

THEOLOGICAL DISSERTATION, ON THE MOST HOLY TRINITY,

Which

With the inspiration of the Most Holy Trinity

IN THE ALMA MATER VIADRINA,

UNDER THE PRESIDENCY

OF THE LORD BARTHOLD

Holtzfus/

DOCTOR OF HOLY THEOLOGY & PUBLIC PROFESSOR

ORDINARY.

HIS ETERNALLY REVERED

PATRON and TEACHER,

On the 3rd day of April in the Year of our Lord 1704.

for placid examination

proposes

ANDREAS PANYOKI

A HUNGARIAN.

FRANKFURT an der ODER,

Printed by CHRISTOPH ZEITLER.

A. Ω.

Most nations that have acknowledged any religion have put forth certain mysteries of their true or false worship. It is confessed among authors that the sacred rites of the Egyptians and Chaldeans were full of mysteries. Concerning the Greeks, Arrian testifies to this in his Commentary on Epictetus, Book 3, chapter 21, page 335: "Thus the mysteries are rendered useful to us: Thus we come to the consideration of them. For all these things were instituted by the ancients for the sake of discipline and the amendment of life." Cicero, in Book 2 of his Laws, confesses that the Romans received mysteries, as well as many other institutions, from the Greeks, saying: "To me, while many excellent and divine things seem to have been produced by your Athens and brought into human life, yet nothing is better than those mysteries, by which we have been cultivated from a rustic and savage life to humanity and gentleness; and as they are called initiations, so we have truly known them as the beginnings of life, and we have received from them not only a reason for living with joy, but also for dying with a better hope." From which, namely the greater sacred rites, not only the impious and the profane crowd, but also foreigners were kept away, for whom it was not permitted to inquire or to hear from others; nor was it right for the initiated to divulge what was seen or heard. Nor are the Mohammedans universally destitute of mysteries. The ancient Jews had not a few true mysteries, and those of today boast of many false Kabbalistic mysteries. Our Christian religion also acknowledges and venerates its own true, sublime, and tremendous mysteries, Matthew 13:11, Romans 16:25, Ephesians 1:9, Ephesians 5:32, Colossians 1:26, 1 Timothy 3:16. From their treatment, the ministers of the Divine Word, 1 Corinthians 4:1, are called dispensers of the divine mysteries. Among these mysteries of the Christian religion, the dogma of the Most Holy Trinity deservedly holds the first place, which we shall treat by way of an academic sample; yet with that reverence and sobriety with which it is proper for mysteries to be treated!

SUMMARY.

- §.1. Explanation of the Name Triad, Trinity.
- §.2. Consideration of other words occurring in this mystery, such as: Essence, Nature, Form, Substance.
- §.3. Hypostasis, Πρόσωπον, Person, Τρόπος υπάρξεως.
- §.4. Ὁμούσιος, Περιχώρησις.
- §.5. That these words, not rashly received and therefore not to be rashly eliminated, are to be used, yet under certain cautions.
- §.6. That the principle of knowing the mystery of the Holy Trinity is not Nature or Reason, nor Platonic philosophy, nor the Jewish Kabbalah, nor the Sibylline verses.
- §.7. But only the Holy Scripture of the Old Testament, in which it is more obscurely revealed; and of the New Testament, in which it is more clearly revealed.
- §.8. Passages from the Old Testament are brought forward, from which plurality is inferred. Whether the name Elohim is to be numbered among them?
- §.9. Passages from the New Testament are produced, in which Three are explicitly named. The passage of 1 John 5:7 is vindicated.
- §.10. The Trinity is proven by the Deity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.
- II. The Deity of the Father; whether this implies any superiority, excellence, or eminence?
- The Deity of the Son, asserted from the Divine Names of the Essence.
- §.12. From the Personal Name of the Son and from the Paternal Filiation by Generation.
- §.13. And from the Name Logos.
- §.14. From the Name of the Angel of the face, appearing to the Patriarchs in the Old Testament.
- §.15. From the divine Attributes and Works, also from the Worship of Adoration.
- §.16. Whether and in what sense Christ is *Αυτόθεος*?
- §.17. III. The Personality of the Holy Spirit.
- §.18. The Deity of the Holy Spirit, asserted from His Names, Attributes, Divine Works, and Worship.
- §.19. Personal Order. Also Characteristic Property.
- §.20. The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son is established against the Greeks. A brief history and importance of the controversy between the Greeks and the Latins.
- §.21. The difference of the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Generation of the Son.
- §.22. The Unity of the Essence and the Distinction of the Divine Persons both from the Divine Essence and from each other. Where also the excessively subtle questions of the Scholastics are touched upon.

- §.23. The attributes of this Mystery: I. Sublimity. II. The necessity of believing this dogma. III. Truth.
- §.24. Opposites. The infidelity of the Jews and Mohammedans.
- §.25. The errors of the Heterodox, the Antitrinitarians, which are briefly reviewed.
- §.26. Conclusion.

§.I.

In treating the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity, we deservedly make a beginning from the consideration of the words that occur here. Of these, the first is τριάς or Trinity, which, although not in the abstract, is nevertheless read in the concrete in Scripture itself, 1 John 5:7: "There are three that bear witness in heaven," etc. Grotius, in his commentary on John 1:2, wishes to maintain that the word τριάς, among others, was not used by the first Christians, but was taken from the Platonic writers with a somewhat altered sense; among whom you may find: "one must distinguish the monad from the triad, and connect the triad to the monad." This was also the accusation of the ancient Arians. But this word is more rightly believed to be derived from Holy Scripture, since its concrete form exists in that chapter; from which concrete form Athanasius, in Oration 2 against the Arians and in his Exposition of the Symbol, shows that he derived the abstract word. Not to mention that the thing itself is found in Scripture, Matthew 28:19. It is inconveniently translated into German by the name Dreyfaltigkeit, as it corresponds more to the word Triplicity than Trinity. Since, however, God is not composed of three, and thus is badly called Triplex; but has one essence and three modes of subsisting, which make Him Three-in-One or Triune; hence He is rightly called Dreyeinig in German, and badly Dreyfachig or Dreyfaltig. The Blessed Luther observed this in the Hauspostille for the Feast of the Trinity, p. 664: "Dreyfaltigkeit is a very bad German word: for in the Godhead there is the highest unity. Some call it Dreyheit (threeness). But that sounds all too mocking. Augustine also complains that he has no suitable word, for I cannot say that as there are three men or three angels, so also there are three Gods, but can only say that there is one single God. There is indeed a thirdness in the Godhead: But this thirdness are persons of the one Godhead, not three Gods, not three Lords, not three Creators, but one God, one Lord, one Creator. I call it a thirdness: for Dreyfaltigkeit sounds strange, and I can give it no right name." And Chemnitz in his Postil for the Feast of the Trinity: "It is thus coarsely called Dreyfaltigkeit (threefoldness), as if there were a threefold God, or a threefoldness in the Divine Being, whereas there is no such threefoldness. Therefore it would be better to call it Dreyeinigkeit (three-unity) or Dreyheit (threeness), because in the Divine Being there is one single God, and yet three distinct persons." But the word Trinity is better translated into German as Dreyeinigkeit or Dreyeinheit, which are also most in use today. The Jews, with a hostile mind, call it [Hebrew text missing/garbled].

§.II.

Besides the word Trinity, to which we have deservedly given the first place, others are used here, such as: οὐσία, or Essence, Hypostasis, πρόσωπον, Person, τρόπος υπάρξεως, ομοούσιον, περιχώρησις; about which we must also treat briefly. [The Hebrew term] יהוה [in] Job 12:16, which signifies essence in Latin, exists in the sacred writings, not indeed in so many letters, but as to the thing itself and its synonyms, such as: Θεότης, Colossians 2:9, θειότης, Romans 1:20, θεῖα φύσις, 2 Peter 1:4, i.e., Deity, Divine Nature. Οὐσία and φύσις, or Essence and Nature, are here taken for the same thing. "For every essence is called

Nature," says Aristotle in *Metaphysics*, book 4. So also Damascenus in the *Introduction to Dogmas*, Chapter 1: "Οὐσία καὶ φύσις καὶ μορφή, κατὰ τοὺς ἁγίους πατέρας, ταυτὸν ἐστίν," i.e., "Essence, Nature, and Form, according to the Holy Fathers, are the same." Yet Danaeus rightly observed in his *Examination of the Book of Chemnitz on the Two Natures*, p. 13 (in his *Works*, p. 1354), that although οὐσία and φύσις are used by the Fathers for the same thing, they nevertheless differ among themselves. For the word οὐσία, used by the Fathers in the Council of Nicaea according to the mind of Scripture, was later so explained in the Council of Chalcedon, that οὐσία is the simple constitution of anything, destitute of all its properties and accidents; whereas φύσις or Nature is the essence clothed in its properties. Therefore, the Fathers of that council decreed that in the one person of Christ there are not only the simple οὐσίαι, namely the divine and the human, but also the φύσεις, i.e., the essences joined with their true properties, and that these remain safe and sound in the one person of Christ, and not at all confused. This destroyed the error of the Monothelites and Monophysites which arose later. This observation of Danaeus is approved by D. Joh. Georg. Dorscheus, *Pentadecas Disp. Prælim.* §. 10. p. 6. and D. Quenstedt, *Syst. Theol.* Part 1, Ch. 9, Sect 1, Thesis 6, p. 320. Μορφή, a word transferred from artificial things to natural, created things, and from these to divine things, designates not only the οὐσία and the essential properties of a thing, but also other adjuncts which are accustomed to follow the nature of the thing. Coherent with the word Essence and Nature is the word Substance, which is to be attributed to God, not because He underlies accidents, but from "standing under" (substando), because He subsists from Himself, by Himself, and through Himself, so that He needs no other thing for His essence and perseverance in it, and is the first cause of all substances. The ancients preferred to use the name Essence rather than Substance. Wherefore Augustine, in book 7 on the Trinity, chapter 4, says: "The word Essence properly applies to God, but the word substance is used of him improperly." Without doubt, this was to signify that God is not included in the predicaments, but is superior to the Aristotelian categories, as being a super-essential essence (ουσίαν υπερούσιον). Hierotheus, quoted by Dionysius in book 1 on the Divine Names, chapter 1, says: "The essence of God is super-essential, having the super-essential in a super-essential way." And the Platonist Iamblichus calls God "the most ancient and most honorable essence, existing in and of itself;" Philo in *On Monarchy* calls Him "the truly existing one." Anselm in the *Monologion*, chapter 26, writes: "The divine substance is not included in any common treatment of substances." But because the word Substance was taken by most for Essence, but by others for Subsistence, Hilary therefore conceded three substances in God in his book *On the Synods*, where he explains the faith of the Council of Antioch. However, it is more correct to assert only one substance in God, because common usage among the Latins takes the word Substance for Essence. Furthermore, Tertullian in his book *Against Praxeas* acknowledges only one substance in God. Jerome in his letter to Damasus asks: "Who, I ask, with sacrilegious mouth will preach three substances?" Augustine in book 5 on the Trinity, chapter 9, and book 7, chapter 4, and Rufinus in book 10 of his *History*, chapter 29, admit one substance and deny three. Finally, the Second

Council of Toledo, in Carranza's *Summa Conciliorum*, p. 300, and the Lateran Council under Innocent III, chapter 2, p. 600, defined that there is one substance in God.

§.III.

Thirdly, the words signifying Person are to be considered. The first of these is Hypostasis. This is found in Holy Scripture: for it occurs in Hebrews 1:3, 3:14, 11:1; 2 Corinthians 9:4, 11:17. Socrates, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, book 3, chapter 5, denies that it is found among profane Greek writers, in these words: "Those who strive to explain Greek wisdom and learning among the Greeks have defined οὐσία, i.e., Essence, to be taken in many ways; but of Hypostasis, i.e., Substances, or Person, they have made no mention: indeed, Irenaeus the Grammarian in his *Dictionary of the Attic Language* calls the word barbarous: for it is to be found in no ancient writer." Concerning which, however, it should be noted: Budaeus cites Aristotle and Themistius, who used this word. Indeed, Socrates himself cites Sophocles and Menander. It is sufficient for us that it is read in Scripture. This word is composed of ὑπὸ, *under*, and ἵστημι, *I stand, I make to stand, I place, stable*. Hence ὑφίστασθαι means *to subsist, to be firmly established*, and from that, *not to be moved, to tremble, to sustain an attack*. From which it is clear, according to Bellarmine, book 2 *on Christ*, chapter 4, and Polanus, *Syntagma Theologicum*, Book 3, Chapter 1, p. 547, that it is rightly rendered generally as *foundation* or *basis*, which, subsisting by itself, sustains other things. Socrates in chapter 1 observes; if it should happen to be found anywhere, it does not signify the thing for which it is now taken; for in Sophocles' *Phoenix*, ὑπόστασις signifies *an ambush*; but in Menander, *condiments*: it can also be said to mean *the dregs of wine in a cask*.

As for its ecclesiastical use, the Apostle uses this word of Christ, Hebrews 1:3, saying: "ὄς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ etc." which words the Vulgate translates thus: "*Qui cum sit splendor gloriae & figura substantiae ejus, portans omnia verbo virtutis suae.*" (Who being the brightness of his glory, and the figure of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power.) Erasmus: "*Qui cum sit splendor gloriae & expressa imago Substantiae illius, moderatur omnia Verbo potentiae suae.*" (Who being the splendor of glory and the express image of His substance, governs all things by the word of His power.) Thus Luther: "*Er ist der Glanz der Herrlichkeit, und das Ebenbild seines Wesens.*" (He is the radiance of glory and the image of His being.) Beza, however: "*Qui cum sit effulgentia gloriae & character personae illius, sustinet omnia verbo illo suo potente.*" (Who being the effulgence of glory and the character of His person, sustains all things by that powerful word of His.) And Piscator: "*Er ist der aufgegossene Glanz seiner Herrlichkeit, und das ausgedruckte Ebenbild seiner Persohn.*" (He is the poured-out radiance of His glory, and the express image of His Person.)

Where it is conspicuous that the Vulgate, Erasmus, and Luther took the word Hypostasis for Essence or Substance, with the most ancient Doctors of the primitive Church; but Beza and Piscator took it for Person, with the later Doctors and Scholastics. To be sure,

even the Catholics themselves once disagreed among themselves about the genuine meaning of the word *Hypostasis*, which not only by the Fathers who lived before the Council of Nicaea, but also by the Nicene Fathers themselves, was taken for nothing other than οὐσία, Essence, and Substance, and very rarely for Person; as, among others, Dionysius Petavius testifies in *Dogmatum Theologicorum*, Vol. 2, Book 1, Ch. 3, §. 3, p. 12, and Book 4, Ch. 1, §. 5 ff., p. 313 ff. In the Council of Nicaea, those were condemned who maintained that the Son was ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας, "from another substance or nature." In the Synod of Sardica, 250 Catholic bishops, most bitter enemies of the Arians, in their synodical letter, notably speak thus: "We have received this doctrine, thus we have learned, this we hold as the Catholic Tradition, Faith, and Confession, namely that there is one Hypostasis (which word the heretics use for Substance) of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit," as Theodoret reports in his *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 2, ch. 8, p. 58. For the same meaning, Athanasius in his letter to the Africans and Antiochians writes: "ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστίν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαίνονμενον ἔχει ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν," i.e., "Hypostasis is Essence, and signifies nothing other than that which is." For which meaning Petavius, in Vol. 2 of *Dogmatum Theologicorum*, book 4, ch. 1, §.5, p. 313, 314 ff., also adduces the words of Irenaeus, Origen, Basil, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret.

