occurred oftener in the first edition, but were altered into "conceived by the Virgin Mary."]

Spirit, and conjoined with it⁹⁶; by the one part of which humanity he was the Son of Man, as by the other part he was the Son of God.

The belief of this is necessary to prevent all fear or suspicion 167 of spot in this Lamb, of sin in this Jesus. Whatsoever our original corruption is, howsoever displeasing unto God, we may be from hence assured there was none in him, in whom alone
 Job xiv. 4. God hath declared himself to be well pleased. *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? saith Job; a clean and undefiled Redeemer out of an unclean and defiled nature? He whose name is Holiness, whose operation is to sanctify, the Holy Ghost. Our Jesus was like unto us in all things as born of a woman, sin only excepted, as conceived by the Holy Ghost.*

⁹⁶ 'Deus ipsemet ad sanguinem Mariæ addidit aliam materiam, ex quibus deinde Christus conceptus et natus est.' *Smalcus, de vero et naturali Dei Filio, cap. 2.* [p. 17.] 'Verum manet generationem et hanc dici posse, quatenus in Deum ea cadere potest, si ad sanguinem Mariæ addita sit ex parte Dei materia, ex qua cum sanguine Mariæ juncta natus sit Christus.' *Ibid. cap. 3.* What this was thus added to the substance of the Virgin, he elsewhere explains: 'Nos Dei virtutem in Virginis uterum aliquam substantiam creatam vel immisissæ aut ibi creasse affirmamus, ex qua, juncto eo quod ex ipsius Virginis substantia accessit, verus homo generatus fuit.' This he doth not only without any authority affirm, but ground upon it the Sonship of Christ. For so it follows: 'Alias enim homo ille Dei filius a conceptione et nativitate proprie non fuisset.' And again, 'Necessitas magna fuit ut Christus, ab initio vitæ suæ esset Dei Filius, qualis futurus non fuisset, nisi Dei virtute aliquid creatum fuisset, quod ad constituendum Christi corpus una cum Mariæ sanguine concurrir.' Thus while they deny the eternal generation of the Son, they establish a temporal in such manner as is not consonant with that word which they pretend wholly to follow, and have made a body of Christ partly descending from the Father, partly not: and whereas as man he is like to us in all things, sin only excepted, they have invented a body, partly like ours, partly

not, and so in no part totally like. Indeed some of the ancients did speak so as to make the Holy Ghost the semen Dei: as Tertullian; 'Ergo jam Dei filius ex Patris Dei semine, i. e. Spiritu, ut esset et hominis filius, caro ei sola erat ex hominis carne sumenda sine viri semine. Vacabat enim viri semen apud habentem Dei semen.' *De Carne Christi, cap. 18.* [c. 17. p. 311 B.] And St. Hilary calls it 'sementivum inuentis Spiritus efficaciam.' *De Trin. lib. ii. cap. 26.* [p. 801 C.] But in this they only understood the operation of the Spirit, loco seminis. And whosoever spake of any proper semen, they abhorred; as appears by the 191st sermon *De Tempore*; [al. 236. §. 4. vol. v. App. p. 388 G.] 'Nec, ut quidam sceleratissimi opinantur, Spiritum Sanctum dicimus pro semine fuisse, sed potentia et virtute Creatoris operatum.' I know not whether be the greatest folly; to make the Holy Ghost the Father, as these men have done, by creating part of his body by way of seminal conjunction; or to make the same Spirit Mother of Christ, as the Nazareans did. 'In Evangelio Hebræorum quod lecitant Nazareæ, Salvator inducitur loquens, *Modo me arripuit mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus.*' There is only this difference, that one is founded upon no authority of Scripture, the other upon the authority of a pretended, but no Scripture: the one maketh the Holy Ghost a partial, the other a total, mother.

This original and total sanctification of the human nature was first necessary, to fit it for the personal union with the Word, who, out of his infinite love, humbled himself to become flesh, and at the same time, out of his infinite purity, could not defile himself by becoming sinful flesh. Secondly, the same sanctification was as necessary in respect of the end for which he was made man, the redemption of mankind: that as the first Adam was the fountain of our impurity⁹⁷, so the second Adam should also be the pure fountain of our righteousness. *God Rom. viii. 3. sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh; which he could not have condemned, had he been sent in sinful flesh. The Father made him to be sin for us, who 2 Cor. v. 21. knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him; which we could not have been made in him, but that he did no sin, and knew no sin. For whosoever is sinful wanteth a 1 Pet. ii. 22. Redeemer; and he could have redeemed none, who stood in need of his own redemption. We are redeemed with the precious 1 Pet. i. 19. blood of Christ: therefore precious, because of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot. Our atonement can be made by no other High-Priest than by him who is holy, harmless, undefiled, Heb. vii. 26. and separate from sinners. We cannot know that he was manifested 1 John iii. 5. to take away our sins, except we also know that in him is no sin⁹⁸.* Wherefore, being it is so necessary to believe the original holiness of our human nature in the Person of our Saviour; it is as necessary to acknowledge that way by which we may be fully assured of that sanctity, his conception by the Holy Ghost.

Again, it hath been observed⁹⁹, that by this manner of Christ's conception is declared the freedom of the grace of God. For as the Holy Ghost is God, so is he also called the gift of God: and therefore the human nature in its first original, without any precedent merit, was formed by the Spirit, and in its formation sanctified, and in its sanctification united to

⁹⁷ 'Illud unum peccatum, quod tam magnum in loco et habitu tantæ felicitatis admissum est, ut in uno homine originaliter, atque, ut ita dixerim, radicaliter, totum genus humanum damnaretur, non solvitur ac diluitur, nisi per unum Mediatorem Dei et hominum, hominem Christum Jesum, qui solus potuit ita nasci, ut ei non opus esset renasci.' *S. August. Enchir. cap. 48.* [§. 14. vol. vi. p. 214 E.]

⁹⁸ 'In quo non est peccatum, ipse venit auferre peccatum. Nam si esset in illo peccatum, auferendum esset illi, non ipse auferret.' *S. August. [In Ep. Joan. Tract. iv. §. 8. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 854 E.]*

⁹⁹ By St. Augustin; 'Ex hoc, quod de Spiritu Sancto est secundum hominem nativitas Christi, quid aliud quam ipsa gratia demonstratur?' *Enchir. cap. 14.* [p. 211 B.]

the Word; so that the grace was co-existent, and in a manner connatural with it¹. The mystery of the incarnation is frequently attributed in the Scriptures to the love, mercy, and goodness of
 Luke i. 78. God. *Through the tender mercy of our God the day-spring from*
 Tit. iii. 4. *on high hath visited us: in this, the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared.* And though these and such other Scriptures speak properly of the love and mercy of God to man 168 alone, offered unto him in the incarnation of our Saviour, and so directly exclude the merits of other men only; yet because they speak so generally with reference to God's mercy, they may well be thought to exclude all merit universally. Especially considering the impossibility of merit in Christ's humanity², in respect of his conception; because all desert necessarily precedeth its reward, and Christ was not man before he was conceived, nor can that merit which is not.

Thirdly, whereas we are commanded to be holy, and that even as he is holy; by this we learn from what fountain this holiness must flow. We bring no such purity into the world, nor are we sanctified in the womb; but as he was sanctified at his conception, so are we at our regeneration. He was conceived
 John i. 13 not by man, but by the Holy Ghost; and we are *born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* The same overshadowing power which formed his human nature, reformeth ours; and the same Spirit³ assureth us a remission of our sins, which caused in him an exemption from all sin. He which was born for us upon his incarnation, is born within us upon our regeneration⁴.

¹ 'Modus iste quo natus est Christus de Spiritu Sancto non sicut filius, et de Maria Virgine sicut filius, insinuat nobis gratiam Dei, qua homo, nullis præcedentibus meritis, in ipso exordio naturæ suæ que esse cœpit, Verbo Deo copularetur in tantam personæ unitatem, ut idem ipse esset filius Dei qui filius hominis, et filius hominis qui filius Dei: ac sic in naturæ humanæ susceptione fieret quodammodo ipsa gratia illi homini naturalis, quæ nullum peccatum posset admittere. Quæ gratia propterea per Spiritum Sanctum fuerat significanda, quia ipse proprie sic est Deus, ut dicatur etiam Dei donum.' *S. August. Enchir. cap. 40.* [p. 212 D.]

² 'Cum ad naturam Dei non pertineat humana natura, ad personam tamen

unigeniti Filii Dei per gratiam pertinet humana natura; et tantam gratiam, ut nulla sit major, nulla prorsus æqualis. Neque enim illam susceptionem hominis ulla merita præcesserunt, sed ab illa susceptione merita ejus cuncta cœperunt.' *S. August. Tract. 82. in Joan.* [vol. iii. part ii. p. 707 A.]

³ 'Ea gratia fit ab initio fidei suæ homo quicumque Christianus, qua gratia homo ille ab initio suo factus est Christus. De ipso Spiritu et hic renatus, de quo est ille natus. Eodem Spiritu fit in nobis remissio peccatorum, quo Spiritu factum est ut nullum haberet ille peccatum.' *S. Aug. de Præd. Sanct. cap. 15.* [§. 31. vol. x. p. 810 C.]

⁴ 'Nolite desperare; quod semel natus est ex Maria, quotidie et in nobis

All which considered, we may now render a clear explication of this part of the Article, whereby every person may understand what he is to profess, and express what is the object of his faith, when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.* For hereby he ought to intend thus much; I assent unto this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that the only-begotten Son of God, begotten by the Father before all worlds, very God of very God, was conceived and born, and so made man, taking to himself the human nature, consisting of a soul and body, and conjoining it with the Divine in the unity of his Person. I am fully assured that the Word was in this manner made flesh, that he was really and truly conceived in the womb of a woman, but not after the manner of men; not by carnal copulation, not by the common way of human propagation, but by the singular, powerful, invisible, immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, whereby a Virgin was beyond the Law of nature enabled to conceive, and that which was conceived in her was originally and completely sanctified. And in this latitude I profess to believe in Jesus Christ, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.*

169

Born of the Virgin Mary.

