

All of George Gillespie's Writings on  
Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is the Church Only

Edited, Introduced & Annotated

By

Travis Fentiman

Brought to you by

**Reformed Books Online**

[ReformedBooksOnline.com](http://ReformedBooksOnline.com)

The Best, Free, Reformed Books and Articles Online

We hope this work helps you to enjoy and glorify God

# Table of Contents

<a href="#">Introduction</a>	2
<i>Aaron's Rod Blossoming</i> 1646	
Brief Outlines of:	
<a href="#">Ch. 4 - The Agreement and Differences between Church and State</a>	8
<a href="#">Ch. 5 - Of the Two-Fold Kingdom of Christ</a>	12
<a href="#">Ch. 6 - Whether the Magistrate is the Vice-Gerent of Christ as Mediator? Positive Arguments for this Answered.</a>	13
<a href="#">Ch. 7 - Negative Arguments for this Given</a>	16
Extended Outlines of:	
<a href="#">Ch. 4 - The Agreement and Differences between Church and State</a>	17
<a href="#">Ch. 5 - Of the Two-Fold Kingdom of Christ</a>	28
<a href="#">Ch. 6 - Whether the Magistrate is the Vice-Gerent of Christ as Mediator? Positive Arguments for this Answered.</a>	40
<a href="#">Ch. 7 - Negative Arguments for this Given</a>	54
<i>111 Propositions</i> 1647	
<a href="#">A Summary Outline of Propositions #39-101</a>	65
Excerpts from Sermons	
<a href="#">'A Brotherly Examination'</a> 1645	79
<a href="#">'Nihil Respondes'</a> 1645	90
<a href="#">'Male Audis'</a> 1646	99

# Introduction

Rev. Travis Fentiman<sup>1</sup>

George Gillespie (1613–1648), the young but formidable Scot, is sometimes looked upon as an enigma, arguing during the Westminster era that Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is limited to the Church only, it not encompassing all things. Yet, Gillespie was not singular as a proponent of this doctrine, as is demonstrated by the many and various historic, reformed predecessors which he cites before him. Gillespie saw himself as defending the commonly received, reformed, doctrine and gives his own testimony as to how and why this understanding became the historically dominant, reformed position during and shortly after the Reformation in [Aaron's Rod, book 2, ch. 5, pp. 90-91](#). Dr. Richard Muller, one of the world's leading historians of Reformation and Post-Reformation theology, confirms that Gillespie's basic position was the majority, reformed, viewpoint of that era. In contrast to the Lutherans:

"The Reformed, however, tend to attribute the *regnum universale* [universal Kingdom] specifically to the Second Person of the Trinity and only the *regnum oeconomicum* [economic reign, including the Mediatorial Kingdom] to the God-man as Mediator."<sup>2</sup>

Further confirmation that Gillespie was in good company can be found by perusing [The Majority of the Westminster Divines on the Extent of Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom](#).

---

<sup>1</sup> Rev. Fentiman is a [Probationer](#) (an approved Licentiate available for a call to a church) in the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) and earned an MDiv. from Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary. He resides in Vermont, USA, with his bride and two dear children. He initially was persuaded of William Symington's viewpoint on this subject for over a decade after first coming to the issue.

Text in [brackets] is the editor's. Updated English, punctuation, formatting and minimal stylistic changes have been made in order to make this work easier to read. The original intention of the author has been sought to be preserved at all times. The specific version of this work is licensed under the very sharing-friendly: [Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](#) Please share this work in any godly way, shape, or form desired.

<sup>2</sup> Richard Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985) 259-260

The paradigm that Gillespie defended, and the language that he used to do so, is precisely that of the Westminster standards. The Westminster standards:

- (1) Define 'the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ' as 'the visible Church' (WCF 25.2) and use the term consistently throughout their documents;
- (2) Use the common categories and language of the time that undergirded this viewpoint, such as:
  - the 'kingdom of power' (LC 191), 'the kingdom of grace' (SC 102) and 'the kingdom of glory' (SC 102);
  - the kingdom of power being made to subserve Christ's kingdom of grace (LC 191);
  - the significant distinction and use of the word 'power' instead of 'authority' in key passages (WCF 8.3; 33.1; LC 45, 54; FoPCG 'Preface')
- (3) Contain principles that limit Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom to the Church (c.f. WCF 30.1-2; Christ's Mediatorial office as King is coextensive with those for whom He is a Prophet and Priest, WCF 8.1; etc.);
- (4) Go no further than that Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is the Church only (note the careful language of LC 45, amongst other places, all of which Gillespie affirms);<sup>3</sup>
- (5) Interpret all the relevant scripture proof-texts that are used by some to expound that Christ is Mediatorial Head and King of all things, as only speaking of Christ as Mediatorial Head and King of the Church:
  - Ps. 2:6-8, that Christ is Mediatorial King of the holy hill of Zion only, upon which He is set (not the whole world), that the inheritance given to Him is of people out of all the nations of the earth, not a gift of the whole earth, and that Christ dashing resistant kings does not make Him their king, nor does it

---

<sup>3</sup> The Reformed Presbyterian professor, Dr. W.D.J. McKay writes, "...such a view [as Gillespie's] also finds expression in the documents produced by the Westminster Assembly, reflecting English Reformed thinking. When considering the offices of the Mediator, the Westminster Divines describe his kingship entirely in terms of activity in or on behalf of the Church. This is best expressed in the answer to Question 45 of the Larger Catechism." *An Ecclesiastical Republic* (Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 1997) 60

bring the office of obedient kings properly under his Mediatorial government:  
LC 42, 62; WCF 25.2;

- Isa. 9:6-7, that the government placed on Christ's incarnate shoulder is Church government only, not civil government or otherwise, and his Kingdom mentioned herein is the Church: WCF 25.2; 30.1; LC 42; SC 23; FoPCG 'Preface';
- Mt. 28:18, that at the Ascension, Christ as Mediator was given 'power over all things' to exercise for the interests of his Church Kingdom, not that 'all authority' came under, or from, his Mediatorial office, commission, kingship or governmental rule: WCF 8.3; 30.1; FoPCG 'Preface';
- Eph. 1:20-23, that Christ as Mediator, the Head of the Church only (not all of creation), was placed above and over all things in name, glory and power (though not in governmental administration or as their root source of power): WCF 25.1,6; LC 52, 54, 64, 66;
- Col. 1:18, that Christ as Mediator in this passage is Head of the Church only: WCF 25.1,6; LC 52;
- Col. 2:9-10, that Christ in this passage, according to the context, is described in his person and divine nature by creation (not as Mediator) as 'head of all principality and power': WCF 8.3; LC 36, SC 21); etc.

To add further historical validation to Gillespie's view, regarding the Scottish context, it is little known (and contrary to popular assumption) that in fact all of the confessions, national covenants and declarations of the Scottish Covenanters during the 1500's and 1600's affirm the traditional, reformed viewpoint on Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom, as documented on this [page](#) at ReformedBooksOnline. For a brief sketch of

the slow rise of popularity through the 1700's and 1800's of the opposite opinion, that Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom includes all things, see the ['Introduction'](#) on the same page.

Gillespie's writings on the nature and extent of Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom represent the most prominent, full and detailed exposition and defense of the traditional reformed viewpoint in the English language in history. Unfortunately, Gillespie has been little read and often misunderstood. This may be, no doubt, due to his dense<sup>4</sup> treatments of the matter being buried in their sometimes convoluted, polemical context and scattered throughout his infrequently reprinted writings. Yet, Gillespie's extensive Biblical arguments deserve to be heard. It is a good rule of thumb in theology not to take a minority opinion until one at least knows all of the arguments for the majority view. So we present here, for the first time in a contemporary format, all of Gillespie's writings on the extent of Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom. May it be a welcome bolster to Christ's Church.

Gillespie's writings on the topic, in chronological order (1645-47), consist of 3 sermons, 4 chapters of a book, and sizeable chunk of his summary, *101 Propositions on Church Government*. We recommend that one starts with Gillespie's first sermon, *A Brotherly Examination*, which gives a coherent platform and overview of how the issues were defined and proceeded upon. However, the subsequent two sermons quickly get muddied down in polemical sparring, which can be rather difficult to follow, the major points and track of the argument getting clouded under a multitude of counter-responses and minor corollaries. Further difficulty is added in that the opponent's writings are not available online.

The history of these sermons is given by W.D.J. McKay. Gillespie's impetus for the sermons was:

---

<sup>4</sup> The only work, perhaps, more dense than Gillespie's *Aaron's Rod Blossoming* may be Samuel Rutherford's *Lex Rex*.

“...a sermon preached before the House of Commons on 30<sup>th</sup> July, 1645 by Rev. Thomas Coleman, a prominent Erastian divine and Rector of St. Peter’s Church, Cornhill, in London. His text was Job 11:20 and in the course of the sermon, which he entitled *Hopes Deferred and Dashed*, he took the opportunity of defending the basic tenets of Erastianism...

In reply Gillespie wrote *A Brotherly Examination of some passages of Mr. Coleman’s Late Sermon*, to which Coleman responded with a tract entitled *A Brotherly Examination Re-examined*. In due course Gillespie produced his reply to Coleman’s defence, entitled *Nihil Respondes* [Not Responding], appearing the following week. Coleman’s further reply was given the strange title *Male dicis, Maledicis* [Slandrously Bad Speech], and Gillespie brought the exchange to an end with *Male Audis* [Bad Hearing].”<sup>5</sup>

After the first sermon, we recommend going on to the outlines of the four relevant chapters in *Aaron’s Rod Blossoming*, which is Gillespie’s fullest and most organized argument on the subject. The brief outlines will help you see the larger picture and the extended outlines will fill in many details and arguments, though neither replace actually reading Gillespie for oneself. Lastly, the section from *101 Propositions* will confirm in succinct form Gillespie’s delineation of this topic. All of the pieces have unique (and sometimes significant) material in them not in the other works. As a bonus to you, these writings are also the classical delineation of the Establishment Principle: the Biblical relation between Church and State, that the State according to the First Table of the Moral Law (the Ten Commandments) is to profess, protect, promote and civilly establish (*circa sacra*) the true religion in the land.

We hope that you will commit to making this topic, and the numerous related issues it touches on, a long and sincere course of study, in order to know and love the details of God’s Word better and to seek to bring reformation to our land. In the distant days ahead, we hope, if the Lord wills, to greatly expand this Introduction and give a digestible summary of Gillespie’s thought on the topic, as well as to provide a full,

---

<sup>5</sup> W.D.J. McKay, *An Ecclesiastical Republic: Church Government in the Writings of George Gillespie* (Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 1997) 41-42

Biblical defense of the traditional, reformed viewpoint on Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom. Our interest is not historical: we believe Gillespie was right.<sup>6</sup>

An Erastian in the debates at Westminster, held the floor. Gillespie took a pen and scribbled earnestly on paper. Samuel Rutherford went over to his friend and urged him to stand up and defend Christ's prerogatives. Gillespie did so with masterful learning and a great and persuasive victory in the assembly. On his paper, in Latin, was written over and over again: 'Lord, give me light. Lord, give me light. Lord give me light...' May our prayer be the same.

"Unto the upright there ariseth light in the darkness: He is gracious, and full of compassion, and righteous."

- Psalm 112:4

---

<sup>6</sup> One can disagree on some details with Gillespie while in the main agreeing with his basic framework.

# Brief Outlines of *Aaron's Rod Blossoming*

## Chapters 4-7

### Chapter 4

#### Of the Agreements and Differences Between the Nature of the Civil and of the Ecclesiastical Powers or Governments

pp. 85-90

Ten Ways in which the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers Agree: 85-86

1. Both are from God.
2. Both are tied to observe the Law and commandments of God.
3. Both are 'fathers' according to the 5<sup>th</sup> Commandment.
4. Both are appointed for the glory of God as their supreme end and for the good of men as their subordinate end.<sup>7</sup>
5. Both are to be mutually aiding and strengthening to each other.<sup>8</sup>
6. Both are powers and governments.
7. Both require singular qualifications and eminent gifts.
8. Both have degrees of censure and correction.

---

<sup>7</sup> [Gillespie goes on to distinguish within the supreme and subordinate ends of the civil and ecclesiastical powers distinct and different immediate and remote supreme and subordinate ends for each power under the 4<sup>th</sup> Difference below. These distinctions are fundamental to Gillespie's view.]

<sup>8</sup> [Only in the respect that a healthy Church facilitates a healthy State, and the converse likewise. Gillespie is arguing against the Erastians who mingle and confuse their jurisdictions, but here he is conceding where they agree.]

9. Both can only discipline one who is proved guilty.
10. Both have external jurisdiction only.<sup>9</sup>

Ten Differences between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers: 86-90

1. In their Efficient Cause: 'The King of nations has instituted the civil power; the King of saints has instituted the ecclesiastical power.' 86
  
2. In their Matter: Magistracy is monarchical and legislative, having the earthly scepter and temporal sword, being punitive, coercive and remunerative. The ecclesiastical power has the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: of knowledge and doctrine, order in God's worship, corrective discipline, and of ordination and sending. 86
  
3. In their Forms: Magistracy exercises lordly authority and dominion in subordination to God. Ecclesiastical power is ministerial and servant-like, in subordination to Christ as King of the Church. 86
  
4. In their Ends: The end of Magistracy is only the glory of God as King of nations in order to keep his subjects within the bounds of external obedience to the moral law.<sup>10</sup> The immediate supreme end of ecclesiastical power is the glory of Jesus Christ as Mediator and King of the Church. The remote supreme end is the glory of God. 86
  
5. In their Effects: The effects of the civil power are civil laws, punishments and rewards. The effects of the ecclesiastical power are determinations of

---

<sup>9</sup> [In their courts, whereas Gillespie does affirm that the object of the subordinate spiritual end of the Church is with regard to the inward man, whereas for the State it is the external man.]

<sup>10</sup> [The term 'moral law' is used by Gillespie as referring to morality that is known apart from Scripture (Rom. 2:14-15), that is, natural law, and as that same morality is encapsulated and prescribed by Scripture: the 10 Commandments (Ex. 20:1-17), as distinguished from the Mosaic Judicial Law or the Ceremonial Law.]

controversies of faith, order in the Church, ordination and deposition of officers, suspension from the sacrament and excommunication. 88

6. In their Objects: The civil power has for its objects the things of this life, matters of peace, war, justice, king and country matters, being those things that belong to the external man. The ecclesiastical power has for its objects things pertaining to God, the Lord's matters, and things of the inward man. 88

7. In their Adjuncts: 89

(1) The ecclesiastical power is convened in its assemblies by prayer, Mt. 18:19. Civil court can be convened without prayer.

(2) Civil jurisdiction can be in the person of one man. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction is committed to an assembly, Mt. 18:19.

(3) Multiple admonitions ordinarily ought to be given before a private offence comes before an ecclesiastical court. Such need not be the case for a civil court.

8. In their Correlations:<sup>11</sup> The relation of magistracy is of people embodied in a commonwealth, or civil-corporation. The relation of the ecclesiastical power is of people embodied in a Church, or spiritual corporation. The commonwealth is not in the Church, but the Church is in the commonwealth. 89

9. In their Ultimate Terminations: The ecclesiastical power can go no further than excommunication. The civil power can penalize up to 'death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of goods, or to imprisonment.' (Ezra 7:26)<sup>12</sup>  
89

---

<sup>11</sup> [Their mutual relations to each other; that is, they are not the same or symmetrical, but distinct.]

<sup>12</sup> [Gillespie takes Ezra 7:26 as morally approved warrant for the civil magistrate. The thought behind this non-libertarian viewpoint is that, just as the Church is spiritual and its ultimate punishment culminates in spiritual excommunication, so the magistrate, having care, protection and discipline over

10. In their Execution: The ecclesiastical power may, and ought, at times, censure one that is not punished by the Magistrate. The Magistrate may, and ought, at times, punish one with the sword whom the Church does not spiritually cut off. 89

---

the outward welfare of its citizens, can lawfully inflict ultimate punishments regarding those things they have lawful authority over. If they are able to fine citizens for crimes, then they can confiscate goods for great crimes. If they have power over the mortal life of their citizens as they bear the sword as the vicegerent of God, then they have power, within limits, over all lesser things pertaining to the outward and material life of their citizens. The abuse of such power, of course, does not negate its rightful and needful exercise.]

## A Brief Outline of Chapter 5

### Of a Two-Fold Kingdom of Jesus Christ:

A General Kingdom, as He is the Eternal Son of God,  
the Head of all Principalities and Powers, Reigning over all Creatures;  
and a Particular Kingdom, as He is Mediator, Reigning over the Church Only

pp. 90-96

Statement of the Question	90
The History of the Doctrine of the Two-Fold Kingdom of Christ <sup>13</sup>	90
Arguments Proving that the Two Kingdoms of Christ are Different and Distinct:	
1. Christ's Kingdom as the eternal Son of God is essential to Him; his Mediatorial Kingdom is not.	91
2. Christ's Kingdom as the eternal Son of God is not personal to Him (but shared with the other persons of the Trinity); his Mediatorial Kingdom is personal to Him.	91
3. Christ's Kingdom as the eternal Son of God shall be exercised forever. Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom shall not be continued forever, 1 Cor. 15:24-25. <sup>14</sup>	91

---

<sup>13</sup> [This section of Gillespie's, background to it, and a summary of it, are given on this webpage: [Gillespie on the Early Church and Reformation Origins of Christ's Two Kingdoms](#)]

<sup>14</sup> [Gillespie never expounds, clarifies or defends his view on this at any length. If Gillespie did further open up his understanding of this, it is wondered whether he would not concede what his associate Samuel Rutherford argued in *Covenant of Life Opened* (1655) pp. 363 ff., that aspects of the Mediatorial Kingdom will abide eternally. Francis Turretin on the whole agrees with Rutherford, though makes the distinction that the 'mode of its administration' will change (*Institutes*, vol. 2, p. 490 ff.). On

4. Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is administered by and in evangelical ordinances. Christ's Kingdom as Eternal Son is not. 92
5. Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is in subordination to God the Father as his vice-gerent. Christ is not subordinate to the Father in his Kingdom as Eternal Son, but equal with Him. 92
6. Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is in time dispensed and delegated to Him. His Kingdom as Eternal Son is not. 92
7. Christ's Kingdom as eternal Son is over all creatures. His Mediatorial Kingdom is over the Church only. 92
8. Eph. 1:21-23 holds forth a twofold supremacy of Christ: one over all things; another in reference to the Church only, to whom alone He is Head. 93
9. Col. 1 distinguishes the two-fold supremacy and Kingdom of Christ: one which is universal over all things, as He is the eternal Son (v. 15-17); the other is economic and particular in and over the Church as He is the Mediator (v. 18). 93

Hussey's Arguments that Christ as Mediator Reigns over all Things, with Gillespie's Answers 94

1. From the statements of Diodati and Calvin.
2. Christ as Mediator is made 'heir of all things.' (Heb. 1:2)
3. Heb. 2:8 & 1 Cor. 15:28 say that God has put all things under Christ's feet as He is the Mediator.
4. Phil. 2:8-10: Christ as Mediator is exalted to have a name above every name.

Objection: 'The head of every man is Christ.' (1 Cor. 11:3) 94

Gillespie's Argument and Three-fold Distinction from the End of the Lord's Prayer 95

---

this latter view, Gillespie's point still stands: There is no Scriptural indication that Christ's Kingdom as the eternal Son of God will bear any change, whereas the Scriptural indication is pronounced that Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom will bear significant changes. Thus, these are two Kingdoms.]

## Brief Outline of Chapter 6

Whether Jesus Christ, as Mediator and Head of the Church,  
has placed the Christian Magistrate to Hold and Execute his Office  
under, and for Him, as his Vice-Gerent?

The Arguments for the Affirmative are Discussed.

pp. 96-107

Introductory Remarks and Defining the Question	96-97
Hussey's Ten Reasons for Holding the Magistrate to be of Christ the Mediator, with Gillespie's Answers	
1. A Christian magistrate is a governor in the Church.	97
2. From Ps. 2:8 & 1 Tim. 6:15, the names 'Jesus' and 'Christ', implying his relation as Mediator.	97
3. By prophecy the Kingdom of Christ extends to all nations, Matt 28:18.	98
4. Kings' office are called holy, therefore they must be of, and under Christ.	98
5. The office of God that is bounded and limited by the gospel, is under Christ as Mediator. The civil magistrate's office is so, Rom. 13:4.	98
6. The common people are both under Christ and the magistrate; Christ's ends and the king's ends are the same, 1 Tim. 2:2; and hence Christ's office and the magistrate's office must be related as superior, inferior, or co-ordinate.	99
7. Matt 28:18, 'All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth.'	99
8. 1 Cor. 12:28, Christ has placed in his Church civil governors.	101

9. Eph. 1:21-23, Christ the Mediator is the Head of all things. [104](#)
10. Christ is called 'the Head of all principality and power.' Col. 2:10 [106](#)

## Brief Outline of Chapter 7

### Arguments for the Negative of that Question formerly Propounded

pp. 107-114

#### Eight Arguments Against the Office of Civil Magistrate being derived from Christ the Mediator

1. This doctrine nullifies the authority of all heathen magistrates. 107
2. There is no commission from Christ in Scripture to the Civil Magistrate 108
3. The work of the ministry is, by Scripture's direct teaching, to be done in the name of Christ as Mediator and King of the Church; not so for the civil magistrate. 109
4. Christ denies that his Mediatorial commission is to govern in civil affairs, Luke 12:14. 112
5. Christ's Kingdom is spiritual and not of this world, as is the civil magistrate's, John 8:36 112
6. Luke 17:20,21, the Mediatorial Kingdom of Christ is spiritual and does not come with observation, as does a civil kingdom. 113
7. The civil magistracy is from God the Creator, having its foundation in the Law of Nature,<sup>15</sup> and cannot be held of, under or managed (properly speaking) for Christ as Mediator. 113
8. The heathen magistrate does not hold his office of, and under, Christ as Mediator, and Scripture holds forth the same derivation and origination of the Christian magistrate as it does the heathen magistrate. 114

---

<sup>15</sup> [Samuel Rutherford argued that civil government is from God via Nature previously in 1644, in *Lex Rex, Question 2*, pp. 1-3, and generally throughout the book.]

