

An Historical-Theological Disputation on the Nestorian Heresy

WHICH

BY DIVINE GRACE, WITH THE CONSENT OF THE VENERABLE THEOLOGICAL
FACULTY IN THE ELECTORAL ACADEMY,

UNDER THE PRESIDENCY OF THE

MOST REVEREND, MOST DISTINGUISHED, AND MOST EXCELLENT GENTLEMAN,

MR. JOHANNES SIMONIS,

DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY, AND MOST CELEBRATED
PUBLIC PROFESSOR ORDINARY OF THE SAME,

HIS PATRON AND PRECEPTOR,

WITH ALL DEVOTION AND RESPECT,

ON THE DAY OF FEBRUARY, IN THE YEAR OF OUR REDEMPTION 1683,

THE AUTHOR,

BARTHOLDUS HOLZFUSS,

OF RÜGENWALDE IN POMERANIA,

PROPOSES FOR PUBLIC DEBATE.

FRANKFURT AN DER ODER,

PRINTED BY CHRISTOPHER ZEITLER.

Chapter I. Preliminary

§. I.

It has been the solemn custom, at all times, of the slaves of the devil to assail the Christian name with various and most grievous calumnies, by which very act they have testified that they are the genuine children of the devil, which name in Greek signifies calumniator, for he was a murderer from the beginning and has not stood in the truth: when he speaks a lie, he speaks from his own resources, for he is a liar and the father of it, as our Savior testifies in John 8:44. That Nero set fire to Rome can be proven by the common account of all historians, even pagans. Thus Suetonius in his life of Nero, chapter 18: "But he spared neither the people nor the walls of his country. When someone in a common conversation said, 'When I am dead, let the earth be mixed with fire,' he replied, 'No, while I am alive,' and he did so. For as if offended by the ugliness of the old buildings and the narrow, winding streets, he set fire to the city so openly that many consulars did not touch his chamberlains, though they were found with tow and torches in their own properties."

Nevertheless, since Nero had brought great odium upon himself by this deed, in order to shift that crime from himself, that nefarious act was transferred to the Christians, who were deemed worthy of that name, who endured a most grievous and cruel persecution, which is clear to the attentive reader from the fifteenth book of the Annals of Tacitus, likewise a pagan man. For thus he says: "Therefore, to abolish the rumor, Nero substituted as culprits, and punished with the most exquisite penalties, those whom the populace, hated for their shameful acts, called Christians." The author of that name, Christ, had been executed during the reign of Tiberio by the procurator Pontius Pilate. The pernicious superstition, suppressed for the present, broke out again, not only through Judea, the origin of that evil, but also through the city, where all atrocious or shameful things from everywhere converge and are celebrated. Therefore, first those who confessed were seized, then on their information a vast multitude was convicted, not so much of the crime of arson as of hatred of the human race.

§. II.

That they were commonly held by the gentiles as atheists who were plainly touched by no care for divine matters, and that the cause of earthquakes and of all other evils which at that time afflicted the human race was transferred to the innocent Christians, is evident from other sources, but especially from the Edict of Antoninus promulgated for the Christians, which is appended to the Apology of Justin and translated into the Latin language by Johannes Langus, and reads thus: "Indeed, I would think that it is a concern to the gods themselves that such men should not lie hidden; for they, if they could, would much rather take vengeance on those who refuse to worship them, against whom you yourselves stir up tumult and slander their opinion as impious and of no gods, and you bring other charges which you cannot prove. It would certainly be more convenient

for them if they were seen to suffer death for that of which they are accused. And they conquer you, rather casting away their own lives than obeying what you demand. But concerning the earthquakes which have been before or still are, it has seemed not unjust to us to admonish you, who lose heart when they occur, comparing their affairs with yours, since they are far more free and confident toward God than you. And you indeed seem to be ignorant of the gods at that time, and you forget the sacred rites, and you do not hold to the worship of God. Wherefore you also envy those who worship him with emulation, and you persecute them even to death. Concerning matters of this kind, certain other rulers of the provinces have also written to my most divine Father. To whom he wrote back that no trouble should be caused to such men, unless they were found to be plotting something against the Roman Empire. Indeed, many have sent me letters about them, to which I have responded according to the opinion of my Father, which I have thought worthy of imitation: If anyone, having an action against any such person, accuses him merely as such a man, the accused shall indeed be absolved from the crime, even if he appears to be such a person: but the accuser himself shall pay the penalty by judgment.”

§. III.

The fable which is circulated about Thyestes is well known, namely that when he could not harm his brother Atreus through dissension, he returned to a feigned state of grace with him, on which occasion Thyestes lay with his brother's wife; Atreus, however, served him his son to eat, which the sun, abominating, fled so as not to be polluted. Oedipus, on the other hand, they say, killed his father Laius through ignorance, and married his mother Jocasta. That these most terrible crimes, than which Satan never brought forth anything fouler from Orcus, were charged against the most holy men, the Christian Gauls make credible in their epistle in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, book V, at the beginning, where these words of theirs occur: "At the same time certain Gentiles, our slaves, were also captured (for the governor had ordered that we all be sought publicly), who, overcome by the wiles of Satan, and fearing the tortures which they had seen the saints endure, the soldiers also instigating them to this, invented against us Thyestean banquets and Oedipodean incests, and other things which it is not lawful for us to speak or to think, nay, not even to believe that such a thing was ever done by men." Athenagoras has similar things in his Oration for the Christians: "The Gentiles dare to invent detestable feasts and incestuous unions concerning us, partly, lest they seem to be hostile to us rashly; partly because they think that either we, struck with fear, may be drawn away from our profession, or that the minds of the princes may be stirred up and exasperated against us on account of the magnitude of the crimes." Hence the necessity was imposed upon the doctors of the early Church, whom it is customary to call Fathers—Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Quadratus, Aristides, Origen, Arnobius, Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, Theophilus of Antioch, Melito of Sardis—to compose so many apologies for the Christian religion. See our most celebrated Hottinger, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Part 1, section or Chapter II, p. 50 ff., where he derives the source of this evil from the fact

that they confused the Gnostics with the true Christians (concerning whose dogmas and morals the blessed Maresius, Vol. II of Selected Disputations, p. 646, can be consulted), the Carpocratians, and others who falsely bore the Christian name, being devoted to crimes and outrages. Cf. *ibid.* p. circ. fin. And indeed, with these calumnies, which we have thus far reviewed, the Devil has attacked the Christian name through open enemies.

§. IV.

He attempted the same, as it were through underground passages, by means of heretics, the degenerate sons of the Church, who at all times have set their minds to this task, to attribute the most pernicious heresies to the Catholics; but to their own perverse opinions, diametrically opposed to the sacred scriptures, they have given specious titles, which is clear even to those who have only glanced at their writings, from the controversies alone which arose between the ancient Catholics and the Pelagians and Semipelagians, and in our times with the Socinians. Thus, from the fact that the Catholics taught from the sacred scriptures that human nature was infected with original sin through the fall of the first parents, the Pelagians concluded that the Catholics thought with the Manichaeans, who believe that nature is evil and do not confess that man is the work of God.

They also calumniated that the Catholics, through this dogma of theirs, condemned marriage, and in this respect also revived the ancient heresy of Manes; that through the grace of Baptism, according to the opinion of the Orthodox, crimes were not taken away, but shaved off, nor was a full remission of sins obtained; that God, the thrice-greatest and best, was accused of iniquity, who remits his own sins, but imputes the sins of others; that the doctrine of the corruption of nature causes us, despairing of perfection, to become sluggish in the course of piety. Augustine, who defended grace more animatedly and strongly than anyone, both adduces and refutes each of these points scattered elsewhere, and gathers them as if into one bundle at the beginning of his second book against Julian: "You say," he says, "that by asserting original sin, we say that the devil is the creator of newborn men, we condemn marriage, we deny that all sins are remitted in Baptism, we accuse God of the crime of iniquity, we instill despair of perfection." On the contrary, the Pelagians, by denying original sin, wished to be considered patrons of nature and of marriage. In the same way, when they took away the necessity of grace and introduced sinlessness, they said that they praised the Law, Free Will, and the saints. That is, in order that they might offer the poison of their opinions to the unwary in a golden cup of Babylon, they concealed their dogmas, which are hostile to the truth, with the praise of these five excellent things: Nature, Marriage, the Law, Free Will, and the Saints, as Augustine writes in his fourth book against the two epistles of the Pelagians, chapters 1 and 11, where among other things he says: "Whatever they say in praise of the creature and of marriage, they try to refer to this, that there may be no original sin; whatever they say in praise of the Law and of free will, to this, that grace may not help unless it is a merit, and thus grace is no longer grace; whatever they say in

praise of the Saints, to this, that the mortal life in the saints may be seen to have no sin, nor is it necessary for them to pray to God for the remission of their debts." See these things pursued more fully by our most distinguished Gerhard Johann Vossius, *Historia Pelagiana*, Book II, Part II, Thesis V ff., p. 197 ff., and *Theological and Historical Theses*, Disputation XXVIII, Thesis I ff., p. 418 ff.

§. V.

Not only, however, did the Pelagians reproach the Catholics with Manichaeism, but also with Epicureanism and the Stoic Fate, which the most excellent Dr. D. Buchius proves with very many passages adduced for this purpose in his most learned treatise, to which he gave the title: *Fabula Haereseos Praedestinatorum* (The Fable of the Heresy of the Predestinarians). From which it is sufficient to have alleged these: Concerning Epicureanism indeed the words of Augustine, book 3 against Julian, chapter XXI, where he says: "But it is ridiculous that you say I, following the ways of Epicurus, cut all the reins with which desires are restrained." But concerning the Stoic Fate, the words of the eighteen Pelagian bishops themselves, cited by the afore-mentioned author, deserve to be noted: "Under the name of Grace," they say, "they assert fate in such a way as to say that unless God has inspired in an unwilling and reluctant man the desire for good, and that imperfect, he could neither decline from evil nor attain good." These words are so familiar to what the modern Lutherans (for the older ones agree with us in this part) bring forth against the Irresistible Grace with which, according to the opinion of the Reformed, men are endowed in conversion, that an egg cannot be more like an egg, whence it is also easily concluded what arms they use and in whose company they rejoice, who, having proscribed Infallible or Irresistible Grace, propose only an indifferent one.

Indeed, we do not doubt at all that a man endowed with Prevenient Grace irresistibly can resist Preparing Grace, by which he obtains the power to believe, so that he elicits the act of believing resistibly and freely, that is, so that he can not exercise the same. But in conversion properly so called, or operating grace, as it is called by theologians, man behaves merely passively and exerts no act of free will, and therefore this grace is conferred on him irresistibly. For that a man can spurn and reject divine grace (these are the words of the most celebrated theologians of Leiden in their Censure against the Arminians, chapter 17) and resist its operation, we willingly grant, and therefore there is no need to prove it so laboriously. For whether we consider the external grace of the Gospel, which is called the ministry of the Spirit, 2 Corinthians 3, or also the internal operations of the Holy Spirit, by which he convinces the mind of man of the truth of the Gospel and of his own duty; we confess that man can resist the operation of this grace, and therefore can render himself unfit to believe and to obey the divine will when he is divinely called to faith and obedience, and that through his own fault, and that a true fault, and vincible by the same grace, if the man did not hold that grace in unrighteousness, which all men, however, left to themselves, do, as the Apostle testifies in Romans 1:18 and 3:9 ff. But it does not follow from this that there is not some peculiar

grace, administered either by the wisdom of God or by his power, which the man who is called by it never resists. But these things are by the way, and on the occasion of the Pelagian calumny spewed against the Catholics.

§. VI.

The same fate was experienced by the Waldenses, evangelical Christians, who for more than four hundred years before the great men Zwingli and Luther, and indeed, as they frequently write that their own have reported, from the time of the Apostles (whence their origin is wrongly traced to Peter Waldo, who rather came to them than preceded them), have constantly persevered in the valleys of the Alps by a singular divine Providence in the same religion as the Reformed Churches, and agree with them in all things in faith, discipline, and worship, not even excepting the article concerning the Holy Supper. For thus they themselves, in their letters to Benedict, thus they greet him, a man, John Oecolampadius, open their mind about this dogma: "We also believe that the sacraments are only signs of a sacred thing or a visible form of invisible grace, and that it is good for the faithful to use such signs and forms sometimes, if it can be done, holding, however, that they can be saved without such signs and forms." (in Abraham Scultetus, *Annales Evangelici*, Part II, Year 1530). See also concerning this article their Confession from the year 1120, Article 12, in Jean Leger, *Histoire des Vaudois*, L. 1, C. 17. These Waldenses or Albigenses (for although they are not only placed distinctly by the Papists, but also by some Evangelicals, and their dogmas are also reviewed separately, they are nevertheless the same, differing only in the region of their land, so that it is a wonder that Micraelius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, p. 761, and Kromayer, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Cent. 13, p. 100, have included the Albigenses in the census of heretics) were exposed to various calumnies of their adversaries.

For not only were they marked with calumnious names, for example, they were called Sicardi, a name which denotes cutpurses or bag-carriers; in Flanders, Turlupins, because inhabiting inhospitable and rough places, they seemed to have turned into wolves. In Germany, Gazari, a word which is believed to have formerly designated scoundrels and wicked men, whence the modern Kätzer has its origin. Others, however, prefer to derive it from the Greek word Cathari, καθαροι, as if you were to say Puritans, because they aimed at purity of doctrine and morals; others from the schismatic Novatians, who were also called Cathari. They were called Cagnardi in the Dauphiné, by which old name the French mean the lazy and sluggish; Ribaldi or Ribaux, that is, impure fornicators, who rush into Venus with full impetus. Indeed, you may see them not rarely greeted as Manichaeans, Gnostics, Arians, Adamites, etc., from whose errors they were nevertheless most alien, with the intention that the minds of all might be the more stirred up against them to extirpate the heresies condemned by the common suffrage of the Church. They were called Leonists either from the city of Lyon, which among the French is called Lion; or, which is the conjecture of Thuanus, from Leo the Isaurian, the Iconoclast Emperor, because they taught that images and their worship were prohibited by divine law. And they were called Insabbatharii or Insabbathe, either because they

wore wooden shoes, which the French call sabots, or because they wished only the Sabbath or the Lord's Day, rejecting the feast days of the Papists, to be sacred. But their doctrine itself could not be immune from calumnies, which you can read and see refuted in the learned work of our Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, on the succession of doctrine in the Church; also in Hottinger, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, part III, section or chapter XII, pp. 276-298. Compare also Maresius, Vol. II of Selected Disputations, where he has two disputations on the Waldenses, with a Waldensian responding in each, pp. 584 ff. Reinerius himself, a Papal Inquisitor throughout Lombardy, or a censor of those who were considered heretics, who flourished in the year of our Lord 1254, abundantly refutes these monstrous calumnies, when in his book against the Waldenses, chapter 4, he says: "Among all the sects that still exist or have existed, there is none more pernicious to the Church (he means the Papist Church) than that of the Leonists. And this for three reasons: The first is that it is of long duration; for some say that it has lasted from the time of Sylvester, others from the time of the Apostles. The second is that it is more general; for there is almost no land in which this sect is not found. The third is that while all other sects, by the monstrosity of their blasphemies against God, induce horror in their hearers; this one, namely that of the Leonists, has a great appearance of piety, because they live justly before men and believe all things well of God, and all the articles that are contained in the creed: only they blaspheme the Roman Church and the clergy, which the multitude of the laity is easy to believe."

§. VII.

But the same story is being played out today: why then do we seek examples from afar and from past centuries, when we ourselves have plenty of slanderers at home and in this very age? Indeed, the Reformed Christian Church today counts almost as many slanderers as not only the Papists, from whom it is no wonder that we are burdened with calumnies, since they seem to have declared open war on the Truth, but also those doctors have them, whom we are not ashamed to have as brethren, and who strive to claim for themselves the name of Evangelicals above the rest, although by slandering they show themselves to be anything but evangelical. James 3:13 to the end. Now the Calvinist Despairer is brought onto the stage (I meant to say, the pulpit), not without an omen, perhaps so that the fraud may be less apparent. For since the author lacked valid arguments with which to establish his thesis, it was altogether advisable that he should conduct the matter with rhetorical bombast and sesquipedalian words, so that by speaking he might render probable a thing manifestly false and worthy of being inserted into Rollenhagen's *True Lies*. For who would have faith in the author of this fiction, who adduces not a single historian of good faith and not carried away by partisan zeal, let alone the annals of the nation itself? But let us grant that it happened so. Does not he himself, of whom the fable is told, confess that he has committed the sin against the Holy Spirit? Does he not, however, proclaim the doctrine of Augustine and Calvin on predestination not only to be true, but also is he not an authority for all to embrace it? Finally, George Major himself, if the story had been true, would have cut down his own

vineyards, since he held the same opinion that the author here attacks, which is certain not only from his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, but also from that very place where those things are brought forward, where he only inculcates that that doctrine is to be treated not by the synthetic but by the analytic method. Now we are compared with the false apostles themselves, nay, with the Turks, indeed we are said to be worse than devils! Who, seeing those titles alone, would not be completely horrified? Would not the blessed Joseph Scaliger, if he were alive, rightly demand modesty in these German theologians? among whom he is persuaded that no minds are more ready to speak ill than those which are most horrid and rustic. Would not the same man rightly ask: How many monstrosities of Teutonic writers are produced? Who in the rest of Europe has seen more or more petulant arguments of impotent minds than those mottoes of books, partly in the German language, partly in Latin, but conceived by German Furies? Who is so depraved as to demand to waste good hours in reading (I add, in refuting) them? Who would blame him who, with the same man, at the sight of such revilings, would exclaim: God grant me better things than that, leaving other studies, I should spend even one moment of time on them! Is there such great wrath in celestial minds? But Satan does this, seeing the most exact agreement of our Christian religion with the sacred scriptures, he instills in those theologians a Vatinian hatred against us, so that, because they are not equal to refuting the manifest Truth, they may at least become superior by slandering and may frighten men away from our religion by their calumnies.

§. VIII.

We are daily accused of denying universal grace and divine Φιλανθρωπία (love for mankind), and that so boldly and without any shame, as if those men had it more certainly explored what we believe than we ourselves. But the matter is well: he who denies election from foreseen faith, of which there is neither trace nor vestige in sacred scripture, is not immediately to be considered as denying universal divine Φιλανθρωπία, on the contrary, he makes grace particular, special, abundant, proper to the elect alone, and sometimes also teaches, in the administration of divine grace, that the inscrutable judgments of God intervene with the sacred scriptures. Indeed, that this too is a calumny, our Confessions, all of them to a one, declare in set terms. But the Reverend Fathers of the Synod of Dort wish that the opinion concerning divine grace be sought from the Confessions, not from the private doctors of the Reformed Church. Therefore, this Synod of Dordrecht adjures, by the name of the Lord, all who piously invoke the name of our Savior Jesus Christ, that they judge of the faith of the Reformed Churches not from calumnies heaped up from here and there, nor even from the private sayings of some, both ancient and recent, doctors, often either cited in bad faith or corrupted or twisted into a different sense; but from the public Confessions of the churches themselves, and from this declaration of orthodox doctrine, confirmed by the unanimous consent of all and every one of the members of the entire Synod. (Acts of the Synod, p. 376). Just as, therefore, all our Confessions say with one voice that Christ

suffered for the entire human race, not only because his λύτρον (ransom) was sufficient to redeem the whole human race, but because the intention of God the Father, in sending God the Son, and of the Son, in undergoing death, was to redeem the whole human race: for which opinion it will suffice for the present to have alleged the *Brief, Popular, and Founded on the Word of God Confession* of the theologians of Heidelberg and Neustadt, first printed in German in the year 1562 at Heidelberg, afterwards several times in the year 1601 at Herborn, which testifies that the Reformed believe concerning the death of Christ: that the death of Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, as John says, that is, not only for the sins of the elect to whom he was writing, but also for all other men who will live in the whole world until its end, etc. And the Heidelberg Catechism, which to the question: "What do you believe when you say: 'He suffered'?" answers: "That Christ, during the whole time of his life which he spent on earth, but especially at the end of it, sustained in body and soul the wrath of God against the sins of the entire human race, so that by his passion, as the one and only propitiatory sacrifice, he might deliver our body and soul from eternal damnation, and obtain for us the grace of God, righteousness, and eternal life." Thus, the *Refutation of the Golden Ladder* from the year 1592 does not permit us to doubt that the Palatinate theologians understood our Confessions, in which they speak thus on page 13: "whence it is apparent that the question does not properly turn on whether Christ died for all men, but rather, in what way and sense Christ died and did not die, and therefore that an injustice is done to us by these theologians, before God and the whole world, when we are accused of this capital error (that we say Christ did not die for all men)." The same, on page 14: "Just as, therefore, the Gospel teaches and experience proves, that Christ died for all: so also it was the will and purpose of the heavenly Father, and his very own, that he should die for all; for what Christ did, without any doubt it was his will that he should do it, and do it as he did: Now from his revealed word it is clear that he indeed died for all in common as to the sufficiency and perfection of his merit and sacrifice, as also the universal call and invitation to the faithful acceptance of the same; but especially for all believers and the elect as to the application, efficacy, and fruit of his death, etc."

That this is the meaning of our Confessions was also certain to the great Reformed theologian, Ludovicus Crocius, Professor and Pastor of Bremen, who was present at the Synod of Dort; for this reason he believes that a great injustice is done to the Reformed Churches before God and the whole world if they are accused of this error, that they deny that Christ died for all men: and that those who teach otherwise defend not the catholic confession of our church, but a private opinion. *Dyodecas Dissertationum Exegeticarum & Apologeticarum Syntagmatis S. Theologiae Dissert. XI. De Gratia Redemptionis* §. 2. p. 610.