THE third person considerable in this third Article is represented under a threefold description, of her name, condition, and action. The first telleth us who it was, it was Mary; the second informeth us what she was, a Virgin; the third teacheth us what she did, she conceived and bare our Saviour, and brought forth the Son of God, which was *born of the Virgin Mary.*

The Evangelist, relating the annunciation, taketh particular notice of this name; for shewing how an angel was sent unto a
 Luke i. 27. *Virgin espoused to a man,* he first observeth that his name was *Joseph*; and then that *the Virgin's name was Mary*: not for any peculiar excellency in the name itself, or any particular application to the Virgin arising from the origination of it, as some have conceived⁵; but only to denote that singular person, which

nascitur.' *S. Hieron. Comm. in Psal. Christi:* [vol. iii. p. 346 D.] 'Ἐπειδὴν ἐτέχθη τὸ παιδίον, ὠνόμασε μὲν αὐτὴν Μαρίας, ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπωνυμίας τὸ θεόδοτον διασημανθείη τῆς χάριτος' mistaking, as I conceive, the origination of *Mary* for that of *Anna*, her mother,

⁵ For some have thought the dignity of the Virgin to be denoted in her name. As Gregorius Nyssenus (or rather his interpolator,) *Homil. in Natal.*

was then so well known to all men, being espoused unto Joseph, as appeareth by the question of his admiring countrymen, *Is not this the Carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary?* Otherwise the name was common even at that time to many; to the

sister of Lazarus, to the mother of James and Joses, to the wife of Cleophas*, to the mother of John, whose surname was Mark, to her which was of Magdala in Galilee, to her who bestowed

John xi. 1.
Mat. xxvii.
56.
John xix.
25.

הנה. Thus he thought *Grace*, others *Dominion*, to be contained in her name. 'Η Μαρία ἐρμηνεύεται κυρία, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑλπίς. Κύριον γὰρ ἔτεκε τὴν ἐλπίδα τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου Χριστόν. *Auctor Homil. de Laudibus B. Mariæ, sub nomine Epiphaniï.* [Epiph. vol. ii. p. 292 B.] Τίεται ποιγαροῦν ἡ χάρις (τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ Ἄννα ἐρμηνεύεται) τὴν κυρίαν τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τῆς Μαρίας τὸ ὄνομα. *Damasc. Orthod. Fid. lib. iv. cap. 14.* [vol. i. p. 275 B.] 'Sciendum quod *Maria* sermone Syro *Dominia* nuncupatur.' *S. Hieron. de Nom. Hebraicis.* So Chrysostolus; 'Dignitas Virginis annunciat ex nomine: nam *Maria* Hebræo sermone, Latine *Dominia* nuncupatur. Vocat ergo Angelus *Dominam*, ut *Dominantis* genitricem trepidatio deserat servitutis, quam nasci et vocari *Dominam* ipsa sui germinis fecit et impetravit auctoritas.' *Serm. 142.* [p. 765 D.] 'Sermone Syro *Maria*, *Dominia* nuncupatur, et pulchre, quia *Dominum* genuit.' *Isidor. Hi-pal. Orig. lib. vii. cap. 10.* [p. 62 E.] The same Isidore, with others, gives another etymology: '*Maria*, illuminatrix, sive stella maris; genuit enim *lumen mundi.*' *Ibid.* And Bernard, *Homil. 2. super Missus est*, [p. 31 M.] 'Loquemur pauca et super hoc nomine, quod interpretatum *maris stella* dicitur, et matri Virgini valde conuenienter aptatur. Ipsa namque aptissime sideri comparatur, quia sicut sine sui corruptione sidus suum emittit radium, sic absque sui læsione Virgo parturit filium.' So far not amiss. But when from a bad etymology he makes worse divinity, calling her the *Star of Jacob*, and attributing unto her the light

of our minds, the life of our graces, and extirpation of our vices, (the work of the Spirit of Christ,) when in the midst of all our temptations, horrors of conscience, and depths of despair, he adviseth us immediately to a 'Respice Stellam, *Mariam* cogita, *Mariam* invoca;' his interpretation can warrant no such devotion. This etymology also descendeth from St. Jerom, who in his interpretation of the names in Exodus, as from Philo, '*Maria*, illuminatrix mea, vel, illuminans eos, aut smyrna maris, vel stella maris.' And again, on the names in St. Matthew, '*Mariam* plerique existimant interpretari, illuminant me isti, vel illuminatrix, vel smyrna maris; sed mihi nequam videtur. Melius autem est ut dicamus sonare eam stellam maris, sive amarum mare.' 'Ερμηνεύεται πάλιν τὸ Μαρία σμύρνα θαλάσσης. *Homil. de Laudibus B. Mariæ.* [p. 292 B.] 'Dictæ sunt et ante *Mariæ* multæ: nam et *Maria* soror *Aaron* dicta fuit, sed illa *Maria* amaritudo maris vocabatur.' *S. Ambros. Instit. Virg. cap. 5.* [§. 34. vol. ii. p. 257 B.] Indeed that *ab amaritudine*, without the adjection of *mare*, is the etymology observed by the Jews, as appears by the author of the *Life of Moses*†, who, relating how *Amram* took *Jochebed* to wife, and of her begat a daughter, addeth שמחה ותקרה מרים כי נבעת ההיא החלו המצריים בני ישראל; הם למרור היי בני ישראל; *She was called Miriam, because at that time the Egyptians, who were the offspring of Cham, made the lives of the sons of Israel bitter.* And in the like manner *Seder Olam*, [c. iii. p. 19.] נקרא שמחה מרים על שם מרור

* [The wife of Cleophas, and the mother of James and Joses, seem to have been the same person. Compare Matt. xxvii. 56. John xix. 25.]

† [An account of this anonymous work, called שמחה של משה, may be found in Wolf's Bibliotheca Heb. ii. 1278. The words quoted occur in page 2 of the Venice edition of 1544.—R. P. S.]

much labour on St. Paul: nor is there any original distinction between the name of these and of the mother of our Lord⁶. Luke viii. 2. For as the name of Jesus was the same with Josuah, so this of Rom. xvi. 6.

170 *Mary* was the same with *Miriam*⁷. The first of which name recorded was the daughter of *Amram*, the sister of *Moses* and *Aaron*, a Prophetess; to whom the bringing of *Israel* out of *Egypt* is attributed, as well as to her brethren. For *I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt*, saith the Lord, *and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron,*

6 This is to be observed, by reason of some learned men, who make the name of the Virgin different from that of others called *Mary* in the Gospel, upon two grounds, in respect of the accent, and the termination; the one being *Μαριάμ* the other *Μαρία*; the first with an Hebrew termination, indeclinable, and the accent *in ultima*; the latter with a Greek termination, declinable, and the accent *in penultima*. As, 'Ὀνομα τῆς παρθένου *Μαριάμ*, Luke i. 27, in the nominative: 'Απογράψασθαι σὺν *Μαριάμ*, Luke ii. 5, in the dative; *Μὴ φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν *Μαριάμ**, Matt. i. 20, in the accusative; and *Μὴ φοβοῦ, *Μαριάμ**, Luke i. 30, in the vocative case. All which belong to the Virgin, who is never named *Μαρία*; as none of the rest by any of the Evangelists is ever called *Μαριάμ*. But notwithstanding this observation, we find the same Virgin's name declined: as, *Μηστουθελίης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας*, Matt. i. 18, and, *Σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ *Μαρία* τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, Acts i. 14, both which must come from the Greek termination *Μαρία in recto*. And, on the contrary, that *Mary* which St. Paul mentioneth hath the same Hebrew termination with the Virgin, 'Ἀσπάσασθε *Μαριάμ*, ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ἡμᾶς. Rom. xvi. 6. Beside, the Syriac translation makes no difference between the name of these and of the Virgin, as, מרים מגדליהא ומרים אחרהא Mark xv. 40. So again, מרים מגדליהא ומרים אחרהא Matt. xxviii. 1. And therefore there can be no sufficient foundation for any such distinction.

7 For whereas we first read, Exod. xv. 20, מרים הנביאה, the LXX. translate it, *Μαριάμ ἡ προφήτις*, and the vulgar Latin, *Maria prophetissa*. The Hebrew first was מִרְיָם; the

Syriac altering the pronunciation, not the letters, מַרְיָם *Marjam*, as for מִרְיָה מִרְיָה. And because the Greek language admitteth no *jod* consonant, they pronounced it *Μαριάμ*. Though sometimes indeed even the Greeks did use the barbarous pronunciation in the barbarous words, as *Lucian* with the *Latins* makes 'Ιουδαῖος of three syllables:

'Ιουδαῖος ἕτερον μῶρον ἐξέδει λαβών. *Tragop. v. 172.*

Again, because no Greek word endeth in *μ*, to make it current in that language, it was necessary to alter the termination, according to their custom; as for *Annibal* Ἀννίβας, *Asdrubal* Ἀσδρούβας, *Amilcar* Ἀμιλκας, and *Kátin*, Κάτιν. This was to be done sometimes by addition; as *Nách* Νάχος, 'Ἀβέλ Ἀβελος, *Laoméx* Λάμεχος, 'Ιαρεδ Ἰαρεδος, Ἐνώς Ἐνωσος, Σήθ Σήθος, Ἀδάμ Ἀδαμος, Ἀβραάμ Ἀβρααμος and Ἀβραάμης. And so for *Μαριάμ*, *Μαριάμμη* or *Μαριάμμη*. *Josephus*, *Μαριάμη* τοῦ παιδὸς ἀδελφῆ, of *Miriam* the sister of *Moses*; whom in another place he calls ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ *Μαριάμμη*. Therefore he thought the name of *Mariamne* to be the same with *Miriam*. And as the Greeks were wont to add their own terminations to exotic words, so did they at other times leave out the exotic terminations, if thereby their own were left. As for *Αβία* and *Ἄββα*, for *Αβια* and *Ζαρὰ*, for *Μαριάμ* *Μαρία*. Wherefore from the Hebrew *Miriam* came, by variety of pronunciation, at first the Syriac *Marjam*, and from the Syriac *Marjam*, at first, only by the variation of pronunciation, *Μαριάμ*, then, for the propriety of termination, *Μαρία*.

miraculous manner, to be the son of a woman, not of a man.

Gen. iii. 15. The first promise of him seems to speak no less; *The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head*: for as the name of *seed* is not generally or collectively to be taken for the generation of mankind, but determinately and individually for that one seed, which is Christ; so the woman is not to be understood with relation unto man, but particularly and determinately to that sex from which alone immediately that seed should come.