# Extended Outlines of *Aaron's Rod Blossoming*

## Chapters 4-7

### Chapter 4

#### Of the Agreements and Differences Between the Nature of the Civil and of the Ecclesiastical Powers or Governments

pp. 85-90

#### Ten Ways in which the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers Agree 85-86

1. They are both from God, are authorized by Him, are his ministers and shall give account to Him.
2. Both are tied to observe the Law and commandments of God and have scriptural directions to them to guide them.
3. Both are fathers according to the 5<sup>th</sup> Commandment. Luther is quoted.<sup>16</sup>
4. Both are appointed for the glory of God as their supreme end and for the good of men as their subordinate end.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> [See [Westminster Larger Catechism](#) #124 and its proof-texts.]

<sup>17</sup> [Gillespie goes on to distinguish within the supreme and subordinate ends of the civil and ecclesiastical powers distinct and different immediate and remote supreme and subordinate ends for each power under the 4<sup>th</sup> Difference below. These distinctions are fundamental to Gillespie's view.]

5. They are both to be mutually aiding and strengthening each other.
6. They are both powers and governments.
7. Both require singular qualifications, eminent gifts and endowments. To a candidate's gifts, it must be asked, 'to which [government] is this suitable?'
8. Both have degrees of censure and correction according to the degree of offences.
9. Both can only discipline one who is proved guilty.
10. Both have external jurisdiction only, *in foro exteriori*.

The civil government has a coercive government in external civil matters. Though Church power be spiritual and exercised about the inward man only, yet the Church still only has an external jurisdiction, exercised in censures and excommunication. Dr. Andrew Rivet (†1651) is quoted on the distinction.

## Ten Differences between the Civil and Ecclesiastical powers

86-90

### 1. In their efficient cause:

86

The King of nations has instituted the civil power over all mankind to be in his stead as gods upon the earth [Ps. 82].

Christ, the King of saints, has been set on Zion (Ps. 2:6) 'to reign over the house of Jacob forever,' (Lk. 1:33) and 'has the key of the house of David laid upon his shoulder,' (Isa. 22:22). He has instituted the ecclesiastical power and government in the hands of Church-officers, whom He sends forth in his name.

2. In their matter:

86

Magistracy is monarchical and legislative, having the earthly scepter and temporal sword, being punitive, coercive and remunerative.

The ecclesiastical power has the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: of knowledge and doctrine, order in God's worship, corrective discipline, and of ordination and sending; and that, not to be administered by each minister alone, but by presbyteries and synods.

3. In their forms:

86

Magistracy exercises lordly authority and dominion in subordination immediately to God, and are called gods [Ps. 82:1].

Ecclesiastical power is ministerial and servant-like, in subordination immediately to Christ as King of the Church, in name and authority.

4. In their ends:

86

The end of Magistracy is only the glory of God as King of nations over the inhabitants of the earth, in order to keep his subjects within the bounds of external obedience to the moral law, which obligation lies upon all nations and men.

The immediate supreme end of ecclesiastical power is the glory of Jesus Christ as Mediator and King of the Church. The remote supreme end is the glory of God, as having all power and authority in heaven and earth.

Of supreme ends:

Should the Christian magistrate intend the glory of Jesus Christ, and be subservient to Him as He is Mediator and King of the Church?

Yes, he must and ought, but not as a magistrate, but as a Christian.<sup>18</sup>

Must not the Christian Magistrate intend to be subservient to the Kingdom of Jesus Christ as Mediator more than just by personal or private Christian duties, which are incumbent on every Christian?

Yes, he ought to glorify Christ in the administration of magistracy.

---

<sup>18</sup> [Gillespie is sometimes misunderstood on this point, as if he meant that the King's personal faith had no bearing on the public outworking and character of the administration of his office as magistrate (as in the case of modern, pietistic, civilly sanctioned pluralism, known in the Book of Judges as civilly sanctioned polytheism and historically as the doctrine of Toleration and Voluntaryism). Rather, as Gillespie affirms on this page and the next, the Christian magistrate ought to use his office so that in the administration thereof he does all in the name of Christ, according to the will of Christ and for the glory of Christ. Gillespie emphasizes this in propositions 68 & 95 of his *111 Propositions*, 1647 (in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*, vol. 1):

"68. But whereas the Christian magistrate does wholly devote himself to the promoting of the Gospel and kingdom of Christ, and does direct and bend all the might and strength of his authority to that end: this proceeds not from the nature of his office or function, which is common to him with an infidel magistrate, but from the influence of his common Christian calling into his particular vocation."

"95. For Christian magistrates and princes, embracing Christ, and sincerely giving their names to Him, do not only serve Him as men, but also use their office to his glory and the good of the Church; they defend, stand for, and take care to propagate the true faith and godliness, they afford places of habitation to the Church, and furnish necessary helps and supports, turn away injuries done to it, restrain false religion, and cherish, underprop, and defend the rights and liberties of the Church..."

The question is not whether the administration of the Christian magistrate's office is to have a Christian character (as the Scottish civil parliaments of 1560, 1581 and 1638 had nationally, socially covenanted to profess, protect and promote Christianity as the true religion), but rather what are the theoretical underpinnings of this? In Gillespie deriving the source of this Christian character from the common calling of a Christian, and not from the office itself, Gillespie shows himself to be defending the explicit teaching of all of the national Scottish covenants before him. See the [Introduction](#) to the webpage: [All of the Scottish Confessions, National Covenants and Declarations from the Reformation, Puritan and Covenanting Eras on Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is the Church Only](#).

By the call of the Gospel, persons are to use their natural powers and offices (including the magistrate), within the designs and ends of those natural callings (without usurping the prerogatives and functions of Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom), for Christ's glory and the good of his Church. (Mt. 6:33)]

It is incumbent on Church officers to intend the glory of Christ as Mediator 'out of the very nature of the thing' of their ecclesiastical power and government, which has no other end or use than that for which it was intended.

But the magistrate, though Christian and godly, does not intend the glory of Christ 'out of the nature of the thing', in regard to the nature of his particular calling, but in regard of the common principles of Christian religion, which do oblige every Christian in his particular calling and station.

All Christians are commanded, that whatsoever they do, they are to do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (Col. 3:17), that is, according to the will of Christ and for the glory of Christ.

Every Christian of any calling ought to intend the glory of Christ and the good of his Church. So the Christian magistrate ought to administer his calling that Christ may be glorified as King of the Church, and that this Kingdom may flourish in his dominions.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> [At face value, Gillespie's careful delineation of this issue is balanced and correct: While it is reasonable to suppose (and taught and confirmed by Scripture) that the Christian is to do all that they do, including in serving in their common vocation (the magistracy included, Ps. 2:10-11; 72:11, etc.), for the glory of Christ and in his name, yet this does not change the source of authority of the magistracy itself, as (Gillespie argues in *Aaron's Rod*, ch. 7, sections 2 & 3) the magistrate has no explicit commission from Christ (as the Church does, Mt. 28:18-20), has not been given authoritative Keys of power from Christ (whereas the Church has been given this), does not perform its authoritative acts (such as declaring war, executing offenders, making civil laws, etc.) in Christ's name, which would be contrary to Christ's redemptive purpose (whereas the Church does perform its acts in Christ's name), its assemblies can be convened without Christ's called upon presence (whereas the Church's assemblies cannot), and the main passages that speak of the civil magistrate in the N.T. derive his origin and authority from God the Trinity (Rom. 13:1-5; 1 Pet. 2:13-14) and not Christ, amongst many other things that Gillespie points out.

An illustration of this is the example of a plumber (Gillespie uses similar analogies of common vocations in *Aaron's Rod*, p. 87). Becoming a Christian adds nothing, nor changes the design of the job of plumbing itself, which is to fix pipes, etc. But upon a plumber becoming a Christian, the plumber seeks further to do his job well, treat people morally and with integrity, do his work glorifying and professing Christ as a plumber, and would naturally be desirous to help advance the Kingdom of Christ, the Church, through plumbing (perhaps by fixing any plumbing issues God's people may have, etc.). Yet none of these things change the science or designs of plumbing in and of itself. So it is with the office-bearing

To the ministry, the glory of Christ as Mediator and King of the Church is both *finis operantis*, the end of the godly minister working, and *finis operis*, the end of the work of the ministry itself. To the Christian magistrate, the glory of Christ as Mediator is only *finis operantis*, the end of the Christian magistrate working as a Christian, but not the *finis operis*, the end of his work with regard to his calling as a civil magistrate.

Of subordinate ends:

87

The subordinate end of all ecclesiastical power is that all Church members live godly and righteously, are kept within the bounds of obedience to the gospel, void of all known offense toward God and man, and that they walk according to the rules delivered to us by Christ and his apostles.

The subordinate end of the magistrate is that all public sins committed presumptuously against the moral law may be exemplarily punished, and that peace, justice and good order may be preserved and maintained in the commonwealth [1 Pet. 2:13-14].

This does greatly redound to the comfort and good of the Church and promoting the course of the gospel. For this end we are to pray for kings and all in authority, 'that we may live under them a peaceable and quiet life, in all godliness and honesty.' (1 Tim. 2:2)<sup>20</sup>

---

politician who becomes a Christian: the authority and source of origin of the power of his office from God, mediately by the people, does not change, though he uses his office in its worldly powers and designs to most benefit Christ's glory and the Church, including glorifying and professing Christ in all that he does through the office, acting as God's vicegerent, in God's authority, room and stead. Thus, when civil magistrates profess the true religion and act on behalf of the Church's good in Scripture, it is by the same authority they had before and in no way alters it, the source of it or the nature of that authority (Gen. 20:6-7,14-15; Dan. 6:26-27; Ezra 7:21-26). See Proposition 95 of Gillespie's *111 Propositions* for more details.]

<sup>20</sup> [Gillespie is defining from Scripture, in part, how the civil magistrate is to promote Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom, not by taking over the Church's prerogatives or designs, but by doing its own job well, which greatly benefits the Church.]

The magistrate is to take special care that all his subjects are made to observe the Law of God,<sup>21</sup> and live not only in honesty, but in godliness, and that in so living, to enjoy peace and quietness. This is what we mean when we say that he is a 'keeper of both tables of the Law'.<sup>22</sup>

The end of Church censures is that men may be ashamed, humbled and reduced to repentance, that their spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord. Erastus' concession on 1 Tim. 1:20 to Beza is quoted. Church censures are for the purpose that offenders 'may learn' [1 Tim. 1:20] in the inward man not to offend anymore, as contradistinguished from lordly coercion (so that they are 'not able' to offend anymore); which coercion does not make the spirit safe in the Day of the Lord.

The end of civil punishments is that justice may be done according to the Law and that peace and good order may be maintained in the commonwealth.

5. In their effects:

88

The effects of the civil power are civil laws, punishments and rewards.

The effects of the ecclesiastical power are determinations of controversies of faith, order in the Church, ordination and deposition of officers, suspension from the sacrament and excommunication.

---

<sup>21</sup> [Gillespie, by the term 'Law of God' is referring to the moral law, as revealed in General Revelation and Natural Law with regard to lands where the gospel has not come, and, in nations where the gospel has come, is referring to the moral law as encapsulated and revealed in the Ten Commandments (as the rest of the paragraph shows), which, in the thought of Gillespie, is in addition to General Revelation and Natural Law, not in exclusion from it. Gillespie is not referring to the Mosaic Judicial Laws or the Ceremonial Law, except as the Moral Law may be found therein.]

<sup>22</sup> [The idiom refers to all Ten Commandments. Gillespie is distinguishing and defining the reformed use of the idiom from the Erastian abuse of the idiom. For the best short, but detailed, defense that the civil magistrate is to uphold the First Table of the Law, see [The Power of the Civil Magistrate in Matters of the First Table](#) by the New England puritan Cambridge Synod of 1646 (14 pp.)]

The powers being distinct in their nature and causes, the effects must be distinct which flow from them, in the execution of that power.<sup>23</sup>

6. In their objects:

88

The civil power has for its objects 'the things of this life', matters of peace, war, justice, king and country matters, being those things that belong to the external man.

The ecclesiastical power has for its objects things pertaining to God, the Lord's matters, and things of the inward man, distinct from the things of the outward man.

Francis Junius (†1602) is quoted at length on this distinction, as well as Abraham Tilenus (fl. 1646) and Lambert Daneau (†1595) briefly.

How does this consist with the civil magistrate rightly taking special care of religion, the conservation and purgation thereof, of the abolishing of idolatry and superstition, and him being a keeper of both tables of the Law?

This is affirmed, as expressed in the *Confession of Faith of the Church of Scotland*, ch. 24 (1560). When reformed divines say that the object of magistracy is to be only things that belong to this life and to human society, they do not mean that he is not to take care of religion (in the ways aforementioned), but they mean that the object of his operation is the

---

<sup>23</sup> [This is Gillespie's disagreement with the Reformed Presbyterian viewpoint that Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is over all things. The Reformed Presbyterian viewpoint holds onto the Civil Magistrate, in his office, being under Christ as He is the Mediator, but then denies that the Erastian execution of that office follows. Gillespie, in this section of *Aaron's Rod*, argues that if the source of power is the same, then it must necessarily entail that the execution of its administration be the same. If the execution of the administrations are different, then their source of power is different, because the execution necessarily flows from the source of power.]

external man and external punishments,<sup>24</sup> not the spiritual administration of the keys or Church censures.

7. In their adjuncts:

89

1. The ecclesiastical power is convened in its assemblies by prayer, Mt. 18:19. Civil court can be convened without prayer.
2. Civil jurisdiction can be in the person of one man. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction is committed to an assembly of at least two or three, Mt. 18:19.
3. Multiple admonitions ordinarily ought to be given before a private offence comes before an ecclesiastical court (not to dispute extraordinary exceptions). Such need not be the case for a civil court.

8. In their correlations:

89

The relation of magistracy is of people embodied in a commonwealth, or civil-corporation.

The relation of the ecclesiastical power is of people embodied in a Church, or spiritual corporation.

---

<sup>24</sup> [For instance, the Scriptural design of the civil magistrate in abolishing idolatry and punishing idolaters is not to spiritually convert them, or to even restrain their spiritual idolatry, but only to externally enforce God's Moral Law (in this case, the Second Commandment) within the land for the glory of God and the good of all. The Magistrate upholds the Law as Law, reflecting the righteousness and power of God as Creator. The Church, where it is present, must be the one that seeks the person's inward spiritual good, repentance, recovery and their eternal life, as the Church's minister are sent specially by Christ the Mediator with spiritual authority to recover and save man. Erastians confused this distinction, and thus argued that because the magistrate seemingly had a spiritual end to it in some respect, therefore the Magistrate in principle held the spiritual administration of the Keys.]

The commonwealth is not in the Church, but the Church is in the commonwealth.

One is not in the Church because he is in the commonwealth, of which the Church is a part, yet, every member of the Church is a member of the commonwealth, as distinguished in 1 Cor. 5:12-13.

The ecclesiastical power of jurisdiction may be taken away by persecution or defection while the civil may remain, and therefore they are not interchangeable.

9. In their ultimate terminations:

89

The ecclesiastical power can go no further than excommunication, or, in extraordinary cases: *anathema maranatha* [1 Cor. 16:22]. After this, they leave him to the judgment of God.

Claudius Salmasius (†1653, a reformed divine) is referenced. The elders of the Church may receive a disciplined offender again upon repentance, but they have no such power as the magistrate to compel him if the offender does not care or does not submit to it

The civil power can penalize up to 'death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of goods, or to imprisonment.' (Ezra 7:26)<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> [Gillespie takes Ezra 7:26 as morally approved warrant for the civil magistrate. The thought behind this non-libertarian, but consensus of the Reformation and Puritan eras viewpoint, is that, just as the Church is spiritual and its ultimate punishment culminates in spiritual excommunication, so the magistrate, having care, protection and discipline over the outward welfare of its citizens, can lawfully inflict ultimate punishments regarding those things they have lawful authority over. If they are able to fine citizens for crimes, then they can confiscate goods for great crimes. If they have power over the mortal life of their citizens as they bear the sword as the vice-gerent of God, then they have power, within other qualifying limits, over all lesser things pertaining to the outward and material life of their citizens. The abuse of such power, of course, does not negate its rightful and needful exercise.]

They are different.

The ecclesiastical power may, and ought, at times, censure one that is not punished by the Magistrate.

The Magistrate may, and ought, at times, punish one with the sword whom the Church does not spiritually cut off.

David Pareus (†1622) is referenced on this distinction.

Even those who plead for civil toleration of heretics still believe that the church whereof they are members ought to censure and excommunicate them.

The church may excommunicate one that yet is permitted to live in the commonwealth. The most notorious and scandalous sinners may, by repentance be brought back into the Church, though the magistrate may and ought to do justice according to the law even upon penitent sinners.

## Extended Outline of Chapter 5

### Of a Two-fold Kingdom of Jesus Christ:

A General Kingdom, as He is the Eternal Son of God,  
the Head of all Principalities and Powers, Reigning over all Creatures;  
and a Particular Kingdom, as He is Mediator, Reigning over the Church Only

pp. 90-96

Intro

90

Whether the civil magistrate is a vice-gerent of Christ as the Mediator, or only of God the Trinity, hinges, in part on the there being a two-fold Kingdom of Christ, one as God the Son, and the other as Mediator.

The history of the doctrine of the two-fold Kingdom of Christ<sup>26</sup>

The Socinians (1500-1600's) followed the ancient Church heresy of Photinus (†376), that Christ is only called God and Lord as he is vice-gerent and Mediator of the Church, but not from his essence as divine.

This gave the occasion for orthodox Protestant divines to assert more fully, and show the great difference between, Christ's two Kingdoms, one by divine right over all, and one by mediation over the Church. The Reformed works and theologians: *Stegmann's Photinianism*, the Leiden professors in their *Synopsis of Pure Theology*, Francis Gomarus, the *English Annotations* and Amandus Polanus, are referenced as arguing this distinction.

---

<sup>26</sup> [This section of Gillespie's, background to it with relevant links, and a summary of it, are given on this webpage: [Gillespie on the Early Church and Reformation Origins of Christ's Two Kingdoms](#)]

Nine Arguments proving that the Two Kingdoms of Christ are different and distinct: 91-93

1. Kingdoms that are accessory to each other, and not dependent upon each other for their existence, are most different and distinct kingdoms. 91

Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is not essential to Him: if it were not in existence, it would not take away from his Godhead.<sup>27</sup>

Christ's Kingdom as the eternal Son of God necessarily flows from his Godhead, so that without it, He would not be God.

2. Kingdoms where one is proper and personal to Christ as God-man, and the other is not, but is common to the Father and Holy Ghost also, are most different and distinct Kingdoms. 91

Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is proper and personal to Christ as God-Man, as the Father and the Holy Ghost cannot be said to rule as Mediator.

Christ's Kingdom as the eternal Son of God is not proper and personal to Christ, but common to the Father and the Holy Ghost.

3. Those kingdoms where one is exercised forever and the other is not, are two distinct kingdoms. 91

Christ's Kingdom as the eternal Son of God shall be exercised forever.

---

<sup>27</sup> [To clarify and elaborate: Christ cannot but have a divine Kingdom given God's choice to create. However, God could have created and yet not chosen to redeem any of his creatures, and thus there would be no Mediatorial Kingdom, as there was no necessity for God to save, it stemming only from his free and sovereign good pleasure. This is not a hypothetical case only: there was a time (Gen. 1:1-3:14) when only Christ's divine Kingdom as Creator existed, before his Mediatorial Kingdom existed and entered human history by way of promise, ordinances and salvific rule (Gen. 3:15,21; 4:3-4, etc.). If one Kingdom can exist without the other, then Christ has Two Kingdoms.]

Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom shall not be continued forever, 1 Cor. 15:24-25.<sup>28</sup> *The Synopsis of Pure Theology* (1625) and Zacharias Ursinus (†1583) are quoted in Latin.

Hussey admits this, but says that the Kingdom that Christ lays down to the Father at the end must be over all the world.

Gillespie hopes that Hussey will not say that Christ will lay down his Kingdom as the Son of God at that Day; hence, Hussey implicitly admits that Christ has two Kingdoms (which Hussey actually denies).

Whatsoever Kingdom of sovereign, general power and dominion over all his creatures Christ does not lay down at that Day is his Kingdom as the eternal Son of God.

4. A Kingdom administered by evangelical ordinances, versus a Kingdom administered by divine power, are two different and distinct Kingdoms. 92

Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is administered by, and in, evangelical ordinances. Christ does not reign in the same Kingdom over devils and damned spirits that He reigns by in his Church, by and in his ordinances.

Christ's Kingdom as Eternal Son is administered without evangelical ordinances.

---

<sup>28</sup> [Gillespie never expounds, clarifies or defends his view on this at any length. If Gillespie did further open up his understanding of this, it is wondered whether he would not concede what his associate Samuel Rutherford argued in *Covenant of Life Opened* (1655) pp. 363 ff., that aspects of the Mediatorial Kingdom will necessarily abide eternally. Francis Turretin on the whole agrees with Rutherford, though makes the distinction that the 'mode of its administration' will change (*Institutes*, vol. 2, p. 490 ff.). On this latter view, Gillespie's point still stands: There is no Scriptural indication that Christ's Kingdom as the eternal Son of God will bear any change, whereas the Scriptural indication is pronounced that Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom will bear significant changes. Thus, these are two Kingdoms.]

5. He that has a kingdom in subordination to God the Father, and as his vice-gerent, and another wherein He is equal with God the Father, has two different Kingdoms. 92

Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is in subordination to God the Father, and as his vice-gerent. Christ executes the Father's commands and must give an account of his ministrations to Him, as proved by Isa. 53:1; John 14:28; 1 Cor. 11:3.

Christ, in his Kingdom as Eternal Son, is not subordinate, but equal to God the Father. Hussey seems to inconsistently concede this.

6. If Christ has a Kingdom delegated to Him in time, whereunto He is anointed, and has another Kingdom which is not delegated, nor dispensed in time, nor is He anointed to it, but it does naturally accompany the communication of the divine nature to Him by eternal generation, then He has two very different Kingdoms. 92

Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is in time dispensed and delegated to Him (Acts 2:36), and for which He was anointed (Ps. 45:6-7).

His Kingdom as Eternal Son is not dispensed or delegated to Him, nor is He anointed to it, but it necessarily and naturally accompanies the communication of the divine nature to Him by eternal generation.

7. If Scripture holds forth a Kingdom which Christ has over all creatures, and another which He has over the Church only, then it holds forth the two-fold Kingdom. 92

Christ's Kingdom as eternal Son is over all creatures (Rom. 9:5; Ps. 145:3; Dan. 4:34-35), for his Father and He are one [Jn. 10:30].

