

The TWO  
BOOKS

OF

John Crellius

FRANCUS,

Touching

ONE OF THE  
FATHER.

Wherein many things also concerning the Nature of the *Son of God*, and the *Holy Spirit* are discoursed of.

Translated out of the *Latin* into *English*.

Printed in *Kosmoberg*, at the Sign of the *Seven-beams*, in the Year of our Lord MDC LXV.

# **THE TWO BOOKS OF JOHN CRELLIUS FRANCUS, TOUCHING ONE GOD THE FATHER.**

**Wherein many things also concerning the nature of the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit are discoursed of.**

Translated out of the Latin into English.

Printed in Kosmoberg, at the Sign of the Sun-beams, in the Year of our Lord, MDCLXV.

**By John Crell**

## GREETINGS

JOHN CRELLIUS MINISTER OF THE RACOVIAN CHURCH, TO THE CHRISTIAN READER, GREETING.

We set forth not long since, Christian Reader, a Book touching God and his Attributes, which we prefixed before the Books of *John Volkelius* touching the true Religion: When we discoursed therein touching the Unity of God, it seemed requisite to the full explication of that Unity, that we should shew the most high God to be One, not in Essence only, but also in Person, and to be no other then the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and indeed we began to demonstrate this with divers Arguments, and to guard those Arguments against such Exceptions as were either common, or somewhat more specious and plausible. But since the Work did, as we there said, grow under our hand, we thought that this Treatise was to be parted from the rest of the Work: For not only the plenty of Arguments, which did of their own accord offer themselves to us out of the Scripture, increased the bulk of our Writing; but also our desire not willingly to omit any of those things which might seem to men to be of some moment for the over-throwing of our Arguments.

For since, for this Opinion chiefly, touching One God the Father, though grounded upon many most clear Testimonies of the Scripture, we are exposed to the most bitter hatred and Persecution of all men, I thought it very expedient to shew what great injury was done unto us in this behalf; yea, how injurious the Christian World was to it self, in so obstinately rejecting this part of the Divine Truth; especially since there is so various and notable use of this Doctrine in Divinity, and in the whole Christian Religion, as by the help of God we will shew in the end of these Books. Now I thought this Book to be the more necessary, in that I saw our Men, whilst they were daily opposed by the Adversaries, for the most part with an hostile Mind and Pen, were chiefly busied in answering their Reasons, inserting their own Arguments commonly in brief, and in a scattered manner here and there; inasmuch as they acted the parts of Respondents rather than Opponents. For though certain Eminent Men in our Church did sometimes begin to take upon them the Office of Opponents in this Controversie; yet being diverted by other labour of Writing, they were forced to lay this out of their hands: Wherefore they left to us nothing but the beginning of that Work which they undertook to this end, and which we certain years ago did publish. Certainly it was a thing exceedingly to be desired, that such men, far better furnished with Wit, and with Knowledge of Divine Things, than we are, had rather finished this Work, than left it to Us to be perfected: But inasmuch as that hath not been done by them, we ought not to suffer that it should never be accomplished. Now we might the more boldly attempt this labour, in that the evident Truth of the Opinion, and the multitude of most solid Arguments arising of their own accord out of the holy Scriptures, did ease the meanness of our Wit; and in that we saw how the Opinion it self had for so many years together been opposed by so many and so acute Adversaries, with all sorts of Arms and Engines, to no purpose: wherefore we took Courage from the Goodness of the Cause. Truly we hope in God and Christ, that they who are studious of knowing the Truth, when they shall have weighed our Arguments, will see the Truth of that Opinion that we hold; yea, that they also whose minds are so beset and besieged with pre-conceived Opinions, that they will at no hand give place to the Truth, will notwithstanding perceive (if they will have but the patience to reade our Writing) that we were not moved with slight Reasons from that Opinion which hath for so many Ages been received in the Christian World; and if they have any Equity and Humanity left in them, will cease to pursue us with so great an hatred for so doing: For though we, relying on the Divine Help, are ready to suffer any thing for the Truths sake; yet would it be the part of others, not only to abstain from all bitterness of Hatred, but also to be touched with compassion towards them whom they thought to be fallen indeed into a great Error, but yet were driven thereinto with no slight grounds: For it is not the part of a Christian, yea, not of a Man, when he thinketh any one fallen into some Error of Judgment, though in a weighty matter, not only to forbear in a courteous way to raise him up out of the same, but also with a bitter spirit to plunge him further thereinto. But let them do what they please, we in the mean time trust in God that

they shall never be able to make us repent of the Opinion which we profess. Howbeit, Christian Reader, we beseech thee by the love both of the Truth, and of thy own Salvation, that thou wouldest diligently consider the things which we write, and examine them by the Rule of Gods Word: We crave nothing which the Apostle hath not already required of thee, whilst he commandeth to *try all things, and hold fast that which is good*. To despise and slight those things, is altogether inconsistent with Piety: For though we should omit other things, which are to be mentioned in their place; consider that the Glory of God is herein concerned, the least part whereof, is greater than the greatest of human Affairs; whereon notwithstanding, see how much pains all, and thou perhaps thy self doest bestow. The ignorance of these things is excusable in another, because he hath perhaps wanted an opportunity to be acquainted with them, and so is not guilty of contempt; but thou canst have no excuse for thy self before that Judge, who, that thou mayst no longer be ignorant, offers thee an occasion of better information; thereby causing that thou canst not be ignorant of those things without contempt: The Divine Truth suffers not it Self to be despised Scot-free. Thou knowest that of our Saviour, *To whom much is given, of him much shall be required; and with whom they have deposited much, the more shall be expected of him*. The Lord will require more of thee than of others, because he affordeth thee a more ample occasion of knowing the Truth, than to many others: Beware lest that most Righteous Judge find thee an Unrighteous Judge in this Cause; who, when thou hearest our Adversaries every where opposing us, for the most part with Railing, rather than Reason, dost notwithstanding refuse to hear us, who defend our Selves and our Opinion in a modest manner. But if thou farther darest to condemn our Cause, holding that we are not only excluded out of Heaven, but ought also to be banished out of all Countries; think with thy self, that to condemn Men before their Cause is heard, is to condemn them as innocent. Neither will it be enough for thee to refer the labour of examining unto others, so as to follow their Judgment without thine own; Think that thou thy self must answer for thy self: Thou, thou, I say, according to thy Understanding and Opportunity, oughtest to *try all things, and hold fast that which is good*: For, shalt thou commit all things unto others? Take heed, and that very diligently, lest thou commit thy self and thy Salvation unto men either negligent, or puffed up with an Opinion of Learning and Knowledge, or wholly addicted to human Authority and pre-conceived Opinion, or otherwise obstinate, and not knowing how to yield; or loving their own quiet and security, rather than their own or others Salvation; or cowardly, and not daring to utter their Opinion: In short, lest blindly following blind Guides, thou fall with them into the Ditch. Think not they are Godly, and Lovers of the Truth, whom I follow: For to omit that this Opinion concerning others is often times confuted by their manners and Actions, there are many hiding holes of Vices, and private Closets in the Breasts of Men, into which none but God and Christ can penetrate; so that we are in greater danger of mistaking in our Judgment concerning other mens Piety, when we go this way to work, than if the question only is concerning an Opinion, concerning which we dare not pass Sentence. Neither canst thou say, These things are too subtile for my Understanding: For, if thou considerest the Opinion it self, whereof we here dispute, what is more plain and simple than it? For, what doth it contain above that which is called the Apostles Creed, which Children are acquainted with? Namely, that that One God is no other than the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. If you look upon the Arguments which we have drawn out of the Scriptures, they are of themselves plain and easie; so that the Adversaries can no other way decline their force, than by turning away from the simplicity of the Word, and endeavouring to draw us away from the same: Yea, those Arguments which we have fetch'd from Reason, if you except a few which we have added for the sake of Learned Men, are so clear, that one must rather offer violence to his Reason and Understanding, that he may not admit the force of them, than use any great intention of Mind to understand them. But perhaps, if any thing occur in the defence of the Arguments fetch'd out of the Scripture, which may to a Man unskill'd in the Art of Disputing, seem somewhat subtile, he may pass it by: for the other things which may easily be understood by every one, we are confident will be sufficient for him to pass sentence concerning this Cause: Though we have so tempered this whole kind of Writing, that all things may be understood by a man indifferently versed in Learning; even those which in the second Book we have culled out of Philosophy, and the received Opinion of the Schools. Neither indeed is it to be imputed to us, if now and then we speak something which the ruder sort may call subtile, but to the Adversaries; who, as we have said, do draw us away from the simplicity both of the Words and meaning of the Spirit of God, which Reason doth dictate to the unlearned themselves, and by the subtilties of distinctions endeavour to elude the most plain Arguments which we produce for our

Opinion: Wherefore we friendly admonish and beseech all them to whom this Writing of ours shall come, that they would diligently weigh and examine our Words by the Balance of the Divine Oracles, and offer no violence to their conscience, when they have found the Truth, and so either by resisting it, or perpetually burying it in silence, increase their own and others servitude; but use diligence to draw Others, partly to the truer Opinion partly to more moderate Counsels, and as much as in them lies, cause that all may dare to erect their Mind to a free Inquiry touching sacred matters, and to lift up their Eyes to the Light thereof: And that so through the whole World, Men may with Piety of Mind, Mouth, and Life, praise that One God the Father, of whom are all things; and that One Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things: To Him be Glory and Power for ever and ever.

AMEN.

## **THE SCOPE AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE WORK.**

The scope of this our Work is to shew, That the most High God is no other besides the Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Now we will divide the whole Work into two Books: In the first we will confirm our Opinion with Scripture-Testimonies, and Arguments drawn thence; In the latter we will make use of other sufficient Reasons to prove the same, and refute the contrary; Though even there we will now and then recall the Reader to the Scriptures. But in the former part of the Work, we will so proceed, as that we will first directly prove, That only the Father of Jesus Christ is the most high God; and that partly by those Testimonies of the sacred Scripture which make open *mention of the Father*; Partly by those wherein the Name of the Father is not indeed exprest, yet is he truly spoken of. Then will we demonstrate the same indirectly, as they say; when we shall shew out of the same holy Scripture, That neither Christ, whom otherwise we confess to be by the Gift of the Father a God over all, to be blessed for evermore, is the most High God; nor the Holy Spirit, whom we will prove to be the Virtue and Efficacy of the most High God. Book 1. Sect. 3. Chap. 5. For so it will remain that the Father only is the most High God; since no other else can be imagined.

**THE FIRST BOOK. THE FIRST SECTION.**

**WHEREIN IS DIRECTLY PROVED THAT ONLY THE FATHER OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST IS THE MOST HIGH GOD; AND FIRST OUT OF THOSE TESTIMONIES OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES WHICH SPEAK EXPRESLY OF THE FATHER.**

### CHAP. I: John 17. 3.

**The first Argument from the words of Christ, *John 17. 3. This is Life eternal, that they might know thee (Father) the Only true God, and whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ.***

The first Testimony therefore, and Argument of our Opinion, shall be that of Christ himself, speaking to his Father in these words, *This is Life eternal, &c.* Here none doubteth that by the Name of the *true God*, is understood the most high God. Wherefore since Christ so describeth the Father, as to call him *the Only true God*, it is understood that only the Father of Christ is the most High God.

#### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Many there are, who forced by the evidence of the Words, grant all that which we say, but not to the same purpose: For they say, that the Father is not therefore called the only true God, to exclude the Son and holy Spirit from the same Godhead; but only to exclude Idols, or the false Gods of the Heathen. For that here the TRUE God is opposed to false ones. And indeed it is true, that only the Father is therefore called the true God, to exclude them from true Godhead, who were then falsely esteemed and worshipped for gods: but nevertheless, it is done by Christ in such a manner, as is of larger extent, and excludeth not only them, but all others also, besides the Father, from the most high Godhead.

Wherefore it is given us to understand, that if the most high Godhead is attributed to any one besides the Father of Jesus Christ, it is done erroneously. Now as for that which we assert, both the force of the words, and the occasion or cause intimated by the Adversaries themselves doth require. For as to the first, such is the force of the word, ONLY, as that it excludeth all others from the communion of the predicate, besides him to whom it is applied. But he to whom the word ONLY, if you consider the sense (for we will afterwards speak of the construction of the words) is applied, is the Father of Jesus Christ, as they themselves confess; with whom we have now to do. And the Predicate is, THE TRUE GOD, or the Most High God: Wherefore the word ONLY doth from the communion of the Predicate, exclude all besides the Father, and consequently Christ and the holy Spirit. As to the latter; either therefore the gods of the Heathen, are by these words of Christ understood to be excluded from true Godhead, because it is apparent that they are different from the Father, whom Christ calleth the only true God; or because it is already apparent that they are false gods. Not for the latter cause, for otherwise they would be judged already excluded from true Godhead, before they were understood to be excluded by virtue of the words of Christ, nor would there be need to make use of these words to that purpose. If for the former cause, it is necessary that all, who are apparently different from the Father of Jesus Christ, should be excluded from that true or most high Godhead; for otherwise the Argument which should from these words be drawn to exclude the Idols of the Heathen from the true Godhead, would be invalid. For it would be thus, if it should by way of Syllogism be proposed: some different from the Father of Jesus Christ, are not the true God. The Idols of the Heathen are different from the Father of Jesus Christ; therefore are not the true god. The Major would be particular in the first figure, which makes the consequence invalid. Wherefore although the false Opinion of the Heathen touching their Idols, gave occasion to Christ, to call his Father the only true God, yet did he so shape his words, that others also might be *excluded* from *that true Godhead*? And not only they, to whom supreme Godhead was then falsely attributed, but such also to whom the same might in time to come be likewise falsly attributed. For, that we may add this also, who doubteth that *Peter* (for example) *Paul, Gabriel, Michael*, are by virtue of these words of Christ, strongly excluded from the most high Godhead? But there was then none, that held them to be most high Gods; nor consequently did Christ specially intend, to exclude them from the Deity. Wherefore the force of the words and meaning is of a larger extent than the occasion of them, and is rightly drawn forth to others likewise, besides the Idols of the *Gentiles*. Neither may any one here say, that therefore not only the Idols of the *Gentiles*, but also those Men and Angels, are by virtue of these words, excluded from the most high Godhead, because they are not of the same essence or substance, but that the Son and holy Spirit are not excluded, because they are of the same Essence with the Father; Since it is agreeable, if any thing

be attributed to the Father only, that those persons should not be excluded from the communion thereof, which have the same numerical substance: For besides, that this is indeed nothing else than to take that for granted which is most in controversie; when Christ called his Father the only true God, he meant no less the only Person of the Father, then the Essence or Substance, & consequently no less excluded them from that true and most high Godhead, who were different Persons from the Father, then who were different Substances. For Christ useth a popular kind of speaking, and applyeth himself to the capacity of his Disciples. For therefore he with a clear voice uttered Prayers to the Father in their presence, that he might both instruct and comfort them no less with this supplication to the Father, then he had formerly by speaking to them. But among the people, yea among all, THE FATHER ONLY doth no less denote the only person of the Father, then the Substance; and consequently doth no less exclude all different persons from the Father, than Substances. Besides, when the Vulgar think of a Person different from the Father, they also presently think of a Substance different from him. Where they conceive one Substance, they cannot think of a different Person. Certainly concerning Moods, Subsistences, Suppositalities and Personalities, which existing in the same numerical Substance, do constitute Persons really distinct, even at this day the vulgar sort of Christians do not think: so unlikely is it, that heretofore among the Jews, even Fishermen did know them.

Wherefore if Christ fitting himself to the capacity of the Vulgar, would have all different Substances from the Father, be excluded from the most high Godhead, he would also have all different Persons from the Father excluded from the same. Whence we are given to understand that in these words, the contrary to what is urged in this exception, is rather taken for granted, namely, that he who is distinguished in Person from the Father, as Christ is, is also distinguished from him in Substance; and consequently, by virtue of these words of Christ, are excluded from that true and most high Godhead.

And this is so much the more to be believed touching Christ, in that the Disciples, who were then present, did not only see him to be a true man, but also heard him distinguished from the Father, as a Messenger from the Sender; and also that he poured out prayers unto the same, and begged glory of him. Again, if none by virtue of these words of Christ, is excluded from the true Godhead, although he manifestly differ in person from the Father, unless it be also apparent that he is different from him in Essence, it will follow, that he cannot be confuted by these words, who shall say, that *Gabriel* (for example) *Peter*, *Paul*, or finally *Jupiter*, *Neptune*, or the other gods of the Heathen, are the true God, differing indeed from the Father in Persons, but yet of the same Essence with him; namely, in such a manner, as they commonly think of Christ, or the holy Spirit.

But who seeth not that such Persons, whether true or feigned, are by virtue of these words of Christ, most efficaciously excluded from the Deity, so that one confess them to be DIVERS from the Father.

But they say, that we our selves contend, that if any thing be attributed to God only, it is not presently denied to them, who depend on him, or are subordinate to him, in the number of whom we rank Christ. Wherefore although the FATHER ONLY be called the true God, yet is not Christ presently denied to be a true God. As neither when God only is said to be wise, or potent, or to have Immortality, are they excluded from these attributes, who have received them from God? But this Objection, if the thing be rightly understood, is so far from overthrowing our Opinion and Argumentation from the words of Christ, that it doth confirm it. For neither do we hold, that Christ is by virtue of these words wholly excluded from true Godhead; namely, if true Godhead be more largely taken, so as to comprehend that Godhead also, which doth indeed, and not only, in the false opinion of men, depend on the most high Godhead. For we have shown in our Book of *God and his Attributes*, that the name GOD, is in its own Nature common, and agreeth to all them, who have some sublime Empire, or eminent Power; as to Princes and Magistrates on the Earth; in the Heavens, to Angels; and above all these, to Christ, the Head of all Angels, and King of all kings; but by way of Excellency to that Supreme and Independent Monarch, and attributed to him as proper. Wherefore our meaning only is, that Christ, by virtue of the words in contest, is excluded from that true Deity, by way of excellency so called; that is, from Supreme and Independent Deity. For by these words, first, all besides the Father are held to be excluded from Supreme Godhead; and consequently, from Deity

taken more largely, all such who have not received it from the Father; to whom alone supreme and independent Divinity is said to agree. For he is accounted as Independent, who doth not depend on him, on whom only he can truly depend. Whence all the Idols of the *Gentiles*, are by virtue of these words, or rather, of the sense therein comprehended, simply excluded from true God head; since they were so far from truly depending on the Father, as that they were not believed to depend. But Christ is not excluded therefrom, because his dependance on the Father, in respect of his Divine Empire over all things, and Worship suitable to such an Empire, hath by most evident proofs been demonstrated.

Now what we speak touching this place, doth likewise come to pass in others, wherein such Attributes are attributed to God only; which nevertheless are communicated to others besides him. For in them likewise, all besides God are excluded from the Communion of those Attributes taken by way of excellency, and strictly. For God is said to be only wise, powerfull, having Immortality, not because he alone is simply wise, powerfull, immortal, but because he is only such of himself. And therefore all others besides God, are by virtue of such words, excluded from independent and underived Wisdom, Power and Immortality; and then at length simply and universally excluded from those Attributes, when it is apparent that they have not received them from God, to whom they first agree, and consequently do not herein indeed depend on him. A feigned Dependency, is by right accounted for nothing. Whence it is understood, what our meaning is, when we say, That if any thing is in the Scripture attributed to God only, it is not presently denied to them, who are dependent on God, and subordinate to him: For we mean not that such Attributes are in no wise denied unto them; (for they are denied unto them being taken by way of Excellency) but that they are not presently denied simply and universally, or in a larger signification.

But perhaps they with whom we now have to do, will object and say, that they do in some sort hold the same: For that the Father only is called the true or most high God, because he is the Fountain of Divinity, and consequently in regard thereof hath a Prerogative above the Son and holy Spirit, inasmuch as They have the Divine Essence from Him, but He from no other. For which reason they expressly call the Father *God of himself*, thereby opposing him to the Son and holy Spirit. But they who answer thus, either contradict themselves, or say nothing; and obtrude upon us bare words instead of things: for if the Father hath a true Prerogative or Excellency above the Son and holy Spirit, so that for it the Name of GOD may be attributed to the Father alone, but taken away from the Son and holy Spirit; it cannot be that the Son and holy Spirit should be the supreme and most high God: for nothing in any wise more worthy, nothing more excellent than the most high God, can possibly be imagined: And they themselves, in *Athanasius's* Creed, contend that in the Trinity nothing is before or after, nothing greater or less: But if the Father is the Fountain of Divinity, in respect of the Son and holy Spirit, how will there be the same numerical Divinity of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit? For the Father would be the Fountain of his own Divinity, or Divine Essence, before and after himself: How, if the Father be the Fountain of the other Persons, shall not the Son and holy Spirit depend on the Father? How shall not each be an Effect of the Father? And finally, How shall the Son and holy Spirit be the supreme and most high God? For He is dependent on none, is the Effect of none. But if they will not acknowledge these things, what else do they, then obtrude upon us empty words instead of things, and so say nothing? And upon what ground, I pray, dare they to this purpose wrest the words of the Scripture, which are most plain, and exposed to the capacity of the rudest understanding? For how can an ignorant man (that I may not now speak any thing of the Learned) conceive in his mind that the Father only is the most high God, when in the mean time he is commanded to believe that also the Son and holy Spirit is the same most high God? How can he imagine a Prerogative of any one above him who is the most high God? How the Prerogative of him above one who is the same Numerical God with himself? How him to be the Fountain of other Persons, on whom they do not depend as Effects on a Cause? Certainly this is not to teach an ignorant man, but quite to take away his Understanding, and to cause that he who comprehended something, does now comprehend nothing at all: Which will also happen to learned Men, if they will endeavour to consider things, and rather conceive them in their mind, then to cozen themselves and others with a mere sound of words. By this also it may easily be understood, how we ought to answer them who say that the Name of *GOD* is by an attribution or an appropriation, as they speak, both here and elsewhere ascribed to the Father, and that, as we now suppose, to him only: for either they grant that the Name of *GOD* is by reason of the

Prerogative which the Father hath above the Son and holy Spirit, attributed to him only as proper, and so tacitly taken away from the Son and holy Spirit; or without any regard to that Prerogative: If the first, how they may be refuted, we have already spoken; if the latter, they shall be able to shew by no sufficient Example, out of either sacred or prophane Writers, or out of the vulgar Custom of speaking, that an Attribute equally common to Many, may be rightly ascribed to but One of them, in such a manner as that it may be said to agree to him ONLY. Wherefore no regard is to be had to such an attribution in these words of Christ.

But now let us refute other things which are wont to be alledged by way of answer to this first Testimony of our Opinion. There are therefore some who deny that the words of Christ before cited, contain this Opinion, which is admitted by others, namely, That the Father Only is the true God; for they explain the Words in another, and that a two-fold way: Some say that the word ONLY doth not belong to the Subject of Christs words, which if we consider the sense is the Father, but to the Predicate, namely, The TRUE GOD. for that Christ doth say, That THE FATHER IS THE ONLY TRUE GOD, and not THE FATHER ONLY IS THE TRUE GOD: Which first proposition doth not hinder, but that the Son also, or the holy Spirit may be called the *True God*, yea, the *Only True God*: Inasmuch as these Propositions are not repugnant one to the other, the Father is the only true God, and the Son or the holy Spirit is the true God, or the only true God. But others contend that these words are so to be ordered and construed, that the sense may be, *THIS IS LIFE ETERNAL, THAT THEY KNOW THEE, AND WHOM THOU HAST SENT JESUS CHRIST, TO BE THE ONLY TRUE GOD*: So that these words are so far from excluding Christ from supreme Deity, that they rather are to be thought expresly to attribute the same unto him; Which Answers, what weight they carry with them, let us see.

As to the first therefore, they are exceedingly mistaken: for the Adjective ONLY, as oft as it is employed to exclude other Subjects from the communion of the Predicate, belongs to the Subject, not the Predicate. Now that in this place the word *Only* is employed to exclude other Subjects, namely, Idols, from the communion of the Predicate, which is the *True God*, all the Adversaries contend; wherefore it belongeth not to the Predicate, but to the Subject, which, if we consider the sense, is none but the Father. And that you may more plainly perceive the thing, see whether by our or their opinion, the Idols or gods of the Gentiles are strongly excluded from true Deity: If you follow our Opinion, the business is dispatched: for, if Only the Father of Christ be the true God, certainly Idols cannot so be, since they are not the Father of Christ. But if you follow their Opinion, the business is not yet dispatched: for they hold, that notwithstanding that Proposition, *THE FATHER IS THE ONLY TRUE GOD*, the same Predicate may also be applied to other Subjects: for that it may nevertheless be said *THE SON IS THE TRUE GOD*, yea, *THE ONLY TRUE GOD*, in like manner also the Holy Spirit. And therefore these words of Christ would not by themselves hinder, but that the same Predicate might also be attributed to infinite other Subjects: so that it would not be apparent from these words of Christ, that Idols are not the true God, but that were wholly to be understood from elsewhere.

Perhaps some one will say, That the Subject, to which the word ONLY is immediately adjoined, is the name of GOD, not the FATHER; and the Predicate from the Communion whereof other Subjects are excluded, is the word TRUE. For that the sense is, that the Father is that God, who only is true. But this shift likewise is vain, and that for two Reasons; First, Because the word TRUE is not here such a Predicate, as here signifieth any thing by it self, and denoteth some peculiar Attribute of any thing, but only together with it, whereto it is adjoined. For neither doth TRUE in this place signify the same with *Trusty*, or *truth speaking*; but when it is opposed to a thing that is false, or falsely so called, it signifies nothing but the reality of the thing to which it is annexed. And therefore it is predicated of nothing by it self, but together with it to which it is annexed which in this place, is God. So that, being taken together with that word, it signifies him, who in truth and very deed, and not only in the opinion of men, is God. Thus we say that Christ is a true Man, is the true Messiah, and so forth. For it is all one as if you should say, that he is truly and in very deed a Man, and the Messiah; not falsely, nor only in the Opinion of Men. Wherefore these words, THE TRUE GOD, are not so to be parted, as that the one may again constitute a Subject, the other a Predicate, and the word ONLY thought to be applied to that of GOD, that the Predicate of TRUE may be removed from all other Subjects besides God; but

the words TRUE GOD, do jointly constitute one Predicate; and the word ONLY must be thought to be annexed unto the Subject thereof, namely, the *Father*; that all other Subjects beside the Father, may be excluded from the Communion of this Predicate, namely, *The True God*. And indeed the design of Christ was not simply to exclude Idols, or the Gods of the Heathen from truth, but to shew that they are to be excluded from true Godhead, or not to be accounted true Gods. But if you say, the word GOD is again to be repeated, that the sense may be, That the Father is that God who only is the true God; what else will you do, than make Christ to speake that by circuity of words, which any one would simply utter, and so without necessity double both the Subject and the Predicate, referring the Subject again to the Predicate; as if any one should take this speech directed to Christ, THAT THEY MAY KNOW THEE THE ONLY TRUE CHRIST OR MESSIAS, and rather express it thus, THAT THEY MAY KNOW THEE TO BE THAT CHRIST WHICH ONLY IS THE TRUE CHRIST; then simply to say, THAT THEY MAY KNOW THEE WHO ONLY ART THE TRUE CHRIST OR MESSIAS. For, that we may also adde the other Reason, although the words were so to be taken, as if it were said that the Father is that God who only is the true God; yet would it be all one as if it were said, That the Father only is the true God: As if I should say, *Christ is that Man who Only was born of a Virgin*, or *Christ is that Man who Only is the true Messias*; it is all one as if I should say, *Christ Only is the Man born of a Virgin*, *Christ Only is the true Messias*. Thus also, *Elias is that Prophet who Only was carried towards Heaven in a fiery Chariot*; it is all one as if I should say, *Elias Only is that Prophet who was carried towards Heaven in a fiery Chariot*: Likewise *Gabriel is that Angel who Only declared to the Virgin Mary the Conception of Christ*, it is all one as if you should say, *Gabriel Only is that Angel which declared to the Virgin Mary the Conception of Christ*. Neither shall they bring any instance to the contrary, either out of the Scripture or other approved Authors, or out of the common and vulgar use of speaking. Certain it is, that as often as any one is said to be that, to which only some other thing is attributed, it is all one as if it should be said that both did jointly agree to that first subject only.

Neither do they quit themselves handsomely, who feign Examples of this sort; as namely, That a certain Church (we for instance sake, will take the ancient Church of *Antioch*) is that Church which only is a true Church, although there be other true Churches extant together with it: for they say, that we must speak thus, *The Church of Antioch is a Church that only is true*; namely, because it is of the number of those Churches which only are true Churches. Thus another would say, *Peter is a living Creature which only is rational*, because he is one of those living Creatures which only are rational. But those Examples are without Example: for it should be proved by some sufficient Example, either sacred or prophane, that one may rightly speak in that manner: Out of the Scripture they shall not produce an Example, neither do the Vulgar speak so: But Christ speaks after the Vulgar fashion. Now that they do not speak rightly, who make use of such Examples, is hence evident: because when we say, that any Church only is a true Church, if so be we hold that there are many true Churches by the name of that Church which only is true, we do not understand any particular Church taken separately, but the whole kind or rather species of that Church: for it cannot be said of any particular Church taken separately, that it only is a true Church: otherwise it would be rightly said, that the Church of *Antioch* only was a true Church, which they themselves will not admit, who feign such Examples: But that doth agree as proper to that whole species or kind of Churches, namely, which professeth the saving Doctrine of Christ, and is rightly said to accord to that only.

Now this which we say, is also hence apparent, in that when we will attribute to any Church Only the name of a true Church, we cannot adde to that Church the word *every*, which would signify that the same might be affirmed of all Churches separately: for it is not agreeable to say, *Every Church professing the saving Doctrine of Christ is only a true Church*; but only simply, *A Church professing the saving Doctrine of Christ, only is a true Church*: But when we call the Church of *Antioch* a Church, we so take the name of the Church, as that it denoteth a particular Church, and one considered separately; or a Church taken distributively, not *collectively*: For one cannot separately predicate the whole kinde, or species taken *collectively*, of *any Individuum*. Wherefore one cannot like wise say, That the Church of *Antioch* is that Church which only is true. In the same manner it is not rightly said, That *Peter* is that living Creature that only is rational; for *Peter* is not that whole kinde or species of a living Creature, to which only it agreeth to be rational: and so in the rest.

Hitherto therefore it remaineth unshaken, that in the words of Christ this meaning is contained, That the Father only is the true God. We say this sense is contained in these words: for that we may adde this likewise, which will give great light both to the words of Christ, and to our Opinion: These words, *The only true God*, are put by apposition to the preceeding word, *Thee*, designing the Father; as if it were said, *Who only art the True God*: And therefore the article set before the word only in the Greek, sheweth that the same thing is again described, as it is elsewhere wont to come to pass in appositions. You have a place very like to this, 1 Tim. 6. 16. where, when *Paul* had said, *Which* (namely, the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ) *in his times he will shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords*; he addeth, *Who only hath Immortality*: Where every one seeth that these words agree with the former by apposition, and that the article in the Greek serveth to join this new description of God with those going before, and that the word *Only* is referred to the subject; Wherefore let none imagine that we think that the word *only*, if we consider the grammatical construction, is to be connected with the precedent word *Thee*: for both the article set before the word only doth hinder, and by this means we must understand the Verb TO BE: For it would be all one as if Christ had said, *Thee only to be the true God*; which though it is by it self true, will yet presently after appear to be disagreeable unto the sense of this place.

For now it is time to examine and confute their Opinion likewise, who so take these words, as if Christ had said, *This is life eternal that they know thee (Father) and him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ, to be the only true God*. First, we say, that this Explication cannot therefore consist, because it refers the word *Only* to the Predicate; namely, *The true God*, which we before shewed was to be referred to the Subject. But if any one will so take the word, as if it were said, *Thee, and whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ only*, to be the true God; First, the placing of the word *Only* doth hinder it; for when the word *Only* is referred to many subjects at once, it is wont either to be set after all, as we even now did, or to be set before all. Which latter happeneth in those words of *Paul*, which are alone brought by some to illustrate their Explication of this place, and are extant, 1 Cor. 9. 6. for thus it is there to be read out of the *Greek*, *Or have only I and Barnabas no power to forbear working?* But in this place of ours, not alone the word *only*, but together the whole Predicate, namely, *The true God*, is interposed between these two Subjects, to which it is thought to be referred; that is to say, between the word *Thee*, and *Jesus Christ*, whom the Father hath sent. To omit, that the Article set before the word *only*, doth not suffer, that it should be in that manner joined either with the word *Thee*, or with the words *Jesus Christ*; as all who are not ignorant of the Greek Tongue will confess.

Again, By this means notwithstanding, the Opinion of the Adversaries touching the Deity of the holy Spirit, will be overthrown: for if the Father and Christ only be the true God, the holy Spirit cannot also be. The same will also follow, although you so take the words, as if Christ had said, *That they know thee (Father) and whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ, to be that God who only is the true God*: For we have before shown, that this is all one as if it had been said, *Thee and Jesus Christ only to be the true God*; there is, I say, no difference in this behalf, whether the word *Only* be presently added to the first Subject, or to that Subject which is part of the Predicate. Besides, it is false, That Eternal Life, or the Way to attain Eternal Life, doth herein consist, that men know the Father and Christ to be the only true God: Properly taken it cannot consist; otherwise it would be both necessary, requisite, and also sufficient to acknowledge the Father and Christ for the only true God. But by this account, all, who comprehend that Opinion in their minds, should attain Eternal Life, when nevertheless they may withal stick in those vices, concerning which the Scripture openly pronounceth, that they who do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven.

You will say therefore, that it is to be taken improperly, that this knowledge may comprehend in it self faith in Christ, working by love and all kind of virtues; namely, by a *Metonymy* or *Transnomination* joined with a *Synecdoche*; whereby under the name of the cause, the effect is also comprehended. After which manner Eternal Life seemeth in the Scripture to be ascribed to that Faith whereby men believe, That Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. But neither can this consist, for even so nevertheless, it would be signified, that this Knowledge is necessary for all unto eternal Life, and a certain ground of faith working by Love: But that this is false, doth hence appear, in that not only

Christ himself, who was sent by God to declare unto men the way of Salvation, and implant in them Saving-Faith, did never openly deliver, or inculcate to men this Doctrine; yea, neither his Apostles, the most clear Preachers both of his Divinity and Doctrine. For as to Christ, he did not only of his own accord not teach and inculcate, that he together with the Father, is the only true God, but also when a commodious occasion was afforded him to pronounce that concerning himself, did yet abstain from so doing, speaking in such a manner of himself, as that he openly differenced himself from God, taken by way of excellency, and shewed that himself wholly depended on him; as appeareth from the 10th chapter of this very Gospel, verse 33, &c. concerning which words we have elsewhere spoken; and shall hereafter speak in its place: But the Apostles when they speak of the Dignity of Christ, the Knowledge whereof is the ground of that Faith and Piety, whereby we are saved, do mention no higher things, than that Jesus is the Christ, or the Son of God; both which they put for the same; and that is very frequent in this Writer.

Concerning which thing likewise, we shall have occasion to speak of hereafter.

Moreover, the sacred Writers, and *John* by name, when they speak of that Knowledge wherein Religion, or the Way to eternal Life consisteth, intend not such a Knowledge whereby some attribute, essential to God or Christ, is known to be in him such as this knowledge would be, that the Father and Christ is the only true God: but they mean the knowledge of God simply; whereof we suppose Christ here speaketh, understanding the knowledge of God chiefly in respect of his will, and of the things any way thereunto belonging; and also the knowledge of Christ in respect of his office, which wholly pertaineth to discover, confirm, execute, and perfect the Divine Will. I pass by the manner of speaking such, as neither *John* nor any Writer of the new Covenant useth, when he speaketh of the knowledge of some whole complex or proposition; for the Sacred Writers would express this sense, which they with whom we now dispute, would have to be comprehended in those words of Christ, in this manner, *That they know, that thou art the only true God, &c.* as they, who are more diligently versed in the reading of the Scripture, will observe: Thus for example sake, we read in the same *John, Who have known that thou art the Christ the Son of God. The Rulers have known that this is the Christ.*

I forbear to urge (what we will elsewhere demonstrate) that neither the prayers which Christ here poureth out to the Father, nor his sending from the Father, whereof in these very words he maketh mention, do admit, that Christ should be accounted the true and supreme God, together with the Father. I will only here speak, what hath in some measure been observed by certain very learned Adversaries, namely, that it is not agreeable to this place, that Christ should pronounce concerning himself, that he together with the Father is the only true God; partly because he prayeth to the Father, and so speaketh most modestly of himself; partly because he considereth and describeth himself as the Fathers Ambassador. For praying to the Father, he is not to be thought to have equalized himself to the Father, and to have pronounced that of himself, then which the Father hath nothing greater, but as it became one that is very modest, and a supplicant, to have set himself below him. Furthermore, in that he here considereth and describeth himself as the Fathers Ambassador, he is not to be thought to have attributed unto himself the supreme Majesty and Glory of the Father that sent him, which herein consisteth that he is the only true God. Besides, both the order and the meetness of the speech, doth require that the first description should be proper to the Father, to whom it is immediately joined, as the latter is peculiar to Christ, and not Christ be described both in a peculiar manner; and again, in such an one, as is common to him with the Father, and that in those words, which, if you respect the order, seem no less properly to be attributed to the Father, than the latter to Christ. And the first of these three Reasons was in some measure touched by a most accute and learned popish Interpreter. For amongst other causes, for which Christ in this place called not himself, but the Father, the only true God, he allegeth this also, that Christ would, *as it became a Son, speak honorably of his Father, but very modestly of himself; (wherefore saith he) he called not himself God, but the Father. Upon the same account, I suppose, neither would he name himself; for he said, not that they may know thee and me, but that they may know thee, and whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ, speaking of himself in the third Person, which argueth greater modesty than to name himself, when he treateth of honorable things, such as this was.* But if Christ is to be thought to have here regarded Modesty in so small a matter, how much more in not saying, that he together with the Father, is that only true and most high

God? although Christ would not only have regard to modesty, but to the very thing it self; for he would join himself to the Father, and the knowledge of himself to that of the Father, in such a manner, as that he might withal shew what difference there was between them: for he would signify that the Father is to be known as the supreme Monarch and Prince of all things, and that his will is to be regarded by its self; but that he himself was to be looked upon as his Ambassador, who declareth his will, and demonstrateth it by most certain proofs, being afterwards in the name of God, to execute and complete the same; for such descriptions of Persons in the Scripture, are not wont to be idle, but fitted to illustrate the thing that is treated of. But enough of this.

He that liketh plain Interpretations of the Scripture, cannot chuse but reject this which we oppose, and embrace ours, unless he will prefer his pre-conceived opinion concerning that thing, before any proof whatsoever:

## CHAP. II: 1 Cor. 8. 6.

**The second Argument taken out of the words of *Paul*, 1 Cor. 8. 6. *To us there is One God the Father, of whom are all things.***

The second testimony of our Opinion touching *One God the Father*, shall be that notable place of *Paul*, where he explaineth to us, who is that One God, whilst he speaketh in this manner, *To us there is One God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we to him, or, for him.* What could be more clearly spoken to shew, that that *One God* is no other besides the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? For *Paul*, explaining who that One God is, simply saith, *That he is the Father*; not the Father, Son and holy Spirit. But it could no way come to pass, that *Paul* being about to explain, who that one God is, should mention the Father only, omitting the other persons, if that one God were not only the Father, but also the Son and holy Spirit, since those two Persons besides the Father, were as necessary to declare who that one God is, as the Father himself; so that they could not here by him be omitted or concealed.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

These things though they be so plain and clear, that at the first sight they gained belief, yet hath the love of defending mens Opinions, prompted them somewhat to answer thereunto.

For some except, that *Paul* doth not say, that that one God is only the Father, but simply is the Father; by which means the other Persons are not excluded: and that they may not seem to speak this without ground, they alledge the words immediately following, where *Paul* affirmeth, *That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* But (say they) none will say that that one Lord is Christ *only*; otherwise the Father would not be that one Lord, which every one may see to be most absurd, inasmuch as that one God cannot chuse but be that one Lord.

Others answer, that the name of the *Father* being used in divine things, is ambiguous; for it is one while taken essentially, signifying indistinctly the Godhead or whole Trinity; another while hypostatically, that is personally, denoting the first Person of the Trinity (as they speak) even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that in this place it is taken in the first signification, not in the second, as our Opinion requireth.

But as to the first Adversaries, we have already shewn, that the force of these words of *Paul* is such, as if it were said, that that one God is no other besides the Father: For the Apostle would here explain who that one God is. But doth he rightly explain a thing, who omitteth not only as much, but more also then he expresseth, when in the mean time that which he omitteth, is necessary to explain the thing, and instead of three Persons, mentioneth but one; as the Apostle by this account would do? Who, I pray you, of our Adversaries, when he is to explain who that one God is, doth so handle the matter, as that he maketh mention of the Father only, and saith, that there is one God, namely, the Father of Jesus Christ? Which of them doth not or would not rather say thus, there is one God, namely, the Father, Son and holy Spirit? for indeed, he ought so to speak, if he will speak agreeable to his Opinion: But had the Apostle been of the same Opinion with the Adversaries, he should rather have spoken so, to avoid the giving of occasion to this Opinion of ours; which (as they imagine) is an error so grievous and pestilent, namely, that that one God should be accounted one no less in Person than in Essence, and believed to be no other than the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; especially since the distinction of a Person from its Essence was not then commonly known, or to speak more rightly was not yet invented: and besides, it might justly be doubted of the Son and holy Spirit, whether they were the most high God, partly because it was confessed amongst all, that both do proceed from the Father, partly because the Apostles did most frequently distinguish both from God simply so called, by calling the one the Son of God, the other the Spirit of God: Wherefore that most faithful Teacher, who was most studious of mens salvation, ought not to speak so dangerously, and give to the faithful an occasion of so great and pernicious an Error, as they are pleased to stile it. From whence also it

appeareth, that that is nothing which some here answer; namely, that *Paul* said by an Attribution or Appropriation, as they call it, that that one God is the Father; for by this course he had not at all instructed the vulgar sort of Christians, but had rather, as we have already said, entangled them with most grievous error; for of that Attribution which is here held, the Vulgar doth not understand the reason, since many of the very Learned themselves have not so much as heard of it: So that it was not worth the while, to use this figure to the detriment of the thing it self. In explaining of things, all faithful Teachers study clearness; and that the more, the greater the things are, and the greater the danger is that may accrue from obscurity.

But who was more faithful than the Apostle? What was greater than the things treated of? What Error, especially if we believe our Adversaries, more grievous? What Danger more prejudicial? Besides, what kind of Attribution or Appropriation is this? is it such a one, that a word of a stricter signification, namely, *The Father*, should be a larger word, and actually comprehending in it many persons, namely, *God*, be joined by apposition, or simply predicated of it? But by what instance will they shew, that this may rightly be done? Indeed the name of an Individual is sometimes wont to be adjoined to the name of the Species; as the name of *Jesus Christ* to the word *Man*: but then the name of the Species doth not actually comprehend many Individuals, but only denoteth some one Individual comprehended under it. But if they say that the Appropriation lies herein, namely, that the word *God*, which otherwise is common to many persons in number, that is, to the Father, Son and holy Spirit, is here taken as proper to one, to wit, the Father. First, they take that for granted, which is not only controverted, but also false, and ought to be accounted contrary to these very words of *Paul*; namely, that the name *God*, when it is put for the most high God, is common to many persons in number; so that it may univocally, or essentially be predicated of each: in which manner they hold that the Father is God, and the Son God, and the holy Spirit God. For since the most high God is but *one* in number, and is so here by *Paul* said to be, he cannot in that manner be predicated of many distinct in number; for one in number cannot be univocally predicated of many differing in number, since that it is proper only to the Species and the Genus, or rather to that which is one in Genus or Species.

Again, by this means, the aforesaid Answer to our Argument, namely, that the Apostle saith not, that that one God is the Father only, falleth to the ground; for if the word *God*, is in this place taken as proper to the Father, certainly it is agreeable to his mind to say, that that one God is the Father only: for if he were not the Father only, but also the Son and holy Spirit, then the word *God* would not be taken as proper to the Father, but as common to the three Persons. Wherefore at the beginning, they ought not to deny that *Paul* saith that which we affirm, namely, *That that one God is the Father Only*; or reciprocally, *That the Father only is that one God*; but only to dispute with us concerning the sense of this very assertion. Furthermore, if the word *God* is here used as proper to the Father, it is either taken by way of excellency, and signifieth that Person which is the fountain of the others: or without any regard to that excellency, is simply put for the Father. If the first be said, we have already shewn in the foregoing Chapter, that they who so speak, do either contradict themselves, and hold the Father only to be indeed the most high God, or say nothing to the purpose. If the latter, the Apostle had not spoken to the thing in hand; for the question was not, whether there be one Father, but whether there be one God; as is manifest from the preceding words of the Apostle, though even on the first account the Apostle had not spoken to the matter; for the question was not, whether there were but one, that was the fountain of other persons, endued with supreme Deity; but simply, whether there were one or more, who indeed had supreme Deity, and consequently were originally and by themselves capable of Divine Worship.

Hitherto we have explained and defended one reason chiefly whereby their answer is confuted, who denied it to be the meaning of *Pauls* words, *That that one God is the Father only*.

Another reason is, that if you will say, that that one God is not the Father only, but also other Persons; namely, the Son and holy Spirit, you must of necessity fall into one of these two absurdities; either to say, that the Father is not that one God, nor likewise the Son, nor the holy Spirit; or that every one of these Persons is both the Father, and Son, and holy Spirit: for when you assert, that the Apostle saith not, that that one God is the Father only, but only that that one God is the Father, either you hold that the expression of the Apostle is not proper, but by a Synecdoche, one Person of the Trinity is put for

the whole Trinity; whereas the proper expression would be this, That one God is the Father, Son and holy Spirit, or the whole Trinity; or else you suppose this expression, That one God is the Father, to be proper; but yet not such, but that we may notwithstanding properly say, that one God is the Son, that one God is the holy Spirit. If you hold the first, either every Person of the Trinity is the whole Trinity, or is not that one God: For thus we may argue, That one God is the whole Trinity, or the Father Son and holy Spirit jointly. But the Father is that one God; therefore the Father is the whole Trinity. There is the like reasoning concerning the Son and holy Spirit. But if you acknowledge the conclusion to be absurd, you must deny the Minor; which is partly confirmed out of the Scripture, partly out of your Opinion. For thus we may reason; That one God is the whole Trinity. The Father is not the whole Trinity: Therefore the Father is not that one God. In like manner may we discourse concerning the Son and holy Spirit. If you hold the latter, we will thus reason; That one God is the Father; That one God is the Son and holy Spirit; Therefore the Son and holy Spirit are the Father; and contrariwise.

Now we add not in the conclusion the particle, *Some one*, because the terms are singular. But if you will not admit the conclusion as being absurd, you must again deny the Minor: For thus we will dispute; That one God is the Father. The Son and holy Spirit are not the Father; Therefore the Son and holy Spirit are not that one God. In like manner we may also conclude thus concerning the Father, That one God is the Son, or holy Spirit. The Father is not the Son, nor the holy Spirit; Therefore the Father is not that one God.

The third Reason may be fetched from the following words; For if that one God were not only the Father, but also some other, certainly Christ would be he. But Christ is here manifestly distinguished from that one God; and so is demonstrated not to be that one God, whilst it is added, *And One Lord Jesus Christ: by whom are all things: and we by him.*

But whereas they say, that these very words intimate, that when that one God is called the Father, the Son or holy Spirit is not excluded from the same Godhead; because neither here, where that one Lord is called Jesus Christ, the Father is excluded from the same Lordship; they are therein exceedingly mistaken, inasmuch as the word *Lord* doth in this place denote him who is some ways inferiour to the most high God, and subordinate to him in dominion, although he be next to him; that is, signifieth him: by whom the most high God governeth all things any way belonging to the Salvation of Men. But in this manner that one God is not Lord, since he cannot in any sort be inferiour and subordinate to himself: wherefore he is rightly excluded by the following words from such a Lordship. And what we have spoken, is proved by a twofold Reason drawn from this very place. For first, *That one Lord*, is either the same with that one God, or some way inferiour to him. The same he is not, otherwise there will be no ground of distinction, nor would there be any cause, why that one God should be said to be the Father, and that one Lord, Jesus Christ; for no less that one Lord, than that one God, should be said to be the Father; for what reason there was, why that one God should be said to be the Father, the same would there also be, for which that one Lord should be said to be the Father: It remaineth therefore, that it signifieth him, who is someway inferiour to that one God. Again, The same is proved by the descriptions which are added to both; that is, both to the Father and to Christ; and by which they are distinguished one from another; for, as we hinted in the former Chapter, the Descriptions that are added to things or Persons in the Scripture, are not wont to be either idle, or foreign to the thing which is treated of, but fitted to illustrate or prove the same. In this place, if these descriptions make any thing to the purpose, namely, that the Father is he, *of whom are all things, and we to him*, and Christ he, *by whom are all things, and we by him*, they shew that the Father is that one God, and Christ that one Lord; as if the Apostle had said, To us there is one God, namely, the Father, in as much as all things are of him, and we consequently to him; and there is also to us one Lord, namely, Jesus Christ, in as much as all things are by him, and we consequently by him; for it is necessary that he should be that one God, *of whom are all things*; that is, who is the first and highest efficient cause of all those things which pertain to us Christians (for that he hath a peculiar regard to Christians, the word *We* several time repeated doth intimate) and consequently *to whom*, as the ultimate Scope we ought to look, and to confer all worship and honour: For he is to be accounted by us the most high God, who is the first and highest Cause, as of other things, so of those, namely, which belong to us

and our Salvation. He also is to be accounted *One*, who is the highest Cause, not only of some things, but of all; for if he were not *one*, some would proceed from him, others from another, as the prime Author and highest Cause; and consequently, the glory of those things ought by us to be referred partly to him, partly to the other. Now that we have one Lord, even Christ, is thence evident, because all things are by him; that is, because he is the middle cause of all those things which belong to us and our salvation, and in that all things are governed & dispensed by him from that first Cause of all things. Where also it followeth, that we by him ought likewise to worship God; that is, that he is the middle scope and end of the honour, which ought by us to be exhibited unto God: for because all things are by *him*, it is apparent not only that he is Lord, but also that one Lord; for if there were many, some things would be administered by him, others by another, and so we ought to worship God partly by him, partly by another. Now who seeth not that these things are very suitable to the words and scope of the Apostle? Neither can any one here object, that it is also said sometimes concerning the most high God, that *all things are by him*; for it is certain that it signifieth not, that some other who is the supreme Cause, doth effect those things by the most high God. But it is frequently said of Christ in the Scripture, that some other, namely, God or the Father, who cannot chuse but be the supreme Cause, doth do something by him, which properly belongeth to a second cause. Concerning which thing, we will hereafter treat more largely in its place.

But that in these words of *Paul* it is not upon the same account said, *that all things are done by Christ*, as it is elsewhere said of God, is very evident; because in this place those expressions, *Of whom are all things, and by whom are all things*; and also those, *We to him, and we by him*, are opposed the one to the other, and put to distinguish divers persons. Wherefore neither is that which is applied to the Father, common to Christ; nor that which is applied to Christ, so taken, as that it may be common to the Father. But this will come to pass no other way, than if the words annexed to the Father, signify that he is the prime efficient cause of all things, and the ultimate end of us and our Religion: and those things which are annexed unto Christ, signify that which the propriety of the words requireth; namely, that he is the middle efficient Cause of all things, and the intermediate end of our Religion. From whence it is now understood, that that one God signifieth him, who is the prime efficient Cause of all things, and the ultimate end; and that that one Lord signifieth him, who is the middle efficient Cause of all things, and likewise the intermediate end of the Worship that is to be performed to God from us; and consequently, that the one is superiour and greater, the other some ways inferiour and less. And indeed the greatest part of Interpreters of Scripture, seem to acknowledge this signification of that Lordship which is peculiarly attributed to Christ; for as oft as they read that Christ is made Lord, or Authority and a Kingdom given unto him, or that he shall at length deliver the Kingdom to God the Father, they usually say, that it is there spoken of that Lordship or Kingdom over the Church, which is peculiarly granted unto him, as mediator, by the Father. Since therefore such a Lordship agreeth to Christ only, why may he not in regard thereof, be called that *One Lord*, especially in this place; where, as we have seen, that one Lord is openly distinguished from that one God; and without making mention of any other, is said to be Jesus Christ, and Christ himself is looked upon as he, by whom are all things, and by whom God is to be worshipped of us; which is proper to a Mediator, as they commonly take the word; where finally there is a plain relation to us Christians and the Church. Wherefore it is evident enough, that the Father is not that one Lord which is here spoken of, nor doth the same Lordship which is attributed to Christ agree to him. Which being so, what they say concerning that one Lord, is so far from over throwing our opinion which we hold is contained in the former words, speaking of that *one God*, that it much confirms it; for if when *Paul* saith, that there is one Lord Jesus Christ, his purpose was to signify, that that Lord is no other but Jesus Christ; in like manner also when he saith, *That we have one God, even the Father*, his purpose was to signify that that God was no other but the Father, for there is the same force and reason of the words; neither hath the one less force to exclude others than the other.

Before we go hence, we must briefly explain, how that one Lord is distinguished from that one God, when notwithstanding the name of *Lord* altogether seemeth here to be taken by way of excellency, for otherwise there would be many Lords; as *Paul* himself in the precedent words, ver. 5. did declare. But the name of *Lord* taken by way of excellency, seemeth to signify no other than the most high God, and that independent Monarch. We answer, that the name of *Lord*, when it is put as proper to Christ,

is taken by way of excellency, but only in respect of other Lords, who are so far forth of the same kind with him, as they have received their Lordship from the most high God, and consequently depend on him: For that Christ is of the same rank, the Scriptures most manifestly testify; and we, hereafter producing most clear testimonies thereof, will demonstrate. Wherefore whatsoever that Excellency be, which is contained in the word *Lord* when it is put for Christ, or attributed to him only, yet is it not of so large extent, nor so sublime, as to comprehend an absolute supreme and independent Lordship, such as is proper to the most high God? and consequently neither doth the name of *Lord* in that sense agree to the most high God, but is distinguished from him. Thus namely, Is it come to pass, that since the name of *God* doth in its own nature signify something more excellent and noble, than the bare name of *Lord*, that the name *God* taken by way of excellency, should denote him, who hath an Empire altogether independent, and is the prime efficient of all things: But the name of *Lord* distinguished from him, who is called God by way of excellency, should by a certain prehemineny design him, who amongst the Lords dependent on God, holdeth the first rank, and is far sublimer than all the rest. Concerning which thing we could say more, but that we must hasten to somewhat else.

For now we must examine the other Answer to our Argument drawn from this place of *Paul*; which is, that *Father* in this place is not taken for the Father of Jesus Christ, but compriseth the whole Trinity: Which answer, that it should come into any ones head, is a wonder: certainly it is altogether inexcusable unto them, who boast that they teach nothing but the mere word of God, and are wont to object to us that following reason, *We depart from the Word of God, and wrest the Scripture*; for what is it to speak besides the Scripture, and to depart from the plain and obvious meaning thereof, if this be not? for by what instance will they ever prove that the word *Father*, spoken of God, doth signify three Persons of Divinity? The places are obvious to any one, wherein the word *Father* either absolutely taken, or manifestly related to us (which they hold is here tacitly done) denoteth the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. And indeed the same is the Father both of Christ and us; as Christ himself teacheth in *John*, and many other things demonstrate. Since therefore this signification of the word *Father*, is notorious to all, and most usual in the Scripture, but that other can by no sufficient instance be demonstrated; what came into their heads, that leaving that, they should imbrace this, or rather devise it, and that in such a place, where *Paul* intended clearly to explain who that *One God* is, and consequently to use the known signification of the word? indeed they alledge places where they think God is for the Creation called Father; but here, they say, respect is had to Creation, since *all things* are said *to be of him*. But this latter is taken without proof; for the word *All* is wont to be referred to the subject matter, and to be restrained thereunto. But here it is spoken of *us*; that is, Christians, and consequently of things peculiarly belonging unto Christians.

Again, They do not prove, that the Father, who is so called for Creation, is any other than the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Certainly we see how in that which is called *The Apostles Creed*, the same is called the Father Almighty, and the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and Jesus Christ said to be his Son; yea, they themselves, though they make creation, and the other actions, which are performed out of God, common to the whole Trinity, do yet affirm, that creation is peculiarly attributed to the Father, redemption to the Son, sanctification to the holy Spirit. Wherefore although God should in this place be called Father for Creation, yet would there be no cause why we should imagine any other besides the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ to be understood: but there would rather be great cause why we should think that he is peculiarly to be meant.

Though furthermore, there is either no place at all, or scarce any in the whole Scripture, wherein, for the first Creation only, concerning what they speak, God is called either simply Father, or our Father, but for other fatherly benefits of his toward men, who call him their Father, and for a certain Creation, not common to all men, but peculiar to his People. Certainly in the new Testament, it may be justly denied, that God is any where, for the first Creation only, either simply called Father, or our Father in particular; for wheresoever the causes of that appellation are alledged, others are alledged besides the first Creation. Finally, they shall no where shew, that Christ is simply called Father, but only once in *Isaiah*, *Father of the Age*, and that, as the Greek and Latin translation addeth, *to come*. Besides, it is one thing for the name of Father to be some where predicated of one; another when the name of Father is applied to signify a certain subject which is the Father; that he should in particular be understood, or be comprehended with others. As for the holy Spirit, they do so slightly prove that he

is the Father, that I am even sorry to mention what they alledge. The cheifest & almost only proof is, that we are regenerated by him, and that Christ saith *Whatsoever is born of the Spirit is Spirit*. But by this means, they ought to make Water likewise the Father, since Christ a little before, joined it with the Spirit in this business, saying, that we ought to be born again of it and the Spirit, *Unless*, saith he, *a man be born again of Water and the Spirit* (the vulgar translation addeth holy) *he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*. Now by Water, they are wont to understand, the elementary water which is used in baptism, and whatsoever you understand by it, it is not a person. Thus also they ought to make Gods Word the Father, because Peter writeth, That we are born again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever. The same reason would also be of force in generation properly so called. Wherefore as oft as it is written, that Christ, for example sake, was born of the Seed of *David*, the Seed of *David* would be accounted the Father of Christ; So in the rest. But if they cannot prove that the holy Spirit is the Father, or may rightly be so called, how much less will they be able to prove, that he is any where designed by, or comprehended under the name of Father, when the Father is used to design a certain subject, as here it is done?

But further more, although such a signification of this word were somewhere found, yet would it here have no place where the Father is manifestly distinguished from Christ, and that by a certain *Mark*; for the Father essentially taken, as they speak, doth in their opinion also include Christ: But he is here in such a manner, as we have before discussed, opposed to the Father, and contra distinguished from him as they speak. Finally, there lies a contradiction in this opinion of theirs: for either the Father, of whom they understand these words, is a Person, or is not: If he is a Person, why do they oppose him to the Father, taken personally? Why do they not suffer him to be the Father of Christ; for either he is one Person, or more: if one, what other can be here understood besides the Father of Christ? If more, he must not be called Father, but Fathers.

But if he be not a Person, he is not the Father; for every father, though figuratively so called, if he be indued with understanding, is a Person; for a father is so called for some action, and chiefly for generation, either properly or figuratively so called. But such actions agree to none but *Suppositiums*; that is, prime Substances complete; as we will explain in its place. But every Suppositum, being indued with understanding, by the consent of all, is a Person. It is therefore necessary, that this Father, whereof *Paul* speaketh, should be a Person, and but one. But the Father taken for one Person in Divinity, by the confession of the very Adversaries, is none but the Father of Christ. So that their endeavour is vain, who to dull the edge of this and the like places, have devised this new signification of the word.

### **CHAP. III: Ephes. 4. 6.**

#### **The third Argument from the place of Paul, Ephes. 4. 6. *There is One God and Father of all.***

To that place of Paul to the *Corinthians*, which we have hitherto urged, to prove that none but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the most high God, this passage of the same Apostle to the *Ephesians*, is not unlike; for here that *God*, which is said to be One, and the *Father*, doth signify one and the same Subject, and consequently the one is of no larger extent than the other; neither is any other that One God, besides *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

Now we suppose that it is not here necessary to shew in many words, that it is very familiar to the Scripture, when it speaketh of the same thing, and designeth it by divers names, to connect those names together by the copulative Particle, and as in this place we see the word *God*, and that of *Father* joined together.

This hath been noted by the Interpreters of the Scripture, both in sundry other places, and also in those by name wherein these: words, namely, *God* and the *Father* are joined together. As when the same Apostle saith, that Christ shall at length deliver up the Kingdom *to God even the Father*; or when he thus speaketh together with *Peter*, *Blessed be God even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*; or when he saith, *That we may unanimously with one mouth, glorify God even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. That I may now omit sundry other passages which are extant in the same Apostle; for it sufficiently appears, that in those places, the same subject is described by divers names, and that it is all one as if it had been said, *God who is the Father*, or *God, that is, the Father*, or some such way.

Now that in this place to the *Ephesians*, one and the same is understood by the name of *God* and *Father*, first is apparent, in that the Apostle speaketh jointly concerning the Unity of the one and the other, and not distinctly, as in all the other things whereof he made mention. Paul had said (intending afterwards to demonstrate the thing) that Christians ought, being knit together with the bond of peace, to maintain spiritual Union, and addeth to that purpose, *that there is One Body, and One Spirit, as they were also called in one hope of their Calling: One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One God and Father of all*. Why did he not likewise say, as in the rest, *There is one God, one Father of all*, if he did understand one by the name of *God*, another by the name of the *Father*? The same is also evident, in that he here distinguisheth that *One God* both from that *One Lord*, and that *One Spirit*, and that in such a manner, as not only to design them by divers appellations, and to include them in divers members of the sentence, but also to interpose other things between them, that it might the more clearly appear, that they are different the one from the other.

But we saw in the foregoing Chapter, that Christ is by name understood by that *one Lord*, what other then should be understood, by that *One God*, distinguished both from that *One Spirit*, and also from that *One Lord*, or Christ, but the Father of Christ? especially since the very name of the Father is by the Apostle himself expressly added. For lest you should understand the whole Trinity by the name of *that God*, who is called *One*, the foresaid Reason doth forbid; namely, in that two Persons of the Trinity were already mentioned, and distinguished from that *one God*.

Again, How absurd would such a speech be, *There is one Trinity of all, and Father*? for to omit that a Trinity, as the Adversaries hold, is not one God, but three, as shall elsewhere be shewn, and is of it self manifest to every one, if he will not for love of his prejudicate Opinion, offer violence to his understanding; what need is there, after the whole Trinity, to add the Father by name, as if he had not been comprehended therein? But would he have added something for Explication sake, he ought to have expressed *three Persons*, not one: for neither doth he who maketh mention of one Person, explain a Trinity of Persons.

#### **The Defence of the Argument.**

But there are not wanting some, who in this place also do by the Name of the Father, understand the whole Trinity, or the Godhead indistinctly taken. Which how absurdly they do, though it may be understood by the Defence of the foregoing Argument, yet is it here also to be shewn; chiefly because the principal Patrons of that Opinion have proceeded so far, as to say, that by *One Spirit, One Lord, One God, and Father*, the very same is here understood, there being no distinction in the thing it self, but only in the words. How bold and absurd that Explication of *Pauls* words is, would be hard to utter. But so was it necessary for them to do, who were resolved to hold their Position, and to defend any thing which the Opinion that they had once set down, did require.

We for bear to urge, that three persons, every one whereof is a Spirit, Lord, God, Father, cannot possibly be one Spirit, Lord, God, Father, as they take it for granted.

Our demand only is, By what Example they extend the name of the Spirit or the Father to the three Persons? As for the name of the *Father*, we spake of it in the foregoing Chapter: from whence let those things be fetched, that are pertinent to this matter.

You shall find that the name of the *Spirit*, one while put simply, another while with an additament, is in infinite places taken for the holy *Spirit*, but no where for the Father or Christ. Indeed the word Spirit is once in the Scripture predicated of the Father twice in a different sense of Christ: but put subjectively, or designing a certain subject which is the Spirit, it is no where understood of Christ, nor the Father. Is it then lawful to reject the most usual signification of words, which it is very apparent that *Paul* here followed, and to impose such a one upon the words as is no where extant? Besides, what cause can be alledged, why the Apostle had rather repeat the same thing thrice, than distinctly to reckon up three distinct things, which might be expressed by the same words, and each whereof was very pertinent to the business in hand? Why, I say, had he rather thrice to name God indistinctly, and only heap up words, than to mention first the Unity of the holy Spirit, under the name of *One Spirit*, than that of Christ, under the name of *One Lord*, afterward that of the *Father*, under this very name? Furthermore, why did the Apostle separate these three by the interposal of other things? Why did he not at least conjoin them, and speak of their Unity in a continued course? The other things which he jointly mentioned, we see are divers, those which he mentioned apart, shall we think the same? We know indeed that the same thing is sometimes repeated with changes of words; but when like things are reckoned up in order, and each of the rest finished in particular members, or Commaes, the same thing is not wont to be repeated in divers members like to the rest; much less to be sundred by the interposal of like things and Commaes. No such example shall be alledged either out of prophane or sacred Writers. Add hereunto, that the same thing is then wont to be by sacred Writers so significantly repeated, (as here it will come to pass) when in each word there is some peculiar force which here hath no place. Certainly there will be no force in the word Spirit; as shall presently be understood: And should the name of that *One Lord* here signify the same with that *One God*, and so design the supreme Monarch of all things, the whole force thereof would not only have been expressed by the name of that *one God*, but also presently explained more clearly, when after the name of the Father it is added, *that he is over all*; for it is signified that he only ruleth over all with the highest Authority, that it may be thence understood, that the Father was deservedly so joined with that One God, as that we should conceive him to be the same; as if he had said, *There is one God and Father of all, as who is over all*; for were not the Father that one God, he could not rule over all with the highest authority. Now then, had not the force of the word *Lord* been sufficiently expressed in these words?

But what force would there be in the word *Spirit*? for it would signify nothing but one spiritual Essence. Not to say, that the Essence of God would not presently be signified, let us even without reason suppose, that a Spirit, or Spiritual Essence, being mentioned, the Substance of God is by name understood? What doth this make to the unity of Christians? is it because they all believe the same to be? but neither is the mention of their faith made in this comma; and the unity thereof is peculiarly mentioned, whilst it is said, *One Faith*. How was it then pertinent to the matter, that there was one spiritual, add, if you please, divine Essence? nothing at all: for you must understand that the Unity of the Faithful, is not thence simply concluded, that every one of these things which are reckoned up, is one in it self, partly in kind, partly in number, it is common to all the Faithful; for from this

Communion of such excellent things, or Unity of things common to Christians, their Unity is concluded: Wherefore all the things which are reckoned up, are either such as exist in the very Christians, whether apart, as Hope, Faith, Baptism; to which we may also refer that one Spirit; or jointly, as that mystical Body, or else they are things which do indeed exist without them, but yet have a manifest relation to them, and reduce them to Unity; such as are that *One Lord*, and that *One God*, and *Father* common to them all, *who is over all*; that is, as we said before, who alone ruleth over all with the highest Sovereignty, and doth alike guide and govern all; and is also *through all*; that is, doth by his providence diffuse himself through all, passeth through all the Members of the Christian Body, and by his goodness reacheth unto all, or, which cometh to the same purpose, is as it were conversant amongst all, and is in the middle of them, namely, by his help, aid and providence; finally, is in all, that is, dwelleth in all by his Spirit; for they to whom all these things are common, ought to be most closely united amongst themselves. But what relation is there between the *Spirit* and Christians, if by that name you understand the spiritual Essence of God; how will that be common to all Christians? for neither is it possessed by them, as the things of the former sort, by us reckoned up; likewise it hath not a relation unto them, as the word *Lord*, *God* and *Father*: Doth not the thing it self shew, that if you will by this word, understand a divine Spirit, you must of necessity understand the holy Spirit, common to all the Faithful, wherewith they are as it were animated and guided? for then he will be in the number of those good things which they by the divine bounty do obtain; neither indeed ought the mention of him at any hand to be here omitted; partly because the holy Spirit is of essential note amongst the good things common to Christians, which unite them one to another, in that he erecteth and sealeth them to the hope of the same happiness. Whence the Apostle speaking of the same thing to the Christians, after he had said that Christ or his Church, is one body as it were compacted of divers members, he addeth, *For with one Spirit we have all been baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and we have all been drenched into one Spirit*; for the same cause he had in the precedent words in the same place, discoursed much concerning the Unity of the Spirit, lest because of such different faculties which he did put forth in different Christians, they should account one another for strangers, or at least in comparison of themselves, despise them who had attained lesser gifts; and that they might on the contrary acknowledge one another to be different members indeed, but yet of the same body, since they were as it were enlivened with the same Spirit of God: why therefore in this place, where the Apostle handleth the same thing, should he not expressly mention that Unity of the holy Spirit wherewith Christians were imbued? add hereunto, that the Apostle in the words immediately following, as also in that place to the *Corinthians*, doth discourse touching the diversities of the gifts or effects of the holy Spirit given to Christians; so that there is no doubt, but that he had first spoken concerning the Unity of that Spirit, as in the other place. But where is he to be supposed to have mentioned it, but when he spake of *One Spirit*? unless perhaps he would have him comprehended under the name of one Baptism; which notwithstanding they themselves do not admit, who stily contend that the Apostle speaketh of Water Baptism: nor are we against it: and certainly if it be here spoken of a divine Spirit, and not of the mind and will, in regard of which the Faithful ought to be one Spirit, there is no doubt but the Apostle speaketh of the holy Spirit. But if by *one Spirit* you understand the holy Spirit, there is no cause why you should not by *one Lord*, understand Christ, as in the foresaid place we see it done; and consequently by the *Father*, that which otherwise the word it self requireth, the Father of Jesus Christ.

I suppose we have sufficiently shewn, that by the name of *Father* in that place to the *Ephesians*, is none meant, save the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and consequently none but he, is by *Paul* held to be that one God.

Now if any one will fly to Appropriation or Attribution, devised by some in this business, he may easily be confuted, if one consider these things which we have spoken thereof in the foregoing Chapter, when we examined the first Answer to our Argument drawn out of that place; so that there is no need any longer to insist upon it.

#### CHAP. IV: Mat. 24. 36.

**The fourth Argument drawn from the words of Christ, *Mat. 24. 36. But of that day and hour knoweth none, no not the Angels of the Heavens, but the Father only:* and *Mark 13. 32. But of the day and hour knoweth none, no not the Angels in the Heavens, no not the Son, but the Father.***

Before we go from the places which make express mention of the Father, we think good to add an Argument more fetched from the words of Christ, *Mat. 24. Mark 13.* wherein he openly affirmeth, *that the Father only*, or, which is all one, *that none but the Father did know of that day or hour*, namely, of the last judgment, or his coming: for our Opinion is hence most clearly demonstrated; for he who only sometimes knew the day or hour of the last judgment, is only *the most high God*. But by the testimony of Christ, the Father only sometimes knew that day or hour: Wherefore he only is the most high God. The truth of the major Proposition, as they call it, is apparent to every one; for he who only sometimes knew all things, is also only the most high God; for the most high God, ever doth and did know all things. But he who only sometimes knew the day of the last judgement, did then only know all things; for he that was ignorant of that day, did not absolutely know all things; wherefore he who only sometimes knew the day of the last judgement, is also *only the most high God*.

If any thing pertaineth to the defence of this Argument, although it is so clear and strong as not to need it, we will speak of it hereafter when we shall treat of Christ. Now follows Arguments drawn out of those places, wherein, though the name of the Father be not expressed, yet it is indeed spoken of him.

## CHAP. V: 1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6.

**Argument the fifth drawn from the words of Paul, 1 Cor. 12, 4, 5, 6. *There are diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit; and diversities of Administrations, but the same Lord; and diversities of Operations, but the same God.***

In these words of the Apostle which we have alledged, it is apparent, that these words, *the same God*, doth signify that one God common to all Christians. Now since the Apostle doth distinguish him both from the *same Spirit*, and the *same Lord*, whom we have before seen, by two places of the same Apostle, to be Christ; it is clear, that that God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and no other besides him; for what other can be imagined, who being distinguished from that one Spirit, and one Lord of Christians; namely, Christ, should be designed by the name of *same God*, besides the Father of Christ? But how was it possible, that under this name of the same God, he should be distinguished from the *same Spirit* and the *same Lord*, if that one Spirit, and that one Lord, were no less that *very same God*, than the Father? Neither will any one doubt of this meaning of that place, who will compare these things with what we have spoken concerning those two places of the same Apostle, 1 Cor. 8. 6. Ephes. 4. 5, 6.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Here we do not much fear, lest any one of the Adversaries should so take these three, namely, *The same Spirit, the same Lord, the same God*, as we said, that some interpreted the like words, Ephes. 4. as, namely, to assert, That all these are common to the Trinity, and do not each of them denote divers persons, or things, but that the same Trinity is described in three divers manners. For, not to repeat what was said in that place to the *Ephesians*, where we saw that that one Spirit is openly distinguished from that one Lord, and that one God, and that each of these names doth design particular persons or things; whence it is easy to collect, the same is done in this place likewise; which is very like to that of the *Ephesians*, partly in words, partly in regard of the Argument and drift: add hereunto, that by this means the word *Spirit* would not signify the holy Spirit distinguished from the Father and the Son, but would be taken for a spiritual Substance; as we saw some took it in that place of the *Ephesians*. But besides, that this is other ways foolish, and foreign to the meaning of the Apostle, as may from thence appear; neither doth the foregoing nor following words endure that interpretation; for that the Apostle doth speak of the holy Spirit by name, which he afterwards sundry times designeth by the simple name of the *Spirit*; all the circumstances do argue; for he began to speak of spiritual Gifts, or such as proceed from the holy Spirit, and in the very beginning proposed a Rule whereby the *Corinthians* should discern the holy Spirit from the impure one, and a divine Inspiration from a diabolical, which might perhaps pass under the name of a divine one. Which very Rule *John* also, though in other words, doth in his first Epistle deliver: *for thus speaketh Paul, None speaking by the Spirit of God, calleth Jesus accursed: and none can call Jesus Lord, but by the holy Spirit*: When he had spoken thus, he addeth, But there are diversities of Gifts, yet the same Spirit; where every one seeth that respect is had to that Spirit whereof immediately before mention was made: as if he should say to all, who speak by the impulsion of Gods Spirit, this is common, that they call Christ Lord, but otherways very divers are the Gifts flowing from that Spirit into men who have been filled with him, although that Spirit be the same, and not divers. Besides, afterwards, ver. 8, &c. he largely reckoneth up those various effects of the holy Spirit, to the end he might explain that which he had before said, namely, *That there are diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit*. These things being apparent to every one, there is, as we said, no great fear, lest any one should seek to get out at that chink, although error is wont to seek all possible ways to escape.

But there are not wanting some, who say that the holy Spirit is described in those three manners, and contend that he is one while called, *the same Spirit*, another while *the same Lord*, another while *the same God*; but this Interpretation is easily confuted by the collation of this place with that to the *Ephesians*, where the Apostle handling the same Argument, doth, as we have seen, manifestly distinguish one Spirit both from one Lord, and one God, and from the unity of each draws particular

Arguments to demonstrate, that Christians ought very studiously to maintain spiritual union among themselves, and not for diversity of spiritual Gifts, or such like things, to separate one from another; which very thing is by the Apostle here also done; as any one may easily perceive if he read over this Chapter. Wherefore it is unsuitable, that the Apostle should here confound them, whom elsewhere, treating of the same thing, he had so openly distinguished; and when, using the same words, he might bring three distinct arguments very fit for his purpose, he would rather comprehend but one, drawn from the unity or sameness of the holy Spirit only: Besides, neither doth the thing it self, nor this place, admit that the holy Spirit should be understood, when *Paul* saith, that there is the same Lord, or the same God; for he speaketh not only of some most high God, or Lord of Christians, by way of excellency so called, but of him, besides whom there is no other; for the meaning of the Apostle is not, that some most high God, or some Lord of Christians, by way of excellency so called, is the same; but simply that, that most high God, and Lord, by way of excellency so called, is the same. But none is Ignorant, that besides the holy Spirit, the Father is the most high God, to whom in innumerable places, the name of God is attributed as proper unto him, as the Adversaries themselves confess, and is in this very place done, ver. 2 [3]. where the Spirit is called the Spirit of God. Certainly, that the Spirit it self, is not there understood by the name of God, appeareth to every one. In like manner that there is also, besides the holy Spirit, a Lord, by way of excellency so called, innumerable places of the Scripture so teach; wherein, by the confession of the Adversaries themselves, the name of Lord is used as proper to Christ; yea, in this very place, in the same second *verse*, it is affirmed, that Jesus is *the Lord*. And how often, I pray you, in the Apostle is mention made of *God* the Father, and of the *Lord* Jesus Christ? Why then should we think, that in this place the holy Spirit being once already named, is understood, when afterward there is distinct mention made of *Lord* and *God*? Wherefore rather following the custom and analogy of the Scripture, we put a difference between *God*, *Lord*, and *Spirit*; as the same Apostle himself doth in the end of the latter Epistle to the *Corinthians*, where he speaketh thus, *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the holy Spirit be with you all.*

## **CHAP. VI: 1 Tim. 2. 5.**

**The sixth Argument taken from these words, 1 Tim. 2. 5. *There is One God, and One Mediator of God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus. To which are added those, Rom. 3. 10. There is one God, who justifieth the Circumcision by Faith, &c.***

Our Argument from that place of *Timothy*, is thus; If the Father only is there understood by the name of that one God, the Father only is that most high God: For if any one besides the Father were the most high God, he would be comprehended under the name of that one God, since he is that One God, besides whom there is no other. Now that the Father only is there understood by the name of that *One God*, is apparent, in that he only is understood by that name: between whom and Men the Apostle saith, *that Christ Jesus is the Mediator*; as is manifest from the connection of the words. But he is none but the Father of Jesus Christ.

### **A further Confirmation and Defence of the Argument.**

That we may fully confirm this Argument that is to be proved, whereof we last spake; namely, That the Father only is that God: between whom and Men the Apostle saith, *That Christ is the Mediator*. For that Christ is the Mediator between the Father and Men, no man doubteth: but that he is the Mediator only between the Father and Men, many men deny; for they hold that Christ is the Mediator of the whole Trinity. But this Opinion cannot consist; for it would thence follow, that Christ, who is held the second Person of the Trinity, would be the Mediator of himself, or interveneth in the middle between himself, which is contradictious. Besides, Christ in this place is most openly distinguished from God, whose Mediator he is said to be. You will say, That Christ is a Mediator only according to the human nature, and that there is no absurdity to hold, that Christ considered according to the human Nature, is the Mediator of himself considered according to the divine Nature, and is rightly distinguished from that one God. But this answer is not only not brought, but also wholly rejected, by many of the very Adversaries; for others altogether contend, that Christ according to both natures is Mediator: but some, although they are afraid to speak so, yet do they indeed say the same, for they refer that office to the whole Person of Christ, considered in its full latitude, or to Christ as he is both God and Man. As for the rest, who would have Christ according to the human Nature only, to be Mediator; neither do they by this distinction escape the difficulty; for there are or have been some, who would have the very human nature of Christ to be indeed the Mediator; and contend, that it only is in *Paul* understood by the name of the *Man Christ Jesus*. These, as the other Adversaries have observed, are necessitated to confess, that the human Nature of Christ is a Person; for both Offices, such as Mediatorship is, agree to none but Persons; and the name of *Man*, and also of *Christ Jesus*, is the name of a Person. But if the human Nature of Christ is a Person, he cannot be a Person of supreme Deity; for there would be in him two Persons, a human and a divine; I say, a divine one essentially. But that there are two Persons in Christ, all justly reject as Nestorian and contrary to the Scripture, and judged to be most absurd.

But there are others, and those far more numerous, who to avoid this Rock, deal more subtilly; for they say, that not the very human Nature of Christ, but his Suppositum, or Person, is properly the Mediator; whereas the human Nature, is the formal Principle of that Mediation; namely, that part of the Subject, which containeth in it self the proper cause of the action; which because it is somewhat obscure, is to be declared by an example. Philosophers teach, that a man properly doth understand, love, and hate, and also eat, drink, run, not the very soul or the body; but that he doth understand, love, and hate according to the soul; whereas he doth eat and drink according to the body: So that the formal principle of some human actions is the soul, of others the body. In like manner the Adversaries say, that the Suppositum or Person of Christ, that is, very whole Christ, is properly the Mediator, and consequently doth such things as pertain to a Mediator, but according to the human Nature: and they farther add this reason, because, should not the very Person of Christ be the Mediator, the actions which he performs as Mediator, would not have infinite efficacy and value, nor satisfy God for the sins of men, deserving infinite punishment, which they think to be the proper Office of Christ the

Mediator. But now because his Person, which is the very infinite God, doth properly perform these actions, though according to the human nature, hence it cometh to pass that they have an infinite force and worth. But whilst they thus dispute, they again shut the hole to get out at, which they seemed to themselves by the distinction of natures to have opened: For if the very divine Person of Christ is Mediator, and performeth the actions proper to a Mediator, it is necessary that the divine Nature also should perform the same, and so Christ be a Mediator likewise according to the divine Nature: for as the Adversaries themselves confess, a divine Person doth not really differ from the divine Nature, nor add any thing to the Nature but a Subsistence. But a Subsistence hath of it self no power to act, but all the power to act resideth in the Nature: the subsistence is only a condition, without which the Nature doth not act: wherefore whatsoever the divine Person of Christ doth act, his divine Nature endued with a subsistence doth act. From whence it may be understood, first, that it is not rightly said, that the very Suppositum, as they speak, or Person of Christ, doth do any thing according to the human Nature, since the Person of Christ, if we follow the force of the Adversaries Opinion, is the very divine Nature, having its subsistence. But it is not rightly said, that the divine Nature subsisting, doth do something according to the human Nature, since the human Nature is not a part of the divine Nature. Whereas the word *according*, as it is used by the Adversaries, includeth the relation of a part; but if you take that expression, as if it were said, *by the human Nature*, then both the Father and holy Spirit might do something according to the human Nature of Christ, though perhaps the Father not as the nearest cause, and such as immediately moveth the human Nature, but the holy Spirit dwelling therein, even as the nearest cause, and immediately moving that Nature.

Again, it is likewise understood from what hath been spoken, that that distinction of Natures cannot cause that it may rightly be said, that Christ is the Mediator of himself, not only because it is incongruous to say, that his Person doth do any thing according to the human Nature, if that Person be the very supreme God; but also, because from that Opinion of the Adversaries it would follow, that the very divine Nature of Christ, doth primarily and properly discharge the Office of a Mediator, although it make use of the human nature in this behalf; for it would be necessary, that the same divine Nature should intervene in the middle between it self and Men, which every one seeth to be absurd. Finally, it is understood, that this distinction of Natures cannot cause, that Christ the Mediator should be distinguished from God, if Christ be very God himself. Add hereunto, that none but those things are simply distinguished one from another: of whom it may be simply affirmed, that the one of them is not the other. But in this place God and Christ, who is said to be his Mediator, are simply distinguished one from another; wherefore neither is that God Christ, nor Christ that God; for the distinction of Natures cannot cause, that any thing should be simply denied of some subject, which for another Nature is to be simply affirmed thereof; as we will shew more at large Chap. 3. of the following *Section*. Wherefore neither can it cause, that any thing should be simply distinguished from that, which is to be simply predicated of it, inasmuch as such a distinction as we have seen, doth tacitly involve a simple negation of one in relation to the other.

Neither can any one here say, that Christ in the words of the Apostle, is therefore rightly distinguished from God, and so tacitly denied that he is that one God, because by the name of *God*, or that *One God*, the whole Trinity is understood, whereas Christ is not the whole Trinity: for by this reckoning it might be said, that the Father himself is not God, or that one God, because the Father is not the whole Trinity. But who could endure to hear one so speaking? certainly he would openly contradict the Scripture, who durst to speak in that manner. Besides, the very Adversaries themselves do not suppose the name of *God*, or that *one God*, to be collective; that is, so jointly signifying three Persons, that it cannot be predicated of each apart: for in predicating, they hold that name hath the nature of an universal, so that it may be predicated of every Person in particular. For instance; The Father is that one God, the Son is that one God, the holy Spirit is that one God; wherefore Christ was not therefore distinguished from that one God, and so tacitly denied to be that one God, because he is not the whole Trinity, but because he simply is not that one God.

Some one will perhaps say, as it followeth not, That Christ is not a man, because he is the Mediator of men, since he is rather therefore a Man, because he is the Mediator of Men: Whence the Apostle expressly saith, *That there is one Mediator of God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus*: So neither from

thence, that Christ is said to be the Mediator of *God*, I say, the most high and only God, doth it follow, that he is not the most high and only God. This, though it be more pertinent to the second *Section* of this book, shall notwithstanding receive a brief answer; especially, because the thing doth not need any long dispute: for who seeth not, when Christ is said to be the Mediator of Men, that by the name of *Men*, other men besides Christ are understood, who were either wholly alienated from God, or not so joined, but that they might be more closely joined in a new Covenant by a Mediator? but certainly Christ was not in the number of them; wherefore we may rather retort this Argument upon the Adversaries: for as Christ was not in the number of those men whose Mediator he was, nor is comprehended under them in this place of *Paul*; so neither is the same Christ that God, or comprehended under the name of that God whose Mediator he is said to be.

Finally, If the whole Trinity were comprehended under the name of that God whose Mediator Christ is; he would also be the Mediator of the holy Spirit. But this is disentianous to the truth; for there would be open testimonies thereof extant in the Tables of the Covenant, whose mediator Christ was. But what are they? We require not such places of Scripture wherein it is expressly said, that Christ was the mediator of the holy Spirit, but from which it may clearly appear, that Christ did so intervene in the midst between the holy Spirit and us, as it is needful that a mediator should intervene between them who are to be joined in Covenant, and that he performed the proper part of that Office between him and us. According to our Opinion, which the most learned Adversaries themselves think not to be false, although they say it is imperfect, It is the Office of a mediator between God and men, to be the messenger of God to men, and to strike a League between both, and so to cause, that men being instructed with the knowledge of the divine Will, may address themselves to worship God. But the Adversaries commonly suppose, that it is the proper Office of Christ the Mediator, by fully paying the punishment of all our sins, to appease the wrath of God kindled against men, and to intercede for them to God (which we think pertaineth to a Priest.) But where is it taught in the Scripture, that Christ was the messenger of the holy Spirit to men, stroke a League between him and men, and brought men indued with the knowledge of his Will to worship him?