XI.

Indeed, those very theologians of ours who more strongly urge the special grace of the elect, hold this opinion as orthodox, among whom I can praise for the present the most distinguished Henricus Altingius, a theologian first of Heidelberg, but afterwards of

Groningen, who was also a most noble member of the Synod of Dort. He, in his *Scripta Theologica Heidelbergensia*, Tom. II, Problemate 42, p. 174 ff., writes that the Reformed theologians use this distinction: Christ died for all and every one sufficiently, but for the elect effectively: to reconcile the scriptures, and to repel the calumny of the adversaries, as if the fault of the destruction of the reprobate resides in God or in Christ. And indeed, they use it in two ways: Absolutely and in itself: that the ransom of Christ, considered in itself and esteemed from its own dignity, is far more than sufficient for all and every man; Relatively, as to the counsel of God and the scope and intention of the dying Christ, that God willed that Christ should die sufficiently for all and every one; and Christ underwent death for this purpose, that it might be a most sufficient price for all and every one (1.) because certain sayings of scripture seem to teach this sufficiency, (2.) because thus no fault of the destruction of the impious can be imputed to God or Christ. And among these he says there is no great, at least not such, repugnance as ought to distract the unity of the Church. The same is stated by the supreme theologian, Andreas Rivetus, a Frenchman, Professor in the Academy of Leiden and most intimate councilor of the Prince of Orange, in his *Theological Works*, Second Volume, in the Thirteen Disputations on the Just and Gracious Dispensation of God concerning the salvation of the human race, disputation 6, thesis 9: "There are others," he says, "who, rejecting that first absolute decree, and rightly, make the conditional decree so common to all men that they assert that the counsel of God the Father in delivering the Son to death, and of the Son in undergoing the same, and also their intention and scope, was to acquire, obtain, and merit for all and every sinful man by that most precious death and passion, that, if they repent, when they are capable of doctrine, and believe in Christ, they can be reconciled with God and receive remission of sins: they deny, however, that actual reconciliation with God or remission of sins or eternal life was actually acquired or obtained for those who remain in impenitence." Thesis 11: "Since these men deny that Christ died equally for the impious and the pious, and affirm that only the pious may glory in the satisfaction of Christ, because the principal fruit and efficacy of that satisfaction comes to them, they agree in sense with all other orthodox Christians, although they differ in their mode of speaking; especially since they acknowledge a certain special decree, according to which he died especially for the elect alone, by which they are led not only to common, but also to singular benefits, namely the grace of regeneration and of efficacious vocation, of justification and of glorification, and they assign to the merit of Christ's death the true and efficacious communion, bestowal, and application of saving grace, and the gift of faith itself, by which the application is made." The same opinion is also reported as orthodox by the most celebrated Gisbertus Voetius, a theologian of Utrecht, in his *Select Disputations*, Part II, *On the Merit of Christ*, Part 2, pp. 251, 252.

§. X.

Thus also from the word of God we teach that God wills all and every man to be saved, that he mocks no one, that he does not will any to perish, but all to return to repentance.

And although no man can believe from the natural powers of free will, nor by mere and external preaching, unless besides the external word, the Spirit of God also illuminates his heart and renews it within; yet we teach that the preaching of the Word is the ordinary means by which the Spirit of God wills to illuminate and so to work in those whom he calls externally, that by his grace they may be able to believe, unless they themselves, by sinning against their conscience, maliciously and pertinaciously reject the word, and so render themselves incapable of the operation of the Holy Spirit, when by his grace they ought to have and could have believed. But that some actually believe and are converted is due to a particular, special, and abundant divine grace, which remains proper to the elect. See our incomparable Conradus Bergius, *Praxis Catholica*, Diss. VI, adducing for this opinion a long series of our Confessions (to which may be added the Colloquies of Thorn and Leipzig). And to him may be joined from our doctors, the common preceptor of Germany, the blessed Philip Melanchthon, to whom after God the credit is to be given that the Reformed religion was introduced into the regions of Germany, and his not degenerate disciple Christopher Pezel, our great Calvin himself in his commentaries passim, Pellicanus, Theodorus Bibliander, concerning whom see the blessed Hottinger, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Vol. VIII, Sec. XVI, part IV, p. 688, Henricus Bullingerus, Benedictus Aretius, Wolfgang Musculus, Christopherus Pelargus, Johannes Crocius, Ludovicus Crocius, especially in his *Syntagma Sacrae Theologiae*, lib. 4, c. 1, from th. 3 to the end of the chapter, and his *Dyodecas Dissertationum*, IX, XXI, XII, Matthaeus Martinius, Johannes Bergius in his *Unterscheid und Vergleich*, also in his commentary on the saying of John 3:16, and also in his *Willen Gottes von aller Menschen Seeligkeit*, Johannes Davenantius, and Joseph Hall, English bishops, Hermannus Hildebrandus in his *Declaratio Orthodoxa*, Gerhardus Johannes Vossius in his *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. VII, Part 1, entire, pp. 650-733, where he introduces the doctors of the ancient Church who agree with us, Gregorius Francus, Reichelius, Moses Amyraldus, Testardus, Camero, Johannes Dallaeus, the venerable senior of our theological faculty, Mr. Dr. Elias Grebenitz in his *Unterricht*, also in his theological treatise *De Gratiae Divinae Universalis Negatione*, Art. II, thesis 5, 29, 30, whom Hottinger also commends, Vol. VIII, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Sec. XVI, P. IV, p. 647. Cf. also Henricus Altingius, *Theologiae Problemata Nova*, Loc. XIV, Problem 3.

§. XI.

Nothing can be imagined or conceived more unworthy of the best, most just, and most holy Deity than that He himself should be the author of the crimes which He is so often read to detest in express words, which He forbids in clear terms, and which He testifies He will severely punish with temporal and eternal death. I would not believe that Stygian Pluto himself, if he had set his mind to attack the majesty of God, could have vomited forth a fouler or more atrocious calumny, nor that any fouler heresy has existed since the foundation of the world than that which would attribute this obscene error to the most benign Deity, since this does not overthrow one or another article of religion, but utterly destroys it, however great it is. Nevertheless, some slanderers do not shrink from

ascribing this pernicious error to our Church. But in truth, not only our Confessions, but also our individual doctors abhor and detest this impiety, and to those who maintain these things, we pronounce a horrible anathema with all detestation. And if by chance one or two of our doctors should cherish such hypotheses, from which this blasphemy could be derived by good and legitimate consequence, let those slanderers know that we are not Pythagoreans, among whom "He himself said it" has its place, and that we have sworn allegiance to the words of none of our doctors. But since that calumny rests on the "first lies" concerning the denial of universal grace, of which we have just spoken, and on the precurse and concourse of God also determining evil; we reject and condemn those statements of Luther from his book *On the Bondage of the Will*, that God damns the undeserving; that both the light of nature and the light of grace dictate that the fault is not of the miserable man, but of the unjust God; that Judas, if God foreknew that he would be a traitor, was necessarily made a traitor. Also that from the same book: "God takes the already evil will of Shimei with all its members, previously kindled against David, David being opportunely presented, so that the divine action and omnipotence justly seizes such blasphemy, and God himself, who is good, through an evil and blasphemous instrument, precipitates, i.e., says by a word and does, namely the snatching of his action, this blasphemy." Also, "The evil will of Pharaoh would not be moved or hardened by itself alone, but the omnipotent actor, when he acts upon it, with an inevitable motion, like the rest of the creatures, it is necessary that it should will something." Then at the same time He presents from without that which naturally irritates and offends it, so that Pharaoh cannot avoid the hardening of himself, just as he cannot avoid the action of divine omnipotence and the aversion or malice of his own will. After a few lines, he introduces God speaking: "Indeed, within by a general motion I will move the evil will itself, so that it may proceed in its own impetus and course of willing, and I will not cease to move it, nor can I do otherwise; but from without I will present the word and the work, against which that evil impetus will strike, since it can do nothing else but will evil, I myself, who am evil, moving it by the power of omnipotence, etc." Because we have not yet been so perspicacious as to see how God can be immune from sin according to this opinion; nay rather, it seems that God alone sins here, but men seem worthy of compassion rather than punishment. On the contrary, we say that the concourse of God in evil actions is only contingent and determinable. Thus, when God cooperates with the will in the desire for an illicit thing, it would be impious for anyone to say that the will desired the illicit thing because God cooperated; for thus the fault would be removed from the creature and attributed to the Creator. But it would be true and pious for anyone to say that that action emanated from God rather than another, because God was operating with a will which He saw, when such an occasion was offered, would want to desire such an object. For example, the sun and a corpse concur in the infection of the air, yet that action does not determine the sun, but only the corpse. For we do not say that the sun infects the air with a stench because the sun is determined to such a kind of action by the corpse, and that action is the production of a stench not because it is from the sun, but because it is from the sun cooperating with the corpse, and thus, speaking simply and absolutely, because it is

from the corpse; for the corpse by its nature is determined to generate a stench rather than a good odor. See, from our philosophers and theologians, the most distinguished Robertus Baronius, *Metaphysica Generalis*, Disputation on the Concourse or Cooperation of God, from p. 151 to 178; the blessed Johannes Bergius, *Diatribes Theologicae de Primo Homine*, Sect. IV, Th. CIV, CV; the Most Reverend Mr. Dr. Grebenitz, *Metaphysica Contracta*, special part, p. 201 ff. See also Maresius, *Disputationes Selectae*, Part II, Disputation on the Predestination of Angels, Th. LV, p. 811.

§. XII.

Of the heresies already condemned of old, none is more frequently objected to us than the Nestorian. But he who does not, with the ancient Eutychians, maintain the ubiquity of Christ's flesh, is not on that account a Nestorian. But that ubiquity was also numbered among the other errors of the Eutychians, Vigilius makes us certain in Book IV, chapter 4, against the Eutychians: "When he was on earth," he says, "he was certainly not in heaven, and now because he is in heaven, he is certainly not on earth, and to such an extent is he not, that we hope that Christ will come from heaven according to the flesh, whom we believe to be with us on earth according to the Word. Therefore, according to you Eutychians, either the Word is contained in its place with the flesh, or the flesh is everywhere with the Word: since one nature does not admit of what is different or contrary in itself. But it is different and far dissimilar to be circumscribed by place and to be everywhere. And because the Word is everywhere, but the flesh is not everywhere, it is apparent that one and the same Christ is of both natures, and is indeed everywhere according to the nature of His divinity, and is contained in a place according to the nature of His humanity. He is circumscribed by place according to the nature of His flesh, and is not contained by place according to the nature of His divinity. This is the Catholic faith and confession, which the Apostles have handed down, the martyrs have confirmed, and the faithful have kept until now." We shall see hereafter whether there is any truth in this accusation. But that this may be done more conveniently, some things must be premised concerning Nestorius and the Nestorian heresy.

Chapter II. On Nestorius and the Nestorian Heresy

§. I.

Marcellinus Comes has recorded that Nestorius, who gave his name to the Nestorian heresy, was born in Antioch. But to this the ancients, to a man, all contradict and in this they amicably conspire, that he was a native of the town of Syria, Germanicea or Germanicia, as it is written by others. Having traveled through various provinces, he fixed his residence in Antioch for some time, doubtless to acquire a cultivated mind, where also, being moderately imbued with the liberal disciplines, he devoted himself especially to exercising his voice, which by nature he had clear and sweet, from which it also came to pass that all who have consigned anything to writing about him, confess with one voice that he was very powerful in eloquence, whence by Socrates he is called εὐφυσικῶς εὔλαλος, i.e., endowed with natural eloquence, Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 32. But whether he was a man so unskilled and utterly devoid of doctrine, as we read reported of him in the same Socrates, one might rightly doubt, since that can scarcely be reconciled with those great honors which he held in the Church, of which we shall speak presently.

§. II.

For it is not unusual even for the most holy fathers to be carried away with more than just vehemence against those whom they experience as contradicting them, which becomes manifest from the example of the blessed Jerome and Orosius, who inveigh with wondrous force against Pelagius, otherwise a most wicked heretic, and reproach him with things which all the rest report to be otherwise, or which had plainly no bearing on the matter under controversy. Thus Jerome objects ignorance to Pelagius in Book LIII against the Pelagians, where he thus addresses Critobulus, i.e., Pelagius: "O happy you, of whom, besides your disciples, no one writes books, so that whatever you see to be displeasing, you may contend is not yours, but another's." He objects a vast and mutilated body to the same in Book I against Pelagius: "You yourself who are puffed up with Catonian pride and swell with the shoulders of Milo." And *ibid.*: "Unless perhaps with Moses in the cloud and darkness you hear the words of God face to face, and thence proceed with a horned brow." Orosius does the same in his Apology on the Liberty of the Will: "What is said neither aptly nor decorously, we ought not to impute to you, to whom neither birth has given that you should be instructed in more honorable studies, nor has it naturally come about that you should be wise; but to those dictators of yours who write down a miserable sense in most miserable speech, and expose you to be laughed at with guffaws, as a title of confusion." He calls him "mutilated, light in the forehead, one-eyed." Also, that "being nourished by baths and feasts, he carries broad shoulders, a robust neck, showing fatness on his forehead." Who nevertheless is said by Bale, in the first century of British writers, to be a man distinguished for learning and skilled in both Greek and Latin. Erasmus judges his epistle to Demetrias to be altogether learned and eloquent (*Censura in Ep. ad Demetr. ap. Hieronymum T. 4.*). Cf. Ger. Joh. Vossius, *Historia Pelagiana*, l. 1, Cap. 4, p. 21. How falsely also the great Jerome

sometimes treated the holy fathers who contradicted him, and hurled against them not what zeal according to knowledge, but what black bile had dictated, can be proven by the example of Vigilantius, who opposed himself to the growing error of the invocation of saints, and for that very reason experienced Jerome as an adversary. On which see the same celebrated Vossius, our own, Disp. XI on the Invocation of Saints, Th. XI. The same fate befell the monk Gottschalk, celebrated for the controversies on predestination moved in the ninth century by Hincmar, as Dr. Buchius reports and proves that he was not only a learned man but also lived an honest life, on the Heresy of the Predestinarians, Sect. III, §. 22, 23. The blessed man Berengar, not only Archdeacon of the Church of Angers, but also scholastic of the same Church (which honor whoever has, is Chancellor of the Academy; for the office of the scholastic was in the greatest churches to teach the clergy and to instruct them in sound doctrine, which John Cosin, Bishop of Durham, observes from Pap. Masson, Annal. Franc. l. 3, in his *History of Papal Transubstantiation*, Chap. VII, §. 4, p. 133), the same calamity afflicted him who in the eleventh century utterly overthrew the great error of the Papists concerning transubstantiation and restored the legitimate use of the Lord's Supper, and for that reason is considered worthy, not only by the Papists but also by those whom it least becomes, to appear among the heretics. That this man was outstanding in the sanctity of his life and in his doctrine, not even the Papists themselves, Platina, Vincent of Bergamo, and others, deny. An outstanding and lengthy eulogy of him, written at that time by Hildebert, Bishop of Le Mans, is reported by William of Malmesbury, from which it will not be tedious to produce a few verses:

Whom the world now admires and will always admire,

That Berengarius, not to die, has died.

Whom, holding the highest pinnacles of the sacred faith,

This fifth day, daring a wicked deed, has taken away.

Whatever the philosophers, whatever the poets have sung,

Has yielded to his genius and his eloquence.

A sacred and wise man, whose name grows hourly,

Than whom whoever is greatest among men is less.

A man sacred from a boy, who as much as his fame excels the world,

So much does he himself excel his own fame.

Fame less than his merits, though it flies through the whole world,

Though it always grows, it will not yet be equal.

A man truly wise and blessed in every part,

Who enriches the heavens with his soul, the earth with his body;

After death I shall live with him, with him I shall rest,

Nor let my lot be better than his lot.

The illustrious Mornay, in *De Sacra Eucharistia*, lib. 4, c. 8, pp. 1630-1635, Jacob Ussher, in *De Successione Doctrinae in Ecclesia*, pp. 195-28, and Hottinger, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Part II, sec. or Cap. XI, p. 530, present the entire poem from our authors. Sigonius reports that in the year of Christ 1059 a synod was held in Rome, and when Berengarius, ordered to expound his opinion, had begun to prove in many words that the sacrifice of the body and blood is a figure, and Alberic the Deacon, a man at that time outstanding in the study of doctrine, could not resist by voice a man most copious in speaking, he asked for a space of seven days to produce a written response. Yet so great is the stupor of men in so clear a matter that they have not hesitated to reproach even this man with ignorance.

§. III.

But, to return to the path from the digression, Theodoret, one of the ancients, who had formerly stood on the side of Nestorius, as is apparent from his epistle to John, bishop of Antioch, and from his censure of the twelve chapters of Cyril, which are read in the Council of Ephesus, Part III, but who afterwards also took up his pen against him, does not deny all learning to Nestorius in his epistle to Sporadius: "That man," he says, "was known to all. This man, a native of the city of Germanicia, to what pursuit he was initially devoted, I do not know. But wandering from one region to another like an Egyptian plague, he came to the great city of Antioch, in which, being moderately instructed and imbued with the liberal arts and endowed with a most beautiful and powerful voice, he crept into the Church of God with its certain ruin, and being inscribed in the number of the priests and having undertaken the care of ruling the people of God, at the very beginning, he openly showed what sort of man he would be for his entire life." According to Evagrius and Nicephorus, he entered the monastery of St. Euprepus, not far distant from Antioch, which indeed neither Theodoret nor Socrates mentions here. From this institution he was transferred to the clergy and made a presbyter, and since he was powerful in eloquence, the province of teaching the people of Antioch was imposed on him, which he so adorned that, having the approval of the people both for and against, he courted popular favor. Furthermore, he put on a certain austerity of life, which was commended by his dark clothing and a countenance composed to severity. Hence he soon acquired a great celebrity of name and was judged to have a fervent zeal against heretics, and when Sisinnus, bishop of Constantinople, died, he was thought worthy to succeed him, just as they had previously summoned John Chrysostom from Antioch and placed him on the throne. As soon as they learned that he had been proclaimed bishop

of Constantinople, how greatly even foreigners congratulated themselves and how much joy they conceived from it, can be known from the letters of Celestine to Nestorius: "When he (Sisinnus), however, departed from this world, when our solicitude extended itself as far as our Lord permitted it, the narrative of the messengers who came made our soul joyful, which the report of the colleagues who had been present at your ordination soon confirmed, who bore you as much testimony as ought to be borne to him who seemed to have been chosen from elsewhere. For you lived with such a great reputation before that a foreign city envied you to yours." (Part 1, Council of Ephesus, c. 18). Cyril himself, as soon as he was informed that he had been created bishop, testifies in his Apology to the Emperor Theodosius (Part 3, Council of Ephesus, c. XIII) that he had sent a most humane and dutiful epistle to him: "Nestorius was chosen as one exercised in the apostolic and evangelical doctrines, and an artist in promoting piety, and one who held the right and entirely blameless faith; and your pious Majesty, and all the presidents of the holy churches, and I myself, desired that such a man should be this man. For when I had received letters concerning his ordination from the most pious bishops who had promoted him, I did not hesitate at all, rejoicing and praising, and wishing that the best things might happen to him as to a brother and fellow minister by divine sentence, I wrote back."

§. IV.

In his very first inaugural sermon, with his speech turned to the emperor, he testified to his most hostile mind towards heretics in this manner: "Give me, O emperor, the earth free from heretics, and I will give you heaven in return; you extirpate the heretics for me, and I will be there for you in destroying the Persians." This saying, not received in the same way by all, gave rise to different judgments, some approving it, others taking it as an omen that the man, just elected, at the very entrance of his new office, immediately breathed a singular fervor in removing heretics from the midst. Nor did he act differently thereafter, as Socrates is a witness in book VII, chapters 29 and 31. But while he moves every stone to remove heretics, he himself falls into heresy, on the occasion of Anastasius the presbyter, whom he had brought with him from Antioch as a companion, and with whom he was on familiar terms. This man had once said from the pulpit: "Let no one call Mary Theotokos (God-bearer), for Mary was a human being, and it is impossible for God to be born of a human being." These words the ears that had long ago learned that Christ was truly God, and in no way, on account of the mystery of the Incarnation, to be admitted as a mere man separated from the divinity, as Socrates says, received with difficulty. But so far was Nestorius the bishop from reprimanding the presbyter on that account, that he rather extolled him with magnificent praises, and not long after, speaking to the people, he inculcated the same thing, saying: "Do not glory, Jew, for you crucified not God but a man." And on another occasion: "I have been taught by the divine scripture that God passed through the Christ-bearing virgin; but I have nowhere been taught that God was born of her." When he was cited to the council by three bishops, he is said to have burst into these words: "I would by no means say that

God was made two or three months old." From which others have concluded that he denied the personal union and divided Christ into two sons, one of God, the other of the Virgin Mary, and therefore acknowledged two persons in Christ. Not only Anastasius, however, but also a certain bishop, Dorotheus, a man, as he is called by Cyril in his epistle to Celestine, Council of Ephesus, chapter 14, "intensely devoted to flattery for the sake of gain and with a tongue prompt even to rashness," having ascended the cathedra, said anathema to anyone who would say that the holy Mary is Theotokos. To whom, however, Nestorius was not only not troublesome, but even made him a partaker of the sacred supper, which Cyril indicates in the epistle written to those by whose letters he had been admonished, as if persuaded by a mere rumor of the common people he had risen up against Nestorius, Council of Ephesus, Part 1, place 10, where these words occur: "For I have expounded the doctrine of the right faith to the men who were greatly offended on account of his exegeses; but he, in the Catholic and Orthodox church, tolerated the good bishop Dorotheus openly saying: 'If anyone says that Mary is the Mother of God, let him be anathema.' Not only did he remain silent when he heard him say this, but he also soon admitted the same man to the mystical communion and made him a partaker of the mysteries."