His Mediatorial Kingdom is over the Church only (Heb. 3:6).

Objection: But the word 'only' is not in Scripture.

Answer:

When we say that faith only justifies, the word 'only' is not in Scripture [in Greek, though it often is interpretively put there in English translations<sup>29</sup>].

David and Solomon were types of Christ the King, yet they reigned only over their subjects, though they had other people subdued as tributaries.

1. So does Christ reign over the house of Jacob only, Lk. 1:32-33; Isa. 9:7;<sup>30</sup> Isa. 21:22.
2. It was prophesied as a peculiar comfort to the Church that Christ would come to reign as their King, Isa. 9:6; Zech. 9:9; Matt 2:6.
3. The Jews did rightly understand that Messiah was to be the Church's King only. Pilate: 'Shall I crucify your King?' The Wise Men: 'Where is He that is born King of the Jews?' (Matt 2:2)

8. Eph. 1:21-23 does plainly hold forth a twofold supremacy of Christ: 93

'one over all things; another in reference to the Church only, which is his body, his fullness, and to whom alone He is Head...'<sup>31</sup>

9. Col. 1 distinguishes the two-fold pre-eminence, supremacy and Kingdom of Christ: 93

---

<sup>29</sup> [Martin Luther was the first to add the word 'only' in Galatians 2:16 in his vernacular German translation (1522). Papists criticized him heavily for adding to the Word of God. Luther responded to the effect that translations were to give the sense of the passage, not only the bare letters of the words.]

<sup>30</sup> [The 'government' that is laid on Christ's shoulder in Isa. 9:6-7 is clearly the spiritual government of Christ's Mediatorial-Church-Kingdom that He rules by his Word, ministers and Spirit, not the civil government. In verse 7 the 'government' progressively increases, which cannot be true if it meant all government (civil included) was given to Him at one point in time. This 'government' is that of the throne and kingdom of David in verse 7, that is, of God's people.]

<sup>31</sup> [Gillespie's extensive arguments defending this are found in *Aaron's Rod*, ch. 6, point 9 and in his sermons.]

One which is universal, over all things and belongs to Him as He is the eternal Son of God:

‘Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature; for by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in the earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by Him and for Him. And He is before all things, and by Him all things consist.’ (v. 15-17).

Another which is economic and particular, in and over the Church as He is the Mediator:

‘And He is the head of the body, the Church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence.’ (v. 18)

Calvin is quoted on Col. 1:18.

Paul indeed spoke of Christ as Mediator earlier in the chapter, but the scope of verses 15-17 are to prove his Godhead. Hussey yields that Christ as God, and not Mediator created the world; but then how can he argue that Paul here speaks of Christ as Mediator?

The Socinians and Photinians (and no others that Gillespie has found) interpreted Col. 1:15-17 as speaking of Christ in the office of Mediator, and the dominion which Christ has as Mediator. Our reformed divines used Col. 1:16-17 to prove the Godhead of Christ against them. See *Stegmanni Photinianismus* and Christian Becmann (†1648). Gillespie formerly cited for the same: Beza, Zanchius, Gualther, Bullinger, Tossanus and Bayne, besides diverse others.

Hussey’s proofs that Christ as Mediator reigns over all things:

94

1<sup>st</sup> Argument: John Diodati (†1649) says that Christ is Head of the Church and King of the Universe. Calvin says that the Kingdom of Christ is over all, and fills heaven and earth.

Answer:

But who denies this? That which he needs to prove is that Christ, as Mediator, is King of the universe, and, as Mediator, his kingdom is spread over all.

And then he must prove that Christ's universal, Mediatorial Kingdom, is not to be only understood ecclesiastically as all nations shall be brought under the obedience of the gospel, but also with respect to civil government; namely, that Christ reigns as Mediator over all creatures whether under or without the gospel, and that all civil power and government is put in Christ's hands a Mediator.

2<sup>nd</sup> Argument: Christ as Mediator is made 'heir of all things.' (Heb. 1:2) 94

Answer: Christ is heir of all things:

1. As the eternal Son of God, as it is said in the next verse that He made the world. Thus, He may be called the heir of all things by nature, Col. 1:15.
2. 'He is the heir of all things as Mediator, for the heathen and all the ends of the earth are given Him for an inheritance, Ps. 2:8, but that is only Church-wise; He shall have a catholic Church gathered out of all nations... and [they] shall be made to serve Him.'<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> [Heb. 1:2 speaks of 'all things' being 'appointed' to Christ, and so more than likely has Him as Mediator in view. Gillespie is understanding the language of 'all things' as qualitative and qualified in this present age, namely people from all the world being brought into his Church. Gillespie elsewhere argues that it is inconceivable that Christ inherit the whole world as his present legal possession definitively at the Ascension with regard to a present Kingdom-governing rule as that would mean that much of his inheritance is lost in devils and reprobates eternally perishing. Christ's appointment to an inheritance, however, can be understood of Him as being appointed to take legal possession of that inheritance in the future, namely at the Last Day when Christ will have progressively subdued all things under his feet (1 Cor. 15:25; Heb. 2:8, etc.) and brought all that will remain eternally into his Church-Kingdom and the New Heavens and New Earth.

3<sup>rd</sup> Argument: Heb. 2:8 & 1 Cor. 15:28 say that God has put all things under Christ's feet as He is the Mediator. 94

Answer:

All things being put under Christ's feet has not fully been accomplished in this world yet, though it will at the End, 1 Cor. 15:24. Insofar as, in measure and degree, it is fulfilled now in this world, it concerns not only men as subjects, but all the works of God's hands: beasts fowls and fish included. (Heb. 2:7; Ps. 8:6-7)

How does Christ rule over all things, as all things are put under his feet as He is Mediator?

[1] Calvin on 1 Cor. 15:27-28: 'He rules so as all things may serve for his glory.'

[2] In regard of his excellency, the dignity and glory to which He is exalted far above all the glory of any creature and in respect to his power and over-ruling providence, whereby He can dispose of all things so as may make most for his glory.

But Hussey needs to prove a third thing, that: Christ as Mediator exercises his office and government over all men as his subjects, over all magistrates as his deputies and over all reasonable creatures (as distinguished from animals and inanimate creatures). By his arguing He has Christ as Mediator governing sheep, oxen, birds and fish.<sup>33</sup>

---

Gillespie affirms in *Aaron's Rod*, ch. 5, Hussey's 3<sup>rd</sup> argument, that the physical creation comes under Christ's subjection and rule 'in measure and degree' in this life. Rutherford, while having argued Gillespie's paradigm extensively previously in the year in 1646 in *The Divine Right of Church Government*, and denying that Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom includes all things, yet allows for other senses in which the whole of creation is promised to Christ in *Covenant of Life Opened* (1654) pp. 354-355, specifically in its blessings made subservient to the Covenant of Grace. Whatever senses there are in which Christ inherits this physical universe, there are none that make the magistrate, pagan or Christian, to rule as Christ's delegated vice-gerent by office in Christ's legislative authority and stead.]

<sup>33</sup> [Gillespie is affirming that all created things have been put under Christ's feet as Mediator in respect of his superior excellency, dignity and in that He rules and orders all created things for his own spiritual purpose and glory, but, that all created things (rocks and unintelligible animals, etc.) should

Hussey, again, out of his own words, implicitly allows for a two-fold Kingdom of Christ.

4<sup>th</sup> Argument: Phil. 2:8-10: Christ as Mediator is exalted to have a name above every name. 94

Answer:

As John Diodati says, here indeed is a dignity, glory and power above all things, but yet not a government or kingdom as Mediator, for the passage includes things 'under the earth', namely, devils; yet devils are not subjects of Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom.

An anticipated objection: 'The head of every man is Christ.' (1 Cor. 11:3) 94

Answers:

1. Some understand this of Christ as God, as the creator of man.<sup>34</sup>

If it be objected that the verse later says that 'the head of Christ is God', so that it is meant of Christ as Mediator: the two parts of the verse are not speaking to the same sense. Peter Martyr's relation of Chrysostom is referenced.

2. Christ as Mediator is the head of every man in the Church. David Dickson (†1662) is quoted.

Jer. 30:6; Lk. 16:16; 1 Cor. 12:7; Heb. 2:9 are similar forms of speech where 'every man' does not mean every man in the world.

---

properly be subjects of his spiritual and redemptive Kingdom (with rights and submission thereunto, with Him as the formal Governor), is absurd. Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom, for Gillespie, is invariably tied to Christ ruling his subjects by his Word through Church ordinances and in the heart by his Spirit, whereas simply ruling all things by his almighty power is native to his divine Kingdom by creation (as well as subordinated to Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom after his Ascension).]

<sup>34</sup> [Gillespie is affirming the legitimacy of all three interpretations in an appropriate respect. Specifically, he affirms, here and elsewhere, that Christ is the Head of all people as God the creator. This is his interpretation of Col. 2:9-10.]

The *English Annotations* (1645) say that Christ is the head of every man 'in as much as he is the first begotten among many brethren [of the Church].'

3. Christ as Mediator may be called the head of every man in the world in respect of dignity, excellence, glory and eminence of place [that is, in a relative respect, 'head' referring to the chief preeminent one of many]. Gualther quoted: in that no man had equality of honor with Christ.

A further argument of Gillespie from the Lord's Prayer:

95

The distinction in Matt 6:13 between (1) *glory*, dignity, honor, (2) *power*, by which He is able to do in heaven and earth whatsoever He will, and (3) his *Kingdom*, and his kingly office and government.

These terms are distinguished with respect to God in the Lord's Prayer; why not for [his vice-gerent] the Mediator also?<sup>35</sup>

In the first two respects (of glory and power), Christ as Mediator is over all things, and so over all men and all magistrates, and they in subjection to Him.

But in the third respect (of Kingdom), the relation is only between the King and the Kingdom, Christ and his Church.

It is not denied that Christ as Mediator does exercise a supreme power and providence over all things for his own glory and his Church's good; and it is affirmed that Christ as Mediator exercises acts of divine power in the behalf of, and for the good of his Church.

But Hussey needs to prove that He, as Mediator, is King, Head, and Governor of the universe, and has not only the government of his Church, but all civil government also put in his hand.

---

<sup>35</sup> [A careful reading of Gillespie shows that he is not claiming that his view is an exegesis of the Lord's Prayer. Rather, as there is a distinction of terms (and hence categories) in the Lord's Prayer, these distinctions are real (as Gillespie also evidences elsewhere from human kings and Israel's O.T. kings). As such, Gillespie uses these distinctions to illustrate his view.]

A further explication of the three-fold distinction:

1. "Solomon did excel all the kings of the earth in wisdom, riches, glory and honor (2 Chron. 1:12), and herein he was a type of Christ. Ps. 89:27, 'I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth.'

But as Solomon was only king of Israel, and was not, by office or authority of government, a catholic king over all the kingdoms of the world, nor all other kings [were] Solomon's vice-gerents or deputies, so Jesus Christ as Mediator is only the Church's King, and is not King or Governor of the whole world, nor civil magistrates his vice-gerents, though He excel them all in dignity, glory and honor."

2. '...David did subdue by power diverse states, provinces and kingdoms, and make them tributary; but was David king of the Philistines and king of the Moabites, and king of the Syrians... because he smote them and subdued them? 2 Sam. 8:15'

Those subdued territories were not properly under the government of Israel as Israel was only bound to extirpate idolaters out of the holy land, but not those lands. Maimonides (a Jewish commentator, †1204) and Dionysius Vossius are referenced. 96

So Christ, on the throne of David, does as Mediator put forth his divine and irresistible power in subduing all his Church's enemies, Ps. 2:9; Rev. 17:14.

But this *vis major*, 'force', this restraining, subduing power, does not make Christ as Mediator to be King, Governor or Head of the whole world, as the power of Christ is also over all things, which are not suitable to those relationships: beasts, birds, fish (Heb. 2:7-8; Ps. 8:7-8) and devils, which is meant by things under the earth (Phil. 2:10).

Just because a great king has [and exerts] power over other lesser kings, it does not mean his kingdom is over them,

else all weaker kings would be in the kingdom of the strongest king.

Nor does a great king's exercises of power over a weaker king make that king to be in his kingdom, for then the great king would be king to his, and his kingdom's, enemies.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> [The argument is often put forward that if Christ as Mediator is given power over all things to rule them for his purposes, then that, by definition, makes all things a part of his Kingdom. If one can have power over things or persons without them becoming a part of one's kingdom, then the argument fails. Gillespie rightly shows that we commonly make affirm the validity of this distinction in human experience and in human law with regard to kings, and that this was the case with the O.T. kings. One can have power over persons that are not, and do not become, citizens of one's kingdom. Christ exercising power against the world, does not bring the world into his Mediatorial Kingdom.

This distinction was also argued by Samuel Rutherford earlier in the same year in *The Divine Right of Church Government* (1646) pp. 614-615. The distinction is also present in the Westminster Standards, which speak of Christ the Mediator being given power over all things (WCF 8.3; LC 45,54) and yet 'the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ' is stated to be the visible Church (WCF 25.2).]

## Extended Outline of Chapter 6

Whether Jesus Christ, as Mediator and Head of the Church,  
has placed the Christian Magistrate to Hold and Execute his Office  
under, and for Him, as his Vice-Gerent?

The Arguments for the Affirmative are Discussed.

pp. 96-107

Introductory remarks 96

Defining of the Question 97

Hussey's Ten Reasons for holding the Magistrate to be of Christ the Mediator

1. A Christian magistrate is a governor in the Church. 97

There is no commission for such in Scripture.

It is one thing to govern in the Church, another to govern the Church.

The magistrate governs the Church not as the Church, but as part  
of the commonwealth, civilly.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> [The common Reformation distinction which Gillespie is following, is that the magistrate governs *circa sacra*, but not *in sacra*. The magistrate governs 'around the sacred', but not 'in the sacred'. Gillespie more fully describes the outworking of this principle in Propositions 46-55 of his *111 Propositions*. Proposition 47 states:

"The matter may further be thus illustrated: there is almost the like respect and consideration of the magistrate as he is occupied about the outward thing of the Church, and of the ecclesiastic ministry as it is occupied about the inward or spiritual part of civil government, that is, about

2. From Ps. 2:8 & 1 Tim. 6:15, the names 'Jesus' and 'Christ' imply his relation as Mediator 97

### Psalm 2:8

Christ as Mediator has a right to the whole earth and to all the kingdoms of the world, not as if all government (civil included) were given to Him, but it is meant of his spiritual kingdom.

[That is, He has been given, as God-man Mediator, a right and power over the nations to draw out his people therefrom into his spiritual kingdom. The 'inheritance' that Christ asks for and receives, is people from every nation, and whole nations, as they are progressively brought by conversion into his Kingdom through history.]

Christ has been given *jus ad rem*, a right to the nations [to take therefrom],<sup>38</sup> but not a *jus in re*, a kingdom-rule in the nations

---

those things which in the government of the commonwealth belong to the conscience. It is one thing to govern the commonwealth, and to make political and civil laws; another thing to interpret the Word of God, and out of it to show the magistrate his duty, to wit, how he ought to govern the commonwealth, and in what manner he ought to use the sword. The former is proper and peculiar to the magistrate (neither does the ministry intermeddle or entangle itself into such businesses), but the latter is contained within the office of ministers."

<sup>38</sup> [The idea is of the right of a conqueror to take choice of the spoil from the defeated enemy. Cross reference Abraham's selective choice of the spoil from his victory against Chedorlaomer, though he had right to all, Gen. 14:16-24. Another analogy is the daughter of Herodias being given the right to take up to half the kingdom, though she only takes as to her possession one thing, Mk. 6:22-24.

Gillespie is interpreting Ps. 2:8 as the Father in principle allowing Christ (the King of Zion, Ps. 2:6, God's people, not the world) to choose for his inheritance out of all the gentiles (qualitatively) in the world. Christ then does particularly choose and effectually call gentiles out of every nation to the uttermost parts of the earth into his Mediatorial Kingdom, whom constitute his unperishing inheritance. Gillespie elsewhere argues that it is inconceivable that Christ inherit the whole world and all therein, as his Mediatorial Kingdom is of a spiritual design, and it would mean that much of his inheritance is lost in devils and reprobates eternally perishing. Rather, as is common throughout scripture, God and Christ's inheritance is his people (Ex. 19:5; 34:9; Dt. 9:26; 32:9; 1 Kings 8:53; Ps. 28:9; 33:12; Tit. 2:14; 1 Pet. 2:9), not the ungodly or external objects.

Commentators and theologians that understand Ps. 2 as speaking of Christ receiving a Church-Kingdom out of the world include (all in location unless noted otherwise): William Gouge (*A Guide to Go to God*, p. 48, 1626), Edward Reynolds (*Exposition of the 110<sup>th</sup> Psalm*, p. 8, 1632), David Dickson (*Explication of the Psalms*, 1653) and Herman Bavinck (*Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 3, pp. 479-480).]

[except insofar as his Church, and the ordinances of his Word, are in those nations].

1 Tim. 6:15, 'King of kings'

98

This is understood either:

1. As Christ is the natural Son of God, Prov. 8:15,16,22-30.

The names of 'Jesus' and 'Christ' are often used in ways that do not imply his Mediatorial office: Lk. 7:37; Jn. 11:35-36; Mt. 22:42; Rom. 9:5.<sup>39</sup>

2. As Christ is Mediator as a superlative: to the most excellent degree.

As the common Hebraisms: 'vanity of vanities', 'Holy of holies'.

Joannes Drusius (a Reformed divine, †1616) says that this idiom 'was taken from the Persians and Assyrians, who called a great king, King of kings, and lord of lords.'

3. By prophecy the Kingdom of Christ extends to all nations, 'Go teach all nations.' (Matt 28:18)

98

His Kingdom is not extended to all nations instantaneously, but successively as the Church, by the gospel, is built up into all nations.

---

<sup>39</sup> [This argument and its sampling of proof-texts are important. Just because something is spoken of Christ the God-Man does not mean that his relation as commissioned, officed Mediator is primarily in view. It is often urged as demonstrably self-evident that because Christ is God-man in Matt 28:18-20 (as He is in nearly every passage in the N.T., though not all passages speak to his relation as Mediator), that therefore Christ in his office as Mediator is primarily in view. Gillespie does take Mt. 28:18-20 with respect to Christ's office as Mediator, though in other respects as well, including his natural divinity.]

4. Kings' offices are called 'holy', therefore they must be of, and under, Christ. 98

Kings' offices are holy if 'holy' is understood in the sense of lawful, and as that office is sanctified by a holy person that uses it.

If holy is understood in contrast to civil, human, worldly, secular,<sup>40</sup> then kings' offices are not holy.

5. The office of God that is bounded and limited by the gospel, is under Christ as Mediator. The civil magistrate's office is so: Rom. 13:4. 98

1. The proposition is false.

2. The apostle's reference in Rom. 13 was inclusive of pagan magistrates,<sup>41</sup> therefore pagan magistrate hold their office by Christ the Mediator; but this is absurd, and Hussey holds that the office of pagan magistrates is sinful and unlawful.

6. The common people are both under Christ and the magistrate. Christ's ends and the king's ends are the same (1 Tim. 2:2). Therefore Christ's office and the magistrate's office must be related as superior, inferior, or co-ordinate.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> [Gillespie is using the word 'secular' as it simply means worldly, that is, of the things of this material world. As this passage makes clear, Gillespie is not using the term as if worldly things are not to be used for Christian service, and to glorify Christ therein.]

<sup>41</sup> [Gillespie takes the majority view of the Reformation and puritan eras (including the Scottish covenanters), that Rom. 13, having both descriptive and prescriptive aspects, applied to the heathen magistrates at the time of the apostle's writing as valid civil governors, who were morally bound to rule according to God's Moral Law in General Revelation, and, if come under gospel light, as also revealed in Special Revelation. To see this Biblical and balanced view of Rom. 13 evidenced from that time period, see the webpage: [Against Separation from Impure Civil Governments](#). Note also Samuel Rutherford's arguments that the moral injunctions of Scripture for civil rulers, and Christian qualifications, are not necessary for the validity of a ruler's holding civil office, whether in a non-Christian or Christian land (note also [WCF 23.4](#), which teaches this), in *The Divine Right of Church Government*, pp. 547-548.]

<sup>42</sup> [The argument is that as Christ's subjects and the king's subjects are the same, and their designs are the same, therefore their offices must be related, and these three relations (of the king's office

1. Scripture says all are under the magistrate, but not all are under Christ (1 Cor. 5:[4,] 11-12). 99

2. The ends of Christ and the magistrate are very different:

The magistrate requires attendance on the means of grace out of natural principles.<sup>43</sup>

Christ's ends are to: destroy our spiritual enemies,<sup>44</sup> Satan, the flesh, the wicked world, death; to put all enemies under his feet, to

---

under Christ, the king's office over Christ, or the king's office side-by-side with Christ) are the only possible options. Erastianism is the only relationship of these that makes sense. Gillespie responds that (1) the subject of Christ and the king are not the same, (2) that Christ and the king have different ends, and that (3) Christ and the king's offices are qualitatively different (one spiritual, the other a physical one of this world) such that there is no necessity of subordination or coordination between them.]

<sup>43</sup> [This was the common Reformation and Scottish view and practice: that the civil magistrate, having power over men's outward lives and welfare with regard to the Moral Law, may use physical coercion (fines, etc.) for all of its citizens to attend the public worship of God, that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Commandment may be publicly, outwardly kept where the civil magistrate has jurisdiction, lest God's discipline come upon the nation for breaking the 2<sup>nd</sup> Commandment. Magistrates in Scripture are called fathers (see [Westminster Larger Catechism](#) #124 and its proof-texts); and who will deny that a father can physically coerce his child in outward obedience to attend public worship?

Gillespie's point is that this responsibility and enforcement of moral obligation is from natural principles of general revelation (though this may be confirmed by Scripture) and its end is not for any redemptive end, spiritual purpose or for spiritual conversion, but is to be in obedience to the Law of God as God expects obedience from all people as He is the righteous Creator (see *Aaron's Rod*, ch. 4, beginning of section 4). Hence the magistrate's end in compelling attendance upon public worship is very different than Christ's spiritual end, and the end of his commissioned ministers, at public worship, which is for conversion and the building up of the saints.]