Concerning the Father, there are most clear testimonies of the Scripture: some whereof we will alledge in the following *Section*. Certainly Christ, without expressing the Fathers name, doth sometimes describe him thus; *He that sent me*; and changeth this description with the name of the *Father*. There is but one place, as far as I can remember, alledged out of the Scripture by the Adversaries, to prove that Christ was sent by the holy Spirit, and it is extant, *Isa. 48. 16.* where the Prophet, according to the vulgar Translation, speaketh thus, *And now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me*. But besides, that the Prophet doth there indeed speak of Christ himself, as even some of the Adversaries have observed, and if any one deny that it is to be understood of. Christ, the Adversaries will have nothing to prove it withal: It is to be noted, that those words may be rightly rendred out of the *Hebrew*, as some latter Interpreters have done, *And now the Lord God hath sent me and his Spirit*. Besides, though the vulgar interpretation be retained, it would be necessary to hold, that the holy Spirit did send Christ otherwise than the Lord God, from whom the holy Spirit is openly distinguished. But here we speak of such a manner, whereby Christ was the Ambassador or Messenger of the holy Spirit, as is proper to God. In like manner, neither is there any thing read of a Covenant-stroke, between the holy Spirit and men, to omit the other things that might be insisted upon. As for the places which the Adversaries alledge, wherein they think it is written, that Christ pacified God toward us: the Adversaries themselves are wont to understand them of the Father, not of the holy Spirit: concerning whom they produce no testimony: neither are they wont to affirm, that Christ doth make intercession for us to the holy Spirit, but to God the Father: whence *John* saith, *We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, who is a Propitiation for our sins*. It remaineth therefore, that not the whole Trinity, but the Father only be understood by the name of God in this place of ours; and so that one God, and the Father, be accounted for the same. But what need many words? The very similitude of this place, with those which we have formerly discussed, wherein by the name of that *One God*, the Father is understood, or that *one God*, is said to be the Father, doth sufficiently teach every one, who will not be obstinate against the truth, that the same is here also to be understood. Furthermore, as in those places, *1 Cor. 12.* and *Ephes. 4.* *Paul* would shew, that there is the same God of all Christians, not one God of these, another of those; so his purpose is here to

shew, that there is the same God of all men, who accordingly is so far forth alike affected towards all, as that he would have all saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, and not some to be saved, and others to perish. Whence likewise he sent one Mediator unto men, to strike the same League with all in his Name, and confirm it with his Blood, and so deliver all out of the bondage of sin and death, having, as it were, given a price, and testify unto all the Sovereign Love of God towards them.

This place putteth us also in mind of that which is extant also in the same Apostle, *Rom. 3. 30.* where being about to shew that God will alike justify by faith all men, both *Jews & Gentiles*, he saith thus, *For there is One God, who will justify the Circumcision* (that is, the circumcised, or Jews) *by Faith, and the Uncircumcision* (that is the uncircumcised, or Gentiles) *by Faith:* Now he speaketh of the God, of whom he had hitherto spoke many things, and to whom he had ascribed the act of justifying, whom he sundry times most openly distinguisheth from Christ, amongst other things, affirming of him, that he appointed Christ a Propitiatory. But that he is no other than the Father of Christ, all seem to acknowledge. Certainly that he is not the whole Trinity, nor Christ himself, nor the holy Spirit, may be shewn, partly by the same, and partly by such like Reasons as we have used in the place immediately foregoing, as the prudent Reader will by himself understand. Wherefore we will no longer dwell hereupon, especially because we would have this place to be only an accession of the former.

## **CHAP. VII: The Father is the Only God.**

**The seventh Argument drawn out of those places, wherein, by the name of the *Only God*, or the *Only wise God*, or the *Only master God*, none but the Father of Jesus Christ is designed.**

Though out of each of those places, wherein after such a manner none but the Father of Jesus Christ is designed, we might draw Arguments; yet because the Arguments are alike among themselves, we will reckon them for one. Thus therefore we may conclude, If by the *Only God*, or the *Only wise God*, or the *Only Master God*, the Father only is some where understood (and we will afterwards shew that he is so understood) it is necessary that the Father only be that God, namely, Most High, Wise, Master. For it is necessary simply to say, the *Only God*, or *Only wise God*, or *Only Master God* is the Father: and contrariwise the Father is the *Only God*, or the *Only wise God*, or *Only master God*. Otherwise these could not be put for the Father as equivalent; or would not signify the Father only, but some other also. Take which of those Propositions you please, and our Opinion will be established. If the first; it cannot be absolutely and simply said, that the only God, or only wise, or only master God is the Father, if the name of the only God, &c. is of larger extent than the Father, or if any other besides the Father, is the only God, &c. For neither is a word of a stricter signification predicated of a large one, but contrariwise. If you take the latter Proposition; it hath been already shewn in the Defence of the first Argument, that it is all one as if you should say, the Father only is God, the Father only is the wise God, or master God. For when any one is said to be he to whom only something doth agree, it is all one as if you should say, that the same attribute agrees to him only, who is first named: as if I should say, God is that Spirit, who only existed from all Eternity; it is all one as if I should say, God only is that Spirit, who existed from all Eternity: and so in the rest.

### **The Confirmation and Defence of the Argument.**

Now that we may shew, that the Father only is some where designed in such a manner, we will begin from that place wherein mention is made of *the only wise God*, as being very clear and most suitable to that which is to be proved. And you shall find it at the end of the Epistle to the *Romans*, where the Apostle saith, *To the only wise God through Jesus Christ be honour and glory for ever and ever*. That in this place by the name of the only wise God, no other is understood but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, may easily be perceived. For it is clear that Christ is not understood by that name, since he is most openly distinguished, from the only wise God, and that as the middle cause of glory and honour from the ultimate scope and object of the same. Nor also the whole Trinity held by the Adversaries. Otherwise to Christ, who would be contained in that Trinity, glory would be attributed through himself, as through the middle cause. For as to the refuge of two Natures, that hath no more place here, than in the former Testimony: since Christ is here considered with relation to the Office which he sustaineth, in respect whereof he is the middle cause of divine Worship. Whence the Adversaries themselves commonly hold, when we are said to worship God through Christ, that Christ is considered as Mediator. But Mediation, as also other Offices, agreeth to none but a person as he is such. Wherefore one must either say, that the human Nature of Christ is a Person, and to be understood by the name of Jesus Christ; or hold that Christ here is considered, according to his divine Nature also; or that it is primarily and directly here understood by the name of Jesus Christ, as hath been shewn in the precedent Chapter. It remaineth, that by the name of the only wise God, a certain divine Person, and that Superior to Christ, be understood. For he is more worthy, to whom glory is given as to the ultimate scope, than the middle cause, through which worship is exhibited to him. But there is no such Person besides the Father. It is in vain here to think of the holy Spirit: for to omit, that it is not granted, that the holy Spirit is so much as a Person, this is certain, that the holy Spirit, is not a Person worthier than the Person of Christ: But we have shewn that that Person is such to whom glory is attributed through Christ. Besides, that the Father is worshipped by Christ, is both from Scripture, and the confession of all, very manifest. But that the holy Spirit is worshipped by Christ, what place of the Scripture, I say not doth affirm, but intimate? yea it is so far from saying that he is to be worshipped through Christ, that it never simply saith, that glory is to be attributed unto him, especially in that manner which we here understand; nor do we there read that it was ever attributed to him by so

much as one man, concerning which thing more largely in its own place. Neither indeed is there any cause if a certain Person is here to be understood, why we should pass by the Father, and understand the holy Spirit, since glory is here attributed to God as the prime Author of Salvation, and of the things belonging thereunto. Now that all those things are wont to be ascribed to the Father, as the prime Author, if not only, yet chiefly the Adversaries themselves do not deny, and is most apparent from that place of *Paul*, where he saith that the Father is he, *of whom are all things*. Whence also he constituteth him the ultimate end of the worship and honour that proceedeth from us; for he is the same, of whom are all things, and to whom are all things. The second of those places is extant in *John*, where amongst other things Christ speaketh thus unto the Jews, *How can ye believe, who receive Glory from one another, and seek not the glory which is from the only God?* In which place that the Father is understood by the name of the only God; First, the whole context sheweth where Christ promiscuously mentioneth one while God, another while his Father, neither is there any the least cause why we should suspect that Christ in the same speech passed from one person to another: since none can deny that all things which are attributed unto that God, are most rightly ascribed to the Father. See now the precedent and following verses, yea that whole conference with the *Jews*, beginning from the 17th verse. Again, Christ speaketh of that God, whom the *Jews* acknowledge for God, and concerning whom it was granted amongst them, that the Glory proceeding from him is to be sought, although they neglect to seek it. For he speaketh of a thing which ought to precede Faith on Christ; whereof because the *Jews* were destitute, they are therefore here by Christ himself pronounced unfit to believe on him. But the *Jews* did then acknowledge for God, no other besides him, whom Christ called his Father. For that they did either imagine a Trinity to be God, or the Son, or holy Spirit, I suppose there is none that dareth affirm. But Christ affirmeth that of his Father, chap. 8. 54. where he saith, *It is my Father that glorifieth me, whom ye say that he is your God*. It is therefore apparent that in this place, that only God is the same with the Father, and the one of no larger extent than the other.

The third place is extant in *Jude*, who if you regard his greek words, saith, that false Teachers, who had already insinuated themselves into the Church, *do deny the only master God, and our Lord Jesus Christ*. For we have already elsewhere shewn not Christ, as many of the Adversaries suppose, but some other is understood by *the only master God*. For first, if he had understood Christ, there would have been no need after he had called him *the only master God*, to name him *our Lord*; especially since the word *Master* doth comprehend all the force of the word *Lord*. Again, neither can Christ be called *the only master God*, since his Father so is, and is so called Master, that being designed by this very name, he is distinguished from Christ. Neither is Christ any where called Master (the greek word being *Asorcornē* which *Jude* maketh use of) in the whole new Testament; but the Father is found so stiled. No marvel, because in the great House of God Christ it not the Master, but the Son of the Master of the Family; and hath God for his Head, as shall be spoken in its place. But the Master of the Family hath not a Head in the House, but is therein the chiefest Lord and Governour. Now whereas some urge the Unity of the Article set before those words, the only Master God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, they prevail nothing thereby. For the Unity of an Article set before divers names, doth not presently argue the Identity of the thing, but often times doth only intimate some affinity or conjunction of divers things; as namely of those which concur to the same action, or about which the same action is conversant. See *Mat.* 3. 7. & 16. 1. & 6. 17. & 1. 27. & 27. 56. *Ephes.* 2. 20. & 3. 5. & 4. 11. 1 *Thes.* 1. 8. *Heb.* 9. 19. Certainly some very learned men among the Adversaries, when they had in this Argument urged the unity of the Article, elsewhere pronounce the reason fetched from thence to be but weak. It is therefore apparent that Christ is not there understood by the name of *the only Master God*. Moreover, neither can we understand by that name the whole Trinity, which is held; otherwise what need was there, after it had been said that they do deny the whole Trinity, that is the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, to add by name that they do deny our Lord Jesus Christ? As if that had not been sufficiently said, when it was asserted that they deny the whole Trinity. You will say that the whole Trinity was but confusedly, and therefore obscurely signified by the appellation of *the only Master God*; therefore something more distinct was to be added for explications sake. We answer, if that reason had any moment, not only the mention of our Lord Jesus Christ, but also the Father, and holy Spirit, should have been expressly made, since they are no less indistinctly and confusedly (if the Opinion of the Adversaries be true) signified by the name of *the only Master God*, then Christ. To

omit, that if Christ is distinguished from that only Master God, it is agreeable that Person should be adjoined to another person, and not when three persons have been confusedly taken, one person, and that of the number of those three, be subjoined. But if some certain Person is to be understood, who is there that dares affirm of the holy Spirit (to omit now the question concerning his personality) that he, the Father being passed by, is joined with Christ as one that rules, and set before him not only in the order of the words, but also in dignity of title? For the Scripture in very many places joineth the Father, as Supreme Monarch with Christ, without making mention of the holy Spirit, and set him before Christ both in order of words and dignity of title: but never passeth by the Father, joining the holy Spirit, as Lord and Prince, with Christ; neither indeed doth it otherwise, unless it be very seldom, join the holy Spirit with Christ; so far is it from setting him before Christ in order of words or dignity of title. Not to say that the Father is expresly called Master, the holy Spirit no where; much less is the holy Spirit designed by the name of the only Master. Yea, neither is the name of God, any where read to be attributed unto him. Concerning which in its place.

## **CHAP. VIII: Visions in Daniel and Johns Revelation**

### **Argument the eighth, drawn from the Visions in *Daniel*, and *Johns Revelation*.**

To the places hitherto alledged, two Visions are to be added, very like to one another, from whence it is apparent that there is but one person of the most high God. Which presently giveth us to understand, that the most high God is no other besides the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Since he by the confession of all, is a divine person; and the others, which are also believed to be persons of supreme Divinity, cannot be so, unless he be a divine person: since he is the fountain and original of the rest, and whatsoever Divinity is in them, is derived from him. Wherefore if there is but one Person of supreme Divinity, the Father only is a Person having supreme Divinity. Not to say that those very Visions, which we will quote, do, if they be compared with other places of Scripture, sufficiently intimate, that the God which did in a manner expose himself to the view, is none but the Father. The first of those Visions is extant in *Daniel*, chap. 7. 9, &c. where it is said that the Ancient of days, that is the God which existed from all eternity, did sit, & that there came to him in the clouds of heaven as it were a Son of Man, and received of him Authority & Honour, and a Kingdom. The latter is extant, *Rev.* 4. and chap. 5. where it is also described, how the Almighty and Eternal God the Creator of all things, sat upon the Throne; and afterwards a Lamb came to him, and received a book from him, which no other was worthy to open and view, a Book I say, of the Sacred Decrees of God concerning things to come. Now in both places, that Most High, and Eternal God, which is understood by the sitter upon the Throne, is represented as one Person, and openly distinguished from Christ, and that, even then when divine Honour is given or said to be worthy to be given unto Christ. For also in *Daniel* it is said, that to him, who came as a Son of man to the Ancient of days, was by him honour given, and that all People, Tribes, and Tongues, should serve him. Where certainly it is not spoken of civil honour and service to be performed unto Christ, but of religious and divine. And in the *Revelation* John writeth, *I heard every Creature which is in Heaven, and on Earth, and under the Earth, and which are in the Sea, and all the things in them, saying, To him that sitteth on the Throne, and to the Lamb, be blessing, and honour, and glory, and power for ever.* Likewise before, praises were given apart to the Lamb by the four living Creatures, and the four and twenty Elders, and also the Angels; as they had been formerly ascribed apart to the Sitter upon the Throne, chap. 4. 8, &c. But were there many Persons of the most high God, and Christ one of them, many also would have been exhibited as sitting upon the Throne; nor would Christ have been so distinguished from him that sitteth upon the Throne, or from the Eternal and Almighty God, but that it would appear that he likewise doth sit upon the Throne, and is that Eternal and Almighty God.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Now if any one say, that the divine Essence only, which is one in number, was represented by the Image of him that sat upon the Throne, and not some Person; he is exceedingly mistaken. For besides the very Image of one sitting upon a Throne, is indeed the Image of a Person, and that one Person: the actions which are attributed to him that sitteth on the Throne, do altogether demonstrate that he is an intelligent Suppositum; that is, a Person. Since actions are commonly said in the Schools to agree unto none but *Suppositiums*: But those actions which are attributed to him that sitteth upon the Throne, are suitable to none but an intelligent Nature. Not to say that very many Testimonies of the Scripture, concerning which we shall afterwards have occasion to speak, being compared with these, sufficiently shew that the Father of Jesus Christ is understood by him that sitteth upon the Throne: for they manifestly affirm, that he gave to Christ Authority, Honour, and a Kingdom, with all other things, without any where hinting that some other gave all these things to Christ.

As for the distinction of Christ, and him that sitteth upon the Throne, no man can justly say, that Christ is according to his human Nature only distinguished from him, being according to the divine Nature the same with him. For first, according to a better Nature, in regard of which, & which only, he is believed to be a Person, were the same with him that sitteth upon the Throne; he could not be simply distinguished from him, for that would be all one as if he should simply be denied to be him

that sitteth upon the Throne. But that cannot simply be denied of any whole, which for another nature or part is simply to be affirmed of the same, although it agree not thereunto according to some one nature, especially the less excellent, as shall be understood from what we will afterwards speak, *Sect. 2. Chap 3.* How, I pray you, could it come to pass, that in the whole description of both Visions, there should not be even the least hint, from whence it might appear, that Christ is the same with him that sitteth upon the Throne, and that the diversities of Natures should be openly expressed, but the unity in the knowledge whereof there was no less moment, not at all? Again, since to Christ, as he is distinguished from him that sitteth upon the Throne, actions agreeing to Persons are attributed, as is manifest from the very Visions themselves, especially the latter; it is apparent that he is considered as a Person, and so distinguished from him that sitteth upon the Throne. But the Person of Christ according to the Opinion of the Adversaries, is the second of the Deity; and so the very divine Nature it self having its substance. Wherefore if they will speak agreeable to themselves, they must confess that it likewise is distinguished from him that sitteth upon the Throne: Or if they will not confess this, they must with us assert, that the Person of Christ is not the second Person of the Trinity, which they hold Furthermore, who would believe, that when divine Honour was ascribed to Christ, he was considered only according to his less excellent nature, and not rather whole, or according to the Nature most worthy of that Honour? but when that Honour is ascribed unto him, he is most openly considered as distinguished from him that sitteth upon the Throne. Wherefore whole Christ, even in respect of that other Nature, or a part, which was in him most excellent, must of necessity be distinguished from him that sitteth upon the Throne. Finally, If Christ according to a divine Nature, were one and the same with him that sitteth upon the Throne, either more persons, namely, that of the Father and the Son (not to speak any thing now concerning the holy Spirit) were to be expressed as sitting on the Throne; or it ought to be held, that the Father and the Son are the same, not only in Essence, but also in Person. Since there is no doubt, that the Person of the Father was expressed by him that sitteth upon the Throne. But that there is the same Person of the Father and the Son, all reject, and justly condemn, as a *Sabellian* Error.

## **CHAP. IX: The Father is the Most High God**

*Sundry Arguments are briefly intimated to shew, that none but the Father of Jesus Christ is the Most High God.*

Besides the Arguments hitherto produced, many others may be brought; but because they do in a manner fall in with those which shall in the second and third *Section* by us be alledged; therefore we will in this place in a brief manner only intimate them, and not all of them neither, but only the chiefest.

The Ninth Argument of our Opinion may be this, namely, That the name of *God*, or *Lord*, when used for the word *Jehovah* or *Adonai*, is in innumerable places of the Scripture taken as proper to the Father, in such a manner, as that he only is understood by that name, either simply put, or expressly with some Epithite, as that of *True, Living, Almighty*, and the like, and being designed by the very appellation, is distinguished from Christ, or the holy Spirit, or from both together. For that would not come to pass, if not the Father only were the Most High God, but also the Son and holy Spirit. Concerning which matter, see what we will say hereafter, Sect. 2. Chap. 1. and Sect. 3. Chap. 5. and if you please also, Chap. 9, 10, 11, 12. of our Book concerning *God and his Attributes*.

The Tenth Argument may be this, That none but the Father of Jesus Christ is of himself, as having received neither his nature, nor any divine thing whatsoever from another, which is the property of the Most High God. To which this also may be adjoined, that the Father only is, as they commonly speak, The Fountain of Divinity. For from him the very Son himself hath his Divinity, as both the thing it self speaketh, and the Adversaries also commonly confess. From the same also proceedeth the holy Spirit. And though the Latin Churches hold, that the holy Spirit doth proceed both from the Father and the Son; which if rightly understood, not only may, but also ought to be granted: nevertheless it is apparent, partly from the Scripture, partly from the Opinion of the Adversaries themselves, that the Son cannot be the first Original of the holy Spirit; as we mean when we use the word Fountain, but such an original as proceeded from another which was before it. For he who doth himself flow from another, and from him receive his Divinity, cannot be the prime Source of anothers Divinity. And indeed whatsoever is spoken in the Scripture, and tendeth to shew unto us that the holy Spirit doth proceed also from the Son, is herein contained, namely, that the Son doth send the holy Spirit, and pour him out upon his confidants. But the Son sendeth the holy Spirit from the Father, as he himself expressly affirmed, *John* 15. 26. he also said that he would ask the Father, and that he should give them another Advocate, *John* 14. 16. and having received the promise of the holy Spirit from the Father, he poured out upon the Faithful so excellent a gift; as Peter testifieth, *Acts* 2. 33. compare also *Luk.* 24. 49. & *Joh.* 7. 39. Therefore the Greek Churches, though they otherwise agree with the Latin concerning the Person of the holy Spirit, do yet herein differ from them; namely, that they say the holy Spirit proceedeth, or is sent or given, not from the Father and the Son, but from the Father by the Son: which kind of speaking is more suitable to express the true Opinion. It is clear therefore that none but the Father of Jesus Christ, is the Fountain or prime Original of Divinity, and consequently he only of whom are all things; which is the property of the Most High God. For as the most high God only is he of whom are all things; so he only of whom are all things, is the Most High God. More things belonging to this Argument, see afterwards, *Sect. 2. Chap. 2, 3. and Sect. 3. Chap. 11.*

The Eleventh Argument is largely diffused, and may be branched out into many; for hereunto belong all those places of the Scripture, wherein some Prerogative is given to the Father above Christ. Hereunto pertain, first, those Testimonies of the Scripture, wherein the Father is expressly said to be either greater than Christ, or the Head of Christ, or the God of Christ: those also, wherein the Father is said to have given a Commandment to Christ, and that Christ was his Servant and Minister, obeyed his Command, and submitted his own will to his. Likewise those, where Christ is said to be God's, to be the Mediator of God, the Priest of God, sent from the Father, to have come not to do his own will, but the Fathers. Hitherto also belong those wherein Christ professeth that not himself, but the Father is the prime Author of those wonderful works which he did, that his Doctrine was not his own, but the

Fathers; that he which believeth on him, believeth not on him, but on the Sender of him, namely, the Father. To which those also are like, which teach that the Father is worshiped through Christ, and that whatsoever divine things Christ either hath or performeth, or are performed unto him from us, redound unto the glory of the Father as the utmost scope; that Christ poured out prayers to the Father; that the Father is the true Author of the Resurrection of Christ; that the Father exalted and glorified Christ; and consequently bestowed all things on him; that Christ shall hereafter deliver up the Kingdom to the Father, and become subject to him; that the Father did or doth all things by Christ. Now we will shew in their places, that whilst those things which we have reckoned up, are ascribed to the Father, a Prerogative is attributed unto him above Christ, wholly and entirely considered, and not according to one nature only; and consequently also that he is greater than the holy Spirit. Which is manifest even from thence, namely, in that those things which we have reckoned up, are absolutely wont to be ascribed to the Father, and no where to Christ, namely, in respect of some more excellent Nature, and no where also to the holy Spirit. Add hereunto others also, which have in part been observed by the Adversaries themselves; as that the Father, not Christ, not the holy Spirit, is said in Scripture to have predestinated men, to have decreed some things to some one either before the world was created, or from the foundation of the world. All glory, all happiness, designed either to Christ or his confidants, was first decreed and provided by the Father. The whole reason of our Salvation dependeth on him.

What should I speak of the Creation of Heaven and Earth? For though the Adversaries endeavour to vindicate it unto Christ and the holy Spirit, yet are they themselves wont to say, that it is wont to be ascribed unto the Father in a peculiar manner, no otherwise than if it were proper unto him; in which manner Redemption is attributed to the Son, Sanctification to the holy Spirit, concerning which thing we will speak somewhat hereafter, *Sect. 3*. Hence also in that which is called the Apostles *Creed*, the Creation of Heaven and Earth is ascribed neither to Christ, nor to the holy Spirit, but to the Father only. For thus we say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth; and in his only begotten Son*, not confessing Christ himself to be the Creator, but the only begotten Son of the Creator. Neither indeed doth the Scripture any where ascribe to Christ the Creation of Heaven and Earth; and when it attributeth a creation to him, it not only speaketh of a new creation, or certain reformation of things, but also no where saith that the Son himself created all things, but that all things were created by him and in him. Finally, when the Scripture speaketh either of Religion, and the Worship of God in gross, or of certain parts thereof, it is so wont to make mention of the Father, that it may easily appear unto all, that the Father is he, to whom in all ages worship was to be given by all men, and was indeed given by all pious men, and to whom only all honour is ultimately to be referred. Whence also after Christ was exalted, yet that custom prevailed in Christian Churches, that public Prayers should for the most part be directed to the Father: some few to the Son, but seldom or never any (especially if you distinguish Prayers from Hymns) to the holy Spirit: concerning which thing we will elsewhere speak somewhat. Whence the Prayers made in Churches are commonly wont to end in this manner, *Through our Lord Jesus Christ*, having also sometimes the name of the Son prefixt, through whom namely as a Mediator and Priest, prayers are poured out unto the Father himself; though we otherwise not only willingly confess, that prayers may be poured out to Christ himself, but contend that they ought often to be poured out; and in our Churches do our selves very frequently perform the same. Notwithstanding that custom which hath for so many ages endured in the whole Christian world, which even that vulgar opinion concerning three Persons of the most high God, hath not been able to take away, giveth testimony to our Opinion touching one God the Father. For such a Prerogative of the Father above the Son and holy Spirit, evinceth that he only is the most high God. Certainly the very truth it self crept into the minds of men, although they set themselves against it, and darted the Beams of her clearness into them, not suffering her self to be wholly darkened with the clouds of errors. For there appear on every side hints and arguments, from which it is clear that the Father only is he, *of whom are all things, and by whom are all things, and for whom are all things*, as *Paul* speaketh of the most high God; that is, by whose counsel and decree all things are at first constituted; by whose efficacious providence and virtue all things are perfected; to whom finally, as the ultimate end, all things are referred. A diligent Reader of the Scripture will easily observe this, especially being thus admonished, if he heed the diversity of things which are attributed

to the Father, Son and holy Spirit, and of the Reason for which they are attributed unto them, and consequently of the forms of speech which are used concerning them.

Last of all, this also may be added, That no other is the most high God, than he who was heretofore called, *The God of Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, the God of the *Israelites*. But this is no other than the Father of Jesus Christ. Whence some of the more learned Adversaries write, That he who heretofore would be called the God of *Abraham* and the Fathers, is now by a proper title called, *The Father of Christ*. The name indeed or description is changed, the person remaining the same. Hence the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, *the God of the Fathers*, being simply so called, is manifestly put for the Father only: *Acts* 3. 13. for thus saith *Peter*, *The God of Abraham*, and *the God of Isaac*, and *the God of Jacob*, *the God of our Fathers*, hath glorified his Son *Jesus*. If not the Father only, but also the Son and holy Spirit, were the God of the Fathers; why is that God of the Fathers, simply so called, said to have raised his Son? Is Christ the Son of himself, and also of the holy Spirit? Why also doth the divine Author to the *Hebrews*, that I may not mention others, put that God who divers and sundry ways spake heretofore to the Fathers by the Prophets, and who is ever and anon called the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, or the God of *Israel*; why, I say, doth he put him simply so called, for the Father? For he addeth, *that he hath in these last times spoken to us by the Son*. Did he not intimate, that that God, who in the whole Old Testament, is brought in speaking, and called the God of the Fathers, is the same with the Father of Christ, and that the one appellation is of no larger extent than the other? Certainly he must be more quick-sighted than *Lynceus*, who will discover in the Writing of that Covenant, that Christ (not to speak any thing of the holy Spirit) was under the old Covenant acknowledged and worshipped for the most high God, so great a silence is there concerning this matter. But of these things hitherto.

## **THE SECOND SECTION.**

### **WHEREIN IS SHEWN, THAT CHRIST IS NOT THE MOST HIGH GOD, THAT SO IT MAY BE UNDERSTOOD, THAT THE FATHER ONLY IS THE MOST HIGH GOD.**

In the foregoing Section, we have produced those places, which principally shew, and that directly, that the Father only is the most high God; nevertheless, they do also prove that Christ is not that very God; which we have undertaken to prove in the second place, since it pertaineth to the demonstration of the former. For if Christ (and we will afterwards teach that the same is to be held concerning the holy Spirit) is not that one most high God, it remaineth that the Father only is he, since there is no other of whom a Christian can so much as suspect that he should be the most high God. But we have shewn that Christ in all those places is distinguished from that One God, and therefore cannot be that One God. For the same should be distinguished from himself. And lest any one should think, that he can here evade by the distinction of Natures, we have shewn, that in most places, out of which Judgment may easily be made concerning the rest, Christ is there considered not according to some nature, which is not a person, but in regard of his very Person: which according to the Opinion of the Adversaries, is that One God, and the second Person of the Trinity, as they speak.

But to those Reasons we think fit to add sundry more, not that they may not, or ought not of themselves to be sufficient for every wise and judicious man: but that it may appear with how many and how strong props of the Scripture our Opinion concerning one God the Father, is supported. For by this means we hope it will come to pass, that all wise men will not only discharge us from all fault of impiety and rashness, in departing from an opinion received for so many Ages, but also begin to wonder that they were dim-sighted, and saw no clearer in so great a lustre of the Truth, shining on every side, and of its own accord darting its beams into the eyes of all; and so understand, that they shall be impiously obstinate, if they shall purposely shut their eyes at so great a Light, and dare to reject the true Opinion which we defend.

First therefore we will alledge those Testimonies of the Scripture, and Arguments drawn from them, which principally shew that Christ is not that One or Most High God; yet do in the mean time withal attribute a Prerogative to the Father above Christ, and that to him alone: from which it may presently be rightly concluded, that the Father only is the Most High God. Then we will subjoin them which do directly demonstrate only this, That Christ, namely, is not the most high God.

## CHAP. X: Christ distinguished from God

**Argument the first, drawn thence, *That Christ is most frequently distinguished from God.***

As to the Testimonies of the first sort, and the Arguments drawn thence, we will begin from those that are largely diffused, and may be referred to the names in some sort either denied or attributed unto Christ: of which we will in this place alledge but two. The first is, That Christ is in innumerable places openly distinguished from God simply put. And that we may out of so great plenty of Examples, produce a few which may put the Reader in mind of the rest. How often do we read that Christ is called the Son of God? Elsewhere we see him called the Word or Speech of God, the Image of God: elsewhere we find it written, that he was in the beginning with God, was sent from God, went out from God, is the Bread of God that descended from Heaven, was in the form of God, and equal to God, sat down at the right hand of God, or of the Power of God, was made Lord and Christ by God, was appointed Judge by God. Now it is certain, that by the name of God in such places, the most high God is understood. How then can Christ himself be the most high God? For it would be necessary by this reckoning, either that there are two most high Gods, he, namely, who is signified by the name of God and Christ: and that Christ is distinguished from himself, which all understand to be absurd.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

But to this Argument two things are wont to be given in answer. First, That by the name of God in such places, the Father is denoted: and that since Christ is a Person different from the Father, there is no marvel that Christ is distinguished from God. Next that Christ in respect of the human Nature is distinguished from God, not in respect of the divine.

The first exception for two causes chiefly, is of no moment. One is, that it would thence follow, either that there are two most high Gods, namely, the Father and Christ; or that these twain, though distinct in persons, do yet make, one God. The first will not be granted by the very Adversaries. The latter also cannot consist, because the name of *God*, is the name of a Person. In as much as it signifieth him that exerciseth Imperial Power over others; and when it is put for the most high God, it designeth him, who with supreme Imperial Power governeth all things. But this agreeth to none but a Person, or, as the Schools, a Suppositum endued with understanding, which is the definition of a person. Wherefore he that saith that there is one most high God, saith that there is one Person with supreme imperial power ruling all things: and he that saith that there are many such persons, saith that there are many most high Gods. Of which thing, more in the second Book. The other Reason is, because if the name of *God* taken for the most high God, is common to Christ with the Father, there is no cause why it should be peculiarly taken for the Father; and so Christ be distinguished from God. For how shall a word common to the Father & the Son, distinguish the one from the other? Should he in their opinion be thought to speak rightly, who should distinguish the Father from God simply put? Who ever, for examples sake, did read, *the Father of God, the Father sent God, the Father gave God, God went out from the Father, if ye believe in the Father, believe also in God*, as we read that Christ is the Son of God, that God sent and gave his Son, that Christ came out from God; and he himself pronounceth, *If ye believe in God, believe also in me*? Do not the very ears of men reject those first forms of speaking, as disagreeable to the use of the Scripture, yea, and of them with whom we have to do? But if you say, that a common word is therefore peculiarly attributed to the Father, because he is the Fountain and Original of Divinity; since the Son and holy Spirit receive their Deity from him: we have already shewn before, that they who answer so, do either contradict themselves, and overthrow their own Tenet concerning a Trinity of Persons in one substance of God, or say nothing, and obtrude upon us empty words. Wherefore we refer the Reader thither.

As for the latter exception, which is, That Christ according to the human Nature, not according to the divine, is distinguished from God absolutely put: this also cannot consist. For first we have already shewn above, that Christ cannot simply be distinguished from God, if he himself be the most high God, although according to some one Nature he be not so. Again, according to the Opinion of the Adversaries, in many of the Places quoted by us, or in such as are like to them, Christ is considered

according to the divine Nature; as when he is called the Son of God, or the only begotten Son of God; and also when he is said to have been in the beginning with God, to have been sent from God into the world, to have descended from Heaven, to have come out from God, to be equal to God. The greatest part also refer hereunto those expressions, that he is called the Image of God, the Word or Speech of God, and that he is said to be in the form of God. Wherefore it is necessary to say, that in such places, whole Christ, how great soever he is, is distinguished from God, and not in respect of one nature only. But from such places, judgment may easily be made of the rest. For why should one seek a different reason of distinction, where it is spoken of the same person, when the same person may every where have place? Add hereunto, that we will afterwards shew that the holy Spirit also is in the same manner also distinguished from God simply put, as we saw Christ was distinguished from him. But if the distinction be the same, why not also the reason of the distinction; especially if the same may have place in both, as the Adversaries either confess, or are forced to confess. For what reason of distinction they hold in the holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity, as they believe, the same must they confess may also be applied unto Christ. But if you fly to a distinction of natures, there will be a far different reason of distinction in both. For this hath no place in the holy Spirit. Wherefore the reason of the distinction between God and Christ, is not to be placed in this, but in some other thing. But we have shewn that no other can be imagined, than that the Father only be acknowledged the Most High God. And let these things suffice to have been spoken concerning the first Argument.

## **CHAP. XI: The Son of God**

### **The second Argument drawn from the name of *The Son of God*.**

The second Argument may be fetched from thence, that Christ is so often in the Scripture called the Son of God. For the Son of God cannot be the most high God. To prove which, we will not now repeat that, which we have urged in the foregoing Chapter; namely, that by this very appellation, the Son is distinguished from God simply so called. We will not likewise urge, that the substance of the Father, must of necessity be different from that of the Son: since every one is really the same with his Substance or Essence: and consequently the Father will be the Son, and the Son the Father. But if there be a different Essence of the Son and the Father, the Son cannot be the most high God, unless you hold two most high Gods. We will not finally here urge, that, as the most ignorant understand, the Son is in time after the Father: whereas the most high God cannot be in time after any, since he existed from all Eternity. These things, I say, we will not now urge, in as much as they are elsewhere to be urged; but only this, That from this appellation it followeth, that the Father is more excellent than the Son. But none is in any sort more excellent than the most high God. For whatsoever excellency there is, which is incident to supreme Divinity, cannot be absent from him who is the most high God. Otherwise he would have some defect. But such an Excellency it is, to be from ones self. For he is excellenter and greater, who hath his Essence, and whatsoever he hath, from himself, than he who hath from another both his Essence, and all things that accompany the Essence, and cannot be had without it. Now that God the Father hath from himself his Essence, and all other things which he hath, is granted amongst all; and had he not, he likewise would be the son of another, or a creature, not the most high God. But the Son for this very reason, because he is the Son, hath from the Father his Essence, and also consequently whatsoever accompanieth the Essence, and cannot be had without it, which is the cause (that we may note this by the way) why Christ is in the Scripture far more frequently called *the Son of God*, than *God*, namely, because the former appellation doth so express the Divinity of Christ, as that it withal distinguisheth the same from that most high and independent Divinity, which belongeth to the Father; whereas the word *God* doth not do so. It is therefore manifest, that the Father is more excellent than the Son; and consequently that the Son cannot be the most high God. Certainly even the very Adversaries themselves, as we have already hinted several times, acknowledge a Prerogative of the Father above the Son and holy Spirit, in that he is the Fountain of Divinity. Whence very many of the ancient Doctors of the Church, take that of Christ, *John 14. My Father is greater than I*, to be meant of him according to his Divinity, as we shall see in its place.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

But there will not be wanting some, who will say that Christ indeed, as he is the Son, or in regard of his Person, is from the Father; but not as he is God, or in regard of his divine Nature. For that in respect hereof, he, no less than the Father, is from himself, and as they speak, *Self-God*. Whence it followeth, that a Prerogative and Excellency, doth agree to the Father above the Son, as he is the Son, not as God. But this hinders not, but that Christ may be the most high God. But this answer is of no efficacy. For that very thing which they confess, is sufficient for us to prove that which they confess not. For first, we have shewn, that none can in any sort be more excellent, than the most high God. But they confess, and are forced to confess, that the Father is more excellent than the Son, as he is the Son, or in regard of his Person. Add hereunto, that the most high God is in no sort whatsoever, that is, neither in regard of his nature, nor of his person (that we may now in this manner, distinguish these together with the Adversaries) from another. For whatsoever is from another, dependeth on an efficient cause. But the most high God in no regard dependeth on an efficient cause. Wherefore if Christ is in regard of his Person, distinguished from the Father, he cannot be the most high God. Besides, it is very ill done of them, so to distinguish the Person of Christ from his divine Nature, as to say, that the one is from the Father, the other not. For a divine Person, is nothing but the divine Nature subsisting, as we will shew in the second Book, and many of the Adversaries confess. For whereas

they, with whom we have now to do, say, that a person, as such, is nothing but a manner of subsisting, which others call a subsistence; they are herein wonderfully mistaken. And they may learn it even from thence, in that the person of the Father doth generate, that of the Son is generated.

But a manner of existence, or subsistence, doth neither generate, nor is by it self generated, but the very nature subsisting. Furthermore, as from other places, so chiefly from *John* 10. 36, &c. it sufficiently appeareth, that Christ may of right have the name of God given him, as he is the Son of God. For Christ there sheweth that, by the example of them, whom God himself heretofore called gods, he, whom the Father had sanctified, and sent into the world, may much more be called the Son of God. Where, for the same reason, he might conclude, that he might much more be called a God, although he concluded it not, that he might by this means shew, that he assumed not to himself supreme Divinity, but, as we have elsewhere explained it, did distinguish himself from the most high God, by this very thing, in that he had called God his Father, and so affirmed himself to be his Son. Certainly, those very persons also whom Christ alledged for an example, were, in that place of the Scripture which Christ did in part alledge, for the same reason called both gods, and sons of God. This difference only those appellations carry with them, that the former doth not by it self distinguish those persons from the most high God, whereas the latter doth distinguish them: the one doth not express the dependency of their Divinity on the supreme God, although it expreseth the Divinity, which doth depend on the supreme God: the other doth also express that dependency. From whence it is understood, that if Christ, as the Son of God, is from the Father, and so the Father is more excellent than he, Christ also as God, is from the Father, and so the Father is more excellent than he. Last of all, if Christ received not his nature from the Father, he was not properly generated. For whosoever is properly generated by another, receiveth his nature from another. But they, as also other Adversaries, do altogether hold and urge, that the Son was properly generated by the Father, and that otherwise he would not be the only begotten Son of God. Wherefore they argue against themselves, whilst they deny that Christ received his divine Nature from the Father, and affirm, that he hath his Person only from him. Though even in that they are not always very constant to themselves, as hath been observed by other Adversaries.

For as much as none doth or can here fly to the distinction of natures in Christ, we therefore touch it not.

## CHAP. XII: John. 5. 19.

**The Arguments which are in the sequel to be alledged, being distributed, a third is proposed from the words of Christ in *John*, Chap. 5. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himself, &c.***

Now that we may leave names, and come to other Arguments of our Opinion, we must produce such Testimonies of the Scripture, wherein something is either denied of Christ, which could not be denied of him, or is on the contrary attributed to him, which could not be attributed to him, if he were the most high God. For it is to be observed, that some things agree to the Predicate of our Question, that is, to the most high God, which agree not to the Subject thereof, namely, to Christ: and on the contrary, some agree to the Subject which agree not to the Predicate; that is, some things agree to Christ, which are disagreeable to the most high God. Wherefore we will draw Arguments from the things of both sorts. And because amongst other Writers, *John* affordeth us very many Testimonies both of the one, and other sort, when in the mean time it is commonly believed, that his end in writing the Gospel, was to shew that Christ is the most high God which existed from all Eternity; therefore we will take our rise from him, and shew, that he was so far from proposing to himself the defence of that, which is commonly believed, that no sacred Writer hath with more and clearer Arguments, overthrown that Opinion. For indeed his drift was, to shew the Divinity of Christ, but such a one, as is wholly dependant on God. *For these things*, saith he, *are written that you may believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, you may have life by his Name.* But this very thing, that Jesus is the Christ, that is, the Anointed and Son of God, doth manifestly distinguish him from the most high God, and sheweth that Christ doth wholly, how great soever he is, depend on him, and is inferiour to him.

Now of those Testimonies which may be fetched out of this Writer, wherein something is denied of Christ, which could not be denied of him, were he the most high God; the first shall be this, which is extant, chap. 5. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himself, unless he see the Father doing it.* Which is in part repeated afterwards, ver. 30. where he saith, *I can do nothing of my self.* In the former words, as certain very learned men among the Adversaries have shewn, the word *unless* is put for *but if*, as it elsewhere hapneth both in the same *John*, and in other sacred Writers, with whom it is sometimes simply set for *but*. For otherwise did the Particle retain its force, it would follow, that Christ would signify, that he could do something of himself, namely, if he saw the Father do it: when nevertheless these twain are opposed, to do something of himself, and to do something then when he seeth the Father do it; so that the meaning of Christ is, that he can do nothing of himself, but then only, when he seeth the Father do it, and, as it were, go before him therein: as any one will by himself easily observe, and the words repeated in the 30th verse does shew. From this place we thus argue, The most high God can do all things of himself, Christ can do nothing of himself; therefore Christ is not the most high God. The major Proposition, as they call it in the Schools, is by it self manifest. For the most high God is the first and supreme Cause of all things; and consequently whatsoever he doth, he doth it of himself, not from another, otherwise he would not be the first and supreme Cause; but the Person rather from whom he had a faculty or power to do something. The Assumption or Minor is Christs.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

To this Argument a double answer is wont to be brought, neither whereof is indeed altogether direct; since one maketh a shew of weakning the Major; the other by either distinguishing or limiting the Premises, endeavoureth to make the whole Argument invalid. For some answer, that Christ therefore saith, he can do nothing of himself, because he hath not the power of working from himself, but receiveth it from the Father, by the eternal generation out of his Essence; and therefore they confess that Christ here speaketh of himself according to his Divinity, and consequently as he is the most high God: and they accordingly deny, that there is any repugnancy for one to be the most high God, and to do all things not of himself, but by a power received from another. Others answer, that Christ here speaketh of himself according to his human Nature, not according to his divine. So that from this

Argument no other thing will follow, than that Christ according to his human Nature, is not the most high God; which themselves willingly confess.

As to the former answer, that cannot consist, for two causes chiefly. The first is, in that it doth sundry ways involve a contradiction. For first, it maketh the same person both to be the most high God, and not the most high God, the most high God expresly; not the most high God, in that it affirmeth him to do all things by a power received from another. For whilst it holdeth so, it denieth him to be the first cause of all things, and so to be the most high God, as appeareth from what was said before. Again, whilst it saith that Christ was generated from all Eternity, it together saith, both that he is Eternal, and not Eternal; Eternal expresly, not Eternal tacitly, whilst it affirmeth him to be generated. Besides, whilst he saith that he was indeed generated out of the Essence of the Father, but so, that he hath the same numerical Essence; yet saith that the same Christ is generated of himself. Since every one, as we hinted before, is the same with his Essence, and the Adversaries confess, that the divine Persons are really the same with the Essence, although they would have them really to differ amongst themselves. The second cause, for which the former answer cannot consist, is that such an explication of the words of Christ, is repugnant to the Text, and thirdly to the words of the following verse, wherein Christ being about to explain the reason of his saying, speaketh thus, *For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things which himself doth; and will shew him greater works than these, that you marvel.* Now that the whole business may be the plainer, some things are here beforehand to be observed. First, these twain as we have already hinted, are opposed, *so to do something of himself, and so to do something if he see the Father doing it;* and Christ doth therefore deny the first of himself, because he affirmeth the latter of himself. Again, *so to do somewhat of ones self,* is to work by a power, wisdom and authority of his own, and not received from another. Whence it followeth, that to do something, if he see the Father *do it,* is to do it not by a power, wisdom and authority of his own, but such as was received from the Father. For Christ in this place compareth the Father to an Artist, which by his own example instructeth his Son, and most faithfully sheweth him what is to be done, and by that means causeth that he likewise may do the same: but himself he likeneth to such a Son, that beholdeth the things shewn unto him by the Father, and learneth, and imitateth them; namely, because he received from him that power, wisdom and authority whereof we have spoken. By giving this therefore, the Father doth shew, by receiving the same the Son doth see. Whence we argue thus; if Christ did therefore deny, that he can to do any thing of himself, because he received from the Father by eternal generation, a Power of doing all things; it would follow that the Father had by that generation shewn him all things. But that this is false, appeareth sundry ways: first, because it would follow from thence, that all things had been absolutely, without the exception of any thing, been already shewn to Christ from eternity, and that nothing more, much less some thing greater, could be further shewn unto him, by that eternal Generation, out of the Essence of God. The Son had received the Essence of God himself, and consequently also his Omnipotency, together with all his natural Properties, as indeed the Adversaries do believe. But to him that hath these, nothing farther can be shewn, or a power of doing nothing, can any farther be given to him no more than to the Father himself. But Christ, as we see manifestly, affirmeth, that the Father would yet shew unto him greater things than these which he had already shewn; that is, give him a faculty of performing greater works. From whence it appeareth, that all things had not been absolutely as yet shewn unto him. Add hereunto, that Christ being about to explain those greater works which the Father would shew unto him, mentioneth two, whereof the one is as it were subservient to the other; namely, a faculty of quickning the dead, and authority of judging, ver. 21, 22. But Christ afterward affirmeth, that these were therefore, that is, should certainly be given unto him, because he is the Son of Man, ver. 27. from whence it would follow, that greater works were by the Father shewn to Christ, because he is the Son of Man, than by that eternal Generation out of the Essence of God, which maketh him to be the most high God; which overthroweth it self.

Besides, if the Father by eternal Generation out of his own Essence, had given that faculty of working to the Son, he would not have given it of his own free will, but of necessity. For that generation is by the Adversaries held to be altogether necessary, and consequently all things that are necessarily contained therein, or necessarily conjoined therewith. And indeed it is necessary they should so hold, otherwise that generation would not be eternal. For whatsoever is simply from eternity, is also simply necessary. What dependeth upon the free will of God, cannot be eternal, because the free act of his

will, doth in time precede it. Now Christ himself in the words, ver. 20. alledged by us, sheweth that the Father did of his own free will, not by necessity, give unto him that faculty, or as he himself speaketh, shewed him all things. For he saith, *The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things which himself doth*; as if you should say, and therefore, namely, because he loveth the Son, he sheweth him all things which himself doth: as every one doth by himself perceive. But whatsoever God doth out of his love towards any one, he doth it of his own free will; what he doth out of necessity, so that he cannot but do it, he doth not out of love. Finally, when the Father is said to shew all things unto the Son, and that out of his love towards him, it is apparent that the Son already existed when he shewed him, and that he is looked upon as already begotten, and not as one who is in that very act begotten. But in that generation Christ is not considered as already begotten (otherwise he would not be begotten) but as one who is in that very act produced. Wherefore the shewing was not made by generation.

As for the latter answer, which by a distinction of Natures in Christ, laboureth to evade the force of our Argument, because the Adversaries do most frequently make use of it; therefore we must for once something more diligently examine it, that the Reader may in the rest, where the same answer occurreth, be referred hither. But forasmuch as the Adversaries commonly think, that they have the Apostles for the Authors of that Description, and consequently also of their answer, in that the Apostles say, that some things agree to Christ, *according to the flesh*. Therefore in the first place we will shew how much the Adversaries are mistaken therein. Then we will teach that that Distinction is of no moment to solve our Argument fetched out of *John 5. 19.* and other the like Finally, that the very saying that some things agree unto Christ according to the human Nature, and others not, doth, as we will shew, quite overthrow the Opinion of the Adversaries touching Christ. To the intent therefore that we may dispatch what we first proposed, of those places in which the Adversaries commonly think, that they have an example of their distinction, the first is extant *Acts 2. 30.* where *Peter* saith, that God swore to *David*, that he would raise up Christ *out of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh*. The second place is extant, *Rom. 1. 3.* where *Paul* saith, that the Son of God *was made of the Seed of David according to the flesh*. The third is in chap. 9. of the same Epistle, where it is said, that Christ was according to the flesh of the Fathers. Now the Adversaries think, *that according to the flesh, is according to the human nature*, and that to this member of the distinction is tacitly opposed, *according to the Divine Nature*; especially, because *Paul*, when he had in that place *Rom. 9.* said, that Christ was of the Fathers according to the flesh, he addeth these words, *who is over all, God* (or rather a God) *blessed for evermore*; when he seemeth not obscurely to afford the other member of that distinction, namely, *according to the divine Nature*: But how much the Adversaries are mistaken in the sense of that distinction the Apostles use, is thence apparent; namely, that whereas those words, *according to the flesh*, do frequently occur in the Scripture, yet are they never opposed to these, *according to the divine Nature*, but always to these, *according to the Spirit*, which have a far differing meaning. Thus *Paul* (to run over those places only which come nearer to our purpose) in the same Epistle to the *Romans*, chap. 4. 1. saith, *What then shall we say, that Abraham our Father according to the flesh found?* For so rightly if you consider the sense, the ancient Interpreter hath ordered the words. Where you see, that *Paul* saith, *Abraham* was his Father, as well as the Father of the other *Jews, according to the flesh*, which every one seeth to be like this expression, that Christ was raised up of the fruit of *David's* loins, or made of the Seed of *David*, or to be of the Fathers *according to the flesh*, to intimate that he here considereth him not as a spiritual Father. For though *Abraham* was also the Spiritual Father of the Apostles, yet was he not also the Father of the other *Jews* in general, with whom the Apostle joineth himself in this place. For he teacheth both in the same chapter afterwards, and elsewhere, yea in the ninth chapter of this Epistle, That *Abraham* is the true Father of none but Believers, and that they only are the true seed of *Abraham*, to which the spiritual Promises of God belong. In the same manner, *Rom. 9.* where Christ is said to be of the Fathers *according to the flesh*; a little before, ver. 3. the Apostle calleth the *Jews, his kindred according to the flesh*, tacitly opposing them to his spiritual kindred, or to his kindred according to the spirit. Thus, *1 Cor. 10. 18.* he commandeth to view *Israel according to the flesh*, likewise opposing it to *Israel according to the Spirit*; that is, the Christian People; for the People of Christ is the true and spiritual *Israel* of God, *Rom. 9. 6. Gal. 6. 16.* thus, *2 Cor. 5. 16.* he saith, that he henceforth knoweth (that is, esteemed and approved) none *according to the flesh*; and if he hath at any time known Christ *according to the flesh*,

he now no longer knoweth him: where likewise *according to the flesh*, is tacitly opposed to that which is according to the spirit, and is to be looked upon either in Christ, or in them who are in Christ. Likewise that place is very notable, which is extant, *Gal. 4.* where one son of *Abraham*, namely, *Ishmael*, is said to be born *according to the flesh*, ver. 23, 29. but the other, namely, *Isaac*, *according to the spirit*, ver. 20 [28]. whereby is meant not according to the divine Nature, but by the divine Power: which for the divine Promises given before, did intervene to accomplish his nativity, compare ver. 23, 28. and *Rom. 9. 8, 9.* although the same *Isaac*, if his generation be compared with the spiritual generation of the Christians, not with the birth of *Ishmael*, it may be said of right, to be made according to the flesh. Thus also Masters according to the flesh, are fleshly Masters, as the old Interpreter hath it, *Col. 3. 22.* that is, such as have power to command only in things according to the flesh, and this earthly life, but not spiritual things. And lest there should be any place for an evasion, that very place, *Rom. 1. 3.* which the Adversaries think make for them, doth confirm our Opinion. For thus saith the Apostle, *Who was made of the Seed of David* according to the flesh, who was declared (Gr. defined or constituted) Son of God in power according to the Spirit of Holiness by the resurrection from the dead. You see that these words, according to the flesh, are opposed to those according to the Spirit of Holiness; that is, the Spirit wherewith Christ was sanctified, and that the discourse is concerning the matter, whereof Christ was made the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead. Concerning which, we will speak more hereafter, chap. 31. but according to the Spirit, doth no where signify according to the divine Nature; neither doth the word Spirit, put subjectively either alone, or with some addition, any where denote the divine Nature or Essence. And the very word Sanctification in this place applied unto it, may sufficiently intimate to every one, that it is not here spoken concerning the holy Spirit, the divine Virtue, whereby Christ was raised from the dead, and appointed heavenly King of the People of God, and consequently made the Son of God by way of excellency. For we shall see hereafter, chap. 31. that, oftentimes in the Scripture, to be Christ, or the King anointed by God, is all one with being the Son of God; from whence also may be understood, another passage in the same Epistle, chap. 9. 5. For in what manner Christ is the Son of God, in the most perfect manner so called, in the same also is he a God over all to be blessed for evermore. But he was made or constituted the Son of God in power by the resurrection from the dead; wherefore a God over all to be blessed for ever more. And indeed those words according to the flesh, annexed to the precedent ones, seem to require that the other members of distinction, should in the following member be understood, it is no hard thing to discern, that what we would have, is rather to be understood, than what was according to the Adversaries Opinion to be supplied. For these words, according to the divine Nature, would be childishly understood. For this the Apostle must be imagined to speak, Who according to the divine Nature, is God over all blessed for evermore. But when you have mentioned the divine Nature or Essence, you have indeed already mentioned that which is annexed. But the absurdity ceaseth if you understand that which we say the Apostle expresseth, chap. 1. of the same Epistle; namely, according to the Spirit of Holiness. I omit that neither Peter in that whole Sermon of his, wherein he affirmeth that God swore to *David*, that he would from the fruit of his loins, raise up Christ according to the flesh, that argueth a divine Essence in Christ, but the resurrection and exaltation of Christ wrought by divine Virtue, whereby he became the Son of God in the most perfect manner, as we have already seen in part, and will more fully shew in its place; wherefore there is nothing in those places, that may establish the distinction of the Adversaries. But if there be nothing in them that may establish it, although among others they seem most of all to confirm it, it may of right be concluded, that neither is there any else in the Scriptures that may establish it, and consequently that it should not be applied to restrain so many places of the Scripture, speaking simply, and used to turn them from their plain meaning. But now we must come to that which we have undertaken to prove in the second place, namely, that this distinction is of no moment to invalidate our Argument drawn from that place, *John 5. 19.* or others like thereunto.

For first, the custom of speaking, doth not admit that what may or ought simply to be admitted of any whole should simply be denied of the same, although it agreeth to the whole, according to one part only, and not according to the other. For who for example sake, will simply deny, that a man doth eat, drink, or is fleshly, thick, tall, or of a low stature, because his soul, or he according to his soul, doth not eat, drink, nor is fleshly, thick, tall, or on the contrary of a short stature? Although the soul be the better part of a man, and those things agree to him only according to the body. But if Christ be the

most high God, it is to be simply affirmed of him, that he can do all things of himself; as was before shewn: neither do the Adversaries, who say, that these words of Christ whereof we treat, are to be understood of him according to the human nature only, not deny, but rather urge it. For neither are they wont less simply to affirm of Christ, what agreeth unto him, according to his better Nature, than to deny what agreeth not to him, according to his inferiour Nature. Wherefore if Christ were the most high God, it could not be simply or without any limitation, and respect of a certain nature, expresly added, be denied of him that he can do any thing of himself. Since therefore it is denied, it is apparent that he is not the most high God. Add hereunto, that Christ in this place is described by the name of the Son of God and that in respect of God. But most of the Adversaries refer this description only to the divine Nature of Christ, all refer it to it chiefly. Wherefore so much the less credit is it, that that is here simply denied of him which agreeth to him according to the divine Nature, and consequently both may and ought to be simply affirmed of the Son of God. Certainly that would be all one as if you should say, that a man or a substance endued with understanding, cannot understand, reason, remember, because he cannot do these things according to the body.

But against that which we have said, some of the Adversaries are wont to alledge, that a man according to his soul is immortal, or incorruptible, and yet it is simply denied, that he is immortal or incorruptible. But it is to be observed that we speak of those Attributes, which both may and are wont to be affirmed of the whole Subject simply and without limitation, although they do primarily and by themselves only agree to one part thereof, so to the whole only by consequence. But to be immortal or incorruptible, as the very Adversaries together with us confess, is not simply and without limitation affirmed of the whole man; namely, because we see the whole composition of man to be dissolved, and to die, and be corrupted, although the Spirit remain after it. But the same Adversaries contend, that as all the attributes which agree to the Humanity of Christ, are wont simply & without limitation to be affirmed of Christ, for example sake, that he was conceived, born of a Virgin, suffered, died, was buried, raised up from the dead, & the like, so also all the attributes of the divine Nature. Wherefore as they simply affirm that he is God, so also they simply and without limitation affirm, and if they will be true to themselves, are forced to affirm, that he existed from all Eternity, Omnipotent, Omniscient, Immense, Creator of Heaven and Earth. Some alledge that of *Paul*, where he affirmeth, that the evils which he worketh, he himself did not work, but sin that dwelleth in him; where they think, that what is simply affirmed of the whole, is simply denied of the same, because it agreeth not to the other part. And therefore that the contradiction which at first sight appeareth in these words, is to be taken away by the distinction of parts. But they are exceedingly mistaken, for neither hath *Paul* respect to divers parts in the same subject, as if the thing were attributed to the subject according to one part, and according to the other part taken away from the same, this, I say, is not there done: but the same attribute is by an elegant *Antanaclasis*, one while taken more largely, another while more strictly, namely, by a certain excellency; and being taken more largely, is attributed to the Subject; but taken more strictly, it is denied of the same whole, and not attributed to another part of the same Subject, but to another Subject, as the place it self sheweth. For the man described by *Paul* under his own person, is said to work those evils, the word *work* being taken properly and largely: but the same is denied to work them, as the word *work* signifieth, to be the prime and principal cause of working. For this, he saith, is not he himself, but sin. In the same manner he elsewhere saith, that he laboured more than the other Apostles, yet not he, but the Grace of God that was with him. He affirmeth, that he himself laboured, if it be properly spoken; but denieth the same, because he was not the prime and principal cause of the labour; but the grace of God that was present with him. Thus also Christ saith, *My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me.* For the Doctrine of Christ was his own, because it was promulgated by him; it was not his own, because himself was not the prime Author thereof, but he that sent him. It is believed on him, because he is the object of faith, not on him because he is not the principal object and ultimate scope of faith; for so he is that sent Christ.

Wherefore that we may return unto our place, it is necessary that Christ when he simply denied, that he could do nothing of himself, did speak of himself wholly, how great soever he is, and not only of one part of himself, or not of himself according to one part only. Which that it may yet more evidently appear, and the rule before set down by us, be the more confirmed, this is to be added; If that which

may, is wont absolutely to be affirmed of the whole, may also simply and absolutely, without any limitation, be denied of the same whole; namely, because it agreeth not thereunto according to some part, though an inferiour one, it will be lawful simply to affirm of Christ, what we would have; namely, that he is not the most high God, did not exist from Eternity, did not create the World, that the Son of God was not incarnate, or made man, was not in Heaven before he was born of the Virgin: because none of these things agree to him according to the human Nature: yea, it may be said, that the Son of God, is not the Son of God, especially the only begotten one, if he is held to be such, as he was begotten out of the Essence of the Father, which agrees not to him according to the human Nature. Finally, it will be lawful to say, that he was neither conceived of the holy Spirit, nor born of *Mary*, nor grew, nor eat, nor drank, nor wept, nor died, nor rose again, nor ascended into Heaven, nor shall come to judgment, and other things innumerable, because none of these things agreeth to him according to the divine Nature. Those first Expressions the Adversaries will not endure; as for the rest, the ears of no Christian man can endure them. Who would endure such a Divinity, as permitteth one simply to deny, that Jesus is the Son of God, or that he sometimes died and rose again. Wherefore if those things are both uncouth, and intollerable; they ought also to imagine, that their interpretation is alike intollerable; whereby they say, that when Christ simply saith, the Son can do nothing of himself, he speaketh of himself according to the human Nature only; whereas according to the divine Nature, he can do all things of himself; whence it followeth, that it may be absolutely said of him, that he can do all things of himself, no less than he is absolutely affirmed to be the most high God.

Again, They with whom we have to do, do either confess, that it may be simply, or without any limitation added, said of the divine Nature of Christ, that it can do nothing of it self, or they do not confess. If they do confess, why do they distinguish between the human and divine Nature? Why do they say, that the words of Christ whereof we treat, are not to be understood of him according to the divine, but according to the human Nature? Will they perhaps say, that also the divine Nature can do nothing of it self according to the human? Who seeth not that such a fashion of speaking and limiting is ridiculous? Will you say that the soul of a man hath not in it self according to the body, a power of thinking, understanding, reasoning? Or that the body is not fleshly, thick, tall, or low according to the soul? But be it that it is lawful, having expressly added such a limitation, to deny these things of the soul as doth indeed agree unto it, but do not agree unto the body; and contrarily of the body, such as agree to it, but do not agree to the soul, will it be presently lawful to do the same simply, and without any limitation? Who ever heard say, that that should simply be taken away from the whole which doth indeed agree thereunto, because it agreeth not to the other part of the same whole? How then could that be simply taken away from the divine Nature, which doth agree to the same; namely, to do all things of it self, because it agreeth not to the human Nature? But if the Adversaries confess not, that it may simply be said of the divine Nature of Christ, that it can do nothing of it self, their Opinion touching the Person of Christ falls to the ground; for if the Son of God is a Person having supreme Divinity, it is necessary that whatsoever is simply either denied or affirmed of him, may also simply be either denied or affirmed of his divine Nature. For a person having supreme Deity, is nothing but the very divine Nature subsisting; as many of the Adversaries confess; and we in the second Book will shew. Since therefore it is simply denied of the Son of God, that he can do nothing of himself, whereas that same cannot be simply denied of the divine Nature, it must be confessed, that the Son of God is not a Person of supreme Deity. Neither can they escape the force of this Argument, who hold a divine Person to be not the divine Nature, but a subsistence of the divine Nature. For first, from this very place of *John*, it is evinced either that their Opinion touching a divine Person, is false, or that the Son of God is not a Person endued with Supreme Divinity. For a Subsistence worketh nothing neither of it self, nor by the shewing of another. For the very nature subsisting, worketh all things, either by a faculty of its own, or such as was received from another. A Subsistence hath no faculty neither from its self, nor received from another. But the Son of God worketh all things by the shewing of the Father. Wherefore he is not a Subsistence. If the Son of God is not a subsistence, either a Person of the supreme Divinity will not be a Subsistence, or the Son of God will not be a Person of supreme Divinity. Furthermore, if a Subsistence did work any thing, it would work in such a manner, as is agreeable to the Nature wherein it is, and with which it is really the same. But the divine Nature, wherein the divine Subsistence is, and with which, as the Adversaries speak, it is really the same, worketh of it self, and not by the shewing of another; wherefore the divine Subsistence also should be

said to work after that manner; nor could it less simply be denied, that it can work of it self, than the same may be denied of the divine Nature. Add hereunto, that it would no less ridiculously be said, that the divine Subsistence can do nothing of it self according to the human Nature, than that the divine Nature can do nothing of it self according to the human Nature.

Besides, were the words of Christ to be restrained, as the Adversaries would have it, Christ had not spoken to the matter. For it appeareth from the very place, and all confess, that Christ answereth the objection of the *Jews*, and defineth those words of his, namely, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*, from all crime of Blasphemy and Arrogancy. For the *Jews* objected it to him as a most grievous crime, because by such words, *he calleth God his own Father, making himself equal to God*, as we read ver. 18. For thus they reason: He that maketh himself equal to God, committeth a crime to be expiated by death. But Christ maketh himself equal to God, in that he calleth God his own Father, and maketh himself equal to him in working. In which Argument it is spoken of whole Christ, and not only of one Nature of his, especially the less worthy. For neither Christ when he affirmed, *My Father worketh, and I work*, spake only one part of himself, and that the less worthy, but of himself as he was the Son of God, and consequently God, as the Adversaries themselves urge, who are wont to object against us those words of the 18th verse; to prove from thence, that Christ is God by Nature, because he both called God his own Father, and made himself equal to God: neither of which can agree to him, who is not God by Nature. To which Argument of the *Jews* Christ answereth, *Verily, verily I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself*. What would the answer make to the purpose, if Christ should here speak of himself, according to the human Nature only; when the question was concerning him, either whole, how great so ever he is, or according to the divine Nature, as the Adversaries will have it? How had he defended his own words, wherein he had spoken of his whole self, or of himself, as the most high God? It is objected against him, thou makest thy self equal to God; namely, in that thou makest thy self the Son of God, and by that means dost (as the Adversaries will have it) arrogate to thy self a divine Nature. Christ answers (according to their Opinion) the Son can do nothing of himself according to the human Nature, and is therein unequal to the Father. What's this to the matter? But if you hold with us, that Christ spake of himself whole, how great soever he was, you will find that he spake very pertinently to the matter, and solidly confuted the crime that was objected against him. For he answers, that he doth not simply and absolutely make himself equal to God, although in respect of working, he compareth himself unto God: because although he doth all things that the Father doth; yet can he do nothing of himself, but those things only which the Father gave him a power to do. Wherefore in respect of the working it self, he is equal to the Father; in respect of the manner of working, unequal. For the Father worketh of himself, but he only as the Father sheweth him, or giveth him power, wisdom and authority. But herein is no Blasphemy, no Arrogancy, no Crime. Add hereunto, that that very equality which is seen in the very workers, considered by themselves, is not altogether absolute. In that the Father will yet shew him greater works, and consequently something may be yet added to that equality.

Finally, if Christ had spoken of himself in respect of the human Nature only, when he said that he could do nothing of himself, and in the mean time would have had it understood, that he in respect of the divine Nature, could do all things of himself, he had not, or rather ought not to have opposed the Father, especially alone to himself in that matter, but himself considered according to the divine Nature, to himself look'd upon according to the human. But Christ doth not this, but the other, whilst he subjon'd, *unless he see the Father doing*. Also, *For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth to him all things which himself doth*; and will shew him greater works than these. For besides that, the reason of the opposition doth more rightly consist, if one nature of Christ be opposed to another Nature; that is, of a different disposition in relation to the thing spoken of, than if the same should be opposed to another person; no just cause can be imagined, why Christ, when in respect of one nature, he had denied that the Son could do any thing of himself, should not in respect of the other nature, openly affirm of the same Son that he could do all things of himself, since there was no greater cause to deny that, than to affirm this. That I may not say, that there was greater cause to affirm this, than to deny that; since the question was concerning the equality of the Son, and that as he is the Son, with the Father. Add hereunto, that the divine Nature of Christ would have been the more near and proper Cause of that faculty of doing Miracles, which he had received according to the human Nature, than

the Father. Unless perhaps you will have the divine Nature in him to be idle. Wherefore the power was to be ascribed to it rather than to the Father. Now whereas some affirm that Christ attributed his works rather to the Father, than to his own divine Nature, that he might give to the Father a Prerogative above himself; this very thing overthroweth their Opinion, and establisheth ours; especially since it is necessary, that that Prerogative should consist in this, namely, that the Father be held to do all things of himself, the Son only by a power received, from the Father. For by this very thing, Christ is denied to be the most high God, whilst another is acknowledged to whom a Prerogative above him doth agree; and whilst it is affirmed that he doth all things by a power, in what manner soever received from another. On the contrary, the Father is alone held, to be the most high God, whilst to him only, as the prime Cause, the works of Christ are ascribed, and a Prerogative attributed to him above Christ.

That now remaineth which we undertook to demonstrate in the third place, namely, that the very Distinction which the Adversaries use, whilst they say that some things agree or not agree to Christ, or the Son of God, according to the divine, others according to the human Nature, doth overthrow their Opinion concerning Christ. For from this very thing it followes, that the Son of God is not a person of supreme Divinity, the reason whereof we have somewhere already touched. For whilst the Adversaries thus distinguish, they shew that the human Nature is a part of the person of Christ, and pertaineth to the constitution thereof. But a human Nature cannot be a part of a person endued with supreme Divinity, nor concur to the constitution thereof. For whether you hold the divine person to be the divine Nature endued with a subsistence, or the very subsistence it self of the divine Nature; the human Nature can neither way be a part thereof. For neither is it a part of the divine Nature, nor of a subsistence, since neither is constituted of divers parts, and both existed entire from all Eternity, and consequently a human Nature can constitute neither. Certainly it is necessary to hold two persons in Christ, one simple, which existed from all Eternity; the other compounded of a human and divine Nature (though by this means a divine person would become part of another, & so cease to be a person) or they must bid farewell to that distinction of Nature. But of this thing more in its place.

We have dwelt longer on this place of *John*, partly because as any place doth more evidently overthrow the tenet of the Adversaries, (and this is one of the most evident) so have they for the most part taken more pains in obscuring and turning it from the genuine sense, partly because many things which have been spoken thereof, will be profitable in the following places, in as much as the Adversaries are wont to make answers to them, either both these ways which we have discussed, or at least one of them.

### **CHAP. XIII: Christ is not the Prime Author of his Doctrine**

**The fourth Argument fetched from those places in *John*, wherein it is denied, *That Christ is the Prime Author of his Doctrine.***

Now that we may proceed to other places in *John*, wherein some thing is denied of Christ, which could not be denied of him if he were the most high God; to that passage which we have examined in the precedent Chapter, those are of kin wherein Christ denies that he is the prime Author of that Doctrine which he publisheth; which places are in great number; and in some of them mention is made also of works; of which he maketh the prime Author, not himself, but the Father, no less than in the precedent testimony. For, *Chap. 7. 16, 17, 18.* when the Jews admired how he knew letters, having not learned them: Jesus answered them, and said, *My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any one will do his Will, he shall know of the Doctrine, whether it be from God, or whether I speak of my self. He that speaketh of himself, seeketh his own glory: but whosoever seeks his Glory that sent him, he is true, and there is no unrighteousness in him. And Chap. 8. 28* When ye shall have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am he, and do nothing of my self, but as the Father hath taught me I speak these things. *And Chap. 12. 49, 50.* I have not spoken of my self, but the Father that sent me, he gave me a Commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak, and I know that his Commandment is eternal Life. *What things therefore I speak, as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak. And chap. 14. 10.* The Word that I speak, I speak not of my self; but the Father that abideth in me, he doth the works. Where under the name of works, his words also are to be included, as the very opposition sheweth; and afterwards in the same chapter, ver. 24. *The Word which ye have heard, is not mine, but the Fathers that sent me.* To which belong also many other Testimonies which are extant in the same Writer, *chap. 8. 38, 40.* and *15. 15, 17.* and *8. 14.* and *chap. 3. 11, 32, 34.* *Wherein we read, that Christ saw those things which he spake, with the Father, heard them from God, or the Father.* And that they were given him from the Father, and that they were the words and speech of God or the Father: from whence it is apparent that Christ is not the most high God. For the most high God is the first and highest Cause of all things, neither can it in any sort be said of him, that his Doctrine is not his, but another persons, and that he speaketh not of himself; as is apparent from the proof of the major Proposition of the foregoing Argument. But we say that those things are very frequently and plainly said of Christ, and he constituted not the first, but the second and middle cause of his Doctrine.

#### **The Defence of the Argument.**

That the refuge of the distinction of Natures hath here no place, we shewed in the last Argument, when we refuted the second Answer, for here Christ simply and without any limitation denieth that his Doctrine is his, and that he spake of himself. Therefore it is necessary that he spake of himself how great soever, especially since he wholly attributeth what he denieth of himself, not to another Nature of his, but to another Person, namely, the Father, and consequently doth therein oppose not one Nature to another, but one Person to another, that is, himself to the Father. For were that the meaning of the words, which the Adversaries using that distinction, would have, he must have said, My Doctrine is not mine according to the human Nature, but according to the divine; or is mine, not as I am Man, but as I am God; and not, *My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me;* to wit, the Father. And in that passage, *chap. 14. 10.* how unsuitable was it for him (were the Adversaries Opinion true) having omitted the mention of his divine Nature, to say, *But the Father that abideth or dwelleth in me, he doth the work?* Where his words also are to be understood, as we have already hinted. For when he would intimate the intrinsical cause of his work, or the cause dwelling in him, why did he not rather name his divine Nature, essentially dwelling in him, and proper to him, than a Person different from him? Why, when he had named the Father, did he, that he might more significantly exclude himself, presently add the pronoun *he*, as if he should say, the Father simply doth the work? Is it not manifest that Christ would distinguish himself wholly, how great soever he is, from the prime Cause of his Works and Words, and having taken it away from himself, ascribed it entirely to the Father? Add hereunto, that Christ when he saith, *My Doctrine, or My Word,* would have it so far forth understood,

to be *his* Doctrine or Word, as it was most belonging unto him; and it was most his, according to the opinion of the Adversaries, as he was a divine Person; from whom, no less than from the Father, that Doctrine had originally proceeded. Wherefore when he had spoken this, and desired to have it understood, there was no cause why he should rather ascribe it to the Father, then to himself, or his divine Nature, although divers natures had place in him. Finally, this thing doth here quite exclude the distinction of Natures, that Christ doth here manifestly consider himself as he sustained the Office of a divine Embassador. But that Office agreeth to none but a Person as such. Wherefore it is either to be held, that Christ here speaketh of the divine Nature, or to be confessed that Christ is not a Person of supreme Divinity. For as we have shewn in the foregoing chapter, and will elsewhere shew more largely, a divine Person is nothing but the very divine Nature, having its subsistence. Besides, the Adversaries will have it, that Christ was first sent according to his divine Nature; for they hold, that the Son was sent from the Father out of Heaven, to assume Flesh, and consequently to undertake the business of Mans Salvation. But if Christ according to his divine Nature, yea, according to this in the first place, is the Embassador of the Father, why are those things which are attributed to him as the Embassador of the Father, restrained to the human Nature only, and not rather ascribed to whole Christ, how great soever he is? But if any one will have it, that in these and other the like places, a Prerogative is attributed to the Father above Christ, and that as Christ is God, as indeed the words altogether require it, he must with all of necessity confess, that Christ is not the most high God, but that on the contrary, the Father only (since such a Prerogative agreeth to no other, and Christ ascribeth to him entirely, without making mention of any other person, both his Doctrine and Works) is the most high God. concerning which thing it hath been spoken in the Defence of the precedent Arguments.

#### **CHAP. XIV: Christ did not come of himself**

**Argument the fifth, fetched from those places in *John*, wherein Christ is denied to have come of himself.**

Like to the former are those places, wherein Christ denieth that he came of himself; affirming that he was sent by the Father. For thus he speaketh, chap. 7. 28, 2Q. *Whence I am, ye know; and I came not of my self; but he is true that sent me: whom ye know not: but I know him, because I am from him; and he sent me.* And chap. 8. 42. *If God were your Father, you would love me, for I went out from God, and am come; for neither came I of my self, but he sent me.* And chap. S. 43. he had said, *I am come in the name of my Father, and ye received me not; if another come in his own name, him ye will receive.* But if Christ is the most high God, how did he not come of himself? For to come of ones self, is to come of his own accord, or relying on his own Authority, and to discharge an office amongst men. But how can the most high God be said to do that, which he doth not of his own accord and authority, but anothers? Certainly although the Father and Son were divers Persons in the same divine Essence, yet could not one be sent, or come from the other, but he must withal come from himself, since there will be the same numerical will in both, the same Authority. Wherefore the Father could decree or command nothing, but the Son would also decree that very thing with the same action. But if it be absurd for any one to be sent from himself, and Christ openly denies, that he came from himself. It must be held, that he is not a person of the same Essence with the Father, and consequently not the most high God.

#### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Why the Exception concerning the two Natures hath here no place, hath already been shewn in the Defence of the precedent Arguments, especially because Christ is here openly considered as sent from the Father, which thing we said pertaineth to the whole Person of Christ, and is by the Adversaries wont by name to be referred unto his divine Nature. And besides, when Christ would by this means procure Authority to himself, and his Doctrine, amongst all the People, what need was there to fetch that Authority from the Father, if he had had the divine Essence in himself, and so, no less than the Father, had been God; yea, the self same God with the Father, and would have men so to understand it (according to the Opinion of the Adversaries) as after he maketh mention of the Father? For, to what purpose is it to fetch Authority from another, when you have it of your self, yea, the same in number with the other, and would accordingly possess all men, with a belief that you have it.

## **CHAP. XV: Christ did not come to do his own will**

**Argument the sixth, fetched from those places in *John*, wherein Christ denies that he came to do his own will.**

In the sixth place, those Testimonies are to be mentioned, wherein Christ denied that he came to do his own will, but the will of the Father that sent him. Which is a consequent of that which went before. For it is the Office of an Embassadour, not to do and seek his own will, but the Will of the Sender. And hereunto belong the words of Christ, *John* 5. 30. *I seek not mine own will, but the Will of him that sent me.* And chap. 6. 30. *I descended from Heaven not to do mine own will, but the Will of him that sent me;* that is, of the Father, as appeareth from the following verses, and many other places, and from the very thing it self. But if Christ were the most high God, how did he not seek his own will, or not come to do it? For to what purpose had he come, but to do the will of the most high God? yea, by this very thing, whilst he affirmeth, that he seeketh the Fathers Will, and came down from Heaven to do it, by this very thing, I say, he would affirm, that he seeketh his own will, and came down from Heaven to do it, if he were the same numerical God with the Father. For as we before hinted, they who have the same numerical Essence, must also have the self same will, and the same numerical act of the will; as the Adversaries hold concerning God the Father, and his Son.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

That Exception touching the human Nature, according to which Christ spake (that I may omit the repetition of other things that were formerly spoken) hath therefore no place; because Christ doth in the second passage, from whence judgment may be made of the first, expresly say, that he came down from Heaven not to do his own will, but the will of his Father. But the descent of Christ agreeth to his whole Person, or, as the Adversaries believe, to him according to the divine Nature. For they contend, that Christ according to the divine Nature came down from Heaven to be born of the Virgin; wherefore he speaketh of his whole Person, and not only one part thereof, or if he attributed these things to himself in respect of one Nature only, he is according to the Opinion of the Adversaries, to be imagined to speak of the divine Nature, which overthroweth it self.

## **CHAP. XVI: Christ did not seek his own glory**

### **The seventh Argument drawn from thence, *That Christ did not seek his own glory.***

Seventhly, Hereunto belong those words of the same Christ, chap. 8. 50. I seek not mine own glory: there is one that seeketh and judgeth. And those words in the same chapter, ver. 54. If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing; it is my Father that glorifieth me. From the first of which we may thus reason. If Christ had been the most high God, he could not chuse but seek his own glory: Since the end of all Gods actions, and the ultimate scope of them that are sent by him, or minister to him, is the Glory of God himself: Wherefore if Christ had been the most high God, he could not chuse but seek his own glory. Again, since he openly professeth, that he seeketh his Glory that sent him, namely, the Fathers, chap. 7. 18. If he had been of the same Essence with the Father, and the same God with him, in seeking his glory, he had also sought his own. Besides, when he saith, that the Father doth seek his glory, and judge, or glorify him, it would of necessity happen, that Christ himself also at the same time, and with the same labour, doth seek his own glory, and judge, and consequently doth glorify himself, since, as we formerly hinted, they that have the same numerical Essence, the same will and power of working, must also of necessity have the same numerical operation. Whence the Adversaries also hold, that the works of the Trinity performed without, as they speak, are undivided, although the reason of that Identity, doth not admit a limitation; and although it should be admitted, yet here, according to the opinion of the Adversaries, must needs be the same operation, because they constitute, and are inforced to constitute that glorification either in the exhaltation of the human Nature, or in the manifestation of Christs glory before men. But now we see that Christ openly denies that he seeketh his own glory, or doth glorify himself.

From the latter place we thus conclude, If Christ were the most high God, he could not say his glory would be nothing, if he glorify himself. For how is the Glory which proceedeth from the most high God, or wherewith the most high God glorifieth himself, how, I say, is it nothing? that is, vain and empty? Certainly it would be no more vain than the Glory that proceedeth from the Father. But Christ openly saith, that if he glorified himself, his glory is nothing, and opposeth the glorification proceeding from the Father, as true and solid, to the glorification proceeding from himself.

## **CHAP. XVII: John. 12. 44.**

**The eighth Argument drawn from the words of Christ, *John 12. 44. He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me.***

That these words of Christ which we have cited, signify that he is not the principal object of Faith, and the ultimate scope to which it tendeth, and in which it resteth, all will easily understand. For thus the common custom of speaking doth require, which it is certain Christ followed, in that he desired to be understood by the people, to whom he spake with a loud voice. But from hence it followeth, that Christ is not the most high God; for the most high God, is the ultimate scope and principal object of Faith. But Christ in the word quoted, denieth that he himself is so.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

The distinction of Natures cannot here have place, both from the simple denial, and also because Christ here considered himself as he is believed, or to be believed on. But he is to be believed on, as the Son of God, and consequently, if we give credit to the Adversaries, as the most high God himself. For which cause, when the question is concerning Christ, they urge that of *Jeremiah, Cursed is the man that putteth confidence in man*, omitting, or not considering that which follows, *and maketh flesh his arm*; that is, placeth his strength and stay in flesh, a frail thing, and *his heart departeth from God*. Neither of which hath place in the Man Christ, especially placed at the right hand of God in the Heavens. Wherefore that we may return unto our place; whilst Christ constituteth himself the object of Faith, but in the mean time denieth that he is the principal object, and ultimate end thereof, he speaketh of himself as the Son of God. But that he according to the human Nature only is the Son of God, the Adversaries will not grant. Add hereunto, that he considereth himself as Embassadour of the Father; for credit given to an Embassadour as such, is ultimately terminated not in him, but the Sender, since his Authority doth depend from thence, and he proposeth not his own sayings, but anothers, namely, the Senders. Indeed Christ did therefore speak this, to commend the Faith placed on him; namely, that it resteth not on him, since he speaketh not of himself, but tendeth to the Father himself, who sent him, and is terminated in the Father. But those things which are attributed to Christ as Embassadour of the Father, are to be referred to Christ how great soever he is; and if he be a person of supreme Divinity, are to be ascribed even to the divine Nature; as we have formerly shewn, chap. 4. of this Section. But if this be absurd, it must be confessed that Christ is not the most high God.

## **CHAP. XVIII: Christ ignorant of the last Judgment-day**

### **The ninth Argument, *That Christ was sometimes ignorant of the last Judgement-day.***

Hitherto we have brought testimonies out of *John*, wherein that is denied of Christ, which could not be denied of him if he were the most high God. It followeth that we produce the like Testimonies out of other sacred Writers also, and that such, wherein a Prerogative is attributed to the Father above Christ. The first shall be that of Christ, which formerly when we treated of the Father, was touched upon, *Mark* 13. 32. *But of that day or hour, namely, of the last judgment, knoweth none, no not the Angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father;* or as *Mat.* 24. 36. speaketh, *but the Father only.* How it may be here evinced, that the Father only is the most high God, we have before shewn. And now we must consider, how it may be hence proved, that the Son is not the most high God; although the first being proved, the second followeth by necessary consequence; but we here go a contrary way to work, and do not demonstrate that Christ is not the most high God, because the Father only is; but that the Father only is, because Christ not. The thing is easy and open to every one; for the most high God neither is, nor ever was ignorant of any thing. But the Son of God was sometimes ignorant of the day and hour of the last judgement. Wherefore the Son of God is not the most high God.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

How much the Adversaries have tortured themselves in unloosing this knot, and what divers interpretations, not only diverse, but the same men have devised, may be seen, as in other Interpreters, so chiefly in *Maldonat*, who reports, that *Jerome* and *Austin*, prest with the difficulty of this testimony, fled to the refuge of saying, that the place was corrupted, and that this was not to be read, namely, *neither the Son but the Father*, contrary to the credit of all books; which if we may call into question, there will be nothing in the Scripture certain, nothing firm, nothing which one may not deny. Neither must we only expunge the words of *Mark*, but also those of *Matthew*, which are of the same import. Next, the same Interpreter saith, that the greater part of the ancient Authors were of opinion, that Christ was ignorant of the day of judgement, not because himself was indeed ignorant thereof, but because he made us ignorant of it, because he would not reveal it to us; because his Body, that is the Church, was ignorant of it, because he dissembled the knowledge thereof; and to that purpose he cites *Origen*, *Chrysostome*, *Gregory*, *Hierom*, *Beda*, *Theophilact*. This Interpretation (if so be it deserves this name) the same Interpreter doth rightly confute by this Argument, because at that rate the Father also would be ignorant of the day of judgement, in that he revealed it not unto us. Again, what manner of reasoning had Christ used, were this Interpretation admitted? The Disciples desired to know of him the day of judgement, Christ answereth, according to the opinion of these men, *The Son causeth you to be ignorant of the day of judgement, he will not reveal it*, he dissembleth his knowledge thereof. But this was the very thing that the Disciples ask, namely, that he will declare it unto them. A cause should have been alledged why he would not declare it, why, as they speak, he did dissemble it. Finally, what manner of Interpretation is this: *I know not*, that is, I dissemble my knowledge? Did Christ deal thus with his Disciples, and delude them with whom he both might and ought to deal openly? Such a kind of speech would be unbecoming even a grave man, much more Christ. Again, the same Interpreter saith, that others, by name *Origen*, *Epiphanius*, *Chrysostome* expounded it, that Christ was ignorant of the day of judgement, because he had not yet experience of it. This opinion he refuteth with the same reason that he did the former; because by this reckoning, the Father also should be ignorant of it, since neither he himself as yet had experience of it. He saith, that others affirm this to be the sense, *Neither doth the Son of man know it, unless the Father know it*; but because the Father knows it, the Son of man also knowes it, as *Enthymius* speaketh. Which Interpretation is very frivolous; first, in that by so speaking, he had not alledged the cause, why he declared not the day of judgement to his Disciples, nor had diminished the desire of knowing it, and inquiring it of him, but increased it; because by this means he had intimated, that the Son of man did know that day. Besides, neither doth the word Son, absolutely spoken of Christ, denote the Son of man, but the Son of God, as he is such, especially since the word Father is presently opposed thereunto, and by it God understood; and the word *but*, in that passage, *but the Father*, agreeth not with the words, *nor the Son*,

Immediately going before, but with those, *none knoweth*. Finally, that interpretation doth thwart the words of *Matthew*, who saith, *that the Father only knoweth it*. For how ridiculous would it be to say, the Son of man knoweth not the day of judgement, unless the Father only knoweth it? for it is a certain contradiction in the Additament, and the condition that is added, subverteth that to which it is added. The same Interpreter further more saith, that many ancient and grave Authors, whose names he orderly reckoneth up, did thus interpret, That Christ, as man, was ignorant of the day of judgement. Which he himself thinketh to be true only in this sense, that Christ knew not the day of judgement upon that score, or for that reason, because he was man, but because he was God. Otherwise he supposeth it to be false, and horrid to be spoken, that the human Nature of Christ was ignorant of any thing. For the Papists, yea, certain others also, imagine, that the human Nature of Christ, from the very first instant of his conception and birth, knew all things. But that Interpretation also he refuteth, because Christ not only denieth, that the Son of man (he ought here rather to say the Son of God) doth know the day of judgment; but also affirmeth, that *the Father only knoweth it*; by which speech he seemeth to exclude, not only the Son, but also the holy Spirit.