§. V.

There are those who think that both Anastasius and Dorotheus brought forth these words by the persuasion and impulse of Nestorius himself, who, however, was not the author and fabricator of this heresy. But that it was handed down first from Ebion, then from Artemon, and Paul of Samosata, and Photinus, and that Theodore of Mopsuestia embraced the same, from whom Nestorius is the authority of Evagrius to have drawn it, who reports that Nestorius, going from Antioch to Constantinople, had his journey through Mopsuestia, and in passing conferred with Theodore, the bishop of that city, and from him received this heresy, of which matter he cites Theodulus as a witness in a certain epistle. (Cf. Dionysius Petavius, *Dogmata Theologica*, Tom. 4, cap. 7, 1.3). The epistle of John, bishop of Antioch, to Nestorius proves that Nestorius was, if not a disciple, at least a familiar of this Theodore, in which he asks him to desist from his purpose by the example of the same Theodore (Binius reads, Paul, but notes in the margin that others have the name of Theodore), who, when something had escaped him in a certain exposition which seemed to others neither right nor sufficiently catholic, considering the tumults which he feared could arise from it, not many days after, generously came forward in public and corrected what had been said not very conveniently by him, for the sake of the Church, and by making the emendation he immediately completely extinguished all the calumny that had been stirred up against him (Conc. Eph. Part. 1, c. 25). For this reason, because he had drawn his opinion from Theodore, he is called his son and the grandson of Samosatenus by Theodore the presbyter of Raithu, who writes in Tom. II, Bib. PP., that he was "the son of this man, and the descendant of Samosatenus," by which words, according to Petavius, not a kinship of family and blood, but of doctrine and error is expressed, so that here son is the same as

disciple, and grandson is a disciple of a disciple. Socrates, however, in book 7, chapter 32, denies that Nestorius received his heresy from Samosatenus and Photinus: "Nestorius," he says, "in my judgment, imitates neither Paul of Samosata nor Photinus, nor does he say that the Lord is only a man; but he only shuns the word 'God-bearer' as if it were a mask, and avoids it." And then: "Nestorius seems to have been utterly ignorant of the works of the ancients, and for that reason he attacks only this word, 'God-bearer.' For that he does not say that Christ is only a man, like Photinus and Paul of Samosata, and that he does not take away the subsisting person of God the Word, but confesses that he subsists in the Trinity and is in its essence, and finally that he does not take away his essence, like Photinus and Samosatenus (the Manichaeans and Montanists also do not hesitate to assert the same), will be sufficiently clear from the sermons published by him."

§. VI.

What savage tumults and clamors were excited on account of those words uttered from the pulpit can be seen from the epistle of Cyril to Celestine, bishop of Rome (Council of Ephesus, Part 1, c. 14), where he says, "Soon a great clamor and dissension of the entire populace followed. For they were unwilling to have communion any longer with him who was endowed with such a mind and such a sense." And at this very time, the populace of Constantinople (with some few and vain men who only flatter him being excepted) abstains from the synaxis. Almost all the monasteries and their archimandrites abstain from it; and the greater part of the senate also abstains, fearing lest they should receive some detriment to the faith from him or from those whom he had brought with him from Antioch when he departed, who themselves vomit forth whatever is perverse. In which epistle Cyril also relates that he had once and again, by letters given to Nestorius himself, warned him to repent from his perverse doctrine. But he was not only not obedient to the word, but also slandered Cyril everywhere as an importunate monitor. Meanwhile, the fame of these controversies pervaded even foreign shores; in particular, his homilies or orations delivered to the people were transcribed and carried to Egypt, and many were led into error. Therefore, Cyril sent an epistle to the monasteries of Egypt, and confirmed in the true faith not only the wavering in Egypt, but also in Constantinople, whither some copies of the same epistle had come, who for that reason gave him thanks. Then, since this evil nevertheless crept more widely day by day, he thought it necessary to attack the same in three books, of which the first was dedicated to the emperor Theodosius, the second and third to the empresses Pulcheria and Eudocia, which can be read in the first part of the Council of Ephesus, in which he prolixly defends the received opinion of the Catholic Church from the sacred scriptures and the holy fathers, the new heresy having been most solidly destroyed and confuted.

§. VII.

Nestorius, in the meantime, did not rest, but delivered his sermons to be submitted to the censure of Celestine, the Roman Bishop, to Antiochus, an illustrious man. Cyril also

sent to the same Celestine his letters to Nestorius, and Nestorius's to him, that he might pass sentence on them. Celestine, without delay, having summoned some bishops, ordered them to inquire into the dogma of Nestorius, and when he had judged it to be contrary to the sacred scriptures, with the bishops approving, he condemned it, the sentence of Cyril being approved with both thumbs. He also sent letters to Nestorius by Posidonius the Deacon, in which he announced to him that, unless at the first opportunity he abjured what he had hitherto defended, and thus sang a palinode, he would be cast out from the episcopal dignity and the Catholic Church, and deposed. Therefore, the epistle to Nestorius in the Council of Ephesus, Part 1, c. 18, says openly: "Know that this is our sentence, that unless you preach concerning Christ our God what the Roman and Alexandrian and the universal Church holds, as also the holy Church of the great city of Constantinople has held most excellently up to you, and unless you, within the tenth day to be numbered from the first notice of this convention to you, have condemned this perfidious novelty, which strives to separate what the venerable scripture joins, by an open and written confession, you shall be cast out from the communion of the universal Catholic Church." He also wrote to the clergy and people of Constantinople, to John of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and other bishops, and informed them of his sentence. Cyril again admonished Nestorius to return to a saner mind, having rejected the opinion which he cherished. But when he disregarded this admonition, Cyril, having convened a synod of his Egyptian diocese at Alexandria, sent his final letters to him (they are found in Part 1 of the Council of Ephesus, c. 26), in which he severely exhorts him to follow the counsel of the synod and to desist as soon as possible from those foolish and absurd dogmas which he cherished and publicly taught, and to subscribe to the twelve anathemas attached. Nestorius, tenacious of his opinion, not only did not comply, but also opposed as many anathemas to those of Cyril, and complained to the Emperor Theodosius of the injury done to him by Cyril, who also, indignant, wrote an epistle to Cyril on this account, in which he reproaches him for his perverse zeal, which was by no means approved by him, and also for the disturbances which he had caused (Council of Ephesus, Part 1, C. 31, 31): "Indeed," he says, "nothing is more ancient to us than piety, on account of which, if any have perhaps erred incautiously, we deem them worthy of pardon. Now therefore let your piety explain why, having contempt for us, to whom you were not ignorant that religion is of such great concern, and for the priests, as many as dwell round about (whom it was certainly fitting to gather together in one place to discuss and settle the controversy that has arisen concerning religion), having despised them, you have stirred up these disturbances and discords among the churches. As if a rash impulse of piety were more becoming to doctrine than a diligent and careful inquiry into the truth, and as if cunning and audacity were of more value with us than care or industry, or any other such thing, more than candor and simplicity of mind. Although, therefore, we do not think that so great an honor will come to us from this, if we are observed by your piety, nor that all things will be thrown into confusion again, if we should wish to make an example of this indignation in you; yet at this time this is more our concern, that the holy peace and the desired tranquility may be restored to the churches. Know in the meantime that a great

perturbation of affairs has been excited by you; nor is it any wonder, indeed, that he who has exceeded the limit has not thus finished his attempts, which pertain to the churches and the priests; but has progressed further, and has believed something of us ourselves altogether unworthy of our piety. For unless you had been persuaded that some dissension concerning religion had arisen between them, or at least had hoped that something of the kind would arise from your letters, why, I pray, would you have written some things privately to us, others again to Eudocia, my most religious wife, and finally others to Pulcheria, my august sister, the same who is most devoted to the study of piety?"

At length, since those commotions could not be settled in any other way, the matter came to a council, which was convened at Ephesus in the year 431, when Antiochus and Bassus were consuls, on the 22nd day of June, by order of the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian, in which Nestorius, having been accused of heresy by the president, Cyril, and more than two hundred bishops, was deposed and driven into exile, Maximian being substituted in his place.

§. VIII.

But so far is it from being the case that after the Synod of Ephesus was held, all things were tranquil, that rather than at last the most serious disturbances arose. For the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian condemned all that had been done or decided at Ephesus, because the Fathers, carried away by their passions, and not having waited for the arrival and consent of all, nor according to the rule of the imperial edict, had examined the opinion of Nestorius, whom they extol with the eulogy of most holy and most pious, and for that reason they wished those things to be null and void, as is clear from the imperial letters sent by Palladius the Magisterianus to Ephesus to the holy Synod, to overturn what had been done before by the fathers of the council, as if the discussion of the faith ought to be done anew: "The most magnificent Candidianus, count of the devoted household troops, has reported that our Piety has received that certain things were transacted in the metropolis of Ephesus through tumult and otherwise than is fitting. For not all the most pious bishops convened, as was decreed (although the bishop of the great city of Antioch with other metropolitans was already approaching), nor did those who had already come consult together (in Greek: οὐτε τῶν ἤδη παραγεγονότων συσκεψαμένων), nor did they agree among themselves, nor did they examine the things that are of faith in the way that was proper, or as was contained in our sacred letters which we sent from time to time, but the matter was so conducted that it became manifest that some were hostile to others on account of their vehement zeal for those things which were pleasing in whatever way, and were not able to pretend a veil. Wherefore, whoever will have considered the things that were done, will have judged them to have been done with partiality. Therefore it has pleased our sacred Majesty that such a mode of proceeding should have no place or force; but that those things which have been done ineptly and without order ceasing, the doctrine of piety should first be discussed, as was decreed, and that it should obtain in the future

according to the common sentence of the entire Synod. Nor indeed does our Piety bear with an equal mind prejudices presumed from industry: nay indeed, it has taken and does take the things that have been done so ill that until the dogmas of piety have been examined by the entire Synod, and someone from our sacred palace, together with the most magnificent count Candidianus, is destined, who by our order may take cognizance of what has been done, and may prohibit what is dissonant with the legitimate order, it will in no way suffer any of the bishops who have convened to depart from the city of Ephesus, or to come to our sacred court, or to return to his own country: so that this may not be lawful for anyone, and no one may hope that it will succeed for him with impunity, etc. Indeed, let this not be hidden from your sanctity; namely, that we have written to the most illustrious prefects of the provinces that they should not admit anyone at all returning to his country or city without our order."

§. IX.

Indeed, after the edict of the emperors had been read, John, bishop of Antioch, and the other eastern bishops who were with him, promulgated a sentence by which Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, president of the council, and Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, who had played the leading roles in the synod, were deposed from the episcopate. The other bishops, however, who had subscribed to the canons of Cyril, were struck with anathema until they should reject them. For thus the forty-three eastern bishops, among whom John, bishop of Antioch, holds the first place, speak in the sentence passed against the fathers of the Council of Ephesus: "We certainly wished, according to the canons of the holy fathers and the letters of our most pious and Christ-loving emperors, to celebrate the synod peacefully. But since you, using a heretical sense and mind, and with temerity and confusion, have celebrated a private assembly among yourselves (although, according to the term predefined in the letters of our most pious emperors, we were already at the doors), and have filled the city and this holy synod with every kind of disturbance, lest indeed an inquiry should be made into the chapters which agree with the impiety and perverse doctrine of Apollinarius and Eunomius and Arius; nor have you awaited the arrival of the most religious bishops summoned from all sides by our most pious emperors, although the most magnificent Count Candidianus, both in writing and by word, had commanded you not to dare any such thing, but to await the common assembly of all the most holy bishops, therefore you, Cyril of Alexandria, and you, Memnon, bishop of this city, know that you are deposed, and alienated from the episcopate, and removed from all ecclesiastical ministry and function; as being the cause that the canons of the fathers were trampled underfoot and the decrees of the emperors were contemned, and all things were mixed with confusion and turmoil, and as being the authors and leaders of the whole crime. But all you others, who have seditiously and iniquitously consented to those acting against the ecclesiastical sanctions and the royal decrees, lie under anathema, until, acknowledging your fault, you repent, and receive the faith set forth by the holy fathers gathered in the city of Nicaea, adding nothing strange or foreign to it: moreover, that you anathematize the heretical chapters set forth by Cyril

of Alexandria, which are openly repugnant to the evangelical and apostolic doctrine: and finally, that you in all things obey the letters of our most pious and Christ-loving emperors, which command that the question of faith be discussed quietly and accurately." They complain more than once that hostile acts were attempted against them, and indeed that death was imminent for them at any moment. For thus they write in their report to the emperor: "After the decree, full of every sense of piety, was read to them, and we had dictated these letters, we set out for the apostolic church of St. John the Evangelist to give thanks to God and to pray for your majesty and for the pious purpose and counsel of your mind. But when they caught sight of us, they suddenly closed the temple to us. Again, when we had worshiped from the outside and were returning in silence, a multitude of some of their servants, rushing out, detained some of our men, took away their pack animals from some, and wounded some. But they pursued us with clubs and stones for a long distance, so that we were forced to flee with great haste as if from pursuing barbarians." And in the epistle to the Prefect and Magister: "We have come to the height of evils, as they say, and we are struggling with the ultimate dangers, and we see death daily before our eyes. For what is boldly committed against us by Cyril and Memnon and the other confederates of their faction exceeds all barbaric fury, and no kind of tyranny has been omitted by them. We are boldly attacked by continuous assaults, as is wont to happen in war; they have inscribed our houses with iambics, namely that they may be manifest and designated to those who are about to make an attack; every temple is closed to us. Wasted by disease and desiring to enjoy even a moderate sky, we do not dare to look out with head askance, fearing our fellow citizens no less than the most hostile enemies, etc." Finally, the bishops themselves, who had mutually excommunicated each other and had opposed synod to synod—Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon—were imprisoned at Ephesus by John, the count of the sacred largesses, which is manifest both from Cyril's homily delivered at Ephesus before he was arrested by the count and handed over to be guarded by soldiers, and from his epistle to the archimandrites, in which he writes: "In the meantime, we are kept bound and guarded, completely ignorant of where this matter will finally end up."

§. X.

The emperor, at last wishing to put an end to these ecclesiastical disturbances, desired some of each party to be sent to him, from whom he might learn the matter in order as it had been transacted. Seven were sent by the Cyrillian party, to whom it was enjoined by the rest that they should plead the cause of Cyril and Memnon with all their strength, but have no dealings with the Orientals. From the Orientals, indeed, as many were sent, but they were forced to stop at Chalcedon, and were forbidden to come to Constantinople on account of the seditions of the monks. The emperor settled the matter thus, that Cyril and Memnon should each remain in his own church, but to Nestorius the liberty was granted of departing wherever he pleased. He, having returned to Antioch, is said to have died in the monastery of St. Euprepius, as Evagrius reports, having been increased with various honors and gifts by the emperor, and at last to have

been eaten by worms. John thereafter returned to favor with Cyril, and in this way peace was at last restored to the Church.

§. XI.

There were not lacking, however, most learned men from all sides, not only heretics, among whom that anonymous author is to be numbered (unless there were more) against whom Maresius disputes in his *Select Disputations*, Part 2, Disputation 1, Curcellæus, and perhaps others, but also from among the orthodox themselves, who at least passed a milder judgment on Nestorius, among whom the distinguished Joh. Hoornbeck, formerly professor at Utrecht and Leiden, professed his name, in his *Summary of Religious Controversies*, book XI, who wonders not without cause that clearer and more manifest documents from the writings of Nestorius were not produced against him, so that anathema was immediately pronounced against him without further examination, and this most severe sentence was pronounced, although the synod had only begun the day before: "Therefore our Lord Jesus Christ, whom he has assailed with his blasphemous words, through this sacred synod decrees that the same Nestorius is deprived of all episcopal dignity, and is moreover alienated from the entire company and assembly of priests." Which sentence was announced to Nestorius the next day in this manner: "The sacred synod, assembled by the grace of God in the metropolis of Ephesus according to the prescription of our most religious and Christian emperors, to Nestorius, the new Judas: Know that you, on account of your impious sermons and your stubborn contumacy against the sacred canons, and your contumacious obstinacy, have been on the twenty-second day of the now current month of June, according to the decrees of the ecclesiastical sanctions, excommunicated by the sacred synod and thus removed from every grade of ecclesiastical dignity." Indeed, that much was given to prejudices and party zeal in this council could be concluded not only from the decree of the emperors cited above (who, however, are believed to have been deceived by Candidianus), but also from the words of Isidore of Pelusium to Cyril: "Preposterous favor does not see acutely: but hatred does not see at all. Wherefore, if you are eager to be pure and immune from both masks, do not pass violent sentences; but commit the crimes brought against you to a just and impartial judgment. Since God also, who knows all things before they arise, for the sake of his humanity, wished to descend and to see the outcry of the Sodomites, teaching us from this to investigate and bring forth matters accurately. For many of those who were assembled at Ephesus traduce you as one who persecutes and avenges your own enmities, and not as one who orthodoxly seeks the things that are of Jesus Christ." And those things which are read in the Acts of the Council concerning the same Nestorius are undoubtedly of such a nature that they are more apt to excuse him than to accuse him.

§. XII.

Indeed, lest we should here give occasion to anyone for calumny, we protest at the outset that we are not speaking of the heresy, as they call it, of Nestorianism, or of the

dogmas condemned in the synod, which no one but a heretic would deny were justly and deservedly condemned, and concerning which we shall have occasion to discourse more fully hereafter; but the question is concerning Nestorius himself: whether he himself cherished those dogmas which are commonly ascribed to him? And that this can deservedly be called into question, and has been called into question, certain learned men do not shrink from asserting. For they hold it most certain that from those words of his which are cited in the Acts of the council, this opinion, which at present is called Nestorian and which the holy fathers with the highest justice struck with anathema, cannot be extorted by any tortures, if only a distinction is made between abstract and concrete predications, which even those who have only touched theology with their first lips will easily grant is most necessary here. But that Nestorius did not know how to distinguish between those propositions, they will undoubtedly grant, was not to be so much imputed to him as a fault that he should be condemned for heresy on that account, who will have considered with themselves that no one of the Wittenberg theologians of the last century, except the greatest theologian, the blessed Philip Melanchthon, had known what the words concrete and abstract meant, which nevertheless were on the lips of all who disputed against Franciscus Stancarus, as the most serene Elector of Brandenburg, Joachim of pious memory, had observed, and for that reason, namely that he might bring a brief and clear explanation of these terms, he had sent the blessed Abraham Bucholcer to Melanchthon at Wittenberg. Melanchthon ordered Bucholcer to be present the next day at the examination of a certain person to be ordained to the sacred ministry. Bucholcer was present. Philip sat in his place with the pastor, deacons, and doctors of theology; opposite him the ordinand held his place. A crown of students surrounded this assembly, as close as each could get. Then Philip, having proposed various questions about the Law, the Gospel, justification, faith, good works, the Church, the use of the sacraments, finally brought forth also that question of the Elector of Brandenburg: What was the use of the words concrete and abstract in the doctrine of the communication of idioms? When the ordinand could not solve this question, Philip, in his usual manner, addressed the nearest students in the circle. He asked one; he was silent. He asked another and a third; they answered the same. Having therefore left the surrounding crown, Philip turned to the assessors. The minds of the hearers were aroused, who, the more of them he had questioned were ignorant, the more eagerly they awaited a certain opinion from someone more learned. But when these elders and the doctors of theology themselves were also silent, the minds of all burned with the desire of hearing the opinion of Philip himself. Therefore, when all were silent, Philip himself responded to the Elector's question in these words: "In the doctrine of the person of Christ, two things are to be considered: the union of the two natures into one person, and the distinction of the two natures. The union is expressed by predication in the concrete; the distinction is expressed by predication in the abstract. Therefore, it is necessary to retain the concrete for the sake of the union, but the abstract for the sake of the distinction of the natures." When these words of Philip, so brief, so rounded, so clear, were heard, a great applause from all followed, and the Pomeranian, a pastor and the designated president of the examinations, already

advanced in age and of a senile body, could not restrain himself for admiration and joy, but suddenly rose, approached the ordinand, and gently patting his shoulder with his outstretched hand, exhorted him in these words in the Pomeranian dialect: "Pay close attention to that, I also want to pay attention, I have become so old and have not heard it so briefly in my life." That is: "Be mindful of this speech; I myself will also engrave these words on my mind. I have reached this advanced age, and I have never heard this doctrine with such brevity and clarity of words." The most serene Elector himself, a prince of the keenest intellect and gravest judgment, when he had heard Philip's response, burst forth in these words with great admiration: "One must let Philip be a man, no one else could have put it so briefly." Which is: "The palm of genius, piety, and erudition must be left entirely to Philip. No doctor could have explained this question of such great weight and moment with such brevity." See our distinguished Melchior Adam in his *Lives of the German Theologians* of the last century, in the life of Abraham Bucholcer. The blessed Luther acknowledges that the matter is so, namely that Nestorius erred only in words, in *On the Councils*, fol. 488: "From this one sees that Nestorius, as an unintelligent, proud bishop, meant Christ with right earnestness, but according to his lack of understanding he does not know what and how he speaks, as one who did not know how to speak rightly of such matters, and yet wanted to be a master of speaking."

§. XIII.