According to this first evangelical promise followed that prediction of the Prophet, *The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, A woman shall compass a man*. That new creation of a man is therefore *new*, and therefore a *creation*, because wrought in a woman only, without a man, compassing a man; which interpretation of the Prophet is ancient, literal, and clear¹¹; and whatsoever the Jews have invented to elude it, is frivolous and forced. For while they force the phrase of *compassing a man*, in the latter part of the prediction, to any thing else than a

¹¹ For it is not to be denied that the proper signification of סבב is *circum-dare, or cingere*. R. Judah has observed but one interpretation of this verb, כולל ענין אחד; and Kimchi testifieth that all words which come from the root סבב signify *incompassing, or circuition*. Therefore those words, נקבה הסובב גבר, must literally import no less than that *a woman shall encompass, or enclose a man*, which, with the addition of a *new creation*, may well bear the interpretation of a miraculous conception. Especially considering that the ancient Jews did acknowledge this sense, and did apply it determinately to the Messiah: as appeareth in *Bereshit Rabba, Parash. 89.** when shewing that God doth heal with that with which he woundeth, he saith, as he punished Israel in a virgin, so would he also heal them with a Virgin, according to the Prophet, *The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, a woman*

shall compass a man. By the testimony of R. Huna in the name of R. Idi, and R. Josuah the son of Levi, והמלך המשיח, ש'ן היום ילדהו, *This is Messiah the King, of whom it is written*, (Psal. ii. 7.) *This day have I begotten thee*. And again in *Midrash Tillim* (fol. 4. c. 3.) upon the 2d Psalm, R. Huna in the name of R. Idi, speaking of the sufferings of the Messiah, saith, That when his hour is come, God shall say, עלי לבראחו בריה חדשה וכן הוא אומר אני ילדהו, *I must create him with a new creation*. And so (by virtue of that new creation) he saith, *This day have I begotten thee*. From whence it appeareth that this sense is of itself literally clear, and that the ancient Rabbins did understand it of the Messiah; whence it followeth that the later interpretations are but to avoid the truth which we profess, that Jesus was born of a Virgin, and therefore is the Christ.

* [Quoted, to the end of the extract from *Midrash Tillim*, from Martini Pug. Fid. p. 284. The *Bereshit Rabba* referred to is not the well-known work of that name, but a somewhat apocryphal manuscript, of which Martinus has made great use in his treatise. Its reputed author is R. Moses Haddarshan, the teacher of the famous Rashi; but the passages quoted are entirely contrary to the views of the Jews in the eleventh century, when he lived. A short summary of the arguments for and against the possible existence of this work may be seen in Wolff's *Bibl. Heb. i. p. 818.*—R. P. S.]

conception, they do not only wrest the Scripture, but contradict the former part of the promise, making the new creation neither new, as being often done, nor a creation, as being easy to perform.

But if this prophecy of Jeremy seem obscure, it will be sufficiently cleared by that of Isaiah, *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his name Emmanuel*. The ancient Jews, immediately upon the promulgation of the Gospel¹², understanding well how near this place did press them, gave three several answers to this text: first, denying that it spake of a Virgin¹³ at all; secondly, asserting that it could not belong to Jesus¹⁴; thirdly, affirming that it was fully completed in the person of Hezekiah¹⁵. Whereas the original word was translated *a Virgin*, by such interpreters as were Jews themselves¹⁶, some hundred years before our Saviour's birth. And did not the notation of the word, and frequent use thereof in the Scrip-

¹² How soon these objections were made use of by the Jews, will appear by Justin Martyr, the first writer which made any considerable explication and defence of the Christian religion; who, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, shews us what were the objections of the Rabbins: 'Επει δὲ ὑμεῖς καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν τολμᾶτε λέγειν, μηδὲ εἰρησθαι ἐν τῇ προφητείᾳ τοῦ Ἡσαίου, Ἰδοὺ, ἢ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει, ἀλλ', Ἰδοὺ, ἢ νεάνις ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται καὶ τέξεται υἱόν.' §. 43. [p. 139 E.] And Tertullian, whose works are full of the divinity of Justin; 'Si quando ad dejiciendos aliquos ab hac divina prædicatione, vel convertere singulos simplices quosque gestitis, mentiri audetis, quasi non Virginem, sed juvenculam, concepturam et parituram Scriptura contineat.' *Adv. Jud. cap. 9.* [p. 192 C.] et *adv. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 13.* [p. 404 B.]

¹³ And as they soon began, so did they go on with this objection: 'Hodie, toto jam credente mundo, argumentantur Judæi, Esaia docente [de Maria et virginitate ejus,] *Ecce virgo in utero concipiet, et pariet filium*, in Hebræo *juvenculam scriptum esse, non virginem*, id est, *halmā, non bethulā.*' [S. Hieron. *adv. Helvidium*, vol. ii. p. 209 A.]

¹⁴ 'Dicunt Judæi, Provoceamus istam prædicationem Esaie, et faciamus comparationem, an Christo, qui jam venit, competat illi primo nomen quod Esaia

prædicavit, et insignia ejus quæ de eo nunciavit. Equidem Esaia prædicat eum Emmanuelem vocari oportere, dehinc virtutem sumpturum Damasci et spolia Samariæ adversus regem Assyriorum. Porro, inquit, iste qui venit, neque sub ejusmodi nomine est editus, neque re bellica functus.' *Tertul. adv. Jud. cap. 9.* [p. 192 A.]

¹⁵ So Justin testifieth of the Jews, speaking to Trypho, and in him to them: 'Ἐξηγγείσατε τὴν προφητείαν ὡς εἰς Ἐξεκίαν τὸν γενόμενον ὑμῶν βασιλέα. *Dial. cum Tryph. §. 43.* [p. 139 E.] And Trypho replies again to Justin, 'Ἰδομεν ὡς ἐκεῖνον εἰς Χριστὸν τὸν ὑμέτερον ἀποδεικνύεις εἰρησθαι.' ἡμεῖς γὰρ εἰς Ἐξεκίαν αὐτὸν λέγομεν πεπρωτηθεῖσθαι. *Ibid. §. 77.* [p. 174 A.]

¹⁶ The LXX. Ἰδοὺ ἢ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται. It is true, the rest of the interpreters, concurring with the objection of the Jews, translated it, Ἰδοὺ ἢ νεάνις, i. e. *adolescens, or juvenula*. But as their antiquity, so their authority is far short of the LXX, especially in this case. I shall not need to shew how the origination of מלמא from מלמא proves no less. We know the affinity of the Punic tongue with the Hebrew; and by the testimony of St. Jerom, 'Lingua Punica, quæ de Hebræorum fontibus manare dicitur, proprie virgo *alma* appellatur.' [vol. iv. p. 109 B.]

tures persuade it, the wonder of the *sign* given by the *Lord himself* would evince as much. But as for that conceit, that all should be fulfilled in Hezekiah, it is so manifestly and undoubtedly false, that nothing can make more for the confirmation of our faith. For this sign was given and this promise made (*a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son*) at some time in the reign of Ahaz. This *Ahaz* reigned but *sixteen years in Jerusalem*; and Hezekiah his son, who succeeded him, *was twenty and five years old when he began to reign*, and therefore born several years before Ahaz was king, and consequently not now to be conceived when this sign was given. Thus while the ancient Jews name him only to fulfil the prophecy, in whom it is impossible it should be fulfilled, they plainly shew, that, for any knowledge which they had, it was not fulfilled till our Saviour came: and therefore they cannot with any reason deny but that it belonged unto the Messiah, as divers of the ancient Rabbins thought and confessed; and is yet more evident by their monstrous error, who therefore expected no Messiah in Israel¹⁷, because they thought whatsoever was spoken of him to have been completed in Hezekiah. Which is abundantly enough for our present purpose, being only to prove that the Messiah promised by God, and expected by the people of God, before and under the Law, was to be conceived and born of a Virgin.

Secondly, as we are taught by the predictions of the Prophets, that a Virgin was to be the mother of the promised Messiah; so are we assured by the infallible relations of the Evangelists, that this Mary the mother of Jesus, whom we believe to be Christ, was a Virgin when she bare him, when she *brought forth her first-born Son*. That she was a Virgin when and after she was espoused unto Joseph, appeareth by the narration of St. Luke:

Luke i. 26, *For the Angel Gabriel was sent from God to a Virgin espoused*

17 It is the known saying of Hillel, recorded in *Sanhedrin c. Chelek*, (fol. 98vo.) אין להם משיח לישראל שכבר (There is no Messiah to the Israelites, because they have already enjoyed him in the days of Hezekiah.) Divers of the later Rabbins endeavour to mollify these words of Hillel by their several expositions, but in vain. And R. Joseph understood him better, who thought he took away all expectation of a Messiah, and therefore fairly prayed for him, 'Condonet Dominus hoc R.

Hillel.' Howsoever it appears that from two principles, whereof one was false, he gathered that false conclusion. For first, he thought those words in Isaiah were spoken of the Messiah: which proposition was true. Secondly, he conceived that those words were spoken of Hezekiah, and fulfilled in him, which proposition was false. From hence he inferred, that the Israelites were not to expect a Messiah after Hezekiah: which conclusion was also false.

to a man whose name was Joseph. After the salutation of that Angel, that she still was so, appeareth by her question, *How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?* That she continued so after she conceived by the Holy Ghost, is evident from the relation of St. Matthew: for when she was *espoused unto Joseph*, *Matt. i. 18. before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.* That she was a Virgin not only while she was with child, but even when she had brought forth, is also evident out of his application of the Prophecy; *Behold, a Virgin shall* *Matt. i. 23. be with child, and shall bring forth a Son.* For by the same prediction it is as manifest that a Virgin should *bring forth, as conceive a Son*¹⁸. Neither was her act of parturition more contradictory to virginity, than that former of conception.

Thirdly, we believe the mother of our Lord to have been not only before and after his nativity, but also for ever, the most immaculate and blessed Virgin. For although it may be thought sufficient as to the mystery of the incarnation¹⁹, that when our Saviour was conceived and born, his mother was a Virgin; though whatsoever should have followed after could have no reflective operation upon the first-fruit of her womb; though there be no farther mention in the Creed, than that he was *born of the Virgin Mary*: yet the peculiar eminency and unparalleled privilege of that mother, the special honour and reverence due unto that Son, and ever paid by her, the regard of that Holy Ghost who came upon her, and the power of the Highest which overshadowed her, the singular goodness and

18 'Hæc est Virgo quæ in utero concepit, Virgoque peperit filium. Sic enim scriptum est, *Ecce Virgo in utero concipiet, et pariet filium.* Non enim concepturam tantummodo Virginem, sed et parituram Virginem dixit.' *S. Ambros. Epist. 7. ad Siricium.* [al. Ep. 42. §. 5. vol. ii. p. 967 C.] So he argued from the prophecy, and St. Augustin from the Creed: 'Quo si vel nascente corrumpetur ejus integritas, non jam ille de Virgine nasceretur; eumque falso, quod absit, *natum de Virgine Maria* tota confiteretur Ecclesia, quæ, imitans ejus matrem, quotidie parit membra ejus, et virgo est.' *Enchir. cap. 34.* [vol. vi. p. 210 A.] As also St. Ambrose in the same Epistle: 'Quæ potuit Virgo concipere, potuit Virgo generare; quum semper conceptus præ-

cedat, partus sequatur. Sed si doctrinis non creditur sacerdotum, credatur oraculis Christi, credatur monitis angelorum dicentium, credatur symbolo Apostolorum, quod Ecclesia Romana intemeratum semper custodit et servat.' [vol. ii. p. 967 A.] And St. Basil upon occasion of the same prophecy: 'Ἡ αὐτῆ γυνὴ καὶ παρθένος καὶ μήτηρ, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἁγισμῷ τῆς παρθενίας μένουσα, καὶ τὴν τῆς τεκνογονίας εὐλογίαν κληρονομοῦσα. *Homil. 25.* [vol. ii. p. 599 D.] 'Virgo peperit, quia Virgo concepit.' *Vigil. de Unitate Trin. cap. 10.* [p. 340.]