Nevertheless, now a-days that Interpretation which the Interpreter rejecteth, namely, that Christ is said truly to be ignorant of the day of judgement, not according to the divine, but according to the human Nature, is commonly most received even amongst them, who otherwise hold, that in the very moment of conception, the Properties of the divine Nature were communicated to the human, or the knowledge of all things infused into the soul of Christ: therefore we must here briefly refute it, and having discussed it in a few words, also disprove that mans own interpretation. Such an Interpretation therefore, and Answer to our Argument as is commonly brought, for three Reasons chiefly ought not to be admitted. First, because Christ simply and without any limitation, denieth that the Son knoweth the day and hour of judgement. Where it followeth, that he spake of himself wholly, how great soever he is; as we have shewn in the examination of the second Answer to that place, *John* 5. 19. Again, to omit other things spoken in the same place, both from the simple word Son opposed to God the Father, and also by the Gradations used by Christ, ascending from the Angels to the Son, and from the Son to the Father, it is apparent that he altogether spake of that Nature according to which he is the Son of God. Thirdly, Because in *Matthew* it is expresly said, that the Father only knoweth the day and hour of judgement: which sense agreeth also to the words of *Mark*, whilst he saith, *None knoweth but the Father*, opposing the Father to the Son himself. But if Christ had according to the divine Nature, known the day of judgement, then not only the Father, but also the Son had known it, and besides, if we believe the Adversaries, the holy Spirit.

Now whereas in this place they so much urge the saying of *Paul*, *Col. 2. 3. In whom are all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge hidden*. First, they do not observe, that these words may as well, yea, far better, be referred to the name of the Mystery of God and Christ; the mention where of immediately precedeth, than to the name of *Christ*. For it is there chiefly treated concerning the knowledge thereof, so that the sense is, in the Mystery of God and Christ, are all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge hidden; but that Mystery is the evangelical Doctrine, Chap. 1. 25, 26, 27. Again, the *Wisdom and Knowledge* here spoken of, is to be understood of all things pertaining to mans Salvation, which have also been revealed by Christ unto us, and are diligently to be known by us. But that the Knowledge of the day of judgement is not comprehended in the number of these things, appeareth from these very words of Christ, whereof we dispute. To omit, although otherwise it were spoken of the same kind of things, yet this special saying concerning the day of judgement, should derogate from the general, and not be interpreted according to that, but that according to it. It remaineth that we speak something of that Interpretation and Answer which the Popish Interpreter, having refuted the Opinions of all the rest, did devise, although he so proposed it, as that himself seemeth to put no great confidence in it; for he saith, Unless I be mistaken, Christ speaketh in the same manner that he had formerly said, *To sit at my right and left hand, is not mine to give you, but to them for whom it hath been provided by my Father*. Wherefore he intimateth what is more; that he not only as a man, but also as God, was in a certain sort ignorant of the day of judgment, not that he was indeed ignorant; but because it was not his office to know, as he said not, for whom it is provided for by me, but by my Father, not that it was not provided by him also; but because to provide the Kingdom, that is, to predestinate, is not his office, but the Fathers. That also it belongeth to the Father,

to appoint when the world is to be dissolved, and when the day of judgment is to be. This is that which the Apostle saith, It is not for you to know the times and seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. Therefore he alone is signified to know it. And this, unless I be mistaken, is the true sense. He did well, twice to add unless I be mistaken; for he was something afraid, lest he should be mistaken; neither did this ingenious man satisfy himself, whilst he endeavoured to satisfy others. But neither did he rightly explain the place, but pervert it, nor take away the difficulty, but in some part augment it. For, first, he without example, and any just reason, departeth from the proper and usual signification, of being ignorant, whilst he interprets it, that it is not ones duty to know, unless perhaps he alledge this very thing for a reason about which we controvert, namely, That it cannot be said that the Son is ignorant of the day of judgment, because he ever knew, as all other things, so that day also. Again, in what manner soever he interpreteth those words, it is not the office of the Son to know that day, yet doth he not escape the difficulty; for either it is not therefore the office of Christ, because he is not bound to know that day, or not obliged to know that day, or because he is bound to be ignorant of that day; so that it is not so much as lawful for him to know it; which latter sense, the places quoted by him, seem to require. If he hold the latter, he increaseth the difficulty instead of diminishing it, and saith more than is needful. For he not only saith, that the Son was then ignorant of the day of judgment, but that it was not so much as lawful for him to know it. But how can he be the most high God, who is not only ignorant of something, but cannot know it, or to whom it is not so much as lawful to know some things, and that as he is God? And notwithstanding the places quoted by him, and duly compared with this, seem altogether to require such a sense; for when Christ saith, To sit at my right hand and left hand, is not mine to give, he signifieth, that it lay not in his power and disposal, or that it was not lawful for him to do it. But the place of the *Acts* maketh express mention of Power, and signifieth that the Father had reserved to his own power and disposal the determination, and consequently also the knowledge of the times and seasons. But if he grant the former, first, what will this make to the purpose? for the sense will be, that none is obliged to know the day of judgment, neither the Angels, nor the Son, but the Father only. But what then? although neither Men, nor the Angels, nor the Son be obliged to know it, yet both he and they may possibly know it, and we, (as the Disciples may be supposed to speak) although we are not bound, are yet desirous to know it, since, saving the truth of that saying, it is possible for us to know it. For he against whom we dispute, doth believe, that although it were not the office of Christ to know the day of judgment, yet he did know it. By this reckoning therefore, Christ had not quenched the desire and longing that the Apostles had to know that day, but had left place for such a cogitation, that it might be, that both Men and Angels did know that day. Again how can it be said, that it is the Office of the Father, or that the Father is obliged to know the day of judgment, and the Son not obliged, if he also be the Supreme, and consequently the same God with the Father? for neither of them can be obliged to know any thing, but that the other also must be obliged, since both have the same numerical understanding, and the self-same knowledge. Besides, whatsoever cause you alledge, why the Father is obliged to know the day of judgment, that will be common to the Son, if he be the supreme God with the Father; yea, were it possible, that one of them should be obliged thereunto, the other not at all or less obliged; it should be held, that Christ is more obliged, because he sustaineth the Office of Judge; and if he be the supreme God, doth therein depend on none; so that he doth according to his own pleasure both constitute and determine the day of judgment. I omit that it is not rightly said, that it is the Fathers Office, or that he is bound to know the day of judgment, since he cannot chuse but know; or if you therefore say, it is his Office because he is bound to define and constitute that day, consider how rightly it is said, that he is bound to do that which lieth in his own pleasure. But of this so far.

## **CHAP. XIX: Mat. 20. 23.**

**Argument the tenth from the words of Christ, *Mat. 20. 23. To sit at my right and left hand, is not mine to give.***

The next place shall be that which a certain Interpreter, as we have seen, compared with that testimony whereof we have hitherto treated, and is extant in the same *Matthew*, chap. 20. where Christ speaketh thus, *But to sit at the right and left hand, is not mine to give*: So it is read in the Greek without adding to you, which is found in the vulgar Translation, *But to whom it hath been prepared by my Father*. Now it is easy to every one to perceive, what the meaning of Christ is; namely, that it is not in his power, or not lawful for him according to his own pleasure, to determine who ought to sit at his right hand in his Kingdom, who also at the left, and so to obtain the next degree of dignity and honour after him. For that this is due to them, for whom it hath been designed by the Father, whose Decrees Christ cannot repeal. From whence it appeareth, that Christ denieth such Authority to himself, as he intimateth, that the Father exerciseth. Whence it followeth, that Christ is not the most high God. For in the Power and Pleasure of the most high God, are all things which fall under any power, such as is that, namely, to give or decree that one should sit at the right hand; another at the left hand of Christ in his Kingdom: for Christ intimateth, that that hath been prepared for some by the Father.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

You will say, that it is not lawful even for God himself, to repeal his own Decrees, especially such as design some good to some person. And that therefore it was not lawful for Christ any further to determine according to his pleasure, who ought to sit at his right hand, who at his left, although he be the most high God, because he hath already made an immutable Decree concerning that matter. We answer, That that is here taken for granted, which is altogether controverted, and can be confirmed by no other testimony of the Scripture, (for, *neither do we read in the Scripture, that the Son or holy Spirit, but the Father only did predestinate any one*, saith the most learned and popish Interpreter on this place) and is not only not agreeable to the words of this place, but also foreign to the same. For were the thing so, neither would Christ simply have said, *To sit at the right hand and left hand, is not mine to give*; nor had he said of the Father only, that it was provided for some by him, but he would have said, either that it was done by him, without naming the Father, or at least he would have joined himself with the Father; for who would not think it to be absurd, should it be supposed that the Father of Christ had already made a decree of giving to some the dignity of sitting at the right and left hand, to bring him in thus speaking? *To sit at the right hand and left hand, is not mine to give, but to whom it hath been prepared by my Son*. Would not the Father upon this account, attribute some Prerogative to the Son above himself, and ascribe that to him, which he took away from himself? Where since now the Son doth in that manner speak of himself, it is to be held, as we see some Interpreters do acknowledge, that Christ, even as he is God, ascribeth some Prerogative to the Father above himself, and what he attributeth unto him, taketh away from himself. Which if you make a true estimate of the thing, is no other than to say, that the Father only is the most high God, but the Son is not; as we have above sufficiently taught.

Some other will say, that Christ doth not here simply deny, it is his to give, that one should sit at his right hand, another at his left; but that it is not his to give it unto those two disciples, the Sons *Zebedee*; for that the words *to you* are either to be read, or to be understood, both because the ancient Interpreters have them, and the following words opposed to those going before, do require it; for it followeth, *But to whom it hath been provided by my Father*. Whence it seemeth apparent, that in the foregoing words, is to be understood the name of the persons, to whom it suiteth not with Christ to give so great a thing, and that they are those disciples who asked that of Christ, and whom the ancient Interpreter designed by the words *to you*. But if those words be added, you will say, Christ affirmeth or denieth nothing of himself, which may not be affirmed or denied of the most high God. But, first, no reason enforceth us to imagine, that the words *to you* are either to be read or understood; but there

is rather good reason, why we should conceive that they are not to be read. For as for the authority of the ancient Interpreter, there is no cause why we should leave the Fountain, and follow the Stream, and think that this is purer than that; yea, rather the reading of the Latin Translation ought to yield to the reading of the Greek Copies, if they agree among themselves, & to be corrected from it. But here the Greek copies among themselves, and that not only in *Matthew*, but also in *Mark*, where it is read in the same manner, and that most learned Popish Interpreter saith, he knoweth no ancient Greek Interpreter, who read the words to you, yea, not so much as *Austin* amongst the *Latins*. But as for the reasons drawn from the following words, that do persuade us, that in the foregoing words, a regard is also had of those persons, to whom it concerned not Christ to give that sitting at his right hand and left; but there it followeth not, that the words to you must of necessity so be understood, and so this great felicity is denied to those two Disciples by name. For every one seeth, that these words may thus also be rightly understood, as if Christ had said, *To sit at the right and left hand is not mine to give*, namely, to whom soever I please, even to my kinsmen, such as you are, having a regard to kindred only, or to give it to such as simply ask, and therein prevent others as you do, but to them at length to whom it hath been designed by my Father. Again, let us grant, that those words, *to you*, are either to be read, or to be understood. Nevertheless, since Christ saith, that it is not his to give that sitting, but to them for whom it hath been prepared by the Father, it followeth that he is not the most high God. For by such words he intimateth, that he is not the prime Author of so great Dignity, but the Father, and that he himself doth both promise, and will at length give that honour, according to the pleasure of another, namely, of the Father, and the Laws appointed by him; otherwise, as we before hinted, he would have said, that so great dignity had for some been provided either by himself, or at least by him & the Father together. But neither of those things which we have spoken, is incident to the most high God; for he is both the prime Author of all such Honours and Rewards, and composeth himself to the pleasure of his own, not of anothers will, and accordingly distributeth rewards and honours.

The exception concerning the human Nature, according to which it was not his to give, whereas it was according to the divine, hath here no place, both for the simple negation, and also because he here opposeth not one Nature to another, but his own Person to the Person of the Father, and what he taketh away from himself, he attributeth to him; and finally, because this reason would have had no force to repeal the petition of those Disciples; for neither did they desire, that he should give unto them what they craved, according to one Nature, not according to another, but simply that he should give it, and consequently, that he should give it according as he is able. Therefore if Christ had answered, that it was not his to give according to the human Nature, they might presently reply, that it did nothing matter them, so that he gave it according to the divine, according to which he was able to give it. But they were not so subtil, although they believed Christ to be the Son of God, as to think of that distinction. Therefore they thought that a simple Negative was simply to be taken, and believed, that Christ spake to the purpose, and did not struggle besides the matter in hand. I omit that the most learned of the Adversaries acknowledge, that Christ here spake of himself as God; as we saw in the examination of the foregoing place.

**CHAP. XX: Mat. 19. 17.**

**Argument the eleventh, from those words of Christ. *Mat. 19. 17. Why dost thou call me good? none is good but God only.***

The third place shall be that which is extant in the same *Matthew*, in the chapter immediately before going, namely the 19. 17. where when a certain young man had thus bespoken Christ, *Good Master, what good shall I do that I may have eternal Life*. Christ answereth him with these words, as it is read both in the Greek books with *Matthew* himself, and in the Latin also with *Mark* and *Luke*, *Why dost thou call me good, there is none good but one, the God, or God only*: which place, both heretofore, and at this day, many have dared so to understand, as if Christ would by the confession of that young man, teach, that himself was that one or most high God. Which if we shew to be false, the Argument will be presently retorted upon them, and it will appear, that the contrary to what they will have, is here taken for granted by Christ. They indeed believe Christ to reason in this manner. *None is good, but God*, namely, the most high God. I by thy confession am good, I therefore am the most high God. But, first, Christ no where, though he had far greater occasions of doing so, did either expressly say, or openly teach, that he is God, as will appear to every one reading the History of the Gospel; yea, as we have above some where hinted, when it was objected against him, that he made himself God, he purposely declined the name of *God*, and professed himself the *Son of God*, so far was he from professing or endeavouring to demonstrate that he was the most high God. How much less therefore in this place did he from the bare appellation of *Good*, and that added to the name of *Master*, collect so great a thing? Again, if Christ would teach this young man, that himself were the most high God, he would have had him also to understand, that there was none besides himself, to whom the name of God or *Good*, taken by way of excellency, doth agree; for he said, that there is none good besides one, namely, *God*. But we have already elsewhere shewn, that if any one be said to be he, to whom only something doth agree, the same is to be attributed also to that very subject only; if Christ would teach that himself was that God, who only is good, he would have had the young man to understand, that there is none such besides himself. But this is false, since, besides Christ, the Father is such; namely, that God, of whom, as different from himself, he elsewhere very frequently, and in the same discourse speaketh. But if any one say, that Christ would have it understood, that there was no other in regard of Essence, to whom the name of *God* and *Good*, taken by way of excellency, doth agree; howbeit, that there is another in regard of Person, he will take for granted, what all acknowledge to be most false, that the young man already knew how to distinguish between the Essence and Person, and that it was apparent unto him, that many divine Persons might be in one numerical Essence, or he would be forced to say, that Christ did by this speech of his, drive the young man, ignorant of that distinction, into a most grievous error; namely, to believe that there was no other Person besides Christ, to whom the name of *God* and *Good*, so taken as we have said, doth agree. Could it be that Christ should touch so great a matter so briefly, and not instruct an ignorant man concerning it? Finally, the very words of Christ, *Why dost thou call me good? There is none good but God only*, do openly enough teach, that Christ rejected so great a title, as agreeing to God only; so far was he from snatching it, to conclude thence a thing as yet more incredible; namely, that he was the most high God. What then will you say, will not Christ be good? We answer, That the word *Good*, when it is so taken, as to agree only to the most high God, in which manner it is here done by Christ, as we have before hinted, taken by way of excellency, and denoteth him who is in the most perfect manner of all, and of himself, good. In which sort we have elsewhere seen, that Wisdom, Power and Immortality, is taken, when God only is said to be Wise, Powerful and Immortal. In this signification, Christ denieth that he is good. For if you object, that the young man, did not simply call Christ *Good*, but *Good Master*, and so took not the word Good in so perfect a signification, but in such an one as might agree to a Master, given by God. We answer, That the young man did both in an unusual manner, so accost Christ, *O good Master*, in which manner we no where find, that he is at any other time stiled, and also would in a singular fashion call him good, and attribute this name unto him by a certain excellency. Now although he thought not of so perfect a signification as agreeth to God only, yet such an appellation, by reason of its singularity, receding from the common custom, seemed to savour of a signification so perfect, and so of a certain Divinity. It became the great Modesty of Christ, not to admit this title, as truly agreeing

only to God, but to decline and reject it. And this was far more becoming, than to draw this title, uttered in another sense, to the confession of his supreme Deity. In like manner, the same Christ below, *Mat. 23. 8, 9, 10.* admonisheth his Disciples, that they suffer not themselves, to be adorned with the titles of *Rabbis* and *Masters*, because there is one Master of ours, the Christ; nor that they call any one on Earth Father, because there is one Father of ours, who is in the Heavens. Although perhaps they who called them *Rabbi*, or *Master*, did not at all think of so perfect a signification, wherein those Appellations did agree to none but Christ, yea, although it were not so much as likely, that they did think, neither also did we take the name of the Father in so excellent a signification, wherein it agreed to none but the most high God: for it is sufficient, that such a custom of accosting, doth savour of something too much, and consequently of something more divine, which agreeth to none but Christ, or to the most high God; for Modesty doth shun even those things also which have a shew of too much. What therefore the Master of most perfect Humility in those words taught the Disciples, that in this place of ours, did he teach by example, whilst he rejected the title of Good, as too much, and proper to God only. Hence also it is apparent, that Christ reasons far otherwise than the Adversaries, and consequently after a contrary manner, namely, thus, *None is good but God, namely, the most high God: which is all one as if he should say, Whosoever is good, namely, by way of Excellency, he is the most high God: But I am not the most high God, wherefore I am not good, taking this name by way of excellency; neither was I so to be called by thee.*

## **CHAP. XXI: Not as I will, but as thou**

### **Argument the twelfth, from the words of Christ to the Father, *Not as I will, but as thou.***

The fourth place shall be that, where Christ in this maner concluded his prayer to the Father, *Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou*: Or as *Luke* speaketh, *Not my will, but thine be done*. For from those words it is collected, that Christ is not the most high God; for the most high God neither permitteth, nor can permit to any other person a power to determine of him, and also to decree contrary to what himself desires and wills; otherwise, by this very act, he would acknowledge that person superiour to himself. But nothing is superiour to the most high God. Whereas Christ permitteth here to another Person, namely, his Father a Power to determine of him, and to decree even contrary to what he himself otherwise willed. Again, had Christ been the most high God, he had also been one and the same God with the Father, as the Adversaries themselves contend, or of one Essence with him, otherwise there would be two most high Gods. But it is apparent from this place, that Christ was not the same with the Father, or of the same Essence with him: for had he been, he would likewise have had one numerical will with the Father, and the same numerical act of the will, as we have above elsewhere taught. But it is apparent from this place, that the will of both was different, and the act thereof different; yea, that it might come to pass, that the one might be contrary to the other in the thing here treated of, although so, that the will of Christ was ready to yield to the Fathers Will; otherwise he could at no hand have said, *Nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done*; for it could not be, that his own will should not be done, if his Fathers will were done: nor could Christ (for example) desire that the cup should pass from him, if the Father would not have it pass.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

It will be here presently answered, that it is manifestly apparent, from the words, that Christ speaketh thus according to the human Nature, not according to the divine. And indeed we believe, that Christ according to the human Nature, or the very human Nature it self, doth here speak, but so, that it is withal to be granted, that there is not in him another Nature, namely, the divine. For, first, the simple Negation, *Not my will be done*, permitteth not that there was another Nature in Christ, and that a better, according to which his own will ought altogether to be done, as it would be necessary to hold, if there had been in Christ the divine Nature, the same in number with that of the Father. To omit, that it is absurd, yea, altogether impossible, that in Christ at the same time, there should be contrary wills concerning the same thing; whereof the one would have the cup pass from him, the other would not. Certainly it would withal be necessary to acknowledge two Persons in him. For, to subjoin another reason for which that distinction of Natures hath here no place, it is necessary that Christ spake these things of himself as he is a Person; for such operations as are, to will, and consequently also to beg, agree to none but *Suppositiums*, endued with understanding, as such; and consequently, to none but persons as such. Either therefore it is necessary for the Adversaries to hold, that Christ spake these things of himself as he is a divine Person, namely, one of the Persons of the Trinity; which we have shewn to be false, and they themselves, who here use a distinction of Natures, do acknowledge: or it is necessary to acknowledge, that his human Nature, according to which Christ willed and begged those things, is a Person; and so, lest two Persons should with the *Nestorians* be held to be in him, contrary to all, both Reason and Scripture, that there is in him no divine Essence and Person. Finally, It is to be observed, that he doth here submit himself not to the power and will of his own divine Nature, but to the Will of the Father, and so opposeth not Nature to Nature, but Person to Person, and the will of that, to the will of this. Wherefore it is altogether to be confessed, that there was not in the Person of Christ, that will, which he attributeth to the Father, and simply opposeth to his own.

## **CHAP. XXII: Heb. 5. 5.**

### **Argument the thirteenth, from the words, *Heb. 5. 5. Christ did not glorify himself.***

Hitherto we have cited places out of the Writers of the Evangelical History, and consequently out of none but the words of Christ himself, wherein those things are denied of Christ, which could by no means be denied of him, if he were the most high God. To which we think fit to subjoin those words of the divine Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, which are extant, chap. 5. 4, 5. *Neither taketh any one the Honour to himself* (namely, of the Pontificate or high Priesthood) *but he that is called by God, as Aaron. So also Christ did not glorify himself to become an high Priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* For if Christ were the most high God, how had he not glorified himself to become an high Priest, if so be the most high God can be any high Priest? Whereof hereafter. For on the most high God, the honour of an high Priesthood doth depend, and so is conferred on others. And in that the Father glorified him to become an high Priest, as here it is affirmed; Christ had also glorified himself, to become an high Priest, had he been the most high God, and so one God with the Father. But that is in this place denied, and he that said unto him, *Thou art my Son*, is said to have glorified him, and not he himself.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

The exception concerning two Natures, hath no more place here, than in the former places; both for the simple Negation, as also because Christ is here considered as he hath attained the Priestly Office, which agreeth to him only as he is a Person. But if that be a Person of supreme Divinity, those things which are here either spoken or denied of Christ, must be attributed or denied of the very divine Nature. Since a Person of supreme Divinity is nothing but the divine Nature endued with a subsistence. Add hereunto, that those things which are here attributed unto Christ, are ascribed to him as he is the Son of God; for the divine Author doth not therefore take those words of the second *Psalms*, that he may only simply describe him that glorified Christ, and made him high Priest, but that this very description may teach, that Christ was made an high Priest by God. For besides the custom both of this and other divine Authors, who are wont to make use of Descriptions of Persons accommodated to the subject matter, not foreign to the matter; the following words also shew this thing; for the divine Author addeth, As he also saith in another place, *Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.* By which words it clearly appeareth, that in the former place also it is spoken of the Priesthood which was given unto Christ. But that place is not commonly to be taken of Christ according to the divine Nature, and to be wrested to his Generation out of the Essence which the Father made from all Eternity; which though it be absurd, and besides other things, repugnant to the words of *Paul, Act. 13. 32, 33.* & so to this very place, doth yet exclude their exception concerning the human Nature, according to which this very place is to be taken of Christ. Finally, would the divine Author here have spoken of a certain Nature only, and not of the whole Person of Christ, he would not have opposed Christ to the Father, but to himself according to the divine Nature, and what he had taken away from the human, he would have attributed to the divine; but that he neither did, nor could do. For if Christ was in that very thing made an high Priest by God, as he was begotten by God, and consequently became the Son of God; as we manifestly see the divine Author intimates; he could not be made an high Priest by himself, no not considered according to the divine Nature; otherwise Christ would have been begotten of himself, considered according to the divine Nature, and so would be his own Son, and the divine Nature might say to him, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* Which how absurd it is, and repugnant to its self, every one perceiveth. Now therefore he at length shall rightly understand this place, and the Authors reasoning, who observes that Christ is chiefly called the Son of God, as by his favour he hath attained the greatest similitude with God; and that Christ was never made more like to God, than when he obtained the perpetual Government of the house of God, and the Office of eternally looking to, and saving the People of God. Which thing is contained in this Priesthood; for the divine Author opposeth not that Office to the Kingly, but in some sort includeth this in that. But let those things be here spoken by the by, in that they will prove advantagious hereafter.

## **CHAP. XXIII: John. 14. 28.**

### **Argument the fourteenth, from the words of Christ, *John 14. 28. My Father is greater than I.***

We have hitherto reckoned up not a few places wherein something is denied of Christ, which could not be denied of him if he were the most high God. It follows that we take a view of those places, wherein something is attributed to him, which could not be attributed if he were the most high God, and that such in the first place, wherein some Prerogative is ascribed to the Father above him, and so the Father made superior to Christ: of which sort those also were which we have hitherto alledged. We will again begin from *John*, in whom there are very many Testimonies of this kind also; amongst which we will give the first place to that wherein Christ, with most open words, professeth that the Father is greater than he; as he doth chap. 14. 28. Where he saith, *My Father is greater than I*: to which ought to be added that place, chap. 10. 29. where the same Christ saith, *My Father which gave them me* (namely, the Sheep) *is greater than all*. Where under the name of those All, Christ himself also is included, as both the collation with those words, chap. 14. and also that doth shew, that in the same place, he attributeth to the Father the giving of those Sheep unto him, and consequently unto himself the receiving of them from the Father. But none can be greater than the most high God.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Here many of the ancient Authors did grant, that Christ speaketh of himself, even as he is the Son of God, and saith that the Father is greater than himself, in as much as the name of Father signifieth the Principle, and as the *Greeks* speak, the cause of the Son. Thus besides others, that Popish Interpreter, whom we have above quoted, saith, it is expounded by *Athanasius, Hilary, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Cesarius, Cyril, Damascen, Chrysostom, Leontius, Theophilact, Euthymius*, citing the places of them to that purpose. *But I know not*, saith he, *whether they granted more to the Adversaries* (namely, the *Arians*, with whom they did dispute) *than was meet*. Indeed this acute man saw, that it followeth thence, that Christ even as he is the Son of God, is not the most high God, in that the Father is greater than he, as such: concerning which thing, we have already above sufficiently spoken. Add hereunto, that that fashion wherein they make the Father greater than Christ, makes nothing to the purpose of Christ; for Christ there renders a reason of that which he had last spoken, namely, *If ye love me, ye would rejoice because I go to the Father*. By which words he signifieth, that some good or happiness should arrive to him, when he was gone away to the Father, and consequently, that the Disciples ought to rejoice even for his sake, that he went away to the Father; as very learned men before us have observed. But what maketh it to the purpose, that the Father is greater than Christ, as he is the Fountain of his divine either Nature or Person, and begat him from Eternity out of his Essence? doth not the thing it self hint, that Christ would signify, that the Father was greater than he, as he was more blessed, glorious, powerful? and that he himself, when he was more nearly joined with the Father, and received into his own seat, should be partaker of the same Blessedness, Glory, Power and Empire? But there is no need to labour much in refuting the Interpretation of the Ancients, since at this day there is scarce any one that followeth it. For latter Writers observing, that by such an Interpretation, the *Arians* Opinion touching the Divinity of Christ, is not a little established; they chiefly seized on that answer, which also not a few of the Antients made use, that Christ there spake not of himself according to the divine, but only according to the human Nature. Which answer may be refuted by the same reason in a manner, which above, chap. 3. of this Section, we alledged, if you change a few things in some of them. For not to repeat those things now, whereby we have taught, that there is no example of such a distinction in the Scriptures, yea, that this very distinction overthroweth the Opinion of the Adversaries concerning the Person of Christ, we have shewn that that cannot be simply denied of the whole, which may, and is wont, or rather altogether ought to be simply affirmed of the same, although it agree not to it according to some one part, especially the less worthy. Whence it followeth, that also on the contrary, that cannot be simply affirmed of some whole, which may, and is wont, or rather ought to be simply denied of the same whole, although it doth agree to it according to some part, especially the less worthy. Now if Christ be the most high God equal to the Father in all things, as the Adversaries affirm, and that without any limitation, and simply; yea, ought

simply to be denied of him, that the Father is greater than he. For neither is it more lawful simply to affirm of him, that he is the most high God, and equal to the Father in all things, than to deny that the Father is greater than he, or that he is less than the Father. Wherefore neither could Christ simply affirm of himself, if he were the most high God, that the Father is greater than he. Add hereunto, that such an affirmation, *My Father is greater than I*, is of equal force with such a Negation, *I am not so great as my Father*; as every one seeth by himself, and the scope of these words before mentioned by us, doth teach; for Christ would signify, that he did yet want something which the Father hath; and therefore that he also may attain the same, he must go away unto the Father. Wherefore since we have taught, that what may or ought to be simply affirmed of the whole, cannot be denied of the same whole; Christ could not thus speak of himself, if for another, and that a better Nature, he would have the contrary understood of him. Again, since he who speaketh is the very Son of God; for he saith, *My Father is greater than I*; thereby intimating, that God the Father is greater than his Son: either it is necessary to say, that the Father is greater than the very divine Nature of Christ, which the Adversaries by that very distinction of theirs, endeavour to avoid, or confess that the Son of God is not a person of supreme Deity, since a person of supreme Deity, is no other than the very divine Nature having its subsistence; as we have above said, chap. 3. Besides, the Interpretation of the Adversaries, doth altogether enervate the force of Christs words, and render them invalid to his purpose. For we saw that therefore Christ uttered those words, that the Disciples might see that he must go away to the Father, to the end he might enjoy greater happiness; and therefore should not only abstain from sorrow, but also rejoice that he went a way: but if Christ according to one Nature only, had been less than the Father, and in the mean time, had in himself a Nature or Person equal to the Father in all things, there would have been no need for him to go to the Father as greater, to the end he might enjoy greater happiness; nor would the Disciples have had cause to rejoice that he went away from them, but rather to grieve, in that he would go away, where as he might stay, and they might presently object to the Lord, yea, why dost thou go away to the Father as greater than thou, since thou art endued with such a Nature or Person as is equal to the Father in all things, and that Nature is always intimately present with thee, even whilst thou art conversant with us on the Earth; why rather dost thou not stay with us, and here procure to thy self that happiness which thou seekest with the Father? You see, that by this reason, if it be taken according to the sense of the Adversaries, Christ could have prevailed nothing with the Disciples. But he could prevail very much, if omitting the distinction of Natures, he would have the words taken of him simply and absolutely, as they were uttered.

But there are some learned men of the Adversaries, who think that those words of Christ, as also many other places in the same *John*, are to be taken neither of the human Nature of Christ, nor of the divine, but of the whole complex, as they speak; because although he were the eternal God, yet when he descended to us, he began to be a middle person between God and us. But this is of no moment; for either they will have it, that the Son, when he descended to us, ceased to be the most high God, or they will not have it. If they will have it, the Son neither is, nor ever was the most high God; for he can never cease to be the most high God. If they will not have it, the Son could not therefore be simply called less than the Father, or, which is all one, the Father greater than he; because none is simply, yea none is any way greater than the most high God. And if the Opinion of the Adversaries concerning Christ, be true, the Son ought to be termed equal to the Father in all things. But as we have shewn before, the same cannot be simply both affirmed and denied of the same whole. Again, since that whole complex whereof they say, that those words of Christ are to be taken, is the Person of Christ, or the very Son of God; as neither they do deny, and we have before shewn; it is necessary for them to confess, either that that Person is not a Person of supreme Deity, or else that it may be said of the divine Nature, that the Father is greater than it, as we have a little before demonstrated. We forbear to repeat that reason whereby we have confuted the Answer which is now a days most received among the Adversaries; namely, that such an Interpretation weakneth the force of Christs words, and renders them ineffectual to what he intended. For the same reason is also prevalent against this Interpretation: for if these words be so to be taken, as that nevertheless it may or rather ought to be understood, that Christ is the most high God, or hath in him the Nature of the most high God; they are not effectual to shew, that Christ must go away to the Father, and his Disciples ought to rejoice, that he would go away to the Father; as may be understood by what was formerly spoken.

Furthermore, did Christ therefore call himself less than the Father, because he is a middle Person between God and us; he would always be less than the Father in that sense, even after he ascended into Heaven, and sat at the right hand of God the Father: since Christ is at this time a middle Person between us and God, in that he is a Priest, and our Advocate, interceding for us with the Father: for which cause the Adversaries themselves say, that he is now a Mediator. But Christ sheweth by these words, that he, after he was gone away to the Father, should be no longer less than he. Whence they themselves, with whom we have to do, affirm, that Christ in those words compareth his present state with his heavenly Glory. For, as we already hinted before, because the Son did yet want that Glory, to wit, Immortality, and sublime Authority over all things, he was therefore less than the Father; having attained the same, he is reputed no longer less than the Father. For neither is a most exact and altogether absolute equality here to be regarded. Wherefore Christ did not therefore say, that he was less than the Father, or the Father greater than he, because he is a middle Person between us and God. I forbear to mention at this time, that they with whom we have to do, hold that Christ was in the same sort even from the beginning of the world, a Mediator of God and Men. Whence it would follow, that his divine Person existing without the human Nature, was already less than the Father, before that descent which they understand; neither do I here urge, that if Christ, because he descended to us, that is, as they imagine, assumed a human Nature, became a middle Person between us and God, and consequently less than the Father; it is necessary that both the Father and the holy Spirit became middle persons between us and God, and less than themselves. For neither could the Son or his divine Nature, assume the human, but that the Nature of the Father, and of the holy Spirit, and consequently the very Father and holy Spirit, would together assume the same human Nature, if that be true which the Adversaries say, that those three have one and the same numerical divine Nature. Concerning which we will treat in the second Book.

## **CHAP. XXIV: The Son sent by the Father**

**Argument the fifteenth, drawn from thence, *That the Son was sent into the world by the Father.***

In the second place, that may be alledged which is so often read in *John*; namely, that Christ was sent by God or the Father; which is also found in other Writers, and amongst others in *Paul*, when he saith, *God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh*, *Rom.* 8. 3. and *Gal.* 4. 4. *When the fulness of time came, God sent his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law.* For it followeth from hence, that Christ is not the most high God, since it is not for him to be sent, but to send, because it is not for him to receive any command from another, but to give commands unto all. But every Embassadour as such, receiveth command from another, and of necessity composeth his words or actions, which he undertaketh as an Embassadour, unto the will and beck of another, otherwise he will not discharge the Office of an Embassadour. Whence also Christ, as we saw before, *John* 12. 49. saith, *The Father that sent me, he gave me a Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak.* And in the following verse, *What things therefore I speak, as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak.*

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Here the Adversaries are not easily wont to fly to a distinction of Natures, partly because they hold, that Christ before he was born of the Virgin, was sent by the Father out of Heaven, yea, sent to this very end, to be born of the Virgin, and assume a human Nature, partly because they see, that to be sent, and so to sustain the Office of an Embassadour, agreeth to none but a person, as such. That I may not say, if Christ had been sent only according to the human Nature, it will follow, that he was also sent by himself, or by his own divine Nature, when notwithstanding he every where maketh another person, namely, the Father, to be the Author of his mission, but never maketh himself; yea, as we formerly saw, he expressly denieth, that he came of himself.

Wherefore the Adversaries are wont to betake themselves to another refuge, and to deny that Christ being sent by the Father, argueth him to be less than the Father; indeed the greatest part of them affirm, that he, saving his equality with the Father, even then when he had not yet assumed a human Nature, was both before the Law, and under the Law sent by God, and was then oftentimes stiled an Angel, or Messenger and Embassadour; which we in our Book concerning God, when we treated of the name *Jehovah*, have, as I suppose, sufficiently refuted. Now they say that it is no unusual thing, that a Senator, for example sake, should be sent by his colleagues, to whom he is otherwise equal in Authority and Power, and in their name discharge an Embassy. Yea, that a greater Person may be sent by a less, either because he doth of his own accord take upon him that Office, or because it is obtained at his hands by prayers, or other persuasions. But, first, they do not refute the reason of the consequence of our Argument; which being safe, the Argument it self is safe. Again, if the thing be so in divine matters, as they hold, it is inhuman; namely, that an equal may be sent by an equal, yea, a greater by a less, nothing will hinder but that also the Father may be sent by the Son, or holy Spirit: which thwarteth the Opinion of the very Adversaries, who deny that the Father may be sent by the Son or holy Spirit, either apart or jointly, though it is a wonder that they deny it, since they hold, that those three Persons are equal to one another in all things; so that there is no repugnancy if one of them may be sent, that the rest also may be sent. But why do I say, that there is no repugnancy? since it cannot be, that one should be sent, but that the other must also be sent, if so be they are of one Essence, and a Person cannot be sent without the Essence. For if the Essence of the Father were sent when Christ or the holy Spirit (that we may now together speak of him also) was sent, certainly it is necessary that the Father himself was sent. For he is sent, whose Essence is sent, since every one is really the same with his Essence. Besides, from this answer of theirs, it will follow, that nothing hinders, but that God or Christ may be sent by Angels, and finally, by Men; namely, being drawn by prayers or other persuasions. But if all understand this to be most absurd, let them also acknowledge it to be most impossible, that Christ should be equal to the Father in all things if he be sent by him; for neither was there any cause why all should judge either this or that, which in the first place was spoke

of, to be absurd, than because reason it self hath taught all men, that the Sender in respect of that thing for which he decreeth the message, is, as I may speak with the Vulgar, the principal: but the Messenger is his Minister in the same thing. And withal, this hath also been understood, that the Father can by no means be inferiour to the Son or holy Spirit, who proceeds from him, & have their Essence from him, or be Minister, much less the Minister of Men or Angels. As for the Instances therefore, or Examples alledged to the contrary, here they ought to remember that which they themselves are often wont to inculcate when there is no place for it; namely, that in this matter an Argument is ill drawn from human things to divine. Now the reason of the diversity is this, because no man (unless perhaps you except sovereign Kings, who are not themselves wont to discharge Embassages) is so great, but that he may in a certain thing, be subjected, or subject himself to another, and so receive commands from him, and minister to him. Wherefore he also who is equal to another in dignity, yea, superiour, may be sent by him, and discharge an Embassy in his own name, and therein become inferiour to him, and in some business be subservient to him as the principal. But the most high God cannot so be changed, as to become inferiour to any one in any thing, and to minister unto him: but he is always superiour to all, and all minister to him. Wherefore can he neither undertake the Office of an Embassadour.

## **CHAP. XXV: Christ received Commands from the Father**

**Argument the sixteenth, drawn from thence, *That Christ received Commands from the Father, and kept them.***

Thirdly, To these are to be subjoined those other places in *John*, wherein Christ openly professeth, that he received Commands from the Father, and that he did keep them; and they are many, for chap. 10. 18. he saith, *This Commandment* (namely, of laying down my soul, that I may receive it again) *have I received from my Father.* And chap. 12. 49. *The Father that sent me, he gave me a Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak.* Which words we have quoted in the foregoing chapter. And chap. 14. 31. *As the Father hath given me a Commandment, so I do.* And chap. 15. 10. *As I have kept the Commandment of my Father, and abide in his Love.* See also chap. 4. 34. and 6. 38. and 8. 29, 55. and 17. 4. and 18. 11. and those places wherein it is very clearly taught, that Christ obeyed God, *Rom.* 5. 19. *Phil.* 2. 8. whereunto add, *Heb.* 5. 8. Hereunto also may be referred, those places in the Prophets, wherein God calleth Christ his Servant, as amongst other places it is done, *Isa.* 42. 1. (which place is cited of Christ by *Mat.* chap. 12. 18.) and 49. 5, 6. of the same Prophecy (which place is in part cited, *Acts* 13. 47.) and 52. 13. and 53. 11. and *Ezek.* 34. 23, 24. & 37. 24, 25. and that where Christ is called, a *Minister of the Sanctuary*, *Heb.* 8. 2. All which shew that Christ is not the most high God; for he can receive Commands from none, and observe none, obey none, be the servant of none, otherwise he would not be the Most High: for he is Superiour, who giveth Commands, and who is obeyed and served.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

The common exception of the Adversaries is, that those things agree to Christ only according to the human Nature. But the exception is easily overthrown by what hath been spoken above in the third and fourth chapter of this *Section*. For, first, those things which we have alledged, are spoken of Christ simply, and without any limitation: but were the very Essence of the most high God in Christ, or rather were he the most high God, they ought no less simply, yea, much more to be denied of the same. For it would no more be lawful simply to affirm of him, those things which agree unto him according to the human Nature, than to deny those things which agree not to him according to the divine; but the same thing cannot be simply affirmed and denied of the same. Again, If Christ be a person of supreme Godhead, that limitation *according to the human Nature*, hath no place in him, neither can it cause, that what agreeth to his human Nature only, should be simply affirmed of his Person. For a Person of supreme Divinity, is the very divine Nature. But it cannot be said, that something agreeth to the very divine Nature according to the human, and much less that be simply affirmed of it, which is repugnant to it by it self, and agreeth only to a creature, such as are, to receive commands from the Father, to keep them, to serve the Father. Now the reason is so much the more to be pressed, if it appear that those things which are spoken of Christ, do indeed and properly agree to a Person only, such as those are which were mentioned. For these actions do not agree properly but to an intelligent Suppositum; that is, a Person as such, especially because in respect of the Office which Christ sustained on the Earth, he received Commands from the Father, and performed them, and is now called a Minister of the Sanctuary, as he is a Priest. But these Offices agree to none but a Person, as such. Now that which doth not properly agree but to the Person of Christ, must needs agree to the Nature, which, with its Subsistence, completeth his Person: But if that Nature be divine, the limitation of the Adversaries restraining such Attributes to the human Nature only, falleth to the ground. If it be a human Nature, either there will be two Persons in Christ, a divine and a human, or that divine, which the Adversaries do hold must be denied, and a human only, if you regard the Essence; but a divine, if you respect the Qualities, whereby it is endued by God, is to be acknowledged, which is the thing that we would have. We now forbear to mention, that Christ received Commands from God, as he was his Embassadour. But the Adversaries hold Christ to be the Embassadour of God, and not only according to the human Nature, but also, and that primarily, according to the divine. By what means then do they restrain the receiving and keeping of Commandments, and consequently, the name of

Servant to the human Nature only? For it is necessary that they renounce that Doctrine before they use such a limitation.

## **CHAP. XXVI: Christ poured out Prayers to the Father**

**Argument the seventeenth, drawn from thence, *That Christ poured out Prayers to the Father.***

Fourthly, We may alledge those places, both in *John*, and also other sacred Writers, wherein we read, that Christ prayed to the Father. Now there is a large Prayer of his poured out to the Father, partly for himself, partly for the Disciples, both present, and to come, in the whole 17th chapter of *John*. To which add that in the Garden of *Gethsemane*, *Mat.* 26. 39, 42, 44. *Luke* 22. 41, 44. and that on the Cross, *Mat.* 27. 46. *Luke* 23. 34, 46. To the former of which poured out by Christ unto God for himself, the divine Author to the *Hebrews* without doubt alluding, chap. 5. 7. speaketh thus, *Who (Christ) in the days of his flesh offering up Prayers and Supplications to him, who could save him from death, with strong cries & tears, was heard for his reverence; or (as it may be turned out of the Greek) for his fear.* Furthermore, we read elsewhere, that he continued all night in prayer to God, *Luke* 6. 12. see also chap. 9. 18, 28, 29. and 11. 1. and *John* 14. 16. From whence it is clear, that Christ is not the most high God; for he needing the help of none, and depending on none, doth never implore the help of any.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

The answer that Christ prayed according to the human Nature only, is sufficiently refuted by what we have spoken before both in the 3d and 14th chapter, and also in the precedent one. Whereunto add, if Christ, as this distinction supposeth, had had a divine Nature in him, there would have been no need that he should fly to another Person, namely, the Father; as we read Christ very often did, and also with tears and strong cryings. For what need is there to ask of another, and that with so great earnestness, yea, further with tears, which you are able by your self, and that by natural strength underived from another at all times, most freely and easily to perform, yea, which you your selves have absolutely decreed to perform, as certainly it is to be held of Christ if he were the most supreme God, or most High. Some here reply, that it may be, that even he who may and will perform something by himself, may beg it of another, to the end he may honour him in this behalf, and in a manner leave to him the glory of the benefit And that it became Christ, as being the Son, in this sort to honour the Father, and to ask of the Father by name, as of the Fountain, those benefits which proceed from the whole Trinity. Which answer, first, taketh not away the difficulty. For they who thus answer, either hold that some Prerogative agreeth to the Father above the Son, and so to the first Person of the Deity above the second, as such, or else they hold it not. If they hold it, those Persons are not of the same numerical Essence, nor is the Son the supreme and most high God; as we have already shewn before. If they hold it not, there is no cause why the Son should rather ask something of the Father, than of himself (if so be any one may ask any thing of himself) or without any prayers performed by himself. For what reason is there, that in an absolute equality, this honour should rather be given unto the Father, and the glory of the deed attributed to him, than to the Son? Yea, Christ should rather have taken heed, lest by the example of his prayers, which he is found to have poured out to the Father only, he should give occasion unto others, to exhibit greater honour to the Father, than either to himself, or to the holy Spirit. For to Persons altogether equal, equal honour is also due; and the Adversaries themselves contend, that those three Persons of Supreme Divinity, which they hold, have equal honour and glory. But if you say, as indeed some do, that it was Christs modesty to ask that of the Father, which of himself he could either assume to himself, or bestow on others. Not to repeat those things which have been already spoken, we may demand, to which Nature they think that modesty is to be ascribed? If to the human, it was not its modesty, but judgement only, to prefer the Father before the Son, and to direct prayers rather to the more honourable. It is greater modesty to make an address to the inferiour, rather than to the Superiour. Or if you think the Persons altogether equal, you shew no greater modesty if you betake your self, and convert your prayers, to one, than to the other. If they ascribe this modesty to the divine Nature or Person (as we said it was necessary, if this Person were divine, that is, if he were the very supreme God) they are very absurd and injurious to the most high God. For Modesty is a Virtue of Men and Angels, not of the most high God; It is, I say, a Virtue of such a Nature, as may be exalted, and cast down; not belonging to such a nature as is

not capable of exaltation and depression. But if you dare to ascribe modesty to the most high God, as such, there will be no cause why you should so earnestly contend, that Christ prayed to the Father not according to the divine Nature, but according to the human only. For it would not be impossible, that Christ according to the divine Nature, did for modesty sake so debase himself before the Father, as to pray unto him for others, namely, Men, and obtain gifts for them, which he could by himself bestow upon them: which, how absurd it is, every one perceiveth, and the Adversaries themselves sufficiently intimate, that they see it, whilst all that I know of, do in this Argument fly to the distinction of Natures.

But furthermore, the manner of Christs prayers to the Father, chiefly expressed by the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and also in part intimated by the Writers of the History of the Gospel, doth at no hand admit that answer; for it argueth the want of Christ, and necessity of praying, not modesty only. This appeareth both from his great assiduity in praying, and also by his strong crying and tears, and perplexity of mind, which shewed themselves, as he prayed a little before his death. If you say it was necessity that Christ prayed, but modesty that he rather prayed to the Father, than to himself, or his own divine Nature, not to repeat what was formerly spoken of the human Nature of Christ, be held to be personally united to the divine, that necessity will quite be excluded, especially in things pertaining to Christ himself, wherein notwithstanding we see, that he used such cryings, and tears, and contention of mind. For by what means, for example sake, could the necessity drive the human Nature of Christ to pray so ardently unto the Father, that he would not forsake it, or leave it destitute of his help, and that he would receive its spirit into his hands, and save it from death, if it had been joined with an indissolveable tie to the divine Nature, which both could and would perform it, yea, could not chuse but perform it? Do we think that the human Nature of Christ was afraid, lest that personal union should be dissolved. But the Adversaries do not so much as permit any one to doubt of that; so far are they from believing that such a thing could come into the mind of Christs human Nature, or of the man Christ, or could it perhaps fear, lest then the union remained entire, yet notwithstanding might perpetually abide in death, and so the divine Nature remain to all eternity, personally united to a dead and bloodless corps? Who would not tremble to think of this, since if you make a true estimate of the thing, this could not be done so much as for a moment. It remaineth therefore, that Christ did not for modesty, but for necessity, pray, and that to the Father, a different person from himself; namely, because he could not perform by himself that which he asked for himself, and could not bestow that which he asked for others, but by power received from the Father, which by praying for others, he tacitly begged should be given to himself. The first of these is intimated by the divine Author to the *Hebrews*, chap. 5. 8. whilst, without expressing his proper name, he thus describeth him, to whom Christ offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, namely, *Who was able to save him from death, or deliver him from death*. For by that description, he would distinguish that Person from the Person of Christ, and withal assign the cause why he offered up prayers unto him, and finally intimate, what he did then so earnestly beg for himself. But neither had he by this means distinguished that Person from Christ, if Christ had been as able to save himself from death, as the Father was to save him, since common things do not distinguish, but proper; neither had he brought a sufficient reason why he made supplication unto him, with crying and tears, that he would deliver him from death.

## CHAP. XXVII: All things given to Christ from the Father

**Argument the eighteenth drawn from thence, *That all things are given to Christ from the Father.***

In the fifth place, Those passages may be alledged where it is written, that all things were given to Christ by the Father; and that partly in general, partly in special terms; that is, certain things given to him by the Father, being expressed by name. Whereunto belong very many places, not only in *John*, but also other Writers. And for as much as we are citing the Testimonies taken out of *John* chiefly, therefore let us begin from him principally, because it is most frequently in him, than in other Writers expresly written, that the Father gave something to the Son. Thus therefore he saith, chap 3. 35. *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand. And chap. 5. Christ being about to declare those words, whereof we have formerly spoken, The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth all things to him which himself doth, and will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel: amongst these things he saith, ver. 22. For neither doth the Father judge any one, but hath given all judgment to the Son, that all may honour the Son as they honour the Father. And ver. 26. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and he hath given him also power to do judgement, because he is the Son of Man.* To which places as touching the Life given to the Son by the Father, that other is not unlike which you find chap. 6. 29 [57]. *As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by reason of the Father, even so he that eateth me, shall live by reason of me: every thing that the Father giveth to me,* (that is, every man of an honest heart, whom the Father draweth to me) *shall come unto me:* which in some sort he repeateth, ver. 39. and chap. 10. 29. *My Father which gave them (the Sheep) me, is greater than all.* Chap. 13. 3. *Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands.* And chap. 17. 2. *Thou (Father) hast given him (the Son) power over all flesh, that every thing which thou hast given unto him, he should give unto them, eternal Life.* Ver. 5. *Glorify me thou Father with thy own self, with the Glory which I had, before the World was, with thee.* For it is all one to glorify, as to give glory; as it is of it self apparent, and is also evident from ver. 22. 24. Again ver. 6. *I have manifested thy Name to the Men whom thou hast given to me out of the world: thine they were, and thou hast given them to me.* And by and by, ver. 7. *Now have they known, that all the things that thou hast given to me, are from thee.* See also ver. 9. 11, 12, 14. and ver. 22. *And the Glory which thou hast given me, have I given them.* And ver. 24. *That they may see my Glory which thou hast given to me, because thou lovedst me before the making of the World.* The same *John* at the beginning of the *Revelation*, saith, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him.* This *Revelation* is largely related afterwards, chap. 5. from the beginning unto the 10th verse. And this cause therefore is added, *For he was slain, and bought us by his blood, and made us Kings and Priests unto our God.* Let the whole place be read, as in a very lively manner setting forth all the business. Moreover, In the second chapter, about the end, the very Son of God saith, *He that overcometh and keepeth to the end my works, I will give unto him power over the Nations, and he shall rule them with an Iron rod, &c. as I have also received of my Father.* Which very same thing he explaineth in other words afterwards about the end of the third chapter, ver. 21.

Now that we may come to the other Writers of the New Testament, who either expresly, or with words equivalent, affirm that something, yea, all things, even the divinest of all, were delivered unto Christ by God the Father. First, Among other things, Christ himself, *Mat. 11. 27.* speaketh on this wise, *All things have been delivered unto me by my Father.* And chap. 21. 24. he citeth concerning himself these words, *Psal. 118. 21. The Stone which the Builders refused, the same is become the head of the corner: this was the Lords doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.* Which place is also in part cited *Acts 14. 11.* and elsewhere, although the word Give is not extant, yet is the thing extant which is signified by that word; that is, it is intimated, that the Glory, Power and Empire is given unto Christ by God. Concerning which thing, *Mat. 28. 18.* Christ speaketh more plainly and openly, whilst he saith, *All Power in Heaven and in Earth is given unto me.* Likewise in *Luke*, chap. 1. 32. the Angel speaketh of him thus, *He shall be great, and he shall be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God shall give unto him the Throne of David his Father. And he shall reign over the House of Jacob for ever: and of his Kingdom there shall be no end.* And chap. 22. 30 [29]. Christ himself saith, *And I dispose to you a Kingdom, as my Father hath disposed unto me.* For that disposal argueth a giving.

Likewise in the same Writer, *Acts* 2. 33. Peter saith, *Being therefore exalted* (namely, Christ) *by the right hand of God, and having received the promise of the holy Spirit from the Father, he hath poured out this which ye now see and hear.* And presently after when he had cited the words of *David* concerning Christ, *The Lord saith unto my Lord, sit at my right hand until I make thy enemies the footstool of thy feet.* He addeth ver. 35. *Wherefore let all the House of Israel know assuredly that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, even this Jesus whom you have crucified.* And chap. 3. 13. *The God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus.* And chap. 5. 31. *Him hath God exalted by his right hand, to be a Prince and Saviour, to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins.* And chap. 10. 42. *And he* (Christ) *commanded us to preach to the People, and testify, that it is he who is appointed of God, Judge of quick and dead:* which *Paul* afterward doth repeat in part, chap. 17. 31. Out of whose Epistles, that we may not be too tedious, we will produce certain places, *1 Cor.* 15. 27. He saith out of the 8th Psalm, *He* (God the Father) *hath put all things in subjection under his feet* (namely, Christ) *But when he saith, that all things are in subjection to him, it is manifest, that he is excepted who put all things in subjection to him.* Which he also clearly explaineth, *Ephes.* 1. 20, &c. where he saith, that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, *did set* (Christ) *at his right hand in heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and authority, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, and hath put all things in subjection under his feet, and hath given him head over all things, to the Church, which is his Body.* And *Phil.* 2. 9. *Wherefore* (namely, because Christ humbled himself, becoming obedient to the very death of the Cross) *God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and every tongue might confess, that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* And who is able to reckon up all the places of the Scripture. See among others *Heb.* 1. 2. and so forth to the end of the chapter, and chap. 2. 7, 8, 9. and chap. 3. 2, &c. chap. 5. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. and *1 Pet.* 1. 21.

Now in the Old Testament, besides the places which are contained in the Testimonies of the Writers of the New Covenant, cited by us, namely, out of *Psal.* 8. and 110. that passage of the second Psalm. ver. 6, 7, 8. is very notable; *I* (God the Father) *have set my King upon my holy Mountain Sion, I will declare the Decree.* (namely, whereby I have been constituted a King: for they are the words of Christ, the Antitype of *David*.) *The Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son, I this day begot thee. Ask of me, and I will give unto thee the Nations for thine inheritance, and the ends of the Earth for thy possession: thou shalt rule them with a rod of Iron, &c.* To which is to be joined that famous Vision in *Daniel*, chap. 7. 13. where he saith, *I saw in the night Vision, and behold in the Clouds of Heaven, there came one like the Son of Man, and he came to the ancient of days,* (that is, the eternal God, before cited, ver. 9. 10.) *and they offered him in his sight, and he* (the Ancient of days) *gave unto him Power and Honour, and a Kingdom, and all people, tribes and tongues shall serve him; his power is an everlasting Power, which shall not be taken away, and his Kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.* We wittingly and willingly omit more places.

Now from these passages it is evinced, that Christ is not the most high God, for none can bestow any thing on him, much less all things, since he bestoweth all things upon all. But we see that the Father hath bestowed on Christ so many and so great things, yea, all things. Wherefore Christ is not the most high God. You might also frame more Arguments, especially out of those places wherein the word *give* or *bestow* is not met withal, but there is the same force of Argument; as if you should say, He that is exalted by God, or glorified by him, or made Lord, and Christ, is not the most high God.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

To this Argument and the places of Scripture whereon it is built, neither do all, nor the same persons, every where make the same answer. For some directly seem to deny the Major, as they call it, of our Argument; others seek refuge in distinctions. For as to the former, some say, that even the Apostle doth affirm, that Christ *shall deliver the Kingdom to God, even the Father,* *1 Cor.* 15. 24. In which place, there is the same word that Christ useth, *Mat.* 11. 27. when he saith, *All things are delivered unto me by my Father.* Wherefore they say, that something might be delivered or given even to the

most high God. Again, as Christ, *John* 17. 2, 5. desireth of his Father to be glorified, and so that Glory should be given to him, so also doth he there affirm, that he had glorified the Father, and hereafter would glorify him.

But first we will speak of such a Giving as proceedeth from the grace and bounty of the Giver: for which cause we did in our Argument make use of this word bestow. For such is that Giving, whereby all things have been given to Christ by the Father. For Christ openly ascribeth it to the love of the Father towards him, in the 3d and the 5th chapters of *John*, and chap. 17. he doth intreat for the Glory designed unto him. And God in the second Psalm saith to the Son, *Ask of me, and I will give unto thee the Nations for thine inheritance, &c.* And *Paul, Phil. 2.* saith, there was *bestowed on Christ, or given out of grace* (for so the Greek word signifieth) *a Name that is above every name.* And the reason for which the power of quickning and exercising Judgment was given unto Christ, namely, *because he is the Son of Man*, doth sufficiently argue, that it was such a Giving as we have spoken of: which very thing is evident from that place of *Daniel*, chap. 7. and others like thereunto. But that the giving, whereby Christ shall deliver the Kingdom to God the Father, is not such an one, all men do of themselves easily perceive. For neither can it be imputed to the grace or bounty of Christ towards the Father, who needeth the bounty of none. For that is such a delivery of the Kingdom, as, for example sake, when a General, appointed by his King to manage a certain War, doth, when it is ended, lay down the Power that was given unto him, and restore it unto his King, who had hitherto exercised it by him, that if he be so pleased, he may hereafter exercise it by himself. And all this is no other than what Right it self doth require, in as much as the Power was given unto him by the King, for the management of that War only. In like manner Christ, who hath received Royal Power from the Father, to subdue his and our enemies, and hither to exerciseth the same in the Fathers name, when all the enemies are subdued, shall yield it up to his Father; that is, so lay it down, that the Father may afterwards exercise it by himself, and, as *Paul* speaketh, *God may be all in all.* From whence also ariseth another reason of diversity, in that we speak of such a Giving, as an Inferiour cannot exercise towards a Superiour, such as is the conferring of power and right on another, the giving of life, or the like things. But the delivery of the Kingdom may be incident to an Inferiour, in respect of a Superiour, yea, can be incident to none but such. But every one doth easily perceive, how much that delivery, whereby Christ shall render the Kingdom to God the Father, doth differ from that, whereby the Father gave to Christ the Throne of *David*, and all Power in Heaven and Earth, and consequently the other things. Because when those things were given to Christ by the Father, he was said to have been made Lord and Christ. But who dare to say of the Father, that he, when Christ delivereth the Kingdom to him, shall then be made and constituted by him Lord and Christ.

But further, let us grant that something may be given to God, who is there that dare to say, that *all things* have been delivered to the most high God by another? That all Power in Heaven and Earth hath been given to him? as Christ affirmeth concerning himself. Would it agree to the Father, whom all grant to be the most high God, to speak in this manner: I dispose to you a Kingdom, as my Son hath disposed unto me? Could it be said, that it is given to the Father by another to have life in himself? that he liveth by another? Would this speech be suitable to him, My Son, who gave me the Sheep, is greater than all? or this, Thine were they (Disciples) O Son, and thou hast given them unto me? Run over the rest, and see whether you can without Blasphemy apply them to the Father; or the most high God. Hence it easily appeareth, how frivolous that other thing is which they alledge out of *John* 17. 2, 4. touching the glorifying of the Father. For there is as wide a difference between the glorifying of Christ which he begs of the Father, and the glorifying of the Father made by Christ on the Earth, as is between the Glory which God promiseth to us, and will at length give by Christ, and that which we are said to give or render unto God: between the blessing, whereby God blesseth us, and that whereby we bless God: between the praise and honour which he will sometimes give to us, and that which we give to him: for the glorifying of the Father, which proceeded from Christ, was only the illustration of the divine Name, or the celebration, or manifestation of the Fathers Goodness, Power and Wisdom; but that which Christ did beg, consisted in the conferring Immortality, and Sovereign Power. Which is manifest by it self, and shall be shewn afterwards when we shall refute the third Answer to our Argument. So that in the words of Christ, *Joh. 17. 2, 4.* there is such an elegant *Antanaclasis*, as if some one of us should say, Glorify us O God, that we may glorify thee: praise and honour us, that we

may praise and honour thee: Or, we have glorified thee on Earth, praised thee, honoured thee, finished the work which thou hast given us to do; wherefore glorify us with thy self with that glory which thou didst design to us, before the world was created.

But now it is time that we see other Answers to our Argument, or rather interpretations of the places from whence it is drawn. Some therefore answer, that all things were given to Christ from the Father, by an eternal generation out of his Essence. Which answer likewise seemeth to strike at the *Major* of our Argument, and so deny it to be universally true. For it is tacitly said, that it is only true of the Father, but not of the Son, or also of the holy Spirit. But this answer is not to be admitted, chiefly for two Reasons. First, Because, as we already above hinted, it doth sundry ways imply a contradiction, for it maketh the same to be at once both eternal and not eternal; both the most high God, and not the most high God; the same in Essence with the Father, and not the same; equal to him, and not equal. The one, while it attributeth to him the same Essence in number with the Father, and affirmeth that he existed from all eternity; the other, while it affirmeth, that he was generated out of the Essence of the Father, and received all things of him, which he hath in respect of his Deity. Next, because it evidently thwarteth very many of the places quoted by us. For some openly speak of a thing which was done in time, and not from all eternity; as the place, *Luke* 1. 32. and *John* 5. 20, &c. where also life is mentioned which the Father hath given to the Son to have in himself; that is, as most learned interpreters do observe, a power and virtue of quickning, which many hold that he received by that eternal Generation from the Father. So also chap. 6. 37. and 17. 4. *Acts* 2. 33, &c. and chap. 3. 13. and chap. 5. 31. and 1 *Cor.* 15. 27. *Ephes.* 1. 20. & *Phil.* 2. 9, &c. whereunto add all those places which we have cited out of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, out of the Epistle of *Peter*, out of the *Revelation*, also out of the *Psalms*, and out of *Daniel*. Some also express such a cause of that giving, as hath nothing common with that eternal Generation out of the Essence of God. As that the Father loved the Son, *John* 3. 35. and 5. 20. and 17. 24. which cause pertaineth also to the Life which the Father gave unto the Son, to have in himself; Or, that the Son, namely, of God, is the Son of Man, *John* 5. 27. or that he was obedient to the Father even to the death of the Cross, *Phil.* 1. 9. and that he glorified the Father on the Earth, and finished the work which he had given him to do, *John* 17. 4, 5. or that he did desire and obtain it from the Father, *ibid.* and *Psal.* 2. 8. Let these things suffice to have been spoken concerning the second Answer.

Now that we may come to those Answers which endeavour by a distinction, to solve the Argument, they again are divers, For some seem to distinguish the word Give, and others that have the same force, others those things which are said to be given, others finally him to whom they are given, in respect of the divers Natures that are in him, one whereof is such, that according to it, something may be given to him, and consequently all things have been given; the other such, that according to it, nothing hath been given to him. Wherefore the first will say, that the word Give in the major Proposition, is to be taken of a giving which is really made: but the *Minor* is to be understood only of such a giving as is made declaratively: For they answer to the places wherewith we have confirmed our Assumption, especially some of them, that they ought not to be understood, as if the Father did at a certain time really give to the Son, the things mentioned therein, but that he declared that the Son had them, or received them by that eternal Generation, causing that they should be acknowledged by all. Thus many take that Glory which Christ begged of the Father; that also, that God made him Lord and Christ; that also, that gave him a name which is above every name. But, first, they themselves sufficiently see, that this answer doth not agree to all the places which we have alledged. But if the rest be safe, our Argument would nevertheless consist, although those places which we have mentioned, or some others also, were to be taken in that manner as they would have. Again, There is no cause (unless they will alledge that very thing which we oppose by this Argument for a cause) wherefore we ought to depart from the propriety & simplicity of the words; yea, there are mighty causes for which we must not depart from the same. For as to that Glory which Christ beggeth of the Father, *Joh.* 17. if Christ had it really in himself already, that which they say was to be manifested, namely, the Majesty of that one God (for this they must of necessity understand by the glory which they contend, that he really had with the Father before the world was created) what need was there to pray the Father that he would glorify him? for that would always have been no less in the hands of Christ himself, than of the Father: nor would he less have glorified himself, than the Father him. Since

it would be necessary that external works, yea, all should be common to them; yea, Christ beggeth it of the Father as the reward of the performance of a work committed to him by the Father; as appeareth by the collation of ver. 4, 5. But besides, that no reward can be given to the most high God, what reward is this of a work performed, that he should be acknowledged the supreme God who is so? is not this very justly due unto God without any respect of any work? And no less to the Son than to the Father, or to the holy Spirit. Besides, how well they explain that, *Father glorify me with thy self?* for what is that *with thy self?* Is it not manifest, that such words are wont to be opposed, and are in this place opposed unto that which is done with men, or appeareth before them, as in the latter words it is tacitly opposed unto them *with me?* It is not therefore spoken of a thing which ought to be done with men, such as would be that manifestation of Christs Glory which he really had from eternity, but which he had with God. What then? ought the Father to declare unto himself the Majesty of the Son? had he not sufficiently known it? And when he knew it not, ought he to declare it to himself, or else to the Angels conversing with him in Heaven? What? had not they sufficiently known the Majesty of the second Person of the Trinity? had they not beheld it with their eyes? As to that place, *Act. 2.* where God is said to have made Jesus Lord and Christ, the words admit not such an explication, for if we follow their explication, *Peter* must be thought to speak thus; Therefore let all the House of Israel assuredly know, that God hath declared him both Lord and Christ, even this Jesus, whom ye have crucified. But to whom hath he declared it? Was it to Angels? Had not they yet known Christ to be that which he was, and had long since been? Was it to men? But *Peter*, and God did by him, in these very words, truly first declare that very thing to the Jews. Again, *Peter* deduceth these words from those in the Psalms, *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand.* But in them Christ is bidden to reign, as *Paul* interpreteth it, *1 Cor. 15. 25.* and is not only declared to reign. What doth the Father perhaps command, the Son himself to declare, that he reigneth, and hath always reigned? But they would persuade us, that Christ, *John 17.* prayed the Father to do it, since he had in like manner already glorified him, and would hereafter glorify him again. To this sitting at the right hand of God, *Paul* opposeth the delivering up of the Kingdom, which certainly shall not consist therein, in that Christ shall no longer declare that he reigneth; yea, if Christ be that one God, he will then declare unto us in Heaven, that he reigneth no less than the Father, since God shall be all in all. I omit other things which might be said concerning these words of the Psalmist. Finally, They who will have it, that God declared Jesus Lord and Christ, either hold that he was Christ from eternity, or made such at a certain time. He could not be from eternity, for to be Christ, is to be Anointed; which is not incident to the most high God, as he is such; neither hath any one, as I know, dared to say so; but all say, that it agreeth to Christ as he is man. He was therefore at a certain time made Christ, and that by him whose Anointed he is said to be, namely, God the Father. Why then go they about the bush, and seek starting holes? since they are notwithstanding, forced to confess that he was sometimes really, and not declaratively only made by God, Lord and Christ (for to be the Christ, is to be the Lord and King of God's People) although they agree not with us about the time when it was done. For that is sufficient for us here, that God hath already made him Lord and Christ. Although who is there, that if he could but impetrate of himself, to lay aside his prejudicate Opinion for a short space, would not see that this happened after the death and resurrection of Christ. Since all the circumstances of the place in hand, do lead, yea, drive us thither, that I may omit others like thereunto; amongst which is that *Ephes. 1. 19.* and *Heb. 1. 3.*

As to that place, *Phil. 2.* neither doth it admit that explication: first, because by those words is explained the exceeding great reward of the debasement and obedience of Christ performed to God, even with the sufferance of the death of the Cross; but could not be to declare who and how great he is, and always was; that is, as the Adversaries must of necessity affirm, to demonstrate him to be the most high God; whereof we have spoken above when we treated of the place, *John 17. 5.* Again, Christ was therefore among other things exceedingly exalted, and a name given unto him above every name, that the knees of all things in Heaven also might be bowed to him. But what need had the heavenly things of such a declaration, that they might bend their knees to Christ, being the second Person of the Deity, whom they had always very well known, and, as I may say, had beheld with their eyes, and did yet behold. But furthermore, the collation of this place, partly with the two precedent ones, partly with other testimonies of the Scripture, which admit not that explication, and are very like unto this place, shew that the same is here also to be rejected. Finally, though we grant that those

places are to be understood only of the declaration of Christs Majesty and Glory, nevertheless, it will from thence appear, that Christ is not the most high God. For otherwise why should the declaration be attributed to the Father, and not to Christ himself? For could not, and would not Christ always declare the same by himself? yea, he could not but declare it when the Father did declare it; as we have in this Chapter a little before hinted. And thus far concerning the third Answer.

But as for them who endeavour to escape chiefly by distinguishing the things given to Christ, they again differ among themselves. For some (which is the fourth Answer) when they read that all Power was given to Christ, that he was set at the right hand of God, that he was made Lord and Christ, and other such like things, say this is to be understood, not of the right of ruling, but of the act and exercise of Rule. Others and (which is the fifth Answer) grant that it is spoken also of the right of ruling, which Christ got to himself by his obedience, and death, as Mediator and Redeemer. But, first, the same may be said of both answers, that was of the third preceding, namely, although this explication of those places was admitted, yet our Argument would be safe, whilst the other places wherewith it is supported, and which refuse that explication, remain safe. Again, as to the former, those places of the Scripture admit it not, for all power in Heaven and Earth denoteth not the act, or exercise, or rule; that is, the actions which proceed from the Regal Office; but this very right and plenary Authority to rule and govern. There is the same force of this sitting at the right hand of God, or in the Throne of God, or in the Throne of *David*. For when any one is placed by another in the Royal Throne, or commanded to sit, not only the exercise of rule, yea, not the exercise it self is primarily given, as which doth properly depend on him that is placed on the Royal Throne; but the very Office, Power and Dignity is granted to him. In like manner one is not said to be made Lord and Christ, or King, when he exerciseth the rule which he by full right obtaineth, and actually possesseth, but when he is put into possession thereof. Besides, that we may together treat of the latter answer also, either Christ always had a full right or faculty to reign, or else he had not. If he had not, how can he be the most high God? Can he be the most high God, who hath not always a full right to rule? If he had, how was it given and bestowed on him at a certain time by another; namely, by the Father, either that he might actually rule, or attain the right of ruling? How could such an Empire be given to him by the Father for a reward of his debasement and obedience? as not only that place of *John* 17. 4, 5. but also *Phil.* 2. 9, &c. and sundry other places intimate, that it was given to him. See *Isa.* 53. 10, 11, 12. *Luke* 24. 26, 46, 47. *Heb.* 2. 9, 10. and 12. 2. 1 *Pet.* 1. 11. *Rev.* 3. 21. For what one already hath in his power, and what he always possessed with most full right, that cannot be paid unto him for a reward, nor at all be given by another. For if any one say, that it may be that one should obtain the same thing by a double, yea, a treble right and title; as if he to whom another is indebted, should both by nature and by will, become his universal Heir; likewise that it may be, that he who already possesseth a thing, may have a new right to possess the same; We answer, if any one already possess any thing, and that by a full right, it can at no hand be said, that it is then given to him by another, when he hath a new right to possess the same. For that which is mine, can no more be made mine, and therefore neither given by another. But further, who would say, that that thing is then bestowed on him, and given of Grace? Who would say, that it is then paid unto him for a reward? Would you not laugh at him who should affirm, that he did bestow on thee, or appoint for thee a reward of thy labour, and consequently pay unto thee in lieu of recompence, a thousand Crowns which thou already possessest, and that by very good right? yea, though thou didst not yet possess them, so they were by very good right due to thee, none would either bestow them on thee, or appoint them for a reward of thy labour as yet to be performed, and consequently pay them in lieu of recompence. Wouldst thou not justly laugh at thy debtor, who should say, that he bestowed on thee, or for some certain labour which thou hast performed to him, payeth to thee in lieu of reward the money which thou hadst lent him? How much less therefore could Power and Empire be bestowed on Christ, and paid in lieu of reward if he had already perpetually obtained it by the greatest and the fullest Right; although a new right to possess the same, had accrued to him? Wherefore since all Power and Empire is said to have been given, and bestowed on Christ by another, since he is affirmed to have been made by God both Lord and Christ after his resurrection. Finally, since he obtained this as the reward of his debasement and obedience, it could not be that he did already possess it before, yea, nor so much as that, that he should have a full right unto that thing before he had performed that obedience; which if it be so, how can he be the most high God? Nor may any one here think, that that right of ruling which Christ hath

as Mediator and Redeemer, is not contained in that Right and Power which the most high God hath of himself, and consequently that it might be given by another unto Christ, although he were the most high God. For the Right and Power of the most high God, extendeth it self to all things that are not in their nature unjust, but certainly that Empire is not unjust, which is attributed to Christ as Mediator and Redeemer. And what, I pray, is that Right of ruling? Is it not a right of prescribing Laws unto us, and of executing them, a Right of remitting our sins, of defending us from our adversaries, and enduing us with eternal felicity? But what? hath not the most high God a Right of doing all these things? How then did the Father give that Right to Christ? how doth he exercise the same by him, if the most high God, hath it not of himself? Wherefore Christ also would have it of himself were he the most high God. Some other things which might be here spoken, shall be hereafter spoken in a more commodious place.

It remaineth that we examine the last, and most usual Answer of all, to the places alledged by us, and the Argument framed out of them, which consisteth in the distinction of the Natures of Christ. For they say commonly these things are spoken of Christ, according to the human Nature, and not according to the divine. But, first, as we have before shewn chap. 14. it could not be simply affirmed, that all these things were given and bestowed on Christ, that he was exalted, glorified, made Lord and Christ, if he had that divine Nature, according to which those things could not be spoken of him. Since the very same things might simply be denied of him, no less than they are simply affirmed of him in the fore-cited places. Add hereunto, that such places contain in them a tacit Negation, and that a simple one; namely, that Christ hath not of himself those things which are said to have been given to him, for otherwise they would not be said to be given to him. But in such Negations, a distinction of Natures hath no place, as we have sufficiently shewn before, especially when we treated on that place *John* 5. 19. Again, To be, or become a King, Christ, Lord, to hold, or exercise Empire, and if there be any thing like to these, do primarily and properly agree to none but an intelligent Suppositum, or Person as such. Wherefore it must be held, either of a very Person, having supreme Divinity, as such, and consequently of the very divine Nature, that all these things have been given to him by the Father, or confest that Christ is not such a person. Finally, If the Essence of the Supreme God were in Christ, there would be no cause why it should be said, that all things were given to him by another person; namely, by the Father, and he made Lord and Christ, and not rather by himself. For was the divine Nature of Christ in this behalf idle? did it not give all things to the human Nature? Certainly the Adversaries contend, that it did give them, and are forced to say so, both by reason of that very straight union of either Nature which they hold, and also because the Father could not give them. But that the Son should withal give the same things, if he is of one Essence with the Father. Why then is this attributed to the Father, and to him alone, not also to Christ? If you say, this is done because of the Prerogative of the Father above the Son, you will hereby confest the Father, not the Son, to be the most high God. Howbeit, neither could a simple Prerogative, cause that this should be so often attributed to the Father, and so openly, but never to the Son. For neither are they to be heard, who, when they reade in certain places, that God gave something to Christ, glorified him, exalted him, made him Lord, and Christ, understand the whole Trinity, or the divine Essence, that they may attribute to Christ the same action. For, first, since we so often read, either that it is expressly written, that the Father did those things; as to omit other places, it happeneth out of those places which are cited out of *John*, or that God glorified the Son, or gave something to him, and since they themselves confest, that the name of God in very many places, denoteth the Father only, why do they not confest, that he is understood in the places under contestation? doth not the very similitude of the places persuade thereunto? Are not those things which seem to be spoken more generally or confusedly to be explained out of those places which express the same thing more specially and distinctly, especially since they are so many in number? Again, Is it not manifest, when the action of giving, exalting, glorifying, is attributed unto God, a Person is understood (for such actions are attributed unto none but Persons) and such an one as is distinct from Christ? For who even amongst the Adversaries themselves, would endure him that should thus speak? The Son of God gave or bestowed a name on Christ; the Son of God glorified Christ, made Jesus Lord, certainly he that should speak so, would by the Adversaries, and that deservedly, said to savour of Nestorianism, and attribute unto Christ two Persons, namely, the Son of God and Christ. But the reason is the same, if you say that God performed those things to Christ, and by the name of God, understand the Son. Nor are the

Adversaries ignorant thereof. But who will say, that the holy Spirit is understood? who is never found in the Scripture expressly named God, much less by that name distinguished from Christ, and preferred before him, is likewise nowhere read to have given any thing to Christ, or to have exalted him. To omit that the same question will return which we urged concerning the Father, namely, why those things should be attributed to the holy Spirit, rather than to the Son, if the Son were the most high God.

**An Appendix of this Argument, wherein is taught, That Divinity was given to Christ of the Father.**

Before we quite leave this Argument, we think fit to add this little Appendix thereunto, whereby our Opinion may be yet more confirmed. For it appeareth from the places which we have alledged, that Divinity or Godhead was bestowed on Christ, of the Father, and consequently that he was made a God by the Father. From whence it also followeth, that Christ is not the most high God. For he was from all eternity of himself God, and did not at any time receive his Divinity from another, otherwise he would not be the most high God. Now that which we have said, may be confirmed chiefly by two Arguments drawn from those places which we have cited and discussed.

The first is this, *He that was made Lord by another, he, if he be a God, was also made a God by another. But Jesus, of whom it is certain, that he is a God, was made Lord by God. Therefore he was also made a God by him.* The *Minor* (as they call it) or the Assumption is *Peters. Acts 2.* The *Major* is confirmed by this reason, because if he were not made God by another, when notwithstanding he is a God, neither could he be made a Lord by another. For he that is a God, especially in so perfect a signification, as Christ is asserted to be a God, is likewise a Lord; and if he be a God of himself, he is also of himself a Lord, and therefore cannot any further be made a Lord by another. The same may also be confirmed by this Reason; The Lordship of Christ is either the same with his Godhead, or different from it. If the same, certainly when he was made a Lord, he was also made a God. If different, it is either equal to his Godhead, or less. For Christ hath nothing greater than his Godhead. If equal (though they cannot speak thus, who attribute to him the supreme and independent Godhead) there is the same reason thereof with his Godhead; and there is no cause, why if he was made Lord, he was not also made a God. If less, it will in like manner follow, that he hath not of himself this privilege of being a God. For if he have not of himself that which is less, much less that which is greater. In which place it is not to be omitted, that *Ambrose* in those very words of *Peter*, instead of the word *Lord*, doth read the name of *God*; as if *Peter* had said, *And God hath made him God and Christ, this Jesus, &c.*

The second Argument is this, He to whom that is given or granted, for which he ought to be worshipped with divine Worship, hath also Godhead given and granted to him. For neither is there any thing besides Godhead for which we ought to worship any one with divine Worship, or causeth that any one is worthy of that worship. But we read, how that was given and granted unto Christ, for which he ought to be worshipped with divine Worship, namely, all Judgment; and a Name above every name: for so, as we have seen, Christ himself speaketh, *John 5. 22, 23. For neither doth the Father judge any one, but hath given all judgment to the Son, that all might honour the Son as they honour the Father: he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father that sent him.* And *Paul, Phil. 2. 9, &c.* saith, *Wherefore also God hath exceedingly exalted him, and given him a Name, which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and in the earth, and under the earth; and that every tongue might confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* Now that in both places it is spoken of the divine Honour & Adoration which is due to Christ from all, both the thing it self sheweth, and all confess. But that this worship is to be exhibited unto him for all Judgment given him by the Father, for a Name given him above every name, the same Testimonies do clearly shew. The same may easily be proved likewise out of that place in *Daniel*, chap. 7. 13. Where Christ is said to have received from the Ancient of days, that is, his Father, Power and Honour, and a Kingdom; and it is added, that all Peoples, Tribes and Tongues should serve him, namely, for so great Power, and the Kingdom given to him. For who would not serve his King? Now this Service is not meant a civil one, as being to be given to one that was not an

earthly King; but a religious and divine one, as to be exhibited to a divine and heavenly King. Why then do the greater part of the Adversaries deny, that Godhead was given or granted unto Christ? And indeed not a few both of the ancient & modern Interpreters of the Scripture, affirm, that when *Paul* saith, there was given unto Christ, a Name above every name, that the name of a *God* is there understood, because there is no other name extant besides that which is above every name. Though therein many are mistaken, who conceive that by *Name*, is meant the very Appellation or Title of a *God*. For how was this Appellation given him at length after his death, when *John* saith, that the Word or Speech was a God in the beginning; namely, of that thing whereof he speaketh, which is the Gospel. Add hereunto, that *Paul* speaketh of the reward which God gave to Christ, for so great debasement and obedience to the very death of the Cross. But what manner of reward is this, to give to any one a Title, if you give him not the thing designed by that Title? Doth the most bountiful and rich God, in this manner render rewards for so great Piety? such a reward would be unbeseeing even a Prince or other Potentate. Besides, when any one hath the thing it self, and that most rightfully, there is no need to give or grant to him the name whereby that thing is designed; especially when that thing hath a name already set and appointed, as here it cometh to pass. If any one be indeed a King, and that very rightfully, there is no need to confer upon him the title of a King: since none can deny the same unto him, but wrongfully. But that is said to be conferred, which might of right be denied. Wherefore we must understand by that *Name*, not a Title, but Dignity or Power; as you have it in a like place, *Ephes.* 1. 21. So that a Name above every name, is Dignity and Power higher than all other. For this is the proper cause of so great Worship and Honour. For as civil Worship is due to earthly and civil Power; and divine Worship is due to heavenly and divine: as also that place *John* S. 22. doth shew, where it is taught, that divine Honour is to be exhibited by all unto Christ for the Power of judging, which is the greatest part of his Power, yea, contained in a manner all. Now if the thing be thus, why do the Adversaries so insult over us, for saying that Christ is a God by the Grace of God the Father, that Godhead was given to Christ by the Father, and he made and constituted a God by him? Why do they upbraid us, saying that we have two Gods; the one (as some are not afraid to jest in so serious a matter) an old God, the other a young God? As if we had either two supreme Gods, or to have one supreme God, and another dependent on him, and subordinate to him, is contrary to the Scripture, which expressly affirmeth that there are many Gods, and affirmeth in down-right terms, that we have one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things; or as if the Father, because he was God from all eternity, may therefore be deservedly called an old God, or Christ a young God, because he is after him in time, as a Son is after his Father; since old age and youth have place in none but corruptible things, but ceaseth in such as are incorruptible and immortal. Now if they would have God so to be old, as *Daniel* calleth him the *Ancient of Days*, to whom, he that was like unto the Son of Man, was brought, and received from him Power, Honour, a Kingdom, and Dominion over all the Peoples of the Earth (which thing all see was not done from all eternity) why do they laugh at this? Why do they impiously oppose that which the Scripture so clearly delivereth? He is not yet sufficiently acquainted with the nature of the Christian Religion, who is ignorant thereof. For this is the thing which doth, as to this consideration, separate Christians from Pagans, That the Christians acknowledge one most high God, nor attribute God head unto any else, but to whom the most high God hath indeed granted it. But this doth not yet distinguish them from Jews or Turks. For this doth sunder them from *Jews* or *Turks*, that the Christians do, besides the most high God, worship his Son also for their God; or, as *Paul* speaketh, acknowledge *One God the Father, of whom are all things, and for whom are we: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and by whom are we.* But this by the by, and yet not without necessity. For we ought a little to turn out of the way, that we might bring them back into the way, who went astray.