It is certain that Nestorius did not deny that Christ is God, but rather manfully asserted the deity of Christ, and for that reason he always appealed to the Council of Nicaea and to the confession issued in it against Arius. He writes more deeply to Cyril before the synod (Council of Ephesus, Part 1, c. IX): "If it seems so, look into their sayings and you will soon find in plain sense that that divine choir of fathers nowhere taught that the consubstantial divinity is passible; or that what is co-eternal with the Father was recently born, or that what raised up the dissolved temple was itself raised up." The Eastern bishops who sided with Nestorius did the same, who repeated even to hoarseness that they would be content with the confession of the Council of Nicaea, from whose writings for the present it will have been useful to have adduced this one passage for the sake of brevity: "We, following the sound faith of the fathers, and patiently allowing nothing foreign to be mixed with it, have been compelled to set forth this our confession in writing and to confirm it with our subscriptions. For the exposition of these few words is sufficient both for accurately handing down the doctrine of piety, and for showing the way of truth, and for refuting heretical depravities and impostures. Now, that exposition of faith is as follows: 'We believe in one God the Father almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, born of the Father, the only-begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father; God of God, light of light, true God of true God, begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made, which are in heaven and which are on earth, etc. But those who say: There was a time when he was not, and

before he was born, he was not, and that he was made from nothing, or from another substance or essence; and who assert that the Son of God is mutable or alterable; those the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes.' This is the faith which the fathers set forth, primarily indeed against Arius who blasphemed and said that the Son of God is a creature; but then also against every heresy of Sabellius, Photinus, Paul of Samosata, Manes, Valentinus, Marcion, and against every heresy which has raised itself against the Catholic Church. In this exposition of faith we all confess to rest; in this we persevere, we who have convened here at Ephesus, and the most religious bishops who live in our provinces, giving their assent to all these things which will be done by us." Nestorius also acknowledges two natures in the one Christ, and their most intimate union with each other, and that Christ is God and man; which even the third anathema of Nestorius opposed to Cyril alone proves, in which he declares himself thus: "If anyone does not say that Christ, who is also Immanuel, is one according to the conjunction, according to nature; also from both substances, both of the Word of God and also of the man assumed by him, in one connection of the Son, which we also now maintain unconfusedly, he does not confess at all, let him be anathema." He proposes his opinion most clearly of all in the cited epistle to Cyril, whom he praises because he frankly confesses that Christ in two natures constitutes only one person: "But in this I do not praise you in everything, that you preach the distinction of the natures according to the reason of divinity and humanity, and their conjunction in only one person; and that you affirm that God the Word did not at all need that other birth, which is from a woman, and that you pronounce expressly that the divinity could not suffer. For all these things are true and orthodox, and most adverse to the vain opinions of all heretics concerning the natures of the Lord." He confesses and inculcates the same thing elsewhere: "Surely God the Word before the Incarnation was both Son and was joined to the Father. But in the last times he also assumed a servile form. But since he was Son before, and was called Son, yet after the assumption of the flesh he ought not to be called Son separately by himself, lest we should seem to introduce two Sons. So also after the man was once united to him, who from the beginning is the Son, and is now joined to the man by an indissoluble bond, as far as pertains to the dignity of sonship, he by no means admits of division; I say, according to the dignity of sonship, not according to the natures. Whence, because God the Word retains a perpetual union with Christ, he is also called Christ. Therefore, let us retain the unconfused conjunction of the natures; let us confess God in man; let us adore the man, joined to the almighty God by a certain divine and pre-eminent bond, together with God." By which last words and the eighth anathema, opposed to Cyril, which is as follows: "If anyone says that the form of a servant is to be worshiped for its own sake, that is, according to the reason of its own nature, and not as mistress of all, and does not rather venerate it through the society by which it is joined to the nature of the blessed and naturally Lord, the only-begotten, anathema be he;" he also refutes the error which is commonly imputed to him concerning the adoration of Christ, namely, Nestorius wills that the person of Christ, consisting of the divine and human nature, should be adored; but he denies, with the orthodox fathers, that the flesh, viewed apart from the Word, should be endowed with divine honor; of which we

shall say more below. For the same reason, he also denies vivifying power to the flesh considered outside the union, in the eleventh anathema: "If anyone says that the united flesh is vivifying from the possibility of its own nature, the Lord and God himself pronouncing: 'It is the spirit that vivifies, the flesh profits nothing,' let him be anathema."

§. XIV.

The reason, indeed, why he was unwilling to call the Blessed Virgin Theotokos (God-bearer), we easily divine from what we have thus far adduced from Nestorius, and what will be adduced hereafter. Nestorius thought, namely, although falsely and rashly, that from the opinion of Cyril and his followers, who maintained that Mary was Theotokos, it followed that the divine nature of Christ was born in Mary, or from her, and was therefore subject to change and passion, the refutation of which opinion is found in his letters and in the writings of the Orientals, which fill both pages. Whence he himself, in the cited letters to Cyril, says: "Wherever, therefore, the divine scriptures make mention of the Lord's dispensation, they always attribute both the incarnation and also death and passion not to the divine, but to the human nature of Christ. Wherefore, if we consider the matter more diligently, the Holy Virgin is to be called not the Mother of God, but the Mother of Christ. Hear how the Gospels proclaim this: 'The book,' they say, 'of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham.' But it is clear that God the Word was not the Son of David, etc. Consider again another voice of the Gospel, expressly confirming this truth: 'The generation of Christ,' it says, 'was thus: when his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, she was found to have in her womb of the Holy Spirit.' But who is so foolish as to believe that the divinity of the Only-begotten is a creature of the Holy Spirit, etc. And that again concerning his passion: 'God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin,' and that again: 'Christ died for our sins;' again: 'Christ having suffered in the flesh.' Finally: 'This is (not my divinity, but) my body, which is broken for you.' There are innumerable other sentences which testify to the human race that the divinity was neither recently born nor capable of bodily suffering, but the flesh itself, which is joined to the divine nature." He preferred to use the name "Christ-bearer" rather than "God-bearer" because he thought that the words "God" and "man" express natures, but the words "Christ," "Lord," and "Son" express the person, which he clearly implies in that oft-cited epistle to Cyril, in which he explains his mind on this matter thus: "Observe here how, laying down as certain foundations the names Lord, Jesus, Christ, only-begotten, and Son, names which are equally suitable to the human and divine nature, they immediately subjoin and build upon them the tradition of the incarnation, death, and resurrection, namely, so that, having proposed certain common names signifying both natures, neither the things that are of sonship and property may be divided, nor again the things that are of the natures may be brought into danger of confusion on account of the singularity of the sonship." In which matter they have followed the authority of Paul. For he, having made mention of the divine incarnation, and being about to subjoin immediately those things which were of the passion, first puts that name, Christ, as I was saying a little before, as common to

both natures, and immediately subjoins the doctrine congruous to both equally, etc. But Nestorius persuaded himself, although he was false in this, that Cyril, by calling Mary Theotokos, established that the divine nature itself was born from her, that a confusion of natures was introduced by him, and therefore that the heresies of Apollinaris, Eunomius, and Arius were being revived from hell, which heresies not only Nestorius himself imputed to Cyril, but also the Orientals addicted to Nestorius in their writings, which can be consulted, more than once imputed to the Cyrillians, nay, even in the very sentence of deposition passed on Cyril and Memnon. Whence Nestorius in the cited epistle continues thus: "It is therefore right and consonant with the evangelical tradition that we should confess that the body of Christ is the temple of the divinity, and that we should establish that it is joined to it by a bond so sublime, divine, and admirable, that the divine nature claims for itself those things which are otherwise proper to the body. But on account of that notion of either communication or appropriation, to ascribe nativity, passion, death, and the other properties of the flesh to the divine Word, this, my brother, is truly the mind of one erring in the manner of the Gentiles, or certainly of the insane Apollinarius and Arius, and of one laboring with the disease of other heretics or even a more serious one." Compare also the two epistles of the same Nestorius to Celestine, Pope of Rome, in the Council of Ephesus, Part 1, c. XVI, XVII. In the latter of which, which we have thus far adduced more fully, he summarizes in this manner: "For a great labor is celebrated here by us, while we labor to root out the most sordid impiety of the most wicked opinion of Apollinaris and Arius from the Church of God. For I know not how some of the ecclesiastics, receiving a certain image of a tempering of the deity and humanity of the only-begotten, are sick with the sickness of the aforesaid heretics, while they dare to superimpose the passions of the body upon the deity of the only-begotten, and feign that the immutability of the deity has passed over to the nature of the body, and confuse both natures, which by the highest and unconfused conjunction are adored in one person of the only-begotten, with the mutability of a tempering." Blind are they who have not remembered the exposition of those holy fathers openly exclaiming against them: "We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary." For this voice in the name, which signifies both natures, i.e., Christ is consubstantial with the Father in his deity, but his humanity was born in later times of the holy Virgin, which, on account of the conjunction of the deity, is worshiped together by angels and men.

§. XV.

In the meantime, however, not only the public councils, especially the general or ecumenical ones of Ephesus and Chalcedon, but also all the compilers of ecclesiastical history—Socrates, Theodoretus, Nicephorus, Evagrius—and indeed the fathers who flourished in his age or after it, and also all the theologians of all parties, attribute with common consent the heretical opinion which was publicly condemned to Nestorius. However the case may be with Nestorius, yet the things which we have thus far adduced for him do not derogate from the doctrine asserted in the holy synod, nor do they aid

the contrary heresy condemned under the name of Nestorius, which we shall not be scrupulous to call Nestorian. For although it has not yet been certainly established for us whether Nestorius cherished that doctrine which was marked as heresy under his name, we are nevertheless certain that he at least gave the occasion for its condemnation, and indeed, that from his pertinacious refusal to call the Holy Mary Theotokos, the rest was derived from his opinion by consequence. Thus today they are called Arminians, who nevertheless at present defend those dogmas against other Christians concerning which Arminius never even dreamed. And those very men who everywhere echo the blessed Luther, how far they depart from the doctrine of Luther in many chapters! Thus, when they impose on themselves the name of Lutherans, they do so against Luther's will. When they defend foreseen faith in the matter of election, they do so likewise against Luther's will, as even his preface alone to the Epistle to the Romans, which is prefixed to the same epistle in most copies, to chapters IX, X, XI, can testify. That Luther had unfortunately defended, or at least left aside, the ubiquity of Christ's flesh, in which today, after oral manducation, the fortress of Lutheranism almost consists, is the opinion of Georgius Calixtus in his *Judgment on the Evangelical Controversies* and of the distinguished Dr. Dreier in his *Thorough Discussion of Certain Difficult Theological Questions Concerning the Person of Christ*, p. 431 ff. The very mode of expounding the words of the institution of the Holy Supper, by the particles "in," "with," "under," which is due to Flacius as its author, Luther refuted long ago in his *Confession Concerning the Lord's Supper*, p. 186, col. 2, and p. 187, col. 2. How much he urges the breaking of the bread in the Holy Supper can be read in Tom. III of the Jena German edition, fol. 22, and also in Tom. 3 of the Jena German edition, fol. 486, which the Lutherans nevertheless today deny against the Reformed. Add to this that not a few say that Luther, near death, changed his opinion about oral manducation, in the presence of Melanchthon. Nothing, therefore, prevents this heresy from being called Nestorian.

§. XVI.

The first dogma of the Nestorian heresy, condemned in the holy synod of Ephesus, from which, as from an impure spring, the other errors flow, is that it denies that the blessed Virgin Mary should be called Theotokos, i.e., the mother of God. This Cyril implies in the letters he wrote to John of Antioch, now reconciled to him, in which he says that the entire struggle for the faith undertaken by him was because he constantly affirmed that the holy Virgin is the mother of God, and for that reason he assigned the first place to the anathema which condemned this error: "If anyone does not confess that Immanuel is true God, and for that reason the holy Virgin is the Mother of God (for she brought forth the incarnate Word of God according to the flesh), let him be anathema." From this, as from a poisoned root, spring up other, no less noxious, errors, namely, that the Nestorian heresy denies the personal union in Christ, divides the hypostases after the union, and says that a man, who was first formed whole and perfect, was afterwards joined to God not by a natural union, but only by a fellowship of dignity or authority or power, and for that reason it attributes the sayings which occur in the sacred scriptures

to two persons, some to the man as considered separately from the Word of God, but others proper to God it transcribes to the Word of God alone; it calls Christ only a God-bearing man, and affirms that God dwelt in the man born of the holy Mary just as in any one of the saints; it calls the Word of God the Father the God and Lord of the man Christ, but does not confess that Christ is at the same time God and man; it maintains that the power of working and glory come to the man Christ from the Word of God as to someone else; and it does not honor Immanuel with one adoration, nor does it attribute one glorification to him, because the Word was made flesh; but it calls those who adore the incarnate Christ "man-worshippers" and "dead-worshippers." It asserts that Christ, like any of the saints, performed miracles not by his own divine power, but by an alien one. It denies that the Son of God, after He became flesh and a man like us, offered Himself to God the Father. On the contrary, it professes that that man who was born of a woman, as if another person distinct from Him, offered Himself as a sacrifice not only for us, but also for Himself. It denies that the flesh of Christ is life-giving and proper to the Word Himself, and that God suffered in the flesh, was crucified, tasted death, and rose again. Just as the chapters of the Nestorian heresy, thus far reviewed, can be derived from the anathemas of Cyril, which were indeed composed in the Alexandrian synod, but were repeated and more broadly explained in the Ephesian synod, which, after the first one we alleged above, follow each other in this order:

II. If anyone does not confess that the Word of God the Father is united to the flesh according to hypostasis, and that Christ is one and only one with his own flesh, the same being God and man at the same time, let him be anathema.

III. If anyone in the one Christ divides the hypostases after the union, and connects them with each other only by that conjunction which is according to dignity or authority or power, and not rather by that concourse which is according to a natural union, let him be anathema.

IV. If anyone attributes to two persons or hypostases those sayings which occur everywhere in the evangelical and apostolic scriptures, and which have been said of Christ by the saints or by Christ himself of himself, and ascribes some to the man as considered apart from the Word of God, but adapts others, as befitting God, to the Word of God the Father alone, let him be anathema.

V. If anyone dares to say that Christ is a God-bearing man and not rather true God, as the one and natural Son, because the Word was made flesh and partook of flesh and blood just as we do, let him be anathema.

VI. If anyone says that the Word of God the Father is the God or Lord of Christ, and has not rather confessed him to be God and man at the same time, as the Word was made flesh, according to the scriptures, let him be anathema.

VII. If anyone says that Jesus, as a man, had the power of working from the Word of God, and that the glory of the only-begotten came to him as to another person from the Word itself, let him be anathema.

VIII. If anyone dares to say that the assumed man is to be worshiped and glorified together with the Word of God, and is to be named God as another with another (for this meaning the particle "with," when added, always and necessarily brings), and does not rather honor Immanuel with one adoration, and attribute one glorification to him, inasmuch as the Word was made flesh, let him be anathema.

IX. If anyone says that the one Lord Jesus Christ was glorified by the Spirit, using His own power as if it were alien, and that He received from the same the power and efficacy by which He worked against unclean spirits and performed divine miracles among men, and has not rather confessed that the Spirit Himself, through whom He performed the divine signs, is His own, let him be anathema.

X. The divine scripture teaches that Christ was made the high priest and apostle of our confession, and that he offered himself for us to God and the Father as a sweet-smelling odor. If anyone, therefore, says that our high priest and apostle is not the Word of God himself, after he was made flesh and a man like us, but that man who was born of a woman, as if another person distinct from him; or if anyone says that Christ offered sacrifice for himself also, and not rather for us alone (for he who knew no sin had no need of an offering), let him be anathema.

XI. If anyone denies that the flesh of the Lord is vivifying and proper to the Word of God the Father, but says that it belongs to some other person joined to the Word according to dignity, or as having only a divine indwelling, and not rather that it is vivifying, as we just mentioned, because it has been made the property of the Word, which can vivify all things, let him be anathema.

XII. If anyone does not confess that the Word of God suffered in the flesh and was crucified, and tasted death in the flesh, and was made the firstborn from the dead, inasmuch as, as God, he is life and the giver of life, let him be anathema.

§. XVII.

Cyril offers this description of the Nestorian heresy or of the Nestorians in his book *On the Right Faith* to Theodosius, at the beginning: "They divide the one Christ into two, and having introduced a certain crass separation between this one and that one, they show each one separately, and as if standing apart: and one, namely, the one who was born of the Virgin, they say is a perfect man, and the other, again, the Word of God the Father himself, etc. For if they were to distinguish only between the natures, they would not err from the truth: for the nature of the flesh is one thing, and the nature of the Word is another. But they do not stop here, but progressing further, they consider one separately and by himself as a mere man; but the other they name Son, as the true and

natural God." Augustine, in his letter to Quodvultdeus, chapter 91, mentions the Nestorians in this way: "The Nestorians, from Nestorius, a bishop, the patriarch of Constantinople, who dared to dogmatize against the Catholic faith that our Lord Jesus Christ was only a man, and that what made him the mediator of God and men was conceived in the womb of the Virgin by the Holy Spirit; but that afterwards God was mixed with the man, and he said that God the man did not suffer and was not buried." This description of the Nestorians, however, is thought by others not to be Augustine's, but of some unlearned person who lived after Augustine's time, because Augustine died either before or immediately after the Nestorian heresy arose. Theodosius, this most pestilent heresy having been condemned, ordered the books of Nestorius himself to be burned, and just as by order of the emperor Constantine, the Arians were called Porphyrians; so the emperor Theodosius sanctioned by a public edict that the Nestorians should in the future be called by the name of Simonians, adding the reason: that it is fitting that those who, having turned away from God, emulate the impiety of Simon, should share the same appellation with him. Nor in this way, however, was the Nestorian heresy completely extirpated and extinguished, but they still at present occupy the greatest part of the East, mixed with Muhammedans and pagans, as the author Edward Brerewood, an Englishman, says in his *Scrutinium Religionum*, chapter 10.

Chapter III. In which it is demonstrated that Nestorianism is imputed to the Reformed by calumny.

§. I.

Having now, with God's help, set forth those things which seemed to pertain to Nestorius and the Nestorian heresy, it remains for us, mindful of our promise, to inquire whether the Nestorian heresy is justly imputed to the Reformed. In which treatise we shall proceed in such a way that in the first place we shall set forth and prove this thesis: that the Reformed are in no way, and not unless by a most impudent and manifest calumny, accused of Nestorianism; then we shall refute the arguments which are wont to be brought forward to the contrary. As to the first point, we prove our thesis in this manner: Whoever confesses that Christ is true, eternal, and consubstantial God with the Father, and a true man in one person and two natures, inseparably, indivisibly, unchangeably, and unconfusedly united by a personal union, and for that reason piously says that Mary is the Mother of God, and does not attribute the sayings which occur in the sacred scriptures concerning Christ to two persons, some to the man, others to God, nor calls the Word of God the Father the God and Lord of the man Christ, nor maintains that the power of working and glory come to the man Christ from the Word of God as to some other person; but that God suffered and was crucified in the flesh, tasted death, and rose again; who honors the one Immanuel with one adoration, and attributes one glorification to him, and that Christ performed miracles by his own power, and that God the Son did not offer sacrifice to God the Father for himself, and who believes sincerely and without guile or deceit that the flesh of Christ is vivifying and proper to the Word itself; they are not Nestorian heretics, but Catholic Christians. But the Reformed confess that Christ is true, eternal, and consubstantial God with the Father, and a true man in one person and two natures, inseparably, indivisibly, unchangeably, and unconfusedly united by a personal union, and for that reason they consider it pious to call the Blessed Virgin the Mother of God, and they do not attribute the sayings which occur in the sacred scriptures concerning Christ to two persons, some to the man, others to God, nor do they call the Word of God the Father the God and Lord of the man Christ; nor do they maintain that the power of working and glory come to the man Christ from the Word of God as to some other person; also that God suffered and was crucified in the flesh, tasted death, and rose again; but they honor the one Immanuel with one adoration, and attribute one glorification to him, and that Christ performed miracles by his own divine power; and that God the Son did not offer sacrifice to God the Father for himself; and they believe sincerely and without guile or deceit that the flesh of Christ is vivifying and proper to the Word itself. Therefore, the Reformed are not Nestorian heretics, but Catholic Christians.

§. II.