Notable concerning the dispute about this word are the words of Jerome in Letter 57 to Damasus, where he addresses him thus: "After the Nicene Faith, after the decree of Alexandria, with the West equally joined, a new name, that of the three Hypostases, is demanded of me, a Roman man, by the prelate of the Arians and the Campenses. Who, I ask, of the Apostles has handed these things down? What new master of the Gentiles, Paul, taught this? Let us ask what they think can be understood by the three Hypostases. They say, 'three subsisting Persons.' We answer that we believe so. The sense is not enough; they demand the name itself, because I know not what poison lies hidden in the syllables. We cry out, if anyone does not confess the three Hypostases, that is, the three subsisting Persons, let him be anathema. And because we do not learn the words, we are judged heretics. But if anyone, understanding *hypostasis* as *ousia*, does not say one *hypostasis* in three persons, he is alien from Christ: and under this confession we are branded with the cautery of union along with you. Distinguish, I beseech you, if you please: I will not be afraid to speak of three hypostases, if you command it: let a new faith be established, after the Nicene, and let us orthodox confess in similar words with the Arians. The whole school of secular letters knows *Hypostasis* as nothing other than *ousia*. And who, I ask, will preach three substances with a sacrilegious mouth?" After a little: "Whoever says there are three hypostases, that is, *ousias*, attempts under the name of piety to assert three natures. And if this is so, why are we separated from Arius by walls, when we are joined by perfidy?" A little after: "Let the three hypostases be silenced, if you please, and let one be held. Or if you shall think it right that we ought to speak of three hypostases with their interpretations, we do not deny it. They interpret *Hypostasis* well, and when I say that I hold what they themselves expound, I am judged a heretic. Finally: Wherefore I beseech your Beatitude, by the crucified, the salvation of

the world, by the *homoousion* Trinity, that authority may be given to me by your letters either for silencing or for speaking of the hypostases."

Nevertheless, no less illustrious are the documents in the writings of the Fathers proving that the word *Hypostasis* was accepted for Person: In the Synod of Alexandria, the Catholic bishops, with Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, sent by the Emperor Constantine to quell the tumult stirred up by Arius, and also Athanasius and Eusebius, being joined together, not only confirmed the Council of Nicaea and affirmed the Consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son; but they also dealt with the names οὐσία and *Hypostasis*: that when speech is instituted concerning God, these words ought not to be used: For the name οὐσία is not found in the sacred letters; but the Apostle, compelled by the necessity of handing down dogmas, used the word ὑπόστασις. Therefore, they decreed that these words should be admitted to explode the opinion of Sabellius, lest, from a poverty of words, we should be forced to think of the reality, which is designated by a threefold name, as if it were one, but that each name of the Trinity should signify God ἐν ἰδίῳ ὑποστάσει, i.e., in his own subsisting Person; the authority for this being Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 3, Ch. 5, p. 619, and Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 5, ch. 11, p. 347. The First Council of Constantinople, the second Ecumenical, in its synodical letter to Damasus and the other bishops gathered at Rome, concludes from the formula of Baptism: that there is one equality of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, one dignity and coeternal kingdom in three perfect ὑποστάσεων, that is, in three Persons; in Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History*, book 5, ch. 9, p. 151. The Council of Chalcedon, in its Exposition of the Faith, asserting one *Hypostasis* of Christ, without doubt understood Person. The Fifth Council of Constantinople, Canon 7, declares anathema on those who deny that the Consubstantial Trinity is to be adored in three Subsistences or Persons. Ibid. Canons 4, 5, 7, 8, it acknowledges one Subsistence or Person in Christ. in Carranza's *Summa Conciliorum* p. 312 ff. Similarly, the Sixth General Council of Constantinople, held against the Monothelites, in several places, namely in the letter of Agatho, also of Sophronius, and finally in the Exposition of the Faith in Carranza p. 450, 451, 453, 457, 458. The emperors Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian, in a letter to the Asian bishops, confess that there is one and the same Essence of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit in three Persons, that is, in three perfect, as the Greeks say, ὑποστάσεις: in Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History*, book 4, ch. 7, p. 114. Of the Fathers, this word is used for Person by Dionysius of Alexandria, Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Isidore of Pelusium, Amphilochius, John of Damascus, etc., whose testimonies Petavius has collected in *Dogmatum Theologicorum*, Tom. 2, lib. 4, c. 1, §. 13, p. 318, 319. These were afterward followed by the Scholastics and all the Protestant Doctors in general, who unanimously approved this meaning of *Hypostasis*.

To better understand the fundamental consensus of the Fathers, who were seemingly in disagreement, it will not be out of place to add the words of Rufinus, *History*, book 1, c. 29: "But there was also a discussion among them concerning the difference of substances and subsistences, moved by Scripture; the Greeks say οὐσῖαι and ὑποστάσεις.

For some said that substance and subsistence seemed to be one, and that since we do not say three substances in God, we ought not to say three subsistences. Others, however, to whom substance seemed to signify something far different from subsistence, said that since substance designates the nature and reason of the thing itself, by which it consists, but subsistence shows this very thing of each person, that it exists and subsists. And therefore, on account of the heresy of Sabellius, three subsistences must be confessed; because this would seem to signify three subsisting persons, lest we should give suspicion of being followers of that faith which confesses the Trinity in names only, and not in realities and subsistences." and the words of John of Damascus, *Dialectica*, c. 42: "The name hypostasis has two meanings: sometimes simple existence, in which notion ousia and hypostasis are the same. Hence some of the Holy Fathers called the natures themselves hypostases. At other times, it means that existence which is by itself and has its own reason for existing. And in this signification, it designates an individual differing in number." And in this latter sense, the Catholic Fathers opposed the name *Hypostasis* to Sabellius, with happy success.

As to the twofold interpretation of the passage in Hebrews 1:3, brought forward above, both are Orthodox: For if the Father and the Son are referred to each other, as a *Relatum* to a *Correlatum*, the word ὑπόστασις will be taken relatively for the Person of the Father, which is the Archetype, to which the express image or Character and *Correlatum*, which is the Son, is referred, or of whose form this image is an expression; but if by the word *Hypostasis* that is understood in which the Prototype and the Image, or the Character and the thing characterized, agree, this word will signify the very Essence of the Father. See Gerhard, *Exegesis on the Trinity*, §. 55, and D. Joh. Bened. Carpzov, *Specimen Theologiae Chemnitianae*, Loc 3, Cap. 1, Th. 6, §.3. p. 85. The second word signifying Person is πρόσωπον, as if to say, πρὸς ὄψας, "to the face," "to the sight" or "to the eye;" so that by reason of its etymology, it is an external species or appearance. Hence it signifies 1. the external state or condition of men, or the external qualities of mind, body, or fortune, whether they be true or apparent, which do not pertain to the state of the cause; such as, for example, knowledge, learning, art; stature, fame, strength; lineage, country, nation, wealth, honors: for which reason we are forbidden to be προσωπολήπται (respecters of persons), James 2:9. 2. the very substance and subsistence of men or of rational or intellectual beings, in which sense Paul takes it in 2 Corinthians 1:11, and it is to be taken here. And this will become more evident from the third word to be attended to here, Person (*Persona*), which is not formed from *personando* (sounding through), as C. Bassus, quoted by A. Gellius, book 5, ch. 8, wants; but more correctly, according to Scaliger, book 1 of *Poetics*, ch. 13, and Christoph Becmann, *Origins of the Latin Language*, p. 845, 846, it is said as if περὶ σῶμα. By reason of its signification, as observed by Matthaeus Martinius in his *Lexicon Philologicum*, a *Persona* is 1. a prominent figure in buildings, which pours water either from its mouth or another part of its body; so called because it usually represents a man or even something else. 2. a feigned, attached face, or a theatrical mask, assumed for the purpose of better representing him in whose place it is. 3. a man who under such a figure represents another; as in a comedy or tragedy

someone acts the part of a king or a servant. 4. an accidental condition or state of a man, or a quality by which a man differs from a man, in mind, body, or fortune, and 5. a man endowed with said quality. In which sense God forbids judges the respect of Persons, Leviticus 19:15, Deuteronomy 1:17, Proverbs 18:5, Proverbs 28:21. 6. a man endowed with a notable quality either in the Church or the Republic, such as a Bishop, Senator, Consul. All of which acceptations are foreign here. 7. In sacred matters; any individual intelligent substance, whether uncreated, divine; or created, angelic or human; called ὑφιστάμενον νοερόν, an intelligent or intellectual suppositum. Which signification of Person, inasmuch as it implies a divine ὑπόστασις, is of this place. And it is an unwritten Latin word; for, as Augustine teaches, book 7 on the Trinity, c. 4: "The necessity of speaking and disputing allowed us to say three Persons, not because Scripture says it, but because it does not contradict it."

Although the word Person is properly not abstract, but concrete, which besides the form, which is Personality, also implies a subject with the form from which it is denominated; sometimes, however, it is taken abstractly: whence it happens that the divine Persons are also considered in a twofold manner; either concretely, when the reality with the mode of subsisting is indicated by the word Person, as when the Son is said to exist in the form of God, Philippians 2:6; or abstractly, when Person denotes the Personality itself or the reason of subsisting, as when the Son is called the Character of the Father's Hypostasis, Hebrews 1:3. Hence also a twofold definition of the Divine Person has arisen; the one concrete, such as that of Boethius: "A person is an individual substance of a rational nature;" or that of Melanchthon and Ursinus: "A person is a subsisting, living, intelligent, incommunicable individual, not sustained by another, nor a part of another;" or "A person is an intelligent suppositum:" the other abstract, such as that of John Calvin, Institutes, Book 1, ch. 13, §. 6, where he says that a Person is "a subsistence in the divine essence, which, related to the others, is distinguished by an incommunicable property." And of others: "A person is the incommunicable existence of an intellectual nature;" who in that matter follow Justin Martyr and Damascenus, who defined a Person by τρόπον ὑπάρξεως or "a mode of subsisting."

The Cartesians will have it that personality does not imply anything positive, but is a mere negation of the conjunction of the divine essence with another thing to constitute one suppositum; in which matter, with respect to created persons, they have the Scotists agreeing with them. But it is better to say that although those modes of subsisting are for the most part negatively expressed through incommunicability, personality, at least in divine things, nevertheless implies such a positive complement by which the essence is so complete in itself that it can no longer be conjoined or united with another thing; and therefore that incommunicability is founded not in a mere negative, but in something positive, which is formally the constitutive of the person, although it is difficult to say what that positive thing is. For otherwise the concept of the Trinity would be merely negative, and the three Persons of the Trinity would be constituted in their personal being and distinguished from each other by a pure

negation, and the personal works ad intra would have only a negative principle. Justin Martyr in his Exposition of the Faith teaches that a divine person is a *τρόπον ὑπάρξεως* or a mode of existing, the word *ὑπάρξεως* here not being taken generally for existence or extance (as Thomas Aquinas often speaks), nor for the essence common to the persons, but for a peculiar, singular, and proper mode of existing or subsisting; which *τρόπον ὑπάρξεως* Cyril of Alexandria calls *ἰδίαν ὑπαρξιν*, *τὴν καθ' ἰδίαν ὑπαρξιν*, and *τὴν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὑπαρξιν*, in the same sense as he calls it *ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν*. See Petavius, *Dogmatum Theologicorum*, Tom. 2, l. 4, c. 2, §.11, 12, p. 325, 326, 327. Nor does anything detract from this phrase, even if the author of this Exposition of the Faith is denied to be Justin Martyr, as Bellarmine, *de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, p. 32, and Rivetus in *Criticus Sacer*, etc., will have it. For it is sufficient that its author is a Catholic and Orthodox doctor, and that other Fathers used the same word.

§.IV.

The word Ὁμούσιος, Consubstantial, was like a Lydian stone by which Catholics were distinguished from Arians. For since Arius with his followers did not deny that Christ was God, but a lesser God than the Father, even with respect to His Deity, created out of nothing before the creation of this universe, yet to the perfect likeness (*τελείαν ὁμοιότητα*) of his Creator, through whom, as an instrument far more excellent and superior than the angels, God the Father produced all other creatures; and therefore asserted Him to be *ἑτεροῦσιον*, of a different essence from the Father; the Orthodox wanted to preclude all hiding places for the Arians and to block all cracks for escape, by saying that the Son is *ὁμούσιον*, Consubstantial, to the Father, and *συναίδιον*, Coeternal, as being begotten from eternity, not made; which they could by no artifice elude or deprave. This Luther expresses in significant words in his book *On the Councils and the Church*, Tom. 7, Jena German ed., fol. 257: "When it came to the heart of the matter, that Christ is homousius with the Father, that is, that Christ has with the Father an equal and one and the same Godhead, equal and one and the same power, they could find no more trick, hole, stratagem, or device."

They did not call the Persons of the Trinity *μονούσιοι*, i.e., that each person has its own solitary essence and has no other individual similar to its substance, such as are the monadic species, like the Sun, the Moon, the Heaven; in which sense three Gods would have been admitted: nor *συνεσίους*, i.e., conjoined in essence, even if one is not from another, nor does it have the same single common essence, in which sense men are *συνέσιοι*, who have one common essence; or (as Petavius wishes) because the word *συνέσιος* signifies *τὴν συναλοιφήν* or the confusion of Persons; concerning the distinction of which words Epiphanius in *Ancoratus* N. 6 writes: "not *συνέσιος*, but *ὁμοούσιος*, that is, not begotten from outside the Father, as some are carried away by irony, wishing the Son to be by position and not by truth. But the bond of faith is to say *ὁμούσιον*. For if you say *ὁμούσιον*, you have dissolved the power of Sabellius. For where there is *ὁμούσιον*, it is indicative of one hypostasis." Nor *ταυτούσιοι*, i.e. of the same essence and subsistence, lest that word, used by some, be drawn to the Sabellian dogma; as Epiphanius says,

Heresies 76, N. 7. But we say ὁμοούσιοι, he continues *ibid.* Epiphanius, as the Holy Faith holds, so that the particle ὁμοῦ may signify perfect persons, since the Son is from the Father, Perfect from perfect; likewise the Holy Spirit is perfect. This, however, is not to be understood as if ὁμοῦ properly signifies perfect, but that it implies a unity and identity of nature, which is perfect and entire in each. See Polanus, *Syntagma Theologicum*, l. 3, c. 8, §.4 p. 620, 621, and Petavius, *Dogmatum Theologicorum*, Tom. 2, l. 4, c. 5, §. 17, p. 357.

The word ὁμοούσιος was so hateful to the Arians, because they felt themselves constrained by it, that they not only called it a recent invention of the Nicene Fathers, utterly unknown to Scripture and the ancients, but also called the Catholics, for using this word, Homousians. Therefore, turning to fraud, they corrupted the Nicene Synod by the addition of a single letter, and for ὁμοούσιον, of the same essence, they put ὁμοιούσιον, of like essence. Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History*, l. 2, c. 18, p. 70. By which fraud not a few of the more simple Orthodox were circumvented, especially in the Council of Ariminum and Seleucia, and subscribed to the ambiguous formula of the Arians. Hilary, the Catholic bishop of Poitiers, deplors this inconstancy of those times to the Emperor Constantine in these words: "After the Nicene Synod, we do nothing but write creeds; while there is a fight over words, while there is a question about novelties, while there is a complaint about authors, while there is a contest about studies, while there is difficulty in consensus, and while one begins to be anathema to the other, now almost no one belongs to Christ. What change does last year's creed have? The first decree orders that *Homousion* be silenced: the next again decrees and preaches *Homousion*: the third, through indulgence, excuses the *Usia* simply assumed by the Fathers: the fourth does not excuse, but condemns. Finally, it has come to this, that nothing holy and inviolable remains thereafter, neither with us nor with anyone before us. We decree annual and monthly creeds about God, we repent of our decrees, we defend the penitent, we anathematize the defended, we condemn either what is foreign in our own, or our own in what is foreign, and biting one another, we are now consumed!"