19 Μέχρι γὰρ τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ὑπηρεσίας ἀναγκαία ἡ παρθενία, τὸ δ' ἐφεξῆς ἀπολυπραγμότητον τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ μυστηρίου. *S. Basil. Homil. de Nativ. Dom.* [§. 5. vol. ii. p. 600 A.]

piety of Joseph, to whom she was espoused, have persuaded the Church of God in all ages to believe that she still continued in the same virginity, and therefore is to be acknowledged the *ever Virgin Mary*²⁰. As if the gate of the sanctuary in the Prophet Ezekiel were to be understood of her: *This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it: because the Lord the God of Israel hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut.*

Ezek. xliv.
2.

Many indeed have taken the boldness to deny this truth²¹,

²⁰ For so the Greek church always called her *ἀειπαρθένος**, and from them the Latins *Semper Virgo*.

²¹ First we read in the time of Origen, that some did maintain the Virginity of Mary no longer than to Christ's nativity. 'In tantam nescio quis prorupit insaniam, ut assereret negatam fuisse Mariam a Salvatore, eo quod post natiuitatem illius juncta fuerit Joseph.' *Homil. 7. in Lucam*†. Tertullian himself was produced as an assessor of the same opinion‡; nor does St. Jerom deny it, though I think he might have done it§. Apollinaris, or at least his followers, delivered the same, says Epiphanius, and Eunomius with his, τὸν Ἰωσήφ μετὰ τὴν ἄρραστον κυφορίαν συνάπτει οὐ πεφορκασί τῇ παρθένω, as Photius out of Philostorgius||. Not that these words in Photius were the words of Philostorgius, for he was clearly an Eunomian, and therefore would never express their opinions with an οὐ πεφορκασί. And as he always commended Eunomius, so was he not commended but by an Eunomian, that is, a man of his own sect. As that epigram,

Εὐνομιανοῦ

* [The earliest writer in whom I have observed this term, is Athanasius, *Orat. ii. cont. Arian. 70. p. 538 B. In Psalm. lxxxiv. 11. p. 1151. In Luc. p. 1271.* She was called so at the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451. (Euvagr. ii. p. 324.) and in the Confession of Faith published by the emperor Justin II. in the sixth century. (Ibid. p. 429, 430.)]

† [That Origen himself maintained the perpetual virginity of Mary, is plain from his saying, εἰ γὰρ οὐδεὶς υἱὸς Μαρίας, κατὰ τοὺς ἰγῶας περὶ αὐτῆς δοξάζοντας, ἢ Ἰησοῦς, κ. τ. λ. in *Joann. i. 6. vol. iv. p. 6 D.*]

‡ [The passages adduced are, *de Carne Christi, c. 7. p. 312. de Monogam. c. 8. p. 529.* but neither of them is conclusive.]

§ [The meaning is, that Jerom might have denied that such an opinion was held by Tertullian.]

|| [The passage may be seen in Reading's edition of the ecclesiastical historians, vol. iii. p. 510.]

Ἱστορίην ἐτέλεσσα Θεοῦ χαρίτεσσι
σοφῆσι

which I therefore mention, because Gotofred hath made an unnecessary emendation in the verse, *ἐτέλεσσ' ἀθέου*, and a worse interpretation in the inscription, taking the Eunomian to be a Catholic, and the name of the sect for the name of a man; and confirming this error by a greater mistake, saying Eunomianus was the name of a man, twice spoken of in Suidas, once in *Εὐνομιανός*, and again in *ἔλουσε*. It is true indeed Suidas says expressly, *Εὐνομιανός, ὄνομα κύριον*, and immediately adds these words, τὸν δὲ Εὐνομιανὸν ἔλουσε Βελισάριος τὸ θεῖον λουτρόν, as if Belisarius had baptized one whose name was Eunomianus. But the words are taken out of Procopius in *Hist. Arcana, pag. 2.* from whence it appears that he who was baptized was by name Theodosius, and by sect an Eunomian. And whatsoever his name was who wrote that epigram on the history of Philostorgius, he was certainly by sect an Eunomian, and that was intended in the inscription, written without question by some Catholic, who thought no

because not recorded in the sacred Writ: and not only so, but to assert the contrary as delivered in the Scriptures; but with 174 no success. For though, as they object, St. Matthew testifieth that Joseph *knew not Mary until she had brought forth her first-born Son*, from whence they would infer, that afterwards he knew her; yet the manner of the Scripture-language produceth no such inference²². When God said to Jacob, *I will not leave* Gen. xxviii.
15.

man could commend the history of Philostorgius but one of his own opinion. These contradictors of the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of our Lord afterwards increased to a greater number, whom Epiphanius calls by a general name, *Antidicomarianitæ*. And from him St. Augustin, '*Antidicomarianitæ appellati sunt hæretici, qui Mariæ Virginitati usque adeo contradicunt, ut affirmant eam post Christum natum viro suo fuisse commixtam.*' *de Hæres. 56. [vol. viii. p. 19 C.]* condemned under that name by the sixth General Council, *Act. 2.* The same were called by the Latins, *Helvidiani*, from Helvidius, (a disciple of Auxentius the Arian,) whose name is most made use of, because refuted by St. Jerom. He was followed by Jovinian, a monk of Milan, as St. Jerom testifieth; though St. Augustin delivereth his opinion otherwise, '*Virginitatem Mariæ destruebat, dicens eam pariendo fuisse corruptam.*' [*Hæc. lxxxii. vol. viii. p. 24 B.*] And Bonosus, a Bishop in Macedonia, referred by the Council of Capua to the judgment of Anysius Bishop of Thessalonica, was condemned for the same, as appeareth by the 79th Epistle of St. Ambrose, written to Theophilus and Anysius: '*Sane non possumus negare de Mariæ filius jure reprehensum, meritoque vestram sanctitatem abhorruisse, quod ex eodem utero virginali, ex quo secundum carnem Christus natus est, alius partus effusus sit.*' [vol. ii. p. 1009 A.] This is the catalogue of those by the ancients accounted heretics for denying the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of our Lord.

²² For in the word *ἔως* there is no such force. Τὸ ἔως οὐ πάντως ἀντιδια-

ρεῖται τῷ μέλλοντι, ἀλλὰ τὸ μέχρι μὲν τοῦδε τίθησι, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἀναί-
νεται. *S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 2. de Filio.* [Orat. xxx. §. 4. vol. i. p. 542 A.] Τὸ ἔως πολλαχοῦ χρόνου μὲν τινα δοκεῖ περι-
ορισμὸν ὑποφαίνειν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀληθείαν
τὸ ἀόριστον δείκνυσιν. *S. Basil. Homil. de Nativ. Dom. [§. 5. vol. ii. p. 600 A.]*
Ἔθος τῇ γραφῇ τὴν ῥῆσιν ταύτην μὴ ἐπι-
διωρισμένον τιθέναι χρόνον. *S. Chrysost.* [In Matt. Hom. v. §. 3. vol. vii. p. 77 A.]
Τὸ ἔως πολλάκις καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ διηλεκτῶς ἐν
τῇ θεῖα γραφῇ εὐρίσκομεν κείμενον. *I-
sidor. Pelus. lib. i. Epist. 18. [p. 6 B.]*
Τὸ ἔως πολλαχοῦ οὐκ ἐπὶ χρόνου λέγει,
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πράγματος. *Adrian. Isag. in S. S.* Τὸ ἔως ἐνίοτε μὲν πρὸς
ἀντιδιαστολήν τοῦ ἐφεξῆς χρόνου παραλα-
βαζόμενον, ἐνίοτε δ' οὐκ ἐπὶ δηλώσει μεγά-
λων μὲν ἔργων καὶ θεοπεριῶν καθάπερ
καὶ νῦν, οὐ μὲν πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολήν ἑτέρου
χρόνου τινός, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐναντίον εἰς ὑπο-
δήλωσιν ἀπεράντου διαστήματος. *Phot. Epist. 30*. [p. 89.]* In the same man-
ner it is observed by the Greek gram-
marians of πρὶν, that if any one declared
that he did it not πρὶν before such a
thing were done, it followeth not that
he did it when or after that thing was
done. As when Helena saw and knew
Ulysses a spy in Troy, she promised
upon oath that she would discover him
to none till he was safe returned to the
Grecian fleet:

— Καὶ ὄμοσα καρτερὸν ὄρκον,
Μὴ μὲν πρὶν Ὀδυσῆα μετὰ Τρώεσσ'
ἀναφήναι,
Πρὶν γὰρ τὸν ἐς νῆας τε θοὰς κλισίας τ'
ἀφικέσθαι. Ὅδ. δ'. 253.

And yet it is not likely, says Eustathius, that Helena did ever discover Ulysses to the Trojans after he was returned. Ἐν δὲ τῷ, Μὴ πρὶν Ὀδυσσεῖα Τρωσὶν

* [Theophylact (ad loc. p. 10 C.) refers to Gen. viii. 7. οὐχ ὑπέστρεψεν ἔως τοῦ ξηρανθῆναι τὸ ὑδᾶρ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. See also 2 Sam. vi. 23. Matt. v. 18. xxiv. 34. xxvi. 29. 1 Tim. iv. 13. Glassius, *Philol. Sacr. p. 457.*]

thee until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of, it followeth not that when that was done, the God of Jacob left him. When the conclusion of Deuteronomy was written, it was said of Moses, *No man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day*: but it were a weak argument to infer from thence, that the sepulchre of Moses hath been known ever since. When Samuel had delivered a severe prediction unto Saul, he *came no more to see him until the day of his death*: but it were a strange collection to infer, that he therefore gave him a visit after he was dead. *Michal the daughter of Saul had no child unto the day of her death*: and yet it were a ridiculous stupidity to dream of any midwifery in the grave. Christ promised his presence to the Apostles *until the end of the world*: who ever* made so unhappy a construction as to infer from thence, that for ever after he would be absent from them?