Since the major premise, from what we have just now adduced from the anathemas of Cyril, is so clear that it needs no proof, we shall only be concerned with proving the

minor premise by parts. This will be done if we here repeat from their mind some things pertinent to this and treated at length by all theologians everywhere. And indeed, we likewise refrain from proving at length that Christ is true, eternal God and consubstantial with the Father, because the matter is conceded on both sides. See, from the theologians of the last century, our blessed Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, L. 1, cap. 13, n. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; Peter Martyr, *Loci Communes*, L. XI; and the most faithful follower of his preceptor Philip Melanchthon, the blessed Victorinus Strigelius, *Loci Theologici*, Part 1, Loc. I & II. And from the more recent, the blessed Altingius, *Loci Communes*, Part II, Loc. 3, p. 357; Wendelinus, *Systema Majus Christianae Theologiae*, Lib. 1, cap. 2, th. 5, etc. This Son of the Most High, or the person of the Word, not, however, the divine nature, out of the supreme goodness with which God, the thrice-greatest and best, was borne towards the miserable human race, subject to eternal damnation through the fall of the first parents, put on human nature, of the same condition and essence as ours, namely, a rational soul and a body, not phantastical and imaginary, as the Cerdonians, Manichaeans, Marcionites, heretics called by the name of Docetae, formerly willed, but true, whole, and perfect, yet destitute of its own hypostasis or personality, as they say, with all the essential properties of human nature, both defects and infirmities, except sin, and united and joined it most closely to himself from the first moment of conception, with a conjunction not accidental, a "humanization" or "energy" according to assistance or operation, as a sailor is in a ship, nor according to relation, such as the conjunction between friends and spouses; nor according to grace or indwelling only, as God dwells in the saints; nor according to a consensus of the divine and human will, as the faithful are also one with the Father and the Son; nor according to a homonymy because of the communication of the name of God; nor only according to an equality of honor or dignity, by reason of the dignity conferred on the assumed flesh; nor of combination, as two planks are joined, nor of commixtion, as water is mixed with wine; nor by an essential conjunction or union, by which several things are essentially united to constitute one essence, so that from two one nature is made, either by a "turning" or "change" of the Word into flesh, or by an "annihilation" of the flesh; but by a personal or hypostatic union, so that the hypostasis of the Word has also become the hypostasis of the human nature, so that the human nature exists in the divine hypostasis, and yet does not become a person, because it does not enjoy its own personality, but being assumed into the person of the Word, it exists in the same, so that one nature is never separated from the other, but in one person both natures remain perpetually united. Indeed, Cyril in the third anathema, and in its declaration, and perhaps also elsewhere, and also Theodoret, when he was still fighting strenuously under the banners of Nestorius, in his censure of the twelve chapters of Cyril, censure of the second and third anathemas, acknowledge two hypostases in Christ; but it must be held that the word "hypostasis" not rarely among the ancients denotes the same as "nature," which becomes manifest from those very places. For the same reason, it was a scruple for Jerome in his epistle to Damasus to speak of three hypostases in the Deity. But this union of the two natures, divine and human, in the God-man is made not only inseparably and indivisibly, which the pious antiquity wished to hold against the

Nestorians; but also immutably and unconfusedly, without change and confusion of the natures, which is to be held against the Eutychians, who convert the two natures into one and confound the properties of the natures. For the divine nature is not changed into the human, nor the human into the divine, nor is the human nature absorbed by God, nor is a certain third thing composed from man and God, nor are the essential properties of both natures confounded, but they remain sound and intact on both sides, for otherwise, if the properties of the natures were abolished or denied, the natures themselves would be abolished and denied. We say, therefore, with the fathers of the Synod of Ephesus in their declaration on the first anathema, that the Word of God himself was made man, and yet was not for that reason turned into what he was not, nor was he altered; for he is always the same, and does not endure the shadow of a turning. But we do not maintain that any commixtion or confusion or concretion of his essence with the flesh was made. But we assert that the Word was united to a flesh perfectly and informed with a rational soul, in a manner which he alone knows (for this matter exceeds the capacity of our mind). Therefore, he remained God even after the assumption of the flesh, and is one Son of God the Father, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same both before all ages and time, inasmuch as he is understood as the Word and the figure of his substance, and in the last times, for our sake, was made man by a dispensatory reason. And with the same explanations of the second anathema, the Word of God the Father was made flesh: not that he was converted or transmuted in his own nature into flesh, as we were just saying, but rather that he made the flesh taken from the holy Virgin his own, being called the one and the same Son: before the incarnation indeed as the Word only, devoid of flesh; but after the incarnation the same also in the body. And hence it is that we say that the same is God and man at the same time, not dividing him into a man set apart by himself, and into the Word of God considered separately by himself, lest in this way we should understand two Sons; but we confess one and the same to be Christ and Son and Lord. But those who think this to be otherwise, or do not wish to believe so, but divide the one Son into two and disjoin what is in reality joined, saying that a man is joined to God only by a fellowship of dignity or authority, we say that they are alien from the right and blameless faith.

§. III.

On account of this most intimate and ineffable union of the two natures of the God-man in one person, we say that the Blessed Virgin Mary is piously and correctly called the Mother of God, because she did not give birth to a mere man, but to the Son of the Most High. "Therefore the holy one to be born of you will be called the Son of the Most High" (Luke 1:35). On which passage the words of the not least among the theologians of the last century, the blessed Theodore Beza, deserve to be noted: "Here also," he says, "(as above in verse 32) the manifestation by the word 'to be called' ought to be understood rather than the principle of essence, as the most learned Calvin rightly observed against Servetus: for he who was born of Mary is not merely a man, but God manifested in the flesh. For which reason the Church rightly established against Nestorius that Mary

should be called the Mother of God." That the Son of God was born of her is said not only in Galatians 4, but also in the creed which is commonly called the Apostles', in whom we confess a little before that we believe. Indeed, Isaiah, chapter 9, verse 6, calls him whom he foretells to be born of Mary, a child, not only "wonderful" and "counselor," but also "mighty God" and "everlasting Father." Why then should we hesitate to call the Blessed Virgin Theotokos, or the Mother of God, or the genetrix of God? Him whom Mary brought forth into the light, the apostles saw, heard, and touched; yet the blessed John, in his first epistle, 1:1, writes that this one is the Word of life, although they neither heard, nor saw, nor handled his divine nature. He whom Mary bore is God manifested in the flesh, as the apostle says in 1 Timothy 3:8, and he who according to the flesh is from the fathers, is also God over all, praised forever (Romans 9:15). Justly, therefore, she will be considered to have brought forth God into the light, and for that reason will be called Theotokos, although she neither conceived nor bore the divinity of Christ. All the Reformed doctors agree here, nor have I yet happened to see one who would assert the contrary. Zanchius, in book 2 *On the Incarnation*, at the end, question 1, has these words: "Hence also it has come about that Mary was called, and deservedly, Theotokos, the mother of God, because she bore him who is God, although she did not receive from her that he should be God, but only that he should be man." Bucanus rejects the error of Nestorius in denying that Mary is Theotokos in his *Institutions of Theology*, L. 2, §. 25, p. 23. Likewise, Altingius in his *Historical Theology*, Loc. 1, Period 1, Art. III, p. 32. The same in his *Exegesis of the Augsburg Confession*, Art. III, Th. II, p. 11, proves this thesis: "Christ, truly God and truly man, was born of the Virgin Mary." In his *Loci Communes*, Part I, Loc. X, he teaches: "Mary bore Immanuel, the God-man, the Son of the Most High, the Son of God, and from that she was named Theotokos in the primitive Church." The distinguished Polanus von Polansdorff argues expressly against the Nestorian heretics who deny Mary in his *Syntagma Theologicum*, lib. VI, Cap. XV. Wollebius, a theologian of Basel, in his *Christian Theology Compendium*, lib. I, cap. XVI, p. 119, has this as his fifth thesis: "Therefore Mary is to be called not only Christotokos (as the Nestorians willed) but also Theotokos." He who is handled by the hands of all, the blessed Wendelinus, subscribes to these when, in his *Systema Theologiae Christianae Majus*, lib. I, cap. XIV, Th. V, Expl. I, he speaks in this manner: "And although the divine nature was neither conceived nor born of the Virgin Mary, yet she is rightly and piously, and according to scripture, said to have conceived and borne the Son of God, God, and the God-man, and therefore is rightly called Theotokos." He refutes the contrary opinion, which is raised by the heretics, in the same place. Samuel Maresius also proluxly defends this thesis against an anonymous author in his *Select Disputations*, Disp. I, *On Nestorius and Nestorianism*, Th. XXIV ff. The plan of our work does not permit us to review more here.

§. IV.

From this most intimate and ineffable union of the two natures of Christ in one person of the God-man flows the communication or communion of idioms or properties, as it is called by the scholastics, but by Nazianzen and Theodoret, a conjunction of names; by

Theodoret also a permutation of names; by Damascene a mutual position, or mode of position of one for the other; also a permutation or alternation, by Cassian it is called synecdoche. And it is, according to the opinion of the sacred scriptures, of orthodox antiquity, and of the Reformed theologians, a consequence of the personal union, by which the properties of both natures are attributed and truly belong to the whole person, whether denominated from the office or from either nature in the concrete. The concrete here is what signifies the nature with the hypostasis or the person itself, as God, man, Son of God, Son of man, Christ Jesus, etc. The abstract is opposed to it, which denotes either nature in itself, as deity, divinity, divine, human nature. The same as this our definition is that which Chemnitz gives on the two natures, c. 5: "The communication of idioms is when what is proper to one nature is predicated of the person, because the Son of God makes it his own." Also, c. 13, he proves this definition of the blessed Philip Melanchthon: "The communication of idioms is a predication by which a property belonging to one nature is attributed to the person in the concrete." Indeed, with both thumbs we approve the definition of Johannes Gerhard, a theologian of Jena, which he adduces in his *Loci Theologici*, Tom. 1, L. IV, c. 10, th. 1, p. 1313: "The communication of idioms is the participation of the properties of the divine and human nature in Christ the God-man, denominated from either or both at the same time, flowing from the hypostatic union." Which Cunradus Dietericus has in almost the same words in his *Institutiones Catecheticae de Persona Christi*, p. 408. And this communication of idioms or properties, according to the opinion of the Reformed, is not verbal, but with respect to the person, altogether real. The phraseology, however, by which this communication of idioms is expressed, is either more direct or indirect, as by the most excellent Mr. President of the Theological College, MSC, Chap. VII, on the person and office of Christ, Th. XII, but by the theologians of Leiden in the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, Disp. XXV, on the incarnation of the Son of God, Th. XXXII ff., it is called proper or improper. The more direct is (1) that by which to either nature that which is its own is attributed in distinct words, or to the person, whether denominated from the other nature, its property or action is attributed in the concrete: as, "the Word was in the beginning, was with the Father, was God, through him all things were made" (John 1). "A child is born to us" (Isaiah 9). "The Son of man is delivered into the hands of sinners, is crucified, and rises again" (Matthew 17:12, 20:19, 16:2). (2) when to the person denominated from both natures, that which is of both or common to both natures is attributed, so that the predicate is adequate to the subject, such as those which denote his office or state, e.g., Christ is Savior, Prophet, Priest, King of his Church. The indirect, however, is when to the person denominated from one nature, a property common to both is attributed, e.g., "the Son of God redeemed us"; "the Son of David made satisfaction for us"; or, conversely, to the person denominated from both natures is attributed a property or action of either nature, and even contrary ones in the concrete: e.g., "Christ is from the Israelites according to the flesh" (Romans 9:5). "From the loins of David as concerning the flesh" (Acts 2:30). "He suffered and was put to death in the flesh, but was made alive in the Spirit" (1 Peter 3:18). Also, "Christ is the Son of David, and is the Lord of David" (Matthew 22:42-43). Then when to the person called from either nature a

predicate proper to the other nature is attributed, as: "The Son of God made of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Romans 1:3). "The Lord of glory was crucified" (1 Corinthians 2:8). "The Prince of life was killed" (Acts 3:15). "The Son of man descending from heaven, is in heaven" (John 3:13). "God redeemed the Church with his own blood" (Acts 20:28). Which propositions are to be vindicated not to two persons, of which one is God, the other man, and of this man, the other person, namely God, is the Lord, and that Christ the man receives the power of working and glory as some other person, but to one person, Christ Jesus, the God-man, which was also done by the holy fathers of the council of Ephesus against the Nestorians with laudable effort. Venerable antiquity approves these things which we have brought forward concerning communication with its vote. Hence the fathers of the council of Ephesus, in the declaration of the fourth anathema, speak altogether with the sacred scriptures: "We therefore attribute all the sayings of the Gospel, whether they sound of something human or something divine, to one person. For we believe that Christ Jesus, that is, the inhumanated and incarnate Word of God, is one Son. Wherefore, if scripture predicates something human of Christ, we shall transfer this to the condition of his humanity (for his humanity is also his own); but if something is enunciated of him as of God, we shall assign the higher words, as befitting the human nature, to the one Christ and Son again, believing him to be God inhumanated, etc. We shall attribute the human things to him on account of his dispensation with the flesh, and the divine things on account of his ineffable generation from the Father." Theodoret subscribes to the opinion proposed by us in dialogue 2, where these words of his are worthy of note: "As the properties of the body and soul are congruous to man, so also must we speak of Christ. When we speak of the natures, the things congruous to each must be attributed, and it must be known what are the properties of the deity, what of the humanity. But when we speak of the person, the properties of the natures are to be communicated, and both are to be attributed to the Savior Christ. And one and the same is to be called God and man, Son of God and Son of man, Son of David and Lord of David." And in dialogue 3, concerning the person, he says: "The properties of the natures have been made common to the person on account of the union, because the same is the Son of God and the Son of man, eternal and recent." So also Damascene, book 3, chapter 4, says: "Human things are not predicated of the deity, but of God according to his humanity; nor divine things of the humanity, but of man according to his deity."

§. V.

From the personal union also flow the charismata or gifts which are conferred on the human nature, finite indeed, yet most excellent, in the number of which come wisdom and knowledge of the human nature, altogether greater than any other creature is capable of, justice, holiness, excellence, supreme beatitude; also the *apotelesmata*, otherwise called theandric works. These things are so manifest of the Truth, that Gerhardus himself, T. I, Loc. IV, p. 1350 (who nevertheless feigns that, according to our opinion, the bare human nature suffered), reprehends Jacobus Andreae, the principal

fabricator of the Formula of Concord, Brentius, etc., for having established that abstract predications should be used: "The Deity suffered," and he refutes them by the silence of scripture, from the nature of God, which is impassible, unchangeable, and immutable, and from the danger of the heresy of the Theopaschites. Nor does he bear this mollification of theirs: "The Deity suffered in the flesh," but wished this to be substituted: "God suffered in the flesh." Which is our very own analysis of this proposition.

§. VI.

The cult of adoration of Christ is also usually referred to this, concerning which Christian truth holds that Christ the God-man, God and man, is to be worshiped with one adoration. We distinguish, however, between the direct and indirect object of adoration. The direct object is either *that which* or the total and adequate and material object; or *that by which*, or the formal and the reason for which that adequate object is adored. The former, namely the object *that which*, is the whole person of Christ, the God-man, God and man, consisting of both natures. The latter, namely the object *that by which* or the formal cause of adoration, is the divine nature of the Savior, which is the foundation or cause why Christ is adored. The indirect object, however, is the human nature of Christ, which we by no means exclude from adoration when we adore Christ, but at the same time, with one adoration, by which we adore the divine nature, because it is not bare flesh and human nature, but the nature and flesh of God assumed into the union of the Word and constituting the God-man together with the divine nature, in which human nature God dwells bodily, and which for that reason cannot be excluded from adoration without the division of the two natures. Here again we have the venerable president of the Synod of Ephesus agreeing with us, who in defense of Anathema VIII praises these words of Athanasius: "But if anyone, besides these things from the divine scriptures, teaches another Son of God, and another adopted Son from Mary according to grace, like us, so that there are two Sons, one by nature the Son of God, who is from God, and one by grace, a man from Mary; or if anyone says that the flesh of our Lord is from above, and not from the Virgin Mary; or that the divinity was converted into flesh, or confused, or changed; or that the deity of the Lord is passible; or that the flesh of our Lord is not to be adored as of a man, and that the flesh of the Lord and God is not to be adored, him the holy and catholic Church anathematizes, obeying the divine apostle who says: 'If anyone preaches to you a gospel contrary to what you have received, let him be anathema.'" See, from our doctors, the most distinguished Joh. Bergius, *Analysis of the Controversy on the Person of Christ*, chap. 14. Altingius, *Theological Problems, New Series*, Loc. XII, Probl. XX, p. 588.

§. VII.

Just as, however, the subject of all the actions of Christ is one, namely the person of the God-man itself, which the Church of Christ has affirmed up to this point against the Nestorians (for actions belong to supposita), and so by reason of the acting person all the actions and passions of Christ can be called theandric; so the Church of Christ has

also constantly asserted that the principle *by which* he acts, as also the natures, is twofold, against the Monothelites and Eutyches, namely that the intellect, will, and active power by which he can operate is twofold: one divine, uncreated, and infinite, the other human, created, and finite. Hence there is a twofold operation of a twofold nature and power, distinctly concurring in the common work or result. So also the doctors of the Reformed Church confess that one and the same Christ the God-man is the author of the miracles which he performed, but that a twofold principle or natures, and a twofold energy, distinctly concur in performing the divine miracles, yet in such a way that they operate distinctly indeed, but not dividedly, but unitedly. For the divine nature acts divinely, or according to God, not in a divine manner, but by the ministry of the assumed nature; in a similar way the human nature acts, as a true man, but not in a human way, or according to man in the common human manner, but above man and for the sake of men. Hence such actions, concurring as it were into one, are called by the ancients theandric, not only by reason of the acting person, but also by reason of the twofold power and operation concurring. These powers and operations, however, in acting are not coordinated, but subordinated, in such a way, namely, that the Word is the principal agent, and his will is the sole ruling principle, directing the will and all the actions and passions of the assumed human nature. The human nature, however, does not act of itself or by itself alone, but being moved by the Word, to which it is subordinated in acting, as cooperating with the principal agent, it is personally united to the same. And although, in the judgment of Cyril, a creature can never receive things that are of infinite virtue, nor do we persuade ourselves to such a madness as to maintain that a creative power or the power of working miracles is elicited from the flesh of Christ, for the reason already alleged; yet we do not shrink from asserting that it is no more foreign to the human flesh of Christ to cooperate with the person of the Word in performing divine works, and to concur in its own way in producing the same, than it was repugnant for it to have been so disposed by divine power that it could coalesce into one hypostasis with the divine nature. For the same capacity that the human nature obtained to be able to be united to the Word, it now has the capacity to be able to concur in performing works which exceed the powers of nature. See the distinguished lights of our former Academy, the blessed Joh. Bergius and the blessed Gregorius Francus, the former in his above-praised *Analysis of the Controversy on the Person of Christ*, chap. XIII, the latter in his third *Disputation on the Gifts given to Christ the God-man*, th. XXII ff.

§. VIII.

Hence we entirely approve of the ninth declaration of the fathers of the Council of Ephesus on Anathema IX, which reads in this manner: "Although the only-begotten Word of God was made man, he nevertheless remained God, having all things in common with the Father except paternity alone. And having as his own the Holy Spirit, who is from him and is essentially in him, he worked the signs of his divine power. Wherefore, after he was made man, he also remained God, and so he worked miracles by

his own power through the Spirit. But those who say that he, as any one of the saints like us, was glorified by the operation of the Spirit, and used it not as divine and his own, but as alien and unbecoming to God, and also that he was assumed into heaven as it were by the grace of the Spirit, they will rightly be subject to the force of this anathema." To which are twin the things which the easily first among the theologians of the last century, the blessed Joh. Calvin, has in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, lib. I, c. XIII, n. 13: "But in the miracles, how clearly and lucidly does the divinity of Christ appear? Although I confess that both the prophets and the apostles performed similar and like things, yet in this there is a great difference, that they dispensed the gifts of God by their ministry, but he exerted his own power. He indeed sometimes used prayer, in order to refer the glory to the Father; but we see for the most part his own power shown to us. And how would he not be the true author of miracles, who commits the dispensation to others by his own authority? For the evangelist narrates that he gave the apostles the power of raising the dead, healing the lepers, casting out demons, etc. But they so performed such a ministry that they sufficiently showed that the power was from nowhere else than from Christ. 'In the name of Jesus Christ,' says Peter, 'rise and walk.' It is no wonder, therefore, if Christ objected his miracles to refute the unbelief of the Jews, inasmuch as, being performed by his power, they gave the most ample testimony of his divinity." It is not worth the effort to relate at length that Christ offered sacrifice to God the Father not for himself but for the human race. See, among our doctors, Joh. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Lib. II, Cap. XVII, n. 6; Altingius, *Theological Writings of Heidelberg*, Tom. II, Probl. XLII; Maresius, *Select Disputations*, Misc. Disp., Exhib. Dec. Theol. Quest., Th. VI.

§. IX.

All the Reformed maintain that the flesh of Christ is vivifying, not by itself, by its own nature and proper power, nor because the essential properties of the divine nature are transfused into it, but by the grace of the personal union, because it was made the proper flesh of the Son of God, who is life itself. Then the flesh of the Savior is vivifying with respect to the office and end of the personal union, namely, that in it, through it, and with it he might accomplish our salvation. Finally, we maintain that the flesh of Christ is vivifying with respect to the application and merit. Hence this flesh, inasmuch as it is given for the life of the world, is called vivifying (John 6). And Christ in the same place severely pronounces that they will not have life in themselves who refuse to eat his flesh and drink his blood, that is, to apply it to themselves by true faith. In a word, the flesh of Christ is vivifying virtually, meritoriously, and when eaten by true faith, but by no means effectively and formally. For just as (which is a most apt simile of our great Calvin) water is now drunk from a spring, now drawn, now led through channels to irrigate fields, which nevertheless does not overflow for so many uses from itself, but from the very source, which by its perennial flow provides and supplies new abundance to them from time to time: so the flesh of Christ is like a rich and inexhaustible spring, which transfuses into us the life that springs from the divinity into itself. Here again the

oft-praised fathers of the Synod of Ephesus rise up for us in the declaration of Anathema XI: "Because," they say, "the flesh has been made the property of the Word, for that reason it is understood and is vivifying, just as the Savior himself says: 'As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will also live because of me.'" Likewise Cyril in his defense of Anathema XI against the Orientals: "Because," he says, "the Word, which is life according to nature, which is from God the Father, makes the flesh vivifying, and in this way the vivifying blessing has been made for us. Therefore Christ also said: 'Amen, Amen, I say to you, I am the living bread, which came down from heaven and gives life to the world.' And again: 'The bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.' And again: 'He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood remains in me and I in him.' See, therefore, how everywhere he names that body of his assumed from a woman as his own, on account of the supreme unity." And these things also, we are certain, are sufficient for the proof of the minor proposition for good and modest minds. Indeed, it would be open to us here to adduce a long series of our confessions, some of which repudiate the Nestorian heresy in express words, and also to weave a lengthy catalog of our authors who confute the Nestorian perfidy, if our intention were to write a whole treatise on that matter. But since the nature of our undertaking sets narrower limits for us, we do not wish to be more prolix in an obvious matter.