## **CHAP. XXVIII: Christ not the author of his Words and Works**

**The nineteenth Argument, *That Christ ascribeth both his Words and Works unto the Father: and that he is not the First, but Second Cause of the things pertaining to Salvation.***

That therefore we may proceed to other Arguments of our Opinion, to those Testimonies which we even now alledged, may be subjoined those places of *John*, wherein Christ ascribeth his Works and Words to the Father, as the prime Author, not to himself, and any divine Nature of his own: On which notwithstanding, we will not here dwell long, partly because we have above said something concerning them, when we cited those places out of *John*, wherein something is denied of Christ, which could not be denied of him, if he were the most high God, in the second and third chapter of this Section; partly also, because they are so nearly allied to those places immediately going before; wherein it is said, that some dignity was given to Christ by God, and granted, or bestowed on him, so that they are in a manner of the same purport with them. Nevertheless, we will recite the chiefest of them, wherein Christ ascribeth his works to the Father (for those which speak of his Doctrine, were for the most part brought by us before, partly ascribing the very words themselves, partly noting the places where they are extant) and we will further add something to what hath been formerly spoken concerning that thing. Wherefore to omit that famous place, chap. 5. wherein Christ affirms, *That he can do nothing of himself, that the Father sheweth him all things which himself doth, and will yet shew him greater*, ver. 19, 20. Likewise chap. 14. 10. where he saith, *That the Father which abideth in him, he doth the works*. Of both which, enough hath been already spoken. Hitherto belong those words of Christ, which are likewise extant, chap. 5. 36. *I have greater testimony than that of John; the Works which the Father hath given me to do, the very works that I do, they bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me*. And chap. 10. 25. *The works which I do in the name of my Father, they testify of me*. Now what is it to do them in the name of his Father, than to do them by the Power, Authority and Command of the Father? and the same chapter, ver. 37, 38. *If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, although you will not believe me, believe the Works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in the Father*. And chap. 11. 41. being about to raise Lazarus, he thus speaketh, *Father, I give thee thanks, because thou hast heard me. But I know that thou always hearest me, but for the Peoples sake that stand about, I speak it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me*. From which place it appeareth, that Christ raised *Lazarus*, and did other the like Miracles, because he was heard by the Father, and a Power to do them was always afforded to him, or being once afforded, was never taken away. Which very thing we see, that even *Martha*, which had already acknowledged Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God, did believe as she professeth, ver. 22. but none of these things could be said of Christ, were he the most high God, and performed all those Miracles of himself, or by a Virtue, Power and Authority that was altogether proper to him, and naturally residing in him. I omit the end of those Works clearly exprest by Christ, namely, That men might believe, that he was sent by the Father; and so, that the Father was in him, as in an holy Embassadour, and most dear Son; and likewise that he was in the Father, or closely united unto him; as the like words in the same *John*, are elsewhere taken. But if Christ were the most high God, and had done Miracles by a Power that was altogether natural unto him, this ought not to have been the end of them, that men should believe that he was sent by another, but rather that they might understand, that he came of himself, and did in his own name give Precepts, and propose Promises unto all.

We have already before stopt the gap through which men fly to a distinction of Natures, inasmuch as these things are simply, and without limitation, uttered concerning Christ: which could not be done if he were that one God, because the same things should also be denied of him without limitation. Again, because those operations properly agree to the Suppositum or Person of Christ, as such; not to a Nature, which is not a Person. Wherefore they ought either to confess, that the human Nature is a Person, if they will understand those things of it, and so are forced to deny, that Christ is a divine Person, and the most high God, or to affirm, that those things are spoken of Christ, even as a divine Person, and the very most high God. Besides, he ought not to ascribe these things to another Person, but to another part of himself; that is, to his divine Nature, unless you will have it, to have been idle

therein: But it was impossible for it to have been idle, whilst the Father wrought, if both had one and the same numerical Nature. To these places fetched out of *John*, are to be added, those words of *Peter*, *Acts* 2. 22 *Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by Signs, Wonders and mighty works, which God did by him in the midst of you, &c.* And those of the same *Peter*, chap. 10. 3B. where he saith, *How God anointed him (Jesus of Nazareth) with the holy Spirit and Power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed by the Devil, because God was with him.* Which thing *Nicodemus* had before acknowledged whilst he thus speaketh unto Christ, *We know that thou art come a Teacher from God; for none can do these things which thou dost, unless God be with him,* *John* 3. 2. But if Christ were the most high God, neither would God be said to do these things by him, nor ought *Peter* to alledge this reason, why Christ did Miracles, namely, because God was with him: but this because he himself was God, or because he had in him the divine Essence, or in what manner soever he pleased to express the same thing.

For that it cannot here be said, that by the name of *God*, the divine Nature of Christ is understood, but the Father of Christ; may be shewn by the same Arguments which we made use of in the defence of the last Argument, when we treated of those Testimonies, wherein God is said to have given something to Christ, or to have conferred something upon him. Likewise we have a little before excluded the distinction of Natures.

But that we may not treat of the sole Miracles of Christ, let us add those places of Scripture whereby is shewn, that Christ was not the first, but the second and intermediate cause of the other actions also which he did, and which were most divine, and most of all concerned our Salvation. And this is understood out of those places, wherein it is affirmed, *That all things were done by him;* as *John* 1. S. *That all things were created in him;* that is, *by him.* For that *In* is after the Hebrew manner every where taken for *by*, is most notorious unto all, *Col.* 1. 16. which is presently explained in the same verse, whilst all things are said to have been created *by him.* For whereas the vulgar translation doth there add, that all things are created *in him;* the *Greek* hath it, for him, and signifieth the end. Thus a little after it is in the same place said, that it pleased him, namely, God, *by him to reconcile all things which are in Heaven and in Earth.* Else where likewise, *All things are said to be by him,* *1 Cor.* 8. 6. of which place we have before treated; where also we have shewn, that it ought not to be taken in that manner; as it is once and again said of God himself, *That all things are by him.* For that it is not so taken of God, as if some other who is the supreme Cause of the work, did do something by him; but simply, that he is the efficient Cause of all things, or that by his Power and Operation all things are brought to an issue. But that it is said of Christ more than once, that some other, namely, God, whom every one knoweth to be the supreme Cause of Works, doth or did all things by Christ. For amongst other things, the Apostle saith, *Ephes.* 3. 9. *Who (God) created all things by Jesus Christ,* as the *Greek* Copies constantly read it, and the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, 1. 2. when he had said, that *God in these last times speak to us in the Son;* that is, by the Son according to the Hebraism a little before observed; he addeth, *By whom also he made the Worlds,* namely, that God who spake unto us by him. So also *2 Cor.* S, 18. it is said *That all things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ.* Elsewhere, *That God hath given us the victory by our Lord Jesus Christ,* *1 Cor.* 1S. S7. *That God hath poured the holy Spirit abundantly upon us by Jesus Christ our Saviour,* *Tit.* 3. S. *That God shall judge the secrets of men (according to Pauls Gospel) by Jesus Christ,* *Rom.* 2. 16. To pass by other-like places, from all which it appeareth, that Christ is not the most high God. For he is the first and highest Cause of all things which he doth, not the second or intermediate: But those places shew, that Christ is the intermediate, not the first and supreme Cause of those thing which he doth; otherwise it could not be said, that *God doth all things by him.*

But if any one say, that *Paul* affirmeth, that he gave to the Thessalonians commandments by our Lord Jesus Christ, or exhorteth them by Christ, although Christ seemeth not to have been the middle cause of that action in respect of *Paul*, but *Paul* rather in respect of Christ, We answer, That that signification which is also otherwise rare in the holy Scripture, cannot there have any place, where God is said to have done either all things, or some things by Jesus Christ, as that very thing we even now speak by way of objection to our selves, doth teach. For in that manner that *Paul* saith, he gave commandments, or exhorteth by the Lord Jesus, none but an Inferiour can do something by a Superiour, for it signifieth, that he did or doth these things by the Authority of the Lord Jesus

interposed, and that he supported his commandments and exhortations herewith. But God can do nothing by any one in this manner. It therefore remaineth, that the most usual signification of the particle *By*, is there to be retained where God is said to do something by Christ; namely, that God be esteemed the first and principal Agent, Christ the second and intermediate one, which dependeth on him. Which is further confirmed by that famous place of *Paul*, which is extant, *1 Cor.* 1. 30. where the Apostle compriseth all the benefits which God hath conferred upon us by Christ, whilst he speaketh thus: *of him* (namely, God) *Ye are in Christ Jesus, who hath been made unto us of God, Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption.* You see that he is made not the prime Author of our Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption, but the second cause, and dependent on a former one, namely, God in as much as he is expresly said, *to be made unto us of God, Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption, and Freedom*, which likewise was signified by the precedent words, wherein the *Corinthians*, namely, as they were Christians, are said to be of God in Christ Jesus, or by Christ Jesus. There is a place like unto this, *Heb.* 5. 9, 10. where it is said, that Christ being made perfect, was made the cause of eternal Salvation to all that obey him, being called of God an high Priest after the order of *Melchisedec*. You see that he was made the cause of eternal Salvation, and that as he was called of God an high Priest. With this place agreeth that which we have formerly cited out of the *Acts*, chap. 5. 31. where God is said with his right hand to have exalted. Christ to be a Prince and Saviour, to give Repentance unto Israel, and forgiveness of sins. To these add those places which spake of the effusion of the holy Spirit made by Christ; which action is one of the most notable ones that pertaineth to the Salvation of mankind, and to omit the repetition of that place out of *John*, which we have formerly alledged, when we discoursed of the Prayers that Christ poured out to the Father, chap. 14. 16. *I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Advocate.* And there is yet another place in the same *John* concerning the same thing afterwards. chap. 15. 26. *But when the Advocate is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father.* Whence you see, that Christ not for himself, as from the prime Fountain, but from the Father would send, and consequently did send the holy Spirit; whom he also expresly saith, *doth proceed from the Father*, making the Father the prime Cause of him, and himself the middle cause. Concerning the same thing, there is a notable place in the *Acts*, which we have formerly cited, chap. 2. 33. where immediately after the first and most illustrious effusion of the holy Spirit upon the Disciples of Christ, *Peter* speaketh thus, *Therefore being exalted by the right hand of God, and having received the Promise of the holy Spirit from the Father, he poured out that which you now see and hear.* Therefore, as Christ himself elsewhere speaketh, he actually received from the Father the holy Spirit, that had been before promised to him, and so poured him out upon the Apostles. Which thing doth signify no other, than that the Father was the first Cause of that effusion, and Christ the second, wholly depending upon the Father therein. Whereby likewise it may be understood, why *John*, chap. 7. 39. said, that the holy Spirit was not yet given, because Christ was not yet ascended, namely, because he could not give the holy Spirit till he was exalted by the right hand of God, and glorified. Whence Christ also himself said, chap. 16. 7. *I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away* (namely, to the Father, and so be glorified) *for unless I go away, the Advocate will not come unto you. But if I go away, I will send him unto you.* Now how far distant these things are from that Opinion which maketh Christ the most high God, and so the first and highest Cause of all things and actions, not only we have already shewn, but every one may of himself easily perceive.

The distinction of Natures hath no more place here than in the former passages & Arguments drawn from thence, both because it would be necessary, that the same things should be denied of the same Christ for his divine Nature, which are here simply affirmed of him for his human Nature; and also because these places likewise contain in them a tacit Negation, and that a simple one; namely, that Christ did not those things of himself, or was not the first cause of those works, and finally, because those operations are not agreeable to any thing, but the Suppositum or Person of Christ as it is such, and partly the places themselves, manifestly intimate, partly the Adversaries themselves confess, that Christ is considered in them, either as a Mediator and Embassadour of God, or as a Priest, or as a King. And to sum up all in a word, as a Saviour, and consequently as a Person. For that these Offices do primarily, and by themselves agree to none but a Person; both we have elsewhere taught, and the Adversaries themselves confess: but what followeth from thence, is understood from the precedent Chapter.

## **CHAP. XXIX: John. 8. 16**

**The twentieth Argument, from the words of Christ, *John 8. 16. My Judgement is true, because I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me.***

We might from the places which we even now, and formerly alledged, form many Arguments, and consequently from every one of them; that is somewhat clear, a particular Argument: But we care not much for the number, but for the weight and evidence, which doth of its own accord increase the number of Arguments. For this matter which we handle, is so fruitful for the evident truth of the Opinion which we defend, that it seemeth that we ought to be more sollicitous in speaking out the measure, than the plenty of Arguments. Wherefore let these places that have last been alleaged and examined, be accounted for the sixth Argument of this rank wherein we are now conversant, & is fetched out of the Testimonies of *John*, and also of other sacred Writers, and wherein something is affirmed of Christ, which could not be affirmed of him if he were the most high God. Of which kind there yet remaine other places in the same *John*, which we will not prosecute.

The seventh Argument therefore we will fetch from those words of Christ, which are extant *John 8. 16. If I judge, my Judgment is true, because I am not alone, but I and my Father that sent me.* By which words Christ intimateth, that if he were alone, and the Father not with him, it might be that he might err in judging, or at least that he might deservedly be doubted concerning the truth of his judgment. Wherefore now there was no cause of doubting, because the Father was perpetually with him, and so suffered him not to err in judgment. But were Christ the most high God, his Judgment would have been no less true, although he had been alone, than it is now to be esteemed true because the Father is present with him. For is not the judgment of one person, who is the most high God, accompted as true if he be by himself, as if it be apparent that another person, which likewise is the most high God, is present with him? Or were they with whom Christ spake so stupid, as that if they had understood Christ to be the most high God, they would presently have confessed, that his Judgment was most true, although they had heard or thought nothing concerning some other person, which was present with him as in other things, so also in judging.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

You will perhaps say, that Christ fitted his speech to the Opinion of the *Jews*, who believed him to be a mere man, and therefore that he could not take for granted that he was the most high God, but was forced to draw his Argument from a thing manifest unto them. But this Answer is of no worth. For first, If Christ would have taken that only for granted which the *Jews* believed concerning him, he neither ought, nor could take that for granted which he here affirmeth of himself, especially if the Opinion of the Adversaries be right. For they did not yet believe, that God was his Father, which he here taketh for granted. Nor did they yet believe that his Father, namely, God, had sent him, and so was also with him. Again, The Adversaries cannot use this Answer, unless they will confess, that Christ did not therefore call God his Father, because he was so generated out of his Essence, as that he was one God with him; for if for this cause he had called God his Father, he had already taken that for granted, which this answer contend he could not take. For what other thing would it be, to take for granted that God was his Father, than that he also was the most high God? But we manifestly see, that Christ here supposeth, that God was his Father. Now if you reply, that Christ doth indeed suppose this, but implicitly and acutely, so that the *Jews* did not understand it, that will fall to the ground which our Adversaries are wont to say; namely, that for Christ to call God his Father, and himself the Son of God, was so manifest an Argument for the Generation of Christ out of the Essence of God, that even the *Jews* themselves do understand it. And this they will have to be the cause why they charged him with the crime of Blasphemy thereupon, and would have stoned him, and did at length crucify him, in that he called God his Father, and himself the Son of God; namely, because they understood, that he did by this means intimate, that he was begotten out of the Essence of God, and so hath one Essence with him. For hither they are wont to draw those places in *John*, chap. 5. 17, 18. and chap. 10. 30 and chap. 19. 7. and *Mat.* 26. 63; &c.

Some other will perhaps say, That Christ intended to say that very thing which we deny; namely, that he was that one God with the Father. For this was the cause why they affirmed, that he was not alone, but the Father was with him, and consequently that he could not err in judging, because the Father was joined to him by unity of Essence. But, first, he had spoken too obscurely, if he would have comprehended so great a matter in those words. For who is there if any one say, I am not alone, but I and the Father, would understand his meaning to be that he is of one Essence with God? For if you say, that this is sufficiently hinted by the word *Father*, it is to be noted, that the force of Christ words, or (as they speak) the middle term of the principal Argument, consisteth not of the word *Father*, but in this, that the Father was present with, Christ. But that God, or the Father should be with any one, hath a far different meaning than to have one Essence with him. For it signifieth, according to the use of speaking, very familiarly unto all, but chiefly to the Jews, that God is present with some one by his favour and assistance. Wherefore the Jews by this means would not have perceived the mind of Christ, and the force of the Argument. Besides, if there is so great force in the word *Father*, why said Christ, that his Father was with him? As if some one might imagine, that they whom he already understood to be of one Essence, might be parted asunder, and the one be left from the other. Finally, that description of the Father, that he sent him, namely, Christ, is repugnant to that Opinion, partly because it is altogether unnecessary that there should be one Essence of him that sendeth, another of him that is sent by him: nor can he be the most high God, who is sent by another, but inferior to him; as hath formerly in its place been shewn; partly because in this description of the Father, the reason is plainly rendered, why Christ was not alone, but the Father was with him; namely, because Christ was the Embassador of the Father, and that an extraordinary one. For God is always by his favour and assistance, present with all his Embassadors in all things, which their office doth any way require: and so much the more with Christ than with others, in that Christ was a more excellent one than they. But unless you will acknowledge this, that description of the Father will make nothing to the present matter. Whereas Christ is not wont to make use of idle descriptions, and such as are nothing to the purpose. But that the Father sent Christ, can no way be the cause, that Christ should be of one Essence with the Father.

The distinction of two Natures in Christ, if any one will here apply, it is easily refuted by the same Reasons that we have used in the Defence of the precedent Arguments; which accordingly a wise Reader changing, as they say, what is to be changed, may of himself transfer hither, and apply to the matter in hand.

### **CHAP. XXX: John. 8. 14.**

**Argument the one and twentieth, from the words of Christ, *John 8. 14. My Testimony is true, because I know whence I am, and whither I go.***

In the eighth place may be alledged these words of Christ in the same eighth chapter of *John*, whence we cited the last Testimony, which certain acute men amongst the Adversaries, have endeavoured to draw to their Opinion, they are extant in ver. 14. where Christ speaketh in this manner, *Though I give testimony of my self, my testimony is true, because I know whence I am, and whither I go.* For had Christ been the most high God, he ought not to bring, and consequently would not have brought this reason, that he knoweth whence he cometh, and whither he goeth: but rather this, that he himself is the most high God, or some such things, containing the same sense. But Christ did not alledge this, but that cause.

#### **The Defence of the Argument.**

They whom we mentioned, here rise up and say, That Christ alledged this very cause; for he spake figuratively, and intimated more than he spaketh; namely, that he is the natural Son of God. But if you object, Why then did he not openly say, because I am God? They answer, that Christ used the figure of insinuation, accommodated, and in a manner necessary, for the persons with whom he spake. *For, say they, the Jews could not have endured it, if he had openly called himself God, or the Son of God. Wherefore he spake what was true, and what was necessary to the cause: but so spake, as that he might delude his Adversaries with the ambiguity and obscurity of his words.* But these men have by this explication, deluded themselves and others, but so did not Christ the Jews. They confess, and it is a plain case, that Christ doth by those words intimate, that he came from the Father, came out of Heaven, and shall again go into Heaven to the Father: For who would make any doubt, that Christ intended here to signify, what he elsewhere speaketh in the same *John*, chap. 16. 18. *I went out from the Father, and came into the World. Again, I leave the World, and go unto the Father.* Which thing is more than once repeated in other, or the like words, with the same Writer. But such words as these are so far from signifying that Christ is the most high God, that they imply the quite contrary. For if these words, *I went out from the Father, and came into the World*, be taken of a local motion, as they spake; that is, of a descent from Heaven to Earth, properly so called, as those opposite ones, *Again, I leave the World, and go to the Father*, are to be understood of a local departure from the Earth into the Heavens, they are not incident to the most high God. For he, as all confess, is not moved out of his place. But if you so take them as that they signify, that Christ had God the Father, as the Author of his Embassy, to whom he shall return, as it may easily be understood out of the ver. 42. of the same chapter: neither doth this argue him to be the most high God, but rather inferiour to the most high God, and depending on him, and having a different Essence from him. But there is no other sense of these words remaining. For if you say that Christ therefore came out from God, because he was eternally begotten of his Essence, as they, against whom we chiefly dispute, seem to hold, this is quite foreign to the place. For it appeareth manifestly enough, that the going of Christ forth from his Father, was joined with his coming into the world, as his return to God was with his leaving of the world, and consequently that the discourse is of a thing that was done at a certain time, and not from all eternity; which is also manifest enough from the 42d verse a little before quoted. And withal, it is likewise apparent, that this going forth from the Father, is such a thing as may elegantly be opposed to his return to the Father, and cannot co-exist therewith. But what opposition is there between eternal generation out of the Essence of the Father, and a return to the Father from the Earth into Heaven? Or why cannot that return to the Father, co-exist with that Generation, if it, as the Adversaries must of necessity hold, doth as yet continue?

## **CHAP. XXXI: John. 8. 29.**

**Argument the two and twentieth, from the words of Christ, *John 8. 29. The Father hath not left me alone, because I always do the things that are pleasing unto him.***

The ninth Testimony of this kind, is extant in the same 8th chapter of *John*, ver. 29. where Christ speaketh thus, *And he that sent me, is with me. The Father hath not left me alone, because I always do things that are pleasing to him.* The former part of which sentence, is also afterwards extant chap. 16. 32. where Christ thus speaketh to his Disciples. *Behold the hour cometh, and now is, wherein shall every one of you be dispersed to your own homes, and leave me alone: yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me.*

From which place it followeth, that Christ is not the most high God, and out of the former for a double reason. First, Because Christ doth by the words of both places intimate, that he should not have sufficient help and assistance, if he were forsaken by the Father, which cannot be thought of the most high God. For he hath always of himself abundance of help and assistance, nor is there any need that any one should be present with him, and give him help. Again, were Christ the most high God, of the same Essence with the Father, he ought not to bring, nor consequently would he have brought the reason why the Father was with him, because he always doth the things that are pleasing unto him, but this, because he is of one Essence with him. For this would indeed have been, both the necessary and the only cause why the Father was with Christ: which being supposed, he could not chuse but be with Christ, and whereunto other causes that might be imagined, could not possibly add any further moment. For that conjunction would not only have preceded those causes in time, but would have likewise been already at the height, and so complete and absolute, that the Father and Christ could not as yet be joined together with any firmer or straiter tie.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

When they who endeavoured to turn the precedent place also to a contrary sense, did see the force of this latter Argument; they said that the particle *For* doth signify not the cause but rather the effect and sign, or argument drawn from the consequence; for that the Father was not therefore with Christ because he did the things that were pleasing to him, as if he would not have been with him; but on the contrary, that Christ therefore did these things, because the Father was with him. For there are innumerable examples even in the very Psalm, where the particle *For* is so used; out of which they produce that *Psal. 17. 6. I cried, because thou hast heard me, O God.* For he did not therefore cry because he was heard, but was therefore heard because he cried. But what cause was there that drove them to depart from the usual and simple signification of that particle which here presently cometh into the mind of every one? Certainly none but the opinion, whereof we now here dispute, for they saw that otherwise this place would not comply with their Doctrine concerning Christ. Howbeit this use of the particle *For* is not so frequent as they say, especially in the New Testament; and that example fetched out of the Psalms is not to the purpose. For, to omit that it is not read in the Hebrew, *For thou hast heard me*, but in the future, *for thou wilt hear me*; which may contain the cause why *David* cried to God, namely because he was certainly persuaded that he should be heard of God. It is further well known that amongst the Hebrews preterperfect as well as future tenses are frequently taken for present tenses, & do like present tenses among the Latines denote a frequency or custom of action. As if *David* should have said, *Because thou art wont to hear me*; whence also certain late Writers do thus translate the place, *Because thou hearest me*. But may not this denote the cause for which *David* cried unto God? Yea most of all. For it doth most of all encourage us to pray unto God, in that we see that God is wont to hear us. Again if Christ would have reasoned from thence, that he always did those things that are pleasing to the Father, as from an effect; he had taken that as sufficiently known to the Jews, with whom he discoursed, that he always did the things that were pleasing to the Father. But Christ doth not do this, for otherwise, he ought likewise to suppose this as manifest enough to the Jews, that he did nothing of himself, but so spake as the Father taught him. For every one seeth if Christ always did those things that pleased the Father, that he also did nothing of

himself or of his own accord, nor spake any thing besides what the Father had taught him. But this latter Christ doth not suppose as manifest to the Jews, but affirmeth, that it should then be known unto them, when they had exalted him, as is apparent from the preceding words. Wherefore neither doth he suppose the former to be manifest unto them, as the opinion of these men requireth. Besides, if Christ would have reasoned from effects, he would rather have alledged his miraculous works, than works of virtue and piety. For they were the most manifest effects of his conjunction with the Father, to which he elsewhere likewise frequently appealeth when he spake of his conjunction with the Father, or of some like thing, as we read in the same Writer: See *Chap.* 5. 36. and 10. 37, 38. and 14. 11. & 15. 24. Furthermore, if it appeareth from other places, that this was the true cause why God was with Christ, in that he always did the things that pleased him, their reason, for which they think they must here depart from the usual and simple signification of the particle *for*, falleth to the ground: But that the thing is so, is thence apparent, in that Christ himself doth elsewhere render this as the reason, why God did consequently love him, & consequently was always with him by his assistance, namely because he had done and would hereafter doe those things that were pleasing to the Father, and agreeable to his commandments. Now it is all one for the Father not to leave Christ, but to be present with him, and constantly to love Christ, and to be perpetually with him by his help and assistance. And that this which we have said was the cause of the Fathers love towards Christ, and consequently of the help which he gave him, is intimated by the words of Christ, which are extant afterwards, *Chap.* 10. 17. *Therefore the Father loveth me, because I lay down my soul that I may receive it again.* For this Commandment, as he himself addeth in the following Verse, he had received from the Father. And *Chap.* 15. 10. *As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you; continue in my love. If you keep my Commandments ye shall continue in my love, as I also have kept the Fathers Commandments, and continue in his love.* Where, whatsoever they say, with whom we have to do, Christ warneth his disciples, that having once obtained his love, they would use their endeavours not to lose it again, but enjoy it perpetually; and sheweth them a way how they should certainly attain it; which he had also formerly intimated by a similitude in the 2d. Verse, namely, by keeping his Commandments. Moreover, he illustrates this way by his own example, shewing it to be the aptest, yea the only means of persevering in his love, in that he himself by keeping his Fathers Commandments, had obtained this favour, to continue in his love, that is, to be constantly loved of him. Wherefore as we said before, that reason falleth to the ground, for which the particle *For* should be thought to signifie not the cause but the effect or sign in these words, *Chap.* 8. 29. But if it signifieth the cause, the thing it self, as we have seen, doth evince, that Christ is not the most high God.

This Argument of ours cannot be solved by the distinction of natures. For first, those causes hinder which we have above hinted in other places; as namely, that these things are simply spoken of Christ, and that it is necessary here to consider him as a person, both for his Mission, and so also for the operations which he attributed to himself according to the capacity wherein he is to be considered. Again, this likewise taketh away the force of that answer, that notwithstanding this, Christ should rather have alledged this for the reason why the Father was with him, and left him not alone, because according to the divine nature to which the human is personally united, he was the same God with the Father.

## **CHAP. XXXII: The Father is called, the God of Christ**

### **The three and twentieth Argument, *That the Father is called, the God of Christ.***

In the tenth place we will recite those testimonies wherein the Father is called the God of Christ. For thus Christ himself speaketh concerning this matter in his discourse with *Mary* afterward, in the same *John*, Chap. 20. 17. *Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my Father, and your Father, to my God and your God.* And in the same Writer, *Rev.* 3. 12. In the same Verse 12. he calleth the Father his God four times, whilst he saith, *Whosoever overcometh, I will make him a pillar in the Temple of my God, and he shall no more go forth, and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the City of my God, the New Jerusalem, which descendeth out of Heaven from my God.*

As for the other Writers, first we read in *Matth.* and *Mark*, that Christ when he hung upon the Cross, cried thus to the Father, *My God my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* *Matth.* 27. 46. *Mark.* 15. 34. And *Paul*, *Ephes.* 1. 17. wisheth that the *God of our Lord Jesus Christ the Father of glory would give unto them the Spirit of wisdom.* And the divine Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. 1. 8, 9. citeth of Christ those words of the Psalmist, *Psal.* 45. 7, 8. spoken heretofore of *Solomon*, as the type of Christ; *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity. Therefore, O God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.* Thus also *Micah* speaketh of Christ, Chap. 5. 4. *And he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the height of the name of the Lord his God.* From whence it appeareth, that Christ is not the most high God, for the most high God hath not a God, or there is no other God of him. For to be the God of any one, is to have Empire and Power over him, or to be his Benefactor, or finally, to be worshipt of him, as his sovereign Benefactor. But none hath dominion over the most high God, none is his Benefactor, none is worshipped of him, otherwise he himself would not be the most high God.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Here they have no other refuge left them besides the distinction of Natures. Though not so much as this is left them, in that we have already sufficiently stopt this hole at which they endeavour to get out; especially because all the circumstances of those places do argue, that it is spoken concerning the whole Person of Christ, or that he is considered as a Person. For he is considered as the Son of God, as our Saviour, as our Lord, as Anointed of God, as God, as Prince appointed of God. Wherefore he cannot be a Person of supreme Godhead, otherwise his divine Nature also would have a God: besides, were Christ the most high God, although he also had a human Nature, yet some other, or another Person, namely, the Father, would not be his God, but he himself would be his own God. For he himself would have sovereign Power over his own human Nature; he himself would be a Benefactor to it; he himself would be worshipt of it, certainly no less than any other person, yea, more. Why then is another, namely, the Father, rather called his God, than he himself called his own God? But if they acknowledge it to be absurd, that any one should be his own God, let them also acknowledge, that Christ is not the most high God.

### **CHAP. XXXIII: 1 Cor. 11. 3.**

#### **The four and twentieth Argument from these words, 1 Cor. 11. 3. *The head of Christ is God.***

We have hitherto chiefly out of the History of the Gospel penned by *John*, produced those Testimonies wherein something is affirmed of Christ, which could not be affirmed of him were he the most high God: and that such ones as give the Father some Prerogative above Christ, and so demonstrate that the Father only (since such a Prerogative agreeth to no other) is the most high God. It followeth, that we may also from other divine Writers draw like Testimonies and Arguments. Although we have already produced not a few when we fetched Testimonies out of *John*, because they contained the same, or the like sense. Of these places therefore which remain, we will give the first rank to that, which is very near to those words that were last of all cited out of *John* and other Writers, as being such wherein God is said to be the Head of Christ; and this is done, 1 Cor. 11. 3. where *Paul* speaketh in this manner, *Now I would have you know, that the Head of every Man is Christ, and the Head of the Woman is the Man, and the Head of Christ is God.* But there is no other Head of the most high God, or he hath no Head above him, otherwise he would not be Most High. For every one easily perceiveth, that to be ones Head, signifieth, to have some Empire or Power over him, and in a certain sort to govern him.

#### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Here the Adversaries again are wont to fly to their distinction of Natures in Christ, as to a sacred Anchor, which notwithstanding the Reader may observe, that we have before sufficiently confuted. We repeat not all things that have been spoken; we only desire that it should here also be observed, that Christ is here likewise considered as a person; for he is considered as the head of the man, & consequently of every man, that is, as a Lord appointed to rule every man, even as the man also is the head of the woman. But Christ is such, as he is a Person. Wherefore if the Adversaries Opinion concerning Christ, is true, he, as a divine Person, and consequently the most high God, must have a Head over him, which implieth a contradiction, and is the very thing which they endeavour to escape, who here use the distinction of Natures. Neither may any one here say, that in the former words indeed, where Christ is said to be the Head of the man, he is considered as a Person, but in the latter he is looked upon only in respect of that Nature which is not a person.

For besides that, this is affirmed without reason, it is disproved by reason. First, because it is certain that God is the Head of Christ, as he hath received from him Dominion and Empire over the man. But Christ received that Dominion as he is a Person. Why then is it not God made the head of Christ as he is here a person? Again, if you inquire the cause, why the Apostle, when he had asserted that Christ is the Head of the man, did likewise say afterwards, that God is the Head of Christ, you shall find this to be the chief, that he might not seem to leave God no further power over the man, because Christ is his Head, or Lord and King: but rather that it might be understood, that God is also upon this very account the Head or Lord, or King of the man, because Christ is the Head of every man, in as much as God is also the Head of Christ himself For as the woman is not therefore exempted from the Empire and Power of Christ, because the man is her Head, in as much as Christ is also the Head and Lord of the man himself, so neither is the man exempted from the Power of God, because Christ is his Head: since God is also the Head of Christ himself.

Moreover, the Apostle spake this to give us to understand, that if we bring any dishonour to Christ, who is our Head, it will at length redound to God himself, who is again the Head of Christ. But neither of these Reasons would be of any force, if God were not the Head of Christ, as he is the Head and Lord of the man. But if God be the Head of Christ, as he is our Lord, he is the Head of that person, as such. Finally, such a gradation ought not to be made, as to ascend from the Man to Christ, from Christ to God, as a different person from him, if besides the human, there were another Nature in Christ, to which it did no less agree, to be his Head, than to a Person different from him, but mention was to be made of that Nature as well as of this. Now if any one will fly hither for refuge, as to say,

that by the name of God the Father is not understood, but the whole Trinity, he must, at least, in the first place alledge some passage, from whence it may manifestly appear, that God distinguished from Christ, denoteth some other besides the Father. For we can alledge innumerable ones, wherein even by the confession of the Adversaries themselves, it denoteth none but the Father, and it is otherwise apparent, that such things as are like hereunto, are expresly attributed to the Father in the holy Scripture. For it is all one to be ones Head, and to be ones God. But the latter is expresly affirmed of the Father of Christ, as every one may perceive from these words of Christ, *John 20. 17.* and those of the Apostle, *Ephes. 1. 17.* Add hereunto, that the Reasons wherefore God is called the Head of Christ, do all agree to the Father. Whether they agree to any other, we have no assurance thereof: or rather we are assured, that they agree to no other; namely, because he gave all Empire to Christ; because he gave the Laws by which he ruleth and governeth us; and also because he bringeth his will to an issue by his hands, and provides for his own Glory by his Empire. But in the last place, those Reasons which evince that Christ is here considered as a Person, permit not the Trinity here to be understood by the name of God. Otherwise the Person of Christ, which is believed to be contained in that Trinity, would be the head of it self, as such. Nor can you understand the Essence it self, which is not a Person. For it can govern none, and consequently is the head of none. But it is to no purpose to feign a true God who is not a Person; since the name of *God* is, as we have already hinted before, the name of a Person.

### **CHAP. XXXIV: 1 Cor. 3.**

#### **The five and twentieth Argument, from the words of *Paul*, 1 Cor. 3. ult. *Christ is Gods.***

The second place shall be that which is extant in the same Epistle to the *Corinthians*, chap. 3. about the end, and it is not much unlike to the foregoing one, because it is therein affirmed, that *Christ is Gods*. Which thing, that it may be the better understood, we will set down the whole place. Thus therefore speaketh *Paul*, *Let none boast in men. For all are yours, whether Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas, or World, or Life, or Death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours, and ye are Christs, and Christ is Gods*. Any one will easily understand from the words themselves, that to be ones, doth in this place signify, either to be in some sort possessed of another, or to be in his Power, or at least to be dedicated to his use, and consequently to have another for his Superiour. Whence the Apostle doth require them, that none should boast in any man, no not in the Apostle himself, so as to brag, that he is *Paul's*, or *Apollo's*, or *Cephas's*, that is, *Peters*, as the *Corinthians* did: But all of them rather glory in Christ, and consequently in God, in that they themselves are no others, but Christs, and consequently also Gods; and therefore all things on the contrary (the Apostles themselves not excepted) theirs. For even the Apostles were consecrated to the use and salvation of Christians, and so were subservient unto them, and not contrariwise. Whence in the latter Epistle to the same *Corinthians*, about the end of the first chapter, he saith, *We are not Lords of your Faith, but Helpers of your Joy*. And chap. 4. 5. *We preach not our selves, but Jesus Christ the Lord, and our selves your Servants for Jesus sake*. Whence it is apparent, that Christ is not the most high God. For the most high God is no ones in that sense which we have explained; otherwise he would not be most high. Indeed God is said *to be some ones God*, but not simply *to be some ones*. The first signifies the supreme Eminency of God above him, whose God he is said to be, and his Empire over him: but the latter would signify that he is as it were possess'd by some one. Howbeit, although this should in some place be affirmed, yet neither would nor could it be affirmed in that sense, as we see it is affirmed of Christ.

#### **The Defence of the Argument.**

This Argument can no more be eluded by the distinction of Natures in Christ, than the precedent Testimonies: both for other causes formerly alledged, and also because Christ is here considered as our Lord, and consequently as a Person; and that no less, when he is said to be Gods, then when we are said to be his. For *Paul*, when he said that *we are Christs*, again affirmeth, that *Christs is Gods*, lest any one should think, that because we are Christs, we are no longer Gods, but rather that he might understand that we are Gods on this very account, inasmuch as Christ himself, and consequently all things that are his, are Gods. But if he be here considered as a Person, his Person is not a Person of the most high God. For that is not another, unless you will have also the divine Nature to be another, which they who here use the distinction of Natures, do by this very distinction endeavour to avoid. Besides, if Christ were the most high God, although he had withal a human Nature, yet could it not be said, that he is more another than his own. But here he is simply said to be Gods; namely, another Persons, without making any mention that he is also his own, or that his human Nature is his divine Natures. If there is any thing that belongeth to the fuller understanding of these Reasons, it may be fetched from the defence of the precedent Reasons.

**CHAP. XXXV: 1 Cor. 15. 24, 28.**

**The six and twentieth Argument, from the words 1 Cor. 15. 24, 28. *That the Son shall deliver up the Kingdom to God the Father, and shall become subject to him.***

The third place is extant in the same Epistle, chap. 15. where it is said, that Christ shall deliver the Kingdom unto God the Father, and be himself subject unto him, who hath put all things under his subjection. For thus he speaketh, ver. 24, 25. *Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver the Kingdom to God even the Father, when he shall abolish all Principalities, and Authority, and Force. For he must reign until he put all his Enemies under his feet.* And ver. 28. *But when all things shall become subject unto him, then shall also the Son himself be subject to him, who put all things under his subjection, that God may be all in all.* Whence we may argue in a twofold manner, and so draw a double Argument, which nevertheless we will reckon for a single one, the first from the 24th verse, the second from the 28th verse. For as for the first, we have before taught, when we spake of those places wherein something or all things are said to have been delivered unto Christ by the Father, that such a delivery of the Kingdom is here understood, as consisteth in the deposing thereof, and the resigning up the right which one had to reign, so that he afterwards manageth that Kingdom neither by himself, as before, nor by him to whom he delivereth up the Kingdom. In which manner a General appointed by a King to wage a certain war, doth when the war is ended, deliver his Power to the King. But the most high God neither doth, nor can deliver his Kingdom unto any one in this manner, unless you will say, that he withal ceaseth to be the most high God. For if he delivereth the Kingdom unto any one, as he did heretofore to Christ, he doth not so deliver it, as that he strippeth himself of the Kingdom, but only reigneth by him, as subordinate unto him, to whom he delivereth the Kingdom. After which sort, a King wageth war by his Captains. And not to stray from the matter in hand, God is said to judge the World by Christ, whom he hath made Judge. For when he is said to judge none, the meaning is that he judgeth none by himself, but by the Son, to whom he hath given all Judgment; for otherwise God is in several places said to judge, either absolutely without mentioning the middle Cause of that Judgment, or openly declaring it, whilst it is said, that he will judge the World *by the man* whom he hath appointed, that is, *by Jesus Christ*, as we expressly read, *Rom. 2. 16.* As for the latter Argument, which may be drawn out of the 28th verse, it is evident that the most high God can become subject unto none. But the Son of God shall at length become subject unto him, who brought all things under his subjection, namely, to the Father. Wherefore the Son of God, cannot be the most high God.

**The Defence of the Argument.**

Here all for the most part fly to the distinction of Natures, but to no purpose, both for the simple affirmation, which is found in both verses, and could not have place, if for the other Nature, namely the divine, the same things ought simply to be denied of Christ; and also because Christ is here considered as a King, and consequently, as a Person, so that either his human Nature is to be acknowledged for a Person, or these things are to be ascribed both to his divine Person and Nature; whereof the first quite overthroweth the Opinion of the Adversaries, the other by their own confession subverteth it self. Add hereunto, that in the latter place it is emphatically said, *the Son also himself* shall become subject to him, who brought all things under his subjection. Now who would believe that *Paul*, when he spake thus, considered Christ not according to that Nature, according to which he is the Son of God, but according to another? For neither can any one say, that the name of the *Son*, is in this place put absolutely without adding the name of *God*, so that also the Son of man may be understood. For the word *Son* is manifestly opposed to God *the Father* as its correlative, as they speak in the Schools; neither is the word *Son* absolutely used of Christ, ever meant otherwise, than as related to God as its correlative, and not to any man. To omit that the Emphasis which is in those two words, namely, *also* and *himself*, doth require that Christ should be thought to be described in that manner, wherein he exceedeth all the other things there mentioned, as being subject to him, and not wherein he is either equal, or inferiour to him, and that manner is that he be called the Son of *God*, and not the *Son of Man*. For in the first manner he is equal to Men, and inferiour to Angels. But as the *Son of*

*God*, by way of excellency so called, he is superiour unto Angels, as it is openly written, *Heb.* 1. 4, 5. Finally, if according to the human Nature only, Christ shall deliver the Kingdom and become subject, but not according to the divine, why is it said, that he shall deliver the Kingdom to the Father only, why that he shall become subject to him only, and not also to himself, or to his own divine Nature? Why is it added that God may be all in all? Why should not Christ himself also be all in all? For neither may any one say, that there the divine Nature, and that even of Christ himself, is absolutely meant. For it is both understood from the thing it self, that some Person is designed, (for operation and the government of all things, is ascribed to him) and that such an one as is distinct from Christ, and all the foregoing words openly teach, that it is spoken of *God the Father*, who brought all things in subjection unto Christ, and placed him at his right hand; as we have elsewhere seen. Now whereas some except, that it is therefore said, that Christ shall deliver the Kingdom to God the Father, because he shall resign that Kingdom which he hath, as Mediator, not which he hath as God, this is also of no moment. For, first, we have already shewn before, that if Christ were the most high God, such a Kingdom could not be given to him, because otherwise he would at the same time, have the same Empire both from himself, and not from himself, be therein subordinate to another & not therein subordinate. In a word, both the most high, & not the most high. For we have taught, that such a Kingdom considered by it self is contained in that Power and Empire which the most high God hath of himself, For there is no act of that Empire, which doth not by it self agree to the most high God. But if Christ, being the most high God, could not receive such a Kingdom, neither can he deliver it to another, and depose it. Wherefore since we read, that he shall deliver that Kingdom to God the Father, and so depose it, it is evident that he cannot be the most high God. Add hereunto, that were such an answer of the Adversaries to be admitted, it will follow, that Christ when he hath delivered that Kingdom, shall not be subject to God the Father, contrary to what the Apostle manifestly witnesseth: For he that retaineth a supreme and independent Empire over all things, becometh subject unto none: Otherwise he would acknowledge another above him, and so not be the most high. Yea, Christ after the delivery of the Kingdom which he hath as Mediator, would be so far from becoming more subject to the Father than before, that he ought rather to be esteemed less subject. For in respect of that Kingdom, he, as we have said, and the holy Scriptures abundantly testify, is dependant on the Father, and subordinate to him: which subordination containeth in it self, some subjection at least, which when that Kingdom should be deposed, would altogether cease his supreme and independent Empire in the mean time remaining, which suffereth not that he be subject to any one. The distinction of Natures hath here no weight, partly because we have already before excluded it with reasons; partly because they who use that answer, will have Christ according to both Natures, or the whole person of Christ to be the Mediator, and consequently to have and administer that Kingdom which agreeth unto him as Mediator.

## **CHAP. XXXVI: Christ is the Mediator of God and Men**

### **The seven and twentieth Argument, *That Christ is the Mediator of God and Men.***

In the fourth place that deserveth to be alledged which we touched at the end of the preceding Chapter, namely that Christ is called the *Mediator of God and men*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. And in the same sense, *The Mediator of a new or better Covenant*, namely than the old was, *Heb.* 8. 6. 9. 15. 12. 24. For it is meant that he intervned in the midst between God and men, to make a covenant between them, and was, as the divine author to the *Hebrews* elsewhere speaketh, the *surety* thereof Chap. 7. 22. Now it is here understood that Christ is not the most high God; for the most high God can be the Mediator of none, but he himself rather hath a Mediator. For if he were a Mediator, first he should have another superiour to him, between whom and men he should intervene in the midst. For whether you will have him to be called a Mediator, because in making a Covenant he manageth the business of God with men, as the messenger and interpreter of his will: or therefore, because he manageth the cause and business of men with God: either way he is looked upon as inferiour to God. Therefore he would at once be both the highest, and not the highest. Again he would be the Mediator of himself: For if any one say, that this latter doth not therefore follow, because that God, whose Mediator Christ is, is none but the Father; not to repeat that which we have elsewhere taught, as namely, that it doth not from hence follow, that Christ is the most high God, because he is distinguished from God simply put. There are yet two things which exclude that exception. The first is, that no cause can be imagined why, if the Father had a Mediator, Christ should not also have a Mediator, and that the same Mediator, if he be the most high, and consequently the same God with the Father. For whether the will of the Father was to be declared unto men by a Mediator, or the cause of men to be managed with God, and he, as they commonly believe, to be pacified; the same cause alike pertained unto Christ, and to the Father; if Christ also be the most high God, the same with the Father. The other is, because for the Unity of Essence it cannot be, that any one should be a Mediator of one Person, and not of the other. For whether one Person doth declare his will by some one, or whether the business be, that his will should be bended to mercy by some one. It is impossible, but that the will of the other Persons likewise which are of the same Essence, should be declared or bended to mercy by the same. For it is necessary, that the will of those persons, as also the understanding, and the other properties, should be the same in number, and their operations be altogether the same; which the Adversaries themselves confess to be true in those things which are to without, such as these actions are: but now it is absurd, yea, impossible, that any one should be the Mediator of himself.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

The Adversaries cannot escape by the distinction of Natures, as for other causes explained oftentimes before, so also because, *Sect.* 1. *chap.* 6. We have taught, that some of the Adversaries, whilst they make Christ a Mediator according to the human Nature, do indeed make the human Nature a Person: And that others say, that the very divine Suppositum, or Person of Christ, dischargeth the office of a Mediator (but it cannot discharge it, unless the very divine Nature discharge it) and finally, that others openly say, yea, contend, that Christ is a Mediator according to both Natures: of which their assertion, they alledge this Reason among others, which neither the other Adversaries can reject, because otherwise he could not satisfy the divine Justice, requiring an infinite price for our sins; and this is either the only or chief ground of the Doctrine touching the Incarnation, as they term it, of the Son of God, the second Person of the Trinity. From which it appeareth, that the Adversaries cannot here fly to the distinction of Natures in Christ. Howbeit, in the mean time, how ill those things which they say hang together, even this doth argue, namely, that *Paul* when he had said, that *there is one God, and one Mediator of God and Men*, being about to describe him, saith not *the God and Man Jesus Christ*, but simply, *the Man Jesus Christ*: but he should have so spoken, if the Opinion of these men were true. For descriptions of Persons, as we have often hinted, used by the sacred Authors, are, as indeed they ought to be, suitable to the things that are spoken of. Wherefore if Christ had been a Mediator, both as God, and as Man, or according to both Natures, the Apostle, when he would describe him, ought to have called him not only a Man, but also God, especially since express mention had been

made both of God, and of Men, whose Mediator he is. And indeed the Adversaries love so to speak, when they explain their Opinion with their own words.

## **CHAP. XXXVII: Christ is a Priest**

### **The eight and twentieth Argument, *That Christ is a Priest.***

Not unlike to the former is this, namely, that Christ, *Psal.* 110. 4. And so in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, is many times called a *Priest*, either simply, or high Priest. Therefore we will here add some things concerning the matter; especially because the very Spirit of God seems by this Appellation, to have provided that none should think Christ to be un subordinate unto God, because of the vast power which he hath. For he that is a Priest, cannot be the most high God, For it belongeth to a Priest to be a Minister of the Sanctuary. Whence also the very Office of Priesthood, is called a Ministry. It belongeth also to him, to negotiate for Men with God, to offer to God for them, and to intercede, and by that means to impetrate remission of sins from God, and finally, to appear before the face of God. All which things are very clear, both from the thing it self, and also from the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, wherein they are in general affirmed, partly of Priests, yea, high Priests, and partly in particular attributed to Christ himself: but none of these things is incident to the most high God. For he it is who hath Priests, high and low, but is himself Priest of none: to him Ministry and Oblation is performed, to him intercession is made for others; before his face an appearance is made, that he may forgive some Persons their sins: He ministers to none, he offers to none, he intercedes to none, he makes appearance before the face of none, that mens sins may be pardoned. For he by his own right and authority, forgiveth sins unto all. Now although these things be figuratively spoken of Christ, as we have elsewhere shewn, yet this is certain, that these kinds of speaking could by no means be applied unto Christ, if he were the first and the highest Cause of the remission of sins, and forgave them unto men of himself, by a power not received from another; that is, if he were the most high God.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

The distinction of Natures hath here no more place or strength, than either in other places above, or in the precedent Chapter, where the Office of a Mediator is handled, especially because the Adversaries place the Office of Mediator, which agreeth unto Christ in his Priesthood chiefly. Wherefore not to repeat other things, we only say thus much. If Christ, besides the human Nature, had also a divine one, it would be necessary, that he no less than the Father, should have an high Priest, and this Priest be himself: since neither any cause can be imagined, nor can it any way be: that the Father should have a Priest, and Christ not have one, if he be God no less than the Father, yea, the same God in number with him, as may appear from those things which we before spake concerning the title of a Mediator. But where is even the least hint in the holy Scripture, whereby it may appear, that Christ hath an high Priest as well as the Father? Who seeth not, that it is very absurd, to hold that the Person of Christ, offereth to himself? Wherefore the Priesthood of Christ is utterly inconsistent with the divine Nature, which is held to be in him.

## CHAP. XXXVIII: Christ rised up by the Father

### **The nine and twentieth Argument, *That Christ was raised up by the Father.***

The sixth Argument of this kind, may be drawn from the places wherein Christ is said to have been raised by another; namely, his Father; which reason is so much the more to be urged, because the contrary thereof is urged by the Adversaries. For they say, Christ raised himself, and by this means clearly demonstrated, that he was the Son of God, begotten out of his Essence, and consequently the most high God. But this Argument partly falls to the ground by it self, in that it is grounded on a false Supposition, as we will by and by demonstrate, partly is weakned by another erroneous Opinion of the same Adversaries. For they hold that the Soul or Spirit of Christ, which they also hold concerning the spirits of other men, after he was dead, did notwithstanding perform such actions as agree to none but Substances, that are actually alive, and understand by themselves. Some say that it went down into Hell, or Purgatory, and brought the Souls of the Fathers out of, I know not what, Prison, or *Limbus*. But if the Soul of Christ, even during his death, did exercise such actions, what hinders but that the same Soul, entering into his own Body, and former habitation, should again unite it unto it self, and by divine Power raise it up? For could the Soul of Christ, furnished with divine Power, do less than his whole humanity when he lived, perform by the same divine Power? could it do less, than (for example sake) some one of the Apostles, to whom Christ sometimes gave the power of raising the dead, and of whom we read, that some of them did actually raise the dead? Which very thing we read likewise of *Elijah* and *Elisha*. Wherefore we will far more rightly invert the Argument of the Adversaries, and retort upon them that weapon which they endeavour to hurl at us. For if Christ were the most high God, his raising should be ascribed to himself, as the true and chief Author. But it is not attributed to him, but to the Father, as the true and chief Author thereof; yea, it is very openly signified, that Christ, if you speak properly, did not raise himself. Wherefore he is not the most high God. The truth of the *Major*, as they call it, is manifest enough. For none doubteth, if Christ be the most high God, that he did altogether raise himself, and that it was most suitable, that he should raise himself. For since it follows from that Opinion, that the human Nature, according to which Christ died, was personally united to the divine, it could at no hand be, that the human Nature should perpetually abide in death; and consequently, in as much as that union, according to their Opinion, can never be dissolved, that a dead corps should in an indissoluble and eternal tie, be united to the divine Nature. Furthermore, if the human Nature were to be raised, by whom rather was it to be raised, than by the divine Nature of the same Christ, which both could of it self very easily perform it, and by reason of that most strict union, did owe this benefit unto the Nature that was joined unto it? Wherefore whether you consider the ability of performing it, the divine Nature of Christ would have been the prime cause of that work; for the Office of performing it, it would have chiefly lain on that Nature. How then would not Christ have been the true and chief Author of his own Resurrection? As for the *Minor*, there are so many and so clear Testimonies of the holy Scripture, which make the Father the true and chief Author of the Resurrection of Christ, and not Christ himself, yea, very openly take away this work from Christ (though even the thing it self, namely, his death, doth sufficiently take it away) that it is a wonder, that any one should doubt of it. For, first, in certain places it is openly said, that the Father raised Christ, or that God raised his Son. But who is that God, whose Son Christ is, but the Father? The former is recorded by Paul, in the beginning of the Epistle to the Galatians, whilst he speaketh thus, Paul an Apostle not from men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father that raised him up from the dead. The latter it is affirmed by Peter, Acts 3. ult. To you God having raised up his Son, first sent him blessing you. And Paul, chap. 13. 33. doth indeed assert the same, whilst he saith, And we declare unto you the Promise which was made unto our Fathers, that God hath fulfilled it unto us their Children, having raised up Jesus, as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Now that he raised him from the dead, no more to return to corruption, thus he said, &c. From which words it appeareth, that he who said unto Christ, thou art my Son, this day I begot thee, which indeed is no other, than the Father, raised him from the dead. The same Apostle saith, 1 Thes. 1. 9, 10. Ye turned to God from Idols, to serve the true and living God, and to expect his Son out of Heaven, whom he raised from the

dead, even Jesus, who delivereth us from the Wrath to come. *Where in like manner God is said, to have raised his Son from the dead.*

To these are added very many other places, wherein it is simply written, that God raised Christ; of which number we will here set down only one or two, with the words at large, contenting our selves to quote the rest. Thus therefore speaketh *Peter, Acts 2. 24. Whom (Jesus of Nazareth) God raised up, having loosed the Throws of Hell, in that it was impossible that he should be held by it. For David saith concerning him, I saw the Lord always before me, because he is at my right hand, that I may not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my tongue rejoiceth. Moreover, also my flesh shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my Soul in Hell, nor suffer thine holy One to see corruption.* And a little after, ver. 32. *This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses.* See also what the same *Peter* saith afterwards, chap. 3. 15. (which verse compare with the 13th) and 4. 10. and 5. 30. and 10. 40. and *Paul, chap. 7. 31. and Rom. 4. 24. and B. 11. and 10. 19. and also 1 Cor. 6. 14. and 15. 15. and 2 Cor. 4. 14. and 13. 4.* But there is amongst others a notable place in the same Apostle, *Ephes. 1. 9, 20. where amongst other things he wisheth to them, That they might know what is the exceeding greatness of his power (namely, whom he had, ver. 17. called the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory) towards us, who believe according to the working of his mighty Power which he wrought in Christ, having raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in heavenly places, &c. And likewise those words which we read chap. 2. 5. and those that are like unto them, Col. 1. 12, 13.* Add also those of the divine Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews, chap. 13. 24.* and those of *1 Pet. 1. 21.*

We mention not those Testimonies, which indeed are not few, wherein it is simply affirmed, that Christ was raised from the dead, which being so often repeated, doth altogether signify, that he was raised by another; as also the circumstances of some places, do plainly intimate. See amongst others, *1 Cor. 15. 4, 12, &c.* where that manner of speaking is seven times used; and afterwards, ver. 15. it is openly asserted, that God did it, and the Resurrection of Christ is made the pattern of our resurrection, which also happeneth elsewhere.

### **A more full confirmation and Defence of the Argument.**

You will say, that although Christ is said to have been raised by another, yet it followeth not that he was not raised by himself, in as much as the same action may proceed from many causes, and those equal among themselves. Moreover that in those places wherein it is asserted, that God raised up Christ, by the name of *God*, may be understood the whole Trinity, or the divine nature of Christ, especially, in that elsewhere the raising of himself seems to be ascribed unto Christ.

But the first is not to be admitted for three causes chiefly.

The first is, because that at least followeth from those places which we have alledged, That Christ is not the principal cause of his Resurrection. For why should the raising of him be so often and so openly ascribed to another person, namely the Father, and not rather to Christ himself? But even this thing alone might here be sufficient for us to shew that Christ is not the most high God. For we have before shewn that he, if he were the most high God, would altogether be the principal Author of his own Resurrection. Another cause is, because the holy Scripture doth so attribute the raising of Christ to God the Father, that it doth not obscurely, yea, very openly intimate, that the same action doth not indeed, agree to Christ himself. First, because if Christ had raised himself from the dead, and that by such a power as was natural and altogether proper unto him, it ought to have been mentioned at least in some of those testimonies which we have alledged; and to omit other places, this ought chiefly to be done, *Acts 2. 24. &c. and Rom. 10. 9, 10. 2 Cor. 13. 4.* For as to the first place, when *Peter* had affirmed, that Christ had been raised from the dead, in that it was impossible for him to be held by death; was there not very great cause to say, that it was therefore impossible, because he was the most high God, who accordingly could not leave his soul in Hell, and suffer his body to see corruption? For this would have been the proper, yea, the only cause thereof, whereas he having alledged the words of *David*, and applied them to Christ, produceth a far different cause, namely, that Christ always saw the

Lord before his eyes, because he was always at his right hand, lest he should be moved; Whence he conceived joy, whence hope, that the Lord would not leave his soul in Hell, nor suffer his holy one to see corruption; whereunto the following words also pertain, where Christ in the Person of *David*, professeth that God had made known unto him, the ways of life, and would fill him with gladness. Which cause hath nothing common with that which should have been alledged, yea, doth subvert it.

As to the second place, it should therefore have been there rather said, that Christ raised up himself from the dead, (if so be any one can raise up himself from the dead) then that God did it, because that is there setdown, which is in a special manner both to be believed with the heart, and to be confessed with the mouth, concerning the dignity of Christ; and which if we believe and confess, we shall obtain salvation. But if Christ had raised himself from the dead, we ought altogether to believe and confess it, as the Adversaries themselves confess, yea, urge, and consequently it should by no means, have here been omitted by the Apostle. For he had omitted that which did not only contain in it self the greater dignity of Christ, but was as necessary to be believed by us, as that which he expressed. As to the third testimony; for this reason in stead of that, which is there said, *That Christ doth live by the Power of God*. It should rather have been said, that *he doth live by his own power*, because the power of Christ is here in question: and it is shewn that he is powerful in the *Corinthians*, by removing the suspicion of infirmity, which might be grounded on his cruel death. To which purpose nothing had been more apt, than if it had been said, that he revived by his own power, and vanquished the force of death. Again, it is apparent from *Acts* 13. 33. and *Rom.* 1. 4. *Col.* 1. 18. *Rev.* 1. 5. that the raising of Christ was such an action, as that by it he was generated by God, and became his Son. Concerning which matter more hereafter. But Christ did not generate himself, nor is the Son of himself.

Thirdly, In some places alledged by us, God, or the Father of Christ, is, without expressing his name, thus described, *He that raised Jesus Christ from the dead*; & is by that description distinguished from Christ himself. See *Rom.* 4. 24. and 8. 11. *2 Cor.* 4. 14. Whence it appeareth, that this action is not common to Christ with the Father, but proper to the Father, otherwise this description, would no less, that I might not say more, agree to Christ than to the Father; and consequently, he who raised Christ from the dead, could not be distinguished from Christ, for common things, as we have elsewhere hinted, do not distinguish, but proper ones. To which may be added that place of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, chap. 5. 7. which we formerly considered, when we discoursed of the prayers which Christ poured out to the Father; for it is thence evinced by a double reason, that Christ could not raise himself from the dead, and consequently did not: partly because he did with so earnest prayers, with so earnest cryings, seconded also with tears, beseech the Father to do it; partly because he to whom he made such supplications, is thus described and distinguished from Christ, namely, *that he was able to save him from death*. Concerning both which things, see what we have formerly said. Finally, that place, *Ephes.* 1. 19, 20. may be added, which we have formerly alledged, where it is shewn, how great Power, how great Might God the Father did put forth when he raised Christ from the dead, and set him at his right hand in the Heavens. But what need would there have been of so great Power, or how could it at all have been employed by God the Father, if Christ had raised himself by a Power altogether proper and natural to him? Now if you say, that the same Power did also belong to Christ, as being common to the Father with the Son, there can no cause be alledged, why it should be said to be put forth rather by the Father, than by Christ, in as much as we have already shewn that the contrary ought rather to be done.

The third cause wherefore that first exception ought to be esteemed of no weight, is this, namely, that such a sense doth exceedingly weaken *Pauls* Argument, whereby from the Resurrection of Christ, he asserteth the truth of our resurrection (as he chiefly doth, *1 Cor.* 15. 11, &c) and so throweth down the strongest prop of our hope. For *Paul* doth thence shew, that we shall arise because Christ arose: But if Christ raised himself from the dead by a power that was inbred, and altogether natural to him, and could not but raise himself, the consequence is of no force. For how followeth it, if Christ raised himself by a power that was proper and altogether natural, and could not but raise himself, that we also, who are altogether destitute of that Power, and whom our nature doth not vindicate from eternal death, shall assuredly rise?

There is now scarce any need to speak of the latter exception, which is, that by the name of *God*, who is said to have raised Christ, either the whole Trinity, wherein Christ also is contained, or the divine Essence, which was no less in Christ, than in the Father, may be understood. For we have brought Arguments even out of those places, where the Adversaries themselves dare not apply that exception, wherein is shewn that Christ did not raise himself from the dead, the contrary whereof is required by that exception. But furthermore, who doth not understand, that when God, or he that raised Jesus from the dead, is distinguished from Christ, a person distinct from Christ, is understood, which is in this place sufficient for us? That a person is understood, is intimated by the name *God*, which we have before shewn to be proper to a Person, and also by the action of raising, which agreeth to nothing but a Person; but that one Person is understood the very word *God*, as also that description, *He that raised Jesus Christ from the dead*, being uttered in the singular number, doth manifest. For neither is the word *God* a collective, neither is that expression, wherein mention is made of him, who raised Christ from the dead, general and common, but proper and singular, but the distinction between Christ, and him that raised Christ from the dead, is manifest from the very places. Nor as we have else where hinted, would he escape the Tax of *Nestorianism*, who by the word *God*, understanding Christ himself by name, should say that he raised Christ, or did any like thing about him, for it would be all one as if he should say, the Son of God raised Christ. But what need more words? When the very Scripture explaineth it self, for what it in one place attributeth to God simply named, it elsewhere openly attributeth to the Father, either expressing the very name of the Father, or describing him, whom God raised by the appellation of his Son. If therefore there were any obscurity, or ambiguity in those places, wherein the raising of Christ is simply attributed unto *God*, without the addition of any other note, implying that it was spoken of the Father, yet would the other places shew that they are to be understood of the Father. For the obscure passages are to be explained by the plain ones, & the confused & ambiguous passages, by the distinct ones. But there is no ambiguity, no obscurity in the word *God*, since there can no place of the Scripture be alledged, where the name *God* put subjectively, and also distinguished from Christ, both which happen in these Testimonies, is taken of any other but the Father.

Now whereas certain Testimonies of the Scripture are alledged, wherein the raising of Christ seemeth to be attributed to himself, as that he himself said, that he would in three days raise up the Temple, namely, of his Body, *John* 2. 20, 21. and that he had power both to lay down his soul, and to take or receive the same again; for so the greek word may indifferently be rendered, *John* 10. 18. These passages evince no other than that Christ was the cause of his Resurrection, and that it was so put in his hands, as I may say, that it could be taken away from him, and interrupted by none. After which manner the same Christ saith in *Luke*, *That he that shall lose his Soul, shall find it*, chap. 9. 24, or quicken it, chap. 17. 33. And *John* saith of them who believed in Christ, and so are born of God, that the word, namely, Christ, *Gave them Power to become the Sons of God*; that is, to become immortal, *John* 1. 13. For otherwise so few Testimonies, whereof the first, as every one seeth, is altogether figurative, ought at no hand to be opposed to so many and so evident Testimonies and Reasons drawn from thence, wherewith it is evinced, that this action is properly to be attributed, not to Christ, but to the Father. Indeed more might be said of these two places, which are alledged to the contrary, but it is not now our intention and work to confute the Arguments of the Adversaries, but with Arguments to assert our own Opinion. Wherefore let it now suffice, to have touched these places.

We Meddle not here with the exception of two Natures in Christ, for the intelligent Reader, if he shall consider both our Argument, or Arguments rather, and also what we have spoken of that distinction in the former chapters, will easily understand that it cannot here have place.

## **CHAP. XXXIX: Christ is called the Image of the invisible God**

### **The thirtieth Argument, *That Christ is called the Image of the invisible God.***

The last Argument of this kind shall be this, that Christ is called the *Image of the invisible God*, *Col.* 1. 15. which is in some part also said, *2 Cor.* 4. 4. where Christ is in like manner said to be *the Image of God*; and *Heb.* 1. 3. where he is said to be the Figure of the *Substance*, or *Charecter of the Person of God*. Now we will not here use that Reason which we have already elsewhere, namely, that Christ is by this means openly distinguished from God, that is, the most high God: but another Reason, and that twofold, the former whereof is common to all the alledged places; the latter more proper to the place, *Col.* 1. For, first, no Image is of the same Essence in number with that whereof it is the Image, otherwise it would be the Image of it self. Wherefore since Christ is the Image of God, he cannot be the same Substance in number with God, and consequently not be God, namely, the most high God. There is the same force, when he is said to be the Figure of the Substance of God, or Charecter of his Person. Again, If Christ be *the Image of the invisible God*, he himself must not be invisible, and consequently not the most high God. For he is invisible, *1 Tim.* 1. 17. As whom none of men hath ever seen, or can see, *John* 1. 18. *1 Tim.* 6. 16. For it is sufficiently apparent, that Christ is therefore called, *the Image of the invisible God*, because whereas we cannot know God by himself, as being invisible, Christ was given to us, in whom as in an Image exposed in a manner to the sight, we may contemplate and know God, as other learned men also have observed, and left in writing. But if Christ were no less invisible than that God, whose Image he is said to be, he could not be his Image, but we should rather need another Image, by which we should come to the knowledge of him.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Here, for as much as the greatest part contend, that Christ was the Image of God from all Eternity, not according to the human Nature, but the divine: therefore that they may solve our first Argument, they are wont to fly not to the distinction of Natures in Christ, but to the distinction of divers Persons in one Deity. For they contend, that the second Person of the Divinity, is the Image of the first; that is, the Son the Image of the Father, because the Son in respect of Essence, is most like to the Father, as being begotten out of his Essence. But they deny that it doth thence follow, that the Son will be the Image of himself, because though he be of the same Essence with the Father, yet he differeth from him in Person. As to the latter Reason, they will perhaps say, that the same Son, although according to the divine Nature he be God, equally invisible with the Father, yet having assumed a human Nature, he became visible, and was seen by men. But these answers do not at all take away the difficulty. For as to the former, first of all, a Person is in vain distinguished from his own Essence; in as much as every own is the same with his own Essence. Wherefore if the Person of the Son be the Image of the Person of the Father, the Essence also of the Son will be the Image of the Fathers Essence; and consequently either both must have an Essence different in number, or the same Person or Essence, will be the Image of it self. Add hereunto, that they themselves, as we have already hinted, do contend, that the Son in respect of Essence, is most like unto the Father, and consequently his Image; wherefore the Son must in respect of Essence, be distinct in number from the Father. For an Image, as it is an Image, doth differ in number from that whose Image it is, and one like from another For these are relatives, and consequently opposites, but opposites, as such, must at least differ in number; nor can you say, that one is sometimes said to be like himself. For in such a kind of speech, respect is had to a different time, in reference to which, the same is compared with it self: but we here speak of like things, having no regard to a different time, but to the same. To omit that the Adversaries themselves, hold that the Son ought really to differ from the Father, that he may be the Image of the Father, but this would make nothing to the purpose, did they not really differ as the one is the Image of the other, if therefore the Son in respect of Essence, be the Image of the Father, the one must differ from the other in respect of Essence.

As to the latter exception, which also striketh at our latter Reason, it will effect nothing, unless you say, that Christ is the Image of God according to the human Nature, wherein he is or was visible, which the greatest part do not admit, for they, as we have said, hold Christ to be the Image of God, as

he was begotten out of the Substance of the Father, and consequently hath the same Substance with him, which agreeth not to him according to the human Nature; wherefore they must first renounce this Opinion, before they make use of that Answer; for neither can they say, that there is no need, that Christ as he is an Image, should be visible, it being sufficient that he is or was by any means visible. For if it were thus, the word *invisible* added to the name of *God*, whose Image Christ is, would be altogether idle. For turn your understanding which way you please, you shall find no other reason, why the Apostle did in that manner here describe God, than to shew that it was therefore needful, that if we would know, and as it were view God, some Image of him, namely, Christ, should be held forth unto us, and exposed to the sight of men, in as much as God is invisible, and cannot be known by himself of any one of us, especially in a full and perfect manner: which *John* also signifieth, saying, *No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.* But if Christ, as he is the Image of God, were no less invisible than God himself, we could no more know God by him, than God by himself; wherefore Christ could not be the Image of God. For it is apparent both from this description of God, and also from that which is said in the other place quoted by us, *2 Cor. 4. 4.* that Christ was called the Image of God in respect of us; namely, because he did represent in himself, and in a manner expose to our view the Will, Goodness, Power, and Wisdom of God. Whence Christ himself saith, None knoweth the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him: and elsewhere, If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also, and from henceforth ye know him: and a little after, He that seeth me, seeth the Father. But furthermore, although Christ was visible according to the human Nature, yet ought he not to be simply distinguished from the invisible God, and herein to be opposed to him, if he in the mean time were that most high and invisible God. For if the name of *God*, namely, the most high God, may and ought to be absolutely attributed unto Christ, as they hold; those things also may and ought to be absolutely attributed to him; which are absolutely spoken of God, and which agree to him in respect of his Essence. But if Christ may and ought for the divine Nature, to be absolutely called invisible, he ought not absolutely to be distinguished from the invisible God.

Some other will perhaps say, that Christ is the Image of God according to the human Nature; which seemeth not disagreeable to their Opinion, who together with us confess, that Christ is called the Image of God in respect of us, namely, because he did in himself, as it were present to our view, the invisible God. But in the first place, they are not constant enough to themselves, whilst they refer that which is the same with *the Image of God*, or at least is of the same efficacy in our Argument, to the divine Nature; namely, that Christ is called *the Character of the Substance of God*; for a Character hath not the same Substance with the thing whose Character it is. Again, By this means Christ would have been the Image no less of his own divine Person or Nature, than of the Fathers; neither would there have been any cause why he should be called the Image of another, rather than of himself. But we find not this, but that rather expressed in the Scripture. For when Christ is called the Image of God, all the Adversaries, as far as I know, hold that the Father is understood; and the distinction of that God from Christ, and finally, the collation of this kind of speaking, with otherlike sayings of the Scripture, do sufficiently shew the same.

I omit that Christ did in himself, as it were present to our view, the invisible God, in that he expressed his Will by Doctrine, his Power by admirable Works, and clearly demonstrated his Faith and Truth by both. But these things agree only to a Person, as such, so that those Adversaries are forced to hold, either that his divine Person, as such, is the Image of the Father, or that the human Nature, if they will attribute this to it only, is a Person. The first of which, overthroweth their Answer, the latter their Opinion. And let these things suffice to have been spoken concerning those Arguments which so shew Christ not to be the most high God, as that withal they give a Prerogative to the Father above him.

## CHAP. XL: Christ called in the Scriptures, The Son of God

**The one and thirtieth Argument, is chiefly drawn from those causes for which Christ is in the Scriptures called, *The Son of God*.**

We must now pass to those Arguments which absolutely shew that Christ is not the most high God, without having any regard to this, that some Prerogative is withal given to the Father above him. Now though we might in this place alledge all the attributes of the Humanity of Jesus Christ, as that he was conceived and born of the Virgin *Mary*, that he did eat, drink, grow, that he was weary sometimes, and did weep, and was disturbed, and finally, suffered most bitter torments, and died, and the like; yea, this very thing that he is and was a Man, in as much as none of those things can be said of the most high God, as they are, and that absolutely of Christ, yet will we here only alledge those things which contain some other Argument of our Opinion, besides that which is common to all those Attributes. Now the first shall be this, That if Jesus were the most high God, he would no otherwise be so, then because he is the Son of God. For neither can any greater thing be spoken of Jesus Christ, then that he is the Son of God: & the Adversaries themselves hold, that he received the divine Essence by generation from the Father, which maketh him the Son of God. But from whence any one hath the divine Essence, he hath also from thence, that he is God. But Jesus is not therefore the most high God, because he is the Son of God, wherefore neither is he simply the most high God.

Our Assumption shall not here be proved by this Reason, that Jesus whilst he is called the Son of God, is thereby distinguished from God, namely, the supreme and only God: Nor also that he is by this very name, made inferiour to the Father, as wholly depending from the Father, where as the Father dependeth from none other, for these reasons we have before used. But we will prove the same by another Argument, and that a twofold one, although other things also will be brought in by the by, whilst we shall be employed in proving the former; which things would also be fit to demonstrate the very Question, or principal Position it self.

The first is this, That whereas several causes are expressed in the holy Scriptures, for which Jesus is the Son of God, yet none of them is such, as constituteth him the most high God, in that they all agree to the Man Christ Jesus, or (that we may speak with the Adversaries) agree to Christ, according to the human Nature, and began at a certain time. Yea, they are so far from either constituting, or demonstrating Christ to be the most high God, as that they rather shew him not to be so; and consequently each of them may justly be accounted as so many Arguments to assert our Opinion. But it is impossible, that if Jesus be the Son of God in such a manner as constituteth him the most high God, this thing should be no where set down in Scripture; partly because we see other reasons exprest, which would be of far less moment than it; partly because that Reason (as indeed the Adversaries themselves contend) would be altogether necessary to be known & believed unto salvation, & so much the more clearly to be explained by the sacred Writers; and so much the more diligently & frequently to be inculcated, by how much it was more removed from our senses and capacity, and consequently more difficult to be known and believed. For since the sacred Scriptures doth place the sum of our faith and confession concerning Christ herein, that we believe and profess Jesus to be the Son of God, namely, in the most perfect manner so called, it is necessary also that we be sure of the true and genuine Reason for which he is called such a Son of God. For neither is it enough to know and pronounce the words, but it is necessary to know and comprehend in the mind the thing it self, as far as it falls under our capacity; otherwise you shall neither truly believe the thing, nor heartily profess it.

Now the thing that is signified by those words, consisteth in the genuine reason, for which Jesus is called the Son of God by way of excellency, which according to the opinion of the adversary, is because he was from eternity begotten out of the Essence of the Father. Neither indeed did this opinion otherwise agree either with it self or with the holy Scriptures, would any other reason be more true or genuine. If therefore we find not this reason expressed, in the holy Scripture, but others far

different from it, we must hold that it is not the true one. The latter Argument wherewith our assumption is confirmed, shall afterwards be seen in this Chapter.

### **A fuller Confirmation and Defence of this Argument.**

Now that it may appear that in the Scripture no such reason for which Christ is the son of God is expressed, as maketh him the most high God, but only such as agree to the human nature of Christ (or to speak more rightly) to the man Jesus Christ; we will rehearse these places wherein the causes are declared for which Jesus hath been called the Son of God, some of which Testimonies, at least, are so ordered, that if Jesus had then already been the Son of God, for some better reason, and namely, because he had from all eternity been generated out of the Essence of the Father, it ought not to have been omitted. Now the causes for which Jesus is called the Son of God, have a certain order amongst themselves, and the latter still addeth something to the former, and maketh Jesus Christ the Son of God in a more perfect manner than before.

The first cause is declared by the Angel in *Luke*, where amongst other things *Gabriel* thus speaketh unto Mary. The holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the most high shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing that shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God. Where we cannot but set down those things which the most learned Popish Interpreter doth amongst other things note upon this place, for he rightly both saw and explained the sense of the words. And first of all as concerning the last words of this place, he noteth that to call doth here signify to be, according to the idiom of the Hebrews, who take the consequent or effect for the antecedent cause, of which he had also spoken in the 32d. vers. for there the Angel likewise saith of the Virgins Son that was to be born, And he shall be called, that is, shall be, the Son of the Most High. This Interpreter hath alleged examples of that Hebraism out of *Isa.* 1. 26. and the 4. 3. to which is also added that place *Gen.* 21. 12. compared with *Rom.* 9. 7. Those likewise might be added, *Matth.* 5. 9, 19. and 21. 13. *Isa.* 56. 7. and *Luke* 1. 76. *Rom.* 9. 26. *Hos.* 1. 10. Wherefore the same Interpreter doth afterwards justly reprove Calvin, who to escape the Argument of Servetus, drawn from those words of the Angel, saith that to be called, doth here signify, to be declared the Son of God. For how, saith he, can the reason of the Angel agree with this interpretation. Therefore the holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. (We ought not to abuse the holy Scripture that we may refute Hereticks.) Again, explaining that reason for which the Angel said that Christ should be called, that is, should be the Son of God; he saith, *all others whom I have seen interpret this, as if the Angel spake of Christ as God, or at least as man assumed into one person with God in that both ways Christ is the true and natural Son of God:* How be it a little after he writeth after this manner. Though I for my part suppose that the words carry another sense, and are not to be understood of Christ as God, nor as a man united to a divine person, but only of his conception and human generation, as if the Angel should say, *He shall be called, that is be the Son of God,* because he shall be begotten not by a man but by God through the power of the holy Spirit. For neither did the Angel speak concerning the nature of Christ, but of the manner of his generation. And the cause which he renders, why he should be the Son of God, in that the holy Spirit should come upon the Virgin, and the power of the most high overshadow her, was not apt to prove that Christ should be the Son of God, as he was God, or man assumed into the same person with God; because a mere man might be conceived by the supervening of the holy Spirit, and overshadowing power of the most high, who would be the Son of God neither of those ways; in as much as he was neither God, nor joined to a divine Person. But to prove that what was to be born of the Virgin, should be the Son of God in such a sense as I have declared, the reason of the Angel was very apt, in as much as the Child was to be conceived not of a man but of God alone. Wherefore, although Christ had not been God, yet being born in such a manner as he was, he had deservedly been called the Son of God, not only as other holy men, of whom it is said, *I said ye are Gods,* and *ye are all Sons of the most high:* but in a singular and proper manner, because he had no other Father than God, being begotten by no other than him. What I pray you could be spoken more aptly and more suitably to the place? I was therefore willing to explain the whole matter in his words rather than in mine own, that it might with all appear by the testimony of a Papist, how evident this opinion is which we defend, concerning the reason exprest in these words of the Angel, for which Jesus is called the Son of God. For what else but the evidence of the thing it self could move a Papist,

especially of that order to which he was addicted, that contrary to the consent of all other Interpreters which he had seen, he should follow the opinion which we hold? especially since he knew that they whom he judged Hereticks, did urge this place for their opinion concerning Christ. Although we see that some, even of them who are called Gospellers, assent both to him and us in this behalf. This then is the first cause, for which Jesus was the Son of God, in that he was conceived and born, not of a man but of God, by the intervening of his power and efficacy, and so had no other Father besides God. But it is incredible, if there had been a far better cause for which this Child, who was to be born of *Mary*, should from his first birth have been the Son of God, that the Angel would not have hinted it, and so have conceived his words, that *Mary* might understand that there was yet a better cause of this thing. But that would have been a far better cause thereof, which most Interpreters are wont to bring, namely, that the man which was to be born of the Virgin, or rather that human nature, was to be assumed into the unity of the Person of the Son of God, begotten from all Eternity out of the Essence of the Father. Why then is there not the least hint of this matter in the words of the Angel? Why did he not so speak, that it might appear that the same person had already been the Son of God from all Eternity; and should now in a new manner be the Son of God? For neither can you say with some Interpreters, that the Angel did in some sort intimate it by the particle also, whilst he doth not simply say; *Therefore the holy thing that shall be born of thee, but, therefore also the holy thing that shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.* For that the sense is, that not only the person, that did before exist, is the Son of God, but also the holy issue of the Virgin should for this admirable conception be called the Son of God. For this opinion doth make two Sons of God, and consequently two persons in one Christ, the one existing before the Virgin, the other born of her. Wherefore unless you will render the Greek words, *and therefore*, so that this expression may serve only to connect the sentence, you must observe what a notable Interpreter amongst the Gospellers have noted on this place. The conjunction *also*, saith he, is here the mark of Parity, and noteth an equal truth of the consequent with the antecedent of the Enthymem. As if it should be said, how true it is that thou shalt conceive by the singular operation of the holy Spirit, and therefore being a Virgin: so true also is it that the Son which thou shalt so conceive and bring forth shall be the Son of God. The same Author a little after denieth that there is any such opposition or comparison here made between the human and divine nature of Christ, as these Interpreters frame, and force out of the particle *also*, which is in the words of the Angel.

But it is now time that we proceed to other Reasons, for which Christ is called the Son of God.

The second Cause therefore of this thing, is exprest by Christ himself, *John* 10. 34, 35, 36. For when the *Jews* had charged him with the crime of Blasphemy, that being a Man, he made himself God, namely, because he had called God his Father, and said that he was one with him, he giveth them this Answer, *Is it not written in your Law, I said ye are Gods? If he called them Gods to whom the Word of GOD came, and the Scripture cannot be broken: how say you of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the World: thou blasphemest: because I said, I am the Son of God?* Where it appeareth, that Christ bringeth this Reason, why he did with far greater Right call himself the Son of God, than those Judges heretofore were called Gods, because he was sanctified of the Father, and sent into the World. Now doth this Reason constitute Christ the most high God? For doth *sending*, that I may speak of this first, constitute the most high God? Hath it any conjunction with the Generation out of the Essence of the Father? And is the Sanctification, that proceeded from the Father, incident to the divine Nature of Christ, and not rather to the human? This certainly is both confest by many of the Adversaries, and averred by the thing it self. For that which is sanctified of God, acquireth some sanctity, in whatsoever thing the same doth consist. But this is not incident to the divine Nature existing from all Eternity, although it be to the human. For neither can any one say, that we also sanctify God and his Name, to whom notwithstanding we procure no Sanctity. For as much as it is manifest, that God is sanctified of us in a different manner, then we are sanctified of God. God is sanctified of us, whilst we acknowledge reverence, and proclaim his Sanctity and Majesty; we of God, whilst through his bounty we obtain some Sanctity, whereof we should otherwise be destitute. Now if the manner that God sanctified Christ, were of the same kind with that wherein we sanctify God, and not rather with that wherein God sanctifieth us, though different in kind and perfection, what would that Sanctification do to shew that Christ is by the greatest right called the Son of God? For doth a

Sanctification which proceedeth from us, constitute God to whom it tendeth, our son? and not rather that which proceedeth from God to us, constitute us his sons; indeed in a more imperfect manner than Christ, because our sanctification is also more imperfect: but yet truly. Now what that Sanctification of Christ is, may easily be gathered from the *sending* that is added thereunto. For that *sending* herein consisteth, that the office of embassage unto men, is committed by God to Christ. But to sanctify, signifieth in the Scriptures, to segregate one from others, and chose him to a singular office, or, as it were, to prepare him for a more divine use. Wherefore it is either so taken in this place, as in *Jeremiah*, to whom God sometime spake in this manner, *Before I formed thee in the womb, I knew thee, and before thou camest out of the belly, I sanctified thee, and gave thee a Prophet to the Nations.* As learned men have noted both there, and in the quoted place of *John*: for it is the same as to fill with the most singular Gifts, such as is divine Power and Wisdom, to discharge a most honourable Office on the Earth, and having by this means segregated one from other men, to prepare him in an eminent way to such an office. Wherefore the sending into the world, containeth in it self that very Office: but the Sanctification is a designation, or preparation thereunto. But of what moment are these things, to assert supreme Divinity unto Christ, or to establish the Generation of Christ out of the Essence of the Father from Eternity? Yea, they are so far from asserting supreme Divinity unto Christ, that they rather demonstrate that Christ is not the most high God. As concerning *sending*, we have formerly shewn it. The same is also to be held concerning Sanctification, which is a designation or preparation to that Office. For if the Office it self be not incident to the most high God, neither can the designation or preparation to that Office be incident unto him, although the same may also be shewn from those things which we have said concerning the places wherein it is affirmed, that something was given of God to Christ. For he that is sanctified of God, hath thereby something conferred upon him by God. But none conferreth any thing on the most high God, who giveth all things to all. Besides, if Christ had been the most high God, if he had been begotten out of the Essence of the Father from eternity, and for that cause the Son of God, how could it be he should here conceal it. For if there were any place where this were to be expressed, certainly this were the place. Christ had affirmed, that he was one with the Father, which the Adversaries will have to be spoken in respect of a divine Nature; for they say that it was therefore affirmed of him, that God was his Father, because he was begotten out of his Essence; that he was therefore one with him, because he had the same Essence in number with him. Moreover, the *Jews* did upon that account, charge him with Blasphemy, because that being a man, he made himself God. Where they take the name of *God* in such a manner, as is not incident to a man: and our Adversaries contend, that they mean it of the most high God; namely because they observed that Christ did not obscurely affirm himself, to be God in such a manner. But if it be thus, it would have been altogether necessary, that Christ should bring such a Reason, wherefore he is the Son of God, as might shew him to be begotten out of the Essence of the Father, & to have the same Essence with him, for otherwise how had he defended that saying of his, which the *Jews* charged with Blasphemy? How had he shewn, that he of right called himself the Son of God in such a manner as the Adversaries would have it? The *Jews*, according to the Opinion of our Adversaries, object to Christ; Thou art a Blasphemer, because thou affirmest thy self to be the Son of God begotten out of his Essence, because thou makest thy self the most high God. Christ answereth, I rightly affirm this of my self, nor am I therein a Blasphemer, because the Father hath sanctified me, and sent me into the world. What is this to a generation out of the Essence of God? What is this to the Supreme and Independent Godhead, which Christ is believed to have challenged to himself? You will say, that Christ sufficiently intimated, that he was begotten out of the Essence of the Father, and consequently the most high God, because he said that he was sent of the Father into the world. For that this sheweth, that he before he was born of the *Virgin*, had been perpetually with God in Heaven, and afterwards descended thence into the *Virgins* Womb, and became Man, which is incident to none but the most high God. But how frivolous these thing be, men would easily observe, if they would a little set aside a prejudicate Opinion. For, first, he might both be sent, and come into the World, who never was in Heaven. The words of Christ himself concerning the Apostles, are in the same *John* very evident, where he also compareth them with himself in this behalf, chap. 17. 18. *As thou (Father) hast sent me into the world, have I also sent them into the world.* And *John* saith of false Prophets, 1 *Epistle* 4. 1. *that many false Prophets are gone out into the world.* But neither had these nor those been either in Heaven, or in any other place out of this World, whence they might afterwards enter into this World. But they were appointed the Embassadors of Christ unto men, and designed to

preach the Gospel unto them: and these came of their own accord unto men, and as if they had been sent of God unto them, presuming to promulgate a new Doctrine amongst them. Wherefore to be sent into the World by God or Christ, is to be constituted his Embassadour unto men, but he may be the Embassadour of God unto men, who never was in Heaven. Again, though it were altogether necessary, that he whom God sent into the world, should first have been in Heaven, and have descended thence to the Earth, which thing we otherwise willingly confess concerning Christ, yet what hinders that he, who is in his Nature nothing but a man, should be assumed of God into Heaven, and being there furnished with instructions, be afterwards sent down unto the Earth to men? and indeed it is altogether necessary to hold it so, if you think that Christ could not be sent into the World; or at least was not otherwise sent, then that he properly descended from Heaven to the Earth. For it is sufficiently apparent from our words, that this sending did agree to Christ only according to the human Nature, which certainly was not generated in Heaven, but on the Earth; and consequently if it was in Heaven, as we also acknowledge, it must needs have ascended thither. And indeed Christ himself doth intimate as much, whilst he saith in this Writer, chap. 3. 13. *None hath ascended into Heaven, but he that descended from Heaven, the Son of Man (which is or rather was in Heaven)* Whence afterwards, chap. 6. 63 [62]. he saith, *If therefore ye shall see the Son of Man ascend where he was before.* In both places he speaketh of the Son of Man, and here he doth not say, that he was at that very time in the Heaven, but had been formerly, and should afterwards ascend thither. From whence it manifestly appears, that he speaks not of the divine Nature, which is neither the Son of Man, nor could ever leave Heaven, nor ever ascend thither.