Again, it is true that Christ is termed the *first-born Son of Mary*²³, from whence they infer she must needs have a second; but might as well conclude that wheresoever there is one there must be two. For in this particular the Scripture-notion of priority excludeth an antecedent, but inferreth not a consequent; it supposeth none to have gone before, but concludeth not any to follow after. *Sanctify unto me*, saith God, *all the first-born*; which was a firm and fixed law, immediately obliging upon the birth: whereas if the first-born had included a relation to a second, there could have been no present certainty, but a suspension of obedience; nor had the first-born been sanctified

ἀναφῆναι, πρὶν αὐτὸν εἰς νῆας ἰκέσθαι, εἴπερ μὴ δοκεῖ πιθανὸν ἢ εὐλόγιστον τὸ ἀναφῆναι ὄλας τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα Τρωσῖν, ἐνθυμητέον τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ, μὴ πρὶν ποιῆσαι τὸ δέ τι πρὶν αὐτὸν τὸδε γένηται· ἦτις ἐν τῇ α' βιβλίῳ τῆς Ἰλιάδος κεῖται. καὶ φανεῖται ἐκεῖθεν, ὡς οὐκ εἰκόσ τὴν Ἑλέην εἰπεῖν τοῖς Ἰλιεῦσι περὶ τοῦ Ὀδυσσεῶς οὐδὲ ὅτε εἰς νῆας καὶ κλισίας ἀφίκετο αὐτός. A negation antecedent πρὶν or ἔως, is no affirmation following them.

23 For I shall not deny that Christ was called the *first-born* in respect of his Mother, though Epiphanius thought that a sufficient answer: *Οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐγέννησε τὸν πρωτότοκον αὐτῆς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτὴν ἔως ἔβου ἐγέννησε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· καὶ οὐκ εἶπε, τὸν πρωτότοκον αὐ-*

τῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸν πρωτότοκον. Ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτῆς ἐσήμανεν, ἐξ αὐτῆς κατὰ σάρκα γεγεννησθαι· ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ τοῦ πρωτότοκου ἐπωνυμίᾳ, οὐκέτι τὸ αὐτῆς ἔθετο, ἀλλὰ πρωτότοκον μόνον. *Heeres. lxxviii. §. 17. [p. 1049 B.]* as if her Son the first-born were not her first-born Son. *Ὁ πάντως ὁ πρωτότοκος πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιγινόμενους ἔχει τὴν σύγκρισιν, ἀλλ' ὁ πρῶτον διανοίγων μήτραν πρωτότοκος ὀνομάζεται. S. Basil. Homil. de Nativ. Dom. [§. 5. vol. ii. p. 600 B.]* 'Primogenitus est non tantum post quem et alii, sed ante quem nullus.' *S. Hieron. adv. Helvid. [§. 10. vol. ii. p. 214 E.]* It is observed by Servius, to that of Virgil's *Æneid. i. 5. Trojæ qui primus ab oris, that primus is post quem nullus.*

* [In the first edition it is "who never made," &c. without the note of interrogation.]

of itself, but the second birth had sanctified the first. And well might any sacrilegious Jew have kept back the price of redemption due unto the priest, nor could it have been required of him, till a second offspring had appeared²⁴; and so no redemption at all had been required for an only son. Whereas all such pretences were unheard of in the Law, because the original Hebrew word is not capable of any such construction; and in the Law itself it carrieth with it a clear interpretation, *Sanctify unto me all the first-born; whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and beast, it is mine. The aperture of the womb determineth the first-born*²⁵; and the law of redemption excludeth all such tergiversation: *Those that are to be redeemed, from a month old thou shalt redeem; no staying to make up the relation, no expecting another birth to perfect the redemption. Being then they brought our Saviour to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord; as it is written in the Law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord; it is evident he was called the first-born of Mary according to the notion of the Law of Moses, and consequently that title inferreth no succession, nor proveth the mother to have any other offspring.*

Indeed, as they thirdly object, it cannot be denied but that we read expressly in the Scriptures of the brethren of our Lord: *He went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren*; and, *While he talked unto the people, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him.* But although his mother and his brethren be named together, yet they are never called the sons of his mother; and the question is not whether Christ had any brethren, but whether his mother brought forth any other children. It is possible Joseph might have children before Mary was espoused to him; and then as he was reputed and called our Saviour's father, so might they well be accounted and called his brethren, as the ancient Fathers²⁶, especially of

24 Thus St. Jerom makes his plea: 'Quid ma in unius mensis stringis articulo? quid primogenitum vocas, quem ana fratres sequantur ignoro? Expecta donec nascatur secundus: nihil debeo sacerdoti, nisi et ille fuerit procreatus, per quem is qui ante natus est incipiat esse primogenitus.' *Adv. Helvid. [vol. ii. p. 215 C.]*

25 Origen first delivereth it on St. Matthew, [tom. x. 17. vol. iii. p. 463 A.] and Eusebius sheweth his opinion, speaking of St. James the brother of our Lord. *Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. 1. [p. 44.]* Τότε δῆτα καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λεγόμενον ἀδελφὸν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ οὗτος τοῦ

26 'Definitiv sermo Dei quid sit Pri-

the Greek Church, have taught. Nor need we thus assert that Joseph had any offspring, because the language of the Jews includeth in the name of *brethren* not only the strict relation of fraternity, but also the larger of consanguinity; and therefore it is sufficient satisfaction for that expression, that there were such persons allied unto the blessed Virgin. *We be brethren*, said Abraham unto Lot; when Abraham was the son of Terah, Lot of Haran, and consequently not his brother, but his nephew, and, as elsewhere properly styled, *the son of his brother*. *Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Come near, carry your brethren from before the sanctuary*; whereas those brethren were Nadab and Abihu, the sons, not of Uzziel, but of Aaron. *Jacob told Rachel that he was her father's brother, and that he was Rebecca's son*: whereas Rebecca was the sister of Rachel's father. It is sufficient therefore that the Evangelists, according to the constant language of the Jews, call the kindred of the blessed Virgin the brethren and sisters of her only Son; which indeed is something the later²⁷, but the most generally approved, answer.

Ἰωσήφ ὀνόμαστο παῖς τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ πατὴρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ. So we read, as it is set forth by R. Stephanus; but in my book collated with an ancient MS. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τοῦ νομιζομένου οἰονεῖ πατρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ· which is much more plain; for ὀνόμαστο παῖς is nothing so pertinent in this particular as υἱὸς ἦν. So St. Epiphanius, Ἦν γὰρ ὁ Ἰάκωβος οὗτος υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ἐκ γυναικὸς τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, οὐκ ἀπὸ Μαρίας. *Hæres.* xxix. §. 4. [vol. i. p. 119 A.] and, speaking of the rest, he calls them τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰωσήφ ἐκ τῆς ὄντως αὐτοῦ ἄλλης γυναικὸς. *Hæres.* xlii. *Refut.* 12. [p. 326 B.] Thus St. Hilary, 'Homines pravissimi hinc presument opinionis suæ auctoritatem, quod plures Dominum nostrum fratres habuisse sit traditum, qui si Mariæ illi fuissent, et non potius Joseph ex priore conjugio suscepti, &c.' *Com. in Matth.* cap. 1. [p. 612 D.] Thus also St. Ambrose *de Virg.* and generally all the Fathers to that time, and the Greeks afterwards, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, Euthymius, Theophylact, Ecumenius, and Nicephorus. These all seem to have followed an old tradition, which is partly still continued, in St. Epiphanius: Ἔσχε δὲ οὗτος ὁ Ἰωσήφ τὴν μὲν

πρώτην αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ κύσκει αὐτῷ αὐτῆ παῖδας τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἕξ, τέσσαρας μὲν ἄρρενας, θηλείας δὲ δύο. *Hæres.* lxxviii. §. 7. [p. 1039 B.] The first of these six children was James: μετ' αὐτὸν δὲ γίνεταί παῖς Ἰωσήφ καλούμενος, εἶτα μετ' αὐτὸν Συμεὼν, ἔπειτα Ἰούδας· καὶ δύο θυγατέρες, ἡ Μαρία, καὶ ἡ Σαλώμη καλονομένη. §. 8. Thus had the Greeks a distinct relation of the sons and daughters of Joseph, and of the order of their generation. Whose authority I shall conclude with that of Jobius; Ἐδεῖ πατέρα καὶ ἀδελφοὺς ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάσαι τὸν ἀπάτορα· οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ληστῶν καὶ πονηρῶν τούτους ἐξελέξατο, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ διαλάμποντας· τοιοῦτος γὰρ Ἰωσήφ, καὶ οἱ τούτου παῖδες. *Econ. lib.* ix. *in Phot. Biblioth.* 222. [p. 202.] and that of Amphilochius Junior; Ἠπίστησαν δὲ ποτε καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ υἱοί, καθὼς μαρτυρεῖ ὁ Εὐαγγελιστῆς, καὶ τῆ πείρα διδαχθέντες τὸ ἀληθὲς, γεγραφήκασιν Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰούδας παντὶ τῷ κοσμῷ, Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλους ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι. *Orat. in Deir.* [p. 56 B.]

²⁷ The first, I conceive, who returned this answer, was St. Jerom, in a Tractate written in his youth at Rome

176 And yet this difficulty, though usually no farther considered, is not fully cleared; for they which impugned the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord, urged it farther, pretending that as the Scriptures called them the *brethren of Christ*, so they also shewed them to be the sons of Mary the mother of Christ. For first, the Jews express them particularly by their names, *Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas*²⁸? Therefore James and Joses were

against Helvidius; wherein, after a long discourse of several acceptions of *brethren* in the Scriptures, he thus concludes: 'Restat igitur, ut—fratres eos intelligas appellatos, cognitione, non affectu, non gentis privilegio, non natura: quo modo Lot Abraham, quo modo Jacob Laban est appellatus frater.' [vol. ii. p. 223 A.] And as for the other opinion of those which went before him, he says it was grounded merely upon an apocryphal history; 'Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Joseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, et quamdam Escham mulierculam confingentes.' *Com. in Matt.* cap. xii. 49. [vol. vii. p. 86 B.] Indeed Origen himself, followed in this particular by the Greek Church, did confess no less; who tells the authors from whom that interpretation first arose; τοὺς δὲ ἀδελφοὺς Ἰησοῦ πατὴρ τινες εἶναι, ἐκ παραδόσεως ὀρμωμένοι τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου, ἢ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ ἐκ προτέρας γυναικὸς, συνωκηκίας αὐτῷ πρὸ τῆς Μαρίας. in *Matt.* [tom. x. 17. vol. iii. p. 462 E.] This Jacobus mentioned by Origen is the same with him whom Eustathius mentions in *Hexaemero* [p. 70.] Ἀξίον δὲ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἦν διέξεισι περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας Ἰάκωβός τις ἐπελθεῖν. Whence he reckons Joseph inter τοὺς χηρεύοντας, and Epiphanius calls Ἰάκωβος Ἐβραῖος. *Lib. de Vita B. Mariæ Virg.* St. Jerom therefore observing that the former opinion of Joseph's sons was founded merely upon an apocryphal writing, and being ready to assert the virginity of Joseph as well as Mary, first invented the other solution in the kindred of Mary, as founded not only in the language, but also testimony of the Scriptures. 'Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Joseph

filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, et quamdam Escham mulierculam confingentes. Nos autem, sicut in libro quem contra Helvidium scripsimus continetur, fratres Domini non filios Joseph, sed consobrinos Salvatoris, Mariæ liberos intelligimus materteræ Domini, quæ esse dicitur mater Jacobi minoris et Joseph et Judæ, quos in alio Evangelii loco fratres Domini legitimus appellatos. Fratres autem consobrinos dici omnis Scriptura demonstrat.' *S. Hieron. in Matt.* xii. 49. [vol. vii. p. 86 B.] After St. Jerom St. Augustin embraced this opinion: 'Consanguinei Virginis Mariæ fratres Domini dicebantur. Erat enim consuetudinis Scripturarum appellare fratres quoslibet consanguineos et cognationis propinquos.' *Tract.* 28. *in Joan.* [§. 3. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 508 E.] *item Tract.* 10. *et cont. Faust. lib.* xxii. cap. 35. [vol. viii. p. 383.] Although therefore he seem to be indifferent in his Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, i. 15. [§. 8. vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 946 A.] 'Jacobus Domini frater, vel ex filiis Joseph de alia uxore, vel ex cognatione Mariæ matris ejus, debet intelligi.' yet because this Exposition was written while he was a presbyter, and those before mentioned after he was made a bishop, therefore the former was taken for his undoubted opinion, and upon his and St. Jerom's authority hath been generally since received in the Latin Church.

²⁸ From this place Helvidius argued, 'Hæc eadem vocabula in alio loco nominari, et eosdem esse fratres Domini, filios Mariæ.' [§. 11. p. 217 A.] And from the next he concluded, 'Ecce Jacobus et Joses, filii Mariæ, quos Judæi fratres appellarunt.' *S. Hieron. adv. Helvid.* [vol. ii. p. 217 D.]

Matt. xiii. 55.

undoubtedly the brethren of Christ, and the same were also as unquestionably the sons of Mary: for among the women at the cross we find *Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses*. Again, this Mary they think can be no other than the mother of our Lord, because they find her early in the morning at the sepulchre with *Mary Magdalene and Salome*, and it is not probable that any should have more care of the body of the son than the mother²⁹. She then who was certainly present at the cross, was not probably absent from the sepulchre: wherefore they conclude she was the mother of Christ, who was the mother of James and Joses, the brethren of Christ.

And now the urging of this argument will produce a greater clearness in the solution of the question. For if it appear that Mary the mother of James and Joses was different and distinguished from Mary the Virgin; then will it also be apparent that the brethren of our Lord were the sons of another mother, for James and Joses were so called. But we read in St. John, that *there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene*. In the rest of the Evangelists we find at the same place *Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses*; and again at the sepulchre, *Mary Magdalene and the other Mary*: wherefore that *other Mary* by the conjunction of these testimonies appeareth to be Mary the wife of Cleophas, and the mother of James and Joses; and consequently James and Joses, the brethren of our Lord, were not the sons of Mary his mother, but of the other Mary³⁰, and therefore called his brethren, according to the language of the Jews, because that the other Mary was the sister of his mother.

Notwithstanding therefore all these pretensions, there can

²⁹ Here Helvidius exclaiming triumphed, 'Quam miserum erit et inpium de Maria hoc sentire, ut cum alia femina curam sepulturae Jesu habuerint, matrem ejus dicamus absentem!' *S. Hieron. adv. Helvid.* [vol. ii. p. 218 A.]
³⁰ 'Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus, ut nonnulli existimant, Joseph ex alia uxore, ut autem mihi videtur, Mariae sororis ma-

tris Domini, cujus Joannes in libro suo meminit, filius.' *S. Hieron. in Catal. Script. Eccles.* 2. [vol. ii. p. 815 A.]
 'Sicut in sepulchro ubi positum est corpus Domini, nec antea nec postea mortuus jacuit: sic uterus Mariae nec antea nec postea quicquam mortale concepit.' *S. August. Tract.* 28. *in Joan.** [vol. iii. part ii. p. 508 F.]

* [There was a tradition, that Joseph and Cleophas were brothers, each of whom married a wife named Mary. Hegesippus *apud Eus. H. E.* III. IV. 22. Epiphanius. *Hæc.* LXXVIII. 7. p. 1039 A.]

be nothing found to raise the least suspicion of any interruption of the ever-blessed Mary's perpetual virginity. For as she was a Virgin when she conceived, and after she brought forth our Saviour; so did she continue in the same state and condition, and was commended by our Saviour to his beloved Disciple, as a mother only now of an adopted son.

The third consideration belonging to this part of the Article is, how this Virgin was a mother, what the foundation was of her maternal relation to the Son of God, what is to be attributed unto her in this sacred nativity, beside the immediate work of the power of the Highest, and the influence of the Holy Ghost. For we are here to remember again the most ancient form of this Article, briefly thus delivered, *Born of the Holy Ghost, and the Virgin Mary*; as also that the word *born* was not taken precisely for the nativity of our Saviour, but as comprehending in it whatsoever belonged to his human generation; and when afterward the conception was attributed to the Spirit, the nativity to the Virgin, it was not so to be understood, as if the Spirit had conceived him, but the blessed Virgin by the power and operation of the Spirit.

First therefore, we must acknowledge a true, real, and proper conception, by which the Virgin did conceive of her own substance³¹ the true and real substance of our Saviour, according to the prediction of the Prophet, *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive*, Isa. vii. 14. and the annunciation of the angel, *Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb*³². From whence our Saviour is expressly termed by Elizabeth, *the fruit of her womb*.

Secondly, as she did at first really and properly conceive, so did she also nourish and increase the same body of our Saviour,

³¹ 'Quamvis tantum ad nativitatem carnis ex se daret, quantum ex se feminæ endendorum corporum susceptis originibus impenderent.' *S. Hilari. de Trin. lib. x. cap. 15.* [p. 1045 B.]

³² That is, by a proper conception, *Συλλαβεῖν ἐν γαστρῇ*, the Syriac in one word *ܢܨܝܐ*, ac si diceret, *ventrescere*. So the LXX. translated the simple *ἔνδρα*, ἐν

* [It appears that there were discussions upon this point in early times: *τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ μετὰ τὴν δοκεῖ ἡ Μαριάμ λεχθῶ εἶναι διὰ τὴν τοῦ παιδίου γέννησιν, οὐκ οὕτω λεχθῶ καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τὸ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν μαιωθεῖσαν φασὶ τινες παρθένον εἶρεθῆναι.* Clem. Alex. *Strom.* VII. 16. [vol. ii.] p. 889. Tertullian, however, did not hold such a notion, 'Virgo quantum a viro, non virgo quantum a partu.' *De Carne Christi*, 23. [p. 324 C.] See Suicer, v. *Μαρία*. Beausobre, *Hist. de Manichéisme*, vol. i. p. 361.]

γεννηθέντα.

Luke i. 42.
 Heb. *פרי בטן*

Matt. i. 18. once conceived, by the true substance of her own; by which *she was found with child of the Holy Ghost*, and is described going with *Joseph to be taxed, being great with child*, and pronounced happy by that loud cry of the woman in the Gospel, *Blessed is the womb that bare thee.*

Thirdly, when Christ was thus conceived and grew in the womb of the blessed Virgin, she truly and really did bring forth her son by a true and proper parturition; and Christ thereby was properly born by a true nativity³³. For as we read, Luke i. 57. *Elizabeth's full time came that she should be delivered, and she brought forth a son*; so in the like simplicity of expression, and propriety of speech, the same Evangelist speaks of Mary, Luke ii. 6, 7. *The days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son.*

Wherefore from these three, a true conception, nutrition, and parturition, we must acknowledge that the blessed Virgin was truly and properly³⁴ the mother of our Saviour. And so is she frequently styled the mother of Jesus in the language of the Evangelists, and by Elizabeth particularly the *mother of her Lord*, as also by the general consent of the Church (because he which was so born of her was God³⁵;) the *Deipara*³⁶; which

³³ Πεπληροφορημένους εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν, ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, υἱὸν Θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν Θεοῦ, γεγεννημένον ἀληθῶς ἐκ παρθένου. *S. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn.* [§. 1.]

³⁴ 'Veri et proprii filii quis nisi absurdissimus neget vere et proprie esse matrem?' *Facund. lib. i. cap. 4.* [p. 671 B.] 'Hoc et ad credendum difficile, et dignum controversia videbatur, utrum Deum illa Virgo genuerit: cæterum quod vere et proprie genuerit, quicquid est ille quem genuit, nulli dignum disceptationis apparet.' *Ibid.*

³⁵ Πῶς γὰρ οὐ Θεοτόκος ἢ Θεὸν υἱὸν ἔχουσα; *Theod. Abucara, Disput. 14.* [p. 407 D.]

³⁶ This name was first in use in the Greek Church, who, delighting in the happy compositions of that language, called the blessed Virgin Θεοτόκον. From whence the Latins in imitation styled her *Virginem Deiparam et Deigenitricem*. Meursius in his Glossary sets the original of this title in the time of Justinian: 'Inditum hoc nomen est matri Domini ac Servatoris nostri Jesu

Christi a Synodo V. Constantinopolitana tempore Justiniani.' Whereas this was not the original, but the confirmation, of that title. 'In hac Synodo Catholice est institutum, ut beata Maria semper virgo Θεοτόκος diceretur: quia, sicut Catholica fides habet, non hominem solum, sed vere Deum et hominem, genuit.' *Paul. Warnef. de Gest. Longobard. lib. vi. cap. 14.* [p. 187 E.] So speaketh he of the same Synod: and it is true, for the seventh Canon of the same runneth thus, *Εἰ τις καταχρηστικῶς—Θεοτόκον λέγει τὴν ἁγίαν ἐνδοξὸν ἀειπαρθένον Μαρῖαν ἢ κατὰ ἀναφορὰν—ἀλλὰ μὴ κυρίως καὶ κατ' ἀλήθειαν Θεοτόκον αὐτὴν ὁμολογῇ—ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνθήμα ἔστω.* [Mansi ix. p. 380 C.] Otherwise in this Council was but confirmed what had been determined and settled long before: and therefore Photius says thereof, *Epist. i.* [p. 11.] *Ἄθνη ἢ ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμένη συνόδος Νεστορίου πάλιν τὰ μιστὰ παραφύεμενα δόγματα εἰς τὸν παντελῆς ἐξεθίρεισε,* that it utterly cut off the heresy of Nestorius, which then began to grow up again. Now part of