<sup>44</sup> [Westminster Larger Catechism #45 & 54 agree. This is one reason why all people cannot be in Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom: because the purpose of a kingdom is by definition for the good of its subjects (see Rom. 13:4 and [WCF 23.1](#)) and yet Christ in the office of Mediator for his people is not ruling for the good of the ungodly, but against them (Ps. 2:8-12). While Christ rules with the Father and Spirit as Creator in the general government of the world for the good of all people in his divine Kingdom (and this is further manifested in the civil magistrate as his vice-gerent ruling for the good of their citizens, see *Aaron's Rod*, ch. 4, section 4), it is their sin that resists this and turns it into judgment upon themselves. Yet, while all people's good is in the design of God's general divine rule of the world (as God is benevolent unto all), it is not in Christ's commissioned rule of his Mediatorial Kingdom. Thus not all people are in Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom. Who ever heard of a king being commissioned by the purpose of his office to destroy his own subjects?

The qualification that Christ only acts by office to his Church, but that He rules the world as part of his Mediatorial Kingdom, though not by his office, cannot stand: If Christ as Mediator received by delegated authority, subordinate to the Father, the whole world as part of his Kingdom, with a commission concerning it (as upon such interpretations of Ps. 2, Mt. 28, Eph. 1:22, etc.), then, by definition, the whole world has been given to Christ by office. If so, then Christ is commissioned by office, as their King, to destroy his own subjects. The [Westminster Larger Catechism](#), on the other hand, defines Christ being given power over his enemies in order to subdue them, as deriving from his delegated office as Mediatorial King for his people, in Questions #45 & 54.]

send out officers for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for edifying the body of Christ, to govern his people by his Word and Spirit, and to keep them through faith unto salvation.

3. Christ's office as Mediator and the magistrate are not related as superior, inferior or co-ordinate, as they are qualitatively different, differing in their very genre.

7. 'All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth.' (Matt 28:18) 99

This text can be legitimately understood in two different ways, per 'our divines' against the Lutherans. Franciscus Gomarus (†1641) is referenced.

1. If this is understood of Christ as God-man, Mediator:

Not 'all' without exception: all power which belongs to the Mediator, for the gathering and governing of the Church,<sup>45</sup> not power that is without the Church and secular, which Christ denies (John 18:36; Luke 12:14).

1. Martin Bucer: 'as the head of the Church economy.'  
So Jn. 20:21-23; Matt 16:19.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> [Rutherford shares substantially the same view as Gillespie. Rutherford speaks of Christ as Mediator in Mt, 28:18 as being given all 'spiritual power', in *Divine Right of Church Government*, pp. 611-613. Rutherford meant that Christ as Mediator was given all power over all things to direct them to his 'spiritual and 'supernatural ends'. The difference between this and the opposite view is that the Erastians posited a change in the origin of all natural and civil power to come (in part) from Christ as Mediator, whereas Rutherford and Gillespie saw the change not as respecting the origin of natural and civil power (still stemming wholly from God as Creator), but that Christ is given power *over* these earthly powers, and thus these powers becomes subservient to Christ's spiritual purposes through his mysterious providence. Gillespie affirmed that Christ has been given authority 'as Mediator... [to] exercise a supreme power and providence over all things for his own glory and his Church's good...' (*Aaron's Rod*, p. 95) As Rutherford notes, Christ does not, in fact, use carnal, physical power for the advancement of his Kingdom, but wholly his mysterious spiritual providence and spiritual suasion through the Word of his ministers and his Spirit.]

<sup>46</sup> [Commentators and other theologians who understand Mt. 28:18 to be speaking of Christ receiving a spiritual, heavenly and Church Kingdom as Head of the Church (while receiving power to govern all for Christ's ends) include (in location unless noted otherwise): Erasmus (*Paraphrase on the New Testament*, †1536), Miles Coverdale (*Fruitful Lessons upon the Passion, Resurrection, Ascension...*, 1593),

2. This understanding is confirmed by the Syriac version: 'All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth: but as my Father has sent Me, even so send I you.' 100

3. Verse 18 is defined and restricted in context by verse 19, 'Go therefore, teach all nations.'

2. If of Christ as the eternal Son of God: 100

1. As omnipotence is communicated in eternity from the Father to the Son as begotten.

2. The declaration or manifestation of Christ to be the Son of God with power when raised from the dead.

Hussey misquotes and misunderstands Gillespie to be saying that something can be given to Christ as God.

With respect to (1): Gillespie is speaking of the Son of God not essentially, but personally. All the attributes of the Godhead are communicated to Him from the Father by eternal generation. The Nicene Creed is quoted.

With respect to (2): Gomarus quotes Augustine:

'To some extent it may be said to be when it begins to be revealed.'

So it is said of Christ that He was begotten when He was raised from the dead (Acts 13:33). Christ had previously relinquished [with regard to his economic relations in human nature, and the manifestation thereof] his divine dominion when He took up the form of a servant; now at his

---

Edward Reynolds (*Exposition of the 110<sup>th</sup> Psalm*, p. 9, 1632), *The Dutch Annotations* (1637), *The English Annotations* (1645), David Dickson (*Exposition of Matthew*, 1651), Samuel Clark (*Annotations on the New Testament*, 1683) and Christopher Ness (*Complete History and Mystery of the Old and New Testament*, 1696).]

resurrection, his formerly relinquished sovereignty is restored.<sup>47</sup>

Hussey adds: Matt 28:18 must be as Mediator, otherwise He would have no authority to send apostles to preach. 101

Apostles: 'How shall we accomplish this mission?' Christ: 'All power is given unto Me. Do you believe that I who send you out am the Son of the Living God? My divine authority and power shall be for you.'

Some Roman Catholics take from Matt 28:18 that Christ and the Pope's supremacy is in all things temporal and civil, yet others are ashamed to assert this and interpret it more soundly.

8. Christ has placed in his Church civil governors. (1 Cor. 12:28) 101

1. The verse does not say that Christ (but rather, God) has placed these 'governors' in the Church. Gillespie: 'I hold church officers and Church government to be under Christ, and under Him as Mediator and King of the Church...'
2. The verse speaks of church governors at the time, and at that time the Church had no Christian civil magistrates. Therefore the verse does not refer to civil governors.

Hussey replies:

1. That the terms in the verse mean 'to appoint' (Jn. 15:16; Acts 19:21), and includes those governments which would afterward by God's appointment come into the Church.

---

<sup>47</sup> [For the orthodoxy of this concept, stated in a bit more careful way, see Turretin, *Institutes*, vol. 2, topic 13, question 19, section 6, p. 370.]

1. That would make this statement to be true if it were delivered in any age, for example: before the Flood.
  2. The context of the verse is of the administration at that time, in light of possible schism. 102
  3. Hussey refutes himself. If the term means 'appoint,' then it means that extraordinary officers have been appointed for all ages of the Church, according to Hussey's interpretation. But the term means 'placed' (Acts 20:28), and thus makes contextual sense, contra Hussey's interpretation.
  4. Εθετο means 'appoint' only when the thing is not presently existent. As the term applies to all the officers (extraordinary ones included), it cannot refer to all future generations.
  5. 'To appoint' or 'decree' would only make sense if the verse said 'to the Church', but the verse says, 'in the Church.'
2. The ordinary civil magistrate replaced the extraordinary workers of miracles, which overawed people to the means of grace by natural principles.

This does not help to prove what he set out to prove as there still were no Christian magistrates in the Church in the time the epistle was originally written.

3. The grammar of the verse implies successive ages. Calvin is quoted.
1. This does violence to the text.
  2. This does violence to the Greek language. 103
  3. This does violence to Calvin.

4. Hussey translates 'helps, governments' as one thing: 'helps to governments.'

Even the Prelates were ashamed of this translation. The Syriac says otherwise. This form of grammar commonly expresses two different things in Greek.

5. Eph. 4:11 - Only the teacher is a perpetual officer in the Church. Thus 1 Cor. 12:28 should be understood of officers not yet present.

What is not in one place is mentioned in another place. Eph. 4, by the context, only lists the teaching offices in the Church.

6. There were no governors in the Church at that time, as the following verse, 1 Cor. 12:29, omits them.

The reason for the omission is that the common people were aspiring to the higher, extraordinary offices (and not the office of governor), which verse 29 speaks to. 104

Gillespie: Thus 1 Cor. 12:28 speaks of church governors, not civil governors in the Church (and hence civil governors are not under Christ as Mediator from this verse).

9. Eph. 1:21-23 - Christ the Mediator is the Head of all things.<sup>48</sup> 104

1. The text does not say that Christ is given to the Church as the Head of all things. Such would make Christ to be a Head to those that are not his Body.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> [KJV: "Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: And hath put all things under his feet, and gave Him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all."]

1. If the text can be made out to mean that Christ is the Head of all things, it cannot be made to say that it is as He is the Mediator. But the verse cannot be made out to say that Christ is Head 'of' all things, but only 'over' all things.
2. Col. 2:10 speaks of Christ as the eternal Son of God, as 'Head of all principality and power';<sup>50</sup> but in Eph. 1 it is in reference to Christ as Head of the Church as Mediator.

2. He that is the Church's Head is over all, both as the Son of God (Rom. 9:5) and as man: exalted to a higher degree of glory than all. But neither of these things together in Him as the Mediator, the Head of the Church, make it so that He exercises his kingly office as Mediator over all powers.

Just as an earthly king is exalted to have more power and more glory than those not only of his subjects, but of another state or kingdom to whom he is not king. 105

If Christ as Mediator is Head and King of all powers, then He is, as Mediator, Head and King of heathen and Muslim powers, as well as the Roman emperor of the first century, they holding their office by and under Christ the Mediator (which is absurd).

---

<sup>49</sup> [Gillespie takes Eph. 1:22 as speaking of Christ the Mediator and understands the Greek as saying, "and gave Him to be the head, which is over all things, to the Church which is his body" (which reading is grammatically possible). Thus Christ as Mediator, on this reading, is the Head of only the Church, and He who is the head has been placed over all things for the Church's good. In the passage the analogy constrains the head to be only the head of the body, and the Church is the only body mentioned in the passage. The world is never said elsewhere in the Scripture to be Christ's body; only the Church, outside of this passage, is ever referred to as Christ's body (see Rom. 12:5; 1 Cor. 12:12,27; Eph. 4:12; 5:23; Col. 1:18; 2:19, etc.).

Other commentators and theologians (all in location unless noted otherwise) that take Eph. 1:22 as speaking of Christ as head of the Church (with no reference to Christ being the head of the world) are: Erasmus (*Paraphrase on the New Testament*, †1536), Theodore Beza (*Greek New Testament*, 1599), *The Dutch Annotations* (1637), *The English Annotations* (1645), Francis Cheynell (*Divine Trinitunity*, p. 350, 1650), James Fergusson (*Commentary on the Epistles*, 1659), Samuel Clark (*Annotations on the New Testament*, 1683) and Herman Bavinck (*Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 3, pp. 479-480), amongst others.]

<sup>50</sup> [Per the immediate context of Col. 2:9, 'For in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily,' and the general context of the whole epistle, which in part is to show that angels should not be worshipped, but Christ ought to be as He is greater than angels and is divine.]

3. The dignity of Christ spoken of in Eph. 1:21-23 has reference to the age to come as well (v. 21); but while Christ's glory as God-man will continue there, his Mediatorial Kingdom and glory will not [1 Cor. 15:24-28].

Hussey has to divide the sense of the phrase into two different exaltations: one in this world, another in the world to come. Calvin, on the other hand, is quoted in support that Christ's glory is eternal.

While Christ's glory shall continue forever, his Kingly office as Mediator will not.<sup>51</sup>

4. 'He has put all things under his feet' (Eph. 1:22), excepts the Church Jerome Zanchi (†1590) says, and refers to God's decree [c.f. Rev. 13:8] (says Jerome), though it is not actually done yet (Heb. 2:8, 1 Cor. 15:25; Acts 2:34,35).<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> [Gillespie never expounds, clarifies or defends his view on this at any length. If Gillespie did further open up his understanding of this, it is wondered whether he would not concede what his associate Samuel Rutherford argued in *Covenant of Life Opened* (1655) pp. 363 ff., that aspects of the Mediatorial Kingdom will abide eternally. Francis Turretin on the whole agrees with Rutherford, though makes the distinction that the 'mode of its administration' will change (*Institutes*, vol. 2, p. 490 ff.). On this latter view, Gillespie's point still stands: There is no Scriptural indication that Christ's Kingdom as the eternal Son of God will bear any change, whereas the Scriptural indication is pronounced that Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom will bear significant changes.]

<sup>52</sup> [Gillespie's view that he here explicates, that the language of all things being put under Christ's feet in Eph. 1:22 (and by way of inference of parallel interpretation, the same language in 1 Cor. 15:24-28; Heb. 2:8) refers to the present assurance and promise of the decreed and certain reality of all things being put under Christ's feet at the Last Day, appears to be on the premise that this language is being understood of Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom rule. In *Aaron's Rod*, ch. 5, 3<sup>rd</sup> arg. of Hussey, Gillespie affirms that the same language of all things being put under Christ's feet from the type in Ps. 8:6 is fulfilled 'in measure and degree' of Christ as Mediator now in this world (by inference, from the Ascension), in two respects: (1) by way of preminent glory over all things, and (2) in being given almighty power to order and direct all things for his glory and the good of his spiritual Kingdom's purposes. This being the case, then it is reasonable to conclude, that in consistency with Gillespie's view, one could so interpret all things being put under Christ's feet in Eph. 1:22 (and other passages, including 1 Pet. 3:22) to refer to Christ as Mediator with respect to his glory and power above all things and his ordering of them for his own ends.]

The Church (which is said to be Christ's body) is distinguished from 'all things' which are put under his feet, but the body is not under the feet.

The other interpretation would have Christ to reign as Mediator after all things have been put under his feet [contra 1 Cor. 15:24], whereas He must reign until He has put all things under his feet [1 Cor. 15:25].

5. Christ's Headship and government are co-extensive. Difference between 'Head of' and 'Head over'. 106

The other interpretation makes Christ the Head not only of men, but also of sheep, oxen, fowls and fishes.

6. The Church is called the fullness of the Head, Christ (Eph. 1:23).

If the Church, as Christ's fullness makes Him complete [as a head is not complete without a body], then there is no other body than the Church.

Christ is not a King to any that He is not the Head of.

10. Christ is called 'the Head of all principality and power' (Col. 2:10). 106

This refers to Christ as the natural Son of God, not Mediator.<sup>53</sup> Bullinger, Gualther and Tossanus are referenced.

The only way to make this verse speak of Christ as Mediator is to infer: that which Christ is as God, He is as Mediator; which is false.

---

<sup>53</sup> [Per the immediate context of Col. 2:9, 'For in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.']

Our reformed divines (Becmanus cited) use this verse in support of Christ's divinity against the Socinians.

He that is Mediator must be worshipped because He is God, but it is doubtful that He is to be worshipped because He is the Mediator, see the Roman Catholic schoolmen: Aquinas, Alensis, Suarez, Valentia and Tannerus; as well as *The Disputation about the Adoration of Christ* and Gisbert Voetius', *Is Christ as Mediator to be Adored?*<sup>54</sup> 107

The context of Col. 2:10 is for the Colossians not to worship angels, because they are servants, but to worship Christ the Son of God, the Lord of angels, it being due to Christ as God.

---

<sup>54</sup> [See the Westminster Divine, Francis Cheynell, who argues this point in a bit of detail: *The Grounds of Christ the Mediator Receiving Divine Worship* (1650, 20 pp.). Turretin also expounds the same view in *Institutes*, vol. 2, topic 14, question 18, p. 494-499]

## Extended Outline of Chapter 7

### Arguments for the Negative of that Question formerly Propounded

pp. 107-114

#### Eight Arguments against the office of civil magistrate being derived from Christ the Mediator

1. This doctrine nullifies the authority of all heathen magistrates. 107

Hussey (though not Coleman, though his arguments might prove such) holds that all heathen magistracy is sinful and unlawful, as whatsoever is not of faith is sin [Rom. 14:23]. That is, heathen rule, is, in principle, simply, and out of its own nature, unlawful.

The difference between an act being materially sin by its nature versus accidentally<sup>55</sup> sin by its manner and purpose.

Hussey's view would make the best virtues of the heathen to be in-and-of-themselves sin, which is absurd.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> ['Accidentally' is being used by Gillespie as a characteristic that is not essential to the existence of the thing itself. To state it in another way: An action may be sinful no matter what the purpose of it is, or an action may be lawful in itself, but sinful if it is used for a bad purpose or in a bad way. Non-Christians exercising civil rule is lawful in itself, but sinful with regard to how it is carried out.]

<sup>56</sup> [Reformation theology acknowledged that though men's wills have an aversion to spiritual good, yet, by God's common grace, there is real good in the actions of heathens (which good is to be admired), though this good is corrupted as it is not done in faith (and in many other ways); and hence, whatever goodness such works have, it does not fully satisfy the glory and justice of God, and hence has

Hussey's view would also make the Christian magistrate's office unlawful when he does not do it in faith, which is absurd.

The holy men of God in the O.T. honored heathen princes and were subject to them as lawful magistrates. Jesus taught us to give unto Caesar what is lawfully Caesar's [Mt. 22:21]. The apostles exhorted the churches to be subject to heathen magistrates, there being no other at the time (Rom. 13: Titus 3:1; 1 Tim. 2:1-2; 1 Pet. 2:13-17).<sup>57</sup>

This is the Anabaptist error of not recognizing non-Christian magistrates. 108

Erastus (on 1 Cor. 6:1-8 about going to a heathen magistrate against a fellow Christian) and Gamachaeus (a Roman Catholic) disagree with Hussey.

This would imply that heathen parents, masters and husbands are unlawful, which is contrary to God's Word.<sup>58</sup> Yet, civil rulers are just as much fathers (in their genre) as familial fathers, according to the Fifth Commandment.

---

no legal merit to earn anything from God. Hussey's view would imply, not Total Depravity, but Utter Depravity, that unbelievers cannot do anything good whatsoever, in any sense of word, which is absurd.]

<sup>57</sup> [Gillespie here takes the majority view of the Reformation and puritan eras (including the Scottish covenanters), that Rom. 13, having both descriptive and prescriptive aspects, applied to the heathen magistrates at the time of the apostle's writing as valid civil governors, who were morally bound to rule according to God's Moral Law in General Revelation, and, if come under gospel light, as also revealed in Special Revelation. To see this Biblical and balanced view of Rom. 13 evidenced from that time period, see the webpage: [Against Separation from Impure Civil Governments](#). Note also Samuel Rutherford's arguments that the moral injunctions of Scripture for civil rulers, and Christian qualifications, are not necessary for the validity of a ruler's holding civil office, whether in a non-Christian or Christian land (note also [WCF 23.4](#), which teaches this), in *The Divine Right of Church Government*, pp. 547-548.]

<sup>58</sup> [This is perhaps one of the strongest and clearest proofs that Gillespie's view is right. If all civil magistrates become Christ's vice-gerents as a result of the Ascension and Session of Christ, then so do all fathers, including Muslim and Hindu fathers, etc. If a civil magistrate only becomes Christ's vice-gerent when he becomes a Christian, then all Christian fathers are Christ's vice-gerents in the design of their office, which is still absurd. If unbelieving civil magistrates lose their God-given authority as magistrates at Christ's Ascension and Session, or upon their not converting ruling according to Christianity when presented with the Gospel, then all non-christian fathers lose their natural, God-given authority, which is even more absurd.]

Both heathen and Christian magistrates are made lawful magistrates  
'by God and nature, or by election of people.'<sup>59</sup>

Their power is the same *in actu signato*, 'in its authority,' though not  
*in actu exercito*, 'in its exercise'.

'The heathen magistrate may do, and ought to do, what the  
Christian magistrate does; but the Christian magistrate is  
fitted, qualified, enabled, and sanctified to glorify and serve  
Jesus Christ, as a magistrate,<sup>60</sup> which the heathen magistrate  
is not.'

## 2. There is no commission from Christ in Scripture to the Civil Magistrate. 108

Ps. 72:11 & Isa. 60:12 (which are prophecies that kings and nations shall serve  
Christ) are no such commissions.<sup>61</sup>

Service to Christ the Mediator does not imply that one holds their office  
from Christ:

If all that serve Christ hold their office of and under Christ as  
Mediator, then the poorest servant that fears God is a vice-gerent of  
Christ as Mediator (Eph. 6:5-7).

---

<sup>59</sup> [See this argued in the opening chapters of Rutherford's *Lex Rex*.]

<sup>60</sup> [Here is Gillespie saying again, that the magistrate is to serve Christ in the administration of his office, such that the exercise of his God-given authority takes on, and should take on, a public Christian character, but this is due to his being called by the gospel as a personal individual, not formally out of the essence and design of the office itself.]

<sup>61</sup> [Service and a commission are distinct things. Service means to serve the one in authority with one's life and natural powers; there is no transfer of authority. A commission is being given a delegated authority from the one in authority, acting in their name and authority, for the purpose of a specific service. All service is not a commission, though all commissions entail service.]

All people are commanded to serve God by way of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Commandments (Mt. 4:10). All Christians are servants of God by way of their common, natural callings (1 Cor. 7:22; Eph. 6:5-7). Yet this command to, and moral obligation upon, all people, and Christians serving Christ in their worldly callings does not make all people and all Christians in their worldly callings vice-gerents of Christ. Rather, the Church ministry actually has been delegated authority for a specific commission (Mt. 28:18-20) as they are the vice-gerents of Christ (2 Cor. 5:18-20) acting in the name of, with the authority of, and in the stead of Christ.]

If those who do not serve Christ are his deputies (if all civil governors derive their office from Christ as Mediator), then the wickedest persecutors have a commission from Christ. 109

The ministry has a clear, undeniable commission from Christ as Mediator: Mt. 16:19; 28:19-20; Jn. 20:21-23; 2 Cor. 5:19-20; Eph. 4:11-12; Acts 20:28; Tit. 1:5.<sup>62</sup>

It is clear and sure from Scripture that the lawful magistrate (heathen or Christian) is God's vice-gerent. It is not sure, and cannot be proven, that the magistrate is Christ's vice-gerent; hence, this is an unsafe foundation of authority for magistrates.

3. The work of the ministry is performed in the name of Christ as Mediator and King of the Church; not so for the civil magistrate. 109

---

<sup>62</sup> [Mt. 16:19, "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

Mt. 28:19-20, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

Jn. 20:21-23, "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."