It should not be concealed, indeed, that the Catholic Fathers, older than the Nicene Synod, 70 in number according to Athanasius, or 80 according to Hilary, in the Council of Antioch held in A.D. 275 against Paul of Samosata, expressly denied that the Son is ὁμοούσιον to the Father. But they did not deny it simply, but in the sense of Samosatenuis, who took this word in a corporeal sense. For Samosatenuis denied that the Son had existed as God from eternity, but had been made God in time, using this argument, that if it were not so, it would follow that He was consubstantial with the Father, and therefore there would be three substances, one primary, and two derived from it; for he so wrongly interpreted τὸ ὁμοούσιον, that as in created and corporeal things one substance is propagated from another, distinct and separate, so it would also be in divine things. And in this, and no other, sense did the Antiochene Fathers deny that the Son of God was ὁμοούσιον to the Father; but the Fathers of the Council of Nicaea said that the Son was ὁμοούσιον to the Father in the sense in which both Dionysii, of Rome and of

Alexandria, older than the Council of Antioch, had said. See Polanus, *Syntagma Theologicum*, lib. 3, c. 8, §. 4, p. 621, and Petavius, *Dogmatum Theologicorum*, lib. 4, c. 5, §. 2, p. 348. Here it is noted that the word ὁμούσιος denotes an identity of essence that is numerical, not specific. Indeed, Stephanus Curcellæus, *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, lib. 2, c. 20, §. 5, p. 74, and *Dissertatio de Vocibus Trinitatis, Personæ, etc.*, §. 70 ff., p. 850, 851 ff., strives with great effort to prove that the Fathers by the word ὁμούσιος signified a specific, not a numerical, unity. But we respond: 1. although the Fathers did not always speak with scholastic rigor, yet 2. since this meaning of this word, of only a specific unity, implies three equal and coeternal Gods, we are therefore religiously bound not to attribute this opinion to the Fathers; especially 3. since the Fathers attributed one and the same essence to the Father and the Son against the Arians; and 4. for that reason they denied that the Father and the Son were συνεσίους, lest they should seem to acknowledge only a specific unity and identity. For thus says Epiphanius in *Ancoratus*, N. 6: "The Son is not συνέσιος to the Father, i.e., having essence together, but ὁμούσιος, i.e., co-essential or consubstantial, i.e., not begotten outside the Father, as some say by a quibble, etc." See here p. 19. 5. Athanasius, in his book *On the Decrees of the Nicene Synod*, Tom. 1, fol. 269, in express words excludes a specific identity, such as has place between parents and children: "Since bodies similar to each other can be distant and far disjoined from each other, such as are children, who resemble their parents by similitude, as it is described of Adam, and of Seth begotten from him, that he was to him κατὰ τὴν ιδέαν, similar in species. But since that generation of the Son from the Father is different from the nature of men, and the Son is not only similar, but inseparable from the substance of the Father, and because both are one, and the Word is always in the Father, and the Father in him, as splendor with respect to light, therefore the Synod, having considered the matter, handed down that they are consubstantial." 6. otherwise there would be nothing wonderful and incomprehensible here, against the common opinion of the Fathers; from this it is concluded that the Fathers here understood not ὁμουσία and specific unity, at least not alone, but numerical. For 7. it is without controversy, when the Fathers teach that Christ according to his human nature is ὁμούσιος, or consubstantial, with us, this is not to be understood of a numerical, but of a specific unity and identity. In which way the Council of Chalcedon defined: "The Son is ὁμούσιος to the Father according to the Godhead, and ὁμούσιος to us according to the manhood." i.e., consubstantial to the Father according to the Deity, consubstantial to us according to the Humanity.

Finally, the word περιχώρησις must also be touched upon here, which indeed, just like the preceding ὁμούσιος, is unwritten (ἄγραφος), yet was not used by the ancients without reason. For this ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἐμπεριχώρησις signifies the intimate union, inexistence, and immanence of the divine persons, which they call mutual circumincession and circumplexion, by which the Father is in the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the Father and the Spirit are in the Son, and the Son and the Holy Spirit are in the Father. John 10:38: "The Father is in me, and I in the Father." John 14:10: "Do you not believe that I am in the

Father and the Father is in me?" John 17:21: "That they all may be one, as you, Father, are in me, and I in you, that they also may be one in us."

§.V.

Because, however, the terms thus far brought forward and explained (at least not all of them) are not found in so many jots and tittles in Scripture; hence the Socinians, and the more recent Remonstrants, and among these Stephanus Curcellæus in *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, lib. 2, c. 20, p. 73, 74, in the Preface to the *Works of Episcopius*, §. 6, p. 795 ff., and in the entire *Dissertatio de Vocibus Trinitatis, Hypostaseos, Personae* etc. p. 811, 812 ff., deny that these words are to be tolerated and used in the Church, and wish on the contrary that they, as having been received rashly, and not only besides, but even against the mind and doctrine of Sacred Scripture, should be utterly eliminated. We, having premised some cautions and theses necessary for correctly perceiving the state of the controversy, will declare our mind.

I. It is certain among all pious theologians that all profane *κενοφωνίας* (and *καινοφωνίας*, as the Vulgate seems to have read), i.e., vain and new words, are to be avoided and shunned, according to the admonition of Paul in 1 Timothy 6:20: "Keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings." For, with and under new words and phrases, new and unusual dogmas are wont to be introduced, which for the most part provide material for disputes.

II. It is also confessed that the very words and phrases of Scripture are to be used as religiously as possible, since no words express or can express the mind and sense of the Holy Spirit more accurately than those which the Holy Spirit Himself has used and consecrated with His own mouth to declare His mind to us. In this matter the Apostles go before us, who, although inspired by God (*θεόπνευστοι*), for the most part use the same words and phrases which Moses and the Prophets used. Hence these sayings of theirs, 1 Peter 4:11: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." 1 Corinthians 2:13: "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." 1 Timothy 6:3: "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife." etc. 2 Timothy 1:13: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." Colossians 2:4: "Let no man beguile you with enticing words (*ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ*)."

III. It is likewise established for all who are knowledgeable in theological matters that the terms wont to be used in the dogma of the Trinity are not absolutely and simply necessary, as if the end, eternal salvation, could not be obtained without them, true faith could not be handed down without their aid, and heterodoxy could not be discerned and refuted without them. For the Christian faith is safe and sound, whether the three Hypostases or persons be called *ὁμοῦσιοι* or co-essential, or whether this be left unsaid,

provided that what is read in so many words in Scripture is sincerely received, and it is acknowledged that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is true God, yet so that the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Father, nor the Father and the Son the Holy Spirit. John Calvin, *Institutes* 1, c. 13, §. 5; Hermann Hildebrand in the Preface to the *Orthodox Declaration of the Three Articles*, p. 67, 68; Gerhard, *Loci Communes* 3, on the Trinity, c. 2, th. 42; D. Joh. Bened. Carpzov, *Specimen Theologiae Chemnitianae*, Loc. 3, c. 1, Thesis 2, §. 6, p. 79. The necessity, therefore, of using these terms and phrases will be only hypothetical, with respect to the heresies that have arisen, and one of expediency.

IV. Hence it is manifest that pious Christians are not to be condemned who, not from a wicked affection and contempt, but led by veneration for Holy Scripture and conscience, prefer to acquiesce in the terms and phrases of Scripture. Thus Luther, in his *Confutation of the Reasons of Jacobus Latomus*, which is extant in Tom. 2, Jena Latin ed., fol. 407, says: "But if my soul hates the name ὁμοούσιος and I should be unwilling to use it, provided I hold the reality defined by the Scriptures in the council, I shall not be a heretic." Because of which hypothetical words, Gregory de Valentia, and Bellarmine in the Preface to his books *On Christ*, p. 227, and others, accuse Luther of Arianism in bad faith. See also Calvin's Letter 350.

V. It is also the constant opinion of theologians that these ecclesiastical words and phrases are not to be preferred to the words and phrases of Scripture.

VI. Nor are the terms, especially of Essence, Substance, Person, to be taken according to their condition in a subject or a finite being, for example, in man; but according to a universal concept: for many things belong to a term with respect to a certain subject, which are not required in its universal concept. Thus the term Person in man implies one essence, distinct in number from others; for example, Peter, because he is a person, has his own one essence in number, distinct from the essence of John; but this does not belong to Person according to its universal concept; and therefore it ought not to be said of the divine persons. Those who wish these terms to be utterly proscribed often sin against this observation. Besides the theologians already cited here, see by all means D. Martin Hund's *Theological Disputation on the Terms to be Used in Theology*; and Dn. D. Samuel Strimesius' *Dissertation on Ecclesiastical Peace*, C. 4. These things, therefore, having been premised, we say: Since the words and terms considered thus far were received by the Church not without urgent necessity, nor rashly, but for grave causes, they are also not to be rashly eliminated, but can be piously used both for the confirmation of the truth and for the refutation of errors.

We seek the reasons 1. from Utility. For they make not only for the explanation and confirmation of this doctrine, but also for the solid confutation of errors. 2. from Necessity; because, without these words and terms, the equivocations of adversaries cannot be so successfully detected, nor their errors refuted. 3. from a parallel reason in other articles: For if in other articles it is lawful to use terms not found in the sacred letters, such as Original and Actual Sin, Incarnation, Satisfaction, Merit, Moral,

Ceremonial, and Forensic Law, Sacrament, etc., surely it will not be illicit in this article either. 4. From the practice of the ancient doctors of the Church: Athanasius, Tom. 2, in the *Disputation with Arius*, before Probus the Gentile Judge: "It has always been the custom of ecclesiastical discipline, if ever a new doctrine of heretics arises, to change the vocabulary of names against the changes of insolent questions, while the realities remain immutably." Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration on the Holy Lights*: "One must not contend with hateful contention about names, as long as the syllables lead to the same meaning." Augustine, book 10 of the *City of God*, Chapter 23: "Philosophers speak with free words, and in matters most difficult to understand, they do not fear offending religious ears: but it is right for us to speak according to a certain rule, lest the license of words should beget an impious opinion, even about the things which are signified by them." Book 7 on the Trinity, c. 4: "We confess that these words were brought forth by the necessity of speaking, when there was need for a copious disputation against the snares or errors of heretics." And Tractate 97 on John: "Against the impiety of the Arian heretics they coined the new name *Homousion*, but they did not signify a new thing by such a name." Hence Thomas Aquinas, 1a, q. 29, art. 3: "The necessity of disputing with heretics compelled the invention of new names signifying the ancient faith." D. Luther, book *On the Councils and the Church*, Tom. 7, Jena German ed., fol. 257, sec. 2: "That one should not use more or other words than stand in Scripture, that cannot be maintained, especially in strife, and when the heretics want to falsify the matter with blind grips and twist the words of Scripture; then it was necessary to summarize the meaning of Scripture, which is set in many sayings, in one short and summary word and to ask if they held Christ to be *Homousion*, as is the meaning of Scripture in all its words, etc."

§.VI.

Since, however, this sublime mystery surpasses human understanding, it can therefore be demonstrated from reason neither *a priori* nor *a posteriori*. 1. Not *a priori*, because God cannot be known in this life as He is in Himself, Exodus 33:20 ff. Nor *a posteriori*; for whatever is thus known is gathered through the visible and manifest works of creation and common providence; in which, since the image of the Trinity is not expressed, the Trinity therefore cannot be known from them either. 2. because it is placed above human reason; so much so, indeed, that not even when revealed can it be comprehended, much less known and demonstrated without revelation. 3. because men in the state of sin, with nature and reason as their guide, do not even penetrate to the intimate knowledge of natural things and of themselves, much less can they, with nature as their guide, demonstrate this mystery. 4. because the Gentiles are said to have been without the true God and to have been ignorant of God, Ephesians 2:12, Galatians 4:8, 1 Thessalonians 4:5.

Certain vestiges of the Trinity have been observed by some learned men to be found in nature; and indeed, in man, they assert that the Intellect in the human mind represents the eternal Father begetting the Son; that Thought represents the Son of God, who is called the *λόγος* or Wisdom of the eternal Father; and that the Will, producing Love from

itself, represents the Holy Spirit. In animals, they continue, each one begets one like itself, whence there is a Begetter and a Begotten, i.e., a Father and a Son: from mutual knowledge, however, there arises a mutual love, by which they adhere to each other; which corresponds to the Holy Spirit. In the Sun, with which God is compared in Psalm 84:12, the Sun begets from itself rays, and from the Sun and the rays proceeds light or heat: thus they will have it that the Father is the source of the Son and from both proceeds the Holy Spirit. And just as the ray is not separated from the sun, nor the heat from both, so neither are the Son and the Holy Spirit separated or divided from the Father: meanwhile, the solar body or the globe of the Sun is not the ray, nor is the ray the globe, and neither of these is the heat; these three, however, are not three suns, but one sun: so there is one God, even if three persons subsist in one divine essence with their substantial properties. In water, a spring or source lies hidden underground, from which a stream arises, and from this a river, which spreads itself far and wide. In which example, they at once urge both one and the same water, and three distinct, yet inseparable things: the source, the stream, and the river, and apply it to our mystery. In herbs they declare three things: the root, the stem, and the plant rising from it; which however live and coalesce by an innate moisture. These examples they also draw speciously, as they think, to this matter, as well as the examples of fire and the rainbow. See Mornay, *On the Truth of the Christian Religion*, C. 5, p. 63, 64. But who does not see that these are only similarities, laboring under no small dissimilarity? Which, if they achieve anything, do indeed illustrate the matter in some way, revelation being supposed, but with revelation set aside, they do not convince the mind nor solidly prove the matter; and therefore they can be proposed to the faithful indeed, yet soberly and cautiously, to confirm them in the truth and credibility of this mystery, but not to adversaries, to convince them of its truth.

Nor can the doctrine of the Holy Trinity be proved from Chaldaic, Egyptian, Pythagorean, or Platonic philosophy: for what is read as said by Zoroaster, Hermes Trismegistus, Pythagoras, Plato and the Platonists, and others, in Mornay's *On the Truth of the Christian Religion*, p. 66 to 72, is so obscure and ambiguous that it can be drawn into diverse senses, and seems rather to be understood of another production than of the generation of the Son from the Father and the procession of the Holy Spirit from both, or if they had any truth, it would have to be said to have been drawn from the Hebrews; not to mention that some think that Zoroaster was Ham, and Hermes Trismegistus was Moses himself.

Nor can the dogma of the Trinity be demonstrated from the Jewish Kabbalah. This is to be noted against Peter Galatinus, Raymundus Martini, Stephan Rittangel, Joseph de Voisin, etc., who will have it that this mystery can be proved from the Jewish Kabbalah. Peter Galatinus indeed, in his book *On the Secrets of Catholic Truth*, book 2, c. 11, 12, brings forward from the Kabbalistic book גלי רזיא an exposition of the Tetragrammaton by means of twelve and forty-two letters, containing an explicit mention of the persons of the Trinity; of which the former, which contains twelve sounds, is this: אב בן וריה הקדש

"Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." The latter, of forty-two letters, is as follows: אב אל בן אל ורוח "Father God, Son God, and Holy Spirit God; but not three Gods, but one God." Which name of forty-two letters others render thus: אב אלהים בן אלהים "Father God, Son God, Holy Spirit God, three in One, one in three." Which Kabbalistic argument Mornay also urges from Galatinus, *On the Truth of the Christian Religion*, c. 5, p. 75. But of what value this argument should be considered is indicated by men most skilled in Jewish matters, Joh. Buxtorf in his *Lexicon*, under the root ספר, saying: "It would be a matter of great worth if this exposition could be confirmed from the books of the Rabbis!" R. Bechai in the beginning of Genesis, fol. 5, col. 2, writes that the name of forty-two letters is derived from the first and second verse of the beginning of Genesis, from the letter ב of the word בראשית to the letter ב of the word ובהו, which are 42 letters, from whose various and multiple combination, known to the Kabbalists, the name expounded by 42 letters is made; but the name of twelve letters is made from the threefold combination of the name יהו. Leusden, *Philologia Hebraea*, Dissert. 27, p. 290, not only doubts whether the book גלי רזיא, *Revelator Arcanorum*, to which Galatinus appeals, ever existed in reality; but also adds this judgment to the Hebrew words cited above: "If we could find these names thus expounded in the very writings of the Rabbis, they would do much to confirm our religion from the Jews themselves."

Voysin urges the ספירות of the Kabbalists and wants to elicit the Trinity from them. But 1. according to the Jews themselves, no firm and apodictic argument can be derived from the mystical and symbolic senses of the Kabbalists: "They do not rely on the mystical sense, nor do they argue from allegorical discourse." With which agrees the opinion of R. Sherira: "Symbolic or mystical expositions are conjectural." 2. By משכת אזילות, the procession of emanations, the Kabbalists do not understand the procession of the divine persons, but the procession of properties and virtues emanating from God, and therefore the divine attributes. 3. This is clear from the fact that they number not two or three emanations (אזילות) or numerations (ספירות) (as many as should be admitted, however, if by those Sephiroth the three divine persons, or the two persons proceeding from the Father, were understood), but ten, namely: 1. Kether, the Crown, upon which they superimpose En Soph, Infinity; 2. Binah, Intelligence; 3. Chochmah, Wisdom; 4. Gebburah, Power; 5. Gedolah, Magnificence or Goodness; 6. Tiphereth, Glory; 7. Hod, Majesty; 8. Nezach, Victory; 9. Jesod, Foundation; 10. Malcuth, the Kingdom or Schekinah, the Indwelling. Hence 4. the Jews and those skilled in Jewish matters everywhere understand the divine attributes by the Sephiroth. See R. Moses in his commentary on Chapter 1 of the *Jezirah*; Menasseh Ben Israel, book *On Creation*, Probl. 27, p. 105, 106; Caesar Evoli of Naples' book *On the Divine Attributes, which the Hebrews call Sephiroth*; Joh. Buxtorf, *Lexicon Talmudicum*, under the root ספר; Joh. Henr. Hottinger, *Thesaurus Philologicus*, book 1, c. 3, p. 451, 452, etc. 5. That the Jewish Kabbalah does not contain the mystery of the Trinity is also evident from the fact that the Jews are sworn enemies of this dogma. See Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, Cap. 3, p. 24, 25, 26.