Chapter IV. In which the principal objections that are usually made here are refuted.

§. I.

Having therefore established our thesis by the grace of God, namely, that Reformed Christians can in no way be made guilty of the Nestorian heresy, it is necessary that we should see those things which are here usually objected by our adversaries, and that we should call them to examination as briefly as possible. D. Calovius, in order to attribute the Nestorian heresy to the Reformed, the Helmstedtians, the Rintelensians, and the Königsberg theologians, in a disputation held in the previous year, on ancient and new Nestorianism, §. 36, sets forth the state of the controversy between Cyril, the other fathers of the Synod of Ephesus, and Nestorius and his followers as this: Whether the union of the two natures in Christ our Savior is to be so conceived and defined, that those things which are proper to the human nature by the power of the hypostatic union can also truly and really be attributed to God and vice versa? And he writes that Nestorius defended the negative of this question. But although this state of the controversy may seem at first glance to be entirely orthodox (for that the Nestorian heresy denied the communication of idioms, as it was described by us above, or even when it substitutes it for the personal union, is most clear from the anathemas of the Council of Ephesus), and formed as it is with concrete words denoting the person of the God-man, yet from the following words of the same and of the 43rd thesis, in which he asserts that the hypostasis or subsistence of the Word and the properties of the divine nature are communicated to the human nature, and vice versa, it is clear that he is speaking of a communication, namely, that which does not happen to the person, which

opinion is undoubtedly orthodox, but that which has its place between the natures. Where, however, it is to be noted that the question between the Reformed and the Lutherans is not: Whether the divine nature in Christ communicated its own glory and excellence to the human nature? For how could those who affirm that the divine nature itself communicated itself to the human nature call this into question? Nor is it in controversy: Whether the human nature in Christ by communication was personally made omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient, etc.? For although that proposition can be understood sinisterly, because it seems to be akin to the Eutychian heresy, yet there is no doubt that it can also be explained orthodoxly, if only a fair interpreter were present. In the meantime, the state of the controversy is badly proposed by such questions, which rather involve the matter than render it clear. But the hinge of the controversy turns on this: Whether omnipresence, omnipotence, omniscience, which are truly and properly called attributes of the divine nature, are so in the human nature of Christ and are predicated of the same, that the human nature in itself and in its essence was made omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient? And we entirely deny this question. And so far is it from being possible for this negative opinion to be called Nestorian, that we hold it for certain that it was rather orthodox and catholic at all times, and that the contrary affirmative was erroneous and publicly rejected in the Council of Chalcedon. If therefore D. Calovius has given proof that this negative is Nestorian, he will surely be a great Apollo to us! For us, on the contrary, it will be very easy to prove that this opinion is plainly orthodox and catholic, namely that the subject to which those attributes are communicated is not so much the human nature, so that it is believed to have been made omnipotent and omnipresent in itself, but the whole person of Christ, although it is most true that nothing can be attributed to the person or suppositum which does not belong to either nature. Whence orthodox doctors here also employ the distinction between the principle *by which*, which they say is one of the natures, and the principle *which*, which they say is the person. For neither a property nor an energy can be predicated of the person, unless it is in and belongs to one of the natures. Whence Cyril, in his *On the Right Faith* to Theodosius, says: "It is manifest that what is in the nature and properly of the Word from God the Father, is preserved for him again even when he appeared as a man. Therefore it is perilous to dare to divide. In this manner, therefore, it can be understood that all things were given to the Son by the Father: that what he had from eternity, inasmuch as he is the Word of the Father, he is seen to have received again, inasmuch as the Word was made flesh and was manifested in the flesh." Athanasius, in *Dialogue 1 on the Trinity*: "A mere man would not have been worthy of such gifts. The Word, on the other hand, alone and mere, would not have needed them. The Word, therefore, was co-opted for us, and imparted his power to us. For in the man existing in the flesh, the man was exalted and received power: therefore these things are referred to the Word, because they were given for the sake of the Word. Therefore, because the Word was in the man, these graces were given, and as the Word was made flesh, so also the man through the Word received them." Theodoretus, *Dialogue 2*: "Thus," he says, "must speech be held concerning Christ: when we speak of the natures, let us attribute to each its own, and let us know that some things are proper to the divinity,

some to the humanity. But when we speak of the person, it is necessary to make the properties of the natures common, and to fit or attribute these and those to the Savior Christ, and to call him both God and man, and Son of God and Son of man, and Son of David and Lord of David, and seed of Abraham and creator of Abraham." Let the same be thought to have been said of all appellations. Vigilius, book 5 against the Eutychians: "Therefore, they are impious and sacrilegious who ascribe the properties of the Word to the nature of the flesh." Theodoret, Dialogue 1: "They inflict insult on the Lord and accuse the truth of falsehood, whoever, fascinated by these persuasions, think that they are giving glory to God, when under the appearance of adoring the deity in Christ, they diminish the truth of his flesh. What? Because these opinions not only are distant from the thing itself and from the truth, but are also most absurd. For if he assumed another body, what does this have to do with my body, which needs salvation?" Damascenus, book 3 of the orthodox faith, says: "When we speak of the person, whether we know it from both parts at once, or from one alone, we impose on it the properties of both natures. For Christ (which word embraces both) is called both God and man, and created and uncreated, and passible and impassible."

What D. Calovius adds in §. 36, near the end, that the hypostasis of the Word with the divine idioms was communicated to the human nature, we grant this, understood with a grain of salt, namely, if "to be communicated" is taken in this place for "to be united," and in this sense not only omnipresence, omnipotence, omniscience, which Calovius wills, but also eternity, infinity, immensity, immutability, in a word, all the essential properties of the divine, and indeed the deity itself, was most really communicated to the human nature of Christ. If, however, the author speaks of a transfusive communication, he will be little different from the Eutychian heresy. Indeed, unless he says with us that the hypostasis of the Word or the personality of the Word was thus given and communicated to the humanity of Christ, so that it might exist in the person of the Word, but so that it might subsist by it, or become a person, he himself will become guilty of the Nestorianism which he attributes to us and to the most learned theologians of Helmstedt, Rintelen, and Königsberg. For to whatever nature personality is communicated, so that it subsists through it, that nature becomes a person. But (according to the opinion of D. Calovius) personality is communicated to the human nature of Christ, so that it subsists through it. Therefore (according to the opinion of D. Calovius) the human nature of Christ becomes a person. And so we will now have two persons in Christ, one which subsists by its own hypostasis, the other by a communicated one. Which is the very heresy of Nestorianism condemned in the Synod of Ephesus. What is added in the same place, that the essential divine idioms differ from the hypostasis not in reality, but only in reason, let it be so granted. But it is surprising why then, with the hypostasis, omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience having been communicated, infinity also, of which omnipresence is only an act, if we have faith in the scholastics, and likewise eternity, is not communicated to the human nature of Christ, since of those things which are really the same, one being communicated, the rest are also communicated? But no theologian, unless one who does not know what it is

to be infinite, immense, and eternal, and to be a creature, will bring himself to say that the human nature is infinite, immense, and eternal. Or does the hypostasis cohere more closely with omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience than with infinity and eternity? I do not think anyone will assert that. But they have another excuse ready; namely, they distinguish between the divine properties that are energetic or operative, and those that are non-energetic or non-operative. They report that the former were communicated to the human nature of Christ, the latter not. But in truth, first, by this reasoning, the foundation and cause of this communication would not be the personal union, which they nevertheless allege, for otherwise all the divine attributes would be communicated to the human nature, but the energy, operation, or actuality of certain attributes. Then omnipresence, for the sake of which, however, this whole controversy is undertaken, and omniscience, these things being so, could not even be communicated, but only omnipotence, since it alone implies energy, operation, or actuality, and is energetic, which would be communicated, the rest would remain.

§. III.

The things which D. Calovius in paragraph 37 adduces against the Syncretists, as he calls them with a hateful name, especially against D. Dreier and D. Calixtus, do not touch us, who above, when we were proving our thesis, inculcated that a most real communication of idioms flows from the personal union, which, however, according to the opinion of the Catholic Church, was not made between the natures, but in the person of the God-man, and to the same the divine idioms, not only omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience, but also all the rest, independence, infinity, eternity, spirituality, were so communicated that they can be said of the flesh of Christ even in the concrete, namely, with words implying the person, most truly and most really. For we do not attribute omnipresence and the other attributes only to the divine nature of Christ, so that the human nature is plainly excluded from their communion. Let this calumny cease! But we confess that omnipresence, omnipotence, eternity, and the other properties of the divinity pertain also to the human nature in this respect and are predicated of the same, inasmuch as they pertain to the hypostasis, to which the humanity is personally united. And hence this person of the God-man is to be called not by an extrinsic denomination, but altogether by an intrinsic one, omnipotent, omnipresent, etc. Hence also the things which D. Calovius adduces concerning a merely external and relative union in thesis 37, near the end, and which we rejected above when we were treating of the personal union, easily vanish. By no means, however, is the human nature of Christ in the abstract to be denominated intrinsically omnipresent, so that its essence is placed in every place, nor intrinsically omnipotent. For to be predicated or said requires to be in, namely, subjectively and inhesively. But that the divine attributes were communicated to the human nature in this way, that they were transfused into it, we judge to be contrary both to the sacred scriptures and to the pious and catholic truth, which asserts that the personal union in Christ was made unconfusedly, that is, without confusion, so that neither the natures themselves, nor

their essential properties, without which the natures cannot be preserved, were mixed or confused with each other, nor was the hypostasis of the divinity transfused into the humanity. For not only the Council of Chalcedon against the Eutychian heresy, which confounded the natures and their essential properties in Christ, but the Synod of Ephesus itself also willed that the natures and their properties be not confused, but sound and intact. Whence Cyril, in the declaration of the first anathema, says: "And we do not maintain that any commixtion or confusion or concretion of its essence (of the Word) with the flesh was made." The same in the explanation of the second anathema: "He who was made like us, although he remained what he was, does not shun what is ours; nay, rather, on account of the dispensation, he admits all those things which pertain to human nature, together with the measures of humanity; nor does he suffer any detriment from this according to his own nature or glory." And in the declaration of the third anathema: "Wherefore, after that secret union, whether you name God Immanuel and incarnate and inhumanated, we receive the Word of God the Father; or whether you say man, we equally acknowledge that very Word of God, who by the dispensation let himself down to the measures of humanity. We say, therefore, that he who is impalpable was made palpable, and he who is invisible, visible. For the body which he united to himself was not alien to him, which we certainly say is palpable and visible."

§. IV.

But especially in the fourth anathema, the orthodox fathers propose the communication of idioms, such as was always believed in the Catholic Church, and which the Nestorian heresy impiously denied, which is very similar to ours, which we have defined above. But that which is said to have its place between the natures, which D. Calovius and his adherents feign, and try to impose on others, is most plainly confuted by this fourth anathema and its declaration. For they say in express words that those sayings which occur in the sacred scriptures are indeed to be vindicated for one person, but in such a way that the human things which are said of it are to be referred to its human nature, but the divine things to the divine. We have adduced the words of these same fathers above in Chapter III, Thesis IV, which it is not worth the trouble to repeat here, since they can be read there. To which deserve to be added what is contained in the same declaration of the fourth anathema: "Whoever says that the incarnate and made man Word of God is one Son and Lord, his person is also entirely one. We shall attribute to him the human things on account of his dispensation with the flesh, and the divine things on account of his ineffable generation from the Father." Indeed, the Catholic fathers observed that very same crassest error, which the orthodox doctors note in D. Calovius and other Lutherans, even in the Nestorians themselves, which is most noteworthy, namely that they always took the natures for the person, and did not distinguish between them. For in this way Maxentius, in his dialogue, introduces Nestorius speaking: "Some astonishing things are being brought to my ears by you, as if it were different and not the same thing to say 'man' or 'human nature,' since a man is nothing but human nature." To which words the Catholic responds: "This is surely the

cause of your error and no other. For while you are unable to discern what is the difference between a person and a nature, understanding that a person is the same thing as a nature, nay, in no way believing that a nature can exist without a person, you confound the terms of person and natures and without doubt you preach two persons altogether, just as you preach two natures of one Son." And Theodoret the Presbyter of Raithu, *On the Hypostatic Union*: "For Nestorius does not assert the number of two natures for this reason, that he might signify the truth of the deity and humanity in Christ and the same immutable and immanent and unconfused; but that he might fraudulently subinsinuate two persons by the binary number itself, the appellation of natures being maliciously and indeed newly usurped for that of persons, introducing by the license of the term 'natures' what it is nefarious to think of persons." Damascenus, book 3 of the orthodox faith, c. 3: "This is what induces error in heretics, that they say nature and hypostasis are the same." But that those who call the flesh of Christ the instrument of the divinity in the operations of the mediatorial office are not to be accused of Nestorianism will be in the open if we consider that they are not speaking of a separate instrument, such as a pen is an instrument in the hand of a writer, but their speech is of a conjoined instrument, or one personally united to the Word, which they are accustomed to call an "enhypostatic organ." Nor only more recent theologians, but also the most ancient fathers and scholastics call the human nature of Christ an instrument. Thus Athanasius, Oration 5 against the Arians, says that God "takes for himself the human body as an instrument," and "uses the human body as an instrument." And Oration 4: "What the apostle says, 'The divinity dwells in the flesh,' is as if you were to say: 'When he was God, he added to himself and had his own body, and using it as an organ, he was made man for our sakes.' And the Word bore the infirmities of the flesh as his own (for the flesh was his), and the flesh served the works of the deity, because he was in it: for it was the body of God." Damascenus, book 3 of the orthodox faith, chap. 15, says: "The flesh was called the instrument of the deity." The reason, however, which has led them to call the human nature the instrument of the divine nature, theologians are wont to give this: because the second person of the Trinity assumed the human nature into his hypostasis for the sake of an operation, that is, for the sake of our redemption and salvation (Hebrews 2:14-16; Galatians 4:4), and he performed the same through the flesh (Acts 20:28; 1 Corinthians 2:8; Hebrews 9:14).

§. V.

But that Nestorianism can be evidently proven by the denial of the omnipresence of the flesh of Christ, D. Calovius writes in §. 39. But in truth, if D. Calovius has proven this, that those who deny the omnipresence of the human nature of Christ are Nestorians, he will have at the same time proven that Christians, as many as have ever been, are at present, and perhaps will be in the future, are Nestorians; but that only the Eutychians of old, and today some Lutherans (for he disputes here chiefly against the Helmstedtians, Rintelensians, and Königsbergers, whom he is pleased to name Calixtines and Syncretists, whom, however, he has not yet been permitted to expunge from the list of

Lutherans, although Strauchius, in his continuation of our blessed Joh. Sleidan, writes that they are no longer worthy to be called Lutherans, because they have departed from the Lutheran Church in 88 chapters) absolve the Catholic Church. Indeed, infinite and most weighty testimonies of the fathers persuade that this dogma was unheard of and unknown in the first Church, which our doctors have collected in great number, and from which we shall be content to have brought forth these few into the midst. Origen judges the division of Christ to be absurd, yet he by no means resorts to the ubiquity of his human nature. For thus, Homily 33 on Matthew: "If Christ is always present to all his own, how do his parables introduce him as traveling? See if we can solve what is asked in this way. For he who says to his disciples, 'Behold, I am with you, even to the consummation of the age,' and again, 'Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them,' and who stands in the midst even of those who do not know him, is the only-begotten of God, God the Word and wisdom, and justice and truth, who is not circumscribed by a bodily compass. According to this nature of his divinity, he does not travel, but he travels according to the dispensation of the body which he assumed. But in saying these things, we do not dissolve the man of the assumed body, since it is written in John: 'Every spirit that dissolves Jesus is not of God,' but we preserve the property of each substance." And a little after: "As a man he travels, who was everywhere according to the nature of his divinity. For it is not a man who is wherever two or three are gathered in his name, nor is a man with us all the days even to the consummation of the age, nor is a man present everywhere to the faithful who are gathered, but the divine power which is in Jesus." Origen, book 2 against Celsus: "But that he who spoke in Jesus that saying, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life,' not even the Gospels so circumscribe by the body that he was nowhere outside the body and soul of Jesus, is clear from many places, of which it is pleasing to append a few here. John the Baptist, prophesying that the Son of God was now at hand, not in that body and soul, but present everywhere, says of him: 'In your midst stands one whom you do not know, who is to come after me.' If they had indeed understood that the Son of God was only there where his body was seen, how could he have said that, 'in your midst stands one whom you do not know'? Jesus himself also, raising the minds of his disciples to a more sublime understanding of the Son of God, says: 'Wherever two or three have been gathered in my name, there I am in the midst of them.' Such also is that promise of his to the disciples, saying: 'Behold, I am with you even to the consummation of the age.' But these things were not said to us for this reason, that we should separate the Son of God from Jesus: for after the dispensation, the soul and body of Jesus are united with the Word of God. For if, according to the doctrine of Paul, who says, 'He who is joined to the Lord is one spirit with him,' whoever understands what it is to be joined, and that he who is joined to him is one spirit with him, how is not that which is composed with the Word of God much more divinely and excellently one?" Augustine, in Epistle 57 to Dardanus: "Do not doubt that the man Christ Jesus is now there whence he is to come: and remember and faithfully hold the Christian confession: that he rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, and will come from nowhere else than thence to judge the living and the dead. And he will come thus, as the angelic voice

testifies, just as he was seen to go into heaven, that is, in the same form and substance of the flesh, to which he certainly gave immortality, he did not take away its nature. According to this form, he is not to be thought of as diffused everywhere. For care must be taken that we do not so construe the divinity of the man as to take away the truth of the body. But it is not a consequence that what is in God is so everywhere as God. For of us also the most veracious scripture is said, that 'in him we live and move and have our being,' and yet we are not everywhere as he is, but that man is in God in one way, since also that God is in man in another, in a proper and singular way. For one person is God and man, and both are one Christ Jesus, everywhere, through that which is God, but in heaven through that which is man." Augustine, Tractate 30 on John: "The Lord is above, but the Lord, who is truth, is also here. For the body of the Lord, in which he rose, must be in one place; his truth is diffused everywhere." Augustine, Tractate 31 on John: "He came so that he did not depart from thence; he returned so that he did not leave us. Why do you wonder? God does this. For a man according to the body is in a place, and migrates from a place, and when he has come to another place, he is not in the place from which he came. But God fills all things, and is everywhere whole, he is not held by places according to spaces. Yet Christ was on earth according to his visible flesh, in heaven and on earth according to his invisible majesty." Augustine, Tractate 50 on John: "Let them hear from us, let them hear from the Gospel. He was killed, he was buried, he rose again, he was recognized by the disciples, he ascended into heaven before their eyes, there he sits at the right hand of the Father, he who was judged will come as judge. Let them hear and hold. They answer: Whom shall I hold? An absent one? How shall I put my hand into heaven, to hold him who sits there? Put forth your faith, and you have held him. Your parents held him in the flesh, you hold him in your heart, because Christ, though absent, is also present. Unless he were present, he could not be held by us ourselves. But because it is true what he says, 'Behold, I am with you even to the consummation of the age,' he both went away, and is here, and will return, and has not deserted us. For he brought his body into heaven, he did not take his majesty from the world." The same, *ibid.*: "He was speaking (namely when he said: 'You do not always have me') of the presence of his body. For according to his majesty, according to his providence, according to his ineffable and invisible grace, what was said by him is fulfilled: 'Behold, I am with you all the days, even to the consummation of the age.' But according to the flesh which the Word assumed, according to that which was born of the Virgin, according to that which was apprehended by the Jews, which was fixed to the wood, which was taken down from the cross, which was wrapped in linen cloths, which was laid in the sepulcher, which was manifested in the resurrection, you will not always have me with you. Why? Because he conversed according to the presence of his body for forty days with his disciples, and as they escorted him, he ascended into heaven, being seen, not being followed, and he is not here. For he is there, he sits at the right hand of the Father; and he is here, for the presence of his majesty has not departed." Cyril, on John, Book 8: "Finally, when he had said of himself, 'But me you will not always have,' the Lord was speaking of the presence of his body. For according to his majesty, according to his providence, according to his ineffable and invisible grace of divinity, what was said

by him is fulfilled: 'Behold, I am with you even to the consummation of the age.'" Cyril, Book 9 on John, c. 21: "The faithful must believe that although he is absent from us in body, yet by his power all things, including us, are governed, and that he himself is always present to all who love him. Therefore he said: 'Amen, Amen, I say to you, wherever two or three are gathered in my name, there I am in the midst of them.' For just as, when he conversed as a man on earth, he then also filled the heavens, and did not leave the company of the angels; in the same way now, since he is in the heavens with his flesh, he nevertheless fills the earth, and is with those who love him. For it is to be observed that although he was to be absent only according to the flesh (for he is always present by the power of his deity, as we have said), yet he said that he would be with his disciples for a little while, openly naming himself, lest anyone should dare to divide Christ into two sons, but that one should believe altogether in one Son of God the Father and of the Virgin, not because there is one nature, but because after the incarnation this pious division is not. For Christ is one in both natures." Fulgentius, Book 2 to King Thrasimund: "The Son of God, both by divine authority and by the faithful and veracious opinion of the holy fathers, is proved to be infinite and immense according to the divine nature, present everywhere, filling all things, a witness now of our thoughts and works, a future judge and retributor of all. But because the same Son of God, true God born of God the Father, was made true man for us from man (for he was made of the seed of David according to the flesh), containing in himself the truth of the divine and human nature, he did not lose what was of true divinity, and he received what is of true humanity, one and the same according to the flesh born of his mother in time, who according to his divinity remains everlasting from the Father, one and the same local from man, who is immense God from the Father, one and the same according to the human substance, absent from heaven when he was on earth, and leaving the earth when he ascended into heaven; but according to the divine and immense substance, neither leaving heaven when he descended from heaven, nor deserting the earth when he ascended to heaven. Which can be known from the most certain word of the Lord himself, who, to show the local nature of his humanity, says to his disciples: 'I ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and to your God.' Of Lazarus also, when he had said, 'Lazarus is dead,' he added, saying: 'But I rejoice for your sakes, that you may believe, because I was not there.' But showing the immensity of his divinity to his disciples, he says: 'Behold, I am with you even to the consummation of the age.' But how did he ascend into heaven, unless because he is a true and local man? Or how is he present to his faithful, unless because the same is immense and true God?" From which anyone understands that it is clear and manifest enough that those who deny the omnipresence of the human nature of Christ are not Nestorians, but defend the catholic opinion of the Catholic Church. That the one hypostasis of the two natures is denied by this most true and founded in the sacred scriptures opinion, is clear and manifest to no one, except to him who, with the Eutychians condemned in the Synod of Chalcedon, labors to recall the confusion of the natures into the person of the God-man into the Church, or at least to abolish the properties of the natures in Christ. But D. Calovius proves his thesis, namely, that those who deny the omnipresence of the human nature of