2 Cor. 5:19-20, "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."

Eph. 4:11-12, "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ:"

Acts 20:28, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Tit. 1:5, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee:"]

1. Nowhere is it found in Scripture that the magistrate rules, judges, makes laws, makes war<sup>63</sup> and peace or punishes evil doers with the sword in the name of Christ.
2. The ministry (1) assembles itself, (2) preaches, (3) baptizes and (4) excommunicates, all in the name of Christ: (1) Mt. 18:20; (2) Lk. 24:47; (3) Acts 2:38; 4:17-18; 5:28,44; 8:16; 9:27; 19:5; (4) 1 Cor. 5:5.

(1) Regarding Mt. 18:20 referring to the assembly of Church rulers, the [Sixth General Council](#), Act 17 (A.D. 680), John Calvin, William Whittaker (†1595) and Thomas Morton (a reformed Anglican, †1659) are referenced.

(2) Preaching in the name of Christ is not disputed by Hussey. 110

(3) Hussey says that Baptism is done in the name of the Father and Holy Ghost also [Mt. 28:19].

The distinction between Christ as Second Person versus as Mediator, is necessary against Arians and Anti-Trinitarians. Without it the Father and Holy Ghost must do all that Christ does as Mediator, which is absurd.

We are to baptize in the name of Christ [Acts 2:38; 8:12; 1 Cor. 1:13, etc.], and in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in different respects, which Gillespie explains.

---

<sup>63</sup> [An sad example of Christians declaring war in the name of Christ (who came to save the world, not to judge it, Jn. 3:17, and to exercise a ministry of reconciliation, 2 Cor. 5:18-20) is from the opening act of Cameronianism in 1680 in Scotland in the [Sanquhar Declaration](#):

“As also, we under the banner of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Captain of Salvation, do Declare a war with such a Tyrant, & usurper, & all the men of these practices, as Enemies to our Lord Jesus Christ & his Cause & Covenant...”

Magistrates may and do declare war in the name and authority of God, who is the Lord of Hosts (Armies), and for grievances ecclesiastical, but this is out of natural concerns and designs, not from a spiritual design of their office as an authoritative vice-gerent of Christ. It is true that Christ has come to put down and conquer those who resist his saving spiritual kingdom (Ps. 2:8-10; 1 Cor. 15:24-28) by way of his mysterious providence in the affairs of men and in confirming the Word of the Church ministry (the rod of his power), yet this aspect of Christ’s commission as Mediator, to destroy his enemies, has in no way been delegated to the civil magistrate.]

(4) Hussey says that excommunication in 1 Cor. 5 was an apostolic act not done in the name of Christ. Yet, according to Gillespie, this was a church act, and hence done by Christ's authority, not an apostolic act only. 111

1. Paul blames the Corinthians that the excommunication was not done sooner (apart from Paul).
  2. He tells them to do it when they are gathered together as a Church.
  3. The censure was inflicted by many (2 Cor. 2:6), not by the apostle alone.
  4. Paul does not later absolve the man (upon repentance), but tells 'them' to forgive him (2 Cor. 2:7).
  5. The Syriac agrees with Gillespie.
3. Hussey says that a thing may be said to be done in the name of Christ or of God: (1) 'when men do anything in confidence that God will assist us' (Ps. 20:5); or, (2) when it is 'done in the authority, room and place of Christ.'

In the first sense, Hussey sets the civil magistrate on par with the poorest Christian servant who is to do all in the name of Christ (Col. 3:17) [which sense Gillespie affirms in ch. 4, section 4].

In the second sense [which is the point of dispute], while it is clear that ministers act in the name of Christ (2 Cor. 5:20), Hussey does not show where this is done by the magistrate in Scripture.<sup>64</sup>

4. Christ denies that his Mediatorial commission is to govern in civil affairs (Luke 12:14).<sup>65</sup> 112

---

<sup>64</sup> [Gillespie's assertion is understated: there is no place in Scripture where the civil magistrate acts in the name (in respect of room, authority and place) of Christ. *The Divine Right of Church Government* (1646): "2. Magistracy is never styled a ministry of Christ in Scripture, nor dispensed in his name." (Section II, 5<sup>th</sup> Argument, minor premise)]

Erastians are of the same opinion as the Jews of Christ's day.

Hussey agrees with the Roman Catholic Azorius,<sup>66</sup> that Christ would not exercise the authority He had in order to hide it. This does violence to the text.<sup>67</sup> Even some Jesuits admit this.

5. Christ's Kingdom is spiritual and not of this world,<sup>68</sup> respecting this world's things, as is the civil magistrate's authority and kingdom (John 18:36).<sup>69</sup> 112

---

<sup>65</sup> [Lk. 12:13-14, "And one of the company said unto Him, 'Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me.' And He said unto him, 'Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?'"

The Erastians held that as Christ ruled and governed just as much in natural, earthly and civil affairs after his Ascension (for instance in dividing people their inheritance based upon civil law) as He did in the spiritual ministry of the Church, and delegated this power to the civil magistrate to do his name, as the nature of Christ's Kingdom was spiritual and natural, so Christ must have had this authority in his ministry on earth. Thus, they sometimes explained the passage as Christ hiding this authority and aspect of his Kingdom during his earthly ministry.

The later Reformed Presbyterians in the 1800's often explained this passage with a difference of time: Christ had not this delegated authority in his earthly ministry, but did receive the delegated authority to govern purely natural and civil affairs at the Ascension. The purpose of Christ's rebuff and instruction though, was to explicate the nature of the spiritual Kingdom He came to establish, and the nature of Christ's Kingdom does not change between his heralding of it in his earthly ministry and the further establishment of it at his Ascension.]

<sup>66</sup> [Probably Juan Azor (1536-1603)]

<sup>67</sup> [This involves Christ denying that He had authority that He actually had. The objection may be put against Gillespie that he speaks of Christ hiding his divine power in human flesh until it is more fully revealed at the Ascension and Session. However, this covering, or hiding, of Christ's personal divine power and Kingdom under human flesh was not absolute: it was revealed in numerous places in Christ's earthly ministry, he never denied it and at times affirmed it, it came to be more fully revealed at the Ascension. The Erastians however, in Lk 12:14, are guilty of making Christ lie.]

<sup>68</sup> [Some of the later Reformed Presbyterians of the 1800's would argue that Jn. 18:36 refers to the origin of Christ's Kingdom, that origin and source of authority being from Heaven. While this is affirmed, yet the verse also speaks to the *character* of Christ's Kingdom, namely, that it is spiritual and not of worldly things or power. The Reformed Presbyterians rightly acknowledged that Christ's Kingdom of Grace is not to be advanced through the use of the sword, however, if the source of all natural and earthly power was transferred to Christ at the Ascension such that now He delegates and dispenses all civil rule throughout the world, and rules therein, and has made all magistrates his vice-gerents, acting in Christ's authority, name and behalf in their civil actions, such as declaring war, etc., then Christ's Kingdom is in fact advanced in his name through war, contrary to Jn. 18:36. See this exact thing historically taking place in the Scottish Cameronian [Sanquhar Declaration](#) (1680) declaring war in the name of Christ.]

<sup>69</sup> [Jn. 18:36, "Jesus answered, 'My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.'"

Herod and Pilate were afraid Christ took up civil rule. Though Christ's Kingdom 'be here, it is not from hence', and thus it is different than civil government.

Hussey says that he does not see how church government is less of the world than civil government. Gillespie refers him to the many differences between civil and ecclesiastical power. 113

If Christ as Mediator may substitute others to reign civilly in his behalf, the fears of Pilate would be justified. But Christ denies it.

Early Christians (as recorded by Eusebius) gave the same answer to Emperor Domitian (A.D. 81-96), that:

'The Kingdom which He received is not worldly and of this world, but heavenly and angelic.'

6. Lk. 17:20-21, 'the Kingdom of God comes not with observation,' and 'is within you.' 113

If Christ as Mediator reigns in, through and by the magistrate, then Christ's Kingdom does come with a crown, scepter, sword, riches, triumph and observation, as the Pharisees had hoped for.

---

*The Divine Right of Church Government* (Section II, 5<sup>th</sup> Argument, minor premise, 1646): "3. Christ's kingdom is not of this world, John 18:36; the magistrate's is."

Edward Reynolds, a Westminster divine (*Exposition of the 110<sup>th</sup> Psalm*, p. 8-9, 1632):

"The quality of this [Mediatorial] Kingdom [of Christ] is not temporal or secular, over the natural lives or civil negotiations of men; He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, his Kingdom was not of this world, He disclaimed any civil power in the distribution of lands and possessions, He withdrew Himself from the people when by force they would have made him a king, and Himself, that in this point He might give none offence, payed tribute unto Caesar, Matt 20:28; Jn. 18:36; Lk. 12:13,14; Jn. 6:15; Matt 17:27.

But his Kingdom is Spiritual, and heavenly over the souls of men, to bind and loose the conscience, to remit and retain sins, to awe and overrule the hearts, to captivate the affections, to bring into obedience the thoughts, to subdue and pull down strong holds, to break in pieces his enemies with an iron rod, to hew and slay them with the words of his mouth, to implant fearfulness and astonishment in the hearts of hypocrites, and to give peace, security, protection and assurance to his people."]

7. The civil magistracy is from God the Creator, having its foundation in the Law of Nature,<sup>70</sup> and cannot be held of, under, or managed [by office, in a delegated capacity] for Christ as Mediator.<sup>71</sup> 113

The Law of Nature, written on man's heart in his first creation, flows from God as Creator, not Christ as Mediator. Nor can Christ be said to rule and govern all nations by the Law of Nature.<sup>72</sup>

Christ would not have reigned as Mediator if man had not sinned, yet some civil government would have formed.<sup>73</sup>

While, if man had not sinned, there would be no evil-doers to be punished, yet there would still be a great propagation of families and the human race, and, as Aristotle says, man's nature is for society and policy. It could not be that man in his natural, though sinless, state, should be without headship, superiority, order, society and government.

The Law of Nature teaches all nations some government [this being evidenced in that all nations have it].

As Jerome (†420) says, nature guides even the very reasonless creatures to a kind of magistracy.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> [Samuel Rutherford argued that civil government is from God via Nature previously in 1644, in *Lex Rex*, [Question 2](#), pp. 1-3, and generally throughout the book.]

<sup>71</sup> [If the civil magistracy was by delegated authority under Christ the Mediator, and his vicegerent, then, by definition, the magistracy must take on the ends and designs of Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom, which are spiritual. This would make the magistrate execute redemptive and spiritual purposes through civil means, which would be tyrannical and absurd.]

<sup>72</sup> [See this more fully expounded and articulated by the Secession Church of Scotland in the 1700's and 1800's, following in the line of Gillespie, though with some different categories and language, on the webpage: [Quotes from the Scottish Secession Church on Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom and the Civil Magistrate](#).

<sup>73</sup> [The force of this argument rests not on speculation, but on the observed and known nature of man, irrespective of any consideration of redemption or even that which is peculiar to us by sin.]

<sup>74</sup> [Animals, insects and others, often have a form of authority in their living arrangements, which are purely natural and derive from natural principles according to their nature (their physiology and natural environments), for natural ends (such as survival, finding food, defense, communal living, etc.). Bees, ants, birds, apes, coyotes, etc. are all examples. The force of this argument is that, if reasonless

8. The heathen magistrate does not hold his office of, and under, Christ as Mediator, and Scripture holds forth the same derivation and origination of the Christian magistrate as it does the heathen magistrate. 114

That heathen magistrates are lawful magistrates, is proved by Rom. 13:1; Dan. 2:37; Jer. 27:6; Isa. 45:1; 1 Kings 19:15.<sup>75</sup>

Augustine says in his *City of God*, Book 5, ch. 21, that:

‘the same God gave a kingdom and authority both to the Romans, Assyrians, Persians, [and] Hebrews [the people of God]; and that He who gave the kingdom to the best emperors, yea, He did give it to Julian the Apostate.’<sup>76</sup>

Tertullian, in his *Apology* (as related by Gillespie), says that:

Ch. 30:

‘the heathen emperors of that time... were from God... He who had made them men, did also make them emperors, and give them their power.’

Ch. 33:

‘It is more rightly to be said that our Caesar is constituted of our God.’

---

creatures have some form of magistracy without a spiritual or redemptive revelation, which they do, then magistracy in its genre, though it has its authority from the God of nature, is nonetheless, in a very significant respect, natural and from nature.]

<sup>75</sup> [Gillespie takes the majority view of the Reformation and puritan eras (including the Scottish covenanters), that Rom. 13, having both descriptive and prescriptive aspects, applied to the heathen magistrates at the time of the apostle’s writing as valid civil governors, who were morally bound to rule according to God’s Moral Law in General Revelation, and, if come under gospel light, as also revealed in Special Revelation. To see this Biblical and balanced view of Rom. 13 evidenced from that time period, see the webpage: [Against Separation from Impure Civil Governments](#). Note also Samuel Rutherford’s arguments that the moral injunctions of Scripture for civil rulers, and Christian qualifications, are not necessary for the validity of a ruler’s holding civil office, whether in a non-Christian or Christian land (note also [WCF 23.4](#), which teaches this), in *The Divine Right of Church Government*, pp. 547-548.]

<sup>76</sup> WCF 23.4: “Infidelity, or difference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate’s just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him.”]

While there are vast differences between the Christian and heathen magistrate, as light is to darkness, yet as to the derivation of their office: Scripture shows no difference.

*111 Propositions*  
*Concerning the Ministry and Government of the Church*<sup>77</sup>

1647

A Brief Summary Outline  
of the Propositions relating to the Two Kingdoms, #39-101

\* \* \*

Ecclesiastical Power Strengthens Civil Power<sup>78</sup>

- 39. Ecclesiastical power does not take away from civil authority, but strengthens it.
- 40. We are to be content with our civil rulers, love, fear, pray for and obey them as they are ambassadors and ministers of God in his stead.

The Magistrate is a Keeper of Both Tables of the Law<sup>79</sup>

- 41. The magistrate is a keeper of both tables of the Law [all Ten moral Commandments] and ought to promote God's glory, preserve religion and punish violators of civil justice.
- 42. The magistrate has the authority not to tolerate heretics, schismatics and enemies of true religion.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> [An easier to read version of this work, though clumsier to find, is in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*, vol. 1.]

<sup>78</sup> [Subtitles are the editor's (as well as the whole of the outline) and are provided for better comprehension.]

<sup>79</sup> [For the best short, but detailed, defense that the civil magistrate is to uphold the First Table of the Law, see *The Power of the Civil Magistrate in Matters of the First Table* by the New England puritan Cambridge Synod of 1646 (14 pp.)]

## Eight Differences Between Ecclesiastical and Civil Power

43. Civil and ecclesiastical power ought not to be mixed. Both are from God, ordained for his glory and are to be guided by his Word, though they have vast differences and are to remain distinct.

### 1st Difference

44. The civil power is grounded upon the law of nature, is common to infidels and Christians and is under the universal dominion of God as the creator of all nations. The ecclesiastical power is by the positive law of Christ alone, belongs unto the Church alone, is the economic Kingdom of Christ the Mediator, and is not of this world.

### 2nd Difference

#### Civil Power is of the Outward Man

45. Civil power is occupied about the outward man (civil and earthly things, war, peace, justice, and good order of commonwealth), including the outward business and external things of the Church that are not spiritual.

#### Civil Power with Regard to the Church

46. As members of the Church are citizens of the commonwealth, the magistrate has power over them to judge regarding the disposing of their bodies and

---

<sup>80</sup> [WCF 23.3: "The civil magistrate... hath authority, and it is his duty... that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed..." (Isa. 49:23; Ps. 122:9; Ezra 7:23,25-28; Lev. 24:16; Deut. 13:5,6,12; 1 Kings 18:4; 1 Chron. 13:1-9; 2 Kings 23:1-26; 2 Chron. 34:33; 2 Chron. 15:12,13).

This authority to discern and punish heretics does not come from any spiritual purpose within the magistrate's office or from the magistrate having any jurisdiction in spiritual things (as Gillespie reiterates below in numerous ways), but from the magistrate's own ability and prudence (Propositions 96-97) to discern by general (or special) revelation fundamental blasphemies (not simply any erroneous religious opinion) contrary to the 3rd Commandment (which commandment is binding upon him to uphold by his office by general and special revelation), or by upholding the ecclesiastical sentences of the Church (Proposition 64), which does have the authority to ministerially determine matters of faith.]

goods, maintenance of the poor, etc., provide places fit for holy assemblies<sup>81</sup> and to remove external impediments of ecclesiastical peace,<sup>82</sup> etc.

47. The ecclesiastical ministry is occupied about spiritual things in the civil government that belong unto conscience: to interpret the Word of God and show the magistrate his duty in governing the commonwealth.
48. The Word of God directs the magistrate in how to execute his office according to the will of God.<sup>83</sup> The minister does not deal with civil business, but with the scandals that arise out of them and in cases of conscience in the administration of the commonwealth. The magistrate is exercised only about the external things that adhere unto spiritual things, not about spiritual things themselves.
49. The heathen magistrate also may, and ought, to help the Church (1 Tim. 2:1-2)
50. Things pertaining to the outward man in the Church that the magistrate has authority over includes: correcting heretics [corporally] and establishing the meeting of regularly and occasionally scheduled synods.

### Civil Assistance in Synods

51. The magistrate's authority in calling a synod<sup>84</sup> is not in anything peculiarly special to it as ecclesiastical, but only in that it is a public assembly in his territory that needs human order.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> [As the magistrate has: a certain jurisdiction over the outward welfare of its society and the Church in it with respect to its material outward-being, a moral obligation by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Commandment to see the flourishing of God's worship in its land, and as the Bible evidences, morally approves and blesses this in its pages by the examples of kings, both godly and heathen, taking care to materially furnish the Temple in the Old Testament, which was due out of the moral principle of serving the true religion with one's legitimate natural power and authority, not from anything distinctive to the Old Testament itself.]

<sup>82</sup> [WCF 23.3: "The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven: yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the church..." (Isa. 49:23; Ps. 122:9; Ezra 7:23,25-28; Lev. 24:16; Deut. 13:5,6,12; 1 Kings 18:4; 1 Chron. 13:1-9; 2 Kings 23:1-26; 2 Chron. 34:33; 2 Chron. 15:12,13)]

<sup>83</sup> [It is often confused that because the Word of God speaks to and directs the magistrate in moral obligations, that therefore his office is formally under, or comes formally under, Christ as Mediator. Gillespie, however, rightly, distinguishes.]

<sup>84</sup> [WCF 23.3: "The civil magistrate... For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the

52. Those who raise heresies and schisms often try to flee trial from a free synod, and thus the magistrate's help is needed to compel obedience.<sup>86</sup>

### Ecclesiastical Power is of the Spiritual

53. Ecclesiastical power is only concerned with the soul (though it cannot search the heart, which is God's power alone), including those external things which belong properly to the spiritual good of the soul.
54. Ecclesiastical power is exercised about preaching, administration of the sacraments, public prayer, catechizing, ecclesiastical discipline, ordination and deposing of ministers, controversies of faith, monetary collections of the faithful and things regarding decency and order in the Church.
55. The civil power is occupied about the same things with respect to the outward man and the disposing of them in his dominion (as previously defined), but these things are properly about the salvation of the soul, even ecclesiastical jurisdiction in an outward court, which inflicts public censures, etc.
56. Ministers are not to usurp the power of life and death, or judge concerning men's honors, goods, inheritance, or other civil business, as these are outside of their office.
57. To ecclesiastical power and right belongs the assembling of synods insofar as they are spiritual assemblies (Acts 15), especially in times of danger to the Church, for their relief and support.

### 3<sup>rd</sup> Difference

58. The civil and ecclesiastical powers are different in their forms three ways:

---

mind of God. (2 Chron. 19:8-11; 2 Chron. 29-30; Matt. 2:4,5)" This is not to deny that the Church has the power to call synods, which [WCF 31.2](#) affirms. The right of the magistrate to call ecclesiastical synods was further qualified to extraordinary circumstances (which is what we see in Scripture) in the [Church of Scotland's Act of 1647](#) in approving the Confession.]

<sup>85</sup> [Just as modern police provide civil order for any large public event in cities.]

<sup>86</sup> [As the magistrate is the only office with authority to physically compel, and as the magistrate is to civilly enforce in its jurisdiction ecclesiastical decisions (see proposition 64 below). A good example of this from reformed history is the magistrate's assistance in the Synod of Dort, and the enforcement of its decisions post-1619, as related by Samuel Miller and Thomas Scott in *The Articles of the Synod of Dort*.]

(1) Civil power, in respect of its subjects, is lordly. Ecclesiastical power is ministerial and fatherly.

59. Magistrates (though ministers of God for the profit of their subjects and are not to rule arbitrarily) are to exercise dominion, hold principality, and to be ministered to and served by their subjects. Ministers of the Church are to oversee and feed as shepherds, correct and rectify, bear the Keys, but are not to govern lord-like over Christ's house, but are to minister and serve.

60. The Lord alone governs our souls and has power over the conscience, but He has appointed his own stewards over his family to give to everyone their portion in dispensing his mysteries, who have the power of the Keys (Mt. 16:19; 18:18; Lk. 12:42; 1 Cor. 4:1; Tit. 1:7).

(2) 61. Civil power has the authority of compelling, not the ministry. All compulsion in ecclesiastical matters must come from the magistrate without. If any excommunicated person insolently rises in rebellion, the Church has no further jurisdiction, but the magistrate may externally repress him.

(3) 62. The magistrate only works politically and civilly, making and guarding civil laws, which he can change and repeal with a secular power. Ecclesiastical power deals spiritually, in the name of Jesus Christ, by his authority received from Him and only uses spiritual weapons.

63. The same sin may be punished one way by the civil power and another way by the ecclesiastical power: by the civil power by civil litigation in the senate as a crime with corporal punishment, as it pertains to the government of the commonwealth; by the ecclesiastical power via ecclesiastical litigation in the presbytery and spiritual censure as it is a scandal and respects the conscience.

### Church Power Around Civil Things

The ministry is exercised about civil things spiritually (including teaching and admonishing the magistrate out of the Word of God, reproving freely unjust judgments, unjust wars and threatening

the wrath of God) just as the magistrate is occupied civilly about spiritual things.<sup>87</sup>

### Civil Power Around Spiritual Things<sup>88</sup>

64. Thus the magistrate civilly punishes idolaters, blasphemers, sacrilegious persons, heretics, profaners of holy things,<sup>89</sup> and, according to the nature and measure of the sin, he condemns to death or banishment, forfeiture of goods or imprisonment. He guards ecclesiastical canons with civil authority and gives a place of habitation to the Church in his territory.
65. The magistrate also takes care for maintaining ministers and schools,<sup>90</sup> and supplies the temporal necessities of God's servants in commanding synods to assemble safely, drawing to trial the unwilling (which cannot be done otherwise) and in moderating at synods in a civil way.