178 being a compound title begun in the Greek Church, was resolved

the heresy of Nestorius was the denial of this Θεοτόκος, and the whole was nothing else but the ground of that denial. And therefore being he was condemned for denying of it, that title must be acknowledged authentic, which he denied, from the time of the Council of Ephesus; in which those Fathers, saith Photius expressly, *τὴν πανάχραντον καὶ ἀειπαρθένον (Χριστοῦ) μητέρα κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς καλεῖσθαι καὶ ἀνευφημῆσθαι Θεοτόκον παραδεδόκασι.* *Epist. i.* [p. 8.] And that it was so then is manifest, because by the denial of this the Nestorian heresy was first discovered, not in Nestorius himself, but in his presbyter Anastasius, who first in a sermon magisterially delivered, *Θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρῖαν καλεῖται μηδῆς.* *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. 32.* [p. 380.] and *Liberat. Breviar. cap. 4.* as also Evagrius and Nicephorus. Upon which words arising a tumult, Nestorius took his presbyter's part, teaching the same doctrine constantly in the Church, *καὶ πανταχοῦ τὴν λέξιν τοῦ Θεοτόκος ἐκβάλλων.* And hereupon the tumult grew so great, that a general Council for that reason was called by Theodosius Junior, *τοῦ Νεστορίου τὴν ἁγίαν Μαρῖαν εἶναι Θεοτόκον ἀρνούμενον,* as Justinian testifieth, *Epist. ad V. Syn.* [Mansi ix. p. 179.] In which, when all things seemed clearly to be carried against Nestorius and his faction, he hoped to have reconciled all by this feigned acknowledgment, *Λεγέσθω καὶ Θεοτόκος ἡ Μαρία, καὶ παυσέσθω τὰ λυπηρά.* *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. 34.* *Liberat. Breviar. cap. 6.* It is plain then that the Council of Ephesus, which condemned Nestorius, confirmed this title Θεοτόκος; I say, confirmed it; for it is evident that it was before used in the Church, by the tumult which arose at the first denial of it by Anastasius; and so confirmed it as received before, because they approved the Epistles of St. Cyril, who proved it by the usage of those Fathers which preceded him. Where by the way it is observable, that while St. Cyril produceth nine

several Fathers for the use of this word, and both before and after he produceth them, affirmeth that they all did use it, there are but three of them who expressly mention it, Athanasius, Antiochus, and Ammon: *Epist. ad Reginas.* [vol. v. pt. ii. p. 48.] And it is something to be admired that he should so name the other six, and recite those places out of them which had it not, when there were before him so many beside them that used it. As Gregory Nazianzen, *Εἴ τις οὐ Θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρῖαν ὑπολαμβάνει, χωρὶς ἐστὶ τῆς θεότητος.* *Epist. i. ad Cledon.* [Ep. cr. vol. ii. p. 85 B.] and in his first Oration of *Filio*, speaking of the difference of his generation from that of others, *Ποῦ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς σοῖς ἔγγυς Θεοτόκον παρθένον;* and St. Basil asserteth, *μὴ καταδέχεσθαι τῶν φιλοχρίστων τὴν ἀκοήν, ὅτι ποτὲ ἐπαύσατο εἶναι παρθένος ἡ Θεοτόκος.* *Homil. de Nativ. Christi.* [§. 5. vol. ii. p. 600 A.] And that in the time of St. Basil and St. Gregory this term was usual, appeareth by the objection of Julian, who derided the Christians for thinking God could be born of a woman; *Θεοτόκον δὲ ὅμοις οὐ πάθετε Μαρῖαν καλοῦντες.* *S. Cyril. Alex. cont. Julian. lib. viii.* [vol. vi. p. 262 D.] Before both these Eusebius speaketh of Helena, who built a church at Bethlehem; *βασιλις ἡ θεοσεβεστάτη τῆς Θεοτόκου τὴν κήσιν μνήμασι θαυμαστοῖς κατεκόσμη.* *De Vita Constant. lib. iii. cap. 43.* [p. 601.] And before Eusebius, Alexander Bishop of Alexandria: *Ἀπαρχὴ γέγονεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, σῶμα φορέσας ἀληθῶς, καὶ οὐ δοκῆσαι, ἐκ τῆς Θεοτόκου Μαρίας.* *Epist. ad Alex. apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 4.* [p. 20.] Before him Dionysius Alexandrinus calls our Saviour *τὸν σαρκωθέντα ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου καὶ Θεοτόκου Μαρίας.* *Epist. ad Paulum Samosat.* [p. 211. ed. 1796.] And speaking of the words of Isaiah, *A Virgin shall conceive, Δείκνυσιν ὅτι ἡ Θεοτόκος τινὰ συνέλαβεν, ἢ παρθένος δηλονότι.* *Resp. ad Quæst. 5.* [p. 238.] And in the answer to the same question, *Πρεβ-*

* [Eusebius also used the term in his treatise *cont. Marcell.* II. i. p. 32, and in two works published by Angelo Mai, *Roma*, 1825. *Quæst. ad Marimum*, (vol. i. p. 69.) *Caten. in Matt.* (ib. p. 83.)]

into its parts by the Latins, and so the Virgin was plainly named the mother of God³⁷.

ματι ἁγίῳ ἠδρασταί, καὶ σκέπεται τῇ
δυναμί τοῦ ὑψίστου ἢ ἀέμνηστος σκηνή
τοῦ Θεοῦ, Μαρία ἢ Θεοτόκος, καὶ παρθένος.
[p. 240.] And again, Οὕτως λέγει καὶ
πάλιν τοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐκ τῆς Θεοτόκου.
[ib.] In the answer to the sixth ques-
tion, Διὰ τὸ φεῦγειν εἰς Αἴγυπτον τὸν
Ἰωσήφ ἅμα τῇ Θεοτόκῳ Μαρίᾳ ἐν ἀγκύ-
λαις φεροῦσα τὴν καταφυγὴν ἡμῶν, [p.
245.] and so often*. Nay yet before
him Origen did not only use, but ex-
pound at large the meaning of that
title Θεοτόκος, in his first tome on the
Epistle to the Romans, as Socrates and
Liberatus testify†. Well therefore did
Antiochus [John] Bishop of Antioch
urge the ancient fathers against Nesto-
rius, calling it πρόσφορον ὄνομα καὶ τε-
τριμμένον πολλοῖς τῶν πατέρων. And
again, Πολλοῖς τῶν πατέρων καὶ συντεθὲν,
καὶ γραφέν, καὶ βηθέν. Τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ
ὄνομα, says he, οὐδὲς τῶν ἐκκλησιαστι-
κῶν διδασκάλων παρήτηται· οἱ τε γὰρ
χρησάμενοι αὐτῷ πολλοὶ καὶ ἐπίσημοι, οἱ
τε μὴ χρησάμενοι οὐκ ἐπελάβοντο τῶν
χρησαμένων. *Concil. Ephes. par. i. cap.*
25. [Mansi iv. pp. 1064, 1065.]

³⁷ Although Θεοτόκος may be ex-
tended to signify as much as the *Mother*
of God, because τίκειν doth sometimes
denote as much as γεννᾶν, and therefore
it hath been translated *Dei genitrix*, as
well as *Deipara*; yet those ancient
Greeks which called the Virgin Θεοτό-
κος, did not call her μητέρα τοῦ Θεοῦ‡.
But the Latins translating Θεοτόκος *Dei*
genitrix, and the Greeks translating
Dei genitrix Θεοῦ μήτηρ, they both at
last called her plainly the *Mother of God*.
The first which the Greeks observed to
style her so was Leo the Great, as was
observed by Ephraim Patriarch of Theo-
polis, whose words have been very much
mistaken by two learned men, Diony-
sius Petavius and Leo Allatius, who
have produced them to prove that he

thought Leo Magnus was the first man
which ever used the word Θεοτόκος. A
strange error this must needs appear in
so great a person as a Patriarch, and
that of the Greek Church; and indeed
not imaginable, considering how well he
was versed in those controversies, and
how he compared the words of Leo with
those of the ancient Greek Fathers, and
particularly of St. Cyril. His words are
these in his Epistle *ad Zenobium*, Πρῶ-
τος ἐν ἁγίοις Λέων ἰδικῶς εἶπεν αὐταῖς
λέξεσιν, ὡς μήτηρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἁγία Θεο-
τόκος, τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πατέρων διαπυρσίσις
ῥήμασι μὴ τοῦτο φαιμένων. [in Phot. Bibl.
228.] That is, *Leo was the first who in*
plain terms called the Θεοτόκος (that is,
Mary) *the Mother of God; whereas the*
Fathers before him spoke not the same in
express words. Petavius and Allatius
have clearly mistaken the proposition,
making the subject the predicate, and
the predicate the subject, as if he had
first called the *Mother of God Θεοτόκος*,
whereas he is said first to call the Θεο-
τόκος *Mother of God*, as appeareth by
the article added to the subject, not
to the predicate. But if that be not
sufficient, his meaning will appear by
another passage to the same purpose, in
his Epistle *ad Syncreticum*; "Ὅτι μητέρα
Θεοῦ πρώτων μὲν ἡ Ἐλισάβετ ἀνέπειν, ἐν
οἷς λέγει, Καὶ πόθεν μοι τοῦτο, ἵνα ἡ
μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου μου ἔλθῃ πρὸς με; σα-
φέστερον δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν
λέξιν πρώτος ὁ ὁσιος Λέων ὁ Πάπας προ-
ήνεγκε. Therefore as he took the *Lord*
and *God* to be synonymous; so he
thought Elizabeth first styled Mary the
Mother of God, because she called her
the *Mother of her Lord*; and after
Elizabeth, Leo was the first who plainly
styled her so, that is, the *Mother of God*.
And that we may be yet farther assured
of his mind, he produceth the words of
Leo the Pope in his Epistle to Leo the

* [The places may be seen at p. 261, 264, 274.]

† [It is also used by Origen in *Deut.* xxii. 23. vol. ii. p. 391 A. in Luc. apud Galland. *Biblioth. Patr.* vol. xiv. append. p. 87 D. Also by Hippolytus, apud Routh. *Reliq. Sacr.* vol. ii. p. 215.]

‡ [Yet Dionysius calls Mary ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Θεοῦ μου. *cont. Paul. Samos.* quæst. 8. p. 265.]

The necessity of believing our Saviour thus to be *born of the Virgin Mary*, will appear both in respect of her who was the mother, and of him who was the son.