Finally, some will have it that the doctrine of the Trinity can be proved from the Sibylline verses, among whom is Lactantius himself, c. 6, *On False Wisdom*, and Bellarmine, book *On Christ*, Cap. 11, p. 296. But this too is rightly denied by our theologians. 1. because it is not very likely that God would have revealed such great mysteries to pagan women. 2. and indeed so that they predicted many things more clearly than any of the prophets, as Bellarmine says, c. 1. Hence 3. what is peddled in the Sibylline verses about Christ and the mysteries of our religion is held by many to be adulterated and supposititious; or 4. if there were any truth underlying these, it would have been drawn from the reading of the Bible and conversation with the faithful. See among others Is. Casaubon, *Exercitationes* 1 against Baronius, p. 53, 54; Christoph Becmann, *Exercitationes Theologicae* 14, p. 219, 220 ff. To which we add Joh. Henr. Hottinger's judgment on the Sibylline verses and the Jewish Kabbalah, concerning this matter, from his *Thesaurus Philologicus*, lib. 1, c. 3, Sect. 5, p. 440: "The more clearly such doubtful books speak of the Trinity, the Incarnation of Christ, the hypostatic union, etc., the more manifestly they convict themselves of spuriousness (τῆς νοθείας). There is nothing that makes the Sibylline verses so suspect to the learned as that insolent facility and perspicuity in discussing the most abstruse mysteries of Christianity, not even customary for the prophets. As if, indeed, God in the Old Testament had revealed his mysteries more clearly to the Gentiles than to the Jews themselves! Thus, the more simple and open the assertions of the ancient Jews are concerning the economy of the New Testament, the greater the suspicion arises of questioning their authority."

§.VII.

Therefore, from revelation alone, contained in Holy Scripture, can the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity be rightly and savingly known, and so it ought to be. For "no man knoweth the things of God, but the Spirit of God," 1 Corinthians 2:11. Wherefore Christ teaches in Matthew 11:27: "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." And John 1:18: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

A doubt, however, has been raised concerning the writings of the Old Testament: whether in them also the doctrine of the Trinity is revealed, and can be known from them? The negative of this question is defended I. by the Socinians; whose standard-bearer, Socinus, in *Animadversiones* 3 on the *Assertio Posnaniensis*, p. 38, writes: "Indeed, this triune God was known neither to any of the ancients (the Patriarchs) who worshipped the true God; nor likewise to any of those who have acknowledged or will acknowledge the true God through Christ, was he ever or will he ever be known. And so it is not those who reject him, but those who embrace him, who have not only a recent, but a plainly imaginary God." And in the *Defense of the Animadversiones* against Gabriel Eutropius, Cap. 7, p. 216. Valentinus Smalcius agrees with Socinus in the preface to his *Refutation of the Theses of Frantzius*: "Who from the Old Testament could show to a sensible man the dogma of the Trinity, such as Frantzius

believes it, who the pre-eternity of the Son, so to speak, who the figment of the satisfaction and merit of Christ, and things similar to these? Certainly the ancient Jews believed all these Scriptures: and yet they were utterly ignorant of these portents." What of the fact that not a few learned men, and even distinguished theologians, have felt that the dogma of the Trinity and others were in no way revealed in the Old Testament, but were reserved for the times of the New Covenant? Joh. Volkelius, *de Vera Religione*, lib. 5, c. 9, p. 405, 406 ff., tries to elide all the places of the Old Testament usually brought forward for the Trinity.

II. The Mennonites, asserting that only the single person of the Father was understood and acknowledged in the Old Testament by the name of the one true God of Israel, that the mystery of the Trinity was by no means revealed, but was veiled to the Fathers; that God revealed himself under the old covenant in general as the one God, etc. see their confession opposed to Faulkel from p. 43 to 48.

III. The Remonstrants; whose mind is declared by Liberius de Sancto Amore, *Epistolae Theologicae* 7, p. 185: "From the neglect of the order of revelations it has come to pass that many have believed that the Holy Trinity, as they explain it, was known to the Fathers of the Old Testament; although the most learned of Christians living today can see it, I will not say in the Old Testament, but not even in the New. Read the Locus on the Trinity and you will see that among the places by which it is usually proved, various ones are brought from the Old Testament, which are so urged by those excellent, if you please, interpreters of Scripture, that they contend that one must be blind not to see the Trinity in them. But if they were to treat of the revelations of the Old and New Testaments separately, they would not fall into such an error. They would look at the places of the Old Testament in themselves, not in relation to the New, and from their sole consideration they would teach what the ancient Hebrews believed, not what Christians can believe." For which reason neither Episcopius, nor Curcellæus in *Religio Christiana Instituta*, lib. 2, c. 19, nor Philippus à Limborch in *Theologia Christiana*, lib. 2, c. 17, adduce sayings of the Old Testament for asserting this dogma.

IV. Roman Catholics: of whose number Bellarmine, lib. 2 *de Christo*, cap. 6, having produced two (the fourth and fifth) arguments from the Old Testament for this dogma, adds these things on p. 329: "It should be noted with Theodoret, lib. 2 ad Graecos, that God in the Old Testament did not wish to propose the mystery of the Trinity expressly, because the Jews were incapable, and because they had recently come out of Egypt, where many gods were worshipped, and were about to enter the land of Canaan, where there were also many gods; lest, namely, they should think that three gods were also proposed to them to be worshipped. God wished, however, to adumbrate this mystery, and that in many ways, so that when it was preached in the New Testament, it would not seem entirely new, or repugnant to the Old Testament." And Alphonsus Salmeron, *Prolegomena in Evangelium* XI, quæst. 3, Can. 25: "The mystery of the Holy Triad was never pervious to any mind, however excellent and speculating most highly on divine things, nor could it be: but its disclosure and preaching of the mystery was reserved for

the Gospel alone." After a little he adds: "that in the Old Testament the article of the mystery of the Trinity was not yet proposed to be believed, because that people was not yet capable of it. In the Law, however, the unity of God was inculcated against idolaters, whence that at the beginning of the legislation: Deut. VI. 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one God.'" also Lucas Brugensis on John 1, v. 49. Galatinus, *de Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis*, cap. 1. In which matter, however, they appeal to the consensus of the Fathers, Tertullian against Praxeas, Cyprian, Sermon 6, Chrysostom, *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*, Homily 45, Jerome against the Luciferians, Theodoret, lib. 2 ad Graecos.

Yet the Pontifical doctors do not simply deny that the Trinity was revealed in the Old Testament; but they will have it thus: that a special, distinct, and explicit faith of the Trinity was necessary for salvation only for the elders, i.e., the doctors, by necessity of precept; but not so for the minors, i.e., the unlearned subjects; but that the faith of these was implicitly contained and hidden in the faith of those. Thus Thomas himself, 2a2ae, quæst. 2, Art. 8, ad 2: "Before the advent of Christ, the faith of the Trinity was hidden in the faith of the elders." Gregory de Valentia, P. 3, disp. 1, q. 2, punct. 5, p. 392: "To believe explicitly in the Trinity is necessary by necessity of precept before the time of Grace, so that only the elders were obliged to believe it explicitly." Tanner, Tom. 3, Disp. 1, q. 7, dub. 2, Assert. 4, n. 60: "In the law of nature after the fall, and in the state of the Mosaic law, by necessity of precept the elders indeed were bound to believe explicitly in the Holy Trinity and the mystery of the Incarnation of Christ, even insofar as he was to redeem the human race by his death and resurrection, but the minors were not so bound. In the meantime, however, it must be confessed that if any of the minors had been sufficiently taught this truth of faith, that truth could in no way then be denied by him, but it had to be believed by him as to the specification of the act. But the minors were not therefore held by a precept of this faith in themselves, so that they ought to inquire into such a truth and to learn it by instruction."

We state that the Holy Trinity in the Old Testament also, not indeed as clearly as in the New Testament, but far more obscurely, as the economy of that time and the state and condition of the still infant Church required, was sufficiently, however, for the reason of that economy and state, revealed for the sake of not only the elders, i.e., the doctors of that Church, but also the minors, i.e., even the unlearned faithful; but in the New Testament, it was revealed most clearly.

§.VIII.

Therefore, for asserting this truth, we will bring forward I. those places of the Old Testament which indefinitely infer some plurality; such as, 1. Genesis 1, v. 26: "Let us make man in our image and likeness." where God is not addressing angels, for man was not created in their image. Genesis 3, v. 22: "Behold, Adam is become as one of us." Where it is to be observed that Onkelos rendered "from us" as "from him," or "by himself." But besides the Jews, our usual version is approved by the Septuagint interpreters, the Vulgate, Tremellius, Luther, Piscator, the English, the French, etc. From whose common

consent one should not rashly depart. Genesis XI, 7: "Come, let us go down, and there confound their language." Isaiah 6:8: "Whom shall I send, and who will go for Us?" To those who object to these places that God speaks in the plural number for the sake of honor, in the manner of kings and princes, we respond 1. that kings and princes have long spoken thus, not from ambition, but rather from modesty, to testify that they command and act not only in their own name but also in the name of the chief men. 2. In Scripture itself, also in Gen 29:27, Job 18:2-3, Dan 2:7-8, Cant 1:3, Laban, Bildad, Daniel, the Church speak of themselves and their friends in this way; in John 3:11, Christ speaks of himself, John the Baptist, and the disciples in this way. 3. It would have to be proved, however, that the kings mentioned in Scripture, Pharaoh, Saul, David, Solomon, Nebuchadnezzar, etc., spoke in this way, and 4. that God always speaks of Himself in this way. Which all will acknowledge to be false. Nor did God, at least in Gen. 1:26, address angels, because He did not take angels into the society of creation.

Plurality is also indefinitely suggested by 2. those places in which God is distinguished from God, not indeed essentially, but personally, such as Gen. 19:24: "The Lord rained sulfur and fire from the Lord." Ps. 110:1: "The Lord said unto my Lord." Hos. 1:7: "The Lord says: I will save them by the Lord their God." Dan. 9:17: "Hear, O our God, the prayer of thy servant and his supplications, etc., for the Lord's sake." To this pertain 3. the testimonies in which a Son is attributed to God. Ps. 2:7: "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." cf. with Heb. 1:5. Zech. 3:9-10: "I will bring forth my servant the Branch (Zemach). For behold the stone that I have laid before Joshua; upon one stone shall be seven eyes." Prov. 8:22, 23, 24: Wisdom is called "the beginning of the way of God, anointed from everlasting, begotten before the earth was made." Prov. 30:4: "What is his name, and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell?" Hither also are referred 4. those places, not without mystery, in which God is emphatically called in the plural number, Creators, our Makers, i.e., our Creator, as in Ps. 149:2: "Let Israel rejoice in his Makers," i.e., his Maker. Eccles. 12:1: "Remember thy Creators." Job 35:10: "Where is God, my Makers, who giveth songs?" Isa. 54:5: "Thy Rulers are thy makers, the Lord of hosts is his name." Josh. 24:19: "Jehovah is a holy Elohim." 2 Sam. 7:23: "Elohim went."

Besides Lombard, Abelard, and the Lutherans, from the Reformed, Bullinger, Polanus, Junius, Piscator, Capellus, Jacob Altingius, and others strive to prove the plurality of Persons in the essence of God from the name אֱלֹהִים constructed with a verb of the singular number, e.g., Gen. 1:1, אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא, "Elohim created." We do not indeed disapprove of their pious study to confirm the faithful in the truth. Nevertheless, with most of the Reformed, namely Calvin, Mercerus, Pareus, Gomarus, Buxtorf, Drusius, Rivetus, C. Schotanus, Wendelinus, Burmannus, Turretinus, Leusdenus, and others, and of the Pontificals, Cajetan, Bellarmine l. 2 de Christo c. 6. p. m. 326. 327, Petavius Theol. Dogm. Tom. 2 c. 7. § 3 p. m. 138. 139, we think that the plurality of persons in the divine essence cannot be sufficiently and solidly proved from this name against infidels and other Antitrinitarians. 1. Because the name Elohim is said of singular persons and things in Holy Scripture, e.g., Jud. 13:22, of one angel who appeared to Manoah: "We shall surely

die, because we have seen Elohim," i.e., an angel. Of one Moses, Exod. 4:16, where Moses is appointed to Pharaoh as Elohim, i.e., God. And c. 7:1, of a single calf, Exod. 32:31; Neh. 9:18; of Dagon alone, Jud. 16:23; of Ashtaroth, the god of the Sidonians; Chemosh, the god of the Moabites; Milcom, the god of the Ammonites, 1 Kings 11:33, in all of which, however, it can signify no plurality, much less a Trinity. 2. Because when used of the true God, it does not always signify God considered essentially, but personally; as in Ps 45:7: "God, thy God (Elohim, Elohecha), hath anointed thee." Hos. 1:7: "I will save them by the Lord their God (Elohehem)." and Gen. 1:2: "The Spirit of God (Elohim) moved upon the face of the waters." In which places it certainly cannot indicate a Trinity or a plurality. 3. Because other plural nouns signifying dominion, such as Adonim, Baalim, are very often explained by the singular number, as Gen. 24:9: "Under the thigh of Abraham his lords," i.e., his master. Gen. 42:30: Joseph is called "the man, the lord (plural) of the land." Gen. 40:1: "The butler and the baker sinned against their lords, the king," i.e., their lord. Ex. 21:29: "But if the ox were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it hath been testified to his lord (Heb. his lords), and he hath not kept him in, but that he hath killed a man or a woman; the ox shall be stoned, and his lord also (Heb. בעליו יומה, his lords shall be put to death) shall be put to death." Exod. 22:11: *Bealav* is said of one master. also Isa. 1:3. Wherefore Buxtorf, *Thesaurus Grammaticus*, l. 2, c. 2, p. 341, forms this rule concerning nouns signifying dominion: "Nouns of dominion, Adon, Elohim, Baal, by the use and property of the language, are put in the plural number with a singular antecedent, to indicate the highest dignity and most excellent honor of the person, as the Hebrew interpreters hand down." 4. Because the name Elohim, even when used of idols, is constructed with a singular verb; Jud. 16:23, where the princes of the Philistines say of Dagon: "Our God (Heb. נתן אלהינו) hath delivered Samson our enemy into our hand." In the same way the name Adonim is constructed with a singular verb, Exod. 21:4: "If his lord (Heb. lords) have given him a wife." Gen. 42:30, of Joseph alone it is said: "The lords of the land spake," for the Lord. 2 Sam. 2:7, of Saul alone: "Your lords Saul is dead," for your Lord. Malachi 1:6: "I am lords," for I am Lord. So also Baalim is constructed, Exod. 21:29: "his lord also shall be put to death." Heb. lords. From which examples Buxtorf, *Thesaurus Grammaticus*, L. 2, c. 10, p. 433, forms such a rule: "An enallage of number is when plural nouns of dominion are joined to a singular verb, to express the highest majesty, or as the Hebrews say, to indicate a plurality of virtues (רבוּי הַכּוֹחַ) and powers in the dominant person." (5) If, therefore, the plural name Elohim implies a plurality of persons, the names Adonim and Baalim will do the same: but the affirmants do not urge these names; therefore, that one should not be urged either; for no reason for disparity can be brought forward. (6) Because the truth and a good cause, when defended by weak arguments, are rendered suspect to Antitrinitarians, who, from the weakness of one argument, judge of the rest, and conceive a prejudice both against the truth and against the arguments by which it is defended. The arguments here are therefore not so much to be numbered as to be weighed; which theologians have prudently warned with these sayings: "The weakness of the proof is a diminution of the truth (τὸ ἀθενὲς τῆς ἀποδείξεως ἐλάττωσις ἀληθείας)." Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, P. I, q. 32, art. 1: "When anyone brings forward reasons that are not cogent to prove the Christian faith, he falls into the ridicule

of unbelievers. For they believe that we rely on such reasons, and believe because of them." Luther, Tom. 2, Jena German ed., fol. 475, sec. 2: "If one thus defends the faith with uncertain grounds and faulty sayings, is it not a shame and a mockery of Christians among the opponents who are skilled in languages? And they only become more stiff-necked in their error and hold our faith, with good appearance, for a human dream." He has similar things in Tom. 6, Wittenberg Latin ed., on ch. 18 of Gen., fol. 233, sec. 2, and Tom. 10, Wittenberg German ed., fol. 395, sec. 2. John Calvin: "Christian readers must be warned to beware of such violent glosses." Mercerus: "We ought not to fight with weak arguments against the Jews, lest we make ourselves ridiculous to them through our ignorance of their language." And Chemnitz warns: "Testimonies are not so much to be numbered as weighed, nor should it be asked how great is the number of sentences, however patched together, but how appositely and perspicuously they teach and confirm this article of the Trinity."