But furthermore, cannot an Angel which hath continually been in Heaven, be sent thence to the Earth, and so to men themselves? Wherefore what Christ here affirmeth of himself, containeth no intimation of supreme Divinity. To omit that although it contained, yet would it not presently follow, that he was the Son of God, and not the holy Spirit, if the holy Spirit likewise be, as they hold, the most high God. For he also is sent out of Heaven, and nothing hinders, if the Son of God would assume a human Nature, that he likewise should assume it, yea, it was necessary that it should be so, if he assumed, who is of the same Essence with him. Concerning which thing elsewhere.

We must now proceed to the other Causes for which Christ is called the Son of God; but with the omission of them which are also common to Believers (if you except the high perfection of them) although they yet read a mortal life; namely, that he was most like unto God in Holiness, and most intimate to him, for the more than fatherly love towards him; of which things enough elsewhere hath been spoken by our men.

The third Cause therefore for which Christ is called the Son of God, is his resurrection from the dead, I say, a resurrection to immortal Life. For he is therefore called by *Paul, The first-born from the dead, Col. 1. 18.* and also by *John, Rev. 1. 5.* But whose first-born is he but Gods? Although the word Resurrection may so far be extended, as to contain the fourth and chief cause for which Christ is called the Son of God, namely, the exaltation or advancement of Christ to the Empire, and sovereign Priesthood, as we will afterward more plainly shew. Now there is a very notable place which sheweth that Christ is the Son of God by reason of his Resurrection more largely taken, wherein the consequent exaltation is also comprehended, namely, *Acts 13. 32, 33.* where *Paul* speaketh thus. *And we declare unto you the promise which was made unto our Fathers, that God hath fulfilled it unto us their children, having raised Jesus, as it is also written in the 2d. Psalm. Thou art my Son, I this day begot thee.* A like passage to which is extant, *Rom. 1. 4.* where when the Apostle had called Christ the Son of God, that he might more fully declare it, he add, *Who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was determined the Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.* In the first place the cause why Jesus is the Son of God, is alledged to be this, namely, that he was raised from the dead. Now that this reason hath nothing common with the generation out of the Essence of God, nothing common with the supreme deity, which agreeth to Christ, is apparent enough from the thing it self, since the Resurrection is a thing of a certain time, not done from eternity, and agreeth to Christ only according to the human nature, as the Adversaries speak; and finally is not ascribed unto Christ as the true author, but to God the Father; and it is so far from arguing Christ to be the most high God, as that it rather demonstrateth him not to be so, as we

have before shewn in its own place. As for the latter place although these words, *By the resurrection of the dead*, may be understood merely of the time wherein Christ was made the Son of God. Nevertheless they shew manifestly enough, that Christ is there said to be made the Son of God for such a cause as had no place in him, especially so perfectly before the resurrection; which agreeth not to that eternal generation of the Son out of the Essence of the Father, nor to any cause for which Christ may be called the most high God.

Now that the matter may the more clearly appear, let us see what the Adversaries answer to these places. It is therefore wont to be answered unto both places, that the Apostle hath no other meaning than that it was declared by the resurrection of Christ, that he was the natural Son of God, that is begotten out of the very Essence of God, and that this is the meaning of the word *determined*, which is in the latter place. Some further add, that the word *rise* doth not signify the Resurrection of Christ from the dead, but his exhibition in the flesh; because the Apostle doth in the following verse, namely, 34. begin to confirm his Resurrection. Others acknowledge that the Resurrection of Christ from the dead is signified by that word; but they say that in Greek this participle is an Aorist, which hath the signification of the preterperfect tense, and is all one as if the Apostle had said, after he had *raised up Jesus*. So that the Apostle doth not affirm, that the expression of the Psalm wherein it is spoken of Christs generation from God, was fulfilled in his very resurrection, but after it, namely, when he was exalted, and made a King by God. But that answer which is alledged concerning the declaration of this, namely, that Christ is the Son of God, is of no moment. For as to the first place, from whence a judgement may and ought to be made of the latter, the word *begotten* cannot be understood of the declaration of a generation out of the Essence of God already made from eternity. For to omit that by this means that nice observation falls to the ground, which very many of the Adversaries fasten upon those words, *to day*, namely, that the eternity of God is thereby signified, wherein there is nothing past or future, but present only, in as much as it cannot be said, that God did from all eternity declare, that Christ was begotten out of his Essence; to omit, I say, this nicety, there are other things which overthrow that interpretation. For in the first place, what is this to the fulfilling of the Promise made to the Fathers, which God hath actually performed to their Children? They with whom we dispute confess, and the thing it self sheweth, that the promise of giving the Messias is here understood. But how is it pertinent hereunto, that God hath declared that Christ is such a Son, as was eternally begotten out of his Essence, for God could declare it many other ways, were the thing otherwise true, than by giving or making of Jesus a King, as they, with whom we dispute affirm he hath declared, but by this way he could in no wise declare the same, for that God hath made Jesus King, is so far from arguing that he was eternally begotten out of the Essence of God, and consequently the most high God, that the clean contrary is rather evinced from it, as we have before shewn, Chap 18. For if you say that he made himself King, in the first place, *Paul* doth not here urge that, in as much as he manifestly attributeth not to Christ himself but to the Father, both his Resurrection, and consequently (as they will have it) the declaration of his generation out of the Essence of God. But the other, not this, should have been urged by the Apostle, would he have intimated that Christ was declared to be the Son of God, begotten out of his Essence, by raising up himself from the dead. Again, although Christ had raised up himself, yet from the raising it self, whether you understand it of Christs nativity, or of his resurrection from the dead, it would not have appeared, whereas it ought to have appeared, if the raising of Christ ought to declare that Jesus was begotten out of the Essence of God, because he raised himself. Now that it did not appear is evident enough, for into whose mind would it come, either that he who is born is the author of his own nativity, or that he who riseth from the dead is the author of his own resurrection? inasmuch as he who is born had no being before, and he that riseth had by death lost his being, and is, as to the strength whereby he might rise, like unto him who is to be born.

It would be therefore necessary, that it should some otherway have been evident, that there was another Nature in him, which did both really exist before his Nativity, and also actually lived during his death, and consequently was the true cause either of his Nativity, or of his Resurrection: but this was the very thing which the Adversaries hold to have been declared by the raising him up, and to have been apparent from it. Finally, although it had been apparent, that Christ had raised up himself, yet how had it thence appeared, that he was the natural Son of God, eternally begotten out of his

Essence? For not to repeat that which we formerly shewd, namely, that from the Opinion of the Adversaries, it followeth, that the Soul of Christ could by divine Power raise its own Body; to omit likewise, that some other Spirit, which had before been united to his Body, might by divine Power have performed this: if the most high God can raise up himself, what hinders but that it was either the Father himself or the holy Spirit, whom they make the third Person of the *Deity*. Be it therefore that it appeared from the raising of Christ, that he himself was the Author thereof; be it that it appeared that he was the most high God, what argueth that he was eternally begotten out of the Essence of God? What connexion is there of the one with the other?

Furthermore, what man is there, who having looked into the words of the *Psalms*, doth not observe that this is the meaning of them, *Thou art my Son, because I have this day begotten thee*? What man also is there who doth not withal observe, that it is far more suitable to this sense, that the word *begotten*, should rather be taken to denote, the act of generating, than the declaration of a generation? What man is there, who, if he here such words as these, would understand them thus, *Thou art my Son, because I have this day declared that I have begotten thee*; and not rather thus, *Thou art my Son, because I have this day really begotten thee*? But what need many words? for if the resurrection of Christ, and the consequent exaltation or advancement to a Kingdom, especially a Priestly one, is a certain generation from God, and one may therefore be justly called the Son of God, although no other more sublime generation did precede, why should any one understand that generation, whereof mention is made in the words of the *Psalms*, rather of the declaration of an antecedent generation, than of the very act of generating? Since that which is expressed by the word *begotten*, was accomplished by the resurrection and exaltation of Christ. But we have already shewn, that the Resurrection of Christ, was a certain Generation from God; and we will a little after more largely shew the same.

Concerning the advancement to a Kingdom, none can make a question, who considers that Kings, Princes and Judges, are by God himself called both *gods*, and also the *sons of God*, or of the *Most High*, *Psal.* 82. 6. which place Christ citeth, *John* 10. 34. to shew that he did not blaspheme in saying, that he was the Son of God. But in that place, regard is had to nothing but the authority and dominion, to which they were advanced by God. For to all them in general, the name of *gods*, and *sons of God* is attributed as they are distinguished from men of an inferiour rank. And see, I pray you, how excellently these things agree both to the other words of the second *Psalms*, and also to the scope of the Apostle, fetching a Testimony from thence. For it is apparent from both, that in these words, *Thou art my Son, I have this day begotten thee*, it is spoken of making Christ a King. For after God had said, *I have set my King on Zion, my holy Mount, David* subjoineth, *I will declare the Decree*; what *Decree*, but such a one as was made concerning that thing, whereof he had begun to speak; namely, that God had set him King on *Zion, his holy Mountain*? But what are the words of the *Decree*? The *Lord saith he said unto me, Thou art my Son, I this day begat thee*. Why then do we seek starting holes? why go we about the bush? Why do not we directly and simply understand these things concerning the Generation of Christ, which consisteth in advancing him to a Kingdom by that Resurrection, rather then concerning the declaration of a Generation out of the Essence of God from all eternity, whereof there is here neither hint, nor footstep? By this means we may elegantly apply these words likewise to *David*, a Type of Christ, although in a far lower sense; to whom, that they are to be applied, both the very words of the *Psalms* make a shew, and others also before us have observed. For when God had sometimes rescued *David* out of sundry calamities, and also out of the very jaws of death, and made him King over his People, he did in a manner beget him, and make him his Son, and that such a Son, as would in respect of other earthly Kings, become the first-born in power and dignity. Whence God speaketh thus of him, *Psal.* B9. 2B. *I will make him, my First-born, higher than the Kings of the Earth*. But what agreed to *David* in that sense, doth in a far nobler way agree to Christ, *who being raised from the dead, was set at the right hand of God in heavenly places, far above all Principallities, and Powers, and Force, and Dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come; and all things were put in subjection under his feet, and he was made Head over all things to the Church, which is his Body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all*. May he not justly be said to have been begotten by God, to have become his Son? for he was not only begotten anew to an immortal life by the resurrection, but also did by the bounty of God, become very like to him in Power and Empire, for which God himself is called God. But by

reason of similitude with God, both Angels and Men are called Sons of God; which the greater it is, the more justly doth this name agree unto them: but no completer similitude can be imagined than that which we even now shewed to agree to Christ, whereby he doth so far surpass both all Angels and Men, that they in respect of Christ, are rather to be called Servants than Sons.

From hence it is already apparent, what is also to be thought of that other place, *Rom. 1. 4.* Although the place doth sufficiently guard it self without foreign help against the vulgar interpretation. For neither the scope of the Apostle, nor the words, nor the thing it self, suffer us to understand, that Christ by the resurrection from the dead, was declared the Son of God begotten out of his Essence. For the scope of the Apostle is to explain not how Jesus Christ was declared the Son of God, but how he is the Son of God; for having described Christ by the name of the Son of God, he accordingly declareth how this is to be understood. And lest any one should perhaps think, that it will thence follow, that he is not the Son of *David*, which notwithstanding the Scripture averreth, he sheweth how both may stand together. First, he teacheth how he is the Son of *David*, then how he is the Son of God; wherefore he saith, *Who was made of the Seed of David according to the flesh, who was determined or constituted the Son of God in Power according to the Spirit of Sanctification, by the Resurrection from the dead.* Doth not the very opposition shew, that, as it is there taught how Christ is indeed the Son of *David*, so it is here signified how he is indeed the Son of God? for neither would a declaration be rightly opposed to the word made, nor those diverse respects be one opposed to the other, namely, *according to the flesh, and according to the Spirit of Holiness*; that is, according to the Spirit wherewith Christ was sanctified. For that expression *according to the flesh*, would signify the reason of the subject; whereas the other, *according to the Spirit of Holiness*, would denote only the middle efficient Cause. Again, the word here rendered *determined*, doth no where in the Scripture, yea, no where at all, signify to be *declared*, unless you take the word declared, as it is then taken when one is said to be declared King or Consul, whilst he is constituted, and this Office is appointed to him. For the Greek word properly signifies to *define*, to determine, but in the Scripture it signifies nothing but to constitute, *to decree or design*, which thing doth excellently agree to Christ, in that he was made King by the intervening of the resurrection. But if you will with the antient interpreter, render it to *predestinate*, although neither the simple word it self requireth that version, nor the thing suffer it; nevertheless, it will be sufficiently evident, that Christ was not really the Son of God from eternity. For neither is that predestinated which is in being, but which is not yet in being, and here it is spoken of no other thing, than of the Sonship of Christ in relation to God. Yea, it will follow, that he at length in the resurrection, was fully ordained to be the Son of God. Finally, in the former place, *Acts 13.* we have shewn that the resurrection of Christ, had in no wise declared, that Christ was begotten of the Essence of God, and so was the Son of God, but rather the contrary.

Now that which concerns thei, Opinion, who contend that the Greek word in *Acts 13.* is not to be referred unto the resurrection of Christ from the dead: but unto his birth and first exhibition, which although he can both grant and urge without prejudice to our principal Argument, yet we will shew that this interpretation cannot subsist. First, because in that place, as we have already observed, such an act of God is spoken of, as whereby he fulfilled his promise of setting up a King over the *Jews*; which we have also shewn out of the words of the second *Psalms*. But Christ was not then made Lord and Christ, or the heavenly King of Gods People when he was born: but when he was raised and set at the right hand of God. Furthermore, both the preceding and following words of the Apostle, which they urge against us, shew that it is spoken of the resurrection from the dead. For when he had said, that *God had raised him (Christ) on the third day*, he adds, *being seen many days of those that accompanied him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people until now.* But whereof were they witnesses, if not of that which he had just now mentioned, and told them had been in some measure presented to their view, namely, the resurrection of Christ, and his exaltation, which followed thereupon? for of this thing they were properly witnesses. See above, chap. 1. 22. & 2. 32. & 3. 15. & 4. 33. & 5. 32. compared with the foregoing, and chap. 10. 40, 41, 42. Therefore seeing the Apostle subjoins, *And we declare this unto you which was promised to our Fathers, because (or that) God hath fulfilled the same unto us their Children, having raised up Jesus*; and it is necessary that he himself should speak of the resurrection of Christ from the dead. For he affirms that he had now declared the same thing to the *Jews* at *Antioch*, that the other Apostles had testified to the People of

*Judea*. If he then told them that he was a witness to the people of the resurrection, and following exaltation, he intimates that he now also speaketh of the same thing. But that which belongs to the following words by them urged against us, is not at length proved in that place, that Christ was raised from the dead: but that being supposed as already sufficiently proved, it only shews, that Christ was so raised from the dead, as no more to return to corruption. For some one might have scrupled, that though Christ were indeed raised from the dead, yet the promise made unto the Fathers be unperformed, seeing Christ might have been so raised, as afterwards to have returned unto corruption; whereas the Messiah promised of old unto the Fathers, and his Government, ought to endure unto the end of the world; as the Writings of the Prophets teach; See 2 *Sam.* 7. 13, 14. and compare it with *Heb.* 1. 5. and *Psal.* 45. 7. (compared with *Heb.* 1. 8.) and 110. 1, 4. and *Dan.* 7. 14. as also *John* 12. 34. The Apostle therefore removes this doubt from his hearers, whilst he adds, *But that he hath raised him from the dead, no more to return unto corruption*, thus he said, *I will give unto you the sure Mercies of David; namely, the Promise that proceeded from Grace and Mercy*, and so onward. Whereby we understand that he had spoken of the resurrection in the words immediately preceding, and sufficiently proved the same; now to remove all manner of doubt, he is willing to speak of the same matter somewhat larger, although that be also absurd, that *Paul*, having but newly said that Christ was at first exhibited, and either born or sent into the world, should presently add, that God had so raised him from the dead, as no more to return to corruption. For what connexion is there? Is it not evident, that those latter words require that the Apostle should speak next of his Resurrection?

But that which concerns those, who say that the promise of Christ, and that expression in the second *Psalms*, God had not fulfilled in raising of Christ, but when he was risen; we will not much contend with for we our selves freely confess; if the raising of Christ be taken in a strict sense, barely for his returning to life, without respect to his exaltation afterwards, that divine promise and expression of the Psalm, had not as yet been really performed. But yet notwithstanding it is to be noted first, that the expression of raising, or resurrection of Christ, doth sometimes by a kind of Synecdoche joined with a Metonymy, comprehend the whole Glory of Christ, to wit, Immortality and Supreme Power that he obtained by the Resurrection. And in this sense only this word seems to be taken, *Acts.* 2. 32, 33. and 4. 33. (compared with 5. 32. & 10. 40, &c.) *Rom.* 4. 25. & 10. 9. *Phil.* 3. 10. 1 *Pet.* 1. 3. and 3. 21. Furthermore, it is also to be observed, that the Participle Aorists, being joined to Verbs of the Pretertense, have oftentimes the same force as Participles of the Presentense when they are joined to the same Verbs. Whereof you have examples amongst others in *Heb.* 1. 4. & 7. 21. & 11. 9. 2 *Pet.* 2. 6, 15. besides that which is every where found in the Evangelists, *he answering, said*. Wherefore it may be rightly concluded, that the Apostles words are to be understood, as if he had said, God hath fulfilled the Promise made unto the Fathers, *having raised* (as an ancient Interpreter hath it) *or in raising Jesus*; chiefly because unto Christs generation of God, the very restoring of him to life, did also conduce, seeing that thereby he was as it were begotten again: but the Immortality which Christ obtained by the intervening of the Resurrection, was far more available. After this manner indeed he became like unto God in his Nature; whereupon our Resurrection also is called Regeneration: and Christ affirmeth, that they who shall be counted worthy of that Age, and the resurrection from the dead, *are the Sons of God, seeing they are the Children of the Resurrection*, *Luke* 20. 36 And *Paul* affirmeth, *That we look for the adoption of the Sons of God, even the redemption of our bodies*, *Rom.* B. 23. For *the fellowship or participation of the divine Nature*, which *Peter* speaks of 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. doth principally consist in Immortality. But hither tends most of all the divine Empire and Power of Christ, for which he is the Son of God in the perfectest manner. If therefore you will only interpret the Greek Participle, *Jesus being risen*; or *after that he had raised Jesus*, we should understand, that the Promise made unto the Fathers, was then really and perfectly fulfilled touching the Messiah; or an extraordinary King that was to be given to the Israelites, and moreover also, that expression of the Psalm, *Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee*, when Jesus was raised from the dead by God, and set at his right hand in the heavenly places, and so made Christ, or a King, and Lord, by the Power and Grace of God. For hence, as we have already seen, doth the Divine Author to the *Hebrews*, chap. 5. 5. take those words of the Psalm, touching the glorification of Christ, or the Priestly honour that was conferred upon him, which doth indeed contain his Royal Power, seeing that his Kingdom is Priestly, and his Priesthood Royal. And hereupon they are elsewhere also in holy Scripture, taken for the same thing, that Jesus is the *Son of God*, and that Jesus is *Christ*, that is, a King anointed by God

over his people, or a *Lord*, even him by whom alone God would administer and govern his Church, with all things belonging to her. For upon this account the principal doctrine of the supreme dignity of Christ, and our faith and confession of him are promiscuously placed in this, that *Jesus is Christ* or *Lord*, or that *Jesus is the Son of God*. Whence it likewise comes to pass, that as often as those two, namely, to be *Christ*, and to be the *Son of God*, are mentioned together of Jesus of *Nazareth*, they are never joined by the copulative particle and, as things different (although this particle hath often times the force of explication only) but they are without it every where joined by apposition, to shew that different things are not connected, but the same thing is diversely described. See *Matth.* 16. 16. 26. 63. *John* 6. 69. 11. 27. 20. 31. And it is first of all to be noted, that that famous confession of Peter, touching Christ and his supreme dignity, being likewise declared in the name of the other disciples, is described by *Matthew*, Chap. 16. 16. in these words, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God*. But by *Mark* Chap. 8. 29. only in these words, *Thou art Christ*: By *Luke*, Chap. 9. 20. *The Christ of God*: Which two latter Evangelists would have left out one, and a principal part indeed of that confession, if it had been one thing *to be the Son of the living God*, and another thing *to be Christ*. But if both be indeed the same thing, they have in effect omitted nothing, but only expressed the same thing more briefly. But now to be Christ, or to be anointed of God, doth in no wise constitute the most high God, nor argue him to be so, but the contrary, seeing that the most high God can be anointed by none, nor be made a King by any one.

And least haply any should say that there still remains another, and that a more sublime cause, for which Jesus may be called the Son of God; that is refuted partly by the Scriptures silence thereof, which could not have omitted so great a matter, and partly from those testimonies of Scripture we have hitherto alledged. For not here to repeat other things, if there had been any other weightier cause for for which Jesus might be called the Son of God, it could in no wise have been omitted in the place before examined by us, *Rom.* 1. 4. For there, as we have seen, the Apostle intended to shew by what reason Christ may be called the Son of God; but he doth not in that place take the name *of the Son of God* in any other signification than that which is most excellent, whilst he describeth him by the appellation *of the Son of God*, the proper name of Jesus Christ having not as yet been expressed. Wherefore we ought to think that he hath expressed the most excellent, or if you will rather, the true and genuine reason of that appellation. But doth he express that to be the cause of that thing, that Christ was begotten out of the Essence of God from eternity, and so was the most high God? by no means: but this rather, which contradicts that and suffers not that Christ should be the most high God, when he saith, that he was *made the Son of God*, and indeed *according to the Spirit of holiness*, that is according to the Spirit wherewith he was sanctified, and that by *the resurrection from the dead*, for that some understand, *by the Spirit of holiness*, the divine Essence, it is done both without an example and without reason, yea contrary to the word *ordained* or *appointed*, and finally to the resurrection from the dead, from which, or by which that might have come to pass. It is manifest therefore that there is no other more sublime cause for which Jesus may be called the Son of God but this, that being raised from the dead, he was made by God both Lord and Christ, or the heavenly and eternal King of his people. Moreover the same thing is plainly seen from the second Psalm, a place that we have explained already. For all, as I know, confess, that when God speaketh thus unto Christ, *thou art my Son*, the name of the Son of God is taken in the most excellent manner. But we have seen that this is the cause why he is in that place called the Son of God, because he, being raised from the dead, was not only made immortal, but also the King of Gods people, and besides, the Priest and Prince of our Salvation, as we have shewn partly from the very Psalm, and partly from *Acts* 13. and *Heb.* 5. Whereto may be added *Heb.* 1. 4, 5. For, when the divine Author had there said, that Christ having purged away our sins by himself, was set at the right hand of God on high, he adds: *Being made so much better, or rather more honourable than the Angels, as he had inherited a more different (that is) a better and more excellent name than they. For to which of the Angels said he at any time: thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son.* From which place it is understood, that the name of the Son of God is not Essential unto Christ, whilst he is said to have inherited it, nor that it is the name of the most high God, for as much as by his exaltation he obtained a dignity and excellency, equal to that name and title, which doth not happen to the most high God. Besides the thing it self shews that Christ is here spoken of according to his human nature, as they say, and also that this is such a name as agrees to Christ according to that

nature. Unto which also the following passage accords, I will be unto him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son, wherein the same sense is expressed. For these words do in like manner argue that it is not spoken of such a thing, as is proper to the most high God, and was in being from all eternity. For both the words do openly respect something future, and in the first and literal sense, as they say, were spoken most clearly of *Solomon* the type of Christ in that respect, as others also confess. Compare 2 *Sam.* 7. 14. with the words both foregoing and following, and 1 *Chron.* 22. 10. and 26. 6. compare also 1 *King* 5. 5. 8. 19. It is therefore necessary, that there should be such a similitude and analogy between the reason whereby Christ is the Son of God, & that whereby *Solomon* was the Son of God, inasmuch as this is a certain representation of that; but how was that, whereby *Solomon* was the Son of God, a certain representation of this whereby Christ is the Son of God, if Jesus be therefore the Son of God, because he was begotten of the Fathers Essence from eternity, and so the same God with the Father? But if Jesus be the Son of God, by reason of most high love, and the benefits flowing from the same, which God bestowed upon him, amongst which the heavenly Kingdom and Empire, that was granted unto him, holdeth the principal place. *Solomon* is rightly constituted the type of Christ, and the words, uttered of him in the literal sense, are rightly and elegantly referred unto him, in a mystical and far stricter sense. It is evident therefore, that neither in the words of the second Psalm, there cited, is any thing contained of the eternal generation of Christ out of the Fathers Essence. Finally, who doubteth, when *Peter* had confessed that Jesus was the Son of God, or when we are commanded to believe and confess the same thing of him, if we would be accounted Christians, and be saved, that the name of the Son of God, is taken in the most perfect signification, wherein it agrees unto Christ? But we saw then that it doth in very deed signify no otherwise, than that Jesus is Christ, or a King appointed of God, and set over his people, to defend and preserve them for ever. wherefore it is to be concluded that this is the principal reason, for which he is called the Son of God, neither can any better be found. But since that doth not constitute Christ the most high God, but rather shews that he is not the most high God; it follows, that there is no other cause of his Son-ship, as they say, which can make Christ the most high God.

We have spoken somewhat largely of the first reason, which shews, that Christ is not the most high God, therefore because he is the Son of God; partly because, if we rightly observe, there are more arguments of our opinion contained in it; and partly because this, that Christ is the Son of God, is commonly believed to contain the strongest argument of the contrary opinion. Wherefore it is to be shewn in a few words, how exceedingly men commonly err, and the true opinion be proved from the reason whereby Christ is the Son of God.

There follows now another proof of the principal Arguments Assumption, which we will dispatch very briefly, namely, that it is very clear from the holy Scripture, that Christ died for us, according to that nature, according to which he was the Son of God, and indeed only begotten and proper. But if he were in that manner the Son of God as he was begotten of the Essence of God, and so was the most high God, he could not have died according to that nature, according to which he is the Son of God. For the most high God, as such, cannot die, yea, cannot in any respect whatsoever. But that which we have already spoken of Christ, is from thence manifest, that the greatest love of God towards us, is in the holy Scriptures shewn from this, that he delivered *his only begotten*, or, *his own Son unto death for us*. See *John* 3. 16. compared with *vers.* 14. and *Rom.* 8. 32. 1 *John* 4. 10. compared with *vers.* 9. aforegoing: add also *Rom.* 5. 10. compared with *vers.* 8. But if Christ died not according to that nature, according to which he was the Son of God; but according to another nature, which was added to the person of the only begotten Son of God, it can neither be truly said of the proper and only begotten Son of God, that he died. or was given for us; neither can the greatest love of God towards us be from thence collected. For what so great wonder is it, for some accession of the only begotten Son of God, or some nature, that was added unto him, to have been bestowed on us, if in the mean while the only begotten Son of God, who was from eternity, had apparently remained safe and entire, nor had he felt any the least pain thereby? Wherefore then is this so vehemently urged, that God delivered up his Son for us, even his proper and only begotten Son, or that he should die for us, that from thence the greatness of the divine love might be understood? But if thou beleevest that even he, the man Christ Jesus, that was begotten of the Virgin *Mary* by a divine power, that was sanctified and sent by God into the world, that was appointed Ruler and Governour of all things even before the foundations

of the world were laid who was most like God in holiness, wisdom and power, and as *Paul* speaketh, was in the form of God, and equall to God, and whom God (as it appears) so entirely loved, if, I say, thou beleevest that he was the only begotten and proper Son of God, then thou mayst at length understand that the only begotten Son of God, and not any thing, that was added to him, died for us; and from thence mayst learn to judge both of the love of God, and of his only begotten Son, who gave himself up to a death so cruel for our sakes. Thus much for the first argument of this order.

## CHAP. XLI: No Incarnation of the most high God in the Scriptures

### **The two and thirtieth Argument, *That there is no mention made in holy Scripture of the Incarnation of the most high God.***

We are able to frame a second Argument, that if Christ were the most high God, who, as that opinion requires, came down from heaven into the womb of a Virgin, and was there incarnated, it were altogether necessary, that this incarnation ought to have been most plainly expressed, not in one, but many places by the Writers of the Gospel and other divine men and the Apostles. For to repeat some of those things that have in this place by our men been very fully explained elsewhere; we see, that those things are most clearly and frequently declared in the Scriptures, which are somewhat hard to be believed, yet most necessary to be believed; as the creation of Heaven and earth, Gods providence over human affairs, the knowledge of our thoughts, the resurtection of the dead, and eternal life to be bestowed on men. Nor do we see only those things, which are altogether necessary to be believed, most elegantly expressed in Scripture: But also other things besides, which we said were in themselves of lesser moment, as that Christ came of the seed of *David*. But now the incarnation of the most high God would be altogether necessary to be believed, if it had really been, although most hard to be believed; of which that is urged by the Adversaries, who therefore accuse us of most grievous heresy and highest impiety, that we deny it: but this they freely confess, and are forced to confess. For who seeth not, that this thing is exceedingly contrary to the judgement of reason, and such at least, as mere reason will judge impossible? Wherefore it were necessary, that that incarnation should both have been most plainly described in the Scriptures, and also most frequently repeated and inculcated by Godly men, that were very careful of our salvation, so that indeed no one might doubt that it was asserted and urged by them. But that that is not done is manifest partly from thence, that what places soever the Adversaries produce to prove that opinion, are such that there is need of consequences, to the end they may deduce this opinion, that the most high God was incarnated or made man; partly because that incarnation is not expressed in those places, in which if it had been true, it must needs have been expressed. For when *Matthew* and *Luke* describe the history of Christs nativity, and rehearse some things that are of a much lesser moment than that incarnation of the most high God; as that he was born of that Virgin that was espoused to an Husband, that he was conceived by the holy Spirit, that he was born in *Bethlehem*, that I may not repeat other things which *Luke* very diligently declares, and *Matthew* omits: how can it be that they should have omitted what had been the principal thing of all in the whole matter, and most necessary to be known and believed, to wit, that the most high God came down into the womb of a Virgin, and there assumed flesh, and afterwards was born? *Luke* speaks of the manger wherein Christ was laid so soon as he was born; and would he have been silent of the incarnation of the most high God, the hypostatical union of the divine and human nature? Whereas our Adversaries cannot now speak touching Christs nativity without mentioning that thing, yea how could it come to pass that *Mark* should leave out all the history of Christs nativity, wherein the incarnation should have been contained, and *John*, whom they judge to have written of the incarnation, should so briefly, so obscurely touch and handle the same? How can it be that the Apostles when they would bring men to Christ and exhorted them to beleieve on him, and to that end declared his majesty, should make no mention of a thing so necessary? Peter preacheth the first Sermon after he had received the holy Spirit, whereupon three thousand men believed in Christ, and were baptized in his name; and also a second to the same people, but there was no mention made of the incarnation; Nor also in the speeches that the same Apostle made either to the Rulers and Elders of the people or to *Cornelius* and others concerning Jesus Christ. There was no mention made of it in *Pauls* oration which he made in the synagogue at *Antioch*, none in that at *Athens* on *Mars-hil*, none in that at *Cesarea* before King *Agrippa*, the *Festus* President and many others. And indeed *Athens* he had a fair occasion to declare that thing, when he spake of the unknown God. But in all those speeches of the Apostles you can read nothing of Christ more sublime, than that he had been raised by God from the dead was received into Heaven, was made Lord and Christ, was exalted by the right hand of God to be a Prince and Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sious, was made judge of the quick and dead. Again, How often do the Apostles commend the exceeding great love and bounty of God exhibited in Christ Jesus to mankind? But what more illustrious argument could there have been of

this love, then that the most high God should willingly be made man for mans sake? Wherefore then is there so great silence in those places concerning this thing? Namely, because it never was, neither was there any (that we may briefly add this thing also) cause which did require that the most high God, the creator of Heaven and earth should assume flesh. For as much as the man Christ Jesus being assisted by divine power, was able to performe, and did really performe when he was upon earth all things that belonged unto our salvation both in teaching, and also in working miracles, and finally, in obeying his Father in all things, and was able also to performe, and did so indeed performe by the same divine power whatsoever things are required to the perfecting of our Salvation. But who dares to say, that God would admit a thing so contrary to his Majesty, without the greatest cause, or rather necessity, although at length it were possible for his nature? But we will not enlarge on this matter, because these things are here and there handled in our Arguments that belong to this place.

But if any one desire to see this also more fully explained, he may read elsewhere in ours.

## **CHAP. XLII: The holy Spirit given unto Christ**

### **The three and thirtieth Argument, *That the holy Spirit was given unto Christ.***

We will make the third Argument this, that the holy Spirit was given by God unto Christ: of which thing we do not read only in one place of holy Scripture. For both in the Old Testament, chiefly in *Isaiah* there are some testimonies of this thing, and also in the New, where some places are likewise cited out of the Old. For so speaketh *Isaias*, in the beginning of the 11th Chapter, *And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and piety*, or as it is in the Hebrew, *of the fear of the Lord*. Which all both see and confess to be spoken of Christ. Likewise in the beginning of the 42d Chapter, God speaketh of the same Christ, *Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth, I have put my Spirit upon him*. Which words are cited by Christ, *Matth.* 12. 17. And Chap. 61. 1. the Prophet bringeth in Christ speaking after this manner: *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for that the Lord hath anointed me*. Which words Christ himself testifieth to be fulfilled in him, *Luke* 4. 18. &c. But in the same Gospel we read how the holy Spirit descended on Christ, when he was baptized of *John*, and abode upon him, *Matth.* 3. 16. *Luke* 3. 22. and *John* 1. 32, 33. Whence *Luke* in the beginning of his fourth Chapter saith, *That Jesus being full of the holy Spirit, went up out of Jordan*. And *Peter* with the same Writer testifieth, *Acts* 10. 38. *That God had anointed him with the holy Spirit and with power*. Whence Christ proveth that he cast out Devils *in or by the Spirit of God*, (which thing also *Peter Acts* 10. doth plainly shew) and accuseth the Pharisees of blasphemy against the holy Spirit, that they durst to ascribe to *Beelzebub* the Prince of Devils, such kind of miracles as were done by the very power of the holy Spirit, *Matth.* 12. 28. 31. *Mark* 3. compare *vers.* 30. with the foregoing. And *Luke* saith, *Acts* 1. 2. That Christ in the same day wherein he was taken up, *gave commandment to the Apostles by the holy Spirit*, that is by the motion of the holy Spirit. For neither did he make use of the ministry of the holy Spirit, by whose intervening help he gave commandments to his disciples; although others by transposition connect the words *by the holy Spirit*, with the following, *whom he had chosen*, whereof it is not necessary to dispute in this place. For as to our purpose the force of the words will be the same, to wit, that Christ by the motion of the holy Spirit chose the Apostles. Neither is it a wonder, seeing that he was *the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel, the Spirit of knowledge*, that is, who produced Wisdom, Understanding, Counsel, Knowledge, and bestowed it on Christ, as appears from *Isa.* 11. a place cited by us.

But that we may from hence demonstrate, that Christ is not the most high God, we will not now use that reason, that by this means something was given unto him by God the Father: which Argument we have elsewhere explained: but this, that he would not truly have stood in need of the holy Spirit, if he were the most high God, especially if that Opinion of the Adversaries be laid down, that the holy Spirit is a Person distinct from the Father and the Son. For what help, I pray you, can the holy Spirit yield unto the most high God? What is there that the most high God cannot perform of himself? For it is not what they say, that Christ's human Nature needed the assistance of the holy Spirit. For that I may not urge that now, that those things are spoken simply of Christ, that are not to be spoken if he were the most high God, as of whom they are simply to be denied: What need was there of the help of the holy Spirit, the third Person of the Deity, as they will have it, unto the human Nature, if the very same was personally joined to the second Person of the Deity; if the whole fulness of the divine Essence (as they interpret that place *Col.* 2. 9.) did dwell therein bodily; if, as the same persons judge, that divine Nature did bestow all the supernatural Gifts upon the human, that hapned unto it; if that did either communicate unto it all its Properties, or at least the full knowledge of all things, as the major part of the Adversaries judge? Whether or no the holy Spirit could add any thing to this store? Wherefore, I pray, is Christ deciphered rather by the holy Spirit, than by his own Nature, either to have cast out Devils, or to have commanded any thing, or to have been endued with Wisdom, Understanding, Counsel, Might, Knowledge, the Fear of the Lord?

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Some one will perhaps say, that therefore those things are rather attributed to the holy Spirit, than to the divine Nature or Person of Christ, because they belong unto Christs Sanctification, and that Sanctification, although common to the whole Trinity, is properly ascribed to the holy Spirit. But they speak thus not only without reason, but even contrary to reason. We will not now rehearse that, that Christ's Sanctification cannot be rather attributed to the holy Spirit, than to the Father, to whom the same is so ascribed, that it is urged as a cause why Christ is his Son. For hence it would follow, if the the same agree rather to the holy Spirit, than to the Father, that the holy Spirit would be rather the Father of Christ, than God himself, who both is the Father of Christ, and is every where in the new Testament so called. That we will say here, which is proper to this place, if any reason can be imagined, why that, which is common to all the Persons, should notwithstanding be ascribed rather to one, than to another; that here would be great cause, why this action is rather to be ascribed to the Son, than to any other Person, and indeed a double cause. The one is that most strict conjunction which agreeth unto the Son according to his human Nature; as the Adversaries Opinion urges. The other is, that the same Adversaries will have the Son to be the natural Wisdom and Power of God, by which he makes all things; and hither they bring those words which in *Prov.* 8. are spoken abstractively, and in general touching Wisdom; and also those which we read of Christ, *1 Cor.* 1. 24. But unto which divine Person would it rather agree to bestow on the human Nature of Christ Wisdom, Understanding, Counsel, Knowledge, than to that, which was nearest unto that Nature, and is the natural Wisdom of God himself? To what would it better agree, than to the natural Virtue and Power of God, to do all those stupendious works by the human Nature? All those things therefore are rather to be attributed to the divine Nature of Christ, than to the holy Spirit.

Besides, we demand of them that make use of this kind of exception, whether or no they determine, that the holy Spirit contributed more to the bestowing of those Gifts upon the human Nature, than the divine Person of Christ himself, or as much the one as the other Person? If that, they overthrow their own Opinion; if this, the Scripture. For if they admit that, either there was not so much power in the divine Person of Christ to perform the same, as was in the holy Spirit, or not so great a will. Neither can be spoken of it, if Christ were the most high God, and indeed of the same Essence with the holy Spirit. But if they admit this, there will be no evident cause, why it should be expressly attributed to the holy Spirit, that he bestowed those Gifts on the man Christ, and no where to the divine Person or Nature of Christ himself. Wherefore this exception hath there no place, and consequently neither the distinction of a human and divine Nature in Christ. For this very thing we demand, why was the holy Spirit given to the human Nature, if that were personally united to the divine Nature.

## CHAP. XLIII: Christ tempted of the Devil

### **The four and thirtieth Argument, *That Christ was tempted of the Devil.***

The fourth Argument of this kind, is this, that Christ, as the History of the Gospel declareth, was tempted of the Devil, and solicited to worship him, and that he was to this very end, namely, that he might be tempted of the Devil, led by the holy Spirit into the wilderness. For this would by no means have hapned, if Christ had been the most high God. For first, what is more unworthy of God, than to expose himself to this impious and wicked Enemy, whom for the contempt of his Majesty, most clearly heretofore seen, he had thrust out of Heaven, to be tempted and solicited to the adoration of him, and so to offer himself of his own accord to be mocked of the Devil? Again, to what purpose should Christ do this? Was it that it might appear, that the most high God was able to endure and overcome the temptations of the Devil? Was there any one who could make any doubt thereof, so that there should need any trial thereof? Furthermore, how durst the Devil attempt so great a matter? I will not now mention, that the Devils tremble at the sight of the divine Majesty, inasmuch as they are afraid at the memory of him, in that they were by him cast out of Heaven, and thrust down to Hell. For feign you now in the wicked spirit, who is very conscious both of the Wrath and invincible Power of God, and of the bonds wherein he is held by him, as much boldness and impudency as you please, yet must you withal confess, that he is exceeding cunning; and I would this were not to be confest! But how can it be, that a most cunning spirit should tempt the most high God, and endeavour to seduce him, and conceive in his mind such a project, as that he should sollicite him to a thing most unworthy and detestable, namely, the adoration of the Devil? For can it be, either that he should attempt a thing which he well knoweth to be impossible, or should not clearly perceive that this thing is altogether impossible? Neither of these things are incident to him, that hath so much as a grain of wit, much less could it happen to a most subtil and cunning spirit.

Moreover, when he saith, *If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become loaves*; And again, *If thou art the Son of God, cast thy self down*: He sufficiently sheweth, that his intention is to make Christ by some means, to begin to doubt, whether he be indeed the Son of God, whom he had a little before heard from Heaven, that he was, and consequently to seek further proofs of a thing some way doubtful. But how could he hope by any means whatsoever, to effect this with such a Son of God, as was begotten out of the divine Essence? For do we think, that an enemy most practised in this kind of fighting, who is commonly called the Author of a thousand cunning tricks, did here use such a kind of tempting, as was the unfittest of all to deceive, and so made use of arms so vain and ridiculous, to assail a most valiant and wise Captain? What would Satan get, if by any reasons he should endeavour to persuade even a common man (who is well in his wits) to doubt of himself whether he was a man, and not rather something inferiour to a man? Would not this rather be a sport than a temptation? But it would be much more ridiculous by any reason whatsoever, to go about to persuade the Son of God, begotten out of the divine Essence, that he should doubt whether he be the Son of God or not.

But you will understand that thing is far otherwise, if you observe that Christ was pronounced by God, to be his Son in such a manner as did not belong to his Essence, and which was indeed grounded on the divine Love, and therein chiefly consisted, that he was already designed to be the Messiah, or heavenly or eternal King of the People of God, such an one as he after actually became. For you will easily understand, that this most cunning enemy did not fight so foolishly, when he called that in question, and that there was no need of a buckler to receive his weapons. I at present omit other things, which occur in that History of the temptation of Christ, as that Satan having brought him into a most high Mountain, shewed him all the Kingdoms of this World, and the glory thereof, as not sufficiently known, or not sufficiently observed by his eye, to the end that he might the more easily allure him to worship the Devil, and that he durst to say before him to this very end, *All this power will I give thee, and the glory thereof, for they are delivered to me, and to whom I will, I give them.* For it is apparent, that Satan understood well enough, that he had not to do with the most high God, but with him, who in respect of his Essence, was a Man, but out of the singular Love of God was his

Son; whom because God had of his own accord, offered to him to be tempted, to the end he might give a proof of his Virtue and Piety; he thought it not altogether impossible, by his arts, to draw him from God. But the ingenious Reader will of himself observe both these and other things.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Neither may any one say, that these things which we have deduced from this History, do therefore not follow, because Christ was tempted according to his human Nature only, and not according to his divine Nature. For to omit the repetition of other things, that have formerly been often spoken, the same absurdities will still follow, although you hold that Satan tempted the human Nature only, but personally united to the most high God, and joined by an indissolvable tie; and that God willed that this human Nature should be tempted. For it would have been unworthy of the most high God, to expose himself in a Nature personally united to him, to an impious and detestable Adversary, that he might mock him and sollicit him to his worship. For the human Nature could do nothing, unless the divine did consent thereunto. Wherefore Satan solliciting the human Nature of Christ to worship him, should together have sollicited the divine Nature to consent to so horrid a crime, and to permit it unto the human Nature. Likewise it had been superfluous, to shew, that a Nature personally united to the most high God, could endure and vanquish the temptation of Satan. For who could make any doubt concerning that matter? Whence it is also apparent, that Satan could not have the least hope to overcome it. For what? could Satan believe it possible, that the divine Nature should so far forsake the human, personally united to it, as to yield to him, and commit a most heinous offence, and so become liable to eternal damnation? did not Satan perceive that he had to do, not only with the human, but also with the divine Nature; and that this Nature was to be seduced, and the wickedness to be persuaded to it, if the human Nature ought to be overcome? What therefore remaineth, but to say, that Satan had no certain knowledge of that union of the human Nature with the divine? but what? Did not Satan, who undertook to oppose this very thing, that Jesus was the Son of God, understand what these words did signify? But, if the Opinion of the Adversaries be true, they signify, that the man Jesus is one Person with the son of God, eternally begotten out of the substance of God. Who would believe, if, as the Adversaries hold, the Incarnation of the Son, eternally begotten out of the Essence of God, was foretold in the holy Scripture, declared to the Virgin *Mary*, and afterward actually performed and acknowledged by her and others, and signified by the heavenly voice of Christ's Baptism, that Satan should have no certainty of this very thing? especially if he heretofore saw God in Heaven, and in him all his Decrees (for the Adversaries hold these to be really the same with God or his Essence) and consequently understood, that the second Person of the Trinity should in those days be incarnated. But in a thing that is evident, there needeth no more to be spoken; only we will add this thing, that whereas Satan intended to make Christ doubt, whether he were the Son of God, namely, that Son, whom he had a little before heard the divine voice, pronounce him to be, it is not suitable that he should in his temptation pass by that Nature of Christ, according to which he was the Son of God. But the Adversaries hold this to be the divine Nature. Wherefore they must renounce either this opinion, or this limitation, whereby they restrain this temptation to the human Nature.

Now we do not conceive, that any discreet man will say, that this Argument is drawn from the testimony of the Devil, who is a lying spirit. For we, contrary to the intention of the Devils words, urge, that that very man, whom the Devil tempted, was and is the Son of God, a little before commended by the heavenly Voice in Baptism. Wherefore the Argument is not drawn from the testimony of the Devil, as if he had said that very thing, we would have; but partly from the act of God, appointing Christ to be tempted, and exposed to the snares of Satan; partly from the sense, words and intention of Satan, as effect, which could not have come to pass, unless our Opinion were true.

## **CHAP. XLIV: Christ the First-born of every Creature**

### **The five and thirtieth Argument, *That Christ is the First-born of every Creature.***

The fifth Argument may be drawn from thence, that Christ is called the *First-born of every Creature*, *Col. 1. 15.* and he doth in the same sense call himself the *Beginning of the Creation of God*, *Rev. 3. 14.* Now as for the first, the Adversaries hold, that it is spoken of Christ according to a divine Nature, and is no mean Argument of that very Nature: when nevertheless the First-born must of necessity, be always contained in the number of them; of whom, except the Parents, it is said to be the first-born; and consequently Christ must be comprehended in the number of Creatures, whose Firstborn he is said to be, which cannot agree to the most high God.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

For whereas they commonly so expound the place, as if it were said, that Christ was born before every creature; this, if it be so taken, as that Christ should be wholly exempted out of the number of all Creatures, is done without any example, and contrary to the received use of speaking in the holy Scripture, and in ordinary speech. Which very thing, certain very learned men among the Adversaries, have sufficiently perceived. For *John Piscator*, although he allow that Exposition as Orthodox, doth notwithstanding propose it to consideration, whether a different Exposition brought by him, be not genuine, namely, that we should understand Christ to be called the First-born of every Creature, because he is the chief Heir of all things. And he a little after addeth, That the native signification of the word *First-born*, hindreth it from being understood of the divine Generation of the Son of God out of the Substance of the Father, for it properly signifieth him who is born at the first birth; and so agreeth to the Mother, not to the Father.

## **CHAP. XLV: Christ equal to God**

### **The thirty sixth Argument, *That Christ is equal to God.***

That place, *Phil. 2. 6, &c.* which is wont to be urged against us, containeth several Arguments of our Opinion. For besides what we have formerly urged, that Christ is there several times distinguished from God simply put; that he was obedient unto God; that he was exalted by him; and that to him was given by God a name above every name; and that the Dignity and Honour given to him, is affirmed to redound to the glory of God the Father, as to the utmost object thereof: besides all these things, I say, this also argueth Christ not to be the most high God, that he is said to be equal unto God. Which the greatest part of the Adversaries say is spoken of him according to the divine Nature, and is an open proof of that Nature. But that, which is equal, hath always a different Essence from that to which it is equal; otherwise the same thing would be equal to it self: whereas equals are relatives, and consequently opposites. If therefore Christ be equal to God, and that as they imagine, in respect of Essence and essential Properties, the Essence of Christ must of necessity be different from the Essence of God. Wherefore they must either hold two divine independent Essences, or two most high Gods, or that Christ is not the most high God.

More Arguments might be brought, but we will at present be content with these; especially because some of them shall hereafter be touched, when we shall prove our Opinion out of such Principles as Reason it self affordeth. For neither will we so draw Arguments from Reason, as that we will not now and then recall the Adversaries to the Testimonies of the Scripture.

### **THE THIRD SECTION.**

#### **WHEREIN IS SHEWN, THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT IS NOT THE MOST HIGH GOD, THAT IT MAY APPEAR THAT THE FATHER ONLY IS THE MOST HIGH GOD.**

It now followeth, that we should shew what we undertook to demonstrate in the third place, namely, That the holy Spirit is not the most high God. Although the business may easily be decided by what we have disputed concerning Christ. For though those testimonies also of the holy Scripture, which shew that the Father only is the most high God, do withal strongly demonstrate, that the holy Spirit is not the most high God; seeing it is granted that the holy Spirit is not the Father, yet will we not use them in this place. For in this place we do not demonstrate, that the holy Spirit is not the most high God; because the Father only is the most high God: but on the contrary, because neither the Son, nor the holy Spirit is the most high God, we evince, that the Father only is the most high God. But with those testimonies wherewith we have shewn that Christ is not the most high God, we can here also demonstrate, that the holy Spirit is not the most high God. For neither can it be, if Christ be not the most high God, that the holy Spirit should be the most high God. Whence neither was there ever any man, that I know of, who, not acknowledging Christ for the most high God, did imagine that the holy Spirit notwithstanding was the most high God. And the reason hereof is manifest, whether you consider the thing it self, or the opinion of the Adversaries. For as to the thing it self, how could it come to pass, that Christ should send the holy Spirit, and give him to men, if the holy Spirit were the most high God, and Christ were not so? For could he send and give the most high God, who is inferior to him? And as for the opinion of the Adversaries, they hold, that the holy Spirit hath his Essence as from the Father, so also from the Son. But how can the most high God have his Essence from him that is not the most high God? The Creator from a creature? He that was from all eternity, from him that began to exist at a certain time? Wherefore having shewn that Christ is not the most high God, we might here stop and bring no other Arguments, to shew that the holy Spirit is not the most high God. Nevertheless, that the thing may be made the more manifest, we will demonstrate the same with farther arguments. And in the first place we will draw Arguments from thence, that many things are omitted concerning the holy Spirit in the Scripture, which could by no means have been omitted, if he had been the most high God. Next we will draw Arguments from these things, which are expresly delivered concerning the holy Spirit in the same Scripture.

## **CHAP. XLVI: The holy Spirit not called God in the Scripture**

**Argument the first, *That the holy Spirit is no where openly called God in the holy Scripture.***

As therefore to the first sort of Arguments, we will begin from the very Name of God. For there can no place of the Scripture be alledged, wherein the holy Spirit is openly called God. But were the holy Spirit God, how could it come to pass that there should not be so much as one place in the huge Volume of the Scripture, where he is openly and clearly called God? Concerning the Father there are so many and so evident places that none can deny that he is God, unless he dares to deny that the Sun shineth at noon. Concerning Christ likewise, although he be not the most high God, yet there are certain plain places of the Scripture, which shew that he is God, which are commonly known to all men. And shall there be no place at all concerning the holy Spirit, although he be the most high God as well as the Father, and not only not inferiour to Christ, but also for as much as Christ is a man by nature, far superiour? Besides the Adversaries hold, that it is necessary to salvation, for a man to believe, that the holy Spirit is God, yea, the most high God. And indeed, if he were the most high God, it would seem altogether necessary to be known; for what faithful man ought to be ignorant of his most high God, and not to worship him? But the thing would withal be such, that unless it were divinely revealed unto us, we could have no certain knowledge thereof, in as much as it is not manifest to our senses. How then should a thing so great, so necessary to be known, so abstruse, not be clearly explained, and purposely delivered by divine men, at the motion of the Spirit himself? How would it not have been again and again repeated and inculcated, that none might be ignorant thereof, unless he were resolved to be blind in the midst of the light? But what place will they alledge, where it is purposely delivered and openly written, that the holy Spirit is God? Certainly, so many thousand Adversaries, so many learned men perpetually conversant in the reading of the Scripture, have for so many ages, wherein this opinion, concerning the holy Spirit hath prevailed, not been able to find out so much as one, which will easily appear, if we examine the principal places which they alledge, endeavouring to shew, that the name of God is attributed to the holy Spirit.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

We will here omit that place, which some have used, or rather abused, *God is a Spirit, John 4. 34.* For as much as the greatest part of the Adversaries have observed and shewn, that in this place the name of *Spirit* doth not denote the holy Ghost, but a spirituall substance. For indeed it is there spoken of the Father, as the foregoing words do manifestly demonstrate; neither hath the word *Spirit* the place of the subject (whence likewise it wanteth an article, which notwithstanding is prefixt to the word *God*) but of the predicate. For the sense is, *God is a Spirit*, that is, a spiritual Essence or Substance. These things therefore, because either all or the greatest part of the Adversaries do acknowledge them, shall now be passed by.

But for the most part of them, that dispute concerning this subject, their main *Achilles* is that place, which is extant *Acts 5. 3, 4.* where when *Peter*, as it is read in the vulgar translation, had said to *Ananias*, *Why did Satan tempt thy heart to lie to the holy Spirit? He addeth a little after, Thou hast not lied to men but to God.* Much likewise is by some attributed to those words of *Paul*, *1 Cor. 6. 19, 20.* Where when he had said, *Your members are the temple of the holy Spirit, which is in you, which you have from God, he addeth; Glorify God in your body.* And to those in the same Epistle, Chap. 12. 4, 5, 6. *There are diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit; and diversities of administrations, but the same Lord; and diversities of operations, but the same God, which worketh all things in all.* Especially because it is afterward said in the 11th. vers. *All these things worketh one and the same Spirit, distributing to every one as he will.* Likewise out of the Old Testament, those words of *David*, are wont to be alledged, *2 Sam. 23. 2, 3. The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue. The God of Israel said to me, the mighty one of Israel spake to me.* They further add those places wherein they think the holy Spirit is called the Lord.

First, they say, That in *Deut.* 32. 12. it is said, *The Lord alone led him* (namely, the people of Israel in the Wilderness) *and there was no strange God with him.* Now the same thing is affirmed of the holy Spirit, namely, that he led *Israel*, *Isa.* 63. 14. Where it is read, *The Spirit of the Lord did lead him.*

Again, they say, That the Lord, *Exod.* 4. 12. *Numb.* 12. 6. and elsewhere declared, that he would speak by the Prophets. But *Acts* 1. 16. the same is attributed to the holy Spirit; as also in that place that was a little before quoted, *2 Sam.* 23. 2.

Thirdly, they say, That the Lord was oftentimes provoked by the *Israelites.* But this is referred to the holy Spirit, *Isa.* 63. 10. *Heb.* 3. 8, 9. *Acts* 7. 51.

Finally, Those words of the Lord, *Isa.* 6. 9, &c. are attributed to the holy Spirit, *Act.* 28. 25, 26. These, as far as I have hitherto been able to observe, are the chiefe testimonies, whereby the Adversaries endeavour to prove, that the holy Spirit is called God, or which is some way of a greater force, the Lord.

But first, it is in none of these places openly written or purposely delivered, that the holy Spirit is God in that it is every where to be concluded by some consequence; and those places, out of which it is concluded, that the holy Spirit is called the Lord, are for the most part written in such places, as are very distinct one from the other. And therefore not one of a thousand amongst the ruder sort, unless he be admonished by some other, will compare those places together, especially so, as to draw such a conclusion from thence, as the adversaries would have. Now, though we do not at all reject lawful consequences, yet have we shewn, that in this case, it is necessary, there should be such places extant in the holy Scripture, wherein it is openly written, that the holy Spirit is God. For it cannot be, were he the most high God, but that it should most openly and frequently be written and purposely declared. Wherefore if such places cannot be alleged, it may of right be concluded that the consequences, which are drawn to prove the matter are not legitimate. And this you will easily perceive by examining those, which we saw were alledged by the Adversaries. For the Arguments, which are fetched out of those places, are for the most part grounded on this reason; that those things, which in one place are attributed to God, or the Lord, are either elsewhere, or in the same place, attributed to the holy Spirit. Which reason, how frivolous it is, may from thence be understood, that by this meanes it might not only be concluded, that the holy Spirit is God, or the Lord, but likewise, that he is Father or the Son; and likewise, that the Son is the Father, and contrarily the Father the Son. For the Adversaries themselves contend, that the external works of the Trinity are undivided or common to all the persons; and alledge many places, where either in the same or in diverse words, the same thing is attributed, either to all those persons, or to two of them. And the reason is manifest enough, why such a consequence is illegitimate; because like things may proceed from diverse causes, or be conversant about diverse objects, or exist in diverse subjects, yea, the self same works may proceed from diverse causes, either coordinate, (as they speak) and united among themselves, or subordinate; whereof the one doth depend on the other; or is subservient thereunto. If there doth seem to be any further strength in those places, that, when we have examined each, will easily be found, to be indeed none.

Wherefore, that we may examine each place as much as it is needful; the first place, quoted out of *Acts* 5, doth not prove that which the adversaries would have. First, because, as others also have observed, it is otherwise read in the Greek, than in the vulgar translation. For it is not there written, *That thou shouldest lie to the holy Ghost, but that thou shouldest belie the holy Ghost:* Or (as a very learned Interpreter among the Adversaries doth read it) *That thou shouldest deceive the holy Spirit:* Which translation others likewise have touched; but a prejudicate opinion hindered them from thoroughly approving it. And this translation is confirmed by that, which is afterward read vers. 9. where *Peter* explaineth the same fault of *Ananias* and *Saphira*, in these words: *Why have ye agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?* For it is the same to tempt the holy Spirit, and to belie him. Now they tempted the holy Spirit, because they acted, as if they would try, whether the holy Spirit dwelling in the Apostles, or the Apostles themselves, by virtue of the holy Spirit dwelling in them, would observe the deceit or not. Wherefore the forecited Interpreter, whom we praised before, who had so rendred the words, vers. 5. [vers. 3.] *That thou shouldest deceive the holy Spirit, doth*

*afterwards explain them in this manner: That thou shouldest endeavour to deceive the holy Spirit, that is, us the Apostles, in whom the Spirit worketh, and to whom he revealeth the things that are needful to the edification of the Church; and this is a Metonymy of the Adjunct.* I do not now mention that explication of those words which *Erasmus* delivered, and other learned men likewise have followed, that the words may be rendred, *to counterfeit the holy Spirit.*

By these things it easily appeareth, that it cannot from this place be concluded, that the holy Spirit is God; since *Peter* doth in one manner speak of the holy Ghost, of God in another. There he saith, *to belie, or deceive and mock the holy Spirit; Here to lie to God.* The first doth simply note the object, about which the fraud and mocking is conversant: The second signifieth the utmost scope unto which that injury and contumely doth redound. For, therefore *Peter*, after he had said, that *Ananias* would deceive the holy Spirit, and mock him with his lie, did add, that he had not lied unto men but to God, that he might the more perceive the greatness of his sin: as if he should have said: Thou oughtest not to think, that this injury pertaineth to us alone, and is terminated in us, for it tendeth to the dishonour of God himself. But there had been no need to add any such thing, if he had said, that *Ananias* had lied to the holy Spirit, and he had known from the doctrine of the Apostles, that the holy Spirit was God himself Like unto this passage is that 1 *Thess.* 4. 8. where, when the Apostle had said, what precepts he had given to them by the Lord Jesus, and upon what terms God had called them, he addeth; *therefore he that despiseth, despiseth not man but God, who hath also given his holy Spirit to us;* that is, who hath imparted his holy Spirit unto us, by whom it is apparent that we are governed, & by whose impulsion we do speak. Whence it appeareth that this injury and contempt of us, and the precepts delivered by us, redound to God himself. Again, though it should be said that *Ananias* had lied to the holy Spirit, and had lied to God withal, yet it would not from thence follow, that the holy Spirit is God. For in one and the same act a man may lie to two, and to one through another; or to one immediately, as here to the holy Spirit dwelling in the Apostles; to another mediately, as to God. So he, that persecuteth the faithful, persecuteth Christ himself: he that heareth and receiveth the Apostles, or, on the contrary, despiseth them, heareth and receiveth or despiseth Christ: he that despiseth Christ, despiseth also God that sent him, *Matth.* 10. 40. *Luk.* 10. 16. Now will any one thence conclude either, that the faithful or the Apostles are Christ, or that Christ is he that sent him, namely the Father? But if we may reason in this manner: *Ananias* lied to God: *Ananias* (at the same time and in the same act) lied to the holy Ghost: Therefore the holy Ghost is God, it will also be lawful to reason thus: *Paul* persecuted Christ: *Paul* (at the same time and in the same act) persecuted the faithful: Therefore the faithful are Christ. Or, he that heareth the Apostles, heareth Christ, and also him that sent him: therefore he that sent Christ is Christ. What then, will the Adversaries answer to these arguments? Without doubt, that there is more in the conclusion than in the premises. Wherefore let them imagine, that the same answer is given to them. For thus it ought to be concluded: therefore some one who lied to the holy Spirit lied to God. As also in those instances, which we alledged: therefore some one who persecuted the faithful, did persecute Christ; some one who heareth him that sent Christ, heareth Christ himself. We have spoken the more largely of this place, because greater stress is laid on it, and yet not all which might be said thereupon. We will run over the other more briefly. As for the second place therefore, which is extant 1 *Cor.* 6. 19, 20. the holy Spirit is not understood by the name of God but is openly distinguished from him. For is not the holy Spirit here manifestly distinguished from God, whilst it is said that they have him *from God?* He speaketh also of the same God in the following words, *Therefore glorify God in your body, &c.* Now, that the Apostle doth not speak of the holy Ghost, even that is an argument, namely, that he speaketh of him, to whom we, as servants, have been bought with a price, but who did ever read that we were bought to the holy Spirit? That we were by Christ bought and invasseld to the Father, both the thing it self speaketh, and it will easily appear from these words of the *Revelation*, which are extant Chap. 5. 9. 10. chap 14. 4. But if they say, that it is from thence proved, that the holy Spirit is God, because we are his temple: for none but God hath a temple: first it will not follow, that the holy Spirit is here called God, and that openly, which is the thing now in debate; For the same Adversaries are wont to alledge many places, from whence they endeavour to evince, that either the holy Spirit, or Christ is the most high God, where notwithstanding both they themselves confess, and all see, that the name of God is not attributed to Christ or the holy Spirit. Again, a temple may be belonging not only to the most high God, but also to him, who is subordinate to God in divine Empire and worship, not only in the opinion of men but in very deed.

Last of all, it may be only so far forth granted, that a temple belongeth to none but God himself, as that a temple is not indeed dedicated to the honour of any other person, nor possess'd by any other person by a more divine right and principally inhabited then by God. Otherwise it is inhabited in a sort by Angels as the ministers of God, and the virtue and efficacy of God doth in a manner dwell therein, so that it may be rightly said to be the temple of the divine efficacy and virtue; seeing God by his efficacy and virtue doth inhabite his temple, especially that which is treated of in that place to the *Corinthians*. Wherefore if any one will conclude that the holy Ghost is God, in that our body is his temple, he must demonstrate that our body is so the temple of the holy Spirit, as that he is a person, to whose honour it is dedicated, and by whom our body is, by such a right as is proper to the divine Majesty, possessed and principally inhabited. But it is impossible to demonstrate this, and it doth even from thence seem to be false, because in a place, very like to this place of ours, which is extant before in the same Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 3. 16. the Apostle doth thence clearly prove, that we are the temple of God, because his Spirit dwelleth in us. As also *John* proveth that God abideth in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit, 1 *John* 3. 24. and 4. 13. For if the holy Spirit were such a person, as before we said and consequently the most high God, what need was there to conclude thence, that God abideth in us, or, that we are his temple, because his spirit is in us; and not rather from thence, because that very spirit that dwelleth in us is God? What need is there, I say, to shew, that we are the temple of God, who is distinguished from the holy Spirit, and by the interveining of him dwelleth in us; and not rather of God, which is the very spirit himself dwelling in us, and inhabiting us as his temple, not by another person, as our Adversaries would have it, but by himself? But the Apostles knew, that it belongeth not to the supreme deity, in his own person and substance to inhabite any temple whatsoever on the earth, and to dwell in the breasts of men, but by his virtue and efficacy, and therefore they do not conclude, that we are the temple of God, or that God abideth in us, because the holy Spirit that dwelleth in us, is the supreme God, but because the spirit of that God dwelleth in us, and was by him given to us. For if the spirit, or force and efficacy of any deity dwelleth in any place, the very deity it self is said to dwell there, and that is the temple thereof, wherein his virtue hath as it were fixed his abode.

The third place which is extant, 1 *Cor.* 12. 5, 6. doth likewise plainly prove the contrary, for there *one and the same spirit* is manifestly distinguished both from *one* and the same *God*, and from *one* and the same *Lord*, of which matter we have before treated. But if they will collect from the unity of operation, which appeareth from the collation of *vers.* 6. with the 11th. that that one God, and that one spirit are the same; first, it is one thing that the holy Spirit should be that one God, another, that he should be called that one God, concerning which matter we here treat. Again, we must conclude that that God also, which worketh all these things by his spirit, is the same with his spirit, in that the same operations agree to both; that is, that the Father is the holy Spirit, and contrarily, the holy Spirit is the Father: yea, that the three persons which are commonly held are but one, and predicated one of another, because they have the same external operations concerning which we here speak. But of this matter also it was formerly treated.

In like manner neither doth the fourth place, which is extant 2 *Sam.* 23. 2. prove that the holy Spirit is God, but rather, that he is not so; so far is he from being there openly called God or the Lord. For he is there openly distinguished from the Lord, which is that one God, whilst he is called the Spirit of the Lord, of which matter more in the following discourse. Now whereas they reason thus: God spake by *David*: The holy Spirit spake by *David*: Therefore the holy Spirit is God; any one easily perceiveth how fallacious this reasoning is; in that it consisteth of mere affirmatives in the second figure, as they speak in the schooles. For if such an argument is to be admitted, we may thus also conclude; God the Father spake by *David*: The holy Spirit spake by *David*: Therefore the holy Spirit is God the Father. For the *Major* is to be granted by the Adversaries, both for the communion of operations, which they hold to be among the persons of the Trinity, and also for the saying of the holy scripture. For that I may produce but on place; the Apostles, *Acts* 4. 25. say of God the Father, *that he spake by the mouth of David his servant*, namely by the holy Spirit, as the vulgar translation hath it. But that God the Father is there understood, is apparent from *vers.* 27. where Jesus is called the son of that God, whom the Apostles spake unto. And indeed God spake by his Spirit, or the intervening of his Spirit by *David*, in that by his Spirit and efficacy he disclosed to him those things, which he ought to speak, and

moved him to utter them. Thus in *Rev. Chap. 2. and 3.* at the end of every Epistle directed to the Angels of the *Asian Churches*, these words are read; *Let him that hath an ear, hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches.* But in these Epistles Christ the son of God doth perpetually speak. Wherefore if we ought to follow the reasoning of the Adversaries, we must conclude that that Spirit, namely, the holy Spirit, is Christ the son of God. Indeed Christ did there speak, but by his Spirit, to whom for that reason the act of speaking is likewise there attributed. Now if the Adversaries will invert their major proposition, and argue in this manner; whosoever spake by *David* he is the God of *Israel*; neither that proposition will be contained, in the place quoted, from whence the Argument is drawn, nor is to be admitted, unless it be thus taken: Whatsoever person principally spake by *David*, he is the God of *Israel*. But if you subsume: The holy Spirit is a principal person spaking by *David*; it likewise will neither be contained in the place that was quoted, nor is at any hand to be granted. But again, *David* spaketh there one way concerning God, another concerning the holy Spirit. Of the Spirit he saith: The Spirit of the Lord spake *by me*; but of God he saith, The God of *Israel* spake *to me*; neither is it spoken of the same thing in both places. For in the former part of the words it is signified, that God moved *David* by his Spirit to utter prophesies: in the latter, that he spake something to *David* himself, or caused something to be declared to him, namely concerning the regal dignity, which he first conferred upon him by *Samuel*, *1 Sam. 16. 13.* afterward confirmed by *Nathan*, *2 Sam. 7. 12, &c.* (compare the said place with *2 Sam. 7. 28. 2 Kings S. S. & 8. 19, &c. 1 Chron. 22. 8, &c. Psal. 88. 4. 20, &c.*) in reference to his posterity. Wherefore in this matter, God did not spake by *David*, but by others to *David*. Howbeit, that this was performed by the Spirit of God, this, as to the force of those words, is altogether by accident. For it had been all one, if God had spoken to *David* in his own person without any Prophet that was divinely inspired.

It is now easy to give an answer to those places likewise, whereby others endeavour to prove, that the holy Spirit is called Lord. For that in none of them it is plainly written, that the holy Spirit is the Lord or God, which that it was requisite to overthrow our Argument, every man perceiveth. But neither do they prove that the holy Spirit is Lord. For when it is said, *Deut. 32. 12. The Lord alone did guide* the People of *Israel*; the word *alone*, doth only so far forth exclude others, either things or persons, which are herein subordinate to God, in as much as they are denied to be the supreme Leaders of that People. For if they should by that Particle, be wholly excluded from the action of bringing the People out of *Egypt*, we must conclude, either that *Moses* did not lead that people, which notwithstanding the History doth most openly shew; or, that he also is the Lord himself. Which should also be said of that Angel, of whom God saith, *That he should go before the People, and keep them in the way, and bring them into the place which he had prepared*, in which Angel he affirmeth his name should be, *Exod. 23. 20, 21.* But it is well that the very words of the place do shew, that the Particle *alone* is indeed opposed to *other Gods*, and persons not subordinate to the Lord; in which number the holy Spirit is, which dwelling chiefly in *Moses*, led the people, as may be understood from that place of *Isaiah*, chap. 63. 11. which hath been cited. Now that this Spirit is not the Lord himself, who is said alone to have led the People, is thence apparent, because in these very words of *Isaiah*, which are compared with that place of *Deuteronomy*, he is distinguished from the Lord, whilst he is called the Spirit of the Lord: and afterward the Prophet turning of his speech unto the Lord himself, saith, *Thus didst thou lead thy People.*

As to the other reason: The Lord said, that he would speak by the Prophets; but the holy Spirit spake by the Prophets; wherefore the holy Spirit is the Lord, An answer hereunto is already evident from those things which have been spoken concerning that place, *2 Sam. 23. 2.* for it is a Syllogism of mere Affirmatives in the second Figure. And if this reason be firm, it will follow, that the Angels also are the Lord. For in the quoted place, *Numb. 12. 6.* the Lord saith, that he would in vision appear to the Prophets, or would speak unto them by dreams. But the Angels also did this, as appeareth both from other places, so especially from the Prophecy of *Ezekiel, Daniel, Zachary*, and from the *Revelation of John*. See *Dan. 8. 16, 17. & 9. 21, &c. cap. 10. 5, &c. Zach. 1. 8, 9, 14, 19. & 2. 1, 3, &c. & 4. 1, &c. & frequently in other places; Rev. 1. 1. 17. 1, &c. and 19. 9, 10. and 21. 9, &c. and 22. 8, &c. and ver. 16.* Moreover, we have examples hereof in the History of the Gospel, and in the *Acts* of the Apostles. And that we may not go far from the places which the Adversaries alledge; that very person, who spake these words to *Moses*, *Exod. 4. 12.* was an Angel sustaining the person of God, as we have

elsewhere shewn; and although a man would not confess it, yet seeing the Law is said to have been disposed, and delivered by Angels, in the hand of a Mediator, he must needs confess, that the Angel, in giving the Law, spake unto *Moses*, of whom those words, *Exod* 4. do treat.

There is the same fault in the third reason, namely, that a conclusion is in the second Figure drawn out of mere Affirmatives: The Israelites provoked the Lord; the Israelites provoked the holy Spirit; therefore the holy Spirit is the Lord. Which is refuted by that very place of *Isaiah*, which is cited, whilst he is said to be the Spirit of the Lord: for he saith, *but they provoked to anger, and grieved the holy Spirit of him*; that is, of the Lord, for of him it is spoken; see ver. 7, &c. A like Argument hereunto would be this; The Israelites were disobedient to the Lord, and exasperated him; The Israelites were disobedient to the voice of the Lord, and exasperated his mouth; Therefore the voice of the Lord, or his mouth, are the Lord himself. Or thus; The Israelites grieved the holy Spirit, and resisted him. The Israelites grieved *Moses*, and resisted him, as the History testifieth in sundry places; yea, they did chiefly so far forth grieve the holy Spirit, and resist him in the wilderness, as they grieved *Moses*, in whom he dwelt, and resisted him. Whence it will follow, if the Argument of the Adversaries be right, that *Moses* himself was the holy Spirit. For it is to be observed, that the words, *Heb* 3. 8, 9. are not so attributed to the holy Spirit, as if they were spoken in his person, as the Adversaries conceive, but because they were pronounced by the impulse of the holy Spirit. Otherwise it would follow, that the holy Spirit is *David* himself, since the holy Spirit is in this place said to have uttered also these words, *Psal.* 95. *Today if you will hear his voice*, namely, God, &c. But it is certain, that both these words, and also the rest, which are read in the beginning of the *Psalms*, are pronounced in the person of *David*. Thus we saw before, that it is ascribed to the holy Spirit, *Rev.* 2. 3. that he spake those things which are most openly pronounced in the person of Christ. Therefore the holy Spirit so spake those words in *David*, as he is said to cry in our hearts, *Abba Father*, *Gal.* 4. 6. namely, because we by him, that is, by his impulse, do so cry, *Rom.* 8. 15. and as he is said to intercede for us with groans unutterable, ver. 26. because he maketh us to pray and groan unto God.

As to the last proof; therefore the words of God are attributed in *Isaiah*, to the holy Spirit, because *Isaiah* pronounced them by the impulse of the holy Spirit. Now as it doth not follow, because *Isaiah* likewise pronounced those words, that they are therefore spoken in his person, and so that *Isaiah* is the Lord; so like wise neither is it to be concluded, concerning the holy Spirit, by whose impulse he pronounced them. It is also here to be observed, what we noted in *2 Sam.* 23. it is not said of the holy Spirit, that he spake those words unto *Isaiah*, but only by *Isaiah*: But the Lord did not only speak them by *Isaiah*, but also, as appeareth by the Prophecy it self, to *Isaiah*; because he spake openly by him, as one person doth to another; which is neither here nor elsewhere attributed to the holy Spirit. For if the holy Spirit is read to have said any thing to any one, it is found to have no otherwise come to pass, than, because some things were declared to some one from God, by the intervening of some Prophet. For in that the Prophets spake by divine Inspiration; therefore the holy Spirit is said to have spoken by them. But when God spaketh openly to any one, or an Angel sustaining his person, the holy Spirit is not said to have spoken to him. And thus much concerning our first Argument.

## **CHAP. XLVII: No command to adore, or invoke the holy Spirit**

**The second Argument, *That it is no where in holy Scripture commanded, that we should adore, or invoke the holy Spirit; yea, there is not so much as any example thereof.***

Let the next Argument be this, that we are no where either enjoined, or any way admonished in the holy Scripture, to adore or invoke the holy Spirit. Yea, so far it is, that there is any precept or admonition concerning this thing, that there is not so much as one example of any man there to be found, which hath done it. Now though it is said in that which is called the Apostles Creed, that we are to believe in the holy Spirit: as many of the Ancients did in like manner say, that we are to believe in the Catholick Church, and in the other things that are there mentioned; yet is it no where expresly said in the holy Scripture, that we ought to believe in the holy Spirit, or that any one did believe in him. But, were the holy Spirit the most high God, how could it be, that all those things should not be openly enjoined, and many examples of them found in holy men? first, because these things would be necessary to be known and practised of all men to salvation, were the holy Spirit the most high God. Again, because these things are not only often, but most openly writ concerning the Father; but also concerning the Son, there are partly precepts, partly admonitions, and very many examples, although we have shewn that he is not the most high God. How much more therefore would there be many examples extant concerning the holy Spirit, were he the most high God.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Indeed the Adversaries endeavour sometimes by certain consequences, to evince that these things are some way contained in the holy Scripture, but here we shall not deal with consequences, but as we have taught, with open precepts, that might be evident to every one, though otherwise he were but a simple man.

As for Invocation, some imagine they have an example thereof, both in *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 13. ult. who wisheth to the *Corinthians*, *The communion of the holy Spirit*: and also in *John Rev.* 1. 4. who wisheth to the seven *Asian Churches*, *Grace and peace to the seven Spirits that are before the Throne of God*. But they are exceedingly mistaken; for as to the wish of *Paul*, it is one thing to wish that the communion of the holy Spirit should be with men; another thing to invoke the holy Spirit himself; for the first is no other than to wish, that the holy Spirit should be communicated unto men, or being communicated, should abide with them. For neither doth the Apostle take the communion of the holy Spirit actively, as if he wished that the holy Spirit should communicate something; otherwise he would have added the name of something which he would have to be communicated to the *Corinthians* by the holy Spirit; but as we have already hinted passively. Thus the communion of the Blood of Christ, and the communion of the Body of Christ, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. is taken, where there is the same word in the Greek, as in that place, 2 *Cor.* 13. ult. For whilst the Apostle wisheth the communion of the holy Spirit to the *Corinthians*, he explaineth in what manner chiefly he desireth that God and Christ should testify their Grace and Love towards them, namely, in giving his holy Spirit to them, or in cherishing and augmenting the same already given unto them, And indeed it would be a wonder, if *Paul* should here wish for something from the holy Spirit, as a divine person, that he should so often have omitted the mention of him elsewhere in the like prayers. Of which matter more hereafter.

As to the wish of *John*, the very number of those spirits sufficiently hinteth, that this place maketh nothing to the invocation of the holy Spirit, whom they would have to be the third Person in the Godhead. For then we should make seven spirits instead of one, so that for three Persons of the Deity, we should have nine. Which, when others perceived, they said, that by these spirits, is to be understood the various power of God, or, as they speak, the various gift of the holy Spirit. And therefore it is all one, as if *John* should pray for Grace and Peace from the holy Spirit himself. But besides that, the Adversaries agree not among themselves concerning this matter (for some by that name understand seven chief Angels of God; others the manifold providence of God and Christ) what

is there that evinceth, that this virtue proceedeth from the holy Spirit, which is a third Person of the Deity? and that he is invocated, when *John* prayeth for Grace and Peace from those seven Spirits of God? There is not the least hint thereof in the *Revelation*, where mention is several times made of those seven spirits. See besides the very place of the first chapter, chap. 3. 1. & 4. 5. & 5. 6. which two places compare with *Zach.* 4. 2, 10. from whence they are in a manner taken. In these places thou shalt see those spirits called the spirits of *God*, they are said to stand before the Throne. Christ is said to have them as eyes and horns. For they are to him instead of eyes, because by them he overseeth and taketh care of his Disciples, and provideth for them; and instead of horns, because by them he pusheth his enemies, and driveth them away, and chaseth them from his People. What hint is here of the holy Spirit, that should be a third Person of the Deity? Doth not the thing it self shew, that if the manifold virtue and efficacy of God which he hath communicated with Christ, be to be understood, *John*, whilst he wisheth grace and peace from those spirits, doth so mention them, as if they were certain persons distinct from God and Christ; yet in the mean time, doth only declare the means & manner whereby he desireth that grace & peace should proceed from God to the Churches? and so doth tacitly repeat the invocation of God himself, whom he had before named, and whose spirits they principally are, and to whom they do in a manner minister? for which reason also he immediately subjoineth them to God. But for as much as Christ also hath these spirits of God, and maketh use of them, therefore having made mention of them, he also commemorateth Christ, and prayeth for grace and peace to the Churches from him; wherefore this wish, and the imploring of the divine help comprehended therein, is properly referred to God and Christ, improperly to the spirits themselves. Which is the cause why other divine men omit the mention of them in their salutations and wishes: they who hold them to be Angels, will say that this invocation, is referred to them only in a secondary manner, as unto Ministers, not as unto Lords, and the true bestowers of grace and peace; and that therefore the mention of them is elsewhere omitted, and they are therefore set before Christ, partly because they belong unto God, to whom they are next subjoined (for which cause also afterwards, chap. 3. the name of the *New Jerusalem* is interposed betwixt that of God and Christ) partly because *John* intendeth to speak more largely of Christ. For he therefore reserveth the mention of them to the end, that without disturbing the course of his speech, he might more freely make an excursion into his prayers. For if he would have reserved the mention of those spirits to the end, he should have either used a longer Parenthesis, or begun a new speech. It is apparent therefore that there is nothing in those places, to establish the invocation of the holy Spirit. And here it is worth the rehearsing, (as learned men have noted) that *Hilary* in his twelve Books concerning the Trinity, never called the holy Spirit God, never said that he is to be adored, but only to be obtained: which is likewise to be observed in other Writers both of that and former times, Yea, the true opinion concerning the holy Spirit, was of so great power, that even after those things, wherein the holy Spirit began to be accounted for the most high God, almost all the prayers of the Churches were directed to God the Father, and to Christ, not to the holy Spirit. And there are yet extant, several Books of the Papists, put forth in the former age, and containing an account of Religion and Ceremonies in use among them, where it is expresly declared, that we must observe how every prayer is directed to God the Father, or to Christ, the Son, and not to the holy Spirit, because a gift is not asked from the gift it self, but from the bestower of the gift. Indeed we are not ignorant, that there is an usual Hymn among them, wherein they pray the holy Spirit to come, and fill the heart of his People; howbeit, the cause which is alledged, that a gift is not asked from the gift it self, but from the bestower of the gift, is universal, and it is clear that regard was had thereunto in most prayers of the Church, and should have been had in all without exception. Now that custom of praying, is an open token of the true Opinion, which did at first prevail in the Church. For if the holy Spirit be the most high God, absolutely equal to the Father, and to the Son, whom they likewise hold to be the most high God, why was he not judged worthy of equal honour? Why were either all, or at least the greatest part of prayers not equally directed to him, as to the Father or the Son? This indeed was the hinderance, that in those first times, it was out of controversie; as both the holy Scripture doth plainly enough testify, and at this day many (though therein inconstant to themselves) confess that the holy Spirit is a gift. For which cause *Hilary*, before cited, illustrating and confirming his opinion concerning the Trinity, with that saying of Christ, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Spirit*, doth in his second Book concerning the Trinity, at the close thereof, thus explain the words, *In the confession of the Author, and of the only Begotten, and of the gift*, which he doth there largely pursue. Wherefore since they had this opinion concerning the

holy Spirit, they directed their prayers not to him, but to the Father and the Son, the bestower of that gift; knowing, that a gift is not asked from the gift it self, but from the giver of the gift. Which custom, even the contrary error hath for so many ages not been able quite to abolish.

## CHAP. XLVIII: The holy Spirit omitted in many verses

**The third Argument, *That the mention of the holy Spirit, is in many places omitted, and would not so have been, were he the most high God.***

The third Argument may thence be drawn, that in very many places of the Scripture, where mention is made of the Father, and of the Son, and sometimes of Angels, or other things, and persons, there is no mention made of the holy Spirit; when nevertheless mention ought to have been made of him, no less than of the Father and the Son; and rather then of the Angels, or of other things and persons, if he were the most high God, coequal (as they speak) to the Father and the Son. Which that it may be plain, we will first alledge those places, wherein there is mention made of the Father, and of Christ only; and then those where mention is made of others, whether Persons, and chiefly Angels, or things, which ought to have been mentioned much less than the holy Spirit, if he had been the most high God. But for as much as the places of the former sort are almost innumerable, we will here recite those only, which are somewhat more illustrious, and such chiefly, as affirm the same thing of God and Christ within the compass of the same sentence; the rest we reserve for the diligence of the Reader.

We will begin from *John*; in the History of whose Gospel, we will give the first place to those words of Christ, which are extant chap. 17. 3. *This is Life eternal, that they know thee (Father) the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.* We do not now urge, that the Father only is said, to be the true God; for that we have done in the beginning of this work; but that mention is made of the Father only, and of the Son, and in the knowledge of these two only, eternal life, or the way to attain it, is placed: when notwithstanding, were the holy Spirit no less the true God than the Father, it would be necessary that eternal Life should lie no less in the knowledge of him, than in the knowledge of the Father; and consequently mention should have been made no less of the one than of the other; much less that a divine Embassadour should rather be mentioned. Neither can the Adversaries say, that the knowledge of the holy Spirit, is contained in the knowledge of the Father, and of Christ. For though this be otherwise most true, yet is it of no force to weaken our Argument. For the knowledge of the holy Spirit is contained in the knowledge of God and Christ; but not as of a person distinct from God the Father, and from Christ; but as of a divine thing to be communicated unto men from the Father by the Son. For otherwise the knowledge of Christ is also oftentimes included in the knowledge of God; and on the contrary, the knowledge of God is comprised in the knowledge of Christ; namely, because he that knoweth and seeth Christ, knoweth and seeth the Father, *John* 8. 19. & 14. 7, 9. And on the contrary, none knoweth the Father, nor cometh to him, but by the Son, *Mat.* 11. 27. *John* 14. 6. So that it is necessary, if a man will attain the saving-knowledge of the Father, that he know the Son also. Nevertheless, Christ in that place of ours, was not content to make mention either of the Father alone, or of himself alone, but joined the knowledge of both together, because his intention was to express those divine persons, in the knowledge of whom eternal Life consisteth. If therefore the holy Spirit were a divine person, distinct from the Father and the Son, he would no less have mentioned him than those two persons, seeing the obtaining of eternal Life would consist no less in the knowledge of him, than of them.