Christ deny the one hypostasis of the two natures in Christ, with this syllogism: "Whatever's hypostasis is in infinite places, that itself is also in infinite places. The hypostasis of the assumed human nature is in infinite places. Therefore, the assumed human nature will also be in infinite places." But it is answered: The major proposition is false. For the consequence from the person of Christ to the human nature is not valid. Or, what is attributed to the person of Christ is not on that account attributed to the human nature of Christ, just as it is not on that account attributed to the divine nature what is attributed to the person. For the person, because it consists of two natures, also claims for itself the essential properties of both natures, which being taken away, the natures themselves are taken away. On the contrary, one nature by no means claims for itself the individual properties of the person. Otherwise it would have to be said of the divine nature that it began in time, that it was quantitative, finite, palpable, passible, etc., and of the human, that it was independent, eternal, infinite, spiritual, omnipresent, immense, impassible, etc. Since no one will easily deny that this is most absurd, the falsity of the major proposition easily becomes apparent from it. For in the same way it could be argued: "Whatever's hypostasis is independent, eternal, infinite, spiritual, immense, immutable, that itself is also independent, eternal, infinite, spiritual, immense, immutable. But the hypostasis of the assumed human nature is independent, eternal, infinite, spiritual, immense, immutable. Therefore, the assumed human nature is also independent, eternal, infinite, spiritual, immense, immutable." Since this conclusion is absurd, either the major or the minor proposition will be false. No one will argue that the minor proposition is false, unless he calls the deity of Christ into question with the followers of Socinus. It remains, therefore, that the major proposition must be entirely false. Which was to be demonstrated! In the same way also the Swabian Lutherans could have argued, who wrongly taught that the human nature of Christ was omnipresent even in the state of exinanition: "Whatever's hypostasis is in infinite places, that itself is also in infinite places. But the hypostasis of the assumed human nature is in infinite places. Therefore, the assumed human nature is also in infinite places." And in this way, most Lutherans will again not be immune from the Nestorianism which the Swabians also boldly reproached the Hessians, likewise Lutherans, if they wish their own hypotheses to be safe and sound. Gerhardus, in his *Theological Loci*, Tom. 1, on the person and office of Christ, feigns that Keckermann, in his *System of Theology*, p. 81, seeking a response to this argument, falls into such absurdity as to deny that the person is infinite. But those who have it ascertained how great a theologian and philosopher the blessed Keckermann was, will scarcely be persuaded that the most distinguished man responded so ineptly to the argument opposed to him. For first, it is most false that Keckermann is responding to the argument of the Lutherans about the divine hypostasis communicated to the human nature, a matter which he treats not on p. 81, where he disputes against those who make war on the Trinity of persons in one divine essence, but on p. 320. Then Keckermann does not deny that the divine person is infinite, but he teaches from metaphysics that the person considered by reason of its essence is entirely infinite, but by reason of its relation or mode of existence is neither infinite nor finite, and that because, according to the received opinion of the philosophers, those modes are not

beings, nor yet are they entirely nothing. It was therefore a consequence that that mode, viewed in itself and abstractly, is neither finite nor infinite. But the words of the most learned author themselves will best refute the calumny attempted against him, which are as follows: "A person is considered in a twofold way: 1. By reason of its essence; and thus it is infinite, but it is not threefold. Secondly, it is considered by reason of its relation, or mode of existence, and thus it is neither finite nor infinite, because finitude and infinitude are affections of a being or a thing; but a person, as a person, or as a mode of existence, is not a being, but a mode of a being, and modes are neither finite nor infinite."

§. VI.

What D. Calovius adds in §. 41: "So the divine subsistence of the nature will not be the subsistence of the human nature, so that one person results from it, from the divine and human nature, if the divine nature is in infinite places without the human nature," that, if he wishes the last words to be so understood, that the divine nature is separated from the human nature in many places, is most true. But in this way D. Calovius fights with shadows in the manner of the Andabatae, and feigns adversaries for himself where he has none in reality, since this has come into no one's mind. But if the particle "without" here ought to denote the same as "outside," a distinction will have to be made between the separative "outside" and the excessive "outside," or as others among the doctors say, the distinctive of the natures. The former, namely the separative, is undoubtedly Nestorian. The latter, however, namely the excessive, which in this place denotes the same as "beyond," is orthodox. Or, the Word is outside the flesh without limit, not outside it separately. By which the orthodox doctors wish to imply nothing other than that the human nature, since it is finite, although personally united to the person of the Word, is not made equal to the infinite divine nature by the personal union, and that because this union is not adequate, which has its place in the conjunction of finite things. Namely, the hypostasis of the Word, or the Word, on account of its immensity, is not enclosed by the narrow limits of the human, and therefore finite, nature, namely the flesh, but being immense and infinite, existing in a place where the flesh, on account of its finitude, is not, it nevertheless remains hypostatically or personally, inseparably, unconfusedly, and indivisibly joined and united to the finite flesh, since the external presence, which is of the flesh in a place where the Word is, being denied, the internal presence, which is of the flesh in the Word and with the Word or the second person of the divinity, is not on that account denied. The outermost member of the human body (let it be permitted to adumbrate a mystery, by all confession great, with a rude simile!) is most truly and really conjoined and united with the entire human body, and remains so, although that member is exceeded by the whole rest of the body, and is not coextensive with the whole body, nor is it comprehended by the same and equal space. Thus the older Catholic Church thinks with us. Hence Eustathius of Antioch, according to Theodoret, says: "The Word is in the flesh as in his temple, in which he dwells, yet in such a way that he is neither terminated nor enclosed, but, comprehending what is

within and what is without the temple, he contains it." And Theodoret himself: "And the person of the Word, that is, is in the body, yet in such a way that he is not contained by the same limits by which the body is." Likewise Anastasius, according to Fulgentius, *On the Incarnation*, c. 3: "The Word is not bound to the body, but he himself contains the body, so that he is in it and outside all things." Damascenus has things twin to these, book 3, chap. 7: "The Word is enfleshed and has not departed from his own completeness, and he is wholly enfleshed and is wholly uncircumscribed. He is made small and contracted bodily, but divinely he is uncircumscribed, the flesh being coextended with his uncircumscribed hypostasis." Hoffmann, a Lutheran theologian, perceived the same truth and defended it most sharply against Hunnius. Therefore he writes: "The Word is within his flesh, but not enclosed, since being enclosed in the finite is opposed to infinity. If he was not enclosed, he will also be without, but not excluded, because the simplicity of the essence of God does not suffer that, by being without, he should be absent from where he is within. For thus he would be subject to dimensions. But that very thing which is wholly within is wholly without, without measure of extension, nor does it ever have part outside of part. Therefore, from this phrase, 'He is also outside his flesh,' it does not follow that part is incarnate, part is outside, that is, without flesh. But since you reproach us with this, see at last whether you do not do this through calumny, that is, whether you do not transform what is used by us in a theological sense, and therefore foreign to the sense which you nevertheless impose on us, into a physical one through mere sophistry. But remove this fault, and afterwards demonstrate that what you impute to us truly follows. Likewise, it pleased you to take the hypostasis, by which indeed both natures subsist, so that it may seem to flee that 'outside' more. But the appearance of the argument is nevertheless fallacious. For if the deity is outside its flesh, it is necessary that the hypostasis of the Word also be outside the flesh, so that the deity of the Word may not lack its subsistence anywhere. If you deny both, you have the evangelists and the orthodox fathers as adversaries. For the Word is nowhere except in his essence and hypostasis, whole, even in the smallest grain, as the Lord Luther says. Just as when God is whole in heaven, he does not cease to be whole in the clouds, and the earth, and the abysses of this. Therefore, the whole Word, with its whole hypostasis, will be in its flesh, since that it is whole with its whole hypostasis elsewhere cannot be denied. Why, therefore, in that fantasy of yours, as if the Word is in no way outside his flesh, do you so delight and glory, do you not thus declare war on God and his most holy servants, who, since they believe the body of God to be perpetually finite, but the deity to be perpetually infinite, never believe this latter to be enclosed within the body, but always acknowledge it outside, without exclusion, etc." How dissonant and absurd the dogma of the omnipresence of the flesh of Christ seemed to the same Hoffmann becomes clear from his own words, with which he puts the colophon to his entire treatise against Hunnius, and with which he thus addresses him: "But that I should agree with you, and corrupt the purer Saxon doctrine with your canon, I abhor your monstrous ubiquitarian dogma with my whole heart, and I pray God that he may deliver you, who are stuck in an execrable heresy, by his mercy." And why should not any pious Christian send a notice to that dogma, which not only is repugnant

to sound reason (which, however, should not be heard here in the least, unless other arguments were available), but also to saner antiquity, so that whoever has estimated the matter without prejudices, and with the skill that is fitting, will not in the least doubt that that unhappy birth, unless one should decide to seek its cradle in the ancient Eutychians, owes its origin only to the last century, and is indeed most contrary to the sacred scriptures.

This dogma is most contrary, since the scriptures inculcate that the body of Christ, both in the state of exinanition and in the state of exaltation, was, is, and will be in one place until the day of the last judgment. In the state of exinanition, it is said in so many words that Christ, as to his body, was not in some places: John 6:24, "When the crowd saw that Jesus was not there." Chapter 11:15, the Savior himself says: "I rejoice that I was not there." Christ is also said to have migrated from place to place. Thus Mark 6:6, "He went about the villages in a circuit." Acts 10:38, Jesus is read to have walked about. In the state of exaltation, that Christ as to his flesh is in a certain place, and therefore not everywhere, can be proven by very many testimonies of the sacred scriptures. Thus the angel says to the women seeking the Savior in the tomb: "He is not here" (Matthew 28:5-6). The Savior himself confirms the same, Matthew 26:11, "You always have the poor, but me you do not always have." John 16:28, he says that he is leaving the world. Verse 7, "It is expedient for us that he go away." Luke 24:51, he is said to have been separated from the disciples and carried up into heaven, and Acts 1:9, while they were looking on, he was lifted up, and a cloud received him and took him away from their eyes. Verse 11, "taken up from the disciples into heaven, he will come in the same way as they had seen him go into heaven." The apostle Peter says that heaven must receive Christ until the times of the restitution of all things (Acts 3:21). Which passage not only Beza, but also the Syriac interpreter, most ancient as well as most accurate, renders passively, to whom Nazianzen is to be added, in his second oration on the Son, in which he speaks thus: "It is necessary that he should reign until a certain time and be received by heaven until the times of the restitution, and have the seat at the right hand until the subjugation of his enemies." And Luther, in the New Testament which he published in the 19th year of the last century, in which he corrected the old translation, renders those words passively, as Abraham Scultetus testifies in his *Annales Evangelici*, Dec. II, p. 260. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes that Christ, if he were on earth, would not even be a priest (c. 8:4). Whence we, while we are in the body, are said to be away from the Lord (2 Corinthians 5:6), and to await Christ from heaven (Philippians 3:20), whom we shall see coming on the clouds of heaven (Matthew 24:30), descending from heaven with the voice of the archangel (1 Thessalonians 4:16-17). The distinctions which are wont to be employed here beg the question, and because they are contradictory to their subject, they are for that reason reconciled to their subject by no means. But those sayings which are wont to be alleged for the contrary opinion treat of the person of the God-man, from which we have just said that the consequence to the human nature is not valid. For in the same way one could argue: Christ the God-man existed before Abraham was; therefore, according to his human nature, he is eternal. Since this is

absurd, anyone who is not led by partisan zeal easily sees what strength there is in those arguments, taken from sayings treating of the person of Christ and adduced for the omnipresence of the human nature. Therefore, let him exclaim, "This can be!"

In paragraph XLI, D. Calovius strives to impose Nestorianism on the Calvinists and Calixtines because they make the communication of idioms merely verbal, or maintain that personal propositions are only verbal. But first, indeed, not without manifest calumny, he traduces the Reformed by the hateful name of Calvinists, since they wish to be called Christians from Christ, who died for them and in whose name they were baptized, but not from Calvin, although they venerate that blessed man as an outstanding and most faithful servant of God, and diagnostically from the Papists, Evangelicals and Reformed, because they profess the Christian religion purged of their dregs and slag according to the rule of the sacred scriptures or the Gospel. Then, as to the matter itself, some of the Reformed do not for that reason call the communication verbal, because there is no reality underlying it, but in the same sense entirely as the ancients called this communication a "conjunction and permutation of names," and thus they meant this, with Wendelinus, a most celebrated man, as interpreter, that when concrete names of the natures are predicated of them as subjects, either the concrete names of the natures, as of God, man, of man, God, or the names of the properties of the other nature, as of God, to have suffered, to have died, of man, to be omnipresent, omnipotent, the predicates, when considered abstractly, do not really belong to or inhere in the subjects, so that, namely, the deity is the humanity, the humanity the deity, that the deity is what suffered and died, the humanity is omnipotent and omnipresent, although most really God is man, and man God, God suffered and died, man is omnipotent and omnipresent, because the properties of the natures are not communicated and confounded, but remain distinct. In the person, however, that communication is as real as possible, because those properties really inhere in the person. But if communication is taken for union, that communication, even between the natures, is most real. Nor does the blessed Danaeus contradict other doctors, not even in those words which D. Calovius cites from Danaeus at the end of the paragraph, to which the following words of the same author against Chemnicus deserve to be added: "To the person itself, not to the nature, this foreign idiom, that is, of the other nature, is attributed by a real essential communication. For who would think that 'to be uncreated' could be said of a creature, or 'infinite' of a finite being, or 'to be uncircumscribed' of a body, truly and really? Therefore, of Christ the man himself, that is, of the person of Christ itself, these things can be said both rightly and truly, because it has both natures united hypostatically in itself." See more testimonies of our authors in the celebrated Massonius, *Anatomia Universalis Triumphantis*, Part II, c. 5.

§. XI.

The same is inculcated by the most deserving theologian of the Church of Christ, the blessed Mr. Joh. Bergius in his *Analysis of the Controversy on the Person of Christ*, who, however, by D. Calovius, such is his lust for vexing theologians, especially those zealous

for peace, even though he has piously and placidly died in Christ, was to be brought onto the stage in §. 42 and sarcastically received. Indeed, the blessed man found not what boys find in a bean, nor what D. Calovius finds in his infinite altercations and monstrous calumnies, especially against the Reformed religion, but what is uniquely necessary for a theologian, and without which he is to be considered a babbler rather than a theologian, namely truth and peace, or charity, not only towards the members of his own religion, but also towards all others. Nor would his words, if cited in their entirety, show that the mind of the distinguished Scharpius was different, which are as follows: "There is both a real and a verbal communication in the person of the Word, as was explained above; but if you understand it of the natures (as they do), that communication is impious and impossible, for then a mere man would really and essentially be God." He explains his mind more prolixly, however, in the preceding sections, to which he also appeals, where he speaks thus: "Furthermore, in the person of the Word a twofold communion is considered: First, a real one, by which the divine nature and its properties are most closely and personally joined to the human nature, and by which the person of the Word in reality, on account of the hypostatic union, bestows subsistence on the human nature. Secondly, a verbal one, which is so called, not because it is feigned or fictitious, but because it pertains to the explanation of the words and phrases of Scripture, and is called by the scholastics the communion of idioms, by which what is proper to one nature is attributed not to the other nature, but to the person denominated from the other nature, and that in the concrete."

§. XII.

In the analysis of personal propositions, the terms are to be considered first, namely, the subject and the predicate. And the concrete of the nature in personal propositions formally denotes one of the natures, not abstractly and in opposition to the other nature, but concretely with a connotation of the hypostasis as the cause of the union and predication. Then, that the connection of those terms in the propositions is real and singular, which D. Calovius teaches in §. 43, we willingly grant, provided that he does not from this elicit a confusion of natures or a transfusive communication of idioms. But that he asserts that the analysis of the personal proposition of the blessed Mr. Bergius, "God is man," namely, "this person of the divinity is also the person of the human nature," and vice versa, is not well under a certain condition, and then judges him according to the mind of others, we cannot sufficiently wonder. For if the blessed Bergius had spoken correctly, but others had not used the same precision, why would not Calovius, if even a crumb of theological candor were left to him, rather have judged the others according to the mind of Bergius, than Bergius according to the mind of others? But that capital hatred with which he persecutes the Reformed name dictated to him that he must proceed in the contrary way here. What we think of the communication of the hypostasis and of the divine attributes, since we have declared our mind sufficiently above, it is not necessary to repeat at length in this place. However, although we do not admit that transfusive communication of the hypostasis and idioms which D. Calovius

urges, it is nevertheless badly concluded from this that those personal propositions, according to our hypotheses, become identical. For in this proposition, "Man is God," the whole personal is placed in the subject, but under the formal denotation of man, and in the predicate the same whole is also placed, but under the formal denotation of God. Wherefore, although in this sense this predication ("Man is God") may seem to be identical, yet it is not, because in the predicate something is predicated under another formality, and is declared of the subject, which cannot be understood by the signification of the subject nakedly, without the predicate, placed outside the enunciation. Which is also true in those predications in which the definition is enunciated of the thing defined. They indeed seem to be identical, but they are not, because the essence is expressed and declared in one way in the predicate, and again in another way in the subject, for there it is confused, here distinct. These are the words of Jacobus Martinus, *Partitiones Theologicae*, Disp. XIV, th. 66.

§. XIII.

D. Calovius then passes on, namely in §. 44, to the genera of the communication of idioms, and reports that the Lutheran doctors have introduced three of them into their schools from scholastic writers. But in truth, why are not those fathers or scholastic writers, the authors of the three genera of communication of idioms, produced? Even those of our doctors who were most versed in the writings of the fathers and scholastics have been able to see neither trace nor vestige of those three genera of communication among the scholastics. Nor have those theologians themselves who follow the Formula of Concord, so far as we know of the matter, been able hitherto to allege any older authors than the six fathers of the Formula of Concord. Without doubt, therefore, D. Calovius wishes these six Bergen fathers to be understood by the name of scholastics. Indeed, the scholastics make mention of the communication of idioms, but of that which we have described above, and which in this place constitutes the first genus for D. Calovius, which, since we receive it with our whole mind, it is only by an insipid calumny in §. 49 that a mere concurrence of idioms in the person of Christ is attributed to us. Nor can he rightly reprehend in §. 50 that we ascribe to the person of Christ both divine and human things, so that the divine are to be understood according to the divine nature, but the human according to the human nature, without communication (understand transfusive between the natures, otherwise we shall write it down as a calumny of D. Calovius), since we have adduced Cyril, the most rigid antagonist of Nestorius, teaching the same in Chapter III, Thesis IV. To which may be added Fulgentius to Thrasimund, who wrote without danger of Nestorianism: "One and the same God and man, Christ, who, what is human, God has in the truth of the human, and what is divine, man has in the truth of the divine nature and substance." What the blessed Mr. Bergius (which D. Calovius does not shrink from asserting in the same paragraph), by the word "God" in this proposition, "God suffered," by no means understands the Son of God himself, but only the human nature, so that no communion, no participation, as to the divine nature of the Word, intervenes there, is an outstanding calumny, for which a theologian, already

near his fate, ought deservedly to be suffused with shame. For since the blessed D. Bergius frankly confesses with all our theologians that the hypostasis or person of the God-man suffered, what else does he mean but that the divine hypostasis truly and really appropriated to itself the passions of the flesh, just as it appropriated the flesh itself to itself?

§. XIV.