II. This truth is proved 1. by those places (suitable for confirming the Orthodox) in which the name of God or Lord is repeated three times; Exod. 3:6: "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." and v. 15: "The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob hath sent me unto you." Num. 6:24-26: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee! The Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee! The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." Ps. 67:6-7: "Let the people praise thee, O God; let all the people praise thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase; and God, even our own God, shall bless us. God shall bless us; and all the ends of the earth shall fear him." Isa. 6:3: "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord God of hosts." C. 33:22: "The Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; he will save us." Conf. Josh. 22:22; Dan. 9:19; Zech. 1:3. 2. By clearer places, in which there is a determinate and more distinct mention of three. Genesis 1, v. 1 ff., there is a distinct mention of God creating all things, the Word producing all things, and the Spirit hovering over the waters. That the Word is not a bare command of God, and therefore an external, uttered *λόγος προφορικός*, nor an internal or mental one, is proven by a comparison of this text with John c. 1:2 ff. To which also belong the words of David in Ps. 33:6: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the spirit of his mouth." Where Jehovah, the Word, and the Spirit are distinctly named. 2 Sam. 23:1-2 ff.: "These be the last words of David: The man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, said... The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue. The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me: He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." In which words David proclaims the God of Israel and his Messiah or Anointed, and the Holy Spirit by whom he himself, being moved, spoke. Isa. 48:16: "The Lord hath sent me, and his Spirit," where distinct mention is made of the sending Lord, the one sent, and the Spirit of God. Isa. 63:9-11, 14: "In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. But they rebelled, and vexed his holy Spirit," where Jehovah, the Angel of the presence, and the Holy Spirit are expressly recounted. Isa. 11:2: "The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him." also Isa. 61:1: "The Spirit of the Lord

is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach," etc. where the Lord, His Spirit, and the Messiah are mentioned. Hag. 2:5-6: "I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts: According to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my spirit remaineth among you." Where, by the mention of God, the Word, and the Spirit, it is shown that the doctrine of the Trinity was not utterly unknown in the Old Testament.

§.IX.

Yet this mystery has been revealed far more clearly in the New Testament. And indeed, I. In the Baptism of Christ, Matthew 3:16-17. Where God the Father, by a voice sent from heaven, inaugurates His Son, baptized in the Jordan, into the Mediatorial office with these solemn words: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased!" The Holy Spirit, however, with the heavens opened, descended like a dove upon Christ. Hence the ancients addressed the Arians: "Go, Arian, to the Jordan and you will see the Trinity." II. In our Baptism, Matthew 28:19, which sacred rite Christ most solemnly instituted and consecrated thus: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Where this is to be faithfully remembered: He in whose name Baptism, the solemn rite of Christian initiation and the sacrament of regeneration, is to be administered, is the True God: A. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. E. Likewise, He into whose Name, i.e., acknowledgment, confession, faith, worship, and obedience we are solemnly initiated and bound, is the true God: A. Into the Name, i.e., the acknowledgment, confession, faith, worship, and obedience of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit we are solemnly initiated and bound. E. III. John 14:16: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter." IV. John 15:26: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." V. 1 Corinthians 12:3: "No man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed." And "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." VI. 2 Corinthians 13:13: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." VII. Galatians 4:6: "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." VIII. Ephesians 2:18: "For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." IX. Ephesians 3:14, 16: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ... that he would grant you... to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man." X. Titus 3:5-6: "God saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." XI. 1 Peter 1:2: "Elect... according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." XII. 1 John 5:7: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." Where not only the number, as they say, is numbered, but the numbering is also had.

Indeed, this passage was not read in some of the most ancient Greek exemplars; that one also which is thought to have been written by the hand of St. Thecla, a noble Egyptian woman and martyr, before the Council of Nicaea, and thus 1400 years ago, and was sent as a gift to the English King Charles I by Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople, and is preserved today in the Royal Library in London; also in the Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, and in the earlier versions of the Blessed Luther, it was wanting, and in other exemplars it was read slightly altered. Whence not only Blandrata in the *Disputatio Albana*, Acts of the 2nd day, E. 1, Francis David against George Major, N. 2, Socinus in his commentary on 1 John 5, p. 416, and in his *Animadversiones* on the *Assertio Posnaniensis* 17, p. 69, Enjedin in his *Explicatio Locorum Scripturae*, fol. 425, Schmalz against Schopper on the Trinity, p. 16, Volkelius, *de Vera Religione*, lib. 5, c. 9, p. 41, Christoph Sandius, *Interpretatio Paradoxa*, Appendix, p. 376 ff., and other Antitrinitarians declare it to be spurious; but also Stephanus Curcellæus, *Dissertatio de Vocibus Trinitatis*, §. 44, p. 833, and Philippus à Limborch, *Theologia Christiana*, lib. 2, c. 17, §. 1, p. 95, do not admit it; nay, Erasmus also in his *Annotations* on this place in the Louvain theological edition, and Joh. Bugenhagen Pomeranus in his *Illustration of the Prophet Jonah*, seem at least to doubt this passage.

But we respond: 1. That this passage can be called supposititious only if it had been found in no exemplar at all, and therefore not in the authentic one either, which however is false, and Erasmus in the cited place reports that he had seen and read this verse in an English and a Spanish codex; besides which it was also found in a codex of Basel, and who can doubt that it existed in many more? 2. Cyprian, who flourished in A.D. 240 under the Emperor Decius, and therefore lived before the Council of Nicaea, cites this verse in his book *On the Unity of the Church*, p. 255: "And again it is written of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit: and these three are one." And again in Letter 73 to Jubaianus: "For if anyone could be baptized among heretics, he could certainly also obtain remission of sins. If he obtained remission of sins, and was sanctified, and became a temple of God, I ask, of which God? If of the Creator, he could not, who did not believe in him; if of Christ, he cannot become a temple of him, who denies that Christ is God: if of the Holy Spirit, since the three are one, how can the Holy Spirit be pleased with him, who is an enemy of either the Father or the Son?" 3. Besides Cyprian, Jerome and Fulgentius allege this verse; the former of whom, in his preface to the Canonical Epistles, suspects that this passage was corrupted by Latin interpreters, and that the testimony of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit was omitted by some. 4. That it was not brought into the battle line by other Fathers, Didymus, Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, Chrysostom, and Augustine in their disputations against the Arians, this was undoubtedly done because at that time it was lacking in many, and therefore perhaps also in their codices; or because they preferred to prove the Holy Trinity from non-controversial passages, since they foresaw that they would make little progress with a controversial passage against obstinate enemies. 5. The context proves this verse to be not spurious but genuine. For as John in v. 7 introduces three celestial witnesses, so in v. 8 he introduces three terrestrial witnesses. Whence in v. 9, 10, 11, with respect to the three celestial witnesses, he infers: "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the

witness of God which he hath testified of his Son." 6. From which it is clear that this verse was erased from those exemplars in which it is lacking. 7. All the celebrated editions, the Complutensian, the Antwerp, that of Arias Montanus, of Erasmus, of R. Stephanus, of Walton, and others, have this verse today. 8. The Racovians themselves inserted it into their German version of A.D. 1630. 9. The Blessed Luther used a corrupt exemplar in his translation; but since it has appeared that this verse is had in certain most ancient codices, and is cited by certain Fathers, the Lutheran doctors did not hesitate to insert it into Luther's version. As for the authors of the expunction of this verse, many Orthodox have thought that it was committed by the Arians. But because 1. the Arians could not have corrupted all the exemplars, even those of the Catholics, e.g., of Athanasius and others, some of which were nevertheless also corrupted, which we said is evident from the fact that they did not urge this passage in their disputations against the Arians. 2. the Orthodox would not have passed over this sacrilege of the Arians in silence, but would have exposed it to the whole Christian world, to the profit of the good cause, but to the detriment of the bad; for this reason we think the opinion of those learned men more probable, who state that before the Arian controversies were moved, this passage was expunged by earlier Antitrinitarians, such as were Artemon and Theodotus the Tanner, who lived under the Emperors Commodus, Pertinax, and Severus, and boasted that they corrected the Scriptures; which Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History*, l. 7, c. 32, p. 758, seems to confirm, saying that the ancient interpreters signified that there were certain men who had depraved that epistle, in order to separate the man in Christ from God.

§.X.

The Deity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit evidently proves the Holy Trinity. I. The Deity of the Father, placed beyond all controversy and contradiction, is nevertheless proven by us with a few arguments from abundance. I. From the divine names. Genesis 1:1: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Psalm 33:6: "By the word of the Lord (יהוה) were the heavens formed, and by the Spirit of his mouth all their host." Deuteronomy 18:15: "The Lord (יהוה) thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." Ps. 45:8, cf. with Heb. 1:9: "God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness." 2 Sam. 23:2: "The Spirit of the Lord (יהוה) spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." Isa. 61:1: The Son says of the Father: "The Spirit of the Lord God (אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה) is upon me; because the Lord (יהוה) hath anointed me." Acts 2:36: "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Acts 3:13: "The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus." Luke 1:32: "He shall be called the Son of the Highest." John 20:17: "I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God." 2 Cor. 1:3; 2 Cor. 11:31; Eph. 1:3, 17; 1 Pet. 1:3, he is called "the blessed God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." In those places where God is said to have given his Son to the world and to have sent him into the world, John 3:16; Rom. 8:31, 32; Gal. 4:4; 1 John 4:9, 10, etc. II. From the divine attributes: Independence, Infinity, Eternity, Omnipresence, Immutability, Omniscience, Omnipotence, etc., which divine properties

belong to God the Father, as even the Antitrinitarians confess. III. From divine actions, *ad intra*, the generation of the Son, Ps. 2:7, cf. with Heb. 1:5; Prov. 8:24; the spiration of the Holy Spirit, John 15:26; and the internal work *ad extra*, our ante-secular election, Eph. 1:5; also external works *ad extra*: the creation of all things, 1 Cor. 8:6: "One God, the Father, of whom are all things." Conservation and governance, John 5:17: "My Father worketh hitherto." 4. From truly divine worship, which is to be attributed to the Father, also without controversy and contradiction. For we are commanded to believe in him, to hope in him, to fear him, to love him, to invoke him, and to worship him.

All these things so belong to God the Father by the consent of all, that from them not only the Socinians, but also the Remonstrants, ascribe to God the Father a certain singular superiority (ὑπεροχήν) or eminence (ἐξοχήν), i.e., excellence and prerogative, even with respect to the Godhead itself, dignity, and power, and they subordinate the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Father. Thus Philippus à Limborch, *Theologia Christiana*, lib. 2, c. 17, §. 25, 26, p. 100: "From these things we gather that the divine essence is common to the Son and the Holy Spirit, but from these it is no less established that there is a certain subordination among these three persons; inasmuch as the Father has the divine nature from himself; the Son and the Holy Spirit from the Father: who is therefore the fount and principle of divinity in the Son and the Holy Spirit. The common consent of Christians, by reason of order, acknowledges this prerogative, always attributing the first place to the Father, the second to the Son, the third to the Holy Spirit. But there is also a certain super-eminence of the Father with respect to the Son and of the Father, and of the Son with respect to the Holy Spirit, by reason of dignity and power. For it is more dignified to beget than to be begotten, to spirate than to be spirated: the one who sends also has power over the one sent, but not the one sent over the one who sends. But God the Father is said everywhere to have sent the Son; and the Son refers all that he does to the Father as author." Episcopius has similar things in *Institutiones*, l. 4, c. 32, 33, and Curcellæus, *Religio Christiana Instituta*, l. 2, c. 19, §. 9, 10, 11, p. 72, and in the *Dissertatio de Vocibus Trinitatis*, §. 60, p. 843, 844.

We distinguish between the Son of God ἔσθαρκον, incarnate, considered economically and in the state of humiliation; and the Son of God ἄσθαρκον, before the incarnation, and considered theologically. In the former way, Christ is less than the Father. For God the Father in the work of our redemption is regarded as ruler and judge, who preserves and protects the rights of the divine majesty, before whom Christ must appear as mediator, sponsor, and advocate of the human race, and plead the cause of men. To this are to be referred the following sayings of scripture. John 14:28: "The Father is greater than I." John 5, v. 19, 20, 30: "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do." "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." John 6:38: "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." John 10:18: "No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." Phil.

2:8: "He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death." Heb. 5:7: "Christ in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared." 1 Cor. 3:23: "All things are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." 1 Cor. 11:3: "The head of Christ is God." cf. John 7:16, 17, 28, 29; John 10:25, 37, 38; C. 14:10; C. 11:41, 42; C. 12:49, 50; C. 14:10, 24; Matth. 12:18; C. 20:23; Mark 13:32; 1 Cor. 15:24, etc.

But as regards Christ considered as ἄσαρκος (unincarnate), we assert that the Son is equal to the Father with respect to essence and deity. Therefore, the Father does not have a superiority (ὑπεροχὴν) or eminence (ἐξοχὴν), i.e., an eminence or excellence, over the Son with respect to the divine essence or deity and power, because an eminence with respect to the deity itself would take away the equality and consubstantiality of the Persons; contrary to John 5:18, Phil. 2:6, John 10:30, 1 John 5:7. But the eminence or superiority (ἐξοχή or ὑπεροχή) which is admitted here by orthodox theologians is rather a priority, and is only with respect to the mode both in subsisting and in operating. In subsisting, because both in personal order (Matth. 28:19, 1 John 5:7) and in personal origin (Ps. 2:7, John 15:26) He is first, and precedes the Son and the Holy Spirit, as one who has no principle of either order or origin, but is from Himself, negatively, not positively; since the other persons have their origin from Him: the Son indeed from the Father alone; but the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Whence the ancients call the Father the fount, origin, and principle of the Godhead. In operating, because the superiority, or rather priority, in operating follows the superiority or priority in subsisting. On account of which priority, creation is also singularly attributed to the Father (Matth. 11:25, Acts 4:24, 26, and in the Apostles' Creed); likewise, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are distinguished by the distinctive prepositions ἐκ (from), διὰ (through), and ἐν (in), 1 Cor. 8:6, John 1:3, Heb. 1:2, 2 Thess. 2:13. In the works of grace also, the love, grace, and mercy of God the Father is declared to be the preceding cause (causa προηγεμένη), John 3:16, Rom. 3:24, as also everywhere in the beginnings of the Apostolic epistles. Whoever, therefore, are the authors who attribute a certain excellence or eminence (ἐξοχὴν or ὑπεροχὴν) to God the Father in this sense only, namely, by reason of order and personal origin, think orthodoxly; such as, from the Reformed, are Calvin, *Institutes*, l. 1, c. 8, §. 23; Zanchius, lib. 5, *de Tribus Elohim*, c. 7, p. 554, etc.; Sohnius, *Exegesis of the Augsburg Confession*, Art. 1, p. 134, 135; Polanus, l. 3, *Syntagma Theologicum*, c. 10, p. 637 ff.; Henricus Alting, *Loci Communes*, part 1, Loc. 3, p. 38, and *Theologia Problematica Nova*, Loc. 3, Probl. 33, p. 228, where he treats this question *ex professo*; Chamier, *Panstratia*, Tom. 2, l. 1, c. 4, §. 34 ff., p. 8, 9; Alsted in the *Supplement to Chamier, de Ecclesia*, l. 2, c. 9, th. 17; Matthaeus Martinius, l. 1, *Theological Tractate*, 3, c. 7; Turretin, *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae*, Loc. 3, qu. 27, §. 16, p. 308, 309; D. George Bull, the Englishman, that strenuous Defender of the Nicene Faith, in his *Defense of the Nicene Faith*, Sect. 4, c. 1, 2, 3, p. 432 ff., where he teaches that all the Catholic Fathers unanimously attributed to the Father a superiority of order and personal origin, etc. From the Roman Catholics, Gregory de Valentia, Tom. 1 of *Commentarii Theologici*, disp. 2, qu. 7; Bellarmine, l. 1 *de Christo*, c. 10, p. 284, 290, who attributes to the Father a certain excellence and

majority in the said sense, although in the Preface to the books de Christo he writes a diatribe against Calvin for that reason, because he had ascribed a certain superiority (*ὕπεροχὴν*) to the Father; Jodocus Clichtoveus, l. 1 de Fide Damasceni, c. 11; Joh. Baptista Gonet, *Clypeus Theologiae Thomisticae*, Tom. 2, Tract 6, disp. 8, p. 232, 233, etc. and therefore they are not to be referred to the same class as the Remonstrants; whose opinion, however, was adopted and whose style was imitated by Ralph Cudworth, the Englishman, in *The True Intellectual System*, and by Henricus Nicolai, in *Methodus Trinitatis*, th. 36, 37, because the Remonstrants attribute to the Father an excellence and eminence with respect to the Godhead itself, dignity, and power, and from that subordinate the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Father. In which sense the cited Reformed and Roman Catholic authors do not admit an excellence and eminence of the Father over the Son, but assert and defend the equality of the divine persons.