But now let us proceed to other things, and because we have begun from *John*, let us add other passages, which are extant in the same writer, partly in his History of the Gospel, partly in the Epistles, and partly in the *Revelation*. As for the History of the Gospel, among other passages, Christ spaketh thus, chap. 8. 16, &c. (which place we have upon another occasion before discoursed) *If I judge, my judgment is true, for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me: It is also written in your Law, that the testimony of two men is true. I am one that bear witness of myself; and the Father that sent me, beareth witness of me.* Why now made he not mention likewise of the holy Spirit, if he be the most high God as well as the Father? Did he contribute less to the truth of Christs judgment, than the Father, although he were one God with him? Did he less give testimony to Christ? why therefore did he not mention his testimony, seeing the plurality of witnesses most worthy of credit, addeth greater weight to the testimony; and here Christ urgeth both the number and dignity of the witnesses? Certainly in that place, 1 *John* 5. 7. which is at this day commonly read, though extant,

neither in the ancient Greek Copies, nor in the Syriack translation, nor in most of the ancient Books of the Latin Edition, and omitted by many Greek Interpreters, or Fathers, as they call them, yea, and by some Latin Interpreters, and rejected by some late Writers, and finally, not very well agreeing with the rest of the Text, and for the variety of readings suspected, in that place, I say, there is a peculiar mention made of the witness of the holy Spirit. And indeed his testimony may peculiarly be recited, although he be not a divine person distinct from the Father and the Son; namely, because the testimony which God gave to Christ by him, had something peculiar from the rest; so that he doth seem in a manner to testify apart from both; but there can no cause be brought, why his testimony was omitted, if he be a divine person distinct from the Father and the Son: but if he be the virtue and efficacy of God the Father, his testimony is rightly comprehended in the testimony of the Father, as it cometh to pass in the same chapter of the first Epistle of *John*, where the place now under debate, is at this day commonly read v. 9, 10. which I desire you to confer with the two preceding verses. To these may be added that place likewise in the *5th. chap.* of his history of the Gospel v. 13 [17]. But Jesus answered them, *my Father worketh hitherto and I work.* Yea and all the rest that followeth, where it is spoken concerning the admirable works of Christ, both that were already done, and that were afterward to be done, where there is no mention made of the holy Spirit, who would have had an equall share together with the Father and the Son in effecting these works, if he had been one and the same God with both. But as we have declared before, it would be too tedious to rehearse all such places; let these likewise be looked upon chap. 14, 22 & 15. 24 & 16, 3.

Now that we may come to the Epistle of the same Apostle; what is that which is read 1 Epist. 1. 3. *Our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ?* why is it not added also, *with the holy Spirit*, if he be a divine person distinct from both, and yet equal in all things to both, yea, one God with both? What likewise is that, chap. 2. 24. *If that which you have heard from the beginning, shall remain in you, you also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father?* why not also in the holy Spirit? What is that 2 Epist. ver. 3. *Grace be with you, Mercy and Peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father?* why not also from the holy Spirit? Concerning which matter, we will afterward speak more, when we rehearse the salutations of *Paul*. Add to these the words of ver. 9. in the same Epistle, *He that abideth in the Doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son:* why not also the holy Spirit?

As for the *Revelation*; to omit those places, wherein other things or persons are joined with God and Christ, which are afterward to be rehearsed by us; how famous is that place, chap. 5. 13. where all the Creatures which are in any place, are read to have said, *Blessing, Honour, Glory and Power be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever?* why not (as now a-days all the Temples of the Adversaries do ring) glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the holy Spirit? Why only to him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb? For that he, that sitteth upon the Throne, is the same with the Father, whosoever doth not understand from that whole 5th chapter, and from other things written in the same Book, certainly he must needs be a man of very little understanding.

Hither belong also those words, chap. 11. 15. *The Kingdoms of this world, are become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ.* And chap. 12. 10. *Now is come salvation and strength, and the Kingdom of our God, and the Power of his Christ:* Why not also of the holy Spirit? For neither may any one say, that in the name of our God, the holy Spirit is included. For as we have above seen, neither is the holy Spirit any where called God in the Scripture; and he is here called our God, whose Christ or Anointed Jesus is; for it is said, and the power of his Christ; that is, the Christ of our God. But Jesus is not the Christ of the holy Spirit, nor is so any where called; but the Christ of God the Father; as is very apparent from the second *Psalm*. For neither was he anointed of the holy Spirit, but with the holy Spirit of God, namely, the Father, *Acts* 10. 38. and also *Isa.* 42. 1. *Mat.* 12. 17. *Isa.* 61. 1. *Luke* 4. 18. Hitherto belong also those words, chap. 14. 4. *These are redeemed from among men, the first-fruits unto God, and to the Lamb:* why not also to the holy Spirit? Like things are read of them, which have a part in the first resurrection, chap. 20. 6, *But they shall be Priests of God, and of Christ:* why not also of the holy Spirit? So also chap. 21. 22. *For the Lord God Almighty, and the Lamb are the Temple of it:* and ver. 23. *for the Glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the Light*

*thereof: and chap. 22. 1. proceeding out of the Throne of God, and of the Lamb: and ver. 3. But the Throne of God, and of the Lamb shall be in it.* In which places there is no cause, why the holy Spirit should be omitted, if he be a divine person distinct from the Father and the Son, but equal unto both.

Now that we may come to other sacred Writers; what is more clear than those salutations of the Apostle *Paul*, which are extant in the beginning of all his Epistles; *Grace and peace unto you from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ?* Neither is that clause much unlike, which is extant, *Ephes. 6. 23. Peace be to the Brethren, and Love, with Faith, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.* We saw also a Salutation like to these of *Paul*, in the second Epistle of *John*, ver. 3. But why doth not *Paul* so much as once wish grace and peace to the Faithful from the holy Spirit? Was his grace less necessary to the faithful, though he were the most high God? or, was he less the Author of that peace or felicity, which *Paul* wished to the Faithful, or less worthy, to whom he should expressly give the honour of invocation, then God the Father of Christ? Certainly even this alone ought to admonish every man, that he should not think of any third person of the Deity.

Now, that the same *Paul* doth else where pray for the communion of the holy Spirit, that, as we have seen in the former chapter, maketh nothing to the invocation of the holy Spirit. We have likewise given an answer to those words of the *Revelation*, where *John* prayeth for Grace and Peace to the Church, from the seven spirits, which are before the Throne of God. Add hereunto those prayers of the Apostle *Paul* for the *Thessalonians*, 1 *Thes. 3. 11. Now God himself, even our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you:* and 2 *Thes. 2. 15. Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father, who hath loved us, &c.* Add also those, chap. 1. ult. *According to the grace of our God, and the Lord Jesus Christ.* There are also other places extant in the same Apostle, where there is no mention made of the holy Spirit, when God the Father and Christ are named. Thus *Colos. 2. 2. he rehearseth the Mystery of God, even the Father, and of Christ.* And 2 *Thes. 1. 1. he writeth to the Church of the Thessalonians, in God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.* So 1 *Tim. 1. 1. he saith, that he was an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the commandment of God our Saviour, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who is our hope.* For neither may any one think, that the same person is here described; for besides the very form of the speech, the custom of the Apostle every where distinguishing God from Christ, and the collation of other places containing the same sense, sheweth, that God the Father is described by the name of *God the Saviour*. See the beginning of the second Epistle to the *Corinthians*, and also of those which are extant to the *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, *Collossians*, as also the beginning of the latter Epistle to the same *Timotheus*, and to *Titus*; in which last place he describeth God in the same manner, as he doth here, whilst he calleth him, *Our Saviour*. For neither is that word proper to Christ alone. It doth in the first place agree to God to save, and by his means likewise to others, and especially to Christ, whom he hath raised and sent to be a Saviour, and afterwards exalted by his right hand. See *Acts 5. 31. and 13. 23. 1 John 4. 14. compared with vers. 9. 10.* Hence God is called a Saviour, in the same Epistle to *Timothy*, *Chap. 2. 3.* Where he is manifestly enough distinguished from Christ in the two following verses. And *Chap. 4. 10. Tit. 2. 3, 4.* where he openly distinguisheth God the Saviour also from Christ, in the two following verses. Which is done likewise in the last verse of *Jude*, where it is said; *To the only wise God our Saviour, by Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, &c.*

Wherefore that we may returne to our place, taken out of the first epistle to *Timothy*: two different persons, namely the Father and the Son without any mention of the holy Spirit, are joined together. The like is done in the same epistle elsewhere. For to omit that place, *chap. 5. 21.* Which pertaineth to the second rank before appointed by us. *Paul* speakes thus. *chap. 6. 13. I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickneth all things, and before Jesus Christ, who witnessed a good confession. &c.* And in the second Epistle to the same *Timothy*, *chap. 4. 1. I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his kingdom, &c.* There are also the like words used by the same Apostle *Eph. 5. 5.* Where he denieth that any fornicator or unclean person, or covetous person, *hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ, and of God.* And *Tit. 2. 13.* where he mentioneth the appearance of *the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.* For whereas certain Adversaries, because of the unity of the article set before the name of God and Christ, contend that the same person is designed by that name, they are therein exceedingly mistaken.

For the unity of the article doth not always denote the unity of the subject, but oftentimes the conjunction of diverse subjects, as we have taught in a like place *vers.* 4. of *Jude*, where he saith of certain wicked men that *they deny the only Master God, and our Lord Jesus Christ*; Where there is one article prefixt both to that Master God and to the Lord Jesus Christ, and yet diverse persons, namely God the Father and Christ, are joined together. Now that diverse persons are understood by the name of God and Christ in the quoted place, is thence apparent because *Paul*, as also other writers perpetually distinguish God put subjectively, as it is done in both places, from Christ Jesus. Moreover, if the Apostle in that place, *Eph.* 5. would have designed the same person, he would have set first the name of *God*, as being more general and less distinctly signifying that person which he intended; and would have subjoined the name of *Christ*, as being more distinct and fitter to explain the same; whereas now he doth the contrary. For neither may any one conceive; that the Apostle did it for amplification sake, intending to ascend from a lower title to an higher. For that would then have had some place if the word *God* had been spoken of some subject by way of Epithite or Predicate, and not made use of to design the very subject it self; which if it be one, such a gradation is not wont to be observed, but rather the most special names thereof are wont to be subjoined to the general, the more distinct to the confused ones. Deservedly therefore both those places, as also that of *Jude*, alleged by us on this occasion, ought to be added to the other examples, whereby we have shewn, that God and Christ are wont to be mentioned without the holy Spirit, who nevertheless should be alike mentioned if he were a divine person distinct from both, yet equal to both. Such places, as these, are also extant in *Peter*, who in the beginning of the latter epistle, twice doth the same thing, which we before shewed *John* and *Paul* were wont to do. For thus he saith *vers.* 1. *Simon Peter an Apostle of Jesus Christ to them that have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.* And again, *ver.* 2. *Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ our Lord.* Those places, wherein it is either spoken of them, who have divine empire over us, or of our duty towards them, do not much differ from the passages hitherto alledged, but have the same force as to our purpose, as making mention only of God and Christ, although in a manner somewhat different. Of which we will alledge some, that the reader being admonished by us, may also observe others, that are like unto them. Hereunto belongeth that famous place, 1 Cor. 8. 6. Where it is spoken of them, who have divine empire over us, and are by us to be worshipt with divine worship: *But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* For why is it not added, and one holy Spirit, as some men indulging their error, durst to add contrary to the credit of all ancient books? indeed he is added, yea, set before that one Lord and that one God in the same epistle chap. 12. 4. Because there it was chiefly spoken concerning the holy Spirit, and his effects in Christians. But here he ought not to be omitted, if he hath divine empire over us, as well as the Father and Christ, and so deserveth divine worship. I say a just cause may be alledged, why he was mentioned, although he be not a person distinct from God and Christ? for as much as things are often times in the Scripture joined with persons, and those divine ones, as hath been elsewhere by our men, and we our selves by and by intend by certain examples also to shew. But no just cause can be alledged, why in such places the holy Spirit was omitted, if he be a divine person, every way equal to the Father and the Son. Hitherto be long those words of the same Apostle, which are extant in the *Acts.* chap. 20. 21. Where he explaineth the sum both of his preaching and our duty, saying, that he testisied both to Jews & Gentiles, *repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ*, and those of the same author, 1 *Thess.* 1. 9, 10. *How ye turned from Idols to God, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus which delivered us from the wrath to come.* And 2 *Thess.* 3. 5. *The Lord direct your heart into the love of God and the patient waiting for Christ.* And that we may also mingle other passages, although written of another subject; thus saith *Jude*, *vers.* 1. *To them who are beloved in God the Father, and kept by Jesus Christ.* And *John* in the *Revelation* bringeth in these men, that fear the punishment to be inflicted on them, speaking thus: *Fall upon us, O ye Mountains, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth upon the Throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb.* Chap. 6. ult. and Chap. 12. 17. *Who keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.* Chap. 14. 12. *Here is the patience of the Saints, who keep the Commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.* And Chap. 20. 4. *The souls of them that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God.*

You may also every where observe other passages, which do more largely, or in another form of speech, make mention of God and Christ only, when they speak of divine things.

Now that we may pass to the second rank of Places, which we before appointed; there is mention made of Angels, the holy Spirit being omitted. First, in those words of Christ which are extant in *Luke, Chap. 9. 26. For whosoever shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Fathers, and of the holy Angels.* Like unto which, though in a contrary matter, are those words of the same Christ, which are read, *Rev. 3. 5. He that overcometh, &c. I will confess his name before my Father, and before his Angels.* And those of *Paul, 1 Tim. 5. 21. I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect Angels, &c.* Who would believe, that the holy Spirit could be omitted, and Angels rather mentioned in his stead, were he a divine person distinct from the Father and the Son, and equal to both? Was a greater weight added to his words, if omitting the most high God, his servants were mentioned? If omitting the Creator, his creatures were mentioned? You will say, that what we would have cannot be concluded from that omission; because otherwise the same was to be concluded concerning the Father. For that he in a place like to these two, which we have cited out of *Luke, 9.* and *Rev. 3.* is omitted, and the Angels only mentioned, namely, *Luke Chap. 12. 8.* where Christ saith, *Also, I say unto you, whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the Angels of God, &c.* I answer, that mention is here made of the Angels only, because they alone among the heavenly persons shall be really present in judgment, when Christ shall either confess or deny their names, that are here spoken of. But in the places before alledged by us, because mention is made of the Father likewise, it appeareth that Christ and *Paul* intended to mention all the heavenly persons, whose sight we ought to reverence, and before whom it is most honourable to be praised, most dishonourable to be reprov'd and rejected, and so not to pass by them, who either are, or shall hereafter be present by their power only. Whence it followeth, that the holy Spirit could not have been omitted in such places, if he had been a divine person, but should have been named in stead of the Angels, or if it had pleased the Scripture to name them also, he should have been set before them.

Now, let us shew that other things are wont to be joined with God and Christ, whilst the name of the holy Spirit is omitted. For this we have a notable place in the *Revelation*, out of which we have before alledged many testimonies; namely, *Chap. 3. 12.* where Christ promiseth a reward to him that overcometh in these words, *I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the City of my God, new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of Heaven from my God, and my new name.* Where you see, that between God and Christ, or rather the name of both, the *New Jerusalem*, and the name of it is interposed. Why did he not likewise say, that he would write upon him the name of the holy spirit? Why the name of the *New Jerusalem* rather than of the holy spirit, if he be the most high God? We will shut up all our proofes with that famous place, *Heb. 12. 22, 23, 24.* where not only Angels are joined with God and Christ, but also pious men, partly alive, partly dead, or their spirits, and certain other sacred things, to which Christ hath given an access unto Christians, but the mention of the holy Spirit is altogether omitted. For thus there speaketh that divine Writer, *But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of Angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in Heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.* Who would believe that in so large a catalogue of persons, who for their sovereign excellency may be called divine, the holy Spirit could have been omitted, if he were such a divine person as the Father or Christ?

Neither may any one say, that under the name of *God the Judge of all*, the holy Spirit is comprehended. For this would be some way tollerable, could but one plain place of the Scripture be alledged, wherein the holy Spirit is called God.

Again, who perceiveth not from the places, which were both above and also a little before in great number alledged, that the name of God put subjectively doth denote the Father, and that he is in that manner distinguished, both from all other persons, & also from Christ himself? Neither can it seem

likely unto any one, that the Father was here omitted, whom we never find in like places to be passed by. But he was no where mentioned unless there, where mention is made of *God the Judge of all*. Neither may any one say, that the Father indeed is understood, yet not he alone, but also the holy Spirit. For if more persons were understood, the person of Christ, no less than that of the holy Spirit, ought to be included in that name, according to the opinion of the Adversaries, touching the persons of the Deity. But the person of Christ the Mediator is openly distinguished from that God, as being afterwards mentioned apart. Besides, it is at no hand to be granted, that there are many persons of God, and not also many Gods and Judges. But here mention is made of *God the Judge of all*, and not of *Gods the Judges of all*.

But some one will perhaps object, That, if the reason drawn from this place were of force, it would not only follow, that the holy Spirit is no person, but also no sacred or divine thing, such as we see here to be recited, or at least the things here mentioned, are more divine than the holy Spirit; which we our selves will not admit.

We answer, That this Objection would have some strength, if all things, at least the most divine, had been reckoned up, as we see the most divine and holy persons are all reckoned up; and also if here were the same reason of all divine things, as is of persons. But the thing is otherwise of the good things, that are promised us of God by Jesus Christ, namely, of immortality and remission of sins, there is no express mention made; but only the place thereof is figuratively mentioned, namely, Mount *Sion*, and the heavenly *Jerusalem*, and the middle efficient cause thereof, namely Christ the Mediator of the new Covenant, and the sprinkling of Blood, which speaketh better things than that of *Abel*; and the prime efficient cause of both even God. In like manner, neither was the holy Spirit mentioned, which is contained among the good things, which are promised to us. Namely, because he would reckon up all the persons, with whom we have some conjunction & communion by right of the Christian religion; so that we may be rightly said to have access unto them: but the divine author intended to mention only those sacred and divine things, which are in some sort without us, and elegantly answer, and are in some sort opposed to those things to which the people of *Israel* had heretofore access, when the Law was given them out of Mount *Sinai* by *Moses* the Mediator. But in this number is not the divine efficacy or virtue which floweth from God to us, and is sent into our hearts, so neither the remission of sins and immortality. But were the holy Spirit a person, we had come to him no less than to the Father, and should have intimate communion and society with him; neither could he by any means be omitted in so large and accurate an enumeration of those persons with whom we have conjunction. But it is no marvel, that he is here omitted, seeing *John*, as we saw before, describing our communion with divine persons, which deserve to be so called by way of excellency, saith, 1 *John* 1. 3. *That our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ*: intimating that it consisteth within the compass of those persons. Indeed the communion of the holy Spirit is with us, because we are partakers of him: but we are not said to have fellowship with him, because our fellowship is not with the gift, but either with him, who bestoweth the gift on us, or with him that hath the same gift with us, or is in some sort of the same condition.

**CHAP. XLIX: Mat. 11. 27.**

**The fourth Argument from *Matth. 11. 27. None knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any one the Father but the Son, &c.***

We have hitherto alledged testimonies enough, wherein the mention of the holy Spirit is omitted; but ought not to be omitted if he were a divine person. We will now subjoine one place, that is different from the former testimonies, and more like to them, wherein something is expresly denied of the holy Spirit. Because though it make not express mention of the holy Spirit, yet doth it in general deny something of him, that could not be denied, were he a divine person, distinct from the Father and the Son, and equal unto both. This place is extant *Matth. 11. 27.* where Christ speaketh thus: *None knoweth the Son, but the Father, neither knoweth any one the Father, save the Son, &c.* But how could this be true were the holy Spirit a divine person, distinct from the Father and the Son, and in all things equal unto both? for some other besides the Father, would have known the Son; and some other besides the Son would have known the Father, namely, the holy Spirit; Yea he would have known him without the revelation of another.

Neither can it be here said, that the word *none* is put only to exclude creatures. For otherwise why is it added, *save the Father*? Why is he excepted? Is he haply ranked among the creatures, so that he was there expresly to be excepted? For that only is excepted, which otherwise is comprehended under the general name, and which, had it not been excepted, might be thought to have been comprehended under the general speech, and so the same either affirmed or denied of it, which is affirmed or denied of others belonging to the same kind. There is the same difficulty concerning the Son, if you consider the opinion of the Adversaries. For they hold him, as he is the Son of God, to be no creature. But here he is looked upon as he is the Son. Neither may any one say, that the holy Spirit is tacitly included in the Father and the Son. For if the holy Spirit be a person distinct from both, by what right is this affirmed? Again, is the holy Spirit more included in the Father and the Son, than either the Son in the Father, or contrarywise, the Father in the Son? Certainly no more. Wherefore if no mention be made of the holy Spirit, because he is included in both, there ought to be no express mention made either of the Son, or of the Father, because the one is included in the other. And truly the mention of the Father doth more openly include the Son, or the mention of the Son, include the Father, than the mention of both doth the holy Spirit, if he be a person distinct from both; yea there is not so much as any suspicion, that he is included. But there the very names have a mutual relation each to other. Wherefore mention should rather have been made of the holy Spirit, than either of the Father, when it is spoken concerning the knowledge of the Son; or of the Son, when it is spoken concerning the knowledge of the Father.

Finally, neither may any one say, that the holy Spirit is comprehended among them, to whom the Son will reveal, the Father or himself; because he bestoweth on him, as the Essence, so also the knowledge of the Father. For to omit, that nothing is revealed to any one, unless he doth already exist; it is here spoken of such a revelation, as happeneth at a certain time, and dependeth on the will of the Son, and not on the necessity of nature. But that revelation, if it ought to have such a name, as it is caused by the procession of the holy Spirit from the Essence of the Son, is conceived both to have been from all eternity, and not to depend on the will of the son, but on the necessity of nature. Doth not the thing it self intimate, that men are here understood to whom Christ is willing to deliver the knowledge of the Father by the doctrine of the Gospel. Though further, this very thing that is affirmed in this exception, demonstrateth the holy Spirit not to be the most high God. For he is not the most high God, who receiveth his Essence, and whatsoever he hath from another: but he who hath that from himself, as we have taught in our disputation concerning Christ.

## **CHAP. I: The holy Spirit distinguished from God**

### **The fifth Argument, *That the holy Spirit is very often distinguished from God.***

After that we seem to have spoken enough of those things which are not mentioned in the Scripture, concerning the holy Spirit, and which would not have been omitted were he the most high God; it follows, that we view those things also which are expressly delivered concerning him in the holy Scripture, and are such; as that they shew the holy Spirit not to be the most high God. And they are of two sorts; For some are such, as being properly taken, agree no more to persons, than to other things, or also at no hand agree to persons, but are only proper to things: But some are such, as taken properly, agree to persons only; but are ascribed to the holy Spirit by a certain figure. To which we will add those also which primarily and by themselves agree to singular substances, and only consequently unto other things. We beginning from the first will teach that the holy Spirit is so far from being the most high God, as that he is not a person: although this last is not proved by all the arguments we shall alledge but yet it is by many of them.

Our first Argument therefore drawn from these things, which agree no more to persons, than things, shall be this. That the holy Spirit is oftentimes most openly distinguished from God, or the Lord. Now, that the holy spirit is oftentimes, and most openly distinguished from God, or the Lord even those places do shew, wherein he is called the Spirit of God, or of the Lord; or God, or the Lord calleth him his spirit, many of which are extant in the holy scripture; of which we have before seen one or two, alledged by the Adversaries, to shew that the holy Spirit is called God, or the Lord, or understood by his name; namely, those two, 2 *Sam.* 23. 3. *Isa.* 63. 10. Likewise of many passages that are here and there extant in the scripture add these few: *Isa.* 11. 2. and 42. 1. & 59. 21. and 61. 1. *Joel* 1. 28. *Matth.* 3. 16. and 12. 28. *Rom.* 15. 19. 1 *Cor.* 2. 11, 12. 14. and 3. 16. and 6. 11. We have above likewise seen other places out of the same Epistle, where the holy Spirit is in another manner distinguished from God, chap. 6. 19. and chap. 12. 4, 5, 6. and 2 *Cor.* 13. last: which places are wont to be alledged by the Adversaries, to shew, that the holy Spirit is a divine person. But in a manifest thing, no more proofs are needfull. Now we have reckoned up those places of the scripture chiefly, wherein the Adversaries do either confess, that it is spoken concerning the very person of the holy Spirit, or also urge it least any one should contend, that it is spoken only concerning the gift proceeding from the same person, and that it only, but not the holy Spirit properly so called, is termed the spirit of God: concerning which distinction we will treat in the following Argument.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

But they say, that when the holy Spirit is distinguished from God, or the Lord, that by the name God, or the Lord, the Father is understood, or also the son, who likewise is the Lord. For therefore he is called the spirit of both, because he proceedeth from both. A like exception we have seen concerning Christ, who is also most frequently distinguished from God. Now the same things, that we have there spoken to that exception, or like unto them, may here likewise be alledged; Wherefore since they may thence be fetched, there is no need to repeat them here.

## CHAP. LI: The holy Spirit is the Power of God

### **The sixth Argument, *The holy Spirit is the Power of God.***

The second Argument of this rank, but the sixth of this Section, shall be this, that the holy Spirit is the power or efficacy of God, namely, (that we may explain it by the by) which proceedeth from God, and issuing unto men, doth sanctify and consecrate them, and produce various and admirable effects in them: which power they are wont to call divine inspiration; but the power and efficacy of God, can at no rate be the most high God, or a person of supreme Deity; as shall better be understood in the Defence of this Argument.

But even our Adversaries, who are a little more versed in the holy Scripture, are aware, that the holy Spirit is the power or efficacy of God. For among others, that place is very plain, *Luke 24. 49.* where Christ saith, *And I send the promise of my Father upon you: but abide ye in the City of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.* Where, by all Interpreters that I know, it is observed, that under the name of that power, with which the Apostles were to be endued, the holy Spirit is understood; and this was that Promise of the Father, from Christ to be sent upon them. See among other places, *Acts 1. 4, 5, 8.* and *2. 4, 33.* Therefore this place also was brought, to illustrate those other places, in which the holy Spirit is signified by the appellation of the divine Power. It likes me to set down here the words of two most learned Interpreters of the holy Scripture, one a Papist, the other a Protestant, in their Annotations on *Luke 1. 35.* where the Angel saith to the Virgin *Mary, The holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the Power of the most high shall over shadow thee.* For the former Interpreter, after he had said, that *Gregory, Crysostome, Victor, Damascen, Beda, Theophilact,* interpret the Power of the Most high, to be Christ, or the Son of God, adds, Others think, that he whom before he called the holy Spirit, now is called the Power of the most high God; as *Euthymius*, whom I rather follow, though of less account, and the only Author, yet saying things more like truth than many, and those of greater esteem. For it is a repeating of the same sentence, such as the *Hebrews* chiefly in songs do frequently use, one sentence concluding one verse, which in the fore part of the verse is expressed in some words, in the latter is repeated in other words, as *Psal. 2. 4. He that dwelleth in the heavens, shall deride them, and the Lord shall mock them.* For in the same manner we see, the Angel a little before to have said, *Hail thou that art full of favour, the Lord is with thee,* varying the words, the sense being the same. And the holy Spirit is wont to be termed, as the *Finger*, so also *the Power of God* by the same similitude; as beneath, chap. 24. 49. *But stay ye in the City, until ye be endued with Power from on high.* Therefore Power and Spirit are wont most often to be coupled in the holy Scriptures; as below, chap. 4. 14. and in *Acts 10. 38. Rom. 1. 4. and 15. 13. 1 Cor. 2. 4. Ephes. 3. 16. 1 Thes. 1. 5.* But the latter so writes. And the Power of the most high, that is, the same holy Spirit, who is the Power proceeding from the Most High, that is, God the Father. A description. For the same sentence is repeated in other words by way of explication. So below, ver. 24. 49. the holy Spirit is named the Power from on high. To them also, other most learned men assent. For that many of the Ancients have understood, the Son of God by the Power of the most high, that I repeat not the reason brought by a most learned Interpreter of the Papists, it is also refuted by other Arguments. First, because *Mat. 1. 20.* where the Angel expresseth the same thing to *Joseph*, he mentions only the holy Spirit; nor would he have left out the Son of God, if *Gabriel* had by name conjoined him with the holy Spirit in this place, and had made him Author of his own conception: seeing there was no greater cause of mentioning him here, than there. Moreover, because by this means, Christ should be made the son of himself, seeing in the former *Section*, we have shewed that Christ was called the son of God, by reason of so wonderful a conception and generation.

Perhaps some other will say, that the Power of the Most High, in this place signifies, neither the son, nor the holy Spirit: but the efficacy flowing from the holy Spirit. For here two efficient Causes of the conception of Christ are mentioned; one the Person of the holy Spirit, the other his Power. But first, that reason which we now brought concerning the son, is against it, because by this reason, the holy Spirit should be made the Father of Christ: of which by it self, we shall afterward in the following chapter treat. Furthermore if any person here had been to be named besides the Father of Christ, such

especially, who, being to come upon the Virgin, was to cause the conception of Christ, the son had been to be named, whom the Adversaries hold, to have descended from heaven into the Virgins womb, and there to have assumed human flesh. But we have already shewed, and it is laid down in this exception which we now refute, that the son was not named in the words of the Angel, as the Author of his conception. Lastly, such an opinion should require, that that Power, of which in the words of the Angel there is mention, should be called the power of the holy Spirit, or by the name of the Most High, whose power he is said to be, should be understood the holy spirit. But any one sees the former was not done. The latter is hereby refuted, because, both by the following words, and also by comparing with the 32d verse, it sufficiently appears, that by the words, *The Most High*, the Father of Jesus Christ is understood. Wherefore this is another place, from whence it is proved, that the holy Spirit is the divine power or efficacy.

The third place is extant in *Paul*. 1 *Cor*. 2. 4, 5. where he saith, *And my speech, and my preaching was not in the enticing words of mans wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit, and of power, that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the Power of God*. Where you see the Apostle, instead of that which he had before expressed in two words, *spirit* and *power*, afterwards puts only *the power of God*. To which are to be added also those words of *Peter*, in *Acts* 10. 38. of Christ, *how God anointed him with the holy Ghost, and with Power*: and those of the Angel, in *Luke* 1. 17. of *John Baptist*, *And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias*. For the same thing in very deed is designed by the name of *spirit*, or *holy Spirit* and *power*. Neither is it of moment, that some where the *power of the holy Spirit* is mentioned. For both of power and efficacy, there may be again other power and efficacy depending on that former: And furthermore, it is to be observed, that the Genitive Case, *of the holy Spirit*, may with good right be taken for the Genitive of the species. After which manner, both the *gift of the holy Spirit*, is taken for that gift, which is the holy spirit, *Acts* 2. 38. & 10. 45. comp. chap 11. 15, 16, 17. and the *earnest of the spirit*, for the earnest which is the holy Spirit, 2 *Cor*. 1. 22. and 5. 5. as both of it self it is easily understood, as also by comparing with the words, *Ephes*. 1. 14. is perceived. So also the promise of the holy Spirit, *Acts* 2. 33. is taken for the thing promised, which is the holy Spirit. But there is no need of more examples, when frequently enough the Genitive Case put after another Noun, signifies its certain species, as it is observed by learned men.

To the places hitherto brought, the words, *Ephes*. 3. 7, 10. may be added, in which, if in the place of divine power, you put the holy spirit, you will see, that there indeed will be no difference of the sense: as also on the contrary, where mention is made of the holy Spirit, if you put power, or divine efficacy, or divine inspiration, there will arise no diversity of meaning; although there, where the name of Power, as a genus, is put before it, the manner of speaking is to be somewhat changed: or where that is added for explication sake, it is not any more afterwards to be repeated. Those words also of Christ in *Luke*, chap. 11. 20. may be added, in which he affirms, that by the *Finger of God*, he cast out Devils. Where it is easily to be seen, that by the name of *Finger*, the power and efficacy of God is understood; as it also happens elsewhere in the holy Scripture: in which manner also the *hand of God* is taken. For therefore that by which God performs his Works, that is, his Power or Efficacy, is termed Hand or Finger, because we are wont to effect our works with hands and fingers; as others have long since observed. But Christ expressing the same thing in *Matt*. 12. 28. saith, that he cast out Devils *in the spirit of God*: so that the Finger of God, or the Power and Efficacy, is the same with the Spirit of God.

Lastly, That the holy Spirit is the Power or Efficacy of God, thence appeareth, because both prophesies, and other admirable gifts and works, which come from that Power and Efficacy, which we are wont to call the divine Inspiration, are all ascribed to the holy Spirit, as to the next cause, and inwardly working in men; and that not because it is revealed by God, that the holy Spirit doth effect them, but because it is from the thing it self manifest enough, if it appear that they are performed by a divine Power. See *Luke*. 1. 41, 67. and 2. 26, 27. *Acts* 4. 8, 31. & 6. 10, 55. & 9. 31. & 10. 44, 45, 47. & 11. 15, 16, 24, 28. & 13. 2, 4, 9, 52. & 15. 8, 28. & 16. 6, 7, 20, 23, 28. & 21. 4, 11. and (that I may pass by many more places of holy Scripture) 1 *Cor*. 12. 4, 7, &c. 2 *Pet*. 1. 3. ult. Whence also, when the divine Writers would signify any one to be divinely inspired, and filled with divine power, they say, that he is filled with the holy Spirit; or using some like manner of speaking, affirm him to be

endued with a divine Spirit. But if the holy Spirit were not the very Power and Efficacy of God, but a person distinct from the Father and Son, there would be no cause, why all those things should be ascribed to the holy Spirit, as the next cause, and inwardly working in men. For as much as it might come to pass, that the Father and the son by their Efficacy, might effect all those things, the person of the holy Spirit not intervening, as a middle cause. Certainly, although it should be manifest, that prophesy, or any other gift, comes from God, nevertheless, it could not appear without manifest divine revelation, that the holy Spirit did intervene, as a middle and next cause, to perform that thing. But the holy scriptures do so speak of that thing, that they plainly enough shew, that it is manifest by the thing it self without other peculiar revelation. Neither indeed *Paul*, when writing to the *Corinthians*, he said, his words were in demonstration of spirit, to wit, divine: or among other things commended himself, as the servant of God *in the holy Spirit*; would at length be understood by his words, that he was endued with the holy Spirit, and that from it his words or deeds came, but from the thing it self. But if you say, that therefore all those things are ascribed to the holy Spirit, and that thing was manifest to all believers, because the holy Spirit is God himself, from whom no man is ignorant all those things come; he besides that he shall take as granted the thing here controverted, and unknown to those men, to whom *Paul*, for instance, chiefly would demonstrate, that he spake by the spirit of God; also will not loose the knot. For nether are those works ascribed, to the holy Spirit in the same manner as to the Father, who is by the confession of all, the supreme God: nor in that manner, by which they are ascribed to the son, but, as also the Adversaries themselves in part confess, by a certain proper and peculiar manner; that is, as to the next cause, and inwardly working in men. And this is that, which the holy scriptures in the places before alledged, and infinite other places, would have us understand. But concerning this thing, nothing should be manifest from the works themselves performed by divine power, if the holy Spirit were that supreme God; and yet in person distinct from the Father & son. Yea, if the holy Spirit were the supreme God, it should rather be concluded, that the holy Spirit is not such a cause of those works. For it belongs not to the supreme God, that personally inhabiting in men, he should do any works in or by them; but that he inspire Power and Efficacy to them, and by that means perform works to be admired in or by them.

### **A larger Defence of the Argument.**

Sufficiently, as it seems to us, we have hitherto confirmed our Argument. Yet nevertheless, since two answers either are wont, or may seem to be made to it, they are to be refelled by us. The former is against the major Proposition of the Argument, which by an instance, the Adversaries endeavour to infringe. For they say, that Christ also is called the Virtue or Power of God, 1 *Cor.* 1. 24. and yet notwithstanding, he is not only a Person, but also the most high God himself. But this latter we have above refuted: and by this very thing also, is sufficiently refelled, in that he is the virtue of God, to wit, the most high, and so is manifestly distinguished from the Supreme God. But further, we take the name of Power and Efficacy, in our Argument, properly. But when will they prove, that Christ is the Virtue or Power of God properly so called? For whether they take the word *Power*, for that Virtue which naturally dwells in God, or for that which flows from him as its fountain, and is also in some manner communicated to the creatures; neither of them is a person, but a quality; and that indeed, an essential property of God common to three persons, as they will have it. But that Christ is a person, all know, and urge. The same may be also understood by the other term of excellency, which in the same place ( 1 *Cor.* 1. 24.) is given to Christ, to wit, that he is called the Wisdom of God. For the Wisdom of God speaking properly, is his attribute, or natural property, by which God both understands all things, and disposeth most aptly his Counsel s and Works. But this is in no sort a person, but in like manner is his attribute, or natural property, common to three persons; as is the opinion of the Adversaries. Certainly, since Christ is a person distinct from the Father, and the Father in himself, or his own person, hath all Wisdom, whereby he understandeth and disposeth all things; neither may any one understand, by another person, but by himself, and Wisdom implanted in himself; Christ cannot, speaking properly, be the Wisdom of God. Therefore neither in like manner, the Power of God. For there is the same reason of both. It is therefore to be understood, as the preaching of the Cross in the same place to the *Corinthians* is termed, the Virtue or Power of God: in like manner also the Gospel, *Rom.* 1. 16. to wit, because in it the singular Virtue or Power of God is put forth, and manifestly appears to all Believers: so also Christ is called the Virtue or Power, and likewise Wisdom; because in

him the supreme Power and Wisdom of God hath been put forth, and in him may most clearly be perceived by all believers. Let the place it self be looked, and ver. 18. 24. be compared together; and that it is so, any one will easily understand. By these things then it appeareth, that this instance is of no moment to invalid our Argument, seeing we speak of the Efficacy of God properly so called, and have shewed, that the holy Spirit is the very Power or Efficacy of God, proceeding and flowing from him. Certainly, by the Opinion of the Adversaries themselves, it is necessary that in one wise Christ, in an otherwise the holy Spirit, be the Power of God. For if Christ be the substantial Power of God, having his proper person, and the holy Spirit also be such a Power of God, there will be two Powers, or substantial Virtues in God, having their personality; those two persons, as such, shall be altogether like to themselves: Of which, neither can be. Not that, because the one or the other efficacy should be in vain; since one may altogether suffice to do all things. But in him, who himself doth nothing in vain, nothing also is altogether in vain, or nothing over much. Yea, it is also impossible, because two forms wholly of the same Nature, cannot consist in the same subject, unless perhaps according to divers parts; which hath no place in God. For otherwise the thing would proceed *in infinitum*. Of which we shall elsewhere speak more plainly.

And this latter therefore cannot consist, because they both hold, and are constrained to hold, that those divine persons, so far as they are distinct from the Essence, are unlike. Wherefore, that those absurdities, of which we have spoken, may not happen, it is necessary to determine, that the holy Spirit is such a power as is not a person. And thus much concerning the former Answer to our Argument.

The latter Answer is placed in a distinction, which otherwise the Adversaries often use, when there is speech of the holy Spirit. For they say, the term *holy Spirit* is taken in a double manner: one while for the third person of the Deity: another while for his effect or gift flowing from him, and that indeed properly is called, *holy Spirit*; but this Metonymically, in that the Cause is put for the effect. I remember not indeed to have read, that that answer is accommodated to this our Argument. But because it may yet be accommodated, it will be worth our labour to examine it here, chiefly because it may seem that nothing may be said more speciously. For when we by Power or Efficacy of God, understand a certain force flowing from God, and his natural power into men, some one may say, that the holy Spirit is indeed such a power of God, but taken metonymically. For that Efficacy of God, is the effect or gift of the holy Spirit, properly so called. But in this place is not disputed of the holy Spirit metonymically, but properly taken not of his gift, but of himself. Therefore our Argument is ineffectual, and makes nothing to the matter. But we somewhat otherwise take the Gift of the holy Spirit in this Answer, or at least stretch it wider than the Adversaries are commonly wont. For so much as I have been able hitherto to find, they are wont by the gift of the holy Spirit, to understand those admirable faculties implanted in men by divine Power; as the faculty of prophesying, or speaking with tongues, and other, whether visible, as they are called, or invisible, or if you had rather more hidden effects of the holy Spirit in men. But that Power of God, of which the places of holy Scripture, brought by us, speak, is not such a faculty, or faculties rather, but the efficient of them, although it again flow from power naturally resident in God. Wherefore, if the gift of the holy Spirit should be taken so strictly, this Answer could not be fitted to our Argument, or the places by which we have confirmed it; unless any one would perhaps say, that in all those places in which the holy Spirit, and Power of God, are put as equipollent, or the one is put instead of the other, the name of the holy Spirit, or divine Power, is used for such a faculty divinely ingenerated in a man; but no where for the divine Efficacy that effects such faculties in men: which neither will the Adversaries easily say, nor can it in any manner consist; as partly the places themselves, a little more diligently looked into, will shew to every one; partly will be understood by the things which follow. Wherefore that that distinction may seem to make something against our Argument, we will suppose that our Adversaries do make that divine Efficacy, also flowing from the natural Power of God, which is the cause of wonderful effects in men, to be the gift of the holy Spirit, and so to be understood by the name of the holy Spirit, not properly, but by a Metonymy only; namely, because it flows from the third Person of the Deity, which properly may be called the holy Spirit.

That therefore we may refell this exception, we say that it is in no wise to be granted, that that Power and Efficacy of God, which is in this place understood, is only metonymically termed the holy Spirit, and not rather properly, as far indeed as propriety hath place here. For if it should be called only metonymically, the Spirit of God or the holy Spirit, to wit because it comes from the holy Spirit properly so called; there would be no cause why it should not be called likewise the Father or Son, since it should no less come from the Father & Son, then from the holy Spirit even according to the Adversaries opinion, since it is some effect of the natural power of God: which according to their opinion is common to the three persons of the Deity; and is indeed first in the Father, as the fountain of the Deity; then by him, as they would have it, in the son and holy Spirit, who from him have their Essence. Neither may you say that that inspiration is therefore called rather the holy Spirit, then the Father or son; because it immediately proceeds from the holy Spirit, but from the Father and son only mediately; for what hindreth the Father or the son; since they have the same power in themselves, efficacious for all things, which the person of the holy Spirit hath, to put it forth also by themselves, as well as the person of the holy Spirit? as we see by the holy Scripture they have indeed put it forth. Yea how can it be, in this unity of Essence, and all things pertaining to it, that the Father and the son should not as immediately put forth their power, as the holy spirit? For it is judged that the Father and son have so communicated their virtue and power, whence that efficacy or divine inspiration immediately comes, to the holy Spirit, as that nevertheless it remained the same in number in Father and Son, and is put forth by the three persons by the same act altogether. Whence therefore is that difference, that the holy Spirit puts it forth immediately, the Father and the Son mediately? But if the Father and the Son put forth that force and efficacy alike immediately; there is no cause, wherefore that force should be termed more the holy Spirit than the Father or the Son, if it be not the holy Spirit himself, but be called so therefore only because it comes from him. We repeat not that which we have said before, that although the Father and Son should put it forth only mediately, the holy Spirit immediately, yet that could not be manifest by the thing it self, without a peculiar divine revelation; when nevertheless we see, as soon as any thing hath been manifest to have been done by divine virtue or inspiration, that forthwith is ascribed to the holy Spirit, as the next cause. But further, the Adversaries cannot use that answer in some of the places brought by us, unless together they overthrow one of their chief Arguments, whereby they endeavour to prove the holy Spirit to be a *Suppositum* and person; to wit, that which is drawn from the actions proper to Persons, or at least *Suppositums*. For in the first place brought by us from *Luke* 1. 34. where the holy Spirit is said to come upon Mary, the Adversaries themselves seem to understand the person of the holy Spirit, especially since the action of *coming upon* agrees not properly but to a person, or at least to a *Suppositum*. I omit that also in the place (*Ephes.* 3. 20.) cited by us, the virtue or divine Power is said to work in the Apostles. Besides we shall see in the following Chapter a new Reason by which that Answer may be overthrown.

## CHAP. LII: Christ not the Son of the holy Spirit

**The seventh Argument, *That Christ should be the Son of the holy Spirit if he were the most high God.***

The third Argument of this rank, which respects the defence of the next foregoing also may be this; That if the holy Spirit were God, or at least some person, Christ also should be the son of the holy Spirit, yea, more rightly should be termed his son than the Fathers; which thing overthrows it self. For we have seen above that (*Sect. 2. Chap. 31.*) Christ therefore was first termed the Son of God, because the holy Spirit came upon Mary his Mother, and the power of the most high overshadowed her, and so Christ was conceived and begotten by the power of the holy Spirit. But if the holy Spirit be a person, who immediately put forth that force in the womb of the Virgin, and produced Christ, the holy Spirit is rather the Father of Christ, than God the Father, who performed that only by the intervening of another person. Besides that sanctification, *John 10. 34, 35.* which Christ himself brings as a cause why he called himself of right the son of God, will agree also to the holy Spirit, especially by the Adversaries doctrine. For they, although they would have all works to without, as they speak, to be common to the whole Trinity, yet affirm that Creation agrees more properly to the Father, Redemption to the Son, Sanctification to the holy Spirit. Lastly, *Paul* also, *Rom. 1. 4.* as in like manner we have seen above, saith, *Christ was constituted the Son of God in power, according to the spirit of sanctification, by the resurrection of the dead:* making the spirit of sanctification the proper and next cause of that filiation. But if he be a person, or comes from the person of the holy Spirit, the holy Spirit will be the Father of Christ. From which absurdity our opinion is far remote, which makes not the holy Spirit a person, but the power and efficacy, of God; which, however it concurred to the generation of the Son, yet it concurred not as a Father, but as that by which the Father begat. But if the holy Spirit be not a person, neither is he the most high God, as who is of necessity a person, and indeed of this thing is here the question between us and the Adversaries; Whether the holy Spirit be a divine person, namely, distinct from the Father. Therefore let this be the third Argument of this rank.

## **CHAP. LIII: The holy Spirit given to men by God**

### **The eighth Argument, *That the holy Spirit is given by God to men.***

The fourth Argument drawn from those things which are openly delivered in the holy Scripture concerning the holy Spirit, shall be this; That the holy Spirit is given to men by God, and that men obtain, receive and have him from God by prayers; as numberless places of the holy Scriptures shew; out of which it is sufficient to have looked into but these few, *Luke* 11. 13. *John* 7. 39. and 14. 16, 17. *Acts* 5. 32. and 15. 8. *Rom.* 5. 5. *1 Cor.* 6. 19. Whence also the holy Spirit is termed a Gift, *Acts* 11. 17. which compare with the precedent: Yea, in all those places where mention is made of *the gift of the holy Spirit*. For we shewed above (*Chap.* 6. of this *Section*) That there is not there the *Genitive Case* of the Efficient but of the Species: otherwise both the gifts rather than the gift of the holy Spirit had been to be mentioned, and by it had not been signified, that men either have received, or were to receive the holy Spirit, which notwithstanding the holy Scriptures using that manner of speech, would altogether shew; but only some effect of it.

Now by these things it is evinced, that the holy Spirit is not the most high God; for he is given or bestowed by none upon any, is obtained of none by prayers. For first, Every Gift, and whatsoever is obtained by prayer, is in the power of the giver. But the most high God is not in the power of another; otherwise by this very thing he should have some one above himself, and moreover should not be most high. Besides, the gift is made also his to whom it is given, so as that it may be possessed by him. But may the most high God be so a mortal mans, as that he may be possessed by him? Moreover, to what end should so great a gift be given to men? What fruit would there be of it? No other certainly can be imagined, but that those effects may exist in a man, which the holy Scriptures testify to be produced by the holy Spirit. What then? Is it needful, to the end God should fill any man with such effects and gifts that he himself be given to him? When the Father filleth any man with such gifts, is it necessary, that he himself should be given to him? Why then may not the holy Spirit be able to do the same, which the Father, if in like manner he be most high and so the same God With the Father?

Lastly, What cause is there why the holy Spirit should be obtained by us from the Father or Son, if he himself be the most high God? Why is he not given by himself if so be he may be given?

### **A larger Confirmation and Defence of this Argument.**

To these things I see not what they can answer, who doubt not to affirm (neither indeed can they otherwise, as it shall hereafter be made manifest) that the very person of the holy Spirit is given to men, together with his effects. Therefore others endeavour to decline the blow, that they affirm, that not the holy Spirit properly so called, is given to men by God: but its effect, or rather various effects, such as are those which, *1 Cor.* 12. 8, &c. are largely enough rehearsed, and others, common to all believers. For these are by a Metonymy signified by the name of the holy Spirit, when he is said to be given unto men, and so to be received and had of them. For the efficient cause is put for the effect. Although some who say, there is a Metalepsis in the phrase, seem to take the thing a little otherwise. For neither do they seem to take the name of the holy Spirit it self for his effects or gifts, but for that very divine person which they hold. Nevertheless, in the mean while, they signify that the giving, passively taken, is attributed to him only improperly; because that which may properly agree to the effects, may be also improperly attributed to the efficient cause it self; seeing the effects of the holy Spirit may be properly given, not he himself. And indeed both these seem to themselves to deal more warily, than those who simply confess that the holy Spirit himself is given, yet in the mean time they do not perceive, that both this hole by which they endeavour to get out is stopt; and likewise, although I should somewhat enlarge it to them, yet are they no whit less held fast bound. For first, it is false, that the effects only of the holy Spirit, not the holy Spirit himself, is given to men. And further, that when he is said to be given, or received by us, or had, it is said but by a Metonymy or Metalepsis. Besides, although it was granted, it must be no whit the less confessed, that the holy Spirit is not the most high God.

As to the former; we shall demonstrate it, first by certain general reason, and common to all those places of which we treat; then by other more special and proper to certain places; and lastly from certain hypotheses of the Adversaries.

As to the general reason; If by the name of the holy Spirit in these places, of which we treat, is understood some divine and holy inspiration, or some power flowing from God, which is as it were breathed into men; the holy Spirit is properly given, that is, not by a Metonymy only, or by a Metalepsis is said to be given unto men, to be received and had of them. That the thing is so, will be afterward understood. For we shall first shew that such an inspiration is understood by the name of the holy Spirit, when he is said to be given to us, to be received and had by us: although it may easily seem truth to any one by it self. Christ himself shewed it and represented it by a certain external breathing, when after his resurrection appearing to his disciples, he said, *Receive ye the holy Spirit*. For *John* relates, that he being about to utter those words breathed into or upon the disciples. For what other thing would he shew by that action, than that he was about in a more divine and more secret manner to breath on them, and inspire into them some heavenly power, which what it should be, he taught presently in express words, when he added, *Receive ye the holy Spirit*. But besides, the same thing is thence manifest, because the holy Spirit in the place above noted by us, and the like to them, is taken in that sense in which at that time it was taken commonly among the *Jews*. For do we think that *John* Baptist, when speaking to the people he said; that Christ should baptize with the holy Spirit, did use that term in a signification unknown to the people? or that the people hearing the same, did not understand what *John* said? But this is that spirit, which Christ promised to them that ask, and which was afterwards given to the Apostles and other disciples, as is understood as well by the thing it self, as also by the place, *Acts* 1. 4, 5. is manifest. What else meant Peter when he discoursed to the people of the holy Spirit newly poured out, and promised the same to the auditors, if they would repent and be baptized into the name of Jesus Christ; do we think, that he used the word holy Spirit, in a signification unknown to them, that is, that he would not be understood, or at least was not understood of them? In like manner when after Chap. 5. in the Senate of the *Jews*, he said, *We are his witnesses of these things, and so is also the holy Spirit, which God hath given to them that obey him*; do we think that he used the word holy Spirit otherwise than those Elders of the *Jews* were wont to take it? Or did not he therefore mention these things that the Adversaries well understanding what the term holy Spirit signified, and how much was to be given to its testimony, might give credit to his sayings, and the rest of the Apostles? The same is to be held of the words of the same *Peter* used in the house of *Cornelius*, in which he affirmed, that Christ was anointed with the holy Spirit, that by this means he might conciliate to him divine authority. What? that both *John*, and Christ in him, have declared the words, by which the holy Spirit was more obscurely designed by the simple word either of Spirit or holy Spirit: as appears by the places brought by us, *John* 7. 39. and Chap. 14. 16, 17. to which add *vers.* 26. of the same chap. and 15. 26. Now this doth sufficiently shew, that the signification of that word was then commonly known. But what did the *Jews* of that time commonly understand by the name of the holy Spirit? did they perhaps mean a Divine person? Why then comes it to pass, that not so much indeed as any footsteps of that opinion remained among the *Jews* after that time, nor doth it appear in those who were next unto those times? Did they, that they might disquiet the Christians, forswear all their opinions commonly received by all? You can never persuade this to an intelligent man. What then shall we believe, they understood by the name of the holy Spirit, but divine inspiration; to wit, that which the original both of the Hebrew word, by which the Spirit is noted, and of the Greek and Latine shews, and which among the Gentiles also however otherwise erring in the thing it self, was understood by the name of the divine Spirit. For both the Hebrew word *Ruach* & the Greek *pneuma* which is from *nvssiv* as the Latine *Spiritus* from *Spirando*, properly signify a wind or blast. Wherefore nothing is more apt than that, to signify that divine inspiration, or power which is breathed into the hearts of men from heaven. Which signification, as we have said, was not unknown even to the Gentiles themselves, although in the mean time they did most grievously err in the thing, taking a false inspiration for a true one, a devilish for a divine. But this pertains not by it self to the force and signification of the word. But now if the name of the holy Spirit be taken in those places of which we treat, for that divine inspiration or some power which from God flowes into men; why is the holy Spirit said to be given to us, or further to be received or had by us,

only by a Metonymy or Metalepsis? Why is not the holy Spirit properly so called (as far indeed as that word in this matter may be taken properly) acknowledged to be given to us? For if it be not given properly, either it is therefore, because this holy inspiration may not be said to be the holy Spirit, but only improperly, to wit, by a Metonymy of the efficient cause; or because not properly but by a Metalepsis only it may be said to be given, that is only in respect of the gifts and effects flowing from him. But both is false. For as to the former, those things which are called by some name only by a Metonymy of the efficient cause, do not by themselves deserve that name, but therefore only are so called, because they come from the efficient cause, to which this name doth by it self and in the first place agree. But that power which is inspired into men by God doth of itself deserve to be termed the holy Spirit, and accordingly is so called, without any regard had, that it comes from such a cause, which properly may be called the holy Spirit. No man doubts that it is of it self holy, and may be so called. But that it also of it self deserve the name of Spirit, doth in like manner appear from the things already spoken; to wit, because it is inspired by God into men, and men are breathed upon by it. Neither is it to the purpose that metaphorically, or by reason of similitude, it is termed *Spirit*: For in this place the propriety of the word is not so looked upon as opposed to a Metaphor, but as to a Metonymy. Since this now is the question. But if thou wilt therefore say this inspiration is improperly termed the holy Spirit, because it is called Spirit metaphorically; see by what means thou wilt defend that that third person of the deity is properly called the holy Spirit. For therefore also they think that person to be termed Spirit, because he is breathed by the other two: but not therefore because he is a spiritual substance; otherwise that appellation would no more agree to that person, then to the other two. What then? Is that person properly breathed or blown out? Certainly far less doth it agree to him to be breathed then, to this divine inspiration, of which we treat: since that comes not forth without God; this proceeds from God, and is inspired into men. It is manifest therefore that that divine inspiration is properly termed the holy Spirit not metonymically only. As to the latter I scarce believe the Adversaries will deny that that very inspiration is properly given. For how is that which is breathed and put into the hearts of men to their greatest profit, not properly given them? Therefore there is no Metalepsis here to be sought, by which it may come to pass, that that which properly agrees only to the effect, may improperly be attributed to the efficient cause, since here the very efficient cause of those effects, which are understood, that is the very divine inspiration, is by it self given to men. And let these things suffice concerning the general reason, and common to all the places which we treat of.

As for the special Reasons, more proper to certain places, those words of Christ, which we have before cited out of *John* 14. 16, 17. deserve to be first mentioned, *I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Advocate, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth,; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him. But ye know him; for he dwelleth with you* (to wit, as inhabiting in Christ, he did as it were converse among the Disciples) *and shall be in you*; that is, and further, shall be not only with you, or among you, as now, but also in your selves, being given of the Father unto you. What could be said more clearly, to shew that the holy Spirit, properly so called, is given of God, that it is a gift which may be obtained of the Father by faithful prayers? For what? Is not the comforter that holy Spirit properly so called; or is it not but by a Metalepsis, said to be given to the Disciples by the Father? The former the Adversaries cannot say, unless they will deny that the third person of the Deity, is the holy Spirit, properly so called; which yet they chiefly will have. For that the same is understood by the Comforter, they altogether contend, and urge both the name it self of Paraclet, or Comforter, as also the word *another* added to it, and the actions proper to persons attributed to him in this speech of Christ; of which below we will somewhat treat. This may of right be said, that if it be not there spoken of the holy Spirit, properly so called, it is no where spoken of him: It remains therefore, that they say that it is indeed here spoken of the third person of the Deity, and that this person is meant by the Paraclet: but that he is not said to be given to the Apostles by the Father, but by a Metalepsis: namely, because its effects or various gifts are to be given to them. But neither hath that shift here any place. For by comparing of that place with the words in *verse* 26. of the same chapter, and also with the words *verse* 26. of the following chapter, it will easily appear to any one, that Christ so far asserts, that the Father being asked of him, was about to give the holy Spirit to the Disciples, as he should send him in the name of Christ, or Christ himself should send him unto the Disciples from the Father. For so he saith in that former place, But the

Comforter, the holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, &c. But in the latter, *But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.* And truly what other thing could either the Father or the Son do, pertaining to that giving, than that he should send the holy Spirit to the Disciples with that intent, that he might remain in them for ever, and produce those divine effects, which afterwards appeared in them? But that sending, and the coming of the holy Spirit, which follows it, doth not agree first to the effects of the holy Spirit, and only consequently to him; which should be, if it were attributed to him only by a Metalepsis; but on the contrary. Whence the Adversaries are wont to prove the person of the holy Spirit by that mission; which they could not do, if they did judge it primarily, and of it self to agree to the gifts of the holy Spirit. For as much as such a mission, if it be in no sort proper to a person, cannot also prove it. But if then that mission primarily and of it self agree to the holy Spirit, not to his effects, there will be the same reason of the giving also, which we have seen to consist in that sending. But hence ariseth also another reason of the same thing. For that the holy Spirit should teach the Disciples all things, and recall all Christs sayings into their remembrance, is put chap. 14. 26. as the consequent of the sending of the holy Spirit; and moreover also of the giving it. But if so far only the holy Spirit should be given, as its gifts are bestowed, that thing should be contained in the giving it self of the holy Spirit, but not be a consequent of it. For that imparting of the knowledge of divine things, even first of all pertains to the producing of gifts coming from the holy Spirit upon the Apostles.

This place might have enough warned the Adversaries, that they should not dare to deny the holy Spirit properly so called, to be given to us together with his effects. But there want not also other places which do the same. For by other Adversaries, who therefore use not such an answer, hath that place of *Paul, Rom. 5. 5.* been taken notice of, where he saith, *The Love of God* (that is, the sense of the divine Love) *is shed abroad in our hearts by the holy Spirit which is given to us.* Where indeed it is said concerning that Spirit which diffuseth the sense of divine Love in our hearts, and so is the Author of the spiritual gift, that he is given to us. To which place may be added that of the same Epistle, chap. [8]. 15. where the Apostle saith, *Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby* (that is, by whose force and impulse) *we cry, Abba (Father) for the Spirit it self beareth witness to our spirit, that we are the Children of God.* Of which also in the Epistle to the Galatians, chap. 4. 6. he saith, *God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba (Father.)* So also 2 Tim. 1. 7. it is said, *For God hath not given to us the spirit of fear, but of Power, of Love, and of a sound mind.* For what else is it, than that God hath not given to us such a Spirit, as should effect fear, and cowardice in us, but such as begets in us, strength and fortitude, charity and prudence, or sobriety? But I remember not that I have hitherto heard or read of any, who could dare to deny that the divine Spirit, the efficient cause of these gifts, is the holy Spirit, properly so called. Neither indeed in these places, hath the Metalepsis devised by others any place. For the effects also of the holy Spirit, are rehearsed in the same places, as some things diverse from the holy Spirit given, and so, as effects of the thing given. But if by that Metalepsis, the holy Spirit were said to be given, to wit, in respect of the effects, those effects should be contained in the thing given, nor should be mentioned, or distinct from it. And let these things be said out of the sacred Writings against the Metonymy and Metalepsis, devised in these manners of speaking.

As to the Hypothesis of the Adversaries, although we have used them in some part already, yet it is further to be added, that by such an Answer to our Argument, their own reason is vehemently overthrown, which they are wont to bring further to prove the immensity of the holy Spirit, and consequently its supreme Deity; to wit, that the holy Spirit dwelt in all Believers dispersed through the whole world. For two ways they weaken this Argument. First, because if the very holy Spirit, properly so called, be not given to Believers, but only its effects, it cannot be proved that the holy Spirit himself, or his Essence, is in very deed in every Believer, which is necessary to the concluding of their reason. Again, Because neither such immensity, as they understand, can be thence proved, unless withal they make also the effect of the holy Spirit, or at least all its effects dispersed in the hearts of Believers, though the whole world joined together to be immense, and the supreme God. Therefore the Adversaries cannot deny, that the holy Spirit it self; to wit, properly so called, is given by God to believers, but that together they take away both the testimonies of the holy Scripture, and their own

assertions. But now let us somewhat loosen those bonds by which we have shewn them to be held, and let us grant to them, seeing they will have it so, that not the holy Spirit, properly so called, is given to Believers, but its effect only, yet they shall not escape. For nevertheless, we will hence shew that the holy Spirit is not the most high God. For first, if the holy Spirit were the most high God, it could not be said, no not by a Metonymy or Metalepsis, of him, that he is given or bestowed by another upon men, or that men receive him. For who would not reject such a manner of speaking, as absurd and unworthy of the most high God? More soberly do the holy Scripture speak of the most high God, than to feign in his names such tropes. But if yet any man contend, that such speaking is not unbeseeming God, or absurd, let him shew an example of the like manner of speaking, in the name either of the most high God, or the Father, or any other which is equivalent. Besides, if it were so, it should not be understood that that certain gift, or if you had rather, kind of gifts is given, which yet all understand to be given, when the holy Spirit is said to be given. For the gifts and effects of the most high God, are of most large extent; for what good soever there is, it comes from him. Therefore if thou shouldst hear that the most high God is given, namely, because his gifts are given, either thou wouldst understand that all gifts are given together, or, if thou wouldst understand only a certain kind of gifts to be given, thou wouldst believe that to be given, which is of all the most excellent, either alone, or conjoined with others. The same thing therefore should be thought of the holy Spirit, if he were the most high God, and not said to be given but in respect of gifts and effects only. But neither all gifts are understood to be given, when we hear the holy Spirit is given; nor that which is of all the greatest, to wit, immortal life, or perfect justification; but presently our mind is carried to a divine breathing or inspiration, or the effects of it in men; to wit, because the divine Spirit, properly so called, is a divine inspiration, or a force flowing from God into men, breathed from heaven into their hearts. This, I say, is the true cause, why our mind hearing the holy Spirit to be given, is carried to that certain kind of gift or gifts. But the Adversaries will except that there is in this case another reason of the name of God, or the Father, or also of the Son, another of the name of the holy Spirit, although he be the Supreme God. For they so dispute, as we have before shewed; although all the works to without are common to the whole Trinity, yet in a certain peculiar respect creation is attributed to the Father, redemption to the Son, sanctification to the holy Spirit. Now then they will say, that that kind of gift or gifts, which we understand, as soon as we hear the holy Spirit is given, doth pertain to sanctification. Therefore it is not designed by the name of God common to three persons, not by the name of the Father, nor Son, but the holy Spirit. Thou seest by what circuits the mind is led by the adversaries thither, whither it is forthwith straight carried. But is it credible that those, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles* (who first heard of the holy Spirit to be given to men) either from Christ, or other divine men did either already know those things, or being ignorant of them did not understand, what was signified by the name of the holy Spirit, and what was promised both to them and to others? Were those auditors of *John Baptist* or *Peter*, whom we mentioned before, so knowing of those things, that they could think at first, when they heard of the holy Spirit to be poured out upon them, that some effect should be given them, not peculiar to the first and second person of the Deity, but the third to whom it is proper to sanctify; therefore that effect did pertain to sanctification, and withal was a divine inspiration? Was it not more ready for them to think that which the word it self declared, that a divine inspiration or its effects were promised to them? But besides, whence is it manifest to the Adversaries, that the three persons of the Deity have among themselves thus parted those three gifts? Were they perhaps present at their counsel, that they so boldly affirme these things? They will say, from the holy Scriptures it is manifest to them concerning that thing, as which doth chiefly ascribe creation to the Father, redemption to the Son, sanctification to the holy Spirit. Of creation and redemption there is not now place of disputing. Yet it may be said by the way, that creation, or that first production of all things, is ascribed to the Father, not chiefly only but also solesy, since he was the sole author of it. That redemption is ascribed to the Son, neither alone simply, nor as the first author; but as the chief middle cause, who in the name of the Father and by his command, performed the whole work of our redemption and salvation, and as yet performs it. As to sanctification; neither is that more often ascribed unto the holy Spirit, than to the Father or Son, especially openly; neither is it attributed as to some person, but as to a thing by which sanctification is performed. Which first, is manifest from thence, that where as it is read expressly of the Father that he sanctifies, as also of Christ; it is no where said of the holy Spirit, that I know, that it sanctifies, but only that in or by it men are sanctified, or some such way which is not proper to a person, is sanctification ascribed unto it. Of

the Father you have plain places, *Joh. 10. 36. 17. 17.* to which add 1 *Thess. 5. 23.* Where it easily appears, that there it is spoken of the Father, since the holy Scripture understand him alone by the name of *God* subjectively put, chiefly when he is distinguished from Christ. Neither shall I easily believe that the Adversaries will take this place of the holy Spirit only. Also in the Old testament many places occur, in which God affirms, that he it is who sanctifies the people of *Israel*, which either speak of the Father alone, as we think, or at least of the Father also, not of the holy Spirit alone. Of Christ you have testimonies, *Eph. 5. 26. Heb. 2. 11. 13. 12.* For I pass by those places, in which in some other manner sanctification is ascribed either to the Father or the Son. But if the holy Spirit were a divine person equal to the Father in all things, and to him in some chief respect the action of sanctifying did agree, how could it be, that of him it should not be once said, that he sanctifies, but of the Father and Son it should be said plainly? The action of sanctifying might be directly attributed indeed to the holy Spirit, although it were not a person: since we see, that to many other things, and chiefly to qualities which they call active, actions are directly attributed in holy Scripture, and also the very act of sanctifying. But it cannot be that the holy Spirit should be a person, and that the act of sanctifying should agree to it in a peculiar manner, above the Father and the Son, and yet not be directly any where attributed to it. We have by the way touched above also other reasons; for we shewed in the Argument next foregoing, that it would follow out of that supposition of the Adversaries, that the holy Spirit is the Father of Christ, rather than God, who is every where said to be his Father.

We have seen also above in the Epistle of *Jude*, that Sanctification is ascribed to the Father, Preservation of us to Christ, the holy Spirit being not indeed so much as mentioned: For so the Greek Text hath it; *Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ*, and the brother of James, to them that are sanctified in God the Father and preserved in Christ Jesus, the called. *Or, as some later Interpreters, in some manner studying the perspicuity of the sentence, have rendred it, called of God the Father (or by the Father) sanctified and saved by Jesus Christ.*

Is it credible, if the holy Spirit were a divine person, to whom the action of sanctifying in some respect should rather agree, than to the Father and Son, that this action should be attributed, as proper, to the Father, the mention of the holy Spirit, being altogether omitted? We have seen it also affirmed by *Paul*, That all things, in any manner pertaining to our Salvation, are from God the Father, as the first cause; all things in like manner by the Son, as the middle cause, no mention being made of the holy Spirit. But if the holy Spirit were a divine person, to whom so notable an action, so greatly pertaining to our salvation, should agree, in some remarkable respect, above those two persons: not only the mention of it could not be omitted, but also it could not be rightly affirmed, that *all things are of the Father*, or that *all things are by Christ*. For that person of the holy Spirit, either as the first and supreme cause, should have something in so great a matter above the Father; or as a middle cause above the Son; when notwithstanding not some, but *all things* are entirely attributed to the Father as the first cause, and to the Son as the middle cause, yet holding the next place from the first. Lastly the common opinion concerning the Trinity doth not bear such a partition of actions and offices. For if those persons have one and the same numerical understanding, will, power, & there is not any of these more in one than in the rest; it is necessary, that there be also one operation in number of all these, as even the Adversaries confess; and that one person act not any thing, more than another. For such diversity or inequality of action could not arise any otherwise thence, than that one person of this thing, another of that, a third of another thing, should either think rather, or would rather exercise it, or lastly could better performe it. But such a difference cannot be held in that unity: because seeing those persons think altogether with the same understanding, not with another and another; in like manner also they both will with the same will, and work outwardly by the same power in number: one thinks, wills, and workes as much as another; not one more than another. It is manifest therefore that sanctification, and whatsoever pertains to it, doth in no wise more agree to the holy *Spirit*, than to the Father and Son, if he were one God *with both*. And hence ariseth a third reason, by which it is demonstrated that it cannot indeed be said, no not by a Metonymy of the holy Spirit, that he is given or received by men, if he be held to be that one God together with the Father and Son. For it will follow that the holy Spirit is no more given to us, and received of us, than the Father and the Son. For those gifts and effects, in respect of which, the holy Spirit should be said to be given, should no more

come from the holy Spirit, than from the Father and the Son; nor in one respect from these, and in another from that, but in the same altogether. But who hath ever heard, who hath read, that the Father was given to any, or, was prayed to be given to us, when the gifts of the holy Spirit were prayed for? Who asks at this day, that the Son might be given to him, being about to ask for those same gifts? Who would brook him, that should ask Christ that he would give the Father to him, or would pray to the person of the holy Spirit, that he would bestow the Father and Son, and himself also upon us? But if you look on the force of the Adversaries opinion, it will be very lawful to pray after that manner. And certainly believers, when they ask spiritual gifts, do not intend, that those things be given, which may by name come from the third person of the Deity; as if it were not all one to them, whether the same come immediately either from the Father or the Son. For what other thing do they then seek, than that being endued with divine virtue, they may be filled either with more plentiful knowledge of divine mysteries, or some celestial joy, or singular servour of piety, or other heavenly gifts? All which that they may immediately come, as well from the Father and Son, as from the supposed person of the holy Spirit, is easily understood by all. Wherefore, if the holy Spirit be the most high God, there is no cause, why those gifts should be rather called the holy Spirit, than the Father or Son: Or, when the same are asked or given of God, the holy Spirit should rather be said to be asked or given, than the Father and Son.

Lastly, If the holy Spirit were the most high God, he should not be given by another person, nor commanded to be asked; but from himself rather, as both the chief and proper fountain, those gifts should at least somewhere, be commanded to be asked: But that is no where done. In some sort a double reason doth lie hid in this one Argument.

One, That the gifts flowing from him, are no where commanded to be asked of him, as neither any thing else; of which matter something hath been said above, so that there is no need I should here stay on it.

Another, That the holy Spirit is commanded to be asked, and said to be given of another, to wit, the Father.

For, from hence it follows, that the holy Spirit cannot chose but distribute his gifts, when the Father so wills; and on the contrary, not distribute them when the Father will not. For if he could distribute them when the Father is unwilling, or not distribute them though the Father be willing; it were better to ask the holy Spirit himself, that he would bestow them on us, than the Father. Besides, that it would thence follow, that the Father is not the most high God; as who hath not all gifts absolutely in his own power, and although he would give some gifts to men, yet he cannot but by anothers consent. But now if the holy Spirit cannot but distribute his gifts, when the Father will, and not distribute them when the Father will not, and so necessarily conform himself to anothers will, he is not the most high God. For the most high God is altogether at his own will, at his own dispose, nor doth he ever fashion himself after anothers will, especially necessarily. For he should be in anothers power, and so acknowledge another superiour, by which very thing, he would cease to be the most high God. Now, if you say, that the holy Spirit indeed cannot do otherwise than the Father will, but that cometh to pass, not because he is in the Fathers power, but because he is of the same numerical Essence and Will with him, so that he cannot otherwise either will or doe, than the Father willeth or doth. See into what difficulties and snares you cast your self. For if the Father and holy Spirit, by reason of that unity, necessarily will and do the same thing, as indeed it cannot otherwise be, if they were of the same Essence; when the Father willed to send, and so hath sent the holy Spirit, the holy Spirit also willed to send, and consequently hath indeed sent himself; and on the contrary, when the holy Spirit would be sent, the Father himself also would be sent; when the holy Spirit would, in a corporeal shape, descend upon Christ, and did accordingly descend, the Father also would descend in the same, and did accordingly descend. And what end at length will there be of absurdities? But it is necessary that they cast themselves into Quagmires, yea, into Precipices, who of their own accord turn from a plain and simple Truth, so clearly expressed in holy Scriptures, which they do, who contend that the holy Spirit himself is not given us, but his effect only.

We following that strait path, having shewen, that it follows from this, namely, that the holy Spirit is given to men, that he is not the supreme God; now we shall also shew that he is not a person.

Now this hence is easily manifest, that no person at the same time can be so given to many, much less to innumerable men, that in very deed he should be and dwell in every one of them. And, we have already seen, that the holy Spirit is thus given to believers, dispersed through the whole world. But that a person cannot be given in the said manner, is hence manifest, that that person is either infinite or finite; if infinite, there is no necessity that it be given to men, that it may exist and dwell in them, yea, it cannot indeed be given, since it always was in them, and by reason of its infinity could not but be so; to omit other difficulties. If finite; that I urge not, that it cannot by the adversaries be acknowledged for the most high God, it cannot be so given at once to many, and consequently to innumerable men, that in very deed it should exist in every one; otherwise it would be torn into parts, which very thing it self would destroy that person.

It is easy now to observe, that that instance of the Adversaries, fetched from the giving of Christ, hath no force: For they say that Christ also was given to us, *Isa.* 9. 6. Some add also that of *Paul*, *Rom.* 8. 32. That God *will with Christ give us all things*. But they say that Christ is both a person, and besides the most high God. That he is not the most high God we have shewn before, and it may be evinced even out of those very places which are alledged: For the most high God is neither a little one, nor is born, nor is the Son of God; he cannot be delivered for us, no not indeed by himself, much less by another; he is not such as that he could be spared or not spared.

But besides, that we may mind what is proper to this place; when it is said by *Isaias*, that a son is given to us, it is not signified, that he is so given to us, that he may be indeed in us or possessed by us in any manner, in which sense the holy Spirit is said to be given to us, but that he is given for our profit, or for our cheifest good and benefit; which easily appears from the preceeding verse, where in the same sense he is said to be a little one *born to us*. For neither is Christ said to be *born to us*, that he should exist in us, or be possessed by us, but that by him we should be profited. For the Dative case of the person often signifes, *finem cui*, the end *to which*, as they speak, not the possessor, as is observed by learned men. And hence the appellation of the end *to which* ariseth. But if any say, although from that place of *Isa.* it cannot be evinced, that Christ is so given to us, as to dwell in us, yet that it is manifest from elsewhere; For the Apostle wisheth to the *Ephesians*, that Christ may dwell by faith in their hearts: it is first to be observed, that Christ dwells in the hearts of beleevers, not by virtue of that giving, of which there is mention in *Isa.* as the next cause: as the holy Spirit dwells in them as soon as he is given to beleevers, since that giving of Christ hath hapned to men even as yet unbeleevers, and hath been accomplished as soon as he was born: but Christ dwells not in the hearts of men but by faith, as the place it self shewes. Besides, this is to be observed, that Christ is there taken Metonymically for the religion or doctrine by him delivered, as it is also beneath in the same epistle chap. 4. 20, 21. So also *Moses* is taken for the Law delivered by him, *Acts.* 15. 21. *2 Cor.* 3. 15. The sense then of the words of the Apostle is. That God may give you, that you may believe in your hearts, and adhere constantly to the doctrine of Christ, and that it may be thoroughly fixed in your minds by faith. And though at length it were spoken of the person of Christ; yet it would not follow that *Paul* wisheth, that he in very deed and properly should dwell in the hearts of beleevers, but that he should do it by his grace, aid and spirit, which both the Apostles wish, and the manner or middle cause of that inhabitation expressed by him, to wit, by faith, doth sufficiently shew. For if Christ by his Essence should dwell in them, he should dwell in all men, whether beleevers or not beleevers. For that would be by reason of his natural immensity, which would be excluded from no place whatsoever it be; neither in that thing could there be regard had either of faith or infidelity. For it is necessary, that what is immense in Essence, fill all places and all mens hearts. Neither then that place of *Isa.* nor this to the *Ephesians* makes any thing to purpose. But that place of the Epistle to the *Romans* (chap. 8. 32.) saith not the same with that of *Isa* For that *all things shall be given to us with Christ*, we may so interpret, and indeed more rightly, that God will give to us all things (to wit, which he hath promised us) even as to Christ, or as before in the same chap. the Apostle had said, that we shall be co-heirs of Christ, and be glorified together with him, *vers.* 17. For we must be made conformable to the image of the Son of God, that he may be the first-born among many brethren *vers.* 29. which verse the Apostle

seemes here to eye. But the manner of speaking, should offend none, as if, *with him*, could not signify, *in like manner as to him*, since we have seen already, we are to be together glorified, to wit, with Christ; that is, so as Christ was glorified. So in the same Epistle, it is said, that *we are buried with him*, (that is, as well as he) and *that our old man is crucified with him: that we are dead with him: that we shall live with him*; that is, no otherwise than as he. See also 2 Tim. 2. 11, 12.

*An Appendix of the precedent Argument, in which the places are urged, in which the holy Spirit is called, The Earnest, and by it men are said to be sealed, and to be powered upon, baptized and drenched.*

To the testimonies which speak of the giving and receiving of the holy Spirit, let us join others, which although of themselves also they might be urged against the vulgar opinion concerning the holy Spirit, yet because they are not much unlike to the former, therefore we will have them to be as an overplus of the former Argument. And first, hither pertain those testimonies of Scripture, in which the holy Spirit is called a *Pledge*; or rather, as the Greek Text hath it, *The Earnest*, either simply, or of our inheritance. But the earnest is part of the thing promised, given before hand, which makes him to whom any thing is promised, certain of the residue also. Therefore seeing God doth not as yet in very deed exhibit the inheritance promised, he gives to us, as it were aforehand, the holy Spirit, which may make us sure of the future inheritance, until he really bring us into the possession of it. But hence it sufficiently appears, that the holy Spirit is not the most high God. For he is the promiser, not the earnest or pledge of the thing promised. Who doth pledge or give himself for an earnest? Or how can God be received of a man for an earnest or pledge? For an earnest is in some manner possessed by him to whom it is given. But how may the most high God be possessed by a man? Besides, is it credible, that God hath now already given us more, than he promised he will give in time to come? That surely neither doth the nature of an earnest bear, nor this suffer, to wit, that by the confession of all, we shall here after at length become far more happy, and excellent in dignity, yea, then truly happy and glorious. But he had given us more now than is the inheritance it self, promised unto us, if the holy Spirit were the most high God. For who dares to compare our inheritance, though infinite in time, with God himself?

But the places quoted, advertise us also of another manner of speaking used of the holy Spirit, which shews that he is not a divine person. And that is, that Believers are said to be sealed with the holy Spirit. For so it is plainly written, *Ephes. 1. 13.* to which the place chap. 4. 30. is like. For though it is said in the latter place, that the *Ephesians* were sealed *in the holy Spirit*, which some interpret, *by the holy Spirit*; yet we shall shew a little after, that also in other places, and those such indeed where it is spoken of the holy Spirit, the particle *in* by an Hebraism is redundant: and that it is so in this place is apparent enough, both by comparing of the words chap. 1. 13. where that particle is omitted, and by the thing it self. For neither here would the Apostle shew, who hath sealed, but with how excellent a sign we have been marked, and as it were secured by God, considering which, we might not doubt of our future redemption, and further considering how much is given to us, we might diligently take heed, that we do not, peradventure by vanity of words, deprive our selves of so great a good, and rase and blot out the character and *Mark* stamped on us by God. But the Apostle had not expressed that, if he had only said, that we are sealed by the holy Spirit; unless perhaps any one should take such words in such a sense, in which we would have them said: to wit, that it may be understood, that we have been sealed with the divine Spirit, or that the holy Spirit is as it were a sign, *Mark*, and character impressed on us, by which God hath marked us as his proper goods, and hath made us sacred and inviolable, and safe from all danger of perishing, if we do our duty. The same thing the Apostle hath shewed, *2 Cor. 1. 22.* especially if one compare the place with those two, which we have cited out of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, and chiefly with the former. For in both places, the same thing is explained, nor do the words much differ. For there indeed, after the Apostle had said, ver. 21. *Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ*, (Greek, *into Christ*) and hath anointed us, is God. He adds, ver. 22. *who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.* But here he saith, *In whom* (that is, *by whom*, to wit, *Christ*) *also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise* (that is, the holy Spirit promised) *which is the Pledge* (or *Earnest*) *of our inheritance unto the day of redemption*, &c. namely, the latter clause is added for explication of the former, and what is

the earnest of our inheritance, the same is also the seal with which we are *Marked*. Hence then it again appears, that the holy Spirit is neither the most high God, nor a person. For neither is any thing sealed with a person, but with some thing: nor is any thing more absurd, than to say that the most high God, whose propriety we are, and who hath sealed us unto the day of redemption, is the seal it self wherewith we are sealed.

By these things also, it appears, that the Adversaries labour in vain; who endeavour out of the words *Ephes. 4. 30.* to deduct the person of the holy Spirit, because he is said to be grieved and vexed by us, as if the like things were not attributed to Charity, which is said, *to rejoice in the Truth*: and on the contrary, not to rejoice (which is all one as to be grieved) *with Iniquity*; and as if it were not more easy to find here a feigning of a person, than to shew, that to some person, and he indeed the most high God, it agrees to be a seal imprinted on men. Certainly they, who else where, will they, nill they, are forced to acknowledge, that groans are improperly attributed to the holy Spirit, have no cause, why they will not have grieving figuratively to be ascribed to it; especially when neither themselves can properly ascribe grieving to it, seeing that doth not proper befall God.

But if they say, that that also is improperly, and by a Metaphor, said of the holy Spirit, that we are sealed by it, we answer, Although the thing expressed by that metaphorical kind of speaking, be conceived in proper words, yet nevertheless, the force of our Argument would be the same. For it is signified, as was said, that the holy Spirit is a certain thing given unto us by God, by which we may be certified of our future redemption, and the happiness promised us. Besides, although that manner of speaking be metaphorical, yet it is not such as is fitted to a person. For neither is every Metaphor accommodated to every thing. Let there be brought forth but one place either out of profane or sacred Writers, where some one is said to be sealed with any person. Wherefore if the holy Spirit were a person, *Paul* would have used such a Metaphor, as might have been fitted to a person, and had not less expressed the thing which he here handled, than the word of *sealing*. He had said, to wit, that the holy Spirit was a surety, or undertaker, or hostage, or had been content with the name of earnest, or pledge: which last word is sometime by a Metaphor accommodated to persons. But it is altogether unheard of, that any person who is given to another to certify him of his salvation and safety, is compared to a seal imprinted on him, who is secured, or any one said to be sealed by him. Neither indeed in the places alledged, doth any thing go before, which gave occasion to the Apostle for so bold, yea, absurd a kind of metaphor, rather than for another, alike fitted to his purpose, and more to the person. But unusual metaphors and figures, are not wont to be used by considerate and grave men, unless special occasion invites them, and leads them thereto; much less that they speak so absurdly, without any necessity: The same we would have also said unto them, who say these things are pronounced of the holy Spirit by a Metonymy or Metalepsis, to wit, in respect of the gifts which come from him. For there are also other Metalepsis, in some manner accommodated to persons, or at least more in use. But unusual ones are not to be ascribed to considerate men, unless it appears that they are led to them by some certain occasion. Although the same Adversaries also are bound to excuse a Metaphor, which would nothing less concur with a Metalepsis.

In the third place those places of holy Scripture deserve to be mentioned, in which *the holy Spirit is said to be poured out on men*, such as are these, *Isa. 44. 3. Joel 2. 28. 29.* (which place is cited by Peter, *Acts 2. 18, 19.*) *Zach. 12. 10. Tit. 3. 6.* to which also those are to be joined, in which men are said, *to be baptized in or with it*, and its baptism is opposed to the baptism of water used by *John*, as it is *Mat. 3. 11.* and the places in the other Evangelists answering to it; and likewise *John 1. 33. Acts 1. 5, 11, 16.* add *1 Cor. 12. 13.* although there, *to be baptized in one spirit*, is taken by some, for, to be baptized by one Spirit, & so we might say, we are baptized by Christ, by whom God hath poured out abundantly the holy Spirit upon us, *Tit. 3. 6.* when nevertheless otherwise, where ever that phrase, *To be baptized in spirit*, is extant, it signifies nothing else, as all confess, than *to be baptized with the spirit*; the particle *in* among the Greeks being redundant, which hath flowed from an Hebraism. For because that which the Greeks express by the simple Dative case, the Latins by the Ablative, the Hebrews cannot express without the Particle prefixed, which is for the most part *Be*, that is *In*; therefore it is often retained by the hebraising Greek Writers, and prefixed to the dative, which alone would have that force. But that those words, *in the holy Spirit*, are elsewhere so to be understood,

easily appears by the opposite member. For in most places, in which it is said, that *John* baptized *with water*, it is in Greek *in water*: only in *Luke* 3. 16. and *Acts* 11. 16. the particle *In* is omitted, and it is said simply, and without an Hebraism, that he baptized *with water*. Wherefore the same is to be held concerning the place *1 Cor.* 12. especially when by the thing it self, it may sufficiently appear, that the Apostle would demonstrate the unity of Believers by this, that all are endued and filled with the same Spirit. Which, that he might the more significantly express, he makes mention also of making to drink. For because a man is then fully made partaker of liquor, when he is both washed outwardly with it, and as it were immersed in it, and made to drink it, or if you had rather, drenched with it, that he may be also inwardly filled with it. Therefore *Paul*, that he might signify, that Christians were every way replenished with the holy Spirit, saith, they were so made to drink, that they breathed one spirit, and were wholly endued with it: Which agrees with that of Christ, who in *John*, inviting men to the participation of so excellent a gift, thus saith, *If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink*, understand it of *that living water*; which it is manifest by the things which follow, is the holy Spirit. Let those places also be added to these, in which either Christ himself is said to be anointed, or others are signified to be anointed with the holy Spirit. For from all these it is understood, that the holy Spirit is not a person. much less the most high God. Who will say that a person, much less the most high God, is poured out on men, that men are baptized, drenched and anointed with it? That a man may be said to be anointed with divine Virtue, this very thing sufficiently shews, because Christ in that place where he is said to be anointed with the holy Spirit, is said also to be anointed with Power, namely, divine. Those things that we have said before, refute the Metonymy, which is fained to be in these kinds of speech. And although if it were admitted, it would shew that the holy Spirit is not the most high God. For who can believe, that the holy Writers, in the name of the most high God, would so often use such Metonymies, and forms of speaking, which not only of themselves very much abhor from the nature of the supreme Deity, but the like of which do not readily occur, no not in the names even of other persons, either in vulgar speech, or in the sacred Writings.