When, however, D. Calovius, in paragraph 53, writes that the blessed D. Bergius did not adduce the sayings of the fathers, in which he notes a certain impropriety of speech, because they write that the divinity suffered, with the fidelity that befitted a theologian, he judges the blessed man by the genius of himself and his own, for some of whom it is a solemn custom to allege the writings of our authors with a Punic faith, as they say, and one which did not befit theologians. An example of this thing was given in the last century by the court pastor of the most serene Elector of Saxony, Lord Christian I of most glorious memory, D. Martin Mirus, who, when he was ordered to produce from their own writings the cause of a certain virulence poured out from the pulpit against the Calvinists, as he called them, excused himself from doing so by the lack of Calvinist authors. He also, after the most powerful Elector began to consult the scriptures himself, and without any trouble discovered the truth of the Christian religion which was being traduced under the hateful name of Calvin, was for that reason removed from the ecclesiastical pulpit. See the blessed Abraham Scultetus, *Curriculum Vitae*, pp. 18, 19, who at that time, when these things happened, was devoting himself to his studies at Wittenberg, and he himself read the decree of the most illustrious Elector, by which the professors of theology and the preachers were ordered to abstain from all persecution of the Reformed, affixed to the parish church. An outstanding document of this thing was also given by Mylius, who transcribed these words of the Lutheran theologian Brentius: "If one were to speak according to the divine capacity, and as far as pertains to the immutability of God, the sentence stands firm: whomever God has chosen before the foundation of the world, he cannot perish. For no one snatches us from the hand of this Shepherd. But whom he has rejected, he cannot be saved, even if he has done all the works of the saints. So unretractable is the sentence of God," to the Reformed theologian of France, Marloratus, who had alleged them, citing the name of Brentius, and reproaches our Palatinate theologians with them in his *Evangelical Church Brotherhood*, Thesis 171, adding the gibe: "There you have your clause, you dear Palatines." D. Calovius himself, with the same faith which least befitted a theologian, in his *Anti-Calvinist College*, Disp. V, Th. 31, cited our blessed Wendelinus. Namely, Wendelinus, in his *Theological Exercises and Vindications*, 1, p. 9, had produced these words of Luther from his book *On the Bondage of the Will*: "God does not will the death of a sinner, that is, by his revealed will, but he wills it by his inscrutable will," for the purpose of showing that the blessed Luther sometimes spoke far more crudely than any of our authors on the matter of grace. D. Calovius, however, according to his candor, attributes those words to Wendelinus himself, and exclaims: "O impious and impure mouth!" Which attributes to

God an execrable and blasphemous hypocrisy (which feigns virtues and dissimulates vices, according to Didacus Saavedra, in his *Idea of a Christian Political Prince*, Symbol X, p. 77). Such a twofold Calvinist God, one namely revealed in the word, apocalyptic, the other apocryptic, hidden outside the word, would cherish contradictory wills, namely, contrary to that of Malachi 3, v. 6: "I the Lord have not been changed." See the most excellent Mr. President, Disp. VII, Theol., on Election and Reprobation, Subsect. II, Real. n. 10 ff. Not to mention in silence those who are not accustomed to cite the sayings of the fathers with the fidelity that befitted theologians, which the most excellent Dr. D. Buchius, in his tract on the Predestinarians, Sect. III, §. 7, observes in Strauchius, who in his disputation on the Predestinarians, §. 18, introduces the author of the *Hypognosticon* under the name of Augustine, refuting sixteen articles of the Predestinarians, of which that author never even dreamed. For the author of the *Hypognosticon* published his work against the Pelagians and Coelestians, which Strauchius could have seen from the title itself. But of those sixteen articles which Strauchius boasts, not even a mention occurs in that author; but those sixteen articles are the Vincentian objections themselves, which Prosper of Aquitaine confuted as so many calumnies of the Semi-Pelagians against the doctrine of Augustine in a special writing. On the contrary, that the blessed D. Bergius cited the sayings of the fathers with the best and German faith, not even D. Calovius himself can deny, who adduces them in the same order as they were alleged by D. Bergius. The first place is claimed for itself by the saying of Augustine from Epistle 57: "Through our head we are reconciled to God, because in him the divinity of the only-begotten was made a partaker of our mortality, that we also might be partakers of his immortality." The second place, to which D. Calovius not badly guesses that the blessed Bergius intended to point his finger, treats of the descent of Christ into hell, by which descent the blessed man, without doubt, with many most learned theologians, not even excepting the Lutherans, understood the most exquisite pains which Christ sustained in his soul, and the same passage is read in this way in book 1 against Felicianus, c. 11: "I know that the divinity of the Son of God descended into hell by the property of the flesh." Most clear of all, however, is what he cites from Vigilius, book 7 against Eutyches, c. 13, in which the divinity is said to have been fixed with nails, and also to have endured passion, and to be of both natures. But what Calovius in §. 54 opines, that the distinction of the blessed D. Bergius between the subject *which* and the subject *by which* does not, as is fitting, declare the mind of the fathers and other theologians, is frivolous. For not only our theologians, but the Lutherans themselves, in that very matter, use that distinction very frequently. But what is repeated in the same paragraph concerning the real communication of idioms between the natures, which he persuades himself the fathers intended to indicate by such formulas of speaking about the suffering divinity, begs the question. It would be open to us perhaps to adduce more sayings from the fathers which say that only the human nature suffered, which, however, must be reconciled entirely with the rest, unless we wish to impose Nestorianism on them also.

§. XIV.

At last, in §. 95, D. Calovius proceeds to that apple of discord, the second genus of the communication of idioms, by which, as Calovius defines it, the Word with its divine nature communicates its own proper glory and excellence to the humanity hypostatically united to it, on account of this very hypostatic union, truly and really, without any commixtion or confusion of the natures and properties, for common possession, use, and denomination. Indeed, many things could be noted here, but we will be content to have opposed to that transfusive communication the words of Jacob Scheckius, a Lutheran philosopher: "I ask," he says, "what can be said more foreign to the truth? What, on account of the implication of a contradiction, more false, than that what is proper to a diverse nature is communicable? Is not every proper thing defined by the unity of the nature of the subject and by incommunicability? For if it is communicated, it will no longer be proper, for it is part of the definition and essence of a proper thing that it cannot be communicated. Therefore, these men do not understand what an idiom or a proper thing is, when they maintain that it is communicable by itself, and it is truly a puerile error and to be corrected more with rods than with arguments. But he who says that a proper thing is communicable, says that the opposite is in the adjunct." Thus Scheckius. What is then adduced from the fathers in the following paragraphs, we approve all and every one.

§. XV.

Concerning the adoration of Christ, we have proposed our opinion above, to which the blessed J. Bergius teaches twin things, whom, however, D. Calovius here again gnaws at, not because he himself spoke badly, but because he wishes his mind to be judged from the words of others, which is a most perverse judgment of this man, proceeding from a defect of Christian charity, when nevertheless he, in thesis 192 of his *Analysis of the Controversy on the Person of Christ*, had already excused those who seem to think otherwise, namely that those who distinguish a twofold honor, one due to the Word, another to the flesh, do not properly distinguish a twofold adoration, but teach that in the same adoration a principal respect is to be had to the Word as the fount of good things, a secondary one to the flesh, so that what is its own may be hoped for from both natures. He likewise writes in thesis 194 that they seem to wish only this, that the flesh is not the proper and adequate object to which invocation or adoration should be directed separately and by itself. For neither scripture nor the example of the ancient Church has ever taught us to pray thus: "Human nature of Christ, have mercy on us," but that invocation should be directed to the whole Christ or the incarnate Word. Then, that the reason why Christ is adored is not properly from the humanity, but from the divinity of the Word and from the office and benefits of the person. And indeed, if this were not their mind, which we nevertheless do not doubt that it is, their opinion would not be approved by us, who rather acquiesce in the simile of our distinguished Antonius Walaeus, which was also praised by D. Calovius himself, who nevertheless a little before inveighs promiscuously against our authors with the same thesis, saying: "Just as a king, if he is also a baron, is accustomed to be honored with a royal, not a baron's honor, and

indeed with that alone, so also since Christ is God and man in one person, he ought to be honored with an honor befitting the whole person, not only the inferior nature." As for the blessed Piscator, whom D. Calovius here nibbles at, he criticizes the error of those who make the human nature of Christ the adequate object of adoration. And so far is it from being the case that the same man judges that the human nature of our Savior is to be honored with only a civil cult, that he rather exhorts that we should follow Christ not in a civil manner, which the Magi seem to have done, but with a religious cult; which will be clear to those who have not yet forsworn all Christian charity, from the very words of the cited author, which are read in this way: "By the example of the Magi, we also ought to adore Christ; and that not only civilly as a man, as they seem to have adored, but also religiously as God. See examples of such adoration in Peter, Luke 5:8; in that man born blind, John 9:38; in Stephen, Acts 7, at the end. But the error of the Ubiquitarians is to be avoided, who wish the flesh of Christ itself to be adored religiously, which results in their confounding the properties of the natures in Christ. For adoration is properly due to the divine nature, according to that saying: 'You shall adore the Lord your God and him only shall you serve.'" Similar is that of the most distinguished man Theodore Beza, from which D. Calovius, in §. 66, wishes to carve out Nestorianism. It is of the blessed Augustine, the most learned of the fathers, whose words in Sermon 58 on the words of the Lord are as follows: "If the Son is not God by nature, but a creature, he is not to be worshiped at all, nor to be adored as God, as the apostle says: 'And they worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever.' And to the Galatians: 'But then, not knowing God, you served those who by nature are not gods.' But they will reply to these things and say: 'What of the fact that you adore his flesh, which you do not deny to be a creature, together with the divinity, and serve it no less than the divinity?' I adore the Lord's flesh, nay, the perfect humanity in Christ, for this reason, because it has been assumed by the divinity and united to the deity, so that I confess not one and another, but one and the same God and man, the Son of God. Finally, if you separate the man from God, like Photinus or Paul of Samosata, I will never believe in him nor serve him, just as if one of us should find a royal purple or diadem lying about, would he attempt to adore them? But when the king has been clothed with them, he incurs the danger of death if he scorns to adore them together with the king. So also in Christ the Lord, he who scorns to adore the humanity, not alone or bare, but united to his divinity, one Son of God, true God and true man, will suffer the penalty of eternal death." Thus far Augustine, whom, as in the chapter on the grace of God and the holy supper, so in the article on the person of Christ, D. Calovius experiences as his greatest adversary, to whom, however, that he is about to impute the Nestorian heresy, we can scarcely be induced to believe. Furthermore, I ask, let D. Calovius also recall to his memory that the Acts of the Colloquy of Montbéliard can prove nothing against Beza, who immediately, as soon as they were published, solemnly protested against their edition made at Tübingen, and disapproved that edition as spurious.

§. XVI.

The things which D. Calovius calumniates in §. 65 about Syncretism, by which name he censures the study of ecclesiastical concord, and about collusion in a lie, deserve to be refuted by the most serious words of the distinguished Mr. Dreier, a theologian of Königsberg, on whose side, and that of the blessed Calixtus and other students of peace, a game is especially played in that disputation, with which words, in his oration on Syncretism, he so sharply rebukes those like D. Calovius, most hostile haters of ecclesiastical concord, with the asperity that is fitting: "You have now heard enough what true ecclesiastical concord is, what the true study of peace, what the unity of the Church of Christ. If you call this Syncretism, understanding the concord of brethren, you do not speak so appropriately in a good sense. If you mean a confusion of dogmas, and a collusion in a lie, and a defense of heresy, as most of you trifle, you prove yourselves to be schismatics all the more, the more you labor to defame the study of peace and ecclesiastical concord with ignominious words, and to render it odious." And after a few lines: "You are led by an itch for calumny, you have submitted yourselves to the spirit of the calumniator, you burden your brethren with lies. You accuse others of a crime of which you yourselves are most guilty. You are said to induce confusion by loving Catholic unity, but you induce a shameful confusion of the articles of faith and of other dogmas, nay, and of your own dreams with the chapters of the faith. You condemn for heresy those who preserve the entire faith in unity and concord with all Christians, but you fall into manifest heresy by denying the Catholic Church, that is, the Church diffused throughout the whole world. You object collusion in a lie to those who are on fire with the love of unity, but you yourselves, with all the sects, put forth and defend one lie, that your faction alone is the true Church. You accuse others of Syncretism, as that word can be taken in the worst sense, but you yourselves are the worst Syncretists, liars, evil beasts, lazy bellies; liars, on account of your errors and calumnies; evil beasts, on account of your savagery and cruelty; lazy bellies, on account of your intermission of reading the fathers and ancient writers, from whom you could learn the properties of the Church of Christ. What you are, you say of others. Since you are Syncretists, you proclaim others to be Syncretists." Let the world judge whether those who seek the unity of the Catholic Church in the way that Christ and the Church have prescribed for us are guilty of Syncretism, or those who say that the Church has perished and has remained in their part, that Christians are hidden in the whole world and are conspicuous only in their part; that not those articles of faith which all know, but also other dogmas of their faction, unknown to the universal Church, are necessary to be known for those who are to attain salvation; and what other things are erroneous and lies, in which you have placed your hope. Let the world and Orcus be moved and let the bowels of Codrus burst, the true disciples of Christ will not cease to seek, preserve, and promote the unity of the universal body of Christ, saving the truth of the faith. Thus the distinguished Mr. D. Dreier.

§. XVII.

D. Calovius finally descends to the vivifying power of the flesh of Christ, which is rightly established by orthodox theologians as an Apotelesma, and therefore is badly referred by D. Calovius to the second genus of the communication of idioms, concerning which the fathers of the Council of Ephesus treat in Anathema XI, and concerning which we have treated in Thesis IX, Chapter III, to which the blessed Joh. Bergius teaches things plainly similar in his *Analysis of the Controversy*, §. 201, 202, and in his *Unterscheid und Vergleich*, q. 36, which D. Calovius, out of his accustomed lust for contradicting our authors, reprehends. But the things which he produces against the consent of the Catholic Church are rejected with the same facility with which they are adduced. We grant one vivifying virtue by reason of the person of the God-man, which, however, we do not hesitate to assert, belongs to the divine nature of Christ by itself, but to the human nature not by itself, yet not merely by a trope and improperly, but also by the grace of the union, inasmuch as it exists enhypostatically in the hypostasis of the Word, truly and really. That the human nature is established by the fathers and scholastics as the organ or instrument of all the Apotelesmata, and thus also of the vivification, is beyond controversy, all of whom would be to be accused of Nestorianism if anything akin to the Nestorian heresy lay hidden in this dogma. Nor is the human nature of Christ, but the whole person of the God-man, consisting of the divine and human nature personally united, the meritorious cause of our salvation. From which it is established that it is a rancid calumny that D. Calovius feigns, that by our opinion the human nature is excluded from the merit of our salvation.

§. XVIII.

And from those things which we have thus far adduced, it is most clear that the calumny of those who do not shrink from still reproaching the Reformed with the Nestorian heresy is shameless. Would that Calovius, which he indeed tries to show in §. 77, were as far from Eutychianism as the Reformed, by the grace of God, are from Nestorianism! Calixtus, indeed, boldly imputes Eutychianism to the patrons of ubiquity in Disp. III, Th. XLIII, with D. Calovius himself citing in §. 67: "It is manifest," says Calixtus, "that those are not alien from Eutychianism, whoever ascribe immensity or omnipresence to the flesh." Nor will he doubt that those who defend the ubiquity of the flesh of Christ fall into Eutychianism, who will have considered with the attention of mind that is fitting even that one passage which we have produced above from Vigilius, in which he asserts in express words: "According to you Eutychians, either the Word is contained in its place with the flesh, or the flesh is everywhere with the Word." Which last words, the Lutherans, who alone wish to be so called, but wish the Calixtines, as they call them, to be excluded from this name, cannot themselves deny express the opinion, unless they wish to forbid us the use of reason and our senses. That encyclical epistle of Leo I, bishop of Rome, to Flavian, bishop of Constantinople, against the heresy of Eutyches, which was read in the Council of Chalcedon before six hundred and thirty bishops, was approved by the consenting suffrages of all, was inserted into the second action of that council, and was strengthened by the subscriptions of all, inculcates nothing so much as

that the properties of both natures remain safe and sound through the personal union. "Therefore, each nature holds its own property without defect, and just as the form of a servant does not take away the form of God, so the form of God does not diminish the form of a servant." Now indeed, those who deny that the human nature is in a certain place, and one adequate to it, and on the contrary contend that it was made everywhere present, omnipotent, omniscient, etc., do they not transfer the divine properties to the human nature, and take away the properties of the human nature from the midst? We leave it to others to judge. May God, the thrice-greatest and best, forgive our erring brethren the sins proceeding from a more vehement hatred against us, and lead them back to the way of truth; at least may he inspire in them Christian charity and meekness, so that, laying aside that Vatinian hatred, they may live fraternally with us, and celebrate his praises with us in one spirit, to whom be praise, honor, and glory for ages without end.

COROLLARIES

I. The term ἀλλοίωσις (alteration) is most unjustly traduced as a figment of Zwingli, since that it was taken from Damascene, not even Chemnitz himself, in his book on the two natures, Chap. 12, p. 65, Col. 1, can deny.

II. The decree of reprobation presupposes in the divine foreknowledge not only common sin, but also all other particular sins to be committed, both against the Law and against the Gospel, which such were to commit. Nor does this most just decree take away or deny all grace in the reprobate, but only that which is peculiar to the elect. The theologians of Leiden in the *Synopsis of Purer Theology*, disp. XXIV, Th. LII, LIV ff.

III. Good works are necessary for attaining salvation.

You rightly teach Nestorius's faults, and likewise what were the dogmas of the Nestorian heresy. Then you refute the clamors and frauds of those who strive to falsely burden our faith. I praise your efforts; may you continue to extend your fame with your writings. Thus you will bear a prize worthy of your studies.

To the most learned author of the disputation, his special friend, I have composed this.

— PHILIPPUS BUCHIUS, D., Dean of the Theological Faculty at this time.

Confusing the properties of Christ is the Savior's strength. Reprehending the properties of Nestorius, he cuts down his own properties. For the cuckoo loves to betray its own name. The excellent Holtzfuss teaches this with eloquent speech, so that the vain tribe may learn to have its own at home.

— ELIAS GREBENITZ, D.

To tear apart the two natures of the Savior is that heresy which is called Nestorian. This very thing you learnedly and clearly refute, Holtzfuss, asserting that the two are more closely united. And thus you teach that you have not wasted the past time in idleness, but have diligently applied yourself to your studies. I rejoice at your progress! Be always a strenuous and pious assailant of all error and heresy, but a tenacious and just defender of the true. And at all times the Savior will rightly bless your work.

— JOHAN. RIESSELMANN, D.

Nestorius of Byzantium once thought wrongly, and what the Nestorian faith is at present, while Holtzfuss teaches, he rightly demonstrates, and the same, that only satanic forces have striven to transcribe this pestilence with a lying pen to our nation, and thus to stain the holy flock of Christ. He shows at the same time how much acuteness of mind he has, and how great a store of doctrine. I congratulate Holtzfuss on such great love of piety, and I pray that he may receive the worthy rewards which he grasps.

Thus the President applauded the most distinguished and most learned author.

EPIGRAM

To the Most Learned Mr. Respondent and Author of the Disputation, a most diligent student of Sacred Theology and Philosophy, his most assiduous hearer.

To mix the embraces of the mistress and the servant is shameful. Sacred doctrine uses philosophy as a servant. Do you burn for both, and fix your kisses on each? Tell me, did not Abraham love both the mistress and the servant? Therefore, such mixed love is perhaps more just than that. But beware lest Hagar the servant mock the mistress! Remember that the offspring of the servant is not the heir of the heaven sought by the innocent blood of Christ! Meanwhile, while you defend what you cherish from the error of Nestorius, to His glory, may you live, I pray, to the old age of Nestor, blessed in every part.

I composed this.

— SAMUEL STRIMESIUS, V.D.M., Public Professor of Theology and Philosophy and today Dean of the Philosophical Faculty.

We who know him know Holtzfuss to be learned. This learned writing proves to anyone that he is learned.

Congratulating, I composed this.

— GOTHOFREDUS VALANDUS, Professor Ordinary.

Holtzfuss, ornament of youths, and sure hope of the Muse, whom Pallas destines for the distinguished ranks, whose mouth we see speaking both Hebrew and, with much praise, eloquent Rome with the Greeks; whose eloquence has taught of the adorable Christ, and dogmas mixed with the new sayings of the ancients; does the strength of your mind therefore rise to such bold undertakings? Does the arena of your learned mind therefore now lie open? He who is your guardian, God, and your port and salvation, you worship with true dogmas and religion. You assert the eternal titles and names of Jesus, and you do not cease to deceive those accustomed to be deceived, and to speak false things. The Parnassian breasts applaud your learned cares, and the learned crowd rejoices in your pious studies. Minerva herself, the witness of your labor, your praise itself, will fit worthy prizes to your merits.

Thus Tido Henricus Lith, Professor Ordinary of Eloquence, applauded the most learned and most distinguished Mr. Holtzfuss.

Phoebus, powerful, display the bright beam of the eastern light, and you, crowd of the Aonides, favor these sacred rites. For now our Holtzfuss marks his times with eternal records. He ascends to the stars of the pole. The vain errors which vain Nestor or one worse than Nestor brings forth, he piously dispels. But for your merits and such bold undertakings, I pray that the arena may give you what fame sings.

With these few words, A. W. Amandernende, P.P.O. of Philosophy and the Hebrew Language, wished to applaud the most learned Mr. Respondent, who for just reasons is his dearest friend.

As the Hyblaeen bee, drinking the liquor from various flowers, fashions sweet honey in its throat, after it has plucked the highest tops of the herbs and gathered the nectareous combs through every grove; so you, Holtzfuss, with the highest study and equal labor, collect the best things from various books. For what Luther, what Calvin, and what Melanchthon, and what noble work Beza left to the world, and what innumerable volumes others have written, you alone have turned over with the greatest diligence. But now, desirous of becoming famous by your own writings, you produce a noble work of a noble genius. Thus it is fitting to pluck the choice fruits of studies! Thus it is pleasing to have become known to the world by one's writings! Continue, Holtzfuss, to apply yourself to sacred studies; may these be your whole delight and your honor. Continue, like a bee, to compose shining flowers; thus you will be able to be read by late posterity!

Thus Joachimus Bergius, a student of Philosophy and Sacred Theology, sang in congratulation to the most noble and most learned Mr. Holtzfuss, his dearest roommate.