#### 4<sup>th</sup> Difference

### The Ends of the Magistrate

---

<sup>87</sup> [Note the balance of this Biblical teaching in contrast to modern pietistic notions which hold that the Church cannot tell the magistrate what to do with regard to moral concerns that Scripture speaks to.]

<sup>88</sup> [Gillespie is here describing (without using the words) the Reformation and Puritan doctrine that the magistrate has power *circa sacra*, around spiritual things, but not *in sacra*, in spiritual things. Likewise, as in Proposition 63, the church has spiritual power around civil things, but not in civil things.]

<sup>89</sup> [This authority to discern and punish heretics does not come from any spiritual purpose within the magistrate's office or from the magistrate having any jurisdiction in spiritual things (as Gillespie reiterates in numerous ways), but from the magistrate's own ability and prudence (Propositions 96-97) to discern by general (or special) revelation fundamental blasphemies (not simply any erroneous religious opinion) contrary to the 3rd Commandment (which commandment is binding upon him to uphold by his office by general and special revelation), or by upholding the ecclesiastical sentences of the Church, which does have the authority to ministerially determine matters of faith.]

<sup>90</sup> [The puritans understood schools to pertain to the magistrate's legitimate province of authority in that they are cooperative efforts for the outward well-being of the nation's citizenry, falling under the category of a 'human ordinance' (1 Pet. 2:13) for social and civil good, without impeding upon the parents' natural right to raise their children. The problem with modern schools is not that they are government run, but that they are atheistic and do not teach or discipline in line with God's Word and his Moral Law.]

66. They are distinguished by their ends. The immediate, nearest end of the magistrate is that the good of the commonwealth may be provided through military prudence, giving temporal safety, external peace and preserving civil liberty.
67. The chief and final end of the magistrate is the glory of God the Creator so that evil doers are restrained by a superior power and the good are praised and so that virtue, justice and the moral Law of God in both Tables (to which all the human race is obliged) may flourish.<sup>91</sup>

### How the Magistrate is Called by Christ

68. While the Christian magistrate does wholly devote himself and all his strength of authority to promoting the gospel and Kingdom of Christ,<sup>92</sup> this proceeds not from the nature of his office or function, but from his common Christian calling into his particular vocation.<sup>93</sup>
69. Every member of the Church (including the godly magistrate) ought to order his particular vocation, faculty and power to the end that the Kingdom of Christ may be promoted. In this way the advancement of the gospel is the end of the godly magistrate, though not of magistracy in-and-of-itself: it is not the end of the office itself, but of him who executes the same piously.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> [The relation between Propositions 66 &

<sup>92</sup> [As all persons are called to do: Mt. 6:33, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness..."]

<sup>93</sup> [The magistrate has a worldly calling: is concerned about the affairs of the temporal life of this world, as outlined in Proposition 66. Christ's calling to the magistrate does not give his office spiritual ends: his immediate nearest end and final chief end for his office (outlined in Propositions 66 & 67) remain the same, but he orders his natural calling within its natural and proper limits to most befit the Kingdom of Christ the Mediator, the Church (as every person of every natural calling should) as described in Propositions 69, 72-73, 94-97 & 100-101. For what it looks like for a Christian to administer the magistrate's office to the glory of Christ by way of his common Christian calling, see Proposition 95.

That Gillespie, in teaching that serving Christ is not a design of the magistratical office itself, but is by way of the common Christian calling, was simply defending the view of the previous Scottish national covenants, see the [Introduction](#) to the webpage: [All of the Scottish Confessions, National Covenants and Declarations from the Reformation, Puritan and Covenanting Eras on Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is the Church Only.](#)]

<sup>94</sup> [An illustration of this is the example of a plumber (Gillespie uses similar analogies of common vocations in *Aaron's Rod*, p. 87). Becoming a Christian adds nothing, nor changes the design of the job of plumbing itself, which is to fix pipes, etc. But upon a plumber becoming a Christian, the plumber seeks further to do his job well, treat people morally and with integrity, do his work glorifying and professing Christ as a plumber, and would naturally be desirous to help advance the Kingdom of Christ, the Church, through plumbing (perhaps by fixing any plumbing issues God's people may have, etc.). Yet none of

## The Ends of Ecclesiastical Power

70. The end of ecclesiastical power, of the ministry, and of the godly minister, is that the Kingdom of Christ may be set forward, the paths of the Lord made straight, his holy mysteries kept pure, stumbling-blocks removed, that the faithful walk as becomes the gospel and that the wandering sheep be restored.
71. The purpose of excommunication is to gain the offending brother and to deter others from soul-infection.

### 5<sup>th</sup> Difference

#### The Effects of Civil Power

72. They are distinguished by the effect. The proper effect of the civil power is the temporal safety of the commonwealth and the things which are necessary to the civil society of men. The effect by way of redundance<sup>95</sup> is the good of the Church in that by the execution of good laws, some impediments that hinder the course of the gospel are taken away.
73. In the faithfulness of the magistrate in punishing the wicked, encouraging good men and driving away subverters of the Church, the orthodox faith is held in estimation and sin feared. As subjects are outwardly contained by God's Law, the Church has fewer scandals and more freedom and peace.

#### The Effect of Ecclesiastical Power

---

these things change the science or designs of plumbing in and of itself. So it is with the office-bearing politician who becomes a Christian: the authority and source of origin of the power of his office from God, mediately by the people, does not change, though he uses his office in its worldly powers and designs to most benefit Christ's glory and the Church, including glorifying and professing Christ in all that he does through the office, acting as God's vicegerent, in God's authority, room and stead. Thus, when civil magistrates profess the true religion and act on behalf of the Church's good in Scripture, it is by the same authority they had before and in no way alters it, the source of it or the nature of that authority (Gen. 20:6-7,14-15; Dan. 6:26-27; Ezra 7:21-26). See Proposition 95 for more details.]

<sup>95</sup> [The meaning of this appears to be that when the civil magistrate does its job well within its civil ends, positive effects redound to the Church.]

74. The proper effect of the ecclesiastical power is wholly spiritual as the act of retaining and remitting sins reaches to the soul itself (unlike the civil power). Just excommunications, being ratified in heaven, ought to be esteemed as inflicted by Christ Himself.

#### 6<sup>th</sup> Difference

75. There is a difference in respect of subjects. The civil power is committed sometimes to one person or many, by election or succession.<sup>96</sup> The ecclesiastical power is given not to individuals, but to the Church, the consistory of presbyters. (2 Cor. 2:6)

#### 7<sup>th</sup> Difference

76. They differ as touching the correlative. The civil power extends to all members of the commonwealth. The ecclesiastical power only extends to members of the Church [which persons are a subset of the commonwealth].<sup>97</sup>

#### 8<sup>th</sup> Difference

77. There is a divided exercise of authority. If either power do not do its duty, the other power may and ought still do its duty to such offenders.
78. Neither power is bound to cast out or receive him whom the other power casts out or receives. Absolution by ecclesiastic censure does not free an offender from civil judgment.

---

<sup>96</sup> [This, as well as other things, shows that there is no 'Regulative Principle of Civil Government' as there is with Church Government, other than that the civil magistrate is morally obligated to the general principles of God's Word (Proposition 48 & WCF 23).]

<sup>97</sup> [This corrects the common misconception of the puritan period that one was a member of the Church just by being a member of the State (which was the Erastian notion). The misconception probably arises from the public covenants of Scotland (1560, 1581 & 1638) being taken by the whole nation. Yet in these cases their membership in the Church was due to their profession of faith contained in the social covenant, not due to civil citizenship. Even then, as Gillespie illuminates, as people were disciplined out of the Church, the Church no longer was co-extensive with the civil commonwealth. Any binding moral obligation upon the children of such persons from the national social covenant did not of itself make the children members of the Church.]

### Thus, the Magistrate does not have Ecclesiastical Discipline

79. Thus, the functions of ministers and elders are not contained in the office of the magistrate and hence magistrates ought not to usurp ecclesiastical jurisdiction any more than ministers should meddle in the magistrate's calling.
80. The magistrate has the same powers whether or not he is a Christian, and gains none by becoming a Christian, other than by faith and piety he is made more fit and willing to undergo the duty of his office.<sup>98</sup>
81. Thus the magistrate ought not to usurp the ministry of the Word or the spiritual sword.

### The Christian Magistrate is Subject to Ecclesiastical Discipline

82. It is unlawful for a Christian magistrate to withstand the execution of ecclesiastical discipline by unjust laws, an evil example or contemning it.
83. If the Christian magistrate gives any scandal to the Church, he ought to submit himself to the power of the spiritual keys,<sup>99</sup> as he is a member of the Church.

### Extraordinary Circumstances

---

<sup>98</sup> [The significance of this is that some Erastians, in order to affirm the common sense and Scriptural position that heathen magistrates are valid magistrates, held that the magistrate only becomes a vice-gerent of Christ when he becomes a Christian. At this moment in time, they held, that particular magistrate's office comes under Christ as Mediatorial Head. Rutherford argues against this in *Divine Right of Church Government*, pp. 607-611]

Some Reformed Presbyterians of the 1800's argued that all civil magistracy came under Christ's Mediatorial Headship at Christ's Ascension, though the heathen civil magistrates were ignorant that they were Christ's vice-gerents (which Rutherford argues is an impossibility). When the light of the gospel comes to such a magistrate and he does not embrace it, the validity of his civil authority becomes nulled, he being therefrom no magistrate at all. The teaching that magistrates cease to be magistrates when they resist Christ is contrary to Ps. 2:2-3,9-12 which says that it is magistrates resisting Christ. Note also that Herod and Pontius Pilate, upon ignoring Christ's witness to them, did not cease to be magistrates (Acts 4:25-27). On either paradigm, Gillespie admits of no such change in office upon the magistrate either becoming, or not becoming, a Christian.]

<sup>99</sup> [This is an awkward way to put it, as the magistrate *is* under the spiritual power and discipline of the Church, and is morally obligated thereto, but Gillespie's concern is probably that the magistrate has the physical, coercive power not to submit to Church discipline, and did this all too often.]

84. In the worst and most troublesome times, when the ordinance of God in the Church is violently turned into tyranny to the treading down of true religion and nothing is sound, some things are lawful to godly magistrates which are not ordinarily lawful to them, as extraordinary remedies apply to extraordinary diseases.<sup>100</sup>

Likewise, if the magistrate abuse his power unto tyranny, making havoc of all, it is lawful to resist him by some extraordinary means which are not ordinarily allowed.<sup>101</sup>

### Separate Jurisdictions

85. Yet, by ordinary and common law in settled churches it is not lawful to bring ecclesiastic causes under the civil tribunal.
86. If ministers and elders intermeddle in judging civil causes or disturb the civil commonwealth, they are liable to civil trial and judgments.

### Ecclesiastical Discipline is Self-Sufficient

87. To ecclesiastical evils, ecclesiastical remedies are appointed: inferior judgments are to be corrected by superior assemblies, as in the commonwealth, yet without intermingling.
88. The objection that an erring national synod has no remedy equally applies to an erring civil parliament.

---

<sup>100</sup> [Gillespie is probably thinking of the many Old Testament examples of this: Ezra 7:23,25-28; 1 Chron. 13:1-9; 2 Kings 23:1-26; 2 Chron. 34:33; 2 Chron. 15:12,13. The legitimacy of the magistrate in extraordinary times acting 'to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the church' (WCF 23.3) by physical coercion stems from the reality that the Church can be easily trampled and disordered by troublers, it not having the power of physical coercion itself, and is thus dependent for its safety on the civil magistrate (see Propositions 52, 61, 64, & 72). This is not to give spiritual jurisdiction to the magistrate (see Propositions 96-97), it is simply for the magistrate to guard the outward safety of the existence and well-being of the Church like any other corporation in the commonwealth, though with extra care as it is the magistrate's design of office by nature in the 1<sup>st</sup> Table of the Law to guard the true religion. Once the Church is set in due order from unrestrained havoc and obvious violations of the 1<sup>st</sup> Table of the Law, the Church then can exercise its proper and regular spiritual jurisdiction safely for its well-being.]

<sup>101</sup> [Gillespie is probably thinking of the Biblical philosophy of [resistance to tyranny](#) outlined by Rutherford in *Lex Rex*.]

89. There is a divine medicine for an erring national synod: Christ is present with her and assists her; whence, later synods often correct former ones.
90. Further, a national synod is subordinate to a universal [ecumenical] synod, whereas there is no such trans-national civil court.

### Civil Relations to National Synods

91. The national synod ought to declare the grounds of their sentence to the magistrate,<sup>102</sup> and if he is not satisfied, he may require another national synod to debate the matter, the matter thus being lawfully determined in an ecclesiastical way.
92. Two cautions are necessary:
  - (1) Notwithstanding a possible future revision, the former ecclesiastical sentence ought to be executed in the interim lest evils in the Church take deeper root and lest none fear to breakdown the decrees of synods.
  - (2) 93. Regard is to be had to weaker persons who doubt and are willing to be taught, but place is not given to the contentious who seek to oppress the Church's liberty by endless impediments.

### The Christian Magistrate is to Support the Church

94. The Christian magistrate is not only to make no impediment to ecclesiastical discipline, but is also to afford special furtherance and help to it. (Isa. 49:23)

---

<sup>102</sup> [Not as if he has any power in spiritual jurisdiction, but as even he ought not to be required to have an implicit and blind faith (see Propositions 96-97). Thus Rutherford describes the practice of the Church of Scotland in his day (*Peacable and Temperate Plea*, ch. 20, article 12):

“...our national assembly... with us the King or his commissioner is present, as in the national assembly of the Jews, was King David (1 Chron. 13:1,2), Asa (2 Chron. 15:9), Hezekiah (2 Chron. 29:4), Josiah (2 Chron. 34:29), for the King bears the sword, and is there as a politic president, and nursing Father (Isa. 49:23; Rom. 13:4).”

This is still the practice of the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing), which invites a commissioner to her General Assemblies and sends her minutes to the Queen.]

95. Christian magistrates are to not only serve Christ as men, but to use their office to his glory and good of the Church by: defending, standing for and propagating the true faith, afford and furnish places of habitation to the Church and restrain false religion.<sup>103</sup>
96. The power of these nursing fathers is cumulative and auxiliary. They ought to establish ecclesiastical discipline not with implicit faith or blind obedience, but with Christian prudence, which is true of every Christian.
97. The magistrate is a judge of his own civil act about spiritual things: either defending, approving or tolerating them in his dominions and is held accountable to this by the Supreme Tribunal.<sup>104</sup>

### Ecclesiastical Discipline is Independent

98. Ecclesiastical discipline ought to be retained by the society of the faithful whether or not it is established by civil authority. The lack of such civil establishment is an absent gain, but not a damage; as it superadds nothing [to the existence of the Church], so it takes nothing away.
99. If the magistrate abuse his authority and forbid what Christ has ordained, we are to obey God rather than men under any extremity [Acts 5:29].

---

<sup>103</sup> [What should the Christian administration of civil government look like? Gillespie, in saying that the Christian magistrate should use his office as God's vice-gerent for Christ's glory and the good of his Church is here defending the practice of civil Scotland, which professed and propagated Christ and Christianity by its civil parliament adopting Christian confessions of faith and covenants in 1560, 1581, 1640, 1644 & 1649, and enforcing civil laws around them, thus establishing Christianity in the land as the true religion countenanced, professed, protected and promoted by the civil magistrate. While this confession of Christ and of Christianity in the exercise of the civil administration stemmed from the common Christian calling of the gospel to all people (See the [Introduction](#) to the webpage: [All of the Scottish Confessions, National Covenants and Declarations from the Reformation, Puritan and Covenanting Eras on Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom is the Church Only](#)) and not from the design or source of power of the magistracy itself, yet the Scots rightly believed that the civil government could bind itself and future generations by civil law to a perpetual Christian exercise and administration of the civil magistracy (which they did by making Christian covenants, legislation and, at times, Christian qualifications to office, etc.), though such was not inherent to, or from, the office itself, or necessary to the validity of the office itself.]

<sup>104</sup> [This is a consequence of the Biblical doctrine that the power, authority and jurisdictions of Church and State are coordinate: the civil government answers directly to God the Trinity as Creator as its Head, and the Church answers directly to Christ the Mediator as its Head, but neither is subordinate, or ultimately answers, to the other.]

## The Aims and Concord of Church and State

100. Civil and ecclesiastical discipline should not be opposed to each other (which is hurtful to both), but the aim is that the prerogative royal of Jesus Christ may be maintained, the King of Kings<sup>105</sup> and only monarch of the Church.
101. Another end is that the licentious may be restrained, both powers may enjoy their own privileges, and, they being within their distinct borders and bounds, may underprop and strengthen the other by a holy, mutual and friendly concord.

---

<sup>105</sup> [Per *Aaron's Rod*, ch. 6, section 2, Gillespie understands this phrase to refer to Christ: (1) as divine as the governing Head and King of all kings, or (2) as Mediator, the preminent King of all kings with power over them all.]

# Sermons

An Excerpt from:

## 'A Brotherly Examination

of Some Passages of Mr. Coleman's  
late Sermon upon Job 11:20'<sup>106</sup>

1645

...

The fourth [rule of Coleman's] was this:<sup>107</sup> 'A Christian magistrate, as a Christian magistrate, is a governor in the Church.' And who denies this?<sup>108</sup> The question is whether there ought to be no other government in the Church besides that of the

---

<sup>106</sup> [The whole sermon may be read in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*, vol. 1. The volume uses non-continuous page numbering.]

<sup>107</sup> [This is the last part of Gillespie's sermon, starting on p. 10. The fourth rule of Coleman's in full was this:

'4. A Christian magistrate, as a Christian magistrate, is a governor in the Church. Christ has placed government in his Church, 1 Cor. 12:28. Of other governments beside magistracy, I find no institution; of them I do, Rom. 13:1-2. I find all government given to Christ, and to Christ as Mediator, Eph. 1:22-23. I desire all to consider it. To rob the kingdom of Christ of the magistrate, and his governing, I cannot excuse, no not from a kind of sacrilege, if the magistrate His.'

This is the whole of the section from Coleman's sermon that Gillespie is responding to in this section of his sermon. For Coleman's three other rules of advice for how to carry on discussion of reforming the State and Church in England during the Westminster Assembly, see the one page 'Notice' prefixed to Gillespie's 'Brotherly Examination' in the *Presbyterian Armoury*, vol. 1 (1846).]

<sup>108</sup> [Gillespie affirms that the magistrate rules the Church with regard to civil things (*circa sacra*), but denies that the magistrate rules the Church formally with regard to spiritual things (*in sacra*). Gillespie is seeking, as all disputants should, as much common ground as possible with his opponent and giving him the benefit of the doubt in order to show precisely where the real difference lies.]

Christian magistrate. That which he drives at is: that the Christian magistrate should leave no power of spiritual censures to the elderships. He would have the magistrate to do like the rich man in the parable, who had exceeding many flocks and herds, and yet did take away the little ewe-lamb from the poor man who had nothing save that.

The brother says: 'Of other governments besides magistracy, I find no institution; of them [civil magistrates], I do (Rom. 13:1-2).' I am sorry he sought no better, else he had found more. Subjection and obedience is commanded as due not only to civil, but to spiritual governors, to those that are over us in the Lord (1 Thess. 5:12); so 1 Tim. 5:17, 'Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor;' Heb. 13:7, 'Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the Word of God;' verse 17, 'Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls.' And what does he understand by, 'he that rules,' (Rom. 12:8)? If the judgment of [Rudolph] Gualther [†1586] and [Heinrich] Bullinger [†1575] have any weight with him (as I suppose it has), they do not there exclude, but take in, under that word, the ruling officers of the Church.

But now, in the case, let the reverend brother take heed he has not split upon a rock and taken from the magistrate more than he has given him. He says:

'Christian magistrates are to manage their office under Christ, and for Christ. Christ has placed governments in his Church (1 Cor. 12:28, etc.). I find all government given to Christ, and to Christ as Mediator (I desire all to consider it), Eph. 1:3,23, and Christ, as Head of these, [is] given to the Church.'

If this be good divinity, then I am sure it will be the hardest task which ever he took in hand to uphold and assert the authority either of pagan or Christian magistrates.

First, he lets the pagan or infidel magistrate fall to the ground as a usurper who has no just title to reign, because all government is given to Christ, and to Him as

Mediator. But which way was the authority of government derived from Christ, and from Him as Mediator, to a pagan prince or emperor?

Next, he will make it to fare little better with the Christian magistrate. For if the Christian magistrate be the vice-gerent of Christ, and of Christ as Mediator, and if he is to manage his office under, and for, Christ, then the reverend brother must either prove from Scripture that Christ, as Mediator, has given such a commission of vice-gerentship and deputyship to the Christian magistrate, or otherwise acknowledge that he has given a most dangerous wound to magistracy and made it an empty title, claiming that power which he has no warrant to assume. God and nature has made magistrates, and given them great authority; but from Christ as Mediator they have it not.

I find in Scripture that church-officers have their power from Christ as Mediator and they are to manage their office under, and for, Christ: in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ do we assemble ourselves together (Matt 18:20); in his name do we preach (Lk. 24:47; Acts 4:17-18; 5:28,41; 9:27); in his name do we baptize (Acts 2:38; 4:12,16; 19:5); in his name do we excommunicate (1 Cor. 5:5). But I do not find in Scripture that the magistrate is to rule or to make laws, or to manage any part of his office in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

And as the Mediator has not anywhere given such a commission and power to the magistrate, so, as Mediator, He had it not to give; for He was not made a judge in civil affairs (Luke 12:14), and his Kingdom is not of this world (John 18:36). How can that power which Christ as Mediator has not received of the Father be derived from Christ to the Christian magistrate? I know that Christ, as He is the eternal Son of God and 'thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' does, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, reign and rule over all the kingdoms of the sons of men. He that is Mediator, being God, has, as God, all power in heaven and earth,

(and this power was given to Him, Matt 28:18, both by the eternal generation and by the declaration of Him to be the Son of God with power when He was raised from the dead, Rom. 1:4, even as He is said to be begotten when He was raised again, Acts 13:33: He had relinquished and laid aside his divine dominion and power when He had made Himself in the form of a servant<sup>109</sup> but after his resurrection it is gloriously manifested)

and so He that is Mediator, being God, has power to subdue his and his Church's enemies, and to make his foes his footstool. But as Mediator He is only the Church's King, Head and Governor, and has no other kingdom.