## CHAP. LIV: The holy Spirit partitioned

### **The ninth Argument, *Drawn from those places, which argue some partition of the holy Spirit.***

But yet we must not altogether depart from the giving of the holy Spirit. For the manner of its giving, or certain words which in some places are added, where there is mention made of that donation, yield us yet another argument. For 1 *John* 4. 13. We read that, *God hath given us of his Spirit*; which signifies, that God hath given not all his Spirit, but some part of it, which cannot befall a person, especially divine, and so the most high God. For a divine person cannot be distributed into parts; and, if he were given to any, could not be given but whole.

Perhaps some will say, it is read in the Greek, that God hath given to us, *from or of his Spirit*, which may signify, not that God had indeed given his Spirit it self or some part of it, but something flowing from that Spirit. For this is often the force of the particle *from* or *of*, that it signifies the efficient cause, in which manner all things are said to be *of*, or *from* God, *Rom.* 11. 36. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. And the holy conception of *Mary*, to be *of*, or *from the holy Spirit*, *Matth.* 1. 20. But that that interpretation is at no hand to be admitted in this place; first, a very like place in the same *John*, where the Apostle handles the same thing, doth demonstrate. Now that is extant about the end of the third Chapter, where, when he had said, being about chiefly to commend Charity, that he who *keepeth the commandments of God, abideth in him, and he in him*; he adds, *and by this we know, that he abideth in us, by, or from the Spirit which he hath given us*. Do you see, he saith, that God hath given to us the Spirit, to wit, his, and by it it is known, that he abideth in us? Why then saith he not the same in our place, *Chap.* 4. 1. where, when he had affirmed, if we love one another, God abides in us, and his love is perfected in us; he adds, *In this we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because (or that) he hath given us of his Spirit*. The very likeness of the place evinceth, that *John*, as he there said, that God hath given to us his Spirit, so he also here saith the same; except here speaking a little more distinctly, he sheweth, that God hath given to us, not his whole Spirit, but of it, or a part of it. Besides the thing it self requireth it. For *John* would and ought to express, what God hath given to us, by which we may certainly know, that God dwells in us. But he had not expressed that, if he had only said, that God hath given to us from, or of his Spirit, as an efficient cause. For what that should be, he had only left it to be guessed at by us, and the sentence had been maimed; like as if one should say, God hath given to us from, or of himself as an efficient cause: Which speech had not been worthy a considerate man, much less the Apostle. But that sentence, which we have expressed, is both perfect, and plainly expresseth the thing given, and such indeed as may demonstrate most clearly, that God dwells in us, in some most singular and divine manner, and we in him; and that there is a most strait bond of love, and conjunction between us and him. For, how could we more straitly be joined with him, or he with us, then when he hath imparted to us of his holy Spirit? The same thing which is shewed in those words of *John*, is shewed also in that manner of speaking, which *Luke*, together with the Greek Translators of the Old Testament, useth, describing in Greek, the Speech of *Peter*, in which the place is cited out of *Joel*, *Acts* 2. 18, 19. For in stead of that which God saith to *Joel*, *I will pour out my Spirit*, it is said in *Peters* words, *I will pour out of my Spirit*; the sense indeed remaining the same, but yet so expressed, that it may be signified, That God would pour out not his whole Spirit upon all flesh, and upon their servants and handmaids, but as it were some part of it. For there is an immense plenty of it with God, which is resident in him, as in its fountain, but proceeds and flows from him, when, & so far, as he will, not otherwise than the light from the Sun or that force which they call influence from Stars, or as heat from fire upon things put to it. For, let me be allowed to illustrate a thing most divine by similitudes, to which you have not unlike ones concerning wisdom issuing from God, in the Author of the Book of *Wisdom*, *Chap.* 7. 26. 27. Therefore as the things mentioned by us, diffuse their power, and distribute it into many subjects, and that often unequally, so also God communicateth his power and virtue to many, and not to all in the same measure, and the same degree; whence there ariseth some partition of his power, so that no man may wonder, that we following the Scripture, urge some partition of the holy Spirit. Although what need is there to defend or excuse that which the holy Writings do so plainly assert? For, what is it which the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, *Chap.* 2. 4. saith, *That God confirmed by his testimony, the Doctrine of the Gospel, concerning ever lasting salvation, as well*

by signes and wonders, and divers miracles, as also by the distributions or divisions of the holy Spirit, that is, by distributing the holy Spirit among believers, and imparting it to them in various measures as it hath pleased him? What likewise is that which God long since said to *Moses*, *Num.* 11. 17. *I will take off thy Spirit, and put on them*, to wit, the seventy Elders? Which also we see was done afterward in the very deed. For so we read after *Vers.* 25. *And took (the Lord) of the Spirit which was in Moses, and gave it to the seventy Elders, and when the spirit had rested on them, they prophesied, &c.* What moreover that which we read of *Eliseus*, who would have given to him a double spirit of *Elias*, or as it is in the *Hebrew*, *the mouth of two in the spirit of Elias*, that is a double part of his Spirit, or sufficient for two, as it is explained by learned men, by comparing this place with that, *Deut.* 21. 17. where the same phrase occurs, although in another matter? For there the Father is commanded to give doubles, *Heb.* *the mouth of two*, or a double part of goods to his first-born Son, although born of the hated wife. Neither truly did *Elizeus* in vain ask for that, as is understood by the following words of that place. Moreover *Paul* makes mention also of the first-fruits of the Spirit. *Rom.* 8. 2, 3. Now what else are the first- fruits of any thing, but the first and select parts of it?

Lastly, When *John* saith, that *God giveth the Spirit not by measure*, *John* 3. 34. what other thing would he, than that God gives the Spirit most plentifully? But that cannot be said of a thing, which can in no manner be increased, nor diminished, nor divided into some parts. And surely *John* doth tacitely intimate, that God hath given, or doth give the Spirit in some certain measure: but to Christ alone he hath imparted a certain unmeasurable plenty of it. But it is not necessary for us in this place to say all things which pertain to a further explication of those places; that shall be done, if God will, else where. For it is enough now to have shewn, that a certain distribution doth befall the holy Spirit, which cannot by any means befall a divine person, yea, no person at all, unless with some corruption of it. But the distribution of the holy Spirit brings no corruption to it.

#### **The Defence and Confirmation of the Argument.**

But we have already above, shut up this way for escape, to wit, that these things are to be understood of the gift or effect of the holy Spirit, who is a divine person. Besides that it may appear by some places, alledged by us, and the like to them, that that Spirit, of which these things are said, is one thing, the gift understood by the Adversaries another thing, namely, a quality or motion imprinted on men by a divine spirit. See *Numb.* 11. 25, &c. Compare together *Joel* 2. 28, 29. *Zach.* 12. 10. and *Isa.* 11. 2. *John* 3. 34. That I mention not now the History it self, of the effusion of the holy Spirit, set down, *Acts* 2. by which it is manifest, that the holy Spirit poured out on the Apostles, and distributed, is one thing, the gift flowing from thence, another thing. See *vers.* 3. 4. But of the same Spirit also other places are to be understood.

Out of the places hitherto brought by us, you may easily frame many arguments. For every manner of expression used in the restimonies, signifying either more openly, or more covertly, some division of the holy Spirit; may supply us with a several reason. For they so abhor from the supreme deity, that no man may dare to use them of it. No such thing surely is so much as intimated in the holy Scriptures, either of the Father or of the Son. Who hath either heard or dare say, that there is taken of the Father or of Christ, that there is given or poured out of him, that he is distributed or doubled, that he is given either in measure or without measure, that any one has the first fruits of him, or the first and better parts of him? But what other cause is there of this thing, then because they are persons and indeed divine ones; although the latter, not of himself, but by the grace and gift of God. Therefore there would be the same reason of the holy Spirit also, if it were likewise the most high God.

## CHAP. LV: Guenching the holy Spirit

**The tenth Argument, *That we are forbidden to quench the Spirit, and we read that the holy Spirit sometime was not, and that some disciples were ignorant whether there were any holy Spirit.***

The words of the Apostle, 1 *Thes.* 5. 19. (where speaking of the holy Spirit, he warns, that we *quench not the Spirit*) deserve the sixth place in this rank, whence in like manner is understood that the holy Spirit is not the most high God. For these words shew that that Spirit may be quenched. But who dares say that, in any wise of the most high God? Who would brook him, who should waine thus; beware thou extinguish not God the Father? Would not our very ears refuse such formes of speaking? But there is the same reason of the holy Spirit, as of the Father, if the holy Spirit be the most high God. For that therefore cannot be said of God the Father, because he is the most high God. But if thou wouldst excuse it by some trope, which otherwise we deny not to be in the words; it is to be considered (which we a little before have minded) that tropes ought to be modest, most of all when the name of the most high God is used, of whom we must so speak, and the Apostle so speak, as is beeseeming his Majesty. But we have already hinted that such manner of speaking agrees not to God, and is rejected presently by mens ears as absurd. Some prophets use a more lofty and figurative style than the Apostles, which is seen especially in Psalmes and songs. For they contain some kind of verse, and as is observed by learned men, come nearer to the style of Poets, than to speech in prose. But you shall read no such thing there of God; much less ought we to think that the Apostle who scarce riseth above common speech, hath in delivering precepts, used so bold and unusual a figure, if you acknowledge that the holy Spirit is properly a divine inspiration, or certain power flowing from God into men; you will easily understand that that manner of speaking is not at all absurd. For nothing hinders that a divine inspiration, especially in this, or that man may cease and be extinguished.

Hence also may be understood that manner of speech concerning the holy Spirit used by *John: The holy Spirit was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.* Which some of the Adversaries perceiving not to be agreeable to their opinion of the holy Spirit, they have thought it to be thus read. The Spirit was not yet *given*, which reading others of the Adversaries have noted and shewed that it is not to be admitted. Not much different from this manner of speaking is that which those disciple; that were found by *Paul at Ephesus* used. For when *Paul* had asked of them, whether since they believed, they had received the holy Spirit, they answered, *that they had not so much as heard whether there were a holy Spirit.* Let the Adversaries feign here what Tropes they will: yet will they never persuade a serious man, and one that considers in what manner we are wont to speak of any thing, that either *John*, or those disciples could speak so of the holy Spirit, if the holy Spirit were God. Wilt thou say, God is not yet, the Father is not yet, the Son is not yet, because a certain effect of him is not yet extant among men? What author? What example is there for it? Shall a man say, he knowes not whether the most high God be, because he hath not heard that certain gifts of his doe happen to men? But if you shall think the holy Spirit to be a divine inspiration, or a certain power issuing from God to men, you will not wonder at those manners of speaking. For because Christ being not yet glorified, that inspiration was not wont to happen to men although beleivers, and afterward also those *Ephesian* disciples knew not that it was done; therefore *John* indeed said, that the holy Spirit was not yet; Christ being not yet glorified; but those disciples, that they had not indeed heard, whether there was a holy Spirit.

## CHAP. LVI: John. 15. 26.

### **The eleventh Argument, From *John 15. 26.* where the holy Spirit is said, To proceed from the Father.**

After we have drawn Arguments out of those places of Scripture, in which those things are said of the holy Spirit, which agree not rather to persons than things; it remains that we fetch reasons also from those attributes of the holy Spirit, which indeed properly taken, agree only to persons, or at least *Suppositums*, but are figuratively attributed to the holy Spirit: or first and of themselves agree to *Suppositums*, to other things only consequently.

Let that be the first of them, that the holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Father. There is indeed some Metaphor in the word *proceeding*, which the Adversaries also are compelled to acknowledge, (For to proceed, doth properly agree but to men or to living creatures, which move themselves from place to place) but it hinders not but that we may hence draw an Argument. For it is agreed between us, and the Adversaries, that this word being referred to the holy Spirit, denotes its production from the Father; by which namely the holy Spirit is in very deed that which it is. Whence the Adversaries would that that procession was from eternity: and say that as the Son received his Essence by generation from the Father, so the holy Spirit received the same by procession, of which thing there is no need now to speak more largely. It shall be done, the Lord helping afterward. Now it is enough to have hinted what we have said. For from this, that the holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, and to receive his Essence, it is manifest that he is not the most high God; For the same reasons for which we have said before that the Son of God is not the most high God, because he was begotten of the Father, and from him received his Essence. For in this case there is the same reason of procession, as there is of generation; yea, as we shall shew in its place, that procession devised by the Adversaries, is no less generation than that of the Son. Wherefore what we have said of the generation of the Son of God is hither also to be transferred. Add to those this reason also; that Christ signifies that that procession doth even yet continue. For he doth not say that the holy Spirit *hath proceeded* from the Father, but that it *doth proceed*. Neither indeed do the more learned Adversaries deny it, who have devised such a manner of procession, as hath continued from all eternity, & is to continue unto all eternity. Therefore according to their opinion, the holy Spirit even yet receives his Essence from the Father, and also from the Son, and is to receive it unto all ages. But it must needs be that the most high God hath already fully had his Essence from all eternity, so that he now any more neither hath, nor can possibly receive it; however it be supposed, which is impossible, that he could at any time receive his Essence from another. Besides, they, who contend that the procession of the holy Spirit, of which Christ in *John* speaks, (For there is no where else express mention made of it) hath continued from all eternity, and that it shall continue to all eternity, have not considered that Christ speaks of that procession of the holy Spirit, by which it should come to pass that the holy Spirit should be sent from him to the disciples, and moreover come to them. For if you consider the rest of the things spoken of in the same place, you will find no other cause, why Christ said that the holy Spirit doth proceed from the Father, than that he might declare that which he had said, *whom (to wit the Advocate) I will send to you from the Father*: neither do the Adversaries seem to deny it. But what hath that procession, which continues from eternity to eternity, common with the sending and coming of the holy Spirit to the disciples? yea that would rather hinder this, if by that, the holy Spirit should be the most high God, as the Adversaries would have it. I omit that they, (the Greeks only excepted) hold that the holy Spirit doth proceed eternally no less from the Son than from the Father. But Christ speaks of a thing, which is proper to the Father. For in this behalf, in some sort he opposeth the Father to himself, being about to shew, why he said, he would send the holy Spirit not from himself but *from the Father*. But how much more simple and plain is it to hold, that the holy Spirit doth so far proceed from God, as it is the virtue and efficacy issuing from him into men; than, that the most high God, who is but one only, proceeds from another, who is in like manner the most high God; that he who is from no cause, receives his being from another; that he who hath had most fully his Essence from Eternity, receives it, and is to receive it yet unto all Eternity.

But that the same thing which we have shewed out of the words of Christ, set down by *John*, is taught also by those words of *Paul*, in which he affirmeth, that the holy Spirit *is of God*, 1 *Cor.* 2. 12. For he saith, *Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God.* But whatsoever is of God, is Gods effect and depends on him. But all, as we have said, know, that God is the effect of no thing. Although there is scarce need to make mention of effect, it is enough to say, that the most high God is from none.

## **CHAP. LVII: The holy Spirit sent by he Father and the Son**

### **The twelfth Argument, *That the holy Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son.***

The second of those Attributes, which properly agree only to persons or *Suppositiums*, but are accommodated to the holy Spirit by some Trope, may be that which is in the same place of *John* cited by us in the next foregoing Chapter, and is elsewhere in the same Writer extant, to wit, that the holy Spirit is sent from the Father and Son. For that befalls not the most high God. But although that mission is nothing else than the giving of the holy Spirit, whence that the holy Spirit is *given* and *sent* to the Disciples from the Father, are put for the same thing, as is manifest by comparing the words, *Chap.* 14. 16. with the places now cited. Yet because the Adversaries will have that mission to be such as that it can befall none but a person, especially because Christ brings in, in the same speech, the holy Spirit as his certain Deputy or Ambassador, to be sent to the Disciples, chiefly in *Chap.* 16. 7, 13. therefore almost in the same manner, it may be hence demonstrated, that the holy Spirit is not the most high God; in which we have before demonstrated the same thing concerning Christ, from his sending; so that there is no need to add more in this place.

## CHAP. LVIII: John. 16. 13.

**The thirteenth Argument from the words, *John 16. 13. He shall not speak (the spirit of Truth) from himself: but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, &c.***

Because towards the end of the foregoing *Chapter*, we fell into the mention of the place, *John 16. 13.* where it is spoken of the thing, joined to the sending of the holy Spirit; therefore we will here examine it also. For there, not only that is affirmed of the holy Spirit, which could not be affirmed of him, if he were the most high God, but also that is denied, which cannot be by any means denied of the most high God. For, thus Christ saith, *Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you all into the Truth. For he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine. Therefore I said (that) he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* Here it is denied, that the holy Spirit spake of himself: on the contrary it is affirmed, that he should speak what he heard, and should receive of that which was Christs. And the former indeed is therefore chiefly denied, that it may be shewed, that he is rightly called, the Spirit of Truth, that is, most true: But this latter is therefore affirmed of him, that it might be shewed, that he should glorify Christ. But the most high God, whatsoever he speaks, speaks of himself, and for that very thing he is true, because he speakes of himself. He doth not also hear what he should speak, nor is instructed, like an Ambassador, by another. He receiveth nothing from any, yea, he bestoweth of his own upon all. He hath not glorified Christ by receiving something from him, but by giving to him. How then is the holy Spirit the most high God?

It will not be amiss to cite here the words of *John Maldonate*, a most learned Interpreter of the Papists, who hath in part unfolded this difficulty, speaking in this manner: But (Christ) gives the reason, as *Rupertus* saith, why he called him the Spirit of Truth, *because*, saith he, *he shall not speak of himself*; as if, if he should speak of himself, he should speak not truth, but a lie. Which, how true it is, it doth non enough appear, seeing he rather therefore speaks truth, and cannot speak false, because he speaks of himself. For when he speaks of himself, he speaks as God, since he is nothing else but God. But when he speaks as God, he cannot lie, which if he could do, then truly could he do it when he speaks not of himself, that is, not as God. Therefore *Augustine* and *Bede* question how it may be understood, that he speakes not of himself. For if there were a double nature in the holy Spirit, as in Christ, one a divine, the other a human, or any other; we might perhaps say, that then he speakes not of himself when he speakes as man, as we interpret what Christ saith of himself, *Joh. 14. 4. The words which I speak to you I speak not of my self*; and what he said before, *Chap. 7. 16. My doctrine is not mine but his that sent me.* But since the holy Spirit is but one, and that a divine nature, as St. Austin disputes, we cannot say it; and thus far he. It were even to be wished to the Adversaries in this place, that a double nature could be feigned in the holy Spirit also, as is done in Christ, that they might loose this knot. By what hole then do they endeavour to escape, when there is none? The foresaid interpreter brings a double answer, One of *Augustin*, and *Bede*, another his own. The first is, therefore the holy Spirit is said not to speak of himself, because neither is he from himself, as therefore saith he, he is not of himself, but he proceeds from the Father and Son, so he shall not speak, but what he hath received from the Father and Son by proceeding from them: as a little after he saith, *He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine.* But when the foresaid Interpreter had come to those words, he clearly enough confutes this explication of this place. The commonly received opinion of latter Interpreters saith he, is this, *For he shall receive of mine*, that is, he proceeds from me. Concerning which thing I find here many subtletys in some Writers, I know not how solid, and agreeable to the matter, which I will not so much as recite. I only say, I am fully persuaded, that this is not the sense. For why did he not say more clearly, he shall receive *of me* or *from me*? Why, not, *he hath recieved*, rather than, *he shall receive*, since the procession of the holy Spirit from the Father and Son was not future, but already past? For although I know an answer is made by some to these things, yet I had rather say nothing, than say that which they say; Besides how can it co-here with that interpretation, All things which the Father hath are mine; therefore I have said, that he shall receive of mine? Lastly, here the matter was of the testimony which the holy Spirit was to give of Christ, and wherewith he was to

glorify him: Which ought to be conspicuous and manifest; otherwise, how could he for that glorify Christ? But that essential procession was not conspicuous: Therefore it could not be brought as an argument, whence the disciples might gather, that the works of the holy Spirit did redound to the glory of Christ, For this was to glorify him. There is no need of more words for the refutation of this interpretation, which so much displeased a Papist, and him most addicted to the opinions of his Church, and which he saw could not be defended unless those things be said which he judged unworthy even to be mentioned by him. Although also that interpretation being admitted, it can nevertheless be evinced, that the holy Spirit is not the most high God, since the most high God, as we have a little before seen, Proceeds from none, receives his Essence from none. The same interpreter a little after subjoins his own opinion touching this thing. Therefore, saith he, the true interpretation is, *that he shall receive of mine*, that is, because he shall come in my name, because as my deputy he shall deliver no other doctrine to you than mine. For therefore the glory of his work and doctrine shall redound to my glory, which is to glorify me, because he shall deliver in my name, and no other than my misteries to you, he shall do no other than my works. For with this sense that which followes, doth fitly agree. *All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore I said he shall receive of mine* as we shall presently explain it. Therefore he said by the future tense, he shall receive, because to receive of him is to be sent in his name, and as it were, commands being received from him; and he had not been yet sent. Therefore he said *of mine*, not *of me*, because he would signify, that he should receive of his doctrine and workes whatsoever he should teach, whatsoever he should do among men.

What then doth that Interpreter himself answer? or, in what manner doth he think those things, *he shall receive of mine*, can be said of the holy Spirit, if he himself be the most high God? *Not*, saith he, *that himself had not the same things before, but because, as Cyril saith, he speaks accommodately to human sense. For Embassadors are wont, when they depart from the Prince, to receive commands, both what they shall speak, and what they shall do.* But to those words, ver. 13. he shall not speak of himself, *We may more simply* (to wit, than Augustin and Bede had answered) *say it is no other thing not to speak of himself, than not to speak contrary things to those which he himself had spoken by the will of the Father.* For which opinion, he cites some antient Authors: and adds, *For in the same manner we expounded what he had said, My Doctrine is not mine; and the words which I speak to you, I speak not of my self.* So also he intimates, that those words also, *Whatsoever he shall hear, he shall speak*, are to be taken in such manner as he had taken that of Christ, *As I hear, I judge; and that, I speak those things in the world which I have heard of him;* to wit, that Christ did neither judge any thing, nor should at any time speak any thing, but what he did or should know to be agreeable to his Fathers mind and will: so therefore, that neither the holy Spirit should speak any thing from himself, because he should speak nothing but what he should know to be agreeing with the mind and will of Christ.

But such an interpretation of Christs words, is not every way to be admitted, nor doth it altogether take away the difficulty. For as to the former, those former words, *He shall not speak of himself*, and those that are opposed to them, *but what he shall hear, he shall speak*, cannot be taken of only a bare consent with Christs words, but do altogether signify, that he of whom those things are said; is not the first author of his words, but that some other is the Author of them. For otherwise it might be said, that neither the Father indeed had spoken of himself, because he had spoken nothing but what the Son hath approved, nor the Son, even in respect of the holy Spirit; because, as the opinion of the Adversaries is, the Son spake nothing but what the person of the holy Spirit consented to. But all see that those things are absurd. Add, that that same Interpreter not only confesseth it, but also urgeth it, that the holy Spirit is here looked upon as Christs Legate; that which the very context of the words sufficiently shews. To the propriety of this Embassy, nothing can be wanting, if the holy Spirit be a person. Wherefore those words, *He shall not speak of himself, and whatsoever he shall hear, he shall speak;* and likewise, *He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you*, are so to be taken, as they agree to a Legate. But they so agree to a Legate, that he be not himself the first Author of his words, but only that anothers words and mandates be declared by him to them, unto whom he is sent. And indeed, to a Legate, properly so called, such as the holy Spirit would be, if he were a person, it belongs properly to be instructed with commands from another, and to bring to others, and expound to them, his received will and mind. For a Legate, as such, is anothers Minister, and the Interpreter of

another's will. But that he saith, those words in ver. 14. 15. *He shall receive of mine*, are spoken accommodately to human sense; if he mean this, that he should indeed receive nothing from Christ; because he always had all things; but that it should seem so to men, what else doth he, but to elude Christ's words? as if, forsooth, Christ spake of it, what men, however falsely, should imagine concerning that matter, and not rather, what should truly be, though there may be some figure in the words. Do we think that Christ would have said, that the holy Spirit should glorify him, because men should falsely think, that the holy Spirit received of that which is Christ's? Or do we think that he would acknowledge for his glory, the glory that is founded in the vain opinion of men; and besides, that pertaineth to some deminution of the dignity of the holy Spirit; that is, as it pleaseth them of the most high God? But if he mean that, that the holy Spirit should indeed truly receive something of that which is Christ's, but yet that a figure or trope fetched from human things, is in the word of *receiving*, let him strain himself as he will, and turn himself every way, He shall shew by no example, that it can be said, that he shall receive from another, that he shall speak not from himself, but things heard from another, who is first author of his words, and to whom those words are not delivered, or some way wrought or imprinted by another at a certain time. Although besides, if the holy Spirit were no less properly the Legate of the Son, than the Son formerly of the Father, no impropriety of speech, which might here be of any moment in that matter of which it is here disputed, is to be admitted, either in the word of hearing, or of *receiving*. For it will be altogether signified, that those things which the holy Spirit hath said, were manifested and committed to him by Christ. For that belongs to such a Legate as Christ was, and such as they hold the holy Spirit to be.

By which it is now understood, that the difficulty is not taken away by such an answer, nor our Argument solved; because what ever you devise, these words cannot consist, unless it be acknowledged, that the holy Spirit is not the first author of those things which he made known to the Disciples of Christ, but it came to pass by the will of another, to wit Christ, and so of God the Father himself, that he should reveal those things that he dictated to the disciples. But this befalls not the most high God: For he is the first author of those things, which he either revealeth to men, or otherwise doth.

Neither is it caused by the will of another, that he doth reveal any thing to men. Of which see what we have said above, *Sect. 2. Chap. 3. and 4.* disputing of Christ, when he weighed those his words, *John 5. 19. The Son can do nothing of himself.* And those, *John 7. 16. My doctrine is not mine*, and others like to these.

But perhaps this scruple will trouble some, how it can be that the holy Spirit may be said to hear, and to receive from another, what he may declare to others, if it be but only a divine inspiration, or virtue and efficacy?

I answer, Since the Adversaries also confess, and the thing it self shews, that those things cannot be properly taken concerning the holy Spirit, there is no necessity that we should shew, that they may be taken properly concerning divine inspiration. But if a figure in the words is to be admitted, it is not hard to shew, that they may be rightly and elegantly said concerning divine inspiration, or virtue inspired from heaven into the Apostles. Out of those things which follow, it will be manifest that many things are found in the holy Scripture, spoken by a Prosopopoea, concerning the holy Spirit, as also concerning other things. And that this figure is abhorrent from the place of *John*, of which we treat, shall be by and by shewn. All men perceive that it is here spoken of the holy Spirit as of a Legate, who is to be sent by Christ to the disciples. It belongs to a Legate, as we have said before, not to speak of himself, but to declare to others the commands heard and received from him by whom he is sent. These things then are accommodated, and that by right, also to the divine virtue, long since inspired into the Apostles. For there is something in that divine inspiration, which very well answers to hearing and receiving from another, and declaring, and which consequently, hath made way for the Metaphor, out of which the Prosopopoea ariseth. For not the divine inspiration, but he from whom that inspiration comes, is the true author of those things, which are revealed by it to men; neither can that divine virtue implant any other thing in the spirits and minds of men, than he would from whom it is inspired into men; who is here indeed Christ. Therefore it is like to some Legate, who declares

nothing save the things heard, and received from his Prince and Lord, to those to whom he is sent. But why doth here Christ speak by Prosopopey, concerning the holy Spirit, this is chiefly the cause, because in some manner he compares him with himself, and considers him as it were to be sent into his place to the Disciples now sadned by his instant departure. For Christ hitherto hath been, as it were their Comforter. Therefore he said to them (being sadned by the notice of his departure) That he, asking the Father, would give to them, or would send to them, from the Father, another Comforter, who might abundantly supply his room in this behalf. But comparisons of things with persons, do easily bring forth Prosopopeys. Hence, that we may illustrate the thing by examples, *David* comparing the testimonies of God with Princes, who spake and took counsel against him, and opposing the one to the other, he calls them *his Counsellors*, or, as it is in the Hebrew, *the men of his Counsel*, *Psal.* 119. 24.

Hence also arose that famous Prosopopey in *Solomon*, who brings in wisdom and foolishness contrary to it, as certain women inviting men to them, by reason of the comparison of a strange woman, as most learned men have noted. (See *Cornelius Jansen* on the *Proverbs*) Let the whole place be read, beginning at *Proverbs* 7. 5. where that comparison begins and is continued through the rest of the whole Chapter, and the two following Chapters. Compare also with this place, *Chap.* 24. *Eccles.*

More might be said of this matter, but there is now no place for it, and something also shall yet be said hereafter, by which it shall appear, that no man ought to marvel, that such a Prosopopey, or Fiction of a Person, is used concerning the holy Spirit. Although even that alone may take away wondring from any one, that Christ himself confesseth, that he in that speech of his, in which several times he brings in the holy Spirit as a person, spake to the Disciples in Parables or Figures fetched from common use; but that sometimes he would openly and plainly declare to them of the Father, or of the things pertaining to the Father, *Chap.* 16. 25. But among those things, even chiefly is the holy Spirit, of whom there is often mention in that discourse, one while more openly, another while more covertly. Christ afterwards indeed explained the thing clearly enough, when he poured out the holy Spirit on the Disciples, by which he lead them into all the Truth. For *it*, not as a true person, hath declared any thing to them, but as a divine inspiration inspired into their minds, hath wrought and imprinted in them the fullest knowledge of the Doctrine of Christ.

Wherefore, since the event it self hath sufficiently explained that Discourse, why do we seek another Interpretation?

## CHAP. LIX: 1 Cor. 2. 10.

### **Three Arguments from 1 Cor. 2. 10, &c. *The Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God, &c.***

The fourth place in this rank, we shall assign to those words of *Paul 1 Cor. 2.* which the Adversaries are wont to use to prove, that the holy Spirit is a divine person. For thus the Apostle there speaks: *But God hath revealed them to us* (to wit, those things which God hath prepared for them who love him) *by his Spirit. For the Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God. For who of men knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man that is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth none, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received not the Spirit of this world, but the spirit which is of God, &c.* This place yeelds us divers Arguments, some of which are above alledged by us in *Sect. 3. Chap. 5.*

First, That the holy Spirit is distinguished from God, whilst *God* is said, *by him to reveal to us* the things of salvation, whilst it is called the *Spirit of God*, whilst it is asserted, that *he searcheth the deep things of God*, and *hath known the things which are of God*, whilst, in the end, it is said *to be of God*. Moreover, that men are said to receive it. Lastly, that when he is said *to be of God*, he is made the effect of God. But none of these, we have shewed, can befall the most high God. But besides these three, as many other Arguments may be fetched from the same words.

The first is, That *God* is said to have revealed something to us *by his Spirit*. For thence it is manifest, that it is not the first but the middle cause of that Revelation, which agrees not to the most high God. See what we have said in those places above, *Sect. 2. Chap. 19.* in which God is said to have done either all or certain things by Christ.

The second is, That it is said *to search even the deep things of God*. For neither is any one said to search those things, the most clear and perfect knowledge of which is first in him, and which are by him first constituted and decreed. But if the holy Spirit is the most high God, the deep things of God, that is, his hidden counsels, and most clear and perfect knowledge thereof, in him is first resident, and by him they are all first constituted and decreed. How then could he be said to search them? God and Christ indeed is said to search our hearts, because he penetrates into the secrets of anothers breast, but his own counsels, his own deep things, he is no where said to search. Indeed neither are men said to search their own counsels, unless perhaps, when either they are by some means slipt out of their memory, or they themselves have not yet sufficiently examined the reason of them. But what can be wanting to the most high God, for the most exact knowledge of his depths? The Apostle in this place being about to declare that which he had said of the Spirit of God by the example of the Spirit of man, doth not say, that it searcheth, but *knows* the things which are of a man, although the manner of speaking, which he had used of the Spirit of God, would lead him thereto, that he should affirm that the spirit of man also searcheth those things, which are of a man. But he would not affirm it of the Spirit of man, because in it first are resident those things which are of a man, that is, his counsels and decrees, and by it are constituted. Therefore the same reason should be of the holy Spirit, if he were the most high God. We know indeed that it is said by a Metalepsis which also brings forth a certain Prosopopey, that the Spirit of God searcheth all things, namely, because it causeth men, in whom it is, to find out all things, even the deep and hidden counsels of God. In which manner the same Spirit is said to intercede for us with unutterable groans, and to cry *Abba* Father; because it is the cause, that we may do these things. But the Adversaries cannot use this answer, who endeavour to frame the person of the holy Spirit from this, that the holy Spirit is said to know all things, even those which are of God; which they could not do, if they would acknowledge those things to be said of the holy Spirit by a Metalepsis. For it would no more thence follow, that the holy Spirit is a person, than that Charity is a person, because so many actions proper to persons are attributed to it by a Metalepsis, afterward in the same Epistle, *1 Cor. 13.* Moreover such a Metalepsis would be altogether unusual, if the holy Spirit should be the most high God. Who would say that the Father searcheth the counsel of God, because he may cause another to search them? Why then should the holy Spirit be said to search the

deep things of God, if he himself were the most high God, whose are those deep things? We say the same words of *Paul, Rom. 8. 27.* which we touched a little before; *The Spirit it self asks* (or makes intercession) *for us with unutterable groans, and he that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the Saints, according to God.* For how could these things be said, even by a Metalepsis of the holy Spirit, if he were the most high God, with whom the intercession is made, and who searcheth the hearts, and according to whom, or according to whose will the Saints intercede? For it is not convenient, that not only human action should be attributed to the most high God, but that his own person also should be detracted from him.

The third Argument, which may be drawn from the aforesaid place to the *Corinthians*, is, that if the holy Spirit were a person distinct from the Father and Son, which, speaking properly, should be said to know, it could not rightly be affirmed that none besides him knoweth the things of God. For besides him, also the Father and Son should know, and that primarily. But if they say, the particle, *none*, is here opposed only to creatures, or rather comprehends only creatures and men, as if it were said, *no man knowes those things*; our opinion indeed may admit that, but not the Adversaries. For we acknowledge in those words, *but the Spirit of God*, a metonymy of the adjunct, which also brings forth some Metalepsis, as if the Apostle had said, None of men knowes the mysteries and hidden counsels of God, besides those who are endued with his Spirit, by the power of whom alone those things may be found out by us. But the Adversaries, who would have the knowledge in this place to be properly attributed to the holy Spirit himself, cannot say that, and are forced to confess, that the holy Spirit is therefore expresly excepted, because otherwise he should be altogether comprehended in that general word, *none*. How ridiculous, I beseech you, and unworthy of the Apostle had such a speech been. None of men or creatures knoweth those things which are Gods, but God the Father, or no Angel knoweth those things which are Gods, but Christ or the holy Spirit. For what? Is the Father in the number of men or Creatures? Is Christ or the holy Spirit in the number of Angels? For nothing is wont to be excepted from out of a general speech, but what otherwise is of the same kind of things, of which it is spoken, and which, therefore, unless it had been excepted, had been altogether comprehended in the general speech, and the same thing either affirmed or denied of it, as of the rest. Wherefore if the knowledge of divine things be here properly ascribed to the holy Spirit himself, as the Adversaries would, and that Metonymy which we have explained, is not to be acknowledged in that word, the word *none* cannot be restrained to men or creatures alone, but will comprehend also the divine persons themselves, of the number of which they would have the holy Spirit to be. Whence it followes, seeing the holy Spirit in their opinion is a person really distinct from the Father and Son; that the Father and Son are excluded from the knowledge of vine things in these words of *Paul*; of which absurdity there is no danger in our opinion. In the same manner, if the Spirit of a man were a certain person distinct from the man himself, whose Spirit it is said to be, when it is denied, that any *of men knowes those things which are of a man besides his spirit*; the man himself whose Spirit it is, had been excluded: and besides that exception should have been ridiculous. *What man knowes the things*, which are of a man, *unless the Spirit of man which is in him*? For is the Spirit of man, which is in him, man? But if you take the words of the Apostle, as if he had said, No man knowes the hidden counsels, and thoughts of a man besides himself, who conceives and understands them by his Spirit and mind; the absurdity will cease. For it is to be observed, what Philosophy teacheth namely, that not the Spirit of a man, which they call the soul, doth properly understand, but the man by it, or by its virtue or power.

## **CHAP. LX: The holy Spirit descended upon Christ**

### **The seventeenth Argument, *That the holy Spirit sometime descended upon Christ.***

In the last place it likes me to alledge that, to which many Adversaries attribute much, when they endeavour to shew, that the holy Spirit is not a divine virtue, but a person distinct from the Father and Son. And that is, as *Luke* writes, *Chap. 3. 22.* With whom also the other writers of the Gospel History agree, *Mat. 3. 16. Mark. 1. 10. Joh. 1. 32, 33.* That *the holy Spirit descended on Christ, baptized by John, in a corporal shape, as a dove.* It is an old saying, and at this day commonly spoken among the Adversaries, Go *Arian* to *Jordan*, and thou shalt see the Trinity. Surely, if the Trinity be Father Son and holy Spirit; The Father indeed, who inhabiting in Heaven as the most high God, and removed from mens eyes, commandeth them out of his supreme Authority, and on the Son bestows authority from his Majesty, but the Son a true man, baptized in *Jordan* by *John*, and after from heaven annointed and replenished with the holy Spirit; and lastly, the holy Spirit, a certain thing, sent down from heaven upon Christ, with which he was replenished, if I say, that be the Trinity, he is rightly commanded to go to *Jordan*, who doth not acknowledge the Trinity. We indeed who are sometimes commanded to go thither, long ago by the grace of God have been there and seen that Trinity, and with willing mind acknowledge and profess it. But if the Trinity be to them the conjunction of three persons really distinct amongst themselves in one and individual Essence; it is so far from being seen at *Jordan*, that rather in some sort it may be seen by the very eyes, it has no existency. For what shew or shadow is there of one and the same Essence in number, which may be common to the Father, Son and holy Spirit? Is it the same numerical substance of God, who speaks from heaven not descending thence, and of him a true man, who is baptized in *Jordan*; and lastly of that thing, which descends from heaven upon him? I omit other things, which partly are said before, partly shall be said a little after. They therefore, who have feigned such a Trinity, or defend it feigned by others, are yet to be sent to *Jordan*, that they may as from a near place behold the true Trinity, and may more rightly learn to acknowledge it. We may indeed rightly send thither the *Arians*; who hold that the Son of God is a certain invisible Spirit produced by God before the creation of the world: but our Adversaries who maintain him to be consubstantial, it is so far of, their being able to do it, that the *Arians* rather might send them thither. For the tenet of the *Arians* is less against that History, than that of the consubstantialists. But we will not in this place urge all things, which might be said, but that only, which is written of the holy Spirit; that we may not only, wrest out the weapon of the hands of the Adversaries, with which they fight against us, but also may retort it on them. They urge that the holy Spirit hath both descended, and appeared in bodily shape, to wit, of a dove. For from thence it follows, that the holy Spirit is some substance, not a quality. For it belongs to substances, and those only that are *Suppositums* to descend, and to assume and sustain formes and shapes; and together they say it appears, that the holy Spirit is such a substance, as is really distinct from the Father and Son. For neither the Father or Son descended from heaven, nor assumed that corporeal form, therefore the holy Spirit is a *Suppositum*; and consequently because also he is intelligent (For he is said to search all things, even the depths of God, and to know the things that are Gods, and other like things, proper to intelligent Substances, are pronounced of it) he is also a person, for every intelligent *Suppositum* is a person. Since that is the definition of a person. There is need of so much furniture, that the person of the holy Spirit may be framed hence, which they promised we should see at *Jordan* together with two others. For neither the Trinity of the Adversaries can be seen, unless three persons can be seen, and so as that it may appear they are persons. What is to be answered to this their Argumentation shall be a little after shewed. Let us do now that which we propounded, that assuming those things which partly are read in that sacred History, partly are affirmed by the Adversaries, we may demonstrate the holy Spirit not to be the most high God. They affirme, if the holy Spirit be the most high God, that he ought to be altogether of the same essence with the Father; yea, also with the Son. Otherwise there will be either two or more most high Gods, or the Father or Son, whom they take for the most high God, will not be the most high God. But from this apparition of the holy Spirit, it is manifest, that there is one Essence of the holy Spirit, another of the Father and Son. For the Essence of the Father and Son descended not then from heaven when Christ was baptized, nor took that corporeal shape, the Essence of the holy Spirit, as is manifest by the Adversaries opinion, did both. Therefore the *Essence*

of the holy Spirit is not the *Essence* of the Father or Son, but it is necessary *this* to be one, *that* to be another. Neither indeed may they say, that not the Essence of the holy Spirit, but the person did both. For first every person is a substance, and a substance is an Essence subsisting by it self.

Wherefore whose person descended, and assumed some form, his essence also doth it. And besides do not they themselves, as we have seen urge, that that which descends and sustains a form, is necessarily a substance? But the substance of the holy Spirit, is no other thing than its Essence, and with our Adversaries it is all one to say, the same is the Essence, and the same is the substance of the divine persons, to wit, because every substance is an essence, therefore the Essence of the holy Spirit must have descended. And although at last a person in the Deity, should not be the substance or Essence it self, but something in the Essence, which yet is impossible (For it is repugnant to the nature of a *Suppositum*, and further also of a person to be in another) yet might not that either descend or assume a form, but that its substance in which lastly all the accidents are and rest together, should do the same.

Besides also another shorter way from that, that the holy Spirit descended from heaven upon Christ, & that in a bodily forme or shape, we may shew, that he is not the most high God. For the most God is not moved from place to place, and consequently descends not from heaven. Also no accident befalls the most high God, even by the Adversaries opinion. But that bodily shape in which the holy Spirit descended, was an accident, as also that descent it self.

### **The Defence of the Argument.**

Some Adversaries, observing this, so explain the thing, that it may sufficiently appear, that they neither attribute to the holy Spirits descent, properly called, nor grant that he Assumed that bodily shape on himself; but either that a certain true body in a doves shape descended from heaven, or the shape only of a dove descending, was represented to the eyes of the beholders, which might be a simbole or resemblance of the presence, and operation of the holy Spirit filling Christ with gifts necessary for the discharge of his propheticall office. But if this be so, how will hence be shewed, that the holy Spirit is a thing subsistent by it self, and consequently a *Suppositum* and person really distinct from the Father, and the Son, seeing he neither properly descended on Christ, nor sustained that forme: but was only the shape of a body set before the eyes of the beholders, when indeed there was no body: or, as the opinion is of some of the most learned Adversaries, a true body which descended and sustained that shape. But even things which not only are not persons, but not so much as indeed substances may be said to descend improperly from heaven; and among others, *James* saith chap. 1. 17. *Every good, and perfect gift is from above* (that is from heaven) *descending from the Father of lights*: But that the same may be shadowed by a certain outward shape, and set before the eyes of men, as besides other things that teacheth, which we read, *Act. 2. 3.* of the first effusion of the holy Spirit on Christs disciples. For those cloven tongues did they not express the faculty of diverse languages to be given to the disciples of Christ by the holy Spirit? But nothing prohibites that they might not seem to be moved. How many such shapes of things do we see set before one while the *outward*, another while the *inward senses* of the Prophets? Therefore nothing, if the thing be so explained, may be hence gathered, which belongs to prove the holy Spirit to be a *Suppositum*, much less a person. Besides, although they would have all those things concerning the holy Spirit to be taken figuratively, yet nevertheless they must hold, that here some singular operation of the holy Spirit was shadowed, not of the Father or Son, or at least not equally. For otherwise, why should not the Father and Son also be said to have descended in a bodily shape? But if the Essence of the holy Spirit would be the same with that of the Father and Son, the operation no less of these than of that, had been expressed by that shape and descent; and so the Father and Son, should be no less said to have descended in a bodily shape than the holy Spirit. For such an operation is of the singular substance it self, having in it self all force of operating. Therefore seeing this is supposed the same in those three persons, the same operation also is equally to be attributed to all those persons. Seeing this is not come to pass, it follows, that there is one essence of the holy Spirit, another of the Father and Son, and consequently, unless the adversaries would introduce more Gods, or deny the Father to be the most high God, they are forced to acknowledge the holy Spirit not to be the most high God.

But you will say, How nevertheless do those things agree to the holy Spirit, to descend from heaven in a bodily shape, if it be only a divine virtue and efficacy, not a Suppositum or Person? This although it properly pertain not to the matter in hand, yet we will briefly explain that no scruple may remain.

First, we have already seen, that some of the Adversaries, by the force of their own opinion, are forced to hold, that those things are not properly said of the holy Spirit, but that bodily shape and its descent from heaven, was only an outward resemblance of the holy Spirit, filling Christ with his gifts, which same thing, why it may not be said of divine efficacy, there is no cause.

Besides, If we would by all means have it so, that those things are properly spoken of the holy Spirit, it is to be understood, as to that descent and motion, that the qualities were moved together with their subjects, and consequently in them. Wherefore also the divine efficacy, if it may exist in a man, and in him, or together with him, be moved, it may descend from heaven in another thing likewise, which God will use in the carrying down of it. Neither indeed is there wanting to God a convenient and be seeming Vehicle, that I may so speak, for that efficacy. But as to the shape, if the subject of that efficacy have a certain shape, especially such as may shew and resemble the latent efficacy, nothing at all hinders but that it may be said, that that virtue descends in or with that shape. But of these things, if God will, we shall say more else where.

This we would have here observed, although it be written, that the holy Spirit did then descend on Christ in a bodily form, and it may be easily understood, that which all seem commonly to think, that it appeared in some bodily form on the day of Pentecost; yet neither here nor else where, is it ever said to have appeared in the shape and form of any person, as we read of the Father and Christ, when they appeared in a certain form, and also of the Angels. But if the holy Spirit were a person, Why had it not also appeared in the shape of a person? For whether you hold it to have been the shape of a Dove, in which it descended on Christ, as commonly all contend, or any other; it is certain that was not the form of a person. For neither is the Fire or Dove a Person, seeing a person is nothing but a substance endued with understanding. As for that whereby from the Apostles words, in which it is said, it searcheth or knows, they endeavour to evince, the holy Spirit to be endued with understanding, it is refuted in the foregoing Chapter.

*The conclusion of the first Book, in which it is shewed,* That the Adversaries opinion, concerning the Trinity, is refuted by the very silence of the holy Scriptures, neither doth any thing hinder, but that it may be opposed by Arguments fetched from Reason.

We have shewed enough out of holy writ, that neither Christ, nor the holy Spirit, but only the Father is the most high God; and that the most high God is one, as in Essence, so also in person; not, as it is commonly believed, three in respect of persons. Which opinion, although there were not so many reasons as we have produced, might be refuted, by the bare silence of holy Scriptures. For is it credible that Christ and the Apostles, that I may omit now the Prophets, would have concealed a thing, as it is commonly believed, and as the reason of the tenet holds forth, so necessary to be known, so hard to be believed, and far exceeding all the capacity of human wit? Doth not the thing it self shew us, by how much that tenet should be more necessary both to be known, and more hard to be perceived, by so much the clearer they would have propounded it, and so the oftener and more diligently have inculcated it? Their diligence in other things, much less and easier to be perceived, compels us to believe, as well as the earnest desire, or rather endeavour of the same persons, towards the Salvation of mankind; and also that office which they undertook and sustained.

Shall we think Christ, our Saviour, the Apostles & other divine men had less care of the Salvation of men, than they who either heretofore have defended that tenet, as the chiefe concern of our Salvation, or at this day maintain it? Was there in them less intelligence of that mystery, which they commonly adore, or were words wanting, by which they should describe it? Could *Athanasius* in his Creed express it more clearly than Christ, than the Apostles? Whosoever (saith he) will be saved, before all things, it is necessary that he hold the Catholick faith, which unless a man keep whole and inviolate,

without doubt he shall perish for ever. But the Catholick faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity: neither confounding the persons, nor seperating the substance. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the holy Spirit. But there is one divinity of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, equal glory, coeternal Majesty, &c. What, I beseech you, is there like these things in all the holy Scriptures? We will not now refute the errors of them, who beleieve not all things necessary to salvation, to be contained in the holy Scriptures, which is done by our men elsewhere. This only we say, that, however some positions necessary to salvation should not be contained in the holy Scriptures; yet this, which is made the cheif, and as it were the foundation of other things by them, that it is not openly contained there, is to be judged altogether incredible. But letting these pass, let us deal with them, who acknowledge, and urge, that all things, which are necessary to salvation, are comprehended in the compass of the sacred Volumnes. What reason will they allege, why that tenet is not plainly contained in holy Scripture? Not few say, that though it be not expresly comprehended in them, yet it may be deduced from them by a good consequence. But, that I may now omit other things, we have shewed a little before, that in so hard a thing, so remote from our capacity, so necessary there should be fully shewn, not only consequences, but clear and distinct explication, and that repeated more than once; especially because simple men, to whom God would have the way of salvation to be manifest equally, that I say not, more to learned and ingenious men, understand not those consequences; and besides must take pains not only in perceiving the reason of the consequence, but also in the force of the opinion it self, which is scarce perceived by the learned: if yet that may be perceived, which is répugnant to it self.

Moreover, if they speak true, who say, that the Tenet of the Trinity, pertains even chiefly to the Catholick Faith, without which no man can be saved, ruder men must despair of salvation. For if to believe, be not only to utter the words with the mouth, but also to embrace, and firmly to hold in the mind, the meaning of them, who is thereof the more simple, who believes that tenet? For if any man would comprehend in mind, the meaning of that position, it is necessary that he distinguish between the divine essence and person. For unless he distinguish them, either he will believe, that there is in very deed only one divine Person, as one Essence, or hold three Essences, and so three Gods, no less than three divine Persons: either of which deprives a man of Salvation, according to the Opinion of the Adversaries. But how many are there, who know how to distinguish a divine Person from the Essence, and so may conceive three Persons, that he may not imagine to himself together three Substances subsisting by themselves? Verily he must be a subtile man, and hold a marvellous opinion of a Person, who doth otherwise. What then shall become of the ruder men, for whom alike Christ died? But let us grant, that the ruder may perceive that tenet, will there not be need of a clear, frequent and diligent explication of that thing to them? But where shall we chiefly seek an explication of so abstruse a thing? is it not in the holy Scriptures? Therefore if the perspicuous explication of this thing be not so much as once indeed contained in them, it is to be concluded, that that doctrine is false, and cannot be deduced indeed, no not by good consequence, from the holy Scripture. We refuse not therefore lawful consequences, which we also our selves willingly use: but in such a doctrine as that is, of which we dispute, we rightly hold, that there are no lawful consequences, unless together a perspicuous and open explication thereof could be held forth.

Others say, that not only this Doctrine may be drawn by lawful consequences from the holy Scriptures, but also that it is really contained in them. For though the word Trinity be not extant in them, yet the meaning of it is extant. But neither do we require, that they shew the very name of the Trinity, but the thing and meaning which they commonly comprehend in that name, clearly and perspicuously expressed. That, I say, we require, that they shew where it is written, that God is One in Essence, Three in Persons, the Father to be God, the Son to be God, to wit, most high, the holy Spirit to be God, and yet there are not three Gods, but those three are one God. So the Father to be eternal, likewise the Son and holy Spirit, and yet these are not three eternals, but one eternal. We require these, or the like to them, the meaning of which may be manifest to all men, such as are those of Athanasius, with which at this day all the Temples do ring, but when they bring forth such places, in which there is need of consequence, that it may be made manifest, that this is the meaning of them, which they would have; they shall perform no more than those, who would have so great a thing drawn out of holy Scriptures by consequences only. See their two Achilles, or chief Champions, *Baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Spirit*: how far distant are these

from those positions? Are there three persons in one Essence of God? We see three things; we see not three persons: nor more one Essence of those three; yea, rather we see divers Essences, and those between themselves unequal. Here certainly there is need of consequences. Again, *There are three, who give testimony in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the holy Spirit*: and these three are one. I repeat not now that which we shewed before, how suspected this place is.

Let us grant it to be undoubted. Whence is it manifest, that here is understood the Unity of Essence? They are one: are they therefore one in Essence? Not only the meaning it self is not extant, but neither indeed can it be evinced by lawful consequence. To be One, is a general word, and contains more species under it self: One in essence, One in consent, either of mind or testimony, or of some other thing. But the genus being proposed, some species is indeed proposed, but not forth with a determinate One; as in this place One in Essence. And indeed it were easier from this place, to shew, that there are diverse Essences of those three, than one, yea, it is impossible to shew this. Besides, in which words is it said, that the holy Spirit is a person? They must of necessity fly to consequences.

Now by the things said, it appears, how injuriously they deal, who, when Arguments from Reason are brought against that Doctrine, cry, that this is a mystery, which is to be believed, not searched into; that Reason cannot comprehend these things; that we must rest simply upon the holy Scriptures. We should yield to those men, if they would prove that Doctrine by perspicuous testimonies of holy Scripture; and not rather assert it against open and clear testimonies of them. But now when they cannot produce such places, they do in vain affright us with the name of a mystery, that we might not here use our reason, and so endeavour, as with a Gorgons head set before us, to turn us into stones. Although the trial of Reason were not indeed, no not then, to be declined, if it were manifest that Mystery to have been revealed from God. For what Mystery will they produce out of holy Scriptures, which is repugnant to Reason? Mysteries indeed exceed Reason, but do not overthrow it, they do not extinguish the light of it, but perfect it: yea, Reason alone both perceiveth, and embraceth, and defends the Mysteries revealed to it, which it could not of it self find out. *Paul* useth Reason, when he proves the Resurrection, which Mystery even most of all exceeds Reason. Further add, that the Adversaries themselves do that ill, which they forbid us to do well. I will not now rehearse it, that they cannot discourse of the difference of essence and person, without the help of Reason. For where are those things written in the holy Scriptures? And though they were written, they could not be perceived, nor explained without Reason. I now urge that, that all use consequences, when they dispute of this Doctrine, which they call a Mystery. What then? doth not he use Reason, who useth consequences? Are perhaps all those Argumentations written in the holy Scriptures? You will say, that the propositions of the Arguments are written. First, Let it be so. But the form it self of Argumentation is not there delivered; neither is it shewed, that this which you use, is lawful, that which the Adversaries use, is unlawful. What then doth shew it? Reason. But moreover, resolve your Argumentations, and those of yours, whom you most respect and approve, how few Argumentations will you find, which are manifest from the holy Scriptures? What is more usual than such Argumentations as these? To whom the Properties of that One God agree, he is that one God: But to Christ or the holy Spirit these agree. Again, To whom actions proper to persons agree, he is a person: But they agree to the holy Spirit. But where are those Propositions, which they call major Propositions (that I say nothing now of Assumptions) written? Whence will they draw them but from reason? But if Argumentation, when we treat even of Mysteries, may be firm from one Proposition, which Reason only supplies, why may it not be also from two; if as well Reason approves both as one? Besides, if we argue either from the Opinions of the Adversaries themselves, or from Opinions and Principles confessed by all, who can reprehend it, unless most unjustly? especially if we shew that that Doctrine implies, as they speak, a contradiction, and overthrows itself. For all men, who are of right understanding, do confess, that no doctrine can be true, which implies a contradiction, or the force of which is such, that it is necessary, that the same thing be, and not be together, to wit, in the same respect, part, time. For this principle being taken away, all Science is taken away; and, although you should a thousand times demonstrate God to be three in persons, yet it might be allowed for another alike truly to say, that he is not three, and so in all other things. But we may, without difficulty, shew, that the common Doctrine of the Trinity of Persons in one numerical Essence, doth imply a

contradiction. What then remains, but that it be acknowledged by all to be false? But that the thing is so as we have said, being holpen by Divine Aid, we shall demonstrate in the following Book.

## **THE SECOND BOOK OF JOHN CRELLIUS CONCERNING ONE GOD THE FATHER.**

*Having shewed from the holy Scriptures, the Most High God to be none other than the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; Now we will confirm the same chiefly by other Arguments: and indeed so, that we may refel the Doctrine contrary to this Opinion, partly from the very nature of it, and the received opinions of the Adversaries, partly from other principles. The truth of which may be demonstrated in a certain manner. But we shall divide this whole tract again into three Sections. In the first we shall in general discourse of those three Persons of supreme Divinity which are maintained, and shall shew that that Doctrine doth oppose it self, and also other Suppositions of the Adversaries. In the second of the second Person of that Trinity, which they hold to be the Son of God. In the third we shall speak of the third Person, which they make the holy Spirit. Which being finished, we shall so conclude this whole work, as to shew the manifold Use of this Disputation.*

**THE FIRST SECTION.**

**IN WHICH IS GENERALLY TREATED CONCERNING THE THREE PERSONS OF THE SUPREME DEITY, WHICH ARE COMMONLY MAINTAINED.**

## **CHAP. LXI: One and three Gods at once**

**The first Argument. By which is shewed, *That the common Doctrine of the Trinity overthrows it self: because there would be at once one and three Gods.***

That we may therefore perform that which we have propounded in the first place; first, Thence it is manifest, that the common Doctrine of three Persons in one God, doth imply a contradiction, and so overthroweth it self because both one God, and three Gods, to wit, Most High, are there asserted together: One God indeed expressly; but three, if you consider the force of the Opinion. For they say, That there are three Persons really distinct from among themselves, each of which is God. For as much as they are wont to say, and are compelled to say by the force of their Opinion, *The Father is God, The Son is God, The holy Spirit is God*, but they always speak of the same Most high God. But now where there are three persons, really distinct from among themselves, each of which is the most high God, there are three most high Gods. Reckon up now those Persons, and you will have three most high Gods; for the first will be the Father, the second the Son, the third the holy Spirit. The matter needs no disputation with him, who by reason of a preconceived Opinion concerning God, when there it is treated of him, hath not forgot to number three.

### **A larger Defence and Confirmation of the Argument.**

But nevertheless, they urge, that those three are one God. If they should so call those three one God, as we call three or more Senators one Senate, since it cannot be said of them separately, thus far it might be pardoned to them. But seeing they pronounce the name of the most high God, of each person distinctly taken, and are altogether compelled to pronounce it by the force of their Opinion, they cannot say it. For from this Opinion it doth altogether follow, that either the Father is the Son and holy Spirit; and reciprocally, or the Father is one God in number, another the Son, another the holy Spirit: the former of which takes away the real distinction of the persons; the latter overthrows the Unity of God, and manifestly makes three Gods in number. For as to the former, thus I will argue, *That one God is the Father*, as the holy Scriptures testify it, and the Adversaries confess it. *But the Son*, according to the Adversaries Opinion, *is that one God, that same even in number, who was now called the Father*; Therefore the Son is the Father. But the same Argumentation may be also inverted, the premises being converted and transposed, and in like manner may be framed concerning the holy Spirit, in relation to the Father and Son. Nor can it otherwise be dissolved, unless you say that the Son is one God in number, the Father another, likewise the holy Spirit another, and so there are three Gods in number. Therefore, whithersoever the Adversaries turn themselves, by that their Tenet, they overthrow both their own Doctrine, and the sense of the holy Scriptures. Moreover, do I not rightly argue thus; The Father is a divine Person, the Son is a divine Person, the holy Spirit is a divine Person; therefore there are three divine Persons, not one? The Adversaries will altogether so assert. Why then do I not likewise rightly argue, The Father is the most high God, the Son is the most high God, the holy Spirit is the most high God; therefore there are three most high Gods, not one? If we would urge examples fetched from things created; *Peter* is a man, *Paul* is a man, *John* is a man, therefore there are three men, not one: or *Michael* is an Angel, *Gabriel* is an Angel, *Raphael* is an Angel; therefore there are three Angels, not one: if, I say, we would urge these examples, the Adversaries would cry out, that the thing is one way in creatures, another way in God. But now, when we use the example of divine Persons, what will they say? That the thing is one way in divine Persons, another way in God? Is it so? But what if we demonstrate, that that very God, of whom we treat, is a divine Person, as also on the contrary? Will they yet deny that that is in force in God, which is in force in a divine Person? But it is easy to demonstrate that, partly from the holy Scriptures, partly from the Opinion of the Adversaries themselves. They say, that each divine Person is that one God, and why may they not say it? Forasmuch as they hold, that each of them hath the whole Essence of the one God; neither can they say otherwise without overthrowing that Doctrine of the Trinity. Now the holy Scriptures plainly affirm of the Father, that he is that one God. But that will be false, if that

one God be not a divine Person. For it may be rightly argued thus; That One God is not a divine Person, the Father is a divine Person; therefore the Father is not that one God. The same arguing according to the Adversaries Opinion, will be found concerning the Son and holy Spirit.

These things which are said of us to confirm the first Argument, might also by themselves be alledged to refel the Adversaries Opinion. But it matters not on our behalf, whether they be taken for peculiar Arguments, or for props of the first. Although this may be confirmed also by another general reason, for, *wheresoever subjects are in very deed multiplied, those things also are multiplied, which are said distinctly of each: and are indeed multiplied according to the number of their subjects.* We have already declared the thing by examples, both divine, and angelical, and human: neither can it at all be refelled by any example. Run over all kinds of things, and you will find that the thing is so. As many men as there are, so many living creatures, bodies, substances are there; as many Angels, so many Spirits; as many Lines, so many Longitudes and Quantities; as many Virtues, so many Habits, so many Qualities; as many Fathers, so many Relates; and so in the rest. To wit, because all those Predicates are multiplied according to the number of their Subjects. Wherefore also as many divine Persons as there are, so many Gods, and indeed most high Gods, there will be, seeing the most high God is distinctly predicated of each divine person. Whence it appeareth, that the Athanasian Creed, doth plainly contradict it self, while it thus pronounceth, *The Father is God, The Son is God, The holy Spirit is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God.* And also, the Father is Eternal, Omnipotent, Infinite; in the same manner both the Son and holy Spirit: and yet there are not three Eternals, Omnipotents, Infinities; but one Eternal, Omnipotent, Infinite.

Perhaps some one will say, that the word *God* is one way taken when it is predicated of each person; another way when it is put absolutely: there it is taken hypostatically, or personally; here essentially. Truly I do not believe, that the more accute Adversaries will so answer, since they will have God, as also some the Father, essentially taken, to be predicated also of each of the persons. Add hereunto, that it would be necessary to make the same Ambiguity in the word *Eternal, Omnipotent, Infinite*, that one should be said to be essentially eternal, omnipotent, infinite, not personally: another on the contrary personally. Otherwise they should again labour to reconcile that contradiction which may seem to be in those words, that since the Father is both eternal, and omnipotent, and infinite, and likewise the Son and the holy Spirit; and yet there are not three eternals, omnipotents, infinities, but one only. But I remember not that I have ever read, or heard, that the Adversaries do feign the same ambiguity in the word *Eternal, Omnipotent, Infinite*. Wherefore I do not easily believe, as I said, that the more acute Adversaries will so answer. Nevertheless, if any shall so answer, what other thing will he say, than that the Athanasian Creed plays sophistically, and deceives rude and simple men with the ambiguity of a word? For who of them would think, that the word *God* is there taken two manner of ways. For to what purpose, I pray you, are those words added, *And yet there are not three Gods, but one God?* Is it not for that cause, lest any, especially of the ruder sort of men, hearing the Father to be God, the Son to be God, the holy Spirit to be God, should thence gather, that there are three Gods? But in what signification? Surely in that in which he had heard, that the Father is God, likewise both the Son and the holy Spirit. For this scruple doth first arise, neither presently the other signification of the word comes into the mind of a rude man. This opinion therefore is refuted by those words; and further, the word *God* is taken in the same manner in both places, not one way then when it is spoken of each of the persons, and another way then when it is put absolutely, and God is said to be one. Besides, from such an exception it follows nevertheless, that it may be rightly said, that there are three Gods, if the word *God* be taken personally, as indeed the Adversaries confess it is often so taken in the holy Scriptures. And it might indeed seem strange, that they do not expresly say, that there are three Gods, but that they see, that it is most openly repugnant to the holy Scriptures: whilst they are bold to say, that there are three *Elohim*; and some Books are extant *concerning three Elohim*, written by divers Adversaries. For what other thing doth *Elohim* signify, than *Gods*? Therefore three *Elohim* are three *Gods*; namely, they endeavour by an Hebrew, and less known word somewhat, but ridiculously, to cover the absurdity. Indeed such manner of speaking is reprehended by some more accute Adversaries; of the number of whom yet there are not wanting, who judge the Hebrew *Elohim*, when it is pronounced of the most high God, to be plural, no less in signification than Grammatical form. But if it be plural in signification also, it signifies Gods, no less than the Greek *Theoi*, or other

words answering to it in other languages. Therefore there are more Gods. But moreover, the distinction between God hypostatically or personally and essentially taken, is altogether vain, especially when it is spoken concerning the most high God. For both the very word *God*, is the name of a person, since it is the name chiefly of him that hath command over others; and the most high God signifies the supreme Ruler and Monarch of all things. But to command and rule belongs only to persons. Add, that we have shewed above in this very chapter, that that one God, besides whom there is no other, is a person; as on the contrary, there cannot be any one hypostatically or personally God, I say, the most high God, but he is also essentially so. For is not he essentially God, who hath the divine Essence? But whosoever is hypostatically the most high God, he hath the divine Essence. But if you will say that God taken essentially, signifies the Essence it self, which is neither Father, nor Son, nor holy Spirit, or contrarily, but something subsisting in those three: First, I shall not easily believe that the Adversaries, who speak more accurately, will admit that, since the essence, especially so taken, as that it cannot be predicated of each of the divine persons, signifies something abstract. But *God* is concrete, such indeed as is found in Substances, and denotes an Essence, together with an Existence or Subsistence. But further, whatever at last the Adversaries will determine of this matter, we have already shewn, that the name of God is the name of a person; and since it is certain, that the name of one God is so used in the holy Scriptures, that it is directly predicated of the Father: but the Adversaries would have it so, that it should be predicated also of the Son, and the holy Spirit; it will be necessary to shew, where the word *God*, when there it is spoken of that one God, denotes some such thing, as neither is Father, nor Son, nor holy Spirit. Lastly, Such a signification will make nothing to the matter. For we dispute of that God of whom the Adversaries speak, when they say, that the Father is God, the Son is God, the holy Spirit is God: and not of that God, who cannot after that manner be predicated of the divine persons. And thus much concerning the first Argument.

## **CHAP. LXII: Each Person three in Persons**

### **The second Argument, *Because each divine Person would be three in Persons.***

Another Reason by which it is shewed, that the common Doctrine of the Trinity doth overthrow it self, is, that thence it follows, that each person of the Deity is three in persons, and so it is both one, and not one together. For so say the Adversaries, that that one God is three in persons. The same again, as we have said, affirm that each divine person is that one God. Whence it follows, that each divine Person is three in persons.

Neither indeed may you say, that the Major is particular. For it is singular which here answers to an universal, since nothing may be subsumed in the Minor, which is not contained under that singular, which is the subject of the Major, and the middle term of the Argument, or of which that singular may not be said. But the conclusion is most false, and, as we have seen, overthrows it self. But if any will here use a distinction, and say, that the Major speaks of God essentially taken, the Minor of God personally taken, he shall be no whit advantaged. For we have in the foregoing chapter refuted that distinction, shewing each divine person to be God essentially taken: because it hath the whole Essence of God. Therefore in whichsoever manner you take the word *God*, yet the Minor will be true; even as I believe all the more learned Adversaries will also say. But besides, let us feign, that an Essence, which neither is Father, nor Son, nor holy Spirit, may be rightly called God, and that it is three in persons: which manner of expression I remember not that I have read in the Adversaries: yet if that whole Essence be in each person, the Trinity will be in each person, and so each person no less than that Essence, will be three in persons. For in what the Essence is, in that is also that whole, whatsoever is in that Essence, and is predicated of it in the concrete, especially if that thing be of it self, and not by accident, in the Essence, as here altogether the Adversaries would have, with whom not only the divine persons cannot be accidents of the divine Essence; but there is no accident at all in God.

## CHAP. LXIII: Divine Persons the same, and diverse

### **The third Argument. Because the divine Persons would in very deed be the same, and diverse.**

The third Argument is, That the Adversaries maintain, that the Essence is in very deed the same with the Persons, and that the Persons do really differ from among themselves. For hence it follows, that the same thing is at once both one thing, and more than one; differ really from it self, and not differ. For those things which are the same really with some one thing, are really the same among themselves also. But the three divine Persons, really distinct among themselves, are really the same with some one thing, namely, the divine Essence. Therefore the three persons really distinct among themselves, are really the same among themselves.

The conclusion doth manifestly contradict it self. The Proposition which they call the Major, rests on a Principle known to all, which they do commonly thus express. Those things which are the same with one third thing (that is, with something wherewith they are conferred) are also among themselves the same. And there is the same force of the *Axiome*, if you add both in the predicate, and in the subject of that enunciation, the word *Really*. For those things which are really the same with one third, are one and the same thing with the third. For what other thing is it to be the same things really, than to be one and the same thing? But those things which are one and the same with one third, it is necessary that they be the same thing also among themselves: otherwise that third thing, with which those things are the same thing, should at once be both one thing, and more things. So some of the Adversaries themselves are wont to prove, that the divine Attributes are not really distinguished among themselves. The divine Attributes, say they, are really the same thing with the divine Essence. Therefore they are really the same thing among themselves. Because those things which are really the same with one third, are also really the same among themselves.

But others, who see that their Opinion concerning the Trinity, is by this means everted, say, that this Reason is not firm, and that common *Axiome*, *Those things which are the same with one third, are the same among themselves*; ought thus to be understood, *Those things which are the same with one third thing incommunicable, are the same among themselves*. But it is manifest, that the divine Essence is not incommunicable, since it is the same in number in the three Persons really distinct among themselves. Neither indeed can the Adversaries bring any other instance, by which they may invalid that *Axiome*, besides that thing, of which is here the controversie, and is refelled by this very Reason. But that Major, proposed both by us and others, admits no instance or exception: because the reason of it is altogether universal. For unless it be admitted, a plain contradiction follows, as we have seen; to wit, that one and the same thing, is at once both the same thing, and more things. Wherefore if something be feigned communicable, which is the same thing really with three things really distinct among themselves; as here the divine Essence which is one thing with the three Persons, that shall at once be both one thing, and more than one. Therefore such a communicable thing is not to be admitted; & if it be brought for an instance to invalid that *Axiome* in this our controversy, this will be a mere begging of that which ought to be proved, since that communicable thing by this very reason may be refelled. But it easily appeareth to any one, that such a communicable thing imply a contradiction, if you consider what may be here understood by that word. For here they call that thing Communicable, which when it is one in number, yet may be common to more in number. For so they would have the divine Essence to be communicable. For as much as they acknowledge together with us, that it is one in number, but will have it common to three persons in number, so that it may be distinctly predicated *in concrete* of each of them; namely, in this manner, The Father is God, the Son is God, the holy Spirit is God, and yet they would have those three to be one God. For what other thing is this, than that one thing in number, is more things in number; that it is *individuum*, and not *individuum*? For it is *individuum* because it is one in number, not *individuum*, because it may be so divided into more things of the same name, that yet the whole may be in each of them, which thing is altogether repugnant to the Reason of *individuum*. Therefore that Reason which we have propounded, is firm: which, if it please you, you may also so propound, that it may be concluded, that the divine Essence shall be at once both one only thing, and more than one. For all confess indeed that it is one:

but it follows from their tenet, that it is more than one; because they maintain it, to be really the same thing with three persons really distinct among themselves. For if those three Persons are really distinct among themselves, it is necessary that they are three distinct things. For the same thing really, is that, which is one thing; really distinct, which are more things: which both the thing it self shews, and the chief of the Adversaries confess: and they who deny it, know not what they say. For they are necessitated to maintain the same thing to differ really from it self, which overthrows it self. Now if the Essence be really the same thing with three persons really distinct among themselves; it is necessary, that it be the same thing with three distinct things. But that which is the same thing with three distinct things, it is necessary, that it should be three things. Wherefore the divine Essence, shall be together both one thing, and three things; which, as we have said, is repugnant to it self.

Let us add a Corollary to this Argument, that the divine Persons will be together one of themselves, and one only by Accident: and so one of themselves, and not of themselves; by accident, and not by accident. For those things which are one in respect of Essence, and that indeed the same in number, are chiefly one of themselves. Greater Unity cannot indeed be imagined among those things, which are conceived like diverse things. And in that manner are the divine Persons maintained to be one thing. But again, those things which are actually, and in the ultimate perfection two or more, are not one of themselves, but one only by accident. For those things which are of themselves one thing, are such, and so fitted together, that either one of them doth so respect the other, as *Potentia* doth its *Actus*, or as the thing to be perfected, doth some further perfection; or may be perfected together by some other *Actus*, in as much as yet it hath not in it self its ultimate perfection. For it is the *Actus* which both conjoins and separates. It conjoins, if one; it dis-joins, if more than one. But the divine Persons, are neither so referred to themselves mutually, nor to some other thing; as *potentia* to *actus*, and further perfection, having already attained their utmost perfection. The Essence cannot be such *actus*. For the persons rather add to the Essence something of perfection; to wit, subsistence, and personal propriety, than on the contrary; and that subsistence presupposeth the Essence, not on the contrary.

## CHAP. LXIV: One and three Substances of the Deity

### **The fourth Argument. Because there would be at once one and three Substances of the Supreme Deity.**

Fourthly, By this reason also a contradiction may be shewed in that tenet, because it introduceth together both one and more Substances of God. All maintain that there is one Substance of one God. But the plurality of persons necessarily requires more. For if a person be no other thing than an ultimate intelligent Substance; where there are more persons, it is necessary that there be more ultimate intelligent substances. For the *Definitum*, or the thing defined, being multiplied, which is here a person, the whole definition is also multiplied, or that whole which is expressed in the definition. For the *Definitum*, or the thing defined, and the definition, or that which is expressed in the definition, are really one and the same thing, and differ only in the manner of explaining. You may also propound the same Reason more briefly, thus; If each Person be a Substance, where there are more persons, there also are more substances. For *individuals* being multiplied, that also which obtains the place of a genus, as well as that which obtains the place of a species, is multiplied in the same *individuals*. Because individuals are nothing else than that which is expressed by the name of the species and genus, being contracted by differences, which they call *individuating differences*. Therefore unless that which hath the place of the species and genus, so, as we have said, contracted, be multiplied, individuals are not multiplied. Now persons are individuals, whose *genus* is *substance*. But that every Person is a Substance, and that a Substance is predicated of a Person, as a Superiour on its Inferiour, is first manifest by induction. For both a human and Angelical, and divine Person is a substance. But besides these, there is no other person, if under the name of Angels you comprehend also evil Angels, or Devils. Who doubts Peter or *Paul*, or other men to be Substances? Who *Gabriel*, *Michael*, or other Angels? Who likewise the Devils? For we regard not men of wanton wit, who make the Devils I know not what against so many plain testimonies of the holy Scripture; which same men neither will, nor can say them to be persons. Will you perhaps deny the Father and the Son to be *Substances*? For there are certain superstitious men, who dare not use the word *Substance* concerning God: because it belongs to a Substance to be subject to Accidents: but is an heinous offence with them to say, that there are Accidents in God. And yet the same do not reprehend their own men, who say, that there is one Substance of God; and that which is sung for many Ages in Temples, *The Father, Son, holy Spirit are three names, all the same substance*. But let us free them from this fear. To be *subject* to Accidents, *that* is an Accident to a Substance. To subsist by it self, *this* is to be a Substance. But do not the Father and the Son subsist by themselves? If they subsist not by themselves, nothing will subsist by it self. Will you, who do fear to ascribe any Accident to God, perhaps make God himself an Accident? But whatsoever is not a Substance, is an Accident. I omit that no man can deny the Son to be a Substance, but he who dares to deny him to be a man. But it is necessary that the Adversaries say the same of the holy Spirit, which is said of the Father and Son.

And because some, although otherwise they say, that God is a Substance, yet deny the divine Persons to be Substances, as afterwards will more clearly appear. Let us prove the same thing also by another reason, that being assumed, which is generally put out of controversy by all the Adversaries. They all, being taught by the Schoolmen, do maintain that a person is nothing else but an *intelligent Suppositum*. That *Suppositum* is the *Genus* of a Person; *Intelligent*, the specific difference of it; which being added to that *Genus*, doth perfect the whole definition of a person. And that word *Suppositum*, although in this signification barbarous, is very usual in Schools, when they speak of the divine Persons. For they say that there are three *Suppositiums* in God. But now a *Suppositum*, as it is explained by the Schoolmen themselves, the authors of that word so used, is a *first or individual Substance complete*: they are wont to add, that it is incommunicable, although without necessity; as we shall hear presently. They call it a *Substance*, that they may exclude *Accidents*; a *first Substance*, that they may exclude the universal, to wit, *Genus* and *Species*; a *complete* and *perfect Substance*, that they may exclude the parts of the substances, whether integral or essential. Lastly, they say, that it is *incommunicable*, that it may not be common to more *Suppositiums*, nor be conjoined with another *Suppositum*. Which condition they have added for the sake, partly of the divine essence, partly of the

human nature of Christ; to both which, all other conditions of a *Suppositum* do agree. Therefore except they added this condition, they saw it would follow, that both the one and the other would be a *Suppositum*, and since it is endued with understanding, also a Person. Wherefore, lest thence indeed the doctrine concerning three Persons in one Essence of God, here the tenet concerning the hypostatical or personal union of two natures in Christ, should fall to the ground (for there cannot be more persons in one person) they have this prop of *incommunicability* put to it. But that condition, as far as it hinders the Substance to be common to many *Suppositiums*, is contained in the name of the *first* or singular Substance. For it would not be *singular*, if it were common to many singulars; as we have above (*chap. 3. of this Section*) shewn. But as far as it hinders, lest it may be conjoined with another *Suppositum*, and so cohere with it, that it may be partaker of its subsistence; it is comprehended in the word *Complete*. For now it would not be complete, but it would be the part of another, if it would in the manner be conjoined with another *Suppositum*. Of which thing we shall speak elsewhere (*Sect. 2. chap. 6, and 8. of this Book.*) In this place we have need of this thing. For neither the force of the Argument, which we now urge, is therein placed; but in this, that very *Suppositum* is a Substance. That as yet seems to be added; as we may more rightly perceive the reason of this description, that the Schoolmen have therefore called such a Substance, as I now have described, a *Suppositum*, because that at last may deserve to be called a *Suppositum*; which is, as it were, put under and subjected to all other predications, or things, which may be predicated of some other thing. Briefly, that which is the *ultimum subiectum*, of which other things are predicated, and it self of no other. But this is no other thing but a first and singular Substance. For this is predicated of no other thing, because neither hath it any thing inferiour to it self, nor any *subiectum*, in which it may be inherent like an accident: but it is the *ultimum subiectum*, which both the second Substances; to wit, the *Genus* and *Species*, and Accidents of, are predicated.

Concerning which thing, the *Categories*, which are inscribed *Aristotles*, may be seen. Of those also speak the vulgar *Axiome*, *Actions are of Suppositiums*; because Actions do most properly agree to the first, and that indeed perfect or complete Substances. If therefore *every Person be a Suppositum, and every Suppositum a Substance, every person also must be a substance*: and further, where there are *more Persons, it is necessary, that there be also more Substances*.

Not a few of the Adversaries have seen the force of this Argument. Therefore that they might avoid it, they have perverted the true definition of a person, commonly received also in Schools, if you consider the thing it self. For they say that a Person is not a *Substance*, or thing by it self subsisting, but an incommunicable *subsistence*, of an intelligent nature. This, they say, is the accurate definition of a person: but that by which a person was defined in Schools; to wit, that it is an individual intelligent, incommunicable, that Substance not sustained by another, is less accurate. For it agrees to a person *in concreto*, not *in abstracto*: but the definition of *Concretums*, are not accurate, but that of *Abstractums*. But further, they say that the *subsistence*, is a certain mode of a *Being*, not a *Being* it self. For it being considered by it self, and abstractly, hath not entity. Therefore the Father, Son and holy Spirit, being considered by themselves, and abstractly, or distinctly from the Essence, are with them *non entia*, or no being. And in this indeed I assent to them, that such persons as are conceived by them, are *non entia*, or no beings: for they are in very deed their own devices. But that the Father, and Son, and holy Spirit are *non entia*, or no beings, but modes only of a *being*, it is indeed most false. Certainly this thing is of it self most unworthy of God; yea, as we shall see by its force, takes away all Empire and Honour from the Father and Son, and doth in a manner lead men to Atheism. I will not now urge that manner of speaking only, which shews its absurdity presently at the first sight, that the Father, Son and holy Spirit are by themselves *non entia*, or no beings; from which, yet men of great name mong those of their own way, famous also by their writings in Divinity, do not abhor. For neither do I doubt, but that many even of the Adversaries do disapprove of it. But that very thing also is much unworthy, that they make God and Christ (that I say nothing now of the holy Spirit) a subsistence or mode of a *Being*. For what? He that is God, he that hath a divine Substance, is he a subsistence, and not rather a thing by it self subsisting? a mode of a *being*, not a being it self? How then doth he rule? How doth he do any thing? How is he invoked by us? And that I may comprise all in one word, how is he God? For actions, and those things which are the proper consequents of actions, are not of a subsistence, but of a thing subsisting. For the subsistence hath no faculty and

power, from which action may flow, but the thing subsisting. Doth the subsistence actually will, understand, govern, create, preserve? Do you, when you call upon God, invoke some mode of the divine Essence? Do you ask, that some mode may help or preserve you? Certainly if the divine persons be that, no simple or common men do believe the divine Persons, being by their very subtilty, altogether out of the reach of their best understanding. But what do I speak only of the simple men? Indeed neither most of the learned do respect to themselves such persons, either when they pray, or when they think any other thing of God, or of Christ; perhaps neither they themselves, who have devised those things, except then, when they labour to reconcile some of their tenets to one another.

These things might sufficiently, refute the device (to speak most tenderly) of those men. But yet that both the Nature of a person may so much the more clearly appear, and be so much the more satisfactory, let us say a little more of that matter. First then, Whilst they make a person a subsistence, they forget themselves, who say the same is a *Suppositum*. Neither indeed could I hitherto see any man, who would deny that a *Suppositum* is the *Genus* of a Person, and that it may accurately be predicated of it. And this might be here enough for us, that all acknowledge in God three *Suppositiums*. But now they say, that a *Suppositum* is such a Substance as we have before described: and the reason of its name, which the inventors of it have looked on, requires it. For neither is a subsistence the *ultimum subiectum*, or lowest subject; of which ultimate, all things may at last be predicated, and it self of none: but a Substance it self, or a Being endued with subsistence: subsistence is in a *Being*, and although it be not an Accident, yet is it predicated of that, in which it is in the manner of an Accident. But all such things are denied by all to be *Suppositiums*. Add this, that the actions which are proper to *Suppositiums*, agree not to a Subsistence, but to a Substance itself, or a *Being* that hath subsistence, as that which hath a power necessary for acting: as we have a little before minded. Subsistence doth contribute nothing less, but that a *Being* may subsist by it self; and moreover, may act by it, if, namely, it hath a power and some faculties. Besides, who would say that a man or an Angel is a subsistence, and not rather a substance, or thing by it self subsisting? But every man is a person, and in like manner every Angel: And that we may go higher; Christ also is a substance, not a subsistence; a *being*, not a mode of a *being*. But he is a person, therefore a person is not a subsistence. Otherwise from the Adversaries opinion we should thus argue. Every person is a subsistence: No Man, Angel, nor Christ himself is a subsistence. Wherefore neither a person.

Perhaps some one will say, that created persons are indeed substances, but the divine persons are subsistences: neither is a person a *genus univocum*, to a person created and uncreated; but *analogum* only. But first, we may ask of him, whether he would have Christ to be a created person only, or uncreated, or both together? If created only, his opinion will be false, as being one who maintains Christ to be the second person of the Trinity. For this person is uncreated; nor could it cease to be uncreated, but that the Trinity would fall to the ground, one person, to wit, the second, being taken out of the number of the three. If uncreated only, Christ will be only a subsistence (if a divine person be a subsistence only, not a thing subsisting) which all see to be false, For he who is a man, is certainly a substance, not a subsistence. If both together, he will have two persons of a different nature, or of a different definition. For the one will be a substance, the other a subsistence, not a substance. But there is but one Christ, one person of him, as all confess and urge it against Nestorians.

Furthermore, the reason or definition of a *Suppositum*, which agrees even to a divine or uncreated person, doth not permit, as we have seen, the divine person to be only a subsistence; I say, no more than a created. Lastly, that very thing which is brought for a reason, doth overthrow that Opinion. For if a person be an *analogum genus* to a person both uncreated and created, it must needs be that a divine person is not a subsistence, but a substance. For neither are *analogums* the subsistence of God, and the created thing subsisting; but the substance created is *analogum* to the uncreated, the subsistence to the subsistence, the mode to the mode, and reciprocally. Wherefore if the person created be a substance, not a subsistence, or some mode, also the uncreated will be a substance, not a subsistence, I say, a thing subsisting, not a mode of a thing.