§.XI.

II. The Deity of the Son is proven from the essential divine names. I. From the name *יהוה*. Num. 14:22 & Ps. 95:9, the Israelites are said to have tempted Jehovah, and in Num. 21:5-6, Jehovah is said to have sent fiery serpents among the people murmuring against God and Moses; but Paul attributes this to Christ in 1 Cor. 10:9: "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents." 2. Isa. 6:5: "Mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord (*יהוה*)." But John, in c. 12:40-41, says that Isaiah then saw the glory of Christ and spoke of it. 3. Ps. 102:25-26: "O Lord (*יהוה*), thou hast laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure," etc. But the Apostle applies these words to Christ in Heb. 1:10. 4. Isa. 40:3: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." Mal. 3:1; Jer. 23:5-6: "And this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord Our Righteousness."

II. From the name *Elohim*. 1. Ps. 45:6-7: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever... therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness." 2. Ps. 68:18, of God, whose going forth was before the people, whose chariots are myriads, it is said: "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men," which Paul refers to Christ in Eph. 4:8. 3. Isa. 40:3: "Make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

III. From the name *אל גבור* (Mighty God). "And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Isa. 7:14, the Son to be born of a virgin shall be called Immanuel.

IV. From the name *Adonai* and *Adon*, Ps. 110:1: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand," which Christ himself testifies is said of him, Matth. 22:42-43. V. 5: "The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath." Mal. 3:1: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord... shall suddenly come to his temple."

V. In the N.T. from the name *θεός*. John 1:1: "And the Word was God." John 20:28: "Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God!" Which words, indeed, Theodore of

Mopsuestia once interpreted as of one admiring and astonished at an unusual and unexpected sight. For he asserted that this confession of Thomas, by which, when he touched the hand or side of the Lord after the resurrection, he said, "My God and my Lord," was not said of Christ by Thomas: for he does not say that He is God, but that Thomas, being amazed at the miracle of the resurrection, glorified God who raised Christ. But this opinion was condemned by an anathema in the Fifth Council of Constantinople, Cap. 12, in Caranza, p. 316-317. Socinus, repeating the same explanation after some centuries, was himself contradicted by Jon. Slichtingius in his commentary on this passage. That these are not the words of one admiring is made credible, first, by the fact that Thomas said these words to Christ, i.e., he addressed Christ himself with these words. For John says: "and said to him," namely to Christ, not simply "said," which would be characteristic of one admiring. Then, from mere admiration, the faith of Thomas would not be apparent, which Christ nevertheless soon attributes to him; since we can admire even the apparent form of something that seems incredible to us all the more, the less we believe the thing itself to be truly so. There is no doubt, therefore, that Thomas, convinced by the truth of the matter, as he was admonished by Christ, desisted from his unbelief and showed himself faithful. And therefore he calls Christ his Lord and his God: as if to say: O my Lord and my God! I acknowledge you to be my Lord and my God, etc. Acts 20:28: "God purchased his own church with his own blood." Rom. 9:5: "Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever," which is not an apostrophe to the Father, but a doxology pertaining to Christ. 1 Tim. 4:10: "For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe." Tit. 2:13: "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God." 1 John 5:20: "This is the true God, and eternal life."

VI. From the name *κύριος* which is sometimes attributed to Christ absolutely, sometimes with an appositive. Luke 1:16-17, the Angel concerning John the Baptist: "And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God." Luke 2:11: "For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." 1 Cor. 2:8: "they crucified the Lord of glory." 1 Cor. 8:6: "To us there is but one Lord, Jesus Christ." Eph. 4:5: "One Lord." 1 Cor. 15:47: "the Lord from heaven." Jude v. 4: "the only Lord." Apoc. 17:14: "Lord of lords." C. 19:16: "Lord of lords."

VII. From the name *δεσπότης*; 2 Pet. 2:1: "There shall be false prophets... and false teachers, denying the Lord that bought them." cf. Jude v. 4. Consistent with which, the Christians in the primitive Church were accustomed to say a hymn to Christ as to a God, on a stated day: as Pliny testifies in l. 10, Epist. 97.

§.XII.

The Deity of Christ is also brilliantly proven by that divine Generation, by which, as by a personal action *ad intra*, God the Father, by the communication of the same divine essence, begot and produced the consubstantial Son, truly and properly indeed, yet hyperphysically, incomprehensibly (*ἀκαταλήπτως*), timelessly (*ἀχρόνως*, without succession of time),

inseparably (*ἀχωρίστως*, without division), and impassibly (*ἀπαθῶς*, without passion and change), and the Son was begotten and produced.

By this divine Generation and Filiation are offended: 1. The Jews, who will have it that it is dishonorable for God to have a Son, since He does not have a wife; although in the Old Testament also there is mention both of a Generation and a Son, Ps. 2:7, Prov. 8:22 ff., Prov. 30:4, and of the *πῦξ*, the Branch, Isa. 4:2, Jer. 23:5, C. 33:15, Zech. 3:8, c. 6:12. 2. The Mohammedans, who in the Alcoran, Sura 29, say: "Because of this foul saying (that the Father has a Son) the heaven was almost confounded, and the earth fled away, and every mountain fell." Sura 31: "He who believes that God has a Son," it is said, "will enter hell, as the wicked deserve." Sura 32: "to be devoured by birds." 3. The Arians, who established that Christ is indeed called the Son of God, but on account of his ante-secular creation from nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*); and on account of his conception by the Holy Spirit, also on account of his resurrection from the dead, and on account of his exaltation to the right hand of God and the power given to Christ over all things. 4. The Socinians, who contend that Christ is and is called the Son of God chiefly 1. on account of his conception by the Holy Spirit, Luke 1:35; 2. on account of his segregation and sanctification for the mediatorial office, John 10:34-36; 3. on account of his resurrection from the dead, to which they refer Acts 13:33; 4. on account of his exaltation and elevation to the right hand of God, Acts 2:36; 5. on account of the power given to Christ over all things in heaven and on earth, Matth. 28:18.

5. Indeed, in the 8th century, A.D. 794, Felix of Urgell and Elipandus of Toledo, Spanish bishops, taught that Christ, according to his human nature, is the adoptive Son of God, through the grace of adoption, as being born of the Virgin Mary by the will of the Father, and therefore God by name only; whence the Orthodox deduced this consequence: that two Sons and two Persons are admitted; and that not the Son of God, but a man, the adoptive Son of God, was assumed by the Son of God, suffered, was crucified, and died for us. Wherefore this opinion, commonly called the Felician or Adoptionist heresy, as being akin to Nestorianism, was condemned in the Synod of Frankfurt. But, because Felix and Elipandus believed that Christ, according to his divine nature, is the true, natural, and proper Son of God, begotten from the substance of the Father, and hence true God with the Father and the Holy Spirit, their error does not directly pertain here.

However, just as the error of the Arians arose from the preconceived opinion that Christ was created from nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*) before the world was founded, and that of the Socinians from the prejudice that Christ had his beginning from the Blessed Virgin Mary: so the error of the infidels, Jews and Mohammedans, and partly also of other Antitrinitarians, proceeds from this, 1. that they take generation not in its universal concept, in which sense, from Damascenus l. 1 de Orthodoxa Fide, c. 8, it is described as the production of some suppositum from the substance of another into a similar substance, the same in number or species, inferring the relation of a Son; whence the formal reason of generation consists in giving and receiving substantial being; which holds true in generation in common, inasmuch as it prescind from generation in a certain subject, and

therefore also in divine generation. 2. that they confuse physical generation with hyperphysical, and do not free the latter from the imperfections of physical generation: (1) from the transition and change from not-being to being, i.e., from potency to act; (2) from the division and multiplication of numerical essence; (3) from the priority and posteriority of temporal duration; (4) from the formal reasons of active and passive generation; (5) from the causal dependence of the one begotten on the one begetting, and the minority of the former and the majority of the latter, etc. From which imperfections, however, the matter itself cries out that this generation is to be freed, because this generation is divine and ineffable, by which God the Father begot His Son not by way of a transient act, but by way of an immanent act and by emanation, as rays continually emanate from the sun; according to the indubitable oracles of the sacred letters: Ps. 2:7: "The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." Prov. 8:22, 23, 24: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up (anointed) from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth (אֶלְלֵךְ, conceived or begotten); when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth." Where it is clear that what is to be understood is not wisdom in general or in the abstract, nor the essential wisdom of God, but personal wisdom, because mere personal things are said of her, e.g., she cries out, teaches, opens her lips, calls the sons of men, dwells with prudence, is present in learned thoughts, by her kings reign and princes decree justice, she is present with the Creator, plays before him, exhorts. c. 9, she builds a house, sacrifices victims, prepares a feast, etc. Nor does the brevity of the precepts permit a prosopopoeia to have a place here. The version of the LXX interpreters, ὁ κύριος ἔκτισε με (the Lord created me), can create no prejudice to the original text. It could also have happened that the seventy or the scribes, for ἐκτήσατο (possessed), used ἔκτισε (created), but in the same sense: possessed; since already of old κτ and κτ have been pronounced the same. For those who are begotten are also possessed; in which sense Eve in Gen. 4:1 said: "I have possessed or acquired a man, the Lord." This divine Filiation is also proven by Micah 5:2: "Out of thee, Bethlehem, shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity." Whence he is not only called Zemach, the Branch, Isa. 4:2; Jer. 23:5; C. 33:15; Zech. 3:8: "Behold, I will bring forth my servant the Zemach, the Branch;" Zech. 6:12: "Behold the Man whose name is The Zemach, the Branch;" but he is also called the Son of God, the Beloved, Matth. 3:17; Mark 1:11; Matth. 17:5: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him!" The only-begotten Son, John 1:18; c. 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9. The Son of the Highest, Luke 1:32; Mark 5:7. His own Son, Rom. 8:32. The Son of his love, Col. 1:13. By which amplifying additions this Son of God is sufficiently distinguished from other sons of God, such by right of creation or adoption, as are angels and men, and is preferred even to the angels: "who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his substance... being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." Heb. 1:3-4.

§.XIII.

No less is the Deity of Christ proven from the name *λόγος*, familiar to St. John, John 1:1-3: "In the beginning was the Word (*λόγος*), and the Word (*λόγος*) was with God, and the Word (*λόγος*) was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made," etc., and v. 14: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." And 1 John 1:1: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; This we declare unto you," etc., also 1 John 5:7 and Apoc. 19:13, to which some add Luke 1:2, Acts 20:32, and even Heb. 4:12.

St. John did not borrow this name from Zoroaster, the Orphics, Heraclitus, and especially Plato and the writings of the Platonists, which Amelius, the Platonist philosopher, seems to have persuaded himself, saying: "By Jove, this barbarian agrees with our Plato and Heraclitus that the Word of God is established in the order of a principle, and has transferred the mysteries of our master into his own book." Augustine also, in book 10 of *The City of God*, c. 29, reports that he had heard more than once from Simplicianus, bishop of Milan, that a certain Platonist had said that the beginning of the Gospel of John ought to be described in golden letters and proposed in conspicuous places of all churches. But it is so far from being the case that John borrowed the name *λόγος* from Plato, that, in inverted order, Plato and other gentile authors rather drew the word *λόγος* from the sacred books and Jewish writings, but in a perverted sense, which Christoph Sandius, an Arian, could not deny in his *Dissertation on the Logos*, p. 266, 281, 282. According to Plato, the *λόγος* is the idea of the world to be created, which he formed for himself before the creation of the world, and the exemplar of this visible world formed by the divine intellect, from which and according to which it is measured, not God, but inferior to God, the younger, lesser son of God, the world itself, the Soul of the World. See Seneca, *Ep.* 65. Which things certainly have nothing in common with the *λόγος* whom John describes to us. See Petavius, *Theologica Dogmata*, Tom. 2, lib. 1, c. 1, §.2, p. 2, & c. 2, §.2, p. 7; D. Hermann Witsius, *Miscellanea Sacra*, Tom. 2, Exerc. 3, §.10, p. 96; Arthur Bury, *Latitudinarius Orthodoxus*, Part 2, p. 58, 59; and Dn. D. Samuel Strimesius in *Dyodecas Theologicarum Annotationum*, 3, in *Controversia Remonstrantium*, §. 4, 5, p. 7, 9 ff.

The Stoics, by *λόγος* or Reason, understood God himself as the efficient cause of the world: for they divided nature into two things, as Diogenes Laertius reports in his *Life of Zeno*, Sect. 134, so that one was the efficient (*τὸ ποιοῦν*) and the other the patient (*τὸ πάσχον*); or, as Cicero calls it in *Academica*, Quæst. 1. 1, that which presents itself to this (the efficient), from which something is made. In that which makes, they thought there was force; in that which is made, a certain matter, but in both, both. For neither could matter itself cohere if it were not contained by any force, nor force without some matter. Seneca explains this mind of the Stoics clearly in *Ep.* 65: "Our Stoics say that there are two things in nature from which all things are made: cause and matter. Matter lies inert, a thing ready for all things, which will cease if no one moves it. But cause, that is, reason, forms matter and turns it wherever it wills. From it, it produces various works. There must therefore be that from which something is made, then that by which it is made: this is the cause, that the

matter." After a few things: "We ask what is the cause; a creative reason; that is, God," etc., and finally: "Indeed, all things consist of matter and of God." Add Lactantius, l. 7, *Divinae Institutiones*, c. 3.

Since, therefore, St. John received this name neither from Zoroaster, nor from Hermes Trismegistus, nor from Pythagoras, nor from Plato, nor from the Stoics, it remains that he had this name from the Word of God and the prophetic writings, which proceeded from the Holy Spirit, and that he used it the more willingly because it was known, customary, and pleasing both to the Jews (both from the Hebrew codex, in which *דבר* occurs, and from the Chaldaic paraphrases, in which there is frequent mention of *מִמְרָא*, as the places collected by Buxtorf, Grotius, Georg Vechner, Rittangel, Witsius, and others, teach) and to the gentile writers.

But what is understood here is not the *λόγος προφορικός*, the external, uttered speech or word, nor the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*, the internal, mental word, which denotes either reason itself or the faculty of thinking, or actual thought, which is, as it were, a certain silent speech of the mind; nor the *λόγος ἐπουσιώδης*, a word as it were accidental, which is conceived by way of an accident and quality and is expressed by a decree; but the *λόγος οὐσιώδης ὑποστατικός*, the substantial, personal Word, which all the things predicated of this *λόγος* in John 1:1 ff. prove. And by it the Son of God is signified, both by reason of his prophetic office, because he is the legate, interpreter, mouth, and orator of the Father, announcing the divine will to men, which the Socinians alone will have; and also by reason of his divine person, because he is the eternal wisdom of the Father, not essential, but hypostatic. Concerning which *λόγος*, Tertullian writes: "This we have learned was brought forth from God, and by being brought forth was generated, and therefore is called the Son of God and God from the unity of substance: for God is also Spirit. Even when a ray is extended from the sun, it is a portion of the whole, but the sun will be in the ray, because the sun is the ray, and the substance is not separated, but extended." The same author elsewhere: "We say he was brought forth from the Father, not separated." And indeed the Son of God is called *λόγος* 1. with respect to the mode of production, because of the eternal emanation from the Father, as a word naturally emanates from the mind. 3. [sic] with respect to representation, because as the word represents the mind, so the Son represents and declares the Father. 4. with respect to conjunction, because as the word is most closely united with the mind, so the Son is with the Father. Which Nazianzen, in Oration 2 on the Son, which is the 4th on Theology, thus expressed: "It seems to me that he is called *λόγος*, because he is to the Father as speech is to the mind, not only because of a generation free of passion, but also because of the conjunction and the power of enunciating, because he is the image and character of the Father who begot him, who exhibits the whole Father in himself, as speech represents the whole thought of the mind." Basil the Great has similar things on the beginning of the Gospel of John. From which the deity of the Son appears.