The Photinians<sup>110</sup> have defined the kingly office of Christ thus:

'It is an office committed to Him by God, to govern, with the highest authority and power, all creatures endued with understanding, and especially men, and the Church gathered of them.'<sup>111</sup>

But those that have written against them have corrected their definition in this particular, because Christ is properly King of his Church only.

As for those two scriptures which the brother [Coleman] cites [1 Cor. 12:28 & Eph. 1:21-23], they are extremely misapplied. He cites 1 Cor. 12:28 to prove that Christ has placed civil governments in his Church. If by the 'governments' or 'governors'

---

<sup>109</sup> [What Gillespie evidently means is discerned from the last part of this sentence, that the *manifestation* of Christ's divine dominion and power was laid aside in his economic relations of taking up a human nature in the form of a servant.]

<sup>110</sup> [From the early Church heresiarch Photinus (†376), who, denying Christ's divinity, interpreted all the Biblical passages speaking of Christ as God and exercising divine rule as referring only to his delegated, Mediatorial, kingly office as the vice-gerent of God. Thus, Photinus made Christ's Mediatorial office as King to be over all things, whereas the orthodox writers that came after him, corrected him and taught that, while Christ's divine rule as God is over all things, his Mediatorial office as King is only over the Church.]

<sup>111</sup> [Gillespie also gives the Latin in the original.]

there mentioned, he understood the civil magistrates, yet that place says not that Christ has placed them, but that God has done it.<sup>112</sup>

Next, the apostle speaks of such governors as the Church had at that time; but at that time the Church had no godly, nor Christian, magistrates. This is Calvin's argument, whereby he proves that ecclesiastical, not civil, governors are there meant.

Thirdly, I ask, how can we conceive that civil government can come into the catalogue of ecclesiastical and spiritual administrations? For such are all the rest there reckoned forth.<sup>113</sup>

Lastly, the brother, after second thoughts, may think he has done another disservice to the magistrate in making the magistracy to be below and behind the ministry. The apostle puts them in this order: 'God has set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments,' etc. How does the brother make this to agree with his interpretation?<sup>114</sup>

Next, he cites Eph. 1:21-23, to prove that all government is given to Christ, and to Him as Mediator; and Christ, as Head of these, is given to the Church.

---

<sup>112</sup> [Gillespie's argument is on Coleman's terms: the verse does not actually say that Christ placed governors in the Church, but that God the Trinity did. Thus, if such 'governors' are in fact civil governors, it still only shows that they derive their authority from God the Trinity, not from Christ.]

<sup>113</sup> [Gillespie's argument is that the rest of the list is of all spiritual administrations, therefore one would expect the 'governors' to be ecclesiastical governors, not civil.]

<sup>114</sup> [Gillespie's argument is that the list in 1 Cor. 12:28 has a primacy of order to it. If so then the civil magistrate is less important than the ecclesiastical offices. Yet, this is a disservice to the civil magistrate. On Gillespie's view, the ministry and civil magistracy are co-ordinate, with the magistracy directly under, and only under, God Himself.]

But this place makes more against him than for him, for the apostle says not that Christ is given to the Church as the Head of all principalities and powers. The brother says so, and in saying so, he makes Christ a head to those that are not of his body. The apostle says far otherwise: that God gave Christ 'to be the Head, over all things, to the Church, which is his body,' which the Syriac [version] reads more plainly: 'And Him who is over all, He gave to be the Head to the Church.' He is a head to none but the Church; but He who is head to the Church 'is over all, God blessed forever,' (Rom. 9:5); yea, even as a man, He is over, or above, all. The very human nature of Christ which was raised from the dead, being set at the right hand of the Majesty of God, is exalted to a higher degree of honor and glory than either man or angel ever was, or ever shall be; so that He that is Head of the Church is over all, because He does not only excel his own members, but excels all creatures that ever God made. It is one thing to say that Christ is exalted to a dignity, excellency, pre-eminence, majesty, and glory, far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion; another thing to say that Christ is Head of all principalities and governments, and, as Mediator, exercises his kingly office over these. The apostle says the former, but not the latter.

Shall I need to illustrate this distinction? Is there anything more known in the world? Will any say that he who excels other men in dignity, splendor, honor, and glory, must therefore reign and rule over all those whom He thus excels?<sup>115</sup>

The apostle says indeed, in another sense, that Christ 'is the head of all principality and power,' (Col. 2:10). But that is spoken of Christ not as He is Mediator, but only as He is God. The apostle's meaning in those words is nothing but this: that Christ is true God (says Tossanus);<sup>116</sup> that He is

---

<sup>115</sup> [Gillespie's point is that the one does not necessarily imply the other. A contemporary example is that though America excels all other countries in the world in dignity, power and glory, and thus may be said to be over all the world in glory and power, it does not imply that all other countries come under the ruling jurisdiction of America.]

<sup>116</sup> [Probably Daniel Tossanus, Sr. (†1602), a professor of theology at Heidelberg.]

omnipotent (says [Rudolph] Gualther [†1586]); that He, being the natural Son of God, is together with the Father, Lord of all things (says [Heinrich] Bullinger [†1575]). That this is the meaning will soon appear:

1. From the scope of the place, which is to teach the Colossians not to worship angels, because they are but servants, and the Son of God is their Lord and Head.

2. The apostle expounds himself how Christ is the head of all principality and power. Col. 1:15-17:

‘Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist.’

Now all this is without controversy, to be understood not of the office, but of the person of Jesus Christ; not of his governing and kingly office, as He is Mediator, but to prove that He is true and very God. Therefore [Theodore] Beza, [Jerome] Zanchius, Gualther, Bullinger, Tossanus, Mr. [Paul] Bayne, and diverse other interpreters upon the place, do generally agree that the apostle (verses 15-17) speaks of the dignity and excellency of the person of Jesus Christ, proving Him to be true God; and that in verse 18 he comes to speak of his office as He is Mediator: ‘and He is the Head of the body, the Church...’

So that we may distinguish a two-fold headship of Jesus Christ: one in regard of his Godhead, and so He is head of all principality and power; another, in regard of his office of Mediatorship, and so He is Head of the Church only. The present question is of the latter, not of the former. The

former is common to the Son of God with the Father and the Holy Ghost; the latter is proper to Christ as God and man. The former shall continue forever; the latter shall not continue forever. The former does not necessarily suppose the latter; but the latter does necessarily suppose the former. Christ can reign as God, though He reign not as Mediator; but He cannot reign as Mediator and not reign as God. The object of the former is every creature; the object of the latter is the Church gathered out of the world. This digression concerning the headship of Jesus Christ may for the future prevent diverse objections, so I shall return.

And now (I desire all to consider it) there is not one word in those three last verses of Ephesians 1 which will give any ground for that which the brother with so much confidence avers.

Verse 21 affords this argument against Him: the honor and dignity of Jesus Christ there spoken of has place 'not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.' But the kingdom and government which is given to Christ, as Mediator, shall not continue in the world to come (for when Christ has put his enemies under his feet, He shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father and reign no longer as Mediator, 1 Cor. 15:24,25); therefore the government given to Christ, as He is Mediator, cannot be meant in that place, but the dignifying, honoring, preferring, and exalting of Christ to a higher degree of glory than either man or angel.<sup>117</sup>

Come on now and see whether verse 22 makes any whit more for him: He 'has put all things under his feet,' that is, says Zanchius, all things but the

---

<sup>117</sup> [If one takes the view that aspects of Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom endure through eternity, Gillespie's point still stands. In Eph. 1:20-21 Christ's glory, honor and reign is equal with God. In the age to come, Christ's glory, honor and reign as Mediator will be subject to God (1 Cor. 15:28). Therefore, if Eph. 1:20-22 is speaking of Christ's governmental reign of headship, this is in respect of Christ's personal divinity and not his role as Mediator. Therefore Eph. 1:20-22 may be speaking with respect to Christ's glory and power as Mediator, but not of a Mediatorial Kingdom and reign including all things.]

Church, which is his body.<sup>118</sup> But this must be meant in respect of the decree and foreknowledge of God, as Jerome [347-420] expounds the place; and so does the Scripture expound itself:<sup>119</sup>

Heb. 2:8 'But now we see not yet all things put under Him;'

1 Cor. 15:25 'He must reign till He has put all enemies under his feet;'

Act 2:34-35 'Sit Thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool.'

Now, when Christ shall have put down all rule and all authority and power, and shall put his enemies under his feet, then He shall cease to reign any more as Mediator (which I have even now proved); but before that be done He reigns as Mediator. So that it can never be proved that the meaning of these words, 'He has put all things under his feet,' is that all government in this world is given to Christ as Mediator;<sup>120</sup> and whoever says so, must needs acknowledge that Christ's exercising of government, as He is Mediator, over all principalities and powers, shall continue after all things shall be put under his feet, or that Christ shall not govern as Mediator 'till all things be

---

<sup>118</sup> [This follows the scriptural and natural analogy that the head is above the body and above all, but the body is above the feet and that which is under the feet, as one's body is not under their feet.]

<sup>119</sup> [Gillespie's view that he here explicates, that the language of all things being put under Christ's feet in Eph. 1:22 (and by way of inference of parallel interpretation, the same language in 1 Cor. 15:24-28; Heb. 2:8) refers to the present assurance and promise of the decreed and certain reality of all things being put under Christ's feet at the Last Day, appears to be on the premise that this language is being understood of Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom rule. In *Aaron's Rod*, ch. 5, 3<sup>rd</sup> arg. of Hussey, Gillespie affirms that the same language of all things being put under Christ's feet from the type in Ps. 8:6 is fulfilled 'in measure and degree' of Christ as Mediator now in this world (by inference, from the Ascension), in two respects: (1) by way of preminent glory over all things, and (2) in being given almighty power to order and direct all things for his glory and the good of his spiritual Kingdom's purposes. This being the case, then it is reasonable to conclude, that in consistency with Gillespie's view, one could so interpret all things being put under Christ's feet in Eph. 1:22 (and other passages, including 1 Pet. 3:22) to refer to Christ as Mediator with respect to his glory and power above all things and his ordering of them for his own ends.]

<sup>120</sup> [Which would make Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom a worldly kingdom, about the affairs of this world, as opposed to a spiritual kingdom of his spiritually redeemed and enlivened saints.]

put under his feet,' which is so contrary to the apostle's meaning that Christ shall then cease to reign as Mediator [in 1 Cor. 15:25,28].

The next words, 'and He gave Him to be the Head over all things to the Church,' do furnish another argument against him. Christ's headship, and his government as Mediator, are commensurable and of an equal extent. Christ is a Head to none but to his Church;<sup>121</sup> therefore no government is given to Him as Mediator but the government of his Church.

The last verse does further confirm that which I say, for the apostle, continuing his speech of the Church, says, 'which is his body, the fullness of Him that fills all in all.' He calls the Church Christ's fullness, in reference to his Headship: that which makes Him full and complete so far as He is a head or king. Having his Church fully gathered, He has his complete Kingdom, his perfect body; and this being done, He wants [lacks] nothing so far as He is Mediator: so that the Holy Ghost does here, as it were on purpose, anticipate this opinion, lest any should think all civil government is given to Christ as Mediator. Though, as God, He fills heaven and earth, yet, as Mediator, his filling of all in all extends no further than his body, his Church, which is therefore called his fullness.

Finally, to avoid the mistake of this place, and upon the whole matter, let these three things be well distinguished in the Mediator Jesus Christ:

1. His υπεροκη, or δυξα, his 'eminence' and highness in respect of the 'glory' and majesty He is exalted to, far above whatsoever is highest among all creatures.

---

<sup>121</sup> [Gillespie affirms (for instance in his interpretation of Col. 2:10) that Christ's divine person is head of all created power, but nowhere in Scripture is the world called his body in this respect. Every place in Scripture besides the disputed text in hand (Eph. 1:20-23), where people are called Christ's body, it is without exception always referring to the Church.]

2. His δυναμις, the 'power' by which He can, and does by degrees, and will more and more subdue his and his Church's enemies, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel, and break them with a rod of iron.
3. His βασιλεια [kingdom], his kingly power, by which He exercises act of government.

These three are distinguished in an earthly king: the first two being of a larger extent than the third. The conclusion of that prayer which our Lord taught his disciples does distinguish the same three in God: 'Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory.' [Matt 6:13] Now these being distinguished in the Mediator Jesus Christ, I conclude with these three distinct assertions (the truth whereof I hope I have made to appear):

1. As Mediator He is exalted and dignified above all creatures and his glory is above all the earth.
2. As Mediator He exercises acts of divine power and omnipotence over all creatures in the behalf of, and for the good of, his Church, and restrains, or diverts, or destroys all his Church's enemies.
3. As Mediator He is King, Head and Governor to none but his Church; neither was all government put in his hand, but that of the Church only.

I could enlarge myself further against that most dangerous principle, 'That all government, even that which is civil, is given to Christ, and to Him as Mediator,' but let those things suffice for the present. The reverend brother's opinion will find better entertainment among the Jews who expect a temporal monarchy of the Messiah and among Papists who desire to uphold the Pope's temporal authority over kings as Christ's vice-gerent upon earth.

An Excerpt from  
*'Nihil Respondes,*  
or,  
A Discovery of the Extreme Unsatisfactoriness of  
Master Coleman's Piece...  
'A Brotherly Examination Re-examined''<sup>122</sup>

pp. 11-14

1645

His Errors in Divinity

...

5<sup>th</sup> Error

Where he [Coleman] makes reply<sup>123</sup> to what I had said against his argument from Ephesians 1, the three last verses. He says he will blow away all my discourse with this clear demonstration:

---

<sup>122</sup> [The Latin phrase means, 'a non-response.' Gillespie is saying that Coleman's response to Gillespie's previous sermon did not address the pertinent issues. The whole of this sermon (along with Gillespie's other sermons) may be read in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*, vol. 1. The volume uses non-continuous page numbering.]

<sup>123</sup> p. 21

'That which is given to Christ, He has it not as God; and Christ as God cannot be given. But this place (Eph. 1, the three last verses) speaks both of dignity given to Christ and of Christ as a gift given [to the Church]. Therefore Christ cannot be here understood as God.'

This is in opposition to what I said<sup>124</sup> concerning the headship and dignity of Christ as 'the natural Son of God, the image of the invisible God' (Col. 1:15), and of the dominion of Christ 'as He is the eternal Son of God'.<sup>125</sup>

This being premised, the brother's demonstration is so strong as to blow himself into a blasphemous heresy. I will take the proposition from himself and the assumption from Scripture, thus: That which is given to Christ, He has it not as God. But all power in heaven and in earth is given to Christ (Matt 28:18). Life is given to Christ (John 5:26). Authority to execute judgment is given to Christ (John 5:27). All things are given into Christ's hands (John 3:35). The Father has given Him power over all flesh (John 17:2). He has given Him glory (John 17:22). Therefore, by Mr. Coleman's principles, Christ has neither life, nor glory, nor authority to execute judgment, nor power over all flesh as He is the eternal Son of God consubstantial<sup>126</sup> with the Father, but only as He is Mediator, God and Man.

As for the giving of Christ as God [as a possible interpretation of Eph. 1:22],<sup>127</sup> what if I argue thus: If Christ, as He is the eternal Son of God or Second Person of the ever blessed Trinity, could not be given [with respect to his economic relations to his creatures], then the incarnation itself, or the sending of the Son of God to take on our flesh, cannot be called a giving of a gift to us [Jn. 3:16; 4:10; 6:32-33, etc.]. But this were impious to say. Therefore, [the conclusion follows,] etc.

---

<sup>124</sup> p. 45

<sup>125</sup> p. 43 [Gillespie is saying that Coleman has misrepresented his position, as Gillespie will explain.]

<sup>126</sup> [of the same substance, or essence]

<sup>127</sup> [Gillespie actually takes the verse as speaking of Christ as Mediator, as he says below at the end of this section on Coleman's 5<sup>th</sup> Error.]

Again, if Christ as He is the Second Person of the blessed Trinity could not be given, then the Holy Ghost as He is the Third Person cannot be given (for they are co-essential, and that which were a dishonor to God the Son were a dishonor to God the Holy Ghost). But to say that the Holy Ghost cannot be given as the Third Person, were to say that He cannot be given as the Holy Ghost. And what will he then say to all these Scriptures that speak of the giving of the Holy Ghost? ([Lk. 11:13; Jn. 7:39;] Acts [2:38; 5:32; 8:18; 10:45;] 15:8; Rom. 5:5; [1 Thess. 4:8;] 1 John 4:13, etc.)

Finally, as Mr. Coleman's demonstration has blown itself away, so it could not hurt me were it solid and good (as it is not), for he should have taken notice that in my examination I did not restrict the dignity given to Christ (Eph. 1:21), nor the giving of Christ (verse 22), to the divine nature only. Nay I told<sup>128</sup> that those words of the apostle hold true even of the human nature of Christ.

#### 6<sup>th</sup> Error

He concludes with a syllogism which he calls the scope of my discourse (I know not by what logic, the proposition being forged by himself and contrary to my discourse). Thus it is:

[The Proposition:] 'Whosoever do not manage their office and authority under Christ and for Christ, they manage it under the Devil and for the Devil. For there is no middle: either Christ or Belial. 'He that is not with Me is against Me.'

---

<sup>128</sup> pp. 44-45

[The Assumption:] But according to the opinion of the [Scottish] Commissioner [Gillespie], Christian magistracy does not manage the office and authority thereof under Christ and for Christ.<sup>129</sup>

Therefore, he believes I shall be hard put to it to give the Kingdom a clear and satisfactory answer. It's well that this is the hardest task he could set me. The truth is that his syllogism has *quatuor terminus* [four possible ends], and is therefore worthy to be exploded by all that know the laws of disputation.<sup>130</sup>

Those words in the proposition 'under Christ and for Christ,' can have no other sense but, 'to be serviceable to Christ, to take part with Him and to be for the glory of Christ,' as is clear by the confirmation added, 'He that is not with Me is against Me' [which sense Gillespie affirms]. But the same words in the assumption must needs have another sense, 'under Christ and for Christ,' that is, *vice Christi*, in Christ's stead [which Gillespie denies].<sup>131</sup> For that which I denied was that magistracy is derived from Christ as Mediator, or that Christ as Mediator has given a commission of vicegerentship and deputyship to the Christian Magistrate to manage his office and authority under and for Him, and in his Name, as is clear in my ['Brotherly] Examination'.<sup>132</sup> Nay, Mr. Coleman himself, a little before his syllogism, takes notice of so much. His words are these:

'The [Scottish] Commissioner says, 'Magistracy is not derived from Christ.' I say magistracy is given to Christ to be serviceable in his

---

<sup>129</sup> p. 21

<sup>130</sup> [Each of Coleman's premises are too broad: distinctions need to be made. Hence the conclusion that Coleman hoped to make does not follow, rather, four possible conclusions follow, which allows for Gillespie's position.]

<sup>131</sup> [Hence Coleman is equivocating. Coleman gives the phrase a meaning in the assumption that it did not have in the proposition in order to make his conclusion follow.]

Coleman's essential argument is that if the magistrate serves Christ, then the magistrate is a vicegerent of Christ. The magistrate does serve Christ (Ps. 72:11 & Isa. 60:12); therefore the magistrate is the vice-gerent of Christ. However this does not follow. See *Aaron's Rod*, ch. 7, section 2.]

<sup>132</sup> p. 42

Kingdom; so that though the Commissioner's assertion be sound (which in due place will be discussed) yet it infringes nothing that I said.'<sup>133</sup>

Now then *qua fide* [in what good-faith] could he in his argument against me confound these two things which he himself had but just now carefully distinguished? If he will make anything of his syllogism, he must hold at one of these two senses:

In the first sense, it is true that all are either for Christ or against Christ. And it is as true that his assumption must be distinguished, for *de facto* [in fact] the Christian magistrate is for Christ when he does his duty faithfully and is against Christ if he be unfaithful. But *de jure* [by principle], it holds true universally that the Christian magistrate manages his office under and for Christ, that is, so as to be serviceable for the Kingdom and glory of Christ.

In the second sense (which only concerns me [and is disputed]), taking 'under and for Christ,' to be 'in Christ's stead as his deputies or vice-gerents': so his assumption is lame and imperfect because it does not hold forth my opinion clearly. That which I did, and still do hold, is this: That the civil magistrate, whether Christian or pagan, is God's vice-gerent, who, by virtue of that vice-gerentship, is to manage his office and authority under God and for God, that is, in God's stead, and as God upon earth. But he is not the vice-gerent of Christ as Mediator, neither is he, by virtue of any such vice-gerentship, to manage his office and authority under Christ and for Christ, that is, in Christ's stead and as Christ-Mediator upon earth. This was, and is, my plain opinion (nor mine alone, but of others more learned) and Mr. Coleman has not said so much as γρυ [gry]<sup>134</sup> to confute it. So much for the assumption.

But in the same sense I utterly deny his proposition, as being a great untruth in divinity, for the sense of it can be no other than this [though not said so explicitly by

---

<sup>133</sup> p. 19

<sup>134</sup> [the smallest unit of measurement, a collection of anything of little value]

Coleman, but implicitly assumed by him]: Whosoever do not manage their office and authority in Christ's stead, or as deputies and vice-gerents of Christ as He is Mediator, they manage it in the Devil's stead, as the Devil's deputies and vice-gerents.

Now I assume: pagan magistrates do not manage their office as the deputies and vice-gerents of Jesus Christ as He is Mediator. Therefore [according to Coleman's syllogism, they do manage their office] as the Devil's deputies. Which way [then] was the authority derived to them from Christ as Mediator?<sup>135</sup> Mr. Coleman says in answer to this particular ([which was] formerly objected) that Christ is rightful King of the whole earth and all nations ought to receive Christ, though as yet they do not.<sup>136</sup> But this helps him not. That which he had to show was that the pagan magistrate, even while continuing pagan and not Christian, does manage his office as Christ's deputy and vice-gerent. If not, then I conclude by his principles that a pagan magistrate is the Devil's deputy and vice-gerent, which is contrary to Paul's doctrine, who will have us to be subject for conscience's sake even to heathen magistrates as the ministers of God for good (Rom. 13:1-7).<sup>137</sup>

By the same argument Mr. Coleman must grant that generals, admirals, majors, sheriffs, constables, captains, masters, yea, every man that has an office, is either Christ's vice-gerent or the Devil's vice-gerent. Than the which, what can be more absurd?...