But as for that which they say, that when a person is said to be a *first intelligent substance*, this definition is of a person taken *in concreto*, not *in abstracto*. I will ask of them what they understand

by the name of a person taken *in concreto*, what likewise taken *in abstracto*? If they do in that manner take the *concretum*, in which substances are said of some to be *concretums*; as *man*, *animal*, whose *abstractums* they will have to be *humanity*, *animality*; Of such *concretums*, there are delivered most accurate definitions: and in this manner a person is altogether to be defined in this place, where it is inquired whether the Father, Son, and holy Spirit be three persons in one divine Essence. For neither the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, are personalities, but persons; unless you will say likewise, that man is humanity, animal, animality, Father paternity, and so in the rest: in which manner *concretums* will be *abstractums*, and on the contrary: and so they will be in vain distinguished from one another by the Adversaries. Furthermore, in what manner soever at last you take *concretum*, it is all one to us if it be so, that our definition of a person, as far as *concretums* may be defined, is good, or the *genus* at least is rightly constituted, since there it is spoken of persons taken in *concreto*, not of personalities; and it is necessary that where there are three or more *concretums*, otherwise of the same condition, as three good, three wise, three Kings, Fathers, Sons; there must be also more *subiectums*, or more substances, in which that adjunct, which is in *concreto* expressed. There is the same reason also of those *concretums*, which do in *concreto* express some mode of a *Being* or substance, such as they commonly distinguish from *Accidents*. For those several modes require several *beings* or substances: neither the *concretums*, otherwise of the same condition, are more, unless also the *subjectums*, or *beings*, or substances be more. Lastly, although at length we should grant the divine persons to be subsistences, not substances; nevertheless, yet a contradiction would lie hid in the vulgar tenet of the Trinity. For this also involves a contradiction, that one substance in number hath three subsistences; as we shall shew in the next chapter.

## CHAP. LXV: Three Subsistences of one and the same thing

**The fifth Argument.** *Because there cannot be three Subsistences of one and the same thing.*

The fifth Argument of this kind is, that if there be more persons in one substance of God, it is necessary also, that there be more subsistences in the same: as the Adversaries do not only confess, but also urge, since *subsistence* is the form of a suppositum. But there cannot the same thing be multiplied, unless also the form be multiplied. Wherefore neither can the *Suppositiums* and *Persons* be multiplied, unless also the *Subsistences* be multiplied. The same thing doth more plainly follow from their Opinion also, who hold, that a suppositum and person is the very subsistence. But it is impossible that there should be more subsistences of one substance in number. First, because of one thing there cannot be more forms of the same nature, whether they be substantial or accidental, or with whatsoever name you may call them, lest you should think the modes of things excluded; I say, there cannot be more, either existences, or inherences of one thing; not more rationalities, not more longitudes, or whitenesses, unless perhaps according to divers parts; not more paternities of the same nature, unless in respect of diverse, or in a diverse time, and so in the rest. And the reason is this, because the same thing cannot twice or more times, be that which it is, but once only, namely, in the same time, in the same respect (which is to be observed only in things related) and according to the same parts. Otherwise there would be a progress in *infinitum*. For who shall here set a bound? What cause is there, why a thing may not be infinite times that which it is, if it may be twice or thrice? But a progress in *infinitum* is impossible, even of subsistences or suppositums in God. Wherefore that also is impossible, whence such a progress in *infinitum* doth follow. And that is this, that one and the same thing may be more times that which it is. But this again doth thence arise, because the same thing might have more forms of the same condition, to wit, at the same time, in the same respect and part. For the form is that by which the thing is that which it is. Wherefore where there are more forms of the same condition, the thing is more times that which it is. Add, that if the form be that, by which the thing is that which it is, it being withdrawn, the thing remains not any more that which it was. But if there may be two such forms, as we speak of, of the same thing, the one being withdrawn, nevertheless the thing will remain that which it is. But that is impossible, and is contrary to the nature of the form it self. But that subsistence which we have in hand, is the form of a suppositum, and by it the substance, in which it is, doth become a Suppositum. For that we may explain this also by the way, the subsistence is taken by the Adversaries in a double manner, more largely, and more strictly. The Subsistence taken more largely, is common to all Substances, first, second, perfect, imperfect; whole, parts; and in this sense it is opposed to *inherency* only, which is proper to accidents. Therefore that subsistence is the form of each substance, or that, by which the substance is a substance: the inherency is the form of an accident, that is, that by which an accident is an accident. Concerning this Subsistence, we do not properly treat here, although it be in some manner included in that subsistence which we have in hand, or be presupposed by it, and although it be true concerning that also, that the same substance in number cannot have more subsistences. The Subsistence taken more strictly, agrees not but to *Suppositiums*, or first, that is singular; and those indeed complete and perfect Substances, and is a certain form of such substances, as they are such. Therefore one and the same Substance cannot have more Subsistences of this sort. And that you may look on the matter more nearly; do you judge, that the Substance of God, which is one in number and complete, is either more times a Substance; that is, a thing which inheres not in another, but subsists by it self, or more time complete? If more times, then innumerable times also, for there is no stay.

Besides, If there be more Subsistences in the same Substance, it is necessary that there be some distinction between them. For if there be no distinction, there will be one Subsistence, not more. But there is no distinction between them. For the forms, whether of Substances, or Accidents, whether they be of modes or things, if they be of the same *species specialissima*, cannot be distinguished from among themselves, unless they be in divers *subiectums* or matters, or at least in divers parts of the same *subiectum*, or matter, or be distinguished mutually among themselves by diverse time or respect. But here (that we may transfer this to our matter) neither are there diverse *subiectums*, but the same divine substance in number; the same time; nor divers parts; since neither the subsistence agrees but

to the whole substance, nor the divine Essence is compounded out of parts. Also divers respects here have no place, since subsistence is not a *relatum*. Therefore there will be found no distinction between those subsistences, and consequently between divine persons. But the Adversaries would have them, and the matter would require them to be distinct between themselves, and that indeed really. It remains therefore that they are not of the same nature and definition, and consequently, that they have something in which they do agree; because they all are both subsistences, existing in the divine Essence, and something in which they do mutually differ, and are from among themselves *specie*, or in *the species* distinguished. But neither do the Adversaries, admit such a composition of the genus and specific difference in the divine Persons. And it is impossible, that those things should differ in that species and definition, the essence of which is one in number. For those things which differ in the species and definition, they do differ by this very thing also in the Essence: since the species pertains to the Essence, and the definition of a thing explains the Essence; which where it is altogether one, the definition also is in very deed one. Lastly, that subsistence, of which it is here spoken, doth forthwith make the substance, in which it is incommunicable to more suppositums. Therefore where there is one subsistence, the rest are thence forthwith excluded. For if there would be more subsistences, there would be more suppositums. Although here it is sufficient for us to have shewed, that there are not more suppositums in the same substance. But that that subsistence makes the substance, in which it is incommunicable, is manifest from this, that by reason of it the suppositum is incommunicable to more suppositums. And if the suppositum, also the substance, which by reason of that subsistence, becomes, and is constituted a suppositum. For every form, that which it bestows on the whole, bestows also on the matter in which it is, or on that which answers to the matter; and unless it would bestow it, it should not bestow it, no not to the whole, which is constituted of it. For so far it makes the whole *such*, as far as it makes the matter of the whole, which was such *in potentia*, *such in actu*. There is the same reason of those things, which by analogy answer to these. But here the form is the subsistence: the essence or substance (wherein the subsistence is, and with which it makes the suppositum, or rather, which for that reason that it hath, that subsistence is the suppositum it self) answers to the matter. But if a body, as long as it hath the soul in it self, is, and is called animate, as long as it hath the power of feeling, sensitive: although these forms add something real to the body: much more it may and ought to be said concerning the divine Essence, having in it self that subsistence, and incommunicability, that it it self both doth subsist by it self, and is incommunicable? Since these forms do add nothing really to it, as the Adversaries themselves contend. But these things, although they may be of right accounted for a new reason, yet we shall reckon them with the former.

## **CHAP. LXVI: Divine Persons communicable, and incommunicable at once**

**The sixth Argument.** *That the divine Persons should be at once both communicable, and incommunicable.*

In the sixth place, that may be alledged, that it follows from the common doctrine of the Trinity, that the divine Persons are both incommunicable, and communicable, and so suppositums, and not suppositums; persons, and not persons. For it is manifest among all, that every suppositum, and further also, every person, ought to be incommunicable to another suppositum or person, whether one or more. Whence also in the definition of a person, they commonly express *incommunicability*. But if the divine Essence, the same in number, be common, or, as they speak, communicable to more suppositums, or divine persons, the suppositums also themselves, and those persons will be communicable to more suppositums and persons. For those things, the Essence of which, and that indeed the whole, is communicable to more suppositums, are themselves communicable to more suppositums. For nothing can be more communicated to another (if so be that that be another thing, and not rather the same) than that whose whole, and the same essence in number is communicated to another: and universally, nothing can more agree to any thing, than that which agrees to it in respect of the Essence, and that the whole. Therefore if the whole Essence of the divine persons be communicable to more suppositums, those persons themselves will be communicable to more suppositums. Wherefore they will be together both communicable and incommunicable; and so suppositums, and not suppositums; persons, and not persons.

## **CHAP. LXVII: Unless there be held one person of God, there must be held infinite in number**

**The seventh Argument, drawn from the Analogy with the things created: where it is shewed, That unless there be held one person of God, there must be held infinite in number.**

We will make the last Argument of this kind, that which can be easily understood even by the most rude men: and concerning which, it is believed by the Adversaries, that it is easy to be eluded; to wit, that we see in things created, that there is only one person, not more, of one intelligent substance; and that we may extend this thing further, that there cannot be more *Suppositiums*, except there be also more Substances and Essences in number. Why then should we not hold the same thing concerning God? We shall see by and by the reason of the consequence, when we have examined the exception of the Adversaries, by which they endeavour to subvert this Argument. For they say that there is a different consideration of a substance created and uncreated: for that is finite, this infinite. Therefore the finite indeed, if it be one in number, cannot subsist in more *Suppositiums* or Persons; but the infinite may. But this difference is of no moment in that matter whereof we treat. For then at length it might be of some moment, if a person uncreated should not as well be infinite, as the Essence or Substance, in which it is believed to subsist; or a part of something could be a Suppositum or Person. Now since the case is otherwise, here is the same reason or consideration of a finite and infinite Person. For why cannot a finite Substance, constitute but one person? namely, because a person or suppositum, compriseth the whole substance in it, not some part of it; neither can the same substance at the same time, according to the same thing, be twice the same; and consequently, neither be twice a suppositum, twice a person. But there is the same reason also in a divine Substance, since each divine Person comprehends the whole divine Substance, neither doth or can take to it self only some part of it, unless it cease to be a suppositum or person.

Wherefore an infinite Substance, can no more have more Suppositiums or Persons in it self, than a finite. To which it is added, that if by reason of the difference of the finite and infinite, there should be also difference in the number of *Suppositiums*, it would follow that this difference in respect of number, should be infinite. For the infinite distance, which is between a finite and infinite Substance, and which is thought to bring forth that difference of the number of persons, requires this. Therefore the Persons in the infinite Substance of God, should be held to be infinite in number also, not finite, and that three only. For between three things, and one, is not only a finite, but also a very little difference.

You will say, that this reason doth not evince, that there are in God, infinite, or innumerable persons, but that there may be, or that nothing hinders, but that there may be; because the infiniteness of his Essence may permit it. But besides, that the Adversaries say, that *Esse* and *Posse* are the same in God, this is certain, that whatever things may be naturally in God, and do not depend on his free will, they are in very deed also, and necessarily in him. For it is necessary, that they contain in them some perfection, and that a natural one. But no natural perfection, which can agree to God, can be absent from him, since he cannot be of an imperfect nature, or such, as to whom any thing of perfection may be yet added.

Something pertaining to this exception, shall be said in the following Sections, where the manner of the Generation of the Son, and Procession of the holy Spirit, devised by the Adversaries, shall be examined.

## **THE SECOND SECTION OF THE SECOND BOOK.**

### **IN WHICH IS DISCOURSED CONCERNING THE SECOND PERSON OF THE SUPREME DEITY, WHICH IS HELD BY THE ADVERSARIES.**

Having refuted the Doctrine of the Trinity, from those things which pertain generally to the three persons which are held to be in God; it remains, that we refute the same Doctrine from those things which particularly are asserted concerning certain persons. And they are those things which properly do pertain to the second and third Person of the Trinity, or also to the first, in respect of these two. And in this Section we shall indeed treat of the Second Person; as in the beginning of this Book we promised. In which place two Doctrines chiefly occur to be examined. The one is concerning his Generation out of the Essence of the Father from all eternity: the other concerning his Incarnation. For either of them being taken away, that Opinion commonly received concerning the second Person of the Trinity, falls to the ground.

## **CHAP. LXVIII: The Son is not the Son of himself**

**The first Argument.** *By which is refelled the Doctrine of the eternal Generation of the Son of God out of the Essence of the Father: because the Son should be the Son of himself.*

That therefore we may come to that former Doctrine; the Adversaries affirm, and, unless they would affirm it, they could not defend the Doctrine of the Trinity, that the Son was so begotten from eternity out of the Essence of the Father, that nevertheless, he hath the same Essence in number with the Father. But that doctrine is full of many contradictions, and absurdities. For first, it follows thence, that the Son is the Son and Father of himself. For out of whose Essence any one is generated, he is his Son. But if that opinion of the Adversaries, concerning the Son of God, be true, it follows that the Son is begotten out of his own Essence, wherefore the Son shall be his own Son; and moreover, the Father of himself: which thing implies a manifest contradiction. There is no need to demonstrate the Proposition of the Argument, which they call the Major, seeing the thing is manifest even with the Adversaries. But the Assumption or Minor is thence manifest, because if the Essence of the Father and Son be the same in number; certainly if the Son be begotten out of the Essence of the Father, he is begotten out of his own Essence. Neither indeed can they say, that that Essence was not yet the Essence of the Son, because they hold there was no time, in which the Son was not existent, and had not the divine Essence, otherwise he should not be the most high God. You may also in this manner propound the same Argument. None is generated of himself; for then he should be before he is; he should be so, because he should be the principle and cause of his own generation: he should not be so, because he should be generated. That of which any thing is generated, and that which is generated of it, are relatives. But relatives cannot be in the same thing, in the same respect, and at the same time; for they are opposites. But the nature of opposites is such, that they mutually destroy one another, in the same subject, at the same time and respect, according to the same thing, or the same part. But now if the Son be begotten out of the Essence of the Father, and the Essence of the Father and Son be the same in number, the Son is begotten of himself, because he is begotten also out of his own Essence. But none can more properly be begotten of any one, than when he is begotten out of his Essence.

The same absurdity is manifest also from the manner in which the ancient Fathers, partly the Architects, partly the Patrons of the common opinion concerning the Trinity, have affirmed that the Son of God is generated from eternity; which also at this day very many acknowledge: since they cannot devise another manner by any reason agreeable to their opinion. For they say, *The Father hath begotten the Son by understanding himself.* as again they hold, that the Father and the Son together have produced and breathed the holy Spirit by willing and loving. Which thing may be thus explained after the Adversaries mind: There are in God only two operative Principles, or that have some power of working; whose operations may be both immanent (that is, may remain in God himself, and do not pass into any other subject) and be employed about God himself; to wit, understanding and will. For God both understands him self, and wills and loves himself as the chiefest good. Indeed the Omnipotence of God, is also an operative Principle: but its operations are employed only about other things, not about God himself, and are terminated to other subjects. Now from these things then the Adversaries draw out the second and third Persons of the Divinity in this manner. They say, the understanding doth not understand, but by the Image of that thing which it understands. Wherefore since God hath understood himself from all eternity, it is necessary that he conceived an Image of himself also from all eternity. And this must be necessarily God himself. For they say, that both whatsoever is in God, is God by reason of his greatest simplicity: and that Image of the infinite God must be infinite. But nothing is infinite besides God. But they say that it is likewise necessary, that that Image be a distinct person from him that produced it, otherwise God should have produced himself. Whence at last they conclude, that that Image is the Son of God; because it is both produced, and like to the producer, as his Image, and the same in substance with him. But further, because God loves himself being known, and that his Image, which by understanding he produced, and is again loved by it; this very act of will makes the third person of the Divinity. For both that love is in God, and infinite, and moreover, no less God than that Image produced by the understanding; but in person is necessarily distinct from them by whom he is produced. These Mysteries do they open unto us

concerning the production of two divine persons, it is wonderful with what deep silence of the holy Scriptures kept secret, and how foreign from those things, which the same holy Scriptures do in most plain words deliver concerning the Generation of the Son by God: and in their due place are produced by us. Here they who cry out, that Reason is blind in divine things, who would not that any may dispute from it against the Trinity, who have often that in their mouth, *The searcher of the Majesty, shall be oppressed by its Glory*, as they think was written by *Solomon*: here, I say, they ought to cry out, that Reason is blind: that these search the divine Majesty: that it is unlawful to attempt to express the unutterable Mysteries. But unless such things had been devised, they had not at this day had their Trinity. But it is wonderful how preposterously the Adversaries do here behave themselves. For whilst they do so urge the simplicity, that whatsoever is in God, they hold to be God, yet in the mean time bring in more persons into him, and, if you consider the force of their opinion, infinite, or numberless, they by this very reason quite destroy the Simplicity. But that is yet more grievous, that whilst they seem to be willing to have such regard to the Simplicity, of which notwithstanding the holy Scriptures are silent, as being not necessary to be known to the salvation, and are altogether unknown to the more simple men, they take away the unity, which the holy Scriptures so often and so plainly inculcate. But let us now let pass both these, and not a few other absurdities, which are contained in this opinion; of which some are shewn above; some shall be shewn afterward: and let us demonstrate that which a little before we propounded; to wit, that hence it follows, That the Son of God is his own Son. Neither is it difficult to demonstrate that. For if the Essence, and moreover, the Understanding of the Father and the Son, be the same in number, there is also the same operation in number of the understanding; especially because the more acute Adversaries, by reason of the greatest *Simplicity* of God, hold that his intellect and intellection are the same thing. Therefore if the Father hath begotten the Son by the operation of his understanding, the Son also, whose the same operation was, begat himself. Yea, further, the holy Spirit begat that Son of God existing from eternity: and so is the Father of the Son, and Principle of his own Principle. For by the same intellection, together with the Father and Son from all eternity, he understood and contemplated himself and his Essence, and also even the Father and the Son. And so, because with the same act of will, the holy Spirit, together with the Father and Son, willed and loved whatsoever they will and love: if the holy Spirit be a certain act of will, or something produced by the Father and Son by the operation of will, the holy Spirit also hath produced himself.

Besides, It is to be affirmed, that by this means, not only the same persons have produced themselves, but also infinite or innumerable others. For since each person understands both himself, and the other persons, and desires, and loves them: it is necessary that each again produce more, both Sons and holy Spirits, if those things be true, which they inculcate to us concerning the divine Intellection and love. For there must be a different, and so an unlike Image of the Father, as he is the Father; and of the Son, as he is the Son; and of the holy Spirit, as such. For the Father and Son, as such, are opposite between themselves; and in like sort the holy Spirit, as he is produced by both. For they are relatives: and all relatives, as we have said above, are opposite: but there must be opposite Images of opposite things. However this be, there must be different Images of those things which really differ, which may exactly express them, and not only shew how they agree between themselves, but also how they differ: But according to the diversity and multitude of those Images, there will arise also a multitude of acts of will & love, with which those several persons embrace those Images; and again, those Images prosecute the persons, by which they are produced, and each also themselves, and at length one another. Wherefore if both those Images produced by the intellect, and those acts of will in God are persons, or at least principles of *divers* persons, the persons will be *in infinitum* multiplied. Although, if whatsoever is in God, be God; another way also will divine persons arise. For in God there is an Image of every thing in particular, which he understands (if an intellection be not in God, but by an Image:) likewise both decrees of infinite things, and love towards things created, and divers acts of will: All these things therefore shall be God; yet shall differ in persons from him, or those, from whom they are produced. Therefore even thence, we shall have infinite or innumerable persons in God.

## **CHAP. LXIX: Innumerable Sons, and holy Spirits**

**The second Argument.** *Because there would be innumerable Sons, as also innumerable holy Spirits.*

Lest any one perhaps, should think that they only should fear an infinite multitude of divine persons, who have devised that manner of generation of the Son of God, and procession of the holy Spirit, which in the precedent chapter we have explained; we shall shew, that others also must hold the same, who will have the Son of God to have been generated from eternity out of the Essence of the Father: and moreover, since they see, that the infinite multitude of the divine persons is most absurd, they must acknowledge that also the Doctrine from whence it flows, is most abhorrent from the truth. For if God have begotten the Son out of his Essence, and again, together with the Son, have produced the holy Spirit, and these are with him the same God; there is no cause, why the Son also hath not begotten another Son again, and in like manner the holy Spirit another, and this also another, and so *in infinitum*. For what? Cannot the Son and holy Spirit do what the Father could? Then they are not the same God with him, since they have not the same faculty and power, but an unequal one. Will you say, that they would not? But such things, which pertain to things *ad intra*, or to within, as they speak, in God are altogether necessary, and are not subject to the free will. But if they be subject to the free will, it may come to pass, that within some time more divine persons may grow, when those persons will, which hitherto would not beget or breath other persons.

Some say therefore it cannot be, that the Son or holy Spirit should produce another Son or holy Spirit, not because there is some impotence in the Son and holy Spirit; but because, whatsoever might be begotten or proceed in God, that hath been already begotten and produced; but that, which is already generated or produced, cannot any more be produced; for it should at once both be, and not be: in which manner, neither this world, can be any more created by God, because it is already in being; not by reason of any impotence in God, but by reason of the impotence of the thing it self, as I may so say. Indeed it is true, that the world which now is, cannot any more be created. But do not the Adversaries believe, that another world besides this, may be created of God? I trow they do altogether believe it. Let us apply this to our purpose. That Son, which is already begotten, cannot any more be begotten; neither that holy Spirit, which is already produced, can any more be produced. But what hinders another Son, or another holy Spirit to be produced by the Son and holy Spirit, and by them again others? Since we have shewed above, that it follows from the Suppositions of the Adversaries, that the divine Nature is capable of infinite persons in number. Wherefore they say, not things agreeable to their own Suppositions, when they say, that whatsoever could be generated or produced in God, all that is already contained in the Son, whom the first person of the Divinity hath begotten, and in the holy Spirit, whom the first and second person hath produced; and therefore another Son, and another holy Spirit could not be produced by the Son and holy Spirit; for as much as there, as yet, hath been place for infinite or innumerable persons. And let this be another Argument against that eternal Generation of the Son out of the Essence of the Father.

## CHAP. LXX: The Son of God from Eternity and not from Eternity

**The third Argument. *Because the Son of God both had been, and had not been from Eternity.***

Let this be the third Argument, by which the same Doctrine is refuted, that thence it would follow, that Christ both did exist from all Eternity, and did not exist: that he always was, and sometime was not. It must needs be that he was from all Eternity; because both it is openly said, that he was begotten from all eternity; and, if he had exist at last in a certain time, he would not be the most high God. For the most high God was existent from all eternity. But that he was not from all eternity, is manifest from this very thing, that he was begotten, and indeed in respect of his Substance, and with a Generation properly so called.

You will here presently cry out, and say, that you do easily understand what I would; to wit, that a Generation properly so called, is a change from *not being, to being*. Therefore if the Son of God was properly generated, he was sometime *no being*, or sometimes in very deed he was not existent. I say, this very thing I would. But you will say, that that definition is to be admitted only concerning natural generation, not concerning supernatural. But this generation of the Son of God out of the Essence of the Father, is supernatural, not natural. When the Adversaries say these things, first we very much desire constancy in them. For, if the Generation of the Son of God be supernatural, and so different from the natural; why do they so much urge in this very thing, the example of the human Generation, whilst they do so often inculcate, that he, who is the proper, only begotten, natural Son of God, is necessarily of the same Essence with the Father? For whence do they frame such a Proposition, but from human things, and altogether natural? And indeed they even expressly bring examples of Sons begotten by men, that they may establish that Proposition; neither can they bring any other. For what? Are there perhaps some other only begotten, proper, natural, but supernaturally begotten Sons of any one extant, whom they may bring for an example, and from whom they may frame such a proposition? They will say, that the generation of the Son of God, in that agrees with the human and natural generation, that the Son by it became like to the Father in substance, not in that, that sometime he was not existent. But may you be allowed so to urge, when you list, the reason and similitude of the natural generation; and when you list again, to refuse it? So indeed the Adversaries more than once hold forth the propriety of words, when it serves their cause; and when it doth withstand, they reject it; change the received *Axioms* and *Definitions* in *Schools*; enlarge, restrain and bow them like a *Lesbian* Rule to their opinion. Never did the boldness of human wit permit it self, to feign more things than concerning God, as being a thing remote from our senses, in which it hath believed its devices could not so easily be detected. But that we may return to our matter, if you urge the propriety of the word, when Christ is said, he is begotten of God, and conclude thence, he is altogether begotten out of his substance, because they, who are properly begotten of any, must be begotten of his substance: Why do you not also see, that Christ out of a *no Being*, is made a *Being*, and so sometime was not existent; since this no less than that, pertains to the propriety of the generation of them, from whom you gather that former assertion? For this, as you confess, is essential to the natural generation, that it be a change from not being, into being. Further, why do you not acknowledge, that there is one substance of the begetter, another of the begotten? Since this is at last produced by a generation, that already was before existent; the one is the cause, the other the effect, Lastly, why do you not acknowledge also, that the Son is latter in time than the Father? But if you will not acknowledge these things in the generation of the Son of God, neither doth your opinion permit it, you have no reason to urge the propriety of the word, or estimate it from natural things. But if you depart from the propriety of the word, and be content with the reMarkable and singular similitude, which is between the human, and that divine Generation, we shall easily make the matter plain for you, without the generation out of the Essence of God, as both we, treating of the Son of God, did shew in the first Book; and is by our men elsewhere shewed. But you ought so much the rather to have done this, because you contend, & that rightly, this Generation to be supernatural. For look over all supernatural & divine Generations, you will find none, in which God hath begotten any thing out of his Essence. Neither may you want examples: there are as many as there are Angels, who are all called the Sons of God: as many as godly men, and believing in Christ there are extant; as many as there shall hereafter become immortal. For

all these are either begotten, or as yet to be begotten of God; as is manifest from the holy Scriptures. Neither is there need you should fear, lest that in a Generation of this sort, you should find no special manner, which may be either altogether peculiar to Christ, or so reMarkable, as to exempt him from the catalogue of the rest, and make him the only begotten Son of God. For those things which are disputed, both by us in the said place, and by others elsewhere, will free you from this fear.

But besides, that I may omit, that the Generation out of the Essence of him, who generates, such as the Adversaries will have Christs to be, even chiefly is natural, not supernatural; every Generation properly so called whatsoever, whether you would have it to be natural, or supernatural, is a change from *not being*, into *being*. So, namely, that it is necessary, that that which is begotten, did sometime not exist, and afterward by the generation began to exist. For what? Is not every Generation properly so called, a production and acquisition of an Essence, I say, an acquisition in respect of a begotten? But how can the Essence of that be produced, which doth already exist, and was in very deed always in being? How can that acquire an Essence, which always had it? Is not perhaps the supernatural Generation, although substantial, and properly so called, a production and acquisition of an Essence or Substance? If it be not, we understand no more, no not indeed the name of the generation, when it is uttered concerning supernatural things; and you do use an unknown tongue, who tells us of such a generation. But what ever at length you think, this is certain, that the holy Scriptures, when they mention the Generation of the Son of God, do speak with us in a popular language; and therefore do so speak, that we may perceive the force and meaning of the words, although we do not thoroughly understand the whole reason or nature of the thing. But go to: if it be not necessary, that that which is generated, should not before exist, that may be generated, which now in very deed is existent: and further, nothing will hinder, that he, who today in very deed is, & ceaseth not to be; tomorrow or the next day may properly be generated. By this means he hath been in the end of the way to which he tends, before he hath entered into the way, or gone through it. For the generation is the way to be; in very deed to be, or to have an Essence, is the end of that way. Who therefore doth not see that to be absurd, and against all the nature of the Generation? That may indeed be conserved which is already in being: but not generated. But if the generation may be of a thing already existent, as it existeth, the generation will be the conservation of a thing. But the generation is the Antecedent of the conservation; *that* produceth the thing; *this* upholds, it being produced. If therefore it be repugnant to the nature of the generation, that that be generated, which already doth in very deed exist, it is necessary, that that, which properly is generated, sometime was no *being*, or sometime was not in very deed existent.

They will perhaps say, that to that Generation, which may be performed by an Emanation, as they call it, it is not required, that the thing generated, sometime should not exist; for it is enough, that it hath not its Essence from it self, but from another; to wit, from that from which it emanateth or flows. So the light, or beams, perpetually flow from the Sun, and are generated, not therefore because they were not before existent, but because they have not their Essence from themselves, but from the Sun. For imagine, say they, the Sun to have been existent from eternity, it will be necessary, that it begat light and beams from eternity; and so beams, although generated, should have existed from eternity. But now they say, that the Son of God is begotten of the Father by an Emanation. For he is begotten of the Father, whilst he understands himself, and conceives the image of himself; which action perpetually endureth. Likewise also, that the holy Spirit is produced by a continued act of the will. Of which thing we have treated above. But by this device they profit nothing. For that I may let pass other things mentioned above in the first chapter of this Section, the example of the Sun-beams, which they think to be most fitted to their opinion, makes not for it. Seeing we, with our Adversaries, here speak of the Generation properly so called. But there is no Generation, properly so called, of light and beams, since they are Accidents. But Generation properly so called, is not of Accidents, but of Substances only, as is well known. But if the Emanation of beams from the Sun, were a generation, properly so called, there had been no necessity, that the Adversaries should so carefully distinguish between the natural and supernatural generation, when we urge, that whatsoever is properly generated, it necessarily sometime was not existent, since the Emanation of beams from the Sun is natural; and if it be a Generation properly so called, then they will have an example of a natural generation, in which that, which is generated, even now before (as themselves here urge) was existent, and might always be

existent. Further, those things, which in a sort are generated by an Emanation, have not a perfect and consistent Essence, but their being, as they speak, is in *fieri*; that is, they are only in being, in that they are produced, and pass even as actions and motions. But the Son of God hath a perfect and consistent, not transient Substance. Wherefore he is not begotten by an Emanation.

Lastly, Also in those things, which continually do emanate, and in that regard are as it were generated, that is generated, which was not before existent. For those things have successive parts, whereof one goes before, another follows; and that, which once was generated, because it hath already received its being, is not generated any more, but another which was not yet existent; wherefore if the light be generated perpetually by the Sun, another and another successive part is still generated Otherwise if the whole were once produced according to all parts which should be ever existent, it should not be continually generated, but, being once produced, should be conserved only. By these things, that also appears, that the Son of God cannot be generated by a continued Emanation; or if they will have him to be generated by an Emanation, he cannot be the most high God. For the most high God hath not parts, by which he may be successively generated; that I may forbear to say, that whatsoever is generated by an Emanation, whether perpetual, or not perpetual, the Essence of it depends on that, from which it flows. But the Essence of the most high God depends on none.

## CHAP. LXXI: The Son of God to be generated unto Eternity

**The fourth Argument.** *Because the Son of God should be already generated, and to be generated unto eternity.*

The fourth Argument may be hence drawn, That if God have begotten the Son out of his Essence from eternity, he doth also now beget the same, and shall beget him unto eternity. Which thing even many of the Adversaries confess, they especially; who say that the Son is generated of God by the intellection. For that intellection perpetually endureth; and will endure unto all ages. But not only they, who acknowledge such a manner of the generation of the Son of God, are compelled to confess it, but all others also, unless they would overthrow their other Doctrines. For if God begat the Son from eternity, and now begets him not any more, he is made of a begetter, a not begetter, which change, since it respects not the creatures, but abides within God himself, befalls not God, nor is acknowledged by the Adversaries to befall him. Add, that either the Son is not the most high God, or was begotten of the Father by necessity of nature. For if the Father had not begotten him by necessity of nature, he had begotten him freely and contingently. But he is not the most high God, who exists contingently, not necessarily. But if God have begotten the Son by necessity of nature, he doth perpetually beget him, since his nature is always altogether the same. Besides, with God, if we believe the Adversaries, there is no distinction of time, but the whole eternity is gathered together at once with him, and contracted to a certain point.

Therefore whatsoever he doth; it is necessary, that he doth it in all eternity, and so perpetually. Add, that not a few urge that of *Psal. 2. 7. Today have I begotten thee*. For they say, that the word of the *preter tense*, [*I have begotten thee*] signifies that Generation to be already finished; but the word, *today*, signifies it to be as yet present; because today notes the present time. That is indeed frivolous which they urge: but you may slay the Adversary with his own, even a leaden Sword: as if indeed *today* had not a latitude, and did not comprehend something even past, as also future. Do all things, which are done *today*, as yet continue; or which are to be, are they already? Do you as yet speak all things which you have spoken today, of all the things you are about to speak today, do you already speak? Do I as yet write, what things I have written today? You will say, that in men or creatures the matter is so, not in God. But whence do you know, that *today* notes the present time with God? Is it not from this, that otherwise it is always taken for the present time? Do you perhaps conclude, that *today*, notes the present time from this, that that word is used of God, but with God there is nothing but present? I trow not. But in that manner it is also manifest, that *today* hath a latitude, and consists not in an indivisible moment, but comprehends some certain tract of time: Because otherwise it is always so used. But that there may be no place of tergiversation; I say, that the word *today*, being used of God himself, denotes a certain and definite time, and the actions which he is said to have done, or to be about to do *today*, are circumscribed with a certain time, and so are not eternal: and that is indeed perpetual, since that word is no where used of God otherwise. For that I may pass by those words of *Cain* to God, *Thou drivest me this day from the face of the earth*. So *Moses* saith of him, *See the great things of God, he is about to do today*. Did God perhaps, even then when *Moses* spake so, do those things; yea, had he done them from all eternity, or was about to do them to all eternity? Moreover, God himself also saith of himself, *Observe all things which I command thee today*. And again *Moses*, *For the Lord will appear to you today*. See also *Deut. 2. 25, 26. & 16. 1B. & 29. 12. Jos. 3. 7. 5. 9. 1 Sam 4. 3. and 11. 13. and 15. 2B. and 26. B, 23. and 2B. 1B.* That I omit many other places, which every one by himself may observe by reading the holy Scriptures. But now even from this very thing it appears, that God doth not any more beget, nor that he will beget the Son unto all eternity, since he hath said, that he *hath begotten him today*, which that it signifies a certain space or article of Time, in which that action hath been finished, appears from the examples of the like expressions brought by us: especially since a contrary example cannot be brought: and the Adversaries themselves confess: that the word, *I have begotten*, signifies, that that generation is already finished, or that the Son by that generation, is already perfectly produced. But it should not signify that, unless it might have the force of the time past. But what need we many words? The thing it self shews, that he, who is already long ago in very deed, and perfectly extant, as it is manifest, that the Son of God is extant,

cannot be any more begotten: which both we have before proved by Reason, and all they acknowledge, whose minds the false Philosophy doth not pervert. And many indeed are wont to hide that their mystery, from men ignorant of that their Philosophy, unless when they are constrained in some manner to open it; because they see they shall not easily be credited by them; and it seems absurd to any in his wits, that the Son of God, whom he knows to have been existent in very deed for so many ages past, should now be begotten, and to be begotten perpetually.

That also may be added to the Argument already brought: That since a person is nothing else but a first intelligent Substance, as was shewed in the foregoing Section; if the second person of the Deity be begotten out of the Substance of the first, there will be two Substances in God, the one of the first person, out of which the Son was begotten; the other, which is the Son himself. Which also follows from this, that a generation, properly so called, such as they will have the Generation of the Son of God to be, is not but of a Substance: Now a substance cannot be born but of a substance. Yet again, if the Substance of the Son be born, and the Substance of the Son and Father be the same in number, it follows that the Substance of the Father is also born, and indeed from it self. Therefore also the Father is the Son of himself. For how is he not begotten, whose substance is begotten? How is he not his Son, out of whose substance he is begotten? There might also other Arguments be brought, but we will be now content with these.

## **CHAP. LXXII: Incarnation of The Father and the holy Spirit**

**The fifth Argument. *By which the Doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God is refelled; because the Father and the holy Spirit had been also incarnated.***

We must pass to the Incarnation, which all they are constrained to acknowledge, who hold Christ to be the most high God. For since it is most manifest by the holy Scriptures, that he is by nature a man, and at a certain time born of a Virgin; it was necessary, that they should hold him, or his divine Nature, so to have assumed the human, that the unity of person remaining, he should be at once both God and man. For if God and man should be different persons, neither the Son of God had been a man, nor a man the Son of God, no more than the Father is that Son, whom they hold to be the second person of the Trinity, or the holy Spirit, or on the contrary: yea, less: since the nature of those persons is held to be the same, not only in the *genus* or *species*, but number also: but the nature of the most high God and man, have the farthest distance even in kind from one another. But in that opinion, which we have spoken of concerning the Incarnation of the Son of God, begotten out of the Essence of the Father from eternity, many absurdities are contained.

We will here bring some only, and those more pertinent to our present matter. For first, thence it follows, that not only the Son, but also the Father and holy Spirit have assumed a human nature. For he hath assumed an human nature, whose proper nature or substance hath assumed it, and with it is personally united. But if the divine Nature of Christ hath assumed an human nature, also the proper Nature of the Father, and the holy Spirit hath assumed it, if so be, it be the same in number in those three persons. And indeed the contrivance of the error, hath made, that some of the Adversaries have not feared to say, that the whole Trinity was incarnated; and lately there was one of a certain chief Sect of the Adversaries, a man of a most famous name amongst them, and now indeed teaching Divinity at *Rome*, who dedicated his Book to the uncreated Trinity, and in Jesus Christ created. Which if it be true, both the Father and the holy Spirit was born of a Virgin, and suffered, and died, and was buried, and raised again, and whatsoever we read Christ to have ever done, or was done to him, that also agrees to the Father and holy Spirit. So the Heresy of those Ancients, whether *Sabellians*, or *Patripassians*, condemned by the Adversaries themselves, will revive. And indeed, if you consider the thing rightly, the common opinion of the Trinity is nothing else but a *Sabellianism*, a little more subtilly propounded and varnished with some new colours, and choked with new names. For the same God in number, considered with this mode or subsistence, is the Father; with another mode or subsistence, is the Son; again with another, the holy Spirit. Which what other thing is it in very deed than what *Sabellius* held? For the same God in number, and the same substance, is also in very deed the same person, having three different modes or subsistences.

But that we may return to that, which we began to do, they will say, that the divine Nature indeed or substance, did assume the human, but not in every subsistence, but only in the subsistence of the Son: to this only that union or conjunction of the human and divine Nature, is terminated. You would say, that these men saw with their very eyes that Incarnation, who know to explain so accurately, in which subsistence that union was terminated, although there are three subsistences in the same nature, not really as they speak, different from it. But that the vanity of this device may be shewed, let us somewhat explain what they would; if so be that the matter may be understood. True and real union, such as that should be, which is devised by the Adversaries, is at least between two things, whereof the one explains, or applies its *terminos* or extremities, whether properly or improperly so called to the other. The case is clear in bodily things, which we see with the eyes, and from which the word *terminus*, which they use in this matter, is taken. For a board is joined to a board, a stone to a stone, whilst the superficies of the one is joined to the superficies of the other: but the superficies is the extremity, or a certain *terminus* of a body. But because a superficies of some whole body is extended through all its sides, and for examples sake, one part of it is before, another behind; therefore it may come to pass, that the union and conjunction of two bodies is not terminated unto every part of the superficies or body. So two square stones touch one another according to the superficies only of one side; unless perhaps the one includes the other, and then the outer superficies of the containing stone,

will not touch the superficies of the contained in any part; wherefore to that outer superficies of the containing stone, that union or conjunction will not be terminated, but to the inner only. Now in things incorporeal, there are properly no *termini* or extremities, no diversity of such parts. Whence it was necessary, if the human nature was joined to the divine, which all hold to be incorporeal, that it was joined to the whole divine Nature. But yet with our Adversaries, instead of divers *termini*, there are divers subsistences or modes of the divine nature; whereof one makes the Father, another the Son, a third the holy Spirit. Now they say, that this personal union is terminated to the subsistence of the Son, or so far the human nature is joined to the divine, as this subsists in the Son, but not as it subsists in the Father or holy Spirit; therefore the subsistence of the Son, not that of the Father or holy Spirit, is communicated to the human nature; and this subsists by that, and further makes one person with the Son of God, not with the Father or holy Spirit. The Adversaries usually explain the matter more obscurely. But either this is it they would have, or what indeed they would, cannot at all be understood. But they do nothing. For if the whole divine nature be joined to the human, and there be three subsistences in that whole nature, whereof one differs no more from the Essence than another, or is more thoroughly fastened to it, the human nature also is no more joined to one subsistence, than to another, and so that union is terminated no more to one than to another, and the human nature no more subsists in the subsistence of one person than of another. Yea, if there could be any difference between these subsistences, it should subsist rather in the subsistence of the Father, as being that which is the first in the divine nature, and upon which the two others do as it were lean, than of the Son and holy Spirit. Which that it may be made so much the more clear, that is to be remembred, which we shewed before, that they hold that there is a certain real union between the two natures, and moreover, that the one nature is joined to the other nature first, and by it self; but to those things which are in the nature, only consequently. For nothing can really be joined and united with the mode of the thing, but with the thing it self. We see that in the conjunction of body and soul, which example among all other things they judge to be most like to that hypostatical union. For the body is first and by it self joined unto the soul: consequently to those things which are in the Soul, or to its modes, as to existence, or if there be any other thing, which they may be pleased to call a mode. But if the body be only secondarily joined to those things which are in the soul, it cannot be joined more to one of them, than to another, unless perhaps one be more or before in the soul, than the rest. But it is already shewed, that the subsistence of the Son, is not in this manner in the divine Essence. But moreover, although in some regard the human nature should be more joined to the subsistence of the Son, yet it would suffice to the incarnation of the whole Trinity, that the whole Essence of the Trinity is united with it. For how is not that whole incarnated, the whole Essence of which is incarnated? Add, that since those subsistences exist not without the Essence, yea, are in very deed the same with it; it is necessary that those subsistences also be incarnated together with it. Therefore the whole Trinity is incarnated, hath suffered, satisfied the Father for sins. Oh egregious Divinity, which brings forth such fruits! But let us go on to shew the absurdity of that Doctrine.

## CHAP. LXXIII: Cessation of the second person of the Divinity

**The second Argument.** *Because the second person of the Divinity would cease to be a person.*

Secondly it follows from the same Doctrine, that one person of the Divinity hath ceased to be a person; for it became a part of Christ, constituted of a divine and human Nature. But it is of the Essence of a Suppositum, and consequently also of a person, that it be not a part of another thing, as it is confessed by all.

The Adversaries confess, and it is a thing too manifest, that Christ is a certain whole, consisting of a divine and human nature. Although they say, that he is not *an essential whole*, but *personal*. Which thing doth not infringe our Argumentation, but establish it rather. For what? Is it not equally repugnant to a person, to be the part of a *personal whole*; that is, of a person and suppositum, as to be the part of an *essential whole*? Yea verily most of all: because by this means, there should be two persons in one person, the one a part, the other a whole. Therefore that which perhaps some may think, is nothing, that the distinction between an *essential* and *personal* whole, which otherwise they use, is pertinent to the subverting our reason. Although also otherwise in vain is a *personal whole* feigned, which together is not *an essential*. But there is no need now to demonstrate that. What then? Will they say perhaps, that the human Nature of Christ is not a part of him? Thither some of the Adversaries seem to incline; although many no less contradict them, than that most received opinion, with the defenders, concerning that hypostatical union for so many ages past. For what is more usual with them, than to oppose Christ to either nature severally taken? Whereto pertaineth that distinction between *whole Christ*, and *the whole of Christ*? Besides, if the human Nature be not a part of the person of Christ, it will be an accident of that person, an accident, I say, such, as some call physical or predicable. For it is easy to be shewed, both by reason and the authority of the Philosopher, that it is an accident, which is inherent not as a part, and may be absent from that, in which it is. Now if the human nature of Christ be not a part of Christ; all that which we have said agrees to it. For it is in the person of Christ, and subsists in it, as the Adversaries would. But now it will not be a part. Lastly, it may be absent from that in which it is, to wit, the divine Person or Nature of Christ. For should the divine Nature or Person perish, if the human should be separated from it? I say not that it shall be separated; which they deny shall ever be: But if it should be separated, the divine Person should not be destroyed: which is enough in this place. For there are also inseparable accidents, as they are called in the Schools; which although they are never separated, from the *subiectum*, yet it is therefore said, that they may be absent from it, because if it were supposed, that they are separated from that, in which they are, yet it would not be necessary, that the thing it self should perish. But if the human nature be an accident of the person of Christ, how is the person of Christ, or the Son of God a man? Christ might indeed be said to be human, but not a man. For that which is an accident to another, is not predicated of it *synonymically*, or *univocally*, but *paronymically*? So a Cup, to which Gold adheres, as an accident, is said to be golden or gilded, not a gold; an Iron, in which is fire, is said to be fired, not a fire; and so in the rest.

But besides, how is not that a whole, which is one thing, and consisting of two things separable in their nature? But such is Christ. For he is some one thing, consisting of a divine and human nature, either of which in its nature is separable; although this, according to their opinion is not to be separated. How therefore is not the human Nature a part of Christ? If it be, then the other part will be the divine Nature, having its subsistence; that is, the divine person, which hath assumed the human. But a person, as we have seen, cannot be the part of another, and that indeed a suppositum or person. Perhaps some will say, that the Iron fired, is some thing united of an Iron and Fire; and yet the Iron it self doth not loose the reason or nature of a Suppositum, but only the Fire subsisting in it. Wherefore although Christ be somewhat consisting of a divine person & human nature, yet not *that* but *this* looseth the reason or nature of a person, because this subsists in that. For in this part there is the same reason of a person, and a suppositum: because that, of which we dispute, whether it befall a person, may therefore befall it, or not befall it, because it may befall or not befall a suppositum. But if there be in that Iron a *substantial* Fire, and that Fire, as some part of it, makes that Suppositum, which is called

an *Iron fired*; certainly the Iron taken by it self without that Fire, will be no more a Suppositum. For a Suppositum should be a part of a Suppositum. Neither behooves it any whit, that nevertheless we should call that Iron a Suppositum. For we would not call that Iron severed from the Fire, a Suppositum, but conjoined with it, although the denomination be made from the Iron, as the chief. But if that *substantial* Fire, together with the Iron, doth not make one Suppositum, or is not a part of it; first, I see not how it may be said, that it hath lost the reason or nature of a Suppositum. For it will be so in the Iron, as the air spread through the pores of the Iron. But this is in the Iron only, as it is contained in a certain place, neither in the mean time doth it cease to be a Suppositum, as neither the water insinuating it self in the spaces of more loose bodies, and diffused through them. Besides, this example will not serve the turn: because we have demonstrated, the human nature to be a part of Christ. Let the Adversaries chuse now which they will of these things, which we have said of the Fire (for there is no need that we should decide that controversie) and they shall find, that that instance, or example of the Iron fired, which in this thing they often use, makes nothing to overthrow our reason.

## CHAP. LXXIV: Disparateness of God and man

### **The third Argument. *Because the most high God and man are Disparatums.***

The third reason is, because by their opinion, it is necessary that Christ be together both God, to wit, the most high God and Man, and that God is man, and man is God. But the most high God and Man are *Disparatums*. But one and the same subiectum cannot be together two *Disparatums*, nor one of the *Disparatums* be the other; or, as they speak in the Schools, the *Disparatums* cannot be predicated of the same *subiectum*, *univocally*, or *in quid*, and indeed each severally without any limitation or adjection. They cannot also be said one of another, *univocally* or *in quid*, unless perhaps by a metaphor or similitude: as if I say, a man is a Lion or Fox, that is, like a Lion or Fox. But Figures here have no place. For the Adversaries would have it to be so properly, and are constrained so to hold, partly because of their own doctrine of Christ; partly because of plain expressions of the holy Scriptures. Of which thing something shall be said afterwards. But why the *disparatums* in that manner, we have said, cannot be said of one and the same *subiectum*, much less of one another, this is the reason: because the *disparatums* are *opposite*, although in a looser signification than *Aristotle* took that term. And the Adversaries do not deny it. For they see, that the *disparatums* contain in them a hidden contradiction, which is the greatest and unreconcilable opposition. For by the essential differences, by which they are opposed to each other, they exclude mutually each other, and the one is denied by the other. So a Man and a Horse, differ as a man, and not a man; rational, and not rational; a horse, and not a horse. A Man and a Plant differ not only as a man, and not a man; but also as animal, and not animal; or as sensitive, and not sensitive; and by how much farther any thing is distant from another, by so much more essential differences, which they call generical, are found between them, and by so much more contradictions arise between them. But now if any thing in the *genus* of the substance, be distant from the man, it is God, if yet our Adversaries will permit us to refer God to the *Genus* of the Substance, to hold which here, there is no need. Yea, if we exclude him from the *Genus* of the Substance, so much the farther will he be distant from man, and so much the more differences will arise between him and man, and contradictions, which cause that they be opposed one to the other. For man and God differs as man and not man, animal, and not animal, natural body, and not natural body, and if there as yet any other differences be found, by which God is severed from the *genuses* of a man. Therefore God and man cannot be predicated of the same subiectum, as Christ is, simply and absolutely, and that *univocally* or *in quid*.

Neither indeed may you think, those things are said of Christ *synecdochically*, the names of parts being put for the whole. For first, both words, as elsewhere, so also when they are used of Christ, do denote nothing else but the person of Christ. But the person is a whole, not a part. Besides if they were only predicated of Christ *synecdochically*, I might most rightly say, Christ is not God, Christ is not man; yea, so only should I speak properly and accurately: as I say most truly, that a man is not a soul, a man is not flesh, to wit, taken distinctly from the spirit. For this expression is proper and accurate; the other improper and figurate; to wit, a man is a soul, a man is flesh. But who would brook him that says, Christ is not God, is not man? Add that however the parts are wont to be said *synecdochically* of the whole, yet are they not wont to be predicated mutually of themselves. For I do not say, flesh is the soul or spirit; or on the contrary, the soul is flesh. But here *God* and *man* are predicated of each other mutually. There is no need to speak of the Metaphor, whereby sometimes the *Disparatums* are predicated of the same, or mutually of each other; as if I say, some man is a Lion or Fox, that is, like a Lion or Fox. For Christ, neither after the Adversaries, or our Opinion, is said to be metaphorically God or man, but both properly: and according to them essentially; according to us *man* indeed essentially; but God in the same manner in which he is said to be a King: which thing doth not reach to the Essence.

Not a few of the Adversaries have seen this knot; which when they could not loose, would notwithstanding say, that this is an unusual maner of predicating; and certainly it is unusual, because it saith, that which in its nature is impossible, since, as we have shewed, it implies a contradiction, to wit, that the same at once simply is a man, and is not; is God, and is not. Neither may any say, those

*Disparatums* which contain a hidden contradiction in them, are not predicated of Christ according to the same part, but diverse; and indeed the one according to the divine nature, the other according to the human. But that the same thing may be affirmed and denied of the same according to divers parts, For as the same thing cannot be both affirmed, and denied of the same whole simply, or without a limitation, or some addition; although it be in it according to one part, and be not in it according to another, as we have shewed in the first Book, *Sect. 2. Chap. 3.* so neither are those things said of the same *subiectum* simply, which contain such a hidden contradiction in them, however they may be in the same thing according to divers parts. For that nevertheless would be all one as if the same should be both affirmed and denied of the same whole simply. But such we have shewed two *disparatums* to be, which are predicated of the same *subiectum univocally*, and properly. Besides, the species, under which every individual is contained, is never predicated of the whole in respect of one only integral part or like to the integral, but of the whole, as it is a whole. But *man* is a species under which Christ is contained: and if he were not, it should be denied, that Christ is properly a man. Wherefore *man* is predicated of Christ not in respect of one part only, but of the whole as it is a whole. Why then should not also *God* be the attribute of the whole as such? But *Disparatums* cannot be said of the same whole as it is a whole; for contradictories should be together predicated of the same whole, as it is such.

## CHAP. LXXV: Christ is not two persons

### **The fourth Argument. *Because in Christ should be two persons.***

We will make the last Argument this. If the human nature, [We use the appellation frequent with the Adversaries] be a person, Christ cannot be a divine person in that manner, in which the Adversaries hold it. For there should be two persons in one Christ, a divine and human: which thing overthrows it self.

But now that the human nature of Christ is a person, is proved first from the definition of a person. For every first intelligent substance is a person.

For that which some say, that this is the definition of a person taken *in concreto*, hath here no moment. For neither would we prove any other thing, than that the human nature of Christ, taken *in concreto*, is a person; such as Peter, *Paul*, other men; and besides, every person is some *concretum*. Therefore they will answer, that this definition is more large than the thing defined. For not every first (that is, singular, and one) substance intelligent is a person, although the word person be taken *in concreto*. But that is not rightly answered; first, because otherwise it would follow, that some intelligent suppositum is not a person: which thing there is none which do not acknowledge to be most false: for every first intelligent substance is also a suppositum; even for that very reason, because the action of understanding doth properly agree to it; but actions do not agree save to Suppositiums.

Lastly, What instance, what example will they bring to the contrary? Run over all human substances; run over angelical, and the natures of Devils: all are persons. We have shewed the same before of the divine substance. And be it indeed as the Adversaries would, that it subsists in three subsistences, and so is three in persons; it is enough, that it is a person, whether one or more. For now, when we assert its personality to the human nature of Christ, we dispute not of the number of persons, but of the thing it self. We will give you leave to feign it, even three in persons. But what other first intelligent substances do remain there, which are not persons? You will say, the souls of men separated from their bodies. For they are first, or singular, and intelligent substances. For they may understand, and so in very deed do understand, being separated from bodies. But if the thing be so, why are they not persons? For will they not be intelligent suppositums? You will say they are not suppositums, because they are natural parts of men, or are by nature appointed to it, that they may constitute some whole. What? are not the natural parts of the substances disjoined from each other suppositums? Certainly, as it is the common, so also the most true opinion of the Schools, that they are Suppositiums at that time. For it matters not, that they either have been, or may be naturally parts of other things; if so be that now in very deed they are not, but by themselves make up some wholes. The actions of suppositums agree properly to them, and to each separate actions. Surely to the human souls, if the opinion of the Adversaries be true, not only actions do agree, but also even the most excellent, and most proper to persons, to wit, to understand and will, and if there be any conjoined with these. How then shall they not be suppositums, how not persons? But if they be not persons, let not the actions proper to persons, be ascribed to them. Which will be done, if you shall say, that those souls, as long as they subsist separate, cannot actually understand. For the soul is not intelligent, *ut quod*, or, as which (we speak with the Schools) but *ut quo*, or, as by which, that is, it doth not by it self understand, but is that by which the man understands. Therefore as long as the man himself is not his soul, by it self cannot understand. But since a person is defined, a first substance intelligent, or an intelligent suppositum, that is said to be intelligent, which may by it self actually understand, or which is understanding *ut quod*; or as which, not *ut quo* or as by which. With what instance then will they infringe our definition? Whether by the example of that nature of which we dispute? but that cannot be done without begging of the Question. Will they say the human Nature of Christ is not intelligent *ut quod*, or, as which; but *ut quo*, or, as by which? Then it will not be a substance endued with understanding; as we are; and so neither a human nature. For every substance endued with understanding, is intelligent *ut quod*, or, as which; that is, it self by its act is able to understand. Of which thing we shall say more hereafter.

The second reason by which it is proved, that the human Nature of Christ is a person, is this, that it is a man, I say a singular or individual man, and the son of man. But he who is a man, or the son of man, is a person: for these are names of persons. Whence some more acute Adversaries, will not call the human nature in Christ a man; and they say not a miss, that this phrase savours of Nestorianism, if any say, *God* assumed *man*. For it should be said, God or the divine Nature assumed a humanity, or human nature. Besides if the human Nature of Christ be in very deed a man, and the son of man, no man may doubt that those things are to be understood of it, which are said of the man Jesus Christ, or the Son of man; as Christ calls himself in the holy Scriptures. For there were not two men in Christ. But that son of man is called the Son of God; or on the contrary, the Son of God is called the Son of man: The man Christ is called the Mediator; and other things are attributed to him, which by all mens confession, agree not but to a person. Certainly if that man be not a person, it will be lawful so to argue. The son of man is not a person; the son of God is that son of man; therefore that son of God is not a person. But it is manifest by the definition of a man, that the human nature of Christ, which they fear to call a man, is in very deed and properly a man. For *to which* the definition agrees, *to it* also the thing defined agrees. For as much as the thing defined, and the definition, or the thing comprehended in the definition, differ not but in the manner of explaining, otherwise they are altogether the same thing. But now doth not the definition of a man agree to the human Nature of Christ? Was not it as all other men, a rational animal? Of its being rational, there is no doubt; for his Nature had not been human, if it had not been rational. Of its being an animal also, he ought not to doubt, who knows that the animal when it is made the genus of a man, is no other thing, than a body endued with a sensitive soul. What? Was not the human nature in Christ such a body? Was it not a body, that is, a corporeal substance? Was it not endued with a sensitive soul? He hath put off all sense and reason, who dares to deny it. Therefore the human nature of Christ is a man. But of its singularity, or individuality, who doubts? But if he be a man, he also is the son of man: as well because the holy Scriptures put promiscuously the son of man, and a man, as also is commonly known; as because he who being a man, is born of a woman, cannot but be in proper speaking the son of man.

Perhaps some one will say, that the human nature of Christ, to speak properly and accurately, is neither a man, nor an animal, nor a body, but Christ endued with human nature, is both a man, and an animal, and a body: because a man and animal, are *concretums*, and likewise a body, when it is put for the genus of a man: but that the human nature of Christ is an *abstractum*. But we on the contrary: if the human nature of Christ, speaking properly and accurately, be a corporeal substance, which no man can deny, but he that believes not sense any more, the same also is an animal, since it is endued with a sensitive soul: and further, a man, since it is also endued with a rational soul. Wherefore that which they say, that it is some *abstractum*, and call it *humanity*, or the human nature, not a man, rests on their bare opinion. But besides, what is with them *humanity*, *corporeity*, *animality* abstract? They will not say, that they are universals, as it were severed in the mind from singulars, which sort of *abstractums* we willingly admit in the kind of the substances; for this makes nothing here to the purpose, since the human nature of Christ is singular, and one in number. Also they will not say, that it is the form of a man, animal, or body. For neither doth this make any whit to the purpose, since the human nature of Christ is not the form of a man, but something endued with a form; not a part of the human essence, but the whole essence. What therefore are in their opinion those *abstractums*? Are they the singular nature of a man, an animal, or some body, abstracted from all these things which are not required to constitute it, and considered barely by it self? First, what constrains to consider so the human nature of Christ? since in it there were many things not belonging to the constitution of the essence of the humanity it self, as in other men. And that I may more nearly touch those things, which are wont commonly to be looked on in such *concretums*; there was in him an existence proper to *singulars*, of which no regard is had in the definition of the species and genus; there were *differences*, which they call *individuating*: it was existent in a certain place, in a certain time; I say it was a *being* in very deed existing, and, as other substances, *subsisting*: but such things are not wont to be called abstractums. Besides, I cannot see, why a whole essence, and in all the parts absolute, which is really existing, although it be abstracted in the mind from those things which are in it, deserves not the name of its species or genus: why, I say, this human nature, which is indeed existent (for of this we speak) ought not to be called a man, or this entire nature of an animal, animal. In vain the latter Philosophers

seem here to have sought a distinction unknown to the Ancients, and by reason of difference of words (although also it was necessary to feign those simple abstract words of the substances, as of the humanity, taken for the human nature, animality, corporeity) to have brought in a certain difference of the thing, and signification it self. But perhaps they will say, that the human nature of Christ subsists not by it self, but subsists in the person of the Son of God, by whose proper subsistence it is sustained. Therefore he either ought not to be called a man; or if he be called a man, yet he is not a person.

But that I may omit now other things to be said a little after, that subsistence, which they say the human nature of Christ wants, either appertains to the constitution of the nature of a man, or appertains not to it. If it appertains to it, the human nature of Christ without it will not be entire: and so Christ shall not be a perfect man, contrary to the mind of the holy Scriptures, and the Adversaries themselves: If it appertains not to it, its absence will no whit hinder, but that the human nature of Christ may be properly called a man.

Thirdly, It is proved by this, that the human nature of Christ is a person; because it in proper speaking doth act, and sustains certain offices. But actions, as often we have minded, after the common opinion of the Schools, are not properly but of suppositums, which if they be endued with understanding, by the confession of all are persons. Likewise also offices are proper to persons, as also the Adversaries confess it. But now that the human nature of Christ properly acts, is proved by that, that it doth also really subsist, and hath in it self a strength or power also and faculties sufficient to act. For it hath not less than any man; yea, by so much greater, by how much greater gifts and greater power is given it of God.

But what is required to it, that any thing may in proper speaking act, but that it may really subsist, and have in it self a strength or power sufficient to act? Surely it should be denied that we do properly act, if that might be denied of the human nature of Christ, which; as we have said in those things, that are required to the action properly so called, doth not only equal us, but also in many respects exceed. And that we may declare that thing more peculiarly, doth not it, speaking properly, by it self understand, and reason? Then it is not an intelligent substance, and endued with a rational soul, and further, neither an human. For that is an intelligent substance, that can, especially with some access of use and exercise, really, I say, properly, not improperly, understand and reason. But even the understanding alone would suffice to prove its person, for it is proper to persons, as also we have before minded.

Further, Take now other actions, whether proper to men or animals, as to will, desire, eat, drink, move it self in a place, and stirs its members to act. If the human nature had not faculties to exercise these actions, either it was not an human nature at all, or it was maimed either in respect of the body, or soul. The Truth, or the Adversaries opinion admits neither. The Antiquity condemned the *Monothelites*, who held one only will in Christ. But if there were in him a double will, one in the divine nature, another in the human; as the divine nature hath willed, and doth will by its proper will; so also the humanity by its; for wherefore else should it be in it? Faculties are for actions. And surely his human will shewed forth it self abundantly, whilst he sought of his Father to remove the cup from him. Although here it might be enough for us, that this nature might properly will; for that agrees not but to Suppositums.

Perhaps they will say, that the human nature did not subsist by it self, but in the person of the Son of God; and therefore also by it self could act nothing. For that which subsists not by it self, doth nothing also by it self. Wherefore all the actions properly and directly, are not to be ascribed to the human nature, by which they are performed, but to whole Christ, although according to the human nature. For in whole Christ, or his person, they are terminated and founded. But if you would directly ascribe those actions to the human nature it self, the expression or speaking would be improper; as when I say, the soul understands, wills, feels: when yet the soul doth not properly understand, will, feel, but the man with, or by, or according to the soul. So neither doth the body eat, drink, but the man himself by the body: So lastly, neither doth the arm move it self, although we sometimes so speak, but the man.

Which things let us consider of what moment they are: and first that, why they deny the human nature of Christ to subsist by it self. Now there may be a threefold meaning of that expression, which may here come into ones mind. For first, that may be said to *subsist by it self*, which needs not any *subiectum*, in which it may inhere, and from which if it be removed, it will loose its being. In this manner all substances subsist by themselves; accidents do not subsist, those, namely, which are wont commonly to be distributed into nine Categories, or Predicaments. In this manner the human nature, by the Adversaries confession subsists by it self? for it is a substance, not an accident, otherwise it would not be an *human nature*. Besides, that *subsists by it self*, which needs not at all any outward prop, that it may subsist, and be preserved entire and safe. In this manner no created thing, and depending on another, subsists by it self. But that hinders not, but that the things destitute of this way of subsisting by themselves, act properly, as is manifest to any one. For things corruptible, and chiefly men, want both many causes, that at first they may exist, and many helps, that they may be conserved; and yet they do properly act. Wherefore that will neither hinder the human nature, that it should not, speaking properly, act.

Thirdly, That subsists by it self, which is not a part of another, but constitutes some whole by it self, and absolute in all its respects. In this manner the parts of any thing, whether integrant or essential, are not said to subsist by themselves, and therefore not to act by themselves, but the whole by them. And hitherto belong all those examples brought a little before. Perhaps in this manner the Adversaries will say, that the human nature of Christ doth not subsist by it self: because it is a part of another suppositum, to wit, of whole Christ, or his person. But if the thing be so, neither that second person of the Divinity, with which the human is said to be united, and which therefore is the other part of the same suppositum, shall properly any more act any thing. So a divine person, that is of the supreme God himself, who, speaking properly, hath acted, is become that, which, speaking properly, cannot act, than which nothing can be thought more absurd. For certainly if the human nature be a part, there will be also some other part of the same whole. But what is it besides the person, by which it is assumed, and with which it is said to be united? Wherefore this also will be a part, and consequently will no more subsist by it self (to wit, in that manner of subsisting which we now handle) than the human nature. But besides, if the human nature of Christ be full and perfect, consisting of a human body, and a rational soul, both of them absolute in all respects; is it not by it self an entire thing, having faculties sufficient to act? Certainly if you deny any of these, either you will deny the entireness of the human nature, or you will deny also that we ourselves are such entire things. The Adversaries being constrained by the very truth of the thing, grant the human Nature of Christ to be by it self an essential whole, neither dare they say it is an integrant part of Christ, because they hold those only to be integrant parts which have quantity. Wherefore if Christ should consist of a human nature and a divine as integrant parts, also the divine nature being the other part of this suppositum, would have quantity. Therefore some say that the divine and human nature are as it were essential parts, or like essential parts: and that the human nature is as it were the matter and thing to be perfected, the divine, as it were, the form and thing perfecting. But whilst they say this, they thereby confess, those Natures to be improperly called parts, but properly wholes: or at least if the divine Nature cannot be termed a whole, because it is destitute of parts; the human Nature by it self to be some whole consisting of all essential and integrant parts. But this indeed is to subsist by it self, when that expression is taken in the third signification, which was set down by us. Wherefore in vain do the Adversaries, when they say, that that subsistence of which we speak, may by divine power be separated from an entire and perfect substance, such as is the human nature in Christ. And I believe indeed it may be separated, if together it cease to be perfect and entire, and becomes either an essential part of some thing, or integrant growing together with another body. But that it remaining perfect, and making up an essential and integral whole by it self, should not subsist by it self, implies a contradiction. For that would be that it completes a whole by it self, and doth not complete it, that it both is entire and perfect by it self, and is not. And this reason indeed doth not only shew that actions properly agree to the human Nature, whence further it is concluded, that it is a suppositum and person; but also doth immediately shew that. For if the human Nature be a substance subsisting by it self, to wit, in that stricter manner of subsisting by it self, which we expounded in the third place, it is altogether a suppositum; for as much as this subsistence, is the form of a suppositum, by which a suppositum is a suppositum; as the Adversaries themselves teach: who also bring no other cause, nor

can by their opinion, why the human nature of Christ is not a suppositum, and further, not a person, than because it is destitute of that subsistence.

But that we may return to actions; Thence also it is manifest, that they properly agree to the human Nature, because otherwise it should be necessary to hold, that all Christs actions; whatsoever at length they have been, are to be properly attributed to his divine suppositum, as it is a suppositum; or that that divine suppositum hath properly performed those actions. But thence arise those absurdities which my mind abhors even to think of. For all natural actions proper to human imperfection, and our mortality, which are common to man with brutes: some also, however necessary, yet uncomely, shall properly agree not to the human Nature, but to the divine Suppositum it self; that is, to God himself, as he is a Suppositum. He who fears not to think these absurdities of God, he hath not yet learned to reverence enough that dreadful and most glorious Majesty, and doth the greatest injury to the most holy Religion of Christ. Which by this means he exposeth to the mockery of those which are without. Surely that should be far from them who so much abhor to ascribe any accident to God, or any genus, and the like: which although they were erroneous, yet they could be both conceived, and spoken without disparagement to his Majesty. But so it usually comes to pass, that they which strain at a Gnat, swallow an Elephant; and they whom those things which pertain only to the philosophical subtlety, would be wary even to superstition, but in these things which touch the reverence of the Deity, they are more than careless.

Therefore that we may return to our purpose, since it is sufficiently shewed, that actions do properly agree to the human Nature, it is also easy to shew, that offices also agree to the same.

For, first, that the human Nature of Christ may bear some office, that which would here be sufficient for us, it is easy to demonstrate. For he that may discharge actions proper to intelligent beings, and those very eminent, may also bear some office. For what else is required to the office in general? Besides, the same is without difficulty shewed in particular. Three offices of Christ are held by all, Prophetical, Priestly and Kingly. The part of the first is to expound & confirm the divine Will to men. Of the second, to offer to God, and to intercede for sinners. Of the third, to govern, keep and save the people of God, although also to save belongs to the Priestly office; of which here is not place to speak. But do not these offices agree to the human Nature of Christ? It is the office of a Prophet not to speak in his own name, but anothers, to wit, Gods (for God when he speaks in his own person, doth not execute a Prophets office) and to deliver Oracles or Doctrines unto others received from him. And Christ expressly saith of himself, that he heard the things which he speak, from the Father; that he was taught of him; that he received command from him what he ought to speak; that his Doctrine was not his own, but his, who sent him. All which things the Adversaries will have to have been said of Christ according to his human Nature; not can they otherwise. For the divine Nature or Person, as such, cannot learn, or receive commandments: all things, which he hath or delivers, are his, not anothers. But if the human Nature properly doth not act, we must say, that the divine Person properly hath done those things, which are said to have been done according to it: It therefore hath properly heard of the Father, hath properly learned, received commands; and further, hath spoken by anothers command; hath promulged anothers not his own Doctrine; it properly hath managed the Prophetick office: likewise also hath wrought piety, temperance, chastity; and other virtues: hath done miracles by divine Power: hath by its death confirmed his Doctrine: which was the complement of the Prophetick Office.

Now that we may come to the Priestly office: To intercede for another with God, agreeth not to God himself, nor to a divine Person, as such; as even the Adversaries themselves do see; likewise neither to offer to God; especially because by the expiatory oblation it self, the intercession is made with God for another. Therefore it is necessary, that it be said, that Christ hath done those things according to his human Nature. Whence further it follows, for the reason a little before alledged, that the human Nature hath done, or does those things, and so performs the Office of a Priest.

Lastly, Since we see that Christ is said to have been made and anointed by God a King, and that all Power is given him in Heaven and in Earth, since it is necessary to understand those things of Christ

according to the human Nature; it follows that the human Nature hath that Power; and further, also doth exercise it; which belongs to a King. These things are plain; and have in them no scruple and difficulty. There is no need here of communication of Properties: There is no need to distinguish subtilly between Expressions *in concreto*, and *in abstracto*: to difference the Person from the Nature; again, one Nature from another: to seek how you may attribute human things to the most high God, and things proper to the most high God, to a Man; how the same Person one while governs as the most high God, another while as a Mediator, and so the same person is in some sort distinguished from himself.

Now from that which hath been said, that may also be understood, That there was no need of the Union of two Natures. For if there had been need of it, it had been for this cause, That Christ might bear and manage those Offices. But Christ might discharge them, although he were but a man in Essence: Yea, if he had been God, he could not discharge the two former, he could not receive the last, nor therefore discharge it, because that Kingly office is not the Empire of the most high God, as he is such, but, as the Adversaries speak, such a Kingdom as Christ manageth as a Mediator. And indeed the confirming our faith and hope, and the Glory of the most high God required such a Kingdom. But if any say, that greater than human ability or power was requisite to discharge those Offices, that would be of some moment, if it had been necessary, that he should have that ability or power from himself, nor could receive them from God himself. But now since he both might receive them from God, and the holy Scriptures so often testify, that he hath received them from God, what need was there, that he should be the most high God? Rightly they say commonly, *God and Nature do nothing in vain*; although God doth those things also that Nature doth. But if God does not things unnecessary; much less those things which hinder, and are otherwise unbecoming his Majesty. But we have shewed that that union would have hindered the administration of those Offices. We have shewed also, that it attributes to God not a few absurdities, and things unbecoming his Majesty, and most apt either to take away out of mens minds, or at least to diminish in them that veneration, of it which he would establish by Christ.

### THE THIRD SECTION OF THE SECOND BOOK.

**IN WHICH IS DISCOURSED CONCERNING THE THIRD PERSON OF THE SUPREME DEITY, WHICH IS COMMONLY HELD. AND IT IS SHEWED, THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT SHOULD BE THE SON OF GOD, IF THE COMMON OPINION CONCERNING HIM WERE TRUE.**

We have said enough of the second Person which is held to be in the Trinity. It remains that we add something also of the third. There is no need that we should say much of it, because those things which have been said of the Sons Generation out of the Essence of the Father, being a little changed, may be applied to that procession of the holy Spirit, which the Adversaries have devised. For which reason we also before sometimes have expressly joined the holy Spirit with the Son, and so anticipated the treating of those things, which might have been here alledged: nor did we that without cause. For if you rightly mark it, both the Generation of the Essence of the Father, is some Procession; and on the contrary, such a Procession, as the Adversaries attribute to the holy Spirit, is like that Generation, which the Adversaries attribute to the Son of God. The former the more learned of the Adversaries do confess, who treating of the Generation of the Son, and Procession of the holy Spirit, say, That there are two Processions in God. But why the word *Procession* is accommodated particularly to the holy Spirit, and so is distinguished from the Generation of the Son, they assign this to be the Reason, Because there is a special word wanting, by which that proper and peculiar manner, whereby the holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son, may be designed. Therefore, as in other things it oft comes to pass, the general name is attributed as proper to the species, and so is distinguished from the other species. But that the Procession also of the holy Spirit is a Generation, if that Generation of the Son of God, which the Adversaries hold, be indeed a Generation, is not hard to demonstrate. For what other thing is required to a Generation properly so called, than that one receive his Essence from another, either the same in kind, or (as the Adversaries opinion of God is) in number with his Essence, from whom he receives it? In brief, generation properly so called, is a communication of a substance with another. And is not that Procession of the holy Spirit, devised by the Adversaries, such a communication? Did not the holy Spirit by that Procession, receive the same essence in number with the essence of them from whom he proceeded? So indeed the Adversaries think and contend. But if the Procession of the holy Spirit be a *Génération*, properly so called; we have in the Trinity two Sons; one of the first person only, another of the first and second: and also two Fathers; one of the first person, who will be a Father by a double name; to wit, because he hath begotten the second and third person of the Deity; another the second person, who together with the Father, hath begotten the holy Spirit. But we have learned both from the holy Scriptures, and the Adversaries, that there is but only One Father, and only one Son; to wit, by excellency so called.

The more acute of the Adversaries have seen this Rock of their opinion, and have endeavoured to avoid it. Therefore they have judged, that that definition of a Generation, which otherwise they themselves have delivered, is to be limited, and have said, that not every communication of a substance with another, is a Generation, but at length that, that which such a relation follows, as is between Father and Son, which is barbarously called *Paternity* and *Filiation*. In which indeed they are ridiculous. As if for sooth it could be, that a person may communicate his substance really to a person, and yet such a relation may not thence presently follow; and that person, which communicates his substance to another, by that very thing were not forthwith a Father, or (where there is a distinction of sex, which is not in God) a Mother: and again, he to whom the substance is communicated a Son, or (where there is a distinct sex) a Daughter. The Adversaries themselves confess, that the words, *Father*, *Son*, *Generation*, *Procession*, as also other-like words, are by an Analogy said of God and creatures, and that by reason of likeness they are translated from these to God. But in things created, as soon as the substance is produced, the things are properly said to be generated; nor is there any thing more required to the propriety of the word, but if a person has produced a person, presently the one is called a Father, or, as we have said, a Mother; the other a Son or Daughter. Therefore that which in God is *analogum* to that Generation, doth also deserve to be termed Generation. But that is a production of another person, or a communication of the substance with another person. And the

necessary consequence hereof is *Paternity* and *Filiation*, *Analogum* to that which we see in human generations. For that generation is conversant among Persons.

But say some, therefore the production of a person is called a generation, because by it a person is produced not only like to the producer in essence, but also in some other peculiar respect. For that second person, as such, is the image of the first, as that which it hath produced by understanding it self; but that the Image is like to that the image of which it is. They say there is another reason of the Procession of the holy Spirit, for he is produced from the Father and Son by willing. But it is not the property of the will to produce something like to that thing which it wills and desires. Therefore that the holy Spirit, however by his Procession he is become like to the Father and Son in Essence, or rather the same, yet in respect of his person, by which he is distinguished from the Father and the Son, he is like to neither. But that Procession at last is rightly termed a Generation, by which the person produced becomes altogether like the producer, but that procession is rightly distinguished from a generation, of which in that respect there is a different reason. But these subtil devices avail them nothing. For besides that, we have refuted already above that device of the production of persons, which may be by understanding or willing. There are yet two things which shew the vanity of this exception. The former is that to the propriety of a generation from another, it is not at all required, that the thing generated be like the thing generating in all things: but it is enough if it be like to it in essence or substance; from which likeness follows also a likeness of natural properties, and common to the whole genus or species, although the property of generation by it self, is not seen in this, but in that; and if it could be, that the substance of the thing generated, were like to the substance of the thing generating, but the properties of both divers, nevertheless the property of generation would be certain, although perhaps it might not be so easily acknowledged: because we for the most part know things themselves by the proper tokens, and consequents of things. Wherefore if the holy Spirit by virtue of his procession, became like in substance to the Father and Son, yea, the same, (for according to the Adversaries *identity*, takes not away procession nor generation in divine persons) the holy Spirit was generated of the Father and Son, and so that his procession is generation. In how many things, if you except the Essence and properties immediately following it, are sons wont to be unlike the Fathers? Yet nevertheless, they are not therefore less properly said to be generated of them, or to be their Sons. But here the essence and natural properties are altogether the same. What then is there wanting in the holy Spirit, to the propriety of generation? That I may omit, that the holy Spirit cannot be unlike the Father and Son, no not indeed in that propriety or character which they call *hypostatical*, if another opinion of the same Adversaries concerning those personal properties, be true. For they hold them to be the same really with the Essence common to the three persons, and only distinguished from it by the understanding. Whence it necessarily follows, that he that hath that essence in himself (as each of those three persons hath) hath also all those properties in him, and that those properties are no less common to the three persons, than the Essence. Although that opinion overthrows it self. For they will be at once common and proper in respect of the same persons; and will make those persons unlike, and not unlike, diverse, and not diverse.

The latter, Why that reason or exception of the Adversaries cannot have place, is; Because if we follow their opinion concerning the divine attributes, nothing can proceed from the will, but together it proceeds from the understanding; and on the contrary. For with them all the divine attributes, and so the understanding and will, if you consider the thing it self, are altogether the same thing. For they are the very Essence of God, to which indeed doth agree, no not the least composition or true diversity. And indeed many Schoolmen say, that they may express their opinion, That the understanding and will in God, as also his other attributes, are not only really, but also formally the same thing; that is, that they are not only so joined together, as that they can never be severed from one another, but also are not so much as indeed by proper forms or essences, and definitions distinguished from each other. *Aristotle* would say, they are the same in reality and reason. For with *Aristotle*, those things are the same in reason, which have the same form, and the same definition; he saith they differ in reason who have diverse. Now if in this manner, the will and understanding are the same thing in God, and so the understanding is the will it self; and reciprocally, whatsoever proceeds or is generated from the understanding, proceeds also, and is generated from the will, and on the contrary. Therefore the production by the understanding, is no more generation, than that which is said to proceed from the

will; nor doth that produce a person like to the producer, more than this; neither is the Son more a Son than the holy Spirit; neither is the same Son less the holy Spirit, than the third person of the Trinity. For the Son hath no less proceeded from the will, than the holy Spirit; nor the holy Spirit less from the understanding, than the Son. These indeed are the fruits of the subtilties, wherewith the Scholastick Divinity swarmes.

And yet we see, that those who acknowledge the holy Scriptures for the only Rule of Faith, do follow and admire them.

But they will say, the same Schoolmen have prevented these difficulties. For the divine attributes by their doctrine, although they be not actually distinguished by the nature of the thing, or without the consideration of our mind in any manner, neither really, nor formally, yet are they distinguished *eminenter*; that is, *virtually* and *potentially*. And this difference is the foundation of the diversity between the processions of two persons, of which we now treat, and likewise between various effects flowing from God; and lastly, between the conceits and cogitations of our mind concerning the divine attributes. For we do inadequately conceive the divine attributes by reason of the imperfection of our understanding, and therefore consider them as diverse, which in reality are altogether the same thing. And this the Schoolmen call distinction of reason, which they very often use. For when they have confounded together things diverse, yet because the diversity of things offer it self of its own accord to the minds of them that contemplate them, and they themselves are compelled to speak and dispute of them as diverse, they fly to this irrational difference of reason, as to a sacred Anchor. But although we might dispatch this errour, lying hid even in obscurity of words, as in its lurking hole; yet I am willing first to draw it out thence, that the thing may be more clearly seen by them, who were never conversant in the Schools. To be distinguished *eminenter*, and to be distinguished *actu*, are by the Schoolmen opposed one to another; for it is known that *potentia* and *virtus*, are opposed to *actus* with the Philosophers; and when the Schoolmen say that something is distinguished *eminenter*, it is all one with them as if they said it is distinguished virtually and potentially. Those things then are distinguished *eminenter*, which however, they are the same altogether actually, yet may be distinguished, because they have in some manner the force of more things, or because diverse operations and effects may flow from them; or because being compared with things diverse in some manner, they answer to the forms of each, or have divers respects to the same. But what ever they imagine, either there is an actual difference in the thing of which it is treated, or there is no distinction. For those things are actually distinct of one of which something is rightly affirmed, which of the other at the same time is rightly denied. For if those things nevertheless, be altogether the same thing actually, contradictories will be together in the same thing, or the same thing will be together both affirmed & denied of the same thing, which is impossible. But if you would be so obstinate against the most clear Truth, as to say, nothing hinders but that contradictories may agree, to the same thing, if so be that it may virtually or potentially be more things, nothing will hinder but that all things which are any where extant, are one thing actually, but divers virtually, or potentially: and if any will assert it, he can be refuted by no reason. For if contradictions do not evince those things, of which they are spoken to be diverse actually, nothing will be able to evince it. For whatsoever differenceth one thing from another, differenceth it by the force of a contradiction: and every opposition, every difference doth tacitly include it in it self; and unless it did include it, there would be nothing to hinder, but that opposites should agree to the same thing. Rightly hath the Philosopher said, and said it indeed according to the common consent of all men, if two things are said to be the same, whatsoever is said of the one of them, is said also of the other. If then any thing truly may be said of one thing, which is to be denied of the other, those things cannot simply be the same actually; but it is necessary that they be distinguished in the thing, or in reason; that is, in form and proper essence. That thing verily doth necessarily happen in the understanding and divine will, if those things be true, which we discoursed before according to the mind of the ancient Fathers and Schoolmen, concerning the diversity between the Generation of the Son, and Procession of the holy Spirit. For the Generation is said to have been performed by the operation of the understanding; the Procession of the holy Spirit not so; this again by the operation of the will, that not so; it is said to agree to the understanding, to produce something altogether like to the thing understood, which is denied of the will: the Father alone is said to have produced the Son by the understanding; the Father not alone, but together with

the Son, is said to have produced the holy Spirit by the will. But if these things be true, and did exist actually before all consideration of our mind, it is necessary that the divine Understanding and Will, were also actually distinct without all operation of our mind. Wherefore let them either cease to deny, that there is indeed any actual difference between the divine attributes, or let them take away the difference between the generation of the Son, and of the holy Spirit, and say that the Son is the holy Spirit, the holy Spirit again the Son; by which very thing they will overthrow the Doctrine of the Trinity. For so, besides the Father, there will be only one person, the difference between the Son and holy Spirit being taken away.

Before we put an end to this disputation, since we are fallen into this discourse concerning the virtual distinction, as they speak, I am willing to add this further, that the devise of the same Schoolmen is very vain, when they say, that the persons of the Trinity are distinguished from the Essence neither really nor formally, but *eminenter* only; and further, by the intellect, which may even there conceive a distinction, where there is actually none. For if, as they hold, the divine Essence be actually communicable to more persons, and was communicable before all operation of our understanding; but on the contrary, a person is incommunicable to more persons; also there must actually be a difference between the essence and person; otherwise if altogether they are actually the same thing, contradictories may together be actually in the same thing, as is said before. Neither indeed in that alone, which we have now expressed, a contradiction will be implied, but in all those things, in which the person is distinguished from the Essence: as for example, *That* is a suppositum or person, *this* is not; *that* is really distinguished from the other persons, *this* is not distinguished; *that* hath properly begotten, or was begotten, or proceeded from the Father and the Son, *this* not so. But what need we more words? Altogether irrational, as we have said, is that distinction of reason, which is there fained, where indeed there is none, Truly they who apply this distinction of reason to things, are much like to them, who, when they see but one man, they seem to themselves they see two. These are deceived in their eyes, those in their minds. For the opinion of our mind cannot be true, if it conceive the thing otherwise than it is: For Truth is adequation, as they speak, or agreement of our understanding, and further also, of our words with the thing it self. But if men do truly conceive that as distinct, which is not in very deed distinct, the conceits of the same thing contrary to one another, will be true, to wit, of God and mortal men. For God, and the blessed Angels, and Men, who see God as he is, conceive in their mind no difference in God (if the opinion of these men concerning the divine attributes, be true) because there is none in him: mortal men do. But *true* cannot be contrary to *true*, no more, yea, less, than an Egg to an Egg, Milk to Milk. Neither may they fetched patronage of so absurd a distinction from *Aristotle*, who saith, as we have before minded, that some things are really distinct; some in reason. For with him those things are distinct in reason, which the schoolmen say, are formally distinguished; that is, which although they be united together, and by a certain indissolvable knot, either on both sides, or on one part joined, yet differ in forms and proper Essences; as docility, and the faculty of admiring in the same man: generation and corruption. For every natural, and properly so called Generation, is the corruption of another thing, and on the contrary. Nevertheless, these things differ, yea, are opposite, and so have opposite essences also, which are in the same matter in respect of divers things. For one thing is corrupted, another thing is generated. So the foundations also are distinguished from the relations which rest on them. But those things differ also in the whole genus or predicament. So also the comparisons of the same thing, with divers relations, have forms and essences divers either in the genus or species, or number: as also *termini* and *correlata* differ. Therefore the intellect doth not feign those distinctions in things, but in very deed finds them in them: and the Schoolmen themselves say that those things are distinct actually, which although we think not of them, are distinct in forms, although they exist together. But if they would acknowledge such a difference between the divine persons and essence, the Patrons of it will neither be able to reconcile the common Doctrine of the Trinity with it self, nor with their other Doctrines. Not with it self, for by this means, each person will have its proper form and essence; and so those persons will be, and will not be at once of one essence. Not with their other doctrines, because the exactest simplicity of God will fall. But if they acknowledge not that distinction, then the Trinity will fall, all true difference between the essence and the persons, and thereupon of the persons also between themselves being taken away. Wherefore which way soever the Adversaries turn themselves, they will not be able to defend that their Trinity, or plurality of persons in one Essence of God; and therefore there remains no

other thing, than that they confess together with us, that there is no less one person, than one substance of God.