§.XIV.

In the Old Testament, a singular Angel appeared to the Patriarchs, who in Gen. 48:16 is called the Angel Goel or Redeemer; in Isa. 63:9, the Angel of the presence of God (cf. with Exod. 23:20); and who was the monitor and guest of Abraham in Gen. 18:1 ff.; the rescuer of Lot in Gen. 19:18; the deliverer of Isaac from intended death in Gen. 22:11; the wrestler with Jacob in Gen. 32:24; the redeemer of Jacob in Gen. 48:16; the inhabitant of the bush in Exod. 3:2; the leader of the Israelites through the desert into the land of Canaan in Exod. 13:21-22, C. 14:19-20, C. 23:20; the lawgiver on Mount Sinai in Acts 7:38; etc., etc. Concerning whom it is asked: whether he was a created or uncreated angel? The modern Jews do not admit the great angel Metatron, concerning whom there is an illustrious passage in R. Bechai, and will have it that a created angel appeared. The most ancient doctors of the primitive Church, Justin, Chrysostom, Hilary, Novatian, Ambrose, Leo, understood an uncreated angel, and therefore the Son of God himself, who in a prelude to the incarnation appeared immediately to the patriarchs in a certain appropriate form: whose opinion the Synod of Sirmium so approved that it pronounced an anathema on those who dissented: "If anyone affirms that not the Son wrestled with Jacob as a man, but the unbegotten God, or the Father himself, let him be anathema!" in Socrates, Hist. Eccl. l. 2, c. 25, p. 582. But when the Arians turned this opinion to their own advantage, and from this mission and appearance of the Son of God inferred not only inequality and minority, but also a different essence of the Son from the Father, the later Fathers, Athanasius, Cyril, Jerome, Augustine, Fulgentius, Gregory the Great, in order to oppose the Arians more strongly, said that the Son of God appeared to the patriarchs not immediately, but mediately, and not only the Son, but also the Father and the Holy Spirit (because the works of the Trinity ad extra are indivisible), through an angel. Which opinion was afterward approved everywhere by the doctors of the Roman Church, besides the Jews; also from the Lutheran theologians, D. Georg Calixtus and D. Christoph Dreier; to whom some from the Reformed add Calvin, Peter Martyr, Wolfgang Musculus, Zwingli. The Photinians, Socinians, and Remonstrants also will have it that not the Son of God, but an angel, and sometimes angels, appeared to the patriarchs. All of whom also urge the passages of Scripture: Hos. 12:3-4, Acts 7:30, 35, 53, Gal. 3:19, Heb. 2:2, C. 13:2, C. 1:1-2. See D. Dreier, Erörterung, Qu. 3, p. 116, 117. But to all these is opposed this argument: to whichever angel are attributed the names, attributes, divine works, and the worship of religious invocation and adoration, he is an uncreated angel, and therefore the Son of God. A. To that angel who appeared to the patriarchs are attributed divine names, etc., and worship, etc., which can be seen in the cited places. E.

§.XV.

Besides the names derived both from the essence and from the office, the deity of the Son of God is proven by the divine attributes, which are really the same as the divine essence; such as 1. Eternity, which is ascribed to Christ in Isa. 9:6, where he is called the Father of Eternity. John 1:1: "In the beginning was the Word." Prov. 8:22: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before he did anything from the beginning: I was anointed from eternity and from of old, before the earth was made." Micah 5:2: "His goings forth are from the beginning, from the days of eternity." John 8:58: "Before Abraham was, I am," which is not to be explained thus: "Before Abraham became Abraham," i.e., the father of many

nations, "I am the Messiah;" for the debate between Christ and the Jews was about the existence of Christ, not who or what kind of person Christ was or would be. Apoc. 1:8: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord God, which is, and which was, and which is to come." also c. 11:17. John 17:5: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Col. 1:17: "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Heb. 7:3: "Having neither beginning of days, nor end of life." v. 16, he is said to be a priest after the power of an endless life. v. 24, he abideth for ever. C. 9:14, he offered himself through the eternal Spirit. c. 13:8: "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever." To this can be referred the fact that the Jews in the Talmudic tractates Pesachim, c. 4, and Nedarim, c. 4, refer the name of the Messiah among those seven things that were before this world was created.

2. Immutability: From Ps. 102:27-28; Heb. 1:12: "Thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." Heb. 13:8.
3. Omnipresence. Matth. 18:20: "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." C. 28:20: "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." John 3:13: "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." Hebr. 7:26: "For such an high priest became us,... made higher than the heavens."
4. Omniscience. John 2:25: "And needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man." John 21:17: "Lord, thou knowest all things." Prov. 8 & 9, he is called the Wisdom of the Father. Matth. 11:19: "But wisdom is justified of her children." Luke 11:49, cf. with Matth. 23:34: The Wisdom of God says, "I send unto you prophets and apostles," which in Matthew is thus: "I send unto you prophets, and wise men." Matth. 9:4, he saw the thoughts of men. Matth. 11:27, he knows the Father. John 3:11, 32, he saw what he testifies. John 5:19-20, he sees what the Father does. Apoc. 2:23, he searches the reins and hearts. Heb. 4:13, "neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight."
5. Omnipotence. Apoc. 1, v. 8, he is called *παντοκράτωρ*, the Almighty. Heb. 1:3, "upholding all things by the word of his power." John 5:17, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." V. 19, 20, 21, he does what he sees the Father do, and "as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." Phil. 3:21, he is able to subdue all things unto himself. He showed this omnipotence by miracles. cf. also Isa. 11:2.
6. Sanctity. Isa. 6:3: "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts," cf. with John 12:41, "These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him." Dan. 9:24: "Seventy weeks are determined... to anoint the most Holy." John 10:36, the Father sanctified him. Rom. 1:4, "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness." Heb. 2:11: "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one."
7. MAJESTY AND GLORY, John 17:5: "glorify thou me, O Father, with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Apoc. 5:12: "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing."

II. Divine works prove the deity of Christ. 1. Creation: Ps. 33:6: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens created." from Ps. 102, Hebr. 1:10: "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands." John 1:3: "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." Col. 1:16: "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." 2. Conservation: John 5:17: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." Col. 1:17: "by him all things consist." Heb. 1:3: "upholding all things by the word of his power." 1 Cor. 8:6. 3. The performing of miracles. The work of Redemption: Isa. 54:5: "he that made thee shall rule over thee; the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called." John 17:10: "all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them." Sponson: Hebr. 7:22: "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament." Election, Eph. 1:4: "God hath chosen us in him." John 13:18: "I know whom I have chosen." Redemption, Hos. 13:14: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction." Zach. 9:11. Calling, Mark 16:15; Matth. 28:19; Luke 24:47. Institution of the sacraments, Matth. 28:19; C. 26:26-27; 1 Cor. 11:23. Justification, Isa. 53:11: "by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many." Remission of sins, Matth. 9:6: "the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." Protection of the Church, Matth. 16:18: "upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." John 10:28: "neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." Salvation, Acts 4:12.

III. Hence also divine honor and worship is attributed to Christ. Ps. 2:11-12: "Serve the Lord with fear... Kiss the Son." John 5:23: "That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him." Heb. 1:6: "And let all the angels of God worship him." Philipp. 2:9-11: "God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow," etc. Apoc. 5:12-14: "Worthy is the Lamb... to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing," etc. Hence in Luke 24:52, the Apostles worshipped Christ. Acts 7:59, Stephen said: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Acts 9:14, Christians are described as "all that call on thy name." Matth. 28:19, the faithful are baptized in his name. John 3:15-16; c. 12:36; c. 14:1, we must believe in Christ. 1 Cor. 16:22: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha." The Blessed D. Christoph Becmann has solidly vindicated these passages of Scripture from the exceptions of the Antitrinitarians in his first seventeen Theological Exercises, which see.

§.XVI.

From what has been said, it is established in what sense the Son of God can or cannot be called *Αυτόθεος* (God of himself). Namely, the word *Αυτόθεος* either signifies the true, the very, the self-same God, who has an essence which is of itself, not derived from elsewhere; or it signifies God from himself. In the former sense, it is clearly evident from the

arguments brought forward that the Son of God is *Αυτόθεος*. In the latter sense, however, the Son of God is not *Αυτόθεος*, because He is not God from himself, but begotten of God the Father, and because the Father communicated the divine essence, affected by the mode of subsistence of the Son, to the Son. Whence the Nicene Council calls the Son God of God, Light of Light, by argument of the passages John 5:26: "the Father hath given to the Son to have life in himself." John 6:57: "I live by the Father." John 7:29: "I know him: for I am from him." c. 8:28: "as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." and "I speak that which I have seen with my Father." Matth. 11:27: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father." This was the constant doctrine of the Catholic Fathers, as D. George Bull observes in his *Defense of the Nicene Faith*, Sect. 4, §. 7, 8 ff., p. 439 ff.

In the former sense, John Calvin and Beza called the Son *Αυτόθεος* against Valentinus Gentilis, for which reason Genebrardus, Wilhelmus Lindanus, Peter Canisius, and others, and after them Dionysius Petavius in *Theologica Dogmata*, Tom. 2, de Trin. lib. 6, c. 11, §. 5 ff., p. 618 ff., vexed them and fashioned them as authors of the heresy of the Autotheans. and Cap. 12, p. 623. But Bellarmine himself frankly acknowledged and asserted Calvin's innocence in lib. 2, de Christo, c. 19, p. 346, saying: "But although these things are so, yet when I examine the matter itself, and diligently consider Calvin's opinions, I do not easily dare to pronounce that he was in this error. For he teaches that the Son is from himself with respect to the essence, not with respect to the person, and he seems to say well that the person is begotten of the Father, the essence is not begotten, nor produced, but is from itself, so that, if you remove from the person of the Son the relation to the Father, only the essence remains, which is from itself." which he then proves by producing Calvin's words from *Institutes*, lib. 1, c. 13, §. 13, 19, 23, 25, although, as to the mode of speaking, he judges him undoubtedly to have erred. *Ibid.* c. 5, p. 326, on a related matter he says: "Would that Calvin always erred thus!" nor does he assert anything to the contrary in his *Recognition*. Petavius disapproves of this moderation of Bellarmine towards Calvin's opinion in *Theol. Dogm.* Tom. 2, lib. 6, c. 11, §. 5, p. 618. Jacob Arminius, in a letter to Joh. Uytenbogaert, which is extant in *Epistolae Praestantium ac Eruditorum Virorum*, Ep. 44, p. 58 ff., considers the formula of speech to be simply rejected as akin to the Sabellian heresy, as does George Bull in *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*, sect. 4, §. 7, 8, p. 439, 440.

§.XVII.

III. The dogma of the Holy Trinity is proved by the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit. The Antitrinitarians deny that the Holy Spirit is a divine person, who will have the Holy Spirit to be a virtue, breath, inspiration, breeze, agitation, and quality of God; and they call him, inasmuch as he remains in God as his internal and immanent Spirit, the natural virtue of God, which is to be conceived like a fountain; but inasmuch as he is given by God to the faithful and flows from God into men, a mediate virtue or intermediate quality, which has the nature of an effect and a gift. See Joh. Crellius, *Prolegomena to the Tractatus de Spiritu S. qui Fidelibus datur*, and *ibid.* c. 3, p. 141; also his book *de Deo & Attributis divinis*, c. 22, p. 158, and Volkelius, *de Vera Religione*, l. 5, c. 14, p. 492 ff. Truly paradoxical is the problem of Christoph Sandius: "Whether the genus of holy angels can be understood by

the Holy Spirit?" We believe the Holy Spirit to be a divine person, the third in order, produced from the Father and the Son by one eternal and indivisible act of spiration, i.e., by the communication of the same essence in number, in an incomprehensible manner, who as he proceeds from eternity from the Father and the Son, so in time is sent by both into the hearts of the faithful to be sanctified and regenerated.

Whose personality we prove 1. from personal names, such as God, Lord, to be adduced in the following section. Paraclete, John 14:16: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him." v. 26: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," where the heterosis of genders is to be noted: παράκλητος... τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... ἐκεῖνος διδάξει (the Comforter... the Holy Spirit... He shall teach). also John 15:26: ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος... τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας... ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει (when the Comforter is come... the Spirit of truth... He shall testify), which always indicates a person. c. 16:7: "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come." Witness, 1 John 5:7: "For there are three that bear witness in heaven." 2. from personal properties, such as here are, to proceed, to be sent, to come. Intelligence or intellect, 1 Cor. 2:10: "the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." Will, 1 Cor. 12:11: "But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." 3. from personal acts or works, e.g., he creates, Gen. 1:2, Ps. 33:6. He teaches, John 14:26: "He shall teach you all things." He testifies, John 15:26: "He shall testify of me." he confers various gifts, 1 Cor. 12:11. Rom. 8:16: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." V. 26: "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." He speaks through the prophets, 2 Pet. 1:21: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Acts 13:2: "the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." To explain all these things by prosopopoeia would be violent. 4. From personal appearances, such as is described in Matth. 3:16, Luke 3:22, where the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon Jesus, and Acts 2, on the day of Pentecost. 5. From axioms inferring a person, such as Matth. 28:19, where we are commanded to be baptized in the name of the Holy Spirit equally as in the name of the Father and the Son. He is invoked, 2 Cor. 13:13: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." He is sinned against, Isa. 63:10, where the Israelites are said to have vexed the Holy Spirit. Matth. 12:31-32, the irremissible blasphemy can be committed against him. Acts 5:3, Ananias and Sapphira lied to the Holy Spirit. But he against whom one sins is a person. John 14:16, C. 15:26, C. 16:13, 27; Matth. 3:16, he is another from the Father and the Son, sent by both; all of which infer a person.

§.XVIII.

II. The Holy Spirit is not only a person but a divine person and therefore is God, which is proven against the Jews, Macedonians, Arians, Samosatensians, Photinians, and Socinians. 1. From the divine names. ...[Isaiah 6:9-10] "he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed"... which, in Acts 28:25-26, Paul teaches that the Holy Spirit said through Isaiah the prophet. Exod. 17:1, 7, cf. with Ps. 95:7-8, the Israelites tempted Jehovah in the desert at Massah and Meribah; which in Heb. 3:7, 9 & c. 4:3, 8 is referred to the Holy Spirit. 2 Sam. 23:2, David says: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue; the God of Israel said to me, the Rock of Israel spake, he that ruleth over men, a just ruler in the fear of God." Luke 1:68, 70: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel... as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began." But Peter, 2 Epist. 1:21, teaches that holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. 2. From the name of God. Acts 5:3-4: "Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost... thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." 1 Cor. 3:16: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" From the name of the Lord, 1 Cor. 12:4-6: "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all." 2 Cor. 3:17: "Now the Lord is that Spirit."

II. From the divine attributes. 1. Eternity. Gen. 1:2: In the beginning of creation, the Spirit was hovering over the waters. Heb. 9:14: "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works," etc. John 15:26: The Holy Spirit proceeds or emanates from the Father. 2. Omnipresence. Ps. 139:7: "Whither shall I go from thy spirit?" "If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there," etc. Rom. 8:9: The Holy Spirit dwells in you. 3. Omniscience. 1 Cor. 2:10: "the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." V. 11: "the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." John 16:13: "the Spirit of truth... will guide you into all truth." 4. Omnipotence. Isa. 11:2, where he is called the Spirit of might, and Luke 11:20, where he is called the finger of God, and Luke 1:35, where he is called the power of the Highest. 5. Supreme liberty. 1 Cor. 12:11: "But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." 6. Goodness and mercy. Ps. 143:10: "thy spirit is good; lead me into the land of uprightness." Neh. 9:20: "Thou gavest also thy good spirit to instruct them."