In respect of her it was therefore necessary, that we might perpetually preserve an esteem of her person proportionable to 179 so high a dignity. It was her own prediction, *From henceforth* Luke i. 48. *all generations shall call me blessed*³⁸; but the obligation is ours, to call her, to esteem her so. If Elizabeth cried out *with so loud* Luke i. 42. *a voice, Blessed art thou among women*, when Christ was but newly conceived in her womb; what expressions of honour and admiration can we think sufficient now that Christ is in heaven, and that mother with him³⁹! Far be it from any Christian to derogate from that special privilege granted her, which is incommunicable to any other⁴⁰. We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the *mother of our Lord*, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the primitive Church: Let her be honoured and esteemed, let him be worshipped and adored⁴¹.

In respect of him it was necessary, first, that we might be assured he was *made, or begotten of a woman*, and consequently that he had from her the true nature of man. *For he took not* Heb. ii. 16. *on him the nature of angels*, and therefore saved none of them, who, for want of a redeemer, are *reserved in everlasting chains* Jude 6.

Emperor: Ἀναθεματίζεσθω Νεστόριος, ὁ τὴν μακαρίαν καὶ Θεοτόκον Μαρίαν οὐχὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀνθρώπου δὲ μόνου πιστεύων εἶναι μητέρα. [Ibid.] The sentence which he translates is this, 'Anathematizetur ergo Nestorius, qui beatam Virginem Mariam non Dei, sed hominis tantummodo, creditur genitricem.' *Epist. xvii. cap. i.* [Ep. cxxxiv. c. ii. vol. i. p. 698.] where plainly *genitrix Dei* is translated *μήτηρ Θεοῦ*, and Θεοτόκος is added by Ephraim out of custom in the subject, being otherwise not at all in Leo's words. It is therefore certain that first in the Greek Church they termed the blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος, and the Latins from them *Dei genitrix*, and *mater Dei*, and the Greeks from them again *μήτηρ Θεοῦ*, upon the authority of Leo, not taking notice of other Latins who styled her so before him.

³⁸ 'Non æquanda est mulieribus cunctis, quæ genuit majestatem.' *Auctor lib. de singular. Clericorum.* [§. 26.]

³⁹ 'Elisabet et Zacharias nos docere possunt, quanto inferiores sunt beatæ Mariæ matris Domini sanctitate, quæ conscientia in se habitantis Dei libere proclamat, Ecce enim ex hoc beatam me dicent omnes generationes.' *S. Hieron. adv. Pelag. lib. i.* [§. 16. vol. ii. p. 698 A.]

⁴⁰ 'Absit ut quisquam S. Mariam divinæ gratiæ privilegiis et speciali gloria fraudare conetur.'

⁴¹ 'Ἐν τιμῇ ἔστω Μαρία, ὁ δὲ Πατήρ, καὶ Ἰῶς, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα προσκυνεῖσθω τὴν Μαρίαν μηδεὶς προσκυνεῖτω. *S. Epirh. Hæres. lxxix. §. 7.* [vol. i. p. 1064 D.] Εἰ καλλίστη ἡ Μαρία, καὶ ἁγία, καὶ τετιμημένη, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι. *Ibid.* 'Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῶν μὲν δρωμένων θεολογούμεν οὐδέν· τῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων τοὺς ἐν ἀρετῇ διατρέψαντας ὡς ἀνθρώπων ἀρίστους γεραίρομεν· μόνον δὲ τὸν τῶν ἁγίων προσκυνούμεν Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα, καὶ τὸν ἐκείνου γε λόγον, καὶ τὸ πανάγιον Πνεῦμα. *Theodoret. Therap. Serm. 2.* [vol. iv. p. 502 C.]

under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. And man once fallen had been, as deservedly, so irrevocably condemned to the same condition, but that he took upon him the seed of Abraham. For being we are partakers of flesh and blood, we could expect no redemption but by him who likewise took part of the same: we could look for no Redeemer, but such a one who by consanguinity was our brother⁴². And being there is but
 Heb. ii. 14. *one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus*, we cannot be assured that he was the Christ, or is our Jesus, except we be first assured that he was a man. Thus our Redeemer, the Man Christ Jesus, was born of a woman, that he might redeem both men and women⁴³; that both sexes might rely upon him, who was of the one, and from the other.

Secondly, it was necessary we should believe our Saviour conceived and born of such a woman, as was a most pure and immaculate Virgin. For as it behoved him in all things to be made like unto us; so in that great similitude a dissimilitude
 Heb. iv. 15. *was as necessary, that he should be without sin*⁴⁴. *Our Pass-*
 1 Cor. v. 7. *over is slain, and behold the Lamb that taketh away the sins of*
 John i. 29. *the world; but the Lamb of the passover must be without*
 Exod. xii. 5. *blemish*. Whereas then we draw something of corruption and contamination by our seminal traduction from the first Adam; our Saviour hath received the same nature without any culpable inclination, because born of a Virgin without any seminal tra-
 Heb. vii. 26. *duction*. Our High Priest is *separate from sinners*, not only in the actions of his life, but in the production of his nature. For as Levi was in the loins of Abraham⁴⁵, and paid tithes in him,

⁴² Under that notion did the ancient Jews expect him, as appeareth by the Targum. Cantic. viii. ו. ובהיהו וטמא ונהגלי מלכא משיחא לכנשא דישראל ויימרון ליה בני ישראל אחא חתא עמבא And at that time the king Messias shall reveal himself to the congregation of Israel, and the sons of Israel shall say unto him, Come, be unto us a brother.

⁴³ 'Homini liberatio in utroque sexu debuit apparere. Ergo, quia virum oportebat suscipere, qui sexus honorabilior est, consequens erat ut feminei sexus liberatio hinc appareret, quod ille vir de femina natus est.' S. August. Lib. de divers. quest. lxxxiii. quest. 11. [vol. vi. p. 4 B.] 'Nolite vos ipsos contemnere, viri, filius Dei virum suscepit: nolite vos ipsas contemnere, feminae,

filii Dei natus ex femina est.' Idem de Agone Christiano. [c. xi. §. 12. vol. vi. p. 251 F.]

⁴⁴ 'Non eum in peccatis mater ejus in utero aluit; quem Virgo concepit, Virgo peperit.' S. August. Tract. 4. in Joan. [§. 10. vol. iii. part ii. p. 316 G.] 'Ergo ecce Agnus Dei. Non habet iste traducem de Adam; carnem tantum sumpsit de Adam, peccatum non assumpsit.' Ibid. [p. 317 A.] 'Verbum caro factum in similitudine carnis peccata omnia nostra suscepit, nullum reatus vitium ferens ex traduce prevaricationis exortum.' Joan. IV. Epist. ad Constant. [p. 32 C.]

⁴⁵ 'Levi [in lumbis Abraham fuit,] secundum concupiscentiam carnalem, Christus autem secundum solam sub-

and yet Christ, though the Son of Abraham, did not pay tithes
 180 in him, but receive them in Melchizedek: so though we being in the loins of Adam may be all said to sin in him; yet Christ, who descended from the same Adam according to the flesh, was not partaker of that sin, but an expiation for it. For he which is contained in the seminal virtue of his parent, is some way under his natural power, and therefore may be in some manner concerned in his actions: but he who is only from him by his natural substance, according to a passive or obediencial power, and so receiveth not his propagation from him, cannot be so included in him as to be obliged by his actions, or obnoxious to his demerits.

Thirdly, it was necessary that we should believe Christ born of that person, that Virgin Mary which was espoused unto Joseph, that thereby we might be assured that he was of the family of David. For whatsoever promises were made of the Messias, were appropriated unto him. As the seed of the woman was first contracted to the seed of Abraham, so the seed of Abraham was next appropriated to the Son of David. He was to be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God was
 Luke i. 32. *to give unto him the throne of his father David*. When Jesus asked the Pharisees, *What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?* Matt. xxii. *they said unto him, The Son of David*. When Herod demanded⁴² of the chief Priests and Scribes *where Christ should be born; they* Matt. ii. 4, 5. *said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea, because that was the city of David*, whither Joseph went up with Mary his espoused wife, because he was of the house and lineage of David. After John
 Luke ii. 4. *the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, was born, Zacharias blessed the Lord God of Israel, who had raised up an horn of sal-* Luke i. 68, *vation for us in the house of his servant David*. The woman of⁶⁹ Matt. xv. *Canaan, the blind men sitting by the way, and those other blind* 22: xx. 30: ix. 27. *that followed him cried out, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou Son of David*. The very children, out of whose mouths God perfected praise, were crying in the temple, and saying, *Hosannah to* Matt. xxi. *the Son of David*. And when the blind and dumb both spake¹⁵ and saw, *all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the Son* Matt. xii. 23.

stantiam corporalem. Cum enim sit in semine et visibilis corpulentia et invisibilis ratio, utrumque occurrit ex Abraham, vel etiam ex ipso Adam, usque ad corpus Mariae, quia et ipsum eo modo conceptum et exortum est: Christus

autem visibilem carnis substantiam de carne Virginis sumpsit; ratio vero conceptionis ejus non a semine virili, sed longe aliter ac desuper venit.' S. August. de Genes. ad lit. lib. x. cap. 20. [§. 35. vol. iii. part i. p. 270 D.]

of David? Thus by the public and concurrent testimonies of all the Jews, the promised Messiah was to come of the house and lineage of David; for *God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne*⁴⁶. It was therefore necessary we should believe that our Saviour *was made of the seed of David according to the flesh*: of which we are assured, because he was born of that Virgin Mary who descended from him, and was espoused unto Joseph, who descended from the same, that thereby his genealogy might be known.

The consideration of all which will at last lead us to a clear explication of this latter branch of the Article, whereby every Christian may inform himself what he is bound to profess, and being informed, fully express what is the object of his faith in this particular, when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ which was *born of the Virgin Mary*. For hereby he is conceived to intend thus much: I assent unto this as a most certain and infallible truth, that there was a certain woman, known by the name of Mary, espoused unto Joseph of Nazareth, which before and after her espousals was a pure and unspotted Virgin, and being and continuing in the same virginity, did, by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, conceive within her womb the only begotten Son of God, and, after the natural time of other women, brought him forth as her first-born Son, continuing still a most pure and immaculate Virgin; whereby the 181 Saviour of the world was born of a woman under the Law, without the least pretence of any original corruption, that he might deliver us from the guilt of sin; born of that Virgin which, was of the house and lineage of David, that he might sit upon his throne and rule for evermore. And in this latitude I profess to believe in Jesus Christ, *born of the Virgin Mary*.

⁴⁶ 'Atquin hinc magis Christum intelligere debetis ex David deputatum carnali genere, ob Mariæ Virginis censum. De hoc enim promisso juratur in Psalmo ad David, *Ex fructu ventris tui collocabo super thronum tuum.*' *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 20.* [p. 409 A.]