---

<sup>135</sup> [That is, (according to Coleman's syllogism) pagan magistrates that do not serve Christ, serve the Devil, and hence (according to the syllogism) they are vice-gerents of the Devil. But how can pagan magistrates be vice-gerents of the Devil and derive their authority (on Coleman's view) from Christ as Christ's vice-gerents? The two notions are incompatible.]

<sup>136</sup> p. 19

<sup>137</sup> [Gillespie takes the majority view of the Reformation and puritan eras (including the Scottish covenanters), that Rom. 13, having both descriptive and prescriptive aspects, applied to the heathen magistrates at the time of the apostle's writing as valid civil governors, who were morally bound to rule according to God's Moral Law in General Revelation, and, if come under gospel light, as also revealed in Special Revelation. To see this Biblical and balanced view of Rom. 13 evidenced from that time period, see the webpage: [Against Separation from Impure Civil Governments](#). Note also Samuel Rutherford's arguments that the moral injunctions of Scripture for civil rulers, and Christian qualifications, are not necessary for the validity of a ruler's holding civil office, whether in a non-Christian or Christian land (note also [WCF 23.4](#), which teaches this), in *The Divine Right of Church Government*, pp. 547-548.]

## His Abusing of the Honorable Houses of Parliament

Most honorable Senators,

I humbly beseech you to look about you and take notice how far you are abused by Mr. Coleman:

1. While he pretends to give you more than his brethren,<sup>138</sup> he takes a great deal more from you, and (so far as in him lies) even shakes the foundation of your authority. The known tenure of magistracy is from God:<sup>139</sup> he is the minister of God for good, and the powers that are, are ordained of God, says the apostle [Rom. 13:1]. The magistrate is God's vice-gerent. But now this brother seeks a new tenure and derivation of magistracy which takes away the old. He told in his sermon:

'Christ has placed governments in his Church (1 Cor. 12:28). Of other governments beside magistracy I find no institution; of them I do (Rom. 13:1-2). I find all government given to Christ and to Christ as Mediator. I desire all to consider it: Eph. 1, the three last verses, and Christ as Head of these [authorities], given to the Church.'<sup>140</sup>

Here you have [according to Coleman] these three in subordination: God, Christ, and the Christian magistrate. God gives [at] once [at the Ascension] all government, even civil, to Christ, and to Him as Mediator.

---

<sup>138</sup> [Such as the Presbyterians, in the debates over the Church government of England.]

<sup>139</sup> [Gillespie is saying that his position was the historically accepted, obvious, generally non-disputed position of his day: magistrates exercise the authority of God and the Church ministry exercises the authority of Christ.]

<sup>140</sup> p. 27

Well, but how does it [civil authority and power] come, then, to the magistrate? Not straight by a deputation from God. Mr. Coleman's doctrine makes an interception of the power. He holds that God has put it in Christ's hands as Mediator. How then? The brother holds that Christ as Mediator has instituted and placed the Christian magistrate, yea, and no other government, in his Church. This was the ground of my answer, that he:

'must either prove from Scripture that Christ as Mediator has given such a commission of vice-gerentship and deputy-ship to the Christian magistrate, or otherwise acknowledge that he has given a most dangerous wound to magistracy and made it an empty title, claiming that power which it has no warrant to assume.'<sup>141</sup>

I added:

'As the Mediator has not anywhere given such a commission and power to the magistrate, so as Mediator He had it not to give, for He was not made a judge in civil affairs (Lk. 12:14) and his kingdom is not of this world (Jn. 18:36).'

Now, but what reply has he made to all this? He says,<sup>142</sup> granting it all to be true and sound, yet it infringes not what he said. 'The Commissioner,' says he, 'says magistracy is not derived from Christ. I say magistracy is given to Christ to be serviceable in his kingdom.' But by his good leave and favor he said a great deal more than this, for he spoke of Christ's being Head of all civil governments and his placing of these in his Church, as He is Mediator. Yea, that fourth rule delivered by him in his sermon did hold forth these assertions:

1. That God gave all government, even civil, to Christ, and to Him as Mediator.

---

<sup>141</sup> p. 42

<sup>142</sup> p. 19

2. That Christ as Mediator has power and authority to place and substitute under, and for Him, the Christian magistrate.
3. That Christ has placed and instituted civil governments in his Church to be under, and for Him, as He is Mediator.
4. That the Christian Magistrate does, and all magistrates should, manage their office under and for Christ (that is, as his vice-gerents), He being, as Mediator, Head of all civil government.

Now instead of defending his doctrine from my just exceptions made against it, he reviles; and having brought the magistrate in a snare, leaves him there. He endeavors to vindicate no more but this: that magistracy is given to Christ to be serviceable in his kingdom. But if he had said so at first, I had said with him and not against him in that point [Gillespie agrees with Coleman on this point, in a given respect]. And if he will yet hold at that, why does he refer my assertion to further discussion?<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>143</sup> p. 19

An Excerpt from

*'Male Audis, or an Answer to Mr. Coleman's 'Male Dicis''*<sup>144</sup>

1646

Chapter 4

*'Master Coleman and Master Hussey, their Errors in Divinity'*

Points 6-12

[pp. 29-35](#)

Master Hussey all along calls for [more] divinity scholars; I confess that he has much need of them that he may be better grounded in his divinity; and that if he will plead any more for Christian magistracy, he may not involve himself into such dangerous heterodoxies as have fallen from his pen in this short tractate. I instance [this] in these [examples]:

...

---

<sup>144</sup> [The Latin phrases mean 'bad hearing' and 'bad speaking' respectively. The whole sermon may be read in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*, vol. 1. The volume uses non-continuous page numbering.]

6. Sixthly, he says of Christ,<sup>145</sup> 'He does nothing as Mediator which He does not as God or as man.' It is a dangerous mistake, for, take the work of mediation itself: He neither does it as God, nor as man, but as God-man.<sup>146</sup>

7. Seventhly, he says:<sup>147</sup>

'Nothing can be said of Christ as Second Person in the Trinity in opposition to [Him as] Mediator; but in opposition to [Him as] man, there may [be said such].'

So that he will not admit of this opposition: Christ as the Second Person in the Trinity is equal and consubstantial to the Father, but as Mediator He is not equal to his Father, but less than his Father and subject and subordinate to his Father. This is a distinction used by our divines against the Anti-Trinitarians and Socinians.<sup>148</sup>

Now, by his not admitting of this distinction, he does by consequence mire himself in Socinianism, for Christ as Mediator is the Father's servant (Isa 42:1), and the Father is greater than He (John 14:28), and as the head of the man is Christ, so the head of Christ is God (1 Cor. 11:3). If therefore it cannot be said of Christ as He is the Second Person in the Trinity, that his Father is not greater than He, and that He is not subordinate to God as his head, then farewell Anti-Socinianism.

I dare boldly say: it is impossible to confute the Socinians or to assert the eternal Godhead of Jesus Christ, except somewhat be affirmed of Him as the Second Person of the Trinity which must be denied of Him as He is Mediator, and something be denied of

---

<sup>145</sup> p. 40

<sup>146</sup> [Gillespie is saying that Christ's work of mediation is done by both his human and divine natures, not by one or the other exclusively. Coleman, from Gillespie's quote, appears to have said, or implied, that Christ's work of mediation is done by one or the other nature only.]

<sup>147</sup> p. 35

<sup>148</sup> [Socinians, also Anti-Trinitarians, argued from Christ's work as Mediator that he was less than God in his person and being, from verses like 'The Father is greater than I.' (Jn. 14:28)]

Him as He is the Second Person in the Trinity, which must be affirmed of Him as He is the Mediator.

8. Eighthly, he says<sup>149</sup> that Christ:

‘by his mediation, has obtained from the Father that He shall not judge any man according to rigor, but [to judge them] as they are in or out of Christ; all deferring of judgment from the wicked is ‘in and for Christ’, which otherwise the justice of God would not allow.’<sup>150</sup>

Then Christ did thus far make satisfaction to the justice of God in the behalf of the wicked, and die for them, that judgment might be deferred from them, and thus far perform acts of mediation for the savages and Mahumetans,<sup>151</sup> and for them that never heard the Gospel, that by such mediation He has obtained of the Father that they shall be judged not according to rigor, but by the Gospel, which intimates that Christ has taken away all their sins against the Law, so that all men shall now go upon a new score and none shall be condemned or judged by the Law, but by the Gospel only. For if Christ have not taken away their sins against the Law, the justice of God will judge them according to the rigor of the Law. Must not every jot of the Law be fulfilled? And is there not a necessity that everyone under-take the curse and rigor of the Law, or else that the Mediator has under-taken it for them?

9. Ninthly, he propounds this query:<sup>152</sup> ‘Whether ministers have any right to those privileges which are given to the Church, more than another Christian?’ And he holds

---

<sup>149</sup> p. 36

<sup>150</sup> [Hussey is saying that the deferral of judgment that unbelievers experience in this life (which otherwise would not be allowed by God’s strict justice) is due to Christ’s mediation for them, most likely due to their being in his universal Mediatorial Kingdom. Gillespie replies that a universal mediation implies a universal atonement, as justice, according to the rigor of the Law, must be paid in one way or another. A universal atonement is unacceptable to Gillespie.]

<sup>151</sup> [Muslims]

<sup>152</sup> p. 44

the negative. Now the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments and the power of the Keys are privileges given to the Church, that is, for the Church's good, 'for all things are yours,' says the apostle, 'whether Paul, or Apollo, etc.' (1 Cor. 3:21-22). Therefore by Mr. Hussey's divinity, any other Christian has as much right to administer the Word, Sacraments, Keys, as does the minister.

Come on now to Mr. Coleman's errors in divinity, not to repeat what was expressed in my '*Nihil Respondes*', but to take off the '*Male Dicis*' in the main points:

10. The tenth heterodoxy shall therefore be this, that whatsoever is given to Christ, He has it not as the eternal Son of God. Into this ditch did Mr. Coleman first fall, and then Mr. Hussey after him.<sup>153</sup> I said this tenet leads to a blasphemous heresy.<sup>154</sup>

For the better understanding whereof, let it be remembered what I did premise in my '*Nihil Respondes*'<sup>155</sup> in reply to his proposition, 'That which is given to Christ, He has it not as God.' 'This,' said I, 'is in opposition to what I said concerning the headship and dignity of Christ as the natural Son of God, the image of the invisible God (Col. 1:15)' and, 'of the dominion of Christ, as He is the eternal Son of God. This being premised, etc.'<sup>156</sup> Mr. Coleman, without taking the least notice of that which I did

---

<sup>153</sup> p. 25

<sup>154</sup> [Throughout this section Gillespie has in view the accepted orthodox distinction between Christ's essence as God (the same in substance with the Father and the Holy Spirit, in his attributes of aseity, omnipotence, omniscience, etc.) and Christ's person, that is, those qualities that distinguish Him from the Father and Holy Spirit as a distinct person. Orthodox Christianity has always affirmed that God essentially can never be given anything, because He is complete in and of Himself, and is the source of all things to be given. Gillespie, however, from the beginning of the dispute, was not speaking of Christ essentially as God being given anything, but only with reference to his distinct person as the Eternal Son, whereby He is begotten of the Father, and in this way has his omnipotence communicated, or given, from, the Father. Hussey mistook Gillespie's clear language of Christ's person as the Eternal Son for Christ considered essentially as God. If one denies that Christ in his person can be given anything as the Eternal Son, then one denies his begottenness of the Father, which is a 'blasphemous heresy' destructive of the Trinity.]

<sup>155</sup> p. 11

<sup>156</sup> p. 45,43

purposely and plainly premise, begins to speak of God essentially, and that if something may be given to Christ as God, then something may be given to God, and then God is not absolutely perfect, etc.<sup>157</sup> Thus he turns over to the essence and nature of God what I spoke of the Second Person in the Trinity, or of Christ as He is the eternal Son of God.

Was not the question between him and me whether the Kingdom and dominion over all things may be said to be given to Christ as He is the eternal Son of God? This is the point which he did argue against, because it takes off his argument that was first brought to prove that all government, even civil, is given to Christ as He is Mediator. And still from the beginning I spoke of Christ as the Second Person in the Trinity, or the eternal Son of God. Thus, therefore the case stands.

The reverend brother, to prove that a universal sovereignty and government over all things is given to Christ as He is Mediator, and to confute my assertion that it is given to Christ as He is the eternal Son of God, does frame this argument against me: 'That which is given to Christ, He has it not as God. But here dignity is given to Christ. Therefore [Christ is] not here to be taken as God.' Here there is more in the conclusion than in the premises, for the conclusion which naturally follows had been this: Therefore Christ does not here have dignity as God. It seems he was ashamed of the conclusion, yet not of the premises which infer the conclusion.

But this, by the way, I speak to his proposition ('That which is given to Christ, He has it not as God'): these words, 'as God', either he understands οὐσιῶδως, 'essentially', or ἐπιστατικώς, 'personally', that is, either in regard of the nature and essence of God, which is common to the Son of God with the Father and the Holy Ghost, and in respect whereof those three are one, or in regard of the person of the Word, as Christ is the Second Person in the Trinity and personally distinct from the Father and the Holy Ghost.

---

<sup>157</sup> *'Male Dicit'*, p. 13-14

If [he takes it] in the former sense, then He must lay aside his whole argument as utterly impertinent and making nothing at all against my thesis which affirmed that a universal dominion and Kingdom over all things is given to Christ not as He is Mediator (in which capacity He is only the King of the Church), but as He is the Eternal Son of God. In the opposing of which assertion, as the reverend brother was before *nihil respondens* [not responding], so now he is twice not [responding].

But if in the other sense he understands his proposition (which I must needs suppose he does, it being in opposition to what I said), then I still aver his proposition will infer a blasphemous heresy (as I proved before by a clear demonstration):

[Major] That which is given to Christ, He has it not as God.

[Minor] But life, glory, etc., is given to Christ [Jn. 5:26; 16:14; 17:1,5, etc.].

[Conclusion] Therefore, Christ has not life, glory, etc., as God.

The reverend brother says, 'I acknowledge the conclusion [to be] unsound, and I deny not but that the major [premise] is mine own, and the minor is the very Scripture.' Yet he denies the conclusion and clears himself by this simile:

'That which was given this poor man, he had not before. But a shilling was given this poor man; therefore, he had not a shilling before. Where both propositions are true, yet the conclusion is false [as a man may have had a shilling before he was given another shilling], being contrary to the axiom, *ex veris nil nisi verum* [from the truth comes nothing but the truth].'

You are extremely out sir. Your syllogism of the poor man is *fallacia ab amphibolia* [a fallacy from ambiguity]. The major of it is ambiguous, dubious, and fallacious, and cannot be admitted without a distinction.

But here you acknowledge the major [premise] of my argument [above against Coleman] to be your own, and so not fallacious in your opinion. You acknowledge the minor [premise] to be Scripture. You have not found four terms in my premises, nor

charged my major or minor with the least fault in matter or form, and yet forsooth you deny the conclusion and do not admit that uncontrovertible maxim in logic, *ex veris nisi nisi verum* [from the truth comes nothing but the truth], or as [Bartholomew] Kekerman [†1608] has it: 'It is impossible that a false conclusion should be gathered from true premises.'<sup>158</sup>

Now let us hear what he would say against my conclusion ['Therefore, Christ has not life, glory, etc., as God']: it is concerning the sense of the word 'has'. 'For has,' says he, 'by me [Coleman] is used for receiving, or having by virtue of the gift, but by him [Gillespie], for having fundamentally, originally.'

You are still out sir. I take it just as you take it: for though the Son of God as God essentially, or in respect of the nature and essence of God which is common to all three Persons in the blessed Trinity, has originally of Himself a Kingdom and dominion over all, yet as He is the Second Person in the Trinity, begotten of and distinct from the Father, He has the Kingdom and dominion over all, not of Himself, but by virtue of the gift of his Father. So that the reverend brother is still *nihil respondens* [not responding], and therefore he shall be concluded in this syllogism:

[Assumption] He who holds that whatsoever is given to Christ, he has it not by virtue of the gift as He is the eternal Son of God, or the Second Person of the Trinity, but only as Mediator,

[Consequence] he holds by consequence that Christ has not glory by virtue of his Father's gift as He is the eternal Son of God or the Second Person of the Trinity.

[Conclusion] But Master Coleman holds the former; therefore, Master Coleman holds the latter.

---

<sup>158</sup> 'Ex veris praemissis falsam conclusionem colligi est impossibile.'

The consequence in the proposition is proved from John 17:22, 'The glory which Thou gavest Me.' The assumption he will own, or else quit his argument against my distinction of the double Kingdom given to Christ, as the eternal Son of God and as Mediator.

The conclusion which follows is heretical: for whereas the Nicene Creed [A.D. 325] said that Christ, in regard of his eternal generation, is *Deus de Deo, Lumen de Lumine*, 'God of God, Light of Light', Master Coleman's argument will infer that He is not only *ex seipso Deus* [of Himself God], but *ex seipso filius* [of Himself the Son], and so deny the eternal generation of the Son of God and the communication of the Godhead, and the sovereignty, glory, and attributes thereof from the Father to the Son. For if Christ, as He is the eternal Son of God, has not glory by virtue of his Father's gift, then He has it not by virtue of the eternal generation and communication, but [this would make the glory] fundamentally and originally of Himself [which is wrong].

As for the other branch of Master Coleman's argument, tending to prove that Christ, as He is the eternal Son of God, cannot be given (which he endeavors to vindicate),<sup>159</sup> I answer these two things:

First, granting all that he says: he concludes nothing against me. For I did from the beginning expound those words, 'And gave Him to be the Head over all things to the Church' (Eph. 1:22), in this sense: that Christ as Mediator is given only to the Church, to be her head, but He that is given as Mediator to the Church, is over all. So that the giving of Christ there spoken of, is as Mediator, and He is given to the Church only, which I cleared by the Syriac [version]: 'And Him who is over all, He gave to be the Head to the Church.' But his being over all, there spoken of, if understood of glory, dignity, excellency over all, so Christ is over all as Mediator (yea, in regard of the exaltation of his human nature), but

---

<sup>159</sup> p. 14-15

this does not help Master Coleman, who intends to prove from that place that all government, even civil, is given to Christ as Mediator. But if [Eph. 1:22 be] understood of a Kingdom and government over all, so He is over all as He is the eternal Son of God, or Second Person of the Trinity, and not as Mediator.

Secondly, the question which the reverend brother falls upon concerning the personal inhabitation of the Holy Ghost, will never follow from anything which I said, more than God's giving of his Son to us will infer a personal inhabitation of the Son of God in us. That which I said was to this intent: That both the Son of God and the Holy Ghost are given, not as God essentially, that is, in respect of the Godhead itself, or as they are one in nature with the Father (for so the Father that gives, and the Holy Ghost which is given, could not be distinguished) but the Son is given as the Son proceeding from the Father, and the Holy Ghost is given as the Holy Ghost proceeding and sent from the Father and the Son. Whether He be given to dwell personally in us, or by his gracious operations only, is another question which has nothing to do with the present argument, and therefore I will not be led out of my way.

11. The eleventh heterodoxy is this: 'I see an absurdity to hold that every man in authority is either Christ's vice-gerent or the *Devilo maledicis* [Devil's evil spokesman, vice-gerent].'<sup>160</sup>

Here I make this inference [from Coleman's premises]. Heathen and infidel magistrates are either:

---

<sup>160</sup> p. 16

1. Not men in authority,
2. [are] Christ's vice-gerents, or are
3. The Devil's *Maledicis*.

If he say [1.] they are not men in authority, he shall contradict the apostle Paul who calls them 'higher powers' (Rom. 13:1) and men in activity (1 Tim. 2:2), speaking in reference even to the magistrates of that time, which were infidels.<sup>161</sup>

If he say [2.] they are Christ's vice-gerents, then:

1. I must say that Christ as Mediator reigns without<sup>162</sup> the Church, and is a King to those to whom He is neither Priest nor Prophet.
2. He must find a commission given by Christ to the infidel magistrate.
3. Whom in authority will he make to be the Devil's vice-gerents, if infidel magistrates be Christ's vice-gerents?

If he say that [3.] they are the Devil's vice-gerents, then it follows:

1. That they who resist the Devil's vice-gerent, resist the ordinance of God [which is absurd]; for they that resist an infidel magistrate and do not submit to his lawful authority (which his infidelity takes not away) is said to 'resist the ordinance of God.' (Rom. 13:2)

---

<sup>161</sup> [Gillespie takes the majority view of the Reformation and puritan eras (including the Scottish covenanters), that Rom. 13, having both descriptive and prescriptive aspects, applied to the heathen magistrates at the time of the apostle's writing as valid civil governors, who were morally bound to rule according to God's Moral Law in General Revelation, and, if come under gospel light, as also revealed in Special Revelation. To see this Biblical and balanced view of Rom. 13 evidenced from that time period, see the webpage: [Against Separation from Impure Civil Governments](#). Note also Samuel Rutherford's arguments that the moral injunctions of Scripture for civil rulers, and Christian qualifications, are not necessary for the validity of a ruler's holding civil office, whether in a non-Christian or Christian land (note also [WCF 23.4](#), which teaches this), in *The Divine Right of Church Government*, pp. 547-548.]

<sup>162</sup> [outside the limits of]

2. That the apostle Paul bade pray for the Devil's vice-gerent (1 Tim. 2:1-2) [which is absurd].

The reverend brother does but more and more wind himself into a labyrinth of errors while he endeavors to take away the distinction of the two-fold Kingdom, and the two-fold vice-gerentship of God and of Christ.

12. The twelfth heterodoxy follows: 'Now, it is true that Christ, being God as well as man, has of Himself, originally as God, whatsoever He has by virtue of gift as Mediator.'<sup>163</sup>

Now, subsume [to this premise that] Christ has, by virtue of gift as Mediator, the Priestly office. Therefore, by Master Coleman's principles, Christ has of Himself, originally as God, the Priestly office. And if Christ has it of Himself originally as God, then the Father and the Holy Ghost have it also; so that by his doctrine the Father and the Holy Ghost shall be the Priests of the Church as well as Christ, for Christ has nothing of Himself originally as God [according to Coleman] which the Father and the Holy Ghost have not likewise.

The End

---

<sup>163</sup> *'Male Dicit'*, p. 13