III. From the divine works. 1. Creation. Gen. 1:2; Ps. 33:6; Job 26:13: "By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens." 2. Conservation. Job 33:4: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." 3. Christ's anointing. Isa. 61:1: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me," which Christ applies to himself in Luke 4:18. 4. The working of miracles. Matth. 12:28: "if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God," cf. with Luke 11:20: "if I with the finger of God cast out devils." Acts 2:4: "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." 1 Cor. 12:4, 11: "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit... to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits;

to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues: But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." also Rom. 15:18-19. 5. The mission of prophets and ministers. Acts 13:2: "the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Acts 28:25: "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers." Acts 20:28: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God." 6. Operations in the Church. 1. Illumination. John 14:26: "the Holy Ghost... shall teach you all things." John 16:13: "the Spirit of truth... will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come." Ps. 143:10: "thy spirit is good; lead me into the land of uprightness." Joel 2:28: "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh," etc. John 20:22: "he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." 1 Cor. 12:3: "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." 2. Regeneration. John 3:5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Ps. 51:10: "renew a right spirit within me." V. 11: "take not thy holy spirit from me." Tit. 3:5, he is called the "Spirit of renewal." 3. Justification. 1 Cor. 6:11: "ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." 4. Adoption, whence in Rom. 8:15 he is called the "Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." 5. Consolation, hence the name Paraclete, John 14:16, 26; c. 16:7. 6. Resurrection. Rom. 8:11: "shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." 7. Glorification. Eph. 4:30: "grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."

IV. From divine honor and worship. 1. Consecration in his name, made in our baptism, Matth. 28:19, whence in 1 Cor. 3:16 and c. 6:19-20, the faithful are called temples of the Holy Spirit, because they are a house sacred to his perpetual worship. 2. Faith in the Holy Spirit: for as we have been baptized into the Holy Spirit, so in the Apostles' Creed we profess that we believe in the Holy Spirit. But he in whom we must believe is God, Jer. 17:5. 3. Invocation, 2 Cor. 13:13: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." Apoc. 1:4-5: "Grace be unto you, and peace... from the seven Spirits." 4. Adoration. Isa. 6:3: "the seraphim cried, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God," which in Acts 28:25-26 is transferred to the Holy Spirit. By which example the Christian Church has invoked and adored the Holy Spirit in the hymn of the Holy Spirit, Veni Creator Spiritus, and also Veni Sancte Spiritus. 5. The gravity of sin and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Isa. 63:10: The Israelites "rebelled, and vexed his holy Spirit." Matth. 12:31-32: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven... And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Acts 5:3, 5: Ananias and Sapphira were struck dead because they had lied to the Holy Spirit. Heb. 10:29: "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy... who hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace." These testimonies of Scripture brilliantly prove the deity of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son, and therefore the Most Holy Trinity. And from these it is also clear what is to be thought of the opinion of certain Roman Catholics,

Hosius, Cochlaeus, Melchior Canus, Possevinus, the Jesuit collocutors at the Colloquy of Ratisbon, Coppenstein, Hieronymus a Sancto Hyacintho, Peravius, Masenius, Nihusius and others, that the dogma of the Trinity is sought not so much from Scripture as from ecclesiastical tradition. Namely, although this can be admitted concerning many scholastic questions, and concerning certain ecclesiastical words and phrases, it is in no way to be conceded concerning the dogma itself.

§.XIX.

Among the divine persons there is an order, both in subsisting and in operating; which, however, is not 1. of nature, because the divine persons are *ὁμοούσιοι* (consubstantial), of the same essence; nor 2. of time, because they are *συναιῖδιοι* (coeternal); nor 3. of dignity, because they are *ἰσότημοι* (equal, of the same honor); but of origin and relation. The order in subsisting results from the diverse manner in which these divine persons have the same essence in number; for the Father has it from himself, as the principle, fount, and origin of the Trinity, and hence is the first person of the Godhead, neither begotten nor proceeding, who from eternity begot the Son consubstantial with himself, and with the Son spirated the Holy Spirit, consubstantial and coeternal with himself, by an eternal, ineffable spiration, and in an ineffable manner produced him, creator and conserver of all things, together with the Son and the Holy Spirit, sending the Son as Redeemer, and the Holy Spirit as Sanctifier, who proceeds from both.

The Son, however, has the same divine essence from the Father through eternal generation, and hence is the second person of the Godhead, from the Father from eternity, truly and properly, yet hyperphysically begotten, sent by the Father and the Spirit into the earth for the redemption of the human race, with the Father sending the Holy Spirit who proceeds from both.

The Holy Spirit, however, has his essence from the Father and the Son, through eternal spiration; hence he is the third person of the Godhead, from the Father and the Son, by the communication of the same essence in number, by one indivisible eternal act, ineffably emanating or proceeding; sent by the Father and the Son in time into the hearts of the faithful to sanctify them. This order is indicated in the precept of baptism, Matth. 28:19, and 1 John 5:7.

The order in operating or acting follows the order in subsisting, and therefore the Father acts from himself, the Son from the Father, the Holy Spirit from both; and in the sacred letters it is indicated by the distinctive particles *A* or *Ex* (from), *Per* (through), and *In* (in); of which the first, *Ex*, is attributed to the Father, *διὰ*, *Per*, to the Son, and *ἐν*, *In*, to the Holy Spirit, while preserving the equality of the persons. Thus Rom. 11:36: "For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things." 1 Cor. 8:6: "we have one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." John 1:3: "All things were made by him." Heb. 1:2: "by whom also he made the worlds." Concerning the Holy Spirit, the preposition *ἐν*, *In*, is used in 2 Thess. 2:13: "God hath...

chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." But just as that natural order of the divine persons is not always observed, but an arbitrary one is sometimes used, which happens in 2 Cor. 13:13: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all," and Apoc. 1:4-5, where the Holy Spirit is placed before the Son: so also these prepositions are sometimes interchanged. Thus *διὰ*, Per, is attributed to the Father in Rom. 6:4, 1 Cor. 1:9, Heb. 2:10; *ἐκ*, Ex, to the Son in John 16:15; *ἐν*, In, to the Son in Col. 1:14, 16; *εἰς*, to, *ibid.* v. 16; *ἐν*, In, to the Father and the Son in Jude v. 1.

The characteristic property of the Father is either *ad intra* or *ad extra*; *ad intra* it is *ἀγεννησία*, being unbegotten, which is conceived either negatively, and excludes every mode of origin or procession from another person, or positively and affirmatively, and implies Paternity, according to which the Father is from himself, and has begotten the Son and with the Son has spirated the Holy Spirit. *Ad extra* it is the creation and conservation of the world. The relation of the Father to the second person is active generation; to the third person, active spiration. The characteristic property of the Son *ad intra* is *γέννησις*, generation, which implies a twofold relation, one of which is to the Father, passive generation; the other to the Holy Spirit, active spiration. *Ad extra* it is the redemption of the human race. The characteristic property of the Holy Spirit *ad intra* is passive spiration or *ἐκπόρευσις*, procession from the Father and the Son, the consequence of which is his mission from the Father and the Son in time; *ad extra* it is the sanctification of the faithful.

§.XX.

The Greeks, from the age of Theodoret, will have it that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son; the Latins, from the Father and the Son; with whom the Protestants deservedly agree, 1. because he is sent equally by the Son as by the Father. John 15:26, Christ says: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." John 16:7: "if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." For the temporal mission is a manifestation of the eternal procession and emanation. 2. because in the same way that the Holy Spirit is called with respect to the Father in Ps. 33:6, "the Spirit of the Lord's mouth," Job 33:4, "the breath of the Almighty," Matth. 10:20 & c. 12:18, "the Spirit of the Father," 1 Cor. 2:12, "the Spirit which is of God," he is called with respect to the Son in Isa. 11:4, "the spirit of the Messiah's lips," 2 Thess. 2:8, "the spirit of Christ's mouth," Gal. 4:6, "the Spirit of the Son": "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Rom. 8:9, "the Spirit of Christ": "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." 3. because Christ in time breathed the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles, John 20:22, saying: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." 4. because the Holy Spirit hears and receives from the Son; John 16:13-14: "he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak... He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." 5. because all things that the Father has are also the Son's, John 16:15: "All things that the Father hath are mine." and John 17:10: "all thine are mine." 6. The *ὁμοουσία* of the divine persons and the reason of

the order among the persons of the Holy Trinity require it. 7. To this is added the consensus of the councils and of the more ancient Latin and Greek Fathers, which Bellarmine adduces in a long series in *Lib. 2, de Christo*, Capp. 23, 24, 25.

The first of the Greeks who asserted that the Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Son, nor through the Son, but from the Father alone, was Theodoret, in his *Refutation of the Anathemas of Cyril*, c. 9, being rather addicted to Nestorius, whose party, however, he eventually deserted. This error, having been dormant for some time, was revived by John of Damascus, but more obscurely, in *lib. 1, de Fide Orthodoxa*, c. 8, and afterwards by Theophylact, Archbishop of the Bulgars, on ch. 3 of John, on the words: "God giveth not the Spirit by measure," where he taught that the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of the Son, not because he proceeds from him, but because he is given to men through the Son. Also Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and others. Which opinion the Greeks then defended with such fervor that around the year 1052, in the time of Leo IX, they withdrew from the communion of the Roman Church and complained that the words "and the Son" (*Filioque*) had been added by the Latins to the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, whereas they, on the contrary, wish that this had been done by the Fathers of the Council of Constantinople.

Concerning which matter there was sharp dispute between the Latins and the Greeks in the Council of Gentilly, held in the 7th century, during the reign of Pepin. In the 8th century, the same controversy was aired in the Council of Aachen, where, however, the dispute was not so much about the dogma itself as about the mind of the Council of Constantinople. In the 10th century, it broke out again, with Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, manfully pleading the cause of the Latins against the Greeks. In the 12th century, in the Council of Lyons, which Thomas Aquinas attended, the Greeks seemed to have approved the opinion of the Latins; but not long after, the Greeks returned to their own disposition and pristine opinion. In the 15th century, namely in the year 1439, in the Council of Florence, with the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople consenting, it was defined that the Holy Spirit is eternally from the Father and the Son, and has his subsistent being from the Father and the Son simultaneously, and proceeds eternally from both as from one principle and by a single spiration; and at the same time it was declared that what the holy doctors and fathers said, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, tends to this understanding, that by this it is signified that the Son also is, according to the Greeks indeed a cause, but according to the Latins a principle of the subsistence of the Holy Spirit, just as the Father is. And since all things that are the Father's, the Father himself gave to his only-begotten Son in begetting him (except to be the Father), this very thing, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, the Son himself has eternally from the Father, from whom he is also eternally begotten. Nay, this was also defined there, that the explanation of those words ("and from the Son he proceeds") for the sake of declaring the truth, and because of the now imminent necessity, was lawfully or reasonably added to the Creed, in Carranza's *Summa Conciliorum*, p. 647-648. But from this transaction also the Orientals recoiled, and the more so because the Latins, from that

time, began to urge this dogma, as having been defined by the Pope, as an article of faith necessary to be believed, and to impose it on the Greeks for that reason. Cyril Lucaris himself also professed in his Confession of Faith, Cap. 1, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son.

Although we prefer the opinion of the Latins to the other, and approve it entirely, we do not, however, think that the opinion of the Greeks is to be condemned as heresy, nor that it is a sufficient cause for the schism, either begun or continued. And since the Father and the Son do not spirate the Holy Spirit as two diverse principles, but only as two persons concurring in the procession of the Holy Spirit with one virtue and spiration, numerically, it is clear that in this sense it is wrongly asserted that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, as if he proceeded principally from the Father, but less principally and secondarily from the Son. However, if by this phrase only the mode of subsisting and the personal order is indicated, according to which the Father is the principle, fount, and origin of the Godhead, from whom the Son also proceeds, in this sense, namely, as to the mode of subsisting and the order of procession, it would not be badly said, at least the phrase, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, is to be excused.

§.XXI.

No one denies that there is some difference between the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit; but what that difference is, is safely unknown. Besides Durandus, who affirmed that the divine processions, namely generation and procession, are immediately from the essence of God, so that it itself is their immediate principle, the Scholastics promiscuously teach that generation happens through an act of the intellect, procession through an act of the will, whence the Son is called Wisdom and Word, the Holy Spirit Love or Charity and Gift. To which Athanasius, Cyril, Chrysostom, Basil, Nazianzen, Theodoret, Augustine, Damascenus, Anselm gave a prelude; and whom Melancthon and Keckermann followed; but Martin Chemnitz excused them in his Judgment on Certain Controversies concerning Certain Articles of the Augsburg Confession. But, besides the fact that Scripture is silent here, that opinion is also pressed by this difficulty: if the Father, by beholding or understanding himself, formed an image of himself, i.e., begot the Son, and from that image a mutual love resulted back to the Father, then the Son and the Holy Spirit, similarly, by forming an image of themselves, must be said to have generated a Son: by which reasoning more persons could be feigned and a progression ad infinitum could be instituted. Therefore, one must be sober here, and the saying of Ambrose must be held here: "It is not fitting for a servant to inquire into the birth of the Lord, and it is permitted to know that the Son was born, it is not permitted to know how he was born." And Nazianzen: "The generation of God is to be honored with silence," etc. Meanwhile, our theologians place the difference between generation and procession in three things: 1. with respect to the principle, because the Son emanates from the Father alone, the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. 2. with respect to the mode, because the Son is produced and proceeds through generation, which terminates not only in personality, but also in likeness, on account of which he is called the image of the Father, and according to which the Son at the same time

receives the property of communicating the same essence with the third person. The Holy Spirit, however, emanates through spiration and procession, which terminates only in personality, and by which the proceeding person does not receive the property of communicating his essence with another. 3. with respect to order, because just as the Son is the second, the Holy Spirit is the third person of the Godhead, so generation, in the sign of reason, precedes spiration, and spiration follows generation, although in reality they are coeternal.

§.XXII.

The sacred letters teach that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are one. John 5:18: "the Jews sought the more to kill Jesus... because he said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." John 10:29-30: "I and my Father are one." John 14:1: "ye believe in God, believe also in me." v. 7: "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him." v. 9-10: "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?" c. 16:15: "All things that the Father hath are mine." c. 17:10: "all mine are thine, and thine are mine." v. 11: "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are." 1 John 5:7: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." Phil. 2:6.

Nevertheless, they are distinguished among themselves, but differently from the essence, and differently from one another. From the essence not really, i.e., essentially as thing and thing, as Peter and John, the soul and the body really differ; nor properly modally; but by a distinction of reason which has a foundation in reality, according to the Thomists; or formally and from the nature of the thing, according to the Scotists. In the distinction of the divine persons from one another, two extremes, as two rocks, are to be avoided. 1. Sabellianism, so called from Sabellius of Pentapolis, who arose around A.D. 260, whom Praxeas the Asiatic and Hermogenes the African followed, also Michael Servetus, who feigned the three persons to be three names, and various effects of one person. 2. Tritheism, of Philoponus and Valentinus Gentilis, who established three eternal, but unequal spirits, the Father the essentiator, the Son and the Holy Spirit the essentiated. Against whom the Orthodox teach that the divine persons are distinguished from one another, not modally and personally (for the question always remains, what kind of personal distinction that is) but really: for there are Three: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Also, one and another; John 5:32: "There is another that beareth witness of me." John 14:16: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter," where there is one who asks, one who is asked, and one who is sent.

§.XXIII.

The attributes of this mystery are I. Sublimity: for it is beyond being, beyond reason, and beyond all comprehension; and therefore to be wondered at, not searched into; to be

believed, not vexed; to be adored, not scrutinized. II. Necessity. John 5:23; c. 14; c. 17:3; 1 John 2:23. III. Truth. See §.9, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18.

§.XXIV.

The infidels, Jews, and Mohammedans, who laugh at this mystery, oppose themselves.

§.XXV.

Similarly other Antitrinitarians: Ebionites, Corinthians, Samosatenians, Arians, who were either Anomoeans or pure Arians, also called Aetians and Eunomians; or Semi-Arians; or Acacians; Photinians, Socinians, etc. The scholastic theologians are indeed orthodox here, but with their curious and thorny questions, they obscure this mystery rather than illustrate and declare it.

§.XXVI.

It is our part to venerate the Triune God in spirit and in truth, and in mutual charity, according to our baptismal promise, so that, having been made one with each other, just as these Three are one, we may at last be joined to this Triune God eternally!

FINIS.